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# Introduction

In this contribution, we summarize the email discussion approved for discussion during RAN1 #101-E. Chairman has approved three email discussion threads for RAN1 #101-E. The following are the approved email discussions:

* [101-e-NR-Mob-Enh-01] Email discussion/approval of Issue #1 (UL cancellation for DAPS) and #3 (UL overlapping transmission) in R1-2003747 by 5/29; if necessary, endorse the associated TPs by 6/4 – Daewon (Intel)
* [101-e-NR-Mob-Enh-02] Email discussion/approval of Issue #5 (Power sharing mode for UL DAPS-HO) in R1-2003747 by 5/28; if necessary, endorse the associated TPs by 6/3– Daewon (Intel)
* [101-e-NR-Mob-Enh-03] Email discussion/approval of Issue #6 (PDCCH monitoring in DL DAPS-HO) in R1-2003747 by 5/28; if necessary, endorse the associated TPs by 6/2– Daewon (Intel)

This contribution summarizes the email discussion for [101-e-NR-Mob-Enh-01].

# Email Discussion [101-e-NR-Mob-Enh-01]

This discussion is regarding the uplink cancellation and uplink transmission overlapping issue in UL DAPS-HO (Issue #1 and #3 from [11]).

**Issue and Proposal Summary:**

## Issue #1) Uplink cancellation in UL DAPS-HO [1][2][3][5][6][8]

In RAN1 #100bis-e, TP on uplink cancellation rules for UL DAPS was agreed. However, the TP contained various brackets left for confirmation. Several companies have provided input on this issue. The following is a summary of proposals from contributions.

* Proposal [1]:
  + The timeline for cancellation is defined as PUSCH preparation time assuming d2,1 = 1 and SCS is the smallest SCS between the SCS configuration of PDCCH in the target cell and the SCS configuration of the UE transmission on the source cell.
  + Symbol-based cancellation should be supported for DAPS handover.
  + UL cancellation should be mandatory for a UE supporting DAPS handover and no separate UE capability is needed.
  + The following is the proposed TP:

### TP#1-1

|  |
| --- |
| 15 Dual active protocol stack based handover  <---------------------------Other parts are omitted ------------------------------->  If  - the UE is~~does not~~ provided with *UplinkPowerSharingDAPS-HO-mode*, and  - UE transmissions on the target cell and the source cell overlap  the UE transmits only on the target cell, and cancels the transmission to source cell after the PUSCH preparation time *T*proc,2 for the corresponding PUSCH processing capability [6, TS 38.214] assuming *d*2,1 = 1 after a last symbol of a CORESET where the UE detects a DCI format scheduling the transmission on the target cell and μ corresponds to the smallest SCS configuration between the SCS configuration of the PDCCH carrying the DCI format and the SCS configuration of the UE transmission on the source cell. If the UE transmits PRACH using 1.25 kHz or 5 kHz SCS on the source cell, the UE determines *T*proc,2 assuming SCS configuration *μ*=0.  A UE does not expect to cancel a transmission on the source cell in symbols from the set of symbols that occur, relative to a last symbol of a CORESET where the UE detects a DCI format scheduling a transmission on the target cell, after a number of symbols that is smaller than the PUSCH preparation time *T*proc,2 for the corresponding PUSCH processing capability [6, TS 38.214] assuming *d*2,1 = 1 and *μ* corresponds to the smallest SCS configuration between the SCS configuration of the PDCCH carrying the DCI format and the SCS configuration of the UE transmission on the source cell. If the UE transmits PRACH using 1.25 kHz or 5 kHz SCS on the source cell, the UE determines *T*proc,2 assuming SCS configuration *μ*=0  <---------------------------Other parts are omitted -------------------------------> |

* Proposal [2]:
  + The complexity for DAPS cancellation is not the same as cancellation for SFI and suggest relaxing the cancellation timeline.
  + The UE doesn’t need to treat UL transmissions sub-sequent to a cancelled UL transmission in a special manner.
  + The following is the proposed TP:

### TP#1-2

|  |
| --- |
| < Start of the text proposal >  **15 Dual active protocol stack based handover**  < Unchanged parts are omitted >  If  - the UE does not provide *UplinkPowerSharingDAPS-HO*, and  - UE transmissions on the target cell and the source cell overlap  the UE transmits only on the target cell, and cancels the transmission to source cell after *T*proc,2+2, where *T*proc,2 is the PUSCH preparation time for the corresponding PUSCH processing capability [6, TS 38.214] assuming *d*2,1 = 1 after a last symbol of a CORESET where the UE detects a DCI format scheduling the transmission on the target cell and μ corresponds to the smallest SCS configuration among the SCS configuration of the PDCCH carrying the DCI format, the SCS configuration of the UE transmission on the target cell, and the SCS configuration of the UE transmission on the source cell. If the UE transmits PRACH using 1.25 kHz or 5 kHz SCS on the source cell, the UE determines *T*proc,2 assuming SCS configuration *μ*=0.  A UE does not expect to cancel a transmission on the source cell that occurs, relative to a last symbol of a CORESET where the UE detects a DCI format scheduling a transmission on the target cell, after a number of symbols that is smaller than *T*proc,2+2 for the corresponding PUSCH processing capability [6, TS 38.214] assuming *d*2,1 = 1 and *μ* corresponds to the smallest SCS configuration among the SCS configuration of the PDCCH carrying the DCI format, the SCS configuration of the UE transmission on the target cell, and the SCS configuration of the UE transmission on the source cell. If the UE transmits PRACH using 1.25 kHz or 5 kHz SCS on the source cell, the UE determines *T*proc,2 assuming SCS configuration *μ*=0.  < End of the text proposal > |

* Proposal [3]:
  + UE either cancels the whole source UL transmission, or keep the whole source UL transmission, depending on the beginning time of the source UL transmission, relative to the ending time of received target CG DCI.



**Figure from [3]: Symbol level UL transmission cancellation from agreed TP for DAPS**

* + The following is the proposed TP:

### TP#1-3

|  |
| --- |
| 15 Dual active protocol stack based handover If  - the UE does not provide *UplinkPowerSharingDAPS-HO*, and  - UE transmissions on the target cell and the source cell overlap  the UE transmits only on the target cell, and cancels the whole transmission to source cell if the occasion of the first symbol of source cell transmission is after ~~[~~the PUSCH preparation time *T*proc,2 for the corresponding PUSCH processing capability [6, TS 38.214] assuming *d*2,1 = 1 after a last symbol of a CORESET where the UE detects a DCI format scheduling the transmission on the target cell and *μ* corresponds to the smallest SCS configuration between the SCS configuration of the PDCCH carrying the DCI format and the SCS configuration of the UE transmission on the source cell. If the UE transmits PRACH using 1.25 kHz or 5 kHz SCS on the source cell, the UE determines *T*proc,2 assuming SCS configuration *μ* = 0.~~]~~  A UE does not expect to cancel a transmission on the source cell ~~[in symbols from the set of symbols]~~ with first symbol that occurs, relative to a last symbol of a CORESET where the UE detects a DCI format scheduling a transmission on the target cell, after a number of symbols that is smaller than the ~~[~~PUSCH preparation time *T*proc,2 for the corresponding PUSCH processing capability [6, TS 38.214] assuming *d*2,1 = 1 and *μ* corresponds to the smallest SCS configuration between the SCS configuration of the PDCCH carrying the DCI format and the SCS configuration of the UE transmission on the source cell. If the UE transmits PRACH using 1.25 kHz or 5 kHz SCS on the source cell, the UE determines *T*proc,2 assuming SCS configuration *μ* = 0~~]~~. |

* Proposal [5]:
  + *T*proc,2 provides a reasonable timeline requirement for UE for canceling.
  + UE behavior for symbol based cancellation has already existed in Rel-15, there is no apparent reason that UE cannot support it. The system performance is clear better with the symbol based cancellation.
  + Support UL cancellation rules for Msg 3.
  + The following is the proposed TP:

### TP#1-4

|  |
| --- |
| **Text proposal #1 for section 15 in TS38.213**  A UE does not expect to cancel a transmission on the source cell in symbols from the set of symbols that occur, relative to a last symbol of a PDSCH reception conveying a RAR message with a RAR UL grant on the target cell, after a number of symbols that is smaller than msec, where  is a time duration of  symbols corresponding to a PDSCH processing time for UE processing capability 1 when additional PDSCH DM-RS is configured,  is a time duration of  symbols corresponding to a PUSCH preparation time for UE processing capability 1 [6, TS 38.214] and the UE considers that  and  correspond to the smaller of the SCS configurations for the PDSCH on the target cell and the transmission on the source cell. For , the UE assumes  [6, TS 38.214]. |

* Proposal [6]: Consider reformulating the agreement to simply the interpretation. Remove the brackets around the time offsets.
  + The following is the proposed TP:

### TP#1-5

|  |
| --- |
| **15 Dual active protocol stack based handover**  < Unchanged parts are omitted >  If  - the UE does not provide *UplinkPowerSharingDAPS-HO*, and  - UE transmissions on the target cell and the source cell overlap  the UE transmits only on the target cell  the UE transmits only on the target cell, and cancels the transmission to source cell after the PUSCH preparation time *T*proc,2 for the corresponding PUSCH processing capability [6, TS 38.214] assuming *d*2,1 = 1 after a last symbol of a CORESET where the UE detects a DCI format scheduling the transmission on the target cell and *μ* corresponds to the smallest SCS configuration between the SCS configuration of the PDCCH carrying the DCI format and the SCS configuration of the UE transmission on the source cell. If the UE transmits PRACH using 1.25 kHz or 5 kHz SCS on the source cell, the UE determines *T*proc,2 assuming SCS configuration *μ* = 0.  The UE does not expect to cancel a transmission on the source cell the PUSCH preparation time *T*proc,2 for the corresponding PUSCH processing capability [6, TS 38.214] assuming *d*2,1 = 1 after a last symbol of a CORESET where the UE detects a DCI format scheduling the transmission on the target cell and *μ* corresponds to the smallest SCS configuration between the SCS configuration of the PDCCH carrying the DCI format and the SCS configuration of the UE transmission on the source cell. If the UE transmits PRACH using 1.25 kHz or 5 kHz SCS on the source cell, the UE determines *T*proc,2 assuming SCS configuration *μ* = 0. |

* Proposal [8]:
  + UL cancellation behaviour can be based simply to the defined timeline
  + The following is the proposed TP:

### TP#1-6

|  |
| --- |
| If  - the UE does not provide *UplinkPowerSharingDAPS-HO*, and  - UE transmissions on the target cell and the source cell overlap  the UE transmits only on the target cell, and cancels the transmission to source cell after the PUSCH preparation time *T*proc,2 for the corresponding PUSCH processing capability [6, TS 38.214] assuming *d*2,1 = 1 after a last symbol of a CORESET where the UE detects a DCI format scheduling the transmission on the target cell and μ corresponds to the smallest SCS configuration between the SCS configuration of the PDCCH carrying the DCI format and the SCS configuration of the UE transmission on the source cell. If the UE transmits PRACH using 1.25 kHz or 5 kHz SCS on the source cell, the UE determines *T*proc,2 assuming SCS configuration *μ*=0.  A UE does not expect to cancel a transmission to the source cell in symbols that occur, relative to a last symbol of a CORESET where the UE detects a DCI format scheduling a transmission on the target cell, after a number of symbols that is smaller than the PUSCH preparation time *T*proc,2 for the corresponding PUSCH processing capability [6, TS 38.214] assuming *d*2,1 = 1 and *μ* corresponds to the smallest SCS configuration between the SCS configuration of the PDCCH carrying the DCI format and the SCS configuration of the UE transmission on the source cell. If the UE transmits PRACH using 1.25 kHz or 5 kHz SCS on the source cell, the UE determines *T*proc,2 assuming SCS configuration *μ*=0. |

## Issue #3) Overlapping UL transmission between source and target cells [1][2][4][5][8]

The issue for PRACH and PUSCH/PUCCH/SRS overlapping scenarios was discussed in RAN1 #100-E meeting. However, some companies have provided further input to the issue.

Contribution in [1] mentioned that that definition of overlapping slots for PRACH and PUSCH/PUCCH/SRS could be ambiguous when target and source cell are synchronized. Therefore, suggests updating the description.

* Proposed TP from [1]:

### TP#2-1

|  |
| --- |
| 15 Dual active protocol stack based handover  <---------------------------Other parts are omitted ------------------------------->  For DAPS operation in a same frequency band, a UE does not transmit PUSCH/PUCCH/SRS to the source MCG in a slot ~~when the transmission would~~ overlapping in time with a PRACH transmission to the target MCG or when a gap between a first or last symbol of a PRACH transmission to the target MCG in a first slot would be separated by less than symbols from a last or first symbol, respectively, of the PUSCH/PUCCH/SRS transmission to the source MCG in a second slot. for or , for or , and is the SCS configuration of the active UL BWP for the PUSCH/PUCCH/SRS transmission to source MCG. |

Contribution in [2] noted that if the time gap between source and target cell PUSCH/PUCCH/SRS is too short UE may not be able to switch the transmissions, especially if UE is using the same RF chain to serve target and source cells.

 

**Figure from [2]: Gap between UL transmission to source MCG and UL transmission to target MCG**

* Proposed TP from [2]:

### TP#2-2

|  |
| --- |
| **<Unchanged parts are omitted>**  For DAPS operation in a same frequency band, a UE does not transmit PUSCH/PUCCH/SRS to the source MCG in a slot when the transmission would overlap in time with a PRACH transmission to the target MCG or when a gap between a first or last symbol of a PRACH transmission to the target MCG in a first slot would be separated by less than symbols from a last or first symbol, respectively, of the PUSCH/PUCCH/SRS transmission to the source MCG in a second slot. for or , for or , and is the SCS configuration of the active UL BWP for the PUSCH/PUCCH/SRS transmission to source MCG.  For DAPS operation in a same frequency band, a UE does not transmit PUSCH/PUCCH/SRS to the source MCG in a slot when a gap between a first or last symbol of a PUSCH/PUCCH/SRS transmission to the target MCG in a first slot would be separated by less than symbols from a last or first symbol, respectively, of the PUSCH/PUCCH/SRS transmission to the source MCG in a second slot. for or or ， for , and is the SCS configuration of the active UL BWP for the PUSCH/PUCCH/SRS transmission to source MCG. |

Additionally, [4] and [5] mentioned the UE behaviour for when the UE needs to transmit PRACH in the source cell and PUSCH/PUCCH/SRS is missing from specification.

* Proposed TP from [4]:

### TP#2-3

|  |
| --- |
| 15 Dual active protocol stack based handover  *< Unchanged parts are omitted >*  For DAPS operation in a same frequency band, a UE does not transmit PUSCH/PUCCH/SRS to source MCG in a slot overlapping in time domain with PRACH transmission to target MCG or when a gap between the first or last symbol of a PRACH transmission to target MCG in a first slot is separated by less than *N* symbols from the last or first symbol, respectively, of a PUSCH/PUCCH/SRS transmission to source MCG in a second slot. *N* = 2 for *µ*=0 or *µ*=1,  *N*=4 for *µ*=2 or *µ*=3, and *µ* is the SCS configuration of the active UL BWP for PUSCH/PUCCH/SRS transmission to the source MCG.  For DAPS operation in a same frequency band, a UE does not transmit PUSCH/PUCCH/SRS to target MCG in a slot overlapping in time domain with PRACH transmission to source MCG or when a gap between the first or last symbol of a PRACH transmission to source MCG in a first slot is separated by less than *N* symbols from the last or first symbol, respectively, of a PUSCH/PUCCH/SRS transmission to target MCG in a second slot. *N* = 2 for *µ*=0 or *µ*=1,  *N*=4 for *µ*=2 or *µ*=3, and *µ* is the SCS configuration of the active UL BWP for PUSCH/PUCCH/SRS transmission to the target MCG. |

* Proposed TP from [5]:

### TP#2-4

|  |
| --- |
| For DAPS operation in a same frequency band, a UE does not transmit PUSCH/PUCCH/SRS to the source MCG in a slot when the transmission would overlap in time with a PRACH transmission to the target MCG or when a gap between a first or last symbol of a PRACH transmission to the target MCG in a first slot would be separated by less than symbols from a last or first symbol, respectively, of the PUSCH/PUCCH/SRS transmission to the source MCG in a second slot. for or , for or , and is the SCS configuration of the active UL BWP for the PUSCH/PUCCH/SRS transmission to source MCG.  For DAPS operation in a same frequency band, a UE does not transmit PRACH to the source MCG in a slot when the transmission would overlap in time with a PUSCH/PUCCH/SRS transmission to the target MCG or when a gap between a first or last symbol of a PUSCH/PUCCH/SRS transmission to the target MCG in a first slot would be separated by less than symbols from a last or first symbol, respectively, of the PRACH transmission to the source MCG in a second slot. for or , for or , and is the SCS configuration of the active UL BWP for the PUSCH/PUCCH/SRS transmission to target MCG. |

* Proposal in [8]:
  + When PRACH transmission in source cell would be scheduled to occur in same slot or be separated by less than N symbols from PUSCH/PUCCH/SRS in target cell, UE is not required to transmit PRACH in source UL BWP.
  + The following is proposed TP:

### TP#2-5

|  |
| --- |
| For DAPS operation in a same frequency band, a UE does not transmit PUSCH/PUCCH/SRS to the source MCG in a slot when the transmission would overlap in time with a PRACH transmission to the target MCG or when a gap between a first or last symbol of a PRACH transmission to the target MCG in a first slot would be separated by less than symbols from a last or first symbol, respectively, of the PUSCH/PUCCH/SRS transmission to the source MCG in a second slot. For DAPS operation in a same frequency band, a UE does not transmit PRACH in active UL BWP of source MCG in a same slot when the transmission would overlap in time with a PUSCH/PUCCH/SRS transmission to the target MCG or when a gap between the first or last symbol of a PUSCH/PUCCH/SRS transmission in active UL BWP of target MCG in a first slot is separated by less than symbols from the last or first symbol, respectively, of a PRACH transmission in active UL BWP of source MCG in a second slot. for or , for or , and is the SCS configuration of the active UL BWP for the PUSCH/PUCCH/SRS transmission to source MCG. |

## **Discussion:**

The issues and text proposals made in the submitted contributions can be largely categorized into 3 groups.

**Group 1)** Clarification on whether uplink cancellation should be for partial transmission (in units of symbols) or for the whole transmission

* Approach A) partial transmission
  + TP #1-1, TP#1-2
* Approach B) whole transmission
  + TP#1-3

**Group 2)** Supporting uplink cancellation timeline behavior for Msg 3

* RAN1 should determine whether or not such behavior needs to be explicitly defined or not.
* If need to be define whether TP #1-4 is acceptable.

**Group 3)** Reformulation the existing agreed text for better readability

* It was mentioned that the agreed text is quite difficult to parse and read. Suggests some reformulation (e.g. using ‘after’ in the first paragraph and ‘before’ in the second paragraph.
* TP#1-5
  + Feature lead note: may need to double check whether TP#1-5 is the intended text.
* Feature lead note: if the timeline boundary for determining when UE can perform cancellation and when UE does not expect to receive control signal is the same, the text proposal can be cleaned up. Therefore, FL suggests resolving Group 3 issue (reformulate for clarity) after other issues have been resolved.

**Group 4)** clarification of overlapping to avoid ambiguity for synchronized source and target MCG scenarios

* RAN1 should determine whether TP#2-1 is acceptable or not.

**Group 5)** Providing a protection gap between source and target MCG transmissions

 

**Figure from [2]: Gap between UL transmission to source MCG and UL transmission to target MCG**

* RAN1 should determine whether specification should support UE behavior so that UE does not need to handle cases with too short time gap between source and target PUSCH/PUCCH/SRS transmissions. Huawei has mentioned that time gap between source and target cell PUSCH/PUCCH/SRS is too short UE may not be able to switch the transmissions, especially if UE is using the same RF chain to serve target and source cells.
* If agreeable, RAN1 should determine whether TP#2-2 is acceptable or not.

**Group 6)** handling PRACH transmission in source MCG that overlaps with PUSCH/PUCCH/SRS transmission in target MCG

* RAN1 should determine whether specification should support the UE behavior to handle PRACH transmission in source MCG that overlaps with PUSCH/PUCCH/SRS transmission in target MCG. If need to be handled, which TP among TP#2-3, 2-4, or 2-5 is acceptable.

Companies are encouraged to provide comments on the proposal above. Please note comments for Group 1, 2, and 3, and Group 4, 5, and 6 are split into two different comment tables below.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Company Name | Group 1  (prefer approach A/B) | Group 2  (agree/disagree in principle) | Group 3  (agree/disagree reformulation would help readability) | Comments |
| Ericsson | A | Disagree | Agree | For group 1, it is beneficial to stop UL transmission to source as soon as possible. Restarting the transmission to source after the transmission to target is unnecessary. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | A | Need more discussion | Ok in principle | For group 2, More discussion is needed. Settling down the timeline for the general case should be prioritized. |
| Intel | A | agree | Agree in principle. | We may want to clean up the text a bit, as there were confusions with the TP in the previous meeting. |
| Samsung | A, TP1-1 is preferred | Agree in principle | disagree | For Group 1, as we stated in previous meeting and T-doc. We think partial cancellation benefits both UE & gNB. As for TP1-1 or TP1-2, we choose TP1-1 as we think is enough.  For Group 2, if agreed, the TP can be further improved once TP associated with Group1&3 group 1 is stable.  Group 3: We think the current text already exists in Claus 11.1 of 38.213 for some time and should be acceptable. However, we are okay if company provides better wording without changing the meaning. |
| Apple | B | Disagree | Agree in principle | For group 1, we support to cancel the whole UL transmission to source cell. For the timeline, Tproc,2 is not enough. DAPS is based on the DC structure, each CG would require one modem, thus two moderns need time to exchange the scheduling information. We prefer to re-use the NR-DC defined timeline, i.e., T\_offset. If UE supports dynamic power sharing, the UL cancellation is naturally supported without additional effort.  The late TP is showing below for your consideration.   |  | | --- | | If  - the UE does not provide UplinkPowerSharingDAPS-HO, and  - UE transmissions on the target cell and the source cell overlap  the UE transmits only on the target cell, and cancels the whole transmission to source cell if the occasion of the first symbol of source cell transmission is after 𝑇offset  after a last symbol of a CORESET where the UE detects a DCI format scheduling the transmission on the target cell, where 𝑇offset is defined in Clause 7.6.2,  The UE does not expect to have transmissions on the target cell that  - are scheduled by DCI formats in PDCCH receptions with a last symbol that is earlier by less than or equal to  𝑇offset from the first symbol of the transmission occasion on the source cell, and  - overlap with the transmission occasion on the source cell |   For Group 2, we don’t see the necessity to define additional timeline for msg3. If NR-DC timeline is re-used, the offset is larger enough according to UE report capability.  For Group 3, the wording can be updated after Group 1 is stable. |
| Nokia | A | Don’t see absolutely necessary | Agree in principle | Group#1: Like noted, partial cancellation is seen simpler .  Group#2: If seen absolutely necessary can be attempted to accommodate in the general timeline. |
| MTK | B | Need more discussion | Agree | For Group 1, we support Apple’s TP.  For Group 2, we do not see strong need but are open to discuss this issue. |
| ZTE | A | Disagree | Agree in principle. | For group 1, the symbol-based cancellation is more beneficial especially when cancellation occurs after source cell UL transmission has already started. Note, this is similar as symbol-based cancellation due to SFI in Rel-15  The main purpose of defining the timeline is to enlarge the time interval between the UL grant and PUSCH in the target cell. For group 2, the time interval between the RAR and msg3 is large enough (i.e.) since there is addition 0.5ms for the interval except for the PDSCH processing and PUSCH preparation time. The timeline for msg3 is not needed any more. |
| Qualcomm | A | Need more discussion | Agree | For group 3, the text “assuming *d*2,1 = 1 and *μ* corresponds to the smallest SCS configuration between the SCS configuration of the PDCCH carrying the DCI format and the SCS configuration of the UE transmission on the source cell. If the UE transmits PRACH using 1.25 kHz or 5 kHz SCS on the source cell, the UE determines *T*proc,2 assuming SCS configuration *μ*=0.” is repeated 🡪 can reformulate the overall text by having only one such text. |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Company Name | Group 4  (agree/disagree) | Group 5  (agree/disagree in principle) | Group 6  (agree/disagree in principle) | Comments |
| Ericsson | Disagree | Disagree | Agree | For group 4: there seems to be no difference.  For group 5: unnecessary: the dropping rule is sufficient |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Need more discussion | agree | agree | For Group4, I failed to understand how the change is motivated by the concerned synchronized source and target MCG scenarios, so appreciated more explanation.  For group 5, the dropping rule is only for overlapping case, TP in group 5 intends to cover the case where source and target are not overlapping but with a gap. |
| Intel | Need discussion | disagree | agree | For group 4, not entirely sure what is being changed.  For group 5, we assumed the dropping rule will provide enough processing such that UE can cancel transmissions. Once the UE is aware, the cancellation of a transmission should be feasible. The gap (if needed) should be much smaller (a fraction) than the PA transient period. |
| Samsung | Agree and TP 2-1 is acceptable | disagree | Agree in principle  2-3 or 2-5 is preferred | For Group 4, we recalled TP 2-1 is indeed close to the final agreed TP in the email during RAN1-100e.  For Group 5, this is a new behavior we haven’t agreed before. From our point of view, this gap is only needed for some UE implementations. We think dealing with this issue could be part of the DAPS HO basic capability and not needed to be in the spec.  For Group 6, choice of TP really depends on which prioritization we want under this condition. (target cell PUSCH or source cell PRACH ). We prefer prioritizing for target cell transmission to be consistent with general principle in DAPS-HO. But we open to discuss the prioritization. |
| Apple | Open to discuss | Open to discuss | Agree | For Group 4, don’t see the difference, we are open to discuss it.  For group 5, the target cell and source cell are in the same band, not sure the RF retuning time is needed in this case. And if NR-DC timeline is re-used, the target cell UE would check whether UL transmission is collision/overlap before the transmission, so this case can be avoided. |
| Nokia | Disagree | Further discussion needed | Agree | Group#4: Not fully evident what is the problem.  Group#5: Can be considered, but the behavior should follow the agree UL prioritization principle  Group#6: We would prefer to follow the agreed UL prioritization principle. |
| MTK | Agree | Agree | Agree in principle  2-3 or 2-5 is preferred | Group#4: Spec seems more clear with the TP.  Group#5: Spec seems more clear with the TP.  Group#6: We prefer prioritizing for target cell transmission to be consistent with general principle in DAPS-HO. But we open to discuss the prioritization. |
| ZTE | Agree | Disagree | Agree | In RAN1#100-e, it was agreed that the collision is a slot of a source MCG overlapping with a PRACH in the target MCG, where PUSCH/PUCCH/SRS is transmitted on the slot. The agreed TP is copied below. However, it is changed by editor that the collision is the PUSCH/PUCCH/SRS in the source MCG overlapping with a PRACH in the target MCG. When a PUSCH/PUCCH/SRS in the source MCG does not overlap with a PRACH in the target cell but the slot of the PUSCH/PUCCH/SRS (e.g. occupying only a part of a slot) overlaps with the PRACH, the collision is still valid according to the agreement while not current spec. So, the correction is to align with our original intention.  ‘*For DAPS operation in a same frequency band, a UE does not transmit PUSCH/PUCCH/SRS to source MCG in a ~~same~~ [source MCG] slot overlapping in time domain with PRACH transmission to target MCG or when a gap between the first or last symbol of a PRACH transmission to target MCG in a first slot is separated by less than N symbols from the last or first symbol, respectively, of a PUSCH/PUCCH/SRS transmission to source MCG in a second slot. N = 2 for µ=0 or µ=1,  N=4 for µ=2 or µ=3, and µ is the SCS configuration of the active UL BWP for PUSCH/PUCCH/SRS transmission to the source MCG.*’  For group 5, we have the same understanding with Samsung. |
| Qualcomm | Agree | Can be further discussed | Need further discussion | For group 6, we would like to understand the use case of sending PRACH to source and other UL to target in DAPS HO. It was our understandings in RAN1#100e that we would revisit this issue if RAN2 concluded to support such use case. |

## **Summary of all comments received by May 27, 11pm PDT (May 28, 6am UTC):**

The following is a summary of company preferences for each issue group:

***Group 1***

* Approach A: Ericsson, Huawei, HiSilicon, Intel, Samsung (TP#1-1), Nokia, ZTE, Qualcomm
* Approach B: Apple (TP#1-7), MediaTek (supports TP#1-7),

### TP#1-7

|  |
| --- |
| If  - the UE does not provide UplinkPowerSharingDAPS-HO, and  - UE transmissions on the target cell and the source cell overlap  the UE transmits only on the target cell, and cancels the whole transmission to source cell if the occasion of the first symbol of source cell transmission is after 𝑇offset  after a last symbol of a CORESET where the UE detects a DCI format scheduling the transmission on the target cell, where 𝑇offset is defined in Clause 7.6.2,  The UE does not expect to have transmissions on the target cell that  - are scheduled by DCI formats in PDCCH receptions with a last symbol that is earlier by less than or equal to  𝑇offset from the first symbol of the transmission occasion on the source cell, and  - overlap with the transmission occasion on the source cell |

From the discussion, majority of the companies is leading towards support of symbol level transmission cancellation. TP#1-7 seems to be somewhat of a departure from what was agreed in last RAN1 meeting and approach A seems to be also aligned with what was agreed in last RAN1 meeting.

Moderator Suggestion for agreement for Group 1 issue:

* Agree in principle to support partial uplink transmission (in unit of symbols) cancellation for DAPS.
* Agree to TP#1-1 of R1-2004747

***Group 2***

* Agree: Intel, Samsung (in principle),
* Disagree: Ericsson, Apple, Nokia, ZTE
* More discussion needed: Huawei, HiSilicon, MediaTek, Qualcomm

The companies are split for group 2 issue. However, given that group 2 issue is an introduction of new UE behavior associated with Msg 3 and there are few companies who seems to be against such introduction of new UE behavior, Moderator suggests concluding to not introduce such functionality. Companies that have concerns with the suggestion are encouraged to provide further comments and motivations (that may have not been described or emphasized before).

Moderator Suggestion for agreement for Group 2 issue:

* Conclude to not introduce UE behavior description related to special handling of Msg 3 transmission in DAPS.

***Group 3***

* Agree in principle: Ericsson, Huawei, HiSilicon, Intel, Apple, Nokia, MediaTek, ZTE, Qualcomm
* Not needed (disagree): Samsung

Looks like companies are open to clean up the specification text once issues are resolved. Moderator suggest performing a review of all the text changes and perform a clean up at the end.

Moderator Suggestion for agreement for Group 3 issue:

* Once all issues are concluded and TP for each issue are endorsed, review the merged TP from all issues related to uplink cancellation and overlap, and (if needed) clean up the final TP.

***Group 4***

* Agree: Samsung (TP#2-1), MediaTek, ZTE, Qualcomm
* Disagree: Ericsson, Nokia
* More discussion needed: Huawei, HiSilicon, Intel, Apple

Although companies are somewhat split in views. From the comments, it seems companies that disagree with TP#2-1 believe there is no change with the TP. While companies who support think the change is better for clarity. If so there may not be a negative impact from agreeing TP#2-1. Moderator suggests to agree to TP#2-1. If companies have technical concerns on the TP, please provide comments.

Moderator Suggestion for agreement for Group 4 issue:

* Agree to TP#2-1

***Group 5***

* Agree: Huawei, HiSilicon, MediaTek
* Disagree: Ericsson, Intel, Samsung, ZTE
* More discussion needed: Apple, Nokia, Qualcomm

The companies are split for group 5 issue. However, given that group 5 issue is an introduction of new UE behavior associated with gap between source and target cell PUSCH/PUCCH/SRS transmission and there are few companies who seems to be against such introduction of new UE behavior, Moderator suggests concluding to not introduce such functionality. Companies that have concerns with the suggestion are encouraged to provide further comments and motivations (that may have not been described or emphasized before).

Moderator Suggestion for agreement for Group 5 issue:

* Conclude to not introduce UE behavior description related to gap between source and target cell PUSCH/PUCCH/SRS transmission.

***Group 6***

* Agree: Ericsson, Intel, Huawei, HiSilicon, Samsung (TP#2-3 or 2-5), Apple, Nokia, MediaTek(TP#2-3 or 2-5), ZTE
* Disagree: -
* More discussion needed: Qualcomm

Companies all seem to agree to the issue. Among TP#2-3 and #2-5, #2-5 seem to be more compact. Moderator suggest to see if TP#2-5 is agreeable.

Moderator Suggestion for agreement for Group 6 issue:

* Agree to TP#2-5

## **Discussion (after May 27, 11pm PDT/May 28, 6am UTC):**

The following are a summary of all Moderator suggestions.

Moderator suggestion for agreement:

* For Group 1 issue:
  + Agree in principle to support partial uplink transmission (in unit of symbols) cancellation for DAPS.
  + Agree to TP#1-1 of R1-2004747
* For Group 2 issue:
  + Conclude to not introduce UE behavior description related to special handling of Msg 3 transmission in DAPS.
* For Group 3 issue:
  + Once all issues are concluded and TP for each issue are endorsed, review the merged TP from all issues related to uplink cancellation and overlap, and (if needed) clean up the final TP.
* For Group 4 issue:
  + Agree to TP#2-1 of R1-2004747
* For Group 5 issue:
  + Conclude to not introduce UE behavior description related to gap between source and target cell PUSCH/PUCCH/SRS transmission.
* For Group 6 issue:
  + Agree to TP#2-5 of R1-2004747

Companies are encouraged to provide further comments on the above suggestion. Especially, if companies are encouraged to provide further information if they have concerns on the conclusion for Group 2 and Group 5.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments/Views |
| Qualcomm | For Group 6, we suggest the following update to TP#2-5:  **Modified TP#2-5:**  For DAPS operation in a same frequency band, a UE does not transmit PUSCH/PUCCH/SRS to the source MCG in a slot when the transmission would overlap in time with a PRACH transmission to the target MCG or when a gap between a first or last symbol of a PRACH transmission to the target MCG in a first slot would be separated by less than symbols from a last or first symbol, respectively, of the PUSCH/PUCCH/SRS transmission to the source MCG in a second slot. For DAPS operation in a same frequency band, a UE does not transmit PRACH to the ~~in active UL BWP of~~ source MCG in a ~~same~~ slot ~~when the transmission would~~ overlapping in time with a PUSCH/PUCCH/SRS transmission to the target MCG or when a gap between the first or last symbol of a PUSCH/PUCCH/SRS transmission ~~in active UL BWP of~~ to the target MCG in a first slot is separated by less than symbols from the last or first symbol, respectively, of a PRACH transmission ~~in active UL BWP~~ ~~of~~ to the source MCG in a second slot. for or , for or , and is the SCS configuration of the active UL BWP for the PUSCH/PUCCH/SRS transmission to source MCG. |
| Moderator (Intel) | I’ve added the modification Qualcomm suggested to 2-5 in TP #2-8 (for referencing purposes). |

### TP#2-6

|  |
| --- |
| For DAPS operation in a same frequency band, a UE does not transmit PUSCH/PUCCH/SRS to the source MCG in a slot when the transmission would overlap in time with a PRACH transmission to the target MCG or when a gap between a first or last symbol of a PRACH transmission to the target MCG in a first slot would be separated by less than symbols from a last or first symbol, respectively, of the PUSCH/PUCCH/SRS transmission to the source MCG in a second slot. For DAPS operation in a same frequency band, a UE does not transmit PRACH to the ~~in active UL BWP of~~ source MCG in a ~~same~~ slot ~~when the transmission would~~ overlapping in time with a PUSCH/PUCCH/SRS transmission to the target MCG or when a gap between the first or last symbol of a PUSCH/PUCCH/SRS transmission ~~in active UL BWP of~~ to the target MCG in a first slot is separated by less than symbols from the last or first symbol, respectively, of a PRACH transmission ~~in active UL BWP~~ ~~of~~ to the source MCG in a second slot. for or , for or , and is the SCS configuration of the active UL BWP for the PUSCH/PUCCH/SRS transmission to source MCG. |

# Conclusion of Email Discussion [101-e-NR-Mob-Enh-01]

**Summary of email discussion outcome:**

* xxx
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