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# **Introduction**

This document summarizes contributions submitted to AI 9.17.10 regarding UE features for MC enhancements and captures the following email discussion.

|  |
| --- |
| [112bis-e-R18-UE\_features-02] Email discussion on UE features for MC-Enh by April 26 – Shinya (DOCOMO)   * Check points: April 21, April 26 |

According to the initial UE features list from rapporteur [1], there are following feature groups for MC enhancements.

* FGs for multi-cell PUSCH/PDSCH scheduling with a single DCI
  + 49-1 Multi-cell PDSCH scheduling by DCI format 1\_3 on a scheduling cell included in a set of cells
  + 49-1a Multi-cell PDSCH scheduling by DCI format 1\_3 on a scheduling cell not included in a set of cells with same SCS/carrier type between scheduling cell and cells in the set
  + 49-1b Multi-cell PDSCH scheduling by DCI format 1\_3 on a scheduling cell not included in a set of cells with different SCS/carrier type between scheduling cell and cells in the set
  + 49-2 Multi-cell PUSCH scheduling by DCI format 0\_3 on a scheduling cell included in a set of cells
  + 49-2a Multi-cell PUSCH scheduling by DCI format 0\_3 on a scheduling cell not included in a set of cells with same SCS/carrier type between scheduling cell and cells in the set
  + 49-2b Multi-cell PUSCH scheduling by DCI format 0\_3 on a scheduling cell not included in a set of cells with different SCS/carrier type between scheduling cell and cells in the set
  + 49-3 Monitoring both legacy DCI format(s) (0\_0/1\_0, 0\_1/1\_1 and/or 0\_2/1\_2) and DCI format 0\_3/1\_3 on the same scheduling cell
  + 49-4 Multiple sets of cells
  + 49-5 Type 2 HARQ CB support for DCI format 1\_3
  + 49-5a Trigger Type 3 HARQ CB based feedback using DCI format 1\_3
  + 49-5b Trigger enhanced Type 3 HARQ CB based feedback using DCI format 1\_3
  + 49-6 Co-scheduled cell indication based on co-scheduled cell indicator field in DCI format 1\_3/0\_3
* FGs for multi-carrier UL Tx switching scheme
  + 49-X Supported switching option for each band pair in the band combination for UL Tx switching across more than 2 bands
  + 49-Y Minimum separation time for two uplink switching on more than 2 bands within any two consecutive reference slots

Similar to Rel-17, the first priority is to stabilize the signaling structure so that RAN2 can start their work. To this end, in this RAN1 meeting, we focus on the FG structure to have common understanding among companies on how to split the WID into FGs and how to group components/features into rows, while controversial contents can be kept as FFS or […]. Other issues, such as reporting type, can be discussed in future meetings.

# **FGs for multi-cell PUSCH/PDSCH scheduling with a single DCI**

In [1], FGs for multi-cell PUSCH/PDSCH scheduling with a single DCI are captured as below.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Features | Index | Feature group | Components | Prerequisite feature groups | Need for the gNB to know if the feature is supported | Applicable to the capability signalling exchange between UEs (Sidelink WI only)”. | **Consequence if the feature is not supported by the UE** | **Type**  **(the ‘type’ definition from UE features should be based on the granularity of 1) Per UE or 2) Per Band or 3) Per BC or 4) Per FS or 5) Per FSPC)** | Need of FDD/TDD differentiation | Need of FR1/FR2 differentiation | Capability interpretation for mixture of FDD/TDD and/or FR1/FR2 | Note | Mandatory/Optional |
| 49. NR\_MC\_enh | 49-1 | Multi-cell PDSCH scheduling by DCI format 1\_3 on a scheduling cell included in a set of cells | 1. UE supports monitoring DCI format 1\_3 for DL scheduling where scheduling cell is included in a set of cells in same PUCCH group. 2. Scheduling cell is PCell if set of cells includes PCell, and scheduling cell is one of SCells if set of cells includes only SCells. 3. Scheduling cell and co-scheduled cells have same SCS/carrier type (licensed or unlicensed, FR1 or FR2-1 or FR2-2). 4. Max number of co-scheduled cells supported by UE is reported with candidate value set of {[2, 3, 4]} 5. UE can be configured with at least one set of cells. Maximum number of sets for a UE in total and maximum number of sets for a same scheduling cell are reported in FG49-4 6. HARQ feedback based on Type 1 HARQ codebook 7. FDRA field based co-scheduled cell indication |  | Yes |  | UE does not support multi-cell PDSCH scheduling by DCI format 1\_3 on a scheduling cell included in a set of cells | [Per BC] | N/A | N/A | N/A | [Agreement  At least cases 1-1 and 1-2 on SCS are supported:   * Case 1-1: A DCI format 0-X/1-X on a scheduling cell can schedule multiple cells including the scheduling cell and same SCS is used among all the co-scheduled cells including the scheduling cell. * Case 1-2: A DCI format 0-X/1-X on a scheduling cell can schedule multiple cells not including the scheduling cell and same SCS is used among all the co-scheduled cells which may be same or different to the SCS of the scheduling cell.]   [Agreement  Followings are excluded from multi-cell PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling in Rel-18.   * SCell schedules multiple cells including P(S)Cell * Different SCS among co-scheduled cells * Different carrier type (licensed or unlicensed, FR1 or FR2-1 or FR2-2) among co-scheduled cells]   [Agreement  The maximum number of co-scheduled cells by a DCI format 1\_X in Rel-18 is 4.] | Optional with capability signaling |
| 49. NR\_MC\_enh | 49-1a | Multi-cell PDSCH scheduling by DCI format 1\_3 on a scheduling cell not included in a set of cells with same SCS/carrier type between scheduling cell and cells in the set | 1. UE supports monitoring DCI format 1\_3 for DL scheduling where scheduling cell is not included in a set of cells in same PUCCH group. 2. Scheduling cell is PCell or SCell, and a set of cells includes only SCells. 3. Scheduling cell and co-scheduled cells have same SCS/carrier type (licensed or unlicensed, FR1 or FR2-1 or FR2-2). 4. Max number of co-scheduled cells supported by UE is reported with candidate value set of {[2, 3, 4]} 5. UE can be configured with at least one set of cells. Maximum number of sets for a UE in total and maximum number of sets for a same scheduling cell are reported in FG49-4 6. HARQ feedback based on Type 1 HARQ codebook 7. FDRA field based co-scheduled cell indication | 6-10 (CCS with same SCS) | Yes |  | UE does not support multi-cell PDSCH scheduling by DCI format 1\_3 on a scheduling cell which is not included in a set of cells with same SCS/carrier type scheduling cell and cells in the set | [Per BC] | N/A | N/A | N/A | [Agreement  At least cases 1-1 and 1-2 on SCS are supported:   * Case 1-1: A DCI format 0-X/1-X on a scheduling cell can schedule multiple cells including the scheduling cell and same SCS is used among all the co-scheduled cells including the scheduling cell. * Case 1-2: A DCI format 0-X/1-X on a scheduling cell can schedule multiple cells not including the scheduling cell and same SCS is used among all the co-scheduled cells which may be same or different to the SCS of the scheduling cell.]   [Agreement  Followings are excluded from multi-cell PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling in Rel-18.   * SCell schedules multiple cells including P(S)Cell * Different SCS among co-scheduled cells * Different carrier type (licensed or unlicensed, FR1 or FR2-1 or FR2-2) among co-scheduled cells]   [Agreement  The maximum number of co-scheduled cells by a DCI format 1\_X in Rel-18 is 4.] | Optional with capability signaling |
| 49. NR\_MC\_enh | 49-1b | Multi-cell PDSCH scheduling by DCI format 1\_3 on a scheduling cell not included in a set of cells with different SCS/carrier type between scheduling cell and cells in the set | 1. UE supports monitoring DCI format 1\_3 for DL scheduling where scheduling cell is not included in a set of cells in same PUCCH group. 2. Scheduling cell is PCell or SCell, and a set of cells includes only SCells. 3. Scheduling cell and co-scheduled cells have different SCS/carrier type (licensed or unlicensed, FR1 or FR2-1 or FR2-2). 4. Max number of co-scheduled cells supported by UE is reported with candidate value set of {[2, 3, 4]} 5. UE can be configured with at least one set of cells. Maximum number of sets for a UE in total and maximum number of sets for a same scheduling cell are reported in FG49-4 6. HARQ feedback based on Type 1 HARQ codebook 7. FDRA field based co-scheduled cell indication | 18-5 (DL CCS with different SCS) | Yes |  | UE does not support multi-cell PDSCH scheduling by DCI format 1\_3 on a scheduling cell which is not included in a set of cells with different SCS/carrier type scheduling cell and cells in the set | [Per BC] | N/A | N/A | N/A | [Agreement  At least cases 1-1 and 1-2 on SCS are supported:   * Case 1-1: A DCI format 0-X/1-X on a scheduling cell can schedule multiple cells including the scheduling cell and same SCS is used among all the co-scheduled cells including the scheduling cell. * Case 1-2: A DCI format 0-X/1-X on a scheduling cell can schedule multiple cells not including the scheduling cell and same SCS is used among all the co-scheduled cells which may be same or different to the SCS of the scheduling cell.]   [Agreement  Followings are excluded from multi-cell PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling in Rel-18.   * SCell schedules multiple cells including P(S)Cell * Different SCS among co-scheduled cells * Different carrier type (licensed or unlicensed, FR1 or FR2-1 or FR2-2) among co-scheduled cells]   [Agreement  The maximum number of co-scheduled cells by a DCI format 1\_X in Rel-18 is 4.] | Optional with capability signaling |
| 49. NR\_MC\_enh | 49-2 | Multi-cell PUSCH scheduling by DCI format 0\_3 on a scheduling cell included in a set of cells | 1. UE supports monitoring DCI format 0\_3 for UL scheduling where scheduling cell is included in a set of cells in same PUCCH group. 2. Scheduling cell is PCell if set of cells includes PCell, and scheduling cell is one of SCells if set of cells includes only SCells. 3. Scheduling cell and co-scheduled cells have same SCS/carrier type (licensed or unlicensed, FR1 or FR2-1 or FR2-2). 4. Max number of co-scheduled cells supported by UE is reported with candidate value set of {[2, 3, 4]} 5. UE can be configured with at least one set of cells. Maximum number of sets for a UE in total and maximum number of sets for a same scheduling cell are reported in FG49-4 6. FDRA field based co-scheduled cell indication |  | Yes |  | UE does not support multi-cell PUSCH scheduling by DCI format 0\_3 on a scheduling cell included in a set of cells | [Per BC] | N/A | N/A | N/A | [Agreement  At least cases 1-1 and 1-2 on SCS are supported:   * Case 1-1: A DCI format 0-X/1-X on a scheduling cell can schedule multiple cells including the scheduling cell and same SCS is used among all the co-scheduled cells including the scheduling cell. * Case 1-2: A DCI format 0-X/1-X on a scheduling cell can schedule multiple cells not including the scheduling cell and same SCS is used among all the co-scheduled cells which may be same or different to the SCS of the scheduling cell.]   [Agreement  Followings are excluded from multi-cell PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling in Rel-18.   * SCell schedules multiple cells including P(S)Cell * Different SCS among co-scheduled cells * Different carrier type (licensed or unlicensed, FR1 or FR2-1 or FR2-2) among co-scheduled cells]   [Agreement  The maximum number of co-scheduled cells by a DCI format 0\_X in Rel-18 is 4.] | Optional with capability signaling |
| 49. NR\_MC\_enh | 49-2a | Multi-cell PUSCH scheduling by DCI format 0\_3 on a scheduling cell not included in a set of cells with same SCS/carrier type between scheduling cell and cells in the set | 1. UE supports monitoring DCI format 0\_3 for UL scheduling where scheduling cell is not included in a set of cells in same PUCCH group. 2. Scheduling cell is PCell or SCell, and a set of cells includes only SCells. 3. Scheduling cell and co-scheduled cells have same SCS/carrier type (licensed or unlicensed, FR1 or FR2-1 or FR2-2). 4. Max number of co-scheduled cells supported by UE is reported with candidate value set of {[2, 3, 4]} 5. UE can be configured with at least one set of cells. Maximum number of sets for a UE in total and maximum number of sets for a same scheduling cell are reported in FG49-4 6. FDRA field based co-scheduled cell indication | 6-10 (CCS with same SCS) | Yes |  | UE does not support multi-cell PUSCH scheduling by DCI format 0\_3 on a scheduling cell which is not included in a set of cells with same SCS/carrier type scheduling cell and cells in the set | [Per BC] | N/A | N/A | N/A | [Agreement  At least cases 1-1 and 1-2 on SCS are supported:   * Case 1-1: A DCI format 0-X/1-X on a scheduling cell can schedule multiple cells including the scheduling cell and same SCS is used among all the co-scheduled cells including the scheduling cell. * Case 1-2: A DCI format 0-X/1-X on a scheduling cell can schedule multiple cells not including the scheduling cell and same SCS is used among all the co-scheduled cells which may be same or different to the SCS of the scheduling cell.]   [Agreement  Followings are excluded from multi-cell PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling in Rel-18.   * SCell schedules multiple cells including P(S)Cell * Different SCS among co-scheduled cells * Different carrier type (licensed or unlicensed, FR1 or FR2-1 or FR2-2) among co-scheduled cells]   [Agreement  The maximum number of co-scheduled cells by a DCI format 0\_X in Rel-18 is 4.] | Optional with capability signaling |
| 49. NR\_MC\_enh | 49-2b | Multi-cell PUSCH scheduling by DCI format 0\_3 on a scheduling cell not included in a set of cells with different SCS/carrier type between scheduling cell and cells in the set | 1. UE supports monitoring DCI format 0\_3 for UL scheduling where scheduling cell is not included in a set of cells in same PUCCH group. 2. Scheduling cell is PCell or SCell, and a set of cells includes only SCells. 3. Scheduling cell and co-scheduled cells have different SCS/carrier type (licensed or unlicensed, FR1 or FR2-1 or FR2-2). 4. UE can be configured with at least one set of cells. Maximum number of sets for a UE in total and maximum number of sets for a same scheduling cell are reported in FG49-4 5. FDRA field based co-scheduled cell indication | 18-5b (CCS with different SCS) | Yes |  | UE does not support multi-cell PUSCH scheduling by DCI format 0\_3 on a scheduling cell which is not included in a set of cells with different SCS/carrier type scheduling cell and cells in the set | [Per BC] | N/A | N/A | N/A | [Agreement  At least cases 1-1 and 1-2 on SCS are supported:   * Case 1-1: A DCI format 0-X/1-X on a scheduling cell can schedule multiple cells including the scheduling cell and same SCS is used among all the co-scheduled cells including the scheduling cell. * Case 1-2: A DCI format 0-X/1-X on a scheduling cell can schedule multiple cells not including the scheduling cell and same SCS is used among all the co-scheduled cells which may be same or different to the SCS of the scheduling cell.]   [Agreement  Followings are excluded from multi-cell PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling in Rel-18.   * SCell schedules multiple cells including P(S)Cell * Different SCS among co-scheduled cells * Different carrier type (licensed or unlicensed, FR1 or FR2-1 or FR2-2) among co-scheduled cells]   [Agreement  The maximum number of co-scheduled cells by a DCI format 0\_X in Rel-18 is 4.] | Optional with capability signaling |
| 49. NR\_MC\_enh | 49-3 | Monitoring both legacy DCI format(s) (0\_0/1\_0, 0\_1/1\_1 and/or 0\_2/1\_2) and DCI format 0\_3/1\_3 on the same scheduling cell | Monitoring both legacy DCI format(s) (0\_0/1\_0, 0\_1/1\_1 and/or 0\_2/1\_2) and DCI format 0\_3/1\_3 on the same scheduling cell | At least one of {49-1, 49-1a, 49-1b, 49-2, 49-2a, 49-2b} | Yes |  | UE does not support monitoring both legacy DCI format(s) (0\_1/1\_1 and/or 0\_2/1\_2) and DCI format 0\_3/1\_3 on the same scheduling cell | [Per UE] | No | No | No | [Agreement  For any cell within a set of cells which can be co-scheduled by a DCI format 0\_X/1\_X, RAN1 specification supports monitoring the DCI format 0\_X/1\_X and DCI format 0\_0/1\_0, 0\_1/1\_1, and/or 0\_2/1\_2 (if supported by the UE), if configured from a same scheduling cell.   * The DCI format 0\_X/1\_X and the DCI format 0\_0/1\_0/0\_1/1\_1/0\_2/1\_2 can be monitored simultaneously. ]   [Note: this FG is referring to FG11-1a] | Optional with capability signaling |
| 49. NR\_MC\_enh | 49-4 | Multiple sets of cells | 1. Max number of sets of cells supported by UE in total is reported with candidate value set of {[2, 3, 4]} 2. Max number of sets of cells supported by UE for a same scheduling cell is reported with candidate value set of {[1, 2, 3, 4]} | At least one of {49-1, 49-1a, 49-1b, 49-2, 49-2a, 49-2b} | Yes |  |  |  |  |  |  | [Agreement  Following is supported in Rel-18 multi-cell scheduling   * A UE can be configured one or multiple sets of cells with each set configured for multi-cell scheduling using DCI format 0\_X/1\_X.   + Up to 4 sets of cells can be configured per PUCCH group.   + Up to N sets of cells can be configured and respectively scheduled by DCI format 0\_X/1\_X from a same scheduling cell.     - The value of N is reported as UE capability.] |  |
| 49. NR\_MC\_enh | 49-5 | Type 2 HARQ CB support for DCI format 1\_3 | HARQ feedback based on Type 2 HARQ codebook for PDSCHs scheduled by DCI format 1\_3 | At least one of {49-1, 49-1a, 49-1b} | Yes |  | UE does not support HARQ feedback based on Type 2 HARQ codebook for PDSCHs scheduled by DCI format 1\_3 | [Per UE] | No | No | No | [Agreement  HARQ-ACK codebook types (Type-1, Rel-15 Type-2, Rel-16 Type-3, Rel-17 Type-3) are applicable when multi-cell PDSCH scheduling is configured.]  [Agreement  For Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook, two sub-codebooks are generated with a first sub-codebook comprising HARQ-ACK information bits for PDSCH(s) scheduled by DCI(s) with each scheduling a single cell and a second sub-codebook comprising HARQ-ACK information bits for PDSCH(s) scheduled by DCI(s) with each scheduling more than one cell.   * Separate DAI counting for DCI(s) with each scheduling a single cell and DCI(s) with each scheduling more than one cell. * Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook is generated by concatenating the first sub-codebook and the second sub-codebook.]   [Note: this FG is referring to FG5-24] | Optional with capability signaling |
| 49. NR\_MC\_enh | 49-5a | Trigger Type 3 HARQ CB based feedback using DCI format 1\_3 | Trigger Type 3 HARQ CB based feedback using DCI format 1\_3 | 10-16 (Type 3 HARQ CB), At least one of {49-1, 49-1a, 49-1b} | Yes |  | UE does not support HARQ feedback based on Type 3 HARQ codebook triggered by DCI format 1\_3 | [Per band] | N/A | N/A | N/A | [Agreement  HARQ-ACK codebook types (Type-1, Rel-15 Type-2, Rel-16 Type-3, Rel-17 Type-3) are applicable when multi-cell PDSCH scheduling is configured.]  [Note: this FG is referring to FG10-16] | Optional with capability signaling |
| 49. NR\_MC\_enh | 49-5b | Trigger enhanced Type 3 HARQ CB based feedback using DCI format 1\_3 | Trigger enhanced Type 3 HARQ CB based feedback using DCI format 1\_3 | 25-6 (Enhanced Type 3 HARQ CB), At least one of {49-1, 49-1a, 49-1b} | Yes |  | UE does not support HARQ feedback based on enhanced Type 3 HARQ codebook triggered by DCI format 1\_3 | [Per band] | N/A | N/A | N/A | [Agreement  HARQ-ACK codebook types (Type-1, Rel-15 Type-2, Rel-16 Type-3, Rel-17 Type-3) are applicable when multi-cell PDSCH scheduling is configured.]  [Note: this FG is referring to FG25-6] | Optional with capability signaling |
| 49. NR\_MC\_enh | 49-6 | Co-scheduled cell indication based on co-scheduled cell indicator field in DCI format 1\_3/0\_3 | Co-scheduled cell indication based on co-scheduled cell indicator field in DCI format 1\_3/0\_3   * Combinations of co-scheduled cells are configured via RRC | At least one of {49-1, 49-1a, 49-1b, 49-2, 49-2a, 49-2b} | Yes |  | UE does not support co-scheduled cell indication based on co-scheduled cell indicator field in DCI format 1\_3/0\_3 | [Per UE] | No | No | No | [Agreement  For a set of cells which is configured for multi-cell scheduling using DCI format 0\_X and DCI format 1\_X, support the following:  •If table defining combinations of co-scheduled cells for the set of cells is configured,  O an indicator in the DCI is included and points to one row of the table.  O The table is configured by RRC signaling for the set of cells.] | Optional with capability signaling |

Following inputs are provided in contributions for the RAN1#112bis-e meeting.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| [2] | vivo | UE capabilities can be classified as basic capabilities and optional capabilities. Basic capabilities for R18 multi-carrier scheduling (mc-scheduling) are to ensure that the basic features and essential functions of mc-scheduling are supported by UE, while optional capabilities may be related to some advanced features or fancy designs.  As per RAN1 agreement, a series of legacy DCI fields are carried by mc-DCI, including some related to optional capability signalling reporting. Further discussion is needed regarding whether support of those fields and corresponding features in mc-DCI should be mandated or optional. Here is one method for determining basic and optional fields/features:   1. Basic features are the ones that have existed since R15, or their corresponding fields are mandatorily present in fallback DCI or non-fallback DCI, such as PDCCH monitoring/TDRA/FDRA/HARQ, etc. 2. Optional features are usually requiring optional R15-17 UE capabilities reporting.   The basic capability of R18 mc-scheduling should include the monitoring of DCI format 0\_X/1\_X. Additionally, as per RAN1 agreement, separate reporting for the maximum number of the supported co-scheduled cells for UL and DL is needed considering that the UE’s capabilities of uplink CA and downlink CA may be asymmetric.  Regarding PDCCH monitoring of DCI format 0\_X/1\_X, it is agreed that the BD/CCE of mc-DCI is counted on the reference cell, which may also be configured with sc-DCI monitoring. The monitoring capability of mc-DCI and sc-DCI should share the legacy R17 BD/CCE limit. For basic UE, decoding both mc-DCI and sc-DCI simultaneously for the same reference cell should not be mandatory. Separate monitoring of mc-DCI and s-c-DCI is sufficient in most cases while supporting such kind of simultaneous monitor requires additional hardware processing capability.  **Proposal 1. Simultaneous monitoring of both DCI format 0\_0/0\_1/0\_2(if supported) and DCI format 0\_X simultaneously for the same reference cell is an optional feature for mc-scheduling.**  **Proposal 2. Simultaneous monitoring of both DCI format 1\_0/1\_1/1\_2(if supported) and DCI format 1\_X simultaneously for the same reference cell is an optional feature for mc-scheduling.**  Regarding HARQ-ACK for mc-scheduling, as all co-scheduled cells have the same SCS and the same PUCCH resource, the generation procedure of Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook for mc-scheduling is almost identical to that of for sc-scheduling, which is mandatorily supported with capability signalling reporting in R15. Thus, the support of Type-1 HARQ-ACK generation for mc-scheduling can be considered a basic capability. But for Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook for mc-scheduling, as several changes, including changes on DAI counting, and the number of HARQ-ACK bits per DCI are introduced, Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook for mc-scheduling should be an optional feature.  **Proposal 3. Support of Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook is a basic feature for mc-scheduling.**  **Proposal 4. Support of Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook is an optional feature for mc-scheduling.**  Regarding whether/how to support existing optional features of other WIs in earlier releases or future releases, some issues need to be discussed.  Firstly, in R15-17, 3GPP introduced a series of capability signaling to indicate the support for some specific features in sc-DCI. When it comes to mc-DCI, an issue that needs to be resolved is how to determine which of these features/DCI fields the UE mandatorily supports for the mc-scheduling. Should RAN1 introduce a new R18 capability for each of the features/DCI fields that have introduced UE capability signaling, or should RAN1 simply reuse the existing capabilities defined for a legacy DCI format (e.g., DCI format 0-1/1-1) and extend the corresponding features to mc-DCI?  An example is DCI-based BWP switching. In R15, NW can include a BWP indicator in a sc-DCI and trigger BWP switching via a sc-DCI only if the UE reported a per Band capability ***bwp-SameNumerology*** or ***bwp-DiffNumerology*** for DCI-based BWP switching. For mc-scheduling, whether new mc-DCI-based BWP switching capabilities, e.g., ***bwp-SameNumerology-DCI-0-X-And-DCI-1-X***, ***bwp-DiffNumerology-DCI-0-X-And-DCI-1-X*** are needed? Or, legacy capability can be directly reused, and NW assumes that mc-DCI-based BWP switching capability is supported by UE if the UE reported ***bwp-SameNumerology*** or ***bwp-DiffNumerology*** for at least one of the co-scheduled cells? Another example is Type-3 HARQ-ACK codebook, which is an optional feature with capability signalling in NRU, it seems that the legacy capability signalling can be reused in this case.  In most cases, reusing the existing capabilities could be feasible. But for dormancy/deactivation, one question that needs clarification is whether the dormancy/deactivation of the reference cell needs additional capability indication. Similar discussions had occurred in R17 DSS regarding the dormancy/deactivation of sScell. In R17 DSS, scheduling from Pcell falls back to self-scheduling only, and the BD/CCE budget for Pcell self-scheduling changes after the sScell becomes dormant or deactivated. As this dormancy/deactivation procedure results in the redistribution of BD/CCE counting, new UE capabilities were introduced for dormancy/deactivation of the sScell. Similarly, if the reference cell becomes dormant or deactivated, the mc-DCI scheduling function should be disabled. As discussed earlier, when the UE monitors both mc-DCI and sc-DCI for a reference cell, the monitoring of mc-DCI and sc-DCI shares the legacy R17 BD/CCE limit dynamically. If mc-scheduling is disabled, the reference cell falls back to sc-DCI-based scheduling only, and the single-cell scheduling for the reference cell is subject to the R17 BD/CCE limit. On the other hand, since PDCCH monitoring for sc-DCI scheduling the reference cell is not performed when the reference cell is dormant or deactivated, the dormancy/deactivation procedure of the reference cell may not cause a BD/CCE budget re-allocation. Therefore, reusing existing capability is also feasible for this case.  **Proposal 5. For each existing optional NR UE feature that corresponds to a field agreed to be included in mc-DCI, consider one of the following: - Alt1. Existing UE capabilities for the feature can be directly reused to indicate the support of this feature and the corresponding DCI field for mc-DCI when the UE capabilities are reported together with the basic capability of mc-DCI monitoring. - Alt2. Introduce new UE capabilities for supporting the feature for mc-scheduling.**  Secondly, in addition to the existing fields, mc-DCI also introduces some new fields and functions.  It should be noted that although ‘Antenna port(s)’, ‘Precoding information and number of layers’ and ‘SRS resource indicator’ are existing fields, they are different from the legacy sc-scheduling in that the types of these fields are configurable between Type-1A and Type2. Since Type-1A and Type-2 lead to different field structures and interpretations, it is unreasonable to force basic UEs to support both types for a single field. The support of type configurability should be an optional feature. For simplicity, basic UE may only support these three fields as Type-2. If UE is not informed by NW of the field type for these fields, Type-2 is assumed by default.  **Proposal 6. Support of configurability between Type 1A and Type-2 is an optional feature. If UE does not report the support of configurability between Type 1A and Type-2 for ‘Antenna port(s)’, ‘Precoding information and number of layers’ or ‘SRS resource indicator’, it means that UE only supports these fields as Type-2.**  The indicator of cell sets and the indicator of co-scheduled cells are new fields introduced in R18. Regarding the ‘cell set indication’, support of one cell set should be a basic capability, and advanced UEs can further report the number of supported cell sets. Regarding indicating cell combinations, two solutions are agreed:  1) indication based on cell combination indicator;  2) indication based on FDRA.  The two solutions would result in different DCI structures and interpretations. Both solutions work. But it is not necessary to force basic UEs to support both solutions. If each cell combination in a cell set only contains a subset of the cell set, the solution 1) is favorable as it makes the DCI decoding easier to UE (as the cell indication is a standalone dedicated field), and it has better flexibility and a smaller DCI size. If there is a cell combination containing all the cells in the cell set, these two solutions are almost the same in terms of DCI structures and interpretations. Whether to support a cell combination that includes all cells in a cell set can be considered a prerequisite for supporting the FDRA-based solution. In other words, the cell combination indicator-based solution, which is always applicable, should be a mandatory capability, while the support of a cell combination that includes all cells in a cell set can be an optional capability.  **Proposal 7. The cell combination indicator-based solution should be a basic feature, while the support of a cell combination that includes all cells in a cell set and FDRA-based cell combination indication can be an optional capability.**  **Proposal 8. Regarding the cell set indication, the support of one cell set should be a basic feature, and advanced UEs can further report the support of more cell sets.**  In 38.306, the number of unicast DCIs that can be processed per scheduled cell per scheduling CC slot has been specified. With mc-DCI introduced in R18, it should be clarified whether these restrictions are applicable to mc-DCI. For simplicity, a mc-DCI should be considered as a unicast DCI from the perspective of the reference cell, and the total number of unicast sc-DCIs and mc-DCIs that can be proceeded simultaneously in a scheduling CC slot should not exceed the maximum number specified in the 38.306:   | ***crossCarrierSchedulingProcessing-DiffSCS-r16***  Indicates the UE cross carrier scheduling processing capability for DL carrier aggregation processing up to X unicast DCI scheduling for DL per scheduled CC. X is based on pair of (scheduling CC SCS, scheduled CC SCS) where a pair of (15,120), (15,60), (30,120) kHz SCS can have X = {1,2,4} while a pair of (15,30), (30,60), (60,120) kHz SCS can have X = {2}, and X applies per slot of scheduling CC. | FS | No | N/A | N/A | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | ***crossCarrierSchedulingProcessing-DiffSCS-r16***  Indicates the UE cross carrier scheduling processing capability for UL carrier aggregation processing up to X unicast DCI scheduling for UL per scheduled CC. X is based on pair of (scheduling CC SCS, scheduled CC SCS) where a pair of (15,120), (15,60), (30,120) kHz SCS can have X = {1,2,4} while a pair of (15,30), (30,60), (60,120) kHz SCS can have X = {2}, and X applies per slot of scheduling CC. | FS | No | N/A | N/A |   Proposal 9. From the perspective of the reference cell counting toward the BD/CCE/DCI size of mc-DCI, a mc-DCI is considered as a unicast DCI, and the total number of mc-DCI and sc-DCI for the reference cell should not exceed the legacy restriction of the maximum number of unicast DCI specified in 38.306.  With the above logic, an example of the corresponding UE feature for DCI monitoring in R18 mc-scheduling is as below. The previous agreements on the restrictions for mc-scheduling are also reflected in the table.  Proposal 10. For mc-scheduling, consider the FGs in Table 1.  Table 1. Example of UE feature for mc-scheduling   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Index | Feature group | Components | note | | XX-1  Basic  (mandatory with signalling) | Monitoring DCI format 0\_X and DCI format 1\_X | 1. Support monitoring DCI format 0\_X for UL scheduling  a)The maximum number of co-scheduled UL CCs supported by the UE  2, Support monitoring DCI format 1\_X for DL scheduling  a)The maximum number of co-scheduled DL CCs supported by the UE  3. UE is not expected to monitor both DCI format 0\_0/0\_1/0\_2(if supported) and DCI format 0\_X simultaneously for the same reference cell  4. UE is not expected to monitor both DCI format 1\_0/1\_1/1\_2(if supported) and DCI format 1\_X simultaneously for the same reference cell  5. Number of cell set N  6. Support HARQ enhancements for Type 1 HARQ codebook for multi-cell PDSCH scheduling with same SCS/carrier type/duplex mode among the co-scheduled cells  7. DCI format 0\_X/1\_X includes an indicator to indicate the co-scheduled cells | Component 1-a), the candidate value are {2,3,4}  Component 2-a) , the candidate values are {2,3,4}  Component 5, the candidate values are {1,2}  Note:  UE supports that a DCI format 0-X/1-X on a scheduling cell can schedule multiple cells including the scheduling cell and same SCS is used among all the co-scheduled cells including the scheduling cell.  UE supports that a DCI format 0-X/1-X on a scheduling cell can schedule multiple cells not including the scheduling cell and same SCS is used among all the co-scheduled cells which may be same or different to the SCS of the scheduling cell.  UE does not support that a DCI format 0-X/1-X on a scheduling cell can schedule multiple cells and different SCS are used among all the co-scheduled cells.  UE only supports that a DCI format 0-X/1-X on a scheduling cell can schedule multiple cells and the same carrier type (licensed or unlicensed, FR1 or FR2-1 or FR2-2) is used among all the co-scheduled cells.  UE does not support both CBG-based PDSCH/PUSCH transmission and the multi-cell PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling on the same or different cells within a same PUCCH group  UE does not support both multi-PDSCH scheduling and multi-cell PDSCH scheduling on the same or different cells within a same PUCCH group.  UE does not support enhanced Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook for the multi-cell PUSCH/PDSCH scheduling by a DCI format 0-X/1-X.  UE supports Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook only for the case where co-scheduled cells by a DCI format 1\_X have same SCS/carrier type/duplex mode.  UE does not support that more than one scheduling cells are configured for DCI format 0\_X/1\_X for each scheduled cell.  UE does not support PUSCH repetition Type B operation with DCI format 0\_X (i.e. UE cannot be configured with PUSCH repetition Type B applicable for DCI format 0\_1)  UE does not support that SCell schedules multiple cells including P(S)Cell.  UE does not support that both multi-cell PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling and multi-TRP are configured for a scheduled cell.  UE does not support that PCell schedules multiple cells by DCI format 0\_X/1\_X when a sSCell is configured to schedule PCell | | XX-1a  optional | Monitoring both DCI format 0\_1/0\_0/0\_2(if supported) and DCI format 0\_X simultaneously | Support monitoring of both DCI format 0\_0/0\_1/0\_2(if supported) and DCI format 0\_X simultaneously for the same reference cell |  | | XX-1b  optional | Monitoring both DCI format 1\_1/1\_0/1\_2(if supported) and DCI format 1\_X simultaneously | Support monitoring of both DCI format 1\_0/1\_1/1\_2(if supported) and DCI format 1\_X simultaneously for the same reference cell |  | | XX-2  optional | Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook for multi-cell PDSCH scheduling | Support HARQ enhancements for type 2 HARQ codebook for multi-cell PDSCH scheduling |  | | XX-3  optional | FDRA-based cell combination indicator | Support all the cells in a cell set to be scheduled by a DCI format 0-X/1-X  Support indicating a scheduled cell combination by FDRA | The UE determines the actually scheduled cell(s) based on the FDRA field of each cell of the set of cells.  -For Type 0 FDRA, all 0s indicates the cell is not scheduled.  -For Type 1 FDRA, all 1s indicates the cell is not scheduled. | | XX-4  optional | Configurable field Type | Support ‘Antenna port(s)’, ‘Precoding information and number of layers’ and ‘SRS resource indicator’ being configurable between Type 1A and Type-2 |  | |
| [3] | OPPO | ***UE feature for multi-cell scheduling with DCI 0\_X/1\_X***  In the current UE feature structure, DCI 0\_0/1\_0/0\_1/1\_1 are mandatory Rel-15 feature (in FG3-1) without capability signaling while DCI 0\_2/1\_2 is optional Rel-16 feature (FG11-1) with capability signaling. In our view, some characteristics of DCI 0\_2/1\_2 feature can apply to DCI 0\_X/1\_X.  ***Proposal 1: A new FG is defined for Rel-18 support of multi-cell scheduling with DCI 0\_X/1\_X.***   * ***The new FG is optional with UE capability signaling.*** * ***The new FG does not differentiate between FR1 and FR2.***   + ***FFS whether/how to capture RAN1 agreement that the co-scheduled cells per single DCI 0\_X/1\_X shall have the same carrier type between FR1 and FR2.*** * ***The new FG does not differentiate between FDD and FDD.***   As for the new FG components, RAN1 agreed that, although the spec-allowed maximum number of co-scheduled cells per single DCI 0\_X/1\_X is 4, the maximum number of co-scheduled cells by a DCI format 0\_X and the maximum number of co-scheduled cells by a DCI format 1\_X for a UE can be the same or different, and can be smaller than or equal to 4. This should be reflected as a UE capability.  However, according to the RAN1 agreements on DCI 0\_X/1\_X payload size determination, the “maximum number of cells in a co-scheduled cell set” can have stronger influence to the UE implementation on PDCCH processing than the “maximum number of co-scheduled cells by a single DCI 0\_X/1\_X”. The latter one may be more meaningful for UE’s capability on co-scheduled PDSCH, while the former one is more meaningful for UE’s implementation capability on PDCCH. Therefore we suggest including “maximum number of cells in a co-scheduled cell set” in the new FG components as well. Additionally, RAN1 already agreed that the number of cell sets that UE can be configured and scheduled from a same scheduling cell is reported as UE capability.  ***Proposal 2: The new FG in Proposal 1 has the following FG components:***   * ***Component-1: Supports monitoring DCI format 1\_X for DL scheduling, with one DCI format 1\_X scheduling PDSCH on up to NDL,max cells in a co-scheduled cell set that can have maximum Nset\_size,max cells, where 2≤NDL,max ≤ Nset\_size,max≤4.*** * ***Component-2: Supports monitoring DCI format 0\_X for UL scheduling, with one DCI format 0\_X scheduling PUSCH on up to NUL,max cells in a co-scheduled cell set that can have maximum Nset\_size,max cells, where 2≤NUL,max ≤ Nset\_size,max≤4.*** * ***Note: NDL,max , NUL,max and Nset\_size,max above are UE capability parameters*** * ***Component-3: Maximum number of co-scheduled cell sets (Nset,max) that can be scheduled from a same scheduling cell.*** * ***FFS whether to introduce multiple combinations of values for these capability parameters.***   Note that the “maximum number of cells in a co-scheduled cell set” (i.e., ***Nset\_size,max*** above) can work for both table-configuration based indication and FDRA-reuse based indication for the co-scheduled cell combination. For a capability indication with more precise capability granularity, the maximum number of table rows can be considered as an alternative capability parameter for table-configuration based cell combination indication.  Regarding to the FFS in Proposal 2, Proposal 2 introduces four capability parameters < ***NDL,max , NUL,max, Nset\_size,max, Nset,max*** > and gives individual maximum values, under the assumption of no dependency among these maximum values. However, it is also possible to take these four capability parameters into a multi-dimensional capability space, with multiple combinations of maximum values, where one combination of maximum values may observe a larger value for one capability parameter and a smaller value for another capability parameter comparing to another combination of maximum values. Under this scheme, a UE may report, e.g., both <3,3,4,2> and <2,2,3,4> as capability. This scheme may allow better utilization of UE implementation resources but may lead to more sophisticated RAN1 discussions.  There was a brief discussion in RAN1 #112 regarding to whether/how to have UE capability indication for UE’s support of two mechanisms to indicate the co-scheduled cell combinations: table-based indication and FDRA-reuse-based indication. We certainly do not think the UE implementation should be mandated to support both. There was a proposal in RAN1 #112 to make the FDRA-reuse-based method mandatory and the table-based method optional. However, it was also commented that the DCI 0\_X/1\_X payload size derivations (3rd and 4th bullets) in the following FDRA-reuse based method are not clearly finalized and are still open to solution explore. It is premature to lock some uncertainty as mandatory at this stage.   |  | | --- | | * + The UE determines the actually scheduled cell(s) based on the FDRA field of each cell of the set of cells.     - For Type 0 FDRA, all 0s indicates the cell is not scheduled.     - For Type 1 FDRA, all 1s indicates the cell is not scheduled.   + The size of the Type 2 fields for each cell does not change according to actually co-scheduled cells.   + The payload size of DCI format 0\_X is derived by UE based on RRC configuration of the active BWP(s) of all cells within the set of cells.   + The payload size of DCI format 1\_X is derived by UE based on RRC configuration of the active BWP(s) of all cells within the set of cells. |   ***Proposal 3: At least one method of co-scheduled cell combination indication, between table-based and FRDA-reuse-based, is capability optional in FG component.***   * ***RAN1 clarifies details of the DCI 0\_X/1\_X payload size derivation for the FDRA-reuse based cell combination indication, before determining which method is selected as optional.***   Given RAN1 agreement does not prevent DCI 0\_X/1\_X from being configured in the same search space with legacy DCI formats (if we correctly understood the RAN1 #112 agreement about “independent configuration of separate search space sets between DCI 0\_X/1\_X and legacy DCIs”), there should be another FG similar to FG11-1a, created for support of monitoring DCI 0\_X/1\_X and any of legacy unicast DCI in the same search space.  ***Proposal 4: With clarification of RAN1 #112 agreement on “independent configuration on separate search space”, a second new FG is introduced for DCI 0\_X/1\_X upon necessity to fulfill the similar purpose of FG11-1a.***  Besides the above UE features that can find logic source from existing UE feature architecture and earlier RAN1 discussion in Rel-18 WI, there are some DCI 0\_X/1\_X related features that are logically brand-new in Rel-18 and therefore may need further discussion. One example is the new configuration, Configuration 3, of nominal RBG size for RA type 0. Within Configuration 3, RBG size of 32 is a new RBG size that never appears in legacy specification, and therefore the UE implementation should be given a chance not to implement it in support of scheduling with DCI 0\_X/1\_X in RA type 0. Another example is Type-2 HARQ codebook that contains two sub-codebooks.  ***Proposal 5: The following FG component is included in the new FG in Proposal 1.***   * ***Support of nominal RBG size of Configuration 3.*** * ***Support of Type-2 HARQ codebook within multi-cell scheduling by DCI 0\_X/1\_X.*** |
| [4] | ZTE | **Issue 1: The scheduling of multi-cell scheduling**  Since multi-cell scheduling is a new feature in NR, whether the UE supports multi-cell scheduling or not should be reported by the UE. Since the co-scheduled cells within a set of cells can be in different bands, the report granularity should be per BC report.  For multi-cell scheduling, the following agreements have been reached on the number of co-scheduled cells and the number of sets.   |  | | --- | | **Agreement**  Confirm the following working assumption reached in RAN1#110 meeting.  **Working Assumption**   * The maximum number of co-scheduled cells by a DCI format 1\_X in Rel-18 is 4. * The maximum number of co-scheduled cells by a DCI format 0\_X in Rel-18 is 4. * FFS: The maximum number of configurable cells for co-scheduling   **Agreement**  For a set of cells which is configured for multi-cell scheduling, up to 4 cells within the set of cells are supported.   * A DCI format 0\_X/1\_X can schedule PUSCH(s)/PDSCH(s) on a combination of co-scheduled cells among the same set of cells.   **Agreement**  Following is supported in Rel-18 multi-cell scheduling   * A UE can be configured one or multiple sets of cells with each set configured for multi-cell scheduling using DCI format 0\_X/1\_X. * Up to 4 sets of cells can be configured per PUCCH group. * When multiple sets of cells are configured,   + a cell in one set of cells can’t be included in another set of cells.   + n\_CI value is independently configured for each set of cells.   + reference cell for counting DCI size and BD/CCE of DCI format 0\_X/1\_X is independently determined for each set of cells.   + search space configuration of DCI format 0\_X/1\_X is independently configured for each set of cells.   + DCI size of DCI format 0\_X is independently determined for each set of cells.   + DCI size of DCI format 1\_X is independently determined for each set of cells. * The multiple sets of cells can be scheduled by DCI format 0\_X/1\_X from different scheduling cells. * Up to N sets of cells can be configured and respectively scheduled by DCI format 0\_X/1\_X from a same scheduling cell.   + The value of N is reported as UE capability.   + An indicator is included in the DCI to indicate the scheduled set of cells,     - The size of the indicator is equal to ceil(log2(N)), where N is the number of sets of cells.   + Unique n\_CI value is configured for each set of cells. |   It was agreed that the maximum number of co-scheduled cells by a single DCI format 0\_X/1\_X is 4 and up to 4 sets of cells can be configured for a UE. Therefore, the number of the co-scheduled cells by a single DCI format 0\_X/1\_X shall be reported by the UE. Since the number of sets of cells that can be configured with the same scheduling cell should be reported by the UE as agreed, up to 4 sets of cells per PUCCH group can be guaranteed by gNB configuration. For multi-cell scheduling for downlink, all the Type-1, Type-2, Type-3 codebook are supported. If a UE support multi-cell scheduling for downlink, the corresponding HARQ feedback should also be supported since HARQ feedback is always needed for downlink scheduling.  ***Proposal 1:*** *For multi-cell scheduling cell scheduling with single DCI, it should be per BC report with the following three components.*   * *The support of multi-cell scheduling for the band combination.* * *The number of co-scheduled cells by a single DCI format 0\_X/1\_X, including the candidate value 2, 3, and 4.* * *The number of sets that can be scheduled by the same scheduling cell, including the candidate value 1, 2, 3, and 4.*   **Issue 2: RBG size for multi-cell scheduling**  For FDRA indication, a larger granularity was introduced to reduce the overhead of FDRA field as shown below.   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Agreement**   * A new RBG size configuration “Configuration 3” is added with the following values and only used for DCI format 0\_X/1\_X for RA type 0. * RBG size is configured per BWP per cell. * Independent RA type configuration is applied per BWP per cell for multi-cell scheduling DCI.   Table 5.1.2.2.1-1 / Table 6.1.2.2.1-1: Nominal RBG size *P*   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Bandwidth Part Size | Configuration 1 | Configuration 2 | Configuration 3 | | 1 – 36 | *2* | 4 | 8 | | 37 – 72 | 4 | 8 | 16 | | 73 – 144 | 8 | 16 | 32 | | 145 – 275 | 16 | 16 | 32 |   **Agreement**  New RRC parameter of RBG granularity for RA type 1 can be configured per BWP per cell for DCI format 0\_X/1\_X with same value range applicable for DCI 0\_2/1\_2. |   Therefore, the UE should be report whether it supports the new configuration of the RBG size or not. It should be per UE reporting since it is not related to the band.  ***Proposal 2:*** *The support of new configuration of the RBG size should be reported by the UE and the type should be per UE reporting.* |
| [5] | Nokia, NSB | Based on the agreements and functionalities for multi-cell PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling, we see a need for discussions related to the following potential specific UE capabilities:   * **Separate capabilities for multi-cell PDSCH and multi-cell PUSCH?**    + The operation for multi-cell scheduling of PUSCH & PDSCH is handled through the structure of ‘a set of cells’. As the set of cells is the same for PUSCH & PDSCH based on RAN1 agreements, separating the capabilities of multi-cell PUSCH and multi-cell PDSCH seems to be creating issues with the related UE capability of some of the aspects below. Moreover, we don’t think a separate capability for scheduling using DCI format 0\_3 and 1\_3 will be needed. * **Supported maximum number of ‘set of cells’ within a PUCCH cell group:**   + We agreed to support up to a maximum of 4 set of cells from specification perspective. There could be some signaling on the maximum number of set of cells supported by the UE for multi-cell PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling if seen needed. * **Supported maximum number of cells per set of cells**   + From specification perspective, up to 4 cells within a set of cells are supported. If seen needed, there could be UE capabilitiy signaling of the component. * **Scheduling of more than one set of cells from a single scheduling cell**   + There is a RAN1 agreement that up to N set of cells can be scheduled from a single scheduling cell, with N being a UE capability. Therefore, such signaling would need to be defined. * **Indication of the scheduled cell combination**   + Two different ways for indicating the scheduled cell combination (which also affects on the DCI content) have been agreed in RAN1.     **Proposal 1: Take table 1 as the basis for UE capability discussion for the Multi-cell PDSCH / PUSCH scheduling using DCI format 0\_3 / 1\_3**  Table 1: Starting point for Rel-18 UE capabilities for Multi-cell PDSCH / PUSCH scheduling   |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | FG | FG name | Components | Value range | Note | | X-1 | Multi-cell PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling | * Multi-cell PDSCH/ PUSCH scheduling for up to M set of cells with a PUCCH cell group from different scheduling cells * Support for up to L cells within a set of cells * Scheduling of PDSCH on one or more cells of a set of cells using DCI format 1\_3 * Scheduling of PDSCH on one or more cells of a set of cells using DCI format 0\_3 | For component 1: M={1,2,3,4}  For component 2: L={2,3,4} | Basic capability for this feature with potential UE signaling on the maximum number of supported set of cells and max. number of cells within a set of cells | | X-2 | Multi-cell scheduling PDSCH / PUSCH scheduling of different sets from the same scheduling cell | Multi-cell PDSCH/ PUSCH scheduling for up to N set of cells for a PUCCH cell group from the same scheduling cell | For component 1: N={2,3,4} | X-1 is a pre-requisite capability  No separate signaling of M and L needed, can be taken from X1 with the total number of set of cells that can be scheduled given by M of X-1. | | X-3a | Indication of scheduled cell combination based on indicator field in DCI 0\_3 / 1\_3 | Support for using an indicator in DCI 0\_3 / 1\_3 to indicate the scheduled cell combination for PDSCH or PUSCH scheduling | {Supported} | X-1 is a pre-requisite capability  Note: A UE supporting X-1 (or X-2) needs to support X-3a or X-3b (or both) | | X-3b | Indication of scheduled cell combination based on FDRA field in DCI 0\_3 / 1\_3 | Support for using the FDRA field in DCI fomat 0\_3 / 1\_3 to indicate the scheduled cell combination for PDSCH or PUSCH scheduling | {Supported} | X-1 is a pre-requisite capability  Note: A UE supporting X-1 (or X-2) needs to support X-3a or X-3b (or both) | |
| [6] | Samsung | Based on the following RAN1 agreements, a UE can be configured with up to 4 sets of cells for multi-cell scheduling, with each set of cells including up to 4 cells. The up to 4 configured sets of cells for multi-cell scheduling can be associated with different scheduling cells, while only up to *N* sets of cells can be from a same scheduling cell, where *N* can be a UE capability.  A DCI format 0\_X/1\_X can schedule one or more PUSCHs or PDSCHs on one or more cells in one set of cells, from the configured sets of cells. The cell combinations, in a set of cells, that a DCI format 0\_X/1\_X schedules can be configured in a table and associated with an index that is indicated in the DCI format 0\_X/1\_X, or can be arbitrary and indicated by FDRA values, where a non-reserved FDRA value for a cell indicates that the cell is scheduled, and a reserved FDRA value for a cell indicates that the cell is not scheduled.  Accordingly, the following parameters can be potentially considered as UE capability:   1. Maximum number of sets of cells in a PUCCH group (i.e., across all scheduling cells) 🡪 since different scheduling cells are considered, there seems little motivation to introduce a new UE capability for this parameter. The maximum value of 4 sets of cells, as already agreed, can be assumed for all Rel-18 UEs that support multi-cell scheduling; 2. Maximum number of sets of cells from a same scheduling cell 🡪 this is already agreed in RAN1 to be a UE capability. This parameter can be further considered in conjunction with parameter (5) below for a total number of configurable cells for co-scheduling from a same scheduling cell; 3. Maximum number of cells in a set of cells 🡪 since a DCI format schedules only subsets / combinations of cells from a set of cells, there seems little motivation to introduce a UE capability for this parameter. The maximum value of 4 cells in each set of cells, as already agreed, can be assumed for all Rel-18 UEs that support multi-cell scheduling; 4. Maximum number of cells in a/any configured cell combination from a set of cells 🡪 this parameter is related to a legacy UE capability for UL/DL CA. For example, if a UE reports a legacy capability for 2-cell UL CA (e.g., by FG 6-6 “Basic UL NR-NR CA operation”), the UE does not expect to be scheduled by an UL MC-DCI format 0\_X on a cell combination that includes more than 2 UL cells. Therefore, a new UE capability for MC-DCI may not be necessary.    * When a UE determines a co-scheduled cell combination based on FDRA values, there is no pre-configured list/table of cell combinations provided to the UE. Therefore, the legacy UE capability for DL/UL CA implies a maximum number of non-reserved values for FDRA in a DCI format 0\_X/1\_X supported by the UE. 5. Maximum total number of configurable cells for co-scheduling from a same scheduling cell 🡪 Since Rel-17 supports up to 8 scheduled cells from a same scheduling cell, the UE does not expect to be configured a total number of cells across the *N* sets of cells that exceeds 8 cells. However, each set of cells can include fewer cells, such as 4 sets of cells, each including 2 cells. Therefore, it can be further discussed whether parameter (2) can be combined with or replaced by parameter (5); 6. Maximum total number of cells across cell combinations that are co-scheduled by a DCI format 0\_X/1\_X from a same scheduling cell in a PDCCH monitoring occasion (or in a same slot) 🡪 This parameter is related to a total number of DCI formats that the UE can process in a slot/MO for a same scheduling cell and prepare corresponding PUSCHs/PDSCHs. This parameter is related to FG 18-5 and 18-5b “DL/UL cross-carrier scheduling with different SCS”, and can be further discussed as potential UE capability; 7. Maximum total number of configurable cells for co-scheduling across all sets of cells / scheduling cells 🡪 Since different scheduling cells are considered, similar to parameter (1), there may be little motivation for a new UE capability. This parameter appears to be related to legacy DL/UL CA capability, such as FG 6-5 and 6-6 for “Basic DL/UL NR-NR CA operation”.   **Proposal 1: Further discuss whether/how to introduce UE capability for the following parameters for multi-cell scheduling:**   * **Maximum number of sets of cells for multi-cell scheduling from a same scheduling cell;** * **Maximum total number of configurable cells for co-scheduling, across different sets of cells for multi-cell scheduling, from a same scheduling cell;** * **Maximum total number of cells across cell combinations that are co-scheduled by a DCI format 0\_X/1\_X from a same scheduling cell in a PDCCH monitoring occasion (or in a same slot).**  |  | | --- | | **Agreement (RAN1#109-e)**   * For a UE, the maximum number of cells scheduled by a DCI format 0\_X can be same or different to the maximum number of cells scheduled by a DCI format 1\_X.   **Agreement (RAN1#109-e)**   * One value for the maximum number of co-scheduled cells by a DCI format 0\_X in Rel-18 is selected from {3, 4, 8}. * For a UE, the maximum number of co-scheduled cells by a DCI format 0\_X can be smaller than or equal to the maximum number supported in Rel-18.   **Agreement (RAN1#109-e)**   * One value for the maximum number of co-scheduled cells by a DCI format 1\_X in Rel-18 is selected from {3, 4, 8}. * For a UE, the maximum number of co-scheduled cells by a DCI format 1\_X can be smaller than or equal to the maximum number supported in Rel-18.   **Agreement (RAN1#110bis-e)**  Confirm the following working assumption reached in RAN1#110 meeting.  **Working Assumption**   * The maximum number of co-scheduled cells by a DCI format 1\_X in Rel-18 is 4. * The maximum number of co-scheduled cells by a DCI format 0\_X in Rel-18 is 4. * FFS: The maximum number of configurable cells for co-scheduling   **Agreement (RAN1#111)**  For a set of cells which is configured for multi-cell scheduling, up to 4 cells within the set of cells are supported.   * A DCI format 0\_X/1\_X can schedule PUSCH(s)/PDSCH(s) on a combination of co-scheduled cells among the same set of cells.   **Agreement (RAN1#112)**  Following is supported in Rel-18 multi-cell scheduling   * A UE can be configured one or multiple sets of cells with each set configured for multi-cell scheduling using DCI format 0\_X/1\_X. * Up to 4 sets of cells can be configured per PUCCH group. * When multiple sets of cells are configured,   + a cell in one set of cells can’t be included in another set of cells.   + n\_CI value is independently configured for each set of cells.   + reference cell for counting DCI size and BD/CCE of DCI format 0\_X/1\_X is independently determined for each set of cells.   + search space configuration of DCI format 0\_X/1\_X is independently configured for each set of cells.   + DCI size of DCI format 0\_X is independently determined for each set of cells.   + DCI size of DCI format 1\_X is independently determined for each set of cells. * The multiple sets of cells can be scheduled by DCI format 0\_X/1\_X from different scheduling cells. * Up to N sets of cells can be configured and respectively scheduled by DCI format 0\_X/1\_X from a same scheduling cell.   + The value of N is reported as UE capability.   + An indicator is included in the DCI to indicate the scheduled set of cells,     - The size of the indicator is equal to ceil(log2(N)), where N is the number of sets of cells.   + Unique n\_CI value is configured for each set of cells. |   The following agreement was reached as a compromise for indication of a co-scheduled cell combination in a DCI format 0\_X/1\_X using one of two methods: table-based and FDRA-based. If selection between the two methods is to be based on a UE capability, the first method based on RRC-configured table should be considered as the baseline method and default UE capability, as it leads to more efficient DCI size.  **Proposal 2: If a UE capability is to be introduced for selecting the method for indication of co-scheduled cells in a DCI format 0\_X/1\_X, adopt the “table-based” method as the default UE capability.**   |  | | --- | | **Agreement (RAN1#112)**  For a set of cells which is configured for multi-cell scheduling using DCI format 0\_X and DCI format 1\_X, support the following:   * If table defining combinations of co-scheduled cells for the set of cells is configured,   + an indicator in the DCI is included and points to one row of the table.   + The table is configured by RRC signaling for the set of cells.     - Separate tables are configured for downlink scheduling and uplink scheduling   + The size of the indicator is equal to ceil(log2(N)), where N is the number of rows in the table.   + The max number of rows in the table is 16   + The size of the per-cell Type 2 fields for each co-scheduled cell does not change according to the indicated co-scheduled cell combination   + The payload size of DCI format 1\_X is derived by UE based on RRC configuration of the active BWP(s) of co-scheduled cell combinations within the set of cells.     - The payload size of DCI format 1\_X is the same for the active BWP(s) of all the co-scheduled cell combinations and equal to the largest payload size among the active BWP(s) of all the co-scheduled cell combinations determined by the co-scheduled cell combination table.   + The payload size of DCI format 0\_X is derived by UE based on RRC configuration of the active BWP(s) of co-scheduled cell combinations within the set of cells.     - The payload size of DCI format 0\_X is the same for the active BWP(s) of all the co-scheduled cell combinations and equal to the largest payload size among the active BWP(s) of all the co-scheduled cell combinations determined by the co-scheduled cell combination table. * Otherwise,   + The UE determines the actually scheduled cell(s) based on the FDRA field of each cell of the set of cells.     - For Type 0 FDRA, all 0s indicates the cell is not scheduled.     - For Type 1 FDRA, all 1s indicates the cell is not scheduled.   + The size of the Type 2 fields for each cell does not change according to actually co-scheduled cells.   + The payload size of DCI format 0\_X is derived by UE based on RRC configuration of the active BWP(s) of all cells within the set of cells.   + The payload size of DCI format 1\_X is derived by UE based on RRC configuration of the active BWP(s) of all cells within the set of cells. |   The following RAN1 agreement describes the UE behavior for monitoring legacy single-cell scheduling DCI (SC-DCI) formats in parallel with the new DCI format 0\_X/1\_X for multi-cell scheduling for a same scheduled cell. In Rel-17, the UE can be configured to monitor different SC-DCI formats for a same scheduled cell in same or different monitoring occasions, without any restriction or UE capability. Since RAN1 has agreed to maintain the Rel-17 PDCCH monitoring limits when DCI formats 0\_X/1\_X are configured, there is no reason to make an exception or restriction for monitoring DCI formats 0\_X/1\_X, so an additional UE capability is not necessary.  **Proposal 3: Do NOT introduce a UE capability for monitoring, for any scheduled cell, both DCI formats 0\_X/1\_X and DCI formats 0\_0/1\_0, 0\_1/1\_1, and/or 0\_2/1\_2 (if supported by the UE), either simultaneously or non-simultaneously, from a same scheduling cell.**   |  | | --- | | **Agreement (RAN1#110bis-e)**  Confirm below working assumption reached in RAN1#110 meeting with revision.  Working Assumption   * For any cell within a set of cells which can be co-scheduled by a DCI format 0\_X/1\_X, RAN1 specification supports monitoring the DCI format 0\_X/1\_X and DCI format 0\_0/1\_0, 0\_1/1\_1, and/or 0\_2/1\_2 (if supported by the UE), if configured from a same scheduling cell. * The DCI format 0\_X/1\_X and the DCI format 0\_0/1\_0/0\_1/1\_1/0\_2/1\_2 can be monitored simultaneously. * Note: This does not mean a UE is required to support number of BDs/CCEs beyond the Rel-17 limits (i.e., and ) for PDCCH candidates for each scheduled cell.   **Agreement (RAN1#111)**  Confirm the RAN1#110bis-e working assumption with the following changes:  **Working Assumption**  For a set of cells which is configured for multi-cell scheduling,   * Existing DCI size budget is maintained on each cell of the set of cells. * DCI size of DCI format 0\_X/1\_X is counted on one cell among the set of cells.   + DCI size of the DCI format 0\_X/1\_X is counted on the reference cell. * BD/CCE of DCI format 0\_X/1\_X is counted on one cell among the set of cells.   + BD/CCE of the DCI format 0\_X/1\_X is counted on the reference cell. * Same reference cell is used for both DCI format 0\_X and DCI format 1\_X. * The reference cell is   + the scheduling cell if the scheduling cell is included in the set of cells and search space of the DCI format 0\_X/1\_X is configured only on the scheduling cell;   + one cell of the set of cells which search space of DCI format 0\_X/1\_X is configured on and associated with the search space of the scheduling cell with the same search space ID if search space of the DCI format 0\_X/1\_X is configured on the cell in addition to the scheduling cell.     - It is up to gNB on which cell the SS of the DCI format 0\_X/1\_X is configured on. * To address Rel-17 BD/CCE limit for any given cell (operating the feature under Rel-17 BD/CCE limit)   + For the reference cell, a total number of configured BD/CCEs for both DCI formats 0\_X/1\_X and legacy DCI formats (if configured) does not exceed the Rel-17 limits.   + For other cells in the sets of cells, Rel-17 limits for PDCCH/DCI monitoring and BD/CCE counting rules for legacy DCI formats (not including DCI formats 0\_X/1\_X) apply | |
| [7] | MediaTek | In RAN1 #110be [1], it is agreed that:  Agreement:   * Confirm below working assumption reached in RAN1#110 meeting.   **Working Assumption**   * The maximum number of co-scheduled cells by a DCI format 1\_X in Rel-18 is 4. * The maximum number of co-scheduled cells by a DCI format 0\_X in Rel-18 is 4. * …   In RAN1 #111 [2], it is agreed that:  Agreement:   * For a set of cells which is configured for multi-cell scheduling, up to 4 cells within the set of cells are supported.   + A DCI format 0\_X/1\_X can schedule PUSCH(s)/PDSCH(s) on a combination of co-scheduled cells among the same set of cells.   In RAN1 #112 [3], it is agreed that:  Agreement  Following is supported in Rel-18 multi-cell scheduling   * A UE can be configured one or multiple sets of cells with each set configured for multi-cell scheduling using DCI format 0\_X/1\_X. * Up to 4 sets of cells can be configured per PUCCH group. * … * Up to N sets of cells can be configured and respectively scheduled by DCI format 0\_X/1\_X from a same scheduling cell.   + The value of N is reported as UE capability.   + …   We hence have the following proposals:  **Proposal 1: For R18 multi-cell scheduling with a single DCI, introduce the following UE capabilities:**   * **Supportable maximum number of co-scheduled cells in one set (for DL and UL separately)**   + **Candidate values: {2, 3, 4}**   + **Type: Per BC** * **Supportable maximum number of sets in one PUCCH group (for DL and UL separately)**   + **Candidate values: {1, 2, 3, 4}**   + **Type: Per BC** * **Supportable maximum number of sets in one cell group (for DL and UL separately)**   + **Candidate values: {1, 2, 3, 4}**   + **Type: Per BC** * **Supportable maximum number of sets in one PUCCH group with the same scheduling cell (for DL and UL separately)**   + **Candidate values: {1, 2, 3, 4}**   + **Type: Per BC** * **Supportable maximum number of sets in one cell group with the same scheduling cell (for DL and UL separately)**   + **Candidate values: {1, 2, 3, 4}**   + **Type: Per BC** |
| [8] | Apple | For Rel-18 multi-cell scheduling with a single DCI for PDSCH/PUSCH, in our view, a new UE capability framework to indicate the support of scheduling more than 1 cell should be introduced. As a candidate values under this UE capability, UE can report the maximum number of cells that can be scheduled by a single scheduling cell from {2,3,4}. Maximum value of 1 should not be considered for this UE capability. For up to 1 cell, legacy framework can be used. Furthermore, it can be considered whether a separate capability can be indicated for multiple PUSCH scheduling and multiple PDSCH scheduling from multiple cells.   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Features | Index | Feature group | Components | | XX. NR\_MC\_enh-Core | XX-1 | Indicating supported option for scheduling more can one cell with single DCI | Indicating supported option for scheduling more can one cell with single DCI  Candidate values set is {2,3,4} |   ***Proposal 1: For Rel-18 multi-cell scheduling, a new capability (new FG) should be introduced to indicate the support of multi-cell scheduling using single DCI format***   * ***It can be further discussed on whether to support separate capability for multiple PUSCH and multiple PDSCH scheduling***  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | *Features* | *Index* | *Feature group* | *Components* | | *XX. NR\_MC\_enh-Core* | *XX-1* | *Indicating supported option for scheduling more can one cell with single DCI* | *Indicating supported option for scheduling more can one cell with single DCI*  *Candidate values set is {2,3,4}* |   Another aspect related to UE capability is whether the same scheduling cell can be used for scheduling more than 1 set of cells or not. Based on the RAN1 agreement, UE can report the maximum number of sets of cells that can be scheduled by same scheduling cell. For this UE capability indication, a candidate set of values {1,2} can be reported. Furthermore, this can be an optional capability and if not reported, the default capability is that only 1 set of cells can be scheduled by a given scheduling cell.  ***Proposal 2: For Rel-18 multi-cell scheduling, a new capability should be introduced to indicate the support of number of sets of cells that can be scheduled by the same scheduling cell***   * ***This is an optional capability and if not reported, the default value is 1***  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | *Features* | *Index* | *Feature group* | *Components* | | *XX. NR\_MC\_enh-Core* | *XX-1a* | *Indicating supported number of sets of cells that can be scheduled by same scheduling cell* | *Indicating supported number of sets of cells that can be scheduled by same scheduling cell Candidate values set is {1,2}* |   Furthermore, based on RAN1 agreement, for determining the actually scheduled cells from the set of cells, two options have been agreed. In our view, mandating UE to support both options is not reasonable and it should be a UE capability to report the support for either one or both the options. The candidate values set will include { table-based, FDRA-based}. Furthermore, it can be discussed, if this capability can be optional and if one of the two options can be a default option   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | *Features* | *Index* | *Feature group* | *Components* | | *XX. NR\_MC\_enh-Core* | *XX-1b* | *Indicating supported option for indication of co-scheduled cells within a set of cells* | *Indicating supported option for indication of co-scheduled cells within a set of cells*  *Candidate values set is {table-based,FDRA-based}* |   ***Proposal 3: For Rel-18 multi-cell scheduling, a new capability should be introduced to indicate the supported option for indicating the co-scheduled cells within a set of cells.***   * ***It can be further discussed whether this is an optional capability and what is the default option***  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | *Features* | *Index* | *Feature group* | *Components* | | *XX. NR\_MC\_enh-Core* | *XX-1b* | *Indicating supported option for indication of co-scheduled cells within a set of cells* | *Indicating supported option for indication of co-scheduled cells within a set of cells*  *Candidate values set is {table-based,FDRA-based}* | |
| [9] | Qualcomm | First of all, multi-cell PDSCH scheduling and multi-cell PUSCH scheduling should be separate features, same as for Rel-16 DL/UL cross-carrier scheduling (FG18-5, FG18-5b). In addition, multi-cell scheduling should not prerequisite cross-carrier scheduling since multi-cell scheduling works even without cross-carrier scheduling.  **Proposal 1:**   * Introduce separate capabilities for multi-cell PDSCH scheduling and multi-cell PUSCH scheduling * Capabilities for multi-cell PDSCH scheduling and multi-cell PUSCH scheduling do not prerequisite UE capabilies for R15/16 cross-carrier scheduling (FG6-10, 18-5, 18-5b)   There are various DL/UL-CA configurations including intra/inter-bands, FDD/TDD, multiple SCSs, inter/intra-FR, etc. It should be possible to support multi-cell scheduling for a limited set of bands in a DL/UL-CA configurations. Three options can be considered:   * Option 1: a UE reports support for one or multiple combinations of {a band for scheduling cell, a set of band(s) for scheduled cells} for multi-cell scheduling * Option 2: a UE reports support for one or multiple combinations of {a carrier type for scheduling cell, a carrier type for scheduled cells} for multi-cell scheduling   + Carrier type: one from {FDD, TDD, Unlicensed, FR2} * Option 3: a UE reports support for one or multiple combinations of {a SCS for scheduling cell, a SCS for scheduled cells} for multi-cell scheduling   Example is illustrated in Fig. 1.    Fig. 1 Example of multi-cell scheduling for a subset of cells/bands in a CA band combination  It is essential to incorporate one of the above options. Among the three, considering the fact that UE features for legacy cross-carrier scheduling were based on SCS, Option 3 could be straightforward. Within each combination, the UE should be able to report the max number of cells that can be in the set of cells for multi-cell scheduling by a DCI format. In addition, RAN1 agreed to support UE capability indicating the number of sets of cells for multi-cell scheduling by respective DCI formats from the same scheduling cell. This should also be part of the UE capability for basic multi-cell scheduling.  **Proposal 2:** For multi-cell PDSCH or PUSCH scheduling:   * For a given DL-CA or UL-CA band combination, the UE reports support for:   + Opt. 1: one or multiple combinations of {a band for scheduling cell, a set of band(s) for scheduled cells} for multi-cell scheduling by a single DCI format   + Opt. 2: one or multiple combinations of {a carrier type for scheduling cell, a carrier type for scheduled cells} for multi-cell scheduling by a single DCI format     - Carrier type: one from {FDD, TDD, Unlicensed, FR2}   + Opt.3: one or more combination(s) of {a SCS for scheduling cell, a SCS for scheduled cells} for multi-cell scheduling by a single DCI format * For each combination in either of Options, the UE also reports:   + Max number of cells in a set of cells configured for multi-cell scheduling by a DCI format     - Candidate values: {2, 3, 4}   + Max number of sets of cells configured for multi-cell scheduling a same scheduling cell     - Candidate values: {1, 2, 3, 4}   In the following, we assume Option 3 is adopted and a UE can report one or more combination(s) that the UE supports multi-cell scheduling per CA band combination.  RAN1 agreed two options for identifying actually co-scheduled cell(s) by a single DCI format. Since the options are quite different, the UE should be able to indicate support of either or both of them. To make the multi-cell scheduling work, the indication should be part of basic UE capability for multi-cell scheduling.  It was agreed that Antenna port(s) for DCI format 1\_X and Antenna port(s), TPMI, and SRI for DCI format 0\_X are configurable fields between Type-1A and Type-2. Because of potential IODT problem, it is not always true that this configurability is available. Therefore, UE should be able to indicate support either or both of Type-1A mode and Type-2 mode. If a UE indicate support of both, the network can configure either of the modes.  Support of Type-1/2/3 HARQ-ACK codebook was agreed. To make the multi-cell scheduling work, at least one type of HARQ-ACK codebook construction is necessary. A UE should be able to indicate support either or both of Type-1 and Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook constructions. Type-3 HARQ-ACK codebook should be based on a separate optional UE capability.  **Proposal 3:** For a given combination of {a SCS for scheduling cell, a SCS for scheduled cells} in a CA band combination that the UE indicates support of multi-cell PDSCH scheduling by a single DCI format 1\_X:   * + For co-scheduled cell(s) identification, the UE reports support for either or both of:     - Based on the co-scheduled indicator field     - Based on FDRA fields   + For HARQ-ACK codebook, the UE reports support for either or both of:     - Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook     - Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook based on a concatenation of two sub-codebooks   + For Antenna port(s) field, the UE reports support for either or both of:     - Type-1A (common field for all the scheduled cells)     - Type-2 (per scheduled cell field)   **Proposal 4:** For a given combination of {a SCS for scheduling cell, a SCS for scheduled cells} in a CA band combination that the UE indicates support of multi-cell PUSCH scheduling by a single DCI format 0\_X:   * + For co-scheduled cell(s) identification, the UE reports support for either or both of:     - Based on the co-scheduled indicator field     - Based on FDRA fields   + For Antenna port(s) field, Precoder and Number of Layers, and SRS resource indicator, the UE reports support for either or both of:     - Type-1A (common field for all the scheduled cells)     - Type-2 (per scheduled cell field)   RAN1 agreed that specification supports simultaneous monitoring of DCI format 0\_X/1\_X as well as legacy DCI formats 0\_0/1\_0, 0\_1/1\_1, and/or 0\_2/1\_2 (if supported by the UE), if configured from a same scheduling cell, simultaneously. However, this is quite unrealistic scenario while requires extra complexity on PDCCH monitoring. Our view of the basic operation of multi-cell scheduling is following:   * Case 1: When a scheduling cell for multi-cell scheduling for a set of cells is part of the cells in the set (i.e., when the scheduling cell is the reference cell that counts BD/CCE/DCI-size of the DCI format 0\_X/1\_X), the UE should be able to monitor DCI format 0\_0/1\_0 on the scheduling cell for self-scheduling, as well as DCI format 0\_X/1\_X for the set of cells * Case 2: When a schedulin cell for multi-cell scheduling for a set of cells is NOT part of the cells in the set (i.e., when the scheduling cell is NOT the reference cell that counts BD/CCE/DCI-size of the DCI format 0\_X/1\_X), the UE does not need to monitor any other DCI formats for the set of cells   In other words, we consider monitoring PDCCH for non-fallback legacy DCI formats for a cell in the set of cells configured for multi-cell scheduling by a DCI format 0\_X/1\_X is not part of the basic operation. Monitoring legacy non-fallback DCI formats, as well as DCI format 0\_X/1\_X, should be optionally supported.    Case 1 example    Case 2 example  Fig. 2 Case 1 and Case 2 of basic PDCCH monitoring framework for multi-cell scheduling  Monitoring legacy non-fallback DCI formats should be split into two cases:   * (i) monitoring legacy non-fallback DCI formats for the reference cell   + i.e., only for the cell where BD/CCE/DCI-size of DCI format 0\_X/1\_X is counted * (ii) monitoring legacy non-fallback DCI formats for any cell of the set of cells   The reason is that (ii) effectively increases the number of BDs/CCEs/DCI-sizes that a UE has to support for a cell in the set as we have explained in Section 5.1 of R1-2301429. Having said that, we consider the UE should be able to indicate optional support of non-fallback DCI formats for the reference cell or for any cell in the set.  **Proposal 5:** For a given combination of {a SCS for scheduling cell, a SCS for scheduled cells} in a CA band combination that the UE indicates support of multi-cell scheduling:   * The UE indicates support for:   + Monitoring DCI formats 1\_1/1\_2 for a cell, as well as DCI format 1\_X for a set of cells:     - Candidate values: {no, for the reference cell, for any cell} * The UE indicates support for:   + Monitoring DCI formats 0\_1/0\_2 for a cell, as well as DCI format 0\_X for a set of cells:     - Candidate values: {no, for the reference cell, for any cell}   Regarding the number of unicast DCI to process, legacy FGs (FG3-1/18-5/5b/5c/5d) counts the number of unicast DCI per scheduled cell per scheduling cell span/slot. Now for multi-cell scheduling, each DCI can schedule one or multiple cell(s) in each set of cells where actual co-scheduled cell(s) by each DCI is up to the network. Therefore, for multi-cell scheduling, the number of unicast DCI to process should be defined per set of cells for multi-cell scheduling per scheduling cell span/slot. Otherwise, the number of unicast DCIs per scheduling cell per scheduling cell span/slot varies depending on the number of cells each DCI schedules, making the UE to identify the maximum possible number of unicast DCIs at a span/slot unpredictable.  At least as for basic framework, following should be feasible.  **Proposal 6:** For multi-cell scheduling,   * Number of unicast DCI to process for a set of cells for multi-cell PDSCH scheduling   + From lower SCS to higher SCS, or same SCS     - One unicast DCI per slot of scheduling cell for a set of cells configured for multi-cell PDSCH scheduling for FDD/TDD scheduling cell   + From higher SCS to lower SCS     - One unicast DCI per N consecutive slots of scheduling cell for a set of cells configured for multi-cell PDSCH scheduling for FDD/TDD scheduling cell, where:       * N = 2 for (30, 15)       * N = 4 for (60, 15), (120, 30)       * N = 8 for (120, 15) * Number of unicast DCI to process for a set of cells for multi-cell PUSCH scheduling   + From lower SCS to higher SCS, or same SCS     - One unicast DCI per slot of scheduling cell for a set of cells configured for multi-cell PUSCH scheduling for FDD scheduling cell     - Two unicast DCIs per slot of scheduling cell for a set of cells configured for multi-cell PUSCH scheduling for TDD scheduling cell   + From higher SCS to lower SCS     - One unicast DCI per N consecutive slots of scheduling cell for a set of cells configured for multi-cell PUSCH scheduling for FDD scheduling cell, and     - Two unicast DCIs per N consecutive slots of scheduling cell for a set of cells configured for multi-cell PUSCH scheduling for TDD scheduling cell, where:       * N = 2 for (30, 15)       * N = 4 for (60, 15), (120, 30)       * N = 8 for (120, 15)   Similar clarifications are necessary for span-based PDCCH monitoring (FG3-5b, 11-2, 22-8c, 22-8d) and slot-group-based PDCCH monitoring (FG24-4, 24-5). Whether/what new FGs to introduce should be discussed once we have clear understanding on the basic feature as above.  For multi-cell scheduling, both FDRA Type-0 and Type-1 introduce new mechanisms. These should be separate UE features.  **Proposal 7:**   * New FDRA features are introduced for multi-cell PDSCH scheduling and multi-cell PUSCH scheduling:   + 1) FDRA Type-0 configuration 3 (larger RBG size)   + 2) FDRA Type-1 granularity of 2, 4, 8, or 16 consecutive RBs based RIV   Note: these are only for PDSCH(s) scheduled by DCI format 1\_X and only for PUSCH(s) scheduled by DCI format 0\_X  RAN1 agreed to support priority indicator for DCI format 0\_X and 1\_X. There are UE features for priority indicator in a DL DCI and in a UL DCI as FG11-4, 11-4a, 11-4b, 12-1, and 12-1a. However, these are not applicable to DCI format 1\_X and DCI format 0\_X.   * FG11-4/11-4a are for the case where only DCI format 0\_1/1\_1 or only DCI format 0\_2/1\_2 is configured. * FG11-4b indicates support of operation with mixed DCI formats (1\_1 and 1\_2) with priority indication field. * FG12-1 is for the case where dynamic indication of priority level of dynamic PUSCH with a single DCI format. Although there is no specific description of which DCI format this applies, it is clear from FG12-1a that this single DCI format is either DCI format 0\_1 or DCI format 0\_2. * FG12-1a indicates support of operation with mixed DCI formats (0\_1 and 0\_2) with priority indication field.   With the understanding, we need new FGs to accommodate DCI format 1\_X and DCI format 0\_X with priority indication field.  For mixed DCI formats with priority indication field with DCI format 1\_X or 0\_X, we do not think it is necessary to support three DCI formats with priority indication fields (1\_X + 1\_1 + 1\_2, or 0\_X + 0\_1 + 0\_2). The mixed DCI formats with priority indication field for Rel-18 multi-cell scheduling can be 1\_X + (1\_1 or 1\_2), and 0\_X + (0\_1 or 0\_2).  **Proposal 8:**   * UE features for DL priority indicator in a DCI format 1\_X should be introduced:   + 1) Two HARQ-ACK codebooks with different priorities with up to one sub-slot based HARQ-ACK codebook enabled for DCI format 1\_X   + 2) Two HARQ-ACK codebooks with different priorities with two sub-slot based HARQ-ACK codebooks enabled for DCI format 1\_X:   + 3) Mixed DCI formats including DCI format 1\_X for DL priority indication in a BWP     - Support of priority indication field in DCI formats (1\_1 or 1\_2) and 1\_X   **Proposal 9:**   * UE features for UL priority indicator in a DCI format 0\_X should be introduced:   + 1) UL priority indication in DCI with DCI format 0\_X     - Support of priority indicator field configured in DCI format 0\_X   + 2) Mixed DCI formats including DCI format 0\_X for UL priority indication     - Support priority indication field in DCI formats (0\_1 or 0\_2) and 0\_X   One shot HARQ-ACK feedback (Type-3 HARQ-ACK codebook) can be triggered by DCI format 1\_1 with FG10-16 and by DCI format 1\_2 with FG25-4. There should be aonther FG for triggering by DCI format 1\_X. Relevant to this, phy priority handling (same as FG25-5) and enhanced Type-3 HARQ-ACK feedback (same as FG25-6) by a DCI format 1\_X should be enabled by another set of FGs.  **Proposal 10:**   * UE features for Type-3 HARQ-ACK feedback triggered by DCI 1\_X should be introduced:   + 1) One-shot HARQ-ACK feedback by DCI 1\_X:     - Type-3 HARQ-ACK feedback triggered by a DCI format 1\_X scheduling one or more PDSCHs     - Type-3 HARQ-ACK feedback triggered by a DCI format 1\_X without scheduling a PDSCH using reserved FDRA values   + 2) PHY priority handling for one-shot HARQ-ACK feedback by DCI 1\_X:     - Support transmission of Type-3 HARQ-ACK codebook using the first or second PUCCH configuration based on PHY priority indication in the triggering DCI format 1\_X   + 3) Enhanced Type-3 HARQ-ACK codebook feedback triggered by a DCI format 1\_X   FG25-7 specifies that HARQ-ACK re-transmission can be triggered by DCI format 1\_1 and DCI format 1\_2. To enable this by using DCI format 1\_X, corresponding new FG is necessary.  **Proposal 11:**   * UE feature for HARQ-ACK re-transmission triggered by DCI format 1\_X should be introduced   FG18-5 indicates support of SCell dormancy indication by DCI format 0\_1/1\_1. There must be a corresponding FG for SCell dormancy indication by DCI format 0\_X/1\_X. Since now we are willing to enable multi-cell scheduling for DL and UL separately, it is preferred to have the feature for DL and UL separately.  **Proposal 12:**   * UE features for SCell dormancy indication within active time by DCI format 1\_X and DCI format 0\_X should be introduced   + 1) SCell dormancy indication within active time by DCI 1\_X:   + 2) SCell dormancy indication within active time by DCI 0\_X:   FG19-2 indicates support of cross slot scheduling with minimum scheduling offset K0/K2 by DCI format 0\_1/1\_1. It is necessary to have another FG indicating support of dynamic indication of applicable minimum scheduling restriction by DCI format 0\_X and 1\_X.  **Proposal 13:**   * UE features for cross-slot scheduling by DCI format 1\_X and DCI format 0\_X should be introduced   + 1) Dynamic indication of applicable minimum scheduling restriction by DCI format 1\_X   + 2) Dynamic indication of applicable minimum scheduling restriction by DCI format 0\_X   FG23-1-1b and FG23-10-1b specify the UE capabilieis for unified TCI with joint and separate DL/UL TCI updates by a DCI format. According to their description, the FGs are limited to DCI format 1\_1. In order to support the features by DCI format 1\_X, it is necessary to introduce the FGs for joint DL/UL TCI update and for separate DL/UL TCI update, respectively.  **Proposal 14:**   * UE features for Unified-TCI indication by DCI format 1\_X should be introduced   + 1) Unified TCI with joint DL/UL TCI update with DCI-based TCI state indication for DCI format 1\_X:     - TCI state indication for update and activation       * b) MAC-CE + DCI-based TCI state indication (use of DCI format 1\_X with DL assignment(s)),       * c) MAC-CE + DCI-based TCI state indication (use of DCI format 1\_X without DL assignment)     - The min beam application time in Y symbols per SCS     - The max number of MAC-CE activated joint TCI states per CC in a band   + 2) Unified TCI with separate DL/UL TCI update with DCI-based TCI state indication for DCI format 1\_X:     - TCI state indication for update and activation       * b) MAC-CE + DCI-based TCI state indication (use of DCI format 1\_X with DL assignment(s)),       * c) MAC-CE + DCI-based TCI state indication (use of DCI format 1\_X without DL assignment)     - The min beam application time in Y symbols per SCS     - The max number of MAC-CE activated DL TCI states per CC in a band     - The max number of MAC-CE activated UL TCI states per CC in a band |
| [10] | DOCOMO | **Co-scheduled cell indication as basic feature**  Regarding co-scheduled cell indication in DCI format 0\_X/1\_X, the following agreements were made at the RAN1#112 meeting.   |  | | --- | | **Agreement**  For a set of cells which is configured for multi-cell scheduling using DCI format 0\_X and DCI format 1\_X, support the following:   * If table defining combinations of co-scheduled cells for the set of cells is configured,   + an indicator in the DCI is included and points to one row of the table.   + The table is configured by RRC signaling for the set of cells.     - Separate tables are configured for downlink scheduling and uplink scheduling   + The size of the indicator is equal to ceil(log2(N)), where N is the number of rows in the table.   + The max number of rows in the table is 16   + The size of the per-cell Type 2 fields for each co-scheduled cell does not change according to the indicated co-scheduled cell combination   + The payload size of DCI format 1\_X is derived by UE based on RRC configuration of the active BWP(s) of co-scheduled cell combinations within the set of cells.     - The payload size of DCI format 1\_X is the same for the active BWP(s) of all the co-scheduled cell combinations and equal to the largest payload size among the active BWP(s) of all the co-scheduled cell combinations determined by the co-scheduled cell combination table.   + The payload size of DCI format 0\_X is derived by UE based on RRC configuration of the active BWP(s) of co-scheduled cell combinations within the set of cells.     - The payload size of DCI format 0\_X is the same for the active BWP(s) of all the co-scheduled cell combinations and equal to the largest payload size among the active BWP(s) of all the co-scheduled cell combinations determined by the co-scheduled cell combination table. * Otherwise,   + The UE determines the actually scheduled cell(s) based on the FDRA field of each cell of the set of cells.     - For Type 0 FDRA, all 0s indicates the cell is not scheduled.     - For Type 1 FDRA, all 1s indicates the cell is not scheduled.   + The size of the Type 2 fields for each cell does not change according to actually co-scheduled cells.   + The payload size of DCI format 0\_X is derived by UE based on RRC configuration of the active BWP(s) of all cells within the set of cells.   + The payload size of DCI format 1\_X is derived by UE based on RRC configuration of the active BWP(s) of all cells within the set of cells. |   Based on the agreement, two methods are supported for co-scheduled cell indication in DCI format 0\_X/1\_X; one is co-scheduled cell indicator field-based indication, and another is FDRA field-based indication. Which indication method to apply can be configured by NW, i.e., if combinations table of co-scheduled cells for the set of cells is configured by RRC, co-scheduled cell indicator field-based indication is applied, otherwise FDRA field-based indication is applied. Of course, UE should support at least one of them for multi-cell scheduling feature, however, it is unclear whether UE should support both co-scheduled cell indicator and FDRA field-based indication.  Co-scheduled cell indicator-based indication can optimize the field sizes of Type 2 fields by repurposing the field for each cell when the maximum number of co-scheduled cells for the set of cells is smaller than the number of cells included in the set of cells. On the other hand, it was concerned that such repurposing operation may increase the complexity at UE, and hence FDRA-based indication which does not require such repurposing of DCI fields was also supported. In that sense, at least UE supporting multi-cell scheduling feature should support FDRA-based indication.  It should be noted that if it is up to UE to support which co-scheduled cell indicator-based and/or FDRA-based indication, it may result in the fragmentation. This implies that NW has to configure/schedule based on the reported capability which indication method is supported by a UE and it would increase the complexity at NW. Therefore, it is preferable to define at least one of them as the basic feature for multi-cell scheduling.  **Proposal 1:**  **For co-scheduled cell indication in DCI format 0\_X/1\_X, at least one of co-scheduled cell indicator-based indication or FDRA field-based indication should be supported as basic feature.**   * **FDRA-based indication can be the basic feature for multi-cell scheduling.**   **Relation between scheduling cell and set of calls/UL and DL**  Given that the UE capability for CA can be different between UL and DL, it should be considered that the support of multi-cell scheduling by DCI format 0\_X and 1\_X can be reported separately. Furthermore, similar to the UE features for legacy cross-carrier scheduling, support of multi-cell scheduling can be reported separately depending on whether scheduling cell is included in the set of cells or whether scheduling cell and co-scheduled cells are configured with the same SCS/carrier type.  Then, based on the agreements so far, it is unclear whether UE can report different maximum number of co-scheduled cells and set of cells between UL and DL.  As stated above, the maximum number of CCs UE supports can be different between UL and DL, it seems reasonable to allow UE reporting different maximum number of co-scheduled cells for UL and DL. On the other hand, for the maximum number of set of cells, the total number of supporting sets for UL and DL should be reported by a UE while the set(s) of cells (number of sets and the cells included in the set(s) of cells) can be appropriately configured for UL and DL separately by NW based on the reported capability for supporting number of CCs and co-scheduled cells for UL and DL.  **Proposal 2:**  **For a UE supporting multi-cell scheduling,**   * + **support of multi cell scheduling can be reported separately depending on whether scheduling cell is included in co-scheduled cells.**   + **support of multi cell scheduling can be reported separately depending on whether SCS/carrier type of scheduling cell and co-scheduled cells are the same.**   + **supporting maximum number of set of cells should be the unified value for UL and DL.**   + **supporting maximum number of co-scheduled cells can be separately reported between UL and DL.**   **HARQ-ACK codebook type as basic feature**   |  | | --- | | **Agreement**  Confirm below working assumption:  **Working Assumption**  HARQ-ACK codebook types (Type-1, Rel-15 Type-2, Rel-16 Type-3, Rel-17 Type-3) are applicable when multi-cell PDSCH scheduling is configured. |   Similar to the discussion above for co-scheduled cell indication, at least one type of HARQ-ACK codebook generation for multi-cell PDSCH scheduling needs to be supported by a UE which supports multi-cell scheduling feature, however, it is unclear whether the UE should support all types of codebook for multi-cell scheduling. Accordingly, similar to co-scheduled cell indication, we should clarify the basic feature on HARQ-ACK codebook type.  Considering that Type-1 and Type-2 codebooks are supported as mandatory feature for Rel-15 UEs, both of them can be the basic feature for multi-cell PDSCH scheduling while the support of Type-3 and enhanced Type-3 codebook for multi-cell scheduling can be reported with other UE feature than basic features for multi-cell scheduling as anyway support of Type-3 and enhanced Type-3 HARQ-ACK codebook are optional. Given the enhancements from previous releases, no/little enhancements are specified for Type-1 codebook while some enhancements are specified for Type-2 codebook, e.g., sub-codebook generation, HARQ-ACK information bits for each DCI and DAI counting, etc. Therefore, it can be discussed whether the support of Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook for multi-cell scheduling is part of basic feature or optional.  **Proposal 3:**  **For multi-cell PDSCH scheduling with DCI format 1\_X, at least one type of HARQ-ACK codebook generation should be supported as basic feature.**   * **Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook can be the basic feature for multi-cell scheduling, and whether Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook can also be the basic feature for multi-cell scheduling or not can be discussed.** |
| [11] | Ericsson | Below we provide a few initial comments.   1. RAN1 agreed to following two types of indication of co-scheduled cells via DCI 1\_X/0\_X.    * Alt 1: Explicit field for indication of co-scheduled cells    * Alt 2: Indication Via FDRA field   As discussed during WI discussions, either all UEs supporting DCI 1\_X/0\_X based scheduling should support both indication mechanisms or at least one common mechanism to avoid unnecessary implementation complexity (e.g. at the gNB). Considering this and UE impact, we think Alt 2 should be considered for support in the basic functionality.  For Indication of co-scheduled cells via DCI 1\_X/0\_X, at least ‘Indication via FDRA’ is supported in the basic functionality.   1. RAN1 also agreed to support multiple sets of serving cells that can be scheduled using DCI 1\_X/0\_X from a same scheduling cell. The basic functionality would support one set per scheduling cell for downlink/uplink and additional values can be reported using additional capability signaling.   Maximum number of sets that can be supported per scheduling cell is included in the FG.   1. Regarding pre-requisites (especially legacy cross-carrier scheduling), it is preferable to discuss on a case-by-case basis. For example, a UE may support DCI 1\_X to support up to four cells while the UE may or may not have the capability (e.g. due to BDs) to support cross-carrier scheduling using legacy CIF for the same case. If UE indicates support for both multi-cell scheduling via DCI 1\_X/0\_X and cross-carrier scheduling, the UE should support DL/UL reception on a cell in the set also using legacy DCI formats with CIF.   Support of DL (UL) reception on a cell within the set of cells via cross-carrier scheduling with DCI 1\_1/1\_2 (0\_1/0\_2) with CIF from the scheduling cell, if UE indicates support for cross-carrier scheduling.   1. At least slot-based monitoring for DCI 1\_X/0\_X should be in the basic functionality.   Slot-based PDCCH monitoring on the scheduling cell on which DCI 1\_X/0\_X is monitored should be assumed in basic functionality. |
| [12] | Huawei, HiSilicon | Monitoring DCI format 0\_X/1\_X and legacy DCI formats (DCI format 0\_0/1\_0/0\_1/1\_1/0\_2/1\_2) from a same scheduling cell has been agreed to be supported in previous meetings, as shown in the following.   |  | | --- | | **Agreement**  Confirm below working assumption reached in RAN1#110 meeting with revision.  **Working Assumption**   * For any cell within a set of cells which can be co-scheduled by a DCI format 0\_X/1\_X, RAN1 specification supports monitoring the DCI format 0\_X/1\_X and DCI format 0\_0/1\_0, 0\_1/1\_1, and/or 0\_2/1\_2 (if supported by the UE), if configured from a same scheduling cell. * The DCI format 0\_X/1\_X and the DCI format 0\_0/1\_0/0\_1/1\_1/0\_2/1\_2 can be monitored simultaneously. * Note: This does not mean a UE is required to support number of BDs/CCEs beyond the Rel-17 limits (i.e., and ) for PDCCH candidates for each scheduled cell. |   This feature is useful to enable different traffic/services at the same time for a same UE without always relying on a DCI format with relatively large DCI size.  On the other hand, there are difference between the potential legacy DCI formats that are to be simultaneously used with the new DCI format, in terms of UE implementations. For a same legacy DCI format, it may be or even required to be able to be used for self-scheduling. For example, considering single DCI is a non-fallback DCI, it is necessary to monitor legacy DCI formats such as DCI format 0\_0/1\_0 for self-scheduling and DCI format 0\_X/1\_X to maintain transmission reliability, which can be served as a basic UE capability.  While it is also possible for a legacy DCI format to be used for cross-carrier scheduling, since the PDCCH capacity in scheduling cell is expected to be larger than other scheduled cells and data part can be conveyed on scheduled cell(s). In this case, compared to multi-cell scheduling together with a legacy DCI for self-scheduling especially fall-back DCI formats, more cross-carrier configuration and UE processing are required, including separate BD/CCE and DCI size budget counting per scheduled cell etc.  As multi-carrier scheduling with a single DCI is not a simple extension of cross-carrier scheduling, support of multi-carrier scheduling does not mean that the UE directly supports cross-carrier scheduling, which has adds-on UE implementation thus as well as complexity. Cross-carrier scheduling is also a later feature introduced than self-carrier scheduling, when different SCS scheduling is considered. Thus, the simultaneous use of cross-carrier scheduling by legacy DCI format with multi-carrier scheduling can have different implementations, UE complexity and commercial support compared to multi-cell scheduling together with a legacy DCI for self-scheduling.  ***Proposal 1:*** *Support of the following as separate UE capabilities:*   * *Simultaneously monitoring DCI format 0\_X/1\_X and legacy DCI format(s) where the legacy DCI format(s) is for self-carrier scheduling* * *Simultaneously monitoring DCI format 0\_X/1\_X and legacy DCI format(s) where the legacy DCI format(s) is for cross-carrier scheduling.* |

## **Discussion**

**Question 2-1:**

* **Regarding the component 1 in FGs 49-1/1a/1b and 49-2/2a/2b, companies are encouraged to provide views on whether to separate FG for DCI format 0\_3 and 1\_3**
  + Yes: vivo, OPPO, ZTE, Nokia/NSB
  + No: QC

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Qualcomm | It is true that single FG11-1 indicates support for DCI format 0\_2 and 1\_2 for the same cell. It was because URLLC DCI formats can be used for primary cell scheduling. For CA, by default, UE capabilities are separate for DL CA and UL CA. Therefore, it does not make sense to combine DCI formats for DL and UL multi-cell scheduling.  Support of UL CA so far is not as wide as DL CA in the market. If we combine 0\_3 and 1\_3, there will be less chances to enable multi-cell scheduling for DL due to the limitation of UL CA. In future, support of UL CA maybe wider, but it would still be subset of DL CA configuration. Even for this case, there is no benefit to couple support of 0\_3 and 1\_3. |
| MTK | We support to have separate FG for DCI format 0\_3 and 1\_3. |
| Apple | We tend to share similar views as QC and would prefer to have separate FG for DCI format 0\_3 and DCI format 1\_3 |
| LGE | We also have similar view with other companies that it is reasonable to have separate FG for DCI format 0\_3 and 1\_3. |
| Nokia/NSB | We think there should be separate indication for 0\_3 and 1\_3, but we don’t necessarily think there needs to be a separate capability. It may be easer to have more candidate values provided for the number of set of cells for 0\_3 & 1\_3, with having overall also the number of set of cells in the primary and secondary PUCCH cell group (this seems to be currently missing here).  Why we think it would be better to have this couple in a single capability (but with independent UE capability indication on the number of sets etc. for UL & DL) is the relation to (a) different SCS for the scheduling cell and (b) number of sets scheduled from a single scheduling cell. When having this combined, it will be easier to note what the UE actually supports. |
| Xiaomi | We support to have separate FG for DCI format 0\_3 and 1\_3. |
| vivo | If the basic FG for MC is for DCI format 0\_3 and 1\_3 monitoring, we think a single basic FG could be considered as it provides a whole picture for what UE supports. In additional, the details for UL co-scheduling/DL co-scheduling, such as the maximum number of co-scheduled cells, can be separately reported as a component of the basic FG or sub-FGs, and whether UE supports UL CA can be determined based on other legacy FGs (e.g., FG for MIMO). Having said that, we are ok to have separate capabilities if the majority see the needs  For the note part: two sScell scheduling Pcell cases(1.sScell scheduling Pcell by a mc-DCI, 2. Pcell schedule multi-cells by mc-DCI while sScell schedules Pcell by sc-DCI) are excluded from MCE per RAN agreement:  **Updated proposal 4.5:**   * Followings are excluded from multi-cell PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling in Rel-18.   + SCell schedules multiple cells including P(S)Cell   + Different SCS among co-scheduled cells   + Different carrier type (licensed or unlicensed, FR1 or FR2-1 or FR2-2) among co-scheduled cells   + Configuration of both multi-cell PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling and multi-TRP for a scheduled cell   + Support for any sidelink scheduling   **Conclusion:**   * Following is excluded from multi-cell PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling in Rel-18.   + PCell schedules multiple cells by DCI format 0\_X/1\_X when a sSCell is configured to schedule PCell   But the 2nd conclusion is not reflected, the following should be added in the note  [Agreement  Followings are excluded from multi-cell PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling in Rel-18.   * SCell schedules multiple cells including P(S)Cell * Different SCS among co-scheduled cells * Different carrier type (licensed or unlicensed, FR1 or FR2-1 or FR2-2) among co-scheduled cells] * UE does not support that PCell schedules multiple cells by DCI format 0\_X/1\_X when a sSCell is configured to schedule PCell |
| OPPO | Our original reasoning was following:   1. There is certain common functionality such as co-scheduled cell set, which consequently leads to the common implementation capability, between DCI 0\_3 and 1\_3. The two separate FGs between 0\_3 and 1\_3 may require UE to report the same capability for certain common components. This may build correlation between FGs. 2. Single FG can have separate components for DCI 0\_3 and 1\_3. So DCI 0\_3 capability can be individually turned off if UL CA is not supported.   But we are also fine with the structure proposed by FL to have separate FGs between DL and UL, if that turns out to be the majority view. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We are fine to support separate FG to report the monitoring capability for DCI format 0\_3 and 1\_3 considering that the CA capability can be different between UL and DL. |
| Samsung | Support separate FGs for DCI formats 0\_3 and 1\_3. |
| ZTE | Our first preference is one FG to support Multi-cell scheduling by single DCI, with one component of supported DCI formats {DCI format 0\_3, DCI format 1\_3, both DCI format 0\_3 and 1\_3} as three values. If it is majority view, we are fine to support separate FG for uplink and downlink due to the UE may have different capability for uplink and downlink. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Firstly, we also think it is not necessary to have separate capability for DCI format 0\_3 and 1\_3, since there should be no fundamental difference to support DCI format 0\_3 and 1\_3 from UE capability perspective. We agree that the capability of DL CA and the capability of UL CA are independent, however as long as the configuration of the monitoring of DCI format 0\_3 and 1\_3 is separate, it can match the CA capability. Note that the support of DCI format 0\_3/1\_3 doesn't imply the support of DL CA/UL CA, CA capability is still determined based on the other existing FGs. DCI format 0\_3/1\_3 will be configured for monitoring only if the corresponding CA capability is supported by the UE.  Secondly, even we only have single capability for DCI format 0\_3/1\_3, we also agree that separate values for maximum number of co-scheduled cells (i.e. component 4) and maximum number of sets (i.e. component 5) can be reported separately for DL and UL. |
| Intel | We support separate FG for DCI format 0\_3 and 1\_3. |
| CATT | We support separate FG for DCI format 0\_3 and 1\_3. |
| Ericsson2 | OK to have separate FGs for 0\_3 and 1\_3. |
| Moderator | Summary of companies’ view   * + Single FG for DCI format 0\_3 and 1\_3: [vivo], [OPPO], [ZTE], Nokia/NSB, HW/HiSi,     - Separate components for DCI format 0\_3 and 1\_3 (e.g. Max number of co-scheduled cells)     - Some capabilities are common for DCI format 0\_3 and 1\_3 (e.g., Max number of sets of cells)   + separate FG for DCI format 0\_3 and 1\_3: QC, MTK, Apple, LGE, Xiaomi, [vivo], [OPPO], DCM, Samsung, [ZTE], Intel, CATT, E///   Note that the agreements captured in Note column will be deleted because it was captured by rapporteur for reference.  Given that more companies prefer to have separate FG for DCI format 0\_3 and 1\_3 and some companies showed their flexibility to go with it, following proposal is made. Note that details are being discussed in other questions.  **Proposal 2-1:**   * **Introduce separate FGs for the support of monitoring DCI formats 1\_3 and 0\_3 as FGs 49-1 and 49-2**   + **Note: Some capabilities can be reported separately for DCI formats 1\_3 and 0\_3, details FFS** |
| Moderator | Following was agreed in the Tuesday GTW session  **Agreement**   * Introduce separate FGs for the support of monitoring DCI formats 1\_3 and 0\_3 as FGs 49-1 and 49-2   + Note: Some capabilities can be reported separately for DCI formats 1\_3 and 0\_3, details FFS   + FFS whether/which capabilities can be commonly applied for DCI formats 1\_3 and 0\_3, FFS how to report |

**Question 2-2a:**

* **Regarding the components 2/3 in FGs 49-1/1a and 49-2/2a, companies are encouraged to provide views on whether to separate FG for the case when a scheduling cell is not included in a set of cells with same SCS/carrier type between scheduling cell and cells in the set (i.e., whether to support separate FGs 49-1a/2a)**
  + Yes: Rapporteur

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Qualcomm | We would like to understand the intention of the question – is the proposal to have a separate FGs for (1) scheduling cell included in a set of cells, and (2) scheduling cell not included in the set of cells? This depends on some other aspects, e.g., whether to prerequisite FG6-10 (CCS with same SCS).  From our point of view, in any FG49-x, FG6-10 should not be prerequisite. The reason is that multi-cell scheduling can work with DCI format 0\_3 or 1\_3 without using DCI format 0\_1/0\_2/1\_1/1\_2 with CIF for cross-carrier scheduling. It is possible for a UE to indicate support of both CCS and multi-cell scheduling. But it should not be prerequisite.  If FG6-10 is not prerequisite, we are OK to have a single FG indicating support for multi-cell PDSCH or PUSCH scheduling on a scheduling cell included/not-included in the set of cells with same SCS/carrier-type between scheduling cell and cells in the set. If FG6-10 is prerequisite, then we need separation of FG49-1 and FG49-1a, or FG49-2 and FG49-2a. |
| MTK | Yes (support to have separate FGs 49-1a/2a) |
| Apple | Yes, agree to have separate FGs for the case when a scheduling cell is not included in a set of cells with same SCS/carrier type between scheduling cell and cells in the set |
| LGE | Yes, (to have separate FG for the case when scheduling cell is not in the set of cells) considering the aspect of (reference cell for) SS linking, BD/CCE counting, and DCI size counting. |
| Nokia/NSB | No. We don’t think this is needed, as the issue in the scheduling is the same SCS and not necessarily if the scheduled cell is included in the scheduled cell group or not. |
| Xiaomi | We are fine to have separate FG 49-1a/2a. |
| vivo | We are not sure why FG6-10 (CCS with same SCS) should be prerequisite for 49-1a while is not for 49-1. In both cases, the scheduling cell may use mc-DCI to schedule another cell, there is no difference in scheduling complexity between the two FGs. We don’t think there is a need to have separate capabilities them if the support of mc-scheduling is not coupled with legacy CCS.  For the note part, similar comment to Q2-1. |
| OPPO | Yes, agree with Rapporteur. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We are fine to have separate FGs as 49-1a/2a while we prefer to have a single FG when SCS/carrier type is same among scheduling cell and co-scheduled cells. |
| Samsung | There is no need for distinction between scheduling cell being included or not included in the set of cells. The key distinction is whether same or separate SCS / carrier type is considered between the scheduling cell and the co-scheduled cells.  So, suggest to combine 49-1 with 49-1a, and also combine 49-2 with 49-2a. Accordingly, component 2 can be removed from these FGs, and the texts in component 1 and also in the “Consequence” column of these FGs can be updated. |
| ZTE | We don’t support the separate FGs. We don’t think an additional FG is needed for the case when the scheduling cell is not included in the set. There is no big difference between the case of scheduling cell included in the set and the case of scheduling cell not included in the set since the cross cell scheduling should be supported anyway for multi-cell scheduling. If the scheduling cell is configured to be included in the set, the network just follows the restriction as agreed. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Firstly, there is no need to have FG for cross-carrier scheduling (e.g. FG 6-10) as the prerequisite for any FG of FG 49-x. Cross-carrier scheduling and single DCI are two separate features, the support of DCI format 0\_3/1\_3 is feasible without the support of cross-carrier scheduling.  Secondly, there is no necessity to have separate FGs for the case of scheduling cell included in the set and the case of scheduling cell not included in the set when the scheduling cell and the scheduled cells have same SCS. Of course, separate FGs should be set for the case of same SCS and different SCS. |
| Intel | We support separate FGs 49-1a/2a |
| CATT | No, we don’t support separate FGs 49-1/1a or FGs 49-2/2a.Actually, there is no functional difference between the case of scheduling cell included in a set of cells or the case scheduling cell not included in a set of cells. If separate FGs are supported, it will introduce an unnecessary limitation for NW scheduling. |
| Ericsson2 | No – we don’t think separate FGs are necessary for these cases. |
| Moderator | Summary of companies’ view   * + For the case when a scheduling cell is not included in a set of cells with same SCS/carrier type between scheduling cell and cells in the set,     - Separate FG: Rapporteur, QC (if FG6-10 is prerequisite), MTK, Apple, LGE, Xiaomi, OPPO, [DCM], Intel,     - Single FG: QC (if FG6-10 is not prerequisite), Nokia/NSB, vivo (if FG6-10 is not prerequisite), [DCM], Samsung, ZTE, HW/HiSi, CATT   Before making some proposal, it would be necessary to further discuss whether FG6-10 (Cross carrier scheduling for the same numerology) is prerequisite of either of FG 49-1/1a/2/2a (Multi-cell scheduling by DCI format 1\_3 or 0\_3 for same SCS/carrier type)  **Question 2-2a-1:**   * **Companies are encouraged to provide views on whether FG 6-10 is prerequisite of either of FGs 49-1/1a/2/2a.** |
| Moderator | To move forward, question is refined as follows assuming that that FG 6-10 can only be prerequisite of FGs 49-1a/2a  **Question 2-2a-2:**   * **Companies are encouraged to provide views on which option you have strong concern.**   + **Alt1-1: Separate FG (i.e. Keep FG 49-1/1a and 2/2a as separate FGs) with keeping FG 6-10 as prerequisite for FGs 49-1a/2a**   + **Alt1-2: Separate FG (i.e. Keep FG 49-1/1a and 2/2a as separate FGs) with removing FG 6-10 as prerequisite for FGs 49-1a/2a**   + **Alt2: Single FG (i.e. Merge FGs 49-1 and 49-1a as well as FGs 49-2 and 49-2a) with removing FG 6-10 as prerequisite for merged FGs 49-1/2** |
| LGE | On Q2-2a-1: FG 6-10 is to be prerequisite of FGs 49-1/1a/2/2a. (there is no functional difference between CCS and single-cell scheduling by DCI 0\_X/1\_X)  On Q2-2a-2: Alt1-1 is preferred. |
| Qualcomm | We prefer not to prerequisite FG 6-10 in any case.   * Firstly, FG 6-10 is for both DL-CCS and UL-CCS. For a given CA BC that the UE supports DL-CA and UL-CA, suppose the UE wants to support FG49-1a (but not FG49-2a). It does not make sense to mandate such UE to support UL-CCS. * Secondly, “prerequisite FG” is usually defined when a new FG cannot work without the FG. This is not the case for multi-cell PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling – it works without cross-carrier scheduling. * Thirdly, if FG 6-10 is agreed as prerequisite for FG49-1a/2a, it may propagate to FG49-1b/2b – e.g., one may say FG49-1b/2b should prerequisite FG18-5/5b. We have also concern to make FG18-5/5b as prerequisite for FG49-1b/2b. * Finally, we do not understand the benefit of prerequisiting FG 6-10 for FG49-1/1a/1b/2/2a/2b. Even without prerequisite it, UE can support both FGs if it wants/needs. Making prerequisite just puts the bar of supporting multi-cell scheduling higher. |
| Nokia, NSB | We support Alt2, i.e. single FG.  We tend to agree with Qualcomm on the prerequisite issue. From a plain use case perspective it would be natural to add 6-10 as prerequisite, but the standardized functionality doesn’t really depend on 6-10 to work. Hence, no need for a prerequisite here. But we would like to note here, that 6-10 becomes a pre-requisite for 49-3 (i.e. single cell DCI monitoring). |
| Apple | We prefer not to have FG6-10 as a pre-requisite and we support Alt1-2 |
| NTT DOCOMO | While we don’t have strong concern on any options, we prefer Alt 2 since we don’t see the strong need to have separate FG as FG49-1/2 and 49-1a/2a. We are fine not to have FG6-10 as prerequisite feature. |
| ZTE | We support Alt 2.  For multi-cell scheduling, for the scheduled cell which is not the scheduled cell, it is like cross carrier scheduling. Based on the agreement, the legacy DCI and MC DCI should be from the same scheduling. It means that the scheduled cell should support cross carrier scheduling as well. Then from this perspective, we are fine to prerequisite FG 6-10. On the other hand, we understand there may be some potential issue if FG 6-10 is prerequisite. We are also fine not to prerequisite FG 6-10. |
| Vivo2 | We support Alt 2. |
| Samsung2 | We are OK to keep the basic DL FG separate from the basic UL FG, and also OK to not include FG 6-10 as a prerequisite for the DL/UL FGs for multi-cell scheduling, but as mentioned before, we suggest to combine 49-1 with 49-1a (one basic DL FG), and also combine 49-2 with 49-2a (one basic UL FG), as there is no UE impact from having the scheduling cell within or outside the set of cells as long as they have the same SCS / carrier type. |
| Intel | We tend to think FG 6-10 does not need to be prerequisite.  We support Alt 1-2. |
| Moderator | A number of companies showed their concern on having FG 6-10 as prerequisite. If FG 6-10 is removed from prerequisite, there seems no strong need to keep separate FGs 49-1/1a and 2/2a, Therefore, Alt2 is taken for the proposal.  **Proposal 2-2a-2:**   * **FGs 49-1 and 49-1a are merged with removing FG 6-10 as prerequisite for merged FG 49-1** * **FGs 49-2 and 49-2a are merged with removing FG 6-10 as prerequisite for merged FG 49-2** |
| Moderator | Following proposal was discussed in the Thursday GTW but could not achieve consensus.  **Proposal 2-2a-2:**   * **FGs 49-1 and 49-1a are merged with removing FG 6-10 as prerequisite for merged FG 49-1**   + **FFS1: Note: If UE indicates FG 6-10, a cell in the set of cells can be scheduled using legacy DCI formats with CCS**   + **FFS2: whether some capabilities can be separately reported for the cases when** **scheduling cell is included in a set of cells or it is not included in a set of cells with same SCS/carrier type between scheduling cell and cells in the set** * **FGs 49-2 and 49-2a are merged with removing FG 6-10 as prerequisite for merged FG 49-2**   + **FFS1: Note: If UE indicates FG 6-10, a cell in the set of cells can be scheduled using legacy DCI formats with CCS**   + **FFS2: whether some capabilities can be separately reported for the cases when** **scheduling cell is included in a set of cells or it is not included in a set of cells with same SCS/carrier type between scheduling cell and cells in the set**   For FFS1, companies are encouraged to provide view on this note. Moderator’s understanding is that just supporting FG 6-10 with FGs 49-1/2 does not imply the UE support monitoring both legacy DCI format(s) (0\_0/1\_0, 0\_1/1\_1 and/or 0\_2/1\_2) and DCI format 0\_3/1\_3 on the same scheduling cell for a cell in a set of cells, which can be discussed for FG 49-3.  For FFS2, **as I asked to Apple in the GTW, please provide your view on which capabilities should be separately reported for the two cases** so that companies can further check whether these FGs should be merged or not. |
| Qualcomm | We support Proposal 2-2a-2 in the current form. We understand Apple’s comment on GTW – search space linkage between scheduling cell and the reference cell is indeed an extra feature required for FG49-1a/2a, which can be differentiated as a component in the merged FG49-1/49-1a. We notice another one which is now discussed under FG49-3.  On FFS1, If the note does not mean simultaneous operation of legacy DCI format(s) and DCI format 0\_3/1\_3, the note can be deleted. If the note does mean it, then we have a concern. So we are not OK to confirm the note.  On FFS2, we agree with Apple that search space linkage between scheduling cell and the reference cell is indeed an extra feature required for FG49-1a/2a, which can be differentiated as a component that has candidate values {supported, not supported} in the merged FG49-1/49-1a. We notice another one which is now discussed under FG49-3. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support this proposal and we share the same understanding as Moderator on FFS1. If this Moderator's understanding is common understanding, we are fine to remove FFS1. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are fine with proposal 2-2a-2.  On FFS1, if the UE also reports the support of FG49-3, then a cell in the set of cells can be scheduled using legacy DCI formats with CCS. |
| LGE | We’d like to clarity Moderator’s understanding in above.  Does “supporting FG 6-10 and FGs 49-1/2” imply that a cell can be scheduled from multiple different scheduling cells with different DCI formats? (i.e., introduce new feature “configure multiple scheduling cells to a single scheduled cell” in this WI?)  Also, we’d like to hear other companies’ views on the note in above FFS1. |
| Apple | Thanks FL for your efforts and the updated proposals.  In our point of view, we still strongly prefer to have FG 49-1 and FG 49-1a as separate FGs rather than combined due to following reasons:  - Depending on whether the scheduling cell is within the set or outside the set, we presume the component 4 (max number of co-scheduled cells) should be reported separately. If the 2 FGs are combined, then we will always need to report a single value that may be optimal for one FG, but not for other. This will limit UEs capability.  - Also, combining these 2 FGs will have any impact on how we report other capabilities such as FG 49-3. We will always need to report the support for 49-3 in case of combined single FG if we want to have self-scheduling for the scheduling cell. However, if they are separate and we just report 49-1, then we don’t necessarily need to report 49-3 because the new DCI format could be used for self-scheduling also. So essentially how we report other FGs might also be impacted depending on whether FG 49-1 is combined with FG 49-1a or not.  - And quite importantly, with combined FGs, if UE just wants to support the capability with scheduling cell within the set, it is then required to support the capability with scheduling cell outside the set as well - they become mutual pre-requisite to each other. This is not reasonable from UE perspective  Considering above, we suggest following updated proposal to just remove FG 6-10 as pre-requisite for FG 49-1, 49-1a, 49-2, 49-2a. We don’t see any technical concerns keeping the 2 FGs separate.  *•****~~FGs 49-1 and 49-1a are merged with removing~~ FG 6-10 is removed as prerequisite for ~~merged~~ FG 49-1 and FG 49-1a***  *****FFS1: Note: If UE indicates FG 6-10, a cell in the set of cells can be scheduled using legacy DCI formats with CCS***  *~~~~****~~FFS2: whether some capabilities can be separately reported for the cases when~~******~~scheduling cell is included in a set of cells or it is not included in a set of cells with same SCS/carrier type between scheduling cell and cells in the set~~***  *•****~~FGs 49-2 and 49-2a are merged with removing~~ FG 6-10 is removed as prerequisite for ~~merged~~ FG 49-2 and FG 49-2a***  *****FFS1: Note: If UE indicates FG 6-10, a cell in the set of cells can be scheduled using legacy DCI formats with CCS***  *~~~~****~~FFS2: whether some capabilities can be separately reported for the cases when~~******~~scheduling cell is included in a set of cells or it is not included in a set of cells with same SCS/carrier type between scheduling cell and cells in the set~~*** |
| ZTE | We support this proposal. We also think the first FFS1 can be removed as it is exactly the capability indicated by FG 6-10. |
| Samsung3 | Fine with Proposal 2-2a-2 from the Moderator.  Regarding FFS1, we understand this as joint operation of MC-DCI and legacy SC-DCI, and we are fine with that. If there is different intention, would like clarification from the Moderator or proponent (Ericsson). Specially, regarding the comment from LGE, we don’t see FFS1 to imply multiple scheduling cells for a scheduled cell, which is already ruled out in the WI.    Regarding the comments from QC, the search space linkage between the scheduling cell and the reference cell may be needed even when the scheduling cell is included in the set of cells, per the following agreement – up to gNB to select the scheduling cell or another cell as the reference cell. So, this is not a differentiating point between the two cases (i.e., scheduling cell within or outside the set of cells). Accordingly, we fail to see the issue in the first bullet from Apple, as to why the UE would need to report different values for max number of cells in the set in these two cases, and therefore in the third bullet from Apple. Regarding the second bullet from Apple, handling legacy DCI formats is a more general discussion and should be supported in all cases.  **Agreement (RAN1#111):**  Confirm the RAN1#110bis-e working assumption with the following changes:  **Working Assumption**  For a set of cells which is configured for multi-cell scheduling,   * Existing DCI size budget is maintained on each cell of the set of cells. * DCI size of DCI format 0\_X/1\_X is counted on one cell among the set of cells.   + DCI size of the DCI format 0\_X/1\_X is counted on the reference cell. * BD/CCE of DCI format 0\_X/1\_X is counted on one cell among the set of cells.   + BD/CCE of the DCI format 0\_X/1\_X is counted on the reference cell. * Same reference cell is used for both DCI format 0\_X and DCI format 1\_X. * The reference cell is   + the scheduling cell if the scheduling cell is included in the set of cells and search space of the DCI format 0\_X/1\_X is configured only on the scheduling cell;   + one cell of the set of cells which search space of DCI format 0\_X/1\_X is configured on and associated with the search space of the scheduling cell with the same search space ID if search space of the DCI format 0\_X/1\_X is configured on the cell in addition to the scheduling cell.   … |
| Apple2 | In addition to the differences we already mentioned, another key difference to highlight between the cases when scheduling cell is included in the set or not is how the scheduling cell can itself be scheduled. In case when scheduling cell is within the set, it can only be self-scheduled, and we see this set as self-contained, and it doesn’t need to monitor any other cell. However, when scheduling cell is outside the set, then another different cell could be configured to schedule this cell. So now UE is required to monitor the scheduling cell for the cells within a set and monitor another different cell for the scheduling cell.  This clearly brings increases UE monitoring requirements compared to the case when scheduling cell is within the set. |
| Qualcomm | @ Samsung3  The agreement clearly says “The reference cell is the scheduling cell if the scheduling cell is included in the set of cells”. We do not think there is a gNB’s flexibility on whether the scheduling cell or another cell as the reference cell. |

**Question 2-2b:**

* **Regarding the components 2/3 in FGs 49-1/1a/1b and 49-2/2a/2b, companies are encouraged to provide views on whether to separate FG for the case when a scheduling cell is not included in a set of cells with different SCS/carrier type between scheduling cell and cells in the set (i.e., whether to support separate FGs 49-1b/2b)**
  + Yes: QC, DCM

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Qualcomm | Agree in principle, but the proposal is not sufficient.  A UE should be able to indicate which SCS can be used for scheduling cell and which SCS can be used for the set of scheduled cells. Low-to-high and high-to-low are quite different. In addition, there are many SCSs now – including 480kHz and 960kHz. Just low-to-high or high-to-low is insufficient.  Same as our answer to Question 2-2a, we think FG18-5 should not be prerequisite. |
| MTK | Yes (support to have separate FGs 49-1b/2b). Open to have more SCS combination indications as mentioned by QC. |
| Apple | Yes, agree to have separate FG for the case when a scheduling cell is not included in a set of cells with different SCS/carrier type between scheduling cell and cells in the set |
| LGE | Yes, (to have separate FG for the case when scheduling cell is with different SCS/carrier type) as for CCS with same/different SCS between scheduling cell and scheduled cell. |
| Nokia/NSB | May not be needed, but could be directly deduced from the UE capability of cross-carrier scheduling of different SCS.  But if we have a capability, then such capability should not be separate for UL & DL (i.e. 0\_3 and 1\_3) but a generic scheduling capability, such as:   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | 49-1a | Multi-cell PDSCH and/or PUSCH scheduling for the same and different SCS of scheduling and scheduled cells | UE supporting the Multi-cell PDSCH and/or PUSCH scheduling of 49-1 also for the case of different SCS between scheduling cell and scheduled cells   * + Note: this does not include a set of cells including the PCell. | |
| Xiaomi | Yes, we agree with companies that separate FG for the case scheduling cell is not included in a set of cells with different SCS/carrier type. |
| vivo | Ok to have separate capabilities for mixed SCS case between the scheduling cell and scheduled cell, but need to clarify whether FG18-5 is the prerequisite  For the note part, similar comment to Q2-1. |
| OPPO | Yes. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Yes, the same principle as existing UE feature for CCS can be considered. Regarding the SCS combination, it can be reported whether the UE supports scheduling cell and co-scheduled cell SCS relation with low-to-high and/or high-to-low similar to CCS. |
| Samsung | Yes, support separate FGs for same vs. different SCS / carrier type. Open to discuss more details on supported SCS combinations and carrier type combinations, e.g., unlicensed scheduling licensed should not be supported. |
| ZTE | We think the separate FG is not needed. If the UE supports cross cell scheduling with different SCS for single cell scheduling, it means that the UE can support the case of scheduling cell having different SCS/carrier type from the scheduled cells if the UE supports FG 49-1. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Firstly, there is no need to have FG 18-5 as the prerequisite.  Secondly, separate capability should be introduced for the case of different SCS for scheduling cell and scheduled cell and the case of same SCS for scheduling cell and scheduled cell, and at least have separate capability for the case of scheduling cell with larger SCS and the case of scheduling cell with smaller SCS. |
| Intel | We support separate FGs 49-1b/2b. We are open for the discussions of SCS combinations for multi-cell scheduling. |
| CATT | Yes |
| Ericsson2 | OK in principle to have separate FG for different SCS between scheduled and scheduling cells. |
| Moderator | Summary of companies’ view   * + separate FG for different SCS/carrier type between scheduling cell and cells in the set: QC (report the supported combination of SCSs), DCM (report low-to-high and/or high-to-low), MTK, Apple, LGE, Nokia/NSB (common for DCI format 0\_3 and 1\_3), Xiaomi, vivo (need to clarify whether FG18-5/5b is prerequisite), OPPO, Samsung, HW/HiSi, Intel, CATT, E///   + Single FG for this case: Nokia/NSB (derived from FG18-5/5b), ZTE (derived from FG18-5/5b)   Given more companies prefer to have separate FG for different SCS, following proposal is made based on the agreement made in Tuesday GTW session.  **Proposal 2-2b-1:**   * **Introduce separate FGs for the support of same and different SCSs between scheduling cell and cells in the set**   + **Note: Some capabilities can be reported separately for same and different SCSs, details FFS**   + **FFS whether/which capabilities can be commonly applied for same and different SCSs, FFS how to report**   In addition, for the report of the supported SCSs, following question is made to collect companies view.  **Question 2-2b-2:**   * **Companies are encouraged to provide views on how to report the support of the case when a scheduling cell is not included in a set of cells with different SCSs between scheduling cell and cells in the set, e.g.,**   + **Opt1: Report the supported combinations of SCSs**   + **Opt2: Report low-to-high and/or high-to-low SCSs**     - **Opt2-1: Separately report from FG18-5/5b**     - **Opt2-2: Derived from FG18-5/5b (i,e., FG18-5/5b are prerequisite FGs for )**   For the carrier type, as discussed in the Tuesday GTW session, it would be better to have a specific discussion whether/how to separate the capability (e.g., report the supported combinations of carrier type, with some limitation such as not to support unlicensed scheduling licensed).  **Question 2-2b-2:**   * **Companies are encouraged to provide views on whether/how to report the support of the case when a scheduling cell is not included in a set of cells with different carrier types between scheduling cell and cells in the set, e.g.,**   + **Opt1: Report the supported combinations of carrier type**     - **If companies support this option, please indicate which combinations of carrier type should be included in candidate value set, e.g, {licensed-licensed, licensed-unlicensed, unlicensed-unlicensed}**   + **Opt2: Separate capability is not necessary** |
| LGE | On P2-2b-1: Fine with the proposal.  On Q2-2b-2: Opt2-2 is preferred. (there is no functional difference between CCS and single-cell scheduling by DCI 0\_X/1\_X)  On Q2-2b-2: Open to discuss on whether/how to report the carrier type combination. |
| Qualcomm | Proposal 2-2b-1: We are OK with the Proposal.  Question 2-2b-2: Opt.1.  Suppose a CA band combination of FDD band (15kHz) + FDD band (30kHz) + FR2 band (120kHz). If Opt.2 is taken, just for low-to-high, the UE has to support 3 combinations of scheduling-SCS and scheduled-SCS for multi-cell scheduling. In other words, unless all the 3 combinations are supported and tested, it is not possible to declare support of FG49-1b/2b. This effectively means that if we go with Opt. 2, multi-cell scheduling would be practically limited for up to two SCSs in a CA band combination. We do not think this is a right way to go, since even today, UEs/networks are supporting 3 SCSs/carrier-types in a CA band combination.  Question 2-2b-2:  If we adopt Opt.1 on Question 2-2b-2, we think it is good to consider carrier-type-combo report should be as simple as possible. One way could be to introduce 1 bit indication on whether to support unlicensed band(s) for scheduled cells. Note that in the RAN1 WI phase, it was common understanding that scheduling on unlicensed band(s) should be a use-case of multi-cell scheduling, but not vice versa (i.e., scheduling from unlicensed band(s) would not be typical).  One way to move forward is to leave a sentence “FFS: whether/how to indicate support of scheduling on unlicensed band(s)”. |
| MTK | Proposal 2-2b-1: Fine with the Proposal.  Question 2-2b-2: We prefer Opt.1.  Question 2-2b-2 (should be 3?): We prefer Opt.1. Open to consider the suggestion from Qualcomm. |
| Nokia, NSB | 2-2b-1: fine with the proposal with the note that we think common FG for DCI format 0\_3 and 1\_3 for monitoring with different SCS is sufficient.  2-2b-2: either derive functionality from 18-5/5b or, if needed, define a similar FG to work in conjunction Rel-18 multi-cell scheduling. Actually 18-5/5b would only be a pre-requisite for the single DCI monitoring (from different SCS through x-scheduling, as discussed for the same SCS & 6-10)  2-2b-2(3?): in principle agree with Qualcomm that report needs to be kept as simple as possible, and perhaps some more discussion is needed to understand the really cases of concern instead of trying to address all possible combinations in the FG. |
| Apple | Proposal 2-2b-1: Support  Question 2-2b-2: We prefer Opt1  Question 2-2b-2(3): Share similar view as QC and agree to have the suggested FFS |
| NTT DOCOMO | Proposal 2-2b-1: We support this proposal.  Question 2-2b-2: We support Opt.2-1. For Opt.1, the supporting relation of scheduling cell and co-scheduled cell can be further restricted by reporting carrier type if needed which is discussed in below Question 2-2b-2(3), thus we think “low-to-high or high-to-low” reporting same as legacy CCS is sufficient.  We would like to note that we can effectively reduce the signaling overhead if we support option 2-1 with some carrier type restriction as following analysis;   * Opt.1 + carrier type {licensed and/or unlicensed}: It requires **30 bits** to report supporting combinations of {15,30,60,120,480,960} kHz SCS and 2 bits to report whether scheduled cell can be on {licensed, unlicensed, both} band if necessary. (= **32 bits** in total.) * Opt.2-1 + carrier type {FR1/FR2-1/FR2-2} and {licensed and/or unlicensed}: It requires **2 bits** to report supporting {low-to-high, high-to-low, both} SCS, **9 bits** at most to report supporting combinations of {FR1, FR2-1, FR2-2} which includes same FR cases and across FR cases and 2 bits to express whether scheduled cell can be on {licensed, unlicensed, both} band if necessary. (= **13 bits** in total.)   For Opt.2-2, it cannot address the case where, e.g., a UE supports both low-to-high and high-to-low SCS relation for scheduling cell and scheduled cell for legacy CCS but only support low-to-high SCS relation for scheduling cell and co-scheduled cell for multi-cell scheduling. We think such reporting flexibility should be allowed.  Question 2-2b-2(3): We are open to discuss between Opt.1 and 2 if Opt.2 in above Question 2-2b-2 is supported. We tend to agree with Nokia that we would need to discuss which case should be separately reported. |
| ZTE | For proposal 2-2b-1, we can go with majority view even though we don’t think separate FG is not needed. Also we support Nokia suggestion that this can be single FG for DCI format 0\_3 and 1\_3.  For Question 2-2b-2, we support Option 2 because we don’t see the need to report SCS combination. Low-to-high or high-to-low is sufficient, which is the same as legacy. We prefer option 2-2.  For Option 2-2b-2, we don’t see the need of separate FG. As QC pointed out, there is only one scenario for the scheduling across different carrier type. Then if the unlicensed band is included in the band combination, it means that the UE support multi-cell scheduling across different carrier type. |
| Vivo2 | For proposal 2-2b-1, We are OK with the Proposal.  For Question 2-2b-2, prefer opiton1. There is no need to introduce separate signaling for all possible combinations.  For Option 2-2b-2, agree with Qualcomm that report needs to be simple, separate report for whether unlicenced operation is support is sufficient, and this report can also be combined with the case where scheduling cell is in the cell set. |
| Samsung2 | OK with proposal 2-2b-1.  For question 2-2b-2, prefer Opt.2-1 to follow the legacy design for low-to-high and high-to-low SCS.  For question 2-2b-2(3), can consider capabilities for different frequency ranges similar to legacy CCS, as well as capability reporting with respect to unlicensed scheduling; also, suggest to capture (as a note or component) the restriction that scheduling from unlicensed to licensed is not supported. |
| Intel | Proposal 2-2b-1: We are fine with the proposal.  For Question 2-2b-2: We prefer Opt2-1.  For Option 2-2b-3: We think this is a corner case and no need to have separate FG. |
| Moderator | Summary of companies’ view   * Proposal 2-2b-1   + Support: LGE, QC, MTK, Nokia/NSB, Apple, DCM, ZTE, vivo, Samsung, Intel   + Not support: * Question 2-2b-2   + Opt1: QC, MTK, Apple, vivo (limited combinations)   + Opt2-1: Nokia/NSB, DCM, Samsung, Intel   + Opt2-2: LGE, Nokia/NSB, ZTE * Question 2-2b-2 (this should be “2-2b-3”. Sorry for the mistake)   + Opt1: QC (FFS: whether/how to indicate support of scheduling on unlicensed band(s)), MTK, [Nokia/NSB], Apple (FFS: whether/how to indicate support of scheduling on unlicensed band(s)), [DCM], QC (FFS: whether/how to indicate support of scheduling on unlicensed band(s)), Samsung (similar to legacy CCS, add a note)   + Opt2: ZTE, Intel   For Proposal 2-2b-1, an FFS is added based on the comments from Nokia/NSB and ZTE  **Proposal 2-2b-1:**   * **Introduce separate FGs for the support of same and different SCSs between scheduling cell and cells in the set**   + **Note: Some capabilities can be reported separately for same and different SCSs, details FFS**   + **FFS whether/which capabilities can be commonly applied for same and different SCSs, FFS how to report**   + **FFS whether the FG for the support of different SCS is common for DCI format 0\_3 and 1\_3**   For Question 2-2b-2, more companies prefer to have separate reporting from FG18-5/5b (either Opt1 or Opt2-1). As suggested by DCM, it would be better to discuss together with carrier type (Question 2-2b-3). Companies are encouraged to provide view on **which options you have strong concern**.  **Proposal 2-2b-2/3:**   * **Regarding the case when a scheduling cell is not included in a set of cells with different SCSs/carrier types between scheduling cell and cells in the set**   + **Opt1: Report the supported combinations of SCSs between scheduling cell and cells in the set**   + **Opt2: Report the support of low-to-high and/or high-to-low SCSs as well as supported combinations of {FR1, FR2-1, FR2-2} between scheduling cell and cells in the set**   + **FFS: whether/how to indicate support of scheduling on unlicensed band(s)** |
| Moderator | Following was agreed in the Thursday GTW session  **Agreement**   * Introduce separate FGs for the support of same and different SCSs between scheduling cell and cells in the set   + Note: Some capabilities can be reported separately for same and different SCSs, details FFS   + FFS whether/which capabilities can be commonly applied for same and different SCSs, FFS how to report   + FFS whether the FG for the support of different SCS is separate or common for DCI format 0\_3 and 1\_3   For **Proposal 2-2b-2/3**, companies are encouraged to provide view on **which options you have strong concern**.  **Proposal 2-2b-2/3:**   * **Regarding the case when a scheduling cell is not included in a set of cells with different SCSs/carrier types between scheduling cell and cells in the set**   + **Opt1: Report the supported combinations of SCSs between scheduling cell and cells in the set**   + **Opt2: Report the support of low-to-high and/or high-to-low SCSs as well as supported combinations of {FR1, FR2-1, FR2-2} between scheduling cell and cells in the set**   + **FFS: whether/how to indicate support of scheduling on unlicensed band(s)** |
| Qualcomm | Support Opt.1.  We have a strong concern on Opt.2 since it does not differentiate SCSs in FR1. If the UE indicate support of low-to-high and FR1 to FR2-2, the UE has to support 15kHz-to-120kHz and 30kHz-to-120kHz in typical band combo (and 60kHz-to-120kHz if 60kHz in FR1 is supported, 15kHz-to-60kHz/30kHz-to-60kHz if 60kHz in FR2 is supported).  If we go with Opt.2, the combinations should be {FR1-FDD, FR1-TDD, [FR1-Unlicensed], FR2-1, FR2-2}. This is fine for us. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We have a concern on option 1 that the signaling overhead would be unnecessarily increased. As we commented in the previous round, in our view, opt.2 in this Proposal 2-2b-2/3 can provide sufficient reporting granularity while it can save the signaling overhead around 20 bits compared to opt.1. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We prefer option 2 considering it follows what we did before, and can save signalling overhead as DCM analysed above. |
| LGE | OK with the proposal except for clarification on “carrier types” in the main bullet.  If it is not related to the options, it can be deleted. |
| Apple | Support Opt1 |
| ZTE | We support Option 2. We share the same view with NTT DOCOMO and Huawei. |
| Samsung3 | OK with the proposal and prefer Option 2. |
| Qualcomm | We can compromise if Opt.2 differentiates FR1-FDD and FR1-TDD. Otherwise, we do not think Opt.2 works for FG52-1b/2b.  @ DOCOMO  We are not sure how much critical the 20 bits is, for RRC signalling. |

**Question 2-3:**

* **Regarding the component 4 in FGs 49-1/1a/1b and 49-2/2a/2b, companies are encouraged to provide views on whether to report following for DL and UL separately (i.e., whether to report the number as a component in FGs 49-1/1a/1b and 49-2/2a/2b or as a unified FG similar to FG 49-4)**
  + **Max number of co-scheduled cells supported by UE:** **Candidate value set of {[2, 3, 4]}**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Qualcomm | Yes, should be separated.  One comment: we think the component should be “Max number of co-scheduled cells supported by a DCI format for the UE”. |
| MTK | Yes, should be separated. |
| Apple | Yes, agree to report separately |
| LGE | Yes, (to be separated) |
| Nokia/NSB | Support |
| Xiaomi | Support. |
| vivo | YES |
| OPPO | Yes. We also think this maximum number should refer to “**Max number of co-scheduled cells supported in a DCI by UE**”.  We also propose to consider “max number of co-scheduled cells supported by UE in a co-scheduled cell set” as another capability parameter. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We are fine with supporting separate report for UL and DL. |
| Samsung | Yes, separate values for DL and UL.  Also, agree to clarify as suggested by QC/OPPO or as follows: “Max number of co-scheduled cells, in a DCI format 1\_3/0\_3, supported by UE.” |
| ZTE | Yes. since the UE may have the different capability for DL and UL, especially on CA. We also support the update from QC. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes, considering UE may have different DL CA capability and UL CA capability. |
| Intel | Support |
| CATT | Yes |
| Ericsson2 | OK for UL and DL to be reported separately, while we slightly prefer unified FG 49-4. |
| Moderator | Summary of companies’ view   * + Max number of co-scheduled cells supported by a DCI format for the UE: Candidate value set of {[2, 3, 4]}     - Separate for DL and UL: QC, MTK, Apple, LGE, Nokia/NSB, vivo, OPPO, DCM, Samsung, ZTE, HW/HiSi, Intel, CATT, E///   All companies are fine to separately report for DL and UL. Following proposal is made  **Proposal 2-3:**   * **Following capability is reported separately for DCI formats 1\_3 and 0\_3**   + **Max number of co-scheduled cells supported by a DCI format for the UE:** **Candidate value set of {[2, 3, 4]}** |
| Moderator | Also would like to check whether we can remove the bracket from the candidate value set |
| LGE | On P2-3: Fine with the proposal. (by removing the bracket) |
| Qualcomm | We are OK with Proposal 2-3. |
| MTK | Fine with Proposal 2-3. |
| Nokia, NSB | OK |
| Apple | Support Proposal 2-2 and square brackets can be removed |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support this proposal and also fine to remove the brackets. |
| ZTE | OK |
| Vivo2 | OK |
| Samsung2 | OK with the proposal and with removing the brackets.  Suggest to clarify that these are not separate FGs, rather components of the main FGs 49-1/1a/1b and 49-2/2a/2b, respectively. |
| Intel | Support |
| Moderator | Most companies are fine to remove the brackets. Proposal is updated based on the comment from Samsung  **Proposal 2-3:**   * **Following capability is reported separately for DCI formats 1\_3 and 0\_3 as a component of FGs 49-1/1a/1b and 49-2/2a/2b**   + **Max number of co-scheduled cells supported by a DCI format for the UE:** **Candidate value set of {~~[~~2, 3, 4~~]~~}** |
| Moderator | Following was agreed in the Thursday GTW session.  **Agreement**   * Following is reported separately for DCI formats 1\_3 and 0\_3 as a component of FGs 49-1/1a/1b and 49-2/2a/2b   + Max number of co-scheduled cells supported by a DCI format for the UE: Candidate value set of {2, 3, 4} |

**Question 2-4:**

* **Regarding the component 5 in FGs 49-1/1a/1b and 49-2/2a/2b and FG 49-4, companies are encouraged to provide views on whether to report followings for DL and UL separately (i.e., whether to report the numbers as components in FGs 49-1/1a/1b and 49-2/2a/2b or as a unified FG 49-4)**
  + **Max number of sets of cells supported by UE in total: Candidate value set of {[2, 3, 4]}**
  + **Max number of sets of cells supported by UE for a same scheduling cell: Candidate value set of {[1, 2, 3, 4]}**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Qualcomm | We think FG49-4 should be reported in each FGs 49-1/1a/1b/2/2a/2b. These aspects cannot be decoupled from the support of same/different SCSs for scheduling/scheduled cells. |
| MTK | Yes, report for DL and UL separately. |
| Apple | Yes, agree to report separately. Regarding, the candidate value set for max number of sets of cells supported by UE in total, just to clarify, these are optional/additional values. If not reported, by default, 1 set of cells is supported |
| LGE | Yes, (to be separated) |
| Nokia/NSB | See our comments to the split of UL & DL above.  We think we need slightly more differentiation including:   * + Max number of sets (a) per PUCCH cell and (b) in total (or [1...4] for the primary group, [0...4] for the secondary PUCCH group and [1...8] in total for the UE. 1..4 is only for the PUCCH group limit – but not the limit in total   + We agree with 1...4 for the maximum number of cells scheduled by a single scheduling cell   It is not clear yet whether separate capabilities are the right direction, instead of combining most functionality in a single capability and differentiating by means of its components. |
| xiaomi | Yes, it’s better to report separately. Besides, the candidate value for total number should contain 1. |
| vivo | * + **Max number of sets of cells supported by UE in total: Candidate value set of {[1, 2, 3, 4]}**   1.not sure if the above bullet assumes that 1 set is always supported if no candidate value is reported, or if UE has to supports up to 2 sets? We think 1 should be included.  2.we are ok to have separate capabilities reporting for UL and DL, but when it comes to total number of cell sets that UE supports and configuration of cell sets per UE perspective, there is no need to have separate cell sets for UL CA and DL CA, as UL CA is a subset of DL CA. The supported number of sets by UE = the reported numbers of sets for DL |
| OPPO | Yes, (to be separated). Also agree with vivo that “1” should be added to the list. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Regarding the max number of set of cells, we agree with Nokia that 4 is the max number per PUCCH group and at most 8 can be reported as max number of sets for a UE if the UE supports two PUCCH cell groups. Note that even if a UE reports the capability for supporting more than 4 sets, at most 4 sets are configured per PUCCH group. It can be further discussed whether the total max number of sets for a UE and the max number of sets per PUCCH group can be separately reported.  In our view, it can be discussed separately from UE features for DCI format 0\_3/1\_3 monitoring and the max number of co-scheduled cells which can be reported separately between UL and DL. As per our understanding, set of cells is the framework of configuration of cells for multi-cell scheduling and hence we don’t see the need to support separate FG between UL and DL. NW can appropriately configure the set(s) of cells for UL and DL based on the reported UE capabilities of CA for UL/DL respectively, max number of co-scheduled cells within a set for UL/DL respectively and the total number of sets of cells. |
| Samsung | Agree to report a notion related to number/size of sets of cells, separately for DL and UL.  However, it is not evident that the proposed quantities well reflect the essential capability metrics. It is up to gNB how to distribute cells in different sets of cells. From UE perspective, a Rel-18 MCE UE can support scheduling on same number of cells as for Rel-17 CA/CCS (e.g., up to 8 cells from a same scheduling cell), but with fewer number of DCI formats.  So, the metric should be:   * **the total number of cells, across different sets of cells, supported to be co-scheduled from a same scheduling cell**, and/or * **the total number of cells, across different sets of cells, supported to be co-scheduled by DCI formats 1\_3 (respectively, 0\_3) from a same scheduling cell in a same slot / monitoring occasion**   Such metric can be reported separately for DL (FG 49-1/1a/1b) and UL (FG 49-2/2a/2b). |
| ZTE | First, we don’t think the first bullet is needed. There is no capability on the number of cells for cross cell scheduling for single cell scheduling in legacy. Similarly, reporting the number of sets of cells is not needed for multi-cell scheduling. For the second bullet, we can support it as separate FG. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes, DL and UL should be reported separately as commented before. |
| Intel | Separate for DL and UL. |
| CATT | Yes, report DL and UL separately. |
| Ericsson2 | OK for UL and DL to be reported separately, while we slightly prefer unified FG 49-4. |
| Moderator | Summary of companies’ view   * + Max number of sets of cells supported by UE in total: Candidate value set of {[1, 2, 3, 4]}     - Separate for DL and UL: MTK, Apple, LGE, xiaomi, OPPO, HW/HiSi, Intel, CATT, [E///]     - Common for DL and UL: vivo, DCM, [E///]     - Not necessary: ZTE     - Separate for FGs 49-1/1a/1b/2/2a/2b: QC     - Whether to separate the total max number of sets for a UE and the max number of sets per PUCCH group; Nokia/NSB, DCM     - Whether to report the total number of cells, across different sets of cells, supported to be co-scheduled from a same scheduling cell: Samsung   + Max number of sets of cells supported by UE for a same scheduling cell: Candidate value set of {[1, 2, 3, 4]}     - Separate for DL and UL: MTK, Apple, LGE, xiaomi, OPPO, ZTE, HW/HiSi, Intel, CATT, [E///]     - Common for DL and UL: vivo, DCM, [E///]     - Separate for FGs 49-1/1a/1b/2/2a/2b: QC     - Whether to report the total number of cells, across different sets of cells, supported to be co-scheduled by DCI formats 1\_3 (respectively, 0\_3) from a same scheduling cell in a same slot / monitoring occasion: Samsung   To be updated after GTW |
| Moderator | **Proposal 2-4:**   * **Following capabilities are reported separately for DCI formats 1\_3 and 0\_3**   + **Opt.1**     - **Max number of sets of cells supported by UE per PUCCH group: Candidate value set of {[2, 3, 4]}**     - **Max number of sets of cells supported by UE for a same scheduling cell: Candidate value set of {[1, 2, 3, 4]}**     - **FFS whether to report max number of sets of cells supported by UE in total (i.e., among PUCCH groups)**   + **Opt.2**     - **Max total number of cells, across different sets of cells, supported to be co-scheduled from a same scheduling cell: FFS value range**     - **Max total number of cells, across different sets of cells, supported to be co-scheduled by DCI formats 1\_3 (respectively, 0\_3) from a same scheduling cell in a same slot / monitoring occasion: FFS value range**   + **FFS whether to report the capabilities separately for SCS combinations between scheduling and scheduled cells** |
| LGE | On P2-4: Opt 1 is preferred. (by including “1” in the candidate value set for the max number of sets per PUCCH group) |
| Qualcomm | We prefer Opt.1 with the following changes. It is not clear why the default information that the UE report to the network is per PUCCH group, so suggest to swap per-UE in total and per-PUCCH-group.   * + **Opt.1**     - **Max number of sets of cells supported by UE ~~per PUCCH group~~: Candidate value set of {[1, 2, 3, 4]}**     - **Max number of sets of cells supported by UE for a same scheduling cell: Candidate value set of {[1, 2, 3, 4]}**     - **FFS whether to report max number of sets of cells supported ~~by UE in total (i.e., among~~ per PUCCH groups)** |
| MTK | We prefer Opt.1 @Qualcomm: The reason moderator uses “per PUCCH group” is due to the following RAN1 agreement in #112:  Agreement  Following is supported in Rel-18 multi-cell scheduling   * A UE can be configured one or multiple sets of cells with each set configured for multi-cell scheduling using DCI format 0\_X/1\_X. * Up to 4 sets of cells can be configured per PUCCH group. |
| Nokia, NSB | We are more leaning towards Option 1, with the following additional points for consideration:   * We think that we need clear capability signaling for the primary / secondary and for all PUCCH groups in order for the gNB to now the flexibility in operation, i.e.,   + Max number of sets of cells supported by UE for the primary PUCCH cell group: Candidate value set of {[2, 3, 4]}   + Max number of sets of cells supported by UE for the secondary PUCCH cell group: Candidate value set of {[2, 3, 4]}   + Max number of sets of cells supported by UE across PUCCH groups: Candidate value set of {[2...8]}   + Max number of sets of cells supported by UE for a same scheduling cell: Candidate value set of {[1, 2, 3, 4]} |
| Apple | We support QC’s updated version for Opt. 1 and agree that such capability should at least be reported for UE |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support Opt.1 in principle.  Regarding the FFS, we think the max. number of sets in total can be reported as well if a UE supports two PUCCH cell groups. Then, NW would configure set(s) of cells based on the reported capability on the max. number of sets in total and per PUCCH group. |
| ZTE | Option 1 is preferred if the first bullet could be removed. Alternatively, we just need to keep either the first bullet or the third bullet because the network can determine one from another one in conjunction with the number of cells that can be scheduled by a DCI format.  Then, the for the first bullet we think the candidate value 1 may not be needed because it is the default value, i.e., If the UE support multi-cell scheduling without reporting any value of the first bullet, it means it only supports one set. However, we are also fine to include it. |
| Vivo2 | If the majority prefer to have separate reporting for UL and DL, we can accept option1 to proceed, but 1 should be included in the Max number of sets of cells supported by UE per PUCCH group.  **Proposal 2-4:**   * **Following capabilities are reported separately for DCI formats 1\_3 and 0\_3**   + **Opt.1**     - **Max number of sets of cells supported by UE per PUCCH group: Candidate value set of {[1, 2, 3, 4]}**     - **Max number of sets of cells supported by UE for a same scheduling cell: Candidate value set of {[1, 2, 3, 4]}**     - **FFS whether to report max number of sets of cells supported by UE in total (i.e., among PUCCH groups)** |
| Samsung2 | We are still unclear about the benefits of an FG based on Opt.1. We would like to know how Opt.1 is combined with Proposal 2-3.  For example, if a UE reports 2 sets of cells (per PUCCH group) in Opt.1, and has reported support for co-scheduling 4 cells in a set of cells per Proposal 2-3, so a total of 8 cells, then why can’t the UE support 4 sets of cells, each with 2 cells?  In our view, the key UE capability is for a number of co-schedulable cells, similar to legacy cross-carrier scheduling, and not the certain categorization and grouping which can be up to the gNB configuration. This is aligned with the following FFS.  **Agreement (RAN1#110bis-e)**  Confirm the following working assumption reached in RAN1#110 meeting.  **Working Assumption**   * The maximum number of co-scheduled cells by a DCI format 1\_X in Rel-18 is 4. * The maximum number of co-scheduled cells by a DCI format 0\_X in Rel-18 is 4. * FFS: The maximum number of configurable cells for co-scheduling   For progress, suggest the following revision:   * + **Opt.1**     - **Max number of sets of cells supported by UE per PUCCH group: Candidate value set of {[1, 2, 3, 4]}**     - **Max number of sets of cells supported by UE for a same scheduling cell: Candidate value set of {[1, 2, 3, 4]}**     - **Max total number of cells, across different sets of cells, supported by UE per PUCCH group: Candidate value set of {[2, 3, …, 16]}**     - **Max total number of cells, across different sets of cells, supported by UE for a same scheduling cell: Candidate value set of {[2, 3, …, 8]}**     - **FFS whether to report max number of sets of cells supported by UE in total (i.e., among PUCCH groups)**     Also, similar to Proposal 2-3, suggest to clarify that the above are not separate FGs, rather they are components of the main FGs 49-1/1a/1b and 49-2/2a/2b, respectively. |
| Intel | We are generally fine with Opt. 1 with the update from QC update. |
| Moderator | Most companies are fine with Opt1 and some companies showed flexibility to go with Opt1 with some update  Candidate value “1” was not included since original FGs 49-1/1a/1b and 49-2/2a/2b include the case at least 1 is supported. But it may be unclear from the proposal so better to include “1” to have common understanding that least 1 is supported.  Proposal is updated accordingly.  **Proposal 2-4:**   * **Following capabilities are reported separately for DCI formats 1\_3 and 0\_3 as a component of FGs 49-1/1a/1b and 49-2/2a/2b**   + **~~Opt.1~~**     - **Max number of sets of cells supported by UE per PUCCH group: Candidate value set of {[1, 2, 3, 4]}**       * **FFS whether to separately report for primary and secondary PUCCH cell groups**     - **FFS: Max total number of cells, across different sets of cells, supported by UE per PUCCH group: Candidate value set of {[2, 3, …, 16]}**     - **Max number of sets of cells supported by UE for a same scheduling cell: Candidate value set of {[1, 2, 3, 4]}**     - **FFS: Max total number of cells, across different sets of cells, supported by UE for a same scheduling cell: Candidate value set of {[2, 3, …, 8]}**     - **FFS whether to report max number of sets of cells supported by UE in total (i.e., among PUCCH groups)**   + **~~Opt.2~~**     - **~~Max total number of cells, across different sets of cells, supported to be co-scheduled from a same scheduling cell: FFS value range~~**     - **~~Max total number of cells, across different sets of cells, supported to be co-scheduled by DCI formats 1\_3 (respectively, 0\_3) from a same scheduling cell in a same slot / monitoring occasion: FFS value range~~**   + **FFS whether to report the capabilities separately for SCS combinations between scheduling and scheduled cells** |
| Qualcomm | We acknowledge that RAN1 agreed to support up to 4 sets per PUCCH-group. However we are reluctant to make a quick agreement on the per PUCCH group capability.  The case where both (1) two PUCCH groups and (2) multi-cell scheduling on one or both PUCCH groups are configured is supposed to have many (perhaps 3 or more) carriers/bands. For such scenario, the UE reports one or multiple combination(s) of carrier-type(s) in the primary PUCCH group and carrier-type(s) in the secondary PUCCH group, separately, per BC (see FG22-7/7a/7b/7c). Then it is unclear what does the number of sets of cells per PUCCH group mean. Is it common for all the combinations of the primary PUCCH group and/or secondary PUCCH group, or is it reported per primary/secondary PUCCH group per combination? We do not think common value does not make sense.  So, we still prefer to focus on per-scheduling-cell or per-UE in case two PUCCH groups are NOT configured for now.   * + **Opt.1**     - **Max number of sets of cells supported by UE when two PUCCH groups are not configured ~~per PUCCH group~~: Candidate value set of {[1, 2, 3, 4]}**     - **Max number of sets of cells supported by UE for a same scheduling cell: Candidate value set of {[1, 2, 3, 4]}**     - **FFS whether/how to report max number of sets of cells supported ~~by UE in total (i.e., among~~ on primary and secondary PUCCH groups)** |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support this Proposal 2-4.  Regarding the max number of sets when a UE supports two PUCCH cell group, we don’t see the need for separate capability reporting between primary and secondary PUCCH cell group. More specifically, if a UE supports two PUCCH cell group, the UE supports doubled value of max number of sets per PUCCH group in total. If this reporting framework is concerned, the max value of sets in total across PUCCH groups can be reported. Therefore, we are fine to remove “**FFS whether to separately report for primary and secondary PUCCH cell groups”**. |
| Vivo3 | 1ST FFS: OK  If the maximum number of cell sets for two PUCCH groups are separately reported, then we don’t see the need of reporting Max number of sets of cells supported by UE among two PUCCH groups, the total number of cell sets is the summation of two values reported for each PUCCH group. We also don’t see the FFS on number of cells across different cell sets are needed.  We support FL’s proposal without the 3 FFS  **Proposal 2-4:**   * **Following capabilities are reported separately for DCI formats 1\_3 and 0\_3 as a component of FGs 49-1/1a/1b and 49-2/2a/2b**   + **~~Opt.1~~**     - **Max number of sets of cells supported by UE per PUCCH group: Candidate value set of {[1, 2, 3, 4]}**       * **FFS whether to separately report for primary and secondary PUCCH cell groups**     - **~~FFS: Max total number of cells, across different sets of cells, supported by UE per PUCCH group: Candidate value set of {[2, 3, …, 16]}~~**     - **Max number of sets of cells supported by UE for a same scheduling cell: Candidate value set of {[1, 2, 3, 4]}**     - **~~FFS: Max total number of cells, across different sets of cells, supported by UE for a same scheduling cell: Candidate value set of {[2, 3, …, 8]}~~**     - **~~FFS whether to report max number of sets of cells supported by UE in total (i.e., among PUCCH groups)~~**   + **~~Opt.2~~**     - **~~Max total number of cells, across different sets of cells, supported to be co-scheduled from a same scheduling cell: FFS value range~~**     - **~~Max total number of cells, across different sets of cells, supported to be co-scheduled by DCI formats 1\_3 (respectively, 0\_3) from a same scheduling cell in a same slot / monitoring occasion: FFS value range~~**   + **FFS whether to report the capabilities separately for SCS combinations between scheduling and scheduled cells** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | The first bullet and the first FFS seems somehow conflict? The main bullet says the reported value if per PUCCH group, which means same value for the two PUCCH group, then what is the point to do separately report for primary and secondary PUCCH cell groups, separately reporting with the same value? Sorry I may miss some point here. Or maybe we should revise as below?   * + - **Max number of sets of cells supported by UE ~~per~~ for a PUCCH group: Candidate value set of {[1, 2, 3, 4]}**       * **FFS whether to separately report for primary and secondary PUCCH cell groups**   We are fine with other bullets in proposal 2-4, even we think some of the FFS not needed, but since it is FFS we are fine. |
| LGE | We share the similar view with vivo that there doesn’t seem to be need of reporting the max number of sets by UE or the max number of cell across sets.  So, we are fine with the vivo’ updated proposal in above. |
| Apple | Share similar view as QC and are fine with QC’s updated proposal |
| ZTE | We are fine this proposal by removing all the FFS. Reporting the total number is not needed. It can be inferred by the number of sets and the number of cells in a set. |
| Samsung3 | Support from Proposal 2-4 the Moderator and OK with change from HW.  If the second and third FFS points are taken out, the UE would under-report the values for number of sets or number of cells in the set. However, if the metrics in the second and third FFS point are reported by the UE, the UE can report the number of sets and the number of cells in the set with less restriction, leaving flexibility for the gNB to decide on how to configure the cells sets/combinations.  For example, as mentioned in our previous response, why couldn’t a UE support 4 sets of cells each having 2 cells (so a total of 8 cells) if the UE reports support for 2 sets and for 4 cells in a set (again a total of 8 cells)? When including the second and third FFS, such UE can report support for 4 sets of cells and 4 cells in each set and a max of 8 cells in total, knowing it will never be configured a combination that it cannot support.  Would like to hear technical reason from companies that prefer to exclude these metrics. |
| Qualcomm | We wonder if somebody can elaborate how the candidate value “per PUCCH group” works if the UE indicates one or multiple combinations of PUCCH-grouping via FG22-7/7a/7b/7c for the BC that the UE indicates FG52-1/1a/1b/2/2a/2b. Whichever option is adopted in Proposal 2-2b-2/3, we think the “per PUCCH-group” report should be for each PUCCH group per combination in Proposal 2-2b-2/3.  Also, we wonder why candidate value 0 is not included. Does it means that if a UE indicate support of dual PUCCH-groups and the value 1 for ‘Max number of sets of cells supported by UE per PUCCH group’, the UE shall be able to handle two sets for two PUCCH groups? It is not clear why a UE is not allowed to indicate support of one set when two PUCCH-groups are configured. |

**Question 2-5:**

* **Regarding the component 6 in FGs 49-1/1a/1b and FG 49-5, companies are encouraged to provide views on which HARQ-ACK CB(s) should be included as a component of FGs 49-1/1a/1b**
  + Type 1 CB
    - As a component of FG49-1/1a/1b: vivo, DOCOMO
    - Report either or both: QC
  + Type 2 CB
    - As separate FG: vivo
    - As a component of FG49-1/1a/1b: OPPO
    - Report either or both: QC
    - FFS: DOCOMO

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Qualcomm | Our first preference is to let UE to report either or both. We are also fine to have a separate FG for Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook. |
| MTK | Same view as Qualcomm. |
| Apple | Prefer to have separate FG for type 1 CB and type 2 CB |
| LGE | Both type 1 and type 2 are as component of FG49-1/1a/1b or separate FG. |
| Nokia/NSB | We think that a UE supporting the PDSCH multi-cell scheduling (i.e. 1\_3) should support Type 1 and Type 2 HARQ-ACK codebook. Limiting the baseline support to Type 1 HARQ-ACK codebook only seems to be unnecessarily restrictive (and limiting the feature introduction) |
| Xiaomi | Prefer to have separate FG as type-2 CB is further enhanced for MC while type-1 CB is kept the same as legacy. |
| vivo | We prefer to have separate FG for type-2 CB as type-2 CB introduces a lot of spec changes according to 213 CR while type-1 CB is kept the same as legacy. Additionally, as type-1 is supported only for the case where co-scheduled cells by a DCI format 1\_X have same SCS/carrier type/duplex mode in Rel-18.  This restriction should be reflected in the FG   1. HARQ feedback based on Type 1 HARQ codebook when all co-scheduled cells have same SCS/carrier type (licensed or unlicensed, FR1 or FR2-1 or FR2-2)/duplex mode(FDD or TDD)   **Updated proposal 4.2:**   * Enhanced Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook is not supported for the multi-cell PUSCH/PDSCH scheduling in Rel-18. * Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook is supported only for the case where co-scheduled cells by a DCI format 1\_X have same SCS/carrier type/duplex mode in Rel-18.   + Additional restriction(s) can be discussed in RAN1 |
| NTT DOCOMO | At least one of type 1 or type 2 codebook should be supported as component of FG49-1/1a/1b. We think at least type 1 codebook can be considered as basic feature for multi-cell PDSCH scheduling but also fine to include type 2 codebook in basic feature as well. |
| Samsung | Support to have Type-1 CB as a component of FGs 49-1/1a/1b, since Type-1 CB for MC-DCI is same as legacy operation, based on FG 4-11 which is mandatory. For Type-2 CB, there are some changes to the legacy operation (FG 4-10), so OK to report the UE support for Type-2 CB as a value of a separate component of FG 49-1/1a/1b or as a separate FG. |
| ZTE | We are fine to include the HARQ codebook as a component. But we don’t think the UE can report something on HARQ feedback. The HARQ feedback is the basic feature for downlink scheduling. If the UE does not support HARQ feedback, then the downlink scheduling cannot work. The UE should support the HARQ feedback if it supports multi-cell scheduling for downlink. It should be noted, for multi-PDSCH scheduling, the UE does not report anything for HARQ feedback even though both Type-1 and Type-2 codebook are enhanced for multi-PDSCH scheduling. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We prefer to have separate FG for type 2 HARQ-ACK codebook and take type 1 as the basic one, since no enhancement on type 1 HARQ-ACK codebook. |
| Intel | One of Type 1 or Type 2 codebook is included as component of FG49-1/1a/1b |
| CATT | We think Type-1 CB can be a component of FG49-1/1a/1b. |
| Ericsson2 | Prefer UE supports Type 2 CB in basic FG. |
| Moderator | Summary of companies’ view   * + Type 1 CB     - As separate FG: Apple, LGE     - As a component of FG49-1/1a/1b: vivo, DOCOMO, LGE, Nokia/NSB, Xiaomi, Samsung, ZTE, HW/HiSi, [Intel], CATT     - Report either or both: QC, MTK   + Type 2 CB     - As separate FG: vivo, [QC], [MTK], Apple, LGE, Xiaomi, Samsung, HW/HiSi     - As a component of FG49-1/1a/1b: OPPO, LGE, Nokia/NSB, [DCM], ZTE, [Intel], E///     - Report either or both: QC, MTK     - FFS: DOCOMO   **Proposal 2-5:**   * **Component 6 in FGs 49-1/1a/1b is kept, i.e., Type 1 HARQ-ACK CB is included as a component of FGs 49-1/1a/1b**   + **FFS whether Type 2 HARQ-ACK CB is introduced as a separate FG 49-5 or as a component of FGs 49-1/1a/1b** |
| LGE | On P2-5: Not supportive to the proposal. (i.e., differentiation of two CB types is not preferred/desirable since those are complementary to each other with trade-off between DCI overhead and UCI overhead)  It is preferred/desirable that both two CB types are included as component of FGs 49-1/1a/1b, or both are introduced as separate FGs. |
| Qualcomm | OK with the Proposal 2-5 |
| MTK | Fine with Proposal 2-5 |
| Nokia, NSB | We are not very comfortable with the proposal. It is clear that many companies see the need to have type 2 HARQ codebook as part of the basic functionality. While this is not forbidden by the current proposal, it is not really bringing us much forward as the real debate is simply postponed as FFS. |
| Apple | We can live with Proposal 2-5 |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support this proposal. We are also fine to include Type-2 CB as a component of FGs 49-1/1a/1b. |
| ZTE | We share the same view with Nokia that it is better to go further considering that many companies believe Type-2 CB can be a component. This is also inline with the UE feature for multi-PDSCH scheduling. It is noted that Type-2 codebook for multi-PDSCH scheduling is reused for multi-cell scheduling with just adaptive modification. |
| Vivo2 | OK with the Proposal 2-5. It is worth noting that the support of HARQ-ACK for Multiple PDSCH scheduling by single DCI for 120kHz in FR2-2 or FR2-1 are separately reported because both of the CBs require enhancement on the HARQ codebook CB generation procedure. According to the 213 CR for MCE, type1 CB for MCE is almost the same as legacy while a new procedure is introduced for type2 CB  ***multiPDSCH-SingleDCI-FR2-1-SCS-120kHz-r17***  Indicates whether the UE supports multi-PDSCH scheduling by single DCI for the operation with 120kHz SCS in FR2-1 and HARQ enhancements for both type 1 and type 2 HARQ codebook.  ***multiPDSCH-SingleDCI-FR2-2-SCS-120kHz-r17***  Indicates whether the UE supports multi-PDSCH scheduling by single DCI for the operation with 120 kHz SCS in FR2-2 and HARQ enhancements for both type 1 and type 2 HARQ codebook. |
| Samsung | OK with Proposal 2-5. Also, OK to include Type-2 as a component of 49-1/1a/1b. |
| Intel | We share similar view as Nokia and ZTE that both should be basic component. |
| Moderator | Some companies do not support the proposal because of the FFS part. As you can see from the input, there are still divergent views on Type-2 CB and hence let’s try to agree on Type-1 at first and keep the door open for Type 2 for now. To move forward, I added another question on Type-2  **Proposal 2-5:**   * **Component 6 in FGs 49-1/1a/1b is kept, i.e., Type 1 HARQ-ACK CB is included as a component of FGs 49-1/1a/1b**   + **FFS whether Type 2 HARQ-ACK CB is introduced as a separate FG 49-5 or as a component of FGs 49-1/1a/1b**   **Question 2-5-1:**   * **Companies are encouraged to provide views on which options you have strong concern for the support of Type 2 HARQ-ACK CB**   + **Opt1: Type 2 HARQ-ACK CB is included as a component of FGs 49-1/1a/1b**   + **Opt2: Type 2 HARQ-ACK CB is introduced as a separate FG 49-5** |
| Qualcomm | Proposal 2-5: We are OK  Question 2-5-1: Support Opt. 2. We are not OK with Opt. 1 if “included as a component” means the component is mandatory component of FGs 49-1/1a/1b. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We have no strong concern on both Opt.1 and Opt.2, while prefer Opt.1. |
| Vivo3 | **Proposal 2-5:** agree  **Question 2-5-1:** we believe that Option 2 would be the more favorable choice as Type2 CB adds UE complexity compared to Type1. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | 1. Proposal 2-5: We are OK  2. Question 2-5-1: We support option 2, just same as the existing system that separate capabilities are supported for type 1 and type 2. |
| LGE | Opt 1 is preferred since both two CB types have been supported as essential features from Rel-15, and it would be inefficient if legacy DCI based scheduling for the cells not configured with multi-cell scheduling, cannot be configured with Type-2 CB just due to configuration of multi-cell scheduling for other cells.  Moreover, we don’t see the complexity issue compared to Type-2 CB in case of Rel-17 multi-PDSCH scheduling. |
| Apple | Proposal 2-5: Fine  Question 2-5-1: We support Opt2 and not OK with Opt1 |
| ZTE | We are fine with Proposal 2-5.  For Question 2-5-1, we have strong concern on Option 2 because Option 2 may have impact to the legacy scheduling. If we go with Option 2, it may lead to the Type-2 codebook cannot be configured even for legacy DCI scheduling in the case of multi-cell scheduling if the UE does not support Type-2 codebook and multi-cell scheduling. Currently, the Type-2 codebook is similar as Rel-15, i.e., there are two sub-codebooks and the sub-codebook is very similar as the sub-codebook for CBG in Rel-15. We don’t understand why Type-2 codebook needs separate report. |
| Samsung3 | OK with proposal 2-5.  Prefer Opt-1, but can be OK with Opt-2. |

**Question 2-6:**

* **Regarding the component 7 in FGs 49-1/1a/1b and 49-2/2a/2b and FG 49-6, companies are encouraged to provide views on which co-scheduled cell indication scheme(s) should be included as a component of FGs 49-1/1a/1b and 49-2/2a/2b.**
  + Based on FDRA field
    - As a component of FGs 49-1/1a/1b and 49-2/2a/2b: DOCOMO, E///,
    - As separate FG: vivo, Nokia/NSB, Samsung, Apple
    - Report either or both: QC
  + based on co-scheduled cell indicator field
    - As a component of FGs 49-1/1a/1b and 49-2/2a/2b: vivo, Samsung
    - As separate FG: Apple, DOCOMO
    - Report either or both: QC

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Qualcomm | Our first preference is to let UE to report either or both. However, if we have to select one as a default component, we believe it should be FDRA field based. The reason is that we consider the primary usecase of multi-cell scheduling is to schedule up to all the cells in a set of cells. For this case, the option based on the co-scheduled cell indicator field rather increases the overhead and hence there is no benefit compared to FDRA based. In addition, the option for co-scheduled cell indicator field requires handling of floating Type-2 fields in a DCI payload, which may cause IOT issues. Therefore, we do not agree to include co-scheduled cell indicator field as a component of FGs 49-1/1a/1b and 49-2/2a/2b. |
| MTK | Same view as QC. **Using co-scheduled cell indicator field** may **require UE to do dynamic DCI parsing in one set**, as shown below (figure courtesy of Qualcomm), which increase UE computation complexity; hence, “based on co-scheduled cell indicator field” should be optional and not a default component. |
| Apple | We are also fine to have FDRA as a component of FGs 49-1/1a/1b and 49-2/2a/2b and co-scheduled cell indicator field as separate FG |
| LGE | We are fine with separate FG (although our preference is to have co-scheduled cell indicator field as a component of FGs 49-1/1a/1b and 49-2/2a/2b). |
| Nokia/NSB | If we need a separate UE capability, then there should be separate UE capabilities for both. And a UE supporting the 0\_3 and/or 1\_3 operation should indicate at least one of them. |
| Xiaomi | We are fine to have FDRA based co-scheduled cell indication in FG 49-1/1a/1b and 49-2/2a/2b. |
| vivo | For the co-scheduled cell indicator field, the RRC provides semi-static configurations for all cell combinations. Once the configurations are provided, the UE can determine the field for each combination, similar to how the UE handles single-cell scheduling DCI for different cells in legacy CCS. Thus, this should not add significant complexity, and it is preferable to FDRA, which often incurs unnecessarily large DCI sizes.  Having said that, we are ok if both schemes can be reported separately by the UE, and we are ok to leave it up to the UE to report which one or both they can support. |
| OPPO | Our preference is to not have any by-default, and just to allow UE to report either or both.  If the discussion direction is going to have a by-default component, we would like to ask RAN1 to firstly complete the functional behaviors within FDRA-based indication, since so far it is not clear how the payload size is derived under FDRA-based solution. It is premature to lock on a by-default component whose functional behavior is not clearly finalized yet. |
| NTT DOCOMO | At least one of FDRA field-based or co-scheduled cell indicator field-based indication should be supported as component of FG49-1/1a/1b. In our view, co-scheduled cell indicator field-based indication would increase the complexity for type-2 field interpretation on UE and even for schedular. The co-scheduled cell indicator field-based indication is beneficial only when the combinations of co-scheduled cell configuration does not include the case where all the cell in a set is co-scheduled, and we think it is corner case. Thus, it is reasonable to support at least FDRA field-based indication as basic feature and co-scheduled cell indicator field-based indication can be supported by separate FG. |
| Samsung | Don’t support FDRA-based as default capability, as it increases DCI overhead unnecessarily. Support table-based indication as default capability, which is beneficial especially for UL case, and FDRA-based indication can be a separate capability.  As compromise, OK to have a component with values {viaTable, viaFDRA, [both]} included in FG 49-1/1a/1b and 49-2/2a/2b. |
| ZTE | We slightly prefer that no component is needed since co-scheduling indication is the basic function of multi-cell scheduling. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We prefer to leave it to UE to report either or both, considering different braches have different pros and cons. For example, table based may help reduce the DCI size, while FDRA based seems simpler in some aspects, e.g. from DCI size determination perspective. |
| Intel | We support carrier indication table as a default capability. |
| CATT | We prefer to include ‘based co-scheduled cell indicator field’ as a component of FGs 49-1/1a/1b and 49-2/2a/2b. |
| Ericsson2 | Support FDRA as part of basic FGs. Separate FG can be introduced for co-scheduled cell indication field. |
| Moderator | Summary of companies’ view   * + Based on FDRA field     - As a component of FGs 49-1/1a/1b and 49-2/2a/2b: DOCOMO, E///, [QC], [MTK], Apple, LGE, Xiaomi, ZTE     - As separate FG: vivo, Samsung,     - Report either or both: QC, MTK, Nokia/NSB, vivo, [Samsung], HW/HiSi   + based on co-scheduled cell indicator field     - As a component of FGs 49-1/1a/1b and 49-2/2a/2b: vivo, Samsung, LGE, ZTE, Intel, CATT     - As separate FG: Apple, DOCOMO, [LGE], E///     - Report either or both: QC, MTK, Nokia/NSB, vivo, [Samsung], HW/HiSi   **Proposal 2-6:**   * **Down select from one of the following:**   + **Opt1:**     - **Component 7 in FGs 49-1/1a/1b and 49-2/2a/2b is kept, i.e., co-scheduled cell indication scheme based on FDRA field is included as a component of FGs 49-1/1a/1b and 49-2/2a/2b**     - **FG 49-6 is kept, i.e., co-scheduled cell indication scheme based on co-scheduled cell indicator field is introduced as a separate FG**   + **Opt2:**     - **Following is introduced as a component of FGs 49-1/1a/1b and 49-2/2a/2b**       * **Supported co-scheduled cell indication schemes: Candidate value set of {FDRA field based, co-scheduled cell indicator field based, both}** |
| LGE | On P2-6: Opt 2 is preferred. |
| Qualcomm | We are OK with either option. We understand that from operator/network point of view, it is much useful if there is a default option that all the UEs supporting the FG is supposed to support. Having said that, Opt. 1 makes sense and is a good option to go.  If there is a concern on Opt.1 still, another option that could potentially be a compromise could be:   * + **Opt2x:**     - **Following is introduced as a component of FGs 49-1/1a/1b and 49-2/2a/2b**       * **Supported co-scheduled cell indication schemes: Candidate value set of {FDRA field based, FDRA field based and co-scheduled cell indicator field based~~, both~~}**   Note sure if this is acceptable. |
| MTK | We are OK with either option. Also fine with Qualcomm’s Opt2x. |
| Nokia, NSB | We prefer the Option 2 as described by the moderator |
| Apple | We are fine with either option |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support Opt.1 or Opt2x by Qualcomm. As Qualcomm commented, we have a concern with Opt.2 which may increase the complexity on schedular. |
| ZTE | We prefer Option 2 from moderator. |
| Vivo2 | We prefer the Option 2 as from the moderator, not ok with opt2x from QC as they impose a mandatory FDRA based scheme. |
| Samsung2 | Don’t support Option 1 – the FDRA-based method was agreed in RAN1 as part of a compromise, despite inefficiency and DCI overhead, so cannot be set as the default method. Not OK with Option 2x, as it is essentially the same as Option 1.  OK with Option 2 from the Moderator as a compromise that is aligned with the RAN1 agreement. |
| Intel | We prefer Option 2. |
| Moderator | Summary of companies’ view   * + Opt1: DCM   + Opt2: LGE, Nokia/NSB, ZTE, vivo, Samsung, Intel   + Opt2x: QC, DCM   Opt2x seems almost same as Opt1 (i.e. FDRA field based is mandatory, co-scheduled cell indicator field based is optional). Given more companies support Opt2, let’s take it.  **Proposal 2-6:**   * **~~Down select from one of the following:~~**   + **~~Opt1:~~**     - **~~Component 7 in FGs 49-1/1a/1b and 49-2/2a/2b is kept, i.e., co-scheduled cell indication scheme based on FDRA field is included as a component of FGs 49-1/1a/1b and 49-2/2a/2b~~**     - **~~FG 49-6 is kept, i.e., co-scheduled cell indication scheme based on co-scheduled cell indicator field is introduced as a separate FG~~**   + **~~Opt2:~~**     - **Following is introduced as a component of FGs 49-1/1a/1b and 49-2/2a/2b**       * **Supported co-scheduled cell indication schemes: Candidate value set of {FDRA field based, co-scheduled cell indicator field based, both}** |
| Qualcomm | We support Proposal 2-6. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We still prefer to support option 1. For option 2, as we commented before, we have a concern to increase the schedular complexity if there is no basic operation on co-scheduled cell indication. Therefore, we prefer to decide the default capability of co-scheduled cell indication from either FDRA-based indication or table-based indication.  We do understand the benefit provided by the table-based co-scheduled cell indication that it can optimize the size of Type-2 field for a specific case that a combination of all the cells is not included in the table while we think this is corner case.  However, we believe that the default capability should be decided as the simplest way from both UE and NW perspective. In that sense, FDRA-based indication is preferable which does not require the repurposing of Type-2 field based on actually co-scheduled cells while it is required for table-based indication. Furthermore, for table-based co-scheduled cell indication, it requires co-scheduled cell indicator in MC DCI while FDRA field is always present in MC DCI and co-scheduled cell indicator is omitted for FDRA-based indication.  Based on the discussion so far, it is unclear for us what is the concern on supporting FDRA-based indication by default, thus we would like to ask companies supporting only option 2 what is the strong concern on it. |
| Vivo3 | Support FL’s proposal |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are fine with either option 1 or option 2, option 1 is friendly from gNB implementation perspective, while option 2 is more flexible from UE implementation perspective. |
| LGE | Fine with the proposal. |
| Apple | Support proposal 2-6 |
| ZTE | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Samsung3 | OK with the updated proposal 2-6 from Moderator.  Regarding the comments from DCM, DCI saving with the table-based method can be significant, especially for the UL case. The DCI will include at most 4 bits for the co-scheduled cell indicator, but will save couple/few tens of bits for Type-2 fields (FDRA, MCD, HPN, etc.). Also, RAN1 already excluded any repurposing, so none of the fields, including FDRA, are repurposed in MC-DCI. |
| Qualcomm | @ DOCOMO  The comment technically makes sense, and we are also OK with Opt.1, if many infra/operators support the statement.  @ Samsung3  We do not think co-scheduled cells indicator can save the overhead in typical scenario – rather, it increases. The reason why network configures MC-DCI for a set is it wants to schedule the cells in the set simultaneously. Co-scheduled cells indicator can save the bits only if the MC-DCI is configured such that it does not schedule all the cells in the set. |

**Question 2-7:**

* **Regarding FGs 49-1/1a/1b and 49-2/2a/2b, companies are encouraged to provide views on whether to add following restrictions.**
  + Number of unicast DCI to process for a set of cells for multi-cell PDSCH scheduling
    - From lower SCS to higher SCS, or same SCS
      * One unicast DCI per slot of scheduling cell for a set of cells configured for multi-cell PDSCH scheduling for FDD/TDD scheduling cell
    - From higher SCS to lower SCS
      * One unicast DCI per N consecutive slots of scheduling cell for a set of cells configured for multi-cell PDSCH scheduling for FDD/TDD scheduling cell, where:
        + N = 2 for (30, 15)
        + N = 4 for (60, 15), (120, 30)
        + N = 8 for (120, 15)
  + Number of unicast DCI to process for a set of cells for multi-cell PUSCH scheduling
    - From lower SCS to higher SCS, or same SCS
      * One unicast DCI per slot of scheduling cell for a set of cells configured for multi-cell PUSCH scheduling for FDD scheduling cell
      * Two unicast DCIs per slot of scheduling cell for a set of cells configured for multi-cell PUSCH scheduling for TDD scheduling cell
    - From higher SCS to lower SCS
      * One unicast DCI per N consecutive slots of scheduling cell for a set of cells configured for multi-cell PUSCH scheduling for FDD scheduling cell, and
      * Two unicast DCIs per N consecutive slots of scheduling cell for a set of cells configured for multi-cell PUSCH scheduling for TDD scheduling cell, where:
        + N = 2 for (30, 15)
        + N = 4 for (60, 15), (120, 30)
        + N = 8 for (120, 15)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Qualcomm | Yes, this is an important clarification. Without this, it is unclear how many unicast DCIs a UE may need to process per PDCCH monitoring. The number should not be dependent on the number of scheduled cells, since DCI 0\_3/1\_3 can schedule arbitral number of cells in a set (up to the max number). Therefore, we think it should be “per set of cells”. |
| MTK | Yes, same view as Qualcomm. |
| Apple | Yes, we support the addition of such restrictions i.e., to limit the number of unicast DCI for a set of cells. |
| LGE | Yes, we are open to consider such restrictions. |
| Nokia/NSB | The same limitations as for the related cross-carrier scheduling could be applied (as we agreed to use the cross-carrier scheduling framework). But we are not sure if we need to spell all of those out specifically (could be sufficient in 38.213). |
| Xiaomi | Yes, we agree with Qualcomm. |
| vivo | Need clarification  1.‘unicast DCI’ in the proposal refers to mc-DCI only, or includes both mc-DCI and sc-DCI if sc-DCI is additionally configured for the reference cell?  If it refers to mc-DCI only, suggest replacing ‘unicast DCI’ by ‘DCI format 1\_3/0\_3’. One understanding is that when UE reports both legacy DCI processing capability ***crossCarrierSchedulingDL-DiffSCS-r16*** (e.g., one unicast DCI per N slots) for the reference cell in a cell set and the above UE capabilities for a cell set (e.g., one unicast mc-DCI per N slots) for DL scheduling, and N=2, UE can process one unicast sc-DCI for the reference cell and one mc-DCI per 2 consecutive scheduling CC slot per reference cell for DL scheduling. Or does it mean that UE can process up to one unicast DCI per 2 consecutive scheduling CC slot per reference cell for DL scheduling, and the unicast DCI can be a mc-DCI or a sc-DCI.Which understanding is correct?  ***crossCarrierSchedulingDL-DiffSCS-r16***  Indicates the UE supports cross carrier scheduling for the different numerologies with carrier indicator field (CIF) in DL carrier aggregation where numerologies for the scheduling CC and scheduled CC are different.  Value *low-to-hig*h indicates UE supports scheduling CC of lower SCS to scheduled CC of higher SCS;  Value *high-to-low* indicates UE supports scheduling CC of higher SCS to scheduled CC of lower SCS;  Value *both* indicates UE supports both scheduling CC of lower SCS to scheduled CC of higher SCS and scheduling CC of higher SCS to scheduled CC of lower SCS.  NOTE 1: Following components are applicable to cross carrier scheduling from lower SCS to higher SCS when the UE reports this feature:  - Processing one unicast DCI scheduling DL per scheduling CC slot per scheduled CC for FDD scheduling CC  - Processing one unicast DCI scheduling DL per scheduling CC slot per scheduled CC for TDD scheduling CC  NOTE 2: Following components are applicable to cross carrier scheduling from higher SCS to lower SCS when the UE reports this feature:  - Processing one unicast DCI scheduling DL per N consecutive scheduling CC slot per scheduled CC for FDD scheduling CC  - Processing one unicast DCI scheduling DL per N consecutive scheduling CC slot per scheduled CC for TDD scheduling CC  - N is based on pair of (scheduling CC SCS, scheduled CC SCS): N=2 for (30,15), (60,30), (120,60) and N=4 for (60,5), (120,30), N = 8 for (120,15)  2. Not sure why (60,30), (120,60) are not included for N=2 |
| OPPO | Yes, in principle. But clarification as asked by vivo can help. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We are fine to apply the limitation on the number of unicast DCI for multi-cell scheduling DCI per set of cells. |
| Samsung | Open to discuss such capability. As mentioned in our response to Question 2-4, such restrictions are more meaningful than introducing restrictions on a number/size of sets of cells. |
| ZTE | We don’t think this report is needed. The BD/CCE budget is counted in the reference cell. The gNB just check the legacy BD/CCE capability reported by the UE. It is also noted the BD/CCE budget is not related to DCI formats for unicast. In addition, if the UE report such capability, how to understand this capability. Which scheduled cell capability is it? |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | The clarification is needed. |
| Intel | Reasonable to consider such restriction, e.g., similar as FR2-2. |
| Ericsson2 | In principle OK, but note this leads to significantly reduced tput for the low SCS scheduling high SCS case((for example, for 30 kHz scheduling cell and 120 kHz scheduled cells, current FGs would allow scheduling on only one of four 120 kHz slots from a 30 kHz scheduling cell). So, another FG with larger limits should also be supported (like FG 18-5c/5d). Example component text below for DL.  *Processing up to X unicast DCI scheduling for DL per set of cells*  *- X is based on pair of (scheduling CC SCS, SCS of the set of cells):*  *- Candidate value(s) of X*  *- X={1,2,4} for (15,120), (15,60), (30,120) and X={2} for (15,30), (30,60), (60,120 kHz)*  *- X applies per slot of scheduling CC* |
| Moderator | To be updated after GTW |
| Moderator | Based on the comments, following proposal is made  **Proposal 2-7:**   * **Following restrictions are added in FG 49-1.**   + **Number of unicast DCI to process for a set of cells for multi-cell PDSCH scheduling**     - **From lower SCS to higher SCS, or same SCS**        * **One unicast DCI per slot of scheduling cell for a set of cells configured for multi-cell PDSCH scheduling for FDD/TDD scheduling cell**     - **From higher SCS to lower SCS**       * **One unicast DCI per N consecutive slots of scheduling cell for a set of cells configured for multi-cell PDSCH scheduling for FDD/TDD scheduling cell, where:**         + **N = 2 for (30, 15)**         + **N = 4 for (60, 15), (120, 30)**         + **N = 8 for (120, 15)** * **Following restrictions are added in FG 49-2.**   + **Number of unicast DCI to process for a set of cells for multi-cell PUSCH scheduling**     - **From lower SCS to higher SCS, or same SCS**       * **One unicast DCI per slot of scheduling cell for a set of cells configured for multi-cell PUSCH scheduling for FDD scheduling cell**       * **Two unicast DCIs per slot of scheduling cell for a set of cells configured for multi-cell PUSCH scheduling for TDD scheduling cell**     - **From higher SCS to lower SCS**       * **One unicast DCI per N consecutive slots of scheduling cell for a set of cells configured for multi-cell PUSCH scheduling for FDD scheduling cell, and**       * **Two unicast DCIs per N consecutive slots of scheduling cell for a set of cells configured for multi-cell PUSCH scheduling for TDD scheduling cell, where:**         + **N = 2 for (30, 15)**         + **N = 4 for (60, 15), (120, 30)**         + **N = 8 for (120, 15)** * **FFS whether to introduce advanced capability for the number of unicast DCI to process for a set of cells**   Proponent (Qualcomm) is also encouraged to reply to the questions from vivo and ZTE. |
| Qualcomm | Support the proposal with updating the main bullets as:  “**Following restrictions are added in FG 49-1/1a/1b**” and “**Following restrictions are added in FG 49-2/2a/2b**”.  @ Ericsson  Understand, we are fine to consider another advanced FG(s) that supports larger limits of the number of unicast DCIs.  @ vivo  ‘Unicast DCI’ here is any unicast DCI including MC-DCI and SC-DCI for the set of cells. The whole point of this restriction is to allow a UE to know, before decoding PDCCH, how many DCI format(s) that schedules unicast data on the set of cells the UE should expect. Currently, for each scheduled cell, a UE does not need to expect more than 1 (or 2 for some case) unicast DCI at a PDCCH MO. At the basic UE FG, we need the same thing.  Agree, N=2 can include (60, 30) and (120, 60).  @ ZTE  We don’t understand the question. We have the same restriction already in legacy releases, even in FG 3-1. |
| MTK | Fine with Proposal 2-7. |
| Nokia, NSB | While we are not necessarily against the restrictions themselves, this is defining essential functionality by means of UE capabilities, which is not a good approach. Unless we are defining extra FGs for more advanced UEs with more relaxed restrictions, these limits should be captured in RAN1 specs instead. |
| Apple | We support Proposal 2-7 |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support Proposal 2-7. |
| ZTE | There is such restriction in legacy indeed. It is related to how many DCIs a UE can process, which is also important to the gNB. Since the restriction is for the set of cell as clarified by QC, what is not clear to me is which cell this restriction is applied to, e.g., the set of cells, any one of the cells, or the reference cell of the set. Assuming a set includes 4 sets, there are 3 understanding on the restrictions for the number of DCIs a UE can process. In legacy, the UE can process at most 4 DCIs in a slot, each for a scheduled cell in the case of the same SCS.  Understanding 1: it is applied to the set of cells  It means a UE can process only one MC DCI per slot. The question is that whether this MC DCI is an additional DCI. According to QC’s response to vivo, it seems it is not. Then it means that the UE can process only one DCI for the set of cells, which can be SC-DCI or MC-DCI. It is not acceptable because in legacy the UE can process at most 4 DCIs in a slot. We prefer that the MC-DCI is an additional DCI if this understanding is the intention of the restriction. That is to say, the UE can process at most 4 SC-DCIs and 1 MC-DCI in a slot.  Understanding 2: it is applied to any cell  The UE can process at most 4 DCIs, including at most 3 SC-DCI and one MC-DCI.  Understanding 3: it is applied to the reference cell  The UE can process at most 4 DCIs, including 3 SC-DCI one one MC-DCI. However, the UE can process at most one MC-DCI or the SC-DCI for scheduling the reference cell.  Hope this example clarify my question. |
| Qualcomm | @ ZTE  Thanks for the clarification. As responded to Ericsson, we are open to consider separate FG indicating support of such capability (more than one/two unicast DCI(s) per set of cells). However, as part of FG 49-1/1a/1b/2/2a/2b, we think Proposal 2-7 is necessary.  Regarding “in legacy, the UE can process at most 4 DCIs in a slot, each for a scheduled cell in the case of the same SCS”, yes. This means a UE can process up to one/two unicast DCI(s) per 36 candidates (for 30kHz) per scheduled cell per slot in legacy. The one/two unicast DCI(s) for different scheduled cells are always found from different 36 candidates and the UE knows which 36 candidates are for a DCI for which scheduled cell (unless search space sharing is enabled). Following the same principle, even for MC-scheduling, the basic case should be up to one/two unicast DCI(s) per 36 candidates (for 30kHz) per slot, which is understanding 1 in your reply.  Again, we are open to consider advanced cases once Proposal 2-7 is agreed. |
| Vivo2 | Thanks QC for the kind reply.  If ‘Unicast DCI’ here is any unicast DCI including MC-DCI and SC-DCI for the set of cells.’, we think some changes should be added to improve clarity.  **Proposal 2-7:**   * **Following restrictions are added in FG 49-1.**   + **The total of Number of unicast DCI to process for a set of cells, including the DCI format 1\_3 for multi-cell PDSCH scheduling for the set of cells and unicast DCI for single-cell PDSCH scheduling (if configured) for any scheduled cell in the set of cells**      - **From lower SCS to higher SCS, or same SCS**        * **One unicast DCI per slot of scheduling cell for a set of cells configured for multi-cell PDSCH scheduling for FDD/TDD scheduling cell**     - **From higher SCS to lower SCS**       * **One unicast DCI per N consecutive slots of scheduling cell for a set of cells configured for multi-cell PDSCH scheduling for FDD/TDD scheduling cell, where:**         + **N = 2 for (30, 15),** **(60,30), (120,60)**         + **N = 4 for (60, 15), (120, 30)**         + **N = 8 for (120, 15)** * **Following restrictions are added in FG 49-2.**   + **The total of Number of unicast DCI to process for a set of cells, including the DCI format 0\_3 for multi-cell PUSCH scheduling for the set of cells and unicast DCI for single-cell PUSCH scheduling (if configured) for any scheduled cell in the set of cells**     - **From lower SCS to higher SCS, or same SCS**       * **One unicast DCI per slot of scheduling cell for a set of cells configured for multi-cell PUSCH scheduling for FDD scheduling cell**       * **Two unicast DCIs per slot of scheduling cell for a set of cells configured for multi-cell PUSCH scheduling for TDD scheduling cell**     - **From higher SCS to lower SCS**       * **One unicast DCI per N consecutive slots of scheduling cell for a set of cells configured for multi-cell PUSCH scheduling for FDD scheduling cell, and**       * **Two unicast DCIs per N consecutive slots of scheduling cell for a set of cells configured for multi-cell PUSCH scheduling for TDD scheduling cell, where:**         + **N = 2 for (30, 15) ,** **(60,30), (120,60)**         + **N = 4 for (60, 15), (120, 30)**         + **N = 8 for (120, 15)** * **FFS whether to introduce advanced capability for the number of unicast DCI to process for a set of cells** |
| ZTE2 | @Qualcomm  Thanks for your respond.  If the we go with the direction of new capability including both SC-DCI and MC-DCI, it seems that this new capability is contradictory to the legacy capability for single cell scheduling and even it reduces the legacy capability. For example, if the network only schedule SC-DCI in a monitoring occasion, the UE can process multiple SC-DCIs for downlink with each for a scheduled cell according to the legacy capability. However, according to the new proposed capability, the UE can process only one DCI for downlink scheduling for the scheduled cells. So which UE capability (legacy or new) should the gNB refer to when the gNB only schedule legacy DCI in a monitoring occasion. If the gNB refers to the new capability, it is not reasonable in my understanding. So, we think the new capability is dedicated for MC-DCI only. |
| Samsung2 | We are open to define capabilities in this direction, but would like more discussion to ensure the UE capabilities for multi-cell scheduling will not be worse than legacy UE.  RAN1 agreed to separate search space sets and unique n\_CI values for MC-DCI and SC-DCI, so that the UE can determine, before decoding the PDCCH, whether the PDCCH would include an SC-DCI or an MC-DCI. If the UE detects an MC-DCI in a slot, the UE is not expected to process more DCI formats in that slot. But, if there is no MO for an MC-DCI in a slot or if the UE does not detect an MC-DCI in a slot, the UE should be able to process up to 4 SC-DCIs for the up to 4 cells in the set of cells, in the slot as in legacy capability.  More discussion is needed to ensure proposal 2-7 reflects the above legacy capabilities. |
| Moderator | Seems more discussion is necessary to have common understanding among companies.  Companies are encouraged to provide feedback to the comments from others. |
| Qualcomm | @ ZTE, @ Samsung2  DCI format 0\_3/1\_3 has full functionalities of multi-cell PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling, so network can operate using MC-DCI for CA. One may consider that a UE shall be able to monitor SC-DCIs for all the cells in the set as well as MC-DCI for the set of cells, so that legacy SC-DCI based scheduling is enabled without any delay/reconfig for network’s flexibility. However, does not pay the cost at UE. Considering the trade-off between the network’s flexibility and UE complexity, we believe having this component in the basic FG while to define another optional FGs is reasonable. |
| NTT DOCOMO | If we go with vivo’s updates, we may need a further check on relation between legacy capability. We are also fine to defer the discussion until we have a progress on other UE capabilities for MC DCI monitoring. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Looking at the discussions here, seems better to defer the discussion later. |
| ZTE | The MC-DCI is similar as legacy DCI considering that the DCI size budget and BC/CCE budget is counted on only one cell. The only difference is that it may have a larger size than the legacy when 4 cells are scheduled by the DCI. So we just regard it as a special DCI. |
| Samsung3 | Appears that this discussion is linked with the discussion on Proposal 2-11 (FG 49-3). Can revisit after a decision is made on that proposal. |
| Qualcomm | This discussion is not linked to FG49-3. This is a common restriction started from Rel-15. Without this, requirement on UE implementation is essentially same as search space sharing, which is quite problematic if it is not optional. |

**Question 2-8:**

* **Regarding FGs 49-1/1a/1b and 49-2/2a/2b, companies are encouraged to provide views on whether/how to report the support of configurability between Type 1A and Type-2.**
  + Type-2 as a component in FGs 49-1/1a/1b and 49-2/2a/2b: vivo
  + Report either or both: QC

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Qualcomm | Our first preference is to let UE to report either or both. We are open to fix one of them as a default. |
| MTK | Same view as Qualcomm. |
| Apple | We are fine to report then separately |
| LGE | We are open to either way. |
| Nokia/NSB | We don’t see a need for any separate capability here. |
| Xiaomi | We are fine to report them separately. |
| vivo | Our first preference is to fix type2 as default. 2nd preference is to let UE report either or both. |
| OPPO | Same as Qualcomm: 1st preference to let UE report either or both. This helps UE to reduce testing cases. |
| NTT DOCOMO | In our view, the number of configurable fields is minimized and UE should support both operations as Type-1A and Type-2 as basic capability. If separate FG is needed, at least one default Type should be decided. |
| Samsung | OK to include as values in FG 49-1/1a/1b and 49-2/2a/2b. No need for a default value. |
| ZTE | We don’t think this component is needed. In the current DCI format, all the DCI field types are supported. There is no difference between the field that can be configured as Type 1A or Type 2 and the field that is specified as Type 1A or Type 2. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are ok to let UE to report either or both. If need to take one as a default, we prefer type 2. |
| Intel | We do not see much need to report the support of configurability between Type 1A and Type-2. |
| Ericsson2 | Prefer UE supports both. |
| Moderator | To be updated after GTW |
| Moderator | Summary of companies’ view   * + Type-2 as a component in FGs 49-1/1a/1b and 49-2/2a/2b: vivo, [HW/HiSi]   + One of them as a component in FGs 49-1/1a/1b and 49-2/2a/2b: [QC], [MTK], [OPPO], [DCM]   + Both as a component in FGs 49-1/1a/1b and 49-2/2a/2b (or component is not necessary): Nokia/NSB, DCM, ZTE, Intel, E///   + Report either or both: QC, MTK, Apple, Xiaomi, [vivo], Samsung, HW/HiSi, OPPO   Based on the comment, following proposal is made  **Proposal 2-8:**   * **Add a component to indicate the support of configurability between Type 1A and Type-2 in FGs 49-1/1a/1b and 49-2/2a/2b with the following candidate values**   + **Opt1: {Type-2, Type 1A and Type-2}**   + **Opt2: {Type-1A, Type-2, Type 1A and Type-2}** |
| LGE | Opt 2 is preferred. (separate FG rather than as component) |
| Qualcomm | We are ok with either option. |
| MTK | We prefer Opt2. |
| Nokia, NSB | Overall, we think that UE should support the configurability without capability indication. Having capability here will increase the number of different UE implementations the network has to deal with.  If indication is needed (not out preference), having one default operation that the UE needs to support will reduce this slightly (i.e. Option 1) but not really helping. |
| Apple | We prefer Opt 2, but can be fine with Opt1 as well if majority prefers |
| NTT DOCOMO | We share the same view with Nokia. We tried to minimize the number of configurable fields in MC DCI, and only Antenna port, TPMI and SRI is defined as configurable as a result. If we really need to define the UE capability reporting for supporting Type of filed for configurable fields, we can accept Opt.1. |
| ZTE | We think the UE should support both because we have minimized the configurable fields as possible when discussing the DCI field. There are only 4 fields for downlink scheduling and 5 fields for uplink scheduling. |
| Vivo2 | We prefer option1 but can also live with option2 if the majority prefer option2. Without capability indication means that UE has to support both types for Type3 fields, which will increase the UE implementation complexity. If capability indication cannot be agreed, we suggest type2 only as default. |
| Samsung2 | Prefer to support both without any separate FG, but can be OK with Option 1 if that’s majority view. |
| Intel | Both Type 1A and Type 2 should be supported. There are other fields for Type 1A and some other fields for Type 2. It is not clear why such configurability is needed. |
| Moderator | Summary of companies’ view   * + Opt1: [Nokia/NSB], [Apple], [DCM], vivo   + Opt2: LGE, MTK, Apple, [vivo]   + Support both: Nokia/NSB, DCM, ZTE, Intel   It seems Opt1 is reasonable middle ground among companies and let’s take it.  **Proposal 2-8:**   * **Add a component to indicate the support of configurability between Type 1A and Type-2 in FGs 49-1/1a/1b and 49-2/2a/2b with the following candidate values**   + **~~Opt1:~~ {Type-2, Type 1A and Type-2}**   + **~~Opt2: {Type-1A, Type-2, Type 1A and Type-2}~~** |
| Qualcomm | Support Proposal 2-8. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We can live with this proposal while our preference is supporting both types as default. |
| Vivo3 | We support FL’s proposal |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Fine with proposal 2-8. |
| LGE | Although Opt 2 is preferred, we can live with the proposal if it is hard to have consensus on Opt 2. |
| Apple | Fine to support Proposal 2-8 |
| ZTE | We don’t support this proposal. We think the both types should be supported by the UE as commented above. |
| Samsung3 | OK with the proposal, although prefer to support both types by default. |

**Question 2-9:**

* **Regarding FGs 49-1/1a/1b and 49-2/2a/2b, companies are encouraged to provide views on whether/how to report the support of nominal RBG size of Configuration 3.**
  + As a component of FGs 49-1/1a/1b and 49-2/2a/2b: OPPO
  + As separate FG: ZTE, QC

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Qualcomm | This is quite new feature and hence requires a separate indication of the support in either case. |
| MTK | Yes (report the support of nominal RBG size of Configuration 3). |
| Apple | Support as separate FG |
| LGE | Fine with separate FG |
| Nokia/NSB | No separate capability needed – UE supporting 0\_3/1\_3 needs to support smaller RBG. |
| Xiaomi | Fine with separate FG. |
| vivo | If we go with this direction, it seems that for all newly introduced RRC parameters, we need a corresponding separate capability reporting. We are ok with this direction if the signalling overhead would not be a concern to the group. |
| OPPO | Support as either a component or a separate FG. |
| NTT DOCOMO | In our view, this is a basic feature for multi-cell scheduling, i.e., no need to have a separate FG. |
| Samsung | OK with a component or separate FG |
| ZTE | Separate FG. The FG is common for DL and UL. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Fine with separate UE capability. |
| Intel | RBG size of configuration 3 is mainly for DCI payload size reduction, which is an important feature to enable multi-cell scheduling. We think this should be component of FGs 49-1/1a/1b and 49-2/2a/2b |
| CATT | Fine with separate FG |
| Ericsson2 | As a component of FGs 49-1/1a/1b and 49-2/2a/2b. |
| Moderator | To be updated after GTW |
| Moderator | Summary of companies’ view   * + As a component of FGs 49-1/1a/1b and 49-2/2a/2b: OPPO, Nokia/NSB, DCM, Samsung, Intel, E///   + As separate FG: ZTE, QC, MTK?, Apple, LGE, Xiaomi, OPPO, Samsung, HW/HiSi, CATT   Given more companies prefer separate FG, following proposal is made  **Proposal 2-9:**   * **Introduce a separate FG to report the support of nominal RBG size of Configuration 3.** |
| LGE | On P2-9: OK with the proposal. |
| Qualcomm | Support the Proposal 2-9. It is not sure whether the RGB size of config 3 is IOTable and hence cannot be a component of basic FGs. |
| MTK | Fine with Proposal 2-9. |
| Nokia, NSB | The question is not only whether it is a separate FG or not, but whether it is a functionality to be supported by UEs or not. If a separate FG is created it should still be a pre-requisite to FGs 49-1/1a/1b and 49-2/2a/2b, so what do we gain by creating the new FG?  @Qualcomm, if one cannot do IOT for RBG size of configuration 3, then what is the meaning of creating a new FG for it? That FG could never be tested and thus never reported, and hence it should not exist. |
| Apple | Support Proposal 2-9 |
| NTT DOCOMO | We don’t see the need to introduce separate FG. As we commented for Question 2-10, configuration 3 for FDRA type-0 can be a part of monitoring DCI format 0\_3/1\_3. |
| ZTE | OK. We are also fine it as the component. |
| Qualcomm | Now we have a question, what does “As a component” means? A UE can indicate support or not in this component, or once it is in the component, the UE shall support it once the UE reports FG49-1/1a/1b/2/2a/2b?  Our understanding is “As a component of..” means the UE SHALL support the feature since it is a component of FG49-1/1a/1b/2/2a/2b. If so, we disagree due to the reason mentioned earlier.  If the intention is that the config 3 is a component and UE can indicate support or not in this component we would like to ask clarify this.  @ Nokia  Our understanding of “As a component of..” is the UE SHALL support this. This means that unless config 3 is IOTed, the UE cannot indicate support of FG49-1/1a/1b/2/2a/2b itself. |
| Vivo2 | ok |
| Samsung2 | Prefer to support by default without any separate FG. |
| Intel | We still think RBG size of configuration 3 should be a component. |
| Moderator | To be updated after GTW |
| Moderator | @Qualcomm  I have the same understanding that component without candidate values cannot be reported whether it is supported or not. Once UE reports an FG is supported, all components without candidate values in the FG shall be supported.  If **Proposal 2-9** is not acceptable, **please provide your view on what your strong concern is and also provide alternative proposal which is acceptable to all**.  **Proposal 2-9:**   * **Introduce a separate FG to report the support of nominal RBG size of Configuration 3.** |
| Qualcomm | Thanks moderator for the clarification.  Support Proposal 2-9. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Considering that this FDRA configuration is not the essential function for multi-cell scheduling, we can be flexible to support this proposal while we prefer to support this feature by default. |
| Vivo3 | We support FL’s proposal |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are fine with proposal 2-9. |
| LGE | Fine with the proposal. |
| Apple | Support Proposal 2-9 |
| Samsung3 | OK with the proposal, although prefer to support by default. |

**Question 2-10:**

* **Regarding FGs 49-1/1a/1b and 49-2/2a/2b, companies are encouraged to provide views on whether/how to report the support of FDRA Type-1 granularity of 2, 4, 8, or 16 consecutive RBs based RIV.**
  + As separate FG: QC

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Qualcomm | Yes, should be based on a separate FG |
| MTK | Yes (as separate FG) |
| Apple | Support as separate FG |
| LGE | Fine with separate FG |
| Nokia/NSB | No separate capability needed – UE supporting 0\_3/1\_3 needs to support smaller RBG. |
| Xiaomi | Fine with separate FG. |
| vivo | Same as 2-9 |
| OPPO | Fine with the reporting. |
| NTT DOCOMO | No. For DCI format 0\_2/1\_2, RBG-based RIV for FDRA Type-1 is supported as basic feature and no separate FG, and hence we think we can follow the same framework. |
| Samsung | OK with a component or separate FG |
| ZTE | Similar as above, it can be separate FG and is common for DL and UL. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Fine with separate UE capability. |
| Intel | Same view as Question 2-9. |
| Ericsson2 | As a component of FGs 49-1/1a/1b and 49-2/2a/2b. |
| Moderator | To be updated after GTW |
| Moderator | Summary of companies’ view   * + As separate FG: QC, MTK, Apple, LGE, Xiaomi, OPPO, Samsung, ZTE, HW/HiSi,   + As a component of FGs 49-1/1a/1b and 49-2/2a/2b: Nokia/NSB, DCM, Samsung, Intel, E///   Given more companies prefer separate FG, following proposal is made  **Proposal 2-10:**   * **Introduce a separate FG to report the support of FDRA Type-1 granularity of 2, 4, 8, or 16 consecutive RBs based RIV.** |
| LGE | On P2-10: OK with the proposal. |
| Qualcomm | Support Proposal 2-10, due to the same reason for Proposal 2-9. |
| MTK | Fine with Proposal 2-10. |
| Nokia, NSB | Do not support, for similar reasons as for proposal 2-9. |
| Apple | Support Proposal 2-10 |
| NTT DOCOMO | According to the current specification, if a UE supports compact DCI, RBG-level RIV is supported as well without any capability signaling. Similarly, we don’t see the need to introduce separate FG for this. |
| ZTE | OK. We are also fine it as the component. |
| Vivo2 | ok |
| Samsung2 | Prefer to support by default without any separate FG. |
| Intel | Similar to Proposal 2-9. |
| Moderator | To be updated after GTW |
| Moderator | If **Proposal 2-10** is not acceptable, **please provide your view on what your strong concern is and also provide alternative proposal which is acceptable to all**.  **Proposal 2-10:**   * **Introduce a separate FG to report the support of FDRA Type-1 granularity of 2, 4, 8, or 16 consecutive RBs based RIV.** |
| Qualcomm | Support Proposal 2-10. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Similar comments as Proposal 2-9. Considering that this FDRA configuration is not the essential function for multi-cell scheduling, we can be flexible to support this proposal while we prefer to support this feature by default. |
| Vivo3 | We support FL’s proposal |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Fine with proposal 2-10. |
| LGE | Fine with the proposal. |
| Apple | Support Proposal 2-10 |
| Samsung3 | OK with the proposal, although prefer to support by default. |

**Question 2-11:**

* **Regarding FG 49-3, companies are encouraged to provide views on whether/how to report the support of monitoring both legacy DCI format(s) (0\_0/1\_0, 0\_1/1\_1 and/or 0\_2/1\_2) and DCI format 0\_3/1\_3 on the same scheduling cell.**
  + Same FG for DCI format 0\_3 and 1\_3 (i.e., support FG 49-3): OPPO
  + Separate FGs for DCI format 0\_3 and 1\_3: vivo, MTK, QC (for non-fallback DCI, separate FG for the reference cell or any cell)
  + Separate FGs for self-carrier scheduling and cross-carrier scheduling by legacy DCI formats: HW/HiSi
  + Not necessary (i.e., support by default): Samsung

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Qualcomm | Separate FGs are necessary. In addition, a UE should be able to indicate support of legacy DCI format(s) for the reference cell only, or for any cell, in the set of cells.  In addition, we do not think this FG should be per UE. This causes a bar to support the FG very high and hence in reality this cannot be supported. |
| MTK | We support separate FGs for DCI format 0\_3 and 1\_3. |
| Apple | Support separate FGs for DCI format 0\_3 and 1\_3 |
| Nokia/NSB | We tend to agree with Samsung, no separate capability seems to be needed. |
| Xiaomi | We tend to agree with Samsung and Nokia. If separate FG for DCI format 0\_3 and 1\_3 is introduced, what is the UE behaviour for the case UE reports other MC FGs but FG 49-3, e.g. UE reports FG 49-1 only? |
| vivo | We think separate signalling is needed for supporting the **simultaneous** monitoring of legacy DCI and mc-DCI for the same reference cell. |
| OPPO | If the discussions on earlier questions go to the direction of splitting FGs between DCI 0\_3 and 1\_3, we can also accept separate FGs between DL and UL for this one. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We are fine to have a single UE feature to report whether UE supports simultaneous monitoring of legacy DCI and MC DCI as FG49-3 in the current UE feature list. |
| Samsung | This can be part of the description for FG 49-1/1a/1b and 49-2/2a/2b.  In Rel-17, the UE supports to monitor different legacy single-cell scheduling DCI (SC-DCI) formats for a same scheduled cell in same or different monitoring occasions, without any restriction or UE capability. Since RAN1 has agreed to maintain the Rel-17 PDCCH monitoring limits when DCI formats 0\_3/1\_3 are configured, there is no reason to make an exception or restriction for monitoring DCI formats 0\_3/1\_3, so a separate UE capability is not necessary.  It is noted that FG 11-1a is for support of both DCI 0\_1/1\_1 and DCI 0\_2/1\_2 in a same search space set. However, for DCI 0\_3/1\_3, RAN1 has already agreed to separate search space set from legacy SC-DCI formats, so a similar reasoning is not applicable here. |
| ZTE | We don’t think this FG is needed. It should be the basic feature for multi-cell scheduling. No need to report. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Firstly, we don't see the necessity to have separately capability for DCI format 0\_3 and DCI format 1\_3.  Secondly, we don't think legacy DCI formats should include DCI format 0\_0/1\_0, i.e. the UE should support simultaneous monitoring of DCI format 0\_0/1\_0 and DCI format 0\_3/1\_3. For example, when the scheduling cell is PCell, it doesn't make sense not support monitoring DCI format 0\_0/1\_0.  Thirdly, we think separate capability should be set for the following two cases:  Case 1: Simultaneous monitoring of DCI format 0\_3/1\_3 and legacy DCI formats (i.e. DCI format 0\_1/1\_1 and/or 0\_2/1\_2) with self-carrier scheduling  Case 2: Simultaneous monitoring of DCI format 0\_3/1\_3 and legacy DCI formats (i.e. DCI format 0\_1/1\_1 and/or 0\_2/1\_2) with cross-carrier scheduling.  Since self-carrier and cross-carrier scheduling are separate capability in the legacy system. |
| Intel | This is basic feature on the support of multi-cell scheduling. Seems no need to report. |
| Ericsson2 | Legacy DCI formats should be supported as a minimum (i.e. as part of basic FG) on the scheduling cell even when scheduling cell is in the set of cells. |
| Moderator | To be updated after GTW |
| Moderator | Summary of companies’ view   * + Same FG for DCI format 0\_3 and 1\_3 (i.e., support FG 49-3): OPPO, DCM   + Separate FGs for DCI format 0\_3 and 1\_3: vivo, MTK, QC (for non-fallback DCI, separate FG for the reference cell or any cell), Apple, [OPPO]   + Separate FGs for self-carrier scheduling and cross-carrier scheduling by legacy DCI formats: HW/HiSi   + Not necessary (i.e., support by default): Samsung, Nokia/NSB, Xiaomi, ZTE, Intel, E///   Given more companies support following two options, can we down-select from one of the followings?  **Proposal 2-11:**   * **Regarding FG 49-3, down-select from one of the followings**   + **Opt1: FG 49-3 is split into two separate FGs for DCI format 0\_3 and 1\_3**   + **Opt2: Delete FG 49-3, FFS whether to capture in FGs 49-1/1a/1b and 49-2/2a/2b** |
| LGE | On P2-11: Opt 2 is preferred. (with removal of the FFS part) |
| Qualcomm | One comment: We think FG 49-3 should be “Monitoring both DCI format 0\_3/1\_3 for a set of cells and legacy DCI format(s) (0\_0/1\_0, 0\_1/1\_1 and/or 0\_2/1\_2) for a cell in the set of cells”.  We would like to emphasize the issue on this for non-reference cell in a set of cells.   * If a UE is configured to monitor DCI 0\_3/1\_3 for a set of cells with a reference cell in the set, and DCI 0\_1/1\_1 for a non-reference cell in the same set, the number of BDs/CCEs/DCI-sizes the UE has to handle for the non-reference cell is doubled. * For example, the UE has to perform 36 BDs for DCI 0\_3/1\_3 which are counted on the reference cell, and perform another 36 BDs for DCI 0\_1/1\_1 which are counted on the non-reference cell, where both DCI 0\_3/1\_3 and DCI 0\_1/1\_1 can schedule unicast data on the non-reference cell. This essentially requires support of doubled amount of BDs/CCEs/DCI-sizes for the non-reference cell. * UE is allowed to report smaller capability for BDs/CCEs via *pdcch-BlindDetectionCA* series. However, the capability is per-FR or per-BC. By utilizing these, a UE has to underreport these capabilities to address the concern on doubled BDs/CCEs, which impact on PDCCH monitoring for all the cells that are not part of the set of cells. Further, this does not resolve the issue of the number of DCI sizes.   Therefore, we would like to make sure that, at least, support of DCI format 0\_3/1\_3 for a set of cells and legacy DCI format(s) for a non-reference cell in the set of cells is a separate optional FG.  For monitoring both DCI format 0\_3/1\_3 and legacy DCI format(s) for the reference cell in a set of cells, we would like to first fix the discussion on whether FG 6-10 is prerequisite for FG49-1a/2a and whether FG18-5/5b are prerequisite for FG49-1b/2b. Depending on the outcome, we could be flexible. |
| MTK | We prefer Opt 1 but can be open to other options to facilitate the progress. |
| Nokia, NSB | Opt 2 |
| Apple | Prefer Opt1 |
| NTT DOCOMO | We prefer option 2. For option 1, we are not sure whether separate FGs are required for DCI 0\_3 and 1\_3. The monitoring of DCI format 0\_0/1\_0, 0\_1/1\_1 is supported mandatorily without capability signaling. In addition, the monitoring of DCI format 0\_2/1\_2 is reported with a single FG 11-1. If we consider a case, for example, a UE supports monitoring of DCI format 0\_2/1\_2 and DCI format 0\_3/1\_3 but does not support simultaneous monitoring of legacy and MC DCI only for UL, separate FGs are required but we are not sure this case is really concerned. |
| ZTE | We support Option 2 |
| Qualcomm | We have mentioned the technical problems above, and we do see any convincing reply on it.  @ DOCOMO  Monitoring DCI 0\_0/1\_0/, 0\_1/1\_1 and monitoring DCI 0\_3/1\_3 and 0\_0/1\_0/0\_1/1\_1 are quite different. Same for 0\_3/1\_3 and 0\_2/1\_2.  On the proposal, we are a bit confused. Option 1 is to propose split the FG into DL and UL, and Option 2 is to delete the FG? We need to resolve the issues mentioned above, and whether to split the FG into DL and UL is a next level question. |
| Vivo2 | We would like to clarify our preference.  Firstly, if the capability is only for DCI format monitoring, as we commented on the last GTW session, we don't see the necessity to have separate capability for DCI format 0\_3 and DCI format 1\_3. For the case where mc-DCI and sc-DCI are not monitored at the same time, we are ok with either to have 1 separate capability or to capture in FGs 49-1/1a/1b and 49-2/2a/2b  But for the case where mc-DCI and sc-DCI are monitored at the same time, UE is required to handle multiple DCIs in the same MO with high capability. For this case, optional signalling(e.g., Simultaneous monitoring of DCI format 0\_3/1\_3 and legacy DCI formats, or separate signalling for Simultaneous monitoring of DCI format 0\_3 and legacy UL DCI formats and Simultaneous monitoring of DCI format 1\_3 and legacy DL DCI formats )should be reported |
| Samsung2 | Prefer Option 2. Regarding the FFS, this should be captured in the descriptions of the main FGs 49-1/1a/1b and 49-2/2a/2b. Also, the wording needs to be updated along the lines of the RAN1 agreement (similar to what QC provided above).  **@QC:** The agreement in RAN1#111 to count the BD/CCE of MC-DCI for only towards the budget of the reference cell was the outcome of long debate on the issue. Counting BD/CCE / DCI size of MD-DCI towards budget of all cells was one of the options and it was not agreed. As clarified, the BD/CCE of MC-DCI is NOT counted towards the budget of non-reference cells, and operation of non-reference only involves SC-DCIs and are same as Rel-17 limits, so the comment on doubling the BD/CCE budget is not applicable. Similar for DCI size.  **@Vivo:** In terms of BD/CCE/DCI size for PDCCH monitoring, the RAN1 agreement below is generic and does not consider an assumption for simultaneous or non-simultaneous monitoring of SC-DCI and MC-DCI formats. The issue of DCI processing is the scope of Proposal 2-7 above and suitable considerations can be made for the case of SC-DCI and MC-DCI in the same slot.  **Agreement (RAN1#111):**  Confirm the RAN1#110bis-e working assumption with the following changes:  **Working Assumption**  For a set of cells which is configured for multi-cell scheduling,   * Existing DCI size budget is maintained on each cell of the set of cells. * DCI size of DCI format 0\_X/1\_X is counted on one cell among the set of cells.   + DCI size of the DCI format 0\_X/1\_X is counted on the reference cell. * BD/CCE of DCI format 0\_X/1\_X is counted on one cell among the set of cells.   + BD/CCE of the DCI format 0\_X/1\_X is counted on the reference cell. * Same reference cell is used for both DCI format 0\_X and DCI format 1\_X. * The reference cell is   + the scheduling cell if the scheduling cell is included in the set of cells and search space of the DCI format 0\_X/1\_X is configured only on the scheduling cell;   + one cell of the set of cells which search space of DCI format 0\_X/1\_X is configured on and associated with the search space of the scheduling cell with the same search space ID if search space of the DCI format 0\_X/1\_X is configured on the cell in addition to the scheduling cell.     - It is up to gNB on which cell the SS of the DCI format 0\_X/1\_X is configured on. * To address Rel-17 BD/CCE limit for any given cell (operating the feature under Rel-17 BD/CCE limit)   + For the reference cell, a total number of configured BD/CCEs for both DCI formats 0\_X/1\_X and legacy DCI formats (if configured) does not exceed the Rel-17 limits.   + For other cells in the sets of cells, Rel-17 limits for PDCCH/DCI monitoring and BD/CCE counting rules for legacy DCI formats (not including DCI formats 0\_X/1\_X) apply * ~~Note: This does not mean a UE is required to support number of BDs/CCEs beyond the Rel-17 limits (i.e., and ) for PDCCH candidates for each scheduled cell.~~ |
| Intel | We prefer Opt. 2 |
| Moderator | To be updated after GTW |
| Moderator | Summary of companies’ view   * + Opt1: MTK, Apple,   + Opt2: LGE (remove FFS), Nokia/NSB, DCM, Samsung   + Wait for outcome from **Proposal 2-2a-2** and **Proposal 2-2b-2/3**: QC   + Separate FG for support of DCI format 0\_3/1\_3 for a set of cells and legacy DCI format(s) for a non-reference cell in the set of cells: QC   If companies also think it is better to wait for the outcome from **Proposal 2-2a-2** and **Proposal 2-2b-2/3** (i.e., whether FG 6-10 is prerequisite for FG49-1a/2a, whether FG18-5/5b are prerequisite for FG49-1b/2b) before discussing **Proposal 2-11**, we can do so. Otherwise, I would like to continue the discussion. In this case, companies are encouraged to provide view **which option you have strong concern**. |
| Qualcomm | Still consider better to wait for outcome of the other earlier proposals.  We have still a strong concern on Option 2. If we have to agree either Option 1 or Option 2 without waiting for the outcome, we support Option 1.  We are also not sure if companies are on the same page. What we would like to have is the following (updated from our contribution to reflect the latest structure of FGs in this discussion).  **FG49-3:**  **Configuration of SS set(s) for DCI format 0\_3/1\_3 for a set of cells and SS set(s) for legacy DCI format(s) (0\_1/1\_1 and/or 0\_2/1\_2) for a cell in the set on the scheduling cell**   * **Component 1: SS set(s) for legacy DCI format(s) in the set when the scheduling cell is included in the set**   + **Candidate values: {only for the reference cell, for any cell}** * **Component 2: SS set(s) for legacy DCI format(s) in the set when the scheduling cell is NOT included in the set**   + **Candidate values: {none, only for the reference cell, for any cell}** * **For FG49-1b/2b,**    + **this is reported per supported combinations of SCSs between scheduling cell and cells in the set if Opt.1 of Proposal 2-2b-2/3 is adopted**   + **this is reported per combinations should be {FR1-FDD, FR1-TDD, [FR1-Unlicensed], FR2-1, FR2-2} if Opt.2 of Proposal 2-2b-2/3 is adopted**   @vivo2  Regarding your comment on UE complexity for simultaneous monitoring of MC-DCI and SC-DCIs vs not simultaneous (but staggered) monitoring MC-DCI and SC-DCIs, we think technically makes sense. However, we are not sure the practical benefit of staggered configuration, and who/which operator/network enables staggered PDCCH monitoring for MC-DCI and SC-DCIs in such a way (as far as observed in this WI discussion, seems no). In addition, this would create side effects on, e.g., span-based PDCCH monitoring, NR-DC BD/CCE limits, etc. So we think separate FG for enabling DCI 0\_3/1\_3 for a set of cells and legacy DCIs for a cell in the set would be simple approach to go.  @ Samsung2  It does not matter on which cell DCI 0\_3/1\_3 is counted. **It is the matter of how many BDs/CCEs/DCI-sizes the UE has to process for each scheduled cell.** Suppose a UE is configured with MC-DCI configured for cell#1 and cell#2 with the reference cell = cell#1. Suppose the UE is also configured with SC-DCI for cell#1 and SC-DCI for cell#2. To get a grant for cell#2, the UE has to process per-cell BDs/CCEs/DCI-sizes for MC-DCI counted on cell#1, and per-cell BDs/CCEs/DCI-sizes for SC-DCI for cell#2. As we have repeated during WI, the agreement doubles the numbers of BDs/CCEs/DCI-sizes per scheduled cell. We cannot incorporate this as part of the basic FG and separate FG is necessary. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Thank Qualcomm for your comment. We are fine to discuss after it is agreed whether FG 6-10/18-5/18-5b is prerequisite or not, but still prefer opt.2.  In addition, per understanding based on the RAN1 agreement, BD/CCE is counted on only one cell, i.e., reference cell, thus separate FG is not necessary for non-reference cell case, but we are open to discuss it. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Looking at the discussions here, better to discuss this later. |
| Apple | Our preference is Opt1 and we cannot support Opt2. Can also be discussed later |
| Qualcomm | @ DOCOMO  It does not matter on which cell DCI 0\_3/1\_3 is counted. **We would like to have a basic FG such that, a UE does not need to process more than 36 candidates per scheduled cell.** Without separating feature for legacy DCI formats for non-reference cell(s), how can we make sure the process is up to 36 candidates per scheduled cell?  The alternative way is to underreport *pdcch-BlindDetectionCA*, which impacts on PDCCH process capability for all the cells in the CA configuration. We do not think this is a preferable consequence. |
| Samsung3 | Wondering about QC’s statement: “*It does not matter on which cell DCI 0\_3/1\_3 is counted.* ***It is the matter of how many BDs/CCEs/DCI-sizes the UE has to process for each scheduled cell.***” This is indeed the same discussion companies had during the WI, and the agreement to count on one reference cell (rather than on all cells) was the outcome of that long discussion, so not sure why it should not matter. The FG discussion cannot overturn the framework that was agreed by RAN1. |
| Qualcomm | @ Samsung3  It does not overturn the agreement/framework – rather it fully aligns with the agreement.  Agreement:  Confirm below working assumption reached in RAN1#110 meeting with revision.  Working Assumption   * For any cell within a set of cells which can be co-scheduled by a DCI format 0\_X/1\_X, **RAN1 specification supports** monitoring the DCI format 0\_X/1\_X and DCI format 0\_0/1\_0, 0\_1/1\_1, and/or 0\_2/1\_2 (if supported by the UE), if configured from a same scheduling cell.   + The DCI format 0\_X/1\_X and the DCI format 0\_0/1\_0/0\_1/1\_1/0\_2/1\_2 can be monitored simultaneously.   + Note: This does not mean a UE is required to support number of BDs/CCEs beyond the Rel-17 limits (i.e., and ) for PDCCH candidates for each scheduled cell. |

**Question 2-12:**

* **Regarding existing FG corresponding to a filed included in DCI format 0\_3/1\_3, companies are encouraged to provide views on whether/how to report the support of the FG in DCI format 0\_3/1\_3.**
  + Alt.1: Reuse Existing FG to indicate the support for DCI format 0\_3/1\_3
  + Alt.2: Introduce new FG to indicate the support for DCI format 0\_3/1\_3
    - UE features for DL priority indicator in a DCI format 1\_3
    - UE features for UL priority indicator in a DCI format 0\_3
    - 49-5a: Trigger Type 3 HARQ CB based feedback using DCI format 1\_3
    - 49-5b: Trigger enhanced Type 3 HARQ CB based feedback using DCI format 1\_3
    - PHY priority handling for one-shot HARQ-ACK feedback by DCI 1\_3
    - UE feature for HARQ-ACK re-transmission triggered by DCI format 1\_3
    - UE features for SCell dormancy indication within active time by DCI format 1\_X and DCI format 0\_3
    - UE features for cross-slot scheduling by DCI format 1\_X and DCI format 0\_3
    - UE features for Unified-TCI indication by DCI format 1\_3

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Qualcomm | It is obvious that all the legacy FGs defined for DCI format 1\_1/1\_2 or DCI format 0\_1/0\_2 are not applicable to DCI format 1\_3 or DCI format 0\_3. The only way to enable these features is to introduce the corresponding FGs. |
| MTK | We prefer Alt. 2. |
| Apple | We support Alt. 2 |
| Nokia/NSB | Alt. 1 – a UE supporting PHY priority, Type 3 or enhanced Type 3 incl. PHY priority, HARQ-ACK re-tx, SCell dormancy, ... – would also support the related features in combination with DCI format 0\_3 and 1\_3. |
| Xiaomi | Prefer Alt.2. |
| vivo | Our first preference is for alternative 1, where the network can interpret the UE's report of both the MCE basic FG and the existing FG as indicating the support for the corresponding features for MCE. However, we are also open to alternative 2 if signalling overhead is not a concern in the group. |
| OPPO | We support Alt 2. |
| NTT DOCOMO | For some UE features, i.e., HARQ-ACK retransmission, SCell dormancy and cross-slot scheduling, the UE behaviour seems the same as the case which is supported by legacy DCI format, and hence we think we can reuse the existing FGs, i.e., Alt1. For other UE features, we are fine with Alt.2. |
| Samsung | In general, when the corresponding functionality is not changed due to DCI format 0\_3/1\_3, legacy FGs can be re-used, and when new functionality is introduced for DCI 0\_3/1\_3, a new FG can be considered. Can be discussed case by case once the functionalities are more stable in the specs. |
| ZTE | We prefer Alt 1 because these features are independent to DCI formats. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We slightly prefer Alt.1. However, we are open if more justification can be provided for Alt.2. |
| Intel | We slightly prefer Alt. 2. |
| Ericsson2 | We have a preference for Alt 1. |
| Moderator | To be updated after GTW |
| Moderator | Summary of companies’ view   * + Alt.1: Reuse Existing FG to indicate the support for DCI format 0\_3/1\_3: Nokia/NSB, vivo, DCM (for some FGs), [Samsung (case by case)], ZTE, HW/HiSi, E///   + Alt.2: Introduce new FG to indicate the support for DCI format 0\_3/1\_3: QC, MTK, Apple, Xiaomi, OPPO, DCM (for some FGs), [Samsung (case by case)], Intel   As pointed out by some companies, this should be discussed case by case, and that’s why I listed corresponding features in the sub-bullets. Question is updated to collect further view.  **Question 2-12a:**   * **Regarding existing FG corresponding to a field included in DCI format 0\_3/1\_3, companies are encouraged to provide views on whether following existing capabilities need to introduce new FGs to report the support of the capabilities in DCI format 0\_3/1\_3.**   1. **UE features for DL priority indicator in a DCI format 1\_3**   2. **UE features for UL priority indicator in a DCI format 0\_3**   3. **49-5a: Trigger Type 3 HARQ CB based feedback using DCI format 1\_3**   4. **49-5b: Trigger enhanced Type 3 HARQ CB based feedback using DCI format 1\_3**   5. **PHY priority handling for one-shot HARQ-ACK feedback by DCI 1\_3**   6. **UE feature for HARQ-ACK re-transmission triggered by DCI format 1\_3**   7. **UE features for SCell dormancy indication within active time by DCI format 1\_X and DCI format 0\_3**   8. **UE features for cross-slot scheduling by DCI format 1\_X and DCI format 0\_3**   9. **UE features for Unified-TCI indication by DCI format 1\_3** |
| LGE | On Q2-12a: Alt 1 is preferred. (i.e., reuse existing FG to indicate the support of DCI 0\_3/1\_3) |
| Qualcomm | We are fine to discuss case-by-case. However, TR 38.822 and TS 38.306 clearly capture some (or all?) of the above are for legacy DCI formats. For such FGs, our understanding is that DCI formats 1\_3/0\_3 are not applicable. |
| MTK | For Question 2-12a, we prefer to introduce new FG for 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9. We are open to further discuss the details case by case. |
| Nokia, NSB | Reusing existing FGs should be the baseline.  Please note, that this list may not be complete looking at some discussions e.g. on the draft CR discussions, such as support for TBoMS, available slot counting, SFN operation, DMRS bundling ... – and covering all of them will be close to impossible at this stage anyhow. |
| Apple | We can discuss case-by-case based, but in general, our preference would be to introduce new FG |
| NTT DOCOMO | Given the situation of companies view, we think we should discuss case-by-case. As commented in the previous round, we think HARQ-ACK retransmission, SCell dormancy and cross-slot scheduling, the UE behaviour seems the same as the case which is supported by legacy DCI format, and hence we can reuse the existing FGs for them. For other UE features, it may be not exactly the same from legacy DCI and needs some enhancements for multi-cell operation, thus we are fine to introduce new UE feature. |
| ZTE | We agree with Nokia that reusing legacy FG should be baseline because these features does not introduce new foundational UE behaviors and the only difference is the DCI indication. |
| Vivo2 | May need to discuss case by case. If reusing existing FG is feasible, then we prefer reusing existing FG. If for some FGs, reusing existing signalling is not feasible as QC commented due to the restrictions on specific DCI formats, new FGs should be introduced. |
| Samsung2 | Agree to discuss case by case, and OK to re-use legacy FGs as much as possible. But suggest to wait until specs/functionalities are more stable. |
| Intel | It would be good to discuss case by case. |
| Moderator | To be updated after GTW |
| Moderator | Following features received specific comments to consider new FG   * 1. UE features for DL priority indicator in a DCI format 1\_3: QC, MTK   2. UE features for UL priority indicator in a DCI format 0\_3: QC, MTK   3. 49-5a: Trigger Type 3 HARQ CB based feedback using DCI format 1\_3: QC, MTK   4. 49-5b: Trigger enhanced Type 3 HARQ CB based feedback using DCI format 1\_3: QC, MTK   5. PHY priority handling for one-shot HARQ-ACK feedback by DCI 1\_3: QC, MTK   6. UE feature for HARQ-ACK re-transmission triggered by DCI format 1\_3: QC, MTK   7. UE features for SCell dormancy indication within active time by DCI format 1\_X and DCI format 0\_3: QC   8. UE features for cross-slot scheduling by DCI format 1\_X and DCI format 0\_3: QC   9. UE features for Unified-TCI indication by DCI format 1\_3: QC, MTK   Some companies suggest waiting until specs/functionalities are more stable. Therefore, Let’s do not try to agree on anything on this aspect in this meeting but companies are invited to provide views on **which of the above features need new FG for DCI 0\_3/1\_3** by the end of this meeting. |
| NTT DOCOMO | In our view, new FG can be introduced for 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 9 from list provided by Moderator for now. |
|  |  |

# **FGs for multi-carrier UL Tx switching scheme**

In [1], FGs for multi-carrier UL Tx switching scheme are captured as below.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Features** | **Index** | **Feature group** | **Components** | **Prerequisite feature groups** | **Need for the gNB to know if the feature is supported** | **Applicable to the capability signalling exchange between UEs (Sidelink WI only)”.** | **Consequence if the feature is not supported by the UE** | **Type**  **(the ‘type’ definition from UE features should be based on the granularity of 1) Per UE or 2) Per Band or 3) Per BC or 4) Per FS or 5) Per FSPC)** | **Need of FDD/TDD differentiation** | **Need of FR1/FR2 differentiation** | **Capability interpretation for mixture of FDD/TDD and/or FR1/FR2** | **Note** | **Mandatory/Optional** |
| 49. NR\_MC\_enh | 49-X | Supported switching option for each band pair in the band combination for UL Tx switching across more than 2 bands | Indicate supported switching option for each band pair in the band combination for UL Tx switching across more than 2 bands   * Candidate value set is {switchedUL, dualUL, both} |  | Yes |  | [UL Tx switching across more than 2 bands cannot be supported for the band pair in the band combination] | [Per band pair per band combination, details up to RAN2] | [N/A] | [N/A] | [N/A] | [Agreement  Ask RAN2 to consider following alternatives for UE capability reporting about the supported UL Tx switching options   * Alt.1: report {switchedUL, dualUL, both} for each band pair in the band combination]   [Agreement in RAN2#121  For UE capability of switching options, introduce a per-band-pair UE capability to report supported switching options for Rel-18 UL Tx switching.] | Optional with capability signaling |
| 49. NR\_MC\_enh | 49-Y | Minimum separation time for two uplink switching on more than 2 bands within any two consecutive reference slots | If two uplink switchings are triggered and UL transmissions involved in the two uplink switchings are on more than 2 bands within any two consecutive reference slots, then the time duration between the start of all transmission(s) after the first uplink switching and the start of all transmission(s) after the second uplink switching within the two reference slots is expected to be not less than a minimum separation time   * The minimum separation time is a maximum of X us and the switching gap required for the second uplink switching, and X us is reported with a candidate value set of {0us, 500us} | 49-X | Yes |  | [two uplink switching cannot be triggered in two consecutive reference slots for UL transmissions on more than 2 bands] | [Per BC] | [N/A] | [N/A] | [N/A] | [Agreement  Confirm the working assumption with following updates   * (working assumption) If two uplink switching are triggered and UL transmissions involved in the two uplink switching are on more than 2 bands within any two consecutive reference slots, then the time duration between the start of all transmission(s) after the first uplink switching and the start of all transmission(s) after the second uplink switching within the two reference slots is expected to be not less than a minimum separation time   + The minimum separation time is a maximum of X us and the switching gap required for the second uplink switching.   + X us is subject to UE capability with a value set of {0us, 500us}] | Optional with capability signaling |

Following inputs are provided in contributions for the RAN1#112bis-e meeting.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| [2] | vivo | |  | | --- | | **Agreement in RAN1 112[1]**  Confirm the working assumption with following updates  (working assumption) If two uplink switching are triggered and UL transmissions involved in the two uplink switching are on more than 2 bands within any two consecutive reference slots, then the time duration between the start of all transmission(s) after the first uplink switching and the start of all transmission(s) after the second uplink switching within the two reference slots is expected to be not less than a minimum separation time   * The minimum separation time is a maximum of X us and the switching gap required for the second uplink switching.   X us is subject to UE capability with a value set of {0us, 500us} |   It has been agreed that the minimum separation time is a maximum of X us and the switching gap required for the second uplink switching, and the X us is subject to UE capability with a value set of {0us, 500us}. Regarding the granularity of this UE capability, it can be reported per UL Tx switching band combination for simplicity.  Proposal 11. UE reports the value of X us per UL Tx switching band combination.   |  | | --- | | **1Tx-1Tx switching case**[2]**：**  In RAN4 #106, RAN4 discussed the scenario of 1Tx-1Tx switching, i.e., the UL carriers in both bands before and after switching are capable of one transmit antenna connector, and agreed to apply the same length of switching period for 1Tx-1Tx switching and 1Tx-2Tx switching. |   It has been agreed to apply the same length of switching period for 1Tx-1Tx switching and 1Tx-2Tx switching in RAN4’s LS. However, how to report the 1Tx-1Tx switching period needs clarification. One understanding is that a single parameter is reported (e.g.: *uplinkTxSwitchingPeriod-r16*) applying for both 1Tx-1Tx switching and 1Tx-2Tx switching. Another understanding is that two parameters (e.g.: *uplinkTxSwitchingPeriod-r16, uplinkTxSwitching1T1T-r18*) are reported separately applying for 1Tx-2Tx switching and 1Tx-1Tx switching respectively, but the two parameters should have the same value. In our view, there is no additional benefit to introducing a new parameter to indicate 1Tx-1Tx switching period. For simplicity, the legacy parameter *uplinkTxSwitchingPeriod-r16* is applied for both1Tx-1Tx switching and 1Tx-2Tx switching.  Proposal 12. The legacy parameter *uplinkTxSwitchingPeriod-r16* is applied for both1Tx-1Tx switching and 1Tx-2Tx switching. |
| [4] | ZTE | **Issue1: Whether a separate UE feature to indicate the support of UL Tx switching among 3/4bands is needed?**  RAN2 has been agreed to reuse the Rel-16/17 band combination list for Rel-18 UL Tx switching. However, RAN2 is discussing the following two approaches regarding the feature set for UL Tx switching. If Approach 1 is adopted, then it seems a separate UE capability to indicate whether UE supports UL Tx switching among 3/4 bands is not necessary because it can be implicitly indicated by the feature set row. In other words, if 3/4 FeatureSetUplink are reported in one row in FSC for the 3/4 UL bands, then UE supports UL Tx switching among 3/4 bands. However, if Approach 2 below is adopted, then a separate UE feature to indicate the support of UL Tx switching among 3/4 bands is needed.   |  | | --- | | **Approach 1: the 3/4 FeatureSetUplink are reported in one row in FSC for the 3/4 UL bands involved in Rel-18 UL Tx switching;**  **Approach 2: the FeatureSets reported for Rel-16/17 Tx switching between 2 bands can be combined to indicate UL capabilities on the 3/4 UL bands for Rel-18 UL Tx switching;** |   Overall, we have the following proposal.  ***Proposal 3****: Regarding whether a separate UE feature to indicate the support of UL Tx switching among 3/4bands is needed, consider the following two alternatives.*   * *Alt.1: Not needed. The support of UL Tx switching among 3/4 bands is implicitly indicated by the feature sets indication for UL Tx switching.* * *Alt.2: Needed. It is a per BC UE capability.*   **Issue2: Which band pair is switchedUL and which band pair is dualUL?**  Based on the following agreements, this issue will be decided by RAN2 and RAN2 has agreed to have per band pair indication for *switchedUL* and *dualUL*.   |  | | --- | | Agreements (RAN1)    Ask RAN2 to consider following alternatives for UE capability reporting about the supported UL Tx switching options   * o      Alt.1: report {switchedUL, dualUL, both} for each band pair in the band combination * o      Alt.2: report {switchedUL, dualUL, both} for the band combination and report supported band pair for concurrent transmission for the band combination * § Note：If there is no report on the supported band pair(s) for concurrent transmission while the UE reports “dualUL” or “both” for the band combination, gNB may assume that the UE supports concurrent transmission on all the band pairs within the band combination * o      Alt.3: report {dualUL} for each band pair in the band combination * § Note: Within the band combination, the UE shall be capable of being operated in switched UL mode for all band pairs   *Agreements (RAN2):*   1. For UE capability of switching options, introduce a per-band-pair UE capability to report supported switching options for Rel-18 UL Tx switching. 2. Configure {switchedUL, dualUL} for combination(s) of serving cells (i.e., for each band pair in the band combination) 3. For RRC configuration to clarify ambiguous Tx state, RAN2 should introduce an RRC configuration that associates a band to another band which the unused Tx chain is switched to when the switch is from concurrent transmission on two bands to 1 Tx transmission on another band. 4. For UE capability of 2-port UL transmission, RAN2 reuse the per-FS UL-MIMO UE capability (no spec change). |   ***Observation 1****: Regarding the UE feature for indication of switchedUL and dualUL for each band pair, it is introduced by RAN2.*  **Issue3: which band/carrier supports 2-port transmission?**  RAN1 agreed that there is no restriction on number of bands supporting up to 2 ports UL transmission for both switched UL and dual UL and for both 3 bands and 4 bands. However, no new UE capability is needed since UE can already report its MIMO capability via legacy UE capabilities.   |  | | --- | | **Agreement**  There is no restriction on number of bands supporting up to 2 ports UL transmission for both switched UL and dual UL and for both 3 bands and 4 bands.   * It is up to UE capability to support 2 ports UL transmission on none/some/all of the 3 or 4 bands * Note: UE with only 1 Tx chain is not expected to perform UL Tx switching (no spec impact) |   ***Observation 2****: No need to introduce new UE capability to indicate the number of ports for PUSCH transmission for Rel-18 UL Tx switching.*  **Issue4: Duration of the switching period**  Regarding the duration of the switching period, RAN4 has agreed that for Rel-18 UE, for a band pair within a band combination supporting Tx switching among 3/4 bands, the switching period reported by UE for Rel-18 3/4-band Tx switching can be the same or different from the switching period for Rel-16/17 2-band switching operations. The UE capability can be decided by RAN2 and RAN4.   |  | | --- | | **Issue 1: Exact value of Tx switching period for each band pair**  RAN4 discussed the exact value of Tx switching period for each band pair in the band combination, and has agreed that:   * For Rel-18 UE, for a band pair within a band combination supporting Tx switching among 3/4 bands, the switching period reported by UE for Rel-18 3/4-band Tx switching can be the same or different from the switching period for Rel-16/17 2-band switching operations.   + Note 1: the set of candidate values is still the same, i.e., {35 us, 140 us, 210 us}, according to the agreement in RAN4 #104e.   + Note 2: here the band pair is a pair of bands within which there is a switching with a switching period. |   ***Proposal 4****: Regarding the UE capability for duration of the switching period, it is to be introduced by RAN2/RAN4.*  **Issue5: Minimum separation time**  RAN1 has agreed the following for minimum separation time. This UE capability should be discussed in RAN1. Based on the initial discussion in RAN1#112 meeting, the UE capability can be per BC type.   |  | | --- | | **Agreement**  Confirm the working assumption with following updates  (working assumption) If two uplink switching are triggered and UL transmissions involved in the two uplink switching are on more than 2 bands within any two consecutive reference slots, then the time duration between the start of all transmission(s) after the first uplink switching and the start of all transmission(s) after the second uplink switching within the two reference slots is expected to be not less than a minimum separation time   * The minimum separation time is a maximum of X us and the switching gap required for the second uplink switching. * X us is subject to UE capability with a value set of {0us, 500us} |   ***Proposal 5****: Introduce a per BC UE capability for value X for determination the minimum separation time.*  **Issue6: Advanced UE capability**  RAN4 has agreed to introduce an advanced UE capability to indicate whether UE is able to transmit with the unchanged Tx chain during the switching period of another Tx chain.   |  | | --- | | **Issue 3: Impact from switching of one Tx chain on the other Tx chain**  **Scenario of one band with the number of Tx chain unchanged due to switching**  When one of the two Tx chains is triggered to switch from one band (named “band A”) to another band (name “band B”), the other Tx chain is maintained on a different band (named “band C” or “band D” in the case of 4-band) and the number of Tx chain on band C or band D is unchanged due to the switching, RAN4 agreed the granularity of the optional UE capability to allow UL transmission on the band with the number of Tx chain unchanged during UL switching as follows:   * Per band (only for the band(s) in the band combination but not included in the pair of bands before and after switching) for each pair of bands before and after switching in each band combination. |   ***Proposal 6****: Regarding the UE capability to indicate whether UE is able to transmit with the unchanged Tx chain during the switching period of another Tx chain, it is to be introduced by RAN2/RAN4.* |
| [7] | MediaTek | For UE feature of multi-carrier UL Tx switching, we have the following proposal:  **Proposal 2: For R18 UL Tx switching, the following UE feature need to be introduced.**   |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Feature group** | **Components** | **Prerequisite FG** | **Type** | **Mandatory/Optional** | | ULTxSwitchingBandPair-r18 | * {bandIndexUL1-r18, bandIndexUL2-r18} * Switching among bands {3bands, 4bands} * uplinkTxSwitchingPeriod-r18 {n35us, n140us, n210us} * uplinkTxSwitching-OptionSupport-r18{switchedUL, dualUL, both} | ULTxSwitchingBandPair-r16 | Per BC | Optional | |
| [8] | Apple | For Rel-18 UL Tx switching, extension up to 4 bands would require quite substantial updates to UE’s implementation in comparison to 2 bands in Rel-16/17. Therefore, in our view, a new UE capability framework to indicate support of Rel-18 UL Tx switching for UL CA option 1, UL CA option 2 and both UL CA option 1 and 2 should be introduced. Furthermore, based on the agreements in RAN2, such UE capability should be indicated per band pair per combination [1]. Pre-requisite/dependency on FG 22-1 for UL Tx switching in Rel-16 can be further discussed.   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Features | Index | Feature group | Components | | XX. NR\_MC\_enh-Core | XX-2 | Indicating supported option for UL Tx switching for inter-band UL CA for more than 2 bands | Indicating supported option for UL Tx switching for inter-band UL CA for more than 2 bands  Candidate values set is {option1, option2, both option 1 and option 2} |   ***Proposal 4: For Rel-18 UL Tx switching, a new UE capability (new FG) should be introduced to indicate the support of Rel-18 UL Tx switching for UL CA option 1, UL CA option 2 and both UL CA option 1 and 2***   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | *Features* | *Index* | *Feature group* | *Components* | | *XX. NR\_MC\_enh-Core* | *XX-2* | *Indicating supported option for UL Tx switching for inter-band UL CA for more than 2 bands* | *Indicating supported option for UL Tx switching for inter-band UL CA for more than 2 bands*  *Candidate values set is {option1, option2, both option 1 and option 2}* |   ***Proposal 5: For Rel-18 UL Tx switching, the new capability (new FG XX-2) is indicated per band pair per band combination of up to 4 bands***  ***Proposal 6: For Rel-18 UL Tx switching, for the new capability (new FG XX-2), any pre-requisite/dependency on FG 22-1 (for UL Tx switching in Rel-16) can be further discussed***  Another UE capability aspect is whether concurrent transmission is supported for a band pair for which UE indicated capability to support dualUL (UL option 2) [2]. Therefore, a UE capability for indicting support for concurrent transmission for a band pair should be reported. This UE capability will be dependent on the proposed FG XX-2. If UE indicates support of UL option 2 or both for FG XX-2 for a band pair within a band combination, then UE can indicate whether it supports concurrent transmission or not for that band pair. This should be an optional capability and in absence of this capability reporting, concurrent transmission can be assumed for the band pair for which UE indicated support of UL option 2 or both with FG XX-2.   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | *Features* | *Index* | *Feature group* | *Components* | | *XX. NR\_MC\_enh-Core* | *XX-2a* | *Indicating support of concurrent transmission for the band pair* | *Indication whether the band pair for which option 2 or both are supported by FG XX-2, supports concurrent transmission or not {concurrent transmission, non-concurrent transmission only}* |   ***Proposal 7: For Rel-18 UL Tx switching, introduce an additional capability to indicate support of concurrent transmission per band pair per band combination***   * ***This capability is subject to FG XX-2 report on whether option 2 or both is reported to be supported for the band pair within the band combination*** * ***This is an optional capability and if not reported for a band pair for which option 2 or both is reported to be supported in FG XX-2, then concurrent transmission is assumed to be supported for that band pair***  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | *Features* | *Index* | *Feature group* | *Components* | | *XX. NR\_MC\_enh-Core* | *XX-2a* | *Indicating support of concurrent transmission for the band pair* | *Indication whether the band pair for which option 2 or both are supported by FG XX-2, supports concurrent transmission or not*  *Candidate values set is {concurrent transmission, non-concurrent transmission only}* |   Another aspect for UE capability is indication of minimum separation time between 2 switching instances within 2 reference slots. Based on the agreement in RAN1 [3], UE can report from a value set of {0us,500us}. UE capability under the proposed FG XX-2 can be reported by UE. Furthermore, since this is applicable for the case when more than 2 bands are involved in the 2 switching instances, therefore, this capability can be reported per band combination.   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | *Features* | *Index* | *Feature group* | *Components* | | *XX. NR\_MC\_enh-Core* | *XX-2c* | *Indicating support of minimum separation time between two switching instances with more than two bands within two reference slots* | *Indicating supported option for minimum separation time between two switching instances for more than 2 bands between two reference slots*  *Candidate values set is {0us,500us}* |   ***Proposal 8: For Rel-18 UL Tx switching, introduce a UE capability to indicate minimum separation time between two switching instances with more than two bands within two reference slots***   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | *Features* | *Index* | *Feature group* | *Components* | | *XX. NR\_MC\_enh-Core* | *XX-2c* | *Indicating support of minimum separation time between two switching instances with more than two bands within two reference slots* | *Indicating supported option for minimum separation time between two switching instances for more than 2 bands between two reference slots*  *Candidate values set is {0us,500us}* |   Another UE capability that should be introduced is related to RAN4 agreement on whether the unchanged band during a switching on two other bands can be used for UL transmission or not during the switching period. As a default capability, UE is not expected to be scheduled with UL transmission on any of the bands within a band combination during the switching period. This UE capability could be reported per band combination.   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | *Features* | *Index* | *Feature group* | *Components* | | *XX. NR\_MC\_enh-Core* | *XX-2d* | *Indicating support of transmission during the switching period for the band on which UL Tx chain remains unchanged* | *Indicating support of transmission during the switching period for the band on which UL Tx chain remains unchanged*  *Candidate values set is {supported, notSupported}* |   ***Proposal 9: For Rel-18 UL Tx switching, introduce an optional UE capability to indicate support of transmission during the switching period for the band on which UL Tx chain remains unchanged***   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | *Features* | *Index* | *Feature group* | *Components* | | *XX. NR\_MC\_enh-Core* | *XX-2d* | *Indicating support of transmission during the switching period for the band on which UL Tx chain remains unchanged* | *Indicating support of transmission during the switching period for the band on which UL Tx chain remains unchanged*  *Candidate values set is {supported, notSupported}* | |
| [10] | DOCOMO | **Reporting type of minimum separation time capability**  At the last meeting, the working assumption regarding minimum separation time was confirmed with necessary updates. In addition, the reporting type of minimum separation time capability was discussed, but RAN1 did not make agreement due to lack of time [1].  Based on the discussion at the last meeting, it seems majority supports per-BC reporting granularity. We think that potential finer granularity than it e.g., per switching band pair in the band combination seems too much. So, we propose that X us is reported per UL Tx switching band combination (such as 3 or 4 bands BC).  **Proposal 4:**  **UE capability on the X us is reported per BC.** |
| [12] | Huawei, HiSilicon | In last RAN1 meeting, following agreement for the restriction of two UL Tx switching is achieved. In this section, the UE reporting granularity for minimum separation time is discussed.   |  | | --- | | Agreement  Confirm the working assumption with following updates  (working assumption) If two uplink switching are triggered and UL transmissions involved in the two uplink switching are on more than 2 bands within any two consecutive reference slots, then the time duration between the start of all transmission(s) after the first uplink switching and the start of all transmission(s) after the second uplink switching within the two reference slots is expected to be not less than a minimum separation time   * The minimum separation time is a maximum of X us and the switching gap required for the second uplink switching. * X us is subject to UE capability with a value set of {0us, 500us} |   In Rel-17, 2T+2T band combination and 2T+ {intra band 2T+2T} band combination have been agreed to support without the restriction of minimum separation time, which can be set the capability baseline of UE memory management for Rel-18. Therefore, the restriction of minimum separation time should be only for the Rel-18 band combination where the aggregated number of supported Tx across all bands is more than 4, e.g., 2Tx-2Tx-2Tx band combination on 3 bands scenario and 1Tx-1Tx-2Tx-2Tx band combination on 4 bands. It is because additional 500us is to manage RF hardware and only high dimension of combined UL-MIMO capabilities across all bands can increase UE implementation burden to manage UE RF hardware compared to Rel-17 UL Tx switching. With this baseline, the UE reporting granularity for minimum separation time has following candidate schemes,   * Option 1: UE reports X us with a value set of {0us, 500us} per FS. * Option 2: UE reports X us with a value set of {0us, 500us} per BC.   ***Observation 1:*** *The case of the configured band combination where the aggregated number of configured Tx across all bands is no more than 4 has been supported in Rel-17 UEs without the new scheduling restriction, which can be taken as the UE capability baseline of UE RF management for Rel-18.*  For Option 1, UE can report different values for different FSs (feature sets). The granularity of per FS can achieve better flexibility of capability reporting because the restriction of minimum separation time can be only reported for some FS groups. For example, UE can report 500us for one band combination where UL-MIMO capability of one FS group is 2Tx-2Tx-1Tx and report 0us for the same band combination where UL-MIMO capability of another FS group is 2Tx-1Tx-1Tx. However, the signaling overhead is large because the field of X us exists in every FS. Additionally, it can allow a UE to report different values of separation time for each band, e.g. 0 us for Band A and 500 us for Band B within the same band combination, which seems too flexible and needs some clarifications.  With respect to Option 2, UE can report different values for different band combinations. For example, a UE may report 500us for one band combination and report 0us for another band combination. Therefore, Option 2 has smaller signaling overhead and proper flexibility compared to Option 1.  ***Proposal 2:*** *For the restriction of minimum separation time between two succeeding UL Tx switchings in Rel-18 UL Tx switching, a UE reports X us with a value set of {0us, 500us} per BC.* |

## **Discussion**

**Question 3-1:**

* **Companies are encouraged to provide views on whether to introduce FG 49-X**
  + Yes: [MTK], Apple
  + Defined in RAN2: ZTE

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Apple | Yes, we support to introduce new FG per BC |
| Qualcomm | We support define this new FG. However, it seems RAN2 already agree on the new signaling and we prefer not having duplicate discussion. |
| ZTE | It seems that RAN2 already defined the UE capability according to the following RAN2 agreements.  *Agreements (RAN2):*   1. For UE capability of switching options, introduce a per-band-pair UE capability to report supported switching options for Rel-18 UL Tx switching. 2. Configure {switchedUL, dualUL} for combination(s) of serving cells (i.e., for each band pair in the band combination) 3. For RRC configuration to clarify ambiguous Tx state, RAN2 should introduce an RRC configuration that associates a band to another band which the unused Tx chain is switched to when the switch is from concurrent transmission on two bands to 1 Tx transmission on another band. 4. For UE capability of 2-port UL transmission, RAN2 reuse the per-FS UL-MIMO UE capability (no spec change).   We need to avoid parallel and duplicated discussion. Once Ran2 has finalized the capability design, we can copy it into our RAN1 UE feature list if necessary (just for information). |
| Xiaomi | Similar views as Qualcomm. |
| vivo | Similar views as Qualcomm and ZTE |
| OPPO | Support to introduce FG49-X. |
| NTT DOCOMO | For FG 49-X regarding supported switching option for Rel-18 UL Tx switching, RAN1 made a principal agreement and asked RAN2 to discuss/decide details of UE capability for it. RAN2 already made an agreement on capability design as captured in the Note column. In that sense, it just captures what RAN1 and RAN2 agreed and no need to have discussion in RAN1 on details of capability design. Based on internal checking with our RAN2 colleague, it may be good to capture FG 49-X in RAN1 UE features list for information to RAN2 as it is based on RAN1 agreement. |
| Samsung | We support to introduce the new FG. |
| Nokia, NSB | OK. Duplicate discussion and signalling should be avoided, of course, as mentioned by Qualcomm above. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Since RAN2 has implemented this capability IE, we prefer not to spend time on any discussion for it. If only to complete the RAN1 list, then RAN1 can save one placeholder for it and ask RAN2 to fill the details up when RAN1 send an LS to RAN2. |
| LGE | Support to introduce FG 49-X |
| Intel | Share similar view as other companies that duplicated discussion needs to be avoided. |
| CATT | Similar views as Qualcomm and ZTE |
| Ericsson | Considering DCM explanation, the intention is not duplication but capture it in RAN1 TR for Ue features as information. With that understanding, we are fine with DCM and support to capture it as information. |
| Moderator | Summary of companies’ view   * + Yes: [MTK], Apple, OPPO, DCM, Samsung, LGE, E///   + Defined in RAN2: ZTE, QC, ZTE, Xiaomi, vivo, Nokia/NSB, HW/HiSi, Intel, CATT   As mentioned by the rapporteur, the intention of FG 49-X is to capture what RAN1 and RAN2 agreed and no need to have discussion in RAN1 on details of capability design. To make it clear, we can add following note and conclude RAN1 discussion  *This FG is based on the following agreements. Up to RAN2 whether to capture this FG in RAN1 UE feature list or RAN2’s one.*  **Proposal 3-1:**   * **Introduce FG 49-X as follows**  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | 49. NR\_MC\_enh | 49-X | Supported switching option for each band pair in the band combination for UL Tx switching across more than 2 bands | Indicate supported switching option for each band pair in the band combination for UL Tx switching across more than 2 bands   * Candidate value set is {switchedUL, dualUL, both} |  | Yes |  | [UL Tx switching across more than 2 bands cannot be supported for the band pair in the band combination] | [Per band pair per band combination, details up to RAN2] | [N/A] | [N/A] | [N/A] | This FG is based on the following agreements. Up to RAN2 whether to capture this FG in RAN1 UE feature list or RAN2’s one.  [Agreement  Ask RAN2 to consider following alternatives for UE capability reporting about the supported UL Tx switching options   * Alt.1: report {switchedUL, dualUL, both} for each band pair in the band combination]   [Agreement in RAN2#121  For UE capability of switching options, introduce a per-band-pair UE capability to report supported switching options for Rel-18 UL Tx switching.] | Optional with capability signaling | |
| Moderator | Following was agreed in the Tuesday GTW session  **Agreement**   * Introduce FG 49-X as follows  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | 49. NR\_MC\_enh | 49-X | Supported switching option for each band pair in the band combination for UL Tx switching across more than 2 bands | Indicate supported switching option for each band pair in the band combination for UL Tx switching across more than 2 bands   * Candidate value set is {switchedUL, dualUL, both} |  | Yes |  | [UL Tx switching across more than 2 bands cannot be supported for the band pair in the band combination] | [Per band pair per band combination, details up to RAN2] | [N/A] | [N/A] | [N/A] | This FG is based on the following agreements. RAN1 will not discuss the detail of this FG and the detail is up to RAN2  [Agreement  Ask RAN2 to consider following alternatives for UE capability reporting about the supported UL Tx switching options   * Alt.1: report {switchedUL, dualUL, both} for each band pair in the band combination]   [Agreement in RAN2#121  For UE capability of switching options, introduce a per-band-pair UE capability to report supported switching options for Rel-18 UL Tx switching.] | Optional with capability signaling | |

**Question 3-2:**

* **Companies are encouraged to provide views on whether to introduce FG 49-Y**
  + Yes: vivo, ZTE, Apple, DOCOMO, HW/HiSi

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Apple | Yes, we support to introduce FG 49-Y for minimum separation time |
| Qualcomm | We support to define this new UE capability.  In RAN1 #112, two related proposals received majority support as below. The current proposal already includes the per BC capability and we propose to agree on and include the second bullet as well.   * UE capability on the X us is reported per BC * For more than one TAG case, X us is subject to UE capability with a value set of {0us, 500us} as well as for one TAG case |
| ZTE | Yes.  Regarding the “Consequence if the feature is not supported by the UE”, our understanding is that, the current 49-Y is trying to add some restriction for the scheduling. If UE doesn’t indicate 49-Y, then the UE should be advanced UE that support “two uplink switching **can** be triggered in two consecutive reference slots for UL transmissions on more than 2 bands without the minimum separation time”. |
| Xiaomi | Similar views as Qualcomm. |
| Vivo | Ok with Qualcomm’s proposal |
| OPPO | Yes. support to introduce FG49-Y |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support the FG 49-Y and per BC reporting.  In addition, we are also fine to agree on following.   * For more than one TAG case, X us is subject to UE capability with a value set of {0us, 500us} as well as for one TAG case   If above is agreed, then we should also discuss whether value X is reported separately for one TAG case and for more than one TAG case or single value X is reported for both cases.  In our view, whether or not to require 500us minimum separation time would not be impacted by number of TAGs and hence FG 49-Y can be used for both one TAG case and more than one TAG case. |
| Samsung | We support to introduce the new FG. |
| Nokia, NSB | OK |
| MediaTek | We support introducing FG 49-Y but with changes.  A UE that doesn’t require “minimum separation time”, doesn’t need to report X of 0us. The separation gap can’t be 0us. To explain, assume;   * Y1 is the “start of all transmission(s) after the first uplink switching” * Y2 is the “start of all transmission(s) after the second uplink switching”   Between Y1 and Y2, there will be at least one UL transmission and one switching period. The duration of the UL transmission and the switching period can’t be 0us.  Thus, the focus of the feature should be on the UE that requires “minimum separation time” of 500us.  So, in the “Component” field should be updated as follows:  If two uplink switchings are triggered and UL transmissions involved in the two uplink switchings are on more than 2 bands within any two consecutive reference slots, then the time duration between the start of all transmission(s) after the first uplink switching and the start of all transmission(s) after the second uplink switching within the two reference slots is expected to be not less than **500us** ~~a minimum separation time.~~   * ~~The minimum separation time is a maximum of X us and the switching gap required for the second uplink switching, and X us is reported with a candidate value set of {0us, 500us}~~ |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support the FG 49-Y and per BC reporting. Regarding two TAG case, it is unnecessary to have separate UE capability. Therefore, if anything to be agreed for two TAG now, only a note as a subbullet to state that it is applicable to both single TAG and two TAGs. |
| LGE | Support to introduce FG 49-Y and per BC reporting |
| Intel | Support to introduce FG 49-Y |
| CATT | We support to introduce the new FG. |
| Ericsson | Support to introduce FG 49-Y.  With respect to comment on TAGs, we prefer to leave the discussion to RAN4/RAN2. |
| Moderator | Summary of companies’ view   * + Yes: vivo, ZTE, Apple, DOCOMO, HW/HiSi, QC, Xiaomi, vivo, OPPO, Samsung, Nokia/NSB, MTK, LGE, Intel, CATT, E///   + Whether value X is reported separately for one TAG case and for more than one TAG case or single value X is reported for both cases: QC, Xiaomi, vivo, DCM   Given we may need more time to discuss TAG aspects, following proposal is made  **Proposal 3-2:**   * **Introduce FG 49-Y as follows**  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | 49. NR\_MC\_enh | 49-Y | Minimum separation time for two uplink switching on more than 2 bands within any two consecutive reference slots | If two uplink switchings are triggered and UL transmissions involved in the two uplink switchings are on more than 2 bands within any two consecutive reference slots, then the time duration between the start of all transmission(s) after the first uplink switching and the start of all transmission(s) after the second uplink switching within the two reference slots is expected to be not less than a minimum separation time   * The minimum separation time is a maximum of X us and the switching gap required for the second uplink switching, and X us is reported with a candidate value set of {0us, 500us} * FFS value X for different TAG cases | 49-X | Yes |  | [two uplink switching cannot be triggered in two consecutive reference slots for UL transmissions on more than 2 bands] | [Per BC] | [N/A] | [N/A] | [N/A] |  | Optional with capability signaling | |
| Moderator | This proposal could not be discussed in Tuesday GTW session.  Companies are encouraged to provide view whether **Proposal 3-2** is acceptable or not. In addition, companies are encouraged to provide view on the following question.  **Question 3-2a:**   * **Regarding FG 49-Y, companies are encouraged to provide views on whether value X is reported separately for one TAG case and for more than one TAG case, or single value X is reported for both cases, or leave the discussion to RAN4/2** |
| ZTE | Maybe one middle ground is to add one note for this FG.  **Note: RAN1 assumes the same value X is reported for one TAG case and more than one TAG case unless RAN4/2 has a different understanding.**  Then, RAN1 can send LS to RAN4/2 and ask them to confirm. |
| Nokia, NSB | Prop 3-2: OK  Q 3-2a: The same value can also apply for multi-TAG. When there is a switch within a TAG and then between TAGs, the distance of those two switches depends on the TA differential, but the minimum distance that the UE is guaranteed can still be the same. |
| MediaTek | As we explained in our initial response, the intention of “0us” in RAN1 agreement was meant for the UE that doesn’t require “minimum separation time”, and the UE can follow exactly same requirements as Rel-16/17 in terms of switching separation. Thus, it is unacceptable to have a feature that says: “I don’t need the minimum separation time that is introduced in R18”.  Introducing a feature for “minimum separation time” with 0us will cause possible issues for R18 UL Tx switching. The current CR does define the separation time as *max{X,Y}* as below.  -    the minimum separation time between the start of all transmission(s) after the first switch and the start of all transmission(s) after the second switch is max {*X*, *Y*}, where  -    *X* is {0, 500 µs} as indicated by [*MinSwitchSeparation*]  -    *Y* is the switching gap capability indicated for the band pair of the second switch  And ff we assume:   * Y1 is the “start of all transmission(s) after the first uplink switching” * Y2 is the “start of all transmission(s) after the second uplink switching”   Between Y1 and Y2, there will be at ***least one UL transmission (Q duration)*** and ***one switching period (Y)*** as explained in the figure below. With max{X,Y}, and having X=0us, the separation between Y1 and Y2 can be equal to switching gap (Y), which doesn’t leave time for the UL transmission (i.e., Q should be 0us). Shall the UE assumes that this transmission is cancelled in this case? How we then define if the “first uplink switching” has occurred or not given that the corresponding transmission can’t happen (Q=0us)? |
| Apple | We are fine with proposal and agree to further study if separate value for X is needed for multi-tag case. |
| NTT DOCOMO | As in our initial comment, we think single value X reported in 49-Y can be applied to both one TAG case and more than one TAG case (if supported).  It is also ok for us to ask confirmation from RAN4 as RAN4 is discussing more than one TAG case. But since minimum separation time has been discussed and agreed in RAN1, RAN1 should provide RAN1’s understanding/assumption.  So, we are fine with proposal 3-2 with updating the second sub-bullet in component column as below.   * ~~FFS value X for different TAG cases~~ The reported value X is applied to both one TAG case and more than one TAG case (if UE supports more than one TAG case) |
| LGE | One comment for the column “Consequence if the feature is not supported by the UE”: We are wondering the current wording is the right reason to support this feature. Rather, it seems if UE doesn’t support the feature, two uplink switching can be triggered without any restriction.  We are OK with the remaining parts of Proposal 3-2. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | The FG was discussed and introduced only in RAN1. Not sure why RAN1 cannot make the decision for the question 3-2a.  In our view, one capability signaling for both cases is sufficient.  If more inputs from RAN4 are needed, then an FFS for two TAGs is sufficient. A suggested change is  FFS ~~value X~~ for different TAG cases |
| Samsung2 | Proposal 3-2: acceptable  Question 3-2a: We think that the same reported value X can apply for the 1 and the 2 TAG cases. Ok with RAN1 assumption that same value is reported and check with RAN2/4 to confirm. |
| Moderator | To be updated after GTW |
| Moderator | Summary of companies’ view   * Proposal 3-2   + Support: Nokia/NSB, Apple, LGE, Samsung   + Not support: MTK * Question 3-2a   + RAN1 assumes the same value X is reported for one TAG case and more than one TAG case unless RAN4/2 has a different understanding: ZTE, Samsung   + single value X is reported for both cases: Nokia/NSB, HW/HiSi, Samsung, DCM   + FFS: Apple   Regarding the point raised by MTK, I think this should be discussed in maintenance agenda at first if they want to revert the agreements, but I would like to hear company’s view  Regarding the point raised by LGE, the sentence is in square brackets with yellow highlighting, so it can be discussed later.  Given most companies are fine to have single value X for both cases, proposal is updated as follows:  **Proposal 3-2:**   * **Introduce FG 49-Y as follows**  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | 49. NR\_MC\_enh | 49-Y | Minimum separation time for two uplink switching on more than 2 bands within any two consecutive reference slots | If two uplink switchings are triggered and UL transmissions involved in the two uplink switchings are on more than 2 bands within any two consecutive reference slots, then the time duration between the start of all transmission(s) after the first uplink switching and the start of all transmission(s) after the second uplink switching within the two reference slots is expected to be not less than a minimum separation time   * The minimum separation time is a maximum of X us and the switching gap required for the second uplink switching, and X us is reported with a candidate value set of {0us, 500us} * ~~FFS value X for different TAG cases~~ The reported value X is applied to both one TAG case and more than one TAG case (if UE supports more than one TAG case) | 49-X | Yes |  | [two uplink switching cannot be triggered in two consecutive reference slots for UL transmissions on more than 2 bands] | [Per BC] | [N/A] | [N/A] | [N/A] |  | Optional with capability signaling | |
| ZTE | We are ok with the latest proposal from FL.  Regarding the point raised by MTK, from our perspective, even if UE reports 0us, UE still needs a minimum separation time, i.e., switching gap required for the second uplink switching. If UE doesn’t report this UE FG, then there is no such restriction as minimum separation time. But we are open to discuss MTK’s proposal as well. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support the proposal 3-2.  Based on the contributions, per BC part would also be agreeable, but we are fine to defer this discussion.  Regarding MTK/LGE comments (as well as ZTE’s first comment on consequence if FG is not supported), we think there are four possible cases related to this FG as below.   * Case 1: if UE reports X=500 us, when two uplink switchings are triggered and UL transmissions involved in the two uplink switchings are on more than 2 bands within any two consecutive reference slots, the UE expects that the time duration between the start of all transmission(s) after the first uplink switching and the start of all transmission(s) after the second uplink switching within the two reference slots is not less than the minimum separation time which would be equal to 500 us (according to current RAN4 agreements on switching period values and determination)   + This case is the main intention of the agreement and there should be no question/concern. * Case 2: if UE reports X=0 us, when two uplink switchings are triggered and UL transmissions involved in the two uplink switchings are on more than 2 bands within any two consecutive reference slots, the UE expects that the time duration between the start of all transmission(s) after the first uplink switching and the start of all transmission(s) after the second uplink switching within the two reference slots is not less than the minimum separation time which is equal to the switching gap duration required for the second uplink switching based on reported switching period value(s) (according to current RAN4 agreements on switching period determination)   + This case is concerned by MTK, as they think the start of all transmission(s) after the first uplink switching can be the same timing with the start of minimum separation time. But this is what described in the agreement clearly. * Case 3-1: if UE does not report FG49-Y, when two uplink switchings are triggered and UL transmissions involved in the two uplink switchings are on more than 2 bands within any two consecutive reference slots, the minimum separation time is not applied i.e., same as for the case where two uplink switchings are triggered and UL transmissions involved in the two uplink switchings are only on two bands.   + This is the ZTE/LGE’s proposed consequence if the FG49-Y is not supported as well as the MTK’s proposed consequence if the value X=500us is not supported/reported. * Case 3-2: if UE does not report FG49-Y, two uplink switching cannot be triggered in two consecutive reference slots for UL transmissions on more than 2 bands (but the UE can expect two uplink switching can be triggered in two consecutive reference slots for UL transmissions on 2 bands as well as in Rel-16/17).   + This is rapporteur’s proposed consequence if the FG49-Y is not supported.   We think Case 3-2 should be consequence if the FG49-Y is not supported so that the FG49-Y is not “incapability”.  Regarding Case 2 and 3-1, we think they are almost same. Both cases allow two uplink switching in two consecutive reference slots for UL transmissions on more than 2 bands without requiring 500 us minimum separation. Only difference is whether UE can expect that the start of all transmission(s) after the first uplink switching does not occur within the switching gap duration required for the second uplink switching, but if the start of all transmission(s) after the first uplink switching occurs within the switching gap duration required for the second uplink switching, it should be anyway outside of the scenarios for minimum separation time application, and such case is not restricted even in case of Rel-16/17 and Rel-18 with switching for UL transmissions on 2 bands.  Therefore, we think current proposal (Case 1 if UE reports X=500 us, Case 2 if UE reports X=0 us, Case 3-2 if UE does not report FG49-Y) or maybe MTK’s proposal (FG49-Y is component of basic FG for Rel-18 UL Tx switching, Case 1 if UE reports X=500 us, Case 3-1 if UE reports X=0 us) would be reasonable. But we think the current proposal is aligned with RAN1 agreement and in case of MTK’s proposal, the issue is which FG can have FG49-Y as component. Majority supports FG49-Y could be per BC while FG49-X was agreed as per band-pair per BC in RAN2. So, the current proposal would be the best way. |
| Vivo3 | We support FL’s proposal . |
| Apple | We would still prefer to keep the FFS for value X for different TAG cases. However, if majority is fine with the updated proposal without FFS, we can live with it |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | It is agreed to be up to two TAGs. Suggest to change “more than one TAG case” to “two-TAG case” for the following sentence.  “more than one TAG case (if UE supports more than one TAG case)”  Conclusion  It is RAN1’s understanding that RAN4 should lead the discussion on UL Tx switching with multiple TAGs for both 2 bands case and more than 2 bands case   * For further discussion in RAN1 with regards to UL Tx switching with multiple TAGs, it will be discussed only if triggered by RAN4 * If it is decided to support UL Tx switching with multiple TAGs, it is RAN1's working assumption that the number of TAGs should be limited to up to 2 |
| Samsung3 | We support the FL’s proposal. |

**Question 3-3:**

* **Companies are encouraged to provide views on whether to introduce a FG for the support of transmission during the switching period for the band on which UL Tx chain remains unchanged**
  + Yes: Apple
  + Defined in RAN2/4: ZTE

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Apple | Yes, this should be introduced as a FG. We are open to consider this in RAN2/4 as well if the majority thinks so |
| Qualcomm | It seems RAN4 already informed this new capability and we prefer not having duplicated discussion in RAN1 unless necessary. |
| ZTE | This functionality is introduced by RAN4 and has sent LS to RAN2 to introduce this UE capability (copying the previous LS content in the table below).   |  | | --- | | **Issue 3: Impact from switching of one Tx chain on the other Tx chain**  **Scenario of one band with the number of Tx chain unchanged due to switching**  When one of the two Tx chains is triggered to switch from one band (named “band A”) to another band (name “band B”), the other Tx chain is maintained on a different band (named “band C” or “band D” in the case of 4-band) and the number of Tx chain on band C or band D is unchanged due to the switching, RAN4 agreed the granularity of the optional UE capability to allow UL transmission on the band with the number of Tx chain unchanged during UL switching as follows:   * Per band (only for the band(s) in the band combination but not included in the pair of bands before and after switching) for each pair of bands before and after switching in each band combination. |   From our perspective, we should avoid parallel and duplicated discussion, thus it is proposed to define it in RAN2/4. |
| Xiaomi | Similar views as Qualcomm/ZTE. |
| vivo | This can be up to RAN4 |
| NTT DOCOMO | The support of transmission during the switching period for the band on which UL Tx chain remains unchanged has been discussed and agreed only in RAN4, while there has been no discussion/agreement at all on this in RAN1. Therefore, we think we should leave it to RAN4/2. |
| Samsung | We prefer that the need for such a separate FG is discussed and decided in RAN4 and RAN2. |
| Nokia, NSB | This doesn’t require a RAN1 FG, as it is related to a RAN4 decision. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No needed because it was introduced by RAN4 and will be eventually reflected in the feature list of RAN4. |
| LGE | Share the same view with NTT DOCOMO |
| CATT | Define it in RAN2/4 |
| Ericsson | Same view as DCM |
| Moderator | Summary of companies’ view   * + Yes: Apple   + Defined in RAN2/4: ZTE, [Apple], QC, ZTE, Xiaomi, vivo, DCM, Samsung, Nokia/NSB, HW/HiSi, LGE, CATT, E///   All companies are fine to leave it to RAN2/4 and thus we can close this discussion |

# **Conclusions**

Following agreements were made in this meeting.

**Agreement**

* Introduce separate FGs for the support of monitoring DCI formats 1\_3 and 0\_3 as FGs 49-1 and 49-2
  + Note: Some capabilities can be reported separately for DCI formats 1\_3 and 0\_3, details FFS
  + FFS whether/which capabilities can be commonly applied for DCI formats 1\_3 and 0\_3, FFS how to report

**Agreement**

* Introduce FG 49-X as follows

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 49. NR\_MC\_enh | 49-X | Supported switching option for each band pair in the band combination for UL Tx switching across more than 2 bands | Indicate supported switching option for each band pair in the band combination for UL Tx switching across more than 2 bands   * Candidate value set is {switchedUL, dualUL, both} |  | Yes |  | [UL Tx switching across more than 2 bands cannot be supported for the band pair in the band combination] | [Per band pair per band combination, details up to RAN2] | [N/A] | [N/A] | [N/A] | This FG is based on the following agreements. RAN1 will not discuss the detail of this FG and the detail is up to RAN2  [Agreement  Ask RAN2 to consider following alternatives for UE capability reporting about the supported UL Tx switching options   * Alt.1: report {switchedUL, dualUL, both} for each band pair in the band combination]   [Agreement in RAN2#121  For UE capability of switching options, introduce a per-band-pair UE capability to report supported switching options for Rel-18 UL Tx switching.] | Optional with capability signaling |

**Agreement**

* Introduce separate FGs for the support of same and different SCSs between scheduling cell and cells in the set
  + Note: Some capabilities can be reported separately for same and different SCSs, details FFS
  + FFS whether/which capabilities can be commonly applied for same and different SCSs, FFS how to report
  + FFS whether the FG for the support of different SCS is separate or common for DCI format 0\_3 and 1\_3

**Agreement**

* Following is reported separately for DCI formats 1\_3 and 0\_3 as a component of FGs 49-1/1a/1b and 49-2/2a/2b
  + Max number of co-scheduled cells supported by a DCI format for the UE: Candidate value set of {2, 3, 4}

# **References**

[1] R1-2303735 Draft RAN1 UE features list for Rel-18 Multi-carrier enhancements for NR NTT DOCOMO, INC.

[2] R1-2302515 Discussion on UE features for Multi-carrier enhancements vivo

[3] R1-2302577 Discussion on UE features for multi-carrier enhancement OPPO

[4] R1-2302763 Discussion on UE feature for MC enhancements ZTE

[5] R1-2302897 Initial views on UE features for Multi-carrier Enhancements Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell

[6] R1-2303159 Discussion on UE features for multi-carrier enhancements Samsung

[7] R1-2303343 On UE feature discussion for Rel-18 MC enhancements MediaTek Inc.

[8] R1-2303512 Initial views on UE features for Rel-18 multi-carrier enhancements Apple

[9] R1-2303621 UE features for MC enhancements Qualcomm Incorporated

[10] R1-2303736 Discussion on UE features for MC enhancements NTT DOCOMO, INC.

[11] R1-2303762 UE features for MCE Ericsson

[12] R1-2303863 UE features for MC enhancements Huawei, HiSilicon