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# Introduction

This feature lead (FL) summary (FLS) concerns the Rel-17 work item (WI) for support of reduced capability (RedCap) NR devices [1]. Earlier RAN1 agreements for this WI are summarized in [2], which also includes links to earlier FLSs.

This document captures this email discussion on maintenance issues for HD-FDD for RedCap:

|  |
| --- |
| [109-e-R17\_RedCap-02] Email discussion under 8.6.2 for maintenance on HD-FDD, for issue 1, 2 and 3 under High Priority Proposal 3-1c in the FL summary [R1-2205107](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_109-e/Docs/R1-2205107.zip)– Chao (Qualcomm)* Discussion and decision by May 18
 |

The three issues mentioned above are the following ones:

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Collision handling between SSB and RACH related transmissions
	* See references [5, 8, 10, 12, 16, 18, 21, 22, 25, 28, 30, 32]
2. Available slot/symbol determination for PUCCH and PUSCH
	* See references [10, 16, 18, 26, 30]
3. Lower priority: Collision handling between NCD-SSB and UL transmission
	* See reference [30]
 |

Each one of the issues listed above is treated in its own section in this document. The feedback forms in this document are tagged and color coded with High Priority or Medium Priority. The aspects that are in the focus of this round of the discussion are furthermore tagged FL1.

**FL1 Question: Please consider entering contact info below for the points of contact for this email discussion.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Point of contact** | **Email address** |
| vivo | Xueming Pan | panxueming@vivo.com |
| Nordic | Karol Schober | karol.schober@nordicsemi.no |
| Qualcomm | Jing Lei | leijing@qti.qualcomm.com |
| DOCOMO | Shinya Kumagai | shinya.kumagai@docomo-lab.com |
| Nokia | Rapeepat Ratasuk | rapeepat.ratasuk@nokia-bell-labs.com |

# 1 Issue #1: Collision handling between SSB and RACH related transmissions

For Case 5 of SSB overlapping with Msg3 (re)transmission and HARQ-ACK for Msg4/MsgB, majority majority does not view any critical issue for prioritizing SSB over Msg3 or PUCCH for Msg4/MsgB and supports to confirm the WA from RAN1#108-e. It is also noted in [5, 30] that there is no need for RAN1 specification change if the WA from RAN1#108-e is agreed since the specification text does not differentiate between dynamically scheduled PUSCH, CG-PUSCH, and PUSCH scheduled by RAR UL grant.

In [10], it is proposed that the collision cases involving SSB should consider only the SSB in the active BWP, and the WA should be confirmed with clarifying that the SSB refers to the one that present in the active BWP.

[12] presents view on whether the same prioritity rule is reused for the collision of SSB vs. msg2/msg4/Type-1 CSS when a separate initial DL BWP without SSB is configured for RACH for RedCap UEs. It is viewed in [10] that during the RACH procedure, e.g., from the transmission of the Msg.1 to the transmission of the PUCCH for Msg.4, the RedCap UE in idle/inactive mode does not need to monitor paging or CD-SSB in case a separate initial DL BWP without CD-SSB is configured.

**FL1 High Priority Proposal 1-1: Confirm the following WA from RAN1#108-e:**

* For Case 5 of SSB overlapping with Msg3 (re)transmission or PUCCH for Msg4/MsgB, reuse the same handling as for other dynamically scheduled UL transmission and prioritize the SSB
	+ Note: Whether the above collision rule is reused for Msg3 PUSCH repetition is up to the agreement in the CE WI.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| vivo | Y |  |
| Nordic  | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |
| Apple  | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |

**FL1 High Priority Question 1-2: Companies are invited to provide views on whether the SSB refers to the one that present in the active BWP for collision handling between SSB and RACH related transmission?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| vivo | Y with modification  | About the collision cases involving SSB, it makes sense to consider only the SSB (either CD-SSB or NCD-SSB) present in the active BWP. Therefore, we would like to make the following modification:**“the SSB refers to the one that present in the active BWP for collision handling between SSB and ~~RACH related~~ UL transmissions, i.e., dynamically scheduled or configured UL transmissions.”** |
| Nordic  | Y | RAN1 spec talks about SSB only, and only SSB within BWP matters. This is in our opinion current specification.  |
| Qualcomm | Y | If the active DL BWP of a HD-FDD RedCap UE includes an SSB transmitted by the serving cell, the collision handling between SSB and UL transmissions dynamically scheduled or configured in the active UL BWP of the RedCap UE refers to the SSB in the active DL BWP. |
| Apple  | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y | SSB in the active DL BWP is considered for the collision handling |
| Nokia, NSB | Y | Agree that this refers to the SSB in the active DL BWP |

# 2 Issue #2: Available slot/symbol determination for PUCCH and PUSCH

For the issue of determining available slots for PUCCH/PUSCH repetition, it is proposed in [16, 18, 26] to have a unified solution for both PUSCH and PUCCH repetition that the slot in which a PUCCH/PUSCH transmission does not have sufficient gap with the SSB is not counted as available slots for PUCCH/PUSCH repetition.

In [30] it is proposed to firstly clarify whether or not the “back-to-back” non-overlapping UL/DL without sufficient gap between SSB and dynamic PUSCH or PUCCH repetition is allowed.

The similar view is expressed in [10] that if the “back-to-back” non-overlapping UL/DL without sufficient gap between SSB and dynamic UL transmission is treated as error case the UE behaviour and specification will become quite complicated especially for PUSCH/PUCCH repetition with K>1.

In [30], it is also discussed whether the invalid symbols for PUSCH repetition Type B should also include the symbols that are not at least $N\_{Tx-Rx}⋅T\_{c} $before the first symbol or not at least $N\_{Rx-Tx}⋅T\_{c}$ after the last symbol indicated for SSB.

Based on the received response, it seems reasonable, at least from the moderator’s view, to allow the “back-to-back” non-overlapping UL/DL without sufficient gap between SSB and dynamically scheduled UL to simplify UE behaviour and specification errort. Based on this, a unified solution for determining available slots can be considered for PUCCH/PUSCH repetition based on a configured grant and scheduled by a PDCCH.

**FL1 High Priority Proposal 2-1:**

* The “back-to-back” non-overlapping UL/DL without sufficient gap between SSB and dynamically scheduled UL may happen, i.e., allowed for HD-FDD UEs

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| vivo | Y | As analyzed in our contribution, allowing “back-to-back” non-overlapping UL/DL without sufficient gap between SSB and dynamic scheduled UL happen can simplify UE behaviour and specification a lot.  |
| Nordic  | N, but | We do not think this should be a general rule. Saying this, we could be fine with allowing exceptions for validation purposes below.  |
| Qualcomm | N | It is necessary to clarify if the SSB is an CD-SSB or NCD-SSB.If the SSB is an NCD-SSB configured by RRC and the HD UE capability is known to NW, such “back-to-back non-overlapping UL/DL without sufficient gap” between SSB and dynamically scheduled UL can be avoided by NW. |
| DOCOMO | Y | At least for PUCCH/PUSCH repetition case it should be allowed  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y | We prefer to have the same solution for PUCCH and PUSCH repetition and therefore this should be allowed |

If the above FL proposal is agreed, then the following proposals can be considered.

**FL1 High Priority Proposal 2-2:**

* For a HD-UE in paired spectrum and for a PUCCH transmission over $N\_{PUCCH}^{repeat}$ slots
	+ A slot is not counted in the number of $N\_{PUCCH}^{repeat}$ slots if a PUCCH transmission in the slot does not start or end at least $N\_{Rx-Tx}⋅T\_{c}$ or $N\_{Tx-Rx}⋅T\_{c}$, respectively, from the last or first symbol in the set of symbols with SSB transmission

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| vivo | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |

**FL1 High Priority Proposal 2-3:**

* For a HD-UE in paired spectrum and for PUSCH repetition Type A scheduled by DCI format 0\_1 or 0\_2 or with a configured grant
	+ When *AvailableSlotCounting* is enabled
		- For K>1, a slot is not counted in the number of K slots if a PUSCH transmission in the slot does not start or end at least $N\_{Rx-Tx}⋅T\_{c}$ or $N\_{Tx-Rx}⋅T\_{c}$, respectively, from the last or first symbol in the set of symbols with SSB transmission
		- For K=1, the HD-UE does not transmit PUSCH if PUSCH transmission in the slot does not start or end at least $N\_{Rx-Tx}⋅T\_{c}$ or $N\_{Tx-Rx}⋅T\_{c}$, respectively, from the last or first symbol in the set of symbols with SSB transmission
	+ When the UE is not configured with *AvailableSlotCounting* or when *AvailableSlotCounting* is disabled, the HD-UE does not transmit PUSCH in a slot if a PUSCH transmission in the slot does not start or end at least $N\_{Rx-Tx}⋅T\_{c}$ or $N\_{Tx-Rx}⋅T\_{c}$, respectively, from the last or first symbol in the set of symbols with SSB transmission

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| vivo | Y | We support this proposal to align the UE behavior agreed in Cov\_enh.  |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |

**FL1 High Priority Proposal 2-4:**

* For a HD-UE in paired spectrum and for PUSCH repetition type B transmission
	+ Symbols that are not at least $N\_{Tx-Rx}⋅T\_{c} $before the first symbol or not at least $N\_{Rx-Tx}⋅T\_{c}$ after the last symbol in the set of symbols with SSB transmission are considered as invalid symbols for PUSCH repetition type B transmission

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| vivo | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y |  |

# 3 Issue #3: Collision handling between NCD-SSB and UL transmission

One more remaining issue discussed in [30] is how to handle the collision between NCD-SSB and UL transmission. It is proposed in [30] to handle the NCD-SSB in the same way as CD-SSB when an RRC-configured active DL BWP in connected mode contains the NCD-SSB.

**FL1 Medium Priority Proposal 3-1:**

* For collision handling between NCD-SSB and UL transmission, NCD-SSB is handled in the same way as CD-SSB

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| vivo | Y with comment  | We think this proposal can be discussed together with **FL1 High Priority Proposal 1-1.** In addition, we think it is necessary to change specification since in current TS 38.213 section 17.2, the SSB refers to the “*ssb-PositionsInBurst* in *SIB1* or in *ServingCellConfigCommon*” while for NCD-SSB, it is configured by UE-dedicated RRC signaling *NonCellDefiningSSB*. |
| Nordic  | Y | RAN1 spec talks about SSB only, and only SSB within BWP matters. This is in our opinion current specification.  |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Y | Agree that they should be handled in the same way and this should refer to the SSB in the BWP |
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