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# 1 Introduction

This document summarizes the discussions for email thread [105-e-NR-DSS-01] under agenda item 8.13.1 on Cross-carrier scheduling (from SCell to PCell) for the Rel17 WI on NR Dynamic spectrum sharing (DSS).

# 2. Discussion

## 2.1 Moderator Summary

Below is a short moderator summary based on tdocs [1-21] submitted for RAN1#105-e

### 2.1.1 PDCCH monitoring and BD/CCE limit handling

Following aspects were discussed related to PDCCH monitoring and BD/CCE limit handling when CCS from sSCell to PCell/PSCell is configured

1. PDCCH monitoring (definitions of Alt 2-1,2-2,2-4 are in the RAN1#103-e agreement in the Annex)
	* Alt 2-1
		+ [3],[4],[7],[10],[12],[15],[16],[19],[20]
		+ [13] –second preference as optional UE feature
	* Alt 2-2
		+ [5],[9],[18]
		+ [13] – first preference as optional UE feature
		+ [1] - Modified Alt 2-2 – [1]
			- Dynamic switching of PDCCH monitoring of DCI formats 0\_1,1\_1,0\_2,1\_2 between monitoring on PCell/PSCell USS sets and monitoring on sSCell USS sets is supported
				* FFS: Details of switching mechanism
			- UE may monitor DCI formats 0\_1,1\_1,0\_2,1\_2 on both PCell USS set(s) and sSCell USS sets simultaneously in certain scenarios, e.g. when the UE falls back to monitoring USS set on the PCell, it is not forbidden from monitoring the USS set on the sSCell.
		+ [1] - Alt 2-4 with SS Group Switching (Alt2-2+Alt-2-4)
			- The USS set(s) on PSCell/PCell and the USS set(s) on sSCell are configured such that UE does not monitor DCI formats 0\_1,1\_1,0\_2,1\_2 on both PCell USS set(s) and sSCell USS set(s) simultaneously
			- SS Group Swithcing is employed for dynamic switching mechanism
	* Alt 2-4
		+ [7], [18], [6]
		+ [8] - Alt 2-4 with additional restrictions
			- Following search space sets are configured so that the UE does not monitor both of them in the same slot
				* USS set(s) for any DCI formats and Type3-CSS set(s) for DCI formats 1\_0/0\_0 with C-RNTI/CS-RNTI/MCS-C-RNTI configured on P(S)Cell
				* USS set(s) for P(S)Cell configured on sSCell
			- There is no restriction on Type-0/0A/1/2-CSS sets configurations
			- + BD limit handling as described in Proposal 4 of [8]
	* Alt 2-4a (as below based on [13])
		+ UE does not monitor PDCCH (including CSS and USS candidates) for P(S)Cell from both P(S)Cell and sSCell in a same slot (for smallest SCS)
	* No restrictions on PCell CSS monitoring slots due to CCS from sSCell to PCell -- [20]
	* Change to WA in RAN1#104e -- [1]
2. BD/CCE limit handling
	* Discussion related to sSCell overbooking
		+ [3] – is “overbooking across PCell and sSCell for scheduling the PCell” supported? (also discussed in [12])
			- Not allowed per agreement from RAN1#104b-e? – “*PDCCH overbooking on sSCell USS set(s) is not allowed*”
	* Based on Option A discussed in RAN1#104b-e
		+ [4],[5],[8],[11],[12],[14],[15],[20]
	* Based on Option B discussed in RAN1#104b-e
		+ [3],[7],[11],[13],[16],[19] , [6]
	* Based on Option C discussed in RAN1#104b-e
		+ [3], [2],[4],[5],[9],[10],[19]
	* CA scaling
		+ Count sSCell as additional cell –[16],[19],[20], [6]
		+ Count sSCell as one cell – [3]
		+ Separate BDfactor (can be less than 1) for sSCell and P(S)Cell at least when they have different SCS – [2]
		+ Separate scaling factors [13]
		+ FFS – [9],[11]
	* SCS between P(S)Cell and sSCell for BD/CCE computation
		+ Use smaller SCS – [12], [13]
		+ Do not support P(S)Cell SCS > sSCell SCS – [8],[19]
3. Handling of DCI formats 0\_0 and 1\_0 on USS for scheduling PCell/PSCell PDSCH/PUSCH
	* Present only on P(S)Cell as in Rel15/16 – [3],[5],[6],[7],[8],[10],[11],[12],[19],[13] ,[6]
	* Specs also allow UEs that cannot be configured to monitor DCI formats 0\_0/1\_0 on USS set(s) for scheduling PCell/PSCell PDSCH/PUSCH – [8]
	* follows for non-fallback handling – [4]
	* FFS – [16]
4. DCI format 2-5
	* follows Rel16 – [4],[6],[7],[11],[16],[17]
5. DCI format 2-6
	* Follows Rel16 handling – [3],[5],[6],[7],[11],[14],[16],[17]
	* Can be sent also on sSCell – [4]
6. SS handling when sSCell is deactivated – [3],[19]
7. Impact on DCI size budgets – [5],[8],[11]
8. Impact on #DL and UL unicast DCI per monitoring occasion/span – [3],[11],[14],[19]
9. Separate config of UL and DL DCI formats – [20]
10. PDCCH in SS set provided by recoverySearchSpaceId can be monitored on the sSCell – [21]

### 2.1.2 Configuration details for CCS from sSCell to P(S)Cell

1. Use CIF for PCell non-fallback DCI – [3],8],[12?]
2. Search space linking configuration for CCS
	* Use SS linking as in Rel16
		+ [4],[9],[10],[17]
	* Use SS linking but PeriodicityAndOffset, SymbolsWithinSlot, and duration can be configured separately
		+ [7],[8],[14]
	* Separate search space config for sSCell to PCell scheduling
		+ [5],[13]
3. RRC configuration details for CCS from sSCell to PCell/PSCell (How to indicate using CrossCarrierSchedulingConfig) – [3], [4],[6],[7]

### 2.1.3 Remaining details on scheduling framework

Following aspects were discussed related to scheduling framework when CCS from sSCell to PCell/PSCell is configured

1. Dynamic activation/activation/switching of sSCell 🡪 PCell/PSCell scheduling
	* Support – [3],[12],[17],[13]
	* Not support – [4],[6],[14]
	* FFS –
	* Handling when sSCell is deactivated/dormant –
2. Dormancy supported for sSCell?
	* Supported – [5],[6],
	* FFS – [16]
3. ~~DCI or MAC CE based switching of sSCell – [13]~~

### 2.1.4 Other aspects

1. SCell to PCell/PSCell scheduling has no impact on PUCCH or PUSCH/SRS for non-CA – [1]
2. Whether sSCell can be unlicensed band? – [19]
3. BFR on sSCell – [21]
4. SCell to Pcell scheduling also supported for multi-cast broadcast PDSCH – [13]

Below are some proposals for discussion

## 2.2 Proposals

### Proposal 1

* Confirm that “overbooking across PCell and sSCell for scheduling the PCell” is not allowed per previous RAN1#104b-e agreement (“PDCCH overbooking on sSCell USS set(s) is not allowed”)

Companies are requested to indicate their view about the above proposal in the Table below

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company Name** | **Comments (Proposal 1)** |
| Moderator notes | According to RAN1#104b-e agreement any kind of overbooking on sSCell USS set(s) is not allowed. However, two tdocs [3],[12] discussed whether “overbooking across PCell and sSCell for scheduling the PCell” is allowed and it may be good to clarify. |
| Qualcomm | Agree with the proposal |
| Apple | We are fine with the FL proposal to make progress. Strictly speaking, it spends on the SS pattern, especially if it is TDM for simultaneous.  |
| Samsung | We understand that the proposal from [3], [12] does not relate to “overbooking on sSCell USS sets is not allowed”. Rather that BD/CCE counting for scheduling on the P(S)Cell is across the PCell and the sSCell. That is a separate issue.Additionally, there are a few statements in the summary above that are incorrect:1. removing the link among search space sets for the scheduling cell (sSCell) and the scheduled cell has nothing to do with Alt. 2-4a.
2. Alt. 2-4a does not imply any change in the WA. The WA states “FFS: Whether the UE can monitor PDCCH from both cells in the same slot.”
3. Some revisions are made above for other clarifications.
 |
| Ericsson | OK to confirm. |
| CATT | Agree with the proposal. |
| ZTE | Firstly, in RAN1 #104b-e meeting, the agreement is “overbooking on sSCell USS sets is not allowed”. Then, there are still two potential options open1. Overbooking on PCell for self-scheduling is supported;2. Overbooking across PCell and sSCell for scheduling PCell is supported.Secondly, there are Option A/B/C for BD/CCE limits, if Option A/C is agreed, then we are fine with the proposal 1 because the “across case for overbooking” does not exist. If Option B is agreed, using overbooking across PCell and sSCell for scheduling PCell seems to be the valid scheme.From our perspective, if Option B is precluded, then it is fine to agree the Proposal 1 here. BTW: We updated some parts in Section 2.1 regarding our contribution ([3]) with change mark. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Agree with the proposal. |
| vivo | Further clarification is needed. We think overbooking across Pcell and sScell has the following two cases:Case 1: When the total configured BD/CCE budget across Pcell and sScell over a slot with reference SCS can exceed the budget (e.g. Z2 in Option B), dropping of Pcell and sScell USS is allowed;Case 2: The total configured BD/CCE budget across Pcell and sScell over a slot with reference SCS can exceed the budget (e.g. Z2 in Option B), dropping of Pcell USS only is allowed.Then it needs to clarify which of the following understanding is correct for the above proposal:Understanding 1: Case 1 is not supported and Case 2 is still supported;Understanding 2: Both Case 1 and Case 2 are not supported.We need to have a common understanding before agreeing the proposal. |
| MTK | We are fine with the FL proposal. We also think the overbooking rule would need to be further investigated if Option B if adopted, and thus it may be good to avoid choosing Option B. |
| Intel | We share view from ZTE that Proposal 1 has relation with BD/CCE handling Option A/B/C. we think Option B is beneficial for the case that PCell and sSCell have the same SCS. For the two cases listed by vivo, our understanding is Case 2. Therefore, if the total number of BD/CCE exceeds Z2, only dropping USS set on PCell is done (up to gNB to guarantee that max numbers are not exceed after dropping one or more USS sets on PCell). That is, overbooking only happens on PCell, so it is aligned with previous meeting agreement.  |
| LG Electronics | Agree with the FL proposal. |
| ETRI | We are fine with the proposal, but we also think that “overbooking across PCell and sSCell” is a valid option for Option B. It is slightly preferred to make decision after choosing BD/CCE handling options A/B/C. |
| InterDigital | We agree with the proposal. |
| Spreadtrum | We support the proposal. |
| Nokia | Not clear why we need to confirm an agreement with a more ambiguous text than the original agreement. This doesn’t seem to take us any further. |
| OPPO | Agree with the proposal. In order to handle overbooking/dropping on PCell, it is better to define an explicit maximum budget of BD on PCell. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | OK. We agree with Intel’s comments. |
| Xiaomi | Agree with the proposal |

### Proposal 1v2

* For UE configured with CCS from sSCell to P(S)Cell
	+ Dropping of USS sets on P(S)Cell due to PDCCH overbooking is supported
	+ Dropping of USS sets on sSCell due to PDCCH overbooking is not supported
		- Note: It has already been agreed that “PDCCH overbooking on sSCell USS set(s) is not allowed”

Companies are requested to indicate their view about the above proposal in the Table below

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company Name** | **Comments (Proposal 1v2)** |
| Moderator notes | Updated based on some of the received comments (e.g. comment from Vivo). The second bullet may be repeating old agreement but adding to align the language to avoid any further confusion. |
| Apple | We are fine with the proposal |
| OPPO | Fine with the proposal.  |
| Qualcomm | We prefer to defer this decision until we conclude the framework of PDCCH configuration/monitoring and BD/CCE limit handling. |
| Samsung | Although we can support the proposal, it may depend on whether Option B or Option A/C is selected.  |
| Nokia | This is a nice improvement over the original proposal 1. We are fine with the proposal. Given QC and Samsung’s point on BC/CCE limits, we could make this a working assumption subject to be confirmed after the BD/CCE decision has been taken. |
| Intel | Fine with the second sub-bulletRegarding the first sub-bullet, it needs to clarify how is the number of BD/CCE counted. Two options can be considered, i.e. * Option 1: Dropping of USS sets on P(S)Cell due to PDCCH overbooking is supported if the number of BD/CCE configured on P(S)Cell exceeds the corresponding maximum numbers
* Option 2: Dropping of USS sets on P(S)Cell due to PDCCH overbooking is supported if the total number of BD/CCE configured on P(S)Cell and sSCell exceeds the corresponding maximum numbers

The above Option 2 is aligned with Option B for BD/CCE handling. On the other hand, Option 1 is for Option A/C. Since we don’t have agreement on Option A/B/C yet. We suggest to explicitly capture the two options in the FL proposal.  |
| CATT | Support the proposal.We are not quite sure about the relation between overbooking and BD/CCE limit. No matter which option is adopted in the end, i.e. option A/B/C, the functionality is to determine a threshold which can be used to make a decision on drop partial USS or not.  |
| vivo | We support the proposal and fine with Intel’s further clarification..To Qualcomm and Samsung: I think this doesn’t imply Option A/B/C and it is a good clarification for previous agreement. As Intel indicates, there are two interpretations based on Option A/C and Option B respectively.  |
| ZTE | The only progress of Proposal 1v2 is “Dropping of USS sets on P(S)Cell due to PDCCH overbooking is supported” compared with what had already been agreed in RAN1 #104b-e. But this is aligned with current spec which may not need an agreement.While, the question/clarification is how option B works with proposal 1v2.* Understanding 1: the USS index used for PCell self-scheduling are all larger than that used for s-p scheduling.
* Understanding 2: only the USS index used for PCell self-scheduling are involved dropping and without the restriction in understanding 1.

For the understanding 1, the restriction is the order of USS index should be carefully configured for p-p self-scheduling and s-p scheduling, and the overbooking/dropping can be only performed on PCell for p-p self-scheduling while the USS used for s-p scheduling can not be dropped. For understanding 2, this may be easily worked with some spec changes because only partial of the USS index are involved in dropping pseudocode.So, using overbooking across PCell and sSCell for scheduling PCell for option B seems to be the valid scheme due to the USS index is independent used of p-p self-scheduling and s-p scheduling. |
| LG Electronics | We share the view with Intel. Clarification on the USS dropping of USS on P(S)Cell between Options 1 and 2 in Intel’s comment seems needed. |
| Spreadtrum | We support the proposal.It makes sense with any Option A/B/C. Because Option A/B/C are for how to define the BD/CCE limits. However, this proposal just defines the dropping operation is on PCell not on sSCell. |
| Huawei, HiSi | Fine with the proposal and modifications from intel can be incorporated. |
| Xiaomi  | Support the proposal. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We are fine with the proposal. |
| InterDigital | We are fine with the proposal.  |

### Proposal 2

* Down select from below alternatives for handling of PDCCH monitoring and BD/CCE limits when P(S)Cell SCS is less than or equal to sSCell SCS
	+ **(based on Alt 2-1)** When UE is configured to monitor DCI formats 0\_1/1\_1/0\_2/1\_2 on P(S)Cell USS set(s), and on sSCell USS set(s), and for case when sSCell is activated
		- UE can monitor DCI formats 0\_1,1\_1,0\_2,1\_2 on both P(S)Cell USS set(s) and sSCell USS sets in overlapping [symbol/slot] of P(S)Cell and sSCell
		- Further discuss detailed BD/CCE handling based on Option A ~~or Option B~~ or Option C discussed in RAN1#104b-e
			* For Option C, at least the case where Z3 + Z4 ≤ $M\_{PDCCH}^{max,slot,μ}$ is supported where $μ$ is SCS configuration of the P(S)Cell
	+ **(based on Alt 2-2)** When UE is configured to monitor DCI formats 0\_1/1\_1/0\_2/1\_2 on P(S)Cell USS set(s), and on sSCell USS set(s), and for case when sSCell is activated
		- Dynamic switching of PDCCH monitoring of DCI formats 0\_1,1\_1,0\_2,1\_2 between monitoring on P(S)Cell USS sets and monitoring on sSCell USS sets is supported using one of the following switching mechanism(s)
			* Search space set switching by unicast DCI formats/MAC CE/DCI format 2-0
			* SS Group Switching
		- Further discuss detailed BD/CCE handling
	+ **(based on Alt 2-4)** When UE is configured to monitor DCI formats 0\_1/1\_1/0\_2/1\_2 on P(S)Cell USS set(s), and on sSCell USS set(s), and for case when sSCell is activated
		- The USS set(s) on PSCell/PCell and the USS set(s) on sSCell are configured such that UE does not monitor DCI formats 0\_1,1\_1,0\_2,1\_2 on both PCell USS set(s) and sSCell USS set(s) in overlapping [symbol/slot] of P(S)Cell and sSCell
		- Dynamic switching of PDCCH monitoring of DCI formats 0\_1,1\_1,0\_2,1\_2 between monitoring on P(S)Cell USS sets and monitoring on sSCell USS sets is not supported
		- Further discuss detailed BD/CCE handling based on Option A ~~or Option B~~ or Option C discussed in RAN1#104b-e
			* For Option C, at least the case where Z3 + Z4 ≤ $M\_{PDCCH}^{max,slot,μ}$ is supported where $μ$ is SCS configuration of the P(S)Cell

Companies are requested to indicate their view about the above proposal in the Table below

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company Name** | **Comments (Proposal 2)** |
| Moderator notes | Please provide any comments/clarifications to above alternatives. Intention is to discuss the down selection in GTW session |
| Qualcomm | We would like to make sure that at least one type of UEs is allowed to implement monitoring unicast PDCCH on one of the scheduling cells in each P(S)Cell slot. * Our first preference for this is to fix this unicast PDCCH scheduling cell to the sSCell semi-statically – this is our original proposal; support Ues with Alt.1 only (with supporting Ues with Alt.2-1 with Option A as an advanced UE type).
* As a compromise, we have added an alternative proposal in R1-2105970, wherein one unicast PDCCH scheduling cell is determined based on higher-layer configurations (Alt.2-4 with hybrid b/w Option A and Option B) for each P(S)Cell slot.

We suggest companies to consider either of the above frameworks. Between the above two, the first preference is friendly to UE side while may cause scheduler restriction to NW side. The above compromised option could take a good balance between UE complexity and NW flexibility.Regarding the Proposal 2:For **the option based on Alt.2-1 (first sub-bullet)**, we are in general OK with this if the WA (UE is allowed to support only Alt.1 functionalities) is confirmed and if the following is added:* UE is allowed not to support monitoring USS for fallback DCI formats on the P(S)Cell

For **the option based on Alt.2-4 (third bullet)**, just limiting non-fallback DCI formats on only one of the scheduling cells per P(S)Cell slot just resolves part of the implementation concerns. We propose to rephrase the proposal as following. With this change, we do not need to agree “UE is allowed not to support monitoring USS set(s) for fallback DCI formats on the P(S)Cell”, which must be beneficial for NW side.* Following search space sets are configured so that the UE does not monitor both of them in the same slot
	+ USS set(s) for any DCI formats and Type3-CSS set(s) for DCI formats 1\_0/0\_0 with C-RNTI/CS-RNTI/MCS-C-RNTI configured on P(S)Cell
	+ USS set(s) for P(S)Cell configured on sSCell

In addition, for this solution, it is not reasonable to combine with Option A/C for all the slots as long as “one unicast PDCCH scheduling cell is determined based on higher-layer configurations for each P(S)Cell slot” is ensured. Therefore, we further propose (on top of the above changes) to add following:* For P(S)Cell slot m where the UE monitors PDCCH for P(S)Cell only on P(S)Cell,
	+ PDCCH monitoring candidates on P(S)Cell are configured such that x1(m)+x2(m) is less than or equal to BD limit Z4
* For other P(S)Cell slot(s) where the UE monitors PDCCH for P(S)Cell on both P(S)Cell and sSCell,
	+ PDCCH monitoring candidates on P(S)Cell and sSCell are configured such that max of x1(m1) + max of y(m2) corresponding to any P(S)Cell slots m1 and m2 that the UE monitors PDCCH for P(S)Cell on both P(S)Cell and sSCell is less than or equal to Z4
* At least the case of Z4 = 44 is supported for P(S)Cell SCS 15kHz

The outlook of this solution is like following.For **the option based on Alt.2-2 (second bullet)**, this is a significant enhancement from Rel.16 NR-U features. Mandating this for Rel.17 DSS with cross-carrier scheduling even without unlicensed/shared spectrum is questionable. Besides, the benefit compared to the above our proposed modified option based on Alt.2-4 is not clear. |
| Apple | We prefer Alt 2-4We are also open to discuss the new proposal from QC which is USS + Type3-CSS based partition  |
| Samsung | Do not support any of the proposals. No changes to UE implementation or additional specifications are needed to support DSS.Alt. 2-1 should be optional for DSS and should be combined with option B, not option C (why is Option B crossed out when it has a large support?) – same for Alt. 2-4.Under the current wording, Alt. 2-2 and Alt. 2-4 limit the non-simultaneous monitoring only to USS (non-fallback DCIs) and also unnecessarily exclude DCI 0\_0/1\_0 from USS. That has practically no effect on reducing UE complexity over Alt. 2-1 and will lead to similar additional specification requirements. There is also no technical reason to support Alt.1 or any of its variants. We first support doing nothing (which is Alt.2-4a – resolve the FFS of the WA as “UE cannot monitor PDCCH from both cells in the same slot.”). The NW ensures that the UE does not simultaneously (same slot) monitor PDCCH on both P(S)Cell and sSCell based on SS set configuration and there is zero spec impact. That also has no impact on legacy Ues, no impact on CSS monitoring (Type-3 can be either on P(S)Cell or sSCell at any slot for both legacy and non-legacy Ues and non-Type-3 is anyway not monitored more often than 20 msec), and nothing is ‘friendlier’ to UE implementation. Alt. 2-2 can be an enhancement to Alt.2-4a under the same conditions (PDCCH monitoring only on one scheduling cell per slot). In summary, none of the proposals needs to be agreed to support DSS and we therefore do not agree to any of them. A modified Alt. 2-2 can be considered as an enhancement under the framework of no “simultaneous” (same slot) PDCCH monitoring on 2 scheduling cells and Alt. 2-1 may be considered as an optional most complex enhancement. |
| Ericsson | We support the described approach based on Alt 2-1, as it provides good balance between UE complexity (when paired with Option A and/or Option C) and NW scheduling flexibility. This has least impact on primary cell self-scheduling, and in general, we do not support alternatives that lead to undesirable scheduling restrictions for primary cell self-scheduling case.Regarding the proposed approach from QC – our preference is to support the described approach based on Alt 2-1, and consider the modifications to Alt 2-4 proposed by QC in R1-2105970 as a solution that could potentially replace the Alt1 Ues in the WA. |
| CATT | Our first preference is alt 2-4 with adding option B back. We don’t think option B should be precluded. From our understanding, it is the exactly same way as the current specification to handle BD/CCE, i.e. counting the BD/CCE per-slot or per-span.For sake of progress, we suggest to split the discussion between USS monitoring and BD/CCE handling. It is much friendly to discussion step by step.We can also live with option 2-4a. |
| ZTE | Our first preference is Option B + Alt 2-1 (same view as Samsung for Alt 2-1) which is the most flexible than other solutions. And the Z1 or Z2 is preferred to be determined by larger SCS of the two scheduling cells or both SCS of the two scheduling cells which are all aligned with the intention in Rel-16 CA to determine the BD/CCE limit for the scheduled cell according to the SCS of the scheduling cell.Comparing Option A/B/C in Table 1. With same total BD limits, Option B has more BD opportunities due to shared BD between two scheduling cells per Pcell slot, while Option A and C are similar but Option A is more flexible than option C due to shared BD between two consecutive slots overlapped with one Pcell slot.Table 1 Examples of Option A/B/C

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Option A | Option B | Option C |
| Z1=44 per slot with μ1=0 | Z2=44 per slot with μ1=0 | Z3=22 per slot with μ1=0 and Z4=11 per slot with μ2=1 |

To make some progress, we can also support the alternative based on Alt 2-1 above with following changes.* + **(based on Alt 2-1)** When UE is configured to monitor DCI formats 0\_1/1\_1/0\_2/1\_2 on P(S)Cell USS set(s), and on sSCell USS set(s), and for case when sSCell is activated
		- UE can monitor DCI formats 0\_1,1\_1,0\_2,1\_2 on both P(S)Cell USS set(s) and sSCell USS sets in overlapping [symbol/slot] of P(S)Cell and sSCell
		- Further discuss detailed BD/CCE handling based on ~~Option A or Option B or~~ Option C discussed in RAN1#104b-e
			* For Option C, Z4 is per slot of sSCell, at least the case where Z3 + 2μ1-μZ4 ≤ $M\_{PDCCH}^{max,slot,μ}$ is supported where $μ$ is SCS configuration of the P(S)Cell, where μ1 is SCS of the sSCell.

The difference between Option A and Option C is that, Option A defines BD limit for sSCell-schedule-Pcell per two sSCell slots overlapped with one Pcell slot and Option C defines the BS limit per sSCell slot. Option C is preferred because it is similar as normal BD limit definition and can be used for the case that SCS of scheduling cell is larger or smaller than the SCS of the scheduled cell.@Qualcomm, maybe your concern for USS Alt 1 can be discussed in UE feature discussion at a late stage. For your new Alt 2-4, the main drawback is same as original Alt 2-4, i.e., the USS scheduling opportunities are semi-statically limited on certain slots, where the scheduling opportunities can’t be flexibility chosen between PCell and sSCell.  |
| NTT DOCOMO | We prefer Alt.2-2/2-4. However, in order to progress the discussion, we can accept Alt.2-1 if the working assumption is confirmed. |
| Vivo | In general, we agree the approach to discuss PDCCH monitoring and BD/CCE budget jointly. For proposal 2, we prefer the proposal based on Alt. 2-1 since it achieves tradeoff of flexibility and less UE complexity. One question on the red part below: in our understanding, Option C will have separate BD/CCE limit in P(S)cell and sScell separately per slot of the cell respectively. So what’s the meaning of Z3+Z4 here? We suggest to remove the red part.* + **(based on Alt 2-1)** When UE is configured to monitor DCI formats 0\_1/1\_1/0\_2/1\_2 on P(S)Cell USS set(s), and on sSCell USS set(s), and for case when sSCell is activated
		- UE can monitor DCI formats 0\_1,1\_1,0\_2,1\_2 on both P(S)Cell USS set(s) and sSCell USS sets in overlapping [symbol/slot] of P(S)Cell and sSCell
		- Further discuss detailed BD/CCE handling based on Option A ~~or Option B~~ or Option C discussed in RAN1#104b-e
			* ~~For Option C, at least the case where Z3 + Z4 ≤~~ $M\_{PDCCH}^{max,slot,μ}$ ~~is supported where~~ $μ$ ~~is SCS configuration of the P(S)Cell~~
 |
| MTK | We support Alt 2-1 as an advanced UE type and Alt 1/Alt 2-4 as a basic UE type. For the basic UE type, it would be related to whether to confirm the previous WA of supporting Alt1 Ues in DSS. |
| Intel | Our preference is Alt 2-1 and prefer to keep Option B for BD/CCE handling open at the moment.  |
| LG Electronics | We support Alt 2-1 to allow more flexible scheduling option. It should be noted that we already have the UE type with Alt 1 in previous working assumption. For BD/CCE limit, Option B is preferred since per slot BD/CCE checking has been defined from Rel-15 UE. We share the view with Samsung. It should be clarified why Option B is excluded in Alt 2-1. |
| ETRI | We prefer Alt 2-1 which provides better flexibility and latency performance. Given that the issue of sSCell overbooking in Proposal 1 is not fully clear, we also prefer not to preclude Option B in Alt 2-1. |
| InterDigital | We support Alt 2-1. We are fine with Alt 2-2 only if the existing SS group switching is re-used. |
| Spreadtrum | Our first preference is Alt. 2-2, and it can include DCI 1\_0 and 0\_0 in the USS at PCell. The reason is Alt 2-2 has the significant benefit when considering sSCell activation/deactivation and sSCell dormancy. Such as when sSCell is activation or in non-dormancy BWP, UE can monitoring USS sets in sSCell which can increase the PDCCH capacity on PCell/PSCell. Otherwise, when sScell is deactivated or switched into dormancy BWP, UE can monitoring USS sets on PCell/PSCell. Alt 2-2 can use SS group switching as the starting point, little specification is needed.We can live with Alt 2-4.  |
| Nokia | We’d be OK with any of the options, our original preference was 2-1. but it is clear that that won’t be the baseline solution. |
| OPPO | Alt 2-2 is our 1st preference. It has less complexity because UE does not need to monitor DCI formats 0\_1,1\_1,0\_2,1\_2 in both PCell-USS and sSCell-USS at the same time. Alt 2-2 is also more flexible than semi-static configuration in Alt 2-4. Option C is preferred for Alt 2-2, because it makes SS configuration and PDCCH overbooking handling easy and clear. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We think option A can limit scheduling flexibility in slots/spans wherein not all search spaces exist. Also, we think* Option B could be used if simultaneous PCell and sSCell PDCCH monitoring for PCell scheduling is agreed (e.g., Alt 2-1), and
* Option C could be used if PCell and sSCell PDCCH monitoring for PCell scheduling in TDM manner is agreed (e.g., Alt 2-4).
 |
| Xiaomi | Alt 2-2 and option C are preferred, because they can make UE complexity reduced. |

### Proposal 2v2

* Down select from below alternatives for handling of PDCCH monitoring and BD/CCE limits when P(S)Cell SCS is less than or equal to sSCell SCS
	+ **(based on Alt 2-1)** When UE is configured to monitor DCI formats 0\_1/1\_1/0\_2/1\_2 on P(S)Cell USS set(s), and on sSCell USS set(s), and for case when sSCell is activated
		- UE can monitor DCI formats 0\_1,1\_1,0\_2,1\_2 on both P(S)Cell USS set(s) and sSCell USS sets in overlapping [symbol/slot] of P(S)Cell and sSCell
		- Further discuss detailed BD/CCE handling based on Option A or Option B or Option C discussed in RAN1#104b-e
			* ~~For Option C, at least the case where Z3 + Z4 ≤~~ $M\_{PDCCH}^{max,slot,μ}$ ~~is supported where~~ $μ$ ~~is SCS configuration of the P(S)Cell~~
	+ **(based on Alt 2-2)** When UE is configured to monitor DCI formats 0\_1/1\_1/0\_2/1\_2 on P(S)Cell USS set(s), and on sSCell USS set(s), and for case when sSCell is activated
		- Dynamic switching of PDCCH monitoring of DCI formats 0\_1,1\_1,0\_2,1\_2 between monitoring on P(S)Cell USS sets and monitoring on sSCell USS sets is supported using one of the following switching mechanism(s)
			* Search space set switching by unicast DCI formats/MAC CE/DCI format 2-0
			* SS Group Switching
		- Further discuss detailed BD/CCE handling
	+ **(based on Alt 2-4)** When UE is configured to monitor DCI formats 0\_1/1\_1/0\_2/1\_2 on P(S)Cell USS set(s), and on sSCell USS set(s), and for case when sSCell is activated
		- The USS set(s) on PSCell/PCell and the USS set(s) on sSCell are configured such that UE does not monitor DCI formats 0\_1,1\_1,0\_2,1\_2 on both PCell USS set(s) and sSCell USS set(s) in overlapping [symbol/slot] of P(S)Cell and sSCell
		- Dynamic switching of PDCCH monitoring of DCI formats 0\_1,1\_1,0\_2,1\_2 between monitoring on P(S)Cell USS sets and monitoring on sSCell USS sets is not supported
		- Further discuss detailed BD/CCE handling based on Option A or Option B or Option C discussed in RAN1#104b-e
			* ~~For Option C, at least the case where Z3 + Z4 ≤~~ $M\_{PDCCH}^{max,slot,μ}$ ~~is supported where~~ $μ$ ~~is SCS configuration of the P(S)Cell~~

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company Name** | **Comments (Proposal 2v2)** |
| Moderator notes | My understanding of company inputs for Proposal 2 is summarized below. 2v2 is an update reflecting some of the comments and further discussion can be continued in the GTW session* Approach based on Alt 2-1
	+ Prefer – Ericsson, ZTE (B), vivo(C), MTK(A?, cap1), Intel(B), LG(B), ETRI(B), Interdigital, Nokia?
	+ OK with it – Qualcomm (A, confirm WA), ZTE (C/A), Docomo, Lenovo/Mot (B), [Samsung(B, cap)?]
	+ Do not prefer – Samsung(A/C)
* Approach based on Alt 2-2
	+ Prefer – Docomo, Spreadtrum, Oppo(C), Xiaomi(C)
	+ OK with it – Interdigital (only SSSG), Nokia, [Samsung(B,cap)?]
	+ Do not prefer – Qualcomm, Samsung(A/C)
* Approach based on Alt 2-4
	+ Prefer – Apple, CATT(B), Docomo, MTK(cap2)
	+ OK with it – Spreadtrum, Nokia, Lenovo/Mot (C), Qualcomm (5970 – see below)?
	+ Do not prefer – Samsung(A/C)
* Approach based on Alt 2-4a proposed by Samsung
	+ Prefer – Samsung
	+ OK with it - CATT
	+ Do not prefer - Ericsson
* Approach based on Qualcomm proposal in R1-2105970 (based on 2-4 but with additional restrictions)
	+ Prefer – Qualcomm
	+ OK with it – Apple, Ericsson (in place of Type1)
	+ Do not prefer – ZTE?
 |

### Discussion Point 2v3

Following was discussed in the GTW session

**For further consideration in RAN1#105-e (for comeback on Monday)**

For handling of PDCCH monitoring and BD/CCE limits [when P(S)Cell SCS is less than or equal to sSCell SCS] introduce

* Basic feature for UEs supporting CCS from SCell to PCell (e.g. based on Alt2.4 or Alt1)
* Advanced feature for UEs supporting CCS from SCell to PCell (e.g. based on either Alt2.1 or Alt2.2)

Companies are encouraged to provide their preference for PDCCH monitoring and BD/CCE limit handling considering above discussion from the GTW session

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company Name** | **Comments (Discussion Point 2v3)** |
| Ericsson | Considering the need to progress on this topic, we are ok with general direction to introduce two UE types to support CCS from sSCell to P(S)Cell. However, we prefer to avoid terms like ‘basic feature’ as such discussion (i.e., what are basic feature components) should happen in UE capability phase for Rel17. Instead we prefer to refer to UE Types as Type A and Type B UEs. Our expectation is that both Type A and Type B UEs should be ‘useful’ and ‘implementable’.As we mentioned earlier, CCS from sSCell to P(S)Cell should be a complimentary mechanism to existing P(S)Cell self-scheduling on a DSS carrier. Motivation of CCS is to improve the scheduling capacity/flexibility for P(S)Cell PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling. The sSCell should not be seen as a substitute for the P(S)Cell, and in our view configuring the feature should have as little impact on P(S)Cell self-scheduling as possible. The WID also includes “The total PDCCH blind decoding budget should not be changed as a result of this work” and UE complexity should be managed to account for this.Considering the above, our preference is as follows * Type A UE (based on Alt 2-4 with the updates proposed in R1-2105970)
	+ PDCCH monitoring
		- Following search space sets are configured so that the UE does not monitor them in overlapping [slot/symbol] of P(S)Cell and sSCell
			* USS set(s) for any DCI formats and Type3-CSS set(s) for DCI formats 1\_0/0\_0 with C-RNTI/CS-RNTI/MCS-C-RNTI configured on P(S)Cell
			* USS set(s) for P(S)Cell configured on sSCell
		- There is no restriction on Type-0/0A/1/2-CSS sets configurations
	+ BD/CCE limit handling
		- For P(S)Cell slot m where the UE monitors PDCCH for P(S)Cell only on P(S)Cell,
			* PDCCH monitoring candidates on P(S)Cell are configured such that x1(m)+x2(m) is less than or equal to BD limit Z
		- For other P(S)Cell slot(s) where the UE monitors PDCCH for P(S)Cell on both P(S)Cell and sSCell,
			* PDCCH monitoring candidates on P(S)Cell and sSCell are configured such that max of x1(m1) + max of y(m2) corresponding to any P(S)Cell slots m1 and m2 that the UE monitors PDCCH for P(S)Cell on both P(S)Cell and sSCell is less than or equal to Z4
		- At least the case of Z = 44 is supported for P(S)Cell SCS 15kHz
			* Handling of pdcch-BlindDetectionCA and possibility of Z4 larger than above based on UE capability (e.g. similar to BDFactorR in Rel16) should be discussed separately
* Type B UE (based on Alt 2-1)
	+ PDCCH monitoring
		- If following search space sets are configured in overlapping [slot/symbol] of P(S)Cell and sSCell, UE monitors them on both P(S)Cell and sSCell
			* USS set(s) for any DCI formats and Type3-CSS set(s) for DCI formats 1\_0/0\_0 with C-RNTI/CS-RNTI/MCS-C-RNTI configured on P(S)Cell
			* USS set(s) for P(S)Cell configured on sSCell
		- There is no restriction on Type-0/0A/1/2-CSS sets configurations
	+ BD/CCE limit handling
		- PDCCH monitoring candidates on P(S)Cell and sSCell are configured such that max of (x1(m1) + x2(m1)) + max of y(m2) corresponding to any P(S)Cell slots m1 and m2 that the UE monitors PDCCH for P(S)Cell on both P(S)Cell and sSCell is less than or equal to Z
		- At least the case of Z = 44 is supported for P(S)Cell SCS 15kHz
			* Handling of pdcch-BlindDetectionCA and possibility of Z4 larger than above based on UE capability (e.g. similar to BDFactorR in Rel16) should be discussed separately

The framework of Type A and Type B UE is similar (so additional standardization effort of having two types of UEs is minimized) with difference being that Type B UE does not impose most of the constraints on P(S)Cell self-scheduling that are imposed by Type A UE.Regarding BD Option B, our understanding based on the discussion so far is that when applied to sSCell context, to provide benefits over Option A/C in terms of flexibility, this option is more complex compared to Rel16 (even though the BD limit definition can be formulated in similar way as Rel16). Considering this, we are OK with Option A/C.Regarding dynamic switching of PDCCH monitoring between P(S)Cell and activated sSCell (i.e., Alt 2-2), we do not see the need for introducing it as the additional benefit compared to Type A and Type B UEs is unclear (The Type B UE is better than Alt2-2 in terms of flexibility without need for switching delays/interruptions. The Type A UE is better than Alt2-2 in terms of simplicity). However, we are open to considering switching to ‘normal’ PDCCH monitoring on P(S)Cell when sSCell is deactivated (this can provide benefit especially for Type A UEs).Regarding Alt1 UE, our understanding is such UEs (especially with the constraint “UE is allowed not to support monitoring USS set(s) for fallback DCI formats on the P(S)Cell” proposed by Qualcomm added) impose significant limitations for system operation and also increase UE power consumption (proper operation with Alt1 UEs requires sSCell has to be always activated). We see the Type A UE described above as better ‘low complexity UE’ option both from UE/NW perspective compared to Alt1 UE. |
| Apple | In principle, we are okay with the proposal It looks to us that we are likely going to design multiple solutions* One is based on Alt-1 which is USS with non-fallback DCI only on sSCell
* Some variant of TDM USS between SpCell and sSCell
* Potentially the simultaneous USS on both SpCell and sSCell

This is the order in our view. We may not specify all the solutions. When we drop some solution which we strongly feel we need to, we should drop it from the bottom to the top in order in our view. Note, in the current CCS scheduling for NR, we only support one scheduling cell per scheduled cell. Therefore, Alt-1 already provides more flexibility compared to the current NR design, which is more than enough for DSS. If there is any further enhancement, it should be in general for CA enhancement.  |
| OPPO | In general, if RAN1 decides to have multiple solution forks for the same UE functionality/feature, we prefer to have those solution forks share the commonality as much as possible in order to avoid making two or more quite different UE implementations for the same functionality. With this in mind, we share Apple’s view on the list of three solution forks and the preference in dropping from the bottom of the list. Then we see following narrow-down, which we are ok to take for further discussion. * Basic feature for UEs supporting CCS from SCell to PCell (~~e.g. based on~~ Alt2.4, ~~or~~ spec allows Alt1)
* Advanced feature for UEs supporting CCS from SCell to PCell (~~e.g. based on either Alt2.1 or~~ Alt2.2)
 |
| Qualcomm | We have explained our views on the alternatives in the first round and hence do not repeat again. Regarding support of two types of UEs, we think it is a good direction. As for implementable and useful feature, we would like to ensure at least the following:1. At least one type of UEs is allowed to monitor unicast PDCCH (i.e., PDCCH with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI/MCS-C-RNTI/CS-RNTI that schedules unicast PDSCH/PUSCH on P(S)Cell) only on either sSCell or P(S)Cell (not on both).
	* Preferably, the cell for monitoring unicast PDCCH is fixed to sSCell (this is the motivation of Alt.1 in the WA). We are proposing a compromised solution wherein one cell for unicast PDCCH monitoring is determined based on semi-static configuration at each P(S)Cell slot. This is the updated proposal in R1-2105970.
2. When the UE monitors PDCCH on both sSCell and P(S)Cell (in a P(S)Cell slot), the BD/CCE limit determination for P(S)Cell (or for sSCell) is not dynamic across these P(S)Cell slots. There should be a single BD/CCE limit for P(S)Cell (or for sSCell) which applies to all these P(S)Cell slots.

On Ericsson’s proposed Type-A and Type-B, Type-A satisfies both 1 and 2 and Type-B satisfies 2. In this regard, supporting these two types is a possible way forward. We are OK with the proposal. |
| Samsung | Fine with Type-A/Type-B instead of basic/advanced (that is a rather secondary aspect, probably with no impact on features (and certainly no impact on specifications)). We disagree with having the ‘basic’ type rely on Alt.2-4/Alt.1 because there is no value for it (in such case, we even disagree with having two UE types). The ‘basic’/‘advanced’ UE types directly relate to the resolution of the FFS from the WA (“FFS: Whether the UE can monitor PDCCH from both cells in the same slot”). A negative answer yields Rel-16 operation - nothing can be simpler for a UE implementation, for fast DSS deployment, or for avoiding a specification impact. A positive answer yields Alt. 2-1.There have been (unsubstantiated) comments that not monitoring CSS in a same slot on both scheduling cells has an impact on legacy UEs or on the network operation. That is incorrect. DSS intends to offload the PDCCH from the P(S)Cell. Non-Type-3 CSS is monitored every 20 msec (SIB1) or less frequently. It is trivial for a network to use the P(S)Cell in those slots – in typical deployments, the network can even have those slots be the UL slots on the sSCell. Type-3 CSS can be monitored on the P(S)Cell or on the sSCell at arbitrary slots since Rel-16 (and, obviously, DCIs 2\_5/2\_6 don’t matter for DSS) - nothing changes.So, for Type-A UE we support the following and do not support the proposal. The difference on UE implementation and on specification impact (none) compared to the framework from Ericsson is clear.* Type A UE (based on resolving the FFS from the WA as negative)
	+ PDCCH monitoring
		- Search space sets are configured so that the UE does not monitor them in overlapping [slot/symbol] of P(S)Cell and sSCell
	+ BD/CCE limit handling
		- As in Rel-16

For Type-B UE, a conclusion among options A/B/C is needed, rather than a statement such as “At least the case of Z = 44 is supported”. We should not continue trying to indirectly avoid a technical discussion by instead trying to reach a conclusion through some text that is not supported by either Tdocs or technical merits – that has not been the best use of anyone’s time. There is no additional UE complexity for Option B while it certainly provides more flexibility to the network to support DSS (under Alt. 2.1). The impact from Option B is that USS sets on sSCell scheduling the P(S)Cell will not be considered for overbooking (same as for CSS sets). There is no UE complexity (not even for a “Type-A” UE). For the network, the benefit from Option B is obvious. Alt. 2-2 may be considered as an enhancement – specification impact and associated UE complexity over Rel-16 can be trivial.We do not support the updated proposal provided for consideration. Compared to it, no further agreement on this topic is preferable.  |
| Nokia | We don’t believe that an operation based purely on TDM configuration of monitoring the USS is suitable. We can’t afford to split the monitoring in slot level and having symbol level TDM in CORESET configuration is extremely limiting. As has been said in the past by many parties, typically we don’t need the flexibility of 2-1 in the gNB (not that we wouldn’t be happy to have it available when needed), and recognize that this is a painpoint for many. We have also gotten the understanding that switching the monitoring slot-by-slot or symbol-by-symbol is also a painpoint to many.That said, we believe 2-4 “configured such that UE does not monitor DCI formats x\_1/2 simultaneously” can be defined so that the CORESETs and Search Spaces are configured for the two, but there is a mechanism that dictates which cell the UE monitors and a rapid slot-by-slot or symbol-by-symbol hopping between the two carriers is not allowed. For Alt-1 or Alt2-2 supporters, we would see that all these three are very close to each other.So – we are generally OK with the proposal, and hope that we can agree on a 2-4 based solution that does not require constant swapping of the PDCCH montitoing between sSCell and Pcell. This is not useful for the network and appears to be undesirable for many Ues. |
| Intel | We are supportive to define two UE capabilities. We share the views from Ericsson that, it is better to name it as Type A and Type B. ‘basic/advanced’ is misleading since it may imply ‘basic feature’ is the precondition to support ‘advanced feature’Type A UE could be based on Alt 2-4. That is, USS sets are not in same slot across PCell and sSCell and there is no limitation on the timing of CSS sets. Therefore, in the slot that USS set(s) are configured on sSCelll, there may or may not exist CSS in the same slot in PCell. Type B UE could be based on Alt 2-1 to allow USS sets are configured on same slot/symbol across PCell and sSCell. It is the most flexible way. We don’t think there is any real additional complexity. Regarding BD/CCE handling Option A/B/C, as commented several times, we prefer to clarify how to define $M\_{PDCCH}^{total,slot,μ}$ and $C\_{PDCCH}^{total,slot,μ}$ if PCel and sSCell have different SCSs. In NR, the two values are jointly calculated for all serving cells with same SCS. It is clear for Option C. However, in Option A, if the max BD/CCE for PCell and sSCell are determined by a reference SCS (say it is same as PCell SCS but different from sSCell SCS), how to determine $M\_{PDCCH}^{total,slot,μ}$ and $C\_{PDCCH}^{total,slot,μ}$ for sSCell and other SCells having same SCS as sSCell? On the other hand, Option B in our view is best for PCell/sSCell with same SCS, however, it cannot be used if PCell/sSCell has different SCSs.  |
| CATT | For the updated proposal, it seems there is a possibility to specify multiple solutions for the case wherein a UE monitoring DCI format 0\_1/1\_1/0\_2/1\_2 in the USS on both P(S)Cell and sSCell, i.e. alt 2-4 is adopted as the basic feature or UE type A in the end. Based on the working assumption below, there is already a clear guidance on the basic feature, i.e. alt-1. **Working Assumption*** When CCS from sSCell to PCell/PSCell is configured, UE can be configured to monitor DCI formats 0\_1/1\_1/0\_2/1\_2 that schedule PDSCH/PUSCH on PCell/PSCell on PCell/PSCell USS set(s), and/or on sSCell USS set(s)
* The WA to be confirmed after agreements are made on PDCCH BD/CCE handling and PDCCH overbooking handling for CCS from sSCell to PCell/PSCell
* Specs also allow UEs supporting functionality of only Alt-1. Capability signaling details, if any, can be handled during the UE capability discussion for Rel17
* FFS: Whether the UE can monitor PDCCH from both cells in the same slot.

We are not sure about the definition of basic feature. If alt-1 is adopted as the basic feature, it aligns with the above working assumption. If alt 2-4 is adopted as the basic feature, does this mean alt 1 is automatically precluded?We are generally fine with the direction to discuss the UE feature or UE type firstly. However, we think it is better to clarify the relations between the basic feature in the updated proposal and the functionality of only alt-1 in previous working assumption.Additionally, if alt-1 can is a candidate of basic feature, we think it is natural that alt 2-4 should be a candidate of advanced feature given it is advanced compared to alt 1. |
| vivo | We are fine with defining two type of UEs. However, we need to be clear what is the metric to differentiate the two types of UEs, e.g. UE implementation complexity. In our understanding, the UE complexity is mainly from slot by slot change of BD/CCE budget on one monitoring cell for scheduling Pcell. In this sense, the BD/CCE budget handling scheme is the dominant factor to impact the UE complexity. For example, Alt. 2-1+Option A/C has similar UE complexity with Alt. 1/Alt. 2.4+Option A/C. So, if Option A/C is adopted, we are not clear of what’s is the benefit brought by Alt. 1 over Alt. 2-1 considering UE complexity. Before defining UE types, I suggest the group to compare the UE complexity with the following schemes:Scheme 1: Alt. 1+Option A/CScheme 2: Alt. 1+Option BScheme 3: Alt. 2-1+Option A/CScheme 4: Alt. 2-1+Option BScheme 5: Alt. 2-4+Option A/CScheme 6: Alt. 2-4+Option BIn our understanding, the UE complexity will be Scheme 1=Scheme 3=Scheme 5<Scheme 2<Scheme 6<Scheme 4. From network flexibility perspective, Scheme 4>Scheme 3>Scheme 6>Scheme 5>Scheme 2>Scheme 1. According to this understanding, type A UE could be the type of UEs with the least UE complexity, i.e. Scheme 1/3/5. Among them, Scheme 3 provides the best network flexibility. Type B UE could be higher UE complexity while providing the best network flexibility, i.e. Scheme 4. In summary, we think Type A UE=Alt. 2-1+Option A/C and Type B UE=Alt. 2-1+Option B. We are also fine with considering Type B UE with lower complexity by further limitation if it is a serious concern, e.g. Scheme 2 or Scheme 6. |
| ZTE | We are fine to define two types, Type A and Type B. For type A, we are ok to define it based on Alt. 2-4. For type B, we support to define it based on Alt. 2-1. For type A (original Alt.2-4), we tend to agree with Samsung, it seems Ok to reuse the same Rel-15/Rel-16 BD/CCE handing (maybe with potential updates). For type B, we support Option B for BD/CCE counting considering its flexibility for network. Overall, we are ok with the following:1. Type A: based on Alt.2-4 + reusing the Rel-15/Rel-16 BD/CCE handing;2. Type B: based on Alt.2-1 + Option BWe still have some concerns on Option A. For BD/CCE handling, as we comment for proposal 2, if option B is precluded, option C is preferred compared with option A. BD/CCE limit should be defined/described per each scheduling cell slot. If y(m2) is used for s-p scheduling, m2 should be the slot index on sSCell. If we follow the current description of Option A, y(m2) is the #BDs for s-p scheduling in all sSCell slot(s) that overlap slot m2 of P(S)Cell, it seems y(m2) is determined by the numerology of PCell, which has to be further discussed. This will end up with defining a BD/CCE limit (M\_max) on sSCell for s-p scheduling per multi-slots of sSCell. However, the M\_total used for the sSCell during CA scaling is performed via the numerology of the sSCell, it is not clear how to calculate min{M\_max, M\_total} on sSCell for s-p scheduling if different numerologies are applied for M\_max and M\_total. |
| LG Electronics | We are supportive of defining two types of UEs where one is based on Alt 2-4 and the other is based on Alt 2-1. We don’t see the necessity of dynamically switching the scheduling cell between P(S)Cell and sSCell (i.e., Alt 2-2), rather Alt 2-2 requires switching delay and it can be implemented by BWP switching, if necessary, as discussed in GTW session.However, we don’t support BD/CCE limit handling under each type UEs in Ericsson’s proposal. In our opinion, Option B does not require any further UE complexity since based on the previous agreement (PDCCH overbooking on sSCell USS set(s) is not allowed) UE doesn’t need to apply overbooking rule for sSCell USS set(s). Therefore, we suggest Option B for every type of UEs or separate discussion for BD/CCE limit handling. |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine to define total two Types UE. According to Type A UE, we think there are 3 Options. It is clear that Option 2 cannot suitable for an independent type. Because it has agreed that Alt 1 is supported. Thus Option 1 or Option 3 can work well. Option 1: UE support Alt 1 onlyOption 2: UE support Alt 2-4.Option 3: UE can support Alt 1 and Alt 2-4Regarding Type B UE, if Option 1 is adopted, Alt 2-4 can be applied. Otherwise, if Option 3 is adopted, we are fine with Alt 2-2 or Alt 2-1. Alt 2-2 only reuse the same mechanism of NR-U. Nothing enhanced compared with Rel-16 SS group switching. It can provide additional flexibility when sSCell is dis-activated. Obviously, Alt 2-1 is the most complex UE implementation. If Option A/C is used, we can live with Alt 2-1.  |
| Huawei | We should use Type A or Type B rather than basic/advanced feature. |
| Xiaomi | We are fine with the proposal.  |
| NTT DOCOMO | We are fine with defining two Types as Type A and Type B. |
| InterDigital  | We are ok with the general intention of the proposal by introducing two types of UEs.  |

### Proposal 3

* At least the following is supported for BD/CCE limit handling when P(S)Cell SCS is less than or equal to sSCell SCS
	+ PDCCH monitoring candidates on P(S)Cell and/or sSCell are configured such that total of (x1(m)+x2(m))+ y(m) ≤ $M\_{PDCCH}^{max,slot,μ}$ ,where $μ$ is SCS configuration of the P(S)Cell
* FFS: whether/how (x1(m)+x2(m))+ y(m) > $M\_{PDCCH}^{max,slot,μ}$ is also supported
* Discuss further detailed BD/CCE limit handling e.g. based on Options A/B/C from RAN1#104b-e
* Note
	+ x1(m) is #BDs for PDCCH CSS(s) candidates monitored on P(S)Cell slot m
	+ x2(m) is #BDs for PDCCH USS(s) candidates monitored on P(S)Cell slot m
	+ y(m) is #BDs for PDCCH USS(s) candidates monitored on sSCell in all sSCell slot(s) that overlap slot m of P(S)Cell
	+ USS(s) => USS(s) that can schedule PDSCH/PUSCH on P(S)Cell

Companies are requested to indicate their view about the above proposal in the Table below

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company Name** | **Comments (Proposal 3)** |
| Moderator notes | Almost all companies seem to be OK with at least supporting case where the PDCCH BDs across P(S)Cell and sSCell is less than 44 per 1ms (i.e., $M\_{PDCCH}^{max,slot,μ}$, when P(S)cell is 15kHz SCS ) and intention of Proposal 3 is to capture this. There are different opinions on how to further adjust complexity/flexibility (e.g. according to the BD Options) and this will be discussed further.  |
| Qualcomm | Intention is OK. On the main bullet, “at least if a UE does not report *pdcch-BlindDectectionCA*” should be added. Or alternatively, adding one sub-bullet “FFS: if the UE reports *pdcch-BlindDetectionCA*” is also OK. |
| Apple | We should like to also limit themax (x1(m) + x2(m))max(y(m))Imagine if UE has to use two CC to handle this PDCCH monitoring, for example, in the case that SpCell and sSCell has different SCS. We would want to limit the BD/CCE per CC, it is not enough to simply have a total limitation since it will allow (44, 0) and (0, 44).  |
| Samsung | OK with the proposal in principle but not OK with the current wording. The proposal can be simply worded as a UE not having to exceed its Rel-16 PDCCH monitoring capability for the scheduled P(S)Cell at any given slot of the P(S)Cell.There is no reason for x1(m) and x2(m) – can be a single x(m). That may relate (not necessarily) to the previous discussion of not mandating to have CSS in every slot on the P(S)Cell – no reason for that and contrary to the objectives of DSS. |
| Ericsson | OK with the proposal.In addition to above starting point, as discussed in our tdoc we are also OK to introducing additional limits on individual components (x1(m)+x2(m), and y(m). For this our preference is to use an RRC configured scaling factor on $M\_{PDCCH}^{max,slot,μ} $for determining P(S)Cell BD/CCE limit, and use the remaining BD/CCEs for the sSCell.Regarding the proposed modification from QC – regardless on number of configured cells, we think the upper limit for BDs across P(S)Cell and sSCell should be of 44/1ms. Then, the individual P(S)Cell/sSCell limits due to CA scaling do still apply and this ‘upper limit of 44/1ms for BDs across P(S)Cell and sSCell’ is applied as an additional constraint. |
| CATT | OK with the proposal. We share the same views as Ericsson that the BD/CCE limit should be identical despite of the reporting of *pdcch-BlindDetectionCA*. Furthermore, we don’t see the necessity of introducing separate limit for PCell and SCell. Considering there is only one scheduled cell, i.e. Pcell, the limit should be defined from the scheduled cell perspective. How to allocate the BD between Pcell and sSCell is totally gNB work. It also aligns with the motivation of DSS that offload part of PDCCH monitoring from Pcell to sSCell. |
| ZTE | Not support. We are not sure about the intention here. The similar restriction has been included in Proposal 2, not sure why we need a separate proposal here. If we really want to have some high level proposal here, we share similar view as Samsung, i.e., a UE is not required to exceed its Rel-16 PDCCH monitoring capability for the scheduled P(S)Cell at any given slot of the P(S)Cell.Besides, regarding the y(m) that #BDs for PDCCH USS(s) candidates monitored on sSCell in all sSCell slot(s) that overlap slot m of P(S)Cell, it seems y(m) is determined by the numerology of PCell, which has to be further discussed. This will end up with defining a BD/CCE limit (M\_max) on sSCell for s-p scheduling per multi-slots of sSCell. However, the M\_total during CA scaling is performed via the numerology of the SCell based on our understanding, it is not clear how to calculate min{M\_max, M\_total} on sSCell for s-p scheduling if different numerologies are applied for M\_max and M\_total.  |
| Vivo | We don’t see much progress for this proposal. Focusing on down selection of Option A/B/C is more important. |
| MTK | We can support the FL proposal to capture the intention that “at least supporting case where the PDCCH BDs across P(S)Cell and sSCell is less than 44 per 1ms”. Detailed wording and how to express the formulas in Proposal 3 to fit in the style of current spec can be further discussed. |
| Intel | We are not OK with the proposal. There are many aspects missing in the proposal. There are two kinds of maximum numbers in BD/CCE handling, i.e. $M\_{PDCCH}^{max,slot,μ}$ and $M\_{PDCCH}^{total,slot,μ}$. $M\_{PDCCH}^{total,slot,μ}$ needs to be calculated for a group of cells with same SCS. $M\_{PDCCH}^{total,slot,μ}$ for a PDCCH should be derived based on the SCS of the cell that carries the PDCCH, i.e. following the scheduling cell. Therefore, if PCell and sSCell have different SCSs, $M\_{PDCCH}^{total,slot,μ}$ needs to be determined separately for the two cells, that is Option C. It may be flexible to define $M\_{PDCCH}^{max,slot,μ}$, i.e. either Option A or Option C. however, to have an unified overall design, Option C should be used to determine $M\_{PDCCH}^{max,slot,μ}$ too. We are fine to consider Option B if same SCS between PCell and sSCell, since it increases the flexibility to configure SS sets on the two cells. However, if single option is desired, it should be Option C.  |
| LG Electronics | We support Proposal 3 for the case where x1(m)+x2(m)>0. In a slot m where x1(m)+x2(m)=0, it might be possible to fallback to Rel-15/16 behavior, i.e., y(m) ≤ $M\_{PDCCH}^{max,slot,μ}$ ,where $μ$ is SCS configuration of the sSCell. |
| ETRI | We are fine with the proposal in principle. |
| InterDigital | We are fine with the proposal.  |
| Spreadtrum | OK with the proposal. |
| Nokia | OK with the proposal |
| OPPO | Agree with the intention in principle, but the wording makes it easy to misunderstand the proposal into supporting Option-A. We suggest to just re-word the proposal as “at least supporting case where the total PDCCH BDs across P(S)Cell and sSCell per 1ms does not exceed the Rel-16 PDCCH monitoring capability”. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | OK with intention of the proposal. Can be discussed after proposal 2. |
| Xiaomi | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Huawei | Agree with Intel. The first question that needs to answer is for sScell, whether the BD/CCE limit is calculated based on the SCS of Pcell or can be determined based on the SCS of sScell.  |

### Discussion Point 4

* BD/CCE limits to account for CA are specified according to following conditions in 38.213
	+ $\sum\_{μ=0}^{3}\left(N\_{cells,0}^{DL,μ}+γ∙N\_{cells,1}^{DL,μ}\right)\leq N\_{cells}^{cap}$
		- $M\_{PDCCH}^{total,slot,μ}=M\_{PDCCH}^{max,slot,μ}$ or $γ∙M\_{PDCCH}^{max,slot,μ}$
	+ $\sum\_{μ=0}^{3}\left(N\_{cells,0}^{DL,μ}+γ∙N\_{cells,1}^{DL,μ}\right)>N\_{cells}^{cap}$
		- $M\_{PDCCH}^{total,slot,μ}=\left⌊N\_{cells}^{cap}⋅M\_{PDCCH}^{max,slot,μ}⋅{\left(N\_{cells,0}^{DL,μ}+γ∙N\_{cells,1}^{DL,μ}\right)}/{\sum\_{j=0}^{3}\left(N\_{cells,0}^{DL,j}+γ∙N\_{cells,1}^{DL,j}\right)}\right⌋$
* When CCS from sSCell to P(S)Cell is configured for the UE, how should the ‘CA scaling calculation’ be specified to derive $M\_{PDCCH}^{total,slot,μ}$ ?
	+ Alt1
		- P(S)Cell is counted once
		- sSCell is counted once
	+ Alt 2
		- P(S)Cell is counted once
		- sSCell is counted twice (with same SCS as sSCell)
	+ Alt 3
		- Use scaling factors $γ\_{μ1} $and $γ\_{μ2}$ $ $with SCS configuration $μ1$ and $μ2$ respectively for P(S)Cell and sScell (the scaling factors may be less than 1)

Companies are requested to provide comments on above alternatives (or additional alternatives) in the Table below

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company Name** | **Comments (Discussion point 4)** |
| Qualcomm | We are not sure what the discussion here is. For cross-carrier scheduling from sSCell to P(S)Cell, part of the BD capability, that was originally implemented for P(S)Cell PDCCH monitoring, is taken by sSCell to enable P(S)Cell scheduling. An example is following.So, the sSCell is not counted as a scheduling cell to P(S)Cell (is this Alt.1 or something else?). |
| Apple | We think it depends on whether total BD/CCE will be relaxed or it stays the same, and, whether we introduce per SpCell/sSCell maximum BD/CCE |
| Samsung | Alt. 3 as an optional configuration with further clarification on the sum of $γ\_{μ1} $and $γ\_{μ2}$ (should be less than one). Alt. 1 if the configuration is not provided. |
| Ericsson | For the case where limit of up to 44 BDs per 1ms is used, we do not see much difference between the different alternatives.For the case of “FFS: if (x1(m)+x2(m))+ y(m) > $M\_{PDCCH}^{max,slot,μ}$ is also supported”, we see Alt 2 providing benefit without increasing the total BD budget*.* |
| CATT | The proposal highly depends on whether the SCS between PCell and sSCell is same or not. If same SCS is configured for Pcell and sSCell, we don’t see the necessity to change anything from the current mechanism.For difference SCS case, it is valid to discuss how to count Pcell and sSCell. For alt.2, it can almost reuse the current mechanism to calculate BD/CCE number across configured serving cells which is slightly preferred. Accordingly, we propose the following update for the main bullet:‘When CCS from sSCell to P(S)Cell is configured for the UE and different numerologies are configured for P(S)Cell and sSCell, how should the ‘CA scaling calculation’ be specified to derive $M\_{PDCCH}^{total,slot,μ}$ ?’ |
| ZTE | Maybe more clarification is needed. Based on our understanding, the scheduled cell (Pcell) can be counted once or twice. It has nothing to do with whether the sSCell is counted once or twice.In Rel-17 DSS case that PDCCH of Scell scheduling PDSCH or PUSCH on P(S)Cell is supported, PDCCH blind decoding will be performed on two cells for this P(S)Cell. In this case, how to calculate the number of P(S)Cell in parameter  is a new issue. So we think for CA scaling, the first issue should be whether Pcell is counted as one or two cells for the two scheduling cells. That means two alt is sufficient. * ZTE-A) Pcell is counted as one cell for the two scheduling cells.
* A-1). The number of Pcell is still count as 1 for only one of the scheduling cells, i.e., Pcell.This can be used combined with Option B.
	+ A-2): The number of Pcell is counted as N1 < 1 and N2 < 1 for the two scheduling cells (Pcell and sSCell) respectively, wherein, N1 + N2 = 1. This can be used combined with Option A/C. (This is similar to Alt.3 listed above by the moderator)
* ZTE-B) Pcell is counted as two cell for the two scheduling cells. And counted as one for each scheduling cell (how to reflect this in the spec can be discussed later, i.e. like BdfactorR). This can be used combined with Option A/C. (This is similar to Alt.1 listed above by the moderator)

For example, assume 6 cells are configured for a UE shown in Figure 3, wherein the SCS = 15kHz for Pcell #1 and the SCS = 30kHz for sSCell #2. In Rel-15/Rel-16 case Pcell cannot be scheduled by sSCell (the red arrow in Figure 3 is not presented), M\_total\_15khz = floor(4\*44\*1/6) = 29; M\_total\_30khz = floor(4\*36\*5/6) = 120. In case Pcell can be scheduled by sSCell (the red arrow in Figure 3 is presented), whether Pcell is counted as one or two cells for the two scheduling cells are nalysed below.Figure 3 CA with Scell-schedule-PcellComparing the two cases (ZTE-A and ZTE-B) above in Table 2, the common part of the two cases is M\_total\_15khz is reduced and M\_total\_30khz is increased compared with the Rel-15/Rel-16 case. The difference of two cases is that the total blind detection capability for the Pcell may be increased and it may occupy the blind detection capability of other Scells in ZTE-B, otherwise the blind detection capability of the Pcell scheduled by sSCell is very limited if keep the blind detection capability for other Scells unchanged. While only partial blind detection capability of the Pcell is transferred to the sSCell in ZTE-A and the blind detection capability for other Scells is not impacted. Since there is a restriction that the total PDCCH blind decoding budget should not be changed as a result of this work, it is preferred to count Pcell as 1 cell for the two scheduling cells.Table 2 blind detection capability for different cases |
| vivo | We think this is better to be discussed when BD/CCE budget handling option is decided. |
| MTK | We prefer Alt. 3 with the assumption that the sum of $γ\_{μ1} $and $γ\_{μ2}$ is less than one. |
| Intel | Clarification on the exact meaning of ‘counted once’ or ‘counted twice’ is necessary. How is BD/CCE of the counted ‘1’ or ‘2’ cells are separated to PCell and sSCell? Doesn’t mean two scaling factors as in Alt 3 will eventually be introduced?In our view, Alt 3 is the best way since it provides the details and covers both cases of same or different SCSs.  |
| LG Electronics | We prefer Alt. 2 and we are also fine with Alt. 3 with the understanding that PCell is counted as $γ\_{μ1} $and sSCell is counted as 1+$γ\_{μ2}$. |
| ETRI | We prefer to discuss this issue when BD/CCE handling options are further clarified/decided. |
| InterDigital | We prefer Alt 3. But we think it is better to discuss it after we agree on the option to handle BD/CCE budget. |
| Spreadtrum | Alt 1 and Alt 2 do not make sense for CCS from sSCell to P(S)Cell. Alt 3 is more align with our understanding, although details are needed, especially how to show these scaling factors in the formula.  |
| OPPO | We prefer to postpone this discussion until RAN1 agrees how to handle BD/CCE limitation.  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Alt3 needs further details (e.g., if LG’s understanding is the common understanding given Samsung’s comment). Would be good to clarify the difference (achieve a common understanding) between the schemes via few numerical examples (e.g., for same or different SCSs). May also depend on whether simultaneous (e.g., Alt 2-1) or TDM approach (e.g., Alt 2-4) is adopted. |
| Xiaomi | We think this can be postponed until RAN1 agrees how to handle BD/CCE limitation. |
| Huawei | Similar view as Samsung. Alt 3 is flexible for network configuration and provide sufficient flexibility for UE report different capabilities between Pcell and Scell, especially if different SCS are assumed between the two cells.  |

### Proposal 5

* Down select from below alternatives for SS set linking (or not) for case when CCS from sSCell to P(S)Cell is configured
	+ Alt1
		- Linking between P(S)Cell and sSCell SS sets is configured as in Rel16
	+ Alt 2
		- at least *nrofCandidates* is derived using the SS set linking as in Rel16
		- at least *monitoringSlotPeriodicityAndOffset, monitoringSymbolsWithinSlot, duration* can be separate for sSCell self-scheduling and sSCell to P(S)Cell scheduling
			* Details FFS
	+ Alt 3
		- SS set linking is not used and a separate SS set is explicitly configured for sSCell to P(S)Cell scheduling
			* Details FFS

Companies are requested to indicate their view about the above proposal in the Table below

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company Name** | **Comments (Proposal 5)** |
| Qualcomm | First preference is Alt.2 only for the search space set configurations involved in cross-carrier scheduling from sSCell to P(S)Cell – for search space set configurations for self- and legacy cross-carrier scheduling, their configuration should remain the same as in Rel.16 (i.e, Alt.1). This does not require a change of ASN.1 structures of *SearchSpace* and *crossCarrierSchedulingConfig*.Second preference is Alt.1 for all the search space set configurations including cross-carrier scheduling from sSCell to P(S)Cell. |
| Apple | We think Alt1 and Alt2 might be talking about two different things Regarding the SS linkage between scheduled cell and scheduling cell, in terms of *nrofCandidates* configuration and other configurations, we can reuse the existing design which might be the intention of Alt2. For *CrossCarrierSchedulingConfig*, we can also largely reuse the existing RRC. It is just that there might be two things (1) now SpCell can be scheduled by sSCell (others), so the note needs to be modified (2) SpCell can also be self-scheduled, so it is not “CHOICE”. But those should be easy to change  |
| Samsung | Alt.3 - if a change is to be made, links should be removed (they were only introduced because RAN2 did not properly implement the RRC parameters provided by RAN1 in Rel-15 that assumed Alt. 3). |
| Ericsson | From our perspective, it is feasible to reuse the SS set linking principles for sSCell scheduling P(S)Cell and still have separate monitoring for sSCell self-scheduling (s-s) and sSCell to P(S)Cell scheduling (s-p) by using multiple search space sets. Alt 2 is a superset that also includes Alt 1, and hence it could be considered as an enhancement. If number of search space sets on sSCell are limited, then sharing the same search space id on the sSCell (s-s, s-p) may be needed and in which case Alt2 allows more flexibility. We are also OK to take a shorter list of alternatives and agree to reuse the SS set linking as the basis for sSCell scheduling P(S)Cell.  |
| CATT | Alt-2 is our first preference considering the flexibility. Totally reuse the current linkage rule, i.e. alt 1, is also OK to us if it is majority view.Considering dynamic BWP switching may happen on either PCell or sSCell, alt-3 would definitely require more efforts. The configuration would be very complicated in order to maintain the same understanding between network and UE. |
| ZTE | Based on our understanding, Alt.1 is the legacy mechanism, which is preferred by us. Alt.2 seems to offer more flexibility which had been discussed during Rel-15/Rel-16 for legacy cross-carrier scheduling, we can also accept Alt.2 if this is the majority view. But we may also need to clarify whether Alt.2 is only for sSCell scheduling PCell, or can also be applied to legacy cross-carrier scheduling, e.g., sSCell scheduling other SCell.For Alt.3, it seems more flexible than alt.2 because the linkage is not used. More clarification is needed for Alt.3 to figure out the detailed mechanism. |
| vivo | Our preference is Alt. 1 with additional re-interpretation. In current NR spec, search spaces with the same *searchSpaceId* in a scheduled cell and a scheduling cell are linked to each other. In Scell scheduling Pcell case, there may exist two kinds of SSs in Pcell configuration: one is full configuration and the other is light configuration with certain fields only (called light search spaces). If following current wording on the linkage rule, the search space ID configured in sScell can’t be used for Pcell self-scheduling. If we adjust it a bit as “a light search space in P(S)cell with *searchSpaceId i* and a full search space in sScell with *searchSpaceId i* are linked to each other”, the same *searchSpaceId* could be shared for Pcell self-scheduling and sScell self-scheduling. So our preference is:Alt. 1a: Linking between P(S)Cell and sSCell SS sets is configured with additional re-interpretation of that in Rel16, i.e. a search space in P(S)cell with configuration of only *searchSpaceId and nrofCandidates* and a search space in sScell with *searchSpaceId i* are linked to each other. |
| MTK | Similar comment as QC, first preference is Alt 2 and second preference is Alt 1 (legacy sheme). |
| Intel | We prefer Alt 1 to maximize reuse of existing spec. Since a sSCell can be the scheduling cell of PCell and other SCells, it is complicated to design different strategy to do CCS for a PCell or for the other SCells.  |
| LG Electronics | We prefer Alt 1 and share the similar view with ZTE. If Alt 2 might be beneficial in terms of flexibility, why is Alt 2 applied only to sSCell-to-P(S)Cell scheduling case? |
| ETRI | Our first preference is Alt. 1, and we are also fine with Alt. 2 if majority companies support it. |
| InterDigital | We prefer Alt 2. |
| Spreadtrum | Our first preference is Alt 1 with some updates. For a search space set of cross-carrier scheduling, the linked SS sets method as same as Rel-15 can be used. While for a search space set of self-carrier scheduling, even there is a same search space ID on sSCell, the two search space sets do not associated with each other.If there is a significant benefits of Alt 2, we can also live with it. Such as why different *nrofCandidates, monitoringSlotPeriodicityAndOffset, monitoringSymbolsWithinSlot, duration* are needed for PCell, not only just because of the flexibility. |
| Nokia | Alt3. Agree with Samsung. |
| OPPO | We prefer Alt 1. *nrofCandidates* can be configured independently for the flexibility. Alt-1 allows the unified SS configuration framework in case there are other SCells scheduled by sSCell.  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Ok with Alt 1 and Alt 2. It would be good to have the same strategy for CCS from sSCell to PCell, and legacy CCS (sSCell to another SCell), which could also be aligned with the note in the WID (“Note: These enhancements are not specific to DSS and are generally applicable to cross-carrier scheduling in carrier aggregation”). Alt3 details needed. |
| Xiaomi | We prefer Alt 1 to reuse existing spec. |
| Huawei | Either alt is fine with us. However, notably that this WI does not have explicit RAN2 TU, the change on RRC might be preferable to be minimized. We don’t mean to say which alt require more spec efforts for RRC, while this can be considered if there is very split view. |

# 3 Conclusions

TBD
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# 5 Annex A – Agreements from previous meetings

## Agreements from RAN1#102-e

Agreements:

* Following scheduling combinations are allowed/not allowed when cross-carrier scheduling from an SCell to PCell/PSCell is configured

	1. self-scheduling on PCell/PSCell is allowed
	2. cross-carrier scheduling from PCell/PSCell to another SCell is not allowed
	3. self-scheduling on the ‘SCell used for scheduling PCell/PSCell’ is allowed
	4. cross-carrier scheduling from the ‘SCell used for scheduling PCell/PSCell’ to another serving cell is allowed
	5. cross-carrier scheduling from another serving cell to the ‘SCell used for scheduling PCell/PSCell’ is not allowed
* FFS: Search space and DCI format handling for the allowed cases above

Agreements:

* Configuring 2 or more Scells to schedule the PCell/PSCell is not allowed

## Agreements from RAN1#103-e

**Conclusion**

* When CCS from sSCell to PCell/PSCell is configured, the configuration of Type 3 CSS set for DCI formats 2\_0, 2\_1, 2\_2, 2\_3, 2\_4 and applicability of the information in the DCI formats are the same as in Rel-15/Rel-16
	+ FFS: DCI format 2\_5 and DCI Format 2\_6 handling
* Note: The SCell configured with CCS to Pcell/PSCell is referred to as ‘sSCell’

**Conclusion**

* When the PCell/PSCell and sSCell use different numerologies, the PDSCH reception preparation time between the PDCCH on the sSCell and the PDSCH on the PCell/PSCell is applied (i.e., as specified in TS38.214 Section 5.5).

Agreements:

* When CCS from an SCell (sSCell) to PCell/PSCell is configured, UE monitors Type 0/0A/1/2 CSS sets (for the DCI formats associated with those SS sets) only on the PCell/PSCell and not on the sSCell
	+ Note: UE monitors Type 0/0A/2 CSS only on PCell while Type 1 CSS can be monitored on PCell/PSCell

Agreements:

* Discuss in RAN1#104-e how to handle ‘DCI formats 0\_1,1\_1,0\_2,1\_2 scheduling PDSCH/PUSCH on PCell/PSCell’ from USS set(s), when CCS from sSCell to PCell/PSCell is configured.. Below alternatives can be considered in the discussion (other alternatives are not precluded)
* ~~Below alternatives can be considered in the discussion (other alternatives are not precluded)~~
	+ Alt 1: ~~When CCS from sSCell to PCell/PSCell is configured,~~ UE cannot be configured to monitor DCI formats 0\_1,1\_1,0\_2,1\_2 on PCell/PSCell USS set(s), and can be configured to monitor them only on the sSCell USS set(s)
	+ Alt 2: ~~When CCS from sSCell to PCell/PSCell is configured,~~ UE can be configured to monitor DCI formats 0\_1/1\_1/0\_2/1\_2 on PCell/PSCell USS set(s), and/or on sSCell USS set(s). The PDCCH monitoring is based on following alternatives (other alternatives are not precluded)
		- Alt 2-1:
			* UE can monitor DCI formats 0\_1,1\_1,0\_2,1\_2 on both PCell USS set(s) and sSCell USS sets simultaneously
				+ ~~FFS activation/deactivation of scheduling from sSCell to PCell/PSCell~~
		- Alt 2-2:
			* Dynamic switching of PDCCH monitoring of DCI formats 0\_1,1\_1,0\_2,1\_2 between monitoring on PCell/PSCell USS sets and monitoring on sSCell USS sets is supported
				+ FFS: Details of switching mechanism (~~e.g. based on SS group switching, based on BWP switching,…~~)
			* UE does not monitor DCI formats 0\_1,1\_1,0\_2,1\_2 on both PCell USS set(s) and sSCell USS sets simultaneously
		- Alt 2-3:
			* UE does not monitor the same DCI format on both PCell USS set(s) and sSCell USS sets simultaneously. UE can monitor some DCI formats on sSCell USS sets and other DCI formats on PCell/PSCell USS sets simultaneously
		- Alt 2-4:
			* The USS set(s) on PSCell/PCell and the USS set(s) on sSCell are configured such that UE does not monitor DCI formats 0\_1,1\_1,0\_2,1\_2 on both PCell USS set(s) and sSCell USS set(s) simultaneously
* FFS following aspects
	+ Impact of sSCell activation/deactivation and sSCell dormancy
	+ Impact on BD/CCE limit handling ~~including considering PDCCH monitoring on CSS sets and PDCCH monitoring of ‘DCI formats 0\_0, 1\_0 scheduling PUSCH/PDSCH on PCell/PSCell’~~
	+ Whether PDCCH overbooking on sSCell is supported or not supported and impact (if any) on overbooking handling on PCell/PSCell
	+ Impact from different numerologies between PDCCH on the PCell/PSCell and that on the sSCell
	+ Whether or not to have mechanism for activation/deactivation of scheduling from sSCell to PCell/PSCell
	+ USS configuration details (e.g. handling of USS type (self-scheduling, cross carrier scheduling) for a ~~configured~~ USS set configured for scheduling of ~~in~~ PCell/PSCell)

## Agreements from RAN1#104-e

**Agreement**

When CCS from sSCell to PCell/PSCell is configured,

* Out of order scheduling is not allowed between a) PDSCH on PCell/PSCell scheduled by PDCCH on PCell/PSCell and b) PDSCH on PCell/PSCell scheduled by PDCCH on sSCell
* Out of order scheduling is not allowed between a) PUSCH on PCell/PSCell scheduled by PDCCH on PCell/PSCell and b) PUSCH on PCell/PSCell scheduled by PDCCH on sSCell

FFS: Whether this agreement requires RAN1 specification impact.

**Agreement**

When CCS from sSCell to PCell/PSCell is configured,

* Simultaneous reception of a) unicast PDSCH on PCell/PSCell scheduled from PCell/PSCell and b) unicast PDSCH on PCell/PSCell scheduled from sSCell is not allowed
* Simultaneous transmission of a) PUSCH on PCell/PSCell scheduled from PCell/PSCell and b) PUSCH on PCell/PSCell scheduled from sSCell is not allowed
* Note: Simultaneous implies full/partial time overlapping

FFS: Whether this agreement requires RAN1 specification impact.

**Agreement**

* When CCS from sSCell to PCell/PSCell is configured, CA activation/deactivation operation for the sSCell is supported

**Working Assumption**

* When CCS from sSCell to PCell/PSCell is configured, UE can be configured to monitor DCI formats 0\_1/1\_1/0\_2/1\_2 that schedule PDSCH/PUSCH on PCell/PSCell on PCell/PSCell USS set(s), and/or on sSCell USS set(s)
* The WA to be confirmed after agreements are made on PDCCH BD/CCE handling and PDCCH overbooking handling for CCS from sSCell to PCell/PSCell
* Specs also allow UEs supporting functionality of only Alt-1. Capability signaling details, if any, can be handled during the UE capability discussion for Rel17
* FFS: Whether the UE can monitor PDCCH from both cells in the same slot.

**Agreement**

* When CCS from sSCell to PCell/PSCell is configured, UE monitors ‘DCI formats 0\_0 and 1\_0 in CSS that schedule PDSCH/PUSCH on PCell/PSCell’ only on the PCell/PSCell and not on the sSCell

## Agreements from RAN1#104b-e

**Agreement**

* When CCS from sSCell to PCell/PSCell is configured
	+ CIF=0 used for sSCell self-scheduling, and CIF for sSCell to PCell cross-carrier scheduling is explicitly configured using RRC signalling

**Agreement**

PDCCH overbooking on sSCell USS set(s) is not allowed

Following was captured in RAN1 Chairman notes

**For RAN1#105-e, companies are encouraged to consider:**

* Further discuss PDCCH monitoring and BD/CCE limit handling in RAN1#105e considering below BD/CCE limit handling options
	+ Option A
		- At least when P(S)Cell SCS is not higher than sSCell SCS, PDCCH monitoring candidates on P(S)Cell and/or sSCell are configured such that max of (x1(m1)+x2(m1))+max of y(m2) corresponding to any P(S)Cell slots m1 and m2 is less than or equal to Z1
		- At least the case of Z1 = 44 is supported for P(S)Cell SCS 15kHz
			* FFS if Z1 larger than above can also be supported based on UE capability (e.g. similar to *BDFactorR* in Rel16)
		- FFS signalling details on how the limit Z1 is realized, e.g.
			* RRC configured BD limit/scaling factor-based limit for max(x1(m)+x2(m))
			* Separate RRC configured BD limits/scaling factor-based limits for max(x1(m)+x2(m)) and max(y(m))
			* separate BdfactorR for P(S)Cell and sSCell
			* SS configuration-based BD limit for max(x1(m)+x2(m)) and max(y(m))
			* RRC configured BD limit/scaling factor-based limit for max(x1(m)+x2(m))+ max(y(m))
			* Counting ‘sSCell-to-P(S)Cell’ scheduling as an additional scheduling cell with numerology given by sSCell numerology in determining the BD/CCE limits
		- FFS reference SCS to use when P(S)Cell has higher SCS than sSCell (if supported)
		- For sSCell scheduling P(S)Cell, the UE is not required to monitor on the active DL BWP with SCS configuration $μ$ of the sSCell more than$M\_{PDCCH}^{max,slot,μ}$ PDCCH candidates per slot of sSCell.
			* FFS how limit$M\_{PDCCH}^{total,slot,μ}$ is computed and applied when CCS from sSCell to P(S)Cell is configured
	+ Option B
		- At least when P(S)Cell SCS is not higher than sSCell SCS, For P(S)Cell slot m, PDCCH monitoring candidates on P(S)Cell and/or sSCell are configured such that x1(m)+x2(m)+y(m) is less than or equal to BD limit Z2
		- At least the case of Z2 = 44 is supported for P(S)Cell SCS 15kHz
			* FFS if Z2 larger than above can also be supported based on UE capability (e.g. similar to *BDFactorR* in Rel16)
		- max of (x1(m1)+x2(m1)) + max of y(m2) corresponding to any P(S)Cell slots m1 and m2 ~~can~~ is allowed to be larger than BD limit Z2
		- FFS signalling details on how the limit Z2 is realized
		- FFS reference SCS to use when P(S)Cell has higher SCS than sSCell (if supported)
		- For sSCell scheduling P(S)Cell, the UE is not required to monitor on the active DL BWP with SCS configuration $μ$ of the sSCell more than$M\_{PDCCH}^{max,slot,μ}$ PDCCH candidates per slot of sSCell.
			* FFS how limit$M\_{PDCCH}^{total,slot,μ}$ is computed and applied when CCS from sSCell to P(S)Cell is configured
	+ Option C
		- PDCCH monitoring candidates on P(S)Cell are configured such that max of (x1(m1)+x2(m1)) is less than or equal to Z3
			* Z3 is derived by the PDCCH monitoring capability of PCell
		- PDCCH monitoring candidates on sSCell are configured such that max of y(m2) is less than or equal to Z4
			* Z4 is derived by the PDCCH monitoring capability of sSCell
		- FFS details to define Z3 and Z4, e.g.
			* Separate RRC configured BD limits/scaling factor-based limits for max(x1(m)+x2(m)) and max(y(m))
		- For sSCell scheduling P(S)Cell, the UE is not required to monitor on the active DL BWP with SCS configuration $μ$ of the sSCell more than Z4 PDCCH candidates per slot of sSCell
	+ Note
		- x1(m) is #BDs for PDCCH CSS(s) candidates monitored on P(S)Cell slot m
		- x2(m) is #BDs for PDCCH USS(s) candidates monitored on P(S)Cell slot m
		- y(m) is #BDs for PDCCH USS(s) candidates monitored on sSCell in all sSCell slot(s) that overlap slot m of P(S)Cell
		- USS(s) => USS(s) that can schedule PDSCH/PUSCH on P(S)Cell)