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# Introduction

In RAN1#118, the following discussion paper in R1-2406327 and draft CR in R1-2406328 are submitted on the first SPS PDSCH after activation.

R1-2406327 Discussion on the first SPS PDSCH after activation CATT

R1-2406328 Clarification on the first SPS PDSCH after activation CATT

This contribution collects companies’ views on the issues and proposals discussed in the above Tdocs.

# Discussion

The draft CR in R1-2406328 intends to clarify that the first SPS PDSCH after activation is included in the description of PDSCH using higher-layer-provided SPS configuration and the procedure of determining the set of SPS PDSCH required to be received in one slot.

## Q: Do you agree with the text proposals in draft CR in R1-2406328?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree or Not Agree** | **Comments** |
| Apple | Comments | In our understanding, the pseudo code is only applicable to the SPS-PDSCHs not associated with DCI. So talking about overlapping PDSCH resources in a CC, the first SPS-PDSCH after activation DCI must be treated as a DG, and 14 symbol gap must be considered. Consequently, it will be an error case to have overlapping of a DG and the 1st SPS-PDSCH. We don’t think spec change is needed. We certainly support a conclusion. |
| DCM |  | Probably it is better to clarify it in spec, but conclusion is fine if majority prefer it. |
| QC | Comment | We are fine with “first SPS PDSCH after activation is included in the description of PDSCH using higher-layer-provided SPS configuration”. But the CR text can be discussed. We are not sure if the terminology “SPS PDSCH” is defined already?“first SPS PDSCH after activation is included in the procedure of determining the set of SPS PDSCH required to be received in one slot” – On this, we have different opinion. We think the procedure only includes non-first SPS PDSCH. First SPS PDSCH should be treated as DG from SPS pruning procedure point of view. Therefore, we agree with Apple’s suggestion “Consequently, it will be an error case to have overlapping of a DG and the 1st SPS-PDSCH”. In addition, it is an error to have overlap between 1st SPS-PDSCH of different SPS configurations.  |
| Nokia | Disagree | Spec change is not needed. The error case mentioned by QC and Apple seems to be covered in spec (the yellow highlighted text in the proponent’s contribution). In our understanding, PDSCH without PDCCH signifies SPS PDSCH including 1st SPS PDSCH in all three cases provided in the discussion, therefore no need to distinguish them as suggested in the TP. Moreover, agree with QC that SPS PDSCH terminology is rather unclear and would not add more clarity. |