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# Introduction

This document is to collect company’s view on the email discussion [107-e-NR-7.1CRs-15]:

[107-e-NR-7.1CRs-15] For all remaining issues not covered under [107-e-NR-7.1CRs-01] ~ [107-e-NR-7.1CRs-14], determine whether to reject or continue discussions in future meetings by Nov 15 – Youngbum (Samsung)

|  |
| --- |
| **Moderator’s note:** From the discussion in [107-e-Prep-AI7.1], the collected issues in this email thread [107-e-NR-7.1CRs-15] are basically considered not essential/critical. Nonetheless, there are still some views to clarify/conclude some point. Therefore, please provide your additional views taking into account the raised comments during [107-e-Prep-AI7.1] but not reiterate your previous comments. Note that this email thread is **to determine whether to *reject* or *continue discussions in future meetings***. Please provide your view **before the start of QUIET PERIOD (UTC 11:59pm November 12th)**. Moderator will suggest the potential conclusion after the QUIET PERIOD. |

# Issue#7: R1-2111209/R1-2111210, Correction on n\_HARQ determination for PUCCH power control, CATT

Table 1: Please indicate your company name in either row below

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| “Reject” |  |
| “Continue discussions in future meetings” |  |

Table 2: Please add your additional comment, if any, supporting your above position (refrain from reiterating your previous comment during [107-e-Prep-AI7.1])

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment (if any) |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# Issue#8: R1-2111211/R1-2111212, Correction on determination of TDRA table to be used for PUSCH, CATT

Table 3: Please indicate your company name in either row below

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| “Reject” |  |
| “Continue discussions in future meetings” |  |

Table 4: Please add your additional comment, if any, supporting your above position (refrain from reiterating your previous comment during [107-e-Prep-AI7.1])

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment (if any) |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# Issue#14: R1-2111783, Maximum data rate limit in TB selection, Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell

Table 5: Please indicate your company name in either row below

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| “Reject” |  |
| “Continue discussions in future meetings” |  |

Table 6: Please add your additional comment, if any, supporting your above position (refrain from reiterating your previous comment during [107-e-Prep-AI7.1])

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment (if any) |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# Issue#20: R1-2112292, On two DCIs in the same slot for BWP switch, MediaTek Inc.

Table 7: Please indicate your company name in either row below

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| “Reject” |  |
| “Continue discussions in future meetings” | MTK |

Table 8: Please add your additional comment, if any, supporting your above position (refrain from reiterating your previous comment during [107-e-Prep-AI7.1])

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment (if any) |
| MTK | This topic was brought up in RAN1 #106e and majority of companies prefer to further discuss. In the preparation phase summary for AI 7.1 during RAN1 #107e [1, RAN1#107-e\_NR\_CRs\_7.1\_summary\_v16\_Apple\_Moderator, [DownloadLink](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_107-e/Inbox/drafts/7.1/Preparation%20Phase/RAN1%23107-e_NR_CRs_7.1_summary_v16_Apple_Moderator.xlsx)], RAN1 Chairman’s initial assessment is   * (same comment as in RAN1#106-e) According to current spec, a UE is not required to receive or transmit in the BWP-changing cell from the end of the third symbol of a slot where UE receives the DL/UL BWP change indication DCI to the beginning of a slot indicated by k0/k2. Based on this, the UE behavior for all 6 cases listed in the tdoc seem clear.   and companies’ stands in [1] are   * + **Agree with the initial assessment, spec is clear:** CATT, DOCOMO, Samsung, Huawei, Futurewei, vivo, Intel   + **Ok to discuss:** MTK, Spreadtrum, E///, Apple   + **Case 3 is error case, other cases are clear in spec:** Qualcomm   Since this issue has been discussed for a second meeting, and Chairman has the same interpretation as us in [R1-2112292](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_107-e/Docs/R1-2112292.zip) for the second time, we suggest to make the following conclusion:   * ***The UE behavior for all 6 cases listed in R1-2112292 fits current 5G NR specification for two DCIs in the same slot for BWP switch.***   to wrap up this issue. |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# Issue#23: R1-2112403, Correction on rate-matching for PDSCH with SPS in TS38.214, Huawei, HiSilicon

Table 9: Please indicate your company name in either row below

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| “Reject” |  |
| “Continue discussions in future meetings” | MTK |

Table 10: Please add your additional comment, if any, supporting your above position (refrain from reiterating your previous comment during [107-e-Prep-AI7.1])

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment (if any) |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# Summary of email discussion

Based on the discussion, moderator would like to suggest the following:

[To be updated]

# Conclusions

[To be updated]
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