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# Introduction

This document is created to facilitate the email discussion of “[106-e-NR-7.1CRs-05] Issue#10: Discussion on cancellation of semi-static transmission due to dynamic transmission”. This email thread is triggered by the following draft CR.

[R1-2106928](file:///D:\Documents\3GPP%20documents\RAN1\TSGR1_106-e\Docs\R1-2106928.zip) Discussion on cancellation of semi-static transmission due to dynamic transmission CATT

# Company views

For operation on a single carrier in unpaired spectrum, for an overlapping case of a DL/UL semi-static transmission and an UL/DL dynamic transmission which collides with semi-static DL/UL symbol(s) or SSB/valid PRACH occasion,

* Understanding 1: both the dynamic transmission colliding with semi-static DL/UL symbol(s) or SSB/valid PRACH occasion and the semi-static transmission overlapping with the dynamic transmission are not transmitted / received;
* Understanding 2: semi-static transmission could be transmitted / received while dynamic transmission colliding with semi-static DL/UL symbol(s) or SSB/valid PRACH occasion is dropped.

More detailed elaboration of the case and the above understandings can be found in R1-2106928.

**Q1: Do you agree with understanding 1 or 2 above?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Understanding 1 or 2** | **Comment** |
| vivo | Understanding 1 | Current spec. reflects understanding 1. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Und. 2 |  |
| Qualcomm | Not agree | Spec does not specify the order of the texts. Therefore, it is up to UE which order to process the relevant steps and hence up to UE whether to transmit/receive semi-static transmission. |
| OPPO |  | We agree with QC that it is up to UE implementation whether to process the semi-static UL/DL transmission. |
| Ericsson | Either is fine. | If possible, it would be good to clarify UE behavior when such configuration and scheduling occurs. |
|  |  |  |

**Q2: Do you think it necessary to clarify the intended UE behavior if there are different understandings among companies? If not, why?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes or No** | **Comment** |
| vivo | Not necessary for Rel-15 and Rel-16.  Open for Rel-17 if there are different understandings among companies. | If there are different understandings,   * For Rel-15 and Rel-16, it may not be possible to have a unified UE behavior due to NBC concern. * But we prefer have a clear UE behavior for future release. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | OK to clarify. | If cannot be converged, our understanding is that for R15 the resulted effect would be up to UE implementation - similar issue as to RACH. For R16, a clarification would be preferred. |
| Qualcomm | No | It causes NBC issue. |
| OPPO | Not | It can be up to UE implementation. |
| Ericsson | If possible, **Yes**. |  |
|  |  |  |

# Conclusion

To be added after the discussion.