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# Introduction

This email discussion is for Rel-18 Dual Transmission/Reception (Tx/Rx) Multi-SIM for NR WI and the scope covers the following agenda items:

* AI 11.17.1 General and work plan
* AI 11.17.2 RRM requirements for Rel-17 MUSIM gaps

Based on the latest approved WI in [RP-220955], the objectives of the WI for the above AIs are duplicated as below:



During email discussion companies are encourages to:

* Provide comments on all interested topics/sub-topics at one time
* Ensure that comments are based on the latest version of the document by checking the folder before uploading
* Use “Track changes” to help identify added comments/changes
* Based on meeting guidance from RAN4 chair when changing the file name, adding your company name

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Name | Email address |
| vivo | Xusheng wei | Xusheng.wei@vivo.com |
| Apple | Qiming Li | Li\_qiming@apple.com |
| MTK | Ogeen Toma | Ogeen.hanna@mediatek.com |
| CMCC | Jingjing Chen | chenjingjing@chinamobile.com |
| Huawei  | Li Zhang | zhangli164@huawei.com |
| Xiaomi | Ziquan Hu | huziquan@xiaomi.com |
| Charter | Thomas Montzka | thomaswigge.montzka@charter.com |
| Nokia | Rafael Paiva | Rafael.paiva@nokia.com |

1. Please add your contact information in above table once you make comments on this email thread.
2. If multiple delegates from the same company make comments on single email thread, please add you name as suffix after company name when make comments i.e. Company A (XX, XX)

# Topic #1: Work plan

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| T-doc number | Company | Proposals / Observations |
| [R4-2213450](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2213450.zip) | vivo | Work Plan |
|  |  |  |

## Open issues summary

### Sub-topic 1-1

**Issue 1-1-1: Work Plan**

* + Work plan is provided at [R4-2213450](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2213450.zip)
* Recommended WF
	+ Suggest to agree the work plan

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Fine |
| MTK | Fine with the work plan. |
| Xiaomi | Fine with the work plan |
| Qualcomm | The work plan only mentions the WID objective about requirements for Rel-17 MUSIM gaps. There is another objective for MUSIM enhancements in Rel-18.We assume the proposed timeline includes both WID objectives. Correct?In our view, RAN4 should not need 9 meetings to define requirements for Rel-17 MUSIM gaps.Also, allocating only one meeting for the performance part seems aggressive.  |
| vivo | @QC. Thanks for the comments. Regarding the Rel-18 MUSIM WI impact, at [RP-220955] it mentions “The work item shall identify whether the WI will have RAN3 or RAN4 impacts by RAN#99 [RAN2]. Hence in this work plan it indicated that the work plan will be updated at RAN4 #106 to address the according to RANP #99 decision. Currently the work plan is based on identified target and it is impossible to plan on objectives which still does not exist right now. Regarding performance part, thanks for the careful review. The performance part will be finished at June 2024. However the current work plan ends at Dec.2023, based on the timetable according to [RP-221060]. Hence there will be 2 extra meetings (0.25 TU each meeting) between Jan 2024 to June 2024 for perf part.  |
| Nokia | Fine with work plan |
|  |  |

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

*One of the two formats, i.e. either example 1 or 2 can be used by moderators.*

### CRs/TPs comments collection

*For close-to-finalize Wis and maintenance work, comments collections can be arranged for TPs and CRs. For ongoing Wis, suggest to focus on open issues discussion on 1st round.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| CR/TP number | Comments collection |
|  | Company A |
| Company B |
|  |
|  | Company A |
| Company B |
|  |
|  | Company A |
| Company B |
|  |
| YYY | Company A |
| Company B |
|  |

## Summary for 1st round

### Open issues

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 1st round, list all the identified open issues and tentative agreements or candidate options and suggestion for 2nd round i.e. WF assignment.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Status summary  |
| Sub-topic #1-1 | **Issue 1-1-1: Work Plan*** + Work plan is provided at [R4-2213450](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2213450.zip)

*Tentative agreements: Endorse the work plan* |

### CRs/TPs

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 1st round and provides recommendation on CRs/TPs Status update*

*Note: The tdoc decisions shall be provided in Section 3 and this table is optional in case moderators would like to provide additional information.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| CR/TP number | CRs/TPs Status update recommendation  |
| XXX | *Based on 1st round of comments collection, moderator can recommend the next steps such as “agreeable”, “to be revised”* |

## Discussion on 2nd round (if applicable)

# Topic #2: RRM requirements for Rel-17 MUSIM gaps

*Main technical topic overview. The structure can be done based on sub-agenda basis.*

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| T-doc number | Company | Proposals / Observations |
| [**R4-2211591**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2211591.zip) | Charter Communications, Inc | **Observation 1: No additional impacts to collect L1 and L3 measurements and RLM/BFD for MUSIM gaps as for legacy measurement gaps.****Proposal 1: Apply the framework agreements from concurrent gaps to define priority rules, collision between gaps and the definition of a collision for MUSIM.** **Proposal 2: MUSIM gaps should have high priority in the event of a collision** |
| [**R4-2211912**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2211912.zip) | Apple | **Proposal 1: priority-based gap collision handling introduced in concurrent gaps design can be reused for collisions between MUSIM gap and legacy measurement gap.****Proposal 2: RAN4 can further study gap-sharing based collisions handling in R18.****Proposal 3: as baseline solution, UE can only perform gap-less L3 measurement and L1 operation outside MUSIM gap. Other solutions are not precluded to handle collision between MUSIM gap and SMTC/RS for L1 operation.** |
| [**R4-2211939**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2211939.zip) | CMCC | ***Proposal 1: it is necessary to discuss whether MUSIM gap patterns can be used for RRM measurement or only used for MUSIM:**** ***MUSIM gap pattern #0 ~#13, more discussion is needed on whether can be used for RRM measurement, since these MUSIM gap patterns are same as legacy gap patterns.***
* ***MUSIM gap pattern #14 ~ #26, not suitable for RRM measurement***
* ***MUSIM gap pattern # 27 and #28, cannot be used for RRM measurement***

***Proposal 2: for collision between different MUSIMs, priority rule can be used as baseline.******Proposal 3: for collision between MUSIM gap and legacy measurement gap, priority rule can be used as baseline.*** |
| [**R4-2211969**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2211969.zip) | Xiaomi | **Observation 1:** **MUSIM gaps can only be used for MUSIM operations and cannot be used for measurements configured for Network A.****Proposal 1: Priority based gap collision handling introduced in Rel-17 for concurrent gap could be used as baseline for collision handling between MUSIM gap and legacy measurement gap, and between different MUSIM gaps, i.e. case 1 and case 3.****Proposal 2: The gap proximity condition of concurrent gap collision could be reused for MUSIM gap collision.****Proposal 3: The principle of defining scaling factor Kp and Kgap for multi-concurrent gaps are applied to the calculation of Kp and Kgap in case 1 and case 3.****Proposal 4: The principle of defining P value for L1 measurement and RLM/BFD measurement in Rel-17 is applied to the calculation of P value in case 1 and case 3.****Proposal 5: RAN4 to define MUSIM gap overhead for MUSIM gap(s).****Proposal 6: RAN4 to define the requirements for Network B in RRC idle/inactive.** |
| [**R4-2212061**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2212061.zip) | OPPO | **Proposal-1: Define the extended measurement period in NW-A due to the collision with MUSIM gap.****Proposal-2: Define the measurement period in NW-B when MUSIM gap is not dropped, and deprioritize the scenario when MUSIM gap is dropped due to collision.****Proposal-3: The condition “distance between the two occasions is equal to or smaller than 4m” could be used as baseline to define MUSIM gap collision in case 1 and case 3.****Proposal-4: The condition “SMTC is overlapping with MUSIM gap” could be used as baseline for MUSIM gap collision in case 2.****Proposal-5: The condition “L1 measurement resource is overlapping with MUSIM gap” could be used as baseline for MUSIM gap collision in case 4.****Proposal-6: Reuse priority rule to handle gap collision in case 1 and case 3, and inform RAN2 to design signalling for the association between MUSIM gaps and priority information.** **Proposal-7: In case 2 and case 4, MUSIM gap should be prioritized over SMTC/L1 resource by default.****Proposal-8: For defining requirements in NW-A, update the following scaling factor by considering the collision with MUSIM gaps:*** **Type 1: the scaling factor Kp for L3 measurements without gap**
* **Type 2: the scaling factor Kgap for L3 measurements with gap**
* **Type 3: the scaling factor P for L1 measurements**.

**Proposal-9: Discuss whether and how to determine the time window W when aperiodic MUSIM gap with higher priority is involved in collision.** |
| [**R4-2212209**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2212209.zip) | Qualcomm Incorporated | **Observation 1: MUSIM gaps do not fulfil any measurement objectives on network A.****Proposal 1: Leverage the priority rule approach developed for Rel-17 concurrent MG enhancement to resolve collisions between MUSIM gaps and measurement gaps.*** **FFS: Discuss the relative priority of MUSIM gaps vs. legacy (pre Rel-17) measurement gaps**
* **FFS: Discuss the relative priority of MUSIM gaps vs. Rel-17 measurement gap enhancements (concurrent MG, pre-configured MG, NCSG)**

**Proposal 1a: Request RAN2 to introduce optional ignalling so that the UE can request the priority level of MUSIM gaps (relative to measurement gaps) via UAI.****Proposal 2: RAN4 will discuss separately how to define and resolve collisions between MUSIM gaps.****Proposal 3: No measurement requirements in network B will be defined by RAN4** |
| [**R4-2212343**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2212343.zip) | Apple | Proposal 1: Address the MUSIM related RF issue when for the uninterrupted operation a UE should use particular band/carrier combinations for two SIM cards.Proposal 2: Address the MUSIM related RF issue when for the uninterrupted operation a UE should apply power back-off larger than existing MPR/A-MPR limits. |
| [**R4-2212687**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2212687.zip) | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | 1. MUSIM gaps provide enough room for Ues to perform idle/inactive measurements in Network B.
2. RAN4 not to change idle/inactive requirements on Network B for a UE configured with MUSIM gaps.
3. RAN4 to specify that all the requirements outside MUSIM gaps for Network A are not impacted by the MUSIM operation.
4. RAN4 needs to define the conditions in which the UE is considered to be in MUSIM operation mode.

Single SIM requirements do not consider the case of measurement gaps overlapping SMTCs during interruption times for RRC\_Connected state mobility. MUSIM gaps may overlap with SMTCs during handover and re-establishment.1. RAN4 to discuss how to handle overlap in SMTC and between MUSIM gaps for RRC connected mobility procedures in Network A.
2. Discuss if concurrent MUSIM and other Rel17/18 measurement gap types is in the scope of this WID or NR\_MG\_enh2.
3. RAN4 to start work on simultaneous RRC connected networks once RAN2 have progressed on the topic.
 |
| [**R4-2212765**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2212765.zip) | Ericsson | ***Observation 1: Two periodic gaps are used in MUSIM as one for measurement and one for paging monitoring.******Observation 2: There is no MUSIM periodic gap collision if the distance between the SSB for AGC and PO is larger than 5ms.******Proposal 1: Sharing the gap between network A’s mobility measurements and the MUSIM measurements is precluded.******Proposal 2: Concurrent gaps framework can be reused for MUSIM gaps.******Proposal 3: MUSIM gaps can be believed as a gap set with a specific usage and priority within the ConMGs.******Proposal 4: UE has the responsibility to avoid the gap collision between MUSIM gaps with other MGs for NW-A.******Proposal 5: MUSIM gaps can be defined as the lowest priority, and periodic MUSIM gaps will be dropped once the gap dropping rule defined in Con-MGs is met.******Proposal 6: UE can request aperiodic MUSIM gap with a higher priority. In this case, aperiodic MUSIM gap should be prioritized.******Proposal 7: NW-A’s RRM procedure, including DL SMTC and UL CSI-RS, PRACH, should have higher priority than MUSIM gaps. The MUSIM periodic gaps should be dropped once the gap proximity rule is met.******Proposal 8: To avoid the collision within MUSIM gaps, UE should request a single periodic gap instead of two separate periodic gaps provided that the distance between these two gaps is shorter than 5ms.******Proposal 9: Aperiodic gap should have higher priority than periodic gaps once collision happens within MUSIM gaps.******Proposal 10: RAN4 to define measurement requirement for NW-B Idle mode which is helpful for both NW-A and NW-B.*** |
| [**R4-2213451**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2213451.zip) | vivo | **Proposal 1: All specification work listed in the 2nd item “Define RRM requirements for Rel-17 MUSIM gaps” are based on existing Rel-17 MUSIM gap patterns defined in Table 9.1.10-1 of [4] and based on corresponding RAN2’s signalling structure defined at Rel-17. All MUSIM gaps cannot be used by any measurements configured for network A and all network A measurements are carried out outside MUSIM gaps.****Proposal 2: Regarding network A measurement with measurement gaps or without measurement gaps, the corresponding measurement requirements on network A should be extended in order to address the impacts of MUSIM gaps due to the collision between MUSIM gaps with other gaps or occasions for measurement.** **Proposal 3: when the MUSIM gap neither collides with any Rel-17 legacy gap nor collide with any SMTC/SSB or any resources for L1 measurement; or only MUSIM gaps are configured and the MUSIM gap does not collide with any SMTC/SSB or any resources for L1 measurement, network A measurement requirements can be reused.****Proposal 4: For the scenario where the MUSIM gap collides only with Rel-17 legacy gap, gap collision issue between MUSIM gap and Rel-17 legacy gaps should be solved firstly. For the gap collision rules, Rel-17 priority based gap handling rules can be considered as one possible solution besides other enhanced solutions.****Proposal 5: when MUSIM gap collides only with SMTC/SSB or any resource for L1 measurement, collision handling rules should be defined before measurement requirements specification.** **Proposal 6: when MUSIM gap collides with both legacy gaps and SMTC/SSB or any resource for L1 measurement, the 1st step is to resolve the collision between gaps. After finishing gap collision handling, principles used for scenario 3 can be reused****Proposal 7: The necessity to define network B requirements should be discussed further. If there is a consensus to specify network B requirement, its priority should be lower compared with the work for network A requirements and could be carried out at the second phase in the WI time frame****Proposal 8: If there is a consensus on defining network B requirements, the following requirements are purposed to be defined for network B idle/inactive state. Requirements are not needed for other “best effort” based functions.** * **UE measurement capability**
* **Measurement and evaluation of serving cell**
* **Measurements of intra-frequency NR cells**
* **Measurements of inter-frequency NR cells**
* **Measurements of inter-RAT E-UTRAN cells**
* **Maximum interruption in paging reception**
* **Measurements for UE configured with relaxed measurement criterion**

**Proposal 9: In case 1, gaps to be considered include all gaps defined till Rel-17 including Pre-MG, NCSG, concurrent gap, ePos, gaps for NTN and legacy gaps for measurement.****Proposal 10: For gap collision case 1 and 3, priority based solution can be considered. Enhanced solutions on gap collision beyond priority based solution are also open for discussion.** **Proposal 11: For priority based solution, priorities can be allocated to each gap patterns and when two or more gap collide, only the highest priority gap is kept and all other gaps are dropped.** |
| [**R4-2213562**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2213562.zip) | Huawei, HiSilicon | **Proposal 1: For collisions between MUSIM gap and legacy measurement gap (i.e. Rel-15 to Rel-17 measurement gaps), re-use the priority rule as defined for Rel-17 concurrent MGs.****Proposal 2: For collisions between MUSIM gap and legacy measurement gap (i.e. Rel-15 to Rel-17 measurement gaps), RAN4 to discuss the order for applying the priority when number of colliding MGs is larger than 2.****Proposal 3: For collisions between MUSIM gap and measurement outside MG (including both L1 and L3), MUSIM gap should apply, and the L1 or L3 measurement resources colliding with MUSIM gaps are dropped.** **Proposal 4: For collisions between MUSIM gaps, re-use the priority rule as defined for Rel-17 concurrent MGs as baseline. FFS whether and how to address the scenario where MUSIM gaps are of same priority is considered.****Proposal 5: For measurements configured by NW A, re-use the ‘counting’ approach defined for Rel-17 concurrent MGs to define scaling factor for the impacts of MUSIM gaps** **Proposal 6: If requirements for measurements in NW B are to be defined, re-use the existing requirements for IDLE/INACTIVE as baseline with DRX cycle replaced by max(DRX cycle, MGRP)** |
| [**R4-2213748**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2213748.zip) | MediaTek inc. | **Observation #1:** NW A can reconfigure the UE with up to 4 MUSIM gaps (3 periodic and 1 aperiodic).**Observation #2:** In Rel-17, when the UE is configured with Concurrent measurement gaps, two measurement gap occasions are considered colliding if at least one of the following conditions is met:* the two occasions are fully or partially overlapping in time domain, or
* the distance between the two occasions is equal to or smaller than [4] ms.

**Observation #3:** MUSIM gaps could collide with a single legacy MG (e.g., Rel-15/16 MG) or multiple legacy MGs (e.g., Rel-17 Concurrent MGs).**Observation #4:** MUSIM gaps periodicity can be larger than SMTC window periodicity, i.e., SMTC occasions can occur more often than MUSIM gaps occasions.Furthermore, the following proposals have been introduced:**Proposal #1:** Introduce new requirements for intra-/inter-frequency and inter-RAT measurements in NW A when the UE is configured with MUSIM gaps.**Proposal #2:** No new requirements to be introduce for NW B measurements in RRC\_IDLE/\_INACTIVE state, however, further study the impact on NW B measurement requirements considering different scenarios.**Proposal #3:** MUSIM gap is considered colliding with the legacy measurement gaps or other MUSIM gaps if at least one of the following conditions is met:* the two occasions are fully or partially overlapping in time domain, or
* the distance between the two occasions is equal to or smaller than [4] ms.

**Proposal #4:** Apply priority rule for handling MUSIM gaps collision with the legacy MGs, where:* UE only performs the measurements associated to a higher priority gap.
* The lower priority gap occasions are considered as dropped.
* Data scheduling is resumed on the dropped gap occasions.

**Proposal #5:** Method 1: First, apply gap-group priority to handle collisions between different gaps groups (i.e., MUSIM gaps group and legacy MGs group). Then, within each gap group, apply different priorities to handle the collision between the gaps within the same group.**Proposal #6:** Method 2: Define individual priorities for all the gaps, regardless of their related gaps-group (i.e., MUSIM gaps group or legacy MGs group). Only a single list of priorities is required.**Proposal #7:** RAN4 to study the issue when the priority is all assigned by NW A, under the current signalling framework, which might lead to missing significant activities in NW B due to MUSIM gap collision handling (e.g., reading the paging in NW B, which are unknown to NW A).**Proposal #8:** MUSIM gaps collision with the SMTC window can be handled by puncturing the collided SMTC occasions with the non-dropped MUSIM gaps. |
|  |  |  |

## Open issues summary

*Before e-Meeting, moderators shall summarize list of open issues, candidate options and possible WF (if applicable) based on companies’ contributions.*

### Sub-topic 2-1 General aspects

**Issue 2-1-1: On MUSIM gap patterns**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: All specification work listed in the 2nd item of WI “Define RRM requirements for Rel-17 MUSIM gaps” are based on existing Rel-17 MUSIM gap patterns defined in Table 9.1.10-1 of TS38.133 (vivo)
* Recommended WF
	+ Suggest to agree option 1

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Apple | Fine with option 1. |
| Ericsson | Fine with option 1. |
| MTK | Fine with option 1. |
| CMCC | OK with option 1. |
| Huawei  | Fine with option 1. |
| Xiaomi | Fine with option 1. |
| Charter | Fine with option 1. |
| Qualcomm | Support option 1. |
| OPPO | Fine with option 1. |
| vivo | Ok with option 1 |
| Nokia | We prefer to keep open so that gap length can also be further discussed.  |

**Issue 2-1-2: On MUSIM gap pattern purpose**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: All MUSIM gaps cannot be used by any measurements configured by network A and all network A measurements are carried out outside MUSIM gaps. (xiaomi Ericsson vivo)
		- Option 1a: MUSIM gaps do not fulfil any measurement objectives on network A (Qualcomm)
	+ Option 2: it is necessary to discuss whether MUSIM gap patterns can be used for RRM measurement or only used for MUSIM (CMCC)
* Moderator note: In Note 1 of Table 9.1.10-2 of TS38.133 the purpose of MUSIM gap is only for target network.
* Recommended WF
	+ Suggest to agree option 1.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Apple | Support option 1, considering the scope is limited to R17 functionality. |
| Ericsson | Option 1.Once the meas. gap will be reused for MUSIM measurements, network A doesn’t know how many MOs will be measured in the gap. Thus, these configured MUSIM gaps should be used by MUSIM measurement exclusively other than sharing with other MOs for NW-A. On the other hand, the configured legacy MG also cannot be used for MUSIM measurements. |
| MTK | Support option 1. The purpose of MUSIM gaps is to monitor NW B only. All the measurements performed in NW A should be outside MUSIM gaps. The purpose of MUSIM gaps also captured in 9.1.10 of 38.133: “If the UE requires gap patterns for MUSIM purpose, such as cell identification and measurement, paging monitoring, SIB acquisition, and/or on-demand SI request of the target cell in the target network, then the network may provide one or more per-UE MUSIM gap pattern(s) for concurrent monitoring of all frequency layers for MUSIM via MUSIM-GapConfig [2].” |
| CMCC | The motivation we propose option 2 is that MUSIM gap pattern #0 ~#13 are same as legacy gap patterns, it may be necessary to discuss whether they are only for MUSIM or can be used for the measurement of network A. According to companies’ clarification, we are also fine with option 1. |
| Huawei  | Option 1.The applicability of MUSIM gaps is already defined in Rel-17. Technically, we also think using MUSIM gaps for NW A measurements can cause additional complexity in the spec and implementation.  |
| Xiaomi | Support option 1. |
| Charter | Support option 1. |
| Qualcomm | Support Option 1/1a. |
| OPPO | Support option 1, and we are also open to option 2 in case that measurements configured by NW-A is fully overlapped with MUSIM gap. |
| vivo | Support option 1. To us option 1a is the same as option 1.  |
| Nokia | We support Option 1. MUSIM gaps used only used for MUSIM, and if gap collision occurs gap priority scheme should apply.  |

### Sub-topic 2-2 On network A requirements

**Issue 2-2-1: Principle on network A requirements**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: Define the extended measurement period in NW-A due to the collision with MUSIM gap (oppo vivo)
	+ Option 2: Introduce new requirements for intra-/inter-frequency and inter-RAT measurements in NW A when the UE is configured with MUSIM gaps (MTK)
* Recommended WF
	+ Topic is covered by following items, no need to discuss here.

**Issue 2-2-2:** **Scenario where network A requirement can be directly reused**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: when the MUSIM gap neither collides with any Rel-17 legacy gap nor collide with any SMTC/SSB or any resources for L1 measurement; or only MUSIM gaps are configured and the MUSIM gap does not collide with any SMTC/SSB or any resources for L1 measurement, network A measurement requirements can be reused. (vivo)
	+ Option 2: RAN4 to specify that all the requirements outside MUSIM gaps for Network A are not impacted by the MUSIM operation. (Nokia)
* Moderator: Option 1 and 2 may not be exclusive each other. Proponent could check whether they are identical or not.
* Recommended WF

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Apple | To our understanding option 1 and 2 are similar. They are both for non-overlapping scenario. We are fine with both. |
| Ericsson | **Issue 2-2-1: Principle on network A requirements**Agree with the recommended WF.**Issue 2-2-2: Scenario where network A requirement can be directly reused**Option 2.Option 1 is incomplete which only considers the DL SSB other than UL signals, such as PRACH. |
| MTK | Two notes for option 1:* In the first line, Rel -17 should be removed as “when the MUSIM gap neither collides with any ~~Rel-17~~ legacy gap nor collide…”
* We are not sure if the scenarios specified in Option 1 are the only ones when the requirements for NW A will not be impacted, for example, what if collision happens between MUSIM gaps and RACH procedure in NW A?

Option 2 is not very clear.In our opinion, we should specify the requirements which are impacted by MUSIM operation not the other way around. We cannot list all the 38.133 requirements which may not be impacted by MUSIM.  |
| CMCC | For Option 1, we share similar view with MTK that “~~Rel-17~~ legacy gap” is better. And in our understanding option 1 targets for the DL related requirements/procedure. And we agree with Ericsson and MTK that the impact on UL related requirements/procedure, i.e. RACH procedure, also need to be considered.Option 2 is more general, but it is not clear enough. For example, “outside MUSIM gaps” includes two cases: fully non-overlap, partial overlap. For the case with partial overlap, the requirements of network A are impacted, may be a factor is needed to xclude the gap occasions which are overlap with MUSIM gaps.One suggestion is that on top of option 1, the impact on UL related requirements/procedure can be added. |
| Huawei  | On option 1, we can understand the intention, and we also agree that if MUSIM gaps do not overlap with any measurement resource (SSB, CSI-RS) in NW A, the current measurement requirements would apply. On the other hand, we are not sure if we need a specific agreement for this scenario, i.e. the requirements with MUSIM gaps will be generic and this is just a special case. For example, in Rel-15 in the requirements for measurement without MG we also consider the impacts of MG with Kp, but if the SMTC is fully non-overlapped with MG, then Kp=1 would apply. On option 2, it is not fully clear to us, e.g. we are not sure how it works with partial overlapping case as mentioned by CMCC. |
| Xiaomi | For option 1, we agree that under the scenarios listed in this proposal, the existing requirements could be reused. We can further check the RACH procedure impacts mentioned by companies. From our understanding, option 2 is more generic proposal that may not be limited to the scope of scenario where network A requirement can be directly reused. Further clarification is needed. |
| Charter | For option 2, we believe it is good to identify when Network A is impacted or not. However, we would prefer to specify when Network A is impacted though.  |
| Qualcomm | For option 1, we think “legacy gap” should be replaced with “measurement gap” (including NCSG). Similar to MTKs comment, it is good to have a baseline understanding about when requirements are not affected but the discussion should focus how to handle cases where requirements would be affected. E.g. MUSIM collisions with SMTC vs. measurements gaps may be defined differently.Option 2 seems too broad. Many RRM requirements are defined over long periods of time and there may be some impact from MUSIM gaps, e.g. if occasional/partial collisions occur.  |
| OPPO | We agree with the principles behind the two proposals.  |
| vivo | We agree most comments regarding option 1 and 2 and agree that the focus should be network A requirement being impacted. |
| Nokia | We prefer Option 2, but agree that both options are similar (different wording). We think that once MUSIM gaps are assigned by network A, the UE should perform measurements regarding Network B using the gaps. Hence, outside the gaps network A is under normal (non-MUSIM) condition and legacy measurement requirements apply (option1). |

**Issue 2-2-3: Principle on layer 3 measurement requirements after gap collision handling**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: The principle of defining scaling factor Kp and Kgap for multi-concurrent gaps are applied to the calculation of Kp and Kgap for layer 3 measurement (xiaomi oppo)
		- Option 1a: re-use the ‘counting’ approach defined for Rel-17 concurrent MGs to define scaling factor for the impacts of MUSIM gaps (Huawei)
	+ Option 2: Define requirements after solving gap collision issue (vivo)
* Recommended WF

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Apple | Fine with option 1/1a. |
| Ericsson | It’s too early to discuss this issue. If the agreement follows ConMGs dropping rule, it’s easy to derive the conclusion. |
| MTK | Option 1 seems fine, but we also agree with option 2, i.e., we should first agree on how to handle the collisions, then we can decide on how to define these requirements. |
| CMCC | Agree with option 2, firstly discuss how to solve the collision issue, then we can discuss the detailed requirements. |
| Huawei  | We can support option 2 at this stage.If the collision handling from Rel-17 con-MG is re-used, then Option 1 and 1a can be applied. |
| Xiaomi | We support option 1 and 1a.Also can accept option 2 to discuss the collision handling issue first. |
| Qualcomm | Agree to address collisions first. |
| OPPO | Option 1. The current priority rules and scaling factors Kp/Kgap defined for concurrent gaps could be considered as the starting point for MUSIM gap. We can also discuss this issue after the solutions to handle gap collision are agreed. |
| vivo | Ok with option 2. Same view as Huawei that is if Rel-17 con-MG is reused, Option 1 and 1a is ok.  |
| Nokia | We can agree with Option 2 as a first step. The exact scaling factor definition should be FFS at this stage of the work.  |

**Issue 2-2-4: Principle on L1 measurement requirements after gap collision handling**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: The principle of defining P value for L1 measurement and RLM/BFD measurement in Rel-17 cam be reused (xiaomi oppo)
		- Option 1a: re-use the ‘counting’ approach defined for Rel-17 concurrent MGs to define scaling factor for the impacts of MUSIM gaps (Huawei)
	+ Option 2: Define requirements after solving gap collision issue (vivo)
* Recommended WF

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Apple | Fine with option 1/1a. |
| Ericsson | It’s too early to discuss this issue. If the agreement follows ConMGs dropping rule, it’s easy to derive the conclusion. |
| MTK | Option 1 seems fine, but we also agree with option 2, i.e., we should first agree on how to handle the collisions, then we can decide on how to define these requirements. |
| CMCC | Same comments as for Issue 2-2-3, agree with option 2, firstly discuss how to solve the collision issue, then we can discuss the detailed requirements. |
| Huawei  | Same comment as for issue 2-2-3. |
| Xiaomi | We support option 1 and 1a.Also can accept option 2 to discuss the collision handling issue first. |
| Qualcomm | Same comments as in issue 2-2-3. |
| OPPO | Support option 1/1a. Different from the collision between MUSIM gaps and other gaps in issue 2-2-3, this issue is talking about the collision between L1 measurement configured by NW-A and MUSIM gap, we think the MUSIM gap should be prioritized by default.  |
| vivo | FFS |
| Nokia | We can agree with Option 2 as a first step. The exact scaling factor definition should be FFS at this stage of the work.  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

### Sub-topic 2-3 Gap collision handling

**Issue 2-3-1: General principles on gap collision handling**

* Proposals:
	+ - Option 1: For priority based solution, priorities can be allocated to each existing gap patterns and when two or more gap collide, only the highest priority gap is kept and all other gaps are dropped (vivo MTK)
		- Option 2: Apply gap-group priority to handle collisions between different gaps groups (i.e., MUSIM gaps group and legacy MGs group). Then, within each gap group, apply different priorities to handle the collision between the gaps within the same group (MTK, Ericsson)
		- Option 2a: MUSIM gaps can be believed as a gap set with a specific usage and priority within the ConMGs (Ericsson)
* Recommended WF

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Apple | Support option 1 for simplicity.  |
| Ericsson | Option 2.From our understanding, option 1 will make the issue too complex. We need to further discuss the max gap number and the additional overhead, gap dropping rule due to multiple gaps. If we go option 2, all the things will be easy. MUSIM gap will be one of the gap in ConMGs. We can inherit the agreements for the max gap number and RAN4 can avoid the discussion for overhead, gap dropping tule due to multiple gaps.Especially, from NW’s perspective, all MUSIM periodic gaps have no any difference and should apply the same priority. How to handle the UE’s behaviours in each MUSIM gap is a black box and fully up to UE. There is no any further impact except the overall interruption to NW-A.  |
| MTK | Maybe further clarification on these two options, as discussed in our paper, gap priority can be applied in two different ways:* Method 1 (same as Option 1): Apply priority individually for each gap, regardless which gap group they belong to (e.g., MUSIM gap group or legacy MG group)

* Method 2 (same as Option 2): Apply gap-group priority to handle collisions between different gaps groups (i.e., MUSIM gaps group and legacy MGs group). Then apply different priority to handle the collision in each group.

In our view both methods in Option 1 and 2 have their own pros and cons which can be further studied. Maybe we can have a high-level agreement on applying priority rule to handle collisions, but the way how to apply it can be FFS. |
| CMCC | For option 2, two questions for clarification:1. According to RAN2 design, up to 4 gaps can be configured for MUSIM. We would like to know whether these MUSIM gaps have same priority or different priority? In our understanding, these MUSIM gaps can have different priority. We would like to hear companies’ views.
2. According to concurrent MG, different priority applies for different MG. When we handle collisions between different gaps groups (i.e., MUSIM gaps group and legacy MGs group), since there is different priority among legacy gaps, how to determine the priority of legacy MGs group? Or does it mean a group level priority will be configured additionally?
 |
| Huawei  | We support option 1, and FFS whether and how to address the scenario where MUSIM gaps are of same priority is considered.In our understanding, in Rel-17 the priority can be configured for each individual gap. Assuming the priority configuration can be extended to MUSIM gaps, would this provide a more flexible framework than group based priority as in option 2? For example, if NW A configures same priority for the MUSIM gaps, then it is effectively same as a group priority. Not sure if we missed some point here, so clarification from proponents of option 2 is appreciated. As discussed in our paper, for concurrent MGs, all the MGs are configured by NW A, and NW A can well determine the priority for each MG based on the measurement purpose. On the other hand, MUSIM gaps are based on UE requests, and it may be difficult for NW A to determine the priority between different MUSIM gaps, so we may need to consider the scenario where MUSIM gaps are configured with same priority. |
| Xiaomi | Support option 1. From our perspective, we prefer all the gaps, i.e. legacy measurement gaps and MUSIM gaps, have different priority. Open to further study. |
| Charter | We prefer option 2.  |
| Qualcomm | In our view, RAN4 should consider two separate cases:* 1. Collisions between a MUSIM gap and measurement gaps
	2. Collisions between MUSIM gaps

We support adopting a priority-based scheme for both cases but the definition of collisions may be different for cases a and b.For option2, we don’t see a clear need to introduce group-level priorities.With respect to assigning priorities, see our comment under issue 2-3-1-1. |
| OPPO | Support option 1, a unified priority should be associated to each MUSIM gap. |
| vivo | For the gap collision generally we have two different way to move forward :1. Define a priority to each gap no matter the gap belongs to which feature or for which purpose. With this priority and after solving ordering issue below then theoretically, only one gap will be left if multiple gaps (more than 2) collide. 2. Solve the gap collision within each feature (group) firstly, for example when MUSIM gap collides, resolving the collision based on priority (or other) rules. Then solve the gap collision between different feature (groups). We think this method is a little bit complicated and the result could be the same as that of method 1. Hence we prefer option 1.  |
| Nokia | We share the view from MTK, Each gap may have different priority depending on the importance of the procedure to run (e.g. paging monitoring in RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE may be more critical than measurements in certain conditions), However, a group priority may also be needed in case gaps from two groups collide w/ same procedure priority. Hence, we prefer to keep this as FFS |

**Issue 2-3-1-1: On network A priority assignment scheme**

* Proposals:
	+ - Option 1: RAN4 to study the issue when the priority is all assigned by NW A, under the current signalling framework, which might lead to missing significant activities in NW B due to MUSIM gap collision handling (e.g., reading the paging in NW B, which are unknown to NW A) (MTK).
* Recommended WF

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Apple | We are open for further study. According to current design UE can provide MUSIM gap preference. Eventually it is still under control of NW A.  |
| Ericsson | We think RAN4 can further discuss this paging handling issue for NW-B. Furthermore, we also need to consider the paging collision between NW-A and NW-B. |
| Huawei  | We are open to further study, and we have same view as Apple that the configuration of MUSIM gaps is controlled by NW A, including their priorities compared to other MGs. |
| Qualcomm | MUSIM gaps are requested by the UE via UAI and network A can either configure at least one of the requested gaps or no gaps at all, according to RAN2 agreement. So network A does not have complete freedom when it comes to configuring MUSIM gaps.Network A does not know exactly how MUSIM gaps will be used by the UE, except that they are used for MUSIM support. Therefore, network A does not have full context to prioritize MUSIM gaps vs. measurement gaps. Our proposal (option 1a under issue 2-3-2-2) is to allow the UE to optionally request priorities for MUSIM gaps via UAI. If no priority is requested by the UE then a default priority would apply. |
| OPPO | Open to discuss. We think UE could indicate the preferred priority for MUSIM gap, based on the target task/activities in NW-B. RAN2’s work is also needed for signaling design and the request/configure mechanism.  |
| vivo | We have similar understanding as Apple and Huawei that UE can provide some preference when applying MUSIM gaps. Open for discussion |
| Nokia | Not clearCan the proponent company clarify if the priority on the proposal is between 2 MUSIM gaps or 1 MUSIM gap and one NetA related gap? In principle this discussion should be taken after the priorities (based on procedure and/or group), and corresponding levels are settled. At procedure level the priorities should be specified, hence, not decided by NWA and corresponding test case can be agreed. |

**Issue 2-3-2: Collisions between MUSIM gap and legacy measurement gap (i.e., Rel-15 to Rel-17 measurement gaps)**

**Issue 2-3-2-1: Clarification on the scope of Rel-17 legacy gap**

* Proposals:
	+ - Option 1: Discuss if concurrent MUSIM and other Rel17/18 measurement gap types is in the scope of this WID or NR\_MG\_enh2 (Nokia)
		- Option 2: In case 1, gaps to be considered include all gaps defined till Rel-17 including Pre-MG, NCSG and legacy gaps for measurement and other purposes (vivo)
* Recommended WF

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Apple | Concurrent MUSIM and other R17 gaps are in the scope. However, potential new R18 gap is not in current scope. We shall focus on R17 gaps first. If time allows we can further consider new R18 gaps if any. |
| Ericsson | We support option 2.R18 gap is unclear and should be deprioritized. |
| MTK | Option 2. |
| CMCC | OK with option 2. |
| Huawei  | On option 1, we think it is a valid question, and we understand concurrent MUSIM and other Rel17 (but not R18) measurement gap types is in the scope of this WID.We are fine with option 2.  |
| Xiaomi | Fine with option 2.  |
| Qualcomm | Option 2 |
| OPPO | Option 2. |
| vivo | Option 2. For option 1, R17 gaps are fine however R18 gap is not clear and is out of the scope of this study. |
| Nokia | I understand that Rel 17 do no specify collisions with PreMG, NCSG, that is the scope of Rel 18 MG\_Enh2. How do we use Rel 17 as baseline and also define requirements for colisions with PreMG and NCSG? |

**Issue 2-3-2-2: Collisions handling rules between MUSIM gap and legacy measurement gap**

* Proposals:
	+ - Option 1: Priority-based gap collision handling introduced in concurrent gaps design can be used as a base for collisions between MUSIM gap and legacy measurement gap (Charter communications Apple CMCC Xiaomi oppo Qualcomm vivo Huawei MTK Ericsson)
		- Option 1a: Request RAN2 to introduce optional signaling so that the UE can request the priority level of MUSIM gaps (relative to measurement gaps) via UAI (Qualcomm)
		- Option 2: Other enhanced gap collision solutions are open for study. (Apple vivo)
		- Option 3: UE has the responsibility to avoid the gap collision between MUSIM gaps with other MGs for NW-A. (Ericsson)
* Moderator: Option 1 and option 2 are not exclusive each other
* Recommended WF

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Apple | Option 1 and 2 are not mutual exclusive. We support starting from option 1 and further consideration option 2. |
| Ericsson | We support option 1 and 2.For option 1a, we need to check it carefully since RAN2 had already agreed no priority indication from UE in R17. |
| MTK | Support Option 1. We can further discuss option 1a.For Option 3, is up to UE implementation. |
| CMCC | Support option 1, and open to other solutions. |
| Huawei  | Support option 1. Option 2 is also fine.On option 1a, we need more time to check. In our view, the configuration of MUSIM gaps is still controlled by NW A, including their priorities compared to other MGs.On option 3, we agree with MTK that this should be up to UE implementation. |
| Xiaomi | Support option 1, and open to other solutions. |
| Charter | We agree with Apple, option 1 and 2 are not exclusive. We support option 1 and happy to study option 2 further.  |
| Qualcomm | Support option 1 with the clarification that “legacy measurement gaps” includes all measurement gaps is Rel-17.Regarding option 1a (we support), please see our comment under issue 2-3-1-1.We do not support option 3 as a mandate to the UE. E.g. say the UE requests MUSIM gaps which are configured by network A. Then, later on, network A configures a gap that overlaps with one of the MUSIM gaps. The UE cannot be responsible for avoiding collisions in such case. |
| OPPO | Support option 1. |
| vivo | As indicated option 1 and option 2 are not exclusive each other. Support option 1 and 2.Option 3 is up to UE implementation and we cannot see there is any directly impact from option 3 on specs.  |
| Nokia | We agree that priority-based handling will be necessary (option 1&2). This question should be part of the discussion on priorities (based on procedure and/or group), and corresponding levels which has the purpose to resolve potential collision.  |

**Issue 2-3-2-3: Priority of MUSIM against other legacy gaps**

* Proposals:
	+ - Option 1: MUSIM gaps should have high priority in the event of a collision (Charter communications)
		- Option 2: MUSIM gaps can be defined as the lowest priority, and periodic MUSIM gaps will be dropped once the gap dropping rule defined in Con-MGs is met (Ericsson)
* Recommended WF

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Apple | For the sake of flexibility, we can leave it to network control. After receiving MUSIM gap preference, it is up to NW A how to configure the priority level. Option 1 may result in NW A degradation. To avoid that, NW A may choose to configure non-overlapped MUSIM gap which may not be the same as preferred by the UE. Furthermore, NW A may even choose not to configure MUSIM gap just to avoid degradation. |
| Ericsson | Option 2From our understanding, all MUSIM gap procedures are best effort. Thus, the simplest way is setting the lower priority for MUSIM periodic gaps.We’re open to further check the potential impact based on this priority setting, such as paging dropping for NW-B.  |
| MTK | For these options, we don’t think we should have a fixed priority for MUSIM gaps group (i.e., onetime MUSIM gap can be higher priority than legacy MG, another time legacy MG can be higher priority than MUSIM gap). In other words, MUSIM gaps priority should be configurable not fixed. |
| CMCC | Similar view as Apple. It is up to network configuration. |
| Huawei  | Same view as Apple, MTK and CMCC, i.e. it may be straightforward to follow Rel-17 where the gap priority is configured by the NW. |
| Xiaomi | We prefer to leave it to network control. |
| Charter | We are willing to compromise to leave it to network control.  |
| Qualcomm | We support Option 1 as the default relative priority of MUSIM gaps vs. measurement gaps. i.e. by default, MUSIM gaps would have higher priority than measurement gaps.We also support having flexibility to choose different priority level(s). However, we do not think it should be entirely up to network A to select the priority, for the reasons mentioned before (see issue 2-3-1-1). |
| OPPO | It is up to NW-A configuration and UE request to indicate the preferred priority for MUSIM gap.In case of R15 legacy gap without priority, we are fine to discuss default priority. |
| vivo | For this issue we think we only define the scheme where priority can be assigned to a gap. Regarding whether MUSIM gap or other gaps have a relative high or low priority could be up to network implementation.  |
| Nokia | Better to keep as FFS: This needs further discussion to evaluate the impact in details |

**Issue 2-3-2-4: Order for applying the priority when number of colliding MGs is larger than 2**

* Proposals:
	+ - Option 1: For collisions between MUSIM gap and legacy measurement gap (i.e. Rel-15 to Rel-17 measurement gaps), RAN4 to discuss the order for applying the priority when number of colliding MGs is larger than 2. (Huawei)
* Recommended WF

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Apple | The simplest solution could be to drop all gaps except the one with highest priority. We are open for further study. |
| Ericsson | Postpone the discussion.We can further check whether this issue is valid based on the conclusion for issue 2-3-1. |
| MTK | Further study the issue. |
| Huawei  | We are fine with FFS. The point is that the number of gaps that may collide can be larger than 2. |
| Xiaomi | Fine to further study. |
| Qualcomm | Agree this issue should be discussed. There was discussion related to this issue in Rel-17 MG\_enh. |
| OPPO | Open to study. |
| vivo | If only one gap is left no matter how many gaps (>2) collide based on priority rules, we think different order will lead to the same result.  |
| Nokia | Should be FFS |

**Issue 2-3-3: Collisions between MUSIM gap and SMTC and other L3/L1 measurement resources**

**Issue 2-3-3-1: Definiton of collisions between MUSIM gap and SMTC and other L3/L1 measurement resources**

* Proposals:
	+ - Option 1: Condition “SMTC is overlapping with MUSIM gap“ and “L1 measurement resource is overlapping with MUSIM gap” could be used as baseline for MUSIM gap collision with SMTC an L1 measurement resources (oppo)
* Recommended WF

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Apple | Fine with option 1. |
| Ericsson | Don’t understand the proposal. Does any special thing need to be further clarification?  |
| MTK  | Option 1 maybe should be: Condition “SMTC is overlapping with MG“ and “L1 measurement resource is overlapping with MG”could be used as baseline for MUSIM gap collision with SMTC and L1 measurement resources.Given the above correction, we are fine with this proposal. |
| Huawei  | We are fine with option 1 based on MTK’s clarification. |
| Xiaomi | We are fine with option 1 based on MTK’s clarification. |
| Qualcomm | We can agree with option 1 assuming MTKs clarification is correct. |
| OPPO | Support option 1 and MTK’s clarification.To Ericsson, the collision between two gaps is discussed for concurrent gaps in Rel17 and is defined as <=4m. Here we are considering a new collision type between SMTC/measurement resource for NW-A and MUSIM gap for NW-B, we think the definition for collision should be specified at first. |
| vivo | For the condition on collision between MUSIM gap and SMTC, the conditions should be the same as that of legacy conditions when SMTC collides with legacy Rel-16 MG.Support MTK’s update.  |
| Nokia | Proposal is unclear.  |

**Issue 2-3-3-2: Priority of MUSIM against SMTC and other L3/ L1 measurement resources**

* Proposals:
	+ - Option 1: MUSIM gaps should have high priority against SMTC and L1 measurement resources (oppo Huaewi MTK)
		- Option 2: NW-A’s RRM procedure, including DL SMTC and UL CSI-RS, PRACH, should have higher priority than MUSIM gaps. The MUSIM periodic gaps should be dropped once the gap proximity rule is met. (Ericsson)
		- Option 3: As baseline solution, UE can only perform gap-less L3 measurement and L1 operation outside MUSIM gap. Other solutions are not precluded to handle collision between MUSIM gap and SMTC/RS for L1 operation. (Apple)
* Recommended WF

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Apple  | Support option 3. Option 1 is identical to the first sentence of option 3. We are open to further discussion on possible optimization.  |
| Ericsson | We think it’s too early to have any conclusion.Before the group to further discuss this issue, we want to clarify the following scenarios for further discussion.* MUSIM gaps collide with SSB/SMTC for L1/L3 measurement
* MUSIM gaps collide with SSB/SMTC for RRC CONNECTED mobility procedures, such as Handover, SCell activation, TCI state switching, etc.
* MUSIM gaps collide with Paging and system info. update for NW-A
* MUSIM gaps collide with important uplink signals, such as PRACH, CSI-RS reporting which is used to indicate the completion of any RRC CONNECTED mobility procedure for NW-A
 |
| MTK | Support Option 1, which follows the same principle when collision happens between legacy MGs and SMTC. For option 2, PRACH procedure can be higher priority than MUSIM gaps, but not for the other mentioned procedures. Option 3, maybe further clarification is required. |
| Huawei  | Support option 1 which is same as for normal MG.In our view, the final control on MUSIM gap is still at NW A, so NW A could consider its impacts as it does for normal MG. Option 2 can be FFS. |
| Xiaomi | Generally fine with option 1, which is the same way as legacy MG requiremnt. |
| Qualcomm | Support Option 1.Regarding option 3, we believe this is already addressed by issue 2-1-2. i.e. no measurements for network A are performed inside MUSIM gaps. |
| OPPO | Support option 1 as the baseline. |
| vivo | OK with option 1 |
| Nokia | We agree with Ericsson that it is too early to define priorities. For Option 1 we think it is not ok to assign higher priority for MUSIM in comparison to L1 measurements as default. For Option 2 it might be ok, since it prioritizes RRC connected procedures in Network A in comparison to RRC idle procedures in Network B.  |

**Issue 2-3-4: Collisions between different MUSIM gaps**

* Proposals:
	+ - Option 1: priority rule can be used as baseline (Charter CMCC Xiaomi oppo vivo Huawei)
		- Option 2: RAN4 will discuss separately how to define and resolve collisions between MUSIM gaps (Qualcomm)
		- Option 3: To avoid the collision within MUSIM gaps, UE should request a single periodic gap instead of two separate periodic gaps provided that the distance between these two gaps is shorter than 5ms (Ericsson)
		- Option 4: Aperiodic gap should have higher priority than periodic gaps once collision happens within MUSIM gaps. (Ericsson)
		- Option 5: It is UE’s responsibility not to request colliding MUSIM gaps from NW-A (Nokia)
* Recommended WF

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Apple | Support option 1. Meanwhile, so far we don’t see necessity to handle this collision differently on top of collision between MUSIM gaps and legacy gaps. |
| Ericsson | Firstly, we want to point out the fundamental different between ConMGs and MUSIM gaps.In ConMGs, UE will use the MG only to perform measurement. The reason to define the gap dropping rule is UE cannot switch too fast between different gaps for different frequency’s measurement.However, in MUSIM gaps, one periodic gap will be used for measurement, one periodic gap for paging reception and another periodic gap for SIB decoding. We don’t think any issue for UE to perform these procedures in sequentially. On the contrary, UE should perform some procedures together. For example, UE should retune the AGC before the paging reception which had already agreed in Idle mode. In this case, we think both gaps(one for measurement and AGC; one for paging) shouldn’t be dropped. Instead, UE should use a single gap to handle them together. Thus, we don’t see any MUSIM gaps dropping rule need to be defined. On the contrary, if the two gaps meet the proximity rule, UE should request a single periodic gap instead of two separate periodic gaps. Or we can call it as a MUSIM gap merge rule.   |
| MTK | As a high-level agreement Option 1 is fine. Option 2 can be discussed next after agreeing on Option 1.For option 3, we should not define the requirement on how UE should request the gap. This is not the scope of the issue.For Option 4, we also agree that aperiodic gap can be higher priority than the periodic ones. |
| CMCC | Prefer option 1.  |
| Huawei  | Support option 1, and option 2 is also fine. The point raised up by Ericsson can also be considered in option 2.On option 3, we understand it is up to UE implementation to request MUSIM gaps.Option 4 can be FFS, we think the issue of handling aperiodic gap is valid. |
| Xiaomi | Prefer option 1. |
| Charter | We support option 1, but we see option 2 and option 4 as options going forward if an agreement of option 1 is reached. |
| Qualcomm | We agree with the point made by Ericsson that there are differences between MUSIM gaps and measurement gaps. That’s why we proposed (Option 2) to consider different definition and handling of collisions between MUSIM gaps, instead of applying the same approach applied for concurrent MGs. |
| OPPO | Support option 1. |
| vivo | Prefer option 1. Priority based rule should be used as like a final backup to resolve collision between MUSIM gaps. Of course other optimization on gap handing solution between MUSIM could be studied. For option 3, it is reasonable however it is up to UE implementation.  |
| Nokia | Option 5 added. We like to question how likely is this scenario? It should be UE’s responsibility that the MUSIM gaps corresponding to its actions on NW-B are not colliding.”  |

**Issue 2-3-4-1: On MUSIM gap collision definition**

* Proposals:
	+ - Option 1: The gap proximity condition of concurrent gap collision could be reused for MUSIM gap collision (Xiaomi oppo MTK Ericsson)
* Recommended WF

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Apple | Support option 1. |
| Ericsson | We agree to reuse the proximity condition, but to define the merge rule instead of dropping rule. |
| MTK | Support Option 1. But this should be more precise to define MUSIM gap collision with other gaps (e.g., not with SMTC). |
| CMCC | The principle in general is fine. To make it more clear, one question for clarification: for “MUSIM gap collision” in option 1, does it mean collision between ifferent MUSIM gaps? Or it means the collision between MUSIM gaps with other gaps? Or both? |
| Huawei | Support option 1. |
| Xiaomi | Support option 1. From our side, the “MUSIM gap collision” cover both conllision between ifferent MUSIM gaps and collision between MUSIM gaps and other gaps. |
| Charter | We support option 1. |
| Qualcomm | We think RAN4 should consider different definition/handling of collisions between MUSIM gaps. See our comment under issue 2-3-4. |
| OPPO | Support option 1, and we think it should apply for collision between two different MUSIM gaps, and collision between MUSIM gaps and other legacy gaps. |
| vivo | Support option 1 to be used as the condition for the collision between MUSIM gap and other gaps.  |
| Nokia | FFS |

**Issue 2-3-5: On aperiodic gap**

* Proposals:
	+ - Option 1: Discuss whether and how to determine the time window W when aperiodic MUSIM gap with higher priority is involved in collision (oppo)
		- Option 2: UE can request aperiodic MUSIM gap with a higher priority. In this case, aperiodic MUSIM gap should be prioritized. ~~And aperiodic gap should have higher priority than periodic gaps~~ (Ericsson)
* Moderator Note: Option 1 and 2 are not exclusive.
* Recommended WF

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | As we proposed before, dropping MUSIM gaps may have some issues for some important procedure for NW-B. Thus, we think aperiodic gap can be a good complementation for these cases. UE can request an aperiodic gap which can have higher priority. There is not too much performance impact to NW-A since it’s a one shot gap. |
| MTK | For Option 1, W can be defined to be the largest periodicity among all the periodic gaps + Time margin [M] for the one-shot aperiodic gap. M can be FFS.For Option 2, whether and how to capture this in the specs, we need to discuss the priority framework first. |
| Huawei  | On option 1, we think it is a valid issue, but since it is related to how we define the detailed requirements in the spec, it can be FFS and discussed later after RAN4 has conclusion on the principle for handling aperiodic gap. On option 2, we understand it is related to option 4 in issue 2-3-4, so we can we can first focus on the principle for handling aperiodic gap. |
| Qualcomm | Regarding option 2, how will this be requested? See our proposal about UAI signalling (issue 2-3-2-2).FFS on option 1. |
| OPPO | For option 2, higher for aperiodic MUSIM gap is reasonable for some emergency activities in NW-B. but it is up to UE implementation and NW-A configuration.For option 1, if this scenario is reasonable, we should discuss the solution for time window W.  |
| vivo | For option 1, we also think it is a valid issue. Same view as HW that we can discuss it later when we define requirements. For option 2, we think it is related to Issue 2-3-4 (Collisions between different MUSIM gaps) and also related to Issue 2-3-2-3 (Priority of MUSIM against other legacy gaps). Basically our understanding is the priority is allocated by the network and UE could provide some assistance information.  |
| Nokia | FFS |

### Sub-topic 2-4 Network B requirements

**Issue 2-4-1: Whether to define network B requirements**

* Proposals:
	+ - Option 1: Define the requirements for Network B in RRC idle/inactive (xiaomi Ericsson)
		- Option 2: No measurement requirements in network B will be defined by RAN4 (Qualcomm)
		- Option 3: No impact on Network B requirements provided that the gaps are configured in Network A. and RAN4 not to change idle/inactive requirements on Network B (Nokia)
		- Option 4: If there is a consensus to specify network B requirement, its priority should be lower compared with the work for network A requirements and could be carried out at the second phase in the WI time frame (vivo)
		- Option 5: If requirements for measurements in NW B are to be defined, re-use the existing requirements for IDLE/INACTIVE as baseline with DRX cycle replaced by max(DRX cycle, MGRP) (Huawei)
		- Option 6: No new requirements to be introduce for NW B measurements in RRC\_IDLE/\_INACTIVE state, however, further study the impact on NW B measurement requirements considering different scenarios. (MTK)
* Recommended WF

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Apple | We consider requirements for NW B as low priority, i.e. option 4.  |
| Ericsson | Option 1.We think it’s important to define UE’s requirement for NW B. Otherwise, the whole MUSIM gaps will be a black box for both NW-A and NW-B. For example, UE should follow the cell evaluation requirement for NW-B to guarantee the performance in NW-B’s Idle mode. |
| MTK | We are fine with Option 2 since it is not straight forward to identify the new requirements in NW B (in IDLE/INACTIVE) when we could have different configurations for MUSIM gaps. |
| Huawei  | Option 2 is our first preference. Same reason as mentioned by MTK. |
| Xiaomi | Support option 1. From our perspective, the measurements on Network B are conducted based on the throughout loss performance of Network A, so it is fair to define RRM requirements for Network B.We can also accept option 4 to deprioritize the NW B requirements |
| Charter | We support option 1. We think Network B should be able to always guarantee receiving transmission, and thus need to ensure to be with the best cell in the network. Therefore, although in idle mode, measurement requirement should be needed to fulfill the guarantee.  |
| Qualcomm | We support option 2. From our discussion paper:“Any new requirements would likely be dependent on the combination of MUSIM gaps that are requested by the UE. Since there are more than twenty MUSIM gap patterns and the UE can request up to 3 periodic gaps (plus one aperiodic gap), there are many such combinations. Additionally, there are no mandatory gap patterns for MUSIM so it would not be possible to define a test case configuration featuring specific gap patterns. All these factors would make the requirements hard to verify.” |
| OPPO | Support option 2 and 4. |
| vivo | To our understanding the intention of MUSIM gaps is to guarantee network A performance. For the network B requirements, if it will be defined, the items needs be defined could be the same as that of network A idle state, if not less. Ok with option 2 and 4.  |
| Nokia | We prefer Option 3, which we believe is equivalent to Option 2. |

**Issue 2-4-2: Scope of network B requirements**

* Proposals:
	+ - Option 1: If there is a consensus on defining network B requirements, the following requirements are purposed to be defined for network B idle/inactive state. Requirements are not needed for other “best effort” based functions. (vivo)
		- UE measurement capability
		- Measurement and evaluation of serving cell
		- Measurements of intra-frequency NR cells
		- Measurements of inter-frequency NR cells
		- Measurements of inter-RAT E-UTRAN cells
		- Maximum interruption in paging reception
		- Measurements for UE configured with relaxed measurement criterion
* Recommended WF

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | FFS |
| MTK | This issue should be based on the conclusion of Issue 2-4-1, whether we want to define network B requirements.  |
| Huawei  | Pending on issue 2-4-1. |
| vivo | Depending on issue 2-4-1 |
| Nokia | Agree with MTK. No need to discuss scope before Issue 2-4-1 is resolved.  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Issue 2-4-3:Principles on network B requirements**

* Proposals:
	+ - Option 1: Define the measurement period in NW-B when MUSIM gap is not dropped, and deprioritize the scenario when MUSIM gap is dropped due to collision (oppo)
* Recommended WF

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | We can further check this issue later. |
| MTK | This issue should be based on the conclusion of Issue 2-4-1, whether we want to define network B requirements.  |
| Huawei  | Pending on issue 2-4-1. |
| OPPO | We are also fine to not define requirements for NW-B. |
| vivo | We understand the logic of this proposal however it depends on issue 2-4-1 |
| Nokia |  No need to discuss principles before Issue 2-4-1 is resolved |
|  |  |

### Sub-topic 2-5 Others

**Issue 2-5-1: MUSIM overhead**

* Proposals:
	+ - Option 1: RAN4 to define MUSIM gap overhead for MUSIM gap(s) (Xiaomi)
* Recommended WF

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | We don’t think it’s necessary to define the overhead for MUSIM gaps.We need to wait the agreement in Rel-17 ConMGs. |
| MTK | This issue is already discussed in Concurrent Gap email thread [211], we can wait for their conclusion. |
| Huawei  | We think it is a valid issue, but it may not be urgent. Suggest FFS. |
| Xiaomi | UE data transmission in NW A would be interrupted during the MGL of the MUSIM gap(s). To avoid high throughput degradation of Network A, we think the gap overhead threshold should be defined for UE configured with MUSIM gap(s). We are fine to refer to the conclusion in concurrent gap. |
| Qualcomm | FFS for now. It can be discussed further once more progress is made. |
| OPPO | Not define MUSIM gap overhead unless it is agreed in concurrent gaps.  |
| vivo | To our understanding this one is out of scope of WI. Suggest FFS |
| Nokia | Still under discussion in Rel 17 , suggest FFS.  |

**Issue 2-5-2: Conditions in which the UE is allowed to request MUSIM gaps**

* Proposals:
	+ - Option 1: RAN4 needs to define the conditions in which the UE is considered to be in MUSIM operation mode (Nokia)
* Recommended WF

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Fine with option 1. |
| MTK | This might not be necessary. |
| Huawei  | We understand we are considering the scenario where a MUSIM UE is in CONNECTED under NW A and in IDLE in NW B. Not sure if anything further needs to be defined. |
| Qualcomm | We do not think RAN4 needs to define such conditions. |
| vivo | Same view as QC, do not think we need define such conditions. |
| Nokia | We agree with Option 1. We think it is good to clarify those conditions.  |
|  |  |

**Issue 2-5-3: Conflicting bands and band combinations for MUSIM**

* Proposals:
	+ - Option 1: Address the MUSIM related RF issue when for the uninterrupted operation a UE should use particular band/carrier combinations for two SIM cards. (Apple)
* Moderator Note: The option is out of the scope however it is ok to collect comments here this meeting. And no official decisions on this issue will be made in this meeting.
* Recommended WF

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | We don’t think this is a RRM issue. It should be discussed in RF session. |
| MTK | This is an RF related issue, and I think it is related to when UE is in Connected state on NW A and NW B simultaneously, which should not be discussed in this meeting. |
| Apple | @**all**: It is the RF related issue as indicated in the paper. Unfortunately, we do not have a dedicated RF agenda item, but that does not mean that the issue is not there. So, one the intentions behind this paper was raise the awareness of this problem and that RAN4 should consider it to enable proper Dual-Rx/Dual-Tx functionality.  |
| Huawei | Suggest FFS |
| vivo | Suggest FFS |
| Nokia | Dual-RX/Dual-Tx case belongs to Rel. 18 UEs. Moderator notes under 2-5-5 also applies here.“ In [RP-220955] it mentions “The work item shall identify whether the WI (Enhancements for MUSIM procedures to operate in RRC\_CONNECTED state simultaneously in NW A and NW B) will have RAN3 or RAN4 impacts by RAN#99”* Recommended WF

Depending on conclusion of RAN#99 and not necessary to have further discussion |
|  |  |

**Issue 2-5-4: Power back-off for MUSIM**

* Proposals:
	+ - Option 1: Address the MUSIM related RF issue when for the uninterrupted operation a UE should apply power back-off larger than existing MPR/A-MPR limits (Apple)
* Moderator Note: The option is out of the scope however it is ok to collect comments here this meeting. And no official decisions on this issue will be made in this meeting.
* Recommended WF

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | We don’t think this is a RRM issue. It should be discussed in RF session. |
| MTK | This is an RF related issue, and I think it is related to when UE is in Connected state on NW A and NW B simultaneously, which should not be discussed in this meeting. |
| Apple | @**all**: It is the RF related issue as indicated in the paper. Unfortunately, we do not have a dedicated RF agenda item, but that does not mean that the issue is not there. So, one the intentions behind this paper was raise the awareness of this problem and that RAN4 should consider it to enable proper Dual-Rx/Dual-Tx functionality.  |
| Huawei | Suggest FFS |
| vivo | We think this RF issue could be valid. Suggest FFS |
| Nokia | Should be RF discussion |
|  |  |

**Issue 2-5-5: On the impact of item 1 of WI (simultaneously RRC connected operation)**

* Proposals:
	+ - Option 1: RAN4 to start work on simultaneous RRC connected networks once RAN2 have progressed on the topic (Nokia)
* Moderator Note: In [RP-220955] it mentions “The work item shall identify whether the WI (Enhancements for MUSIM procedures to operate in RRC\_CONNECTED state simultaneously in NW A and NW B) will have RAN3 or RAN4 impacts by RAN#99”
* Recommended WF
	+ Depending on conclusion of RAN#99 and not necessary to have further discussion

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

### CRs/TPs comments collection

*Major close to finalize Wis and Rel-15 maintenance, comments collections can be arranged for TPs and CRs. For Rel-16 on-going Wis, suggest to focus on open issues discussion on 1st round.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| CR/TP number | Comments collection |
|  | Company A |
| Company B |
|  |
|  | Company A |
| Company B |
|  |
|  | Company A |
| Company B |
|  |
|  |  |

## Summary for 1st round

### Open issues

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 1st round, list all the identified open issues and tentative agreements or candidate options and suggestion for 2nd round i.e. WF assignment.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Status summary  |
| Sub-topic#2-1 | **Issue 2-1-1: On MUSIM gap patterns** * Proposals
	+ Option 1: All specification work listed in the 2nd item of WI “Define RRM requirements for Rel-17 MUSIM gaps” are based on existing Rel-17 MUSIM gap patterns defined in Table 9.1.10-1 of TS38.133 (Apple Ericsson MTK CMCC Huawei Xiaomi Charter Qualcomm Oppo vivo)
	+ Option 2: Keep it open (Nokia)

*Tentative agreements: Based on majority view, suggest to agree option 1**Recommendations for 2nd round: Companies check tentative agreement at 2nd round***Issue 2-1-2: On MUSIM gap pattern purpose** * Proposals
	+ Option 1: All MUSIM gaps cannot be used by any measurements configured by network A and all network A measurements are carried out outside MUSIM gaps. (Apple MTK CMCC Huawei xiaomi Charter Qualcomm oppo Ericsson vivo Nokia)
		- Option 1a: MUSIM gaps do not fulfil any measurement objectives on network A (Qualcomm)
	+ Option 2: it is necessary to discuss whether MUSIM gap patterns can be used for RRM measurement or only used for MUSIM (CMCC)
	+ Option 3: Open to option 2 in case that measurements configured by NW-A is fully overlapped with MUSIM gap (oppo)

*Moderator note: All companies are ok with option 1**Tentative agreements: Option 1**Recommendations for 2nd round: This topic is closed.* |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Status summary  |
| Sub-topic#2-2 | **Issue 2-2-1: Principle on network A requirements*** Proposals
	+ Option 1: Define the extended measurement period in NW-A due to the collision with MUSIM gap (oppo vivo)
	+ Option 2: Introduce new requirements for intra-/inter-frequency and inter-RAT measurements in NW A when the UE is configured with MUSIM gaps (MTK)
* Recommended WF
	+ Topic is covered by following items, no need to discuss here.

**Issue 2-2-2: Scenario where network A requirement can be directly reused*** Proposals
	+ Option 1: when the MUSIM gap neither collides with any ~~Rel-17~~ legacy gap nor collide with any SMTC/SSB or any resources for L1 measurement; or only MUSIM gaps are configured and the MUSIM gap does not collide with any SMTC/SSB or any resources for L1 measurement, network A measurement requirements can be reused. (Apple vivo oppo)
	+ Option 2: RAN4 to specify that all the requirements outside MUSIM gaps for Network A are not impacted by the MUSIM operation. (Apple Ericsson oppo Nokia)
	+ Option 3: On top of option 1, the impact on UL related requirements/procedure can be added. (CMCC)
	+ Option 4: It may be not necessary to have an agreement on scenario in option 1 (Huawei)
	+ Option 5: Further clarification on option 2 is needed (MTK Huawei Xiaomi)
	+ Option 6: Focus on scenario when network A is impacted (MTK Charter Qualcomm vivo)
* Moderator: Option 1 and 2 may not be exclusive each other. Proponent could check whether they are identical or not.

*Tentative agreements: No**Recommendations for 2nd round: Continue discussion***Issue 2-2-3: Principle on layer 3 measurement requirements after gap collision handling** * Proposals
	+ Option 1: The principle of defining scaling factor Kp and Kgap for multi-concurrent gaps are applied to the calculation of Kp and Kgap for layer 3 measurement (Apple xiaomi oppo MTK vivo)
		- Option 1a: re-use the ‘counting’ approach defined for Rel-17 concurrent MGs to define scaling factor for the impacts of MUSIM gaps (Apple xiaomi vivo)
	+ Option 2: Define requirements after solving gap collision issue (CMCC Huawei vivo MTK Qualcomm Nokia)
	+ Option 3: Too early to discuss this issue (Ericsson)

*Tentative agreements: No**Recommendations for 2nd round: A few companies thin it is too early to discuss this topic and other companies are ok with option 2, which is FFS as well. Suggest stop discussion at 2nd this meeting and continue discussion in future meeting***Issue 2-2-4: Principle on L1 measurement requirements after gap collision handling** * Proposals
	+ Option 1: The principle of defining P value for L1 measurement and RLM/BFD measurement in Rel-17 cam be reused (Apple xiaomi oppo)
		- Option 1a: re-use the ‘counting’ approach defined for Rel-17 concurrent MGs to define scaling factor for the impacts of MUSIM gaps (Apple xiaomi oppo)
	+ Option 2: Define requirements after solving gap collision issue (CMCC xiaomi vivo Huawei Qualcomm Nokia)
	+ Option 3: Too early to discuss this issue (Ericsson)

*Tentative agreements: No**Recommendations for 2nd round: A few companies thin it is too early to discuss this topic and other companies are ok with option 2, which is FFS as well. Suggest stop discussion at 2nd this meeting and continue discussion in future meeting* |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Status summary  |
| Sub-topic#2-3 | **Issue 2-3-1: General principles on gap collision handling*** Proposals:
	+ - Option 1: For priority based solution, priorities can be allocated to each existing gap patterns and when two or more gap collide, only the highest priority gap is kept and all other gaps are dropped (Apple MTK Huawei Xiaomi oppo vivo)
		- Option 2: Apply gap-group priority to handle collisions between different gaps groups (i.e., MUSIM gaps group and legacy MGs group). Then, within each gap group, apply different priorities to handle the collision between the gaps within the same group (Ericsson MTK Charter)
		- Option 2a: MUSIM gaps can be believed as a gap set with a specific usage and priority within the ConMGs ()
		- Option 3: Agree at high-level that applying priority rule to handle collisions, but the way how to apply it can be FFS (MTK)
		- Option 4: priority-based scheme for (a) Collisions between a MUSIM gap and measurement gaps and (b) Collisions between MUSIM gaps, but the definition of collisions may be different for cases a and b. (Qualcomm)
		- Option 5: FFS (Nokia)

*Tentative agreements: No**Recommendations for 2nd round: Continue discussion***Issue 2-3-1-1: On network A priority assignment scheme*** Proposals:
	+ - Option 1: RAN4 to study the issue when the priority is all assigned by NW A, under the current signalling framework, which might lead to missing significant activities in NW B due to MUSIM gap collision handling (e.g., reading the paging in NW B, which are unknown to NW A) (MTK Apple Ericsson Huawei QC oppo vivo)
		- Option 2: Clarification is needed for option 1 (Nokia)

*Tentative agreements: No**Recommendations for 2nd round: No more discussion at 2nd round. Since most companies are open for further study on the scenario listed in option 1. It is not necessary to discuss whether to study it or not at 2nd round. Interested companies can bring concrete solution on this issue at next meeting.***Issue 2-3-2: Collisions between MUSIM gap and legacy measurement gap (i.e., Rel-15 to Rel-17 measurement gaps)****Issue 2-3-2-1: Clarification on the scope of Rel-17 legacy gap*** Proposals:
	+ - Option 1: Discuss if concurrent MUSIM and other Rel17/18 measurement gap types is in the scope of this WID or NR\_MG\_enh2 (Nokia)
		- Option 2: In case 1, gaps to be considered include all gaps defined till Rel-17 including Pre-MG, NCSG and legacy gaps for measurement and other purposes (Ericsson MTK CMCC Huawei vivo xiaomi Qualcomm oppo)
		- Option 3: Concurrent MUSIM and other R17 gaps (but not R18) are in scope (Apple Huawei)

*Tentative agreements: No**Recommendations for 2nd round: Continue discussion***Issue 2-3-2-2: Collisions handling rules between MUSIM gap and legacy measurement gap*** Proposals:
	+ - Option 1: Priority-based gap collision handling introduced in concurrent gaps design can be used as a base for collisions between MUSIM gap and legacy measurement gap (Charter Apple CMCC Xiaomi oppo Qualcomm vivo Huawei MTK Ericsson Nokia)
		- Option 1a: Request RAN2 to introduce optional signaling so that the UE can request the priority level of MUSIM gaps (relative to measurement gaps) via UAI (Qualcomm)
		- Option 2: Other enhanced gap collision solutions are open for study. (Apple Charter Ericsson CMCC Huawei xiaomi vivo Nokia)
		- Option 3: UE has the responsibility to avoid the gap collision between MUSIM gaps with other MGs for NW-A. ()
		- Option 4: option 3 is up to UE implementation (MTK Huawei vivo)
		- Option 5: oppose option 3 (Qualcomm)
* Moderator: Option 1 and option 2 are not exclusive each other

*Moderator: All companies are ok with option 1 and most companies are open for option 2. Option 1a could be FFS. Moderator think it is not necessary to discuss option 3 any more at 2nd round.* *Tentative agreements: Agree option 2 and option 1 with the clarification that “legacy measurement gaps” includes all measurement gaps is Rel-17.**Recommendations for 2nd round: Companies check tentative agreement at 2nd round***Issue 2-3-2-3: Priority of MUSIM against other legacy gaps*** Proposals:
	+ - Option 1: MUSIM gaps should have high priority in the event of a collision (Charter Qualcomm)
		- Option 2: MUSIM gaps can be defined as the lowest priority, and periodic MUSIM gaps will be dropped once the gap dropping rule defined in Con-MGs is met (Ericsson)
		- Option 3: Up to NW configuration (Apple MTK CMCC Huawei Xiaomi Charter oppo vivo)
		- Option 4: FFS (Nokia)

*Tentative agreements: No**Recommendations for 2nd round: Continue discussion***Issue 2-3-2-4: Order for applying the priority when number of colliding MGs is larger than 2*** Proposals:
	+ - Option 1: For collisions between MUSIM gap and legacy measurement gap (i.e. Rel-15 to Rel-17 measurement gaps), RAN4 to discuss the order for applying the priority when number of colliding MGs is larger than 2. (Huawei)
		- Option 2: The gap with the highest priority is kept when colliding (Apple vivo)
		- Option 3: FFS (Apple Ericsson MTK Huawei xiaomi QC Nokia)

*Tentative agreements: FFS**Recommendations for 2nd round: No more discussion at 2nd round. Interested companies can bring concrete solution on this issue at next meeting.***Issue 2-3-3: Collisions between MUSIM gap and SMTC and other L3/L1 measurement resources****Issue 2-3-3-1: Definiton of collisions between MUSIM gap and SMTC and other L3/L1 measurement resources*** Proposals:
	+ - Option 1: Condition “SMTC is overlapping with MUSIM gap“ and “L1 measurement resource is overlapping with MUSIM gap” could be used as baseline for MUSIM gap collision with SMTC an L1 measurement resources (Apple oppo)
		- Option 2: option 1 needs more clarification (Ericsson Nokia)
		- Option 3: “Condition “SMTC is overlapping with MG” and “L1 measurement resource is overlapping with MG”could be used as baseline for MUSIM gap collision with SMTC and L1 measurement resources. (MTK Huawei xiaomi Qualcomm oppo vivo)

*Tentative agreements: suggest to agree updated option 1 based on MTK’s comment as below: “*Condition “SMTC is overlapping with MG” and “L1 measurement resource is overlapping with MG” could be used as baseline for MUSIM gap collision with SMTC and L1 measurement resources.*Recommendations for 2nd round: Companies check tentative agreement at 2nd round***Issue 2-3-3-2: Priority of MUSIM against SMTC and other L3/ L1 measurement resources*** Proposals:
	+ - Option 1: MUSIM gaps should have high priority against SMTC and L1 measurement resources (xiaomi oppo Qualcomm Huaewi MTK)
		- Option 2: NW-A’s RRM procedure, including DL SMTC and UL CSI-RS, PRACH, should have higher priority than MUSIM gaps. The MUSIM periodic gaps should be dropped once the gap proximity rule is met. (Ericsson)
		- Option 3: As baseline solution, UE can only perform gap-less L3 measurement and L1 operation outside MUSIM gap. Other solutions are not precluded to handle collision between MUSIM gap and SMTC/RS for L1 operation. (Apple)
		- Option 4: FFS (Ericsson Nokia)

*Tentative agreements: No**Recommendations for 2nd round: Continue discussion***Issue 2-3-4: Collisions between different MUSIM gaps*** Proposals:
	+ - Option 1: priority rule can be used as baseline (Apple Charter CMCC Xiaomi oppo vivo Huawei)
		- Option 2: RAN4 will discuss separately how to define and resolve collisions between MUSIM gaps (Qualcomm Huawei)
		- Option 3: To avoid the collision within MUSIM gaps, UE should request a single periodic gap instead of two separate periodic gaps provided that the distance between these two gaps is shorter than 5ms (Ericsson)
		- Option 4: Aperiodic gap should have higher priority than periodic gaps once collision happens within MUSIM gaps. (Ericsson MTK)
		- Option 5: It is UE’s responsibility not to request colliding MUSIM gaps from NW-A (Nokia)
		- Option 6: Option 2 and 4 can be discussed if option 1 is agreed (Charter)
		- Option 7: Option 2 can be discussed if option 1 is agreed (MTK)
		- Option 8: Option 3 is up to implementation and out of scope (MTK Huawei vivo)

*Tentative agreements: No**Recommendations for 2nd round: Continue discussion***Issue 2-3-4-1: On MUSIM gap collision definition** * Proposals:
	+ - Option 1a: The gap proximity condition of concurrent gap collision could be reused for MUSIM gap collision (Apple Ericsson Huawei Xiaomi Charter oppo)
		- Option 1b: The gap proximity condition of concurrent gap collision could be reused for MUSIM gap collision with other gaps (MTK)
		- Option 2: RAN4 should consider different definition/handling of collisions between MUSIM gaps (Qualcomm)
		- Option 3: FFS (Nokia)

*Moderator note: to moderator’s understanding, MUSIM gap collision includes (a)the collision between different MUSIM gaps and (b) the collision between MUSIM gaps with other gaps**Tentative agreements: The gap proximity condition of concurrent gap collision could be reused for MUSIM gap collision with other gaps, FFS on whether this proximity can be reused for the collision between different MUSIM gap scenario.* *Recommendations for 2nd round: Check tentative agreement at 2nd round***Issue 2-3-5: On aperiodic gap** * Proposals:
	+ - Option 1: Discuss whether and how to determine the time window W when aperiodic MUSIM gap with higher priority is involved in collision (oppo)
		- Option 1a: largest periodicity among all the periodic gaps + Time margin [M] for the one-shot aperiodic gap (MTK)
		- Option 1b: FFS on option 1 (Huawei Qualcomm vivo)
		- Option 2: UE can request aperiodic MUSIM gap with a higher priority. In this case, aperiodic MUSIM gap should be prioritized. (Ericsson)
		- Option 2b: Option 2 up to UE implementation (oppo vivo)

*Tentative agreements: No**Recommendations for 2nd round: Continue discussion* |
|  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Status summary  |
| Sub-topic#2-4 | **Issue 2-4-1: Whether to define network B requirements*** Proposals:
	+ - Option 1: Define the requirements for Network B in RRC idle/inactive (xiaomi Ericsson Charter)
		- Option 2: No measurement requirements in network B will be defined by RAN4 (MTK Huawei Qualcomm Nokia vivo oppo)
		- Option 3: No impact on Network B requirements provided that the gaps are configured in Network A. and RAN4 not to change idle/inactive requirements on Network B (Nokia)
		- Option 4: If there is a consensus to specify network B requirement, its priority should be lower compared with the work for network A requirements and could be carried out at the second phase in the WI time frame (Apple xiaomi vivo oppo)
		- Option 5: If requirements for measurements in NW B are to be defined, re-use the existing requirements for IDLE/INACTIVE as baseline with DRX cycle replaced by max(DRX cycle, MGRP) ()
		- Option 6: No new requirements to be introduce for NW B measurements in RRC\_IDLE/\_INACTIVE state, however, further study the impact on NW B measurement requirements considering different scenarios. ()

*Tentative agreements: No**Recommendations for 2nd round: Continue discussion***Issue 2-4-2: Scope of network B requirements*** Proposals:
	+ - Option 1: If there is a consensus on defining network B requirements, the following requirements are purposed to be defined for network B idle/inactive state. Requirements are not needed for other “best effort” based functions. (vivo)
		- UE measurement capability
		- Measurement and evaluation of serving cell
		- Measurements of intra-frequency NR cells
		- Measurements of inter-frequency NR cells
		- Measurements of inter-RAT E-UTRAN cells
		- Maximum interruption in paging reception
		- Measurements for UE configured with relaxed measurement criterion
		- Option 2: Depending on issue 2-4-1 and FFS (MTK Huawei vivo Nokia Ericsson)

*Tentative agreements: No**Recommendations for 2nd round: Since it* depends on issue 2-4-1, no more discussion at 2nd round**Issue 2-4-3:Principles on network B requirements*** Proposals:
	+ - Option 1: Define the measurement period in NW-B when MUSIM gap is not dropped, and deprioritize the scenario when MUSIM gap is dropped due to collision (oppo)
		- Option 2: Depending on issue 2-4-1 and FFS (MTK Huawei vivo Nokia Ericsson)

*Tentative agreements: No**Recommendations for 2nd round: Since it* depends on issue 2-4-1, no more discussion at 2nd round |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Status summary  |
| Sub-topic#2-5 | **Issue 2-5-1: MUSIM overhead** * Proposals:
	+ - Option 1: RAN4 to define MUSIM gap overhead for MUSIM gap(s) (Xiaomi)
		- Option 2: not necessary to define overhead (Ericsson)
		- Option 3: wait for concurrent gap conclusion (MTK xiaomi oppo)
		- Option 4: FFS (Huawei Qualcomm vivo Nokia)

*Tentative agreements: No**Recommendations for 2nd round: Continue discussion***Issue 2-5-2: Conditions in which the UE is allowed to request MUSIM gaps*** Proposals:
	+ - Option 1: RAN4 needs to define the conditions in which the UE is considered to be in MUSIM operation mode (Ericsson Nokia)
		- Option 2: Not necessary (MTK Huawei Qualcomm vivo)

*Tentative agreements: No**Recommendations for 2nd round: Continue discussion***Issue 2-5-3: Conflicting bands and band combinations for MUSIM** * Proposals:
	+ - Option 1: Address the MUSIM related RF issue when for the uninterrupted operation a UE should use particular band/carrier combinations for two SIM cards. (Apple)
* Moderator Note: The option is out of the scope however it is ok to collect comments here this meeting. And no official decisions on this issue will be made in this meeting.

*Tentative agreements: No**Recommendations for 2nd round: a RF issue, comments have been collection at 1st round and no more discussion at 2nd round.***Issue 2-5-4: Power back-off for MUSIM** * Proposals:
	+ - Option 1: Address the MUSIM related RF issue when for the uninterrupted operation a UE should apply power back-off larger than existing MPR/A-MPR limits (Apple)
* Moderator Note: The option is out of the scope however it is ok to collect comments here this meeting. And no official decisions on this issue will be made in this meeting.

 *Tentative agreements: No**Recommendations for 2nd round: a RF issue, comments have been collection at 1st round and no more discussion at 2nd round.***Issue 2-5-5: On the impact of item 1 of WI (simultaneously RRC connected operation)** * Proposals:
	+ - Option 1: RAN4 to start work on simultaneous RRC connected networks once RAN2 have progressed on the topic (Nokia)
* Moderator Note: In [RP-220955] it mentions “The work item shall identify whether the WI (Enhancements for MUSIM procedures to operate in RRC\_CONNECTED state simultaneously in NW A and NW B) will have RAN3 or RAN4 impacts by RAN#99”
* Recommended WF
	+ Depending on conclusion of RAN#99 and not necessary to have further discussion
 |

### CRs/TPs

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 1st round and provided recommendation on CRs/TPs Status update suggestion*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| CR/TP number | CRs/TPs Status update recommendation  |
| XXX | *Based on 1st round of comments collection, moderator can recommend the next steps such as “agreeable”, “to be revised”* |

## Discussion on 2nd round (if applicable)

*Moderator can provide summary of 2nd round here. Note that recommended decisions on tdocs should be provided in the section titled ”Recommendations for Tdocs”.*

### Sub-topic 2-1 General aspects

**Issue 2-1-1: On MUSIM gap patterns**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: All specification work listed in the 2nd item of WI “Define RRM requirements for Rel-17 MUSIM gaps” are based on existing Rel-17 MUSIM gap patterns defined in Table 9.1.10-1 of TS38.133 (Apple Ericsson MTK CMCC Huawei Xiaomi Charter Qualcomm Oppo vivo Nokia)
	+ Option 2: Keep it open

*Tentative agreements (1st round): Based on majority view, suggest to agree option 1*

*Recommendations for 2nd round: Companies check tentative agreement is fine or not at 2nd round*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Agree option 1. |
| Apple | Support option 1. |
| Nokia | We are fine with tentative agreement |
| Charter | Option 1. |
| CMCC | OK with option 1. |
| Huawei  | Support option 1. |
| Qualcomm | Support option 1. |
| Xiaomi | Support option 1. |
| MTK | Support Option 1. |
| vivo | We are fine with tentative agreement |

### Sub-topic 2-2 On network A requirements

**Issue 2-2-2: Scenario where network A requirement can be directly reused**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: when the MUSIM gap neither collides with any legacy gap nor collide with any SMTC/SSB or any resources for L1 measurement; or only MUSIM gaps are configured and the MUSIM gap does not collide with any SMTC/SSB or any resources for L1 measurement, network A measurement requirements can be reused. (vivo)
	+ Option 2: RAN4 to specify that all the requirements outside MUSIM gaps for Network A are not impacted by the MUSIM operation. (Nokia)
	+ Option 3: On top of option 1, the impact on UL related requirements/procedure can be added. (CMCC)
	+ Option 4: Focus on scenario where NW A is impacted (Ericsson Apple oppo Huawei MTK)
* Moderator: Option 1 and 2 may not be exclusive each other. In addition the discussion on this topic maybe not crucial since the focus should be network A requirement being impacted anyway.

*Tentative agreements (1st round): No*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | We agree with moderator’s comments. We suggest to postpone the discussion since this is not a crucial topic and will be easily solved after all controversial overlapping issue agreed. |
| Apple | Options are not completely mutual exclusive to each other. We are also fine to focus on scenario when network A is impacted. |
| OPPO | Agree with moderator’s comments.  |
| Nokia | We still think Option 2 would be important for the MUSIM requirements definition. Agree that Option 1 and 2 are not mutually exclusive. Is the intention of the moderator to keep all options open? |
| Huawei | Agree with moderator’s comments. We also suggest to postpone the discussion on this issue and focus on the impacts of MUSIM gaps. |
| Xiaomi | Agree with moderator’s comments.  |
| MTK | Agree with moderator’s comments, we should focus on the requirements impacted by MUSIM gaps not the other way around, for which we supported Option 6. |
| vivo | Option 1, 2 and 3 could be further discussed at future meeting. |
|  |  |

### Sub-topic 2-3 Gap collision handling

**Issue 2-3-1: General principles on gap collision handling**

* Proposals:
	+ - Option 1: For priority based solution, priorities can be allocated to each existing gap patterns and when two or more gap collide, only the highest priority gap is kept and all other gaps are dropped (Apple Huawei Xiaomi vivo)
		- Option 2: Apply gap-group priority to handle collisions between different gaps groups (i.e., MUSIM gaps group and legacy MGs group). Then, within each gap group, apply different priorities to handle the collision between the gaps within the same group (Ericsson Charter)
		- Option 3: Agree at high-level that applying priority rule to handle collisions, but the way how to apply it can be FFS (oppo MTK CMCC vivo)
		- Option 4: priority-based scheme for (a) Collisions between a MUSIM gap and measurement gaps and (b) Collisions between MUSIM gaps, but the definition of collisions may be different for cases a and b. (Qualcomm)
		- Option 5: FFS (Nokia)

*Tentative agreements (1st round): No*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Option 2.Compared with option 1, we think option 2 has more benefits and can reuse R17 concurrent gaps agreement as much as possible. For example,1. Max number of gaps supported in Concurrent gaps

Now at most 2 gaps are supported in concurrent gaps and it seems most of companies suggest to keep this number in R18 MG enh WI. If we believe MUSIM gaps as ‘one gap’, then we don’t need to further discuss this issue here but following Concurrent gaps agreement. Both NW and UE can believe MUSIMs gap as one gap.1. Issue 2-3-2-4: Order for applying the priority when number of colliding MGs is larger than 2

Now at most 2 gaps are supported in concurrent gaps and no multiple overlapping issues for 2-3-2-4. If we believe MUSIM gaps as ‘one gap’, then we don’t need to further discuss this issue since we still only have two colliding MGs in concurrent gaps.1. Issue Overhead

RAN4 spent one and a half year to achieve this overhead issue for 2 concurrent gaps. If we believe MUSIM gaps as ‘one gap’, then we don’t need to reopen this issue again in MUSIM gaps.From NW’s perspective, all MUSIM periodic gaps have no any difference and should apply the same priority. How to handle the UE’s behaviours in each MUSIM gap is a black box and fully up to UE. There is no any further impact except the overall interruption to NW-A. |
| Apple | We support option 1 as baseline and open to further discuss other options. Some response to E///, in our understanding MUSIM gap is not explicitly considered when discussing keeping at most 2 gaps in R18. Besides, we are not sure if all MUSIM periodic gaps must have same priority. Anyway, E/// indeed raised some good points. We are open for further discussion. |
| OPPO | We can compromise to high-level rule in option 3. The definition for gap collision can be discussed in other issues.  |
| Nokia | We think this topic needs further discussion in defining the priority schemes and further details.  |
| Charter | We support option 2 and we agree with Ericsson, if MUSIM gaps are treated as ‘one gap’, a lot of the agreements in concurrent gaps are applicable here. |
| CMCC | Option 3. In general, we agree that priority rule can be considered, but the details can be FFS. |
| Huawei  | We support option 1 as baseline.On the issues raised by E///, we are open to discuss the number of gaps and the overhead cap considering MUSIM gaps, but it seems a separate discussion from the priority and collision handling. We also agree that the scenario where MUSIM gaps have same priority needs to be considered, but it seems to be a special case of option 1.  |
| Qualcomm | Option 4.We agree that priority rule can be the baseline to resolve collisions between MUSIM gaps and measurement gaps. The details about how to define/apply the priorities can be FFS.Regarding proposal 2, it’s not very clear if there is an advantage to defining a group-based priority scheme. |
| Xiaomi | Support option 1. But we can can accept option 3 to further discuss the details of the priority rule.We have concern on option 2. If MISIM gaps as a group have higher priority than legacy MGs group, the measurement operations configured for NW A would be severely effected. |
| MTK | As we commented in the 1st round, Option 1 and 2 have their own pros and cons which require careful study, for which we also suggested Option 3 as a high-level agreement. We also agree with the benefits highlighted by E/// for option 2, but we have different view on treating MUSIM periodic gaps as same priority. MUSIM gaps can have their own priorities which can be different.  |
| vivo | It is hard to agree any one among option 1, 2 and 4 based on the discussion. Maybe option 3 can be agreed at the top level. Otherwise this topic should be open.  |

**Issue 2-3-2: Collisions between MUSIM gap and legacy measurement gap (i.e., Rel-15 to Rel-17 measurement gaps)**

**Issue 2-3-2-1: Clarification on the scope of Rel-17 legacy gap**

* Proposals:
	+ - Option 1: Discuss if concurrent MUSIM and other Rel17/18 measurement gap types is in the scope of this WID or NR\_MG\_enh2 (Nokia)
		- Option 2: In case 1, gaps to be considered include all gaps defined till Rel-17 including Pre-MG, NCSG and legacy gaps for measurement and other purposes (MTK Apple Charter CMCC Huawei vivo xiaomi Qualcomm oppo)
			* Option 2a (Ericsson): Use Option 2 with the following note: Note 1: The group needs to further consider how to handle Pre-MG/NCSG and MUSIM gaps. Note 2: The Pre-MG/NCSG and concurrent gaps are discussed in parallel in Rel-18 WI further MG enh.

*Tentative agreements (1st round): No*

*Recommendations for 2nd round: Suggest to agree option 2. Continue discuss whether concurrent MUSIM in option 3 is in the scope or not.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Based on Nokia’s comments, we think option 1 and option 2 isn’t contradictory between each other.We suggest to use the following option 4 as an compromise agreement to further achieve the concern from company supporting option 1.* Option 4(New): When collision happens between MUSIM gap and legacy measurement gap, gaps to be considered include all gaps defined till Rel-17 at least including Pre-MG, NCSG and concurrent gaps for measurement and other purposes (Ericsson)
	+ FFS: Pre-MG and NCSG
	+ Note: The group needs to further consider how to handle Pre-MG/NCSG and Concurrent gaps which are discussed in parallel in WI further MG enh.
 |
| Apple | We are not sure about the difference between option 2 and 3. In our view this issue is about which types of gap need to be considered when discussing overlapping with MUSIM. If this is correct understanding, we believe RAN4 shall consider all gaps defined till R17. Any new gap which are to be introduced in R18 shall not be in the scope. According to clarification from Nokia in the 1st round, we think the intention of option 1 is not to consider R18 new gap. It is more about collision in R18 scope, e.g. collision between Pre-MG and NCSG. The wording in option 1 may be misleading. |
| Nokia | Our comment in the 1st round was regarding the existing Rel 17 requirements, which do not consider combination of PreMG, NCSG and concurrent gaps. That means that if we would like to use Rel 17 as a baseline, we won’t be able to base the collision of MUSIM with other gaps based on legacy behavior. So it is unclear to us how to make the requirements for Pre-MG and NCSG.  |
| Charter | We also are not sure about the differences between option 2 and option 3.We support option 2, because in option 2 it is clear to us what kind of gaps we cover in the scope. |
| CMCC | Support Option 2. We are also not sure about the difference between option 2 and option 3. In our understanding, thery are same. |
| Huawei  | We support moderator’s recommendation.On option 1, we understand the concurrent MUSIM and other Rel-17 measurement gap types is in the scope of this WID.On option 3, we think it is same as option 2.On option 4 from E///, the main bullet already includes pre-MG and NCSG, so why they are FFS in the first sub-bullet? |
| Qualcomm | OK with the recommended WF. |
| Xiaomi | Support option 2 which is more clear from our view. |
| MTK | We support option 2. In our understanding, MUSIM gap collision with the legacy gaps should include all gaps defined till Rel-17, which also include Pre-MG, NCSG and concurrent gaps. |
| vivo | We support option 2 in principle. For Nokia’s concern how to handle the collision on Pre-MG and NCSG needs more study.  |
| Ericsson | Thanks for Huawei’s comments. We update option 4 as follow. Hope it can be a compromise proposal to each company.* Option 4(New): When collision happens between MUSIM gap and legacy measurement gap, gaps to be considered include all gaps defined till Rel-17 at least including Pre-MG, NCSG and concurrent gaps for measurement and other purposes (Ericsson)
	+ Note 1: The group needs to further consider how to handle Pre-MG/NCSG and MUSIM gaps.

Note 2: The Pre-MG/NCSG and concurrent gaps are discussed in parallel in Rel-18 WI further MG enh. |

**Issue 2-3-2-2: Collisions handling rules between MUSIM gap and legacy measurement gap**

* Proposals:
	+ - Option 1: Priority-based gap collision handling introduced in concurrent gaps design can be used as a base for collisions between MUSIM gap and legacy measurement gap (Charter Apple CMCC Xiaomi oppo Qualcomm vivo Huawei MTK Ericsson Nokia)
		- Option 1a: Request RAN2 to introduce optional ignalling so that the UE can request the priority level of MUSIM gaps (relative to measurement gaps) via UAI (Qualcomm)
		- Option 2: Other enhanced gap collision solutions are open for study. (Charter Apple CMCC Xiaomi oppo Qualcomm vivo Huawei MTK Ericsson Nokia)
* Moderator: Option 1 and option 2 are not exclusive each other

*Moderator: All companies are ok with option 1 and most companies are open for option 2. Option 1a could be FFS. Moderator think it is not necessary to discuss option 3 and related options (option 4 and 5) any more at 2nd round since no supporting company.*

*Tentative agreements (1st round): Agree option 2 and option 1 with the clarification that “legacy measurement gaps” in option 1 includes all measurement gaps in Rel-17.*

*Recommendations for 2nd round: Companies check tentative agreement is fine or not at 2nd round*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Agree with tentative agreements. |
| Apple | Agree with the tentative agreements. |
| OPPO | Agree with the tentative agreements. |
| Nokia | Fine with tentative agreement. We corrected a minor typo, using change marks |
| Charter | Agree with tentative agreements. |
| CMCC | OK with tentative agreements. |
| Huawei  | Agree with the tentative agreements. |
| Qualcomm | OK with the tentative agreement |
| Xiaomi | OK with the tentative agreement |
| MTK | Agree with the tentative agreements. |
| vivo | Ok with the tentative agreement |

**Issue 2-3-2-3: Priority of MUSIM against other legacy gaps**

* Proposals:
	+ - Option 1: MUSIM gaps should have high priority in the event of a collision (Charter Qualcomm)
		- Option 2: MUSIM gaps can be defined as the lowest priority, and periodic MUSIM gaps will be dropped once the gap dropping rule defined in Con-MGs is met ()
		- Option 3: Up to NW configuration (Apple CMCC Huawei Xiaomi Charter oppo vivo)
		- Option 3a: Up to UE implementation (MTK)
		- Option 4: FFS (Ericsson Nokia)

*Tentative agreements (1st round): No*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | We suggest to further discuss this issue since all MUSIM gaps are black box to NW based on current RAN2 agreements.To companies for option 3, could you further explain how to decide the priority based on NW’s perspective? From our understanding, a default priority may be better to define the requirement. |
| Apple | Support option 3. To Ericsson: as UE vendor, maybe we are not in the best place to explain how to decide priority based on NW’s perspective since it is up to NW implementation. We can come up with some examples, but eventually it is still under NW control. For instance for low mobility UE, MUSIM gap for NW B measurement can be with low priority. But for high mobility UE, NW may consider higher priority. From use case point of view, maybe gap for paging can have higher priority.On the other way around, we couldn’t see why default priority can be better. At least for now we can observe that some company propose high priority (option 1) while some company propose low priority (option 2). This effectively explains why a certain level of flexibility is beneficial. |
| OPPO | Support option 3. In addition, we think the priority may also rely on UE implementation. Since NW-A has no information about the task associated with each MUSIM gap, UE can also indicate the preferred priority when requesting the MUSIM gap configuration. (as discussed in Issue 2-3-5-1) |
| Nokia | We support option 4. We think there are open questions regarding whether for example MUSIM gaps should have different high/low priority depending on the purpose. In case there is still collision a group priority can be assigned to resolve the collision. FFS to define different level of priority |
| CMCC | Option 3, which is more flexible. |
| Huawei  | Support option 3.We understand NW A can at least determine the priority between MUSIM gaps and other gaps for NW A measurement. Defining a default priority may limit the flexibility at NW A or the usage of MUSIM gaps at UE side. |
| Qualcomm | We support Option 1 as the default relative priority of MUSIM gaps vs. measurement gaps. i.e. by default, MUSIM gaps would have higher priority than measurement gaps.We also support having flexibility to choose different priority level(s). However, we do not think it should be entirely up to network A to select the priority, for the reasons mentioned before (see issue 2-3-1-1). |
| Xiaomi | Support option 3 |
| MTK | We don’t think MUSIM gaps should have a fixed priority. As Apple commented, we think there are scenarios where MUSIM gaps should have higher priority than legacy gaps and vice versa. We appreciate that NW may not be able to define this priority properly under the current signaling framework, for which we think it is reasonable to study Option 1a from the previous issue with regards to this issue (which was proposed by Qualcomm as shown below):* + - Option 1a: Request RAN2 to introduce optional signaling so that the UE can request the priority level of MUSIM gaps (relative to measurement gaps) via UAI (Qualcomm)

Therefore, we suggest updating Option 3 as: Up to NW/UE configuration |
| vivo | Support option 3. Fixed prirority is not preferred since it cannot adapt to different scenario.  |

**Issue 2-3-2-5: Definition on MUSIM gap collides with legacy gaps (separated from Issue 2-3-4-1)**

* Proposals:
	+ - Option 1: The gap proximity condition of concurrent gap collision could be reused for MUSIM gap collision with other gaps (Ericsson Apple Nokia Charter Huawei Qualcomm Xiaomi MTK vivo)
		- Option 2: FFS

*Tentative agreements (1st round): Agree option 1*

*Recommendations for 2nd round: Check tentative agreement is fine or not at 2nd round*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Agree option 1 |
| Apple | Option 1. |
| Nokia | We are not ok with the WF. We want to keep this issue as FFS.  |
| Charter | We support option 1 and the tentative agreements. |
| Huawei  | Agree with option 1. |
| Qualcomm | Option 1 |
| Xiaomi | Agree with option 1. |
| MTK | Agree with option 1. |
| vivo | Agree with option 1. |

**Issue 2-3-3: Collisions between MUSIM gap and SMTC and other L3/L1 measurement resources**

**Issue 2-3-3-1: Definiton of collisions between MUSIM gap and SMTC and other L3/L1 measurement resources**

* Proposals:
	+ - Option 1: Condition “SMTC is overlapping with MUSIM gap“ and “L1 measurement resource is overlapping with MUSIM gap”could be used as baseline for MUSIM gap collision with SMTC an L1 measurement resources (Apple)
		- Option 2: “Condition “SMTC is overlapping with MG” and “L1 measurement resource is overlapping with MG”could be used as baseline for MUSIM gap collision with SMTC and L1 measurement resources. (MTK Huawei xiaomi)
		- Option 3: RAN4 to discuss the proximity condition for the following cases: “SMTC is overlapping with MG” and “L1 measurement resource is overlapping with MG” (oppo Nokia)
		- Option 4: FFS (Huawei Qualcomm Xiaomi MTK vivo)
		- Option 5: Further consider the proximity discussed in NTN other than only the fully/partially overlapping case (Ericsson)

*Tentative agreements (1st round): suggest to agree updated option 1 based on MTK’s comment as below: “*Condition “SMTC is overlapping with MG” and “L1 measurement resource is overlapping with MG” could be used as baseline for MUSIM gap collision with SMTC and L1 measurement resources.

*Recommendations for 2nd round: Companies check tentative agreement is fine or not at 2nd round*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | We think option 3 may need to be updated based on proponent company’s further explanation.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| OPPO | Support option 1 and MTK’s clarification.To Ericsson, the collision between two gaps is discussed for concurrent gaps in Rel17 and is defined as <=4m. Here we are considering a new collision type between SMTC/measurement resource for NW-A and MUSIM gap for NW-B, we think the definition for collision should be specified at first. |

 |

 Instead of following the gap collision proximity agreed in concurrent gaps, we think the discussion in NTN is more suitable which is used for gap with SMTC.

|  |
| --- |
| For the case where one SMTC is inside MG and the other SMTC is outside the MG, if the proximity distance between the MG and SMTC outside the MG is smaller than or equal to the proximity distance threshold, i.e. 4ms, the two SMTCs are considered as colliding SMTCs |

We suggest to update option 3 as follow. * RAN4 to discuss the proximity condition for the following cases: “SMTC is overlapping with MG” and “L1 measurement resource is overlapping with MG”
 |
| Apple | When supporting option 1, we had the 4ms condition in mind. Agree with E/// that discussion in NTN is more suitable for a baseline. |
| OPPO | We are open to discussion, and can also support the update option 3 from Ericsson. Our original consideration is to reuse “overlapping in the time domain” as shown below, which means <=0ms in our understanding. CSSFintra: it is a carrier specific scaling factor and is determined according to CSSFoutside\_gap,i in clause 9.1.5.1 for measurement conducted outside measurement gaps, i.e. when intra-frequency SMTC is fully non overlapping or partially overlapping with measurement gaps or NCSG, or according to CSSFwithin\_gap,i in clause 9.1.5.2 for measurement conducted within measurement gaps, i.e. when intra-frequency SMTC is fully overlapping with measurement gaps, or according to CSSFwithin\_ncsg,i in clause 9.1.5.3 for measurement conducted within NCSG, i.e. when intra-frequency SMTC is fully overlapping with NCSG.The conclusion from NTN cannot be reused directly. It is the collision between two SMTCs, where one SMTC is within gap and the other SMTC is outside MG. While in this case, SMTC may not be contained within MUSIM gap. So we are open to further discussion. |
| Nokia | Tentative agreement still not clear. We think the proposal from Ericsson is ok.  |
| Huawei  | We support option 3 with the consideration as explained by OPPO above. However, it seems there are different understandings among companies, so we are also ok to keep it open as suggested by E///. |
| Qualcomm | We are OK to discuss further. |
| Xiaomi | Support option 3 and share the similar view with OPPO. Open to further discuss. |
| MTK | Option3. We also have same understanding as OPPO for the “overlap” here. To avoid confusion, we are also fine to keep it open. |
| vivo | OK for FFS |
| Ericsson | Thanks for oppo’s further clarification. Now I think we have different understanding on this condition.We think it should further consider the proximity discussed in NTN other than only the fully/partially overlapping case. |

**Issue 2-3-3-2: Priority of MUSIM against SMTC, and other L3/ L1 measurement resources**

* Proposals:
	+ - Option 1: MUSIM gaps should have high priority against SMTC and L1 measurement resources (Apple xiaomi oppo Qualcomm Huawei MTK vivo)
		- Option 2: NW-A’s RRM procedure, including DL SMTC should have higher priority than MUSIM gaps. The MUSIM periodic gaps should be dropped once the gap proximity rule is met. (Ericsson)
		- Option 3: As baseline solution, UE can only perform gap-less L3 measurement and L1 operation outside MUSIM gap. Other solutions are not precluded to handle collision between MUSIM gap and SMTC/RS for L1 operation. (Apple oppo xiaomi)
		- Option 4: FFS (Ericsson Nokia CMCC vivo)

*Tentative agreements (1st round): No*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | We think it’s too early to have any conclusion if no agreement on the scenarios achieved.Before the group to further discuss this issue, we want to clarify the following scenarios for further discussion.* Scenario 1: MUSIM gaps collide with SSB/SMTC for L1/L3 measurement
* Scenario 2: MUSIM gaps collide with SSB/SMTC for RRC CONNECTED mobility procedures, such as Handover, SCell activation, TCI state switching, etc.
* Scenario 3: MUSIM gaps collide with Paging and system info. update for NW-A
* Scenario 4: MUSIM gaps collide with important uplink signals, such as PRACH, CSI-RS reporting which is used to indicate the completion of any RRC CONNECTED mobility procedure for NW-A
 |
| Apple | Fine with option 1 and 3 as baseline. Open to further discussion on scenarios mentioned by E///. |
| OPPO | Support option 1 and 3.We understand this issue is for collision between MUSIM gap and L3/L1 measurements without gap. In the current spec with legacy gap for NW-A, legacy gap is prioritized by default. For scenario 3 and 4, we are open to further discussion. |
| Nokia | We also think this is too early for such detailed agreement.  |
| CMCC | Can be FFS |
| Huawei  | We support option 1 as baseline. Other solutions for handling collision between MUSIM gaps and SMTC/L1 can be FFS. |
| Qualcomm | We support option 1. |
| Xiaomi | For the issue on priority of MUSIM against SMTC, and other L3/ L1 measurement resources, which is similar to scenario 1 listed by Ericsson, we support option 1 and 3.For other scenarios, we are open to further discuss. |
| MTK | Support Option 1.MUSIM gaps should have higher priority when collide with SMTC or L1 measurements. This follows the same principle when such collision happens with the legacy gaps.We are also open to further discuss scenario 3 and 4 from E///. |
| vivo | Ok with option 1 and open for further discussion on all scenarios identified. |
| Ericsson | Thanks for oppo’s further clarification. Now I think we have different understanding on this condition.We think it should further consider the proximity discussed in NTN other than only the fully/partially overlapping case. |

**Issue 2-3-3-3: Priority of MUSIM against uplink signals, such as PRACH, CSI-RS reporting etc.**

* Proposals:
	+ - Option 1: NW-A’s RRM procedure, including UL CSI-RS, PRACH, should have higher priority than MUSIM gaps. The MUSIM periodic gaps should be dropped once the gap proximity rule is met. (Ericsson)
		- Option 2: PRACH procedure can be higher priority than MUSIM gaps (MTK)
		- Option 3: FFS (Huawei Ericsson Apple Nokia CMCC Qualcomm Xiaomi MTK vivo)

*Tentative agreements(1st round): No*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Option 1, 2, 3.From our understanding, CSI-RS reporting for SCell activation completion should also be prioritized except of PRACH. We suggest the group to further check other important RRC procedures except L1/L3 periodic measurement. |
| Apple | Open for further study. |
| Nokia | FFS |
| CMCC | Option 3 |
| Huawei  | We understand the issue is similar to above 2-3-3-2, and suggest FFS. |
| Qualcomm | FFS |
| Xiaomi | We can further study this issue. |
| MTK | Support option 2 also fine to keep it FFS. |
| vivo | OK for FFS |

**Issue 2-3-4: Collisions between different MUSIM gaps**

* Proposals:
	+ - Option 1: priority rule can be used as baseline (Apple oppo CMCC Huawei Xiaomi MTK vivo)
		- Option 2: RAN4 will discuss separately how to define and resolve collisions between MUSIM gaps (Ericsson Huawei Qualcomm)
		- Option 2a: When the time duration between the two closest gap occasions within the two measurement gap patterns is shorter than [4]ms and the second gap occasion is for paging, UE should keep both gap occasions instead of dropping any of them. (Ericsson)
		- Option 3: Aperiodic gap should have higher priority than periodic gaps once collision happens within MUSIM gaps. (Ericsson MTK)
		- Option 4: It is UE’s responsibility not to request colliding MUSIM gaps from NW-A (Ericsson Nokia)
		- Option 5: Option 2 can be discussed if option 1 is agreed (Charter MTK)
			* Option 5a: Option 3 can be discussed if option 1 is agreed (Charter)

*Tentative agreements (1st round): No*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Option 2, 2a, 4.We add option 2a which is an important case needs to be discussed for this collision within MUSIM gaps option 2.We think option 1 priority rule is unnecessary for MUSIM gaps. In ConMGs, UE will use the MG only to perform measurement. The reason to define the gap dropping rule is UE cannot switch too fast between different gaps for different frequency’s measurement. However, in MUSIM gaps, one periodic gap will be used for measurement, one periodic gap for paging reception and another periodic gap for SIB decoding. Could the companies support option 1 to further explain the use case for priority rule in MUSIM gaps?Instead of dropping the gap, UE should perform some procedures together. For example, UE should retune the AGC and receive the paging which had already agreed in Idle mode. In this case, we think both gaps(one for measurement and AGC; one for paging) shouldn’t be dropped. If the two gaps meet the proximity rule, UE should keep both gap occasions instead of dropping any of them.  |
| Apple | Support option 1 as baseline. Open for further discussion on optimization. |
| OPPO | Prefer option 1. In our understanding, one benefit for priority rule is that NW-A can schedule data transmission during the dropped MG occasion to avoid throughput loss.  |
| Nokia | CIn any case we think Option 4 would be agreeable |
| CMCC | Option 1. In general, we agree that priority rule can be used as baseline, but the details or optimization can be FFS. |
| Huawei  | Support option 1 and 2.We think option 1 can be used as baseline, and other solutions can be FFS as in option 2. We agree with the observation from E/// that UE may keep both MUSIM gaps even when they are colliding. Unlike in con-MG where two MGs are used for measurements, the two MUSIM gaps may be used for different purposes such as sync and paging, so it may be reasonable to keep both. |
| Qualcomm | Option 2 |
| Xiaomi | Support option 1 as baseline. |
| MTK  | Support Option 1. We appreciate that collision in concurrent gaps happens between two MGs meant for measurements, however, this could also apply for MUSIM gaps collisions. Since we don’t have gap association in MUSIM gaps, MUSIM gaps collisions could happen between different activities in NW B, for example, between two measurements, between measurement and paging reception, or between measurements and SIB, etc.Therefore, we think priority rule should be applied as a baseline for these collisions between different MUSIM gaps. |
| vivo | Support option 1 at least as the baseline. Not sure how option 4 works since during Rel-17 concurren gap discussion, it was discussed that the collision can be avoided through NW configuration however in the end this was proved to be impractical.  |
| Ericsson | To MTK, could you further explain this measurement collision scenarios in MUSIM?Based on current discussion in Rel-17, UE can request three periodic gaps. One is for measurement, one for paging, and the other for SIB decoding. Could you further explain the reason why UE wants to apply for two gaps for measurement and drop the paging monitoring or SIB decoding?  |

**Issue 2-3-4-1: On MUSIM gap collision definition**

* Proposals:
	+ - Option 1: The gap proximity condition of concurrent gap collision could be reused for MUSIM gap collision (Apple Ericsson Huawei Xiaomi Charter MTK vivo)
		- Option 2: RAN4 should consider different definition/handling of collisions between MUSIM gaps (Qualcomm)
		- Option 3: FFS (Nokia vivo)

*Moderator note: to moderator’s understanding, MUSIM gap collision in option 1 means collision between different MUSIM gaps.*

*Tentative agreements (1st round): No.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | We support option 1.To QC,From our understanding, the gap proximity condition can be reused. The important issue is how to handle UE’s behaviour when this proximity condition is met. |
| Apple | Support option 1. |
| Nokia | If we understand the moderator comment correct, this is only relevant for Network B requirements, if we decide to specify it.  |
| Charter | We support option 1. |
| Huawei  | Option 1. |
| Qualcomm | Option 2. To Ericsson: based on your comments there may be different behavior for collisions between MUSIM gaps. We think that should be considered and it may make sense to modify the proximity condition if new behavior is defined.  |
| Xiaomi | Support option 1 |
| MTK | Support Option 1. |
| vivo | To Nokia, this is to define conditions when two MUSIM gap are called to be collided. To my understanding it is also related to network A requirement since we needs know whether or which MUSIM is left in the end.Prefer option 1 and Ok for FFS |

**Issue 2-3-5: On aperiodic gap**

**Issue 2-3-5-1: On aperiodic gap priority**

* Proposals:
	+ - Option 1: UE can request aperiodic MUSIM gap with a higher priority. (Ericsson Charter)
		- Option 2: Option 1 is up to UE implementation (vivo)
		- Option 3: FFS (Apple CMCC Huawei Qualcomm Xiaomi MTK)

*Tentative agreements(1st round): No*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Option 1.From our understanding, aperiodic gap should be higher priority than other gaps. Otherwise, the aperiodic gap will be dropped when collision happens. Then what’s the meaning for UE to apply for this aperiodic gap? |
| Apple | Option 1 and 2 are not mutual exclusive. In option 1 UE ‘can’ … doesn’t mean UE ‘has to’. It may be true that aperiodic gap has higher priority most of the time. However, if RAN4 agrees to study solutions on top of priority based solution (as supported by several companies), it is possible that UE requests equal priority in this scenario. |
| Nokia | A gap priority – no matter it is periodic or aperiodic – should depend on the procedure for which the gap is requested. |
| Charter | We support option 1. |
| CMCC | Can be FFS. |
| Huawei  | Suggest FFS on how to handle collision between aperiodic gap and other gaps. |
| Qualcomm | OK to keep FFS. |
| Xiaomi | OK to keep FFS. |
| MTK | FFS. We appreciate the motivation but not clear what exactly aperiodic MUSIM gap should be higher priority than. |
| vivo | More clarification on option 1 is needed. Anyway it can be up to UE implementation. |
| Ericsson | We think aperiodic gap should have higher priority than other periodic gaps since it’s a one shot gap. If this gap has lower priority, we don’t think it needs to be requested since it will be dropped when collision happens. |

**Issue 2-3-5-2: On the time window W for aperiodic gap**

* Proposals:
	+ - Option 1: Discuss whether and how to determine the time window W when aperiodic MUSIM gap with higher priority is involved in collision (oppo)
		- Option 2: W could be the largest periodicity among all the periodic gaps + Time margin [M] for the one-shot aperiodic gap (MTK)
		- Option 3: FFS (oppo Ericsson Apple Nokia Charter CMCC Huawei Qualcomm xiaomi MTK vivo)

*Tentative agreements (1st round): No*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Option 3.It’s too early to discuss this issue.  |
| Apple | FFS. |
| OPPO | We are open to further discussion. |
| Nokia | FFS |
| Charter | We are fine to postpone this for later. Option 3 |
| CMCC | Option 3. |
| Huawei  | Option 3, suggest to postpone the issue after the previous one 2-3-5-1 is resolved.  |
| Qualcomm | FFS |
| Xiaomi | Option 3 |
| MTK | We are also fine to FFS. |
| vivo | We also feel it is too early to discuss it. Fine for FFS |

### Sub-topic 2-4 Network B requirements

**Issue 2-4-1: Whether to define network B requirements**

* Proposals:
	+ - Option 1: Define the requirements for Network B in RRC idle/inactive (Ericsson)
		- Option 2: No measurement requirements in network B will be defined by RAN4 (Apple Nokia Huawei Qualcomm MTK vivo)
		- Option 3: No impact on Network B requirements provided that the gaps are configured in Network A. and RAN4 not to change idle/inactive requirements on Network B ()
		- Option 4: If there is a consensus to specify network B requirement, its priority should be lower compared with the work for network A requirements and could be carried out at the second phase in the WI time frame (Apple vivo)
		- Option 5: If requirements for measurements in NW B are to be defined, re-use the existing requirements for IDLE/INACTIVE as baseline with DRX cycle replaced by max(DRX cycle, MGRP) ()
		- Option 6: No new requirements to be introduce for NW B measurements in RRC\_IDLE/\_INACTIVE state, however, further study the impact on NW B measurement requirements considering different scenarios. ()

*Tentative agreements (1st round): No*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Option 1. From our understanding, option 3 which is just one solution for option 1 isn’t contradictory to option 1.We think it’s important to define UE’s requirement for NW B. Otherwise, the whole MUSIM gaps will be a black box for both NW-A and NW-B. |
| Apple | Option 2 and 4. Note that MUSIM gap may be dropped according to previous open issues, which makes operation in NW B more like a best effort operation. |
| Nokia | We prefer Option 2. Network B requirements apply.  |
| Huawei  | Option 2. |
| Qualcomm | Option 2 |
| MTK | Support Option 2. |
| vivo | Ok with option 2 or 4. |
| Ericsson | To moderatorCould you further explain this option 2?We don’t think option 2 means NW-B should follow the legacy Idle mode requirement. Instead, it means no requirement for MUSIM UE in NW-B. |
|  |  |
|  |  |

### Sub-topic 2-5 Others

**Issue 2-5-1: MUSIM overhead**

* Proposals:
	+ - Option 1: RAN4 to define MUSIM gap overhead for MUSIM gap(s) ()
		- Option 2: not necessary to define overhead ()
		- Option 3: wait for concurrent gap conclusion (Nokia)
		- Option 4: FFS (Apple oppo Nokia Charter Huawei Qualcomm Xiaomi MTK vivo)
		- Option 5: Reuse conclusion in concurrent gap if MUSIM gaps can be viewed as “one gap”(Ericsson)

*Tentative agreements (1st round): No*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | We can reuse the conclusion in concurrent gaps if MUSIM gaps can be believed as ‘one gap’. |
| Apple | The conclusion in concurrent gaps is to limit the MGRP, which cannot be directly reused if we considered MUSIM gaps as ‘one gap’.Besides, conclusion in concurrent gaps was concluded based on assumption of up to two gaps in one FR. For MUSIM gaps there could be more gaps than that. We are open for further study. |
| OPPO | FFS. The number of MUSIM gaps (up to 3) and MUSIM gap patterns (larger MGRP, and aperiodic gap) are different from that for concurrent gaps. The conclusion for concurrent gaps cannot be reused. |
| Nokia | Either Option 3, 1 wait for Rel 17 concurent gap conclusion or FFS.  |
| Charter | We support option 4 and wait with any conclusion after the conclusion in concurrent gap. Then we may decide if we should use the same conclusion as in concurrent gap or not. |
| Huawei  | Option 4. We are not sure if con-MG conclusion can be directly re-used because only two MGs are considered. |
| Qualcomm | Option 4 |
| Xiaomi | We share the view with Apple and OPPO that, for MUSIM gap the number of gaps are different from concurrent gaps. So the conclusion on overhead for concurrent gap cannot be directly reused to MUSIM gaps.It was agreed in concurrent gap that “*Regarding the overhead cap on concurrent gaps in Rel-17, measurement requirement does not apply when more than one MGP is configured with MGRP=20ms in an FR*”. We prefer to take this as baseline and further consider the number of gaps issue. Open to further discuss. |
| MTK | Fine with option 4, given that concurrent gap conclusion might not be directly applicable. |
| vivo | FFS. |

**Issue 2-5-2: Conditions in which the UE is allowed to request MUSIM gaps**

* Proposals:
	+ - Option 1: RAN4 needs to define the conditions in which the UE is considered to be in MUSIM operation mode (Ericsson Nokia)
		- Option 2: Not necessary (Apple MTK Huawei Qualcomm vivo)

*Tentative agreements (1st round): No*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Option 1From our understanding, it’s important to define the pre-condition in which UE is considered to be in MUSIM mode and request MUSIM gaps. For example, we’ll further consider MUSIM procedures to operate in RRC\_CONNECTED state simultaneously in NW A and NW B soon. |
| Apple | Support option 2 at current stage.  |
| Nokia | We agree with Ericsson that a pre-condition needs to be specified. Otherwise it is not clear when the UE is allowed to request MUSIM gaps, which have a clear scope on the application.  |
| Huawei | Option 2.We understand the current objective is for scenario where UE is in CONNECTED in NW A and IDLE/INACTIVE in NW B, as discussed in Rel-17. |
| Qualcomm | Option 2 |
| MTK | Support option 2. |
| vivo | Support option 2.  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# Recommendations for Tdocs

## 1st round

**New tdocs**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Title | Source | Comments |
| WF on RRM requirements for Rel-17 MUSIM gaps | vivo |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Existing tdocs**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Tdoc number | Title | Source | Recommendation  | Comments |
| [**R4-2213450**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2213450.zip) | Work plan for Dual Transmission Reception (Tx Rx) Multi-SIM for NR WI. | vivo | endorsed |  |
| [**R4-2211591**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2211591.zip) | Discussion on RRM requirements for Rel-17 MUSIM gaps | Charter Communications, Inc | noted |  |
| [**R4-2211912**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2211912.zip) | RRM requirements for Rel-17 MUSIM gaps | Apple | noted |  |
| [**R4-2211939**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2211939.zip) | Discussion on RRM requirements for Rel-17 MUSIM gaps | CMCC | noted |  |
| [**R4-2211969**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2211969.zip) | Discussion on RRM requirements for Rel-17 MUSIM gaps | Xiaomi | noted |  |
| [**R4-2212061**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2212061.zip) | Discussion on RRM requirements for Rel-17 MUSIM gaps | OPPO | noted |  |
| [**R4-2212209**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2212209.zip) | On requirements for Rel-17 MUSIM gaps | Qualcomm Incorporated | noted |  |
| [**R4-2212343**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2212343.zip) | Potential RF related issues for the MUSIM enhancements | Apple | noted |  |
| [**R4-2212687**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2212687.zip) | Discussion on Rel 18 RRM requirements for MUSIM | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | noted |  |
| [**R4-2212765**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2212765.zip) | Discussion on MUSIM gaps | Ericsson | noted |  |
| [**R4-2213451**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2213451.zip) | Initial consierations on RRM requirements for Rel-17 MUSIM gaps | vivo | noted |  |
| [**R4-2213562**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2213562.zip) | Discussion on RRM requirements for MUSIM gaps | Huawei, HiSilicon | noted |  |
| [**R4-2213748**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_104-e/Docs/R4-2213748.zip) | Discussion on RRM requirements for MUSIM gaps | MediaTek inc. | noted |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Notes:

1. Please include the summary of recommendations for all tdocs across all sub-topics incl. existing and new tdocs.
2. For the Recommendation column please include one of the following:
	1. CRs/TPs: Agreeable, Revised, Merged, Postponed, Not Pursued
	2. Other documents: Agreeable, Revised, Noted
3. For new LS documents, please include information on To/Cc WGs in the comments column
4. Do not include hyper-links in the documents

## 2nd round

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Tdoc number | Title | Source | Recommendation  | Comments |
| R4-2214349 | WF on RRM requirements for Rel-17 MUSIM gaps | vivo | Agreeable |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Notes:

1. Please include the summary of recommendations for all tdocs across all sub-topics.
2. For the Recommendation column please include one of the following:
	1. CRs/TPs: Agreeable, Revised, Merged, Postponed, Not Pursued
	2. Other documents: Agreeable, Revised, Noted
3. Do not include hyper-links in the documents