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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] – [26] submitted to agenda item 8.6.1.3 and captures this email discussion on duplex operation for RedCap:

|  |
| --- |
| [106-e-NR-R17-RedCap-03] Email discussion regarding aspects related to duplex operation – Chao (Qualcomm)   * 1st check point: 8/19 * 2nd check point: 8/24 * Final check: 8/27 |

The final FLS from the previous RAN1 meeting can be found in [27]. The issues that are in the focus of the first round of discussion in this meeting are furthermore tagged FL8.

The issues in this document are tagged and color coded with High Priority or Medium Priority.

# Collision handling for Case 5

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

|  |
| --- |
| Working assumption:   * If a dynamically scheduled UL transmission overlaps with an SSB, down-select one of the following options:   + Option 1: Follow the handling of case 2 that dynamic UL is prioritized over SSB   + Option 2: Reuse the existing collision handling principles of Rel-15/16 for NR TDD that SSB is prioritized over dynamic UL   + Option 3: Leave to UE implementation whether to receive the SSB or transmit the UL transmission   + Other options are not precluded * If a semi-static configured UL transmission overlaps with an SSB, down-select from the following options:   + Option 1: Up to gNB configuration to avoid such collision and if it happens it is an error case   + Option 2: Reuse the existing collision handling principles of Rel-15/16 for NR TDD that SSB is prioritized over semi-static UL   + Option 3: Leave to UE implementation whether to receive the SSB or transmit the UL transmission   + Other options are not precluded * FFS: whether/how to account for Tx/Rx switching time before and after the set of SSB symbols * FFS: whether or not the semi-static configured UL transmission includes a valid RO |

## SSB overlaps with dynamically scheduled UL transmission

For the case of SSB overlaps with dynamically scheduled UL transmission, companies’ views are summarized in Table 2.1-1.

**Table 2.1-1: Views on collision handling for SSB overlaps with dynamically scheduled UL transmission**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Index | Description | Companies | # of Companies |
| Option 1 | Follow the handling of case 2 that dynamic UL is prioritized over SSB | Ericsson, vivo, Nokia, CATT, China Telecom, CMCC, ASUSTeK (1st choice), WILUS | 8 |
| Option 2 | Reuse the existing collision handling principles of Rel-15/16 for NR TDD that SSB is prioritized over dynamic UL | Spreadtrum (2nd choice), Samsung (2nd choice), NordicSemi, OPPO, QC, LG, Intel, Apple, DoCoMo, Xiaomi (2nd choice), Panasonic, ASUSTeK (2nd choice) | 12 |
| Option 3 | Leave to UE implementation whether to receive the SSB or transmit the UL transmission | Spreadtrum (1st choice), Samsung (1st choice), Apple (2nd choice), Xiaomi (1st choice) | 4 |

Another option that differentiates Msg3 or Msg3 re-transmission with other dynamically scheduled UL transmission was proposed in contribution [ZTE08]. That is, if the dynamically scheduled UL transmission happens during RA procedure, the dynamically scheduled UL transmission is prioritized; otherwise, the SSB reception is prioritized.

From the above, Option 1 and 2 receives relatively more support. Specific comments regarding benefits, advantages, drawbacks, concerns and impacts for each of the options in the RAN1#104bis-e agreement are summarized below.

**Option 1: dynamic UL is prioritized over SSB**

Benefits/advantages:

* Additional flexibility for scheduler and is consistent with principle of dynamic scheduling [Ericsson04, CATT10]
* With this option, gNB can still avoid scheduling UL overlapping with SSB [Ericsson04]

Drawbacks/concerns/impacts:

* Will have impact on time and frequency tracking loop at the UE side since UE [ZTE08, Apple19]
* UE may not be able to monitor the overlapped SSB and meet RAN4 RRM timeline [Qualcomm14]
* Risk of introducing more complicated rule for multiplexing between UL channels if different collision handling rules are considered for dynamic and semi-static UL [Samsung09]

**Option 2: SSB is prioritized over dynamic UL**

Benefits/advantages:

* Minimum spec change [Xiaomi23, Spreadtrum07]

Drawbacks/concerns/impacts:

* Lack of flexibility [Ericsson04]

**Option 3: Leave to UE implementation**

Benefits/advantages:

* UE can make the decision based on RRM measurement implementation [Apple19]

Drawbacks/concerns/impacts:

* Increased detection complexity at gNB [vivo05]

**FL1 High Priority Question 2.1-1:**

* **Companies are invited to comment whether and what additional speficiation work are needed to adress the potential risk or concern for each option in the above, in particular regarding whether it is necessary to consider a unified solution to handle all the subcases of Case 5?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| vivo |  | As dynamic scheduled UL transmission is UE specific and fully controlled by gNB, if we allow such collision (SSB v.s. dynamic scheduled UL transmission), the dynamic scheduled UL transmission should be prioritized, i.e., option 1, otherwise, there seems no point to allow such collision to happen i.e. option 2 (gNB can avoid scheduling UL transmission over the SSB symbols). Option 3 is not a good way forward as gNB will not try to schedule UL transmission over SSB symbols if the UE reaction is not predictable.  Therefore, if there is no agreement between option 1 and option 2, we would propose to make such collision case as error case.  In addition, we do not think it is necessary to have a unified solution to handle the collision for the configured UL Tx vs SSB, and the collision for dynamic UL Tx vs. SSB. In Rel-15, UE behaviour is different for DL/UL collisions that involving DG and CG. |
| CATT |  | Prefer to prioritize dynamically scheduled UL. In FDD cell, prioritizing dynamically scheduled UL transmission for HD-FDD does not introduce specification impact. Because the HD-FDD UE will transmit the dynamically scheduled UL regardless of overlapping with SSB or not, which is the same with FDD UEs.  But if SSB is prioritized over dynamically scheduled UL, the negative impact on UL resource utilization and flexibility is introduced. Also, the specification impact will arise (specifying dropping rule for dynamically scheduled UL in FDD cell). |
| Spreadtrum |  | Additional specification work For option 1: Our preference is option 3(1st choice) and option 2(2nd choice), we share the same view with other companies that option 1 may impact the T/F tracking loop or impact the RRM measurement at the UE side. To address this risk, the gNB needs to avoid such an overlapping, which means the dynamic UL will never overlap with SSB from UE side, it bring huge scheduling restriction to gNB.  A unified solution: From our perspective, we prefer to consider a unified solution to handle all the subcases of Case 5 since we do not see the need to have different solutions for those cases. Our top preference is “Leave to UE implementation”, but it seems that option 2 are majority supported, we can also accept option 2 “Reuse the existing collision handling principles…”. |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | Firstly, from our perspective, when Msg3 or Msg3 re-transmission or PUCCH for msg4 are not included in the dynamically scheduled UL transmission, we prefer Option 2, since it has the minimum spec change if it is used for HD-FDD RedCap UEs. Furthermore, in order to guarantee the successful transmission of the dynamical UL, gNB can avoid the collision by scheduling the dynamical UL on the resources which is not overlapped with SSB in time domain. So we think option 2 is flexible enough.  For Msg3 or Msg3 re-transmission or PUCCH for msg4 during random access procedure, if SSB is also prioritized when the collision happens, some problems/issues will occur:   1. *the RA procedure may be interrupted by not sending Msg3 or PUCCH for msg4 from UE. It results in the significant increase of access latency of RA procedure.* 2. *gNB can not avoid the collision by scheduling UL resources for Msg3 or PUCCH for msg4 that are not overlapped with SSB since there is no consensus on the early identification of HD-FDD RedCap UEs by separate PRACH resources. If not supporting earlier indication of HD-FDD RedCap UEs, in order to solve the collision, gNB should schedule UL resources for Msg3 or PUCCH for msg4 that are not overlapped with SSB whatever the UE is a HD-FDD RedCap UE or not. As a result, the average access latency of random access procedure for FD-FDD RedCap UEs will be increased.*   Therefore, for a dynamically scheduled UL transmission overlaps with an SSB, if the dynamically scheduled UL transmission includes Msg3 or Msg3 retransmission or PUCCH for msg4, they should be prioritized; otherwise, Option 2 is prioritized. |
| Ericsson |  | We prefer Option 1 as it provides scheduling flexibility which is consistent with the principle of dynamic scheduling. With this option, it is still possible that gNB can avoid scheduling dynamic UL overlapping with SSB occasions. In our view, the added flexibility is worth specifying a different collision handling behavior under Case 5. In term of specification work, it is possible to expand the collision handling rule in Case 2 to include SSB as part of semi-static DL, thus minimal specification effort/impact.  In our view, there should not be a serious concern on the UE implementation due to Option 1 as the collision handling would be like Case 2. However, we are open to hear and understand more companies’ views, if any. |
| Nordic |  | The SSB is important for UE in RRC connected for serving cell measurements and also to maintain synchronization. Contrary, optimization for eMBB (improved UL TP) or URLLC (latency) are not in scope of this WID. Finally, unified solution is necessary, otherwise priority rules for collision handling would need to be defined. |
| Nokia, NSB |  | Our preference is Option 1. This will allow additional scheduling flexibility and also provide the same handling with FDD UE. We do not think there will be significant specification impact as this is, in principle, the same as semi-statically configured DL reception vs. dynamically scheduled UL transmission (Case 2).  Also, in our view, there is no need to have a unified solution for Case 5. |
| Intel |  | In general, we prefer to define a unified solution for dynamic UL and configured UL. If different handling of dynamic UL and configured UL are used, we need to clearly categorize the different kinds of channel/signals. The potential differentiation of PUCCH carrying HARQ-ACK is just one example. However, it may become quite complicated. |
| Apple |  | Our preference is Option 2. It should be noted that it is up to UE implementation regarding which SSBs are selected for measurement e.g., T/F tracking, intra-frequency RRM measurements as long as the requirement is met. Typically, it is maintained by a separate loop by hardware in implementation, which is not interacted with any L1 control signalling including UL grant. Opt.1 essentially mandates UE to first check the overlapping of DG-PUSCH with the target SSB and then decides to select it or not. This prohibits to reuse the current implementation, especially for HD-FDD UE that does NOT target for high peak data rate.  More that, from system wise, the UL resource that overlaps with SSB can still be utilized by FD-FDD UE and Opt.2 does not cause any resource wastage.  We also prefer to have a unified solution for both CG-PUSCH and DG-PUSCH i.e., priotizing SSB or leaving it to UE implementation. |
| Qualcomm |  | We support Option 2, with the exception of PDCCH ordered PRACH. We can re-visit the case of PDCCH ordered PRACH after progress is made for RO validation rule of HD-FDD UE. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility |  | Our preference is option 2. We also prefer a unified solution for dynamic UL and configured UL. |
| Samsung |  | Our first preference is option 3. But, taking into account the agreement on SSB vs. configured UL, we prefer to have the common rule for SSB vs. dynamic UL as well which can avoid handling complicated scenarios for UCI multiplexing caused by collisions between DG PUSCH and CG PUSCH in the future. |
| Xiaomi |  | Our 1st preference is based on the UE implementation and 2nd preference is to reuse the collision handling principle defined for TDD. Furthermore, we’d like to adopt unified solution for configured UL transmission and dynamic UL transmission. |
| Sharp |  | We slightly prefer Option 1 as it can take more flexibility to the gNB’s scheduler. On the other hand, Option2 may not have a too negative effect when the SSB is sparse in the time domain with a typical periodicity of 20ms. If a unified principle can be reached for dynamic and configured UL, option 2 is also accepted. |
| China Telecom |  | We prefer Option 1 that dynamic UL is prioritized over SSB, which will keep the same handling of Case 2. We do not want to have any contradictions or different understanding on the specifications when dealing with UL/DL collision. |
| OPPO |  | We consider SSB will be priotized. Or it can be looked as error configuration. |
| FL2 | Based on the input, the companies preference is updated as following   * Option 1:   + **Support**: Ericsson, vivo, Nokia, CATT, China Telecom, CMCC, ASUSTeK (1st choice), WILUS, Sharp (1st choice)   + **Not Support**: Apple * Option 2:   + **Support**: Spreadtrum (2nd choice), Samsung (2nd choice), Nordic, OPPO, QC, LG, Intel, Apple, DoCoMo, Xiaomi (2nd choice), Panasonic, ASUSTeK (2nd choice), Lenovo, Sharp (2nd choice), MTK (2nd choice)   + **Not Support**: vivo * Option 3:   + **Support**: Spreadtrum (1st choice), Samsung (1st choice), Apple (2nd choice), Xiaomi (1st choice), MTK (1st choice)   + **Not Support**: vivo   Regarding whether a unified solution is used for all the subcases under Case 5:   * **Yes** (~~7~~8): Spreadtrum, Nordic, Intel, Apple, Lenovo, Samsung, Xiaomi, MTK * **No** (2): vivo, Nokia   **Questions**:   * **Q1:** If a unified solution is not adopted and Option 1 is used for the dynamic UL Tx vs. SSB, do we need to introduce additional collision handling rules for UCI multiplexing on DG PUSCH or CG PUSCH, e.g. for the case of SSB colliding with DG-PUSCH where this is also a PUCCH carrying CSI overlapping with the SSB and DG-PUSCH * **Q2**: Please share your view on the following vivo compromise proposal whether it can be considered if there is no consensus for the three options   + Option 4: It is considered as an error case if a dynamically scheduled UL transmission overlaps with SSB * **Q3**: Please provide any comments, or changes the status or suggestions to help to reach a consensus. | |
| vivo |  | Q1: In that case we may need to discuss the UE behaviour, e.g. the processing order for UCI multiplexing and collision handling with SSB  Q: Defining this case as error case is acceptable |
| DOCOMO |  | Q1: We think existing rule should be reused for UCI multiplexing in HD-FDD, i.e., UCI multiplexing is carried out before DL/UL collision handling as follows:  Clause 9 in TS38.213 ---  In the remaining of this clause, a UE multiplexes UCIs with same priority index in a PUCCH or a PUSCH before considering limitations for UE transmission as described in clause 11.1.  Q2: Option 4 strictly limits scheduling frexibility for dynamic UL w/ repetitions, while both Options 1 and 2 allow the collision between SSB and dynamic UL w/ repetitions. We should try to down-select to one of Options 1 or 2 |
| MediaTek |  | Q1: As Docomo is pointing it out, according to the current standard, multiplexing takes place before prioritization.  Q2: even if we treated it as an error case if a dynamically scheduled UL transmission overlaps with SSB, this would not resolve the similar issue for the case of semi-static UL transmission and the multiplexing scenarios thereof.  We would prefer a unified solution for collision handling with dynamic and semi-static UL transmissions. Option 2 would be our first and Option 3 would be our second preference. (Added MTK to the summary above.) |
| Nokia, NSB |  | Q1: Similar view as DOCOMO.  Q2: We do not think Option 4 will help as it would then require gNB to avoid this situation. Therefore, it is better to have a collision handling rule. |
| Intel |  | Q1: Agree with DOCOMO, we prefer a simple solution, i.e. the existing UCI multiplexing procedure is not impacted, followed by overlap handling. Overlapping with dynamic UL can be fully controlled by gNB, we expect the loss is marginal for such simiplified way.  Q2: Fine to define it as error case if down-selection between Option 1/2 is not achievable, since anyway gNB can manage it. |
| Nordic |  | Q1: Our understanding is not the multiplexing, but behaviour in 11.1 itself is an issue. If dynamic and configured UL collides with SSB, which conflict is resolved first?  Q2: Since UE has to implement error handling for TDD already, it can handle this error also in HD-FDD. |
| Ericsson |  | Q1: The scenario described also exists under Case 2 in general for configured DL vs. dynamic UL. In our view, no additional rule is needed. The existing multiplexing procedure can still apply.  Q2: No. Option 4 is not preferred. |
| Qualcomm |  | Q1: agree with the comments of DCM on the order of UCI multiplexing and directional collision handling. We do NOT support option 1.  Q2: Option 2 is preferred. Option 4 can be supported as well.  Q3: Since this question is related to the RRM measurement and T/F tracking, RAN4’s input is desirable. Suggest to send an LS to RAN4. |
| Apple |  | Q1: We shared the view that Opt.1 results in additional standard effort to go through different combinational cases and define collision handling rule. Nevertheless, Opt.1 forces UE to implement interaction between SSB measurement and UL Grant and make it impossible to reuse the exsiting implementation, which really goes too far especially to optimize the HD-FDD Redcap UEs. We can not compromise on this as it causes unnecessary complexity for HD-FDD.  Q2: We can compromise on Opt.4 if Opt.2 can not be accepted. |
| IDCC |  | We prefer Option 2. We would prefer to have a solution since Option 4 may limit scheduling flexibility. |
| Xiaomi |  | Q1: Agree with the comments from DCM  Q2: Our first choice is opt.3, but we can live with opt.2 to reach a unified solution between configured UL transmission and dynamic transmission |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility |  | Q1: agree with Docomo’s view.  Q2: we still prefer option 2 but can accept option 4. |
| CMCC |  | Q1: Agree with DOCOMO, UCI multiplexing is before collision handling and existing UCI multiplexing rule can be reused.  Q2:With option4, the resource uitilization efficiency is lower than option1. When gNB can avoid the overlapping of SSB and dynamic UL through scheduling, option1 and option2 is the same. When the overlapping exists, option1 will interrupt RRM measurement, but RRM measurement is a long term process, the interruption is not a big problem. However, option2 will cancel dynamic UL, the impact is larger. Thus, we prefer option1. |
| LG |  | Q1: Reusing existing collision rule is preferred.  Q2: Option 4 unnecessarily limits the network flexibility which is not preferred.  Q3: We still support Option 2. |
| Samsung |  | Q1: Prefer the existing spec.  Q2: Our current thinking is Option 4 restricts NW flexibility too much. We think Option 2 is a best way to go in current situation. |
| FL3 | **Observations from discussion:**   * There is a common understanding that the existing multiplexing procedure can still apply if Option 1 is used for dynamic UL Tx vs. SSB. No additional rule is needed * Some companies (DOCOMO, Nokia, Ericsson, IDCC, LG, Samsung) view that Option 4 may unnecessarily limit the network flexibility thus not to support it   **Companies preferences are summarized below.**   * Option 1:   + **Support**: Ericsson, vivo, Nokia, CATT, China Telecom, CMCC, ASUSTeK (1st choice), WILUS, Sharp (1st choice)   + **Not Support**: Apple, Qualcomm * Option 2:   + **Support**: Spreadtrum (2nd choice), Samsung (2nd choice), Nordic, OPPO, QC, LG, Intel, Apple, DoCoMo, Xiaomi (2nd choice), Panasonic, ASUSTeK (2nd choice), Lenovo, Sharp (2nd choice), MTK (2nd choice), IDCC   + **Not Support**: vivo * Option 3:   + **Support**: Spreadtrum (1st choice), Samsung (1st choice), Apple (2nd choice), Xiaomi (1st choice), MTK (1st choice)   + **Not Support**: vivo   For Option 3, the ambiguity may exist between the gNB and UE, especially when there is also a PUCCH carrying CSI overlapping with the SSB and DG-PUSCH. Therefore, in the moderator’s view it may not be good especially considering the agreement for the case of semi-static UL vs. SSB.  Moderator recommendation is to select to one of Options 1 or 2.  **High Priority Proposal 2.1-1:**   * For Case 5 of dynamically scheduled UL transmission vs. SSB, down-select one of the following options:   + 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   **Companies please provide comment whether it is needed to send an LS to RAN4 regarding the impact of SSB collision on RRM measurement, and if so, the RAN1 details associated with question.** | |
| CATT |  | OK with the proposal.  Since we have agreed that SSB is prioritized than semi-static UE-dedicated configured UL (in GTW of Wednesday), Option 1 is the most stuitable choice in this case. If dynamic UL cannot be prioritized, there will be a disaster that UL symbols overlapping with SSB will be forever loss for HD-FDD UE (Option 2) or the gNB will have to blind decode the UL resource endlessly(Option 3), even if a DCI is sent.  We do not think this is the right time to send LS to RAN4. |
| Spreadtrum |  | Fine with the proposal.  As commented in round 1, we prefer to consider a unified solution to handle all the subcases of Case 5, and we already agreed that SSB is prioritized over configured UL transmission, so we prefer option 2 here. |
| vivo |  | If Option 4 is not agreeable, option 1 should be the way to go. In Option 2, why does gNB sent the UL grant if the PUSCH must be dropped? |
| DOCOMO | Y | We don’t see the necessity to send an LS to RAN4 |
| Nokia, NSB |  | We are OK with the proposal and prefer Option 1. We don’t think there is a need to send an LS to RAN4. |
| Nordic | Y | @VIVO for the reason to have unified behaviour irrespective of dynamic/semi-static UL  We do not think RAN4 LS is needed, because it is quite clear that SSB are important for RRM measurements.  Option 2 and we do NOT support Option 1 |
| Intel | Y | Fine to progress a bit by keeping only two options.  We prefer Option 2 to have unified solution as SSB vs. configure UL. This is exactly same behavior as NR TDD. No LS to RAN4 is needed. |
| Ericsson | Y | We are fine with further down-selecting Options 1 and 2. We prefer Option 1 but are open to hear and understand companies’ concerns, if any, and are fine with sending LS to RAN4. |
| Samsung |  | Share a view with Nordic and then Option 2 is preferred for the unified solution. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobiltiy | Y | Option 2 is preferred. |
| China Telecom | Y | We are fine with FL proposal for the sake of progress. And we prefer Option 1 that dynamic UL is prioritized over SSB. We see no need to send LS for RAN4. |
| CMCC | Y | Fine with proposal. We prefer option1 and open to further discuss option2. |
| Qualcomm | Y | Option 2 is supported |
| Apple | Y | Option 2 is supported. |
| Sharp | Y | We are ok with FL’s proposal |
| LG | Y | We prefer Option 2 which is a unified solution and the same handling as in TDD.  No need to send the LS to RAN4 especially if we go for Option 2. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y with modification | From UE’s perspective, it is quite important to prioritize SSB reception for the following benefits, deriving updated MIB,RRM measurement and T/F tracking loop even though no updated MIB is carried on the SSB. Therefore, in connected mode, prioritizing SSB reception should be adopted to obtain the aforementioned benefits.  However, for Msg3 or Msg3 re-transmission or PUCCH for msg4 during random access procedure, if SSB is also prioritized when the collision happens, some problems/issues will occur:   1. *Since HD-FDD identification is not supported right now, if HD-FDD UEs are viewed as FD-FDD redcap UE, it would cause the collision and HD-FDD UE would not send the msg3 and PUCCH for msg4. In this case, the RA procedure may be interrupted by not sending Msg3 or PUCCH for msg4 from UE. It results in the significant increase of access latency of RA procedure especially for the dense RO scenarios.* 2. *If gNB wants to avoid the collision by scheduling UL resources for Msg3 or PUCCH for msg4, then FD-FDD UEs also would be affected, since HD-FDD UE and FD-FDD UE share the same PRACH resource and they are not identified. As a result, the average access latency of random access procedure for FD-FDD RedCap UEs will be increased.*   Therefore, it is suggested to apply the different collision rule for the initial access procedure to avoid the above problems. i.e., for a dynamically scheduled UL transmission overlaps with an SSB, if dynamically scheduled UL transmission refer to Msg3 or Msg3 retransmission or PUCCH for msg4, dynamically scheduled UL transmission should be prioritized; otherwise, SSB is prioritized.  From our perspective, at least, the following modification should be incorporated.  **High Priority Proposal 2.1-1:**   * For Case 5 of dynamically scheduled UL transmission vs. SSB, down-select one of the following options:   + 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 * FFS whether or not the same UE behavior is applied to Msg3 (re)transmission and PUCCH for msg4.   Last, regarding the LS, we think it is not needed. |
| OPPO | Y | Hope we can also make selection during this meeting. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y | And Option 1 is preferred.  HD-FDD is more like a UE-specific TDD, and once the UE is scheduled with UL there is no need for UE to read SSB, which is anyway broadcasted and does not require feedback. |
| MediaTek | Y | Option 2 is preferred |
| FL5 | **@ZTE**: In moderator’s view, gNB has full flexibility to schedule Msg3 (re)transmission and PUCCH for msg4 to avoid potential collision with SSB. This would not increase RA latency too much since SSB is confined only to the first two subframes of a 20ms SSB periodicity. Therefore, optimization for Msg3 and PUCCH for Msg4 is not necessary.  **Companies are invited to share your view on ZTE proposal whether or not to differentiate Msg3 (re)transmission and PUCCH for msg4 from other dynamically scheduled UL transmission.**  Since majorities of companies are supportive to down-select one from Option 1 and 2. Moderator suggests to focus on the down-selection for the following discussion.  **High Priority Proposal 2.1-1:**   * For Case 5 of dynamically scheduled UL transmission vs. SSB, down-select one of the following options:   + 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   **Companies are kindly requested to provide any comments, including update/correction of their positions with respect to the option 1 and 2. For option that is not supported, please also provide technical justification, if possible. Any suggestions to help to reach a consensus is welcome.** | |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y | And Option 1 is preferred.  HD-FDD is more like a UE-specific TDD, and once the UE is scheduled with UL there is no need for UE to read SSB, which is anyway broadcasted and does not require feedback. |
| vivo |  | Fine to down-selection between option 1 and 2. |
| OPPO | Y | Option 2 preferred. |
| DOCOMO | Y | We still support Option 2 for unified solution with configured UL |
| CATT | Y | OK with the proposal. Option 1 is preferred. As point out by HW, HD-FDD is more like a UE-specific TDD, no need to deteriorate it into cell-common TDD.  ZTE’s concern can also be tackled by adoping Option 1, since Msg3 and PUCCH (for Msg4) are belong to dynamic scheduled UL. |
| Samsung | Y | OK with down-selection. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Y | Option 2 is preferred. |
| CMCC | Y | Prefer option1. |
| Sharp | Y | OK with down-selection. |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | @FL: Regarding Msg3 (Re)transmission and PUCCH for Msg4, as our comments to High Priority Proposal 2.1-1 of FL3, we do not think the collision can be avoided by the gNB scheduling and the RA latency is negligible.  More specifically, avoiding the collision by gNB scheduling the resources for Msg3 (Re)transmission/PUCCH for Msg4 not overlapped with SSB would lead the following problems:  **Regarding the gNB scheduling**:  The collision avoided by gNB scheduling msg3 or PUCCH for msg4 would cause scheduling restriction for FD-FDD UE and non-RedCap UE.  Specifically, for FD-FDD RedCap UEs, it is the fact that the collision between Msg3 (Re)transmission/PUCCH for Msg4 and SSB reception does not exist since the FD-FDD UEs can do UL transmission and DL reception simultaneously. Considering that gNB currently can not distinguish whether the UE is a HD-FDD RedCap UE during RA procedure, gNB also can not distinguish the non-RedCap when RedCap UE share the same PRACH resource with non-RedCap UE, the collision still should be avoided by the gNB by scheduling Msg3 (Re)transmission/PUCCH for Msg4 for HD-FDD RedCap UE, FD-FDD UE and non-RedCap UE. In this case, the collision handling rule(gNB scheduling) is also applied for FD-FDD UE and non-RedCap UE, which bring the scheduling restriction for FD-FDD RedCAP/non-RedCap UE.  **Regarding the RA latency**:  Similar as mentioned, if the collision handling rule (gNB scheduling) is also applied for FD-FDD UE and non-RedCap UE, the larger RA delay of FD-FDD UE and non-redcap UE also would be brought, especially for the case that the SSB periodicity is quite dense, e.g., 5ms.  **We do not want to introduce any scheduling restriction on the FD-FDD UE and non-RedCap UE**, when we discuss the collision handling rule for HD-FDD UE. Therefore, it is suggested to apply the different collision rule for the initial access procedure to avoid the above problems. i.e., for a dynamically scheduled UL transmission overlaps with an SSB, if dynamically scheduled UL transmission refer to Msg3 or Msg3 retransmission or PUCCH for msg4, dynamically scheduled UL transmission should be prioritized; otherwise, SSB is prioritized.  From our perspective, at least, the following modification should be incorporated.  **High Priority Proposal 2.1-1:**   * For Case 5 of dynamically scheduled UL transmission vs. SSB, down-select one of the following options:   + 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 * FFS whether or not the same UE behavior is applied to Msg3 (re)transmission and PUCCH for msg4. |
| Nordic | Y | No need to differentiate MSG3, also why would UE transmit PRACH on scheduled MSG3 during ongoing initial access, and agree if gNB wants to make sure, it can avoid scheduling UL on SSBs  No change only Option 2 supported, and fine with ZTE FFS |
| LG | Y | Okay with the FL proposal. We prefer Option 2 which is a unified solution and the same handling as in TDD. |
| China Telecom | Y | We are fine with down-selection between Option 1 and Option 2. And Option 1 is preferred. |
| Intel | Y | We prefer Option 2 to have unified solution as SSB vs. configure UL. |
| Panasonic | Y | Fine with FL proposal. We prefer Option 2.  No need to differentiate Msg3 or PUCCH for Msg4. Even if one UL resource collides with SSB, the next UL resource will be available if scheduled properly. The latency by that would not be so severe for RedCap. |
| Ericsson | Y | We prefer Option 1 but are open to hear and understand companies’ concerns, if any. |
| Xiaomi | Y | We prefer option 2 for unified solution |
| Nokia, NSB | Y | We are OK with the proposal and prefer Option 1. |
| Apple | Y | We are ok with FL proposal. In brief to avoid repeating our argument, Opt.2 is our preference as Opt.1 would require UE to determine which SSB for RRM measurement based on the presence of dynamic PUSCH.  Essentially, Opt.1 excludes the possibility of reusing the existing hardware/BB implementation for HD-FDD and is NOT justified especially considering the fact that HD-FDD UE was designed to minimize the cost and optimization for higher peak data rate should not be pursued. Opt.1 goes the exactly opposite direction. |
| Qualcomm | Y | We support Option 2. |
| FL7 | **Moderator observation: Companies’s position has not changed.**   * Option 1:   + Support [9+1]: Huawei, HiSilicon, vivo, CATT, China Telecom, CMCC, Ericsson, Nokia, NSB, [Sharp (1st choice)]   + Not Support: Apple * Option 2:   + Support [11+5]: Nordic, OPPO, LG, Intel, DOCOMO, Xiaomi, Panasonic, Qualcomm, Apple, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, [Spreadtrum], [Samsung], [MTK], [IDCC], [Sharp (2nd choice)]   + Not Support: Huawei, HiSilicon   **The companies arguments remain the similar as previous discussion:**   * Option 1: Companies arguments in favour of Option 1 include at least the following   + More flexibility and consistent with principle of dynamic scheduling   + HD-FDD is more like a UE-specific TDD   + Same handling as Case 2 for semi-static DL   + … * Option 2: Companies arguments in favour of Option 2 include at least the following   + A unified solution for dynamic and semi-static UL transmissions   + Optimization for UL TP and/or latency are not in scope of this WID   + Same UE implementation for SSB measurement as FD-FDD   + …   **@ZTE:** The moderator shares the same view as Nordic and Panasonic that latency is not an issue for RedCap. gNB could avoid scheduling UL on SSBs. It is okay for further discussion. According to moderator’s understanding, your proposal is actually a combination of Option 1 and 2, i.e. using Option 1 for Msg3 and PUCCH for Msg4 but Option 2 for other dynamically scheduled UL transmission. Therefore, the FFS should not be only under Option 2.  **Moderator recommendation: Decision on Option 1 or 2 during GTW online session.**  **FL7 High Priority Proposal 2.1-1:**   * For Case 5 of dynamically scheduled UL transmission vs. SSB, down-select one of the following options:   + 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   + FFS: whether or not the same UE behavior is applied to Msg3 (re)transmission and PUCCH for msg4 | |
| FL8 | **Moderator recommendation: The same proposal can be considered again**  **FL8 High Priority Proposal 2.1-1: Decision on Option 1 or 2 during GTW online session**   * For Case 5 of dynamically scheduled UL transmission vs. SSB, down-select one of the following options:   + Option 1: Dynamically scheduled UL transmission is prioritized over SSB     - **Support** [9+1]: Huawei, HiSilicon, vivo, CATT, China Telecom, CMCC, Ericsson, Nokia, NSB, [Sharp (1st choice)]     - **Not Support**: Apple, Qualcomm   + Option 2: Reuse the existing collision handling principles of Rel-15/16 for NR TDD that SSB is prioritized over dynamically scheduled UL transmission     - **Support** [11+5]: Nordic, OPPO, LG, Intel, DOCOMO, Xiaomi, Panasonic, Qualcomm, Apple, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, [Spreadtrum], [Samsung], [MTK], [IDCC], [Sharp (2nd choice)]     - **Not Support**: Huawei, HiSilicon   + FFS: whether or not the same UE behavior is applied to Msg3 (re)transmission and PUCCH for msg4 | |
| vivo | Y |  |
| CATT | Y but | OK for down-selection.  However, the FFS should only be the sub-bullet of Option 2.   * For Case 5 of dynamically scheduled UL transmission vs. SSB, down-select one of the following options:   + 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     - FFS: whether or not the same UE behavior is applied to Msg3 (re)transmission and PUCCH for msg4   For Option 1, Msg3 and PUCCH (for Msg4) are clearly belong to dynamically schedule UL, which are prioritized over SSB, and hence no ambiguity issue occurs. Of course there is no need to differnciate Msg3 and PUCCH (for Msg4) behaviour from other dynamically scheduled UL in Option 1. |
| Intel | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y | The indentation adjustment from CATT is fine with us.  As commented before, if the gNB avoid the collision by dynamically scheduling msg3/PUCCH for msg4, then scheduling restriction and RA delay on the FD-FDD UE and non-RedCap UE also would be caused because the HD-FDD UE or non-RedCap UE may not be identified. |
| Ericsson | Y | Ok to down-select. Agree with CATT that if Option 1 is supported,there is no need to differentiate UE behavior for Msg3 (re)transmission and PUCCH for Msg4. Anyhow, we think it is fine to have an FFS in either place. |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| Nordic | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | Y | Option 2 is preferred.  We don’t support Option 1 because the impacts on the measurement requirements of 1 RX/2RX RedCap UEs are unclear. In addition, following the rule of TDD has less spec impacts for R17 RedCap HD-FDD UE. |
| Apple | Y | It is ok to put FFS under Alt.2. |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Y |  |
| Spreadtrum | Y |  |
| LG | Y |  |
| China Telecom | Y | We are fine to make down-selection. And Option 1 is preferred. |

Contribution [Qualcomm14] proposed that PDCCH ordered PRACH should be excluded from the dynamically scheduled UL transmission since it is considered in Case 8, while contribution [vivo05] has a different view that the dynamically scheduled UL transmission includes PUSCH, PUCCH, SRS and PRACH triggered by PDCCH order.

**FL1 High Priority Question 2.1-2:**

* **For Case 5 of SSB overlapping with dynamically scheduled UL transmission, should PRACH triggered by PDCCH order be considered also?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| Vivo | Y | From current specification, the PDCCH ordered PRACH is usually treated similarly as dynamic scheduled UL transmission. It would be good to better understand the justification to treat PDCCH ordered PRACH differently for HD-FDD UEs. |
| CATT |  | We think PRACH triggered by PDCCH order can be considered as dynamically scheduled UL. |
| DOCOMO | N | Since the PRACH triggered by PDCCH order is transmitted on valid RO, it should be considered in Case 8 |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | From an agreement made in RAN1 #104bis-e shown bellow, PRACH triggered by PDCCH order is included in dynamically scheduled UL transmission.   |  | | --- | | 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 * For Case 4: dynamically scheduled DL reception vs. dynamic scheduled UL transmission, reuse the existing collision handling principles in Rel-15/16 NR for operation on a single carrier /single cell in unpaired spectrum   + That is, it is considered as an error case if a dynamically scheduled DL reception overlaps with a dynamically scheduled UL transmission * For Case 2 (semi-statically configured DL reception vs. dynamically scheduled UL transmission), reuse the existing collision handling principles in Rel-15/16 NR for operation on a single carrier/single cell in unpaired spectrum   + The semi-statically configured DL reception may include PDCCH (excluding ULCI), SPS PDSCH, CSI-RS or PRS.     - FFS on PDCCH carrying ULCI, including whether or not it is supported by RedCap Ues (including potential difference between HD vs. FD RedCap Ues)   + The dynamically scheduled UL transmission may include PUSCH, PUCCH, SRS or PRACH triggered by PDCCH order |   So PRACH triggered by PDCCH order should be considered in dynamic UL transmission.  Also, this problem is related to the collision between SSB and valid RO in case 8. It is suggested to follow the handling rule for case8. |
| Ericsson | Y | In view of the agreement for Case 2 (which basically reused the TDD rule), PRACH triggered by PDCCH order is treated as dynamically scheduled UL transmission. In our view, the same principle can be considered for Case 5 here. |
| Nordic | Postpone | Until valid RO for HD-FDD UE is clarified |
| Nokia, NSB | Y | Based on the previous agreement from RAN1#104bis-e, we should follow the same principle as for Case 2. |
| Intel | Y | We prefer to have unified solution to all dynamic scheduled UL transmission |
| Apple | Y | The rule can be applied for PDCCH-ordered RO. For example, gNB has a full freedom to select a RO by PDCCH to avoid overlapping. |
| Qualcomm | N | Although RAN1#104 agreed that PDCCH ordered PRACH belongs to dynamic scheduled UL in general, there is no consensus on the RO validation rule for HD-FDD UE. Therefore, further discussion/agreements were made at RAN1#105 to separate the discussion of PRACH/valid RO from other UL transmissions. |
| Samsung |  | We don’t have strong preference but slightly prefer to handle PDCCH ordered PRACH in Case 8. |
| Xiaomi | Y | We share the same view with majority companies that the PDCCH ordered PRACH is a kind of dynamic UL transmission |
| China Telecom | Y | We have the same understanding that PRACH triggered by PDCCH order can be considered as dynamic UL transmission. |
| OPPO | N | We don’t think it is urgent to have the agreement, looking it as dynamical UL should be decided case by case. |
| FL2 | **@vivo**: The problem is that it is related to the collision between SSB and valid RO. Dependent on the RO validation for HD-FDD UE, collision between SSB and valid RO may or may not exist. If it is considered here, it may imply to use the FDD definition for RO validation for HD-FDD Ues.  **@All:** It is true that the previous agreement from RAN1#104bis-e for Case 2 treats the PRACH triggered by PDCCH order PDCCH as dynamically scheduled UL transmission. In RAN1#105-e, there are further discussion to separate the collision cases related to valid RO from other UL transmission and treat in Case 8 to avoid any possible duplication.  **@All: Considering the clarification above, moderator suggests coming back this issue after the discussion for RO validation.** | |
|  |  |  |

## SSB overlaps with configured UL transmission

For the case of SSB overlaps with semi-statically configured UL transmission, companies’ positions are summarized in Table 2.2-1.

**Table 2.2-1: View on collision handling for SSB overlaps with semi-statically configured UL transmission**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Index | Description | Companies | # of Companies |
| Option 1 | Up to gNB configuration to avoid such collision and if it happens it is an error case |  |  |
| Option 2 | Reuse the existing collision handling principles of Rel-15/16 for NR TDD that SSB is prioritized over semi-static UL | Ericsson, vivo, Spreadtrum (2nd choice), ZTE, Samsung (2nd choice), CATT, NordicSemi, China Telecom, OPPO, QC, CMCC, LG, Apple, DCM, Xiaomi (2nd choice), Panasonic, ASUSTeK, WILUS | 18 |
| Option 3 | Leave to UE implementation whether to receive the SSB or transmit the UL transmission | vivo, SPREADTRUM (1st choice), Samsung (1st choice), Apple (2nd choice), Xiaomi (1st choice) | 5 |

Another two new options are also presented by some companies.

* Contribution [Nokia06] considers a combination of Options 1 and 3. That is, it is up to gNB configuration to avoid such collision. However, if collision occurs, it is up to UE implementation whether to receive the SSB or to transmit on the uplink
* Contribution [Intel18] presents a new option to differentiate CG-PUSCH from other configured UL transmission, i.e., using Option 3 for CG-PUSCH and Option 2 for configured UL transmission other than CG PUSCH.

In contribution [Ericsson03], it is viewed that Option 3 may lead to increased gNB decoding of UL transmission, and a modified version of Option 3 is proposed, i.e., leave it to UE implementation whether to receive the SSB or transmit the UL transmission based on the RRM requirement of the UE.

Views regarding whether the semi-static configured UL transmission includes a valid RO are summarized as following:

* Contributions [vivo05, ZTE08, Qualcomm14] clarify that the configured UL transmission includes PUSCH, PUCCH and SRS but not PRACH
* Contribution [LG16] views that the semi-static configured UL transmission also includes a valid RO and a valid PUSCH occasion for 2-step RACH

From the above, Option 2 receives the majority support. It is noted that most companies supporting Option 3 also consider Option 2 as a secondary preferred solution.

Regarding whether the semi-static configured UL transmission includes a valid RO and/or a valid PUSCH occasion for 2-step RACH, the FL suggestion is to further discuss it in Case 8 to avoid the overlapping discussion.

**FL1 High Priority Proposal 2.2-1:**

* **For Case 5 of SSB overlaps with configured UL transmission, re-use the existing collision handling principles of Rel-15/16 for NR TDD that configured SSB is prioritized over configured UL**
  + **The configured UL transmission may include CG-PUSCH, PUCCH or SRS**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| vivo | Y | Small modification for the sub-bullet:  **The configured UL transmission ~~may~~ includes CG-PUSCH, PUCCH or SRS** |
| CATT | Y | To our understanding, in this proposal, configured PUCCH transmission means the PUCCH not triggered by a DCI. |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
|  |  |  |

Based on the proposals in FL summary #1 in [R1-2108252](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_106-e/Inbox/R1-2108252.zip), the following RAN1 agreements were made in an online (GTW) session on Monday 16th August:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:   * 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 |

**FL1 High Priority Question 2.2-2:**

* **Companies are invited to comment whether to confirm that PUCCH is included in the above agreement. If not, please provide the justification or any modification**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| CATT |  | PUCCH resource is more or less configured by higher layer parameters. However, the key point is whether the PUCCH is dynamically triggered or not.  Specifically, in this proposal, configured PUCCH transmission means a PUCCH that NOT triggered by a DCI.  An example for configured PUCCH transmission in this agreement is P-PUCCH for P-CSI report.  So PUCCH for Msg4 is not included here and should be regarded as dynamic UL. |
| DOCOMO | Y | Configured UL transmission should be included as TDD case. We have the same understanding that configured PUCCH transmission means a PUCCH which is not triggered by a DCI |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | Agree with CATT’s view. PUCCH for msg4 belong to the dynamic UL transmission. |
| Ericsson | Y | Agree with comments from other companies that configured PUCCH should be included, but that Msg4 PUCCH can be considered as dynamic PUCCH. |
| Nordic | Postpone | Reading CATT comment, one more reason to have the same behaviour for configured and dynamic UL in **FL1 High Priority Question 2.1-1:**  No need to further discuss. |
| Nokia, NSB | Y | Similar view as CATT. |
| Intel |  | As discussed online, we prefer to clarify the definition of dynamic PUCCH for HARQ-ACK transmission, and semi-static PUCCH for HARQ-ACK transmission. The wording suggested by Xueming is one way.   * for HARQ-ACK channel without associated DCI, e.g. HARQ-ACK channel for SPS PDSCH is semi-static * otherwise, since K1 can be indicated by the DCI, the HARQ-ACK channel is considered as dynamic   Just to note, this issue doesn’t exist in NR TDD. That is, due to unified handling of SSB overlapping with dynamic UL and configured UL, it is not necessary to differentiate types of HARQ-ACK channels.  In this discussion, depending on the agreement handling SSB overlapping with dynamic UL, such differentiation becomes necessary. |
| Apple | Y | We do NOT see the need to differentiate the PUCCH, with or without HARQ-ACK, to seek for a unified UE behavior for overlapping between SSB and PUCCH.  Note that SSB overlapping with PUCCH, especially for PUCCH using for HARQ-ACK feedback, gNB has full control to avoid this collision by properly setting the K1 value in DCI. Especially, for Msg-4 HARQ-ACK during initial access, increasing latency a bit for HD-FDD UE should be less concerned during initial access. |
| Qualcomm |  | PUCCH carrying HARQ feedback for msg4/msgB are dynamically scheduled UL transmission(s) on configured resources. |
| Samsung | Y | Agree with other companies that configured PUCCH is included except Msg4 PUCCH which should be considered as dynamic PUCCH. |
| Xiaomi |  | In our view the configured PUCCH is PUCCH not triggered by DCI scheduling e.g., P-CSI report or SR . Dynamic PUCCH is PUCCH triggered by DCI scheduling e.g., HARQ feedback. So, in our understanding HARQ feedback for msg4/msgB is dynamic PUCCH  But on the other hand, we share similar view with Apple, we should strive unified solution for dynamic UL transmission and configured UL transmission. |
| China Telecom |  | We share the majority views that the configured PUCCH should be included, while dynamic PUCCH triggered by DCI scheduling can be considered as dynamic UL transmission. In our perspective, there is no need to strive unified solution for dynamic UL transmission and configured UL transmission. |
| OPPO | Y | PUCCH can be included. PUCCH for msg4 can be FFS. |
| FL2 | Companies views are summarized as following   * There is a majority view that configured PUCCH transmission means a PUCCH which is not triggered by a DCI * Most companies are supptive that configured PUCCH should be included, but that Msg4 PUCCH can be considered as dynamic PUCCH   In the moderator’s view, the definition of configured or dynamically scheduled PUCCH is same as described in TDD. From the following text copired from TS 38.213 for collision handling for case 1 and 2 in TDD, it is clear that configured PUCCH is the PUCCH configured by higher layers, and dynamic PUCCH is the PUCCH which is based on a detected DCI format. Therefore, there is no need for further clarification for HD-FDD.  **Case 1: Dynamically scheduled DL reception vs. semi-statically configured UL transmission**   |  | | --- | | For operation on a single carrier in unpaired spectrum, if a UE is configured by higher layers to transmit SRS, or PUCCH, or PUSCH, or PRACH in a set of symbols of a slot and the UE detects a DCI format indicating to the UE to receive CSI-RS or PDSCH in a subset of symbols from the set of symbols, then  - If the UE does not indicate the capability of [partialCancellation], the UE does not expect to cancel the transmission of the PUCCH or PUSCH or PRACH in the set of symbols if the first symbol in the set occurs within relative to a last symbol of a CORESET where the UE detects the DCI format; otherwise, the UE cancels the PUCCH, or the PUSCH, or an actual repetition of the PUSCH [6, TS38.214], determined from Clauses 9 and 9.2.5 or Clause 6.1 of [6, TS38.214], or the PRACH transmission in the set of symbols. |   **Case 2: Semi-statically configured DL reception vs. dynamically scheduled UL transmission**   |  | | --- | | For operation on a single carrier in unpaired spectrum, if a UE is configured by higher layers to receive a PDCCH, or a PDSCH, or a CSI-RS, or a DL PRS in a set of symbols of a slot, the UE receives the PDCCH, the PDSCH, the CSI-RS, or the DL PRS if the UE does not detect a DCI format that indicates to the UE to transmit a PUSCH, a PUCCH, a PRACH, or a SRS in at least one symbol of the set of symbols of the slot; otherwise, the UE does not receive the PDCCH, or the PDSCH, or the CSI-RS, or the DL PRS in the set of symbols of the slot. |   **FL2 High Priority Proposal 2.2-2:**   * For Case 5 of SSB overlaps with configured UL transmission, the configured UL transmission includes PUCCH transmission configured by higher layers | |
| vivo | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| MediaTek | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| Intel | Y |  |
| Nordic | OK | But again, no need to discuss this if same behaviour for configured and dynamic UL is agreed 😊 |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |
| Apple | Y | We can follow the current formulation for TDD as cited by FL. |
| IDCC | Y |  |
| Xiaomi | Y |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Y |  |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| LG | Y |  |
| Samsung | Y |  |

Based on the proposals in FL summary #1 in [R1-2108327](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_106-e/Inbox/R1-2108327.zip), the following RAN1 agreements were made in an online (GTW) session on Wednesday 18th August:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement   * 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. |

## 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.

* In contribution [Ericsson04], it is viewed that 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
* Contributions [Vivo05, Apple19] express view that gNB should ensure the sufficient Tx/Rx switching time before and after the set of SSB symbols and no special handling is needed
* Contribution [ZTE08] presents that Tx/Rx switching time should be considered for SSB overlapped with UL when determining the collision handling rules
* Contribution [Samsung09] indicates that the TX/RX switching time should be considered for SRS overlapped with SSB since SRS can be transmitted before and/or after the set of SSB symbols is received
* Contribution [LG16] has expressed view that the Rx-to-Tx switching time after the set of SSB symbol should be accounted for HD-FDD operation in FDD bands

From the above, the views are split. A common question is whether the back-to-back (without sufficient gap) scenarios can be avoided by gNB, and if not, whether the WA for Case 9 is sufficient to handle the collision, e.g., treating it as an error case. Contribution [ZTE] concerns that reception of SSB may not be successful for the case of SSB immediately following the last symbol of UL transmission without sufficient time gap.

Considering this may be coupled with the discussion for Case 9, the FL suggests we come back to this FFS after Case 9 has been discussed clearly.

Based on the discussion in section 4, it seems some companies prefer to discuss this FFS separately with Case 9.

**FL3 High Priority Question 2.3-1:**

* **Companies are invited to comment whether the Tx/Rx switching time should be accounted before and after the set of SSB symbols for Case 5 of SSB vs. Dynamic or semi-static UL (excluding valid RO)?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| CATT |  | Open to discuss but tend to be negative.  In current 213 spec, for single cell TDD, Ngap symbols are used in (1) Determination of valid RO (RO is valid after Ngap symbols from SSB), or (2) Collision handling related to valid RO.  Seems that Ngap symbols does not take part in collition handling in dynamic or semi-static UL in other cases in current specification.  Is there any reason for HD-FDD to additionally consider Tx/Rx switching time before/after SSB for dynamic or semi-static UL, compared to single cell TDD? |
| Vivo |  | gNB should ensure the sufficient Tx/Rx switching time before and after the set of SSB symbols and no special handling is needed |
| DOCOMO | Y | It is difficult to ensure sufficient gap between SSB and configured UL |
| Nordic |  | gNB responsibility to accommodate TA and switching |
| Intel | Y | In our view, two scenarios should be discussed   * the DL channel and UL channel does not overlap, however the gap in between may be less than switching time * the DL channel and UL channel overlaps, and the gap in between after overlap handling may be less than switching time   It may not always be feasible to leave it to gNB to ensure sufficient switching gaps for all cases, especially of the second type above. |
| Ericsson |  | Regarding whether to account for Tx/Rx switching time before and after the set of SSB symbols, we note that when the overlapping occurs, there is no switching time involved since both options discussed under Case 5 for SSB vs. dynamic UL and the agreement for SSB vs. semi-staic UL involve prioritizing either SSB or UL. Thus, there is no need to account for Tx/Rx switching time before and after the set of SSB symbols.  For the case of SSB immediately followed by an UL transmission or SSB immediately follows the last symbol of UL transmission without sufficient time gap (“back-to-back”), it can be resolve in general if the UE behavior for Case 9 is clarified to ensure that Tx/Rx switching time is fulfilled.  We note that similar scenarios of “back-to-back” UL followed by DL, or vice versa also exist beyond Case 5. For example, under Case 1 when SRS is partially cancelled. In this sense, we prefer that UE behavior in Case 9 is discussed first to avoid potential redundant discussion or conflict. |
| Samsung |  | We share a view with Intel. Even if the collison is solved by a rule, there may still exist remaining UL transmission as in two scenarios by Intel. It may be very difficult for gNB to always ensure sufficient switching time by only implementation. With this reason, the Tx/Rx switching time should be considered. |
| Qualcomm | Y | The TX/RX switching a is physical operation of UE, and the switching time needs to be accounted for in the collision handling procedures. |
| Apple | Y | Tx/Rx switching time should be considered to determine whether the SSB is overlapped with DG/CG-PUSCH. For example, if the gap between the last symbol of SSB and the first symbol of DG-PUSCH is smaller than switching gap, if the gap is not counted, the SSB/DG-PUSCH is not treated as ‘overlapping’ then HD-FDD UE is required to nderst both Tx/Rx and indeed causes the switching. Hence, the gap should be counted to determine whether there is overlapping SSB and DG-PUSCH. |
| LG | Y | Yes for “after SSB” and not sure for “before SSB”, but okay to consider both for the moment. |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | From our understanding, ‘**the Tx/Rx switching time should be accounted before and after the set of SSB symbols**’ means prioritized SSB is the pre-condition. After we confirm the priority for each case, then the switching time can be discussed case by case, based on the agreed priority for each case. |
| OPPO |  | We wonder the TX/RX switching time requirement in section 4 of 211 should already take care of the gap. We actually think additional specification may not be needed. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | N | We don’t see the need to specially handle anything for this issue. |
| MediaTek | Y | We prefere handling this conflict as part of case 5 rather than in case 9. |
| FL5 | Based on the received response, the companies views are split.  In the moderator’s view, the intention to discuss the FFS is to discuss whether the switching time is used to determine the collision of SSB with semi-static or dynamic UL transmission for the non-overlapped case but with a small gap. However, some companies may view it can be resolved in general if the UE behavior for Case 9 is clarified.  If a clarification of the UE behaviour for Case 9 is helpful, it is okay to discuss Case 9 firstly.  Needless to mention that companies are welcome to provide more comments if they wish | |
| Ericsson |  | We agree in principle that Tx/Rx switching needs to be ensured somehow.  In our view, there are anyway cases where even after collision handling is applied for overlapping DL and UL, e.g., with partial cancellation of SRS, the gap between DL and UL is still less than the required switching time. Even the case of non-overlapping DL and UL where the gap between the end and start of UL/DL is less than the switching time should also be handled, especiall when it involves semi-statically configured UL/DL as it may not always be possible to avoid such scenarios by gNB implementation.  We agree with the two points listed by Intel and echoed by Samsung above. With this, we think it is useful to get a clarification of the UE behaviour for Case 9 which could potentially address the question here. |

# Collision handling for Case 8

## PRACH occasion validation for HD-FDD Ues

For the definition of “valid RO” for HD-FDD Ues, the following options are discussed in RAN1#105-e meeting:

* Option 1: Same as NR FDD that all PRACH occasions are valid
* Option 2: Similar to NR TDD that a PRACH occasion in a PRACH slot is valid if it does not precede a SS/PBCH block in the PRACH slot and starts at least Ngap symbols after a last SS/PBCH block symbol

Table 3.1-1 summarizes the companies view for the above two options

**Table 3.1-1: Views on RO validation for HD-FDD Ues**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Index | Description | Companies | # of Companies |
| Option 1 | FDD definition | Huawei, Ericsson, vivo, Nokia, ZTE, Samsung, CATT, CMCC, MTK, Intel, Apple, DCM, Xiaomi, Panasonic | 14 |
| Option 2 | TDD definition | OPPO, LG, WILUS, Qualcomm | 4 |

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

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | FDD validitation rule | TDD validation rule |
| gNB impacts | Support sharing Ros b/w FD-FDD and HD-FDD Ues with consistent SSB-to-RO mapping | Mismatch on SSB-to-RO mapping between FD-UD and HD-UE thus potentially increasing gNB complexity for PRACH detection |
| HD-FDD UE impacts | Increased RACH latency  May not be able to transmit on the Ros associated with the best SSB beams due to persistent collision  May not be able to meet performance requirements for RRM measurements if valid RO is prioritized | All valid Ros can be used for PRACH transmission |
| Spec. Impacts | Need to specify collision handling rule for SSB vs. Valid RO | Need to support configuration of dedicated PRACH resources to HD-FDD Ues |

Contribution [NordicSemi11] presents a new option to address the SSB-to-RO mapping issue by mapping the transmitted SSBs to all PRACH occasions irrespective whether they are valid or not when the TDD rule is reused for HD-FDD.

In Contribution [Huawei01], it is proposed that not only the RO validation but also the PO validation and the RO/Po-to-PRU mapping rules of HD-FDD Ues should follow the rules of FDD’s definition.

For Option 1, there is the case of SSB colliding with valid Ros and the following alternatives are discussed in the contributions

* Alt. 1: Leave it to UE whether to receive SSB or transmit PRACH (e.g., based on RRM requirement)
* Alt. 2: Prioritize only the valid RO used for PRACH transmission; otherwise, SSB reception is prioritized
* Alt. 3: Always prioritize either SSB or RO

Contributions [Ericsson04, vivo05, Nokia06, CATT10, CT12, MTK17, Intel18, Apple19, IDCC21, DCM22, Panasonic24] support Alt. 1 since it provides flexibility and does not expect to cause an impact on gNB operation.

Alt. 2 is considered in contribution [ZTE08] since it is noted that the collision between the valid RO and SSB does not exist if a valid RO is not used for preamble transmission.

**FL1 High Priority Question 3.1-1:**

* **In order to facilitate a converged understanding, companies are invited to comment on the benefits and drawbacks for both Option 1 and 2, in particular regarding how each option can be designed to overcome/minimize the identified drawbacks of the option**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| vivo |  | For Option 2, we think the gNB impact is not only the detection complexity, it may cause PRACH detection failure if incorrect reception beam is chosen by the gNB.  For Option 1, it is not clear reusing FDD validation rule will increase the PRACH latency. On the contrary, reusing TDD validation rule (option 2) will increase the PRACH latency if the PRACH detection often fails due to incorrect reception beam at the gNB side.  For the additional spec impact for Option 1, we think Alt 1 should be sufficient, and Alt 2 can be considered as one particular exemplary UE implementation of Alt 1.  There is additional specification impact for option 2 that the spec needs to define that for paired the spectrum, the RO validation for HD-FDD UE follows the TDD’s definition, which is different from the FD-FDD UE. |
| CATT |  | Support Option 1, i.e. following FDD definition. Sharing the same SSB-to-RO mapping is preferred to avoid increasing the gNB complexity.  Latency for initial access is unlikely to be a serious issue.  Regarding to the ‘Need to specify collision handling rule for SSB vs. valid RO’, note that Alt. 1 (Leave it to UE implementation) does not require collision handling rule. |
| ZTE , Sanechips |  | For the definition of “valid RO” for HD-FDD Ues, if Option 2 is used, mismatch on SSB-to-RO mapping between FD-UD and HD-UE as summarized by FL is a serious problem, and from our perspective, only a separate PRACH resource configuration dedicated for HD-FDD RedCap Ues can address it. So both full duplex and half duplex RedCap Ues should be identified by PRACH, considering NR PRACH may also be used for other purposes in Rel-17 NR, such as for the identification of NR UE with coverage enhancement, it will finally result in the excessive fragmentation of PRACH and cause the decrease of PRACH resource utilization.  For Option 1, regarding the collision with SSB and valid ROs, as we explain in our contribution, the collision does not exist if the HD-FDD RedCap UE intends not to send preamble on the valid RO since the UL(valid ROs) and DL(SSBs) are separate in frequency domain. It is not recommended that all valid ROs should follow the same scheme.  Therefore, from our perspective, Option 1 is prioritized and in the case of SSB colliding with valid ROs Alt 2 is prioritized. |
| Ericsson |  | The drawbacks of using TDD validation rule (Option 2) have been clearly stated in many contributions, i.e., different SSB-to-RO mappings between FD-FDD UE and HD-FDD UE, leading to increased gNB complexity for PRACH detection and the need for dedicated PRACH resources for HD-FDD Ues.  In our view, all the concerns listed above for Option 1 can be overcome if the collision handling rule for valid RO vs. SSB is defined to be up to UE implementation whether to receive SSB or transmit PRACH (Alt. 1). Note that this rule (Alt. 1) is also the majority view among companies. That is, the UE can take into account RRM measurement requirements to prioritize SSB if needed. On the other hand, if the UE wishes to transmit PRACH, e.g., on the RO associated with the best SSB beam, it can prioritize PRACH, and thus not incurring further RACH latency.  From the above, we think it is clear that Option 1 is preferred over Option 2. |
| Nordic |  | There are two aspect to be clarified   1. Mapping of SSBs to Ros and PRACH sequences 2. Collision handling of SSB and valid RO   Therefore, we suggest compromise solution  Proposal-Nordic  Set valid RO as TDD (for collision handling), but clarify in specification that for HD-FDD UE SSBs are mapped to all Ros irrespective whether valid or not. |
| Nokia, NSB |  | Our preference is Option 1.  We prefer not to have separate valid RO definition for FDD and HD-FDD UE as this will increase gNB complexity.  For collision rule, our preference is Alt 2 but we would also be OK with Alt 1. |
| Intel |  | The RO validation of NR TDD, especially the Ngap symbols, is defined considering the necessary switching time at TDD gNB. However, this is not a problem for FDD gNB at all.  Further, applying different rules of RO validation for HD-FDD UE and FD-FDD UE complicate the gNB configuration. |
| Apple |  | Our preference is option 1.  As commented by vivo, the valid RO is used for the association with SSBs. Opt.2 results in different RO association between FD-FDD and HD-FDD Ues in a same cell and causes PRACH detection problem at gNB side due to different preamble transmission direction from FD-FDD and HD-FDD Ues.  The prioritization between overlapping SSB and RO is a separate issue. Even we agree a RO is valid when it is overlapped with SSB. We can still further discuss which of SSB/RO is prioritized for HD-FDD UE. |
| Qualcomm |  | Based on the example shown below (R1-2107353), the RO validation rule of non-RedCap (FD capable) UE is not suitable for RedCap UE incapable of FD-FDD operation, due to the persistent collisions between SSB and RO. As a result, a RedCap UE is not able to transmit on the RO associated with the best SSB beams within a SSB-to-RO association (pattern) period and meet the measurement accuracy requirements, especially for 1 RX UE.  Moreover, the RO valid for non-RedCap UE cannot be assumed valid for RedCap UE by default, since the valid RO for non-RedCap UE is not necessarily within the initial UL BWP of RedCap UE (i.e. initial UL BWP of non-RedCap UE is wider than the max BW of RedCap UE).  Furthermore, R16 already supports separate PRACH resource configuration and different SSB-to-RO mapping patterns when 4-step RACH and 2-step RACH co-exist (TS 38.213, Clause 8.1) on the same CC.  As a trade-off between RO validation rule of FDD and TDD, we have the following proposal for Type-A HD-FDD operation:  ***For a PRACH occasion configured for HD-FDD RedCap UE, the RO is valid if:***   * ***it is within the initial UL BWP of the RedCap UE*** * ***it does not precede a SS/PBCH block in the PRACH slot and starts at least symbols after a last SS/PBCH block symbol, where***    + ***the candidate SS/PBCH block index of the SS/PBCH block corresponds to the SS/PBCH block index provided by ssb-PositionsInBurst in SIB1 or in ServingCellConfigCommon, as described in Clause 4.1 of TS 38.213*** |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility |  | Our preference is option 1. Similar with Nokia’s view, there is no need to have separate valid RO definition for FDD and HD-FDD. |
| Samsung |  | Our preference is Option 1. We think the second or third drawback for HD-FDD UE impacts from Option 1 in the above table is up to how to define the collision handling rule. If Alt.1 (up to UE implementation) is adopted, there is no issue for such drawbacks. |
| Xiaomi |  | We prefer Opt.1. HD-FDD UE and FD-FDD UE will coexist in the same NW, different rule will protentially ause some preamble detection problem on the gNB side |
| Sharp |  | Considering the coexistence with full-duplex Ues, We prefer option 1 which has the same mapping between SSBs and Ros for FD and HD Ues. For the collision handling rules, we are ok with alt1. |
| OPPO |  | We still prefer Opt.2. The Option 1 actually hide the problem of RO collision to SSB and leave this for implementation. This will make unpredictable behaviour of UE and we should avoid. The latency for sure will increase as the RO is not guaranteed. You have to wait until the later SSB-to-RO mapping patterns.  We would prefer to have gNB take care of the HD-FDD mapping and there is definitely awareness of RedCap UE and different processing. |
| FL2 | The companies position has not changed:   * It seems from Option 1 proponents’ perspective, Option 2 has the most problematic issues. Meanwhile some of Option 2 proponents discard Option 1 as well   **Nordic compromise proposal:**   * **Alt-a**: Set valid RO as TDD (for collision handling), but clarify in specification that for HD-FDD UE SSBs are mapped to all ROs irrespective whether valid or not.   **Moderator proposals for way forward**   * **Alt-b**: The overlapping between SSB and RO should be avoided by NW configuration, i.e. the NW can select an ppropriate PRACH configuration applicable to both FD-FDD and HD-FDD with RO not overlapping with SSB * **Alt-c**: For HD-FDD Ues, all ROs are valid (same as FD-FDD), and for the case of collision between SSB and valid RO, leave it to UE whether to receive SSB or transmit PRACH   **Questions**:   * **Q1**: Companies are invited to provide any comment with respect to the above 3 alternantives * **Q2**: Please provide any comments, or changes the status or suggestions to help to reach a consensus | |
| vivo |  | Q1: Alt-c is much easier for NW implementation to accommodate HD-FDD Ues in addition to FD-FDD Ues. Either Alt-a or Alt-b requires NW reconfiguration (of SSB or RO) in order to support HD-FDD Ues, which is not desirable. Therefore Alt-c should be taken. |
| DOCOMO |  | Q1: We support Alt-c proposed by moderator |
| MediaTek |  | Q1: We support Alt-c. The drawback of increased latency is not critical in this scenario. |
| Nokia, NSB |  | Q1: We are OK with Alt-c as proposed by the moderator. |
| Intel |  | Q1: We support Alt-c proposed by moderator |
| Nordic |  | Q1: For Alt a/b, in our opinion clever gNB may find RO configuration that fits both FDD and HD-FDD, so there is no need for reconfig. Alt-c we can accept if all the discussed DL collisions with valid RO are up to UE implementation. |
| Ericsson |  | Q1: Support Alt-c. Alt-b imposes unnecessary restriction on gNB configuration. |
| Apple |  | Q1: Alt-c is preferable. |
| IDCC |  | We perefer Alt-c. |
| Xiaomi |  | We are OK with Alt.-C |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility |  | Q1: We are Ok with Alt-c |
| CMCC |  | We prefer Alt-c. Since this is a FDD system and FD-FDD RedCap UEs also exist in this system, the overlapping between SSB and RO probably occur. Since FDD gNB always transmits SSB and detects PRACH, Alt-c allow UE receive SSB or transmit PRACH timely and has higher resource utilization efficiency. |
| Samsung |  | Support Alt-c. |
| FL3 | Companies preferences on the 3 alternatives are summarized below:   * Alt-a   + Nordic * Alt-b   + Nordic * Alt-c   + vivo, DOCOMO, MTK, Nokia, NSB, Intel, Nordic (2nd), Ericsson, Apple, IDCC, Xiaomi, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, CMCC, Samsung   Moderator recommendation is to consider Alt-c below and focus on concluding this proposal.  **High Priority Proposal 3.1-1:**   * For HD-FDD UEs, all ROs are valid (same as FD-FDD) * For the case of SSB overlapping with valid RO, leave it to UE implementation whether to receive SSB or transmit PRACH   + Note: whether or not the set of symbols overlapping with SSB includes Ngap symbols before the valid RO is discussed separately | |
| CATT | Y | Support.  In addition, we believe the same logic should be applied in Section 3.2, i.e. a RRC\_IDLE UE can determine to receive CSS PDCCH or transmit PRACH. |
| Spreadtrum | Y |  |
| vivo | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| Nordic | Y | Fine 😊 |
| Intel |  | We support the main bullets.  Regarding the ‘Note’, instead of mentioning ‘Ngap symbols’, it is prefer to FFS the necessity of switching time. ‘Ngap symbols’ is just one way to implement switching time. |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| Samsung | Y |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Y |  |
| China Telecom | Y |  |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | Y | We can compromise and support this proposal with the note.  In addition, shall the valid RO for HD-FDD UE be within the initial UL BWP of the RedCap UE ? If so, shall we clarify this proposal as follows ?  **High Priority Proposal 3.1-1:**   * For a RedCap UE operating on paired spectrum (FD-FDD or Type-A HD-FDD), all the ROs configured for the RedCap UE in its initial UL BWP are valid. * For the case of SSB overlapping with valid RO in Type-A HD-FDD operation, leave it to UE implementation whether to receive SSB or transmit PRACH   Note: whether or not the set of UL symbols overlapping with SSB includes Ngap symbols before the first symbol of valid RO is discussed separately |
| Apple | Y |  |
| Sharp | Y |  |
| LG |  | We can live with the proposal if the note is changed to what Intel suggested above for the same reasoning as metioned there. |
| OPPO |  | Ok to move on |
| FL4 | **@Intel**: The inclusion of the “Note” is to address the FFS in the RAN1#105- agreements to avoid any misunderstanding that the FFS will not be discussed further. But if it is clear to all the companies, it is also okay to remove the “Note” from the proposal.  Regarding Qualcomm’s comment, the moderator understanding is the current configuration of PRACH resources is per UL BWP and all the PRACH resources will be within the BWP bandwidth based on the following text in 38.211, section 6.3.3.2. Therefore, probably it is not needed to further clarify whether the valid Ros are in its initial UL BWP or not.   |  | | --- | | Random access preambles can only be transmitted in the frequency resources given by either the higher-layer parameter *msg1-FrequencyStart* or *msgA-RO-FrequencyStart* if configured as described in clause 8.1 of [5 TS 38.213]. The PRACH frequency resources , where equals the higher-layer parameter *msg1-FDM* or *msgA-RO-FDM* if configured, are numbered in increasing order within the initial uplink bandwidth part during initial access, starting from the lowest frequency. Otherwise, are numbered in increasing order within the active uplink bandwidth part, starting from the lowest frequency. |   **FL4 High Priority Proposal 3.1-1:**   * For Type-A HD-FDD ~~UEs~~, all ROs are valid (same as FD-FDD), and for the case of SSB overlapping with valid RO, leave it to UE implementation whether to receive SSB or transmit PRACH * ~~Note: whether or not the set of symbols overlapping with SSB includes N~~~~gap~~ ~~symbols before the first symbol of valid RO is discussed separately~~ | |
| Qualcomm | Y | OK with the FL4 proposal and the clarification above.  In the context of this proposal, we assume all Ros refer to “the Ros configured for RedCap Ues in the UL BWP of RedCap Ues”. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y | We are OK to keep the valid RO definition same with FD-FDD. |
| OPPO |  | OK to have the removal of note. In the main bullet, if remove “UE”. Would be good to say “HD-FDD operation”. |
| Vivo | Y |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y |  |
| CATT | Y |  |
| Intel | Y |  |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| Samsung | Y |  |
| MediaTek | Y |  |
| Nordic | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| LG |  | We still prefer to leave the FFS for switching time as a reminder. If it is clear to all companies then there should be no problem. |
| FL5 | Based on the discussion, the proposal is updated with minor editorial changes as following  **FL5 High Priority Proposal 3.1-1:**   * For Type-A HD-FDD operation, all ROs configured for RedCap UEs are valid (same as FD-FDD), and for the case of SSB overlapping with valid RO, leave it to UE implementation whether to receive SSB or transmit PRACH | |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  | The previous one without note and with UE is fine.   * For Type-A HD-FDD UEs, all ROs are valid (same as FD-FDD), and for the case of SSB overlapping with valid RO, leave it to UE implementation whether to receive SSB or transmit PRACH |
| vivo |  | Suggest a minor change, as NW may not configure RedCap specific Ros.   * For Type-A HD-FDD operation, all ROs ~~configured~~ applicable for RedCap UEs are valid (same as FD-FDD), and for the case of SSB overlapping with valid RO, leave it to UE implementation whether to receive SSB or transmit PRACH |
| OPPO |  | Ok for the FL proposal. |
| DOCOMO |  | Support vivo’s version |
| CATT | Y | vivo’s version is fine since it is possible that Ros are shared. |
| Samsung |  | OK with the FL proposal. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility |  | Fine with vivo’s version. |
| CMCC |  | Fine with vivo’s version. |
| Sharp | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y |  |
| Nordic | Y | OK with VIVO |
| China Telecom | Y | We are fine with FL proposal. |
| Intel |  | Fine with vivo’s version. |
| Panasonic | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y | We think the proposal is already clear without adding “configured for RedCap UEs”, but we can accept the FL5 proposal. Vivo’s revision is also fine. |
| Xiaomi | Y |  |
| FL6 | Moderator understands the concern is only for the newly added words “configured for RedCap Ues” which may cause some confusion. The original FL4 proposal without the note seems more stable. Regarding “UE” or “operation”, no strong view from the moderator. But it is assumed not an issue.  **FL6 High Priority Proposal 3.1-1:**   * For Type-A HD-FDD UEs, all ROs are valid (same as FD-FDD), and for the case of SSB overlapping with valid RO, leave it to UE implementation whether to receive SSB or transmit PRACH | |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y |  |
| vivo | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y |  |
| Nordic | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| Apple | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| Qualcomm |  | There are cases that RO is separately configured for RedCap and non-RedCap UE, and RO is shared between different UE types. For clarify, we prefers the FL5 version with the changes suggested by Vivo. |
| CATT | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Y |  |
| Sharp | Y |  |
| Samsung | Y |  |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| Intel | Y |  |
| OPPO | Y | Seems the updated one has less restriction. Prefer to not add more. |
| FL7 | The proposal is updated as following. Hopefully it can be acceptable to all.  **FL7 High Priority Proposal 3.1-1:**   * For Type-A HD-FDD UEs, all ROs applicable to RedCap UEs are valid (same as FD-FDD RedCap UEs), and for the case of SSB overlapping with valid RO, leave it to UE implementation whether to receive SSB or transmit PRACH | |

Based on the proposals in FL summary #4 in [R1-2108477](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_106-e/Inbox/R1-2108477.zip), the following RAN1 agreement was made in an online (GTW) session on Tuesday 24th August:

|  |
| --- |
| **Working Assumption**   * For Type-A HD-FDD UEs, all ROs applicable to RedCap UEs are valid ~~(same as FD-FDD RedCap UEs)~~, and for the case of SSB overlapping with valid RO from cell specific point of view, leave it to UE implementation whether to receive SSB or transmit PRACH * No support of differentiating of ROs for Type-A HD-FDD Redcap UEs and FD FDD RedCap UEs |

## valid RO overlaps with PDCCH in Type 0/0A/1/2 CSS set

From RAN1 #105-e [2] ,the following agreements were reached for this collision sub-cases:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:   * For Case 8 of valid RO overlapping with PDCCH in Type 0/0A/1/2 CSS set, down-select from the following options   + Option 1: Reuse the existing collision handling principles of Rel-15/16 for NR TDD that valid RO is prioritized over configured PDCCH   + Option 2: Leave to UE implementation whether to receive the configured PDCCH or transmit the PRACH on the valid RO   + Option 3: If configured PDCCH is in a Type-2 CSS set, then PDCCH is prioritized; otherwise the valid RO is prioritized   + Option 4: Configured PDCCH is prioritized over valid RO   + Option 5: Configured by network, e.g. via a priority indicator   + FFS: whether or not the set of symbols overlapping with PDCCH in CSS set includes also Ngap symbols before the valid RO and whether the same value for Ngap in current spec is reused for HD-FDD   + FFS whether a valid RO follows TDD’s or FDD’s definition, and if so, the corresponding impact * FFS: whether or not the same principle is applied to PUSCH occasion of MSGA in 2-step RACH, if supported |

Table 3.2-1 summarizes the companies view for the 5 options in RAN1#105-e agreement.

**Table 3.2-1: Views on collision handling for valid RO overlaps with PDCCH in Type 0/0A/1/2 CSS set**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Index | Description | Companies | # of Companies |
| Option 1 | Reuse the existing collision handling principles of Rel-15/16 for NR TDD that valid RO is prioritized over configured PDCCH | Ericsson (1st choice), Spreadtrum (2nd choice), NordicSemi, OPPO, LG, Apple, Sharp, IDCC, DCM, Panasonic, ASUSTeK, WILUS | 12 |
| Option 2 | Leave to UE implementation whether to receive the configured PDCCH or transmit the PRACH on the valid RO | Huawei, Ericsson (2nd choice), Nokia, Spreadtrum (1st choice), Samsung, CATT, QC, CMCC, MTK, Intel, Xiaomi , Apple (2nd choice) | 12 |
| Option 3 | If configured PDCCH is in a Type-2 CSS set, then PDCCH is prioritized; otherwise, the valid RO is prioritized | vivo |  |
| Option 4 | Configured PDCCH is prioritized over valid RO |  |  |
| Option 5 | Configured by network, e.g., via a priority indicator |  |  |

In contribution [ZTE08], it is noted that if a valid RO is not used for preamble transmission, the collision between the valid RO and dynamically scheduled DL does not exist. Therefore, it is suggested to differentiate the collision handling for the valid RO based on whether it has been selected by the UE for preamble transmission, and for the Ros not intended for preamble transmission, the collision handling rules can be defined per CSS set.

In contributions [Ericsson04, Samsung09, Apple19], it is suggested to consider a unified solution to handle all the sub-cases under Case 8 to minimize the specification impact as well as simplify the collision handling operation.

Contribution [vivo05] argues that Option 3 can achieve better trade-off among prioritizing random access, reception of important downlink signalling and UE complexity. Contribution [OPPO13] views that Type 2 CSS set overlapping with valid RO happens less frequently and the network can ensure the paging to HD-FDD UE not to be sent in a RO slot.

From the above, a common question is whether to define the priority rule per CSS set. Also, it is noted that in the following agreement for Case 2, the PRACH triggered by PDCCH order has a higher priority than the semi-statically configured DL reception (including PDCCH in CSS set). Therefore, it needs to be clarified whether the valid RO in this collision subcase include the RO associated with PRACH triggered by PDCCH order.

|  |
| --- |
| Agreements:   * For Case 2 (semi-statically configured DL reception vs. dynamically scheduled UL transmission), reuse the existing collision handling principles in Rel-15/16 NR for operation on a single carrier/single cell in unpaired spectrum   + The semi-statically configured DL reception may include PDCCH (excluding ULCI), SPS PDSCH, CSI-RS or PRS.     - FFS on PDCCH carrying ULCI, including whether or not it is supported by RedCap Ues (including potential difference between HD vs. FD RedCap Ues)   + The dynamically scheduled UL transmission may include PUSCH, PUCCH, SRS or PRACH triggered by PDCCH order   Agreements:   * For Case 2 (semi-statically configured DL reception vs. dynamically scheduled UL transmission), a HD-FDD RedCap UE is not required to monitor ULCI   + No special handling on the priority rule for PDCCH carrying ULCI |

**FL1 High Priority Question 3.2-1:**

* **For Case 8 of valid RO overlapping with PDCCH in Type 0/0A/1/2 CSS set, should RAN1 consider to define the pirority rule per CSS set? Companies are invited to comment whehter the valid RO in this collision subcase should include the RO associated with PRACH triggered by PDCCH order.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** | |
| vivo |  | The reason we propose option 3 was due to the much less paging occasions that RACH occasion so it would make sense to prioritize Paging monitoring than RACH transmission. However, given the current situation we are fine to accept option 2 also.  The collision handling between PDCCH monitoring and PRACH triggered by PDCCH has already be resolved by the agreement cited by FL above for case 2, no need to re-open the discussion here. | |
| CATT |  | We do not think there is strong need to define priority rule per CSS set. | |
| Spreadtrum |  | Define the priority rule per CSS set: From our perspective, a unified solution is preferred to handle all the CSS set. For type 2 CSS set, we agree that paging and SI are very important, but we think the gNB can avoid this overlapping, so there is no need to treat it specially. | |
| DOCOMO | N | We don’t see the need to consider priority rule per CSS set.  As commented in Question 2.1-2, PRACH triggered by PDCCH order should be included in this case | |
| ZTE,Sanechips |  | As our comment in Question 3.1-1, if we can reach a consensus that the collision for valid RO and DL does not exist if the HD-FDD RedCap UE intends not to send preamble on the valid RO, it is no need to define the priority rule per CSS set. For the valid ROs with no preamble sending, always prioritize valid RO would put too much restrictions for gNB configuring the Type 0/0A/1/2 CSS. For the valid ROs with preamble sending, the RA procedure should not be interrupted with the consequence of increasing access delay. Therefore, valid RO is prioritized on which HD-FDD RedCap UE intends to send preamble ; otherwise, PDCCH in Type 0/0A/1/2 CSS set is prioritized.  As our comment in Question 2.1-2, PRACH triggered by PDCCH order is included in dynamically scheduled UL transmission, so the corresponding collision handling rule can follow Case 2. | |
| Ericsson | N | Among the options listed, Option 1 and Option 2 receive most support, and these options do not require that RAN1 defines the priority rule per CSS set.  In view of the agreement for Case 2, PRACH triggered by PDCCH order can be treated as dynamically scheduled UL transmission. For the sake of discussion, we think that it is fine to separate normal valid RO (treated here in Case 8) from those intended for PRACH triggered by PDCCH order.  In our view, if either Option 1 or Option 2 is selected for Case 8, there will not be any conflict in collision handling rule with that in Case 2. | |
| Nordic | Y | We prefer legacy behaviour, but can live with left up to implementation | |
| Nokia, NSB | N | There is no need to define priority rule per CSS set. In our view, PRACH triggered by PDCCH order is considered dynamically scheduled UL transmission and does not needed to be treated in Case 8. | |
| Intel | N | Since the Type 0/0A/1/2 CSS set may share the same monitoring occasions, we prefer to define the same overlap handling rule for all Type 0/0A/1/2 CSS sets.  In our understanding, Case 8 is to define the overlapping handling for cell-specifically configured valid RO that is used in CBRA. On the other hand, PRACH triggered by PDCCH order is considered as dynamic channel (known to both gNB and UE), hence Case 2 applies. | |
| Apple | N | Prefer to define a unified approach to handle these cases.  Given the less frequent preamble transmission for a given UE, we can go with Opt.2 to leave it for UE implementation. NOTE leaving it for UE implementation in this case does not increase any complexity at gNB side. | |
| Qualcomm |  | In NR R15/16, triggers of RACH procedure have been specified by RAN2. Therefore, unless RACH procedure is triggered by higher layer or ordered by PDCCH, UE is not required to transmit PRACH on the valid RO.  Since RedCap Ues monitoring broadcast PDCCH in **Type 0/0A/1/2 CSS set** may or may not be “triggered” or “ordered” to transmit PRACH on the valid RO, we think such collision handling should be left to UE implementation. | |
| Samsung | N | No need to define the priority rule per CSS set and one common rule is sufficient for all CSS sets. As commented in Case 5, we prefer to include PDCCH ordered PRACH in this Case. | |
| Xiaomi | N | We prefer unified princile | |
| Sharp |  | We don’t see the need to consider priority rule per CSS set. And PRACH triggered by PDCCH order always transmits on a valid RO, so the rules in this subcase should cover the handling for it. | |
| China Telecom | N | We think it would be better to strive the unified handling procedure for semi-static DL vs. valid RO. | |
| OPPO | N | No strong problem is identified. Even for the Type2 CSS set, the mostly collision can be avoided by proper gNB configuration, if it would like to support RedCap Ues, similar as special BWP configuration for RedCap. | |
| FL2 | The majority view is not to define priority rule per CSS set. Since vivo is also okay with Option 2, let us delete Option 3 for down-selection from now. Thanks vivo for compromise.  Regarding PRACH triggered PDCCH order, It seems most companies view it has been covered by Case 2 and there is no need to further discuss it in this subcase.  **FL2 High Priority Proposal 3.2-1: Select one of the following**   * For Case 8 of valid RO overlapping with PDCCH in Type 0/0A/1/2 CSS set   + Option 1: Reuse the existing collision handling principles of Rel-15/16 for NR TDD that valid RO is prioritized over configured PDCCH   + Option 2: Leave to UE implementation whether to receive the configured PDCCH or transmit the PRACH on the valid RO * Note: For valid RO intented for PRACH triggered by PDCCH order, it is covered in Case 2.   **Questions**: **Companies please provide any comments, or changes the status or suggestions to help to reach a consensus.** | | |
| Vivo |  | | Option 2 is acceptable to us. |
| DOCOMO | Y | | We are fine with the proposal. For down-selection, we support Option 1 |
| MediaTek | Y | | We are fine with the proposal and support Option 2 for the collision between valid RO and all DL transmissions (dynamic or semi-static) other than SSB. |
| Nokia, NSB |  | | We are fine the proposal. Our preference is Option 2. |
| Intel |  | | We are fine with the proposal. Option 2 is preferred.  It is not good to always prioritize valid RO since a PRACH preamble is most likely not transmitted at all. In NR TDD, if there is a valid RO, TDD gNB can never transmit. So it is reasonable to prioritize valid RO in TDD. However, it is not the case for FDD gNB. |
| Ericsson |  | | We are open to both options. |
| Qualcomm |  | | Option 2 is supported |
| Apple |  | | Opt.2 is preferrable. |
| IDCC |  | | Option 2 is preferred. |
| Xiaomi |  | | we prefer Option 2 |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Y | | Option 2 is slightely preferred. |
| CMCC | Y | | Prefer option2. If RO is prioritized, HD-FDD RedCap Ues will miss the reception of paging and SI modification, while the new SI may include new configuration of RO. |
| LG |  | | Option 1 is preferred. |
| Samsung |  | | Support Option 2. |
| FL3 | Companies preferences are summarized below.   * Option 1:   + DOCOMO, Ericsson, LG * Option 2:   + vivo, MTK, Ericsson, Nokia, NSB, Intel, Samsung, CATT, QC, CMCC, MTK, Intel, Xiaomi , Apple, IDCC, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility   Considering the majority view is to support Option 2, let us consider the updated Proposal 3.2-1 below and focus on concluding this proposal  **High Priority Proposal 3.2-1:**   * + For Case 8 of valid RO overlapping with PDCCH in Type 0/0A/1/2 CSS set, leave it to UE implementation whether to receive configured PDCCH or transmit PRACH   + Note: For valid RO intented for PRACH triggered by PDCCH order, it has been covered in Case 2. | | |
| CATT | Y | |  |
| Spreadtrum | Y | |  |
| vivo | Y | |  |
| DOCOMO |  | | We can live with the proposal |
| Nokia, NSB | Y | |  |
| Nordic | Y | |  |
| Intel | Y | |  |
| Ericsson | Y | |  |
| Samsung | Y | |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Y | |  |
| China Telecom | Y | | We are fine with FL proposal. |
| CMCC | Y | |  |
| Qualcomm | Y | |  |
| Apple | Y | |  |
| Sharp | Y | |  |
| LG | Y | | Given the clear majority, we can live with this proposal. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | N | | From eNB’s point of view, though the collision happens, it can do preamble detection on the valid RO and PDCCH transmission simultaneously.  From UE’s point of view, if UE implementation method is selected, it can not guarantee that UE will monitor the PDCCH when the PDCCH is overlapped with valid RO on which UE does not send a preamble. This may cause the PDCCH resource wasting.  Therefore, for the case that UE does not send a preamble on the valid RO, the PDCCH detection should be specified.  Additionally, if UE implementation indicates that the UE must detect the PDCCH when the UE does not send a preamble on the valid RO, then specifying the UE behavior, that UE receive the PDCCH on the valid RO on which UE does not send a preamble, still would not have any impact. |
| OPPO |  | | We still see there is not strong Motivation to do that. But we can move forward to see how the specification can take Option2. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  | | There seems to be previous discussion for non-RedCap Ues already and this appears to be an in-optimal solution. But we can live with it. |
| MediaTek | Y | |  |
| FL5 | **Moderator observation:**   * Companies (DOCOMO, LG, OPPO, Huawei, HiSilicon), for sake of compromise and progress, can live with Option 2 * Only company (ZTE, Sanechips) do not support the FL’s proposal   **@ZTE**, On your proposal, the moderator understanding is that it is none of the 5 options for down-selection in the RAN1#105-e meeting agreement. It is not acceptable to revert the previous agreement only due to one company proposal without critical issue identified.  **Companies are also invited to share your view on ZTE proposal whether to prioritize the valid RO used for PRACH transmission.**  **Moderator recommendation:** the same proposal can be considered again.  **FL5 High Priority Proposal 3.2-1:**   * For Case 8 of valid RO overlapping with PDCCH in Type 0/0A/1/2 CSS set, leave it to UE implementation whether to receive configured PDCCH or transmit PRACH * Note: For valid RO intented for PRACH triggered by PDCCH order, it has been covered in Case 2. | | |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y | |  |
| vivo | Y | | We think the current proposal (UE implementation) is inclusive to ZTE proposal, which means UE can implement in the way as ZTE proposed. If the worry is about UE neither transmit PRACH nor monitor PDCCH, we think such behaviour is not allowed by the FL proposal. |
| OPPO | Y | |  |
| DOCOMO | Y | | We share the view with vivo that current proposal includes ZTE’s one, i.e., either PDCCH repection or PRACH transmission is carried out in this case. |
| CATT | Y | |  |
| Samsung | Y | |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Y | |  |
| CMCC | Y | |  |
| Sharp | Y | |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | | @FL  As the main bullet described in the RAN1#105-e meeting agreement, ‘For Case 8 of valid RO overlapping with PDCCH in Type 0/0A/1/2 CSS set’ implies there exists the collision. The precondition of the collision existence is the RedCap UE intend to send a preamble on the RO. In an another word, when the RedCap UE does not intend to send a preamble on the valid RO, then there is no collision. Therefore, we do not need to revert the RAN1#105-e meeting agreement and what should be clarified is the precondition of collision existence is that the RedCap UE intend to send a preamble on the RO.  If the UE intend to send a preamble on the valid RO and there exist the collision, we think the prioritized RO should be provided, instead of UE implementation. This is also covered by option1.  If the UE does not intend to send a preamble on the valid RO. Obviously there does not exist the collision. There is no any other UE behavior except the UE receive the PDCCH. Moreover, UE implementation method can not guarantee that UE will monitor the PDCCH when the PDCCH is overlapped with valid RO on which UE does not send a preamble. This may cause the PDCCH resource wasting. Therefore, for this case, we do not need the down-slection since there is no collision.  However, for the NW, it is not hoped that the UE can refuse to receive the PDCCH when the gNB transmit the PDCCH actually.  In conclusion,   1. the RAN1#105-e meeting agreement implies the handling rule for collision case can be applied in the valid RO only when the UE intends to send preamble. 2. If the UE does not intend to send a preamble on the valid RO, obviously there does not exist the collision. What the UE only can do is to receive the PDCCH, which should be specified. |
| Nordic | Y | | just to understand, will there be something in specification to capture the Proposal? 😊 |
| LG | Y | |  |
| China Telecom | Y | |  |
| Intel | Y | | We share similar view as vivo and DOCOMO that the current proposal includes ZTE preferred operation. That is, when a valid RO overlap with Type0/0A/1/2 CSS sets, if UE needs to transmit PRACH preamble, UE prioritize PRACH; otherwise, UE priroitize Type0/0A/1/2 CSS sets. I don’t think a smart UE will not do as it. |
| Panasonic | Y | |  |
| Ericsson | Y | |  |
| Xiaomi | Y | |  |
| FL6 | **@ZTE**: For sake of progress, we can consider to add one FFS regarding precondition to consider. If it is accepted by all companies we could also add the similar FFS to the proposals in other sections related to the valid RO.  **FL6 High Priority Proposal 3.2-1:**   * For Case 8 of valid RO overlapping with PDCCH in Type 0/0A/1/2 CSS set, leave it to UE implementation whether to receive configured PDCCH or transmit PRACH * FFS: where or note there are onditions that need to be considered. * Note: For valid RO intented for PRACH triggered by PDCCH order, it has been covered in Case 2. | | |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y | |  |
| LG | Y | | As we commented directly in the e-mail, adding the FFS which is not clear enough at this stage is not helpful to complete this WI. If it is to address ZTE’s concern then perhaps ZTE could suggest some some way forward on this. From our perspective, what ZTE suggests is very close to UE implementation solution if it is not the same. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y | | For sake of progress, we can compromise with this FFS.  The benefits for specifying UE behavior is obvious since the UE behavior and gNB scheduling can be kept aligned.  We do not understand what’s problem is here when the UE is specified to receive the PDCCH on the valid RO on which the UE does not intend to send a preamble? If any company do not support to specify this, please clarify the question. |
| Nordic | Y | | **FL6 High Priority Proposal 3.2-1:**   * For Case 8 of valid RO overlapping with PDCCH in Type 0/0A/1/2 CSS set, leave it to UE implementation whether to receive configured PDCCH or transmit PRACH * FFS: whether or not there are nderstand that need to be considered.   Note: For valid RO intented for PRACH triggered by PDCCH order, it has been covered in Case 2.  We assume there was type and we are fine with above FFS |
| Nokia, NSB | Y | | OK to fix typo as suggested by Nordic |
| Apple | Y | | OK with the Nordic’s version for progress. |
| Ericsson | Y | |  |
| Qualcomm | Y | |  |
| CATT | Y | | Though the FFS brings a little ambiguity, we can live with it for progress. |
| DOCOMO | Y | |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Y | |  |
| Sharp | Y | |  |
| Samsung | Y | |  |
| CMCC | Y | |  |
| Intel | Y | |  |
| OPPO | Y | |  |
| FL7 | Based on the received feedback, the proposal is updated by adding an example for considtions in the FFS according to the moderator understanding. Please the concerned company provides exact formulation or any change if needed.  **FL7 High Priority Proposal 3.2-1:**   * For Case 8 of valid RO overlapping with PDCCH in Type 0/0A/1/2 CSS set, leave it to UE implementation whether to receive configured PDCCH or transmit PRACH * FFS: whether or not there are conditions (e.g., exception for valid RO not intended for PRACH transmission) that need to be considered. * Note: For valid RO intented for PRACH triggered by PDCCH order, it has been covered in Case 2. | | |

Based on the proposals in FL summary #4 in [R1-2108477](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_106-e/Inbox/R1-2108477.zip), the following RAN1 agreement was made in an online (GTW) session on Tuesday 24th August:

|  |
| --- |
| **Working Assumption**   * For Case 8 of valid RO overlapping with PDCCH in Type 0/0A/1/2 CSS set, leave it to UE implementation whether to receive configured PDCCH or transmit PRACH * ~~FFS: whether or not there are conditions (e.g., exception for valid RO not intended for PRACH transmission) that need to be considered~~. * Note: For valid RO intended for PRACH triggered by PDCCH order, it has been covered in Case 2 |

## valid RO overlaps with UE-dedicated configured DL reception

From RAN1 #105-e [2] ,the following agreements were reached for this collision sub-cases. There are 3 options in the agreements and other options are not precluded

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:   * For Case 8 of valid RO overlapping with UE-dedicated configured DL reception (e.g. PDCCH in USS, SPS PDSCH, CSI-RS or DL PRS), down-select from the following options   + Option 1: Reuse the existing collision handling principles of Rel-15/16 for NR TDD that valid RO is prioritized over configured DL   + Option 2: Leave to UE implementation whether to receive the configured DL or transmit the PRACH on the valid RO   + Option 5: Configured by network, e.g. via a priority indicator   + Other options are not precluded.   + FFS: whether or not the set of symbols overlapping with configured DL includes also Ngap symbols before the valid RO and whether the same value for Ngap in current spec is reused for HD-FDD * FFS: whether or not the same principle is applied to PUSCH occasion of MSGA in 2-step RACH, if supported |

Table 3.3-1 summarizes the companies’ views for the 3 options in RAN1#105-e agreements.

**Table 3.3-1: Views on collision handling for valid RO overlaps with UE-dedicated configured DL reception**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Index | Description | Companies | # of Companies |
| Option 1 | Reuse the existing collision handling principles of Rel-15/16 for NR TDD that valid RO is prioritized over configured DL | Ericsson, Spreadtrum (2nd choice), CATT, NordicSemi, OPPO, CMCC, LG, Apple, Sharp, IDCC, DCM, Panasonic, ASUSTeK | 13 |
| Option 2 | Leave to UE implementation whether to receive the configured DL or transmit the PRACH on the valid RO | Nokia, Spreadtrum (1st choice), Samsung, MTK, Intel, Xiaomi | 6 |
| Option 5 | Configured by network, e.g. via a priority indicator | Huawei | 1 |

In contribution [ZTE08], it is noted that if a valid RO is not used for preamble transmission, the collision between the valid RO and dynamically scheduled DL does not exist. Therefore, it is suggested to support Option 1 but only for the valid Ros on which UE intends to send preamble

Contribution [vivo05] argues that all the three options in the RAN#105-e agreement have some issues and proposes another two options for down-selection with a slight preference for Option 4.

* Option 3: UE-dedicated configured DL reception is prioritized over the valid RO
* Option 4: Treated as a configuration error of NW (error case)

Contributions [CT12, QC14] express a similar view that the collision handling for this subcase can follow the handling of Case 3, i.e., the overlapping between valid RO and UE-dedicated configured DL reception is not expected by UE and will be treated as a configuration error.

From the above, there is a clear majority view for Option 1. The main concern for Option 2 is the ambiguity exist between the gNB and UE and thus the gNB complexity may also increase unnecessarily. Regarding the new option 4, based on the FL understanding, there is no essential difference compared to option 1. Both options may require the network not to configure the UE-dedicated configured DL reception in the valid RO slots, except that one is soft restriction (i.e., Option 1) and the other is hard restriction (i.e., Option 4).

.

**FL1 High Priority Proposal 3.3-1:**

* **For Case 8 of valid RO overlapping with UE-dedicated configured DL reception (e.g. PDCCH in USS, SPS PDSCH, CSI-RS or DL PRS), valid RO is prioritized over UE-dedicated configured DL reception (same as TDD case)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| vivo |  | UE would not transmit PRACH in most of the valid Ros, thus always prioritize valid RO would put too much restrictions for gNB to configure the semi-static DL receptions. Option 2, however does not result in such restrictions thus can be acceptable to us as 2nd preference. |
| CATT | Y |  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes | We have the similar concerns with vivo that always prioritize valid RO would waste some resources, so our first preference is option 2. But for the sake of progress, we can accept option 1 since the spec impact of this option is small and it is majority supported. |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | As our comment in Question 3.1-1, the collision for valid RO and DL does not exist if the HD-FDD RedCap UE intends not to send preamble on the valid RO.  For the valid ROs with no preamble sending, always prioritize valid RO would put too much restrictions for gNB configuring the DL transmission. For the valid ROs with preamble sending, the RA procedure should not be interrupted with the consequence of increasing delay for access, TA update and beam switching.  Therefore, for Case 8 of valid RO on which HD-FDD RedCap UE intends to send preamble overlapping with UE-dedicated configured DL reception, valid RO is prioritized; otherwise, UE-dedicated configured DL reception is prioritized. |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| Nordic | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB |  | Our preference is that the valid RO can be prioritized if the UE has to send PRACH. Otherwise the UE should receive the DL. |
| Intel |  | We share the same view as vivo, it is not good to always prioritize valid RO since a PRACH preamble is most likely not transmitted at all. In NR TDD, if there is a valid RO, TDD gNB can never transmit. So it is reasonable to prioritize valid RO. It is not the case for FDD gNB.  Having a unified handling of valid RO overlap with any configured DL reception maybe another reason, which depends on the decision of other cases. |
| Apple | Y | We are also ok with Opt.2. However, Opt.1 may cause DL resource wastage as it is unknown by gNB whether UE performs RO transmission or not and always transmit DL SPS. |
| Qualcomm | N | Based on the agreement in RAN1#105, other options are not precluded. Therefore, we think such collisions can be treated as a NW configuration error, which is the simplest solution for RedCap UE.  On the other hand, UE (non-RedCap or RedCap) not necessarily needs to transmit PRACH on a valid RO, since RACH needs to be triggered by higher layer or ordered by PDCCH. Therefore, we are open to discuss the option of “leaving to UE implementation” when a valid RO overlaps with UE-dedicated configured DL reception. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Y |  |
| Samsung |  | Our first preference is to leave it to UE implementation and share similar view with vivo and Spreadtrum that Option 1 is too much restrictions for gNB. But, we can live with the proposal if the proposal is applied for all sub-cases. |
| Xiaomi |  | We share the same view with Spreadtrum and vivo. Opt.1 impost significant restriction and result in potential resource wastage |
| Sharp | Y |  |
| OPPO | Y | Don’t see problem to reuse the TDD rules. |
| FL2 | **@ZTE**: Is your proposal covered also by Option 2 (i.e. one implementation example)? Since RO selection is up to UE and it is unknown by gNB whether UE performs PRACH transmission or not, the prioritization of the RO with preamble sending may not help gNB for optimizing resource utilization.  **@vivo**: Option 2 should include the implementation that UE prioritizes valid RO over dedicated configured DL reception. In such case, how can gNB determine the failure of DL reception is due to channel quality issue or UE’s discarding? Since this subcase is for UE-dedicated configured DL reception, the resources are dedicated to the UE. Wond’t it be a waste of resources if UE decides not to receive on the configured DL resources. To support Option 2, is there any impact on RAN4 spec, e.g. defining new test cases and performance requirement?  **@All**, Can the following proposal be considered as a compromise proposal if there is no concenus between Option 1 and 2?   * Option 4: It is considered as an error case if UE-dedicated configured DL reception overlaps with valid Ros | |
| vivo |  | @FL, gNB cannot be 100% sure about the reason for a DL reception failure in Option 2. Even with ZTE’s proposal, gNB cannot be 100% sure about the reason either, as PRACH transmission may be mis-detected by the gNB. The RAN4 impact of Option 2 is much less than option 1, since in option 2 UE has the flexility to choose between DL reception (for measurement) or RO (for PRACH transmission), while in Option 1 UE is mandated to cancel the DL reception for measurement even though there is no intention to transmit PRACH in a valid RO.  Regarding the possibility to define it as the error case, since DL reception includes PDCCH USS monitoring (which is usually configured as per slot monitoring), it would be hard to avoid the collision between PDCCH USS monitoring with valid Ros completely unless there is an additional TDD DL/UL pattern configuration provided (which we did not agree to introduce for FDD) |
| DOCOMO |  | We still prefer Option 1. The compromised proposal Option 4 does not work because it is difficult to avoid collision between PDCCH USS and valid Ros, as pointed out by vivo. |
| MediaTek |  | We still prefer Option 2 (i.e., by UE implementation). Although the gNB does not know whether the DL transmission failed or was deprioritized, the gNB is aware of the collision and may make the assumption that is optimal or safest for MCS adaptation. The collision should occur relatively infrequently as well.  Option 4 is just as restrictive as Option 1, as Vivo is also pointing it out. Therefore, it does not address the issue efficiently. |
| Nokia, NSB |  | Our preference is still Option 2. As also noted by other companies, in most cases UE will not transmit PRACH in valid RO. Therefore, valid RO can be prioritized if the UE has to send PRACH. Otherwise the UE should receive the DL.  The compromised proposal is too restrictive as it leaves gNB to try to avoid this situation. |
| Intel |  | It is in practically hard to complete avoid the overlap between valid RO and dedicated configured DL, e.g. PDCCH USS. It is more efficient to leave it up to UE implementation. |
| Ericsson |  | We prefer Option 1 for simplicity, but can be open to Option 2.  Option 4 proposed by FL is not preferred. |
| Qualcomm |  | Either Option 4 or Option 2 (UE implementation) is fine for us. |
| Apple |  | We are fine with any for Opt.1/Opt.2/Opt.4. |
| IDCC |  | We prefer Option 2 but are open to other options as well. |
| Xiaomi |  | Compared with option 4, we still prefer Option 2 |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility |  | OK with us. |
| CMCC |  | Prefer option1, open to discuss option2. |
| LG |  | We prefer Option 1. |
| Samsung |  | Prefer Option 2. But, open to Option 1. |
| FL3 | **Observations from discussion:**   * Some companies (DOCOMO, vivo, Nokia, MTK, Ericsson) think the compromised proposal Option 4 is too restrictive and does not address the issue efficiently * Some companies (Ericsson, IDCC, CMCC, Samsung), for sake of compromise and progress, are open for the other option   **Companies preferences are summarized below.**   * Option 1:   + DOCOMO, Ericsson, Apple, CMCC, LG * Option 2:   + vivo, MTK, Nokia, NSB, Intel, Qualcomm, Apple, IDCC, Xiaomi, Samsung   Considering a slight majority view is to support Option 2, let us consider the updated Proposal 3.3-1 below and focus on concluding this proposal  **High Priority Proposal 3.3-1:**   * For Case 8 of valid RO overlapping with UE-dedicated configured DL reception (e.g. PDCCH in USS, SPS PDSCH, CSI-RS or DL PRS), leave it to UE implementation whether to receive the DL or transmit PRACH | |
| CATT | N but | Our first preference is Option 1. At least the gNB can know that there is no need to transmit UE dedicated configured DL to HD-FDD UE in the overlapped symbols with valid RO. For Option 2, considering that different UE vendors may implement different handling priorities, there will be difficulty for gNB to handle such uncertaincy. Conservative scheduling strategy is likely to be adopted, leading to ‘prioritizing valid RO’ equivalently.  If we have to compromise to Option 2, we would like to ask prioritizing dynamic DL in Section 3.4, which gives the gNB the last chance to ‘certainly’ perform DL transmission to a HD-FDD UE in the symbols overlapped with valid RO, using a DL grant with clear intention. |
| Spreadtrum | Y |  |
| vivo | Y |  |
| DOCOMO |  | We can live with the proposal |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| Nordic | Y |  |
| Intel | Y |  |
| Ericsson |  | We can be fine with the proposal for the sake of progress. |
| Samsung | Y |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Y |  |
| China Telecom | Y | We are fine with FL proposal |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |
| Apple |  | We can be fine with the proposal for the sake of progress. |
| Sharp | Y |  |
| LG |  | We can live with the FL proposal for the progress. |
| OPPO |  | We can close this issue base on majority. |
| FL4 | **@CATT**, In the moderator’s view, it is up to gNB implementation. If gNB is not confident in UE implementation, gNB may choose either not to configure UE dedicated DL reception in the RO slots or not to schedule a DL transmission (e.g. UE dedicated PDCCH) in the configured collision resources. However, if gNB cannot avoid such case, as commented by some companies, gNB can use conservative scheduling strategy like safe MCS choice. Regarding prioritizing dynamic DL in Section 3.4, it would be appreciated if we can. However, based on the discussion in Section 3.4, companies views are quite slit at this moment. It is moderator’view that if we can achieve some progress for semi-static DL cases in Section 3.2 and 3.3, it will help to make the convergence in Section 3.4.  To address CATT’s concern, it is suggested to propose it as a working assumption.  **FL4 High Priority Proposed Working Assumption 3.3-1:**   * For Case 8 of valid RO overlapping with UE-dedicated configured DL reception (e.g. PDCCH in USS, SPS PDSCH, CSI-RS or DL PRS), leave it to UE implementation whether to receive the DL or transmit PRACH | |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | N | From eNB’s point of view, though the collision happens, it can do preamble detection on the valid RO and UE-dedicated configured DL transmission simultaneously. From UE’s point of view, if UE implementation method is selected, it can not guarantee that UE will receive UE-dedicated configured DL transmission, when the configured DL transmission is overlapped with valid RO on which UE does not send a preamble. This may cause the DL resource wasting.  Therefore, for the case that UE does not send a preamble on the valid RO, prioritizing configured DL transmission reception should be specified.  Additionally, if UE implementation indicates that the UE must receive the configured DL transmission when the UE does not send a preamble on the valid RO, then specifying the UE behavior, that UE receive the configured DL transmission on the valid RO on which UE does not send a preamble, still would not have any impact. |
| OPPO |  | OK |
| vivo | Y |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  | If network flexibility is not purposed, then we think RO should be priorized given RO is shared. |
| CATT | N, but | Thanks **@FL** for the nderstandi. We agree that gNB can try to handle the case by implementation. But the example of ‘safe MCS choice’ seems not always true since the UE may totoally ignore the DL transmission, regardless of the MCS. Situation will be very complicated when different UE vendors have different implementations.  Our first preference would be Option 1. If we have to compromise to Option 2, we would like to ask companies to consider prioritizing dynamic DL in Section 3.4 (though not discussed here), which gives the gNB the last chance to ‘certainly’ perform DL transmission to a HD-FDD UE in valid RO symbols, by using a DL grant. 🡨 This does not require any specification impact, the HD-FDD UE receives PDSCH scheduled by DCI, which is just the same as the current FDD UE. |
| Intel | Y |  |
| CMCC |  | We concern that if UE implementation method is selected, if UE sends PRACH and does not receive UE-dedicated configured DL transmission, the DL resources are wasted.  If RO is priorized, gNB knows to avoid the overlapping of RO and UE-dedicated configured DL transmission, the DL resources wasting can be alleviated. From the perspective of resource utilization, prioritizing RO seems better. |
| Samsung | Y |  |
| MediaTek | Y |  |
| Nordic | Y | In RRC connected, UE does not send PRACH for no reason, typically when it is in trouble, e.g. UL is out of synch, etc. Therefore we do nost see any issue with missing DL in situations when UE needs to transmit PRACH. |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| FL5 | **Moderator observation:**   * Companies (DOCOMO, Ericsson, Apple, LG, OPPO), for sake of compromise and progress, can live with Option 2 * Companies (ZTE, CATT, Huawei, CMCC) have concern to the FL’s proposal   **@ZTE:** In Moderator’s view, this sub-case is different from the sub-case of PDCCH in Type 0/0A/1/2 CSS set. Since gNB cannot know which RO is selected by UE for PRACH transmission, prioritization of the valid RO used for PRACH transmission cannot help to improve resource unilization for UE-dedicated configured DL transmission. Could you please explain what are the beneifts for your proposal compared to the FL’s proposal of Option 2?  **Companies are also invited to share your view on ZTE proposal whether to prioritize the valid RO used for PRACH transmission.**  **@CATT:** For your preference of Option 1 (valid RO prioritized over configured DL), moderator’s understanding is that it will not conflict with Option 2 (UE implementation). As commented earlier, gNB can either not to configure or transmit UE-dedicated configured DL in the valid RO slots. It is not clear to me why we need to couple this sub-clause with the dynamic DL in Section 3.4, for which I think you prefer to proritize dynamic DL instead of valid RO.  **Moderator recommendation:** the following same proposal can be considered again  **FL5 High Priority Proposal 3.3-1:**   * For Case 8 of valid RO overlapping with UE-dedicated configured DL reception (e.g. PDCCH in USS, SPS PDSCH, CSI-RS or DL PRS), leave it to UE implementation whether to receive the DL or transmit PRACH   **@All**: please provide any comment or suggestion to help to reach a consensus and conclude the discussion. | |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  | Our first preference is to let network configure which one is priotirized.  However as said, if such network flexibility is not pursued, then we think RO should be priorized given that RO is shared.  Perhaps one question:  Is the below note applied to this (and later on) as well, or only for the previous one?   * Note: For valid RO intented for PRACH triggered by PDCCH order, it is covered in Case 2. |
| Vivo | Y | Similar comment as to the other proposal, we think ZTE’s proposed UE beahvior is allowed by the current FL proposal. |
| DOCOMO | Y | We share the view with vivo |
| CATT |  | If we decide to apply Option 2, now we have too many case as ‘left to UE implementation’ when encountering nder RO: SSB, cell-common semi-static DL, UE-dedicated semi-static DL… This leaves a big jam to the gNB to organizing the scheduling for HD-FDD UE. |
| Samsung | Y | Similar nderstanding with vivo/DOCOMO. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Y |  |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| Sharp | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | @FL  Similar with the discussion for PDCCH in Type 0/0A/1/2 CSS set, what we need to emphasize firstly is there exist the collision only when the RedCap UE intend to send a preamble on the RO. In an another word, when the RedCap UE does not intend to send a preamble, then there is no collision.  Regarding the benefits compared with option2, if the UE intend to send a preamble on the valid RO and there exist the collision, we think the prioritized RO should be provided, instead of UE implementation. For example, before UL sync, the RACH procedure may be used for UL sync. In this case, if option2 is selected, the UE may choose to receive UE-dedicated configured DL transmission. However, the HARQ-ACK feedback is not available since the the UL sync is not finished. Consequently, the UE-dedicated configured DL transmission also can not be finished together with the RACH procedure. Therefore, it is not suggested to adopt the UE implementation to solve the collision and prioritizing RO when the UE intends to send preamble should be considered.  In conclusion,  1）RO is prioritized only when the UE intends to send preamble.  2）If the UE does not intend to send a preamble on the valid RO. Obviously there does not exist the collision. What the UE only can do is to receive the UE-dedicated configured DL reception. |
| Nordic | Y |  |
| Intel | Y |  |
| Panasonic | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| Xiaomi | Y |  |
| FL6 | **@Huawei**: The moderator has the same understanding that the note in FL5 High Priority Proposal 3.2-1 should be also applied here since UE-dedicated configured DL reception is part of semi-statically configured DL reception as defined in Case 2. **Companies are invited to provide any comment if there is a different view.**  **@All**: With this clarification, for the NW triggered PRACH transmission, UE behaviour is clear that the valid RO intended for PRACH triggered by PDCCH order is prioritized over configured DL reception. Only for PRACH transmission triggered by higher layer (it happens less frequently in the moderator’s view), the following proposal will apply, if adopted.  **@ZTE:** For sake of progress, we can consider adding the similar FFS as in the FL6 High Priority Proposal 3.2-1, if it is accepted by all.  **FL6 High Priority Proposal 3.3-1:**   * For Case 8 of valid RO overlapping with UE-dedicated configured DL reception (e.g. PDCCH in USS, SPS PDSCH, CSI-RS or DL PRS), leave it to UE implementation whether to receive the DL or transmit PRACH * Note: For valid RO intented for PRACH triggered by PDCCH order, it has been covered in Case 2. | |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  | Ok for the note.  Not prefer too much UE implementation but… |
| vivo | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | Similar view as **Proposal 3.2-1.** |
| Nordic | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| Apple | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |
| CATT |  | In RRC\_CONNECTED mode, ‘up to UE implementation’ is something quite unfortune to the network. Fortunately, there seems nothing to be captured by the spec in this direction. If this is the common understanding, we can reconsider our position. |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Y |  |
| Sharp | Y |  |
| Samsung | Y |  |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| Intel | Y |  |
| OPPO |  | OK |
| FL7 | The proposal is updated by adding the similar FFS as in the Proposal 3.2-1.  **FL7 High Priority Proposal 3.3-1:**   * For Case 8 of valid RO overlapping with UE-dedicated configured DL reception (e.g. PDCCH in USS, SPS PDSCH, CSI-RS or DL PRS), leave it to UE implementation whether to receive the DL or transmit PRACH * FFS: whether or not there are conditions (e.g., exception for valid RO not intended for PRACH transmission) that need to be considered. * Note: For valid RO intented for PRACH triggered by PDCCH order, it has been covered in Case 2. | |
| FL8 | Following the discussion on the GTW session on 24th August, the proposal is updated as following (by removing the FFS and making it as the proposed working assumption).  **FL8 High Priority Proposed Working Assumption 3.3-1:**   * For Case 8 of valid RO overlapping with UE-dedicated configured DL reception (e.g. PDCCH in USS, SPS PDSCH, CSI-RS or DL PRS), leave it to UE implementation whether to receive the DL or transmit PRACH * Note: For valid RO intented for PRACH triggered by PDCCH order, it has been covered in Case 2. | |
| Vivo | Y |  |
| CATT | Y | We understand concerns from ZTE raised in the GTW. The ‘leave to UE implementation’ even in RRC\_CONNECTED mode will increase the uncertaincy of the network unfortunately. If possible, the UE should receive UE-dedicated configured DL if it does not plan to transmit PRACH.  But here the case is that, the network cannot predict and never know whether and when the UE will trigger a PRACH by itself (e.g. for SR) intentionally, which is hard to capture in the spec or in the test case. |
| Intel | Y |  |
| MediaTek | Y | Our preference is Option 2. We are fine the original wording. |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | 1. What to specify   From our opinion, what need to be specified can be referred as following:  For HD-FDD UE, when the valid RO is overlapping with UE-dedicated configured DL transmission and the UE does not transmit the PRACH on the valid RO, the UE performs the UE-dedicated configured DL reception.  From the above description, we can see it is kind of restriction for UE behavior to avoid that the UE does not receive the DL transmission. In this case, no DL transmission is missed when the PRACH is not transmitted. This kind of UE behavior description would not have any impact on the gNB. The gNB also does not need to predict the PRACH transmission. No PRACH transmission is assumed when the gNB do any scheduling.   1. Understanding on UE implementation   From our understanding, when the UE does not intend to transmit the PRACH, there are two kinds of UE behavior for the UE implementation, i.e., ‘receive the UE-dedicated configured DL transmission’ or ‘do nothing’. Specify the UE behavior as above can avoid the UE ‘do nothing’  According to the online discussion, some companies think, when the UE does not intend to transmit the PRACH, there is only one UE behavior, i.e, ‘receive the UE-dedicated configured DL transmission’. If so, try to specify what we have mentioned above is aligned with this understanding, also would make it more clearer, and also would not have any impact on the UE. |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| Nordic | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |
| Apple | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Y |  |
| Spreadtrum | Y |  |
| LG | Y |  |
| China Telecom | Y |  |

## valid RO overlaps with dynamically scheduled DL reception

From RAN1 #105-e [2] ,the following agreements were reached for this collision sub-cases:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:   * For Case 8 of valid RO overlapping with dynamically scheduled DL reception, down-select from the following options   + Option 1: Reuse the existing collision handling principles of Rel-15/16 for NR TDD for operation on a single carrier /single cell in unpaired spectrum   + Option 2: Leave to UE implementation whether to receive the DL or transmit the PRACH on a valid RO   + Option 3: Follow the handling of Case 1 that when the cancellation timeline is satisfied, the UE cancels the PRACH transmission and receives the DL signal/channels on the symbols overlapping with PRACH occasion (Interpretation 2 in R1-2103809)   + Option 4: Valid RO is prioritized over dynamic DL that UE performs PRACH transmission and does not perform the DL receptions (Interpretation 3 in R1-2103809)   + Option 5: When the cancellation timeline is satisfied, the UE neither performs transmission nor receives any DL signal/channels on the symbols overlapping with PRACH occasion (Interpretation 1 in R1-2103809)   + 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 * FFS: whether or not the same principle is applied to PUSCH occasion of MSGA in 2-step RACH, if supported |

Table 3.4-1 summarizes the companies view for the above 5 options in RAN1#105-e agreement.

**Table 3.4-1: Views on collision handling for valid RO overlaps with dynamically scheduled DL reception**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Index | Description | Companies | # of Companies |
| Option 1 | Reuse the existing collision handling principles of Rel-15/16 for NR TDD for operation on a single carrier /single cell in unpaired spectrum | OPPO, LG, Apple, IDCC | 4 |
| Option 2 | Leave to UE implementation whether to receive the DL or transmit the PRACH on a valid RO | Nokia, Spreadtrum (1st choice), Samsung, MTK, Xiaomi | 5 |
| Option 3 | When the cancellation timeline is satisfied, the UE cancels the PRACH transmission and receives the DL signal/channels on the symbols overlapping with PRACH occasion (Interpretation 2 in R1-2103809) | Huawei, vivo, CATT, China Telecom, MTK, Sharp, ASUSTeK | 7 |
| Option 4 | Valid RO is prioritized over dynamic DL that UE performs PRACH transmission and does not perform the DL receptions (Interpretation 3 in R1-2103809) | Ericsson, Spreadtrum (2nd choice), NordicSemi, CMCC, Intel, DCM, Panasonic, Apple | 8 |
| Option 5 | When the cancellation timeline is satisfied, the UE neither performs transmission nor receives any DL signal/channels on the symbols overlapping with PRACH occasion (Interpretation 1 in R1-2103809) | Spreadtrum (2nd choice) | 1 |

The views on the above 5 options in the RAN1#105-e agreement are split.

* Contribution [Ericsson] indicates that a clarification may be needed for Option 3 and 5 for a UE capable of partial UL cancellation and Option 4 is viewed as the cleanest solution among all the options
* Contribution [vivo05] views that option 2 is not desirable since the ambiguity may exist between the gNB and UE, and option 5 resolves the UE behaviour ambiguity but it is not clear what is the motivation for such UE behaviour since the UE loses both PRACH transmission opportunity and DL receptions
* Contribution [Nokia06] presents that UE should prioritize valid RO over dynamically scheduled DL reception if UE needs to transmit PRACH in case of valid RO overlapping with dynamically scheduled DL reception
* In contribution [ZTE08], it is noted that if a valid RO is not used for preamble transmission, the collision between the valid RO and dynamically scheduled DL does not exist, and thus it is suggested to support Option 1 but only for the valid Ros on which UE intends to send preamble
* Contribution [MTK17] indicates that Option 4 and 5 are not meaningful and the optimization achieved by Option 2 is minor
* In contribution [Qualcomm14], it is proposed that the overlapping between valid RO and dynamically scheduled DL reception is not expected by UE and will be treated as a configuration error of NW
* Contributions [Samsung09, Apple19] suggest supporting the same collision handling rule for all the sub-cases in order to avoid creating another complicated scenario, instead of case-by-case optimization
* In contribution [Sharp20], it is noted that the DL reception should be canceled for a TDD cell if the two rules are applied to the same set of symbols, but for a FDD cell and HD-FDD Ues, Option 3 may be the only interpretation of the wording in the specification
* Contribution [IDCC21] views that according to the spec, the UE does not receive the DL transmission and also cancels the UL transmission as timeline allows
* Contribution [Xiaomi23] notes that gNB cannot predict when UE will use the valid RO opportunity for UL transmission and considering gNB can anyway simultaneously transmit DL and do PRACH detection it is preferred to solve the UL/DL collision issue of valid RO by UE implementation
* Contribution [ASUSTeK25] discusses that for scenario that valid RO overlapping with more than one subcase of DL receptions, an identical collision handling rule can be applied

From the above, Option 5 has the minimum number of supports compared to other options thus can be deleted for down-selection. For Option 3 and Option 4, the difference is whether to allow UE to perform full cancellation of PRACH transmission when timeline is satisfied or partial PRACH cancellation when time is not satisfied (i.e., for a UE capable of partial UL cancellation). Option 4 is relatively easier for implementation since the valid RO is always prioritized over dynamically scheduled DL reception, but UE may lose the possibility to receive any DL signal/channels on the symbols overlapping with PRACH occasion.

**FL1 High Priority Question 3.4-1:**

* **Companies are invited to comment whether the conditional PRACH cancellation (fully or partially) will lead to increased UE implementation complexity, and whether it is necessary to support the same collision handling rule for all the subcases under Case 8?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| vivo |  | We do not see much UE complexity issue for PRACH cancellation (at least for the full cancellation) when timeline requirement is satisfied.  The problem of Option 4 is that: UE would not transmit PRACH in most of the valid Ros, thus always prioritize valid RO would put too much restrictions for gNB to schedule the DL transmission, for example the urgent DL transmission cannot be delivered to the UE due to collision with RO. |
| CATT |  | We think there is no much complexity to implement PRACH cancellation. This is similar to the cancellation of other UL channels. Option 3 is preferred to improve the DL flexibility and resource utilization for HD-FDD Ues. |
| Spreadtrum |  | Support the same collision handling rule: for simplify, we prefer to support the same collision handling rule for all the subcases under Case 8. In HD-FDD, gNB can receive and transmit at the same time in different frequency range, and UE may need to transmit PRACH in some cases while in other cases UE could receive DL. Therefore, it can be left to UE implementation to dicided whether to receive DL or transmit PRACH in valid RO. Considering the spec impact and resource utilization, we think “leave to UE implementation” is suitable for all cases. |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | From our perspective, we suggest to clarify firstly that whether the collision for valid RO and DL exists if the HD-FDD RedCap UE intends not to send preamble on the valid RO. In another word, the collision only happens when the RO intends to send a preamble. Based on this, the same collision handling rule can be provided under case8. |
| Ericsson |  | It is preferred to have the same collision handling rule for all the subcases under Case 8 though not necessarily. In our view, Case 4 is reasonable and the simplest among the options. |
| Nordic |  | We prefer the same behaviour as for configured DL whether it is Option 2 or Option 1 (with clarification that valid RO is prioritized) |
| Nokia, NSB |  | Our preference is Option 4, i.e. UE should prioritize valid RO over dynamically scheduled DL reception if UE needs to transmit PRACH. |
| Intel |  | We believe it is fine to define different handling for the overlap with dynamic DL and configured DL. Such solution is commonly used in Case ½/3/4/5 too. Since gNB has full control to schedule DL reception in a resource not overlapped with valid RO, we think valid RO should be prioritized. |
| Apple |  | We do not see differences between Opt. 1 and Opt.4. Hence, we also added name under Opt.4. We also prefer to have a unified solution to treat the collisions as much as possible. |
| Qualcomm |  | It is not necessary to judge on the complexity for partial PRACH cancellation, since the existing rule in NR TDD depends on UE capability and the gap w.r.t. the scheduling PDCCH.  For the collision between valid RO and dynamically scheduled DL reception, we think the easiest way for a HD-FDD RedCap UE is to treat it as a configuration error of NW.  On the other hand, we are open to discuss the option of “leaving to UE implementation”, considering valid RO is just a necessary condition for PRACH transmission and it is not necessary to prioritize valid RO all the time. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility |  | Our preference is option 4, PRACH transmission is prioritized over dynamic DL reception. This option is easy to be implemented in the UE side. |
| Samsung |  | It is unclear the benefit to take the conditional PRACH cancellation and also have two types of capabilities for full and partial cancellation.  We prefer to have the common collision rule in order to avoid handling complicated scenarios by different rules in the future. |
| Xiaomi |  | gNB cannot predict when UE will use the valid RO opportunity for UL transmission and considering gNB can anyway simultaneously transmit DL and do PRACH detection it is preferred to solve the UL/DL collision issue of valid RO by UE implementation |
| Sharp |  | Reusing rules of TDD is preferred, and option3 is an optimal interpretation for this case. |
| China Telecom |  | We prefer Option 3 that when the cancellation timeline is satisfied, the UE cancels the PRACH transmission and receives the DL signal/channels on the symbols overlapping with PRACH occasion, which follows the same handling of Case 1. |
| OPPO |  | The TDD behaviour in current specification have still different interpretation as discussed in last meetings. Thus, we think the Option1 would be preferred. Other options would lead change backward. |
| FL2 | The status is similar to other subcases. Moderator suggests depriortizing this section for further discussion after the discussions for other subcases have been clear.  Needless to mention that companies are welcome to provide more comments if they wish | |
| MediaTek |  | We agre with Xiaomi that gNB FDD operation does not require to know wheather DL or UL is prioritized by UE in this case. (gNB needs to monitor all Ros anyway whereas PRACH transmission depends on UE decision.) Therefore, Option 2 is our preference for all subcases of Case 8. As a second preference we would consider Option 4. |
| Ericsson |  | Okay to wait. |
| Qualcomm |  | Ok to support Option 2 (UE implementation) |
| LG |  | Okay to wait. Our preference is Option 1 and also fine with Option 4. |
| FL5 | **Companies preferences are summarized below (@Nokia and Nordic**: please double check whether your preferences are correctly captured**)**.   * Option 1 (reuse the existing TDD rule):   + Support: Nordic, Apple, OPPO, LG   + Not Support: * Option 2 (Leave to UE implementation):   + Support: Spreadtrum, Qualcomm, Xiaomi, MediaTek   + Not Support: * Option 3 (Following the handling of Case 1):   + Support: vivo, CATT, Sharp, China Telecom, Huawei, HiSilicon   + Not Support: * Option 4 (valid RO prioritized over dynamic DL reception):   + Suppport: Ericsson, Nokia, NSB, Nordic, Intel, Apple, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, LG, MediaTek(2nd choice), Huawei, HiSilicon   + Not Support: vivo   **Regarding whethre to support a unified solution for all the sub-cases related to valid RO**   * Yes: Spreadtrum, Ericsson, Nordic, Apple, Samsung * No: Intel   Based on the received response, Option 5 is not supported by any company. Also, majorities of companies supporting Option 1 indicate another interpretation or preferred option.  **Moderator recommendation**: Decision needed on Option 2, 3 or 4 in the following Proposal  **FL5 High Priority Proposal 3.4-1: Down-select one of the following options (with editical changes to option description to avoid any misunderstanding)**   * For Case 8 of valid RO overlapping with dynamically scheduled DL reception   + Option 2: Leave to UE implementation whether to receive the dynamic 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   **@ZTE**: For your proposal, the moderator has the similar comment as in Section 3.2 and 3.2. If needed, please convince other companies to support your proposal for consideration.  **@All**: **provide any comments, or suggestions to help to reach a consensus. For option that is not supported, please also provide technical justification, if possible.** | |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  | Add our supporting above |
| vivo |  | We prefer Option3, Option 2 might be acceptable. Option 4 is not supported. |
| OPPO |  | We prefer Option 4, if Option 1 absent. We should not optimize for dynamic grant override RO. That is not like happen frequently. |
| DOCOMO |  | We support Option 4 |
| CATT | Y | And Option 3 is preferred for ensure robustness of dynamic grant. |
| Samsung |  | We support Option 2. But, open to Option 4. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Y | We prefer option 4. Option 2 is also acceptable. |
| CMCC |  | We support Option 4. |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | Similar comment in **FL5 High Priority Proposal 3.3-1**  In conclusion:  1）RO is prioritized(option4) only when the UE intends to send preamble on the valid RO.  2）If the UE does not intend to send a preamble on the valid RO. Obviously there does not exist the collision. What the UE only can do is to receive the dynamically scheduled DL reception. |
| Nordic | Y | Option 2 |
| LG | Y | We are okay with the FL proposal and support Option 4. |
| China Telecom | Y | We are fine with FL proposal. And Option 3 is preferred. |
| Intel | Y | Fine for the FL proposal. Option 4 is preferred |
| Panasonic | Y | Option 4 is preferred |
| Ericsson | Y | Ok to down-select. We prefer Option 4. |
| Xiaomi | Y | We prefer Option 2 |
| Apple | Y | We are fine for both Opt.2 and Opt.4. |
| FL7 | **Companies preferences are summarized below**   * Option 2 (Leave to UE implementation):   + Support: Samsung, Nordic, Apple, vivo (2nd), Xiaomi, Lenovo (2nd), Motorola Mobility (2nd), [Spreadtrum], [Qualcomm], [MediaTek],   + Not Support: * Option 3 (Following the handling of Case 1):   + Support: Huawei, HiSilicon, vivo (1st) , CATT, China Telecom, [Sharp]   + Not Support: * Option 4 (valid RO prioritized over dynamic DL reception):   + Suppport: Huawei, HiSilicon, OPPO, DOCOMO, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, CMCC, LG, Intel, Panasoic, Ericsson, Apple, [Nokia], [NSB], [Samsung], [MediaTek],   + Not Support: vivo   **Moderator recommendation: Consider the following updated proposal with adding the similar FFS in Proposal 3.2-1**  **FL7 High Priority Proposal 3.4-1: Down-select one of the following options**   * For Case 8 of valid RO overlapping with dynamically scheduled DL reception   + Option 2: Leave to UE implementation whether to receive the dynamic 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   + FFS: whether or not there are conditions (e.g., exception for valid RO not intended for PRACH transmission) that need to be considered | |
| FL8 | Following the discussion on the GTW session on 24th August, the proposal is updated as following (by removing the FFS and making it as the proposed working assumption).  **FL8 High Priority Proposed Working Assumption 3.4-1:**   * For Case 8 of valid RO overlapping with dynamically scheduled DL reception, down-select one of the following options   + Option 2: Leave to UE implementation whether to receive the dynamically scheduled DL or transmit PRACH     - Samsung, Nordic, Apple, vivo (2nd), Xiaomi, Lenovo (2nd), Motorola Mobility (2nd), [Spreadtrum], [Qualcomm], [MediaTek],   + Option 3: Follow the handling of Case 1 (dynamically scheduled DL reception vs. semi-statically configured UL transmission)     - Huawei, HiSilicon, vivo (1st) , CATT, China Telecom, [Sharp]   + Option 4: Valid RO is prioritized over dynamic DL reception     - Suppport: Huawei, HiSilicon, OPPO, DOCOMO, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, CMCC, LG, Intel, Panasoic, Ericsson, Apple, [Nokia], [NSB], [Samsung], [MediaTek],     - Not Support: vivo | |
| vivo | Y |  |
| CATT | Y | Same comment in **3.3-1**. |
| Intel | Y |  |
| MediaTek | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | Our concern is similar as Working Assumption 3.3-1  Additionally, we think that the combination of the 3 options here are also not precluded, for example, when the UE does not intend to send preamble on the valid RO, option 3 is selected, otherwise option2/option4 is selected. This kind of combination can be a good compromise for the 3 options and also can address our concern. Therefore, it is suggested to add a note as following:  **FL8 High Priority Proposed Working Assumption 3.4-1:**   * For Case 8 of valid RO overlapping with dynamically scheduled DL reception, down-select one of the following options   + Option 2: Leave to UE implementation whether to receive the dynamically scheduled DL or transmit PRACH     - Samsung, Nordic, Apple, vivo (2nd), Xiaomi, Lenovo (2nd), Motorola Mobility (2nd), [Spreadtrum], [Qualcomm], [MediaTek],   + Option 3: Follow the handling of Case 1 (dynamically scheduled DL reception vs. semi-statically configured UL transmission)     - Huawei, HiSilicon, vivo (1st) , CATT, China Telecom, [Sharp]   + Option 4: Valid RO is prioritized over dynamic DL reception     - Suppport: Huawei, HiSilicon, OPPO, DOCOMO, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, CMCC, LG, Intel, Panasoic, Ericsson, Apple, [Nokia], [NSB], [Samsung], [MediaTek],     - Not Support: vivo   + Note: the combination of the above options are not precluded. |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y | We support Option 4. Our understanding is similar to ZTE that if UE doesn’t have to transmit on the PRACH, there is no collision and UE will receive DL transmission. |
| Nordic | Y | Option2, the case is similar to collision with CSS. Up to implementation means that smart UE would receive DL transmission unless needs to transmit PRACH |
| Qualcomm | Y | Option 2 is preferred. Valid RO is a necessary but not sufficient condition for actual transmission of PRACH |
| Apple | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Y |  |
| Spreadtrum | Y | Fine with the proposed working assumption, add us in option 4 and remove the bracket in option 2:  **FL8 High Priority Proposed Working Assumption 3.4-1:**   * For Case 8 of valid RO overlapping with dynamically scheduled DL reception, down-select one of the following options   + Option 2: Leave to UE implementation whether to receive the dynamically scheduled DL or transmit PRACH     - Samsung, Nordic, Apple, vivo (2nd), Xiaomi, Lenovo (2nd), Motorola Mobility (2nd), ~~[~~Spreadtrum~~]~~, [Qualcomm], [MediaTek],   + Option 3: Follow the handling of Case 1 (dynamically scheduled DL reception vs. semi-statically configured UL transmission)     - Huawei, HiSilicon, vivo (1st) , CATT, China Telecom, [Sharp]   + Option 4: Valid RO is prioritized over dynamic DL reception     - Suppport: Huawei, HiSilicon, OPPO, DOCOMO, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, CMCC, LG, Intel, Panasoic, Ericsson, Apple, [Nokia], [NSB], [Samsung], [MediaTek], Spreadtrum     - Not Support: vivo |
| LG | Y |  |
| China Telecom | Y | We are fine to make down-selection. |

## 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, CATT10] express view that Ngap symbols is accounted for in the collision handling related to valid RO since it can be utilized as the Rx/Tx swithcing time and the same value for Ngap for unpaired spectrum in the current specification is reused for HD-FDD
* In contribution [Samsung09], it is discussed that if Ngap symbols are specified for HD-FDD Ues, it can be utilized as the RX/TX switching time. Otherwise, the RX/TX switching time can be additionally considered
* In contribution [vivo05], it is discussed that for the collision subcases where DL reception is cell-specifically configured, including Ngap symbols before the valid RO may be beneficial to account for the DL-to-UL switching time, but for collision case where DL reception is dynamically scheduled or dedicatedly configured, including Ngap symbols before the valid RO is not necessary
* Contribution [LG16] indicates that the Rx-to-Tx switching time before the valid RO needs to be accounted for all the subcases of Case 8 and proposes FFS on whether the Ngap symbols before the valid RO already covers the Rx-to-Tx switching time.
* Contribution [Nokia06] presents that the set of symbols overlapping with dynamic DL reception does not include the Ngap symbols before the valid RO

From the above, the majority view is that the Rx/Tx switching time before the valid RO needs to be accounted at least for the collision subcases where DL reception is cell-specifically configured. Dependent on whether Ngap symbols are specified for HD-FDD Ues (i.e., according to the RO validation discussion in section 3.1), specification work can be different.

**FL1 High Priority Question 3.5-1:**

* **Should RAN1 consider to use the Ngap symbols before the valid RO to account for the DL-to-UL switching time? If yes, comapnies are invited to commen whether the same value for Ngap for unpaired spectrum in the current specification (Table 8.1-2 in TS 38.213) can be reused for HD-FDD?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| vivo | Y | Rx/Tx switching time before the valid RO needs to be accounted at least for the collision subcases where DL reception is cell-specifically configured.  Same value as in current specification for unpaired spectrum can be reused. |
| CATT | Y | We think the same value for Ngap can be reused. We do not see any timing advance is different for RedCap or non-RedCap UE. |
| DOCOMO | Y | Same value as in current specification for unpaired spectrum can be reused |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y | The value of Ngap used for TDD NR can be reused for HD-FDD. |
| Ericsson | Y | The same Ngap for unpaired spectrum in the current specification can be reused for HD-FDD. |
| Nordic | Y | reuse TDD value |
| Nokia, NSB |  | We are OK to go with majority view and reuse the same Ngap value for HD-FDD. |
| Intel |  | It is true Rx/Tx switching time is needed before and after the valid RO. However, ‘Ngap symbols’ is a different thing. Ngap can be 0 or 2 depending on SCS in current NR. In summary, we think ‘Ngap symbols’ is not applicable to HD-FDD UE, that means, we should discuss Rx/Tx switching time separately. |
| Apple | Y |  |
| Qualcomm |  | In principle, we think the DL-to-UL switching time should be rounded to a minimum number of guard symbol(s) for RO validation.  We are open to further discuss the value of Ngap for RO validation. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Y | Reuse TDD value |
| Samsung | Y | We prefer to use Ngap symbols as in the current specification. |
| Xiaomi | Y | Value defined in TDD can be reused |
| Sharp |  | We have a similar view as intel, Ngap and DL-to-UL switching time are not the same things |
| China Telecom | Y | The same value for Ngap for TDD can be reused for HD-FDD, unless new additional requirements are expected. |
| OPPO | Y | Same value for TDD. |
| FL2 | Based on the discussion, majority of the companies are supportive to use the Ngap symbols before the valid RO to account for the DL-to-UL switching time. There are some concerns on reusing the TDD values for HD-FDD since Ngap can be 0 or 2 depending on SCS in current NR TDD.  **FL2 High Priority Proposal 3.5-1:**   * For Case 8, the set of symbols overlapping with semi-static or dynamic DL reception include Ngap symbols before the valid RO   + FFS: the value of Ngap for HD-FDD Ues | |
| vivo | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| MediaTek | Y |  |
| Intel | N | The FL proposal is not agreeable since Ngap can be 0 in NR TDD, which cannot serves as switching time at UE side at all. In other words, it is necessary to define non-zero switching time (no matter we name it as Ngap or just say one gap symbol) for all cases. |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |
| Apple | Y |  |
| Xiaomi | Y |  |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| LG | Y | We are also okay to discuss the switching time separately from the Ngap if there is a concern. |
| Samsung | Y |  |
| FL3 | Based on the discussion, moderator recommendation is to consider the updated Proposal 3.5-1 below  **High Priority Proposal 3.5-1:**   * For Case 8, the set of symbols overlapping with semi-static or dynamic DL reception include Ngap symbols before the valid RO * Down-select one from the following options for the value of Ngap for HD-FDD Ues   + Option 1: The value of Ngap is fixed to one   + Option 2: Reuse the same values in Table 8.1-2 in TS 38.213 for TDD | |
| CATT | Y in principle | But we are not sure why Option 1 has the fixed value to one. In current 38.213, Ngap is defined according to the preamble SCS. But if it is not 0, it will be 2:  Table 8.1-2: values for different preamble SCS   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Preamble SCS |  | | 1.25 kHz or 5 kHz | 0 | | 15 kHz or 30 kHz or 60 kHz or 120 kHz | 2 |   Suggest changing for Option 1:   * + Option 1: The value of Ngap is no less than ~~fixed to~~ one. |
| Spreadtrum | Y |  |
| vivo |  | For option 1, we have similar question as CATT |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB |  | We are OK to go with majority view to include Ngap symbols but we would like to use the same Ngap values from TDD. |
| Nordic | Y | Regarding Intel comment, we would like to understand what is difference between HD-FDD and TDD here, I suppose 1.25 kHz or 5 kHz has very long cyclic prefix that can cover the switching time and therefore R15 set it to 0?  We support Option 2 |
| Intel |  | We understand the intention of ‘Ngap symbols’ is to account for switching time. We prefer unified solution to handle switching time for all Case ½/3/4/5/8. So a general question, is there a preference to define ‘Ngap symbols’ for Case ½/3/4/5?  Focus on the FL proposal for now, since a UE use DL reception timing for PRACH transmission, the symbol boundary for a DL symbol and a UL symbol will be well aligned. That is, if a switching gap is needed before RO, it is also necessary after RO. Therefore, we suggest to revise FL proposal as below.   * For Case 8, the set of symbols overlapping with semi-static or dynamic DL reception include Ngap symbols for switching gap before or after the valid RO * Down-select one from the following options for the value of Ngap for HD-FDD Ues   + Option 1: The value of Ngap is fixed to [one]   + Option 2: Reuse the same values in Table 8.1-2 in TS 38.213 for TDD   One question for clarification, how can Ngap=0 generate switching time at UE side for preambel SCS 1.25kHz and 5kHz? |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| Samsung |  | Fine with Intel’s revision. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Y |  |
| China Telecom |  | We prefer to reuse the same values for TDD. |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |
| Apple | Y |  |
| Sharp |  | For option1, it is not clear why one symbol would be fixed for different SCS.  For option2, we think it is not acceptable for HD-FDD. For a long sequence, there is only one RO per slot, and a non-zero TA offset in TDD can be used as the gap. So the Ngap=0 is not critical in TDD mode.  We think the switching time can be discussed with case 9 for a unified solution. |
| LG |  | We agree with the intention of the FL proposal, but we are not comfortable yet if the switching gap should be included in the Ngap or treated separately as in other collision cases. As it all depends on the switching time anyway, and if we need to change the value of the existing Ngap table based on the switching time, then we tend to prefer to separate the switching time and the Ngap. So, as a compromise, below the FL proposal we would like to put the FFS below.  FFS whether to update the Ngap values or to account for the switching time separately, when the existing Ngap values cannot absorb the Rx/Tx switching time required for HD-FDD operation in FDD bands. |
| OPPO |  | Fine with the proposal. Further, Option 2 is naturally chosen. |
| FL4 | **@CATT**: The moderator’s understanding for Intel’s concern is that a zero value of Ngap can not be used to account for the Tx/Rx switching time. It is okay to further discuss what is the non-zero value for Option 1  **@Intel**: Now we only have FFS on Tx/Rx switching for Case 1 and 5. No agreement for study the Tx/Rx switching for Case 2 and 3 since Case 9 handles the case of collision with switching time. For Case 8, it is different from other cases since the the GP in PRACH format can be used for UE Tx-to-Rx switching. Based on the moderator’s understanding, companies may have different views on the motivation to include Ngap symbols before the valid RO. Some companies want to use it to account for the UE Rx-to-Tx switching time, but others may want to align with TDD on the collision handling by including Ngap symbols before valid RO. Adding “for switching gap” may not be acceptable by companies supporting Option 2.  **@LG**: We can add an FFS for the case that the Ngap values cannot absort the required switching time for HD-FDD operation.  **FL4 High Priority Proposal 3.5-1:**   * For Case 8, the set of symbols overlapping with semi-static or dynamic DL reception include Ngap symbols before the valid RO * Down-select one from the following options for the value of Ngap for HD-FDD Ues   + Option 1: The value of Ngap is larger than zero. FFS the value   + Option 2: Reuse the same values in Table 8.1-2 in TS 38.213 for TDD * FFS: whether or not to account for the Rx-to-Tx switching time if the Ngap values cannot absorb the swtiching time required for Type-A HD-FDD operation in FDD bands   **Companies are invited to comment whether the above modifications are accepted or not.** | |
| Qualcomm | Y | The SCS of the Ngap symbols needs to be clarified. |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | From our understanding, this proposal is based on that the valid RO is prioritized. Additionally, it is worth to point out that this proposal is just used for UE side and would not have any constraining on the gNB side scheduling. Based on this, the UE would adjust the sending time according to the gNB configuration for semi-static or dynamic DL reception. Moreover, the Ngap symbols only applied when there is a preamble to be transmitted on the RO for the UE. Therefore, a possible modification is given as following:  **FL4 High Priority Proposal 3.5-1:**   * For Case 8, the set of symbols overlapping with semi-static or dynamic DL reception include Ngap symbols before the valid RO on which preamble is sent * Down-select one from the following options for the value of Ngap for HD-FDD Ues   + Option 1: The value of Ngap is larger than zero. FFS the value   + Option 2: Reuse the same values in Table 8.1-2 in TS 38.213 for TDD * FFS: whether or not to account for the Rx-to-Tx switching time if the Ngap values cannot absorb the swtiching time required for Type-A HD-FDD operation in FDD bands |
| OPPO | Y |  |
| vivo |  | For the newly added FFS, we are not sure the case (Ngap values cannot absorb the xplanati time) will happen or not, so this should also be part of the study, suggest to update as following   * For Case 8, the set of symbols overlapping with semi-static or dynamic DL reception include Ngap symbols before the valid RO * Down-select one from the following options for the value of Ngap for HD-FDD Ues   + Option 1: The value of Ngap is larger than zero. FFS the value   + Option 2: Reuse the same values in Table 8.1-2 in TS 38.213 for TDD * FFS: whether or not there is a case ~~to account for the Rx-to-Tx switching time if~~ when the Ngap values cannot absorb the swtiching time required for Type-A HD-FDD operation in FDD bands and if so whether or not to account for the Rx-to-Tx switching time |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y |  |
| CATT | Y | Thanks for the xplanation. Both vivo’s version and FL’s version are fine to us. |
| Intel |  | @Nordic: A PRACH preamble starts with a CP followed by the PRACH sequence. Since PRACH transmission follows DL reception timing, there is no any gap between the preceding DL reception and the PRACH transmission. Such a case is common to all SCSs. That means, if PRACH preamble with SCS 1.25 kHz or 5 kHz is transmitted, with assumption that Ngap=0, there is no Rx-Tx switching time at UE. This is why we commented that Ngap=0 doesn’t work.  Following the discussions on ‘FL proposal 3.5.1’ , we understand that the main intention is find a way to account for switching time. We think the discussion is helpful for us to understand the problem. On the other hand, it seems not necessary to rush into an agreement for Case 8. We prefer to check the impact of switching time for Case ½/3/4/5 too. If multiple or all cases need to consider switching time, we prefer a unified design. If only Case 8 need to explicit consider switching time, we could come back to the current proposal 3.5.1. |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| Samsung | Y |  |
| Mediatek | Y |  |
| Nordic | Y |  |
| Ericsson |  | In our understanding, the intention of the proposal is about including Ngap symbols before the valid RO as part of the collision scenario involving valid RO. That is, it is to align with existing TDD rule on the collision handling involving valid RO by including Ngap symbols before valid RO. With this understanding, we support the proposal.   |  | | --- | | For a set of symbols of a slot corresponding to a valid PRACH occasion and Ngap symbols before the valid PRACH occasion, as described in clause 8.1, the UE does not receive PDCCH, PDSCH, or CSI-RS in the slot if a reception would overlap with any symbol from the set of symbols. |   When the collision happens, i.e., DL reception overlaps with set of symbols of a slot corresponding to a valid PRACH occasion including Ngap symbols before the valid PRACH occasion, the collision rule being defined for Case 8 and its sub-cases can be applied.  In many cases, the collision handling involving prioritizing either PRACH or DL reception, and thus there is no Tx/Rx onsidera involves anymore. The only exception may be *if* the collisison handling is based on partial cancellation of PRACH which can result in the “back-to-back” scenario. This case is similar to a general scenario under Case 9 (i.e., collision with the onsidera time) and can be discussed under Case 9 to have a unified solution with clear UE behavior. That is, in our view, the FFS point can be discussed under Case 9.  Note that a similar comment can also be made for Section 2.3, **FL3 High Priority Question 2.3-1.** |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| LG | Y | We are fine with the vivo’s update as well. What we are dealing here is the back-to-back scenario of the DL followed by {Ngap, valid RO} but no overlap b/w the two. We think the switching time is still needed if the Ngap cannot accommodate the switching time, which is dependent on the value of Ngap and switching time for HD-FDD RedCap Ues. In principle, we also prefer a unified handling of the switching time wherever relevant. But currently as no progress has been made on the unified handling itself including whether it is needed or not, we would like to the keep the FFS on the switching time where relevant. |
| FL5 | Based on the received response, moderator understanding is that there are different views on the intention for this proposal.  The majority view is that the intention is to align with existing TDD rule on the collision handling involving valid RO (i.e. the proponent of Option 2). Another view is to use Ngap symbols before valid RO to account for the Rx-to-Tx switching time at UE (i.e. the proponent of Option 1).  To make it clearer, the following updated proposal is proposed for onsideration.  **FL5 High Priority Proposal 3.5-1:**   * 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 in Table 8.1-2 in TS 38.213 for TDD is reused for HD-FDD operatioin * FFS: whether or not there is a case when the Ngap symbosl cannot absorb the swtiching time required for Type-A HD-FDD operation in FDD bands and if so whether or not to account for the Rx-to-Tx switching time | |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y |  |
| vivo | Y |  |
| OPPO | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| CATT | Y |  |
| Samsung | Y |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Y |  |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | We do not see any collision when the UE does not intend to send preamble on the valid RO.  The following update is necessary.  **FL5 High Priority Proposal 3.5-1:**   * For Case 8, the set of symbols overlapping with semi-static or dynamic DL reception include Ngap symbols before the valid RO on which preamble is sent, and the same values in Table 8.1-2 in TS 38.213 for TDD is reused for HD-FDD operatioin * FFS: whether or not there is a case when the Ngap symbosl cannot absorb the swtiching time required for Type-A HD-FDD operation in FDD bands and if so whether or not to account for the Rx-to-Tx switching time |
| Nordic | Y |  |
| LG | Y |  |
| China Telecom | Y |  |
| Intel | N | We don’t see a reason to apply Ngap of NR TDD to HD-FDD operation. We are not conviced if it is just to align with existing TDD rule. What is the technical reason to have such rule for HD-FDD operation. We see a key difference is that both gNB and UE has a limitation of half duplex. However, it is only limitation of UE for HD-FDD operation. We prefer to discuss this issue more before making a conclusion. |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| Xiaomi | Y |  |
| Apple | Y |  |
| Sharp |  | the Ngap value can be FFS as in the previous FL4 proposal |
| FL8 | **@Intel**: In RAN1#104e, there was an agreement to reuse the existing collision handling rules in TDD for HD-FDD operation if deemed applicable. In moderator’s view, the TDD rule can also be applied here. In TDD, the value of Ngap equal to zero is applied to 1.25 kHz or 5 kHz SCS, i.e. preamble format 0-3 that always starts from the first symbol in the subframe. Therefore, gNB could avoid scheduling DL in the last symbol of the previous subframe to avoid collision with PRACH. In other words, there is no issue setting the value of Ngap equal to zero for format 0-3. But for other preamble formats, since the PRACH symbol is not fixed in the subframe but based on the PRACH configuration index and PRACH duration, there would be excessive restrictions on network configuration for the same scheduling based solution. In such case, it would be desirable to use a non-zero value for Ngap and including Ngap symbols before the valid RO for collision handling. These are just the moderator’s views and can be further discussed. That is the intention of the FFS in the proposal.  **Moderator recommendation: The same proposal can be considered again.**  **FL8 High Priority Proposal 3.5-1:**   * 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 in Table 8.1-2 in TS 38.213 for TDD is reused for HD-FDD operatioin * FFS: whether or not there is a case when the Ngap symbosl cannot absorb the swtiching time required for Type-A HD-FDD operation in FDD bands and if so whether or not to account for the Rx-to-Tx switching time | |
| vivo | Y |  |
| CATT | Y |  |
| Intel | N | @FL: In our view, the agreement in RAN1#104e just provides a high level guideline. However, whether NR TDD rule is applicable should be discussed case by case. Regarding ‘Ngap symbols’, could you clarify what do you mean by ‘excessive restrictions on network configuration for the same scheduling based solution’? If gNB can handle it by avoiding DL transmission in a symbol before PRACH format 0-3, the same rule can be applied to other PRACH formats. |
| MediaTek | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| Nordic | Y | For format 0-3 the smallest CP is 0.1ms, this absorbs two symbols of 15kHz.  The TDD Ngap can be resued for FDD |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |
| Apple | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| Intel |  | @Nordic: If observing gNB behavior, the 0.1ms CP for PRACH format 3 can be exploited as switching gap. That is, gNB transmit a last DL symbol in early subframe, use the 0.1ms CP to switch, then do PRACH detection. On the other hand, it is not the case for UE. If UE doesn’t transmit the beginning part of CP of PRACH, it may impact PRACH detection at gNB. In fact, UE may not support a shorten PRACH transmission at all. For PRACH formats other than format 0-3, CP of PRACH is too short, even gNB cannot rely on such CP for switching. Therefore, it is our understanding that ‘Ngap symbols’ is mainly for gNB convenience. However, it is not necessary for FDD gNB in current discussion of HD-FDD operation.  Finally, to account for switching time, we prefer a unified solution for Case 1/2/3/4/5/8 and Case 9. |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobillity | Y |  |
| LG | Y |  |
| China Telecom | Y |  |

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

In contribution [Ericsson04], it is proposed not to have special treatment for PUSCH occasion of Msg A, i.e., the collision handling rule is the same as other configured PUSCH since the 2-step RACH can fallback to the 4-step RACH, e.g., when RA preamble is detected but PUSCH is not received.

Contributions [CATT10, MTK17] view that the handling of MsgA PUSCH follows the handling of valid RO

Contribution [Nokia06] proposes to prioritize MsgA PUSCH over dynamic or semi-static DL.

In contribution [Intel18], it is discussed that 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 (overlap handling Case 1); and when a MsgA PUSCH is overlapped with a configured DL reception, the MsgA PUSCH is cancelled.

Considering this may be coupled with the discussion of collision handling rule for valid RO, the FL suggests we come back to this issue after the collision handling for valid RO has been discussed clearly.

# Collision handling for Case 9

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 |

Regarding the second FFS in the above agreement, the following are discussed in the contributions:

Contribution [Nokia06, CT12, Apple19] view that the concerned collision due to DL/UL direction switching can be handled by gNB, i.e., scheduling the back-to-back DL-to-UL and UL-to-DL transmission and reception with the necessary gaps.

In contribution [Sharp20] it is also suggested to define adequate Tx/Rx switching time for HD-FDD UEs.

In contribution [vivo05], it is viewed that for back-to-back transmission/reception configured by cell-specific higher layer parameters, given the proposal that the Ngap symbols have been included in valid RO, hence the handling of direction switching can be the same as the collision case and a separate rule is not needed. For other cases, the gNB scheduler should ensure the switching time.

Contribution [Ericsson04] views that the collision with the switching time after applying collision handling rules can occur since it may be difficult for gNB scheduler to avoid the immediate back-to-back (without sufficient gap) scenarios for cases involving semi-statically configured DL/UL (including both UE specific and cell specific). If it is interpreted as an error case, excessive restrictions will be imposed on network configuration. Two options are proposed for further discussion.

* Option 1: An earlier DL reception or UL transmission is prioritized by puncturing or skipping first few symbols of the later UL transmission or DL reception
* Option 2: Leave it to UE implementation to ensure the switching time is satisfied

Contributions [Xiaomi23, Intel18] also raise concern for treating it as an error case if the switching time is not enough after applying the collision handling rule and suggest further discussion for the following two alternatives

* Alt. 1: Treat it as an error case
* Alt. 2: Consider it as an UL/DL collision and apply the associated collision handling rule defined in other cases

In contribution [ZTE08], it is discussed that the “last received downlink symbol” or “last transmitted uplink symbol” in this WA may not be equivalent to “last scheduled/configured” downlink or uplink symbol and thus any collision handling rule defined in Case1~Case 8 should follow the restriction defined in Case 9.

**FL1 High Priority Question 4-1:**

* **Shall RAN1 discuss the case that collision with the switching time after applying collision handling rules may occur, in particular regarding whether UE behaviour in suh case should be specified?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| vivo | N | The same principle as in current specification for unpaired spectrum shall be reused, i.e. gNB shall ensure sufficient gap to avoid the collision between DL reception and UL transmission at the UE side, otherwise it is an error case (as no special UE behaviour defined). |
| CATT |  | We think gNB can handle the gap well, and no further RAN1 discussion is needed. |
| Spreadtrum | N |  |
| DOCOMO | Y | It is difficult to avoid all the collisions especially for configured DL/UL, and hence, UE behaviour in this case should be specified |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | The collision handling rule defined in Case 9 should be used as the basic rule for ensuring the sufficient gap. |
| Ericsson | Y | Yes, it would be beneficial to specify one of the options listed in the summary above, i.e.:   * Option 1: An earlier DL reception or UL transmission is prioritized by puncturing or skipping first few symbols of the later UL transmission or DL reception * Option 2: Leave it to UE implementation to ensure the switching time is satisfied   We are also open to consider alternative solutions. |
| Nordic | Y | A conclusion could be made that gNB shall handle to accommodate TA and switching time. Since gNB knows both. |
| Nokia, NSB | Y | Our view is that it should be sufficient for gNB to avoid collisions. However, we are open to discuss further. |
| Intel |  | We see the need to clarify both two cases   1. There is not overlap between DL reception and UL transmisison, but the gap between them is shorter than the necessary swithing time 2. When there is overlap between DL reception and UL transmisison, the gap after overlap handling may be shorter than the necessary switching time.   For case a), it is preferred to clarify how to interpret the current agreement. Is it error case, or allowed but up to UE to handle it? For case b), we prefer to clarify what is the behaviour in NR TDD and what to be defined/enhanced in HD-FDD operation. |
| Apple | N | We think it should be treated as error case and avoided by gNB scheduler. |
| Qualcomm | N | NW should avoid the collision with RX/TX switching time of HD-FDD UE in UL/DL scheduling. |
| Samsung | Y | We see a necessity of specified UE behaviour and share similar view with Intel. As one example, for the overlap between SSB and SRS, if only the overlapped SRS symbols are cancelled, the gap between SSB and remaining SRS symbol may be less than TX/RX switching time. For this case, it should be discussed how to handle the remaining SRS symbol. |
| Sharp | Y | UE’s behavior should be defined clearly in spec |
| China Telecom |  | For the cases of potential collisions, specify detailed rules of priority to handle DL/UL collision if necessary. Otherwise, it is up to gNB proper scheduling to avoid such collisions. |
| OPPO | Y | It should be defined, error cases could be considered. |
| FL2 | Regarding whether to consider the case that collision with the switching time after applying collision handling rules may occur, companies preferences are summarized:   * Yes: DOCOMO, Ericsson, Nordic, Nokia, NSB, Samsung, Sharp * No: vivo, CATT, Spreadtrum, Apple, Qualcomm   **@All**, for Case 5, we have FFS on whether to account for Tx/Rx switching time before and after the set of SSB symbols, and for Case 8, there is also FFS on whether or not Ngap symbols before the valid RO is included. If these FFS are not agreed, then the moderator’s understanding is that collision with the switching time cannot be avoided. The similar issue may happen to other cases, e.g. partial UL cancellation in case 1. If these happen, we need to clarify UE’s behaviour, e.g. whether it is treated as error case or leave to UE implementation.  It is okay to firstly discuss the FFS parts of Case 5 and 8 and then come back to this section. Alternative, we can focus on clarifying UE behaviour for the case of collision with the switching time after applying collision handling rules  **Questions**: **Companies are invited to provide any comments, or suggestions to help to reach a consensus** | |
| vivo |  | Regarding the partial UL cancellation case as mentioned by FL, our understanding is that similar as legacy TDD, UE does not expect DL and UL collision (or no suffient time for DL-UL switching) **after the specifced cancellation behaviour,** gNB scheduler should take care of these. |
| MediaTek |  | We agree with the FL summary and the proposal to discuss the FFS parts of Case 5 and 8 first and then come back to this section. |
| Intel |  | The switching time issue in all Case ½/3/4/5/8 are essentially the same, i.e. lack of switching time after overlap handling. Therefore, we prefer to discuss Case 9 assuming a solution is already available for Case ½/3/4/5/8. For example, if there is lack of switching time after overlapping handling, UE may cancel one more symbol following the same priority rule as Case ½/3/4/5/8.  One the other hand, it is appreciated if FL or other colleagues can clarify the behavior if DL reception and UL transmission is not overlap however there is still no enough switching time. Is it error case, or allowed but up to UE implementation? The reason is there are some discussion that ‘last received’ or ‘last transmitted’ doesn’t mean ‘last scheduled’   * + 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 |
| Ericsson |  | Agree with the analysis of FL. However, as also pointed out by FL, the case of collision with witching time after applying collision handling rules already exists even regardless of FFS parts of Case 5 and 8, e.g., partial UL cancellation in case of SRS collision under Case 1. Thus, we think it is important to discuss a clear UE behavior anyway. |
| LG |  | We are supportive of the FL’s way forward which is to firstly discuss the FFS parts of Case 5 and 8 and then come back to this section. We also think it is important to check if the UE behaviour has been defined clearly for all the cases. |
| Samsung |  | We are fine with the FL’s proposal. We also share other companies’ view that UE behaviour should be clear. |
| FL5 | Based on the discussion in Section 2.3 and 3.5, companies view it is necessary to clarify the UE behaviour for Case 9 to avoid potential redundant discussion or conflict.  **Questions: Comapneis are invited to share your views on the UE behaviour for Case 9:**   * For collision with the switching time after applying collision handling rules, if exist, which of the following is the defined UE behaviour:   + Alt. 1: Treat it as an error case   + Alt. 2: Leave it to UE implementation to ensure the switching time is satisfied   + Alt. 3: Consider it as an UL/DL collision and apply the associated collision handling rules defined in Case 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 8 | |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Open |  |
| vivo |  | Alt 1 is what we have now for TDD, we think it would be sufficient to reuse the TDD principle and gNB schedule should avoid such case to happen. |
| OPPO |  | We think the section 4 of 211 can take care of it, equvelent to error case. |
| DOCOMO |  | We can also consider another alternative which was proposed in [Ericsson04]: An earlier DL reception or UL transmission is prioritized by puncturing or skipping first few symbols of the later UL transmission or DL reception. |
| CATT |  | In our view, collision handling rules and 211 statement should be clear enough. Take the already agreed case for example. If a DG-PDSCH is scheduled, then  (1) CG-PUSCH (if any) overlapped with the DG-PDSCH will be dropped.  (2) UE does not expected to transmit CG-PUSCH, or a DG-PUSCH ealier than [*NRX-TX Tc*] after the end of the scheduled DG-PDSCH. If this case still happens, it is an error case. |
| Samsung |  | Open to Alt.3 or the suggestion from DoCoMo. |
| Sharp |  | we have similar view as DOCOMO, an option with symbol puncturing can be considered. |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | The collision handling rule defined in Case 9 should be used as the basic rule for ensuring the sufficient gap. |
| Nordic |  | Alt 1, agree with VIVO statement, this means that it is up to gNB to give enough time to Ues |
| LG |  | Alt.3 is preferred. |
| China Telecom |  | We are open to this topic. |
| Intel |  | We want to know whether the case is allowed, i.e. there is no enough switching time after overlap handling. Alt 1 is to say it is not allowed. Alt 2 and 3 are the contrary. In our view, it is hard for gNB to guarantee the gap after doing the specified overlapping handling rule Case ½/3/4/5/8. Therefore Alt 2 or 3 is more proper. We hence slightly prefer Alt3. |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| FL6 | **@All**: The intetion for discussion is to clarify whether the back-to-back UL/DL without sufficient gap is allowed or not, and what is the assumed UE behaviour if happens. Therefore, it is important to get company input for the question.  Based on the discussion, companies positions are summarized as following where Alt. 4 is added per request.   * Alt. 1:   + vivo, OPPO, CATT, Nordic, * Alt. 2:   + Intel (2nd) * Alt. 3:   + Samsung, LG, Intel * Alt. 4:   + DOCOMO, Samsung, Sharp   **Comapneis, please share your views including update/correction of positions with respect to the following four alternatives**   * For collision with the switching time after applying collision handling rules, if exist, which of the following is the assumed ~~defined~~ UE behaviour:   + Alt. 1: Treat it as an error case   + Alt. 2: Leave it to UE implementation to ensure the switching time is satisfied   + Alt. 3: Consider it as an UL/DL collision and apply the associated collision handling rules defined in Case 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 8   + Al. 4: An earlier DL reception or UL transmission is prioritized by puncturing or skipping first few symbols of the later UL transmission or DL reception | |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y |  |
| LG |  | Alt.3 is preferred. Can live with Alt.4. |
| vivo |  | OK to list more alternatives, but it seems we are going backwards…  The companies who supported alt ¾, would be good to know what is your understanding about existing TDD assumption and what’s new in HD-FDD that makes gNB difficult to avoid the case (i.e. no sufficient gap for UE switching)? |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | We are OK with these alternatives. However, before we decide on this, the relationship between these alternatives and case9 need to be clarified. |
| Apple | Y | Alt.1 is preferred. |
| Ericsson | Y | In our view, Alt. 4 and Alt. 2 are more flexible. It can resolve any collision with the switching time after applying collision handling rules (Cases 1-8), if exist. Alt. 4 may be preferred over Alt. 2 as the UE behavior is made clear and gNB has a possibility to take into account when configurating/schedudling a HD-FDD UE.  Alt. 1 does not allow gNB configuration which results in in “back-to-back” UL/DL, even if they are not overlapping. It also does not work for cases where even after collision handling rules (under Cases 1-8) are applied, there is still remaining back-to-back UL/DL without sufficient gap.  For Alt. 3, it can be good to clarify how UL/DL collision with switching time is considered, e.g., whether the switching time is included as UL or DL transmission. In our understanding, Alt. 3 does not allow configuration which results in “back-to-back” UL/DL even if they are not overlapping. Or at least there is no UE behavior defined for that case. For semi-statically configured DL/UL, it may not always be possible to avoid such “back-to-back” UL/DL for all the configured occasions. |
| Qualcomm | Y | Alt 1 is supported, which removes the ambiguity on both UE and NW wides. |
| CATT | Y | Alt 1. In fact, Alt 1 have no much difference with ‘up to UE implementation’ (even not required to ensure satisfying the switching time).  Because in an error case, the UE behaviour is unspecified, which can be regareded as one kind of ‘up to UE implementation’. |
| DOCOMO |  | We support either Alt.2 or 4 to support back-to-back UL/DL |
| Sharp | Y |  |
| Samsung | Y | For Alt.3, it is good to clarify whether the switching time is considered as UL or DL. |
| Intel | Y | We prefer to define a behavior to make it workable. Note that we are discussing the behavior after applying collision handling rules. That means, the overlap of DL and UL is already considered as an allowed case. It is reasonable to define a valid behavior instead of making it error case. So Alt 1 is not preferred  Alt 4 is not preferred too. Alt 4 may mean, for example, we drop DL symbols in overlapping handling, then we drop UL symbols because UL channel is the later channel. Finally, both two channels are impacted, which is not desired.  Between Alt 2 and Alt 3, we prefer to define a behavior to align gNB/UE understanding, hence Alt 3 is preferred. |
| OPPO | Y | Just wondering how we can move forward for those alternatives, its it targeting on the next meeting? |
| FL8 | Companies preferences are summarized below.   * Alt. 1:   + vivo, OPPO, CATT, Nordic, Apple, Qualcomm, ~~CATT~~, MTK * Alt. 2:   + Intel (2nd), Ericsson (2nd), DOCOMO * Alt. 3:   + [Samsung], LG, Intel * Alt. 4:   + DOCOMO, Samsung, Sharp, [LG], Ericsson   For Alt. 3, some companies (Ericsson, Samsung) suggest to clarify how the switching time is considered, e.g. included as UL or DL, and whether to allow configuration which results in “back-to-back” UL/DL that are not overlapping. Please the proponent companies provide the exact formulation.  From the discussion, the moderator understanding is some companies view that for HD-FDD operation, it may not always be possible to avoid the “back-to-back” UL/DL scenario without sufficient gap via gNB configuration. Also, for partial cancelation case, e.g. SRS, collision with switching time after applying the collision handling rules may happen. The intention for listing these alternatives is to clarify the interpretation of the UE behaviour in such case. This is also related to the discussion of the FFS in the WA for Case 9 from RAN1#104bis-e. However, from the discussion, companies views are split and there is no consensus.  Based on the received response, moderator suggests to consider the following proposal to conclude the discussion.  **FL8 High Priority Proposal 4-1: Confirm the following modified version of the working assumption from RAN1#104bis-e:**   * 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 (pending confirmation from RAN4)   + ~~FFS: how it jointly works with the agreement for other collision cases~~   + Note: RAN1 discusses the case of collision with the switching time after applying collision handling rules and the case of the “back-to-back” non-overlapping UL/DL without sufficient gap, but no concenus on the assumed UE behaviour is achieved. | |
| vivo | Y | Minor wording update, in the Note: RAN1 discusses -> RAN1 discussed |
| CATT | Y | CATT is counted twice in the statistics, so I take the liberty to delect one of them to avoid confusion…  From our view, UE behaviour is not assumed/unspecified = error case, which belongs to a kind of ‘up to UE implementation’. This is not a new issue for HD-FDD but already happened in TDD. |
| Intel |  | We prefer to align the exact understanding for following 2 scenarios respectively.   * the DL reception and UL transmisison do not overlap, but there is no sufficient gap for switching * the DL reception and UL transmisison overlap, and there is no sufficient gap for switching after overlap handling Case 1/2/3/4/5/8   Is it an error case? That means UE does not expect such short of switching time will happen. Or, UE expect such scenario(s) can happen and UE should handle it? |
| MediaTek | Y | Agree with CATT. We support Alt 1. Added MTK to the statistics above. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y | The clarification for the note may be needed. Does this note mean we will never discuss this issue( the collision with the switching time after applying collision handling rules) again? |
| Ericsson | Y, with modification | As noted by FL and commented by some companies, it is not always be possible, especially when it involves configured UL/DL, to avoid the “back-to-back” non-overlapping UL/DL scenario without sufficient gap for all occasions via gNB configuration. If considering it as error case means that the configuration is invalid, it would be too restrictive for gNB in FDD operation.  If there is no consensus on a clear UE behavior in handling such switching time collision cases, then we think it is ok to have a note proposed by FL. But it is preferred that above cases are allowed (we propose a modified WA below), which then implies that it can be left for UE implementation to ensure that the switching time is satisfied.  **High Priority Proposal 4-1: Confirm the following modified version of the working assumption from RAN1#104bis-e:**   * 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 (pending confirmation from RAN4)   + ~~FFS: how it jointly works with the agreement for other collision cases~~   + Note: the case of collision with the switching time after applying collision handling rules and the case of the “back-to-back” non-overlapping UL/DL without sufficient gap cases may happen, i.e., are allowed for HD-FDD UEs.   + Note: RAN1 discusses the case of collision with the switching time after applying collision handling rules and the case of the “back-to-back” non-overlapping UL/DL without sufficient gap, but no concenus on the assumed UE behaviour is achieved. |
| Nordic | N | Our understanding that above takes into account TA and switching in real time from UE point of view  Collision handling is happening in logical time (TA=0)  Collision handling happens first, and after collision handling, UE expects this   * 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  Therefore, we think that no note is needed. |
| DOCOMO |  | We share the view with Ericsson. Unlike TDD, it is quite restrictive for gNB to assume it as error case considering the coexistence with FD-FDD UEs especially for cell-specific back-to-back UL/DL. We are OK if the note proposed by Ericsson is included. |
| LG |  | We agree with Ericsson and DOCOMO in that the two cases summarized by Intel should be allowed. In that sense, we are okay with the suggested addition of the Note from Ericsson. Regarding the Note delaring no consensus, we understand that it is very hard to reach a consensus on the UE behaviour in this case, but rather than declaring no consensus in this meeting, we would like to keep this as FFS at least until the next meeting. |

# Other aspects (medium priority)

## 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) |

RAN1#104bis-e reached the following WA regarding the second FFS [2]:

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

In [Ericsson04, vivo05, Nokia06, CATT10, CT12], it is suggested to conclude that there is no need to define guard time in symbol units.

Contributions [SPRD07, QC14, WILUS26] prefer to use the symbol-level switching time instead of the actual time unit. It is viewed in contribution [Spreadtrum07, WILUS26] that one OFDM symbol can be defined. Contribution [QC14] discusses that no guard symbol is configured for Tx-to-Rx switching and at least one guard symbols is configured for Rx-to-Tx switching at the UE.

Contribution [LG16] presents that defining the guard time in symbols units can be considered only when we are not reusing the existing switching time (pending confirmation from RAN4).

Considering this may be coupled with the RAN4 feedback about the TX/RX switching time, the FL suggests we come back to this issue after receiving the RAN4 replying LS.

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

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

|  |
| --- |
| 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, vivo05, Nokia06, SPRD07, ZTE08, CT12, LG16, Intel18, Apple19, Xiaomi23, WILUS26] express views that there is no need to extend the timeline to include the Tx/Rx switching time since gNB could take into account the switching time when scheduling dynamic DL to avoid collision with the switching time.

Contribution [Ericsson04] also pointed out that if there are still colliding symbols with the switching time after partial cancellation, then the UE behavior to be clarified under Case 9 can be applied [4].



Figure 2 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 3 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

In contribution [Samsung09], it is proposed to further discuss whether the RX/TX switching time is considered in Case 1 by taking into account the interpretation and also future RAN4 feedback about the RX/TX switching time.

From the above, the great majority view is that there is no need to extend the timeline to include the Tx/Rx switching time in Case 1. Considering the minimum value of Tproc,2 is larger than 5 symbols much larger than the required switching time, the FL suggestion is to make a conclusion without waiting for RAN4 feeedback about the Tx/Rx switching.

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

* **For Case 1 (dynamically scheduled DL reception vs. semi-statically configured UL transmission), there is no need to extend the timeline to include the Tx/Rx switching time.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| vivo | Y |  |
| CATT | Y | OK |
| Spreadtrum | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |
| Intel | Y |  |
| Qualcomm |  | Need to consider RAN4’s reply to RAN1 LS. |
| Samsung | Y |  |
| Sharp | Y |  |
| China Telecom | Y |  |
| OPPO | Y |  |

## 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, vivo05, ZTE08, CT12, Xiaomi23] express views that the agreements for Case 3 may have some overlapping with Case 5 and Case 8 which deal with SSB and valid ROs.

Contributions [Ericsson04, NordicSemi11, Intel18] propose to adopt the following FL proposal in RAN1#104bis-e [4] to revise the RAN1#104bis-e agreements for Case 3.

|  |
| --- |
| **Proposal 3.3-1: 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   + Note: Collision handling related to SSB or RO are to be treated in case 5 and case 8. |

According to discussions in RAN1#104bis-e, some companies prefer to make new agreements under Case 5 and 8 instead of revising the previous agreements. Therefore, the FL suggestion is to come back to Case 3 after Case 5 and 8 have been discussed clearly.

For the second FFS in the agreement, contribution [Samsung09] presents two conditions can be further considered. One is to use the SFI to cancel one of the directions. Another is to use a priority indication for collision handling in some cases, e.g., CG-PUSCH with small periodicity overlapping with PDCCH in CSS set.

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

Regarding whether SFI can be optionally supported for HD-FDD UEs, the following are discussed in a few contributions:

* Contribution [Nokia 06] indicates that there is no need to support dynamic SFI for HD-FDD RedCap UE.
* Contribution [Intel18] raises a potential issue when SFI is supported for HD-FDD UEs. Currently, the DL SFI and UL SFI are separately processed as NR FDD, an open issue is the order to check SFI and to apply overlap handling of a DL reception and a UL transmission since the SFI may cancel certain configured DL reception or UL transmission in the set of overlapped symbols.

## Definition and Identification of HD-FDD UE

One contribution presents view on the UE capability reporting of HD-FDD.

* Contribution [OPPO13] proposes that UE capability of HD-FDD is explicitly defined and to be known by gNB. And the HD-FDD capability of RedCap UE should be identifiable by gNB during the initial access since it may be requested for configuring HARQ-ACK to ensure non-zero gap between the PUCCH and previous DL transmission

# Annex: Companies’ point of contact

**FL1 Question: Please consider entering contact info below for the points of contact for this email discussion.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Point of contact** | **Email address** |
| vivo | Xueming Pan | panxueming@vivo.com |
| CATT | Yongqiang FEI | feiyongqiang@catt.cn |
| Spreadtrum | Sicong Zhao | Sicong.zhao@unisoc.com |
| DOCOMO | Shinya Kumagai | shinya.kumagai@docomo-lab.com |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Youjun Hu | hu.youjun1@zte.com.cn |
| Ericsson | Johan Bergman | johan.bergman@ericsson.com |
| Nordic | Karol Schober | karol.schober@nordicsemi.no |
| Nokia, NSB | Rapeepat Ratasuk | rapeepat.ratasuk@nokia-bell-labs.com |
| Intel | Yingyang Li | yingyang.li@intel.com |
| Apple | Hong He | hhe5@apple.com |
| Qualcomm | Jing Lei | leijing@qti.qualcomm.com |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Yuantao Zhang | zhangyt18@lenovo.com |
| Samsung | Seunghoon Choi | seunghoon.choi@samsung.com |
| Sharp | Xiaojun Ma | xiaojun.ma@cn.sharp-world.com |
| China Telecom | Jing Guo | guojing6@chinatelecom.cn |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
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