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The Issue of MT.4

Apple (R1-2101349) discussed the issue QCL restriction of PDSCH and SSB on the same symbol. In Rel-15, it is specified that the gNB shall ensure that the PDSCH and SSB are QCLed with respect to QCL-TypeD if they are multiplexed in the same symbol, which is specified in the TS 38.214. In M-DCI based mTRP, two PDSCHs could be overlapped in same symbol but with different TCI states and in S-DCI based mTRP, the DMRS of multi-TRP PDSCH could have two different TCI states and thus two different QCL properties. Thus, the text description in current 38.214 would imply that the gNB shall ensure both overlapped PDSCHs are QCLed with the SSB or both of those different TCI states shall be QCLed with the SSB. That restriction could cause some problem. Therefore, Apple proposed to revise the specification in 38.214 considering the multi-TRP PDSCH transmission. Particularly, it is proposed to specify the gNB only need to ensure at least one QCL of the PDSCH are same to that of the SSB, instead of all the PDSCH QCL.

## **Round#1 discussion**

Based on the proposal by Apple, here is the initial proposal for MT.4

**Proposal: Adopt the following TP for 38.214.**

|  |
| --- |
| 5.1.6.2 DM-RS reception procedure \*\*\* Unchanged text is omitted \*\*\*  If the UE receives the DM-RS for PDSCH and an SS/PBCH block in the same OFDM symbol(s), then the UE may assume that at least one DM-RS port and SS/PBCH block are quasi co-located with 'QCL-TypeD', if 'QCL-TypeD' is applicable. Furthermore, the UE shall not expect to receive DM-RS in resource elements that overlap with those of the SS/PBCH block, and the UE can expect that the same or different subcarrier spacing is configured for the DM-RS and SS/PBCH block in a CC except for the case of 240 kHz where only different subcarrier spacing is supported.  \*\*\* Unchanged text is omitted \*\*\* |

If you have comments, please input below

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | comments |
| QC | Is “one DMRS port” referring to the DMRS in the beginning of the sentence? Does the TP address the case of multi-DCI? i.e., If we have PDSCH1 and PDSCH2 both overlapping with the SSB, the TP above cannot be applied to both PDSCHs. |
| OPPO | We have similar question as QC that whether the TP is applied to both S-DCI and M-DCI based M-TRP? |
| Apple | This “one DMRS port” indicates the one DMRS port from both PDSCH1 and PDSCH2 in QC’s example.  It is applied for both sDCI and mDCI.  To address QC and OPPO’s concern, we can add additional change as follows: 5.1.6.2 DM-RS reception procedure \*\*\* Unchanged text is omitted \*\*\*  If the UE receives the DM-RS for PDSCH(s) and an SS/PBCH block in the same OFDM symbol(s), then the UE may assume that at least one DM-RS port from the PDSCH(s) and SS/PBCH block are quasi co-located with 'QCL-TypeD', if 'QCL-TypeD' is applicable. Furthermore, the UE shall not expect to receive DM-RS in resource elements that overlap with those of the SS/PBCH block, and the UE can expect that the same or different subcarrier spacing is configured for the DM-RS and SS/PBCH block in a CC except for the case of 240 kHz where only different subcarrier spacing is supported.  \*\*\* Unchanged text is omitted \*\*\* |
| MediaTek | Support Apple’s updated TP |
| DOCOMO | Support Apple’s latest revision. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | The latest change from Apple’s seems to be fine to us, in principle. In our understanding, for the case of Multi-DCI with overlapped PDSCHs and SSB in the same symbol, how to assume given TCI (associated DMRS ports) is up to the UE, from either PDSCH 1 or PDSCH 2. It seems to be the same concept with single-DCI based with two TCI states, with regarding to type D assumption at the UE side. |
| Nokia, NSB | We understand the concern discussed here but do not clearly see the above TPs solving it.  First, it is hard to capture both single DCI and Multi-DCI scenarios with the text mentioning “DMRS for PDSCH(s)”. As you may refer to in the other parts of the spec, these modes have very specific text when the spec describes behaviors.  Second, we should make sure legacy behavior is not impacted.  Third, we should first try to understand what exactly should be covered in an agreement than trying TPs to make things clearer. |
| Samsung | Our view is that Apple’s latest version is fine for us and it can include all cases: multi-TRP transmission (multi-DCI and single-DCI) and single-TRP transmission. However, as Nokia mentioned, since the spec includes the specific text for multi-DCI or single-DCI cases, including the specific text is also fine for us. |
| ZTE | The clarification is good for us. We support the updated TP. |
| vivo | We have similar feeling as Nokia that even the latest update is unclear. After reading the updated proposal, the legacy QCL assumption of DMRS for PDSCH is changed to not mandating all DMRS ports have same QCL as SSB when the DMRS and SSB are in the same symbol. This is obviously different from Rel-16 behavior.  One option is not to update anything, which implies   * For M-DCI-based MTRP, the DMRS for PDSCH from one of the TRPs cannot overlap with SSB. * For S-DCI-based MTRP, the DMRS for PDSCH of scheme 1a, 2a/2b cannot overlap with SSB either.   We can make a conclusion in this meeting. And we think any other updates are optimization for MTRP. |