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# Introduction

Among other items, the WID "Extending current NR operation to 71 GHz" includes the following RAN1 objective:

|  |
| --- |
| Support enhancement to PDCCH monitoring, including blind detection/CCE budget, and multi-slot span monitoring, potential limitation to UE PDCCH configuration and capability related to PDCCH monitoring. |

This document covers the following as announced by the chairman:

[104-e-NR-52-71GHz-02] Email discussion/approval on PDCCH monitoring enhancements with checkpoints for agreements on **Jan-28, Feb-02, Feb-05** – Alex (Lenovo)

Depending on the progress, new questions or proposal may be added after the defined checkpoints.

# Discussion

FL NOTE: Please refer to the documents listed in Section 3 for individual questions for an identified topic.

## Topic A1: Blind Decoding Capability, Multi-slot span monitoring

### First Round (A1-1a)

**Question A1-1a: Do you see a need to support single-slot span monitoring for one or both new numerologies (480 kHz, 960 kHz)?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Xiaomi | Currently, we see no need. For SCS120khz, the single slot capability is BD/CCE=(20/32). Start from this, for SCS=480/960khz, BD/CCE would be at the level of 10 or even less. Such restriction would cause high blocking probability for even just a few DCIs |
| Qualcomm | For the new SCSs, we think single-slot based PDCCH monitoring should be supported, as well as a new multi-slot based PDCCH monitoring. Although the number of BD/CCE shall be strictly limited for single-slot monitoring, we see there are use cases that more frequent PDCCH monitoring is required, such as an extremely low-latency traffic or outside of a COT. |
| Futurewei | We do not see a strong reason for single slot monitoring at higher numerologies. |
| OPPO | Yes. Single-slot span monitoring is beneficial for some latency-urgent services. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No. We do not see sufficient need to support single-slot span monitoring in addition to multi-slot span monitoring for the new SCS. Multi-slot span monitoring should still be able to schedule a single slot with enough flexibility in the value of k0, so that the single scheduled slot can be in any slot within the multi-slot span/period. On the other hand, supporting single-slot monitoring would offset the benefits of complexity reduction obtained by requiring UEs to only support multi-slot span monitoring with a span of multiple slots. In summary, the only benefit of supporting single-slot span monitoring would be to decrease the scheduling latency. We think the scheduling latency is already very low when using large SCS like 480 or 960 kHz SCS even based on multiple slots monitoring span. |
| Apple | If the question is asking whether we should support FG 3-5b type PDCCH monitoring for a single slot, given the short duration of the slot, we do not see a need for this. If the question is asking whether we should support PDCCH monitoring per slot, also do not see a need as multi-slot monitoring is being proposed to limit UE complexity. Having single slot UE PDCCH monitoring defeats the purpose. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Yes. We think that single-slot span monitoring can be considered as a special case of multi-slot span monitoring and it depends on the configuration of multi-slot span. So from this point of view, it seems that single-slot span should not be ruled out. |
| Samsung | First we would like to clarify the wording. “single-slot span” monitoring is confusing to us. If the intention is to discuss whether Rel-15 legacy per-slot based monitoring, then it’s better to use “per slot monitoring” to be aligned with 38.213. If understanding in such a way, we support the legacy behavior for 480 kHz and 960 kHz. The span based monitoring should be associated with UE capability, so slot based monitoring is still needed at least for case UE capability is not indicated.  |
| Intel | By single slot span, our understanding is that UE capability on max BD/CCE are defined in single slot level. We have concerns on the max number of BD/CCEs per slot.In this case, the numbers of BD/CCE per slot for SCS 480, 960kHz will be a quite small, assuming the numbers of BD/CCE can be obtained by scaling down the corresponding numbers for low SCS. Otherwise, if scaling is not considered, the overall requirement on UE PDCCH monitoring is extremely high since UE needs to monitor PDCCH in every slot. Consequently, PDCCH AL 16 or 8 may not be supported if the number of CCEs is less than 16 or 8. This may indicate that larger ALs may not be supported for single slot span-based monitoring, which may not be desirable as it would pose restriction on PDCCH transmission. |
| MediaTek | Yes. We share the same view with Qualcomm and ZTE that single-slot monitoring is a special case of multi-slot monitoring and it is beneficial in some low latency cases. In addition, single-slot BD/CCE limit might be useful for the discussion of multi-slot BD/CCE limit. Regarding Apple’s comment, we also don’t see the need for FG 3-5b type monitoring but some basic monitoring, e.g., only monitoring first three symbol per slot, can be considered if single slot monitoring is supported.  |
| InterDigital | We agree with Samsung that “single-slot span” monitoring is confusing, and it is better to use “per slot monitoring”. In addition, we think that “per slot monitoring” is beneficial especially for services which require low latency. In that sense, “per slot monitoring” should be supported as an optional feature.  |
| vivo | Yes, we think both single-slot based PDCCH monitoring and multi-slot based PDCCH monitoring can be supported in spec. Multi-slot based PDCCH monitoring capability could be the mandatory capability while single-slot based one is an optional one. UE needs to report whether to support single-slot based PDCCH monitoring or not. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Yes. We think single-slot span monitoring can be supported as the optional for both 480 and 960 kHz SCS if it is possible.  |
| Sony | If UE would be compulsory to support single slot span monitoring, the implementation complexity cannot be reduced for the high SCS. Therefore, it is preferred not to support the single slot span monitoring for new numerologies. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support for single-slot span monitoring for 480kHz and 960kHz will be depending on the support for single DCI format for multiple PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling. In our view, if single DCI format is supported to schedule only multiple PDSCH or multiple PUSCH, then single-slot span monitoring for 480kHz and 960kHz might be needed for the scenario when DL/UL traffic have similar pattern. However, if a single DCI scheduling both multiple PDSCH and multiple PUSCH is supported, then single-slot span monitoring is not needed for 480kHz and 960kHz |
| Nokia, NSB | Yes, in addition to multi-slot -based monitoring there is a need to support also slot-based monitoring.Slot-based monitoring needs to be supported for both new numerologies. |
| Spreadtrum | We see no need. Due to the limitations of UE processing capability, the maximum number of BDs and CCEs may be reduced significantly for new numerologies (480 kHz, 960 kHz). This situation increases the probability of PDCCH blocking. |
| LG Electronics | Yes. On top of multi-slot monitoring support, single-slot monitoring might be needed to support UEs with different capabilities.  |
| CEWiT | Yes. We feel it is needed for latency critical cases. We feel both single-slot and multi-slot span monitoring are required. |
| Ericsson | We support multi-slot span with a "sliding window" as illustrated below.We think the fundamental issue is, as stated in the TR, to “investigate on the maximum number of BDs/CCEs for PDCCH monitoring per time unit, e.g. slot as Rel-15, or new scheduling/monitoring unit.” The motivation is to limit the PDCCH processing loads on the UE over any sliding window of, say, B slots. The maximum BD/CCEs can be distributed by NW configuration to (1) all in one slot or (2) over several slots while respecting the maximum capability constraints over any sliding window of B slots. Such flexibility of distributing the PDCCH processing loads of a UE over the B slots is necessary from the NW’s point of view because the NW needs to distribute these constraints over the B slots for different UEs’ USS and CSS (illustrative examples are provided below). From a UE’s point view, SS can be configured with any existing *monitoringSlotPeriodicityAndOffset* as long as the aggregated MOs respect the processing load constraint within the sliding window.In the following examples we assume B = 4 in which case UEs support a multi-slot PDCCH processing capability of C4-slot = M+N, which represents the total BD or CCE limit. Each UE is configured with CSS with periodicity of 4 slots and the required number of BD/CCEs in each MO for CSS is denoted by N. The height of an MO represents the required processing load.In the first configuration example, each UE is configured with USS with periodicity of 4 slots and the required number of BD/CCEs in each MO for USS is denoted M. Different UEs USS are staggered over time which is important from a network flexibility point of view.In the second configuration example, each UE is configured with USS with periodicity of 2 slots and the required number of BD/CCEs in each MO for USS is M/2. This configuration is beneficial to reduce scheduling latency. |
| CATT | Yes. Single slot should be defined for gNB scheduling flexibility |

First Round FL Summary: 12 companies expressed clear support to standardize per-slot monitoring for 480/960 kHz, while 7 companies see no need to support per-slot monitoring for 480/960 kHz. It has been pointed out that from a design perspective, per-slot monitoring for 480/960 kHz could be seen as a special case in the multi-slot span monitoring with a single slot span.

First Round FL Suggestion A1-1a.1:

Continue discussion on multi-slot span monitoring including a potential case of a single slot span, which should fit in the multi-slot span framework.

### First Round (A1-1b)

**Question A1-1b: If yes for Question A1-1a, what are your thoughts on the maximum number of monitored PDCCH candidates and on the maximum number of non-overlapped CCEs for the new numerologies (480 kHz, 960 kHz) in a single-slot span?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Qualcomm | We think a simple projection (e.g., based on log-linear regression) could be the starting point. Since it is a complicated matter involving lots of implementation and performance aspects (e.g., processing complexity, support for high AL, etc.), further studies should be conducted before making a conclusion.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We think the maximum number of monitored PDCCH candidates and on the maximum number of non-overlapped CCEs for the new numerologies (480 kHz, 960 kHz) only need to be defined for multi-slot span PDCCH monitoring. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We think that the values on the maximum number of monitored PDCCH candidates and non-overlapped CCEs provided by some companies can be used as a reference or starting point for discussion. |
| Samsung | The maximum number of monitored PDCCH candidate and maximum number of CCEs in a slot can be estimated by extrapolating currently supported numbers for other SCSs. We have following numbers as reference for discussion, and whether to keep minimum maximum number of CCE as 16 in 960 kHz SCS can be further discussed.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | 480 kHz | 960 kHz |
| Maximum number of BD | [10-12] | [8-9] |
| Maximum number of non-overlapped CCE | [18-20] | [14-16] |

 |
| InterDigital | We agree with Qualcomm that a simple projection could be the starting point.  |
| vivo | Based on current BD/CCE table, we could first make a non-linear fitting to derive the candidate value for new SCS 480K and 960K as a starting point. Finally, considering the implementation complexity from Chipset, the value could be determined. Besides, the derived value here could also be used as a reference for determination of BD/CCE value for multi-slot span. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We share the same view as Qualcomm. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | In our view, this can be discussed once the agreement is made on whether single-slot span is supported or not for 480kHz and 960kHz |
| Nokia, NSB | Extrapolation based on BD/CCE limits defined for existing SCSs (slot -based operation) is one approach to consider.All UEs should support at least 16 non-overlapped CCEs (in order to support AL 16).How to determine BD/CCE limits for different cases of the multi-slot span (2, 4, 8 slots) could also be discussed. One approach is to take the BD/CCE limits defined for 120 kHz SCS as a starting point. Those values can be scaled according to the actual multi-slot span and/or according to BD/CCE limits (to be) defined for slot -based monitoring. |
| LG Electronics | We think that values less than or equal to the BD/CCE limit for 120kHz can be the starting point to discuss BD/CCE limit for the new numerologies in a single-slot span. Or, a value corresponding to 1/4 or 1/8 of BD/CCE limit for 120kHz can be considered as a starting point.  |
| CEWiT | Reducing the BD/CCE limit might impact the scheduling flexibility for a UE. Hence, dynamic indication of parameters that impacts the number of BD/CCE a UE will perform in a slot should be considered. |
| Ericsson | Agree with Huawei, and as our answer to A1-1a shows, the BD/CCE budget need only be defined on a B-slot basis, e.g., B = 4/8 for 480/960 kHz SCS. |
| CATT | Our view of maximum monitored PDCCH candidates for 480 kHz and 960 kHz per slot is around 11 and 10 per slot respectively |

First Round FL Summary: Different starting points to arrive at the budget, but it as also been pointed out that the final outcome will depend on other design choices.

First Round FL Suggestion A1-1b.1:

In case FL Suggestion A1-1a.1 is adopted, include the BD/CCE budget discussion for per-slot monitoring for 480/960 kHz in the framework of discussing multi-slot span monitoring and related limitations.

### First Round (A1-2a)

**Question A1-2a: Do you see a need to support new multi-slot span monitoring for the existing SCS of 120 kHz? Or can we conclude that for 120 kHz SCS, no PDCCH monitoring enhancement is needed?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Xiaomi | Yes. If time allows, it is better to define multi-slot span monitoring for 120kHz SCS, with the same framework as 480/960khz SCS. But multi-slot span monitoring discussion for 480/960khz SCS should be prioritized over 120kHz SCS. |
| Qualcomm | We don’t see strong motivation for this. At least for PDCCH monitoring, we think the existing FR2 designs and capabilities can be reused. |
| Futurewei | We prefer single slot monitoring for PDCCH @ 120 kHz SCS i.e. no PDCCH monitoring enhancement is necessary. |
| OPPO | We think new multi-slot span monitoring is not needed for 120 kHz. But coverage enhancement for 120kHz SCS may be studied. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We do not see the need to support new multi-slot span monitoring for the existing SCS of 120 kHz, since implementations of single-slot monitoring span have already been proven feasible in commercial devices.  |
| Apple | No. To maximize the re-use of existing hardware is one of the key objectives of this WI. Using the existing PDCCH monitoring design for 120 kHz supports this objective. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | In principle, we think that there is no need on PDCCH monitoring enhancements for 120kHz SCS, but in order to keep alignment with framework as 480/960kHz SCS, we tend to support multi-slot span monitoring for the existing 120kHz SCS. |
| Samsung | We didn’t see a critical need as for 480/960 kHz, so maybe it’s more proper to discuss this after 480/960 kHz discussion is finalized.  |
| Intel | Agree. We prefer to reuse existing PDCCH monitoring for SCS 120kHz to minimize specification impacts.  |
| MediaTek | The motivation to have multi-slot monitoring is to reduce PDCCH monitoring power and improve scheduling flexibility if a slot duration is too short for SCS=480kHz and 960kHz. Both motivations are not valid for 120kHz configuration and we don’t see the need to discuss such enhancement for 120kHz configuration. On the other hand, multi-slot monitoring is already supported in Rel-15/16. The only thing missing is BD/CCE limit per multi-slot, which is not needed in our view.  |
| InterDigital | In order to avoid confusion, definition of “multi-slot span” monitoring should be clarified. If it is span based monitoring capability based on a span with (X slots,Y slots), we think that it is too complicated as time durations in 480/960KHz are short. In that sense, in our view, extending current “per-slot” based capability to “multi-slot” based capability would be a better solution.  |
| vivo | Currently, PDCCH monitoring capability for 120KHz could reuse that in FR2 as we proposed in our Tdoc. The design of multi-slot span monitoring is mainly targeting to 480/960K SCS. After it is designed, the discussion on whether to extend it to 120KHz or other SCS in some special case (e.g. Redcap UEs) could occur later. |
| NTT DOCOMO | In our view, multi-slot span monitoring for 120 kHz SCS is not necessary. The motivation for supporting multi-slot span monitoring is to avoid excessive reduction of the values of PDCCH processing limits (max number of BDs/CCEs) with the time unit of slot for larger SCSs (i.e., 480 and 960 kHz). For 120 kHz SCS, we don’t see any issue for the exiting per-slot and per-span PDCCH monitoring capability.  |
| Sony | We think no PDCCH monitoring enhancement for SCS 120kHz (reusing SCS 120kHz at FR2) is with minimum standard impact.  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | In our view, we don’t see any need to enhance PDCCH monitoring including multi-slot span monitoring for 120kHz |
| Nokia, NSB | No, there is no need for PDCCH monitoring enhancements for 120 kHz SCS. |
| Spreadtrum | We think multi-slot span monitoring is not needed for the existing SCS of 120 kHz. |
| LG Electronics | We don’t see any benefit for this now. But, we are open to discuss it. |
| Ericsson | No PDCCH monitoring enhancement is needed for 120 kHz SCS. |
| CATT | No. The maximum monitored PDCCH candidate for 120 kHz SCS in Rel-15 should be reused. |

First Round FL Summary: A majority of companies see no need to support multi-slot monitoring for 120 kHz during this WI. One company doesn't identify a benefit now but is open to discuss it at a later point of time. Two companies suggested to continue discussion but with lower priority. One company sugested to support it for 120 kHz to be aligned with 480/960 kHz framework.

### Feature Lead Proposal A1-1:

Conclude that for 120 kHz SCS, no multi-slot span monitoring for PDCCH is needed.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Samsung | We are fine with the proposal.  |
| Ericsson | I think use of the word "span" in this context can create some confusion due to the fact that in FL Proposal A1-5 "span" is only defined for Alt-2.Maybe the conclusion can simply be that no new UE capability definition is needed for 120 kHz SCS? |
| MediaTek |  We are ok with the proposal. The updated proposal from Ericsson might be too restrictive in our view. |
| Qualcomm | We are fine with the proposal. However, we share a similar concern with Ericsson regarding the use of “span”, although it is the wording in the WID. Since we used “multi-slot PDCCH monitoring capability” in main bullet of A1-5, we think just removing “span” in A1-1 would make it more consistent. |
| Moderator | Agree that "span" may be better to avoid. How about simply saing the following:"Conclude that for 120 kHz SCS, no multi-slot monitoring for PDCCH is needed." |
| InterDigital | We are fine with the updated proposal from Moderator.  |
| Futurewei | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Apple | We are fine with the updated proposal.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are fine with the updated proposal from the Moderator. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We are generally fine with the updated proposal. For further clarification, we think the proposal can be updated as follows since we think monitoring periodicity with more than 1 slot itself should be possible for 120 kHz depending on the SS configuration as in FR1/2.Conclude that for 120 kHz SCS, no multi-slot UE capability for PDCCH monitoring is needed. |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with the updated proposal. |
| Intel | We are fine with the updated proposal |
| LG Electronics | We are fine with the updated proposal from Moderator.  |
| Xiaomi | We are fine with the updated proposal from Moderator. |
| vivo | Fine with the idea of the proposal. Agree with Docomo that the wording is not accurate enough. |
| Nokia, NSB | We support the proposal. Fine to remove the “span” as well. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support the updated FL proposal (without “span”) |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We have also same confusion about “span”. In our view, we don’t have any conclusion on which of three candidate alternatives will be supported yet, so such wording seems to imply Alt 2,“(X,Y) span” will be eventually adapted to support multi-slot based PDCCH monitoring. Therefore, in order to avoid ambiguity, we think NTT’s update seems better and clearer. |
| Ericsson2 | Agree with DOCOMO, vivo, and ZTE that the clarification is needed so as not to preclude SS configuration with a periodicity of more than 1 slot.We are fine with DOCOMO's suggestion: Conclude that for 120 kHz SCS, no multi-slot UE capability for PDCCH monitoring is needed. |

### First Round (A1-2b)

**Question A1-2b: In case of multi-slot monitoring, what are your views on monitoring periodicities and the corresponding number and location of OFDM symbols (for 120/480/960 kHz), including a potential duration of more than 3 OFDM symbols? If convenient, refer to or suggest modifications to the following cases:**

* Case 1: PDCCH monitoring of all SS sets monitored in a slot occurs within 3 consecutive OFDM symbols that have fixed positions in each slot
	+ Case 1-1: PDCCH monitoring limited to within first three OFDM symbols of a slot
	+ Case 1-2: PDCCH monitoring on any span of up to 3 consecutive OFDM symbols of a slot
		- For a given UE, all search space configurations are within the same span of 3 consecutive OFDM symbols in the slot
* Case 2: PDCCH monitoring cases other than Case 1

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Xiaomi  | From our view, the first step is to define the monitoring cases within a span, then we go to monitoring cases within a slot. For example, the first step discussion can start from,* Case 1: PDCCH monitoring of all SS sets monitored in a span occurs within N consecutive slotsthat have fixed positions in each slot
	+ Case 1-1: PDCCH monitoring limited to within first N slots of a monitoring span
	+ Case 1-2: PDCCH monitoring on any span of up to N consecutive slots of a monitoring span
		- For a given UE, all search space configurations are within the same span of N consecutive slots in the monitoring span
* Case 2: PDCCH monitoring cases other than Case 1

the second step discussion can start from the original proposal,* Case 1: PDCCH monitoring of all SS sets monitored in a slot occurs within 3 consecutive OFDM symbols that have fixed positions in each slot
	+ Case 1-1: PDCCH monitoring limited to within first three OFDM symbols of a slot
	+ Case 1-2: PDCCH monitoring on any span of up to 3 consecutive OFDM symbols of a slot
		- For a given UE, all search space configurations are within the same span of 3 consecutive OFDM symbols in the slot
* Case 2: PDCCH monitoring cases other than Case 1

We are open to define a potential duration of more than 3 OFDM symbols, since with more symbols configured in a slot for PDCCH, the number of slots need to be monitored for PDCCH in a span is reduced. And it is potentially benefit for power saving since UE can stop monitoring after receiving all the PDCCH within a span. |
| Qualcomm | To support multi-slot based PDCCH monitoring for the new SCSs, we think the separation between two monitoring occasions is a more important factor than the position of PDCCH monitoring occasion within a slot. To provide enough processing time for a reasonable number of BD/CCEs, the separation should be large enough, e.g., multiple slots. Thus, none of Rel-15 and Rel-16 PDCCH monitoring capabilities, such as *pdcch-MonitoringAnyOccasionsWithSpanGap* and *pdcch-Monitoring-r16*, is provisioning enough separation between PDCCH monitoring spans and, therefore, a new capability may need to be introduced. In our view, the Rel-16 capability (*pdcch-Monitoring-r16*) can be the baseline to define the new capability. Proper minimum separation between two Mos may be discussed first, for example 4 slots for 480kHz and 8 slots for 960kHz. Then, it may be further discussed whether the distinction between a “fixed position” (Case 1) or “any position” (Case 2) of MO in the slot is necessary with the new capability. |
| Futurewei | Support Case 1, Case 1-2 PDCCH monitoring of any span up to three consecutive OFDM symbols of a slot. |
| OPPO | We prefer PDCCH monitoring with a maximum duration of more than 3 OFDM symbols per PDCCH monitoring occasion in order to carry more PDCCH candidates. Proposed modification on Case 2:* Case 2: PDCCH monitoring cases other than Case 1
	+ Case 2-1: PDCCH monitoring up to X consecutive OFDM symbols, where X is more than 3
		- FFS: the value of X
 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We think Case 1-1 should be supported, where the first three OFDM symbols occur in a slot with a periodicity of N slots, where N might be defined with a different value for 480 and 960 kHz SCS (see response to question A1-2c). So what needs to be defined is where “a slot” occurs in case of multi-slot span monitoring.Case 1-2 can also be supported, within the same slot as case 1-1, i.e. not in every slot but in one slot every N slots. This allows balancing the PDCCH load in more than 3 symbols within the first slot of each multi-slot span/period. Again what needs to be defined is where “a slot” occurs in case of multi-slot span monitoring. |
| Apple | **From our proposal,** RAN1 should define the PDCCH Monitoring Occasions per slot group. The MO could be defined as follows:* Type 1: For all the slots in the slot group, PDCCH monitoring occurs within the first X symbols of the multiple slots. This mirrors case 1-1.
* Type 2: For all the slots in the slot group, PDCCH monitoring occurs on any span of X consecutive symbols within the multiple slots. This mirrors case 1-2.
* Type 3: All PDCCH monitoring occasions can be in any OFDM symbol of a slot-group with a minimum time separation between 2 consecutive transmissions of the PDCCH. This mirrors case 2 with FG 3-5 b.
	+ X : Number of OFDM symbols within which the monitoring occasion occurs,
	+ Y: minimum number of OFDM symbols between the start of different PDCCH Mos
	+ Z: Slot group size

X may be more than 3 but note that this will impact processing timelines. For 120 kHz, this definition should fall back to the Rel-15 definitions. Also, the UE should be able to indicate its support for one or more types based on capability signaling. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | For multi-slot monitoring, we think that the periodicity should be a multiple of N slots (N equals to the number of slots contained in a slot group), or a multiple of slot groups in the unit of slot group. Besides, the number and location of PDCCH monitoring OFDM symbols are also related to other factors, e.g., PDCCH coverage. So we are open for it at this stage. |
| Samsung | It’s a little confusing to use the example cases to discuss multi-slot span based monitoring, since we believe some of the cases are not applicable to or not essentially related to multi-slot span based monitoring. We would like to reuse the framework and terminology used for Rel-16 URLLC (e.g. per span monitoring as in 38.213). For multi-slot span based monitoring in 52.6 to 71 GHz, we support the generalization of the Rel-16 per span monitoring with the following aspects: * The minimum monitoring span gap (X) can be larger than 1 slot to save monitoring complexity.
* The maximum monitoring span duration (Y) can be extended from at most 3 symbols (e.g. to 1 slot or even larger) to allow better flexibility.
 |
| Intel | We prefer that only Case 1-1 is supported in a slot for at least USS set for simplicity. The parameter duration in SS set configuration is reinterpreted as a window. Then, one of every N slots is allocated for PDCCH monitoring for the SS set. N is another parameter for SS set configuration.  |
| MediaTek | We share the same view with Xiaomi that we should first specify the monitoring case within a multi-slot monitoring span. We support monitor the first $n$ slots of every $m$ slots, which follow a similar notion of span defined in Rel-16. Regarding the monitoring pattern within a slot, due to the short slot duration of SCS=480kHz and 960kHz, we support Case 1-1. We notice that Case1-2 and Case 2 can provide more scheduling flexibility within a slot, which might not be needed when slot duration is relatively short. |
| InterDigital | We think that only Case 1-1 should be supported considering short time durations in 480/960 kHz. |
| Vivo | In our view, it is important to define the UE capability on which slot UE could monitor before going into discussions on which symbol within one slot could be monitored. Please refer to comments to Question A1-2d for more details.After determination of the monitored slots, we could then discuss which symbol needs to be monitored within the slot UE needs to monitor. We are open to support both Case 1-1 and 1-2. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We think at least monitoring periodicity per more than 1 slot should be supported. The number of OFDM symbols for a CORESET should not be larger than 3 unless there is any clear motivation to increase the PDCCH monitoring OFDM symbols. For the location of OFDM symbols for a CORESET, we think at least fixed location in each multi-slot should be supported and then OFDM symbols in any place in a multi-slot can be supported as optional. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We agree with Xiaomi’s suggestion to define monitoring cases within a span first and move further thereafter. Also, we agree to support potential duration of more than 3 OFDM symbols per slot for multi-slot span monitoring. |
| Nokia, NSB | The baseline with the current CORESET structures would be Case 1-1. Case 1-2 can be considered as well if a clear motivation is identified. The exact number (3 consecutive or first symbols) can be re-considered depending on the outcome of A2-1. |
| Spreadtrum | We support case 1-1 and case 1-2 and we are open to define a potential duration of more than 3 OFDM symbols. |
| Convida Wireless | Both Case 1-1 and Case 1-2 can be supported. It can be up to the configuration. |
| LG Electronics | We think that, for multi-slot based monitoring, SS set configuration such as periodicity could be a value larger than N (or a multiple of N) slots (where, N equals to the number of slots within a span of multi-slot) and UE could monitor PDCCH in M consecutive slots (M<N) within N slots. |
| Ericsson | As our answer to A1-1a shows, the NW should be able to configure a UE to monitor PDCCHs in any slot within a multi-slot span.For Mos within a slot, Case 1-1 should be sufficient. We can further discuss whether or not Case 1-2 is needed.Case 2 monitoring is not needed for 480/960 kHz. Case 2 monitoring was introduced to support mini-slots (Type B PDSCH mapping); however, since the slot duration for 480/960 kHz is very short to start with, there is no need to have such flexible monitoring within a slot. |
| CATT | We support Case 1-1. The PDCCH monitoring periodicity and duration in SearchSpace are independent to the duration of multi-slot monitoring.  |

First Round FL Summary: Several companies stated support for just Case 1-1 or Cases 1-1 and 1-2. Several companies further see a benefit of extending the duration to more than 3 OFDM symbols per slot in case of multi-slot span monitoring. It has been mentioned that this discussion may depend on the outcome of Question A1-2d.

### Second Round (A1-2b.1)

First Round FL Suggestion A1-2b.1:

* Prioritise further discussion on multi-slot span capabilities, monitoring periodicities, corresponding number and location of OFDM symbols for Cases MSM-1-1 and MSM-1-2. At least Case MSM-1-1 is supported.
	+ Case MSM-1: PDCCH monitoring of all SS sets monitored in a span occurs within N consecutive slots that have fixed positions in each slot
		- Case MSM-1-1: PDCCH monitoring limited to within first N slots of a monitoring span
		- Case MSM-1-2: PDCCH monitoring on any span of up to N consecutive slots of a monitoring span
			* For a given UE, all search space configurations are within the same span of N consecutive slots in the monitoring span
	+ Case MSM-2: PDCCH monitoring cases other than Case 1 MSM-1

Please provide your views, e.g. any suggestions for N, location of OFDM symbols etc.. It is noted that this discussion may have a dependency on the progress of Question A1-2d.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Intel | First of all, we want to clarify on the discussion point. Is it the configuration of a SS set, or on UE capability? The two issues are related; however, they are separate design issues. For the SS set configuration, we don’t think extension of existing case 1-1/1-2/2 within single slot to MSM-1-1/1-2/2 is necessary. It should be enough to just clarify which case(s) from existing Case 1-1/1-2/2 is supported in high frequency. If certain case(s) is supported, what is the potential limitations. For example, we don’t think the flexibility of case 2 is needed for a USS set. We can have some limitation for the positions of Mos of a SS set in a slot. However, as E// commented, we don’t need to limit it to a particular slot within the multiple slots, which gives network more freedom to coordinate the CSS/USS of a UE and across multiple Ues. For UE capability on max BD/CCE, we prefer to allow the Mos in any slot within a multi-slot span. Further, different slots may contain the Mos in different multi-slot span. This is to account for the different requirement on transmission timings of different SS sets. Further, there may be potential limitation from the periodicity of a SS set and the duration of multi-slot span.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are generally fine with the proposal A1-2b.1.We are a bit puzzled by Intel’s response. If we allow MO in every slot then the main complexity reduction benefit of multi-slot span monitoring is gone, even if the BD/CCE budget per MO is reduced. Assuming the multi-slot span monitoring period is the same as one slot of 120 kHz SCS, then we don’t actually see the need for the UE to even monitor USS in different slots than the first slot of the multi-span monitoring period where CSS is monitored (this also comments on Ericsson’s figure on UE capability). In this case we just need to address the PDCCH capacity in that first slot, e.g. by increasing the number of PDCCH symbols available for the network, which could be achieved by case 1-1 with more PDCCH symbols, or case 1-2 by staggering different Ues in different starting symbols. |
| Nokia, NSB | We’re ok with the Suggestion A1-2b.1.We think that Case MSM-1-1 should be used as the starting point* PDCCH monitoring of all SS sets occur within the first slot of a monitoring span.
	+ X=4 slots for 480 kHz SCS
	+ X=8 slots for 960 kHz SCS
* In order to provide further scheduling flexibility, it’s preferable to support also additional values for X:
	+ X=2 slots for 480 kHz SCS
	+ X=[4 2] slots for 960 kHz SCS.
* Finally, it’s preferable to support also slot-based operation. This can be determined as
	+ X=1.

The need for Case MSM-1-2, or Case MSM-2 is unclear.W.r.t location of OFDM symbols, the starting point is that they are within the first 3 OFDM symbols of the slot. Additional flexibility can be easily supported, if there is clear justification. |
| Xiaomi | Agree with the proposal A1-2b.1 |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We prefer to support Case MSM-1-1 and N can be fixed to one, which means PDCCH monitoring can be limited to within the first slot in each monitoring span. Wherein, the position of CORESET can consider the following options: Option1: CORESET can be placed at the starting of each slot in each monitoring span.Option2: CORESET can be placed at the starting of first slot in each monitoring span.Notes: the above mentioned monitoring span corresponds to slot group as shown in Figure below:Option 1Option 2 |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support the FL’s suggestion. Furthermore, we would support to at least agree on Case MSM-1-1 as it is the most straightforward extension. And as a starting point for Case MSM-1-1, we can agree to support CORESET symbols in the first slot in each monitoring span.  |
| Qualcomm | In our view, the proposal should be discussed together with A1-2d. It seems that the distinction of Case MSM 1-1 and Case MSM 1-2 is only relevant to Alt 1 (i.e., fixed window) in A1-2d. For Alt 2 and Alt 3 in A1-2d, the window is floating and Case MSM1-1 and Case MSM 1-2 are not distinguishable. Since we support Alt 2 in A1-2d, we don’t think the suggested extension is necessary. For the position of PDCCH MO(s) within a slot in the window, we think existing Case 1-1 is sufficient. |
| CATT | We are generally OK with A1-2b.1. We support Case MSM-1-2 with configured CORESET distribution through slots in the time span. For Case MSM-1-2, the number of monitored PDCCH candidates would be limited to small number when the CORESETs are limited to first N slots of time span.  |
| NTT DOCOMO | We think both Case MSM-1-1 and MSM-1-2 should be supported. In addition, Case MSM-2 such as Apple mentioned in the 1st round discussion can be farther studied, if it is necessary.  |
| Vivo | We think this restriction of monitoring slots should be discussed together with each alternative in A1-2d. Besides, the BD/CCE counting rules are also associated with each alternative. Some further clarification for each alternative based the agreement for A1-2d is shown below:* Alt 1: A fixed pattern of X slots.
	+ PDCCH could be configured in the first Y consecutive slots
	+ Alt 1-1: Y<X, BD/CCE budget is counted within the first Y slots of each X slot group
	+ Alt 1-2: Y=X, BD/CCE budget is counted for each X=Y slot group
* Alt 2: Use the Rel-16 capability (*pdcch-Monitoring-r16*, (X, Y) span) as the baseline to define the new capability
	+ PDCCH could be configured such that the developed span pattern by SS configuration satisfy (X,Y) requirement, i.e. any two span of Y symbols/slots is separated by at least X symbols/slots
	+ BD/CCE budget is counted for each span of Y symbols/slots
	+ FFS: Values of X and Y and units in which they are defined
	+ FFS: Whether number of slots within which the number of monitoring occasions is counted is needed and if needed, the value of the number of slots
* Alt 3: A sliding window of X=Y slots for defining multi-slot PDCCH monitoring capability.
	+ PDCCH could be configured in any slot
	+ BD/CCE budget is counted within any consecutive X=Y slots
	+ FFS: Increments in which sliding occurs
 |
| Apple | In the proposal, it is not clear what a span is on the first line is and this needs to be clearly defined if it is intended that there is a difference from Rel15/Rel16. Note that we would prefer a consistent definition across releases. From Rel 15/16, span refers to OFDM symbols over which MO can be found: “A span starts at a first symbol where a PDCCH monitoring occasion starts and ends at a last symbol where a PDCCH monitoring occasion ends, where the number of symbols of the span is up to $Y$.” Section 10, 38.213-g40.Is the span definition in this proposal (1) span as in Rel 16 (2) a group of slots that the monitoring occasions can be found in that is further placed within the group of N slots as defined in the agreement on multi-slot monitoring capability or (3) is it the group of N slots defined in the agreement on multi-slot monitoring capability? Please clarify. Note that if N in the proposal is different from N in the multi-slot monitoring agreement, we may want to use another variable e.g. M, to avoid confusion.To clarify our understanding further, please find questions/edits to the proposal in red:* + Case MSM-1: PDCCH monitoring of all SS sets monitored in a span (is a 38.213 span or multi-slot monitoring span ? ) occurs within N consecutive slots that have fixed positions in each slot (should this be multiple slots, monitoring span or a multi-slot span ?)
		- Case MSM-1-1: PDCCH monitoring limited to within first N slots of a monitoring span (define as a multi-slot monitoring span ?)
		- Case MSM-1-2: PDCCH monitoring on any span of up to N consecutive slots of a monitoring span (same as above ?)
			* For a given UE, all search space configurations are within the same span of N consecutive slots in the monitoring span
	+ Case MSM-2: PDCCH monitoring cases other than Case 1 MSM-1

Ideally, we would like a framework that allows the definition of a multi-slot span with MSM-1-1 within the first N consecutive slots, MSM-102 within the same N consecutive slots (any up to N) and MSM-2, the other case. Discussions can start with MSM-1-1 and MSM-1-2. |
| Spreadtrum | We are generally fine with the MSM-1-1 and MSM-1-2. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | After further review and as commented by email, we would prefer to use the word “span” as it is meant in current specifications (meaning it applies to one search space configuration and with consecutive OFDM symbols, as defined by Y), to avoid any confusion.Since MSM-1-1 and MSM-1-2 seem to be defining only the monitoring slots (but not the symbols within each monitoring slot), then we should avoid the use of “span” in A1-2b.1.With that understanding, we think that for a search space a single slot needs to be monitored within each monitoring periodicity. Within that slot, the span (Y) includes multiple consecutive symbols (the exact number can be discussed later). This is similar to the views from Nokia, Qualcomm and ZTE option 2.So the overall description of Case MSM-1 should be revisited first (and we don’t understand what has fixed positions in each slot, as these words seem to apply to “N consecutive slots, which makes no sense).*Case MSM-1: PDCCH monitoring of all SS sets monitored in a span occurs within N consecutive slots that have fixed positions in each slot* We would suggest taking *pdcch-Monitoring* with a (X, Y) span, with Y in symbols and X in unit of [slots or symbols], as a baseline for monitoring one search space, discuss the values of (X, Y) that companies are proposing to support, and discuss how much flexibility needs to be supported for the configuration of PDCCH monitoring for multiple search spaces. |
| Sony | We support the FL’s proposal. We agree to support Case MSM-1-1, and Case MSM-1-2 needs further study to with consideration of the necessity for the network side as well as the complexity on the UE side.  |
| OPPO | We don’t see the need to support both Case MSM-1-1 and Case MSM-1-2, and we prefer to add down selection between the two options. |
| InterDigital | We propose following updates:* Support at least Case MSM-1-1 for multi-slot span capabilities, monitoring periodicities, corresponding number and location of OFDM symbols
	+ Case MSM-1: PDCCH monitoring of all SS sets monitored in a span occurs within N consecutive slots that have fixed positions in each slot
		- Case MSM-1-1: PDCCH monitoring limited to within first N slots of a monitoring span
		- Case MSM-1-2: PDCCH monitoring on any span of up to N consecutive slots of a monitoring span
			* For a given UE, all search space configurations are within the same span of N consecutive slots in the monitoring span
	+ Case MSM-2: PDCCH monitoring cases other than Case 1 MSM-1
* Further discuss whether to additionally support Case MSM-1-2 and Cased MSM-2
 |
| LG Electronics | We prefer MSM-1-1 with N=1 as starting point and open to discuss for MSM-1-2.We also think that Case 1-1 can be sufficient to define the PDCCH MO within a slot.We are agree with Qualcomm and vivo that this proposal should be discussed together with each alternative in A1-2d. We are supportive of vivo’s clarification for each alternative.In addition, we think that the proposal for Case MSM-1 seems to need to be reworded as follows.* Case MSM-1: PDCCH monitoring of all SS sets monitored in a span occurs within N consecutive slots that have fixed positions in each span
 |
| Futurewei | We support the discussion of this proposal together with A1-2d. We support Alt 2, presented in the Vivo’s proposal above and further clarified in our email thread discussions, i.e. use the Rel-16 capability (*pdcch-Monitoring-r16*, (X, Y) span) as the baseline to define the new capability. |
| MediaTek | We are also confused on the notion of ‘N’ in this proposal. If the meaning of ‘N’ in this proposal is the number of consecutive slots UE monitors PDCCH within a multi-slot consisting of X slots, then we suggest to replace notion ‘N’ to ‘M’ to avoid confusion on the ‘N’ slots specified in A1-2d, as suggested by Apple.If our understanding on the meaning of ‘N’ in this proposal is correct, then this proposal is specifying the slots to monitor within a fix multi-slot pattern, which is Alt-1 in the A1-2d agreement. We prefer to support case MSM-1-1 as a starting point and FFS on MSM-1-2 since MSM-1-2 might have burst slots for PDCCH monitoring in consecutive multi-slots.  |
| Samsung | We suggest clarify proposal A1-2d first and come back to this proposal, since current proposal mixed SS configuration and span, so we are not quite sure which is the discussion point. Also, the wording “within N consecutive slots that have fixed positions in each slot” is not clear to us, since a monitoring span should be symbols/slots with PDCCH Mos configured. |

### Second Round (A1-2b.2)

First Round FL Suggestion A1-2b.2:

Continue discussion on allowing a duration of more than 3 OFDM symbols per slot, supported such durations, and potential conditions for allowing such duration.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Intel | It is the question on the duration of CORESET, or duration of a URLLC-like span? We prefer to reuse the existing duration of CORESET, unless the extending CORESET duration is justified. As we commented in A1-2b.1, we prefer to not limit the Mos to certain slot in a multi-slot span. The URLLC-like span cannot provide such functional benefit.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Please see Huawei’s comments on A1-2b.1, because we think the two issues are related. |
| Nokia, NSB | Agree with Intel that it should be clarified if this refers to the duration of a CORESET or the span. We are open to discuss the duration of CORESET (to improve the PDCCH coverage).But we do not see a need for URLLC-like span for SCS>120 kHz. It just increases the system complexity without true benefits in the considered scenario.  |
| Xiaomi | We are open to define a potential duration of more than 3 OFDM symbols, since with more symbols configured in a slot for PDCCH, the number of slots need to be monitored for PDCCH in a span is reduced. And it is potentially benefit for power saving since UE can stop monitoring after receiving all the PDCCH within a span.But we do not mean to limit the MO in only one slot within the span, since it may cause the slot to be largely or fully occupied by PDCCH, which may impact the PDSCH scheduling.  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We think a duration of more than 3 OFDM symbols per slot can be considered since it is beneficial for improving PDCCH coverage and PDCCH capability. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We also agree that more than 3 OFDM symbols per slot and up to 14 symbols (i.e. one slot CORESET) can be considered. |
| Qualcomm | To clarify our understanding, FL’s proposal is not about the duration of a CORESET, which is separately discussed in A2-1. As we commented in A1-2b.1, we think at most one span of Y consecutive symbols per slot, which contains all PDCCH Mos in the slot, is enough. For the value of the span length Y, we think 3 is sufficient, as used in Rel-15/16. |
| Ericson  | We agree with the above comments that the duration of a CORESET should not exceed 3 OFDM symbols as in Rel-15/16.As we commented earlier, we think that case 1-1 monitoring should at least be supported. We can further discuss case 1-2, but the whether or not that is supported, depends on which of Alt-1/2/3 is downselected in issue A1-2d. In some sense, A1-2b.2 and A1-2d should be discussed together. In other words we should discuss capabilities over a multiple slot period in tandem with capabilities within a slot. These two issues are connected.For example if a solution is adopted whereby all monitoring is concentrated within a single slot of an N-slot bundle (not our preference), then it would be needed to have flexibility to configure USS and CSSs in different spans within a slot; case 1-1 would be far too restrictive. If, however, there is network flexibility to configure a UE to monitor in different slots of an N-slot bundle (e.g., CSS and USS in different slots), then case 1-1 would probably be sufficient. |
| CATT | We don’t see the need for CORESET to be more than 3 symbols for a slot. However, the CORESET could be configured distributed through different slots within a time span.  |
| NTT DOCOMO | We don’t see any necessity to extend the duration at this time. |
| Vivo | Agree that further clarification of the proposal is needed.For CORESET duration, we are open to discuss this to improve PDCCH coverage and capacity. |
| Apple | We prefer that the duration of the CORESET should stay at 3 as in Rel-15/16. Any increase would need a corresponding modification of the processing timelines. |
| Spreadtrum | We are open to define a potential duration of more than 3 OFDM symbols. |
| Sony | We are open to define a duration of more than 3 OFDM symbols per slot. |
| OPPO | We support a duration of more than 3 OFDM symbols per slot for PDCCH monitoring. |
| InterDigital | We don’t see the need.  |
| LG Electronics | Same view with Qualcomm that A1-2b.2 is not about CORESET duration. We also think that 3 OFDM symbols per slot are sufficient, but open to discuss for more than 3 symbols. |
| Futurewei | Proposal should be clarified if s refers to the duration of a CORESET or the span. If refers to CORESET we prefer to keep it limited to 3 OFDM symbols as in Rel-15/16. For the duration of a span we also prefer to limit to Y less or equal to 3 as in the present specs. |
| Samsung | For Alt 1-2 and Alt 3 of proposal A1-2d, it’s straightforward the duration of span can exceed 3 symbols. For Alt 1-1 and Alt 2 of proposal A1-2d, we also see the benefit to support the duration of span to be more than 3 symbols for network’s flexibility. We also agree that there is no need to support more than 3 symbols for the duration of CORESET.  |

### First Round (A1-2c)

**Question A1-2c: How long should the multi-slot span be, i.e. how many slots (for 120/480/960 kHz)? Several companies seem to support 4 slots for 480 kHz and 8 slots for 960 kHz, are those agreeable?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Xiaomi | Yes, 4 slots for 480 kHz and 8 slots for 960 kHz can be supported. But we are open to discuss other designs. |
| Qualcomm | For the minimum separation (i.e., gap) between two Mos, 4 slots for 480kHz and 8 slots for 960kHz are agreeable. In addition, based on the UE capability, more than one value for a new SCS may be supported, e.g., {2, 4} slots for 480kHz and {4, 8} slots for 960kHz. |
| Futurewei | We are OK with 4 for 480kHz and respectively 8 slots for 960kHz. |
| OPPO | We think the determination of the maximum multi-slot span depends on how many PDSCHs/PUSCHs can be scheduled with a single DCI. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes. We support that one value of the multi-slot span is defined as 4 slots for 480 kHz and 8 slots for 960 kHz.It can be discussed whether more (configurable) values should be supported, although we think that if more values are supported they may not need to be smaller than 4 slots for 480 kHz and 8 slots for 960 kHz. |
| Apple | Yes. 4 slots for 480 kHz and 8 slots for 960 kHz is agreeable.  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We support N=4/8 slots for 480 kHz and 960 kHz, or N can be configured in a range. |
| Samsung | If the intention is to discuss the minimum monitoring span gap (X), we are OK with the fixed ratio based on SCS configuration, and other values can also be discussed. We also want to note its impact to BD/CCE limit to be specified.  |
| Intel | We think the length of multi-slot span should be configurable. The candidates can be 1, 2, 4, 8. The maximum length can be derived by slot length of SCS 120kHz, i.e. 4 for SCS 480 and 8 for 960kHz. As to minimum length, we consider 1 for SCS 480kHz and 2 for SCS 960kHz.  |
| InterDigital | We also think that 4 slots for 480 kHz and 8 slots for 960 kHz are agreeable. Other values can be further discussed. |
| Vivo | I suppose this value is corresponding to the *N* value as we listed in the comments to Question A1-2d. Agree with that 4 slots for 480KHz and 8 slots for 960KHz is supported and we are also open to discuss other values as well. Another aspect we need also consider is to determine *M* value for Alt. 1 and Alt. 2, i.e. how many slots could be monitored. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support 4 slots for 480 kHz and 8 slots for 960 kHz to align the absolute time with the existing PDCCH processing capability with 120 kHz SCS. In addition, smaller numbers of slots can be investigated. |
| Sony | Support 4 slots for 480 kHz SCS and 8 slots for 960 kHz SCS, considering the same implementation complexity for 120 kHz SCS. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We agree to support at least 4 slots for 480kHz and 8 slots for 960kHz. Further values are not precluded at this point.  |
| Nokia, NSB | Those are agreeable. In addition to those, the following lengths are needed:* 480 kHz SCS: [2] slots
* 960 kHz SCS: [2 4] slots
 |
| Spreadtrum | Yes, We support 4 slots for 480 kHz and 8 slots for 960 kHz. In addition, more values for a new SCS may be supported, e.g., {2, 4} slots for 480kHz and {4, 8} slots for 960kHz. |
| Convida Wireless | Number of slots for supported SCS/numerology can be further studied. |
| LG Electronics | Yes, 4 slots for 480 kHz and 8 slots for 960 kHz are agreeable. And we support more than one value for a new SCS.  |
| Ericsson | As a starting point, a multi-slot span of B = 4/8 should be supported for 480/960 kHz. |
| CATT | 4 and 8 slots for SCS = 480 kHz and 960 kHz respectively |

First Round FL Summary: Most companies are fine to agree to a multi-slot monitoring span of 4 slots for 480 kHz and 8 slots for 960 kHz. Some companies stated that additional values should be supported. Suggested values to add are 1,2 slots for 480 kHz and 2,4 slots for 960 kHz.

### Second Round (A1-2c)

First Round FL Proposal A1-2c.1:

The duration of a multi-slot monitoring span is as follows:

* For 480 kHz: 4 slots, for 960 kHz: 8 slots.
* Additional durations are not precluded

Can we agree FL Proposal A1-2c.1?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Intel | We support the Moderator’s proposal |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support the Moderator’s proposalNote that value 1 goes back to question A1-1a (ok now I read the next question ) |
| Nokia, NSB | We support the Moderator’s proposal.  |
| Xiaomi | Support the Moderator’s proposal |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We support the Moderator’s proposal. Further, according to FL’s proposal A1-1a.1, we suggest that the number of slot equals to 1 should be supported.  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support FL’s proposal |
| CATT | We are OK with Moderator’s proposal |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support the Moderator’s proposal. |
| Apple | We are fine with the Moderator’s proposal. |
| Spreadtrum | Support the Moderator’s proposal. |
| Sony | We support the Moderator’s proposal. |
| OPPO | We support the Moderator’s proposal. |
| InterDigital | We propose following updates:Support at least the following duration of a multi-slot monitoring:* For 480 kHz: 4 slots, for 960 kHz: 8 slots.
* Additional durations are not precluded
 |
| LG Electronics | We support the Moderator’s proposal. |
| Samsung | To clarify, if we are discussing X (which is slot group in Alt 1/3 of proposal A1-2d and span gap in Alt 2 of proposal A1-2d), then we are ok with the proposal; if we are discussing the “duration of a multi-slot monitoring span” (e.g. Y in Alt of proposal A1-2d) as described in the proposal, then we don’t agree with the proposal since we didn’t see a need to support such a large value of span duration to increase UE complexity.  |

Further discussion of Question A1-2c, e.g. if you haven’t considered other values than 4/8 in your comments so far, could you agree on any of them, or are you strongly opposed to any of the additional suggested values [1,2] for 480 kHz and [2,4] for 960 kHz? Note that a span of 1 is understood as per-slot monitoring (related to Question A1-1a).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Intel | We support to have additional values for more flexible operation of high frequency. On the other hand, to reduce the complexity of potential UE capabilities, we are OK to define only single additional value for each SCS, e.g. 2 for SCS 480kHz and 4 for SCS 960kHz. A value larger than 4 (or 8) for SCS 480kHz (or 960kHz) is not needed since its absolute duration will be long than a slot of SCS 120kHz.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | At this point we don’t see the need for additional values (especially not value 1), but if proponents would like to explain the use cases and benefits we can further discuss. |
| Nokia, NSB | We see a need for values [1, 2] for 480 kHz SCS and [1, 2, 4] for 960 kHz SCS. The main motivation is to provide sufficient scheduling flexibility and good latency performance. Additionally, lower values enable optimized handling for different SS sets (CSS, USS) |
| Xiaomi | Introducing more values means more workload for RAN1, currently we tend to not introduce more values unless they show clear benefits. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | As our comments in 2.1.1 A1-1a and FL’s proposal, per-slot span PDCCH monitoring can be considered as a special case of multi-slot span monitoring, thus value 1 can be seen as a special additional duration. In addition, (2, 4) for SCS (480kHz, 960kHz) can be further discussed. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | In our view, per-slot monitoring for at least 480kHz and 2 slots for 960kHz can be considered |
| Qualcomm | We agree with Intel and Nokia. Additional values can be supported based on UE capability. |
| Ericsson | We want to make sure there is common understanding on span and span gap for Alt-1, 2, and 3 in the A1-2d discussion (see our comments there). Is the following common understanding if it is agreed that N = 4/8 for 480/960 kHz?Alt-1 & 3: Y = X = N where N = 4/8 for 480/960 kHzAlt-2: Y < X where Y = 4/8 for 480/960 kHz. What is X in this case? It seems that if [1,2] and [2,4] are supported, it is clear how Alt-1 and Alt-3 are affected, but what happens to Alt-2? What is X? |
| CATT | We support additional value of per slot scheduling. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We think other values than 4/8 slots for 480/960 kHz SCS should be supported and the suggested values can be the candidates. |
| Vivo | We support additional value.For Alt-2, we have a different understanding from Ericsson. For Alt-2, X is the time separation between the first symbol/slot of consecutive span of Y symbols/slots. So here X=4/8 for 480/960KHz and Y<=X (e.g. Y=1 or 2 slots for 480KHz SCS). Here Y can also be equal to X which may result in back to back spans. |
| Apple | Any additional values can be supported based on UE capability as mentioned by Qualcomm. |
| OPPO | Agree with other companies that additional values can be supported based on UE capability. |
| InterDigital | For 480kHz, 1 slot and 2 slots can be supported based on UE capability.For 960kHz, 1 slot, [2 slots] and 4 slots can be supported based on UE capability. |
| LG Electronics | Agree with other companies that additional values can be supported based on UE capability. Any restriction on specific values (or ranges of values) does not needed at this stage. |
| Futurewei | Additional values may be supported based on the UE capabilities. We have the same understanding with Vivo for this proposal. X refer at the minimum separation between two consecutive span starts, while Y is the span duration. In this context X should allowed to multiple values with Y less or equal to X. |

### Feature Lead Proposal A1-2:

Supported values for the monitoring duration of a PDCCH monitoring span:

* For 480 kHz: 4 slots, for 960 kHz: 8 slots.
* Additional shorter durations are not precluded (including 1 slot duration)
* Additional longer durations are not supported

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Samsung | As mentioned in the previous round comment, the wording “monitoring duration of a PDCCH monitoring span” is confusing, and could mean differently in alternatives. For example, the monitoring duration is Y in Alt2 and some of Alt1 proposals, but means X in Alt3 and some of Alt1 proposals. So we suggest to use the notations consistent with Proposal 1-3, and we are fine with the technical aspects of this proposal. Supported values for ~~the monitoring duration of a PDCCH monitoring span~~ X:* For 480 kHz: 4 slots, for 960 kHz: 8 slots.
* Additional ~~shorter durations~~ smaller values are not precluded (including 1 slot duration)
* Additional ~~longer durations~~ larger values are not supported
 |
| Ericsson | Similar comment as I made for FL Proposal A1-1 about the word “span.” Samsung proposes a fix above, and I agree that this would work at least for Alt-1/3.But if there is not common understanding on this, maybe it’s better not to rush to a conclusion. |
| MediaTek | We are ok with the proposal. We are also ok with the updated proposal if the modified proposal 1-3 is agreed. Otherwise, there is no X defined in Alt1 and 3 in the current agreement. |
| Qualcomm | We think this proposal is redundant because the last bullet in A1-5 seems to be capturing similar ideas:* Specific numbers for X, Y may depend on UE capability and gNB configuration
	+ Examples:
		- X = [4] slots for 480 kHz SCS and X = [8] slots for 960 kHz SCS

Thus, the proposal could be combined with A1-5. This may address Ericsson and Samsung’s concern as well. |
| Moderator | Agree that avoiding “span” here is preferred as well. But I think we don’t need to tie it to X just yet – the intention here would be to talk about the monitoring duration (which may or may not correspond to X in the capability proposal). That’s why I though we may want to keep the proposals separate. How about the following:Supported number of slots for multi-slot PDCCH monitoring~~:~~* For 480 kHz: 4 slots, for 960 kHz: 8 slots.
* Additional smaller values are not precluded (including 1 slot)
* Additional larger values are not supported

However, if companies feel this proposal should be postponed, that’s fine as well. |
| InterDigital | We are fine with the updated proposal from Moderator.  |
| Futurewei | We are fine with updated proposal,  |
| Apple | We are fine with the updated proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | The updated proposal is still unclear, unfortunately, because of the unclear relation with the alternatives being discussed for PDCCH monitoring capability. What exactly is 4 slots or 8 slots for “multi-slot PDCCH monitoring”? PDCCH monitoring configuration includes several parameters, including the periodicity. Are we talking about the periodicity between the starting symbols of two consecutive monitoring spans? So we would also prefer to discuss after more clarity on proposal A1-5, or try to propose this together with each alternative under proposal A1-5. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We are fine with the updated proposal from Moderator.  |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with the updated proposal. |
| Intel | We share the views from companies to clarify the main bullet is related to UE capability and its relation with A1-5. Regarding bullet 2, by ‘including 1 slot’, it is no clear to me that 1 slot duration will anyway be agreed, or all smaller values are for further study. I suggest to make it clear. Please check if following update is agreeable Supported ~~number of~~ value(s) X in multi-slot UE capability for PDCCH monitoring (condition on Proposal A1-5)~~slots for multi-slot PDCCH monitoring:~~* For 480 kHz: 4 slots, for 960 kHz: 8 slots.
* FFS: if supported, additional smaller values ~~are not precluded~~ (including 1 slot)
* Additional larger values are not supported
 |
| LG Electronics | We are fine with the updated proposal from Moderator. |
| CATT | We prefer updated proposal from Moderator |
| Xiaomi | We are fine with the updated proposal from Moderator. |
| vivo | Agree with Huawei and Intel that the main bullet is not clear. We are fine with Intel’s revision. |
| Nokia, NSB | We support the updated FL proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Intel’s proposal makes the proposal clear in our view, we support Intel’s revision. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support the updated FL proposal (without span) |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We support the updated proposal from Moderator, as follows:Supported number of slots for multi-slot PDCCH monitoring~~:~~* For 480 kHz: 4 slots, for 960 kHz: 8 slots.
* Additional smaller values are not precluded (including 1 slot)
* Additional larger values are not supported

Besides, we would like to say that agreement have been reached just reflects a general opinion and give a example, but no explicitly express “1 slot is also supported/considered”. so we think the current proposal is more precise and detailed than the existing agreement reached in this meeting. |
| Ericsson2 | We share a similar view with other companies that the first bullet of the Moderators proposal should be clarified such that it is about UE capability.We support Intel's clarification. |

### First Round (A1-2d)

**Question A1-2d: For multi-slot span monitoring, what should the basis for defining the PDCCH monitoring capability is based on how to define the PDCCH monitoring capability (e.g. fixed pattern of N slots; flexible pattern; floating/sliding window)?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Xiaomi | Fixed pattern of N slots should be the basis for define multi-slot PDCCH monitoring capability. Just like in R15 single-slot PDCCH monitoring capability definition, the boundary for a slot is fixed.In fact, we don’t see the need of flexible pattern or floating/sliding window, since it complicate the monitoring cases, which means extra time budget/workload, and brings no clear benefit. |
| Qualcomm | As we commented in Question A1-2b, we think the Rel-16 span-based PDCCH capability (*pdcch-Monitoring-r16*) can be the baseline. A longer separation between two spans (e.g., 4 slot separation for 480kHz and 8 slot separation for 960kHz) can be considered. |
| Futurewei | We prefer a fixed pattern of N slots (TBD) |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | The question seems to contain some grammatical typos. We understand the question comes from the Figure 2 of R1-2100644 (Intel). We think the approach taken since Rel-15 can still apply here, i.e. that the PDCCH monitoring capability is defined for a fixed pattern of N slots, with additional constraints on PDCCH monitoring in back-to-back slots.  |
| Apple | We prefer a fixed pattern |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We tend to support that fixed pattern of N slots should be the basis for definition multi-slot PDCCH monitoring capability and FFS is N can be configured, or fixed as 4/8 for 480/960kHz. For flexible pattern and floating/sliding window, it seems unnecessary and does not see benefits. |
| Samsung | For the pattern over time, the **minimum** span gap and **maximum** span duration are fixed according to X and Y correspondingly, based on UE capability. However, the actual PDCCH monitoring occasions in different span are up to gNB implementation, i.e. determined by SS set configuration. In this sense, we guess it should be called “flexible pattern” (we are not sure of the discussion point here, but we want to state our position again to generalize Rel-16 URLLC per span monitoring)? Also, it would be good to clarify the wording of “fixed pattern”, “flexible pattern”, and “sliding window”.  |
| Intel | We think the capability can be defined based on sliding window (slid in slot level). The window size is N slots. As discussed in our tdoc R1-2100644, a fixed pattern may result in higher requirement on UE PDCCH monitoring than expectation (e.g. slot A & slot B in Figure 2). On the other hand, as discussed yesterday, if max number of BD/CCEs is checked in each sliding window (slot 1-4, 2-5, 3-6, 4-7, 5-8), when the sliding window of slot 2-5 (including slot A & B) is checked, it can limit the total number of BD/CCEs in slot A & B not to exceed the max number of BD/CCEs.  |
| MediaTek | Definition of flexible pattern; floating/sliding window should be specified first. In general, we prefer a fixed monitoring pattern to simplify monitoring and discussion of the associated BD/CCE limit, i.e., monitor the first $n$ slots of every $m$ slots. Otherwise, the discussion of BD/CCE limit for multi-slot needs to consider many monitoring pattern, which complicates the discussion.  |
| InterDigital | We prefer fixed pattern of N slots.  |
| Vivo | As we mentioned in the comments to Question A1-2b, this should be discussed first.As far as I summarized from current contributions, there are at least the following 3 alternatives for multi-slot-based capability definition:Alt. 1: Fixed back-to-back multi-slot span with length of *N* slots* Alt. 1-1: PDCCH monitoring is limited in the first *M* slots
* Alt. 1-2: PDCCH monitoring is limited in any *M* consecutive slots within each multi-slot span

Alt. 2: Flexible multi-slot span pattern with maximum span duration of *M* slots and minimum span spacing of *N* slotsAlt. 3: Extension of Rel-16 mini-slot span pattern larger span spacing of *N*\*14 symbols (e.g. 56 symbols for 480K, 112 symbols for 960K)For Alt. 1-1, the monitoring slots UE could monitor is fixed and gNB could only configure search space on these slots;For Alt. 1-2, the monitoring slots UE could monitor within a fixed multi-slot span is flexible with limited number of slots. However, this exists the problem as indicated in Intel’s Tdoc R1-2100644;For Alt. 2 and Alt. 3, the multi-slot span or mini-slot span pattern are determined based on search space configuration. So gNB needs to configure UE’s search space so that the determined span pattern should satisfy the span spacing (e.g. *N* slots) requirements.We suggest to make an agreement to list all the possible alternatives first in this meeting and then make down selection in next meeting |
| NTT DOCOMO | We think that at least a fixed pattern of N slots or span combination should be considered. Depending on Question A1-2b, flexible pattern and/or floating/sliding window may also need to be considered additionally. |
| Sony | Unless clear motivation can be identified, we prefer fixed pattern at this monument due to its simplicity.  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We think that fixed pattern for defining PDCCH monitoring capability should be defined for multi-slot span. Additionally, we are open to discuss flexible pattern as well.Also, we would like to understand whether the flexible pattern would entail different/flexible durations for monitoring span? |
| Nokia, NSB | The starting point should be fixed pattern of N slots. Benefits of flexible pattern and/or floating/sliding window are not clearly justified for the considered scenario (480/960 kHz SCS). |
| Spreadtrum | We share the same view with Xiaomi. For simplicity of implementation, fixed pattern of N slots should be the basis for define multi-slot PDCCH monitoring capability. |
| LG Electronics | We prefer the fixed pattern of N slots. With this as a starting point, we can further discuss that how to define or configure N value. We also open to discuss on any additional constraints, if required. |
| Ericsson | As our answer to A1-1a shows, we support definition of a sliding window.As mentioned by Intel above, this can solve the potential issue of larger number of BD/CCEs at the end of one multi-slot period and the beginning of the next.*On the other hand, as discussed yesterday, if max number of BD/CCEs is checked in each sliding window (slot 1-4, 2-5, 3-6, 4-7, 5-8), when the sliding window of slot 2-5 (including slot A & B) is checked, it can limit the total number of BD/CCEs in slot A & B not to exceed the max number of BD/CCEs.* It is important to simultaneously consider both UE capability and gNB scheduling flexibility. What is needed from a gNB point of view is to be able to stagger USSs for different users in different slots, recognizing that a slot containing CSS is common for all users. In this sense, a multi-slot BD/CCE budget should be able to be spread across the slots of the multi-slot span. Furthermore, to enable lower latency, further spreading out of the BD/CCE budget should be possible if the gNB configures USS monitoring more frequently than once per B slots.Effectively, this results in an (X,Y) span pattern in which X and Y are defined in terms of slots, and X = Y. |
| CATT | Fixed pattern of time span for 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS. The total number of BD is upper limited at 44 within a span. The CORESET should be distributed within the time span to have sufficient time for PDCCH and PDSCH processing.  |

First Round FL Summary: Most companies prefer a fixed pattern of N slots as the basis for defining multi-slot PDCCH monitoring capability. Some company suggested to consider additional constraints on PDCCH monitoring in back-to-back slots. Proponents of sliding/floating window indicate that this could be seen as an extension of the (X,Y) span approach of Rel-16. Another company proposes to use the Rel-16 capability (*pdcch-Monitoring-r16*) as the baseline to define the new capability, and discussing a proper minimum separation between two Mos may be discussed (for example 4 slots for 480kHz and 8 slots for 960kHz).

### Second Round (A1-2d)

First Round FL Suggestion A1-2d.1: Continue discussion whether one of the following can be adopted:

* Alt A1-2d.1: Starting point for defining the multi-slot PDCCH monitoring capability is a fixed pattern of N slots
	+ N=[4] for 480 kHz SCS
	+ N=[8] for 960 kHz SCS
	+ FFS: Additional constraints on PDCCH monitoring in back-to-back slots
* Alt A1-2d.2: Use the Rel-16 capability (*pdcch-Monitoring-r16*, (X,Y) span) as the baseline to define the new capability
	+ Continue discussion on a proper minimum separation between two Mos: [4] slots for 480 kHz SCS and [8] slots for 960 kHz SCS

Can we down-select between those Alternatives in this meeting? Any other comments or suggestions?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Intel | We share similar views of E//. As commented in A1-2b.2, we prefer to allow the Mos in any slot within a multi-slot span. Further, different slots may contain the Mos in different multi-slot span. This is to account for the different requirement on transmission timings of different SS sets. Further, there may be potential limitation from the periodicity of a SS set and the duration of multi-slot span. Considering this is the first meeting for the discussion, we don’t think we can agree on a single solution. Therefore, it is helpful to list all potential solutions for the further investigations by the companies. * On Alt A1-2d.1, we suggest to remove the FFS sub-bullet, so that it is pure fixed pattern of N slots. The solution may have some drawbacks, but it is the simplest.
* Further, we prefer to add the alternative of sliding window based multi-slot PDCCH monitoring, since it solves the problem of A1-2d.1.

Alt A1-2d.3: A sliding window of N slots for defining multi-slot PDCCH monitoring capability. * + N=[4] for 480 kHz SCS
	+ N=[8] for 960 kHz SCS
 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We have some reservations on the principle to be able to stagger USSs for different users in different slots. Once we recognize that from UE capability perspective it is difficult to monitor PDCCH in back-to-back slots with large SCS (the reason why the study concluded positively on multi-slot span PDCCH monitoring) and that the monitoring periodicity needs not be smaller than one slot of 120 kHz SCS, then it is becomes a problem of PDCCH capacity, and all Ues could monitor PDCCH in the same slot of 480 or 960 kHz SCS once every 4 or 8 slots (although not necessarily in the same OFDM symbols). |
| CATT | We prefer Alt A1-2d.2. We need to further study on details. The number of monitored PDCCH candidates for multi-slot time span should be large enough. |

Please continue discussion on down-selection or technical aspects based on the following agreement:

Choose one of the following alternatives for defining the multi-slot PDCCH monitoring capability

* Alt 1: A fixed pattern of N slots.
* Alt 2: Use the Rel-16 capability (*pdcch-Monitoring-r16*, (X, Y) span) as the baseline to define the new capability
	+ FFS: Values of X and Y and units in which they are defined
	+ FFS: Whether number of slots within which the number of monitoring occasions is counted is needed and if needed, the value of the number of slots
* Alt 3: A sliding window of N slots for defining multi-slot PDCCH monitoring capability.
	+ FFS: Increments in which sliding occurs
* Specific numbers for X, Y and N may depend on UE capability and gNB configuration
	+ Examples:
		- N = [4] slots for 480 kHz SCS and N = [8] slots for 960 kHz SCS
		- X = [4] slots for 480 kHz SCS and X = [8] slots for 960 kHz SCS

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Nokia, NSB | See comments in A1-2b.1Our preference is Alt 2. If multiple values for X are supported (such as X=[8,4] for 960 kHz), the network should have enough flexibility in MO configuration.  |
| Xiaomi | Prefer Alt1 and Alt2. Alt 1is more preferred since it is much simpler.  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Our 1st preference is Alt 1. Wherein, N can be fixed to 1, which means PDCCH monitoring can be limited to within the first slot in each monitoring span, that is, single-slot span monitoring; and also support N=4/8 for 480/960kHz SCS.2nd preference is Alt 2 and X can be configured as 1.Besides, specific N and X value is determined depends on UE capability or gNB capability. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | In our view, Alt 1 should be definitely supported. Further discussion/downselection related to Alt 2 and Alt 3 can be done in next RAN1 meeting. |
| Qualcomm | We support Alt 2. Related to the discussion during the GTW session, with Alt 2, the number of BD and CCE is accounted within a span (i.e., Y consecutive symbols/slots), and thus no additional definition of N-slot window is needed.With Alt 3, if we allow multiple PDCCH Mos distributed over a window of N slots, we see the following issues:* If a MO is included in multiple sliding windows (of different offsets), overbooking and dropping would be complicated. For example, in a sliding window containing MO\_0 and MO\_1, MO1 may be dropped due to BD/CCE limit, but in another sliding window containing MO\_1 and MO\_2, MO\_2 may be dopped. Thus, there is ambiguity in the overbooking rule.
* If Mos are distributed in an N-slot window, UE’s power consumption will increase because UE needs to repeat ramping up and down its front-end blocks and perform FFT operation every MO.

The first issue may not be a concern if 480kHz and 960kHz SCSs are used only for Scells and overbooking is not applied. For the second issue, however, the main benefit of the multi-slot based capability is not only the improved flexibility, but also the enhanced power efficiency. Therefore, we think the number of spans (i.e., Y consecutive OFDM symbols containing MO(s)) should be restricted to at most one per an N-slot window, which then boils down to Alt 2.A concern about Alt 2 during the GTW session was how to align the Y-symbol span with CSS. Based on the outcome of on-going discussion in AI 8.2.1, if 480kHz and 960kHz SCS are only applied to Scells, UE may not be required to monitor CSS(s) (except Type 1/3 CSS, which can be aligned with USS by dedicated configuration) in Scells. |
| Ericsson | Hongbo (Samsung) raised a good point to try to align terminology. Here is a copy of my response. Perhaps companies could comment on if this is common understanding:* For Alt-2, Y <= X and there is an X slot “span gap” between two consecutive Y slot spans (if X and Y are measured in slots). Essentially, with Alt-2, there is an implicit sliding window which can go across a slot boundary for checking if the BD/CCE budget is respected (see the key words “including across slots” from 38.213 Section 10 which is the analogous case for X and Y measured in symbols:

A UE can indicate a capability to monitor PDCCH according to one or more of the combinations $\left(X,Y\right)$ = (2, 2), (4, 3), and (7, 3) per SCS configuration of $μ=0$ and $μ=1$. A span is a number of consecutive symbols in a slot where the UE is configured to monitor PDCCH. Each PDCCH monitoring occasion is within one span. If a UE monitors PDCCH on a cell according to combination $\left(X,Y\right)$, the UE supports PDCCH monitoring occasions in any symbol of a slot with minimum time separation of $X$ symbols between the first symbol of two consecutive spans, including across slots. A span starts at a first symbol where a PDCCH monitoring occasion starts and ends at a last symbol where a PDCCH monitoring occasion ends, where the number of symbols of the span is up to $Y$.* For Alt-1 (fixed window), a span is Y=N slots (UE is configured to monitor in any slot of the N slot span), and the span gap is (X = N). This is like Alt-2, but with Y = X = N.
* Alt-3 (sliding window) is the same as Alt-1, but a sliding window can go across the boundary of two consecutive N-slot spans for checking if the BD/CCE budget is respected. This prevents the end loaded/front loaded issue raised by Intel.

Based on my understanding, an issue with Alt-1 is that at the end of one N-slot span and the beginning of the next N-slot span, the N-slot BD/CCE budget could be exceeded depending on the monitoring configuration. If Alt-1 is agreed, it seems as though there will be lots of follow-on discussion to introduce limitations for various monitoring configuration combinations to avoid this issue. This could be quite complex to specify. Alt-3 tries to solve this issue by introducing an implicit sliding window, that could be specified similar to the above excerpt from 38.213 Section 10 (i.e., the wording “including across slots”). But instead of “across slots” it could say “including across N-slot bundles”, or similar wording. In this sense, Alt-3 is similar to Alt-2.The concern we have about Alt-2 in that if Y is small compared to X, then it will introduce inflexibility from a network perspective. For example, consider N = 4 for 480 kHz SCS. Let’s say the network wants to configure a CSS (i.e., common for all users) in slot 4\*n where n = 0, 1, 2, …. And then say the network wants to configure a USS in slot 4\*n+3. Further, let’s say the UE capability is (X,Y) = (4,2). This would mean that there is a minimum span gap of 4 slots, so this example configuration would not be possible since there is a span gap of only 3 slots. Similarly, putting a USS in slots 4\*n+2 wouldn’t work either. Essentially, having a small value of Y compared to X, forces the network to concentrate the CSS and USS within a small number of slots.It seems that Alt-3 simultaneously achieves flexibility on the network side (like Alt-1, but in contrast to Alt-2) and assurances on the UE side that the BD/CCE budget will not be exceeded over any N slot duration (solving the deficiency of Alt-1 by use of a sliding window).Qualcomm seems to have a concern that specification of a sliding window is complicated. However, it seems such a sliding window exists in Rel-15/16 already, and it would be simple enough to extend this to cover bundles of N slots as discussed above.  |
| NTT DOCOMO | Our first preference is Alt 2 which can reuse the Rel-16 span-level monitoring and can achieve flexibility depending on the configuration of (X, Y).Our second preference is Alt 3. We do not support Alt 1 since BD/CCE budget should not be exceeded in any of N slots. On the other hand, Alt 3 may have some issues, e.g. what Qualcomm mentioned above. |
| Vivo | We support Alt. 2 with more flexibility and the gap between two Mos is guaranteed to reduce the complexity. Before down selection, we may need to have a common understanding on the alternatives especially on the allowed monitored slots and BD/CCE budget counting budget. One starting point is provided in our comments on A1=2b.2 |
| Apple | Our preferences are Alt-1 and Alt-2.Alt-1 combined with MSM-1 in A1-2b.1 will prevent the spike in PDCCH monitoring between multiple slots.For Alt-2, the values of X and Y can be configured to incorporate Alt-1 as a sub-alternative and the UE can select this as a capability.On the issue of whether there needs to be a value N defined for Alt-2, if we look at the current span-gap definition from 38.822:…, there is a minimum time separation of X OFDM symbols (including the cross-slot boundary case) between the start of two spans, where each span is of length up to Y consecutive OFDM symbols of a slot. Spans do not overlap. Every span is contained in a single slot. The same span pattern repeats in every slot. The separation between consecutive spans within and across slots may be unequal but the same (X, Y) limit must be satisfied by all spans. If the separation within and across slots is unequal, but the span pattern repeats every fixed size (slots in this case), **we need a similar reference for the multi-slot case.** To answer Ericsson, for Alt-1, X = N slots, Y = 3 slots where the position of Y depends on if MSM-1-1 or MSM-1-2 is supported. |
| Spreadtrum | We support Alt1 and Alt2. Alt 1is more preferred since it is much simpler. Further discussion related to Alt 3 can be done in next meeting. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | As commented by email and under A1-2b1, we would suggest taking *pdcch-Monitoring* with a (X, Y) span, with Y in symbols and X in unit of [slots or symbols], as a baseline for monitoring one search space, discuss the values of (X, Y) that companies are proposing to support, and discuss how much flexibility needs to be supported for the configuration of PDCCH monitoring for multiple search spaces, for the joint discussion on PDCCH monitoring capability and search space monitoring configuration.This seems to fit Alt2 above. |
| Sony | We support Alt 1. The need of Alt 2 and 3 can be further studied and justified. |
| OPPO | We prefer further discussion based on Alt 1 or Alt 2. The need of Alt 3 can be further studied. |
| Convida Wireless | We prefer Alt 2. |
| Intel | As commented by Hongbo and Steve, we share the view that it is important to align basic definition of span, X, Y, N. For example, by comparing Alt 1 and Alt 2, someone may think X=Y=N in Alt 1, while others may think Y=N while X can be larger for Alt 1. In high level, we think there are two critical points for discussion:1. how to define a window (multiple consecutive slots) to apply max BD/CCE?
	1. for Alt 1, the our understanding is window size is N slots, the kth window includes slots k\*N+[0,1,…N-1]
	2. for Alt 2, our understanding is window size is X slots. Since X is the minimum gap, the different windows may not be consecutive
	3. for Alt 3, our understanding is window size is N slots, the kth window include slots k+[0,1,…N-1]
2. is there a limitation that PDCCH MO can only be configured in a subset of slots with fixed positions in the window?
	1. for Alt 1, we think there is no limitation on such subset of slots (or, we can say the subset equals to the whole window). It is allowed for gNB to configure PDCCH Mos in any slot in the window. The position of slot (s) containing Mos can be different in different windows. However, due to limitation of max BD/CCE, gNB will practically not configure Mos in all slots in the window
	2. for Alt 2, our understanding is it limit to Y fixed consecutive slots/symbols in the window
	3. for Alt 3, same as Alt 1

With the above understanding,1. for Alt 1, the windows are always consecutive and non-overlap
2. for Alt 2, the windows are sliding and non-overlap
3. for Alt 3, the windows are sliding and can overlap
 |
| LG Electronics | We prefer Alt 1 as the baseline to define the multi-slot PDCCH monitoring capability (where specific number for N can be discussed further). In addition, before down-selection, further discussion seems to be necessary to clearly understand and distinguish each alternative. It may be premature to try down-selection before that, and so far we are not sure if all companies share the same understanding.  |
| Futurewei | We note that further clarifications were made during the email thread discussions. Based on these clarifications, we slightly support Alt 2 over Alt 1 for its additional flexibility. We prefer to postpone the Alt 3 discussions.  |
| MediaTek | Our first preference is Alt-1 and we can consider Alt-2 for further discussion. In particular, for Alt-1, we think the alternatives in discussion A1-2b.1 should be included in the Alt-1 for completeness. In that case, we support Alt-1+ MSM-1-1 in A1-2b.1 as the basic functionality and other combination can be further studied.Regarding Alt-3, the issues we can anticipate is the dropping rule in the sliding window. Such dynamic dropping on USS is not desirable and we are not sure it is realizable either. More details might be needed for us to consider this alternative. We also notice that Alt-3 has the most flexible monitoring occasion locations but Alt-3 might make BD/CCE distribution from gNB more difficult than other alternatives since gNB needs to make sure the BD/CCE distribution in a monitoring occasion don’t violate the BD/CCE limit when considering the monitoring occasions in the previous N-1 symbols and future N-1 symbols.  |
| Samsung | We support Alt 2, and ok with a larger value of Y as a UE capability to support better network flexibility.  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Regarding the draft PDCCH monitoring alternatives v03-Ericsson-vivo, we have the following comments:For Alt2 from Ericsson’s update, we think that “including across slot groups” can be removed. In this bullet, it emphasizes the span pattern and the minimum time separation between the start of two consecutive spans is X, which consists of one or X slots. While Y is the number of the consecutive slot/symbol of each span. Based on this understanding, we don’t see a need to add “including across slot groups”. Furthermore, the concept of slot group is not mentioned in this alternative, just using the notion of span. For Alt2 for vivo’s update, as we know about Rel-15/16, it seems that repeated span pattern is not a mandatory requirement. So we hope vivo can further clarify the motivations/benefits and the uses cases to introduce it.  |

Second Round FL Summary: After additional discussion shown in the appendix, companies seem to converge on an update of the alternatives of the previous agreement.

### Feature Lead Proposal A1-3:

Proposed modification of agreement:

Choose one of the following alternatives for defining the multi-slot PDCCH monitoring capability

* Alt 1: Use a fixed pattern of slots within a slot group as the baseline to define the new capability.
	+ Each slot group consists of X slots
	+ Slot groups are consecutive and non-overlapping
	+ The capability indicates the BD/CCE budget within Y consecutive [symbols or slots] in each slot group
	+ FFS: Supported values/constraints of X and Y, e.g. Y<=X, Y=X
	+ FFS: Restrictions on location of the Y [symbols or slots] within a slot group, e.g. the Y [symbols or slots] always start at the first slot within a slot group
	+ FFS: Capability definition within a slot
* Alt 2: Use an (X,Y) span as the baseline to define the new capability
	+ X is the minimum time separation between the start of two consecutive spans
	+ The capability indicates the BD/CCE budget within a span of Y consecutive [symbols or slots]
	+ Y <= X
	+ FFS: Exact values of X and Y and units in which they are defined (e.g., symbols, slots), including cases where a span is longer than one slot or crosses a slot boundary.
* Alt 3: Use a sliding window of X slots as the baseline to define the new capability.
	+ The capability indicates the BD/CCE budget within the sliding window
	+ The sliding unit of the sliding window is [1] slot.
	+ FFS: Capability definition within a slot
* Specific numbers for X, Y may depend on UE capability and gNB configuration
	+ Examples:
		- X = [4] slots for 480 kHz SCS and X = [8] slots for 960 kHz SCS

### Feature Lead Proposal A1-5 (revision of A1-3 after GTW call on 4 Feb 2021):

Proposed modification of agreement:

Choose one of the following alternatives for defining the multi-slot PDCCH monitoring capability

* Alt 1: Use a fixed pattern of slot groups as the baseline to define the new capability.
	+ Each slot group consists of X slots
	+ Slot groups are consecutive and non-overlapping
	+ The capability indicates the BD/CCE budget within Y consecutive [symbols or slots] in each slot group separately
	+ FFS: Supported values/constraints of X and Y, e.g. Y<=X, Y=X
	+ FFS: Restrictions on location of the Y [symbols or slots] within a slot group, e.g. the Y [symbols or slots] always start at the first slot within a slot group
	+ FFS: Capability definition within a slot
* Alt 2: Use an (X, Y) span as the baseline to define the new capability
	+ X is the minimum time separation between the start of two consecutive spans
	+ The capability indicates the BD/CCE budget within a span of at most Y consecutive [symbols or slots]
	+ Y <= X
	+ FFS: Exact values of X and Y and units in which they are defined (e.g., symbols, slots), including cases where a span is longer than one slot or crosses a slot boundary.
	+ FFS: What is a span pattern, how it is defined and whether it is supported. If it is supported, whether number of slots within which the span pattern is repeated is needed, and if needed, the value of the number of slots.
* Alt 3: Use a sliding window of X slots as the baseline to define the new capability.
	+ The capability indicates the BD/CCE budget within the sliding window
	+ The sliding unit of the sliding window is [1] slot.
	+ FFS: Capability definition within a slot
* Specific numbers for X, Y may depend on UE capability and gNB configuration
	+ Examples:
		- X = [4] slots for 480 kHz SCS and X = [8] slots for 960 kHz SCS

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Samsung | We are ok with the proposal.  |
| Ericsson | Support FL Proposal AI-5Additionally, I think it is necessary to keep the following bullet intact* + The capability indicates the BD/CCE budget within Y consecutive [symbols or slots] in each slot group separately

because it essentially describes what Alt-1 is. Without it then we might as well start from scratch. Furthermore, without it, the main bullet for Alt-1 doesn’t provide enough information; the two need to be read together. |
| MediaTek | We are generally ok with the proposal but need one more clarification on the capability sub-bullet under Alt1:o The capability indicates the BD/CCE budget within Y consecutive [symbols or slots] in each slot group separatelyWhat is the significance of separately? |
| Qualcomm | As we commented in A1-2, the last bullet could be combined with A1-2. We are fine with other bullets. |
| InterDigital | As we commented in the GTW session, what we can suggest as a compromise is as follows:* + The capability indicates the BD/CCE budget ~~within Y consecutive [symbols or slots] in each slot group separately~~

If this is not fine, we suggest to further study in the next meeting.  |
| Futurewei | We are in general OK with the proposal. As MediaTEk we do not understand why “separately” is necessary, if already we have “each”, the sentence is clearer without the word “separately” |
| Apple | We are fine with the proposal. Also see that “each” and “separately” communicate that the BD/CCE budget will occur in a single slot group.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We agree with the comment from Ericsson. The main information in these alternatives is the time during which the BD/CCE budget applies, so removing this from Alt1 would lead to an incomplete definition of Alt1 compared to the other alternatives.Perhaps if InterDigital is thinking of something different, then an Alt4 could be proposed by InterDigital. But if InterDigital considers that X=Y in Alt1, then this seems already covered and not contradicting with that specific bullet.  |
| NTT DOCOMO | We are fine with the FL proposal. |
| Spreadtrum | We are generally ok with the proposal. |
| Intel | We are fine with the FL proposal.We think the following bullet is necessary. * + The capability indicates the BD/CCE budget within Y consecutive [symbols or slots] in each slot group separately

Regarding separately, our understanding is it emphasize that max BD/CCE are counted within the Y consecutive slots of a slot group, so there is no counting across slot groups. However, it seems deleting separately is also fine. |
| LG Electronics | We are fine with the updated proposal.  |
| CATT | We are OK with the updated proposal |
| Xiaomi | We also has the same question as MTK. From our understanding, for each slot group, the Y value should be the same and the BD/CCE capacity for each group within the Y slots should be the same too, otherwise too much complexity would be introduced.We are fine with the proposal if in Alt1, the “separately” is deleted.* Alt 1: Use a fixed pattern of slot groups as the baseline to define the new capability.
	+ Each slot group consists of X slots
	+ Slot groups are consecutive and non-overlapping
	+ The capability indicates the BD/CCE budget within Y consecutive [symbols or slots] in each slot group ~~separately~~
	+ FFS: Supported values/constraints of X and Y, e.g. Y<=X, Y=X
	+ FFS: Restrictions on location of the Y [symbols or slots] within a slot group, e.g. the Y [symbols or slots] always start at the first slot within a slot group
	+ FFS: Capability definition within a slot
 |
| vivo | For Alt 1, agree with MTK that “separately” is not clear and needs more modification.In addition, we think “FFS: Capability definition within a slot” should be also under Alt. 2. |
| Nokia, NSB | We are fine with the updated FL proposal: * We don’t have a problem with “separately”

It might be good to have further clarification for the following: * What is exactly meant by “Capability definition within a slot”? (e.g. in the context of Alt 1)
* A better wording could be “Capability definition”
 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Same question as Nokia’s |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support FL proposal and are fine with Nokia’s suggestion  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | For Alt 1, we also think it is redundant for adding “separately”. without it, there seems to be no ambiguity. Besides, for “FFS : Capability definition within a slot” in Alt1/3, my understanding is its intention is to further determine whether UE has the ability to support Per slot monitoring. If my understanding is correct, it seems to overlap with similar description such “symbol or slot” mentioned in Alt1/3. Therefore, “FFS : Capability definition within a slot” in Alt1/3 needs to be further clarified.For last bullet, we think it would be better to add 1 slot in example in order to avoid a case that 1 slot is not considered. Thus suggestion is as follows:* Specific numbers for X, Y may depend on UE capability and gNB configuration
	+ Examples:
		- X = [1, 4] slots for 480 kHz SCS and X = [1, 8] slots for 960 kHz SCS
 |
| Ericsson2 | We are fine to remove "separately." I agree, that it can be viewed as redundant.I have a fairly strong view that we need to keep the following FFS:* + FFS: Capability definition within a slot

The reason for that is that if Y is measured in "slots," then we still need further discussion on if the UE is capable of monitoring only the first 3 symbols of a slot (like Case 1-1 monitoring) or any symbol of a slot (like Case 1-2 monitoring). I believe these issues need to be discussed concurrently. That is the reason for the FFS. |

### First Round (A1-3)

**Question A1-3: Is the following proposal agreeable?**

**Cross-carrier scheduling of cell with 52.6-71GHz frequency from/to a cell of FR1 and FR2 is allowed by specification, however, additional enhancements are deprioritized unless a clear motivation is identified.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Xiaomi  | Support the moderator’s proposal.  |
| Qualcomm | At least the timeline discussion for the new SCSs (i.e., cross-carrier PDSCH and aperiodic CSI-RS preparation time) should not be deprioritized. However, any new procedures specific for the new SCSs would be unnecessary and deprioritized. |
| Futurewei | We support moderator’s proposal. |
| OPPO | We support moderator’s proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | First we think that the formulation of the question implies that 52.6-71GHz does not belong to FR2, but this is pending RAN plenary decision. In fact, our analysis shows that it may be preferable to extend FR2 to include the range of 52.6-71GHz.That being said, the proposal is generally acceptable once properly re-formulated. One possible reformulation is “cross-carrier scheduling of a cell within [52.6-71] GHz from/to a cell outside [52.6-71] GHz”.In Rel-15/16, it is possible to cross-carrier schedule between 15 kHz and 120 kHz SCS, i.e. up to a ratio of 8. It should therefore be possible without any major specification impact to support CCS between 120 kHz and 960 kHz SCS. CCS between 15/30/60 kHz and 960 kHz may not need to be supported, as well as CCS between 15/30 kHz and 480 kHz SCS. So basically, CCS involving 480 or 960 kHz SCS may be limited to cells outside FR1. |
| Apple | Agree |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Support the moderator’s proposal. In addition, Question A1-3 can be removed into 2.1.5 Topic D. |
| Samsung | OK with FL’s proposal.  |
| Intel | We support the FL proposal |
| InterDigital | Support the proposal |
| vivo | Agree with Qualcomm |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support the moderator’s proposal. |
| Sony | Support |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Agree with the proposal |
| Nokia, NSB | Agree |
| Spreadtrum | We support moderator’s proposal. |
| Convida Wireless | We agree with moderator’s proposal. |
| LG Electronics | Yes, it is agreeable. |
| Ericsson | We agree in principleHowever, we think the question needs to be reformulated regarding the pending question on if the 52.6 – 71 GHz band is an extension of FR2 or if it is defined as a new FR.  |
| CATT | We are OK with the proposal. |

First Round FL Summary: Most companies support the FL’s proposal, with some suggestion to clarify the terminology. One company points out that the timeline discussion for the new SCSs (i.e., cross-carrier PDSCH and aperiodic CSI-RS preparation time) should not be deprioritized (see also Question D-1). Another company points out that there could be CCS restrictions depending on the SCS.

First Round FL Suggestion: Agree on FL Proposal A1-3.1 and continue discussion on CCS restrictions depending on SCS in the second round.

First Round FL Proposal A1-3.1:

* Cross-carrier scheduling of a cell within 52.6-71 GHz from/to a cell outside 52.6-71 GHz is supported. FFS: cross-carrier scheduling limitations depending on the applicable SCS on the scheduling and scheduled cells/BWPs.
* Deprioritize discussion on other cross-scheduling aspects except related to timeline for cross-carrier PDSCH and aperiodic CSI-RS preparation time.

### Feature Lead Proposal A1-4:

* Cross-carrier scheduling of a cell within 52.6-71 GHz from/to a cell outside 52.6-71 GHz is supported.
* FFS: cross-carrier scheduling limitations depending on the applicable SCS on the scheduling and scheduled cells/BWPs.
* Deprioritize discussion on other cross-scheduling aspects, except related to timeline for cross-carrier PDSCH and aperiodic CSI-RS preparation time.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Samsung | We are fine with the proposal.  |
| Ericsson | Generally OK, but maybe for now “from/to” can be changed to “from/[to]”. I’m not sure that CC scheduling from a cell within the 52.6 – 71 GHz band to a cell outside this band, e.g., to FR1, makes sense.Also, I think the following clarification in wording is needed:FFS: potential ~~cross-carrier scheduling~~ limitations ~~depending~~ on the applicable SCS(s) of ~~on~~ the scheduling and scheduled cells/BWPs. |
| Qualcomm | We agree with the proposal. |
| InterDigital | We are fine with the proposal.  |
| Futurewei | We are OK with the proposal. |
| Apple | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are fine with the proposal including Ericsson’s revisions. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Intel | We support the FL proposal |
| LG Electronics | We are fine with the first 2 bullets including Ericsson’s revisions.For the last bullet after a further thought, we have one concern. If this comes from Intel’s Proposal 4 and related contents in R1-2100644, it seems to be already covered by the 2nd bullet. However, if not, I’m not sure exactly what the other cross-scheduling aspects refer to. It may be too premature to deprioritize all aspects other than timeline related issues, before identification. Therefore, we suggest to remove the 3rd bullet. |
| CATT | We are OK with moderator’s proposal |
| Xiaomi | We are OK with the proposal. |
| vivo | We are fine with the proposal |
| Nokia, NSB | We support the FL proposal, as well as the modification by ///. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support the FL proposal |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We support the FL proposal with modification on FFS from Ericssion. |

## Topic A2: PDCCH Extensions for e.g. Coverage, Reliability

### First Round (A2-1)

**Question A2-1: Do you see a need to improve coverage or reliability of PDCCH compared to Rel-15/16? Please provide a motivation.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Xiaomi | Currently, we don’t see the need but open to discuss it. |
| Qualcomm | As it was already decided in the WID not to pursue the SSB coverage enhancement in Rel-17, we think PDCCH coverage enhancement should also be deprioritized. It may be considered in the future releases. |
| Futurewei | We expect UL coverage limitation therefore we do not see a need to increase the DL coverage. Additional mechanisms such as beamforming will do the job. The usage of lower SCS (120kHz) also will provide enough coverage. |
| OPPO | If time permits, in spectrum with PSD-limit requirement, the coverage enhancement for PDCCH with 120kHz may be investigated.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We do not see a need to improve coverage or reliability of PDCCH for the range of [52.6-71] GHz. Coverage enhancements are excluded from the WID for SSB and for multi-PDSCH/PUSCH. There is no WID objective to enhance the coverage of uplink channels. Therefore it is not clear why PDCCH would be considered the coverage bottleneck given the scope of the WID. |
| Apple | There may be a need to (a) increase the reliability or (b) have an indication to the gNB whether a PDCCH was received. This is because with multi-PxSCH transmission signaled by a single DCI, loss of that DCI can be catastrophic to the system performance especially if HARQ-ACK feedback is based on the entire transmission.  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We think improving coverage or reliability of PDCCH especially for SCS 480kHz/960kHz is needed. |
| Samsung | We didn’t see a coverage issue for PDCCH in the SI, so this topic can be deprioritized.  |
| Intel | Coverage or reliability enhancement is not in the scope of current WID. For a small cell in high frequency, it is enough to rely on high PDCCH AL e.g.16, high beamforming gain and power boosting to achieve a reasonable link performance of PDCCH |
| MediaTek | We don’t see the strong need to support it since SSB and PDSCH coverage enhancement are excluded in WID. However, we are open to discuss it if this issue can be validated. |
| InterDigital | No. As CovEnh WI is already doing their work, we don’t see a need to improve coverage or reliability of PDCCH.  |
| vivo | We agree to study and discuss coverage or reliability of PDCCH especially when using higher SCS with much shorter duration. Actually, we don’t have much study on this in the SI phase. As apple indicates, loss of DCI will impact the performance a lot especially when we schedule multiple PDSCH/PUSCH with a single DCI. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We don’t see any clear motivation or necessity for coverage/reliability enhancement, but open to discuss it. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We think that coverage/reliability enhancements can be considered for PDCCH. In our view, as also discussed in our contribution, increasing the number of symbols for CORESET is a straightforward solution.  |
| Nokia, NSB | Yes. High SCSs suffer from reduced MCS and MIL compared to 120 kHz SCS. Time domain repetitions are supported already for PDSCH, PUSCH and PUCCH but repetition for PDCCH has not been even considered. When considering PDSCH repetition (slot aggregation), PDCCH can easily become the bottleneck (higher aggregation level alone does not improve the link budget/coverage). Furthermore, it is noted that the DCI size of multi-PDSCH/PUSCH is larger compared to that of single slot scheduling. There are two basic solutions to balance the PDCCH coverage with the repeated PDSCH: * Option 1: Mixed numerology between PDCCH and PDSCH: use a lower SCS, such as 120 kHz, for PDCCH. This is not allowed in Rel. 15/16 NR.
* Option 2: Increased number of symbols available for PDCCH: This can be done either by defining a CORESET with increased length, or by means of CORESET repetition (of existing length).

We think that one of those options needs to be supported. |
| Spreadtrum | We do not see a need to improve coverage or reliability of PDCCH for beyond 52.6 GHz. |
| LG Electronics | We don’t see a need for it. Any DL coverage issues can be deprioritized in this sub-agenda. |
| Ericsson | We do not see a need for coverage enhancement for PDCCH for 480/960 kHz, and this is out of scope in our understanding.120 kHz should be used for coverage demanding scenarios. |
| CATT | No need for enhancement. |

First Round FL Summary: Several companies do not identify a need for discussing PDCCH coverage enhancements, while some companies think that increasing the number of symbols available for PDCCH (being discussed as part of the multi-slot monitoring issue) could also serve this purpose.

First Round FL Suggestion: Include discussion of increasing the number of symbols available for PDCCH in the multi-slot monitoring discussion. Further discussion of other proposals may be (re-)considered in future meetings.

## Topic B: Multiple PDSCH/PUSCH by a single DCI

**FL NOTE: Decisions on BD limitations/capabilities for potential new DCI formats should come after corresponding decisions on support of such scheduling in AI 8.2.5.**

### First Round (B-1)

**Question B-1: Do you see a need for PDCCH monitoring restriction in terms of SS configuration with specific DCI formats?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Xiaomi  | We are not clear about this question. What kind of PDCCH monitoring restrictions? And which specific DCI formats? |
| Qualcomm | Any restriction on the PDCCH monitoring configuration (e.g., periodicity, AL, number of candidates, etc.) should be up to network, as long as it fulfills UE’s PDCCH monitoring capability. |
| Futurewei | Agree with Xiaomi. The question needs further clarifications. |
| OPPO | We should further investigate this issue. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | This discussion should probably wait for progress on supported SCS for initial access, and for the discussion on whether to support single-slot PDCCH monitoring for 480 and 960 kHz SCS under topic A1.At least for 120 kHz SCS, we don’t see any need to change what is already specified for FR2 in terms of SS configuration for the various DCI formats, which can be directly reused in 52.6-71 GHz. |
| Apple | The use of a new DCI for multi-PxSCH transmission needs to be answered first. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | This issue needs to be clarified further. Besides, we understand that it should be discussed “after corresponding decisions on support of such scheduling in AI 8.2.5”. |
| Samsung | Yes, in order to support the multi-slot span based monitoring, there could be restrictions on SS configuration based on the supported value of X and Y, but this can be discussed later (including whether applicable to specific DCI formats) after the framework of multi-slot span based monitoring is done.  |
| Intel | Multiple PDSCH/PUSCH by a single DCI is supported based on WID. So it is fine to discuss how to handle the related DCI format in PDCCH monitoring. We prefer to reuse existing configuration of SS set. The supported DCI format for a SS set is extended to cover fallback DCI, single-TTI DCI and multi-TTI DCI. When multi-TTI DCI is configured for a SS set, it up to gNB to configure proper parameters.  |
| InterDigital | We prefer to discuss this issue after having enough details on multi-slot scheduling. |
| vivo | Agree with Qualcomm |
| NTT DOCOMO | We think this discussion should be postponed after the corresponding discussion on support of such scheduling in AI 8.2.5, as noted by the moderator. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | In our view, PDDCH monitoring restrictions should be considered in terms of at least SS set configuration where the SS is allowed to be configured with only certain combinations of DCI formats for 480kHz and 960kHz SCS. This is further motivated if new DCI is specified for multiple PDSCH scheduling. |
| Nokia, NSB | Too early to decide. |
| Spreadtrum | We agree with Futurewei .The question needs further clarifications. |
| Convida Wireless | We agree with Qualcomm’s comments. The restriction can be up to network configuration. |
| LG Electronics | This issue may be needed to further discuss after a new DCI format is adopted for multi-PxSCH scheduling in AI 8.2.5. It may be premature to conclude at this moment. |
| Ericsson | This discussion can be deferred until more progress is made in multi-PDSCH design.That being said, our understanding is that we are targeting non-fallback DCI (like for multi-PUSCH scheduling in Rel-16). |
| CATT | Current SearchSpace can support new DCI format for multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling. |

First Round FL Summary: Several companies agree that this issue should be postponed until discussion on multi-slot scheduling has made progress (AI 8.2.5). Some companies think that any restriction on the PDCCH monitoring configuration (e.g., periodicity, AL, number of candidates, etc.) should be up to network, as long as it fulfills UE’s PDCCH monitoring capability.

First Round FL Suggestion: Discussion may continue in future meetings.

## Topic C: Multi-Beam Aspects

### First Round (C-1)

**Question C-1: Do you have any views on the need for enhancing PDCCH w.r.t. multiple beams?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Xiaomi  | We are open to discuss. Currently only a few companies have mentioned this topic. Maybe we can wait for more input and discuss later. |
| Qualcomm | PDCCH enhancement associated with multi-beam transmission is already under discussion in eMIMO WI. We don’t think separate discussion is necessary. |
| Futurewei | This discussion may be deprioritized for later. |
| OPPO | We are open for PDCCH enhancement including supporting multiple beams |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | The discussion on the potential support of directional LBT should proceed first under the agenda on channel access mechanisms. |
| Apple | This should be discussed as a secondary priority. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We think that there is a need for enhancements on multi-beam aspects for PDCCH, but this issue should be discussed later e.g. after AI 8.2.6 makes some related progress. |
| Samsung | Support. We proposed this proposal in channel access agenda.  |
| Intel | We are open to discuss beam related operation, especially DCI 2\_0 |
| InterDigital | We think that this is out of scope.  |
| vivo | We are open to discuss the special part other than that in eMIMO WI. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We are open to discuss but this topic can be deprioritized. We agree with ZTE that it depends on the progress in AI 8.2.6.  |
| Sony | We support the proposals from Nokia and LG on making changes to DCI format 2\_0, to facilitate the per beam indication on COT or SS-group switching trigger, RB-sets.  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | In our view, PDCCH monitoring for multi-beam aspects in channel access should be considered.Especially, PDCCH monitoring can be restricted based on beam-specific CORESET(s) monitoring within a COT, that is to say, within a COT initiated by a gNB using directional LBT, the Tx beam configured for a CORESET may be outside the spatial region of the current COT, so that the UE can stop monitoring the PDCCH occasions in such CORESET(s) until the COT ends. |
| Nokia, NSB | GC-PDCCH is an essential part of unlicensed band system, and there seems to be a need to support beam-dependent information, particularly if some form of directional LBT is chosen as coexistence mechanism. |
| Spreadtrum | We are open to enhance PDCCH to support multiple beams. |
| Convida Wireless | We are open for discussion. In addition, Rel-17 FeMIMO has agreed to support PDCCH with multi-beams.  |
| LG Electronics | For efficient utilization of GC-PDCCH in unlicensed operation, we can consider per beam indication of available RB set, CO duration, and/or SS set switching by using DCI format 2\_0.  |
| Ericsson | We agree with the comments from Qualcomm. It seems out of scope.For companies suggesting beam indication for Type-3 CSS (GC-PDCCH) it is not at all clear what scope of enhancements are being suggested. How should this work given that GC-PDCCH needs to address multiple users in different directions? |
| CATT | The TCI state of each CORESET could be enhanced to support dynamically updated through DCI. |

First Round FL Summary: Several companies pointed out that they are open to discuss multi-beam PDCCH aspects/enhancements. Companies also noted that the main discussion for multi-beam scheduling may happen in Rel-17 FeMIMO, and discussion of specific issues for unlicensed channel may need to wait for progress in 8.2.6 (Channel Access). One company identified specific issue is the use of GC-PDCCH indication of beam-specific indication of available RB set, CO duration, and/or SS set switching. One company suggests that the TCI state of each CORESET could be enhanced to support dynamically updated through DCI.

First Round FL Suggestion: Discussion on specific PDCCH issues for unlicensed channel operation with multi-beam operation can be discussed in this AI in future meetings, but may be depending on progress in AI 8.2.6 (Channel Access) and therefore deprioritized for the time being.

## Topic D: Cross-carrier scheduling

### First Round (D-1)

**Question D-1: Would you like to provide any views on the documents and proposals listed under Topic D?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Qualcomm | As we commented in Question A1-3, the preparation time for cross-carrier PDSCH and aperiodic CSI-RS/SRS, should be discussed. Unlike other processing timeline issues for PDSCH/PUSCH, which will be discussed in sub-agenda 8.2.5, the cross-carrier preparation time has implications with PDCCH processing time. Therefore, it should be discussed in this sub-agenda. |
| Futurewei | Support reuse of the existing cross-carrier scheduling specs. Further enhancement may not be necessary. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support Proposal 4 in R1-2101321 (Single DCI schedule multiple PDSCH across multiple CCs should be studied for NR operation from 52.6 to 71 GHz). Note that this is being discussed in the DSS enhancements WI, so if it is specified as part of DSS enhancements (WID clarifies that enhancements would be applicable to CA in general with or without DSS), then we see no reason not to support those enhancements also in 52.6 to 71 GHz.Proposal 6 in R1-2101454 would normally be handled as part of the necessary discussions on processing timelines. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We think that both cross-carrier scheduling and PDSCH reception preparation time should be discussed in AI 8.2.5 HARQ/scheduling and timeline. Besides, it may be deprioritized. |
| Samsung | This topic can be deprioritized unless issues are identified.  |
| Intel | Multi-cell scheduling is out-of-scope. We share QC’s views to define new values for minimum PDSCH scheduling delay and Minimum A-CSI RS triggering offset for SCS 480 and 960kHz.  |
| vivo | It can be discussed as long as the issues are identified. |
| Nokia, NSB | Agree with Intel’s view: additional enhancements are deprioritized unless a clear motivation is identified |
| Convida Wireless | We support single DCI schedule multiple PDSCH across multiple CC. Like the case that a single DCI scheduling multiple PDSCHs in a serving cell, there are several advantages to introduce a single DCI format scheduling multiple PDSCHs across multiple CCs. |
| Ericsson | We agree with Qualcomm's comment. It is important to consider the processing times such that cross-carrier scheduling is functional, e.g., CC in current FR2 scheduling a CC in 52.6 to 71 GHz. |
| CATT | Rel-16 cross-carrier scheduling with different numerology should be reused. |

First Round FL Summary: Several companies expressed the need to discuss minimum PDSCH scheduling delay and Minimum A-CSI RS triggering offset for SCS 480 and 960kHz. However it seems further discussion in this meeting is not likely to result in more progress. For other topics, it would be beneficial to hear views from more companies before arriving at a conclusion.

First Round FL Suggestion: Continue discussion at least on minimum PDSCH scheduling delay and Minimum A-CSI RS triggering offset for SCS 480 and 960kHz in RAN1#104bis-e (or later); other topics can be further discussed but may be deprioritized.

## Topic E: Other

### First Round (E-1)

**Question E-1: Would you like to provide any views on the documents and proposals listed under Topic E?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Xiaomi | For our proposals below, we consider they are necessary, and need to discussed for the new SCS 480/960khz. Search space set group switching is introduced in R16 NR-U for power saving propose and group switching time $P\_{switch}$ is defined for SCS 15-60kHz. To facilitate unlicensed band operation for NR 52.6-71GHz, group switching time $P\_{switch}$ should also be defined for 120/480/960kHz ***Proposal 6: Search space set group switching time*** $P\_{switch}$ ***should be defined for 120/480/960kHz.***The maximum search space periodicity in current spec is 2560 slots, and with SCS increased to 960kHz, the absolute time of the maximum search space periodicity will be decreased by 8 times. So new periodicity parameters may need to be introduced for the new SCSs, as well as the search space offset/duration parameters.***Proposal 7:*** ***New search space periodicity parameters, as well as the search space offset/duration parameters, may need to be introduced for the new SCSs.*** |
| Nokia, NSB | We don’t see a need for these. These can be deprioritized. |
| LG Electronics | Carrier-group based GC-PDCCH could reduce the amount of signaling of RB-set, CO duration and SS set switching to consecutive carriers whose are overlapped to any coexisting RATs in unlicensed band. |
| Ericsson | It would be useful to revisit the timeline for search space set group switching to see if new values are needed for 480/960 kHz SCS. SCS. |

First Round FL Summary: Only a few companies commented on these proposals, so it seems better to defer such discussion to later meetings.

First Round FL Suggestion: Continue discussion on these topics in future meetings.

# Contribution Details

The following sections show extracted discussion and proposals from the contributions submitted to this AI.

## Topic A1: Blind Decoding Capability, Multi-slot span monitoring

List of issues, proposals, and suggestions for handling in the email discussion phase.

### R1-2100058 (Lenovo, Motorola Mobility)

|  |
| --- |
| In RAN1#103-e and in the WID, it has been agreed to specify enhancements to schedule multiple PDSCH/PUSCH by a single DCI. One of the main motivations for this is to avoid the need for UE to monitor PDCCH scheduling PDSCH/PUSCH in every slot as it may not be feasible to monitor and decode by UE due to very short slot duration for higher SCS values such as 480kHz and 960kHz. Therefore, it is quite straightforward extension to allow the possibility for a UE to be configured with multi-slot PDCCH monitoring span, where the UE is not required to monitor PDCCH in every slot.***Proposal 1: For supporting NR between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz with high subcarrier spacing values including 480kHz and 960kHz, multi-slot PDCCH monitoring span should be supported.***Furthermore, exact duration of the multi-slot PDCCH monitoring span can be configurable with different values in terms of number of slots depending upon the SCS values. For example, with 480kHz SCS value, multi-slot PDCCH monitoring span is 4 slots and with 960kHz SCS value, multi-slot PDCCH monitoring span is 8 slots. ***Proposal 2: For supporting NR between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz with high subcarrier spacing values including 480kHz and 960kHz, if multi-slot PDCCH monitoring span should be supported, then the exact duration of the span can be configured depending upon the subcarrier spacing value.***With high SCS values, the absolute duration of the slot is greatly reduced and moreover, when single DCI can schedule multi-PDSCH/PUSCH over multiple slots, it might be beneficial to consider longer duration than 3 symbols for CORESETs. Multiple benefits can be associated with longer duration:* Better support for higher aggregation levels for better reliability
* More resources available for CORESET, but with same or even reduced duration in absolute time
* More symbols available to allow TDM multiplexing between DM-RS and control information
	+ Benefit of a DM-RS symbol with continuous frequency resources will account for better channel estimation with higher SCS values.

In fact, for very high SCS value such as 960kHz, even an entire slot for PDCCH can be considered to allow for only single PDCCH monitoring occasion within a slot.***Proposal 5: For supporting NR between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz with high subcarrier spacing values including 480kHz and 960kHz, CORESET duration longer than 3 symbols should be supported:**** ***FFS: Maximum duration up to 14 symbols in a slot.***
 |

### R1-2100074 (ZTE, Sanechips)

|  |
| --- |
| **Observation 1: For supporting NR operation in 52.6 GHz ~ 71 GHz with SCS 480 kHz & 960 kHz, the PDCCH monitoring capability will be further relaxed, the maximum number of non-overlapped CCEs and PDCCH candidates per slot could be further limited, and the use of the highest CCE aggregation level may be affected.****Option 1:** Define PDCCH BD capability based on a reference period. For example, define PDCCH BD capability according to a slot length of a reference SCS 120 kHz. When configuring the search space set by higher layer parameter *monitoringSlotPeriodicityAndOffset*, the gNB needs to ensure that the duration *TS* is an integral multiple of the slot length of 120 kHz SCS.**Option 2:** Define PDCCH BD capability based on a slot group and PDCCH monitoring is performed on multiple slots. When configuring the search space set by higher layer parameter *monitoringSlotPeriodicityAndOffset*, the gNB needs to ensure that the duration *TS* is a multiple of n slots (n equals to the number of slots contained in the slot group), or a multiple of slot groups in the basic unit of slot group. For example, if a slot group includes four slots, the duration *TS* can be configured as 4, 8, 12, 16, ... of slots. Alternatively, the duration *TS* can be configured as 1, 2, 3, 4, ... of slot groups, i.e. the basic granularity of the duration *TS* should be defined as a slot group. Figure 1 gives two configuration types in a slot group for Option 2.(a) Configuration 1 in Option 2(b) Configuration 2 in Option 2**Figure 1: Define PDCCH BD capability based on a slot group in Option 2****Option 3:** Reduce the monitoring frequency by limiting the configuration of CORESET and/or search space set, such as configuring a larger PDCCH monitoring periodicity *KS* and a smaller PDCCH detection duration, e.g. *TS* = 1. Option 3 can be considered as an implementation issue, i.e. left to gNB configuration.However, Option 3 obviously limits the scheduling flexibility and also may lead to PDCCH congestion. Therefore, a better way is the combination of Option 3 and **Option 4** that can schedule multiple PDSCH/PUSCH via a single DCI. Multiple PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling with a single DCI can not only save DCI overhead, but also reduce PDCCH monitoring frequency without sacrificing scheduling flexibility.In addition to the combination of Option 3 and Option 4, other options can also be combined to enhance PDCCH monitoring, such as Option 1 and Option 4, Option 2 and Option 4, etc.**Proposal 1: The following options can be considered to enhance PDCCH monitoring for NR operation in 52.6 GHz ~ 71 GHz with the newly introduced SCS i.e. 480 kHz & 960 kHz:*** **Option 1: Define PDCCH BD capability based on a reference period**
* **Option 2: Define PDCCH BD capability based on a slot group**
* **Option 3: Reduce PDCCH monitoring frequency by limiting the configuration of CORESET and/or search space set**
* **Option 4: Schedule multiple PDSCH/PUSCH with a single DCI**
* **Option 5: The combination of two or more options from the above**
 |

### R1-2100150 (OPPO)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| With the introduction of 480kHz and 960kHz for data and control transmission, the capabilities for PDCCH monitoring should be reduced. For simplicity, we use the capability for combination (2, 2) as the reference, and by scaling the numbers we can roughly calculate the blind detection/CCE budget for PDCCH monitoring with higher SCSs. Table 1 and Table 2 show the examples of the scaled values for PDCCH monitoring with 480kHz and 960kHz for PDCCH candidates and CCE budgets respectively. Here we considered PDCCH monitoring per slot, per 2-slot, per 4-slot and per 8-slot.**Table 1: Maximum number of monitored PDCCH candidates**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Maximum number** $M\_{PDCCH}^{max,\left(X,Y\right),μ}$ **of monitored PDCCH candidates per serving cell**  |
| $$μ$$ | Per slot | Per 2-slot | Per 4-slot | Per 8-slot |
| 5 | 6 | 12 | 24 | 48 |
| 6 | 3 | 6 | 12 | 24 |

**Table 2: Maximum number of non-overlapped CCEs**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Maximum number** $C\_{PDCCH}^{max,\left(X,Y\right),μ}$ **of non-overlapped CCEs per serving cell** |
| $$μ$$ | Per slot | Per 2-slot | Per 4-slot | Per 8-slot |
| 5 | 6 | 12 | 18 | 36 |
| 6 | 6 | 12 | 18 | 36 |

**Proposal 1: The maximum number of monitored PDCCH candidates and the maximum number of non-overlapped CCEs can be roughly calculated from the PDCCH monitoring capability of combination (2, 2).**As discussed above, with the introduction of 480kHz and 960kHz for data and control transmission in the high frequency range, compared to existing SCS, the symbols become much shorter and the frequency range will be much larger for a given CORESET configuration. Figure 1 compares the CORESET configuration of {12RBs, 2symbols} for 120kHz and 480kHz respectively. **Figure 1: CORESET configuration of {12RBs, 2symbols} for 120kHz and 480kHz**From Figure 1, it can be observed that to keep same CORESET configurations and same PDCCH candidates being monitored, compared to 120kHz SCS, the coverage of PDCCH transmission would be impacted due to the reduced transmission duration, and UE is required to estimate much higher frequency range with the SCS of 480kHz. While the maximum number of non-overlapped CCEs would be smaller for 480kHz SCS than 120kHz SCS. The difference would be much larger if 120kHz and 960kHz SCSs are compared. Therefore, enhancements to CORESET configuration, i.e., reducing CORESET RBs and increasing CORESET symbols for a given higher SCS, seem beneficial. **Proposal 2: CORESET configuration with less RBs and more symbols for 480kHz and 960kHz SCS should be supported.** |

### R1-2100241 (Huawei, HiSilicon)

|  |
| --- |
| ***Observation 1****: Further reducing the slot-level PDCCH monitoring capabilities for 480/960 kHz SCSs will cause the numbers of PDCCH candidates and non-overlapped CCEs to become too small, which may result in lower achievable aggregation levels.*To solve the issue, multi-slot span monitoring can be introduced, i.e., extending the PDCCH monitoring unit from slot to multi-slot. To specify the multi-slot span monitoring, we investigate the following aspects:* + Monitoring capabilities
	+ Search space set

First, the monitoring capabilities can be defined over multiple slots, i.e. the monitoring unit is defined as X slots where X > 1. To save specification efforts, we suggest to support a common span for all SCSs supported above 52.6 GHz. A simple way is to align the span with one slot of 120 kHz SCS, i.e., for 480 kHz SCS, a PDCCH monitoring span can contain four slots, and for 960 kHz SCS, a PDCCH monitoring span can contain eight slots.***Proposal 1****: Introduce the following PDCCH monitoring span for PDCCH monitoring, where the maximum number of monitored PDCCH candidatesfor a DL BWP for a single serving cell is defined over a PDCCH monitoring span, and the maximum number of non-overlapped CCEsfor a DL BWP for a single serving cell is defined over a PDCCH monitoring span, for SCS configurations of 480 and 960 kHz:** + *for 480 kHz SCS, a PDCCH monitoring span contains four slots*
	+ *for 960 kHz SCS, a PDCCH monitoring span contains eight slots*

***Proposal 2:*** *The time domain parameters of search space set configuration should be enhanced to adapt to the multi-slot span monitoring by** + *adding new periodicities to increase the flexibility of search space set configuration*
	+ *changing the unit of duration to multi-slot span*

In Rel-15, the following PDCCH monitoring cases are defined:* Case 1: PDCCH monitoring periodicity of 14 or more symbols
	+ Case 1-1: PDCCH monitoring on up to three OFDM symbols at the beginning of a slot
	+ Case 1-2: PDCCH monitoring on any span of up to 3 consecutive OFDM symbols of a slot
* Case 2: PDCCH monitoring periodicity of less than 14 symbols

If multi-slot span monitoring is adopted, the current definition of the cases may not be able to be applied to 480 kHz/960 kHz SCS directly. Therefore, to facilitate further discussion, RAN1 should clarify the monitoring cases under the assumption of multi-slot monitoring. The following definition can be a starting point for further discussion:* Case 1: PDCCH monitoring periodicity of 14\*X or more symbols
	+ Case 1-1: PDCCH monitoring on up to three OFDM symbols at the beginning of a multi-slot span
	+ Case 1-2: PDCCH monitoring on any span of up to 3 consecutive OFDM symbols of a multi-slot span
* Case 2: PDCCH monitoring periodicity of less than 14\*X symbols
* Note: X is the number of slots in a span

In our view, similar to PDCCH monitoring in FR2, Case 1-1 should be the baseline for multi-slot monitoring, and RAN1 should further analyze whether the other cases are necessary or not.***Proposal 3:*** *For multi-slot monitoring in 52.6~71 GHz, RAN1 should clarify the definition of PDCCH monitoring cases, and further study which case(s) should be supported if the PDCCH monitoring periodicity is defined based on a span of 14\*X symbols (instead of 14 symbols).* |

### R1-2100258 (Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| NR Rel-16 supports PDCCH monitoring restriction according to span -based monitoring. It’s defined according to two parameters, X and Y:* X (symbols) is the minimum time separation between the first symbols of two consecutive spans
* Y (symbols) is the maximum duration of the span.

The span -based monitoring defined in Rel-16 supports only scenarios with X≤7. This corresponds to span-based monitoring within a slot. However, the Rel-16 solution scales to multi-slot scenario as well, and it makes sense to define monitoring restriction for 60GHz scenario based on the same operation logic. This means that the number of monitored PDCCH candidates per span, and the number of non-overlapped CCEs needs to be determined not only per slot, but also per combination (X, Y).***Proposal 1:**** *Support both slot-based multi-slot span -based monitoring for 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCSs*
* *All UEs supporting 480 kHz or 960 kHz SCS should support multi-slot span -based monitoring.*

The first question is how to determine values for parameter *X*? Table 1 shows the number of slots and OFDM symbols w.r.t. a slot with 120 kHz SCS. Based on Note2 [2]“*UEs supporting a band in the range of 52.6GHz-71GHz are not required to support 480kHz SCS and 960kHz SCS*”. This means that 120 kHz SCS is supported by all UEs and all 60GHz deployments. * We think that the maximum number of PDCCH candidates and non-overlapping CCEs could be defined in terms of 120 kHz slots. This corresponds to 4 slots with 480 kHz SCS and 8 slots with 960 kHz SCS, respectively.
* Additionally, we think that span of [2] slots should be supported for 480 kHz SCS, and span of [2, 4] slots should be supported for 960 kHz SCS, respectively.

***Proposal 2:*** *Support the following parameters for X** *X=[28, 56] for 480 kHz SCS*
* *X=[28, 56, 112] for 960 kHz SCS.*

Table 1. Number of slots and symbols / 120 kHz slot (~0.125ms)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| SCS (kHz) | # of slots / 0.125ms | #of symbols / 0.125ms |
| 120 | 1 | 14 |
| 480 | 4 | 56 |
| 960 | 8 | 112 |

For parameter Y, the natural starting point is Y=[1, 2, 3] (i.e. the size options currently available for CORESET duration). ***Proposal 3****: Support at least Y=[1, 2, 3] for multi-slot -span monitoring*Table 2 shows an example for defining PDCCH monitoring capabilities. When considering numerical values for the maximum number of PDCCH candidates per span, and the maximum number of non-overlapping CCEs per span, we think that the existing capabilities defined for 120 kHz SCS could be used as a baseline.* 20 PDCCH candidates per 120 kHz slot duration
* 32 non-overlapped CCEs per (120 kHz) slot duration.

In addition to multi-slot span -based monitoring, UEs with 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCSs should support slot-based monitoring. In order to support slot-based operation with reasonable coverage, one should support at least 8 non-overlapped CCEs (preferably 16) also for slot-based operation. There are number of TBDs in Table 2. The numerical values for these should be decided during the WI.***Proposal 5****: Consdier PDCCH monitoring capabilities defined for 120 kHz SCS as a baseline for multi-slot -span based monitoring** *support at least 20 PDCCH candidates per 120 kHz slot duration*
* *support 32 non-overlapped CCEs per 120 kHz slot duration.*
* *support at least 8 non-overlapped CCEs also for slot-based operation.*

Table 2. Example table demonstrating UE capabilities for multi-slot span -monitoring

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Max. # of monitored PDCCH candidates per slot/span per combination (X,Y) and per serving cell | Max. # of non-overlapped CCEs per slot/span for per combination (X,Y) and per serving cell |
| *μ* | Slot-based | (28, Y) | (56, Y) | (112, Y) | Slot based | (28, Y) | (56, Y) | (112, Y) |
| 3 | 20 | - | - | - | 32 | - | - | - |
| 5 | TBD | TBD | ≥20 | - | ≥8 | TBD | ≥32 | - |
| 6 | TBD | TBD | TBD | ≥20 | ≥8 | TBD | TBD | ≥32 |

 |

### R1-2100371 (CATT)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| One example of a time span cross multiple slots for 480 and 960 kHz SCS is to define a duration, such as the slot duration 0.125 ms of SCS =120KHz, There are 4 and 8 slots within a 0.125 ms time span for 480 and 960 kHz SCS respectively. The maximum number of monitored PDCCH candidates are increased in proportioned but with ceiling bounded at 44 as shown in Table 1. Table 1: Maximum number $M\_{PDCCH}^{max,slot,μ}$ of monitored PDCCH candidates per time span for a DL BWP with SCS configuration $μ\in \left\{0, 1,2,3,5,6\right\}$ for a single serving cell based on that in Clause 10.1 of TS38.213

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| $$μ$$ | Maximum number of monitored PDCCH candidates per time spant and per serving cell $M\_{PDCCH}^{max,slot,μ}$ | Slot number of a time span |
| 0 | 44 | 1 |
| 1 | 36 | 1 |
| 2 | 22 | 1 |
| 3 | 20 | 1 |
| 5 | **11/44** | **1/4** |
| 6 |  **10/44** | **1/8** |

Table 2: Maximum number $M\_{PDCCH}^{max,\left(X,Y\right),μ}$ of monitored PDCCH candidates in a span for combination (X, Y) for a DL BWP with SCS configuration $μ\in \left\{0, 1\right\}$ for a single serving cell in Clause 10.1 of TS38.213

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Maximum number $M\_{PDCCH}^{max,\left(X,Y\right),μ}$ of monitored PDCCH candidates per span for combination $\left(X,Y\right)$ and per serving cell  |
| $$μ$$ | (2, 2) | (4, 3) | (7, 3) |
| 0 | 14 | 28 | 44 |
| 1 | 12 | 24 | 36 |

**Proposal 1: The maximum number of monitored PDCCH candidates for 480 and 960 kHz SCS could be defined per slot or per time span cross multiple slots (e.g. 4 slot for SCS=480, and 8 slots for SCS=960kKHz). The exact numbers of monitored PDCCH candidates for 480 and 960 kHz SCS are FFS.****Proposal 2: The system/UE complexity and specification impacts should be considered when the maximum number of monitored PDCCH candidates is determined** |

### R1-2100430 (vivo)

|  |
| --- |
| **Proposal 1: For NR operation from 52.6-71GHz, PDCCH monitoring capability in FR1&FR2 should be relaxed from slot level to multi-slot level granularity.**To support multi-slot level granularity, the most important issue is to define the multi-slot span that PDCCH monitoring capability is based on. There are two alternatives as described below:* Alt. 1: Fixed multi-slot span based on subframe structure
* Alt. 2: Flexible multi-slot span based on SS configuration and subframe structure

**Proposal 2: To support multi-slot level granularity for PDCCH monitoring capability definition, how to determine multi-slot span pattern should be considered, e.g. fixed or flexible multi-slot pattern.**For mandatory capability definition, Alt. 1 is more suitable as the baseline since it is simpler than Alt. 2. For example, UE is required to monitor the first slot of each multi-slot span. Furthermore, the capability for PDCCH monitoring symbols within the slot could reuse that in FR2. Therefore, the following proposal is made for mandatory PDCCH monitoring capability in NR operation from 52.6-71GHz.**Proposal 3: For NR operation from 52.6-71GHz, UE is expected to be mandatory to monitor PDCCH in the first slot of each fixed multi-slot span where the PDCCH monitoring occasions within the slot satisfy the following conditions:*** **The duration of coreset associated with the PDCCH monitoring occasions is 1-3 symbols;**
* **For type 1 CSS with dedicated RRC configuration, type 3 CSS, and USS, the monitoring occasion is within the first 3 OFDM symbols of the slot;**
* **For type 1 CSS without dedicated RRC configuration and for type 0, 0A, and 2 CSS, the monitoring occasion can be any OFDM symbol(s) of the slot, with the monitoring occasions within a single span of three consecutive OFDM symbols within the slot.**

However, Alt. 1 only allows gNB to configure SS in fixed slot position, which is not flexible for gNB configuration from system perspective. Alt. 2 provides a more flexible choice and UE may monitor PDCCH in any slot, which could be an optional capability. **Proposal 4: For NR operation from 52.6-71GHz, flexible multi-slot span pattern could be considered for definition of optional PDCCH monitoring capability.**First, 120KHz SCS is also the supported numerology for NR FR2 operation. The difference on the range of center frequency doesn’t bring any difference on PDCCH monitoring complexity. Therefore, the BD/CCE budget value for 120KHz (i.e. $μ$=3) in FR2 could be reused for that for NR operation from 52.6-71GHz**Proposal 5: For a DL BWP with 120KHz SCS in 52.6-71GHz, UE derives the BD/CCE budget as the same as that for 120KHz in FR2 including the budget value.**Second, 480KHz and 960KHz are new supported numerologies in 52.6-71GHz. Obviously, the BD/CCE budget value should be defined for them taking into UE complexity into account. Namely, the value for $μ$=5 and $μ$=6 should be added into the **Table 1** and **Table 2**. **Proposal 6: For a DL BWP with 480KHz and 960KHz SCS in 52.6-71GHz, the BD/CCE budget value per slot per serving cell should be determined based on practical UE implementation complexity.**Third, the time domain granularity of current BD/CCE budget definition is per slot as observed from Section 2.2.1. However, PDCCH monitoring capability will be based on multi-slot level as proposed in 2.1.2. Naturally, BD/CCE budget per multi-slot span per serving cell should be defined, e.g. proportional to the value per slot per serving cell by the number of slots within a multi-slot span. This could be used for single cell operation directly. In this case, UE is not expected to monitor more than $M\_{PDCCH}^{max,slot-span,μ}$PDCCH candidates with more than $C\_{PDCCH}^{max,slot-span,μ}$ non-overlapped CCEs per slot in the single serving cell.**Proposal 7: For a DL BWP with 480KHz and 960KHz SCS in 52.6-71GHz, the BD/CCE budget value per multi-slot span per serving cell should be defined and it is used for single cell operation scenario.**For multi-cell operation scenario, the situation becomes more complex by introducing such multi-slot span based BD/CCE budget definition. For Case B in NR FR1&FR2 operation, the scheduling cells with the same SCS are categorized together to meet a total limit. However, for one UE operation in both FR1&FR2 and 52.6-71GHz (e.g. CA deployment), BD/CCE budget is applied per slot level in some scheduling cells while per multi-slot span in other scheduling cells. How to category the scheduling cells to be restricted with a total BD/CCE limit needs to be considered taking into account the above hybrid scenario. Particularly, although the SCS and BD/CCE limit granularity in terms of slot number are different for different scheduling cells, the absolute time domain granularity may be the same, e.g. cell A with 120KHz SCS and slot level BD/CCE budget and cell B with 480KHz SCS and BD/CCE budget per 4 slots. **Proposal 8: For multi-cell operation, the categorization of scheduling cells to be applied with a total BD/CCE limit should consider PDCCH SCS and BD/CCE limit granularity jointly.** |

### R1-2100608 (MediaTek)

|  |
| --- |
| Proposal 1: For 120 kHz SCS, no PDCCH monitoring enhancement is needed. The existing FR2 designs and capabilities for PDCCH monitoring of 120 kHz SCS are reused.For large SCSs (480 kHz and 960kHz), in SI phase, many companies [3][4][5][6] proposed new time units other than per slot or per span for BD/CCE limit, e.g., BD/CCE limits per multi-slot, to address the scaled down per slot BD/CCE limit from shorter slot duration of large SCS configuration and to achieve practical scheduling flexibility with the consideration of Rel-15/16 UE capability. However, BD/CCE limit per new monitoring time unit doesn’t completely address the two UE monitoring complexity issues stated previously without specifying the associated monitoring behavior applied for such BD/CCE limit. For example, without any further configuration restriction, UE can still be configured to monitoring PDCCH in every slots under the capability of BD/CCE limit per multi-slot, which defies the purpose of such enhancement. Moreover, without specifying the PDCCH monitoring configuration applicable for BD/CCE limit of new monitoring time unit, the BD/CCE limit needs to serve for all the possible configuration within the new monitoring time unit, which will complicate the discussion. Therefore, it is necessary to first specify the PDCCH monitoring configurations applied for the new monitoring time unit. With this regard, we propose to limit or at least prioritize the discussion of multi-slot monitoring to the configuration of monitoring PDDCH in the first $n$ slots of every $m$ slots and design the associated new BD/CCE limit accordingly. An example of ($m=4,n=1$) is shown in Figure 1.Figure 1: Proposed multi-slot monitoring framework example of ($m=4,n=1$) Under this framework, UE should signal gNB the supported combination of ($m,n$) as capabilities and the BD/CCE limits for each ($m,n$) combination should be determined. Proposal 2: For 480 and 960 kHz SCSs, multi-slot PDDCH monitoring enhancement should limit the discussion to the configuration of monitoring the first $n$ slots in every $m$ slots. The associated UE capabilities and BD/CCE limits should be defined accordingly. It is worth mentioning the connection between FG 3-5b and the proposed monitoring framework. In Rel-16, a span notion is introduced and defined as a number of consecutive monitoring occasions within a slot where a UE is configured to monitor PDCCH. FG 3-5b describes the possible combination of ($X,Y$) UE can signal as capabilities, where $X$ specifies the minimum symbol gap between the start symbols of every pair of spans and $Y$ specifies the maximum number of symbols within each span. It can be clearly seen that the proposed framework and ($m,n$) definition follows the same spirit of span and ($X,Y$) by modifying the span definition of consecutive symbols to consecutive slots for PDCCH monitoring and modifying the symbol gap $X$ to slot gap $m$. Therefore, similar to FG 3-5b, supported ($m,n$) should be specified as UE PDCCH monitoring capabilities. To design the BD/CCE limit for the combination of ($m,n$), the legacy per slot monitoring should be discussed first, i.e., ($m=1,n=1$). Although per slot monitoring may not be a desirable monitoring mode, it is still useful in some scenarios, e.g., fall-back mode. Moreover, per slot BD/CCE monitoring limit can provide a reference to benefit the discussion of the BD/CCE limit of new time unit. Proposal 3: For 480 and 960 kHz SCS, legacy per slot monitoring should be supported and the associated BD/CCE limit should be defined accordingly.As a consequence of PDCCH monitoring enhancement, another discussed DL enhancement is PDSCH scheduling. In particular, the enhancement of multi-PDSCH scheduled by one DCI has been included in WI to improve data rate under the reduced UE PDCCH monitoring frequency with the help of cross slot scheduling. On the other hand, when the legacy per slot monitoring is configured, same slot scheduling is preferred to maximize the throughput. With the short slot duration of 480 kHz and 960 kHz, it is essential to design a feasible UE behavior of PDCCH monitoring within a slot to realize the same slot scheduling. Therefore, we propose to confine PDCCH monitoring within the first 3 symbols of a slot when per slot monitoring is configured with 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCSs. **Proposal 4: For 480 and 960 kHz SCS, PDCCH monitoring is confined to be within the first 3 symbols of a slot when per slot monitoring is configured.** |

### R1-2100644 (Intel)

|  |
| --- |
| Specifically, 3 cases for SS set configuration within a slot are supported by parameter *monitoringSymbolsWithinSlot*,* Case 1: PDCCH monitoring of all SS sets monitored in a slot occurs within 3 consecutive OFDM symbols that have fixed positions in each slot
	+ Case 1-1: PDCCH monitoring limited to within first three OFDM symbols of a slot
	+ Case 1-2: PDCCH monitoring on any span of up to 3 consecutive OFDM symbols of a slot
		- For a given UE, all search space configurations are within the same span of 3 consecutive OFDM symbols in the slot
* Case 2: PDCCH monitoring cases other than Case 1

Case 1-1 is the basic PDCCH monitoring occasion(s) in the beginning of a slot, which should be supported for high SCS. Case 2 is to configure more frequent PDCCH MOs within a slot, which is targeted to reduce scheduling latency. This is important especially for low SCS, e.g. 15kHz or 30kHz. On the other hand, it is not necessary for a high SCS, e.g. 480kHz or 960kHz, given that the slot length is quite short, i.e. 1/32ms or 1/64ms. In this case, there is no clear motivation to allow full flexibility on the positions of PDCCH MO(s) in a slot, i.e. Case 2. Therefore, restriction on PDCCH MOs in a slot can simplify UE implementation without performance degradation. **Proposal 1: On the PDCCH monitoring occasion in a slot*** **Case 1-1 is supported for all SCS 120kHz, 480kHz and 960kHz**
* **Case 2 is supported for SCS 120kHz**
* **Case 2 is not supported for SCS 480/960kHz**

With the existing SS set configuration, up to 40 SS sets need to be configured to achieve the MO pattern in Figure 1. On the other hand, considering different DCI formats (fallback DCI or normal DCI) and different type of SS set (USS, CSS type0/0A/1/2, CSS type3 with different DCI formats), the required number of SS sets must be much higher than 40. The main drawback of the current SS set configuration comes from the parameter ‘*duration*’which is defined as a number of consecutive slots.To support the MO pattern for SCS 960kHz in Figure 1, a simple extension is to allocate a MO in every N slot, instead of consecutive slot allocation. The parameter ‘*duration*’ is still needed but can be reinterpreted as the window that MOs may be allocated, e.g. the DL period in a TDD period. Denote the number of slots that are configured with MOs of the USS set as M, then $duration=N∙M$.**Proposal 2: Within a period of a SS set configuration*** **The parameter ‘duration’ is reinterpreted as a window on which MOs may be configured.**
* **One slot in every N slots within the window is configured with PDCCH MOs**

As discussed above, the scope of the WI [1] is to define UE capability on PDCCH monitoring in a large window. It is preferable that the length of the window can be configurable by high layer signalling. The potential values of the window length may depend on the SCS too. For example, the maximum window length may be 8 slots which equal to the slot length with SCS 120kHz. Slot length 1 may be included as a special case. In fact, value 1 is needed to support SCS 120kHz, however, it may be too short for SCS 960kHz. One more discussion point is that whether multi-slot span can be applicable to SCS 120kHz. Finally, there is no motivation to support a concept of URLLC-like span, since it conflicts with basic motivation of the WI, i.e. larger window of max BDs/CCEs for a UE capability. **Proposal 5: Span of 2 or 3 symbols as defined in eURLLC is not supported in 52.6-71GHz frequency****Proposal 6: To support multi-slot span based UE capability on maximum numbers of BDs/CCEs*** **There is no further limitation on maximum numbers of BDs/CCEs in a slot**
* **The number of slots in a multi-slot span can be configured by RRC, potential values 1, 2, 4, 8**
	+ **FFS: Certain value may not be applicable to a SCS**
* **FFS: if multi-slot span can be configured for SCS 120kHz**

**Observation 1: gNB may respectively configure most/all BDs/CCEs in consecutive slot A and B which belong to different multi-slot spans. Such a configuration enforces a larger PDCCH detection capability for UE.** **Proposal 7: It is necessary to pose certain limitation on the BDs/CCEs in two adjacent/consecutive slots that belong to different multi-slot spans.** **Proposal 8: PDCCH overbooking applies per multi-slot span,*** **For PCell or PSCell, it is allowed that the configured number of BDs/CCEs in a multi-slot span by the configuration of SS set(s) is larger than the corresponding maximum numbers. Certain dropping rule is defined so that the actual number in the multi-slot span doesn’t exceed the corresponding maximum numbers.**
* **For a SCell, the gNB should guarantee that the configured numbers of BDs/CCEs in a multi-slot span by the configuration of SS set(s) do not exceed the corresponding maximum numbers.**

**Observation 2: The numbers of BDs/CCEs for CSS sets in the multiple slots of a multi-slot span is increased, which requires higher UE capability on BDs/CCEs to accommodate USS sets.** **Proposal 9: A UE does not expect a CSS set will be dropped in PDCCH overbooking****Proposal 10: To handling USS dropping in PDCCH overbooking** * **A USS set with largest SS set index is dropped**
* **If the PDCCH MOs of a USS set are configured in multiple slots in the multi-slot span, the USS set in all the multiple slots is dropped slot by slot.**
 |

### R1-2100817 (Spreadtrum)

|  |
| --- |
| In order to maintain the same UE processing capability as Rel-16, the maximum number of PDCCH BDs per slot will decrease significantly when large SCS is introduced, which affects scheduling flexibility and increases the probability of PDCCH blocking. For the above two problems, we give the following possible solutions. One possible way is to extend the span of PDCCH monitoring to more than one slot for maximum PDCCH BD capability. For example, taking 120kHz as a reference SCS, and the total number of PDCCH BD within 8 slots of 960KHz SCS is limited by the maximum PDCCH BD candidates number defined for 120kHz. In this way, the scheduling and power consumption problems caused by the UE PDCCH monitoring capability can be alleviated. The other alternative is to perform PDCCH blind detection 20 times in a relaxed period. The number of PDCCH BDs can be dynamically allocated according to the PDCCH situation on each slot, or equally allocated. For instance, if relax slots is required to make 20 times PDCCH BDs for 960KHz, the number of PDCCH BD is 2.5 in each slot. ***Observation 1: For NR beyond 52.6 GHz, if larger subcarrier spacings are adopted, the PDCCH monitoring capability and the number of PDCCH candidates per slot would be further reduced.******Observation 2：When a larger subcarrier spacing is introduced in above 52.6GHz frequency range, maximum number of BDs/CCEs for PDCCH monitoring needs to be investigated.*** ***Proposal 1: Defining PDCCH BDs limits over a group of slots or relaxing PDCCH monitoring should be studied for above 52.6GHz.*** |

### R1-2100837 (InterDigital)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| During RAN study item on requirements for NR beyond 52.6 GHz [2], various benefits of 52.6 – 71 GHz such as high speed data rate, low latency and high capacity have been identified based on the enormous amount of available contiguous bandwidth. Based on the benefits, various use cases for 52.6 – 71 GHz are also envisioned. Among the envisioned use cases, most of the use cases such as short-range high-data rate D2D, vertical industry factory application, IAB, Factory automation/IIoT, AR/VR, ITS/V2X and critical medical communication require low latency as a key requirement. However, if NR only supports multi-slot based PDCCH monitoring for efficient signaling, benefits from low latency possible use cases will be significantly reduced. ***Observation 1:*** *For NR in 52.6 – 71 GHz, most of identified use cases require low latency as a key requirement, however, benefits from low latency and possible use cases significantly reduce if only multi-slot based PDCCH monitoring is supported.* ***Proposal 1:*** *Support both per-slot level monitoring and multi-slot level monitoring for transmission and reception.*In contrast to existing SCS, per-slot level monitoring may lead to a more complex UE implementation considering reduced slot durations and UE processing time. Given that, it is desirable to have multi-slot level monitoring for general UE operations e.g., high data rate eMBB and per-slot level monitoring for UEs which require low latency. ***Observation 2:*** *Per-slot level monitoring requires a more complex UE implementation due to reduced slot durations of additional SCSs and possibly UE processing time.* ***Proposal 2:*** *It is preferred to support multi-slot level monitoring for general UE operations and per-slot level monitoring for low latency operations.****Observation 3:*** *As slot durations for additional SCSs (e.g., 31.3 us for 480 kHz and 15.6 us for 960 kHz) are already short enough, limitation based on a span may not be needed for 52.6 – 71 GHz.**Maximum number of monitored PDCCH candidates/non-overlapped CCEs per span is not needed for NR 52.6 – 71 GHz as high SCSs provide short slot durations and enough low latency.* ***Proposal 3:*** *For the existing limitations, it is preferred to define maximum numbers of PDCCH candidates/non-overlapped CCEs per slot for additional SCSs.*For multi-slot level monitoring, additional limitation should be additionally supported. One possible solution is to extend the existing limitations for Rel-15/16 for monitored PDCCH candidates/non-overlapped CCEs. For example, as UE receives an indication for monitoring capability type e.g., Rel-15 type (per slot) or Rel-16 type (per span) in PDCCH config, another configuration can be additionally supported in PDCCH-config with additional limitation tables as shown in Tables 5 *–* 6.Table 5 Maximum number $M\_{PDCCH}^{max,slot,μ}$ of monitored PDCCH candidates in X slots

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| $$μ$$ | Maximum number of monitored PDCCH candidates per X slots and per serving cell $M\_{PDCCH}^{max,slot,μ}$ |
| 5 | A |
| 6 | B |

Table 6 Maximum number $C\_{PDCCH}^{max,slot,μ}$ of non-overlapped CCEs in X slots

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| $$μ$$ | Maximum number of non-overlapped CCEs per X slots and per serving cell $C\_{PDCCH}^{max,slot,μ}$ |
| 5 | C |
| 6 | D |

***Observation 4:*** *Existing method to indicate PDCCH monitoring type configuration and corresponding limitations can be reused to indicate multi-slot level PDCCH monitoring.* ***Proposal 4:*** *For multi-slot level monitoring, it is preferred to define new limitation tables for monitored PDCCH candidates/non-overlapped CCEs per multiple slots and introduce a configuration to indicate multi-slot level PDCCH monitoring in PDCCH-config.* |

### R1-2100851 (Sony)

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **: UE PDCCH monitoring complexity can be reduced by modifying the configuration of search space set and CORESET, or alternatively by limiting the maximum number of BD/CCE per slot, but with potential link performance degradation.**

To avoid the issue introduced by the limitation of maximum BD/CCE per slot, mixed numerology operation is supported in Rel-15/16. e.g. 240 kHz subcarrier spacing for SSB and 120 kHz subcarrier spacing for PDCCH/PDSCH/PUSCH/PUCCH/PRACH. Thus, a mixed numerology where small SCS for PDCCH and large SCS for PDSCH/PUSCH/PUCCH can be considered for 52.6GHz-71GHz frequency band to alleviate PDCCH monitoring burden. However, for mixed numerology, when performing FFT, FFT size switching is needed from PDCCH to PDSCH/PUSCH/PUCCH, which would introduce extra processing complexity. Moreover, extra symbol gaps may also be needed for FFT switching operation. 1. **: UE PDCCH monitoring complexity can be reduced by using mixed numerology between PDCCH and other physical channels but with potential extra complexity and decreased time efficiency for FFT size switching.**

Try to manage the PDCCH monitoring and decoding complexity as well as guarantee the downlink performance, another effective scheme is to define a new time unit for new SCSs, like multi-slot. In this solution, the definition of time unit can rely on the SCSs difference. e.g., for Rel-15 120kHz and new SCS 960kHz, 8 slots in Rel-15 could be grouped into one time unit for the 52.6GHz-71GHz frequency range. In Rel-16 specifications, the time unit with span is supported, thus the processing on span can be referred for the design on new time unit. Together with PDCCH repetitions described in the next section, this solution could reduce PDCCH monitoring complexity and guarantee the DL BLER performance relatively. The link processing details of PDCCH monitoring, scheduling and new signaling for new time unit and the corresponding solutions aiming at a low impact to specification could be discussed further. 1. **: UE PDCCH monitoring complexity can be reduced by operating on a new time unit like multi-slot.**

With the above analysis and discussions among the three solutions, we would like to present the following proposal.1. **: For larger SCS in the 52.6GHz-71GHz frequency range, comprehensive consideration of UE monitoring complexity reduction together with UE power-saving and DL performance guarantee, define a new time unit like multi-slot could be a proper solution.**
 |

### R1-2100893 (LG)

|  |
| --- |
| **Observation #1: UE processing limit for 480 kHz and 960 kHz could be newly defined per slot. But, increasing the capability of handling PDCCH during a fixed time may lead to UE implementation complexity and power consumption. In addition, if the number of CCEs per slot is defined as too small value, support for PDCCH with large AL may be limited.**There are two simple ways to determine the length of a slot-group. The first way is to set the reference length regardless of actual SCS configuration. For instance, the slot length corresponding to 120 kHz SCS can be used as a reference length since 120 kHz is the smallest SCS that could be configured in FR-X. In this case, if one slot length corresponding to 120 kHz SCS is set to the reference length, then the consecutive four slots are used as slot-group for 480 kHz SCS, and consecutive eight slots are used as slot-group for 960 kHz SCS. Another way is to use a new PDCCH monitoring time unit with capability signalling. A preferred reference length can be signalled for each UE, and this length can be used as a basic time unit for PDCCH monitoring. Regarding the PDCCH monitoring per slot-group, associated procedures such as overbooking and dropping may also be enhanced. For example, if consecutive M slots for 960 kHz SCS is set to a slot-group for PDCCH monitoring, then SS set dropping due to overbooking would be performed in unit of slot-group. With this, additional restriction on PDCCH monitoring may be considered, e.g., by applying overbooking/dropping rules for some part of slots within a slot-group.**Proposal #1: Considering simplified UE implementation and potential power consumption reduction, support slot-group based PDCCH monitoring where the maximum number of PDCCH candidates and non-overlapping CCEs are defined per slot-group and the number of slots for slot-group can be determined based on reference SCS (e.g., 120 kHz) or UE capability.**In addition, SS set configuration can also be set appropriately for the slot-group. Through SS set configuration based on slot-group, PDCCH monitoring occasion could be adjusted properly (e.g., restricted), and then, additional power saving effects could be expected. For slot-group based PDCCH monitoring, specifically, SS set configurations such as periodicity (and offset) can be configured to a value larger than M (or a multiple of M) slots. Accordingly, duration may be limited to be configured with less than M (or a multiple of M) slots. Moreover, it can be discussed how to handle the case where the slot-group boundary does not exactly match the periodicity and duration configurations. Therefore, through slot-group based PDCCH monitoring configuration and associated SS set configurations, it can be further expected to reduce the UE implementation burden or power consumption. **Proposal #2: Consider to configure PDCCH monitoring occasions to be confined within the slot-group (or multiple of slot-groups), by using search space set configuration parameters (e.g., periodicity, offset, and duration).**  |

### R1-2101110 (Xiaomi)

|  |
| --- |
| With three SCSs, 120kHz and 480/960kHz are all specified, it may be not necessary to support all the three SCSs for NR 52.6-71GHz especially considering the complexity for high speed processing for 480/960kHz. Since 120kHz is already supported in FR1/2, it is backward compatible to support 120kHz as a default/ mandatory SCS and 480/960kHz as optional. The PDCCH monitoring capability for 120kHz per slot can still reuse the one defined in current spec as a mandatory capability. And the PDCCH monitoring capability for 480/960kHz per slot can be defined as optional capability. And even for the PDCCH monitoring capability for 480/960kHz, different UE capabilities can also be considered, for example UE cap1 supports relatively lower PDCCH candidate numbers and non-overlapped CCE numbers than UE cap2, which allows more flexible UE implementation and gNB scheduling for NR 52.6-71GHz. ***Proposal 1: The PDCCH monitoring capability for 120kHz per slot can still reuse the one defined in current spec as a mandatory capability. And the PDCCH monitoring capability for 480/960kHz per slot can be defined as optional capability.******Proposal 2:*** ***For PDCCH monitoring capability for 480/960kHz, different UE capabilities can be considered*** ***to allow more flexible UE implementation and gNB scheduling for NR 52.6-71GHz.***Similar PDCCH monitoring span as in R16 URLLC can be considered for NR 52.6-71GHz. In R16 URLLC, PDCCH monitoring span (X,Y) is defined as number of consecutive symbols in a slot where the UE is configured to monitor PDCCH. Each PDCCH monitoring occasion is within one span. If a UE monitors PDCCH on a cell according to combination (X,Y), the UE supports PDCCH monitoring occasions in any symbol of a slot with minimum time separation of X symbols between the first symbol of two consecutive spans, including across slots. A span starts at a first symbol where a PDCCH monitoring occasion starts and ends at a last symbol where a PDCCH monitoring occasion ends, where the number of symbols of the span is up to Y.With some little modification, for example, change the unit of X/Y from symbol to slot, a multi-slot PDCCH monitoring span can be defined. That is a span contains X slots and the PDCCH monitoring occasion are located in the first Y slots within the X slots. For SCS 480/960kHz, from our point of view, it is necessary to have this multi-slot span (X/Y) to allow sparse PDCCH monitoring in every X slots. For SCS 120kHz, since the current spec already support it with single slot PDCCH monitoring capability, multi-slot span PDCCH monitoring is not that necessary compared to 480/960kHz.***Proposal 3: Similar PDCCH monitoring span (X/Y) as in R16 URLLC can be considered for NR 52.6-71GHz by modifying the unit of X/Y from symbol to slot.******Proposal 4: It is necessary to define multi-slot span (X/Y) to allow sparse PDCCH monitoring in every X slots for the newly introduced SCS 480/960kHz.***However, compared with defining PDCCH monitoring capability per single slot, defining PDCCH monitoring capability per multi-slot span would allow gNB scheduling DCI in a bursty way, for example when X=8,Y=1. And it may cause the UE to spend more time on decoding all the DCIs scheduled in a DCIs burst, which will increase the total processing time for the scheduled PDSCH/PUSCH since UE has to decoding the DCI first. For example, with maximum number of B1/C1 of BDs/CCEs for PDCCH monitoring per single slot, UE is able to decode the all the DCIs in PDCCH in 1 symbol from the end of the PDCCH. But with maximum number of 4\*B1/4\*C1 of BDs/CCEs for PDCCH monitoring per multi-slot span (4/1) and gNB scheduling DCI in a bursty way, UE may need extra 2 symbols to guarantee to decode the all the DCIs in PDCCH, thus cause the decoding time of PDSCH(N1) and preparation time of PUSCH(N2) may need to be extended as well.***Proposal 5: Impacts on PDSCH/PUSCH processing time(N1/N2) may need be considered if defining maximum number of BDs/CCEs for multi-slot span PDCCH monitoring .*** |

### R1-2101195 (Samsung)

|  |
| --- |
| **Observation 1:** New BD and CCE limits with high SCS (480KHz and 960KHz) for NR from 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz is needed.**Observation 2:** PDCCH monitoring burden is high due to short TTI at high SCS (480KHz and 960KHz).Follow the same principle from Rel-16, a combination (X, Y) can be reused, such that X limits the PDCCH monitoring gap, while Y limits a PDCCH monitoring duration. Both X and Y can be extended from a number of symbols to a number of slots. The minimum PDCCH monitoring gap X should be larger than one slot, so that UE can distribute PDCCH processing/monitoring burden over multiple slots. For maximum PDCCH monitoring span, Y, the applicable value for Y can be same as Rel-15, i.e. one slot, slot-based PDCCH monitoring. Alternatively, Y can also be multiple slots to provide more PDCCH monitoring occasions and higher scheduling flexibility to NW. As UE expects much narrower beam direction from 52.6GHz to 71GHz compared with FR1 or FR2, the additional occasions when Y is larger than one slot can be used to for PDCCH receptions associated with different beam directions. In practice, UE can support multiple applicable values for combination (X, Y). The larger X value is, the more PDCCH monitoring burden reduction UE achieves. To provide more configuration or scheduling flexibility to NW, multiple combinations of (X, Y) can be supported for multi-slot span based PDCCH monitoring at high SCS, such as 480KHz and 960KHz. The combination (X, Y) can either be determined based on UE capability or predetermined for applicable SCS configurations, such as , $μ=5,or 6$.**Proposal 1: Support multi-slot span based PDCCH monitoring based on combination (X, Y), where the minimum PDCCH monitoring gap X is larger than one slot, and the maximum PDCCH monitoring span Y is one or more slots, for SCS of 480KHz and 960KHz.**However, there are some potential issues with multi-slot span based PDCCH monitoring. Firstly, the extended span gap will increase latency. A scheduling delay of (X - Y) slots can be large for some cases, such that X is much larger than Y, or Y is small, e.g. 1. In addition, there will be some loss of data rate if only single PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling per slot is supported. To overcome those issues, adaptation on combination (X, Y) can be considered when a UE is capable of supporting multiple combinations (X, Y). For example, when a UE reports a capability of multiple combinations (X, Y), the UE can be indicated with a selected combination (X, Y) from the multiple combinations based on L1 signaling. The UE can deactivate or activated some PDCCH monitoring occasions according to the PDCCH configuration limitations based on the selected combination (X, Y). Meanwhile, UE can perform joint adaptation on maximum number of BDs based on the indicated (X, Y), if the BD/CCE budget is defined per combination (X, Y), In addition, a UE can report its preferred minimum multi-slot span gap, X, and/or maximum multi-slot span Y according to UE requirements on power savings, latency, and data rate. **Proposal 2: Support adaptation and UE assistance information report for X and/or Y when UE supports multiple combinations (X, Y).**As $M\_{PDCCH}^{max,slot, μ}$ and $C\_{PDCCH}^{max,slot, μ}$ are quite small for SCS of 120KHz, there is no much room to reduce the BD/CCE limit for higher SCS. PDCCH blocking may become an issue when the BD/CCE limit is too small. Therefore, it’s better to consider BD/CCE limits per multi-slot span for high SCS, such as $μ=5, or 6$.**Proposal 3: Support maximum number** $M\_{PDCCH}^{max,(X,Y), μ}$ **of PDCCH candidates per multi-slot span for combination (X, Y), where X >1 slots, Y>=1 slots, and** $μ=5, or 6$**.****Proposal 4: Support maximum number** $C\_{PDCCH}^{max,(X,Y),μ} $**of non-overlapped CCEs per multi-slot span for combination (X, Y), where X >1 slots, Y>=1 slots, and** $μ=5, or 6$**.****Proposal 5: For multi-slot span based PDCCH monitoring based on combination (X, Y), support limitations on search space set configurations, including*** **PDCCH monitoring periodicity,** $k\_{s},$
* **PDCCH monitoring duration,** $T\_{s}.$

**Proposal 6: Support PDCCH candidates allocation/dropping per a span over multiple slots.** |

### R1-2101307 (Ericsson)

|  |
| --- |
| While a large range of search space monitoring periodicities have been supported since Rel-15, the UE PDCCH processing capabilities have been defined only on a per slot basis. For the multi-slot PDCCH monitoring approach discussed in the previous section, it will be necessary to define UE processing capabilities on a per-slot bundle basis considering the following: * We can view the UE PDCCH processing capabilities defined in Rel-15 as being define for a slot bundle size of $B=1$. A search space can have a monitoring periodicity that is an integer multiple of the bundle size, which is any positive integer allowed in the Rel-15 specs since $B=1$.
* For the example of PDCCH monitoring every 4 slots in the above, UE PDCCH processing capabilities for the bundle size of $B=4$ slots will need to be defined. For this bundle size, a search space can be configured to have a monitoring periodicity that is an integer multiple of the bundle size, which, in this example, can be 4, 8, 20 and so forth.
1. The monitoring periodicity of search space is an integer multiple of the bundle size B used to define UE PDCCH processing capabilities per bundle of B slots.

The potential reduction of UE PDCCH processing capabilities per slot shown previously presents difficulties to maintain the same scheduling framework and flexibility as Rel-15 NR. It would impose substantial negative impacts to Rel-17 NR operation in 52.6 – 71 GHz if the UE PDCCH processing capabilities per multi-slot monitoring period remain as restrictive when the UE is configured to monitor the PDCCH every $B$ slots. Therefore, it will be beneficial for NR operation in 52.6 – 71 GHz to scale UE PDCCH processing capabilities per $B$-slots with the bundle size B:$$N\_{BD, μ}^{B-slot}≅B×N\_{BD, μ}^{slot}$$$$N\_{CCE, μ}^{B-slot}≅B×N\_{CCE, μ}^{slot}$$1. A first approach to define the UE PDCCH processing capabilities when PDCCH monitoring per multiple slots is deployed for larger SCS is to scale the UE PDCCH processing capabilities per $B$ slots with the bundle size B. That is, the bundled UE PDCCH processing capabilities are $N\_{BD, μ}^{B-slot}≅B×N\_{BD, μ}^{slot}$ and $N\_{CCE, μ}^{B-slot}≅B×N\_{CCE, μ}^{slot}$.

With this first capability scaling solution, it is in principle possible to support any bundle size. However, it may be difficult or impractical for UE implementation to optimize the hardware and software timelines to support various required UE processing capabilities associated with arbitrary flexible bundle sizes. It will be beneficial for RAN1 to narrow down the bundle size values to those beneficial to system operations such that the specs and implementation are not over-burdened.1. RAN1 strives to narrow down the supported PDCCH monitoring bundle size values to those beneficial to system operations and implementation.

Toward narrowing down the supported PDCCH monitoring bundle values, a second possible solution is to maintain the same scheduling framework and capacity as a 120 kHz SCS system for larger SCS with PDCCH monitoring per multiple slots. For instance, PDCCH monitoring every $B=4$ slots can be deployed for 480 kHz SCS. The UE PDCCH processing capabilities per 4-slot monitoring bundle can then be defined as$$N\_{BD, μ=5}^{4-slot}=N\_{BD,μ=3}^{slot}$$$$N\_{CCE,μ=5}^{4-slot}=N\_{CCE,μ=3}^{slot}$$Similarly, the UE PDCCH processing capabilities per 8-slot monitoring bundle for 960 kHz SCS can then be defined as$$N\_{BD,μ=6}^{8-slot}=N\_{BD,μ=3}^{slot}$$$$N\_{CCE,μ=6}^{8-slot}=N\_{CCE,μ=3}^{slot}$$In other words, the UE capability for BD/CCE per B-slot bundle for a larger SCS (480 or 960 kHz) is the same as the per-slot capability for 120 kHz.1. A second approach to define the bundled UE PDCCH processing capabilities when PDCCH monitoring per multiple slots is deployed for larger SCS with a PDCCH monitoring frequency equal to that of 120 kHz SCS is to maintain the same UE processing capabilities per-slot as in a 120 kHz SCS system. That is, the bundled UE PDCCH processing capabilities are $N\_{BD, μ}^{2^{μ-3}-slot}=N\_{BD,μ=3}^{slot}$, and $N\_{CCE, μ}^{2^{μ-3}-slot}=N\_{CCE,μ=3}^{slot}$.
2. If arbitrary monitoring bundle size of $B$ is supported for UE capability scaling Option 2, i.e., $B\ne 4$ for 480 kHz SCS or $B\ne 8$ for 960 kHz SCS are supported, the bundled UE PDCCH processing capabilities are scaled relative to those for the 120 kHz SCS by a factor of $\left⌈\frac{B}{2^{μ-3}}\right⌉$.
 |

### R1-2101321 (CEWiT)

|  |
| --- |
| **Proposal 1:** **Support for** **dynamic adaptation of the parameters related to PDCCH monitoring, that are configured semi statically, in order to reduce number of blind decodings.**PDCCH decoding is performed blindly over all the available control channel elements (CCE), for all aggregation levels in all the configured search space sets until the limit of number of BDs per slot is achieved. A legacy UE can be configured with up to 10 search space sets. However, for the UEs with lesser amount of data to transmit/receive, the number of scheduled DCIs per slot may be less. Similarly, PDCCH decoding is performed for all the DCI formats configured for that search space set. However, in most cases, all DCI formats would not be scheduled in a slot. Performing blind decoding over all the search space sets and all DCI formats consumes unnecessarily more time and power. If details on the scheduled search space sets and DCI formats are signalled to a UE dynamically, then enormous time and power consumed for PDCCH blind decoding will be saved. There is also a possibility of early detection of DCI in conventional BD process. Performing blind decoding over remaining PDCCH candidates is unnecessary in that case. . Some mechanism to indicate the early termination will help to avoid this wastage.**Proposal 2:** **Dynamic indication of scheduled search space sets, DCI formats, DCI termination etc. is supported.**  |

### R1-2101373 (Apple)

|  |
| --- |
| In summary, RAN1 should support multi-slot monitoring and determine the BD/CCE limits over a group of slots (defined as a slot group/nominal monitoring unit). **The slot-group size can be defined based on a reference SCS and the PDCCH monitoring occasions should be defined per slot group with UE support for different Types that can be identified by the UE as a capability.*****Proposal 1:*** *slot-based and span-based PDCCH monitoring should not be applicable to Rel-17 UEs.* ***Proposal 2:*** *RAN1 should support multi-slot monitoring and determine the BD/CCE limits over a group of slots (defined as a slot group/nominal monitoring unit). The slot-group size can be defined based on a reference SCS.* ***Proposal 3****: RAN1 should define the PDCCH Monitoring Occasions per slot group. The MO could be defined as follows:** *Type 1: For all the slots in the slot group, PDCCH monitoring occurs within the first X symbols of the multiple slots*
* *Type 2: For all the slots in the slot group, PDCCH monitoring occurs on any span of X consecutive symbols within the multiple slots.*
* *Type 3: All PDCCH monitoring occasions can be in any OFDM symbol of a slot-group with a minimum time separation between 2 consecutive transmissions of the PDCCH.*
	+ *X : Number of OFDM symbols within which the monitoring occasion occurs,*
	+ *Y: minimum number of OFDM symbols between the start of different PDCCH Mos*
	+ *Z: Slot group size*

***Proposal 4:*** *Overbooking and dropping are performed per slot group.* |

### R1-2101418 (Convida Wireless)

|  |
| --- |
| Like Rel-16 URLLC PDCCH monitoring span (X, Y) definition, it can be extended to the mobile broadband (EMBB) service for NR from 52.6 GHz and above with few modifications. The PDCCH monitoring span (X, Y) for higher SCS/numerology (e.g. SCS 960 kHz) where the first number X is the number of slots between the beginning of two consecutive monitoring occasions, the second number Y is the number of slots or symbols needs to be monitored in a monitoring occasion. Rel-16 PDCCH/DCI span, it supports limited span like (X, Y) = (2, 2), (4, 3), and (7, 3). Note in Rel-16, the value of X and Y is based on units of symbols. Therefore, the X and Y supported in Rel-16 may not be suitable for NR from 52.6 GHz and above. For NR from 52.6 GHz and above, the duration per span may be across several slots to meet the scheduling requirement due to the number of PDCCH candidate and nonoverlapping CCEs being reduced per slot. The UE can be configured by gNB to monitor PDCCH with the maximum number of PDCCH candidates and nonoverlapping CCEs defined per slot as in NR Rel-15/16 or defined per span for the maximum number of PDCCH candidates and non-overlapping CCEs defined per span. An example of a PDCCH monitoring span shown in Figure 1. In Figure 1, we assume a configuration of PDCCH monitoring span for SCS = 960 KHz. For this example, let a span (X=4, Y=4) is configured, note the unit for X and Y can be either based on number of slots or symbols. it means there are PDCCHs need to be monitored in Y=4 slots/56 symbols and each PDCCH monitoring occasion are separated by X=4 slots/or 56 symbols.**Figure 1**: An exemplary PDCCH monitoring span for NR from 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz.***Proposal 1. PDCCH monitoring can be either based on per slot as Rel-15/16 or per span for NR from 52.6 to 71 GHz.***  |

### R1-2101454 (Qualcomm)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| For the introduction of new high SCSs, i.e., 480kHz and 960kHz, the aspects of processing timeline should be revisited. As suggested in the WID [2], the study involves new UE capability related to the processing timeline. Many of the UE capabilities are already numerology dependent and the “slot” is commonly used as a reference time grid to confine the capabilities. For example, in Rel-15, UE’s capability for PDCCH monitoring, including the monitoring occasion placement, maximum number of PDCCH candidates and non-overlapped CCEs, is determined per slot. However, the per-slot PDCCH monitoring capability may be too restrictive for the new SCSs; due to the short slot length, the maximum number of BD/CCE supported per slot may be too small, which can harm the scheduling flexibility and performance. The appropriate numbers of blind decoding and non-overlapped CCEs for the high SCSs need further discussion in Rel-17, Proposal 1: For new SCSs, support the per-slot PDCCH monitoring capability and further study on the number of BD and non-overlapped CCE.In Table 1, the projected maximum numbers of PDCCH blind decoding and non-overlapped CCEs per slot for the new numerologies are shown. The projection is based on the log-linear regression from the values for existing numerologies with respect to $μ$. Although any physical implementation factors are not accounted, the projected numbers would be a feasible reference to show the trend. As discussed, for the per-slot PDCCH monitoring capability, the numbers of blind decoding and CCEs may be strictly limited for high SCSs.Table 1. Projected values of maximum numbers of blind decoding and non-overlapped CCEs per slot.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| $$μ$$ | Slot length (*μ*s) | # BD | # CCE |
| 0 | 1000 | 44 | 56 |
| 1 | 500 | 36 | 56 |
| 2 | 250 | 22 | 48 |
| 3 | 125 | 20 | 32 |
| 5 | 31.25 | [10] | [18] |
| 6 | 15.625 | [8] | [14] |

Additionally, if the UE is expected to monitor PDCCH in every slot, the micro-sleep opportunities decrease due to the short slot length and the power efficiency during the connected mode would be degraded. Therefore, for the high SCSs that would be introduced in Rel-17, a new time basis, e.g., a bundle of slots, can be considered to confine the UE capabilities.Proposal 2: Multi-slot based PDCCH monitoring capability should be considered for new SCSs with short slot lengths. An example of the per-span PDCCH monitoring capability is shown in Table 2. In the table, the span-based capability is represented by a combination (*X*, *Y*), where *X* is the minimum separation (in symbols) between two consecutive spans, and *Y* is the maximum length of the span (in symbols). Note that, in Table 2, *X*=56 for *μ*=5 and *X*=112 for *μ*=6 amount to 125*μ*Sec separation and the corresponding numbers of BD and CCEs are the same as those for SCS 120kHz. Thus, at least similar extent of scheduling flexibility and micro-sleep opportunity as SCS 120kHz would be achieved by per-span PDCCH monitoring.Proposal 3: The per-span PDCCH monitoring capability in Rel-16 should be extended to define the multi-slot based PDCCH monitoring capability for high SCSs.Table 2. Example of per-span PDCCH monitoring capability for SCS 480kHz and 960kHz.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| *μ* | Maximum number of monitored PDCCH candidates | Maximum number of non-overlapping CCEs |
| (28, 3) | (56, 3) | (112, 3) | (28, 3) | (56, 3) | (112, 3) |
| 5 | 10 | 20 | 40 | 18 | 32 | 56 |
| 6 | 8 | 10 | 20 | 14 | 18 | 32 |

As discussed in Section 2.1, it is desirable to support both per-slot and per-multi-slot PDCCH monitoring capabilities for the high SCSs. However, it needs further discussion which capability should be regarded as the baseline, considering the impact on basic procedures, such as acquisition of SIB1, RAR monitoring, and paging, etc.Proposal 4: For the high SCSs, support both single and multi-slot based PDCCH monitoring capabilities and further study which one should be the default capability.As an alternative switching mechanism, particularly for the unlicensed band operation, search space set group switching can be considered. In this case, each search space set group may be configured for either per-slot or per-span PDCCH monitoring. For example, search space set group 0 (i.e., the default group) can be configured with per-slot PDCCH monitoring and used when the UE is outside the channel occupancy time. On the other hand, search space set group 1 can be configured with per-span PDCCH monitoring and used during a COT. Although search space set group switching has dedicatedly been used for NR-U operation in Rel-16, the discussion on the extension for licensed band operation is in progress in Rel-17 UE power saving WI. Therefore, if supported for the licensed band operation, search space set group switching will provide more dynamic transition between per-slot and per-span PDCCH monitoring, both for unlicensed and licensed band operation.Proposal 5: For the high SCSs, support a dynamic switching mechanism between single and multi-slot based PDCCH monitoring capabilities.Observation 1: Bandwidth part switching and search space set group switching mechanisms can be considered as candidate switching mechanism between single and multi-slot based PDCCH monitoring. |

### R1-210606 (NTT DOCOMO)

|  |
| --- |
| ***Proposal 1****: PDCCH processing limitation values should be defined per longer time duration than a slot to avoid excessive reduction of PDCCH processing limits.*In our view, at least PDCCH monitoring of once in multiple slots should be applied for 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS as basic capability on PDCCH monitoring to reduce the UE burden/power consumption. Then, more frequent PDCCH monitoring than once in multiple slots (including PDCCH monitoring in every slot) can be investigated as potential optional capability on PDCCH monitoring for 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS to achieve higher scheduling flexibility.***Proposal 2****: The feasibility to apply UE feature group 3-1 as mandatory for above 52.6 GHz operation with 480/960 kHz SCS should be discussed.** *If not feasible, how to treat FG 3-1 for above 52.6 GHz operation with 480/960 kHz SCS needs to be discussed*

***Proposal 3****: PDCCH monitoring periodicity of once in multiple slots should be considered as basic capability on PDCCH monitoring for above 52.6 GHz operation with 480/960 kHz SCS.* |

## Topic A2: PDCCH Extensions for e.g. Coverage, Reliability

### R1-2100058 (Lenovo, Motorola Mobility)

|  |
| --- |
| With high SCS values, the absolute duration of the slot is greatly reduced and moreover, when single DCI can schedule multi-PDSCH/PUSCH over multiple slots, it might be beneficial to consider longer duration than 3 symbols for CORESETs. Multiple benefits can be associated with longer duration:* Better support for higher aggregation levels for better reliability
* More resources available for CORESET, but with same or even reduced duration in absolute time
* More symbols available to allow TDM multiplexing between DM-RS and control information
	+ Benefit of a DM-RS symbol with continuous frequency resources will account for better channel estimation with higher SCS values.

In fact, for very high SCS value such as 960kHz, even an entire slot for PDCCH can be considered to allow for only single PDCCH monitoring occasion within a slot.***Proposal 5: For supporting NR between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz with high subcarrier spacing values including 480kHz and 960kHz, CORESET duration longer than 3 symbols should be supported:**** ***FFS: Maximum duration up to 14 symbols in a slot.***

***Proposal 6: For supporting NR between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz with high subcarrier spacing values including 480kHz and 960kHz, CORESET structure with only TDM between the DM-RS symbols and control information should be supported.*** |

### R1-2100058 (Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell)

|  |
| --- |
| There are two basic solutions shown in Figure 2 to balance the PDCCH coverage with the repeated PDSCH: * Option 1: Mixed numerology between PDCCH and PDSCH: use a lower SCS, such as 120 kHz, for PDCCH. This is feasible from phase noise point of view and would minimize changes to PDCCH. On the other hand, this is not allowed in Rel. 15/16 NR.
* Option 2: Increased number of symbols available for PDCCH: This can be done either by defining a CORESET with increased length, or by means of CORESET repetition (of existing length).

We think that these two solutions need to be studied, and at least one solution for improved PDCCH coverage needs to be supported.   ***Proposal 4:****Support improved PDCCH coverage for the cases of high SCS* (i.e. Y>3)Figure 2. Candidate options to improve PDCCH coverage. |

### R1-2101418 (Convida Wireless)

|  |
| --- |
| There are several advantages to reduce the DCI format payload size for NR from 52.6 GHz and above. The first reason is to enhance the coverage and increase the reliability for DCI reception. A DCI format with a smaller payload achieves better reliability and coverage than the normal DCI (e.g. DCI format 1\_0/1\_1) with the same aggregation level (AL). The second reason is to reduce PDCCH blocking probability and enhance the scheduling flexibility. This is because DCI with less size consumes less PDCCH resources and a lower AL may be applied so the probability that PDCCH can be transmitted in the nearest CORESET after the arrival of data. The third reason is to reduce the decoding complexity and potentially save UE power consumption. Also, the presence of a new compact DCI format 1\_x as the compact format may increase the number of BDs for a UE (note: number of BD for a UE = number of PDCCH candidates multiply by the number of DCI format sizes). Therefore, like compact DCI for URLLC in Rel-16, a new compact DCI format 1\_x can be proposed for NR from 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz. Plus, gNB can configure the UEs to monitor only the compact DCI format 1\_x instead of DCI format 0\_0/1\_0 and 0\_1/1\_1 so that the total number of blind decodes won’t increase for a UE. In addition, gNB may dynamically or semi-statically switch between the DCI formats that are supposed to be monitored by the UE. For example, gNB may transmit MAC-CE to switch the monitoring of DCI format 0\_0/1\_0 or 0\_1/1\_1 to DCI format 1\_x.***Proposal 2. A new compact DCI format 1\_x for large numerology/SCS like 480 KHz and above should be studied for NR operation from 52.6 to 71 GHz.***  |

## Topic B: Multiple PDSCH/PUSCH by a single DCI

### R1-2100058 (Lenovo, Motorola Mobility)

|  |
| --- |
| In our accompanying contribution [3], we propose a new single DCI format to schedule multiple PDSCH and PUSCH. In our view, if such new DCI format can be agreed to be supported for high SCS values such as 480kHz and 960kHz, then PDCCH monitoring can be further reduced by restricting the need for UE to monitor other DCI formats for scheduling DL/UL such as DCI format 0\_1 and format 1\_1. If such restriction is supported, then the blind detection for a UE can be significantly reduced. ***Proposal 3: For supporting NR between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz with high subcarrier spacing values including 480kHz and 960kHz, if a new DCI is agreed to schedule multiple PDSCH and/or multiple PUSCH, then restrictions on monitoring of other DCI formats (such as DCI format 0\_1/1\_1) should be supported.***Furthermore, additional restriction can be considered to further reduce the blind detections for UE. One possibility could be to consider only higher values of aggregation levels for monitoring any new DCI format(s) for high SCS values. This provides the benefit of better reliability for URLLC traffic. ***Proposal 4: For supporting NR between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz with high subcarrier spacing values including 480kHz and 960kHz, if a new DCI is agreed to schedule multiple PDSCH and/or multiple PUSCH, then restrictions on certain aggregation levels (for example: lower aggregation levels) for new DCI should be supported.*** |

### R1-2100608 (MediaTek)

|  |
| --- |
| As a consequence of PDCCH monitoring enhancement, another discussed DL enhancement is PDSCH scheduling. In particular, the enhancement of multi-PDSCH scheduled by one DCI has been included in WI to improve data rate under the reduced UE PDCCH monitoring frequency with the help of cross slot scheduling. On the other hand, when the legacy per slot monitoring is configured, same slot scheduling is preferred to maximize the throughput. With the short slot duration of 480 kHz and 960 kHz, it is essential to design a feasible UE behavior of PDCCH monitoring within a slot to realize the same slot scheduling. Therefore, we propose to confine PDCCH monitoring within the first 3 symbols of a slot when per slot monitoring is configured with 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCSs. Proposal 4: For 480 and 960 kHz SCS, PDCCH monitoring is confined to be within the first 3 symbols of a slot when per slot monitoring is configured. |

### R1-2100644 (Intel)

|  |
| --- |
| In a companion contribution [2], multi-TTI scheduling for PDSCH and PUSCH transmissions is discussed. It is straightforward that a new DCI format will be introduced. Correspondingly, the new DCI format for multi-TTI scheduling need to be configured in the SS set configuration. As a simple extension, a SS set configuration can be configured with either a fallback DCI, a normal DCI for single-TTI scheduling or a DCI format for multi-slot scheduling. The DCI format for multi-PDSCH scheduling and multi-PUSCH scheduling may be configured together or separately. **Proposal 3: A SS set can be configured with*** **DCI format 0\_0/0\_1, or**
* **Normal DCI formats for single-TTI scheduling, or**
* **Normal DCI formats for multi-TTI scheduling**
	+ **FFS separate configuration for multi-PDSCH scheduling and multi-PUSCH scheduling**
 |

### R1-2101321 (CEWiT)

|  |
| --- |
| Scheduling of multiple PDSCHs using a single DCI can be used to reduce the time required for PDCCH monitoring. If each of the PDSCH is scheduled using an independent DCI, then the number of scheduled DCIs will be more. If multiple PDSCHs are scheduled by a single DCI, the number of scheduled DCIs will reduce, which in turn will require lesser number of PDCCH candidates to schedule a UE. This in turn requires lesser number of BD’s. Hence, if multiple PDSCHs are scheduled using single DCI, the number of BDs performed by the UE per slot can be reduced.**Proposal 3:** **Scheduling multi-PDSCH through single DCI is supported.** |

### R1-2101321 (Convida Wireless)

|  |
| --- |
| Single DCI can schedule multiple PDSCHs as shown in Figure 2. In Figure 2, a DCI schedule multiple (e.g. two) PDSCHs. In this example shown in Figure 2, the PDCCH monitoring frequency is reduced, thus it can reduce PDCCH decoding efforts for a UE. However, some DCI field like HARQ process number, TB indication, New data indicator and Redundancy version, etc. may not be shared for each scheduled PDSCH. If the single-to-multiple scheduling DCI format (e.g. DCI format 1\_y) with the DCI size is large (e.g. DCI > 120 bits) which it requires a larger CCE aggregation level, then PDCCH blockage may become higher thus degrading the scheduling performance. Therefore, PDCCH blockage needs to be avoided for single-to-multiple scheduling PDSCHs scenario.  **Figure 2**: Single DCI schedule multiple (e.g. two) PDSCHs.***Proposal 3. To avoid PDCCH blockage issue when single DCI scheduling multiple PDSCHs, the size of DCI format should be studied.*** Like the case that a single DCI scheduling multiple PDSCHs in a serving cell, there are several advantages to introduce a single DCI format scheduling multiple PDSCHs across multiple CCs for NR from 52.6 – 71 GHz. One of the major benefits is to enhance the scheduling flexible because less DCIs are transmitted especially slots duration is getting shorter for NR from 52.6 GHz and above. One example of a single DCI scheduling multiple PDSCH across multiple CCs are shown in Figure 4. In Figure 4, we assume there are two CCs are carrier aggregated in a cell group. gNB may signal the COT and LBT results to a UE, then the UE may only monitor PDCCH in a CC (e.g. CC 1). The UE does not need to monitor PDCCH from the other CCs in the same cell group thus it can save power consumption. One thing is worth to note that a single DCI schedule multiple PDSCHs across CCs is not impact by whether support of listen-before-talk (LBT) or not. In addition, a single DCI schedule multiple PDSCHs across multiple CCs can share the design of single DCI schedule multiple PDSCHs discussed in subsection 2.3. **Figure 4**: An exemplary for aggregated channel BW for (a) 2 GHz (b) 4 GHz with SCS = 120 KHz and assuming the maximum $BW\_{channel}=400$ MHz.***Proposal 4. Single DCI schedule multiple PDSCH across multiple CCs should be studied for NR operation from 52.6 to 71 GHz.***  |

## Topic C: Multi-Beam Aspects

### R1-2100058 (Lenovo, Motorola Mobility)

|  |
| --- |
| Another important aspect for PDCCH monitoring is related to directional LBT. Directional LBT may cause some issues comparing with omni-directional LBT. For example, different Tx beams used by gNB may correspond to different COTs, thus different CORESETs which are configured with different Tx beams by higher layer signalling may also correspond to different COTs. From power saving perspective, during a COT initiated by a gNB, a UE can stop monitoring the PDCCH occasions in the CORESET corresponding to a different COT, which can reduce the power consumption cause by blindly decoding. That is to say, after transmitting a PDCCH to a UE within a COT, the gNB will not transmit PDCCH to this UE in the CORESET corresponding to another COT until the current COT ends.***Proposal 7: For NR unlicensed bands between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz with directional LBT based channel access mechanism, within a COT, PDCCH monitoring is nor supported in the CORESETs corresponding to other COTs (PDCCH monitoring restricted to monitoring corresponding to only one COT at a time)*** |

### R1-2100258 (Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell)

|  |
| --- |
| One more issue related to DL control seems to be operation of DCI format 2\_0 in a beam based system. In Rel. 15, DCI format 2\_0 contained only SFI, and from SFI point of view, UL and DL direction is clearly beam agnostic due to strong self-coupling between different panels. On the other hand, in R16 DCI format 2\_0 contains also other information, such as COT or SS-group switching trigger, RB-sets. Any of these pieces of information could become beam dependent. However, support for beam-dependent configurations of DCI format 2\_0 is not possible in FR2 currently. Although a UE can be indicated a change of active-TCI, DCI format 2\_0 PDCCH candidates and, payload location remains the same and thus cannot be beam specific.   ***Observation 2:*** *GC-PDCCH is an essential part of unlicensed band system, and there seems to be a need to support beam-dependent information, particularly if some form of directional LBT is chosen as coexistence mechanism.* ***Proposal 6:****Changes to DCI format 2\_0 may be beneficial for at least unlicensed 60GHz NR operation.*  |

### R1-2100893 (LG)

|  |
| --- |
| In Rel-16 NR-U, several fields such as RB set indicator, CO duration and SS set group switching trigger were introduced to DCI format 2\_0, in addition to SFI. However, for FR-X in Rel-17 where the use of directional beams may be essential, it can be worth considering the beam dependent GC-PDCCH configuration. In other words, it may be beneficial to give a spatial relation for a beam to which information of DCI format 2\_0 is applied. One simple conceivable method is to define some fields in DCI format 2\_0 separately for each beam. For example, RB set indicator and CO duration could be configured separately for each beam, but SFI could be configured as beam agnostic. Alternatively, a new field can be additionally introduced in DCI format 2\_0 to indicate the availability of each beam. In this method, UE receiving DCI format 2\_0 may determine the channel availability for each beam through a combination of the new field and existing fields (i.e., RB set indicator and CO duration). **Proposal #3: Consider per beam indication of available RB set, CO duration, and/or SS set switching by using DCI format 2\_0.** |

## Topic D: Cross-carrier scheduling

### R1-2100644 (Intel)

|  |
| --- |
| Cross-carrier scheduling is a quite useful feature for NR. Therefore, it is expected that cross-carrier scheduling between serving cells using SCS 120/480/960kHz can be supported. On the other hand, one more discussion point is the carrier aggregation (CA) between a cell with 52.6-71GHz frequency and a cell in FR2 or even FR1. From specification completeness point of view, such CA scenario could be supported, especially considering a PCell in lower frequency than 52.6-71GHz is more appropriate for coverage/robustness. On the other hand, if such kind of CA is supported and cross-carrier scheduling is considered, an extreme case could be that, a slot with SCS 15kHz is used to schedule up to 64 slots with SCS 960kHz. The scheduling capability needs to be carefully dimensioned. Without a clear motivation, we prefer to avoid unnecessary optimization for such extreme case. **Proposal 4: Cross-carrier scheduling of cell with 52.6-71GHz frequency from/to a cell of FR1 and FR2 is allowed by specification, however, additional enhancements are deprioritized unless a clear motivation is identified.** |

### R1-2101321 (Convida Wireless)

|  |
| --- |
| Like the case that a single DCI scheduling multiple PDSCHs in a serving cell, there are several advantages to introduce a single DCI format scheduling multiple PDSCHs across multiple CCs for NR from 52.6 – 71 GHz. One of the major benefits is to enhance the scheduling flexible because less DCIs are transmitted especially slots duration is getting shorter for NR from 52.6 GHz and above. One example of a single DCI scheduling multiple PDSCH across multiple CCs are shown in Figure 4. In Figure 4, we assume there are two CCs are carrier aggregated in a cell group. gNB may signal the COT and LBT results to a UE, then the UE may only monitor PDCCH in a CC (e.g. CC 1). The UE does not need to monitor PDCCH from the other CCs in the same cell group thus it can save power consumption. One thing is worth to note that a single DCI schedule multiple PDSCHs across CCs is not impact by whether support of listen-before-talk (LBT) or not. In addition, a single DCI schedule multiple PDSCHs across multiple CCs can share the design of single DCI schedule multiple PDSCHs discussed in subsection 2.3. **Figure 4**: An exemplary for aggregated channel BW for (a) 2 GHz (b) 4 GHz with SCS = 120 KHz and assuming the maximum $BW\_{channel}=400$ MHz.***Proposal 4. Single DCI schedule multiple PDSCH across multiple CCs should be studied for NR operation from 52.6 to 71 GHz.***  |

### R1-2101454 (Qualcomm)

|  |
| --- |
| For cross-carrier scheduling with different SCSs, in particular when the SCS of the scheduling cell is smaller than that of the scheduled cell, the memory requirement for buffering the Rx signal on the scheduled cell during the PDCCH processing may be excessive. In Rel-16, thus, the minimum preparation time for cross-carrier scheduled/triggered reception has been introduced (TS 38.214, Clause 5.5 for PDSCH and Clause 5.2.1.5.1a for aperiodic CSI-RS).With the introduction of new high SCSs, the related discussion should be continued. In the discussion, the following aspects may be highlighted: * Proper values and ranges of the minimum preparation time ($N\_{csirs}$ in Table 5.2.1.5.1a and $N\_{pdsch}$ in Table 5.5-1 of TS 38.214),
* Dependency and adaptation based on UE’s PDCCH monitoring capability (i.e., per-slot or per-span).

Proposal 6: In order to support cross-carrier scheduling, the PDSCH reception preparation time (as well as aperiodic CSI-RS reception) for new high SCSs should be investigated. |

## Topic E: Other

### R1-2100893 (LG)

|  |
| --- |
| Considering the efficient coexistence with Wi-Fi operating with nominal channel bandwidth of 2.16 GHz, NR in unlicensed FR-X band may need to be operated with carrier bandwidth comparable to Wi-Fi. However, since some UEs may not support carrier bandwidth up to 2.16 GHz, it should be considered multi-carrier based operation where each carrier has bandwidth narrower than 2.16 GHz (e.g. 400 MHz) but aggregated bandwidth through multiple carriers can reach to around 2.16 GHz. In such case, some measurements for the channel availability such as LBT result for each carrier can be identical over multiple carriers which overlap to the occupied channel bandwidth of Wi-Fi. To indicate these information to group of carriers efficiently, carrier-group based GC-PDCCH configuration can be considered. For instance, GC-PDCCH indicating available RB sets and CO duration can be configured per carrier-group instead of per each carrier, and the set of carriers within the carrier-group can share these information. For another instance, DL/UL data scheduling can be configured per carrier-group to reduce the amount of GC-PDCCH transmission instead of indicating to each carrier. With carrier-group based configuration, it can be beneficial with respect to the controllability of channel access or data channel scheduling in unlicensed FR-X band.**Proposal #4: Carrier-group based GC-PDCCH configuration for unlicensed FR-X band may be beneficial with respect to signalling efficiency.** |

### R1-2101110 (Xiaomi)

|  |
| --- |
| Search space set group switching is introduced in R16 NR-U for power saving propose and group switching time $P\_{switch}$ is defined for SCS 15-60kHz. To facilitate unlicensed band operation for NR 52.6-71GHz, group switching time $P\_{switch}$ should also be defined for 120/480/960kHz ***Proposal 6: Search space set group switching time*** $P\_{switch}$ ***should be defined for 120/480/960kHz.***The maximum search space periodicity in current spec is 2560 slots, and with SCS increased to 960kHz, the absolute time of the maximum search space periodicity will be decreased by 8 times. So new periodicity parameters may need to be introduced for the new SCSs, as well as the search space offset/duration parameters.***Proposal 7:*** ***New search space periodicity parameters, as well as the search space offset/duration parameters, may need to be introduced for the new SCSs.*** |

### R1-2101454 (Qualcomm)

|  |
| --- |
| Observation 2: Along with the multi-slot based PDCCH monitoring capability, DCI piggyback, as well as multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling, may be considered to compensate the loss of scheduling flexibility and latency.Figure 1: Sparse PDCCH monitoring occasions with DCI transmission on PDSCH. |
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# Appendix: Further Discussion on PDCCH Monitoring Alternatives

## Current version (as of Tuesday 01:05 UTC) – with markup

* Alt 1: A fixed pattern of X slots.
	+ The different X slot groups are consecutive and do not overlap
	+ PDCCH could be configured in ~~the first~~ Y consecutive slots within each X slot group
	+ BD/CCE budget is counted within the Y slots of each X slot group, ~~and different X slot groups do not overlap~~
	+ Alt 1-1: Y<X~~, BD/CCE budget is counted within the first Y slots of each X slot group, and the X slot groups do not overlap for different countings.~~
		- FFS: The Y slots are the first Y slots within the X slot group or not
	+ Alt 1-2: Y=X~~, BD/CCE budget is counted for each X=Y slot group, and the X slot groups do not overlap for different countings.~~
	+ Note: Y is used to facilitate discussion. If Alt 1-2 is agreed, Y is not needed.
* Alt 2: Use (X,Y) similar to the Rel-16 capability (*pdcch-Monitoring-r16*, (X, Y) span) as the baseline to define the new capability
	+ Y<=X
	+ PDCCH could be configured such that the developed span pattern by SS configuration satisfy (X,Y) requirement, i.e. the start of any two span of at most Y symbols/slots is separated by at least X symbols/slots
	+ BD/CCE budget is counted for each span of at most Y symbols/slots
	+ FFS: Values of X and Y and units in which they are defined
	+ ~~FFS: Whether number of slots within which the number of monitoring occasions is counted is needed and if needed, the value of the number of slots~~
* Alt 3: A sliding window of X=Y slots for defining multi-slot PDCCH monitoring capability.
	+ The slot groups are sliding in unit of [1] slot
	+ PDCCH could be configured in any slot
	+ BD/CCE budget is counted within any slot group ~~consecutive X=Y slots~~
	+ ~~FFS: Increments in which sliding occurs~~

## Clean version (as of Tuesday 1:05 UTC)

* Alt 1: A fixed pattern of X slots.
	+ The different X slot groups are consecutive and do not overlap
	+ PDCCH could be configured in Y consecutive slots within each X slot group
	+ BD/CCE budget is counted within the Y slots of each X slot group
	+ Alt 1-1: Y<X
		- FFS: The Y slots are the first Y slots within the X slot group or not
	+ Alt 1-2: Y=X
	+ Note: Y is used to facilitate discussion. If Alt 1-2 is agreed, Y is not needed.
* Alt 2: Use (X,Y) similar to the Rel-16 capability (*pdcch-Monitoring-r16*, (X, Y) span) as the baseline to define the new capability
	+ Y<=X
	+ PDCCH could be configured such that the developed span pattern by SS configuration satisfy (X,Y) requirement, i.e. the start of any two span of at most Y symbols/slots is separated by at least X symbols/slots
	+ BD/CCE budget is counted for each span of at most Y symbols/slots
	+ FFS: Values of X and Y and units in which they are defined
* Alt 3: A sliding window of X=Y slots for defining multi-slot PDCCH monitoring capability.
	+ The slot groups are sliding in unit of [1] slot
	+ PDCCH could be configured in any slot
	+ BD/CCE budget is counted within any slot group

## Update from Ericsson

* Alt 1: A fixed pattern of contiguous slot groups.
	+ Each slot group consists of X slots
	+ PDCCH monitoring can be configured in Y consecutive slots within each X slot group
	+ BD/CCEs are counted toward the budget within the Y slots of each X slot group
		- Note: BD/CCEs are not counted across slot group boundaries
	+ Alt 1-1: Y<X
		- FFS: Whether or not the Y slots are the first Y slots within each X slot group
	+ Alt 1-2: Y=X
		- Note: Y is used to facilitate discussion. If Alt 1-2 is agreed, Y is not needed.
* Alt 2: Use (X,Y) similar to the Rel-16 capability (*pdcch-Monitoring-r16*, (X, Y) span) as the baseline to define the new capability
	+ Y<=X
	+ PDCCH monitoring can be configured such that the span pattern by search space configuration satisfies the (X,Y) requirement, i.e. X is the minimum time separation between the the start of two consecutive spans, including across slot groups
	+ BD/CCEs are counted toward the budget for each span of at most Y symbols/slots
	+ FFS: Values of X and Y and units in which they are defined
* Alt 3: Same as Alt-1-2 (Y=X), except
	+ BD/CCEs are counted toward the budget within an X slot sliding window that can cross a slot-group boundary
	+ The window slides in unit of [1] slot
	+ PDCCH monitoring can be configured in any slot within a slot group

Comments:

* For Alt-1, I modified the first two lines to make it more clear that the pattern is not X slots. Rather, the pattern consists of contiguous slot groups where each slot group consists of X slots
* For Alt-2, aligned the wording to be close to what is in he current 38.213 Section 10, However, what was missing from the Alt-2 description is the implicit sliding window. So I added "including across slot groups" analogous to current 38.213

A UE can indicate a capability to monitor PDCCH according to one or more of the combinations $\left(X,Y\right)$ = (2, 2), (4, 3), and (7, 3) per SCS configuration of $µ=0$ and $µ=1$. A span is a number of consecutive symbols in a slot where the UE is configured to monitor PDCCH. Each PDCCH monitoring occasion is within one span. If a UE monitors PDCCH on a cell according to combination $\left(X,Y\right)$, the UE supports PDCCH monitoring occasions in any symbol of a slot with minimum time separation of $X$ symbols between the first symbol of two consecutive spans, including across slots. A span starts at a first symbol where a PDCCH monitoring occasion starts and ends at a last symbol where a PDCCH monitoring occasion ends, where the number of symbols of the span is up to $Y$.

* Question to all: I'm not convinced that the following is accurate. What happens if there are two spans within a slot group that satisfy the (X,Y) requirement? Is it necessary to introduce a third variable N = number of slots in slot group?

"BD/CCEs are counted toward the budget for each span of at most Y symbols/slots"

## Update from vivo

* Alt 1: A fixed pattern of X slots.
	+ The different X slot groups are consecutive and do not overlap
	+ PDCCH could be configured in Y consecutive slots within each X slot group
	+ BD/CCE budget is counted within the Y slots of each X slot group
	+ Alt 1-1: Y<X
		- FFS: The Y slots are the first Y slots within the X slot group or not
	+ Alt 1-2: Y=X
	+ Note: Y is used to facilitate discussion. If Alt 1-2 is agreed, Y is not needed.
* Alt 2: Use (X,Y) similar to the Rel-16 capability (*pdcch-Monitoring-r16*, (X, Y) span) as the baseline to define the new capability
	+ Y<=X
	+ PDCCH could be configured such that the developed span pattern by SS configuration satisfy (X,Y) requirement, i.e. the start of any two consecutive span of at most Y symbols/slots is separated by at least X symbols/slots
	+ BD/CCE budget is counted for each span of at most Y symbols/slots
	+ FFS: Values of X and Y and units in which they are defined
	+ FFS: Whether number of slots within which ~~the number of monitoring occasions is counted~~ the span pattern is repeated is needed and if needed, the value of the number of slots
* Alt 3: A sliding window of X=Y slots for defining multi-slot PDCCH monitoring capability.
	+ The slot groups are sliding in unit of [1] slot
	+ PDCCH could be configured in any slot
	+ BD/CCE budget is counted within any slot group

Comments:

* For Alt-1, it seems that we already have common understanding on this. The wording refinement from Ericsson is also fine with us.
* For Alt-2, I think the original FFS is still needed but the wording should be adjusted to make it clearer. In single-slot monitoring capability defined in NR Rel-15/16, the multi-symbol span pattern is repeated every slot and there may be multiple spans within one slot. Similarly, to define multi-slot monitoring capability, the multi-symbol/slot span pattern should be repeated in multiple (e.g. M, M>X>=Y) slots. One example could be that the span pattern is repeated in every subframe. Then N is actually the number of slots within which the span pattern is repeated, which is updated as above.
* For Alt-3, it is similar to Alt 1-2 except the BD/CCE counting.

In all the above alternatives, the above mentioned Y slots doesn’t mean all symbols in the slot are monitored. Which symbol needs to be monitored will be further discussed.

## Update from Huawei

It might be more convenient for discussion to provide updates on top of the already made agreement, but these change marks have been lost in the updates above. Here is an update considering revisions provided by Ericsson and vivo.

* My understanding of vivo’s description of Alt2 is that it would be another alternative where a “span pattern is repeated” (e.g. Alt4 requiring 3 parameters instead of 2).
* Ericsson’s “including across slot groups” for Alt2 is ambiguous because “slot groups” are undefined in Alt2. I tentatively replaced by “irrespective of the starting symbol of a span”

**Proposed revised agreement**

Choose one of the following alternatives for defining the multi-slot PDCCH monitoring capability

* Alt 1: A fixed pattern of X-slot groups.
	+ Each slot group consists of X slots
	+ The different X slot groups are consecutive and do not overlap
	+ PDCCH monitoring can be configured in Y consecutive slots within each X-slot group
	+ BD/CCEs are counted toward the budget within the Y slots of each X slot group
		- Note: BD/CCEs are not counted across slot group boundaries
	+ Alt 1-1: Y<X
		- FFS: Whether or not the Y slots are the first Y slots within the X-slot group
	+ Alt 1-2: Y=X
		- Note: Y is used to facilitate discussion. If Alt 1-2 is agreed, Y is not needed.
	+ Note: Y is used to facilitate discussion. If Alt 1-2 is agreed, Y is not needed.
* Alt 2: Use (X,Y) similar to the Rel-16 capability (*pdcch-Monitoring-r16*, (X, Y) span) as the baseline to define the new capability
	+ Y<=X
	+ PDCCH monitoring can be configured such that the span pattern by search space configuration satisfies the (X,Y) requirement, i.e. X is the minimum time separation between the start of two consecutive spans, irrespective of the starting symbol of a span
	+ BD/CCEs are counted toward the budget for each span of at most Y [symbols or slots]
	+ FFS: Values of X and Y and units in which they are defined
* Alt 3: A sliding window of X=Y slots
	+ BD/CCEs are counted toward the budget within an X-slot sliding window that can cross a slot-group boundary
	+ The window slides in unit of [1] slot
	+ PDCCH monitoring can be configured in any slot within a slot group of X slots
	+ Note: X and Y are used to facilitate discussion. If Alt 1-3 is agreed, Y is not needed.

## Update from LG

We are generally fine with Huawei’s version. From this, some modifications have been made for a clearer understanding.

* Alt 1: Use a fixed pattern of X-slot groups as the baseline to define the new capability
	+ Each slot group consists of X slots
	+ The different X-slot groups are consecutive and do not overlap
	+ PDCCH monitoring can be configured in Y consecutive slots within each X-slot group
	+ BD/CCEs are counted toward the budget within the Y slots of each X-slot group
		- Note: BD/CCEs are not counted across slot group boundaries
	+ Alt 1-1: Y<X
		- FFS: Whether or not the Y slots are the first Y slots within the X-slot group
	+ Alt 1-2: Y=X
		- Note: Y is used to facilitate discussion. If Alt 1-2 is agreed, Y is not needed.
* Alt 2: Use (X,Y) span as the baseline to define the new capability
	+ Y<=X
	+ PDCCH monitoring can be configured such that the span pattern by search space configuration satisfies the (X,Y) requirement, i.e. X is the minimum time separation between the start of two consecutive spans, irrespective of the starting symbol of a span
	+ BD/CCEs are counted toward the budget for each span of at most Y [symbols or slots]
	+ FFS: Values of X and Y and units in which they are defined
* Alt 3: Use a sliding window of X=Y slots as the baseline to define the new capability
	+ BD/CCEs are counted toward the budget within an X-slot sliding window that can cross a slot-group boundary
	+ The window slides in unit of [1] slot
	+ PDCCH monitoring can be configured in any slot within a slot group of X slots
	+ Note: X and Y are used to facilitate discussion. If Alt 3 is agreed, Y is not needed.

## Update from ZTE

The following update is based on LG’s version.

* For Alt 1, we understand that “Note: Y is used to facilitate discussion. If Alt 1-2 is agreed, Y is not needed.” is a common description/explanation. Therefore, it may be more suitable to be placed in a separate bullet.
* For Alt2, it is not clear for the sentence of “irrespective of the starting symbol of a span”. because so far some contents have not been determined/agreed/reached a consensus, for example, is the start of a span based on slot boundary or symbol boundary? And how to determine the starting position of a span?. therefore, we think such description on “irrespective of the starting **symbol** of a span” is not suitable and accurate to put it here.
* Besides, in our understanding, “**across slot**” mentioned in Clause 10 of the current TS 38.213, its means even if two consecutive spans are located in two different slots (across slot), the time gap of the start of these two spans should also satisfy the minimum time value X.

**Proposed revised agreement**

Choose one of the following alternatives for defining the multi-slot PDCCH monitoring capability

* Alt 1: Use a fixed pattern of X-slot groups as the baseline to define the new capability
	+ Each slot group consists of X slots
	+ The different X-slot groups are consecutive and do not overlap
	+ PDCCH monitoring can be configured in Y consecutive slots within each X-slot group
	+ BD/CCEs are counted toward the budget within the Y slots of each X-slot group
		- Note: BD/CCEs are not counted across slot group boundaries
	+ Alt 1-1: Y<X
		- FFS: Whether or not the Y slots are the first Y slots within the X-slot group
	+ Alt 1-2: Y=X
	+ Note: Y is used to facilitate discussion. If Alt 1-2 is agreed, Y is not needed.
* Alt 2: Use (X,Y) span as the baseline to define the new capability
	+ Y<=X
	+ PDCCH monitoring can be configured such that the span pattern by search space configuration satisfies the (X,Y) requirement, i.e. X is the minimum time separation between the start of two consecutive spans
	+ BD/CCEs are counted toward the budget for each span of at most Y [symbols or slots]
	+ FFS: Values of X and Y and units in which they are defined
* Alt 3: Use a sliding window of X=Y slots as the baseline to define the new capability
	+ BD/CCEs are counted toward the budget within an X-slot sliding window that can cross a slot-group boundary
	+ The window slides in unit of [1] slot
	+ PDCCH monitoring can be configured in any slot within a slot group of X slots
	+ Note: X and Y are used to facilitate discussion. If Alt 3 is agreed, Y is not needed.

## Moderator suggestion for further discussion

In the following, I try to show my understanding based on the previous revisions in this document, by change marks against the defined alternatives acccording to the agreement.

At the same time, some of the concerns regarding back-to-back monitoring configurations that are being addressed by Alt 3 could be avoided by proper values of X/Y in Alt 1 and Alt 2 in my view, if we agree e.g. that PDCCH monitoring is limited to within first N slots of a monitoring span. That could be part of the further discussion to choose down between the alternatives.

We also need to keep in mind that the monitoring occasion configuration is not necessarily fully aligned with X,Y values for the capability, this could be the subject of later discussion. Most of the revised suggestions anyway state that the monitoring "can"/"could" be configured in a certain manner, which seems not a tight requirement that these would be the only supported configurations. Therefore I do not include such configuration aspects right now in my suggestion (even though it is acknowledged that such descriptions have a benefit to understand how the capability and configuration can share a common framework).

Proposed modification of agreement:

Choose one of the following alternatives for defining the multi-slot PDCCH monitoring capability

* Alt 1: Use a fixed pattern in a slot group as the baseline to define the new capability.
	+ Each slot group consists of X slots
	+ Slot groups are consecutive and non-overlapping
	+ The capability indicates how much BD/CCE budget is available within Y consecutive [symbols or slots] in each slot group
		- FFS: Supported values/constraints of X and Y, e.g. Y<=X, Y=X
		- FFS: Restrictions on location of the Y [symbols or slots] within a slot group, e.g. the Y [symbols or slots] always start at the first symbol of the first slot within a slot group
* Alt 2: Use an (X,Y) span as the baseline to define the new capability
	+ X is the minimum time separation between the first symbol of two consecutive spans
	+ The capability indicates how much BD/CCE budget is available within Y consecutive [symbols or slots] in a span
	+ Y <= X
	+ FFS: Exact values of X and Y and units in which they are defined, including cases where a span is longer than one slot or crosses a slot boundary.
* Alt 3: Use a sliding window of X slots as the baseline to define the new capability.
	+ The capability indicates how much BD/CCE budget is available within the sliding window
	+ The sliding unit of the sliding window is [1] slot.
* Specific numbers for X, Y may depend on UE capability and gNB configuration
	+ Examples:
		- X = [4] slots for 480 kHz SCS and X = [8] slots for 960 kHz SCS

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Intel | For Alt 1, suggest to change ‘Y [symbols or slots]’ to ‘Y slots’, since there is no proposal that Y is 1/2/3 symbols of CORESET duration.  |
| Samsung | For Alt 2, suggest the following changes to be aligned with definition of Y in 38.213: * + The capability indicates how much BD/CCE budget is available within a span of at most Y consecutive [symbols or slots] ~~in a span~~
 |
| MediaTek | Thanks for the good discussion. We have some comments on Alt1 as below.1. We suggest to move the two FFS points in Alt1 one level up to align with the bullet structure in Alt2.2. For the second FFS,FFS: Restrictions on location of the Y [symbols or slots] within a slot group, e.g. the Y [symbols or slots] always start at the first symbol of the first slot within a slot groupThe wording is a little bit confusing for the case that the unit of Y is slot. In our understanding, if the unit of Y was slot, we still need to specify the monitoring occasion configuration within each slot of the Y slots. Therefore, we suggest the following modification:FFS: Restrictions on location of the Y [symbols or slots] within a slot group, e.g. the Y [symbols or slots] always start at the [first symbol of the first slot or first slot] within a slot group.FFS: Restrictions on monitoring occasion location within each slot of the Y slots if the unit of Y is defined as slot. |
| Apple | For Alt-1, we would like to keep it as [Symbols/slots] as we have not yet decided what the units will be. From the email discussion, in Alt-2 there seemed to be consensus to keep the statement* “FFS: Whether number of slots within which ~~the number of monitoring occasions is counted~~ the span pattern is repeated is needed and if needed, the value of the number of slots”
 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | In response to Apple’s comment, our preference was not to keep the text “the span pattern is repeated”. It might be naturally repeated based on the search space configuration, e.g. Y is 3 symbols in the first slot every X slots, without needing to define yet another parameter for it. But if we have an FFS, does this mean it might be precluded unless we resolve the FFS?We support the suggestions from Intel and Samsung.  |
| vivo | We agree with Apple to keep the following statement:“FFS: Whether number of slots within which ~~the number of monitoring occasions is counted~~ the span pattern is repeated is needed and if needed, the value of the number of slots”In response to Huawei’s comment, I don’t think the span pattern is naturally repeated since the span pattern is not determined by one search space but all the configured search spaces. Besides, X is the minimum gap between any two spans which means the gap between two spans is not fixed in Alt. 2.Here I copied the spec on how to determine span pattern in NR Rel-15 below:In order to determine a suitable span pattern, first a bitmap b(l), 0<=l<=13 is generated, where b(l)=1 if symbol l of any slot is part of a monitoring occasion, b(l)=0 otherwise. The first span in the span pattern begins at the smallest l for which b(l)=1. The next span in the span pattern begins at the smallest l not included in the previous span(s) for which b(l)=1. The span duration is max{maximum value of all CORESET durations, minimum value of Y in the UE reported candidate value} except possibly the last span in a slot which can be of shorter duration.One example is given below with two slots where b(l)=11101100001100 according to the SS configuration (blue symbol means there is MO configuration) assuming (X,Y)=(4,3). Then the span pattern is illustrated in red and repeated in every slot. It is clear that the time separation between any two spans including across the slots to see if the gap is larger or equal to X=4 symbols, which means it satisfy the (X,Y) requirement. In this example, X=4 symbols, Y=3 symbols and M=14 symbols where it is clear that M is larger than X.cid:image001.png@01D6FAEC.971219A0Then if we extend X to be multiple slots, with similar mechanism, M should be defined where the span pattern is repeated and M > X. If we consider M slots as a slot group, the span gap should be checked between any two spans within or across the slot group. |
| Ericsson | * Agree with Intel and Samsung's comments.
* I also think it is important that we discuss at the same time about what is the capability within a slot for Alt-1 and Alt-3. Hence I think the following FFS should be added at the end:
	+ FFS: Capability definition within a slot
* An important aspect of Alt-1 is that BD/CCEs are not counted only within a slot group and not across slot groups
* For Alt-2, I think vivo has done a nice job explaining how Rel-15 works. At least I have a better understanding now of where the concept of "repeating" pattern comes from. So I think if the intention of Alt-2 is to be like the Rel-16 span concept, then there needs to be some further clarifications of Alt-2. I'm not sure the FFS is worded accurately "…including cases where a span is longer than one slot or crosses a slot boundary". Isn't the notion of "crossing a slot boundary" like vivo describes " the span gap should be checked between any two spans within or across the slot group."?

I have done some editing for clarity using Alex's proposal above as a baseline, also including Intel and Samsung's suggestions, the FFS I mention above, plus the fix for Alt-1. I have not made an attempt to solve any issues with Alt-2 as mentioned above.Proposed modification of agreement:Choose one of the following alternatives for defining the multi-slot PDCCH monitoring capability* Alt 1: Use a fixed pattern of slots within a slot group as the baseline to define the new capability.
	+ Each slot group consists of X slots
	+ Slot groups are consecutive and non-overlapping
	+ The capability indicates the BD/CCE budget within Y consecutive slots in each slot group and not across slot groups.
	+ FFS: Supported values/constraints of X and Y, e.g. Y<=X, Y=X
	+ FFS: Restrictions on location of the Y slots within a slot group, e.g. the Y slots always start at the first slot within a slot group
	+ FFS: Capability definition within a slot
* Alt 2: Use an (X,Y) span as the baseline to define the new capability
	+ X is the minimum time separation between the start of two consecutive spans
	+ The capability indicates the BD/CCE budget within a span of Y consecutive [symbols or slots]
	+ Y <= X
	+ FFS: Exact values of X and Y and units in which they are defined (e.g., symbols, slots), including cases where a span is longer than one slot or crosses a slot boundary.
* Alt 3: Use a sliding window of X slots as the baseline to define the new capability.
	+ The capability indicates the BD/CCE budget within the sliding window
	+ The sliding unit of the sliding window is [1] slot.
	+ FFS: Capability definition within a slot
* Specific numbers for X, Y may depend on UE capability and gNB configuration
	+ Examples:
		- X = [4] slots for 480 kHz SCS and X = [8] slots for 960 kHz SCS
 |
| LG Electronics | Agree with the proposed modification of agreement from Moderator in principle.For Alt-1, we prefer to keep [symbols or slots] as is and to modify FFS according to the comments from MediaTek. As far as we know, there was no consensus that Y should be in unit of slot. For Alt-2, we agree with Apple and vivo to keep the FFS on repetition issue. We think that whether number of slots within which the span pattern is repeated is needed can be discussed together with defining the multi-slot PDCCH monitoring capability in Alt-2. In addition, agree with Samsung’s suggestion. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Generally, Ericsson updates seem fine to us. We are further open to consider adding FFS in Alt-2 for span pattern repetition.But for Alt-1, not sure if we already need to agree that slots as units are applied and capability will be defined per slot. |
| Nokia, NSB | The latest proposal by Ericsson is generally ok, but we agree with Apple in keeping [symbols or slots]. We see this more as a signaling aspect and if the group later decides that a raster of 14 symbols is sufficient, we can revise the decision accordingly. Correspondingly, the FFS point on “Capability definition within a slot” would not be needed at least yet. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | For Alt1 from Moderator’s suggestion, we think that it it not clear for “in a slot group”, such wording seems to imply PDCCH monitoring pattern is fix in a slot group while not fix in different slot groups. In our understanding, fixed pattern should be applicable to different slot groups.Besides, we have some doubts about parameter Y. If Y represents the first Y slots of a slot group, whether it means any symbols of first Y slots need to be monitored by UE. Or just monitor first Y slot, but specific number of symbol and location of PDCCH monitroing are FFS.For Alt1 from Ericsson’s update, we think new add “not across slot groups” is not necessary, because BD/CCE budget have clearly limited within Y consectutive slots in each slot group, which means it is not feasible across slot gourps. Besides, the same problem as our mentioned in previous two paragragh, we think fixed pattern should be for different slot groups. Thus, the following update for main bullet in Alt1 should be supported:* Alt 1: Use a fixed pattern in slot groups as the baseline to define the new capability.
	+ Each slot group consists of X slots
	+ Slot groups are consecutive and non-overlapping
	+ The capability indicates the BD/CCE budget within Y consecutive [symbols or slots] in each slot group
	+ FFS: Supported values/constraints of X and Y, e.g. Y<=X, Y=X
	+ FFS: Restrictions on location of the Y [symbols or slots] within a slot group, e.g. the Y [symbols or slots] always start at the first symbol of the first slot within a slot group
 |