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# Introduction

This document summarizes the contributions submitted under the “9.10.1 **Multi-cell PUSCH/PDSCH scheduling with a single DCI**” agenda item of the Rel-18 work item on “Multi-Carrier Enhancements (MCE) for NR”.

The Rel-18 WI Multi-carrier enhancements was agreed during RAN#94-e meeting [1], where one of the objectives is targeted to specify a solution for multi-cell PUSCH/PDSCH scheduling with a single DCI. The detailed objectives in the WID are listed below:

|  |
| --- |
| **1. Specify a solution for multi-cell PUSCH/PDSCH scheduling (one PDSCH/PUSCH per cell) with a single DCI [RAN1]**   * **Identify the maximum number of cells that can be scheduled simultaneously** * **Consider both intra-band and inter-band CA operation** * **Consider both FR1 and FR2** * ***The single DCI shall be optimized for 3 or more cells for the multi-cell PUSCH/PDSCH scheduling*** |

The following e-mail thread for Multi-cell PUSCH/PDSCH scheduling with a single DCI is announced by chairman in RAN1#109-e:

[109-e-R18-MC\_Enh-01] Email discussion on multi-cell PUSCH/PDSCH scheduling with a single DCI by May 20 – Haipeng (Lenovo)

* Check points: May 12, May 18, May 20

In this contribution, we summarize the related issues and proposals based on the contributions submitted in RAN1#109-e under the agenda item 9.10.1 [1]-[25]. The whole feature lead summary is structured as follows:

From section 2 to 5, the main issues raised by company contributions are divided into 4 parts and each section covers one main issue. In each section, the background and related proposals submitted in this meeting are listed firstly in sub-section X.1, then summary on one or several sub-issues is provided in sub-section X.2 from moderator’s perspective. Based on the above summary, in sub-section X.3, a set of proposals is recommended by moderator followed by one or multiple tables to collect company views for the initial proposals in the first round of e-mail discussion. If present, in sub-section X.4 the proposals will be updated based on companies’ inputs. As e-mail discussion goes on, more sub-sections may be provided for further e-mail discussion and update.

In section 6, some proposals will be selected for discussion in the GTW session.

In Section 8, the agreements made in previous RAN1 meetings are listed for reference.

Companies are highly encouraged to provide views within 24h. Moderator will try to update the proposals based on companies’ inputs at least on a daily basis.

# Scenarios and basic framework

## Background and submitted proposals

Regarding this issue, companies’ views are summarized as below:

|  |
| --- |
| * **Huawei, HiSilicon** * *Proposal 4: The scenario of same SCS among scheduling and scheduled cells can be prioritized in Rel-18.* * *Proposal 8: In R18 the four cases can be supported for multi-cell scheduling by single DCI.* * *Opt 1: Single PDCCH in PCell scheduling PCell+SCell* * *Opt 2: Single PDCCH in PCell scheduling SCell1+SCell2* * *Opt 3: Single PDCCH in SCell scheduling PCell+SCell* * *Opt 4: Single PDCCH in SCell1 scheduling SCell1+SCell2 or SCell1 scheduling SCell2+SCell3* * **ZTE** * *Proposal 1: For the multi-cell scheduling, scenario 1 should be supported and scenario 2 and scenario 3 can be considered if time allows in this WID.* * **Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell** * *Proposal 2.1: Focus the discussions in the early WI phase on overarching principles for multi-cell PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling incl. overall scheduling framework for a cell, intended application scenarios and multi-cell DCI design framework assumptions before discussing the details of the multi-cell DCI content DCI field per DCI field.* * *Proposal 2.2: The Rel-15…Rel-17 cross-carrier scheduling framework applies as-is; The multi-cell DCI is considered the scheduling DCI, and the PDCCH transmitting it is considered the scheduling PDCCH and the scheduled PxSCH processing and timelines as specified for cross-carrier scheduling are used the same way as with single-cell DCI.* * *Proposal 3.5.1: The design of the MC-DCI should allow for optimization of the MC-DCI size when all cells within the MC-DCI have some commonalities, e.g. same numerology and duplexing mode. Note these optimizations need not be limited to intra-band case.* * **Spreadtrum Communications** * *Proposal 1: It is suggested to study and decide the scope of multi-cell combinations via one single DCI scheduling, to do down select among all those conditions:*   + *FR1 and FR2*   + *Intra-band and inter-band*   + *PCell scheduled by sSCell in FR2*   + *Licensed and unlicensed CCs*   + *Belong to Different TAG cells*   + *CCs from same PUCCH group or different PUCCH group*   + *Different priority scheduling* * *Proposal 2: Scenario#3 PCell scheduled by sSCell in FR2 can be with lower priority* * *Proposal 3: For Scenario#7 Different priority scheduling can be with lower priority* * *Proposal 4: Multiple cells scheduled by one DCI should belong to the same PUCCH group* * **Vivo:** * *Proposal 1. For multi-cell scheduling, the following principles should be taken into account:* * *The multi-cell scheduling grant is for unicast DL scheduling only or unicast UL scheduling only.* * *The scheduled cells can be associated with the same/different TDD configurations/numerologies.* * *Either Pcell or a Scell can be configured as a scheduling cell for joint multi-cell scheduling.* * *For a scheduled cell, there is only one scheduling cell.* * *The scheduled PDSCHs or PUSCHs correspond to different TBs.* * *Changes or extensions to the legacy PDCCH coding/mapping procedure, including the maximum DCI size=140 bits excluding CRC and supported ALs, should be avoided.* * *The number of cells that can be scheduled by a single DCI is no larger than 8 and is configurable.* * **CATT** * *Proposal 6: At least the case that the same SCS configuration among multiple scheduled cells should be supported firstly. Whether to support different SCS configuration among multiple scheduled cells can be further studied.* * **China Telecom** * *Proposal 1: Support UL cell configured with SUL for multi-cell PUSCH scheduling with a single DCI.* * *RAN1 needs to clarify whether both only one UL cell and multiple UL CA cells configured with SUL are the supported scenarios for multi-cell scheduling.* * **Lenovo** * *Proposal 1: Multi-cell scheduling considers two cases: (1) one PDSCH or PUSCH is self-scheduled and other PDSCHs or PUSCHs are cross-carrier scheduled; (2) all the PDSCHs or PUSCHs are cross-carrier scheduled.* * *Proposal 2: Multi-cell scheduling DCI can schedule multiple unlicensed carriers with or without licensed carriers.* * *Proposal 3: A multi-cell scheduling DCI schedules different TBs on different carriers.* * **Xiaomi** * *Proposal 7: DL/UL transmission cannot be scheduled simultaneously by a single DCI.* * **Samsung** * *Proposal 1: Prioritize the intra-band, collocated CA scenario in the multi-cell scheduling designs, while considering inter-band or non-collated CA as well.* * **InterDigital** * *Proposal 4: RAN1 to agree on at least one baseline scenario for the set of schedulable carriers and their bandwidths.* * **NTT DOCOMO** * *Proposal 3: Separate TB is scheduled for each cell by the single DCI scheduling multi-cell PDSCH/PUSCH.* * *Proposal 4: Either PDSCHs or PUSCHs on multiple cells are scheduled with a single DCI.* * *Proposal 5: Multi-cell PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling targets to support at least following scenarios;* * *Scheduling cell and scheduled cells are within a same band or in different bands with same numerology* * *FFS: different numerologies, with potentially updating WID to allow “multiple PDSCHs/PUSCHs per cell”*   + - *case 1: between scheduling and scheduled cells (same numerology across scheduled cells)*     - *case 2: across scheduled cells* * *Proposal 13: For multi-carrier scheduling with a single DCI, the following scenarios need further investigation on additional specification impacts/standardization effort.* * *whether FR2-2 can be supported for a scheduling cell and for scheduled cell(s)* * *whether the cell with shared spectrum operation can be scheduling cell for the multi-carrier scheduling* * *whether scheduled cells can include both cells with and without shared spectrum operation simultaneously* * *whether SCell can be a scheduling cell for multi-carrier scheduling of multiple scheduled cells including P(S)Cell* * **Intel** * *Proposal 2* * *Joint scheduling of cells in intra-band, inter-band CA scenario and in FR1 and FR2 for multi-cell scheduling is supported.* * *Joint scheduling of cells in licensed and unlicensed bands for multi-cell scheduling is not supported.* * *Proposal 5* * *Repetition is not supported if more than one PDSCHs or PUSCHs are scheduled for multi-cell scheduling.* * **Ericsson** * *Proposal 2: At least the case where all PUSCH/PDSCH scheduled by a mc-DCI have same SCS is supported.* * **Qualcomm** * *Proposal 1:* * *Consider following as design target scenarios for multi-cell scheduling with a single DCI*   + - *Scenario 1: Multiple cells with narrow bandwidth(s) (e.g., 5 and/or 10MHz) across FR1 bands*       * + *The cells belong to the same carrier type (e.g., FR1-FDD) with the same numerology*     - *Scenario 2: Multiple cells with wide bandwidth (e.g., 100MHz) within a band*       * + *The cells belong to the same carrier type (e.g., FR2/Unlicensed) with the same numerology*     - *For both scenarios, scheduling cell can be one of, or, none of the scheduled cells*       * + *If the scheduling cell is none of the scheduled cells, the scheduling cell and the scheduled cells can belong to different carrier types and/or can have different numerologies* * *Specification supports multi-cell scheduling by a single DCI of up to [4 or 8] cells* * *Proposal 2:* * *Prioritize both spectral and power efficiency enhancements for CA with multi-cell scheduling with a single DCI* * *With respect to power efficiency enhancements, specify solutions to enable a UE to adapt the bandwidth(s) for operation with multiple cells* * *Proposal 3:* * *In this WI, do not change the following existing CA framework*   + - *A transport block does not span multiple cells*     - *HARQ processes are independent for different cells*     - *SCell activation/deactivation and SCell dormant BWP is per cell*     - *PUCCH is transmitted on only one cell and UCI multiplexing on PUSCH is only one PUSCH among all the overlapped PUSCHs (if any)*     - *Scheduled cells and scheduling cell are in the same cell-group or PUCCH-group*     - *A DCI can schedule either PDSCH(s) or PUSCH(s) (not both)* * *A DCI format for multi-cell scheduling is configured to be monitored on USS set(s) and the DCI format is a non-fallback DCI format*   + *I.e., CSS set(s) and fallback DCI format(s) do not support multi-cell scheduling* |

## Moderator summary and proposals based on contributions

Based on contributions submitted by companies, below issues are prioritized for discussion in this meeting. Within each sub-section, the summary from moderator’s perspective is listed and followed by draft proposals for further discussion round by round.

For convenience of discussion, two DCI formats, DCI format 0-X and DCI format 1-X, can be used for time being only for discussion purpose, wherein DCI format 0-X is used for scheduling multiple PUSCHs on multiple serving cells with one PUSCH per serving cell and DCI format 1-X is used for scheduling multiple PDSCHs on multiple serving cells with one PDSCH per serving cell. The final naming in standards is up to editors.

According to WID, one issue needs to be clarified is whether the multiple PDSCHs or PUSCHs scheduled by a single DCI can carry a single TB with repetitions or different TBs on different carriers. For high data rate purpose, different TBs should be transmitted on different carriers. For reliability improvement purpose, one TB can be repeated on multiple carriers scheduled via a single DCI. Considering existing HARQ entities are maintained per serving cell, TB repetition on multiple serving cells inevitably leads to significant standard impact on RAN2.

Regarding TBs transmitted on co-scheduled serving cells, five companies [ZTE, Lenovo, NTT DOCOMO, vivo, Intel] propose separate TBs are scheduled on multiple serving cells by the multi-cell scheduling DCI. Hence, it is necessary to make it clearer with an agreement, e.g., a multi-cell scheduling DCI schedules different TBs on different carriers.

Regarding whether to adopt fallback DCI for multi-cell scheduling, three companies [NTT DOCOMO, Lenovo, Qualcomm] propose multi-cell scheduling is not supported for fallback DCI considering multi-cell scheduling DCI has large payload size and many fields are configurable based on RRC configuration. It is ok to make it clearer with an agreement although it is obvious.

Regarding search space set for monitoring multi-cell scheduling DCI, two companies [NTT DOCOMO, Qualcomm] propose that only USS set should be the applicable search space type for multi-carrier PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling DCI. This is because the motivation for supporting multi-carrier scheduling is to increase the flexibility and spectral/power efficiency for DL/UL data scheduling by reducing the control overhead. A simple agreement can be made as baseline framework.

For DCI payload size reduction, 7 companies [Nokia, Spreadtrum, vivo, Lenovo, OPPO, Apple, Qualcomm] propose the co-scheduled carriers should be within same cell group so that HARQ-ACK feedback corresponding to the co-scheduled carriers can be included in a same HARQ-ACK codebook. In this way, single DAI, single HARQ-ACK feedback timing indicator, single PUCCH resource indicator as well as single TPC command can be indicated in the DCI and shared/common for all the co-scheduled carriers, which can save DCI overhead without impact on system performance.

To make it clear that the multi-cell scheduling DCI does not support simultaneous scheduling of DL and UL with a single DCI due to significant standard impacts, moderator suggests focussing on the scenario that either PDSCHs or PUSCHs are scheduled with a single DCI in this WI.

As specified in Rel-17 due to introduction of FR2-2, the number of subcarrier spacing values is increased to 7. The SCS has impact on DCI format design and UE processing time. Considering the processing timeline for decoding/preparing control/data for different numerologies can be widely varying, high complexity will be caused if too many different subcarrier spacings are used for co-scheduled cells by a single multi-cell DCI. 5 companies [Huawei, Nokia, CATT, NTT DOCOMO, Ericsson] propose prioritizing same SCS among scheduled cells firstly and FFS different SCS cases. Moderator suggests trying this proposal first for this meeting.

For multi-cell scheduling in case of intra-band CA, it is natural to benefit from the PDCCH overhead reduction by using multi-cell scheduling DCI to schedule PUSCH/PDSCH on the scheduling cell. Therefore, a simple conclusion is required to make it clear.

In Rel-17, cross-carrier scheduling from SCell to PCell is specified. It needs to discuss whether an SCell can be a scheduling cell for multi-cell scheduling multiple scheduled cells including PCell, e.g., PDCCH on SCell schedules multiple PDSCHs/PUSCHs on PCell and one or more SCell(s).

### 1st round of discussions

#### Proposal 1-1:

* Agree the following terminologies only for convenience of discussion:
* DCI format 0-X is used for scheduling multiple PUSCHs on multiple serving cells with one PUSCH per serving cell
* DCI format 1-X is used for scheduling multiple PDSCHs on multiple serving cells with one PDSCH per serving cell.

#### Proposal 1-2:

* Different TBs are scheduled on different PUSCHs by DCI format 0-X.
* Different TBs are scheduled on different PDSCHs by DCI format 1-X.

#### Proposal 1-3:

* Fallback DCI (i.e., DCI formats 0\_0 and 1\_0) does not support multi-cell scheduling.

#### Proposal 1-4:

* The DCI for multi-cell scheduling is monitored only in USS set.

#### Proposal 1-5:

* PDSCH cannot be scheduled by DCI format 0\_X.
* PUSCH cannot be scheduled by DCI format 1\_X.

#### Proposal 1-6:

* All the cells scheduled by a DCI format 1-X are included in same cell group.

#### Proposal 1-7:

* At least support same SCS configuration among co-scheduled cells for multi-cell scheduling.
* FFS: Whether to support different SCS configurations between co-scheduled cells and the scheduling cell in case of same SCS for co-scheduled cells
* FFS: Whether to support different SCS configurations among co-scheduled cells
* FFS: Whether to support different carrier types (e.g., FDD+TDD, licensed + unlicensed) among co-scheduled cells

#### Proposal 1-8:

* DCI format 0-X/1-X on a scheduling cell can be used to schedule PUSCH/PDSCH on that scheduling cell.

#### Proposal 1-9:

* DCI format 0-X/1-X can be transmitted on PCell or SCell.
* FFS whether a DCI format 0-X/1-X on an SCell can schedule multiple cells including PCell.

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Spreadtrum | For Proposal 1-6, we propose to change it into PUCCH group. Since there are can be up to two PUCCH groups in a cell group. However, HARQ-ACK codebook for PDSCHs and UCI multiplexing on PUSCH are both defined within the PUCCH group. Thus, for simplicity, HARQ-ACK feedback for PDSCHs scheduled by multi-cell DCI would be good limited within a PUCCH group, instead of cell group. Proposal 1-6 (update):  * All the cells scheduled by a DCI format 1-X are included in same PUCCH group. |
| Qualcomm | P1-1: OK  P1-2:  We propose to re-formulate it as follows since we have not yet concluded whether/how to support PDSCH or PUSCH repetition in a carrier.   * Different TBs are scheduled on different carriers ~~PUSCHs~~ by DCI format 0-X. * Different TBs are scheduled on different carriers ~~PDSCHs~~ by DCI format 1-X.   P1-3: OK  P1-4: OK  P1-5: OK  P1-6:  We propose to reformulate it as follows. Scheduling cell and scheduled cells should be in the same cell-group or PUCCH-group.   * All the scheduled cells and the scheduling cell for multi-cell PDSCH scheduling ~~scheduled~~ by a DCI format 1-X are included in same cell group or PUCCH-group. * All the scheduled cells and the scheduling cell for multi-cell PUSCH scheduling by a DCI format 0-X are included in same cell group.   P1-7:  We propose to re-formulate it as follows. First of all, the “co-scheduled cells” must mean the cells scheduled by a same DCI format 0-X/1-X, which should be clear.  Then we propose to delete “FFS” on the first subbullet. We think this is important to enable FR1-FR2 CA. We do not see any additional impact from this on most of the aspects (e.g., DCI format design). The only necessary thing is to ensure the time gap between the PDCCH and PDSCH/PUSCH – however, this is already in the spec for cross-carrier scheduling with different numerologies and hence the additional impact must be minor.   * At least support same SCS configuration among co-scheduled cells for multi-cell scheduling by a DCI format 0-X/1-X. * ~~FFS: Whether to s~~Support different SCS configurations between co-scheduled cells and the scheduling cell in case of same SCS for co-scheduled cells * FFS: Whether to support different SCS configurations among co-scheduled cells * FFS: Whether to support different carrier types (e.g., FDD+TDD, licensed + unlicensed) among co-scheduled cells   P1-8:  We propose to re-formulate it as follows.   * DCI format 0-X/1-X on a scheduling cell can be used to schedule PUSCHs/PDSCHs on multiple cells that include the scheduling cell. * DCI format 0-X/1-X on a scheduling cell can be used to schedule PUSCHs/PDSCHs on multiple cells that do not include the scheduling cell.   P1-9: OK |
| Nokia/NSB | We support all the proposals.  Related to proposal 1-6, we are wondering if the MC-DCI PUSCH scheduling using 0\_X should also be limited within the same (PUCCH) cell group. |
| OPPO | Agree all above proposals except Proposal 1-9.    For Proposal 1-9, we prefer the following formulation:  **Proposal 1-9 (revised)**:   * DCI format 0-X/1-X can be transmitted on PCell. * DCI format 0-X/1-X can be transmitted on a SCell if the SCell is not configured to schedule PUSCH/PDSCH on PCell.   + FFS whether a DCI format 0-X/1-X can be transmitted on an SCell, on which DCI is transmitted to schedule PCell.   Note that the above FFS includes two cases:   * case-1: DCI 0\_X/1\_X itself schedules PCell. * case-2: DCI 0\_X/1\_X does not schedule PCell but other DCIs on the same host SCell do. |
| Xiaomi | On proposal 1-1, one clarification question is when you are saying multiple TBs, is the intention is to preclude the possibility that the multi-cell DCI can schedule a single PDSCH/PUSCH on one cell. |
| Fujitsu | In general, we are fine with the spirit of the proposals. For proposal 1-6, we suggest: Proposal 1-6:  * All the cells scheduled by a DCI format 1-X are included in same cell group (MCG,SCG or PUCCH group).   Besides, it seems companies assume only one DL assignment DCI format and only one UL grant DCI format are used for multi-cell scheduling. If it is the correct understanding, we think it is better to be clarified as well, on top of the above proposals. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Proposal 1-6:  It would be good to align the description with Proposal 1-7 to make it clear, hence we propose to update as follows;   * All the co-scheduled cells scheduled by a DCI format 1-X are included in same cell group.   Proposal 1-7:  We are fine with this proposal at this point but also fine to remove ‘FFS’ from fist sub-bullet as Qualcomm proposed to support the scenario such as scheduling from FR1 to FR2 which can efficiently utilize the wideband carriers in high frequency range with reliable and power-efficient PDCCH monitoring.  Proposal 1-9:  We support the modification by OPPO. |
| Langbo | For Proposal 1-6 and Proposal 1-8, we support QC’s updates. We support the other proposals. |
| LG | P1-1: OKP1-2: It may be clearer to update as “different PUSCHs in different carriers” and “different PDSCHs in different carriers”.P1-3: OKP1-4: OKP1-5: OKP1-6: It may be clearer to revise “cell group” into “PUCCH group”, and we can have similar proposal also for DCI format 0-X.P1-7: It may be clearer to update the main bullet as “same SCS configuration and same carrier type among co-scheduled cells and between co-scheduled cells and the scheduling cell”.P1-8: OKP1-9: OK |
| CMCC | We are generally OK with the above proposals. |
| Moderator | Proposal 1-1: @xiaomi, it doesn’t preclude any possibility. As mentioned in the main bullet, this is only for convenience of discussion.Proposal 1-2: @Qualcomm @LG: OK, will update for next round discussion. Proposal 1-6: @Spreadtrum @Qualcomm @Nokia @Fujitsu @NTT DOCOMO @Langbo @LG, your suggestions are fine with me. Will update for next round discussion.  @Fujitsu: regarding your comments, I think it can be clarified when we discuss the DCI format for multi-cell scheduling.  Proposal 1-7: @Qualcomm @NTT DOCOMO, we can remove the first FFS to make progress.  Proposal 1-8: @Qualcomm: OK to capture both cases, will update in next round discussion.  Proposal 1-9: @OPPO: Ok to make it separate and update in 2nd round discussion.  To ALL: Please provide your comments directly in Section 2.2.2 for 2nd round of discussions. |

### 2nd round of discussions

#### Proposal 1-1:

* Agree the following terminologies only for convenience of discussion:
* DCI format 0-X is used for scheduling multiple PUSCHs on multiple serving cells with one PUSCH per serving cell
* DCI format 1-X is used for scheduling multiple PDSCHs on multiple serving cells with one PDSCH per serving cell.

#### Proposal 1-2:

* Different TBs are scheduled on different carriers by DCI format 0-X.
* Different TBs are scheduled on different carriers by DCI format 1-X.

#### Proposal 1-3:

* Fallback DCI (i.e., DCI formats 0\_0 and 1\_0) does not support multi-cell scheduling.

#### Proposal 1-4:

* The DCI for multi-cell scheduling is monitored only in USS set.

#### Proposal 1-5:

* PDSCH cannot be scheduled by DCI format 0\_X.
* PUSCH cannot be scheduled by DCI format 1\_X.

#### Proposal 1-6:

* All the co-scheduled cells by a DCI format 1-X and the scheduling cell are included in same cell group or PUCCH group.
* All the co-scheduled cells by a DCI format 0-X and the scheduling cell are included in same cell group.

#### Proposal 1-7:

* At least support same SCS configuration among co-scheduled cells by a DCI format 0-X/1-X.
* Support different SCS configurations between co-scheduled cells and the scheduling cell in case of same SCS for co-scheduled cells
* FFS: Whether to support different SCS configurations among co-scheduled cells
* FFS: Whether to support different carrier types (e.g., FDD+TDD, licensed + unlicensed) among co-scheduled cells

#### Proposal 1-8:

* DCI format 0-X/1-X on a scheduling cell can be used to schedule PUSCHs/PDSCHs on multiple cells including the scheduling cell.
* DCI format 0-X/1-X on a scheduling cell can be used to schedule PUSCHs/PDSCHs on multiple cells not including the scheduling cell.

#### Proposal 1-9:

* DCI format 0-X/1-X can be transmitted on PCell.
* DCI format 0-X/1-X can be transmitted on a SCell if the SCell is not configured to schedule PUSCH/PDSCH on PCell.
* FFS whether a DCI format 0-X/1-X can be transmitted on an SCell if the SCell is configured to schedule PUSCH/PDSCH on PCell.

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| ZTE | For proposal 1-2, we have the same views with Qualcomm and LG. But we prefer to use ‘cell’ instead of ‘carrier’ to align with the other proposals, e.g., proposal 1. |
| MTK | P1-1: OKP1-2: OKP1-3: OKP1-4: OKP1-5: OKP1-6: We prefer to limit it to “same PUCCH group” and put “same cell group” in FFS. Whether to support “same cell group” can be determined later after RAN1 decides the supportable scenarios (ex. FR1/FR2, intra/inter band, …)P1-7: OKP1-8: OK **P1-9: OK** |
| China Telecom | In Proposal 1-9, for the 2nd bullet, the SCell is not configured to schedule PUSCH/PDSCH on PCell, does it mean single Pcell scheduling or multi-cell scheduling including the Pcell or both? For the 3rd bullet, the SCell is configured to schedule PUSCH/PDSCH on PCell, we understand it means single Pcell scheduling. |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposals in principle.  For Proposal 1-7, suggest to update this as follows: Proposal 1-7:  * At least support same SCS configuration among co-scheduled cells and different SCS configurations between co-scheduled cells and the scheduling cell in case of same SCS for co-scheduled cells by a DCI format 0-X/1-X. * ~~Support different SCS configurations between co-scheduled cells and the scheduling cell in case of same SCS for co-scheduled cells~~ * FFS: Whether to support different SCS configurations among co-scheduled cells * FFS: Whether to support different carrier types (e.g., FDD+TDD, licensed + unlicensed) among co-scheduled cells   For Proposal 1-8, minor editorial update. Suggest to add respectively in each bullet.  For Proposal 1-9, it is not clear to us why Scell scheduling Pcell is not supported for multi-cell scheduling. This should be based on the Rel-17 DSS mechanism. |
| Vivo | P1-1,1-2,1-3,1-4,1-5,1-6: OK  P1-7:   1. the mixed carrier type case is FFS, do we need a bullet to support same carrier type? (e.g., FDD+TDD, licensed + unlicensed) 2. "SCS configuration" is not clear, it can be misinterpreted as the configured SCS list corresponding to the bwps on a cell , however the intention of the proposal is to clarify that the N PXSCHs on N cells scheduled by an mc-DCI should have the same SCSs, rather than aligning the SCSs list configured for the cells  Proposal 1-7:  * At least support same SCS ~~configuration~~ among co-scheduled cells by a DCI format 0-X/1-X. * Support different SCS ~~configuration~~ between co-scheduled cells and the scheduling cell in case of same SCS for co-scheduled cells * FFS: Whether to support different SCS ~~configuration~~ among co-scheduled cells PXSCH * At least support same carrier type among co-scheduled cells by a DCI format 0-X/1-X * FFS: Whether to support different carrier types (e.g., FDD+TDD, licensed + unlicensed) among co-scheduled cells   P1-9: OK, we support to mark the sScell scheduling Pcell case as FFS because currently it not decided yet if a scheduled cell in multi-cell scheduling can be configured with two scheduling cell. |
| InterDigital | Generally OK with all proposals.  For P1-2: Agree with ZTE for terminology, “serving cell” is better than “carrier”. |
| Ericsson1 | P1-1: OK  P1-2 : Suggest to use “cells” instead of “carriers”.  P1-3 to P1-6: OK  P1-7: Suggest following update to first sub bullet – “*Support different SCS configurations between co-scheduled cells and the scheduling cell in case of same SCS for all co-scheduled cells*”  P1-8: OK  P1-9: Not OK – at this point, the main discussion should be whether the DCI can be carried on PCell and SCells, and in our view both should be supported. Any additional restrictions can be discussed further. Therefore, we prefer below formulation *Proposal 1-9-rev:*  * *DCI format 0-X/1-X can be transmitted on PCell or SCell.* |
| Apple | We are generally fine with the proposals, with following comments:  Editorial: there seems to be a mix of 0\_X/0-X and 1\_X/1-X in the proposals. Would be good to align. ☺  P1-2: prefer “cells” over “carriers”.  P1-6: we think they should be in the same PUCCH group (not just the same cell group) for DCI format 1-X, if we want to reduce the DCI overhead by sharing the HARQ-ACK fields. |
| Samsung | We suggest the following revisions. Proposal 1-2:  * Different TBs are scheduled on different ~~carriers~~ cells by DCI format 0-X. * Different TBs are scheduled on different ~~carriers~~ cells by DCI format 1-X.   Reason: The term in the specifications is ‘cell’. Even if UL/SUL is considered, there is no case where a UE would transmit PUSCHs simultaneously on UL/SUL of a same cell. If ‘carriers’ is to remain, we would like a clarification as to why. Proposal 1-7: We cannot agree at this moment to consider only same SCS configuration (and leave different SCS as FFS). Whether such restriction is needed can follow from other design consideration which have not been discussed.Proposal 1-9:  * DCI format 0-X/1-X can be transmitted on PCell. * DCI format 0-X/1-X can be transmitted on a SCell if the ~~SCell is not configured to~~ DCI format 0-X/1-X does not schedule PUSCH/PDSCH on PCell. * FFS whether a DCI format 0-X/1-X can be transmitted on an SCell if the ~~SCell is configured to~~ DCI format 0-X/1-X schedules PUSCH/PDSCH on PCell   Reason: OK to preclude DSS for multi-cell scheduling but no reason to preclude the sSCell from being used for multi-cell scheduling. |
| CATT | We are generally OK with the above Proposals.  For Proposal 1-6, we think the co-scheduled cells by a DCI format 1-X and the scheduling cell should at least be included in the same PUCCH group. Whether support the case co-scheduled cells and scheduling cell are in different PUCCH group but in the same cell group should be further discussed. |
| Spreadtrum | For P1-6, we support the proposal from MTK, use PUCCH group in the main bullet, and FFS cell group for PDSCH. Regarding PUSCH, the PUCCH group should also be applied, because the UCI multiplexing is done within the PUCCH group, for example, if DAI in DCI 0\_X indicates to do HARQ-ACK multiplexing, there would be some problems to find a PUSCH in the co-scheduled cell. Such as how many DAI fields in the DCI to indicate, if across two PUCCH groups.  For P1-9, it is too early to have this restriction of sSCell for PDCCH cross carrier scheduling, support it as FFS as mentioned by vivo. |
| Moderator | @All: below proposals are updated. Hopefully, it can address your comments. (Updated) Proposal 1-2:  * Different TBs are scheduled on different cells by DCI format 0-X. * Different TBs are scheduled on different cells by DCI format 1-X.  (Updated) Proposal 1-6:  * All the co-scheduled cells by a DCI format 1-X and the scheduling cell are included in same PUCCH group. * FFS: All the co-scheduled cells by a DCI format 0-X and the scheduling cell are included in same cell group.  (Updated) Proposal 1-7:  * At least support same SCS among co-scheduled cells and different SCS between co-scheduled cells and the scheduling cell in case of same SCS for co-scheduled cells by a DCI format 0-X/1-X. * Support * FFS: Whether to support different SCS configurations among co-scheduled cells * At least support same carrier type among co-scheduled cells by a DCI format 0-X/1-X * FFS: Whether to support different carrier types (e.g., FDD+TDD, licensed + unlicensed) among co-scheduled cells   @Samsung: Regarding Proposal 1-7, same SCS can simplify the DCI format design. “at least” is used, so different SCS cases are not precluded.  @Intel @Ericsson: Regarding Proposal 1-9, some companies have concern on UE complexity and DCI size budget if DCI format 0-X/1-X on a SCell can schedule PUSCH/PDSCH on PCell. So we add FFS which still has the possibility to support Rel-17 mechanism. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Ok with 1-7 |
| FGI | Fine with all proposals. Before the (Updated) Proposal 1-2, we want to clarify is there any difference between the “serving cells” and the “carriers” addressed in proposal 1-1 and 1-2 respectively.  But now, it makes sense to us. We prefer the updated 1-2. |

### 3rd round of discussions

#### Proposal 1-7:

* At least support same SCS among co-scheduled cells and different SCS between co-scheduled cells and the scheduling cell in case of same SCS for co-scheduled cells by a DCI format 0-X/1-X.
* FFS: Whether to support different SCS configurations among co-scheduled cells
* At least support same carrier type among co-scheduled cells by a DCI format 0-X/1-X
* FFS: Whether to support different carrier types (e.g., FDD+TDD, licensed + unlicensed) among co-scheduled cells

#### Proposal 1-8:

* DCI format 0-X/1-X on a scheduling cell can be used to schedule PUSCHs/PDSCHs on multiple cells including the scheduling cell.
* DCI format 0-X/1-X on a scheduling cell can be used to schedule PUSCHs/PDSCHs on multiple cells not including the scheduling cell.

#### Proposal 1-9:

* DCI format 0-X/1-X can be transmitted on PCell.
* DCI format 0-X/1-X can be transmitted on a SCell if the DCI format 0-X/1-X does not schedule PUSCH/PDSCH on PCell.
* FFS whether a DCI format 0-X/1-X can be transmitted on an SCell if the DCI format 0-X/1-X schedules PUSCH/PDSCH on PCell.

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| New H3C | We are fine with proposal 1-7, proposal 1-8 and proposal 1-9 |
| Qualcomm | P1-7: OK  P1-8: OK  P1-9: OK |
| Nokia/NSB | We are OK with 1-7, 1-8 & 1-9 |
| Apple | P1-7: it seems that same SCS between scheduling cell and scheduled cell is missing from the proposal.  In the main bullet we need to be precise what we may by “carrier type”. I made a modification below, but not sure if anything else is considered as carrier type in this context. Proposal 1-7:  * At least support same SCS among co-scheduled cells and same ordifferent SCS between co-scheduled cells and the scheduling cell in case of same SCS for co-scheduled cells by a DCI format 0-X/1-X. * FFS: Whether to support different SCS configurations among co-scheduled cells * At least support same carrier type (FDD or TDD, licensed or unlicensed) among co-scheduled cells by a DCI format 0-X/1-X * FFS: Whether to support different carrier types (e.g., FDD+TDD, licensed + unlicensed) among co-scheduled cells   P1-8/P1-9: OK |
| Spreadtrum | For Proposal 1-7, “same SCS among co-scheduled cells” refers to (Alt1) the actual scheduled cells by one DCI 0\_X/1\_X, or (Alt2) configured into a multi-cell group can be scheduled by DCI 0\_X/1\_X.  The difference between Alt1 and Alt2 is, for Alt 2 if there is a SCS change e.g. BWP switching of a cell, the multi-cell group should be re-configured to delete this cell out of multi-cell scheduling, to satisfy the requirement of same SCS. For Alt1, if there is a SCS change, the cell never appears in the actual multi-cell scheduling, but it still can be in the multi-cell group. We want to check which understanding is right for Proposal 1-7. |
| LG | P1-7: One clarification question is whether the scheduling cell in the P1-7 can belong to co-scheduled cells (for both SCS and carrier type) since the P1-8 is proposing that the scheduling cell can be included in co-scheduled cells.  P1-8: OK  P1-9: OK |
| NTT DOCOMO | Proposal 1-7:  We are fine with Proposal 1-7 in general. Regarding Apple’s comment, we think “carrier type” can also include FR1/FR2-1/FR2-2, thus we would like to update further as follows; Proposal 1-7:  * At least support same SCS among co-scheduled cells and same ordifferent SCS between co-scheduled cells and the scheduling cell in case of same SCS for co-scheduled cells by a DCI format 0-X/1-X. * FFS: Whether to support different SCS configurations among co-scheduled cells * At least support same carrier type (FDD or TDD, licensed or unlicensed, FR1 or FR2-1 or FR2-2) among co-scheduled cells by a DCI format 0-X/1-X * FFS: Whether to support different carrier types (e.g., FDD+TDD, licensed + unlicensed) among co-scheduled cells   We are OK with Proposal 1-8/1-9. |
| Xiaomi | For proposal 1-7, the first main bullet is a bit ambiguity, suggest to update it as the following if I get your point:   * At least support the co-scheduled cells with the same SCS by a DCI format 0-X/1-X, the SCS for co-scheduled cells and scheduling cell can be the same or different. * FFS: Whether to support different SCS configurations among co-scheduled cells |
| Intel | We are fine with Proposal 1-8 and 1-9.  For Proposal 1-7, it seems that different companies have different understanding on the carrier type. It would be good to clarify this. |
| Samsung2 | We continue to have strong concern on Proposal 1-7. The baseline for Rel-18 multi-cell scheduling should be Rel-17 CA (no-DSS), in which various cell combinations are allowed (e.g., a scheduling cell can have scheduled cells with same or different SCS, and same or different “carrier types”). Proposal 1-7 widely restricts the feature without any technical discussion or analysis on potential/claimed gains achieved by imposing such constraints. We think full flexibility should be kept unless a problem is shown (e.g., specification complexity, UE complexity, ...).  OK with Proposals 1-8 and 1-9. |
| Ericsson2 | OK with 1-7,1-8  For Proposal 1-9. Not OK.  Regarding following comment – “*Intel @Ericsson: Regarding Proposal 1-9, some companies have concern on UE complexity and DCI size budget if DCI format 0-X/1-X on a SCell can schedule PUSCH/PDSCH on PCell. So we add FFS which still has the possibility to support Rel-17 mechanism*).” DCI size budget and BD complexity has to be checked for all options in our understanding. Given this, we are not ok to agree to the proposal unless a major issue is identified. Understanding from moderator comment seems to be that the intention is to not preclude a DCI format 0-X/1-X on SCell scheduling PCell at this point. The we suggest below alternate formulation. Proposal 1-9rev:  * DCI format 0-X/1-X can be transmitted on PCell or SCell   + FFS: if any cross-carrier scheduling combinations supported from Rel15/16/17 are excluded. |
| MTK | P1-7: OK  P1-8: OK  P1-9: OK |
| vivo | We are OK with 1-7, 1-8,  1-9: NOT OK   * DCI format 0-X/1-X can be transmitted on a SCell if the DCI format 0-X/1-X does not schedule PUSCH/PDSCH on PCell.   This bullet does not preclude the scell scheduling Pcell case, if a new DCI format is used for multi-cell scheduling. e.g., DCI format 0-3/1-3, the bullet allows the Scell to transmit DCI format 0-1/1-1 to schedule Pcell. As we commented before, whether to combine multi-cell scheduling and sScell scheduling Pcell scheduling should be FFS.  we prefer the previous wording in round2. |
| Moderator | @Apple: your addition on proposal 1-7 is fine.  @Spreadtrum: “same SCS among co-scheduled cells” means same SCS is used for all the co-scheduled cells by a DCI format 0-X/1-X. I am not sure about multi-cell group as you mentioned.  @LG: Yes.  @NTT DOCOMO: maybe we can use same frequency range here.  @Xiaomi: your addition is OK.  @Intel: same carrier type means same duplex (FDD or TDD), same licensed carrier or unlicensed carrier, as well as possible same FR.  @Samsung: in Rel-17, there is 1:1 mapping between a scheduling cell and a scheduled cell. In Rel-18, high complexity will be caused if too many different subcarrier spacings are used for co-scheduled cells by a single multi-cell DCI because the processing timeline for decoding/preparing control/data for different numerologies can be widely varying. That is reason why a FFS is needed for different SCS case. With FFS, we don’t exclude the possibility of different SCS cases.  @Ericsson: your proposal may not be agreeable to companies who have concern on using DCI format 1-X/0-X on a SCell to schedule PCell. We add FFS for that case which should be Ok to check it later after we resolve CCE/BD budget issue.  @vivo: This propose does not preclude the scell scheduling Pcell case and propose FFS the case. |
| CMCC | P1-7: Regarding the first bullet, as the SCS between co-scheduled cells and the scheduling cell can be same or different, we are fine with DOCOMO’s update to the proposal.  We are OK with P1-8 and P1-9. |
| Fujitsu | We are OK with P1-7~9 with DOCOMO’s update. |
| Langbo | Support Proposal 1-7, 1-8 and 1-9 |
| CATT | We are fine with Proposal 1-8 and Proposal 1-9  For Proposal 1-7, we want to clarify that the SCS relationship between co-scheduled cells and the scheduling cell will include the following 3 cases.   * Case 1: The SCS of co-scheduled cells is same as the SCS of scheduling cell. * Case 2: The SCS of co-scheduled cells is larger than the SCS of scheduling cell, e.g. using 15kHz scheduling cell schedules 60kHz co-scheduled cells. * Case 3: The SCS of co-scheduled cells is smaller than the SCS of scheduling cell. e.g. using 60 kHz scheduling cell schedules 15kHz co-scheduled cells. |
| ZTE | We are OK with P1-7, P1-8 and P1-9. |
| Moderator2 | @CATT: For P1-7, yes, both case 2 and case 3 are covered by “different SCS between co-scheduled cells and the scheduling cell in case of same SCS for co-scheduled cells by a DCI format 0-X/1-X”.  @ALL: Based on companies’ input, further update from my side is listed below: (Updated)Proposal 1-7:  * At least support same SCS among co-scheduled cells and same or different SCS between co-scheduled cells and the scheduling cell in case of same SCS for co-scheduled cells by a DCI format 0-X/1-X. * FFS: Whether to support different SCS configurations among co-scheduled cells * At least support same carrier type (FDD or TDD, licensed or unlicensed, FR1 or FR2-1 or FR2-2) among co-scheduled cells by a DCI format 0-X/1-X * FFS: Whether to support different carrier types (e.g., FDD+TDD, licensed + unlicensed) among co-scheduled cells |
| LG | @FL: I guess your answer “Yes” means the scheduling cell in the P1-7 can belong to co-scheduled cells.  Then, how can I interpret “different SCS between co-scheduled cells and the scheduling cell in case of same SCS for co-scheduled cells” in the P1-7? Is this intended the case where scheduling cell #1 has different SCS from other scheduled cell #2 and #3 while two scheduled cells #2 and #3 has same SCS? But in this case, the scheduling cell #1 can be co-scheduled with cell #2 and/or #3, isn’t it?  If this is the case, it may be clearer to use scheduling cell and other scheduled cells rather than using “co-scheduled cells”. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We’d like to ensure that NUL+SUL in a different cell can be co-scheduled as well. Not so sure it is carrier type related discussion. |
| Vivo2 | @FL: Thank you for providing the reply.  Regarding the proposal 1-9 Proposal 1-9(round3):  * DCI format 0-X/1-X can be transmitted on PCell. * DCI format 0-X/1-X can be transmitted on a SCell if the DCI format 0-X/1-X does not schedule PUSCH/PDSCH on PCell. * FFS whether a DCI format 0-X/1-X can be transmitted on an SCell if the DCI format 0-X/1-X schedules PUSCH/PDSCH on PCell.   My point is that the 2nd bullet still includes sScell scheduling Pcell, more specifically, the case where the Scell use DCI formats other than DCI format 0-X/1-X to schedule Pcell also fits the 2nd sub-bullet, right? That’s why we want to go back to the version in round2 as below Proposal 1-9(round2):  * DCI format 0-X/1-X can be transmitted on PCell. * DCI format 0-X/1-X can be transmitted on a SCell if the SCell is not configured to schedule PUSCH/PDSCH on PCell. * FFS whether a DCI format 0-X/1-X can be transmitted on an SCell if the SCell is configured to schedule PUSCH/PDSCH on PCell.   Alternaively, we suggest another wording based on P1-9 in round3 Updated Proposal 1-9(round3):  * DCI format 0-X/1-X can be transmitted on PCell. * DCI format 0-X/1-X can be transmitted on a SCell if there is no DCI format configured on the Scell to schedule PUSCH/PDSCH on PCell. * FFS whether a DCI format 0-X/1-X can be transmitted on an SCell if the DCI format 0-X/1-X schedules PUSCH/PDSCH on PCell.   My point is that the 2nd bullet still includes sScell scheduling Pcell, more specifically, the case where the Scell use DCI formats other than DCI format 0-X/1-X to schedule Pcell also fits the 2nd sub-bullet, right? That’s why we want to go back to the version in round2 as below |
| InterDigital | Fine with updated P1-7 from Moderator as well as P1-8 and P1-9. |
| Samsung3 | Regarding Proposal 1-7, thanks to Moderator for providing some explanation. However, in our view, the following reasoning is not clear yet: “*In Rel-18, high complexity will be caused if too many different subcarrier spacings are used for co-scheduled cells by a single multi-cell DCI because the processing timeline for decoding/preparing control/data for different numerologies can be widely varying. That is reason why a FFS is needed for different SCS case*”. We agree no new timeline should be defined in order to support multi-cell scheduling, and we are fine to clarify any timeline behaviours for a MC-DCI format (they will be needed regardless of same/different SCS, or same different carrier type).  Therefore, we are not OK to agree with Proposal 1-7 at this point. More analysis and discussion would be needed. If clear/major issues are identified, restrictions can be imposed later accordingly. |
| FGI | We are fine with the updated proposals. |
| Moderator3 | @LG: Based on below update, all the co-scheduled cells have same SCS which can be same or different to SCS of scheduling cell. If a scheduling cell also schedules itself, then the scheduling cell is regarded as one of the co-scheduled cells. (Updated)Proposal 1-7:  * At least support same SCS among co-scheduled cells and same or different SCS between co-scheduled cells and the scheduling cell in case of same SCS for co-scheduled cells by a DCI format 0-X/1-X. * FFS: Whether to support different SCS configurations among co-scheduled cells * At least support same carrier type (FDD or TDD, licensed or unlicensed, FR1 or FR2-1 or FR2-2) among co-scheduled cells by a DCI format 0-X/1-X * FFS: Whether to support different carrier types (e.g., FDD+TDD, licensed + unlicensed) among co-scheduled cells   @Huawei: regarding SUL/NUL, I think it is included in multi-cell PUSCH scheduling. With one-bit NUL/SUL indicator, gNB can schedule NUL or SUL for a serving cell. So the legacy behavior may not be changed.  @vivo: I think it may be a bit early to exclude sSCell scheduling PCell following Rel-17 CCS. That’s the reason for the update. |
| LG | @FL: If scheduling cell schedules itself as one of the co-scheduled cells as you mentioned in above, then it seems a bit contradictive on interpreting the part “different SCS between co-scheduled cells and the scheduling cell in case of same SCS for co-scheduled cells” since the scheduling cell can be co-scheduled cell as you mentioned. According to the part, co-scheduled cells have same SCS while scheduling cell have different SCS, but the scheduling cell can also be co-scheduled cell.  Are you considering that the scheduling cell is not co-scheduled with other scheduled cell?  Another different question on the second main bullet in the update P1-7 is the carrier type of the scheduling cell. Does the P1-7 propose that the scheduling cell can have same or different carrier type with co-scheduled cells? or all of scheduling cell and scheduled cell have same carrier type? |
| MTK | Fine with updated P1-7 from Moderator as well as P1-8/P1-9. |
| Moderator4 | @LG: Thanks for the good comments. I think it is better to list all the cases one by one on SCS and carrier type. Please kindly check whether below update is fine: (Further update) Proposal 1-7:  * At least below cases on SCS are supported: * Case 1-1: A DCI format 0-X/1-X on a scheduling cell schedules multiple cells including the scheduling cell and same SCS is used among all the co-scheduled cells including the scheduling cell. * Case 1-2: A DCI format 0-X/1-X on a scheduling cell schedules multiple cells not including the scheduling cell and same SCS is used among all the co-scheduled cells which may be same or different to the SCS of the scheduling cell. * FFS: * Case 1-3: A DCI format 0-X/1-X on a scheduling cell schedules multiple cells including the scheduling cell and different SCS is used among all the co-scheduled cells including the scheduling cell. * Case 1-4: A DCI format 0-X/1-X on a scheduling cell schedules multiple cells not including the scheduling cell and different SCS is used among all the co-scheduled cells. * At least below cases on carrier type are supported: * Case 2-1: A DCI format 0-X/1-X on a scheduling cell schedules multiple cells including the scheduling cell and same carrier type (FDD or TDD, licensed or unlicensed, FR1 or FR2-1 or FR2-2) is used among all the co-scheduled cells including the scheduling cell. * Case 2-2: A DCI format 0-X/1-X on a scheduling cell schedules multiple cells not including the scheduling cell and same carrier type (FDD or TDD, licensed or unlicensed, FR1 or FR2-1 or FR2-2) is used among all the co-scheduled cells which may be same or different to the SCS of the scheduling cell. * FFS: * Case 2-3: A DCI format 0-X/1-X on a scheduling cell schedules multiple cells including the scheduling cell and different carrier type (FDD or TDD, licensed or unlicensed, FR1 or FR2-1 or FR2-2) is used among all the co-scheduled cells including the scheduling cell. * Case 2-4: A DCI format 0-X/1-X on a scheduling cell schedules multiple cells not including the scheduling cell and different carrier type (FDD or TDD, licensed or unlicensed, FR1 or FR2-1 or FR2-2) is used among all the co-scheduled cells   @ALL: Please provide your comments directly in next section for new round of discussions. |

### 4th round of discussions

#### Proposal 1-7:

* At least below cases on SCS are supported:
* Case 1-1: A DCI format 0-X/1-X on a scheduling cell schedules multiple cells including the scheduling cell and same SCS is used among all the co-scheduled cells including the scheduling cell.
* Case 1-2: A DCI format 0-X/1-X on a scheduling cell schedules multiple cells not including the scheduling cell and same SCS is used among all the co-scheduled cells which may be same or different to the SCS of the scheduling cell.
* FFS:
* Case 1-3: A DCI format 0-X/1-X on a scheduling cell schedules multiple cells including the scheduling cell and different SCS is used among all the co-scheduled cells including the scheduling cell.
* Case 1-4: A DCI format 0-X/1-X on a scheduling cell schedules multiple cells not including the scheduling cell and different SCS is used among all the co-scheduled cells.
* At least below cases on carrier type are supported:
* Case 2-1: A DCI format 0-X/1-X on a scheduling cell schedules multiple cells including the scheduling cell and same carrier type (FDD or TDD, licensed or unlicensed, FR1 or FR2-1 or FR2-2) is used among all the co-scheduled cells including the scheduling cell.
* Case 2-2: A DCI format 0-X/1-X on a scheduling cell schedules multiple cells not including the scheduling cell and same carrier type (FDD or TDD, licensed or unlicensed, FR1 or FR2-1 or FR2-2) is used among all the co-scheduled cells which may be same or different to the SCS of the scheduling cell.
* FFS:
* Case 2-3: A DCI format 0-X/1-X on a scheduling cell schedules multiple cells including the scheduling cell and different carrier type (FDD or TDD, licensed or unlicensed, FR1 or FR2-1 or FR2-2) is used among all the co-scheduled cells including the scheduling cell.
* Case 2-4: A DCI format 0-X/1-X on a scheduling cell schedules multiple cells not including the scheduling cell and different carrier type (FDD or TDD, licensed or unlicensed, FR1 or FR2-1 or FR2-2) is used among all the co-scheduled cells

#### Proposal 1-9:

* DCI format 0-X/1-X can be transmitted on PCell.
* DCI format 0-X/1-X can be transmitted on a SCell if the DCI format 0-X/1-X does not schedule PUSCH/PDSCH on PCell.
* FFS whether a DCI format 0-X/1-X can be transmitted on an SCell if the DCI format 0-X/1-X schedules PUSCH/PDSCH on PCell.

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Apple | For P1-7, we are generally fine. Just a minor editorial suggestion:   * FFS: * Case 1-3: A DCI format 0-X/1-X on a scheduling cell schedules multiple cells including the scheduling cell and different SCS is used among ~~all~~ the co-scheduled cells including the scheduling cell. * Case 1-4: A DCI format 0-X/1-X on a scheduling cell schedules multiple cells not including the scheduling cell and different SCS is used among ~~all~~ the co-scheduled cells.   In fact, if we want to go with something more concise, we could just use the original FFS (FFS: Whether to support different SCS configurations among co-scheduled cells) which can cover both case 1-3 and 1-4. But we are also fine with the current form.  Fine with P1-9. |
| Qualcomm | P1-7: Agree with Apple.  P1-9: OK |
| Moderator | @Apple @Qualcomm: As commented by LG, the original FFS does not mention the relationship between the scheduling cell and the scheduled cells. To be more precise, I divided it into two sub-cases although it may be a bit redundant. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Thanks for FL clarification however, since NUL/SUL as carrier type is also captured in 306, we’d like to make sure this proposal does not preclude these carrier types. Can we add a note that:  The co-scheduled cells include an NUL of one cell and an SUL of another cell. |
| vivo | For P1-7 ok  For P1-9 not ok  Regarding moderator’s comment on P2-5: *On Proposal 2-5: we can hold this discussion to wait for the conclusion from other issue.* Whether UE configured with mc-DCI may have more than 1 scheduling cell for a scheduled cell is deferred because some companies think it may be a bit early to discuss this. Proposal 2-5:  * For a scheduled cell, both multi-cell scheduling and single cell scheduling can be supported from a same scheduling cell. * FFS whether there is at most one scheduling cell for each scheduled cell. * FFS whether to support multi-cell scheduling from one scheduling cell and single cell scheduling from the scheduled cell via self-scheduling. * FFS whether to support multi-cell scheduling from one scheduling cell and single cell scheduling from another scheduling cell for the scheduled cell via cross-carrier scheduling.   And as I commented several times, the updated 2nd bullet in P1-9 still allows sScell scheduling Pcell(SSP) by using other DCI format, in which cases two scheduling cell are supported when mc-DCI is configured, and thus P1-9 should be modified to make the SSP part for FFS considering that we have not approved P2-5 yet, but the moderator replied that it may be a bit early to exclude sSCell scheduling PCell following Rel-17 CCS. Then I am a bit confused now, what I am trying to do is not to preclude sScell scheduling Pcell but to put FFS for the case with two scheduling cells, just as what FL suggested on P2-5. sScell scheduling Pcell is a very special case allowing two scheduling cell, while what is proposed in P2-5 is more high level. We would prefer to discuss such a specific case after progress has been made in the more general part in P2-5. If most companies prefer the wording in the latest P1-9, we can live with it and add a sub-bullet to clarify that SSP is for further discussion. Proposal 1-9:  * DCI format 0-X/1-X can be transmitted on PCell. * DCI format 0-X/1-X can be transmitted on a SCell if the DCI format 0-X/1-X does not schedule PUSCH/PDSCH on PCell.   + FFS whether DCI format 0-X/1-X can be transmitted on a Scell when the Scell schedules Pcell by DCI format(s) other than DCI format 0-X/1-X * FFS whether a DCI format 0-X/1-X can be transmitted on an SCell if the DCI format 0-X/1-X schedules PUSCH/PDSCH on PCell. |
| Intel | We are generally fine with the proposal.  For Proposal 1-7, we need further discussion on Case 2-2. We are fine to consider different carrier types for FDD or TDD, FR1/FR2-1/FR2-2 for scheduling and co-scheduled cells. However, for unlicensed/licensed case, it may not be desirable to consider unlicensed scheduling cell schedules multiple scheduled cells.  In Case 2-2, SCS should be carrier type as updated below:   * Case 2-2: A DCI format 0-X/1-X on a scheduling cell schedules multiple cells not including the scheduling cell and same carrier type (FDD or TDD, licensed or unlicensed, FR1 or FR2-1 or FR2-2) is used among all the co-scheduled cells which may be same or different carrier type ~~to the SCS~~ of the scheduling cell. |
| Xiaomi | We share the view from Huawei on SUL and NUL. This may need to be clarified. |
| New H3C | We are fine with Proposal 1-7 and 1-9. |
| Nokia/NSB | We are fine with P1-7 & P1-9 |
| LG | P1-7: Thank you FL for reflecting my comment. I suggest some slight modifications to the proposal below. Proposal 1-7: (updated)  * At least below cases on SCS are supported: * Case 1-1: A DCI format 0-X/1-X on a scheduling cell can schedule~~s~~ multiple cells including the scheduling cell and same SCS is used among all the co-scheduled cells including the scheduling cell. * Case 1-2: A DCI format 0-X/1-X on a scheduling cell can schedule~~s~~ multiple cells not including the scheduling cell and same SCS is used among all the co-scheduled cells which may be same or different to the SCS of the scheduling cell. * FFS: * Case 1-3: A DCI format 0-X/1-X on a scheduling cell can schedule~~s~~ multiple cells including the scheduling cell and different SCS is used among ~~all~~ the co-scheduled cells including the scheduling cell. * Case 1-4: A DCI format 0-X/1-X on a scheduling cell can schedule~~s~~ multiple cells not including the scheduling cell and different SCS is used among ~~all~~ the co-scheduled cells. * At least below cases on carrier type are supported: * Case 2-1: A DCI format 0-X/1-X on a scheduling cell can schedule~~s~~ multiple cells including the scheduling cell and same carrier type (FDD or TDD, licensed or unlicensed, FR1 or FR2-1 or FR2-2) is used among all the co-scheduled cells including the scheduling cell. * Case 2-2: A DCI format 0-X/1-X on a scheduling cell can schedule~~s~~ multiple cells not including the scheduling cell and same carrier type (FDD or TDD, licensed or unlicensed, FR1 or FR2-1 or FR2-2) is used among all the co-scheduled cells which may be same or different carrier type ~~to the SCS~~ of the scheduling cell. * FFS: * Case 2-3: A DCI format 0-X/1-X on a scheduling cell can schedule~~s~~ multiple cells including the scheduling cell and different carrier type (FDD or TDD, licensed or unlicensed, FR1 or FR2-1 or FR2-2) is used among ~~all~~ the co-scheduled cells including the scheduling cell. * Case 2-4: A DCI format 0-X/1-X on a scheduling cell can schedule~~s~~ multiple cells not including the scheduling cell and different carrier type (FDD or TDD, licensed or unlicensed, FR1 or FR2-1 or FR2-2) is used among ~~all~~ the co-scheduled cells   P1-9: OK |
| Fujitsu | We are generally fine with the proposals. OK with the editorial changes. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Proposal 1-7:  We support Intel’s update that “SCS” should be “carrier type”.  Proposal 1-9:  Support. |
| MTK | We are fine with Proposal 1-7: (updated). |
| ZTE | We are fine with this proposal.  For the carrier type, we think SUL should not be included. First, here carrier type actually refers to the cell operation mode, including both downlink carrier and uplink carrier. However, SUL is only an uplink carrier. Second, in the carrier aggregation operation, only one SUL can be configured at most. And the SUL transmission and the NUL transmission including the NUL from another serving cell can not be performed simultaneously. Therefore, it is impossible to schedule multiple PUSCHs including a PUSCH on the SUL considering that the multiple PUSCHs needs to be transmitted simultaneously. Actually, this issue is being discussed in the Tx Switching session. We think it can be discussed after the conclusion is achieved in Tx switching session. |
| CMCC | We are generally fine with the Proposal 1-7 and Proposal 1-9. |
| InterDigital | Fine with P1-7 and P1-9. |
| Langbo | OK with the two proposals. |
| Samsung4 | We **cannot** agree to Proposal 1-7.  We have asked several times about the technical issue/reason for down-scoping the multi-cell scheduling feature to only same SCS and same carrier type and we have not received any response (expect for a generic mention of timeline issues by the FL, which we explained is not relevant).  Since the FL and companies have spent some time to spell out various cases, we can use this list as reference for future work. If major issues are shown for certain cases during the detailed design, RAN1 can agree to down-select the cases – but that cannot happen at this stage. Proposal 1-7:  * ~~At least~~ below cases on SCS are ~~supported~~ considered for design of multi-cell scheduling: * Case 1-1: A DCI format 0-X/1-X on a scheduling cell schedules multiple cells including the scheduling cell and same SCS is used among all the co-scheduled cells including the scheduling cell. * Case 1-2: A DCI format 0-X/1-X on a scheduling cell schedules multiple cells not including the scheduling cell and same SCS is used among all the co-scheduled cells which may be same or different to the SCS of the scheduling cell. * ~~FFS:~~ * Case 1-3: A DCI format 0-X/1-X on a scheduling cell schedules multiple cells including the scheduling cell and different SCS is used among all the co-scheduled cells including the scheduling cell. * Case 1-4: A DCI format 0-X/1-X on a scheduling cell schedules multiple cells not including the scheduling cell and different SCS is used among all the co-scheduled cells. * ~~At least~~ below cases on carrier type are ~~supported~~ considered for design of multi-cell scheduling: * Case 2-1: A DCI format 0-X/1-X on a scheduling cell schedules multiple cells including the scheduling cell and same carrier type (FDD or TDD, licensed or unlicensed, FR1 or FR2-1 or FR2-2) is used among all the co-scheduled cells including the scheduling cell. * Case 2-2: A DCI format 0-X/1-X on a scheduling cell schedules multiple cells not including the scheduling cell and same carrier type (FDD or TDD, licensed or unlicensed, FR1 or FR2-1 or FR2-2) is used among all the co-scheduled cells which may be same or different to the SCS of the scheduling cell. * ~~FFS:~~ * Case 2-3: A DCI format 0-X/1-X on a scheduling cell schedules multiple cells including the scheduling cell and different carrier type (FDD or TDD, licensed or unlicensed, FR1 or FR2-1 or FR2-2) is used among all the co-scheduled cells including the scheduling cell. * Case 2-4: A DCI format 0-X/1-X on a scheduling cell schedules multiple cells not including the scheduling cell and different carrier type (FDD or TDD, licensed or unlicensed, FR1 or FR2-1 or FR2-2) is used among all the co-scheduled cells |
| Moderator | @LG @Intel: Thanks for the good revision. It is fine with me.  @Huawei @ZTE: regarding SUL/NUL, I don’t think it is an issue needs to be addressed separately for multi-cell PUSCH scheduling. It can be studied when we discuss how to indicate NUL/SUL indicator in DCI 0-X. At least for multi-cell scheduling, the legacy behavior may not be changed.  @vivo: On P1-9, sorry to misunderstand your point. I think your suggested FFS can be covered in P2-4 FFS: UE can be configured to monitor both multi-cell scheduling DCI and legacy single cell scheduling DCI for a scheduled cell. Taking PCell as one scheduled cell now, when a SCell can schedule PCell by Rel-17 DCI format (it should be single-cell scheduling DCI), whether UE can monitor DCI 0-X/1-X or Rel-17 DCI on the SCell for scheduling PCell is FFS.  @Samsung: TU is limited and we have to prioritize some simple cases/scenarios to ensure the completion of Rel-18 CA by this November. When we design detailed DCI format, the different SCS cases can be also considered. Based on your proposals, it seems we waste one week time without any progress.  Since almost all the companies support P1-7, can you live with it?  @All: based on current comments, minor update is provided as LG’s suggestions: (updated)Proposal 1-7:  * At least below cases on SCS are supported: * Case 1-1: A DCI format 0-X/1-X on a scheduling cell can schedule~~s~~ multiple cells including the scheduling cell and same SCS is used among all the co-scheduled cells including the scheduling cell. * Case 1-2: A DCI format 0-X/1-X on a scheduling cell can schedule~~s~~ multiple cells not including the scheduling cell and same SCS is used among all the co-scheduled cells which may be same or different to the SCS of the scheduling cell. * FFS: * Case 1-3: A DCI format 0-X/1-X on a scheduling cell can schedule~~s~~ multiple cells including the scheduling cell and different SCS is used among ~~all~~ the co-scheduled cells including the scheduling cell. * Case 1-4: A DCI format 0-X/1-X on a scheduling cell can schedule~~s~~ multiple cells not including the scheduling cell and different SCS is used among ~~all~~ the co-scheduled cells. * At least below cases on carrier type are supported: * Case 2-1: A DCI format 0-X/1-X on a scheduling cell can schedule~~s~~ multiple cells including the scheduling cell and same carrier type (FDD or TDD, licensed or unlicensed, FR1 or FR2-1 or FR2-2) is used among all the co-scheduled cells including the scheduling cell. * Case 2-2: A DCI format 0-X/1-X on a scheduling cell can schedule~~s~~ multiple cells not including the scheduling cell and same carrier type (FDD or TDD, licensed or unlicensed, FR1 or FR2-1 or FR2-2) is used among all the co-scheduled cells which may be same or different carrier type ~~to the SCS~~ of the scheduling cell. * FFS: * Case 2-3: A DCI format 0-X/1-X on a scheduling cell can schedule~~s~~ multiple cells including the scheduling cell and different carrier type (FDD or TDD, licensed or unlicensed, FR1 or FR2-1 or FR2-2) is used among ~~all~~ the co-scheduled cells including the scheduling cell. * Case 2-4: A DCI format 0-X/1-X on a scheduling cell can schedule~~s~~ multiple cells not including the scheduling cell and different carrier type (FDD or TDD, licensed or unlicensed, FR1 or FR2-1 or FR2-2) is used among ~~all~~ the co-scheduled cells |
| CATT | For Proposal 1-7, we are ok with the updated Proposal from LG.  For Proposal 1-9, we are ok with the proposal. |
| Apple | OK with the updated P1-7 from the moderator.  OK with P1-9. |
| Ericsson4 | For Proposal 1-9. Not OK. The Rel18 DCI enhancement should be applicable to Rel17 cross-carrier scheduling also. The motivation to preclude it is not given except for some high-level comment on BD complexity for which even initial BD/CCE budget design has not been agreed yet. That said considering company inputs so far, we suggest below formulation. Proposal 1-9rev2:  * DCI format 0-X/1-X can be transmitted on PCell. * DCI format 0-X/1-X can be transmitted on a SCell at least when the DCI format 0-X/1-X does not schedule PUSCH/PDSCH on PCell. * FFS whether a DCI format 0-X/1-X can be transmitted on an SCell if the DCI format 0-X/1-X schedules PUSCH/PDSCH on PCell. |
| Spreadtrum | We support the proposals. |
| China Telecom | Fine with the updated proposals. |
| New H3C | Fine with the updated proposals |
| Moderator | @Ericsson: Your update is fine with me. We can try it in GTW session. |
| LG | Fine with the updated proposals |
| Moderator2 | Companies are encouraged to continue input on P1-7 and P1-9. |
| MTK | Fine with the updated P1-7 and P1-9 |
| Samsung6 | For proposal 1-7, we have not yet seen any technical discussion why certain cases have advantages over other cases. We sympathize with the FL about the urgency of making progress. That’s why it’s somewhat surprising to us that RAN1 is spending time on proposals such as 2-4 to enable features that require long discussions and huge spec impact and are quite far from the WID (if not totally outside scope), while debating in this proposal to down-scope essential elements such as SCS configuration and carrier types that are directly relevant to the utility of the multi-cell scheduling feature. Proposal 1-7, as is, places restrictions on the feature without even knowing first whether they are needed.  However, for the sake of progress, we are OK to proceed based on the FL comment: “*we have to prioritize some simple cases/scenarios to ensure the completion of Rel-18 CA by this November. When we design detailed DCI format, the different SCS cases can be also considered*”. Therefore, we suggest to take the exact same understanding of the FL as the proposal, rather than ruling out certain cases as FFS in this early stage – If RAN1 identifies any major technical issues with certain cases later (e.g., high specification complexity, UE/gNB complexity, etc.), RAN1 can agree to down-scope as needed. (updated)Proposal 1-7:  * At least below cases 1-1 and 1-2 on SCS are ~~supported~~ prioritized, and Cases 1-3 and 1-4 can be also considered: * Case 1-1: A DCI format 0-X/1-X on a scheduling cell can schedule~~s~~ multiple cells including the scheduling cell and same SCS is used among all the co-scheduled cells including the scheduling cell. * Case 1-2: A DCI format 0-X/1-X on a scheduling cell can schedule~~s~~ multiple cells not including the scheduling cell and same SCS is used among all the co-scheduled cells which may be same or different to the SCS of the scheduling cell. * ~~FFS:~~ * Case 1-3: A DCI format 0-X/1-X on a scheduling cell can schedule~~s~~ multiple cells including the scheduling cell and different SCS is used among ~~all~~ the co-scheduled cells including the scheduling cell. * Case 1-4: A DCI format 0-X/1-X on a scheduling cell can schedule~~s~~ multiple cells not including the scheduling cell and different SCS is used among ~~all~~ the co-scheduled cells. * At least below cases 2-1 and 2-2 on carrier type are ~~supported~~ prioritized, and Cases 2-3 and 2-4 can be also considered: * Case 2-1: A DCI format 0-X/1-X on a scheduling cell can schedule~~s~~ multiple cells including the scheduling cell and same carrier type (FDD or TDD, licensed or unlicensed, FR1 or FR2-1 or FR2-2) is used among all the co-scheduled cells including the scheduling cell. * Case 2-2: A DCI format 0-X/1-X on a scheduling cell can schedule~~s~~ multiple cells not including the scheduling cell and same carrier type (FDD or TDD, licensed or unlicensed, FR1 or FR2-1 or FR2-2) is used among all the co-scheduled cells which may be same or different carrier type ~~to the SCS~~ of the scheduling cell. * ~~FFS:~~ * Case 2-3: A DCI format 0-X/1-X on a scheduling cell can schedule~~s~~ multiple cells including the scheduling cell and different carrier type (FDD or TDD, licensed or unlicensed, FR1 or FR2-1 or FR2-2) is used among ~~all~~ the co-scheduled cells including the scheduling cell. * Case 2-4: A DCI format 0-X/1-X on a scheduling cell can schedule~~s~~ multiple cells not including the scheduling cell and different carrier type (FDD or TDD, licensed or unlicensed, FR1 or FR2-1 or FR2-2) is used among ~~all~~ the co-scheduled cells   For proposal 1-9, “at least” is not needed in view of the next FFS, but we are OK to proceed with that update. |
| Moderator3 | @Samsung: Thanks. With “At least” at the beginning of each bullet, can we make minor update on the two main bullets?   * At least below cases 1-1 and 1-2 on SCS are ~~supported~~ prioritized: * At least below cases 2-1 and 2-2 on carrier type are ~~supported~~ prioritized: |
| Qualcomm | We are OK with Moderator3.  @ Samsung, Moderator quite fairly handles (non-majority) proposals such as Case 1-3/1-4/2-3/2-4 and P2-4/P2-5 – basically all these are not precluded for now but it is suggests to agree simple cases first. We think the way how Moderator handles these is reasonable. From this pov, we think the updated proposal 1-7 by Moderator was the best. However, we can live with the latest update by Moderator3 as well. |
| New H3C | We are fine with FL proposal |

# DCI format design

Based on contributions submitted by companies, below issues are prioritized for discussion in this meeting. Within each sub-section, the summary from moderator’s perspective is listed and followed by draft proposals for further discussion round by round.

## Maximum number of cells scheduled by a single DCI

Regarding this issue, companies’ views are summarized as below:

|  |
| --- |
| * **Huawei, HiSilicon** * *Proposal 2: The scenario that 2 and 3 cells scheduled simultaneously by a single DCI can be prioritized.* * *Proposal 3: The actual number of cells which could be scheduled simultaneously by a single DCI can be smaller than the maximum number of cells which could be scheduled simultaneously by a single DCI.* * **ZTE** * *Proposal 2: 4 or 8 should be supported as the maximum number of scheduled cells.* * **Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell** * *Proposal 3.3.2: Support a maximum of 4 cells that can be scheduled simultaneously by a single DCI.* * *Proposal 3.3.3: To limit the DCI size, the maximum number of cells that can be scheduled should be based on RRC configuration (i.e. from the set of {2,3,4}).* * *Proposal 3.3.4: Support separate configurations for the multi-cell scheduling DCI for PDSCH and PUSCH* * **Spreadtrum Communications** * *Proposal 5: At least Support up to 4 cells scheduling with a single DCI.* * **Vivo:** * Proposal 1. For multi-cell scheduling, the following principles should be taken into account: * *The multi-cell scheduling grant is for unicast DL scheduling only or unicast UL scheduling only.* * *The scheduled cells can be associated with the same/different TDD configurations/numerologies.* * *Either Pcell or a Scell can be configured as a scheduling cell for joint multi-cell scheduling.* * *For a scheduled cell, there is only one scheduling cell.* * *The scheduled PDSCHs or PUSCHs correspond to different TBs.* * *Changes or extensions to the legacy PDCCH coding/mapping procedure, including the maximum DCI size=140 bits excluding CRC and supported ALs, should be avoided.* * *The number of cells that can be scheduled by a single DCI is no larger than 8 and is configurable.* * **CATT** * *Proposal 1: The maximum number of cells that can be scheduled by a single should be no more than 4 Cells with each TB scheduled per cell.* * *Proposal 2: There are two options on the actual number of scheduled cells by a DCI as follows.* * *Option-1: is fixed to N, the scheduled cells are configured by higher layer.* * *Option-2: can dynamically change from 1 to M, the combination of scheduled cells is indicated by DCI, e.g. carrier indicator field.* * **China Telecom** * *Proposal 6: The maximum number of cells that can be scheduled simultaneously should not lead to the increasing of maximum DCI size supported by polar code.* * **NEC** * *Proposal 1: The maximum number of cells that can be scheduled simultaneously is 4.* * **Lenovo** * *Proposal 4: The maximum number of carriers which can be scheduled by a single DCI is 4.* * *Proposal 5: For a given DCI format, the maximum number of carriers which can be scheduled by the DCI is configured by RRC signaling from a set of possible values of 2, 3 and 4.* * **Xiaomi** * *Proposal 1: The maximum number of cells which can be scheduled by a single DCI is 3.* * *Proposal 2: The number of scheduled cells can be dynamically indicated by the scheduling DCI.* * **OPPO** * *Proposal 1: The maximum number of cells scheduled simultaneously is configurable.* * *The configured “maximum number” is not larger than 4.* * *The configured “maximum number” is subject to reported UE capability.* * *Proposal 2: If the maximum number of cells scheduled simultaneously is configured as M,* * *The DCI format used for multi-cell scheduling has its field length and total size determined by value of M.* * *The DCI format used for multi-cell scheduling could actually schedule N cells simultaneously for N≤M, with the unused payload corresponding to (M-N)-cell scheduling filled with padding.* * **InterDigital** * *Proposal 5: The maximum number of simultaneously scheduled cells is not lower than 4.* * **CAICT** * *Proposal 2: The maximum number of cells to be simultaneously scheduled by a single DCI is configurable.* * **Apple** * *Proposal 1: RAN1 specifications support a maximum of 3 or 4 cells (FFS 3 or 4) that can be scheduled simultaneously by a single DCI for both PDSCH and PUSCH.* * *The actual maximum of cells scheduled by a single DCI should depend on UE capability and the band/band combinations.* * **NTT DOCOMO** * *Proposal 6: Discuss following alternatives for the target maximum number of scheduled cells;* * *Alt.1: 8* * *Alt.2: 6* * *Alt.3: 4* * *Note1: Following aspects should be considered to specify the maximum number of scheduled cells: DCI size limitation, DCI compression gain by multi-carrier scheduling by single DCI, PDCCH blocking rate, practical use-case.* * *Note2: UE is configured with a certain number of potential scheduled cells (equal to or less than above value), and UE capability for maximum number of scheduled cells may be considered.* * **LG Electronics** * *Proposal #3: Discuss how to limit DCI payload size of the multi-cell DCI, based on the following considerations.* * *The maximum number of simultaneously scheduled cells is to be limited to X (e.g. X = 4).* * *The maximum number of simultaneously scheduled TBs is to be limited to Y (e.g. Y = 4).* * **MediaTek** * *Proposal 1: For R18 multi-cell PUSCH/PDSCH scheduling with a single DCI, RAN1 aims to support* the maximum number of cells that can be scheduled simultaneously to be 4, or more. * **Intel** * *Proposal 1* * *Maximum number of cells for multi-cell scheduling can be 8.* * **Ericsson** * *Proposal 1: Maximum number of cells scheduled by a mc-DCI is selected from {4,8}.* |

### Moderator summary and proposals based on contributions

Compared to single PDSCH scheduling, the DCI overhead for multi-cell scheduling is rapidly increased with the number of co-scheduled carriers. According to WID, clearly the number of co-scheduled carriers should be at least 3 so it does make sense that the maximum number of schedulable carriers can be 4, 6 or 8. However, in the existing standards, the maximum size of DCI in the Polar code is 140bits excluding 24-bit CRC. Determining the maximum number of schedulable carriers by a single DCI should consider both the limitation of 140bits for Polar coding and scheduling flexibility as well as the probability of scheduling a large number of carriers.

Regarding maximum number of schedulable carriers by a single DCI, below companies express clear views on the max number:

* **Maximum number of schedulable carriers by a single DCI is 4.**
* *Supported by Nokia/NSB, Spreadtrum, CATT, NEC, Lenovo, OPPO, LG*
* **Maximum number of schedulable carriers by a single DCI is 8.**
* *Supported by vivo, Intel*
* **Maximum number of schedulable carriers by a single DCI is 3.**
* *Supported by Xiaomi*

In addition, two companies [ZTE, Ericsson] support 4 or 8 as the maximum schedulable carrier number. One company [Apple] propose FFS 3 or 4. One company [InterDigital] propose the maximum number is not lower than 4. One company [NTT DOCOMO] propose FFS 8, 6 or 4. One company [MediaTek] propose 4 or more.

It is obvious that majority companies prefer maximum 4 schedulable carrier. Moderator suggests maximum 4 schedulable carriers by a single DCI in the first round of discussions. If not agreeable, then we can agree the maximum schedulable carrier number is down-selected from {4 or 8}.

Assuming N is the maximum number of cells supported in standards, it does not mean that always N serving cells are scheduled by the multi-cell scheduling DCI considering the traffic and CA capability of UE. Therefore, it is true the actual maximum number of schedulable cells can be dependent on gNB configuration, e.g., for a UE, maximum M cells can be scheduled by a multi-cell DCI, M<=N. The actual number of scheduled carriers may be smaller than M.

Moreover, considering different CA capabilities and transmission power for DL and UL for a UE, the configuration for multi-cell scheduling DCI can be different for DL and UL.

### 1st round of discussions

#### Proposal 2-1:

* The maximum number of cells scheduled by a DCI format 0-X in Rel-18 standards is 4.
* For a UE, the maximum number of cells scheduled by a DCI format 0-X can be smaller than 4.

#### Proposal 2-2:

* The maximum number of cells scheduled by a DCI format 1-X in Rel-18 standards is 4.
* For a UE, the maximum number of cells scheduled by a DCI format 1-X can be smaller than 4.

#### Proposal 2-3:

* For a UE, the maximum number of cells scheduled by a DCI format 0-X is separately configured from the maximum number of cells scheduled by a DCI format 1-X.

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Qualcomm | P2-1:  We think working assumption would be better on the maximum number of cells that can be scheduled by a DCI format 0-X for the purpose of further discussion of DCI format design. It is premature to conclude/fix the value without any analysis/discussion. We think we can go with the number “4” as working assumption.  P2-2:  We think working assumption would be better on the maximum number of cells that can be scheduled by a DCI format 1-X for the purpose of further discussion of DCI format design. It is premature to conclude/fix the value without any analysis/discussion. We think we can go with the number “4” as working assumption.  P2-3:  The proposal is not clear. Our understanding is as follows.   * A UE can be configured with one or multiple sets of cells where each set can be scheduled by a DCI format 0-X.   + Within each set, the actual data scheduling by the DCI format 0-X can be for a subset of cells. * A UE can be configured with one or multiple sets of cells where each set can be scheduled by a DCI format 1-X.   + Within each set, the actual data scheduling by the DCI format 1-X can be for a subset of cells. |
| Nokia/NSB | We support all 3 proposals. |
| OPPO | Although we proposed 4 in our contribution, we think it is safer to keep both 3 and 4 in the loop, and can choose 4 if such choice turns out not to force RAN1 to consider some debatable solutions like 2-stage DCI due to Polar coding limitation.  In addition, we would like to suggest the max number of scheduled cells in a DCI would be eventually subject to UE capability. Further, the actual number of scheduled cells can be smaller than this maximum.  We would suggest the following: Proposal 2-1 (revised):  * The maximum number of cells scheduled by a DCI format 0-X in Rel-18 standards never exceeds Nmax,0, where Nmax,0 is TBD from {3,4}. * For a UE, the maximum number (M0) of cells scheduled by a DCI format 0-X can be equal to or smaller than Nmax,0.   + For the same UE, the actual number of cells scheduled by a DCI 0\_X can be equal to or smaller than M0.  Proposal 2-2 (revised):  * The maximum number of cells scheduled by a DCI format 1-X in Rel-18 standards never exceeds Nmax,1, where Nmax,1 is TBD from {3,4}. * For a UE, the maximum number (M1) of cells scheduled by a DCI format 1-X can be equal to or smaller than Nmax,1.   + For the same UE, the actual number of cells scheduled by a DCI 1\_X can be equal to or smaller than M1.  Proposal 2-3: (revised)  * For a UE, the maximum number of cells scheduled by a DCI format 0-X and the maximum number of cells scheduled by a DCI format 1-X are separately configured, and subject to reported UE capability. |
| Xiaomi | If majority goes to maximum 4 scheduled cells, we are fine to accept it. Meanwhile, we also think it may be better to have it as working assumption. |
| Fujitsu | Proposal 2-1&2-2:  We are generally okey with the proposals. But we think it might be better not to preclude ‘8’ at this stage.  Proposal 2-3:  Is the intention of the proposal to introduce RRC parameter to configure the maximum number to UE? If it is, we think it is premature to conclude this and the configuration may be unnecessary. So we cannot accept the proposal as is.  If the spirit of the proposal is like Qualcomm’s understanding, we are fine with it. But the proposal needs to be revised, e.g. as suggested by Qualcomm. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Proposal 2-1/2-2:  We think it is premature to agree on the exact maximum number of cells that can be scheduled by a single DCI since it has dependency on discussion for DCI format design/size limitation, DCI compression gain, PDCCH blocking rate and/or practical use-case, etc. However, considering the limited TU, it would be good to agree on the candidate target values and we are also fine to agree on this proposal as a working assumption. |
| Langbo | We support OPPO’s updates to Proposal 2-1 and Proposal 2-2 as working assumptions. |
| LG | P2-1: OKP2-2: It is reasonable at this stage to update the first bullet as “The maximum number of cells with maximum 1-TB transmission per PDSCH scheduled by a DCI format 1-X” considering DCI overhead in case of multi-cell scheduling including the cells with maximum 2-TB transmission per PDSCH.P2-3: It may be better to revise “is separately configured from” into “can be same as or different from” since explicit configuration on the maximum number of cells may or may not be necessary. |
| CMCC | Proposal 2-1:  For the first sub-bullet, we think it is feasible to support 4 as the maximum number of scheduled cells.  For the second sub-bullet, we understand that the actual maximum number of cells scheduled by a DCI format 0-X can be less than or equal to the maximum number in the first sub-bullet, which depends on network implementation. While the description of this sub-bullet is a little bit unclear, thus we suggest the following proposal:  **Proposal 2-1:**   * The maximum number of cells scheduled by a DCI format 0-X in Rel-18 standards is 4. * For a UE, the actual maximum number of cells scheduled by a DCI format 0-X can be smaller than or equal to 4.   Proposal 2-2:  Similar to Proposal 2-1, the revised proposal is suggested as the following: Proposal 2-2:  * The maximum number of cells scheduled by a DCI format 1-X in Rel-18 standards is 4. * For a UE, the actual maximum number of cells scheduled by a DCI format 1-X can be smaller than or equal to 4.   Proposal 2-3:  Our understanding is that the actual number of cells scheduled by a DCI format 0-X and the actual number of cells scheduled by a DCI format 1-X can be separately configured. Proposal 2-3:  * For a UE, the actual number of cells scheduled by a DCI format 0-X and the actual number of cells scheduled by a DCI format 1-X can be separately configured. |
| Moderator | On Proposal 2-1 and 2-2:  @all: Thanks for the good comments. Let’s make the max number as working assumption.  @OPPO: Setting max number as 3 may be a bit conservation since the overhead can be reduced greatly in case of intra-band CA or with feasible reduction method. For time being, it should be OK if we make assumption on 4.  On Proposal 2-3: My intention is the maximum schedulable carrier number of DL and UL can be different instead of introducing RRC configuration. I made some update to address this concern.  @LG: Regarding your comments on 1-TB or 2-TB per PDSCH, I think it is also depended on detailed DCI field design, e.g., support 2nd MCS/NDI/RV. Making a working assumption on the max number should be OK. Anyway, we can confirm that number after detailed DCI design.  To ALL: Please provide your comments directly in Section 3.1.3 for 2nd round of discussions. |

### 2nd round of discussions

#### Proposal 2-1:

* (Working assumption) The maximum number of cells scheduled by a DCI format 0-X in Rel-18 standards is 4.
* For a UE, the maximum number of cells scheduled by a DCI format 0-X can be smaller than or equal to 4.

#### Proposal 2-2:

* (Working assumption) The maximum number of cells scheduled by a DCI format 1-X in Rel-18 standards is 4.
* For a UE, the maximum number of cells scheduled by a DCI format 1-X can be smaller than or equal to 4.

#### Proposal 2-3:

* For a UE, the maximum number of cells scheduled by a DCI format 0-X can be same or different to the maximum number of cells scheduled by a DCI format 1-X.

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| ZTE | Regarding the maximum number of the cells that can be scheduled by a DCI, we think it is important because it is highly related to the scenario and the DCI design. Generally, more scheduled cells requires a larger DCI size. If we want flexibility, we need the separate indication for the field. But we think flexibility is determined by the operator according to the scenario and configuration. We also think it is premature to conclude the maximum number of the scheduled cells.  To give the more flexibility to the network, we think the DCI design should not restrict the maximum number of the scheduled cells. For example, we can define the two maximum numbers. One is specific for the DCI field design, which could be the smaller value (e.g., 4). The other one is the maximum number of scheduled cells, which could be the larger value (e.g., 8). In this case, if many fields can be shared based on the configuration, the network can still schedule more cells.  For proposal 2-3, we can support it. |
| MTK | We suggested 4 or more in our contribution only for 2-stage/2-segment DCI structure which is not limited by the 140 bits DCI payload size. Considering the possibility that RAN1 may still take a 1-stage/1-segment DCI design, **we prefer to keep both 3 and 4 on the table**. **Hence, we prefer OPPO’s version in first round discussion.** |
| Intel | In NR, one scheduling cell can schedule up to 8 cells with self-carrier and cross-carrier scheduling. Our understanding this can be straightforwardly extended to multi-cell scheduling. Further, in our analysis, PDCCH blocking can be reduced substantially when considering > 4 cells for both multi-cell PDSCH and PUSCH scheduling.  Hence, in our view, we prefer to support maximum number of cells as 8 for both multi-cell PDSCH and PUSCH scheduling. Considering this is the first meeting for multi-cell scheduling, we suggest to down-select from 4 or 8 in the next meeting.  We are fine with Proposal 2-3. |
| vivo | We proposed 8 in our paper because 8 is maximum number of scheduled cell for a scheduling cell in the CCS framework, but we are also open to have 4 as WA if the majority prefers a smaller value.  In addition, we would like to avoid any DCI designs exceeding the polar code limitation considering the limited TU, 140 bits can be agreed as the maximum DCI size for multi-cell scheduling, so we suggest adding a sub-bullet or new proposal,   * The maximum size of a DCI format 0-X or DCI format 1-X scheduling multi-cell (excluding CRC) should be no larger than 140 bits  Proposal 2-3: ok |
| InterDigital | We are ok to take 4 as a working assumption.  Note: “in Rel-18 standards” in the proposals unnecessary. |
| Ericsson1 | OK. |
| Apple | Although we proposed 3 or 4 as FFS, we are fine to accept 4 as the working assumption. But we would like to add a note (similar to what vivo has): The UE does not expect to be configured with a DCI format 0-X or 1-X that has a DCI size larger than 140 bits excluding CRC.  We are fine with the proposals otherwise. |
| Samsung | We do not see a justification for picking a maximum cell number at the moment and we prefer to not agree to one. That maximum number can be determined after details on the DCI format design are progressed. A default maximum is the legacy one of 8 scheduled cells from a scheduling cell. So, we propose the following modifications at least for the PDSCHs: Proposal 2-2:  * (Working assumption) The maximum number of cells scheduled by a DCI format 1-X in Rel-18 standards is no more than 8. * For a UE, the maximum number of cells scheduled by a DCI format 1-X can be smaller than or equal to 8. |
| CATT | We are OK with the above proposals. |
| Spreadtrum | We support 4 as the working assumption. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | OK with the above proposals. |
| Moderator | I made below update to collect all the possible max number in this meeting although majority companies support 4. |

### 3rd round of discussions

#### Proposal 2-1:

* The maximum number of cells scheduled by a DCI format 0\_X in Rel-18 standards is down-selected from {3, 4, 8}.
* The maximum payload size of a DCI format 0\_X (excluding CRC) should be no larger than 140 bits.For a UE, the maximum number of cells scheduled by a DCI format 0\_X can be smaller than or equal to the maximum number supported in Rel-18 standards.

#### Proposal 2-2:

* The maximum number of cells scheduled by a DCI format 1\_X in Rel-18 standards is down-selected from {3, 4, 8}.
* The maximum payload size of a DCI format 1\_X (excluding CRC) should be no larger than 140 bits.
* For a UE, the maximum number of cells scheduled by a DCI format 1\_X can be smaller than or equal to the maximum number supported in Rel-18 standards.

#### Proposal 2-3:

* For a UE, the maximum number of cells scheduled by a DCI format 0\_X can be same or different to the maximum number of cells scheduled by a DCI format 1\_X.

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| New H3C | We are fine with proposal 2-1,2-2 and 2-3. |
| Qualcomm | P2-1:  We are OK with the first two bullets. The 3rd bullet is unclear. It is not clear whether the 3rd bullet is talking about UE capability (max # of cells that can be scheduled by one DCI format), or about the configuration. We suggest to delete the 3rd bullet.  P2-2:  We are OK with the first two bullets. The 3rd bullet is unclear. It is not clear whether the 3rd bullet is talking about UE capability (max # of cells that can be scheduled by one DCI format), or about the standard. We suggest to delete the 3rd bullet.  P2-3: OK |
| Nokia/NSB | Support 2-1 to 2-2  On the comment by Qualcomm: could be UE capability or gNB config to our reading (this could be maybe clarified further) |
| Apple | For P2-1, we would like to clarify the intention. Which one of the following do we mean? (1) the DCI format is defined such that the payload size is no larger than 140 bits no matter what configuration is provided by gNB. (2) the payload size of the DCI format is guaranteed to be no larger than 140 via proper gNB configurations. We think it should be the 2nd one, and suggest the following changes:  The payload size of a DCI format 0\_X (excluding CRC) should be configured to be no larger than 140 bits.  Same comment on P2-2. |
| Spreadtrum | We support the proposals.  For the comments from QC of P2-1, our understanding is “the maximum number supported in Rel-18 standards” refer to the first bullet, which would be down select from {3, 4, 8}. New UE capability report might be needed here to report its own maximum number. Next, gNB can configured another value which is always smaller than the value UE reports. Thus, from this understanding, the third bullet makes sense. |
| LG | P2-1: OK  P2-2: OK  P2-3: OK |
| NTT DOCOMO | Proposal 2-1/2-2:  We are fine with this proposal.  For the 3rd bullet, we prefer to keep it. Regarding the Qualcomm’s comment, we share the similar understanding with Nokia that it could be the number reported by UE capability or configured by gNB, at this point.  Proposal 2-3:  OK |
| Xiaomi | Not sure if we need the second sub-bullet for proposal 2-1 and 2-2. Our understanding is that this should be naturally supported in any case under polar coding. |
| Intel | For Proposal 2-1 and 2-2, the third bullet, we suggest to update this as   * For a UE, the ~~maximum~~ number of cells scheduled by a DCI format 0\_X can be smaller than or equal to the maximum number supported in Rel-18 standards.   We are fine with Proposal 2-3. |
| Ericsson2 | OK with 2-1,2-2,2-3. |
| MTK | P2-1/P2-2: We are NOT ok for the second sub-bullet, if we limit the DCI size of 0\_X/1\_X to be <= 140 bits, how would it be possible to support 8 cells as the candidate listed in the first sub-bullet? We suggest to delete the second sub-bullet.  P2-3: OK |
| vivo | We are fine with proposal 2-1,2-2 and 2-3. |
| Moderator | @Qualcomm @Spreadtrum: Assuming R18 standards support a single DCI can schedule max 4 cells. Of course, for a given UE, which has two DL carrier capability, it can be configured to support max 2 cells by a single DCI.  @Apple: your proposal may imply the DCI size is configured by gNB. No matter how the DCI size is determined, the max size should be no larger than 140. That is the intention of the bullet. I think it should be fine.    @Xiaomi: I agree with you. But it should have no harm if we add this.  @Intel: Here, the “max” means the max number of schedulable cells for a UE <= max number in Rel-18 standards. E.g., if R18 standards support max 8 cells can be scheduled by a single DCI, for a UE with 4 DL CC capability, it can be configured with max 4 cells scheduled by a DCI.  @MTK: 2nd bullet should be baseline. Whether to support 8 cells depend on DCI field design and overhead reduction method. |
| CMCC | We are generally OK with P2-1, P2-2 and P2-3 |
| Fujitsu | We are OK with P2-1~3. |
| Langbo | Support the three proposals. |
| CATT | We are fine with the above proposal. |
| ZTE | To bring more flexibility to the network, we prefer to use the listed (or down selected) value for DCI field design only. The network can schedule more cells as long as the payload of DCI (without CRC) does not exceed 140 bits, which depends on the DCI field configuration. So we suggest to remove the third bullet in P2-1 and P2-2. |
| Moderator2 | @ZTE: P2-1 and P2-2 intend to decide the max number in standards. If standards support max 8 cells can be scheduled by a single DCI, network has full flexibility to schedule 2~8 cells via a single DCI may including one cell as proposed by other companies.  As for DCI size, it can be decided later after we make conclusion on DCI field design. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | OK |
| InterDigital | Fine with P2-1, P2-2, P2-3. Same understanding as Nokia/NSB and NTT DOCOMO regarding 3rd bullet of P2-1. |
| Samsung3 | OK with Proposal 2-1, 2-2, 2-3 |
| MTK | We are NOT fine with the proposals,  The SID clears says that   * the designed single DCI multi cell PUSCH/PDSCH scheduling mechanism “**shall be optimized for 3 or more cells**   We do not think “restricting the DCI payload to be <=140bits” in the very beginning of discussion phase is “**optimized for 3 or more cells**”. |
| Moderator3 | @MTK:  the intention of restricting the DCI payload to be <=140bits is to avoid any impact on legacy Polar coding. I believe all the companies including MTK don’t want to introduce >140 bits for Polar coding.  How about replacing “The maximum payload size of a DCI format 0\_X (excluding CRC) should be no larger than 140 bits.” with “Note: Legacy Polar interleaver on support of max 140bits excluding CRC is not changed.”? (Updated)Proposal 2-1:  * The maximum number of cells scheduled by a DCI format 0\_X in Rel-18 standards is down-selected from {3, 4, 8}. * Note: Legacy Polar interleaver on support of max 140bits excluding CRC is not changed. * For a UE, the maximum number of cells scheduled by a DCI format 0\_X can be smaller than or equal to the maximum number supported in Rel-18 standards.  (Updated)Proposal 2-2:  * The maximum number of cells scheduled by a DCI format 1\_X in Rel-18 standards is down-selected from {3, 4, 8}. * Note: Legacy Polar interleaver on support of max 140bits excluding CRC is not changed. * For a UE, the maximum number of cells scheduled by a DCI format 1\_X can be smaller than or equal to the maximum number supported in Rel-18 standards.   @ALL: Please provide your comments directly in next section for new round of discussions. |

### 4th round of discussions

#### Proposal 2-1:

* The maximum number of cells scheduled by a DCI format 0\_X in Rel-18 standards is down-selected from {3, 4, 8}.
* Note: Legacy Polar interleaver on support of max 140bits excluding CRC is not changed.
* For a UE, the maximum number of cells scheduled by a DCI format 0\_X can be smaller than or equal to the maximum number supported in Rel-18 standards.

#### Proposal 2-2:

* The maximum number of cells scheduled by a DCI format 1\_X in Rel-18 standards is down-selected from {3, 4, 8}.
* Note: Legacy Polar interleaver on support of max 140bits excluding CRC is not changed.
* For a UE, the maximum number of cells scheduled by a DCI format 1\_X can be smaller than or equal to the maximum number supported in Rel-18 standards.

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Apple | For the note, instead of just saying “legacy polar interleaver”, we would prefer to say the polar code for PDCCH is not changed. Even though the limit of 140 bits is currently introduced by the interleaver, I haven’t seen any company having the intention to change any aspect of the polar code design.  Our suggestion is:  Note: Legacy Polar code for PDCCH is not changed, which supports a max of 140bits excluding CRC. |
| Qualcomm | Regarding the note, we think it is sufficient to say “DCI format 1\_X/0\_X does not require change on TS38.212 Section 5.3.1.1”. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Ok. But wonder if there is possibility that different FRs have different max numbers of schedulable cells. |
| vivo | ok |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposals in general.  For the polar code part, we understand the intention. However, the original wording on the maximum payload size < 140 bits is better. Regarding the maximum number of cells for a UE, if the intention is to capture this for UE capability, we suggest to add this part in the sub-bullet. Proposal 2-1:  * The maximum number of cells scheduled by a DCI format 0\_X in Rel-18 standards is down-selected from {3, 4, 8}. * Note: ~~Legacy Polar interleaver on support of max 140bits excluding CRC is not changed~~. The maximum payload size of a DCI format 0\_X (excluding CRC) should be no larger than 140 bits   For a UE, the maximum number of cells scheduled by a DCI format 0\_X can be smaller than or equal to the maximum number supported in Rel-18 standards, subject to UE capability. |
| Xiaomi | The maximum number of the cells is highly dependent on the scenario. Is the intention is to preclude the possibility to have different values for different scenarios. |
| New H3C | OK |
| Nokia/NSB | Support P2-1 & 2-2  We would be fine with the Apple suggested changes to the note, but don’t see this as critical.  On the suggestion by Intel, subject to UE capability is one thing but we still think having a smaller number based on gNB configuration should still be supported as well (as Xiaomi pointed out). |
| LG | P2-1: OK  P2-2: OK  Our understanding on the intention of this proposal is NW configurability to a UE on the max number of schedulable cells by new DCI, rather than introducing UE capability. |
| Fujitsu | OK with the proposals. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support this proposal.  Regarding Intel’s comment for the second bullet, we prefer the description in the current proposal. In our understanding, the second bullet intends that the actual number of co-scheduled cells does not need to be fixed as a maximum number specified for Rel-18 MC-scheduling. It can be configured by gNB to be smaller than the maximum value in Rel-18 standard and whether the configurable value varies depending on UE capability would be discussed further. |
| MTK | We are fine with the proposal. |
| ZTE | We can accept this proposal and we think the second bullet can be discussed in the UE feature. In addition, we think a compromise is to set two maximum numbers if it is not easy to down select the listed value due to diverse understandings. |
| CMCC | We are fine with the Proposal 2-1 and Proposal 2-2. |
| InterDigital | Fine with P2-1 and P2-2. |
| Langbo | OK with the proposals. |
| Samsung4 | We prefer the previous wording, but OK with this version as well if that’s majority view. In general, this WI should not make any changes to legacy designs for Polar coding for DCI/PDCCH. |
| Moderator | @Intel: The reason to change the note is to address concern from MTK since they prefer two-segment DCI which has no restriction on max 140 bits.  @Intel @Nokia @LG @NTT DOCOMO: regarding UE capability, I think LG and DOCOMO’s comments can clarify Intel’s concern.  @ZTE: it is not relevant to UE feature. The max schedulable cell number has direct impact on DCI field design and size/BD/CCE budget design. We have to select one max value.  @Apple: The update is fine.    @Huawei: The max number of schedulable cells by a single DCI supported in standards should be a single value. For a UE, if cross-FR multi-cell scheduling is supported, then it seems not necessary to allow different FRs having different max schedulable cell number; if multi-cell scheduling is only allowed within a FR, then it may be needed to allow that since more cells can be anticipated in FR2 than FR1.  @xiaomi: The intention is not to preclude the different values for different scenarios. The proposal intends to identify a single value which is supported by Rel-18 standards. For concrete scenarios, the max schedulable cell numbers can be different without exceeding the max number supported in Rel-18 standards.  @All: Further update based on Apple’s suggestion: (updated) Proposal 2-1:  * The maximum number of cells scheduled by a DCI format 0\_X in Rel-18 standards is down-selected from {3, 4, 8}. * Note: Legacy Polar code for PDCCH is not changed, which supports a max of 140bits excluding CRC. * For a UE, the maximum number of cells scheduled by a DCI format 0\_X can be smaller than or equal to the maximum number supported in Rel-18 standards.  (updated) Proposal 2-2:  * The maximum number of cells scheduled by a DCI format 1\_X in Rel-18 standards is down-selected from {3, 4, 8}. * Note: Legacy Polar code for PDCCH is not changed, which supports a max of 140bits excluding CRC. * For a UE, the maximum number of cells scheduled by a DCI format 1\_X can be smaller than or equal to the maximum number supported in Rel-18 standards. |
| CATT | We are fine with the Proposal 2-1 and Proposal 2-2.  Per our understanding, the second bullet in the P2-1and P2-2 means that the maximum number of cells schedules by DCI format 0\_X/1\_X can depend on gNB configuration, which is no more than the maximum number of cells supported in Rel-18 standards. |
| Apple | OK with the updated P2-1 and P2-2 from the moderator.  According to the earlier comments, our understanding on the second bullet in the proposals means that the max # of scheduled cells for a UE can depend on UE capability and/or gNB configuration, which will be further discussed. |
| Ericsson4 | OK, and agree with Intel’s suggestion to capture the maximum payload size of a DCI format 0\_X/1\_X (excluding CRC) should be no larger than 140 bits |
| Spreadtrum | One clarification: the maximum number of cells scheduled by a DCI format 1\_X/0\_X refers to the maximum number of the co-scheduled cells by one DCI (Interpretation 1), or total cell number of all combinations of scheduled cells (Interpretation 2)?  One example:  Combination1 of co-scheduled cells: #CC0, #CC1, #CC2, #CC3  Combination2 of co-scheduled cells: #CC1, #CC2, #CC3,#CC4  Assume maximum number is 4, it is allowed according to Interpretation 1, while it is not allowed with Interpretation 2, because the total cell number is 5.  Our understanding is Interpretation 1. If so, small change is suggested for Proposal 2-1, Proposal 2-2 can have similar change: (updated) Proposal 2-1:  * The maximum number of cells co-scheduled by a DCI format 0\_X in Rel-18 standards is down-selected from {3, 4, 8}. * Note: Legacy Polar code for PDCCH is not changed, which supports a max of 140bits excluding CRC.   For a UE, the maximum number of cells co-scheduled by a DCI format 0\_X can be smaller than or equal to the maximum number supported in Rel-18 standards. |
| Moderator2 | @Spreadtrum: Interpretation 1 is correct. |
| MTK | Fine with the proposals. |
| China Telecom | We are fine with the updated proposals. |
| New H3C | Fine with updated proposals |
| LG | It seems the clarification from Spreadtrum is valid.  “The maximum number of cells scheduled” needs to be updated into “The maximum number of cells co-scheduled” as suggested by Spreadtrum, or “The maximum number of cells simultaneously scheduled”. |
| Moderator3 | Given below agreement, this thread is closed.  **Agreement**   * One value for the maximum number of co-scheduled cells by a DCI format 0\_X in Rel-18 is selected from {3, 4, 8}. * For a UE, the maximum number of co-scheduled cells by a DCI format 0\_X can be smaller than or equal to the maximum number supported in Rel-18.   **Agreement**   * One value for the maximum number of co-scheduled cells by a DCI format 1\_X in Rel-18 is selected from {3, 4, 8}. * For a UE, the maximum number of co-scheduled cells by a DCI format 1\_X can be smaller than or equal to the maximum number supported in Rel-18. |

## Scheduling possibilities

|  |
| --- |
| * **Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell** * *Proposal 3.2.1: Each scheduled cell can be configured to be scheduled by a multi-cell DCI in one and only one scheduling cell.* * *Proposal 3.2.3: For a scheduled cell,*    + *support multi-cell DCI and single-cell DCI scheduling from one scheduling cell*   + *support multi-cell DCI scheduling from one scheduling cell and single-cell DCI self-scheduling*   + *do not support multi-cell DCI and single-cell DCI cross-carrier scheduling from more than one (other) scheduling cell.* * *Proposal 3.3.6: Support the monitoring for at least two multi-cell DCIs for PDSCH (or PUSCH) on different scheduling cells within a PUCCH cell group, where each of the multi-cell DCIs can schedule a different (non-overlapping) subgroup of cells within a PUCCH cell group.* * **Spreadtrum Communications** * *Proposal 6: At least support Case 0 multi-cell scheduling, i.e one Cell’s scheduling only from multi-cell scheduling, not configured as self-carrier nor cross-carrier scheduling* * *Proposal 7: Further study the other type of multi-cell scheduling, e.g. combination of self/cross-carrier scheduling.* * *Proposal 8: It is recommended to give a restriction for the maximum number of scheduling cells when multi-carrier scheduling is configured for a scheduled cell.* * **Vivo** * *Proposal 1. For multi-cell scheduling, the following principles should be taken into account:* * *The multi-cell scheduling grant is for unicast DL scheduling only or unicast UL scheduling only.* * *The scheduled cells can be associated with the same/different TDD configurations/numerologies.* * *Either Pcell or a Scell can be configured as a scheduling cell for joint multi-cell scheduling.* * *For a scheduled cell, there is only one scheduling cell.* * *The scheduled PDSCHs or PUSCHs correspond to different TBs.* * *Changes or extensions to the legacy PDCCH coding/mapping procedure, including the maximum DCI size=140 bits excluding CRC and supported Als, should be avoided.* * *The number of cells that can be scheduled by a single DCI is no larger than 8 and is configurable.* * *Proposal 2. For a scheduled cell, both multi-cell scheduling and single-cell scheduling can be configured at the same time.* * **China Telecom** * *Proposal 4: The cell(s) to transmit the multi-cell scheduling DCI are configured by RRC signaling.* * *Proposal 5: Multi-cell scheduling and single-cell scheduling can be dynamically switched for a cell supporting multi-cell scheduling DCI.* * **LG Electronics** * *Proposal #4: Discuss how to support multi-cell scheduling and single-cell monitoring in case with the multi-cell DCI, based on the following three approaches.* * *Approach 1: The multi-cell DCI is allowed to perform single-cell scheduling for any of the cells schedulable by the multi-cell DCI.* * *Approach 2: The multi-cell DCI is not allowed to perform single-cell scheduling for any of the cells schedulable by the multi-cell DCI.* * *Approach 3: The multi-cell DCI is allowed to perform single-cell scheduling only for the scheduling cell (while not allowed for other cells).* * **Ericsson** * *Proposal 3: mc-DCI on a scheduling cell can be used to schedule PUSCH/PDSCH on that scheduling cell, at least when all cells have same SCS.* * *Proposal 4: When mc-DCI is configured for scheduling PUSCH/PDSCH on multiple cells, a mc-DCI can schedule PUSCH/PDSCH on all of the cells or a subset of those cell (including single cell).* * *Proposal 5: When mc-DCI is configured for scheduling PUSCH/PDSCH on multiple cells, for each of those cells, UE can also be configured to monitor existing single cell DCI format(s) scheduling PUSCH/PDSCH (i.e. 1\_1/1\_2/0\_1/0\_2).* * *Proposal 6: When mc-DCI is configured for scheduling PUSCH/PDSCH on multiple cells, existing Rel-17 DCI size budget is maintained for each scheduled cell.* * *Proposal 7: Size of mc-DCI is explicitly configured by higher layers.* * *Proposal 8: Support independent configuration of mc-DCI for PUSCH and PDSCH.* * **FGI** * *Proposal 3: Support self-scheduling for a DCI scheduling multiple cells.* * *Proposal 4: Support monitoring in a Scell for a DCI scheduling multiple cells.* * *Proposal 5: Support monitoring in a sSCell for a DCI scheduling multiple cells including Pcell.* |

### Moderator summary and proposals based on contributions

Regarding scheduling possibilities for multi-cell scheduling and possible single-cell scheduling, several issues need to be considered.

A first issue is whether there is only one scheduling cell for a scheduled cell. In Rel-15/16, there is only one scheduling cell for each serving cell by self-scheduling or cross-carrier scheduling. In Rel-17, a sScell can be configured to cross-carrier schedule Pcell in addition to Pcell self-scheduling so that Pcell can have two scheduling cells. For Rel-18 multi-cell scheduling, it could be easier if the principle that there is only one scheduling cell for each scheduled cell can be maintained.

However, if multi-cell DCI scheduling and single-cell DCI scheduling are only from the same scheduling cell, this would lead to high DL control load on the scheduling cell as both multi-cell scheduling DCI and single-cell scheduling DCI are transmitted from same scheduling cell for multiple scheduled cells. In this way, it is beneficial if multi-cell DCI scheduling from one scheduling cell and single cell scheduling from the scheduled cell via self-scheduling can be supported.

A second issue is whether UE can be configured to monitor multiple multi-cell scheduling DCIs on multiple scheduling cells. This would add to the network DCI loading flexibility but is likely adding more UE side implementation burden and add to the blind decoding budget management complexity. Therefore, at most one serving cell can be configured for monitoring multi-cell scheduling DCI for a scheduled cell.

### 1st round of discussions

#### Proposal 2-4:

* For each scheduled cell, at most one scheduling cell can be configured for a UE to monitor multi-cell scheduling DCI.

#### Proposal 2-5:

* For a scheduled cell, both multi-cell scheduling and single cell scheduling can be supported from a same scheduling cell.
* FFS whether there is at most one scheduling cell for each scheduled cell.
* FFS whether to support multi-cell scheduling from one scheduling cell and single cell scheduling from the scheduled cell via self-scheduling.
* FFS whether to support multi-cell scheduling from one scheduling cell and single cell scheduling from another scheduling cell for the scheduled cell via cross-carrier scheduling.

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Spreadtrum | For Proposal 2-4, it needs a clarification, that not all serving cell support multi-cell scheduling, so it would be good change into “For each scheduled cell applicable for multi-cell scheduling ” |
| Qualcomm | P2-4: We are not OK.  For CA with different numerologies (e.g., FR1-FR2 CA), monitoring DCI 0-X/1-X on a FR1 cell that can schedule FR2 cells is a potential power efficient operation.  However, due to the SCS/slot-length difference between the FR1 scheduling cell and the FR2 scheduled cells, if the scheduling cell is fixed to the FR1 cell, the UE has to be able to (1) process multiple DCIs in a PDCCH MO of the FR1 cell, or (2) monitor multiple PDCCH Mos of a slot of the FR1 cell. One option could be to enable “scheduling cell switch” dynamically. We consider this could be a potential resolution for other issues such as DCI size budget, BD/CCE budget, HARQ re-transmission flexibility, etc.      P2-5: We are not OK.  Not clear but the proposal looks implying that, if a UE is configured with 1-to-N multi-cell scheduling, the UE has to be able to support 1-to-N cross-carrier scheduling altogether. When N=4, on the scheduling cell(s), the UE monitors DCI format 0-X/1-X for the N=4 cells and also monitors DCI formats 1\_1/0\_1 with CIF for all the N=4 cells. This is extremely high cost from UE’s PDCCH process capability point of view.  We are open to discuss a certain way of switching as illustrated above. It should be clear whether P2-5 means the UE has to support simultaneous monitoring MC-DCI and SC-DCI. |
| Nokia/NSB | We support the 2 proposals above. |
| OPPO | P2-4: Agree.  P2-5: We think it is a bit too early to agree on this. This proposal could be questionable if the multi-cell scheduling DCI can accomplish the single-cell scheduling functionality. |
| Xiaomi | For proposal 2-4, the intention is not clear to us. Is it aim to avoid UE monitoring DCIs on multiple cells for a scheduled cell? |
| Fujitsu | We are fine with the proposals. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support both Proposal 2-4 and 2-5. |
| Langbo | Support the two proposals. |
| LG | P2-4: We support the P2-4. For a cell scheduled by multi-cell DCI, if more than one scheduling cell is configured for a scheduled cell, additional impacts, for example, distributing BD budget to multiple scheduling cells, needs to be introduced. In addition, we are not sure if the dynamic switch of scheduling cell is essential to support Rel-18 CA. P2-5: It may need to clarify the first bullet on whether the single-cell scheduling would be performed by multi-cell DCI or by single-cell DCI, or which DCI is used for each case is FFS for now. If it is FFS for now, we are OK with the P2-5. |
| CMCC | Proposal 2-4: OK  Proposal 2-5: From our view, for one single scheduled cell, both legacy one-to-one cross-carrier scheduling and Rel-18 one-to-many multi-cell PUSCH/PDSCH scheduling should be supported. Furthermore, dynamic switching between the two scheduling mechanisms for a scheduled cell is also needed to avoid unnecessary UE PDCCH monitoring. |
| Moderator | On Proposal 2-4:  @Spreadtrum @Qualcomm @Xiaomi @LG: The intention is not to configure two scheduling cells with each supporting multi-cell scheduling for a given scheduled cell. I think LG’s comments are quite clear. So I prefer keeping current proposal for time being for further discussion.  On Proposal 2-5:  @Qualcomm: It depends on how to design the DCI size budget. If existing 3+1 size budget is kept, there is no high UE complexity.  @LG: as you mentioned, both options are possible now. The intention of this proposal is to support both scheduling manners for a same scheduled cell.  @ALL: please further discuss the two proposals. |
| ZTE | For P2-4, we think it is a bit urgent to make the restriction. It is related to the BD/CCE budget determination. For example, if the BD/CCE budget of the multi-cell scheduling is counted for one of the scheduled cells. For the other scheduled cell, it can be scheduled by the multi-cell scheduling DCI from another cell because its BD/CCE budget is not affected. This can overcome the issue of scheduling flexibility reduction of the multi-cell scheduling. For example, the scheduled cell can be scheduled by the different DCI with different configuration. The BD/CCE capability for a UE can still be the same as legacy.  On the other hand, we agree that the multi-cell scheduling DCI with the BD/CCE budget counted for a scheduled cell should be configured on at most one scheduling cell to align with the legacy configuration. Therefore, we have the following updates. Proposal 2-4:  * For each scheduled cell, at most one scheduling cell can be configured for a UE to monitor multi-cell scheduling DCI with the corresponding BD/CCE budget counted for this scheduled cell.   For P 2-5, we think it is related to the DCI format discussion for multi-cell scheduling. If the multi-cell scheduling DCI can schedule single PDSCH/PUSCH. We think the single cell scheduling DCI may not be needed. |
| MTK | P2-4: Agree to avoid distributing BD budget to multiple scheduling cells. P2-5: Seems a bit too early to agree on this. If UE still needs to monitor single-cell self-scheduling DCI on each cell, plus the multi-cell scheduling DCI, the UE processing complexity seems too high. |
| China telecom | Does P2-4 solve the first FFS of P2-5? |
| Intel | We are fine with Proposal 2-4 and 2-5. |
| Vivo | P2-4: ok  P2-5:  For the 1st FFS, ‘at most’ can be replaced by ‘only’, ‘at most one’ includes 1 and 0 but there is no case where a scheduled cell to have 0 scheduling cell. Furthermore, we are still not convinced to support different scheduling cells for multi-cell scheduling and single-cell scheduling for a scheduled cell. In the discussion, the proponents explained that the PDCCH load would be problematic when the cell on which multi-cell DCI is transmitted is also used for single-cell scheduling, so the cell may perform self-scheduling to offload PDCCH. But if the scheduled cell has PDCCH, why not just configure the cell to be completely self-scheduled?  Then 2nd FFS and 3rd FFS can be removed as they are depended on the conclusion of the 1st FFS Proposal 2-5:  * For a scheduled cell, both multi-cell scheduling and single cell scheduling can be supported from a same scheduling cell. * FFS whether there is ~~at most~~ only one scheduling cell for each scheduled cell. * ~~FFS whether to support multi-cell scheduling from one scheduling cell and single cell scheduling from the scheduled cell via self-scheduling.~~ * ~~FFS whether to support multi-cell scheduling from one scheduling cell and single cell scheduling from another scheduling cell for the scheduled cell via cross-carrier scheduling.~~ |
| InterDigital | Support both Proposals. |
| Ericsson1 | Support both proposals 2-4 and 2-5. In our view, the impact on UE processing complexity would be handled via BD/CCE budget which would be shared between monitoring of single-cell DCI and multi-cell DCI. |
| Apple | P2-4: OK  P2-5: we think it is premature to agree at this stage. More discussion is needed, especially on the handling of BD/CCE limits. |
| Samsung | This WI scope does not include generic CA enhancements that are not related to multi-cell scheduling. The baseline should be the non-DSS framework where a scheduled cell has only one scheduling cell. Therefore, we suggest the following revisions. In particular, we don’t understand the FL’s intention for the second bullet in Proposal 2-5.Proposal 2-4:  * For each scheduled cell, at most one scheduling cell can be configured for a UE to monitor multi-cell scheduling DCI. * Note: the [at most one] scheduling cell for monitoring a multi-cell scheduling DCI format corresponding to a scheduled cell is the same as the scheduling cell configured for monitoring single-cell scheduling DCI format for the scheduled cell.  Proposal 2-5:  * For a scheduled cell, both multi-cell scheduling and single cell scheduling can be supported from a same scheduling cell. * ~~FFS whether there is at most one scheduling cell for each scheduled cell.~~ * ~~FFS whether to support multi-cell scheduling from one scheduling cell and single cell scheduling from the scheduled cell via self-scheduling.~~ * ~~FFS whether to support multi-cell scheduling from one scheduling cell and single cell scheduling from another scheduling cell for the scheduled cell via cross-carrier scheduling.~~ |
| CATT | OK with Proposal 2-4.  For Proposal 2-5, we suggest to remove last two FFS, it’s too early to discuss them. |
| Moderator2 | @China Telcom: no. The first FFS covers the case where single-cell scheduling is used.  @ZTE: Anyway, BD/CCE budget should be considered. For time being, I prefer keeping Proposal 2-4 unchanged.  @vivo: I understand your concern. Is below update Ok to you? (Updated)Proposal 2-5:  * For a scheduled cell, both multi-cell scheduling and single cell scheduling can be supported from a same scheduling cell. * FFS whether there is only one scheduling cell for each scheduled cell. * FFS below options if more than one scheduling cell for each scheduled cell   + Option 1: support multi-cell scheduling from one scheduling cell and single cell scheduling from the scheduled cell via self-scheduling.   + Option 2: support multi-cell scheduling from one scheduling cell and single cell scheduling from another scheduling cell for the scheduled cell via cross-carrier scheduling. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | OK with the proposal 2-4 and the first bullet of updated proposal 2-5. |
| Moderator 3 | On Proposal 2-4:  @ZTE: I see your point. It could be dependent on DCI size budget. I agree with your update. Let’s check other companies’ views.  On Proposal 2-5: we can hold this discussion to wait for the conclusion from other issue. |

### 2nd round of discussions

#### Proposal 2-4:

* For each scheduled cell, at most one scheduling cell can be configured for a UE to monitor DCI format 0\_X/1\_X with the corresponding BD/CCE budget counted for this scheduled cell.

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| New H3C | We are fine with proposal 2-4. |
| Qualcomm | We are not OK with the proposal.  Again, our focus is FR1-FR2 CA. PDCCH monitoring on FR1 cell for scheduling data on FR2 cells is much cost/power efficient from a UE point of view and therefore, multi-cell scheduling from FR1 cell to FR2 cells is promising. However, due to the SCS difference between FR1 cell and FR2 cells, always scheduling from the FR1 cell to FR2 cells is not efficient when there are a lot of data coming to a UE. Therefore, we propose to enable scheduling cell switch. We are open to discuss if it is possible to switch BD/CCE counting or DCI size counting. If this is enabled, then there must be less concern on BD/CCE or DCI size budgets. Having said that, we do not accept P2-4 and would like to discuss enhancement. |
| Nokia/NSB | We are fine with the first part of the proposal – but not latter part of “*with the corresponding BD/CCE budget counted for this scheduled cell*” – as (i) it should be ‘for this scheduled cell’ (but this is only a technical detail) and (ii) we think it should not all be counted for the scheduling cell as is (but needs further discussions). |
| Apple | We are not OK with the last part of the proposal, because more discussion is needed on BD/CCE limits.  We are OK if the last part regarding BD/CCE budget is removed. |
| Spreadtrum | Agree with Apple, we also want to separate this proposal from BD/CCE budget. |
| LG | Same view with Nokia and Apple.  We are OK with P2-4 if the last part related to BD/CCE budget is removed. |
| NTT DOCOMO | BD/CCE budget should be discussed separately, and hence we suggest to remove “with the corresponding BD/CCE budget counted for this scheduled cell”. |
| Xiaomi | We share Apple’s view. |
| Intel | We are also fine with the first part. The second part regrading BD/CCE needs separate discussion. |
| Samsung2 | Agree with other companies that the discussion on BD/CCE handling should be separated. In addition, we would like to clarify that, this proposal is not intended to create new RRC configuration for the scheduling/scheduled cell relationship. The Rel-17 CA (no-DSS) framework is the baseline. Therefore, the scheduling cell for DCI format 0\_X/1\_X is the same as that used for single-cell scheduling. So, we suggest the following modification: Proposal 2-4:  * For each scheduled cell, at most one scheduling cell can be configured for a UE to monitor DCI format 0\_X/1\_X ~~with the corresponding BD/CCE budget counted for this scheduled cell~~.   Note: the [at most one] scheduling cell for monitoring DCI format 0\_X/1\_X corresponding to a scheduled cell is the same as the scheduling cell configured for monitoring single-cell scheduling DCI format(s) for the scheduled cell. |
| Ericsson2 | OK with the first part of the proposal but the BD/CCE budget/counting part should be removed. How to handle BD/CCE budget and counting needs further discussion for the case when 0\_X/1\_X is configured. Suggest below update.   * *For each scheduled cell, at most one scheduling cell can be configured for a UE to monitor DCI format 0\_X/1\_X ~~with the corresponding BD/CCE budget counted for this scheduled cell.~~* |
| MTK | We share similar view as Apple. |
| Vivo | Ok with the former part ‘at most one scheduling cell can be configured for a UE to monitor DCI format 0\_X/1\_X’. The later part should be discussed separately. |
| Moderator | @Qualcomm: I understand the benefit of dynamic switching scheduling cell. I just have concern on the BD/CCE budget complexity. Legacy cross-carrier scheduling does not adopt such mechanism in case of different SCSs. We can further consider it.  @Samsung: To me, the note may be not needed as the main bullet is clear enough.  @all: Ok to remove the second part. (Updated)Proposal 2-4:  * For each scheduled cell, at most one scheduling cell can be configured for a UE to monitor DCI format 0\_X/1\_X. |
| CMCC | We are OK with the updated proposal. |
| Fujitsu | We are OK with the updated proposal. We share the view that BD/CCE budget issue should be separately discussed. |
| Langbo | We are OK with the updated proposal with the second part removed. |
| Qualcomm | We are not OK with the updated proposal 2-4 due to the reason mentioned above. We would like to discuss solutions to enable efficient FR1-FR2 CA operation. Moreover, this does not impact the DCI format design. We do not need to rush limiting our designs. |
| CATT | We are OK with the updated proposal. |
| Nokia/NSB | We are with Updated 2-4 |
| ZTE | From our understanding, this issue is related to the DCI size or BD/CCE budget. If companies prefer to discuss the two issue separately, we suggest the following updates.   * For each scheduled cell, at most one scheduling cell can be configured for a UE to monitor DCI format 0\_X/1\_X if the DCI size budget of DCI format 0\_X/1\_X is counted for each of the co-scheduled cells. |
| LG | Fine with the updated P2-4. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Fine |
| Vivo2 | We are ok with Updated 2-4 |
| InterDigital | Fine with updated P2-4. |
| Qualcomm | @Moderator: dynamic switch maybe able to switch the UE behavior in terms of BD/CCE handling. This principle has been supported for Rel-17 DSS sSCell deactivation/dormancy. This is a potential solution to resolve the concern of BD/CCE budget limitation. Therefore, we think it does not make sense to preclude it especially if companies consider BD/CCE budget is an issue.  We are OK with the following formulation for compromise. (Updated)Proposal 2-4:  * For each scheduled cell, a UE monitors DCI format 0\_X/1\_X on at most one scheduling cell in a slot. |
| Samsung3 | Thanks Moderator for the response. Since a few companies have been suggesting new scheduling cell combinations, we think the clarification in the note is useful/necessary.  Note: the [at most one] scheduling cell for monitoring DCI format 0\_X/1\_X corresponding to a scheduled cell is the same as the scheduling cell configured for monitoring single-cell scheduling DCI format(s) for the scheduled cell. |
| Moderator2 | @Qualcomm: Your update is fine with me.  @Samsung: Ok to add the note. (Updated)Proposal 2-4:  * For each scheduled cell, a UE monitors DCI format 0\_X/1\_X on at most one scheduling cell in a slot.   Note: the at most one scheduling cell for monitoring DCI format 0\_X/1\_X corresponding to a scheduled cell is the same as the scheduling cell configured for monitoring single-cell scheduling DCI format(s) for the scheduled cell. |
| LG | Fine with the updated P2-4 including the newly added Note. |
| MTK | Fine with the **(Updated)Proposal 2-4**. |
| Nokia/NSB | We would have preferred the earlier formulation (without the ‘in a slot’) but well, this could be discussed still later on.  But **we do not agree with the added note**, as this would prevent single-cell self-scheduling combined with 0\_X/1\_X scheduling from another scheduling cell. This would lead to have all the PDCCH load at the scheduling cell of 0\_X/1\_X, reducing the usefulness of the feature dramatically (… then better to have self-scheduling configured without the enhancement). |
| Moderator3 | @Samsung: could you accept the proposal without note considering Nokia’s comments?  @ALL: Please provide your comments directly in next section for new round of discussions. |

### 3rd round of discussions

#### Proposal 2-4:

* For each scheduled cell, a UE monitors DCI format 0\_X/1\_X on at most one scheduling cell in a slot.

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Apple | OK, even though our preference is to remove “in a slot”. |
| Qualcomm | OK |
| vivo | We prefer to remove the ‘in a slot’.  If the scheduling cell for mc-DCI can be changed dynamically, it means that the DCI size would also change dynamically because there are several field(i.e., dormancy, CIF) depended on scheduling cell configuration, this will increase the complexity of DCI BD decoding significantly, because UE 1)does not know which cell is the scheduling cell for a given scheduled cell, 2)thus has neither prior info of cells scheduled by a received DCI nor prior info of the DCI size as the size dynamically changes with the scheduling cell. |
| Intel | We prefer the original wording, or we are fine the current one by removing “in a slot”.  The wording “in a slot” indicates that UE may need to monitor different scheduling cells for multi-cell scheduling, which is not desirable from system operation while the benefit is not clear. Proposal 2-4:  * For each scheduled cell, a UE monitors DCI format 0\_X/1\_X on at most one scheduling cell ~~in a slot~~. |
| Qualcomm2 | There seem some misunderstanding. Let me explain what the proposal here is.  Our proposal is similar to BWP-switch or SSSG-switch. A UE has two states – in one state, the UE monitors e.g., DCI format(s) in a serving cell; then in the other state, the UE monitors different DCI format(s) in different serving cell.  For example:   * State 1: UE monitors MC-DCI on a cell for a set of scheduled cells * State 2: UE monitors MC-DCI on another cell for the set of scheduled cells   Another example:   * State 1: UE monitors MC-DCI on a cell for a set of scheduled cells * State 2: UE monitors SC-DCI on each cell of the set of scheduled cells   BD/CCE budget, DCI size budget, etc can be per state. The state can be determined/selected based on DCI indication or cell deactivation/dormant status.  This way enables flexible PDCCH monitoring without requiring UE to implement highly complex behaviors. For Rel-17 DSS cross-carrier scheduling, similar concept has already been adopted. |
| Xiaomi | Fine |
| New H3C | OK |
| Nokia/NSB | Same as other, we would prefer to remove the “in a slot” |
| LG | OK and also prefer removing the “in a slot”. |
| Fujitsu | We prefer to remove “in a slot”. Since the TUs are very limited, we should prioritize fundamental functions. Support of dynamic switching would require a lot of extra standardization effort and the benefits are not quite clear. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We prefer to remove “in a slot” from the proposal. Considering the limited TU, we think we can focus on the basic scenario that a UE monitors mc-DCI on at most one scheduling cell for each scheduled cell first. The dynamic change of the scheduling cell for MC-scheduling can be discussed after at least the design of DCI fields (e.g., whether/which field(s) is(are) belong to type-3 of Proposal 3-1 depending on the condition of inter/intra band/FR etc.) are clarified. |
| MTK | We are fine with the proposal. |
| ZTE | We think this issue is related to BD/CCE budget for DCI 0\_X/1\_X. This issue can be discussed after the BD/CCE budget issue is finished since it does affect the DCI field discussion. However, we can accept this proposal if it is the majority view. |
| CMCC | We are fine with the proposal and prefer to remove “in a slot”. Whether to restrict at most one scheduling cell in a slot needs to be further discussed. |
| Langbo | Similar to other companies, we prefer to remove “in a slot”. |
| Samsung4 | We do NOT support the updated proposal.  We don’t see any reason to introduce new CA framework within this WI. The legacy CA framework allows a single scheduling cell for each scheduling cell (except for the PCell in Rel-17 DSS). A scheduling cell can already monitor PDCCH for up to 8 scheduled cells, per Rel-17. The benefit of multi-cell scheduling is to combine multiple DCIs/PDCCHs into a single MC-DCI, and therefore save the DCI/PDCCH signaling overhead.  There is no need to allow for multiple scheduling cells for each scheduled cell, in a same slot or in different slots. The configuration should be same as in Rel-17 (FFS for PCell per Rel-17 DSS).  We suggest to remove “in a slot” and capture the previously suggested note to avoid any confusions. We think this is a basic design principle, and needs to be decided/agreed in this meeting.  Note: the [at most one] scheduling cell for monitoring DCI format 0\_X/1\_X corresponding to a scheduled cell is the same as the scheduling cell configured for monitoring single-cell scheduling DCI format(s) for the scheduled cell. |
| Moderator | @Qualcomm: I think more details on your solution may be needed, e.g., in your first example, does the UE simultaneously monitor two MC-DCIs on two cells for same set of scheduled cells? If no, according to which conditions shall the UE switch the scheduling cell? In which time scale? In your second example, it seems last two bullets of P2-5 which has been hold for time being.  Considering majority companies prefer removing “in a slot”, can you live with it? (Updated)Proposal 2-4:  * For each scheduled cell, a UE monitors DCI format 0\_X/1\_X on at most one scheduling cell . |
| CATT | We are fine with the proposal without ‘in a slot’.  In the current cross carrier scheduling framework, there is only one scheduling cell for each scheduled cell. Considering the limited TU, the same principle can be a baseline for discussion. |
| Apple | We support the proposal without “in a slot”. Similar as CATT, we also prefer to have a not-too-complicated design considering the time we have. |
| Ericsson4 | OK. |
| Qualcomm | The UE does not monitor two MC-DCIs on two cells for the same set of scheduled cells simultaneously. We are open to discuss how the switching is enabled, but some straightforward examples are provided below.  Suppose FR1-FR2 CA where FR1 cell is the PCell while FR2 cells are SCells   * MC-DCI is monitored on a FR2 cell for scheduling all the FR2 cells * If the FR2 cell where the UE monitors MC-DCI is deactivated or dormant, the UE monitors MC-DCI on the FR1 PCell   Another way is to utilize SSSG switching. Currently we have supported SSSG switching in a given scheduling cell. This can be extended to enable switching scheduling cells as part of SSSGs.  If we delete “in a slot”, use of MC-DCI for one of the important scenarios, that is FR1-FR2 CA where FR1 cell is a scheduling cell, becomes not attractive. We do not see any alternative proposals on how to support FR1-FR2 CA in spectral/power efficient manner.  @ DOCOMO, if we delete “in a slot”, we cannot discuss this later in the Rel-18 WI. |
| Spreadtrum | We support (Updated)Proposal 2-4, without “in a slot”. |
| Qualcomm | For compromise, we can accept following:   * At least following is supported:   + For each scheduled cell, a UE monitors DCI format 0\_X/1\_X on at most one scheduling cell . |
| Moderator2 | @Qualcomm: your update is fine. We can try it in GTW session. |
| LG | We also support (Updated)Proposal 2-4, without “in a slot”. |
| Moderator3 | @Samsung: I understand your point to follow Rel-17 CA framework. As I commented in GTW session, your concern is more relevant to Proposal 2-5 whether there is only one scheduling cell for each scheduled SCell (for PCell, following Rel-17 DSS, it can have two scheduling cell). I made some update on Proposal 2-5 and you can share your views on it. For Proposal 2-4, the intention is there is at most one scheduling cell for UE to monitor multi-cell scheduling for each scheduled cell. They are separate issue. Hopefully, this clarifies your concern and Proposal 2-4 is agreeable to you.  @All: Please further discuss the below two proposals in next round. |

### 4th round of discussions

#### Proposal 2-4:

* At least following is supported:
  + For each scheduled cell, a UE monitors DCI format 0\_X/1\_X on at most one scheduling cell .

#### Proposal 2-5:

* For a scheduled cell, support monitoring DCI format 0\_X/1\_X and legacy DCI format from a same scheduling cell.
* FFS whether to support monitoring DCI format 0\_X/1\_X and legacy DCI format from different scheduling cells for a scheduled cell

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Qualcomm | P2-4: OK  P2-5: We think that a UE supporting 1-to-N multi-cell scheduling is not required to support 1-to-N cross-carrier scheduling as well as 1-to-N multi-cell scheduling. In addition, whether or not the monitoring of DCI 0\_X/1\_X and legacy DCI format is simultaneous is a highly important question. Considering that there would be no time to conclude this, we propose the following changes to the first bullet:   * For a scheduled cell, support monitoring DCI format 0\_X/1\_X and legacy DCI format from a same scheduling cell.   + FFS: whether they are monitored simultaneously   + FFS: for which scheduled cell this is supported * FFS whether to support monitoring DCI format 0\_X/1\_X and legacy DCI format from different scheduling cells for a scheduled cell |
| MTK | P2-4: OK  P2-5: If the new 0\_X and 1\_X can schedule single cell, we do not see the necessity to support legacy DCI. Also, P2-5 seems to require UE to also support legacy cross-carrier scheduling when supporting the new 0\_X and 1\_X, which we also do not see the necessity.  **We prefer not to have P2-5 for now**, considering the interaction between R18 multi-carrier scheduling and legacy cross-carrier scheduling has not been determined. |
| Nokia/NSB | We are OK with both proposals. We don’t see a need for the additional FFSs suggested by QC. |
| LG | P2-4: OK  P2-5: We are fine with P2-5 in principle, but would like to clarify the relationship between this P2-5 and the FFS point in the following agreement made in Tuesday.  Can we understand that this P2-5 is intended to resolve the FFS below?  **Agreement**   * **(Working assumption)** DCI format 0\_X/1\_X is a new DCI format for multi-cell scheduling * DCI format 0\_X can be used for single cell PUSCH scheduling. * DCI format 1\_X can be used for single cell PDSCH scheduling. * FFS: UE monitors one of or both multi-cell scheduling DCI and legacy single cell scheduling DCI for a scheduled cell. |
| Moderator | @Qualcomm @MTK: For a cell which can be scheduled by DCI 0-X/1-X from the scheduling cell, in case of small data packet, there is one possibility that gNB needs to only schedule the cell. Using legacy DCI for single-cell scheduling can save CCE resources and obtain wide coverage which is more efficient than using DCI 0-X/1-X to do it. On the other hand, UE may need to monitor fallback DCI.  In that sense, simultaneously monitoring DCI 0-X/1-X and legacy DCI may be needed. That is the intention of the main bullet of P2-5.  @LG: Thanks for the good comments. In P2-6, “FFS: UE monitors one of or both multi-cell scheduling DCI and legacy single cell scheduling DCI for a scheduled cell.”, it doesn’t mention whether the multi-cell DCI and legacy DCI for a scheduled cell is from a same scheduling cell or different cells. In P2-5, it intends to support both DCI from a same scheduling cell and FFS both DCIs from different scheduling cells. If P2-5 is agreed, then it can resolve FFS in P2-6. |
| Qualcomm | Thank you Moderator for the elaboration of the intention. If the intention is as such, we have more preference to have the FFSs. We understand the importance of “fallback” but we do not want to agree monitoring both MC-DCI and SC-DCIs simultaneously for all the cells.  We are also OK with MTK’s proposal – not agree P2-5 for now. |
| MTK | Thanks moderator for the further explanation on P2-5. We can sympathize moderator’s intention to allow legacy operation, but looking at the current wording:   * For a scheduled cell, support monitoring DCI format 0\_X/1\_X and legacy DCI format from a same scheduling cell.   If the scheduled cell is SCell 1, while the scheduling cell is PCell 0, then P2-5 seems to say   * UE needs to support using 0\_X/1\_X to schedule SCell 1 from PCell 0, * and, at the same time, also support R15/R16/R17 cross-carrier scheduling using 0\_1/1\_1 to schedule SCell 1 from PCell 0   This seems premature to us as the interaction between R18 multi-carrier scheduling and legacy cross-carrier scheduling has not been determined. |
| Samsung6 | We prefer to decide on Proposals 2-4 and 2-5 jointly.  As the FL has mentioned above, Proposal 2-5 aims to resolve the FFS from the GTW Agreement cited by LG (originally, proposal 2-6), and Proposal 2-4 is directly connected to Proposal 2-5 to determine the framework for scheduling-scheduled cell relationship for single-cell and multi-cell scheduling.  We think Proposal 2-5 should be the baseline (in our view, the only) framework for multi-cell scheduling. We don’t think it is feasible to finish this WI in time if RAN1 decides to consider, in addition to multi-cell scheduling design, generic CA enhancements with multiple scheduling cells for any given scheduled cell – It took an entire Rel-17 DSS to enable two scheduling cells for PCell only, considering single-cell scheduling only.  Nevertheless, for the sake of progress, we are OK to agree to a merger of the Proposals 2-4 and 2-5 with some editorial clarification as follows. Proposal 2-4 & 2-5 (merged):  * At least following is supported:   For each scheduled cell, a UE monitors DCI format 0\_X/1\_X on at most one scheduling cell.   * For a scheduled cell configured in a set of co-scheduled cells, support monitoring DCI format 0\_X/1\_X and legacy DCI formats from a same scheduling cell. * FFS whether to support monitoring DCI format 0\_X/1\_X and legacy DCI formats from different scheduling cells for a scheduled cell configured in a set of co-scheduled cells. |
| Moderator2 | @MTK: Your example is correct. As we have below agreements, we need to discuss the interactive between multi-cell scheduling and legacy single cell scheduling. Even we can’t achieve any agreement in this meeting, it is better to exchange our views.  **Agreement**   * **(Working assumption)** DCI format 0\_X/1\_X is a new DCI format for multi-cell scheduling * DCI format 0\_X can be used for single cell PUSCH scheduling. * DCI format 1\_X can be used for single cell PDSCH scheduling. * FFS: UE monitors one of or both multi-cell scheduling DCI and legacy single cell scheduling DCI for a scheduled cell.   @Samsung: I intended to separate two proposals because vast majority companies are OK with proposal 2-4. We can try the merged one now.  @Qualcomm: I am OK to add the first FFS. Regarding 2nd FFS, I understand your point is the number of scheduled cells support monitoring both DCIs. Can we update it as whether other cells within the set of configured cells which can be co-scheduled by DCI format 0-X/1-X support monitoring both DCIs? (merged)Proposal 2-4 & 2-5:  * At least following is supported:   + For each scheduled cell, a UE monitors DCI format 0\_X/1\_X on at most one scheduling cell. * For a cell within a set of configured cells which can be co-scheduled by a DCI format 0\_X/1\_X, support monitoring DCI format 0\_X/1\_X and legacy DCI format(s) from a same scheduling cell.   + FFS: whether DCI format 0\_X/1\_X and legacy DCI format(s) are monitored simultaneously   + FFS: whether for other cells within the set of configured cells this is supported * FFS whether to support monitoring DCI format 0\_X/1\_X and legacy DCI format(s) from different scheduling cells for a cell within a set of configured cells which can be co-scheduled by a DCI format 0\_X/1\_X. |
| Qualcomm | OK with Moderator’s (merged)Proposal 2-4 & 2-5 |
| New H3C | OK with updated proposal |

## New or existing DCI format for multi-cell scheduling

|  |
| --- |
| * **Huawei, HiSilicon** * *Proposal 5: Introduce new DCI formats for multi-cell scheduling by single DCI for DL and UL respectively.* * *Proposal 6: Legacy DCI formats for PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling and new DCI formats for multi-cell PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling can be monitored simultaneously.* * **ZTE** * *Proposal 6: Whether using legacy non-fallback DCI formats or new DCI formats for multi-cell scheduling should be down-selected.* * **Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell** * *Proposal 3.1: Introduce new DCI formats 0\_X (e.g. 0\_3) for multi-cell PUSCH scheduling with a single DCI and 1\_X (e.g. 1\_3) for multi-cell PDSCH scheduling with a single DCI.* * *Proposal 3.2.2: Support the combination of multi-cell DCI scheduling and single-cell DCI scheduling (using legacy DCI formats) for PDSCH (or PUSCH) of a serving cell.* * **CATT** * *Proposal 4: Whether to introduce a new DCI format for the DCI that can schedule multi-cells PDSCH/PUSCH need to be discussed until it is clear how to determine each configured field of the DCI.* * **Vivo** * *Proposal 5. Introduce new DCI format(s) for mc-DCI.* * **Xiaomi** * *Proposal 3: New DCI formats should be introduced to support multi-cell scheduling.* * *Proposal 4: The DCI supporting multi-cell scheduling can also be used for single cell scheduling.* * *Proposal 6: Single cell scheduling using legacy DCI and multi-cell scheduling can be enabled simultaneously.* * **Langbo** * *Proposal 3: New DCI formats are introduced respectively for multi-cell PUSCH scheduling and multi-cell PDSCH scheduling.* * **OPPO** * *Proposal 6：A new DCI format is needed to support multi-cell scheduling in a single DCI.* * *FFS: whether this new DCI format uses existing DCI format name or new DCI format name.* * **CMCC** * *Proposal 1. For one scheduled cell, both multi-cell PUSCH/PDSCH scheduling with a single DCI and legacy single cell PUSCH/PDSCH scheduling with a single DCI should be supported.* * **CAICT** * *Proposal 1: One cell could be scheduled by a legacy DCI or by a new DCI for multi-cell PUSCH/PDSCH scheduling. The new DCI for multi-cell PUSCH/PDSCH scheduling could also be used to schedule a single cell.* * **Apple** * *Proposal 6: The multi-cell scheduling DCI formats are designed based on DCI formats 0\_1 and 1\_1.* * *FFS whether to introduce new DCI formats or modify DCI formats 0\_1/1\_1, and potentially the handling of the limit on the number of DCI sizes* * **Fujitsu** * *Proposal 1: To support multi-cell PUSCH/PDSCH scheduling with a single DCI, legacy non-fallback DCI formats (DCI format 0\_1/1\_1, DCI format 0\_2/1\_2) should be used.* * *Proposal 2: For discussion on DCI fields to support basic function of multi-cell PUSCH/PDSCH scheduling with a single DCI, take DCI format 0\_1/1\_1 in Rel-15 or DCI format 0\_2/1\_2 in Rel-16 as the starting point.* |

### Moderator summary and proposals based on contributions

Regarding the DCI format design for multi-cell PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling, reusing legacy DCI format, e.g., DCI format 0-1 or 1-1, can avoid extra blind detection effort for a UE since existing “3+1” DCI size budget is maintained. However, the drawback is there are too many carrier-specific fields which have to be left unused in case of same DCI format for single carrier scheduling and the more CCEs are required for transmitting the DCI format. Furthermore, the standard efforts for differentiating DCI format for multi-cell scheduling or single cell scheduling are needed.

On contrast, introducing new DCI format for multi-cell scheduling can provide a clean design for standards and gNB can flexibly adopt multi-cell scheduling or single cell scheduling dependent on actual scenarios. However, with the introduction of the new DCI format for multi-cell scheduling and the legacy DCI format for single cell scheduling, “3+1” DCI size budget may not be maintained since UE has to monitor DCI formats for single cell scheduling, DCI formats for multi-cell scheduling and one fallback DCI format. Extra standard effort is needed to keep existing “3+1” DCI size budget.

8 companies [Huawei, ZTE, Nokia/NSB, CATT, vivo, Lenovo, Xiaomi, Langbo, OPPO, CAICT] propose new DCI format for multi-cell scheduling by a single DCI. Two companies [ZTE, CATT] propose FFS whether introducing new DCI format or reusing legacy DCI format until each DCI field is clear. One company [Fujitsu] propose reusing legacy non-fallback DCI formats (DCI format 0\_1/1\_1, DCI format 0\_2/1\_2).

Furthermore, if new DCI format is introduced for multi-cell scheduling, one follow-up issue is whether this multi-cell scheduling DCI can be used for single cell scheduling. As mentioned above, when the multi-cell scheduling DCI is used for scheduling a single cell, too many cell-specific bits have to be reserved. It does make sense that the multi-cell scheduling DCI is only used for scheduling two or more serving cells.

Another follow-up issue needs to be resolved is whether for one scheduled cell, both multi-cell scheduling DCI and legacy single cell scheduling DCI should be supported.

### 1st round of discussions

#### Proposal 2-6:

* New DCI formats are introduced for multi-cell PUSCH/PDSCH scheduling by single DCI for UL and DL respectively.
* The new DCI formats are not used for single cell PUSCH/PDSCH scheduling.
* Note: Legacy DCI formats are used for single cell PUSCH/PDSCH scheduling.
* UE can be configured to monitor both multi-cell scheduling DCI and legacy single cell scheduling DCI for a scheduled cell.

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Qualcomm | P2-6:  For the 1st bullet, we can make it as a working assumption. It is not fruitful to discuss whether the DCI 0-X/1-X is a new format or a modification of a legacy format. Or alternatively, we do not need to determine it for now.  For the 2nd bullet, we are not OK with this proposal due to the same comment as for P2-5. If the intention of the proposal is to enable “fallback to legacy single-cell scheduling operation”, it should be clear for which condition(s) a UE is configured to monitor both multi-cell scheduling DCI and legacy single-cell scheduling DCI. For example, for legacy cross-carrier scheduling, the UE can monitor only DCI 1\_1/0\_1 with CIF for scheduled cells that is not the scheduling cell, and can monitor both DCI 1\_1/0\_1 with CIF and DCI 1\_0/0\_0 without CIF if the scheduled cell is the scheduling cell. We are open to discuss the need of such fallback mechanism. However, we cannot agree to support monitoring both DCIs simultaneously for all the scheduled cells in general. |
| Nokia/NSB | We support the main bullet of Proposal 2-6, but don’t think the restriction of the first sub-bullet is actually needed (should be removed from a potential agreement).  Could be left to gNB to still use the MC-DCI to schedule also only a single cell with the MC-DCI (if SC-DCI monitoring is not to be configured for a serving cell). |
|  |  |
| OPPO | We are ok to the 1st main bullet, but not ready to agree on the sub-bullet. FL mentions that “when the multi-cell scheduling DCI is used for scheduling a single cell, too many cell-specific bits have to be reserved”. But the padding could be anyway there in case of DCI size alignment between multi-cell scheduling DCI and single-cell scheduling DCI. To leave more DCI formats within monitoring basket may consume more RNTI or require additional operating modes.  Further, given quite a few DCI payload design logic on the table, there could be a chancefor multi-cell scheduling DCI to be even shorter than legacy single cell scheduling DCI – we understand the chance will be low, but it is not none. |
| Xiaomi | We are fine to the first main bullet but have issue on the sub-bullet. We don’t see the need to preclude the use case that MC-scheduling DCI can be used for single cell scheduling. Depending on the service requirement, the actually scheduled cell can be dynamically indicated in the MC-scheduling DCI. The payload of the MC-scheduling DCI can be dynamically changed depending on the actually scheduled cells. We don’t see an issue of a reserved cell-specific bits.  For the second main bullet, I think this related to the first proposal and thus can be hold until we have a ncluding. |
| Fujitsu | For the 1st bullet, although we prefer to reuse legacy DCI formats, we can compromise to introduce new DCI formats dedicated for multi-cell scheduling (i.e. not used for single cell scheduling). If the new DCI formats are also used for single cell scheduling, we do not see extra benefits compared with reusing legacy non-fallback DCI formats.  For the 2nd bullet, it can be discussed later. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We think whether to introduce new DCI formats or reuse legacy non-fallback DCI formats should be discussed considering at least DCI size budget which is discussed in Proposal 2-7 and/or which DCI format can be monitored on the scheduling cell for multi-cell scheduling in addition to the MC-DCI. |
| Langbo | Similar views as Nokia. |
| LG | OK for the first main bullet, but it seems to need more discussion on other bullet/sub-bullet with consideration of DCI size budget handling and PDCCH BD configuration/counting.  We can consider one possible approach that the multi-cell DCI is allowed to perform single-cell scheduling only for the scheduling cell, for simplified handling on DCI size budget and PDCCH BD configuration/counting. |
| CMCC | We are OK the main bullet of Proposal 2-6, but for the sub-bullet of the first bullet, we think there is no need to restrict the new DCI from scheduling a single DCI. If dynamic indication of the actual scheduled cell(s) is supported, the new DCI will be enabled to schedule one or more cells each time. |
| Moderator | @all: Thanks for the comments. Using the multi-cell scheduling DCI for scheduling a single cell is not economical, e.g., for a multi-cell scheduling DCI which can schedule max 4 cells, definitely, it requires many CCEs. Using such DCI for single cell scheduling will lead to CCE waste. I add one FFS for the 1st sub-bullet. Please check whether it is OK.  To ALL: Please provide your comments directly in Section 3.1.3 for 2nd round of discussions. |

### 2nd round of discussions

#### Proposal 2-6:

* New DCI formats are introduced for multi-cell PUSCH/PDSCH scheduling by single DCI for UL and DL respectively.
* FFS: Whether the new DCI formats can be used for single cell PUSCH/PDSCH scheduling.

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| ZTE | Regarding the DCI format, we think many issues should be discussed and resolved firstly. At least, we need to compare the new DCI format and the extension of the legacy DCI.  If the new DCI format 0\_3/1\_3 is introduced only for scheduling PUSCH/PDSCH on N cells, and all the existing DCI formats are used for legacy scheduling. The both single cell scheduling DCI and multi-cell scheduling DCI will be monitored by a UE. This will challenge the DCI size budget/alignment. And another issue is how to schedule in case the number of cells that need to be scheduled simultaneously changes dynamically from 1 to N. (e.g. if two cells need to be scheduling simultaneously, using the MC-DCI or two single cell DCI?).  For the extension of the legacy DCI, there is less issue on the spec efforts. For example, we only need to define which cell the BD/CCE budget is counted for. There is no impact on the DCI size budget and size alignment. The drawback may be the bigger DCI size should be kept to avoid additional blind decoding regardless of actual scheduled number of cells. But considering the maximum DCI bit number is 140 bits, it may be acceptable.  Therefore, for the first bullet, We think this can be discussed together with the DCI size alignment after the DCI field design finished, to see whether a new DCI format is needed. |
| MTK | We are fine with the updated FL Proposal 2-6 |
| Intel | We are fine with the updated proposal in general.  We share similar view as other companies that depending on the gNB scheduler decision, gNB may use multi-cell scheduling DCI to schedule a single cell. In this case, dynamic switching between single cell and multi-cell scheduling can be enabled.  We suggest to remove the FFS in the first sub-bullet. Proposal 2-6:  * New DCI formats are introduced for multi-cell PUSCH/PDSCH scheduling by ncludi DCI for UL and DL respectively. * ~~FFS: Whether~~ the new DCI formats can be used for single cell PUSCH/PDSCH scheduling. |
| Vivo | Ok |
| InterDigital | Fine with the updated FL proposal. Not sure how we could avoid introducing new DCI format for this functionality. |
| Ericsson1 | Support the main bullet.  We prefer to remove the FFS. gNB should be able to utilize the new DCI format to scheduling single cell also, e.g. if single-cell DCI monitoring is not configured, PDCCH candidate availability (as BDs/CCEs budget may be split between single-cell DCI/multi-cell DCI), etc. |
| Apple | We feel it may a bit premature to conclude on the introduction of new DCI formats without discussing the DCI configurations, handling of BD/CCE limits and the limit on the number of DCI sizes. We prefer a bit more discussion before concluding. |
| Samsung | We are OK with the modified FL Proposal 2-6.  It’s best to keep the FFS for now and resolve it after further discussion on DCI size and PDCCH monitoring aspects. |
| CATT | OK |
| Spreadtrum | We support the proposal, without FFS. |
| Moderator | Ok to remove FFS (Updated)Proposal 2-6:  * New DCI formats are introduced for multi-cell PUSCH/PDSCH scheduling by ncludi DCI for UL and DL respectively. * The new DCI formats can be used for single cell PUSCH/PDSCH scheduling. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Generally OK with the updated proposal.  Some concerns about the sub-bullet, when single DCI for multi-cell scheduling is used for single-cell PUSCH/PDSCH scheduling, many fields will be reserved, which will affect the coverage performance due to the increased DCI payload compared with the legacy DCI. |

### 3rd round of discussions

#### Proposal 2-6:

* New DCI formats are introduced for multi-cell PUSCH/PDSCH scheduling by single DCI for UL and DL respectively.
* The new DCI formats can be used for single cell PUSCH/PDSCH scheduling.

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| New H3C | OK with proposal 2-6. |
| Qualcomm | OK |
| Nokia/NSB | OK  But based on the question by OPPO this morning, I guess we would only introduce a single new format 0\_X and 1X. So if we would like to be precise here, it could be for the man bullet:  *A new DCI format 0\_X is introduced for scheduling multiple PUSCHs on multiple serving cells and a new DCI format 1\_X is introduced for scheduling multiple PUSCHs on multiple serving cells* |
| Apple | Even though our preference is to understand better the potential impact before agreeing to introduce new DCI formats, we could be flexible. But we would like to understand why the companies think we have to introduce new DCI formats. E.g. >52.6GHz did not introduce new DCI format for multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling. Is it more for convenience or there is some real technical benefit being seen here? |
| Spreadtrum | According to OPPO’s comment on GTW, for one scheduling cell, we also wonder why multiple DCI formats are needed. Support Nokia’s version. |
| LG | We are OK with only main bullet, but not OK with sub-bullet since several companies including us are proposing that single cell scheduling is done by legacy DCI format considering DCI overhead. If the legacy DCI is used for single cell scheduling, we think the new DCI format doesn’t need to schedule single cell since it is quite unnecessary overhead.  If the intention of sub-bullet is not for all the scheduled cells but for only one cell, e.g. scheduling cell, then we are open. |
| NTT DOCOMO | While it is more comfortable for us to discuss the impact on introducing new DCI format more carefully and make a decision which of new DCI formats or legacy DCI formats (i.e., non-fallback DCI) are supported after some other aspects (e.g., whether to maintain the current DCI size budget, which DCI formats are monitored in the scheduling cell, etc.) for multi-cell scheduling are clarified, we are fine to agree on this proposal as working assumption. |
| Xiaomi | Fine with the proposal |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Samsung2 | We are OK with the main bullet, but prefer to keep the FFS for the second bullet for now and resolve it after further discussion on DCI size and PDCCH monitoring aspects. |
| Ericsson2 | OK. Also OK with Nokia proposed update. |
| MTK | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Vivo | Prefer to keep the FFS for the sub-bullet, main bullet is fine. |
| Moderator | @Nokia: Your update is fine.  @Apple: In >52.6GHz, due to multiple PDSCHs or PUSCHs scheduled on a single cell, most fields are shared expect NDI/RV. The increase of payload size is not as significant as multi-cell DCI. It is straightforward to use DCI 0-1/1-1 for multi-slot scheduling. However, for multi-cell scheduling, the DCI size will be much larger than existing DCI 0-1/1-1. That is the intention why a new DCI format is needed. Hope this clarifies your concern.  @Spreadtrum: In my understanding, monitoring new DCI format for multi-cell scheduling and legacy DCI format for single-cell scheduling may be needed. Even multi-cell scheduling DCI can schedule a single cell, it should be possible to use legacy single cell DCI format for scheduling a single cell for saving CCEs.  @LG: Intention of the sub-bullet is new DCI format CAN be used to schedule a single cell as pointed by other companies, they think it is gNB scheduler flexibility. I agree with you using legacy DCI scheduling single cell is more appropriate and economical. I think we don’t exclude the possibility of using legacy DCI for single cell scheduling.  @Samsung: Ok to keep 2nd bullet with FFS.  @All: given below agreement, we may not need to say “a new DCI format…” to avoid any ambiguity. So the issue now is whether DCI format 0-X/1-X can be used for scheduling a single cell. Based on this, I made some update below for your information.  **Agreement**  Agree the following terminologies ONLY for convenience of discussion:   * DCI format 0\_X is used for scheduling multiple PUSCHs on multiple cells with one PUSCH per cell * DCI format 1\_X is used for scheduling multiple PDSCHs on multiple cells with one PDSCH per cell.   The above does not imply introducing new DCI format(s) at this point.  Please kindly check below update. (Updated)Proposal 2-6:  * DCI format 0\_X can be used for single cell PUSCH scheduling. * DCI format 1\_X can be used for single cell PDSCH scheduling. * FFS: UE can be configured to monitor both multi-cell scheduling DCI and legacy single cell scheduling DCI for a scheduled cell. |
| CMCC | We are OK with the updated proposal. |
| Fujitsu | We also have concerns on the sub-bullet. If the new DCI format can also be used for single-cell scheduling, we do not see much benefit compared with reusing legacy DCI format. And there is similar issue as reusing legacy DCI format. For example, there would be issue of large DCI payload issue for single-cell scheduling. From that perspective, our preference is to support new DCI format dedicated for multi-cell scheduling.  Keeping FFS to the sub-bullet is okey to us. |
| Langbo | We support the updated proposal. |
| Qualcomm | We are OK with the updated proposal 2-6. |
| CATT | We are fine with the updated proposal. |
| Nokia/NSB | We are fine with the updated proposal.  But, looking at the feedback received in the 3rd round, we were thinking if we could not try to at least have a working assumption (as suggested by DCM) on having the following in addition  *Proposal 2-6-A (Working Assumption):*  *A new DCI format 0\_X is introduced for scheduling multiple PUSCHs on multiple serving cells*  *A new DCI format 1\_X is introduced for scheduling multiple PUSCHs on multiple serving cells* |
| ZTE | We are OK with the updated proposal 2-6. |
| Moderator2 | @Nokia: whether DCI format 0-X/1-X is a new DCI format or extension of existing 0-1/1-1 is not decided, I prefer not using “new” to avoid any concern from those companies who prefer extending existing 0-1/1-1. |
| LG | @FL: Thank you for providing the reply.  But, since we still think new DCI doesn’t need to schedule single cell if legacy DCI is used to schedule same single cell in terms of DCI overhead, we suggest the updated P2-6 as working assumption with addition of one FFS point as below. (Updated)Proposal 2-6:  * DCI format 0\_X can be used for single cell PUSCH scheduling. * DCI format 1\_X can be used for single cell PDSCH scheduling. * FFS: UE can be configured to monitor both multi-cell scheduling DCI and legacy single cell scheduling DCI for a scheduled cell. * FFS: whether DCI format 0\_X/1\_X can be used for single cell scheduling for all of the scheduled cells or for only one of the scheduled cells. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We think Nokia intention is to explicitly decide to introduce new DCI format, which can be tried. |
| InterDigital | Fine with updated proposal and working assumption proposed by Nokia/NSB. |
| Samsung3 | Agree with DCM/Nokia/HW that majority of companies seemed to be fine to decide on using new DCI format for multi-cell scheduling. This would be a step forward compared to the GTW agreement that FL has cited.  Regarding the “(Updated)Proposal 2-6” from FL, we think more progress is needed on DCI field/size design, method for indication of co-scheduled cells, PDCCH monitoring aspects, etc., before deciding on the issue in this proposal. |
| Moderator3 | @LG: it does make sense that the multi-cell DCI format is used to schedules a single cell. Like multi-slot scheduling, a single slot can be also scheduled if TDRA field points to a row with a singles SLIV. For multi-cell scheduling, it seems no need to preclude single cell scheduling case as long as gNB intends to do it although it is not an efficient way. But legacy single-cell scheduling DCI may also be monitored by UE to allow using less CCE for single-cell scheduling.  As for the added “FFS” from your side, it is not clear to me about “for single cell scheduling for all of the scheduled cells”. For single cell scheduling, it should correspond to one cell.  @Huawei @Samsung @IDC: for a step forward, we can try “new” here. (Updated)Proposal 2-6:  * (Working assumption) DCI format 0-X/1-X is a new DCI format. * DCI format 0\_X can be used for single cell PUSCH scheduling. * DCI format 1\_X can be used for single cell PDSCH scheduling. * FFS: UE can be configured to monitor both multi-cell scheduling DCI and legacy single cell scheduling DCI for a scheduled cell. |
| LG | @FL: On your comment in the reflector, I agree that whether single cell scheduling is by new DCI or legacy DCI is relevant not only to CIF design but also to DCI size budget handling as well as BD/CCE counting rule.  I didn’t intend to make discussion complicated, but I wanted to point out that this may be important aspect in designing the follow-up aspects related to DCI/BD/SS procedure.  Given that we can discuss this aspect after agreeing on the current P2-6 as you mentioned below, we are OK with the current P2-6. |
| MTK | Fine with **(Updated)Proposal 2-6**. |
| Moderator | @LG: Thanks.  @ALL: Please provide your comments directly in next section for new round of discussions. |

### 4th round of discussions

#### Proposal 2-6:

* (Working assumption) DCI format 0-X/1-X is a new DCI format.
* DCI format 0\_X can be used for single cell PUSCH scheduling.
* DCI format 1\_X can be used for single cell PDSCH scheduling.
* FFS: UE can be configured to monitor both multi-cell scheduling DCI and legacy single cell scheduling DCI for a scheduled cell.

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Apple | Thanks the moderator for sharing you understanding on the benefit of having new DCI formats. We agree that the DCI size can be much larger, but this doesn’t necessarily mean that we need new formats. We think the necessity is somewhat related to the last FFS. If we want to configure both single-cell and multi-cell scheduling DCI on a cell, then we definitely need two different formats. Otherwise, it is arguable whether we need new DCI formats or not. The other advantage that we see for having new DCI formats is cleaner spec, which is why I mentioned “for convenience” in our previous comments.  However, introducing new DCI formats requires the handling of DCI size limit. So I wonder if this decision needs a bit more consideration. |
| Qualcomm | We think P2-6 is reasonable.  We support “DCI format 0\_X/1\_X can be used for single cell PUSCH/PDSCH scheduling”. We agree with Moderator that there is no reason to prohibit it.  Regarding the last bullet, we prefer to keep this FFS. |
| Moderator | @Apple: In previous round of discussions, majority companies prefer new DCI formats and making it as working assumption can be a step forward. If the first three bullets of the current proposal are agreed, i.e., DCI format 0-X/1-X can be used for scheduling multiple cells or a single cell, then we need further study whether legacy single-cell scheduling DCI is also needed since legacy DCI requires less CCEs and has low payload size.  I agree with you that introducing new DCI format requires size budget handling. That’s the reason why we propose making the “new” DCI format as working assumption now. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree. |
| Vivo | We support new DCI format for mutli-cell scheduling but we are fine with keeping it as WA.  We think first we need to decide whether the FFS is supported or not instead of whether the mc-DCI can be used for single-cell scheduling. If the answer is yes, as discussed before, new formats are needed anyway, it would be more appropriate to use legacy DCI for single-cell scheduling in this case. If the answer is no, the benefits to use mc-DCI for ncludi-cell scheduling would be unclear. Therefore, we suggest keeping the following as FFS, and making the last bullet as WA.   * FFS: DCI format 0\_X can be used for single cell PUSCH scheduling. * FFS: DCI format 1\_X can be used for single cell PDSCH scheduling.   ~~FFS:~~ (Working assumption) UE can be configured to monitor both multi-cell scheduling DCI and legacy single cell scheduling DCI for a scheduled cell. |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Qulcomm2 | Regarding the last bullet: we do not think it is feasible to require UE to monitor both MC-DCI and SC-DCIs for all of the scheduled cells. |
| Xiaomi | For the FFS part, is that means UE can be configured to monitor both multi-cell scheduling DCI and legacy single cell scheduling DCI for a scheduled cell simultaneously. |
| New H3C | OK |
| Nokia/NSB | Support.  We support the WA (would be there even fine to take an agreement) and support the intention of the FFS. |
| LG | OK |
| Fujitsu | We are fine with the proposal. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We can accept this proposal as working assumption for first bullet. |
| MTK | We are fine with the proposal. |
| ZTE | We think it is a bit earlier to make the decision on the new DCI format versus extension of the legacy DCI without the comprehensive discussion. But we are also fine with this proposal if all the companies support it. |
| CMCC | We are fine with the proposal. |
| InterDigital | Fine with proposal. |
| Langbo | OK with the proposal. |
| Samsung4 | We support the first proposal in the proposal. We suggest to make the second/third bullet (on fallback to single-cell scheduling) as FFS for now. Such decision would impact the scheduling and PDCCH monitoring aspects. For example, we would like to understand whether companies are considering to restrict PDCCH monitoring for single-cell scheduling for cells within or outside different sets of co-scheduling cells. Also, such fallback behavior may (or may not) have material impact on DCI field/size design. |
| Moderator | @vivo @Samsung: As I clarified several times, allowing DCI format 0-X/1-X to schedule single cell is not to restrict gNB’s scheduling policy if it would like to do it. It is not necessary for gNB to only use legacy DCI format for single cell scheduling. Although using DCI 0-X/1-X scheduling single cell is not efficient, it provides one option to gNB. That’s the reason to allow DCI format 0-X/1-X to schedule single cell. If it is agreed, then the follow-up issue is whether a UE can be configured to monitor both multi-cell scheduling DCI and legacy single cell scheduling DCI for a scheduled cell.  @Qualcomm: agree with you. The FFS only mentions “a scheduled cell”.  @xiaomi: yes. |
| CATT | We support to introduce a new DCI format for DCI format 0\_X and DCI format 1\_X.  In our understanding, the FFS part includes following two cases:   * Case 1: the scheduling cell of mc-DCI and the scheduling cell of s-DCI are the same cell for a scheduled cell. * Case 2: the scheduling cell of mc-DCI and the scheduling cell of s-DCI are the different cells for a scheduled cell.   Both of the case 1 and case 2 should be further studied. |
| Apple | Given that majority of the companies prefer to introduce new DCI formats, we are fine with the working assumption to move forward. |
| Ericsson4 | OK. |
| Qualcomm | @Samsung: we are open to discuss whether/how to enable “fallback” from multi-cell scheduling operation. However, we do not think it is feasible to say a UE monitoring a DCI for 1-to-N multi-cell scheduling is also monitoring DCIs for 1-to-N legacy cross-carrier scheduling. We also think it is important to consider what is the proper “fallback” and how to enable it. From our point of view, “dynamic switch” proposed under P2-4 is one way of improving flexibility without requiring high cost/complexity to the UE. |
| Moderator2 | @CATT: yes, the two cases are covered by the FFS. |
| China Telecom | OK |
| New H3C | Fine with updated proposals |
| Moderator3 | The thread is now closed with below agreement:  **Agreement**   * **(Working assumption)** DCI format 0\_X/1\_X is a new DCI format for multi-cell scheduling * DCI format 0\_X can be used for single cell PUSCH scheduling. * DCI format 1\_X can be used for single cell PDSCH scheduling. * FFS: UE monitors one of or both multi-cell scheduling DCI and legacy single cell scheduling DCI for a scheduled cell. |

## DCI size and BD/CCE budget

|  |
| --- |
| * **Huawei, HiSilicon** * *Proposal 7: Existing “3+1” DCI size budget should be maintained.* * **ZTE** * *Proposal 7: It should be determined that BD/CCE of multi-cell scheduling DCI is counted in one scheduled cell only or each scheduled cell.* * **Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell** * *Proposal 3.4.2: The multi-cell DCI size(s) are not counted towards the DCI size budget (for DCI formats scrambled by C-RNTI) per serving cell and not considered in the related serving cell specific DCI size alignment procedure. Instead,* *the gNB will guarantee that across the K cells applicable for multi-cell DCI scheduling that the total budget of 3\*K DCI sizes is not exceeded.* * **Spreadtrum Communications** * *Proposal 9: For Case 0, the BD and CCE for the scheduled cell are calculated as the scheduling cell. For BD and CCE handling of Case 1 and 2, scaling factor in Rel-17 DSS can be used as a starting point* * **CATT** * *Proposal 5: On the premise that no new requirement of blind detection is introduced for multi-cells scheduling, the ‘3+1’budget of DCI format size should be maintained.* * **Vivo** * *Proposal 6. The mc-DCI should be counted as part of the BD budget of the scheduling cell instead of the BD budget of each scheduled cell.* * **Lenovo** * *Proposal 9: Existing “3+1” DCI size budget should be maintained when designing the DCI format for multi-cell scheduling in Rel-18 CA enhancement.* * **OPPO** * *Proposal 8: The procedure of DCI size alignment should be updated if necessary. Further discussion is needed.* * **Samsung** * *Proposal 7: Further discuss the “3+1” limit on UE budget for DCI sizes, including voiding the limit for the case of multi-cell scheduling.* * **Apple** * *Proposal 7: Study the handling of BD/CCE limit, and whether one cell can be scheduled by multiple cells.* * **NTT DOCOMO** * *Proposal 10: RAN1 should discuss the following aspects related to DCI design for multi-carrier PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling with a single DCI;* * *whether multi-cell scheduling DCI is supported by non-fallback DCI (0\_1/1\_1) or by new DCI* * *whether multi-cell scheduling DCI can also schedule single cell* * *whether DCI size budget (3+1) is maintained* * *Proposal 12: RAN1 should discuss the following aspects related to SS set configuration/monitoring capability and BD/CCE budget for multi-carrier PDSCH scheduling with a single DCI;* * *applicable PDCCH monitoring capability* * *BD/CCE budget for each cell* * *limitation on scheduling cell(s) for a scheduled cell* * **CMCC** * *Proposal 4. The DCI size of new multi-cell scheduling DCI format should be fixed regardless the number of cells it schedules each time.* * *Proposal 5. To maintain the restriction of DCI size budget for a serving cell when a new DCI size is introduced, the DCI size alignment can be performed only on one of the scheduled cells through network configuration or pre-defined rule.* * *Proposal 6. Multi-cell PUSCH/PDSCH scheduling with a single DCI should maintain the current PDCCH BD/CCE budget. The number of PDCCH candidates and non-overlapping CCEs corresponding to the new DCI format can be calculated only in one of the schedule cells.* * **Intel** * *Proposal 9* * *Single or multiple configurations for the DCI fields of the DCI format for multi-cell scheduling can be configured on the scheduling cell.* * *Single-cell scheduling may still be supported at least for a cell that cannot be scheduled by the DCI format for multi-cell scheduling.* * *Special handling on the DCI format for multi-cell scheduling is necessary for the DCI size budget and maximum number of BD/CCEs.* * **LG Electronics** * *Proposal #5: Discuss how to maintain the DCI size budget per cell in case with the multi-cell DCI, according to Approach 1/2/3.* * *Proposal #6**: Discuss how to configure the number of PDCCH candidates per AL for the multi-cell scheduling by single DCI, based on following three alternatives as a starting point.*   + *Alt 1: The number of PDCCH candidates per AL is configured for each scheduled cell schedulable by the multi-cell DCI.*   + *Alt 2: The number of PDCCH candidates per AL is configured for each combination of scheduled cells simultaneously schedulable by the multi-cell DCI.*   + *Alt 3: The number of PDCCH candidates per AL is configured for the multi-cell DCI itself without differentiating scheduled cells.* * **Ericsson** * *Proposal 6: When mc-DCI is configured for scheduling PUSCH/PDSCH on multiple cells, existing Rel-17 DCI size budget is maintained for each scheduled cell.* * *Proposal 7: Size of mc-DCI is explicitly configured by higher layers.* * *Proposal 8: Support independent configuration of mc-DCI for PUSCH and PDSCH.* * **Qualcomm:** * *Proposal 6: BD/CCE budget for each scheduled cell follows the legacy CA* * *If a UE monitors PDCCH candidates for a DCI that schedules data on up to a set of N cells, maximum numbers of BDs and non-overlapped CCEs for the DCI that schedules data on up to the set of N cells are capped by per-cell BD/CCE budget* * **FGI** * *Proposal 6: Discuss how to count the size of a DCI scheduling multiple cells towards the DCI size budgets.* * *Proposal 7: If a DCI scheduling multiple cells is defined as a new DCI format, the DCI size alignment procedure needs to be enhanced to take into account the new DCI format.* * **Fujitsu** * *Observation 1：For multi-cell PUSCH/PDSCH scheduling with a single DCI, it is necessary to discuss how to support PDCCH candidate configuration and determination.* |

### Moderator summary and proposals based on contributions

Based on conclusion of section 3.3, if new DCI format is introduced for scheduling multiple cells and the legacy DCI format is used for scheduling single cell, existing “3+1” DCI size budget may not be maintained since UE has to monitor DCI format 1-1 or 0-1 for single cell PDSCH or PUSCH scheduling, DCI format 1-X or 0-X for multi-cell PDSCH or PUSCH scheduling, and one fallback DCI format.

In legacy design, BDs/CCEs are counted for each scheduled cell. For multi-cell scheduling DCI which can schedule multiple cells, one issue is which cell the BD/CCE of the multi-cell scheduling DCI is counted for. Furthermore, if one cell can be scheduled by more than one cell, e.g., self-scheduling and cross-carrier scheduled by a multi-cell DCI on another cell, whether/how to split the BD/CCE budget between the multiple cells should also be considered.

Regarding the DCI size budget, 5 companies [Huawei, CATT, Lenovo, Ericsson, Qualcomm] propose existing “3+1” DCI size budget should be maintained. One company [Nokia] propose the DCI size budget not counted per cell and gNB guarantees that across the K cells applicable for multi-cell DCI scheduling that the total budget of 3\*K DCI sizes is not exceeded. One company [CMCC] propose the DCI size alignment can be performed only on one of the scheduled cells through network configuration or pre-defined rule and BD/CCE budget corresponding to the new DCI format can be calculated only in one of the schedule cells. One company [vivo] propose the mc-DCI should be counted as part of the BD budget of the scheduling cell instead of the BD budget of each scheduled cell. One company [Samsung] propose further discussing the “3+1” limit on UE budget for DCI sizes, including voiding the limit for the case of multi-cell scheduling.

Since the companies’ views are quite diverse, moderator suggests discussing the high-level principle first whether to keep existing “3+1” DCI size budget per scheduled cell. Then we can discuss details as long as we make conclusion.

### 1st round of discussions

#### Proposal 2-7:

* Further study DCI size budget based on below options if new DCI format is introduced for multi-cell scheduling:
* Option 1: Existing DCI size budget is maintained per scheduled cell.
  + Alt 1-1: via DCI size alignment
  + Alt 1-2: via configured size for multi-cell scheduling DCI
* Option 2: Existing DCI size budget is not necessarily maintained per scheduled cell.
  + Alt 2-1: DCI size budget of multi-cell scheduling DCI is counted only in one scheduled cell.
  + Alt 2-2: DCI size budget of multi-cell scheduling DCI is not counted per serving cell and not considered in the related serving cell specific DCI size alignment procedure, e.g., for K co-scheduled cells, gNB guarantee the total budget of 3\*K DCI sizes is not exceeded.
  + Alt 2-3: voiding the “3+1” limit for multi-cell scheduling

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Qualcomm | We support Option 1.  The size of the DCI format for multi-cell scheduling should be still within the “3+1” budget for each scheduled cell. We are not sure why “3+1” is not sufficient for a given scheduled cell.  For example, following should be the worst case example (if we conclude to agree 2nd bullet of P2-5):   * 1st size for C-RNTI => DCI 1\_0/0\_0 * 2nd size for C-RNTI => DCI 1\_1/0\_1 or DCI 1\_2/0\_2 * 3rd size for C-RNTI => DCI 0-X/1-X   This implies that the DCI 1\_2/0\_2 cannot have different size than DCI 1\_1/0\_1 when it is configured with DCI 0-X/1-X. However, we do not think this is a big deal. It is network’s choice either to use DCI for multi-cell scheduling, or DCI 1\_2/0\_2 that has different size than DCI 1\_1/0\_1. |
| Nokia/NSB | Agree with the intention, but the formulation may not be totally accurate for Option 1. Option 1 basically assumes that the MC-DCI size is considered for each scheduled cell – but this does not have anything to do with ‘mainining the DCI size budget per scheduled cell.  So would be better to change Option 1 description to:  Option 1: The MC-DCI size is considered for each of the scheduable cells and the existing DCI size budget is maintained per scheduled cell.   * + Alt 1-1: via DCI size alignment   + Alt 1-2: via configured size for multi-cell scheduling DCI   Having a configured MC-DCI size could also be applicable to Option 2 (so we think the alternatives for Option 2 may not need to be restricted for now). |
| OPPO | Alt 1-1. Given limited TU for this WI, we do not prefer to change fundamental UE procedure for DCI monitoring. |
| Xiaomi | We are fine to further study the options. |
| Fujitsu | One clarification question:  In the proposal, when talking about DCI size budget using “scheduled cell”, is the “scheduled cell” be either a scheduling cell or a scheduled cell in context of cross carrier scheduling? |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support the Proposal. Regarding the options whether to maintain the current DCI size budget, we are open at this point. |
| Langbo | Support this proposal. |
| LG | We support Alt 1-1 or Alt 2-1 (BTW, we think Alt 2-1 is to be under Option 1 since the multi-cell DCI, anyhow, is counted in cell-level).  We believe that the right direction is to inherit the purpose of the DCI size budget and the monitoring behaviour of the UE. Since multi-cell DCI can have multiple scheduled cells unlike the legacy single-cell DCI, it should be discussed whether to apply the DCI size budget to each scheduled cell or to one of the scheduled cells. |
| CMCC | We prefer Alt 2-1, the DCI size alignment is only performed on one cell, and the DCI sizes of other cells are not impacted by the new multi-cell scheduling DCI format, which can still maintain the current restriction of DCI size budget as the specification for each cell. For example, the scheduled cell can be the cell which the total number of different DCI sizes with C-RNTI configured to monitor is smaller than 3 or the cell with the smallest bit difference between the maximum legacy DCI size and the new DCI size.  For Alt 1-1, If DCI size alignment is performed on each scheduled cell as current spec definition, many padding bits are needed to align the size of legacy DCI to the size of multi-cell scheduling DCI, which increases the DCI payload size of legacy DCI and decrease the PDCCH detection performance. |
| Moderator | The intention of this proposal is to try to list all the possible options for companies to check them.  @Fujitsu: It is “scheduled cell” as legacy spec defines the DCI size budget per scheduled cell. Maybe I miss your point. Please correct me. |
| ZTE | We have a question for clarification. In option 1, existing DCI size budget is maintained per scheduled cell. How to count the DCI size budget for the multi-cell scheduling DCI. It is counted for one scheduled cell or each scheduled cell.  In addition, this issue exists only for new DCI format. There is no issue for the extension of the legacy DCI. |
| MTK | Same view as LG. |
| Intel | We prefer Option 2. We suggest to add two more alternatives   * Alt 2-4: the DCI size budget for DCI size alignment can be separately configured for each cell * Alt 2-5: DCI size budget of the scheduling cell can be increased to account for the DCI format for multi-cell scheduling. Accordingly, the DCI size budget of a scheduled cell can be reduced |
| vivo | We would like ask for clarification for alt1-2, how this alternative works? Does it mean gnb will configure a DCI size that may be the same as another DCI (e.g., DCI format 1-1) for mc-DCI to keep size budget?  We are generally Ok to study these options, but we suggest discuss them later and focus on the more fundamental part such as whether the number of scheduled cell can eb dynamically changed, whether the mc-DCI can be used for single-cell scheduling. |
| InterDigital | Support FL proposal. |
| Ericsson1 | OK to discuss based on the listed options as starting point, noting that other alternatives are not precluded. |
| Apple | Similar to Ericsson, we think the list can be used as the starting point for discussion, and we should add a bullet saying that “other alternatives are not precluded”.  A clarification question: for “Option 1: Existing DCI size budget is maintained per scheduled cell”, which scheduled cell(s) should a multi-cell scheduling DCI be counted towards? |
| Samsung | Before deciding on this issue, some basic aspects need to be clarified about how does the UE determine a size of a multi-cell scheduling DCI format:   * For a scheduling cell, a UE can be configured with one or multiple sets of co-scheduled cells, and the MC-DCI format 0-X/1-X can indicate different combinations of co-scheduled cells. Does the DCI size depend on the actually co-scheduled cells or is it always dimensioned to some maximum value?   Regarding FL proposal 2-7, dropping the “3+1” DCI size budget restriction should be considered. This restriction was placed in Rel-15 to be compatible with some early modem designs and does not affect UE complexity. It has been kept in later releases but it only introduces specification impact and inefficiencies due to padding without being of any meaningful benefit to new modem designs for new releases (in this case, for multi-cell scheduling). |
| CATT | OK to discuss with the proposal and option 1 is our preferred. On the premise that no new requirement of blind detection is introduced for multi-cells scheduling, the ‘3+1’budget of DCI format size should be maintained. |
| Moderator2 | @ZTE: for option 1: the intention is to count per each scheduled cell.  @Nokia: I make below update to address your concern.  @LG: Alt 2-1 is to select one of scheduled cell. Option 1 is to consider size budget per each scheduled cell.  @all: the intention is to list all the possible options and we can down-select further. (Updated) Proposal 2-7:  * Further study DCI size budget based on below options if new DCI format is introduced for multi-cell scheduling: * Option 1: Existing DCI size budget is maintained per scheduled cell and DCI size budget of DCI format 0\_X/1\_X is considered for each of the co-scheduled cells.   + Alt 1-1: DCI size budget is maintained via DCI size alignment   + Alt 1-2: DCI size budget is maintained via configured size for multi-cell scheduling DCI * Option 2: Existing DCI size budget is not necessarily maintained per scheduled cell.   + Alt 2-1: DCI size budget of multi-cell scheduling DCI is counted only in one scheduled cell.   + Alt 2-2: DCI size budget of multi-cell scheduling DCI is not counted per serving cell and not considered in the related serving cell specific DCI size alignment procedure, e.g., for K co-scheduled cells, gNB guarantee the total budget of 3\*K DCI sizes is not exceeded.   + Alt 2-3: voiding the “3+1” limit for multi-cell scheduling * Other options could be considered. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support Option 1.  Alt 1-1 is also OK for us when the case of four DCI sizes happens (DCI X-0, DCI X-1, DCI X-2, new DCI formats). As for Alt 1-2, besides maintaining the DCI size budget via configured size for multi-cell scheduling DCI, maybe some restrictions can be defined in the configuration, for example, restrictions on UE to avoid monitoring the new DCI formats for multi-cell scheduling and DCI format X-2 at the same time. From our perspective, Alt 1-2 has fewer standard impacts. |
| Moderator3 | @Apple: Regarding your comments on which scheduled cell(s) should a multi-cell scheduling DCI be counted towards, in option 1, each scheduled cell is counted.  @Samsung: DCI size should not depend on the actually co-scheduled cells. It has to be decied based on the maximum value which the UE supports. |
|  |  |

#### Proposal 2-8:

* Further study BD/CCE budget for multi-cell scheduling DCI based on below options:
* Alt 1: follow legacy BD/CCE budget for each scheduled cell
* Alt 2: counted only in one scheduled cell
* Alt 3: scaled down to each of co-scheduled cell according to the number of co-scheduled cells
* Alt 4: counted as part of the scheduling cell instead of each scheduled cell

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Qualcomm | P2-8:  We believe Alt.1 is not an alternative – this is a baseline/default to realize the feature with a reasonable UE implementation. |
| Nokia/NSB | The alternatives to be considered do not need to be restricted now (… also additional alternatives could be still considered). |
| Fujitsu | We agree the budget issue should be studied. However. It seems premature to discuss it for the timing being. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We also think Alt.1 should be the baseline unless there is an issue on the current BD/CCE budget design for multi-cell scheduling DCI. |
| Langbo | We prefer to postpone this discussion until search space and DCI format design is stable. |
| LG | OK to further study, but we think specific alternative could be considered later since it would depend on other relevant aspects. |
| CMCC | We think that multi-cell PUSCH/PDSCH scheduling with a single DCI should maintain the current PDCCH BD/CCE budget. While the number of PDCCH candidates and non-overlapping CCEs corresponding to the new DCI format can be counted only in one specific cell of the schedule cells.  If the number of PDCCH candidates and non-overlapping CCEs corresponding to the new multi-cell scheduling DCI format are calculated for each scheduled cell, the number of monitored PDCCH candidates and non-overlapping CCEs actually detected by UE will be less than the total calculated number, which will lead to a waste of PDCCH detection capability. In order to avoid the repeated calculation and effectively utilize PDCCH detection capability, a specific scheduled cell could be determined through network configuration, and the number of PDCCH candidates as well as non-overlapping CCEs corresponding to the new DCI format will only be calculated in this cell. |
| ZTE | First, we guess the current BD/CCE budget should increase.  We are fine with this proposal. We think this also depends on CIF design. If each schedule cell has independent CIF value, then blind decode in each USS associated each nCI will be counted in each scheduled cell, Alt.1 can be used as legacy. If the multiple cells are configured with same CIF, then Alt 2/3/4 can be considered. |
| Intel | One clarification on Alt 3, is it to scale and count the BD/CCE to all scheduled cells including the scheduling cell assuming the scheduling cell can also be scheduled?  With the above understanding, we suggest to add one more alternative   * Alt 5: scaled down to each of non-scheduling cells |
| vivo | Ok to study but we suggest discuss this later, now the framework of the multi-PXSCH is not clear, prefer to discuss such details after determining the framework |
| InterDigital | OK with proposal, but this may not be the most urgent issue. |
| Ericsson1 | OK to discuss based on the listed options as starting point, noting that other alternatives are not precluded. |
| Apple | We think the list can be used as the starting point for discussion, and we should add a bullet saying that “other alternatives are not precluded”.  A clarification question: for “Alt 1: follow legacy BD/CCE budget for each scheduled cell”, which scheduled cell(s) should a multi-cell scheduling DCI be counted towards? |
| Samsung | OK with the proposal. A conclusion may be based on consideration of other aspects and can be discussed jointly. |
| CATT | We are ok with the proposal to discuss. One clarification is that what’s the difference between Alt1 and Alt 2? Per our understanding, Alt 1 means the BD/CCE budget is counted in each scheduled cell that scheduling by mc-DCI. We suggest to modify Alt1 as ncluding:   * Alt 1: counted on each scheduled cells that follows legacy BD/CCE budget. |
| Moderator | @all: the intention is to list all the possible options and we can down-select further. (Updated)Proposal 2-8:  * Further study BD/CCE budget for multi-cell scheduling DCI based on below options: * Alt 1: follow legacy BD/CCE budget for each scheduled cell * Alt 2: counted only in one scheduled cell * Alt 3: scaled down to each of co-scheduled cell according to the number of co-scheduled cells * Alt 4: counted as part of the scheduling cell instead of each scheduled cell * Other alternatives could be considered. |
| Moderator2 | @Intel: yes, intention of Alt 3 is to scale down to each of the co-scheduled cells. It ncluding scheduling cell if it is also scheduled.  @Intel: could you elaborate why the BD/CCE budget is scaled down to each of non-scheudling cells?  @Apple: Regarding your comments on which scheduled cell(s) should a multi-cell scheduling DCI be counted towards, in option 1, each scheduled cell is counted.  @CATT: ok to make it clear. |

### 2nd round of discussions

#### Proposal 2-7:

* Further study DCI size budget based on below options if new DCI format is introduced for multi-cell scheduling:
* Option 1: Existing DCI size budget is maintained per scheduled cell and DCI size budget of DCI format 0\_X/1\_X is counted for each of the co-scheduled cells.
  + Alt 1-1: DCI size budget is maintained via DCI size alignment
  + Alt 1-2: DCI size budget is maintained via configured size for multi-cell scheduling DCI
* Option 2: Existing DCI size budget is not necessarily maintained per scheduled cell.
  + Alt 2-1: DCI size budget of multi-cell scheduling DCI is counted only in one scheduled cell.
  + Alt 2-2: DCI size budget of multi-cell scheduling DCI is not counted per serving cell and not considered in the related serving cell specific DCI size alignment procedure, e.g., for K co-scheduled cells, gNB guarantee the total budget of 3\*K DCI sizes is not exceeded.
  + Alt 2-3: voiding the “3+1” limit for multi-cell scheduling
  + Alt 2-4: the DCI size budget for DCI size alignment can be separately configured for each cell
  + Alt 2-5: DCI size budget of the scheduling cell can be increased to account for the DCI format for multi-cell scheduling. Accordingly, the DCI size budget of a scheduled cell can be reduced.
* Other options/alternatives could be considered.

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| New H3C | We are fine with main bullet of two options and detail alternative can be FFS |
| Qualcomm | OK with the proposal.  We do not see the problem of “3+1” size budget per scheduled cell and we do not see the need of increasing “3+1” size budget per scheduled cell. For now, we are fine with P2-7. |
| Nokia/NSB | Ok |
| Apple | OK with the proposal. |
| LG | We think Alt 2-1 should be under Option 1 to differentiate from Alt 2-5 under Option 2. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support this FL Proposal. |
| Xiaomi | Fine |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Samsung2 | We are OK to study options to address potential DCI size budget issues.  However, there needs to be some discussion and decision first on how to determine the size of the MC-DCI format. Agree with Moderator’s response that, the size of MC-DCI format should not depend on the size of the actually co-scheduled cells by the DCI. However, a UE can be configured multiple scheduling cells with potentially different sizes for corresponding sets of co-scheduled cells, and with different search space configurations. |
| Ericsson2 | OK. |
| MTK | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Moderator | @LG: In Alt 2-1, only one scheduled cell is selected for counting size budget which is different to option 1 where DCI size budget is considered for each of the co-scheduled cells. In Alt 2-5, if my understanding is correct, both scheduling cell and scheduled cell are considered with different budgets. Please proponent company correct me if I am wrong.  @Samsung: the size determination may be discussed after we have conclusion on DCI field types. |
| CMCC | OK with the proposal. |
| Fujitsu | OK with the proposal. |
| Langbo | OK with the proposal. |
| CATT | OK with the proposal. |
| ZTE | We are fine with the proposal. |
| LG | @FL: Thank you for providing the reply.  But even in case with Alt 2-1, we think the existing DCI size budget can be maintained per scheduled cell. This was the reason why I commented the Alt 2-1 is to be under Option 1. In this sense, the P2-7 can be updated as below. (updated) Proposal 2-7:  * Further study DCI size budget based on below options if new DCI format is introduced for multi-cell scheduling: * Option 1: Existing DCI size budget is maintained per scheduled cell ~~and DCI size budget of DCI format 0\_X/1\_X is counted for each of the co-scheduled cells.~~   + Alt 1-1: DCI size budget is maintained via DCI size alignment and DCI size budget of DCI format 0\_X/1\_X is counted for each of the co-scheduled cells.   + Alt 1-2: DCI size budget is maintained via configured size for multi-cell scheduling DCI and DCI size budget of DCI format 0\_X/1\_X is counted for each of the co-scheduled cells.   + Alt 1-3: DCI size budget is maintained via DCI size alignment and DCI size budget of multi-cell scheduling DCI is counted only in one scheduled cell. * Option 2: Existing DCI size budget is not necessarily maintained per scheduled cell.   + Alt 2-1: DCI size budget of multi-cell scheduling DCI is counted only in one scheduled cell.   + Alt 2-2: DCI size budget of multi-cell scheduling DCI is not counted per serving cell and not considered in the related serving cell specific DCI size alignment procedure, e.g., for K co-scheduled cells, gNB guarantee the total budget of 3\*K DCI sizes is not exceeded.   + Alt 2-3: voiding the “3+1” limit for multi-cell scheduling   + Alt 2-4: the DCI size budget for DCI size alignment can be separately configured for each cell   + Alt 2-5: DCI size budget of the scheduling cell can be increased to account for the DCI format for multi-cell scheduling. Accordingly, the DCI size budget of a scheduled cell can be reduced. * Other options/alternatives could be considered. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Ok |
| Samsung3 | The proposal is unclear in the absence of concrete discussion on search space configuration and other PDCCH monitoring aspects.  The UE determines DCI size/budget based on search space set configuration, before decoding the DCI format. So, when referring to “*for each of the co-scheduled cells*” or “*for one scheduled cell*” or “*for K co-scheduled cells*”, is the intention the set of actually co-scheduled cells by the DCI format, or is it based on a configured set of co-scheduled cells (which can be one or multiple sets/subsets), or is it based on the search space configuration for MD-DCI monitoring? Also, how is the DCI size dimensioned?   * For example, if UE is configured Set#1 = {cell#1, cell#2} and Set#2 = {cell#2, cell#3, cell#4, cell#5}, then a MC-DCI format is counted for cells in Set#1 or Set#2? * Is the UE required to always monitor MC-DCI format for both Set#1 and Set#2 in a search space set that indicates MC-DCI monitoring, or is it up to gNB configuration? * Is the MC-DCI size dimensioned based on Set#1 or Set#2?   Such aspects need to be discussed and decided first before making progress on this proposal.  Also, editorial suggestions on the wording in Option 1: “… DCI size ~~budget~~ of DCI format 0\_X/1\_X is counted…” Similar suggestion to remove “budget” in Alt-2-1 and Alt2-2. Also, not sure about the intention of Alt-2-4 (I thought that was to capture Nokia’s proposal similar to Alt-1-2, but the wording in Alt-2-4 is very confusing). |
| Moderator2 | @LG: Ok to make it clearer.  @All: please check the update form LG as below: (updated) Proposal 2-7:  * Further study DCI size budget based on below options if new DCI format is introduced for multi-cell scheduling: * Option 1: Existing DCI size budget is maintained per scheduled cell ~~and DCI size budget of DCI format 0\_X/1\_X is counted for each of the co-scheduled cells.~~   + Alt 1-1: DCI size budget is maintained via DCI size alignment and DCI size budget of DCI format 0\_X/1\_X is counted for each of the co-scheduled cells.   + Alt 1-2: DCI size budget is maintained via configured size for multi-cell scheduling DCI and DCI size budget of DCI format 0\_X/1\_X is counted for each of the co-scheduled cells.   + Alt 1-3: DCI size budget is maintained via DCI size alignment and DCI size budget of multi-cell scheduling DCI is counted only in one scheduled cell. * Option 2: Existing DCI size budget is not necessarily maintained per scheduled cell.   + Alt 2-1: DCI size budget of multi-cell scheduling DCI is counted only in one scheduled cell.   + Alt 2-2: DCI size budget of multi-cell scheduling DCI is not counted per serving cell and not considered in the related serving cell specific DCI size alignment procedure, e.g., for K co-scheduled cells, gNB guarantee the total budget of 3\*K DCI sizes is not exceeded.   + Alt 2-3: voiding the “3+1” limit for multi-cell scheduling   + Alt 2-4: the DCI size budget for DCI size alignment can be separately configured for each cell   + Alt 2-5: DCI size budget of the scheduling cell can be increased to account for the DCI format for multi-cell scheduling. Accordingly, the DCI size budget of a scheduled cell can be reduced. * Other options/alternatives could be considered. |
| Moderator3 | @ALL: Please provide your comments directly in next section for new round of discussions. |

#### Proposal 2-8:

* Further study BD/CCE budget for multi-cell scheduling DCI based on below options:
* Alt 1: counted on each co-scheduled cell following legacy BD/CCE budget
* Alt 2: counted only in one scheduled cell
* Alt 3: scaled down to each of co-scheduled cell according to the number of co-scheduled cells
* Alt 4: counted as part of the scheduling cell instead of each scheduled cell
* Other alternatives could be considered.

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Apple | OK with the proposal. I think we should also add that the BD/CCE budget per cell is not increased compared to R15/16/17. |
| LG | We think it may be better to list consideration points (as the followings) on PDCCH monitoring aspects related to multi-cell scheduling DCI, rather than listing specific options only focusing on BD/CCE budget at this stage.   * How to configure the number of PDCCH candidates for multi-cell scheduling DCI * How to handle/perform BD/CCE budget/counting for multi-cell scheduling DCI * How to determine n\_CI value and compose SS set for multi-cell scheduling DCI |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support this FL Proposal. |
| Intel | We prefer to separate the issue into two aspects   * Whether to reuse the legacy BD/CCE budget or how to adjust it? * How to count the number of BD/CCE of a PDCCH candidate of DCI format 0\_X/1\_X?   It seems the current proposal 2-8 is mainly on 2), however, legacy BD/CCE budget is only mentioned in Alt 1.  For the Alt. 5, sorry for the confusion on our early comment, please see the following update with a new alternative, which is based on Alt. 1   * Alt 5: scaled down to each of scheduled cells excluding scheduling cell * Alt 6: counted on each co-scheduled cell excluding scheduling cell following legacy BD/CCE budget |
| Moderator | @Apple: yes, I agree with you. In Alt 1, following legacy BD/CCE budget per cell does not increase BD/CCE budget in Rel15~17. For other alternatives, I am not sure whether proponent companies agree with this. Since the intention is to list candidate solutions in this meeting, we can perform down-selection next meeting.  @LG: I think all your listed issues are directly relevant to BD/CCE budget. Maybe we don’t need list them since companies should have same understanding, I guess.  @Intel: I think 1st issue should be considered for each alternative. Ok to add Alt 5 and 6. |
| CMCC | We are fine with the proposal. We think that maintaining the current PDCCH BD/CCE budget for multi-cell PUSCH/PDSCH scheduling with a single DCI can be a baseline. |
| Fujitsu | OK with the proposal. |
| Langbo | OK with the proposal. |
| Qualcomm | OK with the proposal. |
| CATT | OK with the proposal. |
| ZTE | We are fine with this proposal. |
| LG | @FL: Thank you for providing the reply.  I see your consideration. |
| Samsung3 | Agree with Apple/Intel/CMCC that multi-cell scheduling should not lead to any changes for BD/CCE budget compared to Rel-17. Then, the options in the FL proposal can be used to discuss how BD/CCEs for MC-DCI are counted towards those limits. So, suggest the following modification: Proposal 2-8:  * A UE configured with multi-cell scheduling DCI determines the BD/CCE limits same as in Rel-17 BD/CCE limits (i.e., with single-cell scheduling only) * Further study BD/CCE ~~budget~~ counting for multi-cell scheduling DCI towards the Rel-17 BD/CCE limits based on below options: * Alt 1: counted on each co-scheduled cell ~~following legacy BD/CCE budget~~ * Alt 2: counted only in one scheduled cell * Alt 3: scaled down to each of co-scheduled cell according to the number of co-scheduled cells * Alt 4: counted as part of the scheduling cell instead of each scheduled cell * Other alternatives could be considered. |
| MTK | OK with the proposal. |
| Moderator3 | @ALL: Please provide your comments directly in next section for new round of discussions. |

### 3rd round of discussions

#### Proposal 2-7:

* Further study DCI size budget including below options if new DCI format is introduced for multi-cell scheduling:
* Option 1: Existing DCI size budget is maintained per scheduled cell ~~and DCI size budget of DCI format 0\_X/1\_X is counted for each of the co-scheduled cells.~~
  + Alt 1-1: DCI size budget is maintained via DCI size alignment and DCI size budget of DCI format 0\_X/1\_X is counted for each of the co-scheduled cells.
  + Alt 1-2: DCI size budget is maintained via configured size for multi-cell scheduling DCI and DCI size budget of DCI format 0\_X/1\_X is counted for each of the co-scheduled cells.
  + Alt 1-3: DCI size budget is maintained via DCI size alignment and DCI size budget of multi-cell scheduling DCI is counted only in one scheduled cell.
* Option 2: Existing DCI size budget is not necessarily maintained per scheduled cell.
  + Alt 2-1: DCI size budget of multi-cell scheduling DCI is counted only in one scheduled cell.
  + Alt 2-2: DCI size budget of multi-cell scheduling DCI is not counted per serving cell and not considered in the related serving cell specific DCI size alignment procedure, e.g., for K co-scheduled cells, gNB guarantee the total budget of 3\*K DCI sizes is not exceeded.
  + Alt 2-3: voiding the “3+1” limit for multi-cell scheduling
  + Alt 2-4: the DCI size budget for DCI size alignment can be separately configured for each cell
  + Alt 2-5: DCI size budget of the scheduling cell can be increased to account for the DCI format for multi-cell scheduling. Accordingly, the DCI size budget of a scheduled cell can be reduced.
* Other options/alternatives could be considered.

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Apple | OK |
| Spreadtrum | For Alt2-1, DCI size budget of multi-cell scheduling DCI is counted only in one scheduled cell, our understanding is existing DCI size budget is not maintained for this scheduled cell, but maintained for the other scheduled cells. If so, it can change into “Alt 2-1: DCI size budget of multi-cell scheduling DCI is counted only in one scheduled cell which does not maintain the existing DCI size budge”, to distinguish with Alt1-3.  In addition, we think one important issue has not been discussed is the association between the search space of DCI0\_X/1\_X and scheduling cell/co-scheduled cells. This association is the fundamental for DCI size budget and BD/CCE limits. Considering this, there is some relationship between DCI size counting and BD/CCE counting. Thus, we prefer to add a “FFS the relationship with BD and CCE counting method” as a bullet.  For example, the following is our understanding towards their relation between P2-7 and P2-8:   * Alt 1-1/1-2 of Option 1 assume Alt1 in P2-8; * Alt 1-3/2-1 assume Alt 2 in P2-8 * Alt 2-5 assumes Alt 4 in P2-8 * Not sure about Alt 2-2/2-3/2-4 |
| Qualcomm | On the first main bullet, we propose to slightly change to “Further study DCI size budgetincluding ~~based on~~ below options if new DCI format is introduced for multi-cell scheduling” since other options/alternatives could be considered.  In addition, we would like to point out following our understanding:   * Although the current spec specifies “3+1” DCI size budget, it allows more than “3+1” when DCI size adaptation/switch is allowed for a scheduled cell.   + For example, UE monitors various DCI sizes when active DL BWP is switched – total number across BWPs could exceed “3+1” budget. * The proposal here does not preclude similar possibility of adaptation/change of DCI sizes. |
| Moderator | @Spreadtrum: Regarding Alt 2-1, I checked the contributions of proponent companies. My understanding is they prefer existing DCI size budget is maintained for the selected scheduled cell. Regarding the second comment, I agree with you that search space configuration for DCI format 0-X/1-X is important and plan such discussions after current proposals are concluded. |
| Vivo | OK |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal. |
| New H3C | OK |
| Nokia/NSB | OK |
| LG | OK |
| Fujitsu | OK with the proposal |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support this proposal. |
| ZTE | We are fine with the proposal. |
| CMCC | We are fine with the proposal |
| Langbo | OK with the proposal. |
| Samsung4 | Since this proposal is for study, we are OK for progress in view of majority view and FL plans for considering other PDCCH monitoring aspects in the next step. Agree with QC’s suggestion to replace “based on” with “including”. |
| Moderator | @Qualcomm @Samsung: Ok to replace “based on” with “including”. |
| CATT | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Apple | OK with the proposed update. |
| Ericsson4 | OK. |
| Spreadtrum | Thank you FL for explanation, we are fine to further discuss the configuration of search space, and BD/CCE counting etc. We support the proposal. |
| China Telecom | Regarding Moderator’s interpretation on Alt 2-1, “My understanding is they prefer existing DCI size budget is maintained for the selected scheduled cell”, then the main bullet Existing DCI size budget is not necessarily maintained refers scheduled cells other than the one selected scheduled cell? Maybe we have some misunderstanding. |
| Moderator2 | @China Telecom: The main bullet of Option 2 is referring to the case where existing DCI size budget is not necessarily maintained for each of co-scheduled cells, e.g., in Alt 2-1, the selected scheduled cell may exceed DCI size budget while other scheduled cells not. |
| LG | We are also Ok to replace “based on” with “including”. |
| Moderator3 | @LG @Qualcomm @Samsung: OK to me. “based on” has been replaced with “including” in the main bullet. |
| MTK | We suggest to revise:   * Alt 2-1: DCI size budget of multi-cell scheduling DCI is counted only in one scheduled/scheduling cell   and we are fine with other parts. |
| Moderator4 | @MTK: for multi-cell scheduling, DCI 0-X/1-X is transmitted from one scheduling cell to schedule multiple scheduled cells. I am not sure why the size budget of DCI 0-X/1-X is counted only one scheduling cell means. Could it elaborate it? |

#### Proposal 2-8:

* A UE configured with multi-cell scheduling DCI determines the BD/CCE limits same as in Rel-17 BD/CCE limits (i.e., with single-cell scheduling only)
* Further study BD/CCE ~~budget~~ counting for multi-cell scheduling DCI towards the Rel-17 BD/CCE limits based on below options:
* Alt 1: counted on each co-scheduled cell ~~following legacy BD/CCE budget~~
* Alt 2: counted only in one scheduled cell
* Alt 3: scaled down to each of co-scheduled cell according to the number of co-scheduled cells
* Alt 4: counted as part of the scheduling cell instead of each scheduled cell
* Other alternatives could be considered.

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Apple | OK |
| Spreadtrum | We are generally fine with the proposal, and want to add a “FFS the association between the search space sets of DCI0\_X/1\_X and scheduling cell/co-scheduled cells”.  Similar comments as P2-7, the association between the search space sets of DCI0\_X/1\_X and scheduling cell/co-scheduled cells should be discussed before the BD/CCE limits. The above alternatives require different associations.   * Alt1 means there are separate search space set configurations for each co-scheduled cell, BD and CCE for each of SS set should be counted. * Alt2 only configure SS sets on one scheduled cell. BD and CCE only counts on this specific cell. * Alt3 treats the SS sets as an entirety, and divided the BD and CCE into each scheduled cell. Although Alt 1 and Alt3 have a same SS set association, Alt 3 only counts once of BD and non-overlapped CCE per PDCCH candidates in search space 1. * Alt4 only put SS sets on scheduling cell, meanwhile does not configure SS sets on co-scheduled cell. So it can be considered as the contribution from the scheduling cell.   The following figure we give our understanding for Alt1~4.    Alt 1 Alt2    Alt3 Alt4 |
| Moderator | @Spreadtrum: For SS configuration on DCI format 0-X/1-X, I kind of think it is separate issue to BD/CCE budget handling. E.g., for Alt 1, it only mentions BD/CCE budget handling is per scheduled cell which may not lead to the SS configuration as you draw. Similar to other alts. |
| Vivo | OK |
| Intel | For the BD/CCE limits, it seems better to separate discuss and . For , it seems fine to reuse the existing solution in Rel-17. On the other hand, for , two options may be studied that fit with the different options in the second main bullet.   * A UE configured with multi-cell scheduling DCI determines or same as in Rel-17 BD/CCE limits (i.e., with single-cell scheduling only) * A UE configured with multi-cell scheduling DCI determines or based on the following options   + Alt 1-1: it is same as in Rel-17 BD/CCE limits (i.e., with single-cell scheduling only)   + Alt 1-2: it can be different from Rel-17 BD/CCE limits (i.e., with single-cell scheduling only)   Further, as we mentioned in the first round, we propose to add   * Alt 5: scaled down to each of scheduled cells excluding scheduling cell * Alt 6: counted on each co-scheduled cell excluding scheduling cell following legacy BD/CCE budget |
| Nokia/NSB | OK |
| LG | OK |
| Fujitsu | OK with the proposal |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support this proposal. |
| MTK | Fine with the proposal |
| ZTE | We are fine with the proposal. |
| CMCC | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Langbo | We are generally fine with the proposal. Share similar views as Intel that separate discussions on and may be clearer. |
| Samsung4 | Fine with the proposal |
| Moderator | @Intel: I think Alt 3 can cover both Alt 5 and Alt 6. Further details can be discussed when we perform down-selection. |
| CATT | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Ericsson4 | Not OK – the case of sSCell scheduling Pcell should not be precluded. Suggest below updates (in red)   * A UE configured with multi-cell scheduling DCI determines the BD/CCE limits same as ~~in~~ Rel-17 BD/CCE limits ~~(i.e., with single-cell scheduling only)~~ * Further study BD/CCE ~~budget~~ counting for multi-cell scheduling DCI towards the Rel-17 BD/CCE limits based on below options: * Alt 1: counted on each co-scheduled cell ~~following legacy BD/CCE budget~~ * Alt 2: counted only in one scheduled cell * Alt 3: scaled down to each of co-scheduled cell according to the number of co-scheduled cells * Alt 4: counted as part of the scheduling cell instead of each scheduled cell * Other alternatives could be considered. |
| Spreadtrum | Thank you FL for explanation. From our understanding, all the BD/CCE counting is based on its own search space sets. So if a SS is not configured for a cell, UE does not count the BD/CCE of this cell. For example, for cross carrier scheduling, although the PDCCH of a scheduled cell is on the scheduling cell. There is a SS configuration under the scheduled cell and connected to the SS with the same ID on scheduling cell. BD/CCE counting based on its own SS configuration, including separate AL and candidate number. Thus for multi-cell scheduling, there is a relationship of BD/CCE counting and SS design.  We can live with the proposal, considering the search space is discussed later. |
| China Telecom | We are fine with the proposal |
| Moderator2 | @Ericsson: OK to me. Let’s check companies’ views.  @All: update on the first bullet. (Updated)Proposal 2-8:  * A UE configured with multi-cell scheduling DCI determines the BD/CCE limits same as Rel-17 BD/CCE limits * Further study BD/CCE ~~budget~~ counting for multi-cell scheduling DCI towards the Rel-17 BD/CCE limits based on below options: * Alt 1: counted on each co-scheduled cell ~~following legacy BD/CCE budget~~ * Alt 2: counted only in one scheduled cell * Alt 3: scaled down to each of co-scheduled cell according to the number of co-scheduled cells * Alt 4: counted as part of the scheduling cell instead of each scheduled cell * Other alternatives could be considered. |
| Qualcomm | Sorry for the late input, but could you elaborate what does “same as Rel-17 BD/CCE limits” mean? Same numbers of BDs and CCEs as in Rel-17, or same way of determining the BD/CCE limits as in Rel-17, or etc?  We suggest to delete the first bullet. It seems the second bullet already covers everything that want to be captured for P2-8. |
| MTK | Sorry for the late input, after reading QC’s comment, it does seem that the second bullet may create new BD/CCE determination rule, so we also suggest to remove the first bullet to avoid potential contradiction. |
| Nokia/NSB | We agree with QC, that the first bullet seems to ambiguous on the meaning there. |
| LG | Fine with the updated P2-8, except for the first bullet.  We have similar view with QC, it is better to remove the bullet, or to make the meaning or intention clearer. |
| Moderator3 | OK to remove the first bullet. (Updated)Proposal 2-8rev:  * Further study BD/CCE ~~budget~~ counting for multi-cell scheduling DCI towards the Rel-17 BD/CCE limits based on below options: * Alt 1: counted on each co-scheduled cell ~~following legacy BD/CCE budget~~ * Alt 2: counted only in one scheduled cell * Alt 3: scaled down to each of co-scheduled cell according to the number of co-scheduled cells * Alt 4: counted as part of the scheduling cell instead of each scheduled cell * Other alternatives could be considered. |
| MTK | Support |
| Samsung6 | We are OK with the new revision, although we prefer the previous wording in “Moderator2” which would provide more progress.  To respond to question from QC, the intention of the first bullet is that, determination of BD/CCE limits are based on and parameters, which depend only on the number of scheduled cells and numerology of corresponding scheduling cells – none of which are impacted by the multi-cell scheduling feature. Therefore, Rel-17 BD/CCE limits can be re-used for a UE with multi-cell scheduling configuration. Then, how to count the BD/CCEs corresponding to an MC-DCI towards those BD/CCE limits can be further discussed using the options listed by the FL. |
| Ericsson5 | OK with (Updated)Proposal 2-8rev. |
| Qualcomm | OK with (Updated)Proposal 2-8rev.  Thanks, Samsung6 for elaboration. Unless the intention is clearly written, it should be good to delete the first bullet for now. |

## Single or two-stage DCI

|  |
| --- |
| * **China Telecom** * *Proposal 7: For the multi-cell scheduling DCI, both options are considered and evaluated by RAN1:* * *Option 1: The bit number of the multi-cell scheduling DCI is semi-statically determined, dedicated fields are mapped to the RRC configured cells that can be scheduled by the DCI.* * *Option 2: There are two stages of the multi-cell scheduling DCI when multiple cells are scheduled, and the bit number of the second stage DCI scales with the actually scheduled cells.* * **InterDigital** * *Proposal 3: Support two-stage DCI for multi-cell scheduling where the scheduling information are carried using two DCIs.* * **MediaTek** * *Proposal 2: RAN1 to adopt a 2-segment DCI structure (as shown in Figure 2©) to support R18 multi-cell PUSCH/PDSCH scheduling with a single DCI.* * *Proposal 4: For the 2-segment aggregated DCI, the 1st and 2nd segment DCI are decoded separately on the same scheduling cell. The 1st and 2nd segment DCI are then linked together to form one multi-cell scheduling DCI. The link procedure of 1st and 2nd segment DCI can be based on some designated DCI bit values of the 1st or 2nd segment DCI* * *The linked 1st segment and 2nd segment DCI should be “both DL scheduling DCIs” or “both UL scheduling DCIs”* * **Samsung**   *Proposal 4: For a multi-cell scheduling DCI format, further consider the following three mechanisms:*   1. *single ‘concatenated’ DCI format in a PDCCH;* 2. *DCI format for multi-cell scheduling multiplexed in a PDSCH (a.k.a., two-stage DCI with 2nd stage on a PDSCH);* 3. *two-stage DCI on linked PDCCHs.* |

### Moderator summary and proposals based on contributions

Regarding the multi-cell scheduling DCI, 4 companies [China Telecom, MediaTek, InterDigital, Samsung] propose support/study of two-stage DCI, where the first stage DCI contains the scheduled cell indicator, common fields for multiple scheduled cells, scheduling information bits for second stage DCI. The scheduling information bits for second stage DCI indicates the time frequency resource used by the second stage DCI. The second stage DCI contains dedicated fields for the actually scheduled cells, which has a dynamically changed size but does not need blind detection. Since the second stage DCI is multiplexed in a PDSCH or a linked PDCCH, there is little constraint in terms of the size of the first-stage DCI. Therefore, the two stage DCI design can avoid additional effort on DCI size alignment as existing “3+1” DCI size alignment can be maintained.

On the other hand, the baseline approach is to support single-stage DCI as it is sufficient when only a few serving cells are co-scheduled, e.g., 2-cell joint scheduling. Moderator suggests focusing on single-stage DCI first then further study two-stage DCI format if time allows.

### 1st round of discussions

#### Proposal 2-9:

* At least single-stage DCI format is supported for multi-cell PDSCH or PUSCH scheduling.
* FFS two-stage DCI format

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Qualcomm | P2-9: in general OK.  We do not think it is appropriate to consider two-stage DCI in this WI considering the necessary work load for that. It will require resolving a lot of open issues. Therefore, we are OK to delete the sub-bullet, so that we do not need to study two-stage DCI in the next meeting. |
| Nokia/NSB | Support, but don’t really see a need for the FFS.  Looking at how much time we have available, agreeing on the details of two-stage DCI format seems to be not possible – besides the negative effects of two-state DCI on decoding latency, increased PDCCH blocking probability (due to linked PDCCH candidates) as well as higher effective BLER (… as both DCIs need to be correctly decoded). |
| OPPO | Ok with the proposal.  We think it is unrealistic to have 2-stage DCI in spec within time frame of this WI. Our preference is to remove “at least” and the whole sub-bullet. |
| Xiaomi | Fine with the proposal. |
| Fujitsu | We support single-stage DCI. In addition, we share the view that the FFS is not needed. It would bring much more effort to discuss/define two-stage DCI mechanism, while the TUs are very limited. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We share the similar view with companies that two-stage DCI is not necessary to consider unless the maximum number of cells that can be scheduled by a single DCI is quite large (e.g., more than 8). As pointed out by companies, two-stage DCI is the completely new function to NR and it is expected to take a long discussion. Considering the limited time for this WI, we propose to focus on the discussion with single-stage DCI. |
| Langbo | Support the proposal. We also don’t think the FFS bullet is needed considering the very limited Tus for this topic. |
| LG | OK but prefer to remove “at least” and the FFS since a lot of discussions and efforts would be needed for the two-stage DCI while very limited time is given in this WI. |
| CMCC | We think it is better to focus on the single-stage DCI format for multi-cell PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling. |
| Moderator | Ok to remove FFS for progress. |
| FGI | We support only the single-stage DCI. |

### 2nd round of discussions

#### Proposal 2-9:

* At least single-stage DCI format is supported for multi-cell PDSCH or PUSCH scheduling.

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| ZTE | We are fine with this proposal since we should first focus on the single-stage DCI first to make sure the WID can be finished on time with the limited TU budget. |
| MTK | We think whether to include a 2-stage/2-segment DCI should be jointly considered with the maximum number of scheduled cells simultaneously. According to our preliminary analysis, a single stage DCI may only support up to 3 cells considering a reasonable scheduling flexibility. Therefore, we do not see the need to preclude 2-stage/2-segment DCI for now. |
| China Telecom | We can accept most companies’ views. |
| Intel | We suggest to remove “at least” in the main bullet.  Our view is that two-stage DCI format is not in the scope for multi-cell scheduling.   * Specify a solution for multi-cell PUSCH/PDSCH scheduling (one PDSCH/PUSCH per cell) with a single DCI [RAN1] |
| vivo | If the FFS is removed, there is no need to keep ‘at least’ in the main bullet |
| InterDigital | Agree with Mediatek – it may be better to leave the FFS until the maximum number of scheduled cells is finalized. |
| Ericsson1 | OK. |
| Apple | We think “At least” should be removed from the main bullet. Our understanding is that two-stage DCI format was excluded during RAN plenary discussion. |
| Samsung | In view of majority view, we are fine to prioritize single-stage DCI, but would prefer to leave the issue open for now as it can be quickly concluded after progress on the DCI format design and the DCI format budget. |
| CATT | Share same view with Apple and suggest to remove ‘at least’. As WID mentions, “Specify a solution for multi-cell PUSCH/PDSCH scheduling (one PDSCH/PUSCH per cell) with **a single DCI**” |
| Moderator | Ok to remove “at least”. (Updated)Proposal 2-9:  * Single-stage DCI format is supported for multi-cell PDSCH or PUSCH scheduling. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | OK with the updated Proposal or can accept original proposal as well, if there is a strong interest. |
| Moderator2 | @Samsung @MTK: Support single-stage DCI doesn’t preclude the possibility of supporting two-stage DCI. It is open if time allows. |

### 3rd round of discussions

#### Proposal 2-9:

* Single-stage DCI format is supported for multi-cell PDSCH or PUSCH scheduling.

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| New H3C | We are fine with proposal 2-9. |
| Qualcomm | OK |
| Nokia/NSB | Support |
| Apple | OK |
| Spreadtrum | Support |
| LG | OK |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support this FL proposal. |
| Xiaomi | Fine |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Ericsson2 | OK. |
| MTK | Would like to clarify the definition of “single-stage DCI” since this term does not seem to be a general term defined in spec, while we do have “two-stage DCI” defined in sidelink application. For example, if we segment one large DCI into two parts, while the two parts can be polar decoded at the same time, does this kind of parallel operation also counts as “single stage”? |
| CMCC | OK with the proposal. |
| Fujitsu | Support. |
| Langbo | OK |
| CATT | Support |
| ZTE | Support |
| Moderator | @MTK: we understand you concern and believe we are all on same page. Here, single-stage DCI is one DCI directly schedules multiple cells or comprise all the scheduling information for scheduling multiple cells. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Ok |
| Vivo2 | Support |
| InterDigital | Ok |
| FGI | Fine with current. We support only the single-stage DCI. |
| MTK | In that case we can NOT accept the proposal. The SID clearly states that   * The single DCI for the multi-cell PUSCH/PDSCH scheduling **shall be optimized for 3 or more cells**   We do NOT think limiting the design to be single-stage DCI is **optimized for 3 or more cells**. |
| Moderator2 | @MTK: Please check companies’ views in this table all the companies except MTK agreee with single-stage DCI. The TU for this topic is quite limited, as we know, we don’t’ have enough time to design two-stage DCI. The pros/cons are well-known to people as this is discussed in the early phase of Rel-15. I really think it is not a right timing to repropose it in Rel-18 multi-cell scheduling. |
| MTK2 | Sorry we can NOT accept the proposal. We acknowledge that the TU is quite limited, but **if TU limit is the only thing we consider**, then **we should reuse all the legacy mechanism and design a 3-cell multi-cell scheduling DCI to make it quick**.  For a 2-stage DCI, the 1st-stage DCI is conveyed by the PDCCH, while the 2nd-stage DCI is conveyed using the PDSCH resources. For the sake of progress, we can compromise to do the following down scope:   * ~~Single-stage DCI format~~Only PDCCH resources ~~is~~are ~~supported~~used for multi-cell PDSCH or PUSCH scheduling. |
| Moderator3 | @MTK: Yes, with limited TU, we should reuse existing mechanism as much as possible.  Either 3-cell or 4-cell may have no significant impact on DCI design. Anyway, single-stage DCI is the baseline. Two-stage DCI can be supported only after we finish the main issues of single-stage DCI design.  Considering almost all companies support current proposal, I think it is not necessary to update it. |
| MTK | In that case, we can **NOT** agree on the current FL proposal. As we mentioned before, the SID clearly states that   * The single DCI for the multi-cell PUSCH/PDSCH scheduling **shall be optimized for 3 or more cells**   Since we have not agreed on the maximum scheduled cells and the DCI size limit, if RAN1 decides the maximum scheduled cell can be 8, then the DCI size may have to accommodate the possibility of scheduling 1, 2, 3, …, 8 cells, for both DL and UL, which would be at least 16 different DCI sizes. **In this case, we think it is too early for now to preclude the possibility of DCI segmentation.**  Again, we can accept the following down scope to first preclude the usage of PDSCH resource as in current 2-stage DCI:   * ~~Single-stage DCI format~~Only PDCCH resources ~~is~~are ~~supported~~used for multi-cell PDSCH or PUSCH scheduling. |
| Moderator4 | @MTK: Yes, we can defer the discussion on single-stage or two-stage DCI after we have conclusion on max number of cells scheduled by a single DCI. |

## Other related issues

|  |
| --- |
| * **Samsung** * *Proposal 5: The value in the search space equation for PDCCH monitoring for multi-cell scheduling corresponds to a set of co-scheduled cells. FFS on the method for associating a search space set and a set-level CIF.* * *Proposal 6: Define the counting of PDCCH candidates and non-overlapping CCEs for multi-cell scheduling.* * **LG Electronics** * *Proposal #7: Discuss how to determine the n\_CI value for the multi-cell scheduling, based on the following three alternatives.* * *Alt A: The n\_CI value is determined as the CIF value configured for each scheduled cell schedulable by the multi-cell DCI (this could be associated with the Alt 1 for PDCCH candidate configuration).* * *Alt B: The n\_CI value is determined as the CIF value configured for each combination of scheduled cells schedulable by the multi-cell DCI (this could be associated with the Alt 2 for PDCCH candidate configuration).* * *Alt C: The n\_CI value is determined/configured for the multi-cell DCI itself (this could be associated with the Alt 3 for PDCCH candidate configuration).* * **Qualcomm** * *Proposal 5: Re-use CIF/nCI framework* * *Multiple cells can be mapped to a CIF/nCI value of a DCI format monitored on a scheduling cell*   + - The DCI may schedule data on one, some, or all of the cells mapped to the CIF/nCI value     - A set of PDCCH candidates associated with the CIF/nCI value is for a DCI format that can schedule data on the cells – size determination and DCI parsing is based on this * *Different CIF/nCI values can be assigned to different sets of cells scheduled from the same scheduling cell* * *Legacy cross-carrier single-cell scheduling can be part of the same framework from the same scheduling cell* * *A DCI format for multi-cell scheduling is configured to be monitored on USS set(s) and the DCI format is a non-fallback DCI format* * *I.e., CSS set(s) and fallback DCI format(s) do not support multi-cell scheduling* * **FGI** * *Proposal 8: Reuse search space linking method for configuration of a search space for a DCI scheduling multiple cells.* |

# DCI field design

Based on contributions submitted by companies, below issues are prioritized for discussion in this meeting. Within each sub-section, the summary from moderator’s perspective is listed and followed by draft proposals for further discussion round by round.

## DCI field types

|  |
| --- |
| * **Huawei, HiSilicon** * *Proposal 1: For the single DCI scheduling multiple cells, some DCI fields can be predefined to be independent for separate PDSCHs, some fields can be predefined to be common for multiple PDSCHs, and the other fields can be configurable to be independent or common based on network decisions.* * **ZTE** * *Proposal 3: Discussing DCI fields one by one is preferred in case none of simple solution of avoiding discussing DCI fields one by one is adopted.* * *Proposal 4: Except the fields that must be separately indicated (e.g., NDI, RV), at most 4 elements can be designed for a configurable field, where each element corresponds to one separate indication of this field.* * **Spreadtrum Communications** * *Proposal 10: At least one stage DCI can be applied for multi-cell scheduling with a single DCI.* * *Proposal 11: For the multi-cell scheduling DCI, in order for payload reduction, all the fields of the DCI can be divided into three types:* * *First type field: common to the multi-cell PDSCHs/PUSCHs* * *Second type field: separate to the multi-cell PDSCHs/PUSCHs* * *Third type field: common or separate to the multi-cell PDSCHs/PUSCHs dependent on RRC configuration* * **CATT** * *Proposal 3: For supporting multi-cells PDSCHs/PUSCHs scheduled by a single DCI, the design of the DCI scheduling multiple PDSCHs/PUSCHs in Rel-17 can be reused as baseline, and RAN1 can discuss which bits field should be modified.* * **Vivo** * *Proposal 3. Regarding whether a DCI field should be shared among the scheduled cells or split into separate indications:* * *Some fields (e.g., CIF/BWP id/identifier DCI) can be shared by the scheduled cells.* * *Discussion for some of the fields (e.g., HARQ process/FDRA/TDRA/PUCCH related field) is needed* * *Other fields can be up to gNB configuration* * **China Telecom** * *Proposal 8: At least MCS, NDI, RV, HARQ process number, BWP can be separately indicated for the scheduled multiple cells in the multi-cell scheduling DCI* * **Lenovo** * *Proposal 6: The fields of multi-cell scheduling DCI are divided into three types:* * *Type-1: shared to all the scheduled carriers.* * *Type-2: separate to each of the scheduled carriers.* * *Type-3: shared to all the scheduled carriers or separate to each of the scheduled carriers dependent on RRC configuration.* * **Xiaomi** * *Proposal 5: It is up to the gNB’s configuration to determine whether the scheduling information can be shared or not for different scheduled cells.* * **Samsung** * *Proposal 3: For a DCI format used for multi-cell scheduling, RAN1 to conclude on:* * *which DCI fields are cell-common, by default or by configuration, and which DCI fields are cell-specific;* * *indication method for each cell-specific field:*   + - *explicit separate indication with restricted value set*     - *explicit differential indication*     - *single indication based on “multi-cell mapping”*     - *no indication* * *Tables 1 and 2 can be starting points for the RAN1 discussions.* * **OPPO** * *Proposal 7: The DCI fields in the new DCI format are discussed one by one regarding to shared indication vs. separated indication.* * **CAICT** * *Proposal 3: The bit fields for each cell scheduling in the DCI is preconfigured and indicated by one flag in the DCI.* * **Apple** * *Proposal 4: Further investigate whether to indicate the following fields separately for multiple PDSCHs/PUSCHs* * *FDRA* * *TDRA* * *MCS* * *NDI* * *RV* * *TCI* * *SRI* * **CMCC** * *Proposal 3. Two options can be considered as a new DCI format used for multi-cell PUSCH/PDSCH scheduling.* * *Option 1. Indicate shared fields and carrier specific fields by pre-defined rule or signalling.* * *Option 2. Same fields are used for all carriers and re-purpose the information fields for each carrier separately.* * **NTT DOCOMO** * *Proposal 1: Multi-carrier PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling with a single DCI is not supported by DCI format 0\_0/ and DCI format 1\_0.* * *Proposal 7: Discuss following alternatives for each field of the DCI scheduling multi-carrier PDSCH/PUSCH;* * *Alt.1: indicate single value (applicable to all scheduled cells or single cell).* * *Alt.2: indicate multiple values (each for each scheduled cell).* * *Alt.3: configurable between Alt.1 and Alt.2.* * *Alt.4: not support in the DCI scheduling multi-cell PDSCH/PUSCH.* * *Proposal 8: The following DCI fields of a multi-carrier scheduling DCI should indicate single value;* * *DCI format identifier* * *Carrier indicator* * *Proposal 9: The following DCI fields of a multi-carrier scheduling DCI should indicate multiple values for each scheduled cell separately;* * *New data indication* * *Redundancy version* * *HARQ process number* * **LG Electronics** * *Proposal #2: Discuss how to composite DCI fields in the multi-cell DCI, based on the following DCI composition types per DCI field.* * *[Categorization of DCI field types]* * *DCI field type 1: “Shared”*   + - *Alt 1: Shared-common* * *The value indicated via one DCI field is commonly applied for all the scheduled cells/TBs.*   + - *Alt 2: Shared-reference-cell* * *The value indicated via one DCI field is applied for only one of scheduled cells while a (pre-defined/configured) default value is applied for other scheduled cell.*   + - *Alt 3: Shared-single-cell* * *The DCI field is present only if a single cell is scheduled by multi-cell DCI while the field is not present if multiple cells are scheduled by the multi-cell DCI.*   + - *Alt 4: Shared-state-extension* * *Each DCI state (or code-point) to be indicated via one field corresponds to a combination of multiple values for multiple cells (unlike the legacy single-cell scheduling where each DCI state corresponds to only one value for single cell).* * *DCI field type 2: “Separate”*   + - *Alt A: Separate-reduced* * *A DCI has multiple separate fields corresponding to multiple scheduled cells/TBs, and the field size can be reduced compared to single-cell scheduling case considering DCI overhead.*   + - *Alt B: Separate-delta* * *Full DCI information is indicated for only one of scheduled cells, and only delta value (relative to the full information) is indicated for other scheduled cell.* * *DCI field type 3: “Omit”*   + - *The field is omitted in a multi-cell DCI.* * *[Composition of multi-cell DCI fields]* * *Resource allocation fields*   + - *FDRA field: Separate-reduced (or Shared-common in some cases)*     - *TDRA field: Separate-reduced (or Shared-state-extension)* * *HARQ related fields*   + - *MCS field: Separate-reduced (or Separate-delta in some cases)*     - *NDI/RV field: Separate-reduced (or Shared-common for RV field)*     - *HARQ ID field: Separate-reduced (or Shared-common)* * *MIMO related fields*   + - *Antenna port field: Separate-reduced*     - *TCI field: Separate-reduced (or Shared-state-extension)*     - *SRI field: Separate-reduced (or Shared-state-extension)*     - *Precoding info & number of layers: Separate-reduced*     - *PTRS-DMRS association: Separate-reduced (or Shared-reference/single-cell)*     - *DMRS sequence initialization: Shared-common or Shared-reference/single-cell (or Omit)* * *Other fields: Shared (or Omit)*   + - *BWP indicator, VRB-to-PRB mapping, PRB bundling size, Rate matching indicator, ZP CSI-RS trigger, Type-3 codebook request, SRS request, CBGTI, CBGFI, Priority indicator, Minimum scheduling offset, Scell dormancy indication, UL/SUL indicator, FH flag, DAI, TPC, CSI request, Beta\_offset indicator, UL-SCH indicator, LBT parameter field, OLPC parameter set indication, Invalid symbol pattern indicator* * **MediaTek** * *Proposal 3: For R18 multi-cell PUSCH/PDSCH scheduling with a single DCI, it is up to network RRC configuration to assign which DCI fields to be common bit fields and which DCI fields to be designated bit fields (which would be assigned independently for each scheduled cell)* * *For example, through a bitmap to determine each DCI bit field is a common bit field or a designated bit field with one bit* * **Ericsson** * *Proposal 9: For mc-DCI scheduling PDSCH on multiple cells, at least the following fields are common for the multiple scheduled PDSCHs* * *Downlink assignment index* * *TPC command for scheduled PUCCH* * *PUCCH resource indicator* * *PDSCH-to-HARQ-feedback timing indicator* * **Qualcomm** * *Proposal 4:* * *For each DCI field, select/conclude one of the following:*   + - *Opt.1: Unchanged* * *Fields that are irrelevant to multi-cell scheduling* * *E.g., DCI format identifier, Scell dormancy indication, PDCCH monitoring adaptation, CSI request, sidelink assignment index*   + - *Opt.2: Common indication* * *Single field indicates a common value for all the scheduled cells* * *E.g., HARQ process number, ChannelAccess-Cpext, minimum scheduling offset*   + - *Opt.3: Joint indication* * *Single field indicates a set of configured values for a set of scheduled cells* * *E.g., BWP indicator, FDRA, TDRA, rate-matching indicator, ZP CSI-RS indicator*   + - *Opt.4: Per-cell indication* * *Per-cell field for each scheduled cells* * *E.g., NDI, RV* * **FGI** * *Proposal 1: To discuss the extension information of scheduling DCI for the multiple cell scheduling via single DCI.* * *Proposal 2: The extension information includes HARQ process number, NDI and TDRA/FDRA information.* |

### Moderator summary and proposals based on contributions

For multi-cell scheduling DCI, signaling overhead can be reduced when some fields can be applicable or common for all the co-scheduled carriers in case of same cell group, e.g., 24-bit CRC, 3-bit PDSCH-to-HARQ\_timing indicator, 3-bit PUCCH resource indicator, 2-bit TPC, 2-bit counter DAI, 2-bit total DAI, 1-bit identifier. These fields can be shared for all the co-scheduled carriers.

Regarding the carrier-specific fields, e.g., MCS, NDI and RV, these fields should be separately indicated in the multi-cell scheduling DCI for each of the co-scheduled carriers. Further overhead reduction, e.g., one-bit RV indication as Rel-16 NR-U or differentiated MCS indication, can be discussed in next step.

For some fields, a single frequency domain resource allocation can be shared for all the co-scheduled carriers in case of intra-band CA case or cell-specific frequency domain resource allocation indication should be included for each of the co-scheduled carriers in case of inter-band CA. In this way, the frequency domain resource allocation can be shared or specific dependent on network configuration, which is similar to time domain resource allocation. For MIMO related fields, those can be shared or separate dependent on network configuration.

13 companies [Huawei, Spreadtrum, vivo, China Telcom, Lenovo, OPPO, Samsung, CMCC, NTT DOCOMO, LG, MediaTek, Ericsson, Qualcomm] propose dividing the fields of the multi-cell scheduling DCI into 3 or 4 types: shared for all the co-scheduled cells, separate for each co-scheduled carrier, shared or separate dependent on network configuration, as well as omitted. Since we can list all the necessary fields for multi-cell scheduling DCI, the omitted field type may not be needed for time being.

Even for shared field, there are several options for detailed design, e.g., carrier indicator field; for separate field, e.g., MCS, some companies prefer independent MCS field for each co-scheduled carrier while others prefer differential MCS indication for co-scheduled carriers for overhead reduction. Moderator suggests no detailed discussion in this meeting. Same as BWP indicator, HARQ process number field, we can put those FFS.

For TDRA indication, several companies [vivo, Samsung, LG] propose/consider a common TDRA field is included in the multi-cell scheduling DCI pointing to one row of a TDRA table defined for the co-scheduled cells with each row indicating multiple SLIVs for the multiple scheduled cells. Moderator suggests the discussion is focused on whether TDRA field is common or separate to the co-scheduled cells with no detailed discussion in this meeting.

### 1st round of discussions

#### Proposal 3-1:

* For multi-cell scheduling DCI, all the fields of the DCI can be divided into three types:
* Type-1 field: A single field applicable/common to all the co-scheduled cells
* Type-2 field: Separate field for each of the co-scheduled cells
* Type-3 field: Common or separate to each of the co-scheduled cells dependent on configuration

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Qualcomm | P3-1: suggest to discuss each field one by one.  We think there should be another type of field (can be called as joint indication field) where it is a single field, but a codepoint of the field indicates same or different values for different co-scheduled cells (the values are configured by RRC). This is similar to TDRA for multi-slot PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling in Rel-16/17. |
| Nokia/NSB | Support |
| OPPO | We feel it is too early to jump into this design philosophy in the very first meeting, e.g., we are not sure whether there would be eventually a Type-2 field, because any type-2 field can be converted into Type-1 by using a table entry pointer pointing to a pre-configured table. We think it is more acceptable to have the following: Proposal 3-1 (revised):  * For design of multi-cell scheduling DCI, companies are encouraged to use the combination of at most three following types of DCI fields: * Type-1 field: A single field applicable/common to all the co-scheduled cells * Type-2 field: Separate field for each of the co-scheduled cells * Type-3 field: Common or separate to each of the co-scheduled cells dependent on configuration |
| Xiaomi | Fine with the proposal |
| Fujitsu | We share the view that we should be open to the case that there may be only one or two types of fields. For example, for intra-band cells, it is possible that all fields are Type-1. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support the proposal in general, i.e., it would be good to agree on the principle of categorization for each DCI field for multi-cell scheduling in this meeting. In addition to the three types captured in the proposal, “not supported for MC-DCI” can be considered as the 4th type if legacy DCI format (i.e., non-fallback DCI) is supported as MC-DCI. |
| Langbo | For Type-3 fields, we think common or separate fields could also be determined ntention in addition to explicit configuration, e.g., depending on intra or inter band CA, FR1 or FR2. |
| LG | It is premature to divide all of various fields into only three types before discussing on each field.  In addition, it may need to clarify how to configure common or separate field for Type-3 field, for example, configure for entire cell group schedulable by multi-cell DCI at once, or configure cell group to share a field within entire cell group, or configure per cell combination scheduled by multi-cell DCI simultaneously. |
| CMCC | We think that Type 3 fields also need to be determined as either common field or separate field according to different scenarios, e.g., both intra-band and inter-band CA operation, FR1 and FR2 bands need to be considered, so that the multi-cell scheduling DCI format will finally be configured with only two types of DCI fields. |
| ZTE | There may be a mixture type of Type-1 field and Type-2 field. That is separate field for a sub-group cell and shared within a sub-group.  For example, 4 cells are scheduled by MC-DCI, where sub-group 1 with cell#1&#2 and su-group 2 with cell#3&#4 are inter-band while the two cells in each sub-group are intra-band. Then two separate fields are enough and each field is shared for the cells in each group.  Besides, we think there is another type of the field, i.e., Type-4 field: the field is not included in the DCI, and the UE behavior is defined by the network.  Therefore, we have the following updates.   * Type-1 field: A single field applicable/common to all the co-scheduled cells * Type-2 field: Separate field for each sub-group of the co-scheduled cells * Type-3 field: Common or separate to each of the co-scheduled cells dependent on configuration * Type-4 filed: not included with the corresponding UE behavior defined by the network |
| MTK | **We support OPPO’s version**. It is possible that we ended up with only Type-3 fields. “At most 3” suggested OPPO seems more accurate. |
| China Telecom | We are wondering can the joint indication field be classified as common field or separate field, if it indicates different configurations for different co-scheduled cells? |
| Intel | For Type -3 field, further clarification is needed how to configure common or separate fields for scheduled cells. For instance, there could be multiple solutions: assuming 4 cells, the following can be considered:   * Configuration 1: all 4 cells have a single shared field * Configuration 2: all 4 cells have separate fields * Configuration 3: 2 cells have same fields and other 2 cells have same fields. |
| Vivo | Generally fine with the spirit of the proposal, but we would like to ask for clarification, if there is one DCI field with joint coding of separate indications for different scheduled cells, is it type1 or type2? |
| Ericsson1 | Prefer below formulation since discussion is still at high level. Our preference is to discuss exact spec impact for each field rather than discussing broad characterization which is anyway not expected to be captured in the specs. Proposal 3-1 (revised-E///):  * For design of multi-cell scheduling DCI, companies are encouraged to consider following types of DCI fields (other types not precluded): * Type-1 field: A single field applicable/common to all the co-scheduled cells * Type-2 field: Separate field for each of the co-scheduled cells * Type-3 field: Common or separate to each of the co-scheduled cells dependent on configuration |
| Samsung | More refinement and clarification are needed for this proposal.  For example, there may be DCI fields (e.g., Type-3 HARQ enabling/indicator, etc.) that are not directly related to any of co-scheduled cells. Are such fields considered to be Type-1 or a new Type-4 field? Also, as mentioned by several companies, the case of DCI fields with “joint indication” / multi-cell code-points needs to be clarified. |
| CATT | We support to divide the fields of DCI into Type-1 filed and Type-2 filed. But, we think Type-3 filed need more clarification since is different from the legacy DCI format configuration. For example, what’s benefit to support one field that depend on gNB configuration to determine common or separate to each of the co-scheduled cells? |
| Moderator | @Qualcomm @China Telcom @vivo: yes, that is the reason I use the wording of “applicable/common” for Type-1. “Applicable” means the field points to a combination with each element corresponding to one specific cell.  @OPPO @MTK: OK to me.  @NTT DOCOMO: my intention is to discuss these three types first then detailed field. If a field is not needed for multi-cell scheduling, it will be excluded.  @Langbo @CMCC: OK to consider both explicit and implicit ways.  @LG: configured per cell group or PUCCH group.  @ZTE @Intel: Ok to sub-group added in Type-2/3.  @Ericsson: I think the discussion on field types can avoid discussion on each field one by one. (Updated)Proposal 3-1:  * For design of multi-cell scheduling DCI, companies are encouraged to consider following types of DCI fields (other types not precluded): * Type-1 field: A single field applicable/common to all the co-scheduled cells * Type-2 field: Separate field for each of the co-scheduled cells or each sub-group * Type-3 field: Common or separate to each of the co-scheduled cells or separate to each sub-group dependent on explicit configuration or implicit condition (e.g., intra or inter band CA, FR1 or FR2). |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | OK with the updated proposal. |
| Moderator2 | @Samsung: For one-shot HARQ triggering, I agree with you that it is not belong to any co-scheduled cell. Currently, the proposal is only focused on high level principle. We can discuss the details later.  @Qualcomm @Samsung: Regarding the field with joint indication to each scheduled cell, I think it belong to Type-1 as the intention of Type-1 is to define a single field for all the co-scheduled cells. I made some update to capture your point.  @CATT: the intention of Type-3 is for some fields which may be useful in some cases while not in others, e.g., FDRA field could be a single field for all the scheduled cells in case of intra-band CA or separate fields for each scheduled cell in case of inter-band CA. in that sense, it needs to be determined case by case, e.g., based on network configuration or implicitly determined. |

#### Proposal 3-2:

* For the multi-cell scheduling DCI,
* Type-1 fields at least include below:
  + Identifier for DCI formats
  + Carrier indicator
  + Downlink assignment index
  + TPC
  + PUCCH resource indicator
  + PDSCH-to-HARQ timing indicator
* Type-2 fields at least include below:
  + Modulation and coding scheme
  + New data indicator
  + Redundancy version
* Type-3 fields at least include below:
  + PRB bundling size indicator
  + Rate matching indicator
  + ZP CSI-RS trigger
  + Antenna port(s)
  + TCI
  + SRS request
  + DMRS sequence initialization
* FFS
  + Bandwidth part indicator
  + Time domain resource assignment
  + Frequency domain resource assignment
  + VRB-to-PRB mapping
  + HARQ process number
  + One-shot HARQ-ACK request
  + ChannelAccess-Cpext
  + Other fields

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Qualcomm | P3-2:  List of Type-1 fields: OK  List of Type-2 fields: NDI and RV can be Type-2. However, MCS should be further discussed.  List of Type-3 fields: we think many of them should be joint indication field. |
| Nokia/NSB | On Type 1 fields:  The ‘carrier indication’ is not fully clear here – is this the indication of the scheduled cells? (maybe use a different wording as the current carrier indication refers to CIF & n\_CI).  On Type 2 fields: we think that e.g. MCS, RV or NDI could be potentially also actually of Type 3 (e.g. if using single cell DCI for re-tx, intra-band CA could lead to same MCS). |
| OPPO | We prefer to keep FFS on the whole P3-2. For example, this proposal should be under discussion only after RAN1 agrees on P2-1/2/3 and P2-9. |
| Xiaomi | Maybe early to decide in this meeting. |
| Fujitsu | It should be deprioritized in this meeting. |
| NTT DOCOMO | For Type-1 fields, we are fine to support as it is but the discussion for TPC, PRI and HARQ timing indicator can be deferred until Proposal 1-6 is agreed.  For Type-2 fields, we agree that NDI and RV belong to this type but we think MCS can be Type-3 field as Nokia commented, thus we propose to move MCS to FFS. |
| Langbo | We are OK for Type-1 list. FFS for others. |
| LG | On the list of Type-1 fields, TPC for PUSCH may be FFS for now.  On the list of Type-2 fields, MCS and RV are FFS for now.  On the list of Type-3 fields, all the fields are FFS considering other possibility (other than common or separate way) such as joint indication, rank restriction, and so on. |
| CMCC | This can be further discussed in light of the progress of Proposal 3-1. |
| ZTE | We are generally fine with this proposal if Type 2 is updated as discussed above. We also think some filed could be Type 4, e.g., HPN. |
| China Telecom | We agree some of the FFS fields could be joint indication field.  For the carrier indicator field, if it relates to how to indicate the actually scheduled cell, we think it should be put into FFS as there is also indication way not requiring the field discussed in the next section. |
| Intel | We share similar view as other companies that the proposal can be deprioritized. In general, we are fine with Type 1 fields.  For Type -2: we are fine with NDI and RV. FFS on MCS  For Type -3. Need further discussions. |
| Vivo | For type1: FFS TPC  For type2: FFS MCS |
| Ericsson1 | Prefer to clarify that this is starting point of discussion than directly agreeing to the Types.  ‘carrier indicator’ needs further clarification. If intention is to say indication of the scheduled cells, then perhaps update accordingly to avoid confusion with existing CIF field in non-fallback DCI formats. Whether they are same or not can be discussed further.  Whether TPC for PUSCH can be Type 1 should be FFS. OK to consider TPC for PUCCH in Type 1. |
| Samsung | We are OK with the list for Type-1 fields (assuming “TPC” means “TPC for PUCCH” – the TPC for PUSCHs is best to go to Type-2 or Type-3 list).  For other fields, we think configurable method is generally more suitable, although more discussion is needed on detailed fields, as well as UE behavior based on the configuration. Especially, the WI needs to pursue DCI size reduction techniques, such as multi-cell codepoints, differential indication, and possibly restricting the value set for DCI fields. |
| CATT | For type-1 filed: suggest to include the fields of ‘Time domain resource assignment’  We wonder how to understand type-3 filed for a UE. Does it means if the gNB configure the same configuration for type-3 filed, then the UE regards these filed are common; otherwise, then the UE regards these filed are separate to each of the co-scheduled cells? |
| Moderator | @Qualcomm: OK to FFS MCS. For Type-3, yes, it may be jointly indicated or separately configured.  @Nokia: replace “CIF” with “indicator of co-scheduled cells”. To address your 2nd concern, I update the main bullet.  @OPPO @xiaomi @Fujitsu @CMCC: yes, this proposal is to be discussed later. Anyway, collecting companies’ views is better.  @NTT DOCOMO: yes, it is dependent on proposal 1-6. Fine to FFS MCS.  @LG: Fine to your 1st and 3rd comments and FFS MCS. Why do you propose FFS RV? RV should be cell specific, right?  @ZTE: FFS can cover your proposed Type-4.  @Intel @vivo: Ok to make below update to address your comments.  @Ericsson: Ok to make below update to address your comments (Updated)Proposal 3-2:  * For DCI format 0\_X/1\_X which schedules more than one ell, * Type-1 fields at least include below:   + Identifier for DCI formats   + Indicator of co-scheduled cells   + Downlink assignment index   + TPC for scheduled PUCCH   + FFS: TPC for scheduled PUSCHs   + PUCCH resource indicator   + PDSCH-to-HARQ timing indicator * Type-2 fields at least include below:   + New data indicator   + Redundancy version * FFS: Type-3 fields at least include below:   + PRB bundling size indicator   + Rate matching indicator   + ZP CSI-RS trigger   + Antenna port(s)   + TCI   + SRS request   + DMRS sequence initialization * FFS   + Modulation and coding scheme   + Bandwidth part indicator   + Time domain resource assignment   + Frequency domain resource assignment   + VRB-to-PRB mapping   + HARQ process number   + One-shot HARQ-ACK request   + ChannelAccess-Cpext   + Other fields |
| Moderator2 | @Ericsson @Samsung: Ok to FFS TPC for PUSCH.  @CATT: It is still open on how to configure it for Type-3. Maybe not if we decide it accoridng to some implicit rules. Here, we just intend to use the definition of types to avoid discussing each field one by one. |

### 2nd round of discussions

#### Proposal 3-1:

* For design of multi-cell scheduling DCI, companies are encouraged to consider following types of DCI fields:
* Type-1 field: A single field indicating common information to all the co-scheduled cells or separate information to each of co-scheduled cells via joint indication
* Type-2 field: Separate field for each of the co-scheduled cells or each sub-group comprising one or more co-scheduled cells
* Type-3 field: Common or separate to each of the co-scheduled cells or separate to each sub-group dependent on explicit configuration or implicit condition (e.g., intra or inter band CA, FR1 or FR2).
* Other types are not precluded.

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| New H3C | We are fine with proposal 3-1. |
| Apple | We are generally fine with the proposal, but think it may be better to separate Type-1 into two types, one for common information, and one for separate information via joint indication. We don’t need any additional work for the first type. But joint signaling design is needed for the second type. |
| LG | We suggest the following update on the P3-1 in above, to avoid confusion as well as to cover some other way.   * For design of multi-cell scheduling DCI, companies are encouraged to consider following types of DCI fields: * Type-1 field: A single field indicating common information to all the co-scheduled cells or separate information to each of co-scheduled cells via joint indication or an information to only one of co-scheduled cells * Type-2 field: Separate field for each of the co-scheduled cells ~~or each sub-group comprising one or more co-scheduled cells~~ * Type-3 field: Type-1 field or Type-2 field for all of the scheduled cells schedulable by multi-cell scheduling DCI or per sub-group of the scheduled cells or per set of co-scheduled cells scheduled by same DCI ~~Common or separate to each of the co-scheduled cells or separate to each sub-group~~ dependent on explicit configuration or implicit condition (e.g., intra or inter band CA, FR1 or FR2). * Other types are not precluded. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support this FL proposal. |
| Xiaomi | Fine |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal in general. We may need further discussion how to differentiate common or independent field in the DCI.  For Type- 3 field, suggest the following update:   * Type-3 field: Common or separate to each of the co-scheduled cells or ~~separate~~ to each sub-group   + FFS, whether it is dependent on explicit configuration or implicit condition (e.g., intra or inter band CA, FR1 or FR2) |
| Ericsson2 | OK. |
| MTK | We are fine with the FL proposal |
| Moderator | @Apple: I think current definition of Type-1 field cover both cases as you mentioned: common information to all the co-scheduled cells or separate information to each of co-scheduled cells via joint indication. It may be a bit redundant if we say Type-1A common information for all the co-scheduled cells and Type-1B separate information to each of co-scheduled cells via joint indication. If majority companies are OK with it, I am fine. |
| CMCC | We are generally fine with the proposal. |
| Fujitsu | OK with the proposal. |
| Langbo | OK with the proposal. |
| Qualcomm | We agree with Apple that common indication and joint indication should be separated. They are quite different. |
| CATT | OK |
| ZTE | We are fine with this proposal. |
| LG | As we commented earlier, Type-1 field needs to be updated as the following, with consideration of some special DCI field such as CSI request, SRS request, UL DAI, and so on.   * Type-1 field: A single field indicating common information to all the co-scheduled cells or separate information to each of co-scheduled cells via joint indication or an information to only one of co-scheduled cells |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Ok |
| Samsung3 | We think differential indication can be beneficial, at least for MCS, to significantly save DCI overhead, so suggest the following modification:   * Type-2 field: Separate field, including differential indication, for each of the co-scheduled cells or each sub-group comprising one or more co-scheduled cells   Also, benefits of configuring sub-groups are not clear yet, so maybe can be captured as FFS. |
| Moderator2 | @LG: OK to add it.  @Qualcomm: There is only a single Type-1 field in the DCI 0-X/1-X which is the ntention to define Type-1. In that sense, not matter a field provides information common or separate info for scheduled cells, it is a type-1 field as long as the field is a single field in DCI 0-X/1-X. More sub-types for Type 1 may be not quite necessary as current definition covers the two cases you mentioned.  @All: below update is listed to add the possibility for Type-1 field. (Updated) Proposal 3-1:  * For design of multi-cell scheduling DCI, companies are encouraged to consider following types of DCI fields: * Type-1 field: A single field indicating common information to all the co-scheduled cells or separate information to each of co-scheduled cells via joint indication or an information to only one of co-scheduled cells * Type-2 field: Separate field for each of the co-scheduled cells or each sub-group comprising one or more co-scheduled cells * Type-3 field: Common or separate to each of the co-scheduled cells or separate to each sub-group dependent on explicit configuration or implicit condition (e.g., intra or inter band CA, FR1 or FR2). * Other types are not precluded. |
| LG | Fine with the updated P3-1 except for one clarification on the part “each sub-group comprising one or more co-scheduled cells” in Type-2 field.  Does it mean that the field is separated between different sub-groups, and then the field is shared within a sub-group? (same question is asked for Type-3 field) |
| Moderator2 | @LG: Regarding sub-group in type-2/3, I share same understanding with you.  @ALL: Please provide your comments directly in next section for new round of discussions. |

#### Proposal 3-2:

* For DCI format 0\_X/1\_X which schedules more than one cell,
* Type-1 fields at least include below:
  + Identifier for DCI formats
  + Indicator of co-scheduled cells
  + Downlink assignment index
  + TPC for scheduled PUCCH
  + FFS: TPC for scheduled PUSCHs
  + PUCCH resource indicator
  + PDSCH-to-HARQ timing indicator
* Type-2 fields at least include below:
  + New data indicator
  + Redundancy version
* FFS: Type-3 fields at least include below:
  + PRB bundling size indicator
  + Rate matching indicator
  + ZP CSI-RS trigger
  + Antenna port(s)
  + TCI
  + SRS request
  + DMRS sequence initialization
* FFS
  + Modulation and coding scheme
  + Bandwidth part indicator
  + Time domain resource assignment
  + Frequency domain resource assignment
  + VRB-to-PRB mapping
  + HARQ process number
  + One-shot HARQ-ACK request
  + ChannelAccess-Cpext
  + Other fields

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Apple | We had comments for P3-1 to separate Type-1 into two types. If this is accepted, we need to separate out indicator of co-scheduled cells.  Prefer to move “TPC for scheduled PUSCHs” to be under the last FFS.  Prefer to merge the list under “FFS: Type-3” with the last FFS and remove Type-3 for now. |
| LG | OK |
| NTT DOCOMO | For the very first bullet, we think it should be updated as follows considering DCI format 0\_X/1\_X may or may not schedule a single cell;   * For DCI format 0\_X/1\_X which can schedule~~s~~ more than one cell,   We support Type-1 and Type-2 DCI fields listed in the proposal. Other all fields can be moved to FFS at this point. |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Samsung2 | Suggest to remove all items with FFS (including “FFS: TPC for scheduled PUSCHs”) as they don’t appear to provide any information. Can make a decision only on stable items for Type-1 and Type-2. |
| Ericsson2 | As commented earlier, prefer to clarify that this is starting point of discussion than directly agreeing to the Types.  Suggest below update to main bullet   * For DCI format 0\_X/1\_X which schedules more than one cell consider below Type classification as starting point for further discussions |
| Moderator | @NTT DOCOMO: Thanks for the good comments. Your suggestion is fine with me.  @Apple @Samsung: Ok to keep Type-1/2 and FFS others.  @Ericsson: Ok to me. (Updated) Proposal 3-2:  * For DCI format 0\_X/1\_X which can schedule more than one cell, below type classification can be a starting point for further discussion: * Type-1 fields at least include below:   + Identifier for DCI formats   + Indicator of co-scheduled cells   + Downlink assignment index   + TPC for scheduled PUCCHPUCCH resource indicator   + PDSCH-to-HARQ timing indicator * Type-2 fields at least include below:   + New data indicator   + Redundancy version * FFS:   + PRB bundling size indicator   + Rate matching indicator   + ZP CSI-RS trigger   + Antenna port(s)   + TCI   + SRS request   + DMRS sequence initialization   + TPC for scheduled PUSCHs   + Modulation and coding scheme   + Bandwidth part indicator   + Time domain resource assignment   + Frequency domain resource assignment   + VRB-to-PRB mapping   + HARQ process number   + One-shot HARQ-ACK request   + ChannelAccess-Cpext   + Other fields |
| CMCC | We are fine with the Type 1 fields and Type 2 fields currently listed. |
| Fujitsu | OK with the proposal. |
| Langbo | OK with the proposal. |
| Qualcomm | OK with the proposal. |
| CATT | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Nokia/NSB | As commented by Ericsson, this should be a starting point – **specifically NDI & RV should be kept as FFS** as it could be potentially common as well  Why? The probability when having two scheduled PDSCHs, that both fail is rather low – so e.g. using for re-tx the single cell DCI maybe be more efficient in the end (and some bits can be saved). |
| ZTE | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Moderator | @Nokia: common NDI and RV lead to scheduling inflexibility which was not agreed in Rel-14 LTE eLAA, Rel-16 NR-U and Rel-17 Above 52. |
| LG | OK with the updated P3-2. |
| Samsung3 | We think the long list of FFS is not needed, but OK with the updated proposal if majority is fine with that. |
| MTK | We are fine with **(Updated) Proposal 3-2**. |
| Nokia/NSB | Thanks moderator for the reply. We still would like to keep NDI & RV open (and preferably configurable by RRC if common & separate).  With the same argumentation, we should not work on MC-DCI in the first place as this had been discussed several times and did not get accepted.  For 4 scheduled cells, the difference makes 3\* (2+1) = 9 bits, which is 6% of the maximum of 140bits. |
| China Telecom | We prefer to move “indicator of co-scheduled cells” to the last FFS. We think indication of scheduled cells may or may not need such an explicit field. |
| Moderator3 | @Nokia: If NDI&RV can be shared to co-scheduled cells, I kind of worry about gNB scheduling restriction and the probability of using multi-cell scheduling. OK to me to FFS NDI and RV for time being.  @ALL: Please provide your comments directly in next section for new round of discussions. |

### 3rd round of discussions

#### Proposal 3-1:

* For design of multi-cell scheduling DCI, companies are encouraged to consider following types of DCI fields:
* Type-1 field: A single field indicating common information to all the co-scheduled cells or separate information to each of co-scheduled cells via joint indication or an information to only one of co-scheduled cells
* Type-2 field: Separate field for each of the co-scheduled cells or each sub-group comprising one or more co-scheduled cells
* Type-3 field: Common or separate to each of the co-scheduled cells or separate to each sub-group dependent on explicit configuration or implicit condition (e.g., intra or inter band CA, FR1 or FR2).
* Other types are not precluded.

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Apple | OK |
| Qualcomm | Now a lot of sub-types is under Type-1 and Type-3.  Type-1: to facilitate future discussion efficiently, we still prefer to split common indication and joint indication. In addition, “an information to only one of co-scheduled cells” might be another type.  Type-2: OK  Type-3: does “common or separate to each of the co-scheduled cells” include joint indication that is currently under Type-1? Or, is it intended to cover only (1) common indication in Type-1, (2) per-cell separate indication in Type-2, (3) per-sub-group separate indication in Type-2? And, does each Type-3 field have to have configurability among all (1) – (3)?  Having said that, we consider following is clearer.   * For design of multi-cell scheduling DCI, companies are encouraged to consider following types of DCI fields: * Type-1 field: A single field in the DCIindicating   + Type-1A: common information to all the co-scheduled cells   + Type-1B: separate information to each of co-scheduled cells via joint indication   + Type-1C: an information to only one of co-scheduled cells * Type-2 field: Separate fields   + Type-2A: for each of the co-scheduled cells   + Type-2B: each sub-group comprising one or more co-scheduled cells * Type-3 field: One of the Type-1 and Type-2 that is determined based on explicit configuration or implicit condition (e.g., intra or inter band CA, FR1 or FR2). * Other types are not precluded. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | OK with FL proposal. |
| Vivo | OK |
| Intel | We are generally fine with the proposal.  Some minor update on Type -3 field. It is too early to decide the mechanism on configure or implicitly determine common or separate of the indication. In addition, sub-group may also have common indication so “separate” can be removed.   * Type-3 field: Common or separate to each of the co-scheduled cells or ~~separate~~ to each sub-group   + FFS: whether it is dependent on explicit configuration or implicit condition (e.g., intra or inter band CA, FR1 or FR2). |
| New H3C | OK |
| Nokia/NSB | OK |
| LG | We think combination of QC’s modification and Intel’s update (as below), seems to be better and clearer (with small clarification in yellow).   * For design of multi-cell scheduling DCI, companies are encouraged to consider following types of DCI fields: * Type-1 field: A single field in the DCI indicating   + Type-1A: common information to all the co-scheduled cells   + Type-1B: separate information to each of co-scheduled cells via joint indication   + Type-1C: an information to only one of co-scheduled cells * Type-2 field: Separate field(s)   + Type-2A: for each of the co-scheduled cells   + Type-2B: for each sub-group comprising one or more co-scheduled cells for which a single Type-1 field is applied * Type-3 field: One of the Type-1 field and Type-2 field(s)   + FFS: whether it is determined based on explicit configuration or implicit condition (e.g., intra or inter band CA, FR1 or FR2). * Other types are not precluded. |
| Fujitsu | OK with the proposal. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support this proposal. |
| MTK | OK with the proposal. |
| ZTE | We are fine with the proposal. |
| CMCC | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Langbo | OK with the proposal. |
| Samsung4 | OK with the proposal, and can consider updates from QC/Intel. |
| Moderator | @Qualcomm @LG: I understand your intention to further separate the first two types. As current definition of Type-1 and Type-2 have well covered each sub-types and majority companies support the current proposal, I tend to keep it with minor change according to Intel. (updated)Proposal 3-1:  * For design of multi-cell scheduling DCI, companies are encouraged to consider following types of DCI fields: * Type-1 field: A single field indicating common information to all the co-scheduled cells or separate information to each of co-scheduled cells via joint indication or an information to only one of co-scheduled cells * Type-2 field: Separate field for each of the co-scheduled cells or each sub-group comprising one or more co-scheduled cells * Type-3 field: Common or separate to each of the co-scheduled cells or to each sub-group.   + FFS: whether it is dependent on explicit configuration or implicit condition (e.g., intra or inter band CA, FR1 or FR2). * Other types are not precluded. |
| CATT | We are fine with the updated proposal. |
| Apple | We are OK with the updated P3-1. |
| Ericsson4 | OK with the proposal. |
| China Telecom | OK |
| LG | We are also OK in principle, but as we commented earlier, a clarification on Type-2 field is needed as below.   * Type-2 field: Separate field for each of the co-scheduled cells or each sub-group comprising one or more co-scheduled cells where a single field is commonly applied to the co-scheduled cells belonging to a same sub-group |
| Moderator2 | @LG: Thanks. It is updated as below. (updated)Proposal 3-1rev:  * For design of multi-cell scheduling DCI, companies are encouraged to consider following types of DCI fields: * Type-1 field: A single field indicating common information to all the co-scheduled cells or separate information to each of co-scheduled cells via joint indication or an information to only one of co-scheduled cells * Type-2 field: Separate field for each of the co-scheduled cells, or each sub-group comprising one or more co-scheduled cells where a single field is commonly applied to the co-scheduled cells belonging to a same sub-group * Type-3 field: Common or separate to each of the co-scheduled cells or to each sub-group.   + FFS: whether it is dependent on explicit configuration or implicit condition (e.g., intra or inter band CA, FR1 or FR2). * Other types are not precluded. |
| MTK | Fine with the updated proposal. |
| Ericsson5 | OK with (updated)Proposal 3-1rev. |

#### Proposal 3-2:

* For DCI format 0\_X/1\_X which can schedule more than one cell, below type classification can be a starting point for further discussion:
* Type-1 fields at least include below:
  + Identifier for DCI formats
  + Indicator of co-scheduled cells
  + Downlink assignment index
  + TPC for scheduled PUCCHPUCCH resource indicator
  + PDSCH-to-HARQ timing indicator
* FFS: Type-2 fields at least include below:
  + New data indicator
  + Redundancy version
* FFS:
  + PRB bundling size indicator
  + Rate matching indicator
  + ZP CSI-RS trigger
  + Antenna port(s)
  + TCI
  + SRS request
  + DMRS sequence initialization
  + TPC for scheduled PUSCHs
  + Modulation and coding scheme
  + Bandwidth part indicator
  + Time domain resource assignment
  + Frequency domain resource assignment
  + VRB-to-PRB mapping
  + HARQ process number
  + One-shot HARQ-ACK request
  + ChannelAccess-Cpext
  + CSI request
  + SRI
  + beta offset indicator
  + Other fields

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Apple | OK |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal in general.  However, we do not quite follow why NDI/RV is FFS. Same design as defined for multi-slot scheduling can be reused. |
| Nokia/NSB | OK |
| LG | OK in principle, but it seems some other fields (e.g. CSI request) are missed… |
| Fujitsu | OK with the proposal. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Share the same view with Intel. NDI/RV should be indicated separately for each scheduled cell assuming that separate TB is scheduled for each cell. |
| MTK | OK with the proposal. |
| ZTE | We are fine with the proposal. |
| CMCC | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Langbo | OK with the proposal. |
| Samsung4 | OK in general. Agree with Intel/DCM that the Type-2 list (NDI and RV) can be without FFS, for more progress. |
| Moderator | @Intel @NTT DOCOMO @Samsung: I share same concern with you and understand this cell-common NDI/RV would lead to quite a few scheduling restrictions.  @Nokia: Can we remove FFS for Type-2 now? |
| Apple | We are fine with removing FFS for Type-2. |
| Ericsson4 | OK. |
| Nokia/NSB | As for most other fields, we would like to keep the RV & NDI open. |
| China Telecom | We prefer “indicator of co-scheduled cells” to be moved to the last FFS or removed. Options to indicate the actually scheduled cells are to be down selected. As option 3 of proposal 3-3, indication of scheduled cells may not need such an explicit field. |
| Moderator2 | @China Telecom: regardless of which options in P3-3 is agreed, indicator of co-scheduled cells is required. If Option 3 is agreed, CIF field can be regarded as “indicator of co-scheduled cells”. |
| LG | @FL: We are OK with the proposal in principle.  But, as commented in above, some other fields mainly related to UL DCI (e.g. CSI request, SRI, beta offset indicator, etc.) seem to be still missed. Is the above proposal intended to focus on DL DCI fields first? |
| Moderator3 | @LG: Thanks for the good comments. We may not have enough time to go through each field one by one in this meeting. It should be OK to list these three fields in FFS. |
| MTK | Support |
| China Telecom2 | Thank moderator for the reply. Our intention of moving “indicator of co-scheduled cells” to FFS is to further study whether a specific state of certain separate field can be used to indicate the corresponding cell is not scheduled. As an example, if FDRA is separate for each cell, the state of the bits setting to all 0 (type 0 RA) or all 1(type 1 RA) can be used to indicate the cell is not scheduled. We think such way can be further studied. |
| Moderator4 | @China Telecomm: Based on FDRA for indicating a corresponding cell is scheduled or not, is there a CIF field indicating the scheduled cells? If not, we can FFS indicator of scheduled cell. |
| China Telecom3 | If we use specific state of certain separate field (e.g.FDRA) to indicate corresponding cell is scheduled or not, we think a CIF field indicating the scheduled cells is not needed. |

## Indication of scheduled cells

|  |
| --- |
| * **ZTE** * *Proposal 5: For designing the CIF filed in the multi-cell scheduling DCI, dynamic or semi-static combination of the multiple scheduled cells should be determined firstly.* * **Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell** * *Proposal 3.3.5: The scheduled cells are indicated in a DCI field pointing to a table of scheduled cell(s).* * *The table of scheduled cell(s) to be scheduled is RRC configured for the UE.* * *Support separate table configurations for the multi-cell scheduling DCI for PDSCH and PUSCH.* * **CATT** * *Proposal 2: There are two options on the actual number of scheduled cells by a DCI as follows.* * *Option-1: is fixed to N, the scheduled cells are configured by higher layer.* * *Option-2: can dynamically change from 1 to M, the combination of scheduled cells is indicated by DCI, e.g. carrier indicator field.* * **China Telecom** * *Proposal 2: The multiple cells that can be scheduled by the multi-cell scheduling DCI are configured by RRC signaling. Detailed configuration signaling are FFS.* * *Proposal 3: The actually scheduled cells among the cells being able to be scheduled by the multi-cell scheduling DCI are determined dynamically by the DCI indication.* * **NEC** * *Proposal 2: The set of cell combinations are configured for each CIF. To determine which cell combination is scheduled via the CIF, down-select the two options:* * *Option A: a new field in DCI to switch the cell combination used in the set for the CIF* * *Option B: a reserved/predefined value in existing field to indicate enabled and disabled of cells in the set for the CIF.* * **Samsung** * *Proposal 2: RRC configures ‘set-level’ CIF values that correspond to sub-sets of co-scheduled cells from a set of co-scheduled cells.* * **OPPO** * *Proposal 3: The indication scheme for scheduled cells needs to be defined, e.g. indicated cells in DCI directly, or indicated by pre-configured cell combination in DCI.* * **InterDigital** * *Proposal 1: Study indicating scheduling information for multiple cells using the same DCI bitfield.* * *Proposal 2: A bitfield in the DCI can indicate the scheduled cells.* * **CMCC** * *Proposal 2. The sets of scheduled cells can be pre-configured by RRC signaling, and the new multi-cell scheduling DCI is used to dynamically indicate which set to be scheduled.* * **LG Electronics** * *Proposal #1: Discuss how to indicate scheduled cell(s) via the multi-cell DCI, based on the following two options.* * *Option 1: Based on CIF field only*   + - *Different CIF values are configured between multi-cell scheduling case and single-cell scheduling case.* * *Option 2: Based on 1-bit flag and CIF field*   + - *The 1-bit flag indicates whether the DCI schedules multi-cell or single-cell, and the CIF field indicates multi-cell CIF value or single-cell CIF value according to the 1-bit flag.* * **Intel** * *Proposal 4* * *For multi-cell scheduling, a joint carrier and BWP indication field is included in the DCI to determine a set of carriers and BWPs from a configured table.* * *Dynamic switching between single-cell and multi-cell scheduling is supported.* * **Fujitsu** * *Proposal 3: A DCI for multi-cell PUSCH/PDSCH scheduling indicates its scheduled cells. Consider the following 3 options to support the indication.* * *Option 1: The DCI includes a single carrier indicator field (CIF). And the CIF can indicate which set of cells is scheduled.* * *Option 2: The DCI includes a bitmap, with bits one-to-one mapping to multiple cells.* * *Option 3: When the DCI includes multiple fields for same indication purpose (e.g., FDRA) with one-to-one mapping to multiple cells, use a specific value of the fields to indicate not scheduling corresponding cell.* |

### Moderator summary and proposals based on contributions

Regarding the indication of co-scheduled cells by a multi-cell scheduling DCI, 12 companies [ZTE, Nokia/NSB, CATT, China Telcom, NEC, Samsung, OPPO, Interdigital, CMCC, LGE, Intel, Fujitsu] propose using/considering single carrier indicator field in the multi-cell scheduling DCI for indicating the co-scheduled cells. Majority companies prefer predefining a table with each row defining a combination of scheduled cells and using DCI to indicate one row of the table. So the DCI overhead can be reduced and the scheduling flexibility is guaranteed. Moderator suggests below proposal to capture a high-level design.

Considering different UE capabilities in UL CA and DL CA, it is reasonable to predefine two tables for DL and UL multi-cell scheduling, respectively.

### 1st round of discussions

#### Proposal 3-3:

* For multi-cell scheduling, the co-scheduled cells are indicated by carrier indicator pointing to one row of a table defining combinations of scheduled cells.
* The table is configured by RRC signaling.
* Separate tables can be configured for multi-cell PDSCH scheduling and multi-cell PUSCH scheduling.

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Qualcomm | P3-3: generally OK.  On the 2nd sub-bullet, we are not sure if the separate tables here mean fully independent tables (we think not). We propose to put “FFS” on the 2nd sub-bullet for now. |
| Nokia/NSB | Support  On the comment by QC, the point being that PDSCH & PUSCH operation is independent (and there may be potentially less UL CA cells than DL CA cells). So having separate configuration for PUSCH & PDSCH scheduling seems to be needed. |
| OPPO | We agree on the single CIF filed. But the single CIF could be either a table pointer or a bitmap. The proposal is just one choice. We do not want to land on a situation that the CIF field overhead saving is not big enough while the RRC table overhead is big. |
| Xiaomi | Fine with the proposal. |
| Fujitsu | We agree CIF field can be used for the indication. However, we think the details (e.g. whether it is table based, what is the RRC signaling) may need more discussions. For now, we suggest to consider following changes: Proposal 3-3:  * For multi-cell scheduling, CIF field in DCI format 0-X/1-X are used for indicating scheduled cells per DCI. * A CIF value corresponds to a set of co-scheduled cells.. * FFS: whether the CIF field is a bitmap, or a row indicator based on a table defining combinations of co-scheduled cells * FFS: how to define/configure the mapping between CIF values and corresponding set of co-scheduled cells * FFS: whether additional field is needed for indicating the scheduled cells. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support this proposal. |
| Langbo | We support this proposal in principle.  In our understanding, the carrier indicator is carried by multi-cell DCI and may not necessarily reuse the existing CIF field or is called CIF.  For separate table or joint table, we do not have strong view. However we prefer to leave it FFS at this moment as a single table can still work if we always restrict UL co-scheduled cells are a subset of DL co-scheduled cells. |
| LG | OK with the main bullet and the first sub-bullet, but it is better to put FFS on the second sub-bullet for now. |
| CMCC | We are generally OK with the proposal, whether to use a mapping table or other forms of dynamic indication can be further discussed. |
| ZTE | We are open to the proposal 3-3. |
| MTK | Same view as OPPO. Using table pointer or a bitmap can be further discussed. |
| China Telecom | For one stage DCI, there is another option. Since the actually co-scheduled cells are not known before decoding the DCI the separate fields are mapped to the RRC configured maximum number of cells that can be scheduled by the multi-cell scheduling DCI. The option is to use specific value (e.g. all “1”) of the fields to indicate the corresponding cell is not scheduled. Thus the carrier indicator is not required, DCI overhead is further reduced and the actually co-scheduled cells are also determined dynamically. |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal in principle. However, we think it would be good to jointly indicate the carrier index and BWP index. We also think same table can be used for PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling. Proposal 3-3:  * For multi-cell scheduling, the co-scheduled cells are indicated by carrier indicator pointing to one row of a table defining combinations of scheduled cells. * The table is configured by RRC signaling. * FFS the cells and BWPs can be jointly indicated. * ~~Separate tables can be configured for multi-cell PDSCH scheduling and multi-cell PUSCH scheduling.~~ |
| Vivo | We are open to the proposal |
| Ericsson1 | As commented earlier, for ‘carrier indicator’, if intention is to say indication of the scheduled cells, then perhaps update accordingly to avoid confusion with existing CIF field in non-fallback DCI formats. The field indicating co-scheduled cells can be different from CIF.  Also, RRC configured table does not seem to be necessary e.g. a bitmap to indicate the co-scheduled cells can be used. |
| Samsung | Generally OK with the proposal, and agree to put FFS for the second sub-bullet.  Also, better to modify as “carrier indicator field (CIF)” to have consistent terminology with legacy DCI formats, although the intention is to refer to a set/subset of co-scheduled cells. |
| CATT | OK |
| Moderator | Below update is added to address your concerns. Proposal 3-3:  * For multi-cell scheduling, the co-scheduled cells are indicated by an indicator in the DCI format 0\_X/1\_X. At least below two options are considered: * Option 1: the indicator points to one row of a table defining combinations of scheduled cells.   + The table is configured by RRC signaling.   + FFS: Separate tables can be configured for multi-cell PDSCH scheduling and multi-cell PUSCH scheduling. * Option 2: the indicator is a bitmap corresponding to configured cells. * FFS whether the co-scheduled cells and BWPs can be jointly indicated |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support option 1. Option 2 may need large quantity of bits to indicate the scheduled cells. |

### 2nd round of discussions

#### Proposal 3-3:

* For multi-cell scheduling, the co-scheduled cells are indicated by an indicator in the DCI format 0\_X/1\_X. At least below two options are considered:
* Option 1: the indicator points to one row of a table defining combinations of scheduled cells.
  + The table is configured by RRC signaling.
  + FFS: Separate tables can be configured for multi-cell PDSCH scheduling and multi-cell PUSCH scheduling.
* Option 2: the indicator is a bitmap corresponding to configured cells.
* FFS whether the co-scheduled cells and BWPs can be jointly indicatedWe

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| New H3C | We are fine with this proposal 3-3 |
| Nokia/NSB | We are OK – but fail to see the FFS there (is this about joint indication of cell & BWP switching)? |
| Apple | We are fine with the first bullet but do not understand the FFS here. |
| LG | We are OK, and same view with Nokia and Apple on the FFS part. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support this proposal in general. For the FFS, we are not sure whether we got the intention correctly, but we understood that it means the BWP index for each scheduled cell can be indicated together with the co-scheduled cells indication described above, is it correct? |
| Intel | FFS is for the joint indication of BWP and cell index.  We are fine with the proposal. |
| Samsung2 | For Option 2, not clear about “configured cells”. Is the intention all serving cells configured to be scheduled by a scheduling cell via single-cell/multi-cell DCI format(s), or is it only the set of co-scheduled cells corresponding to the scheduling cell? In the latter case, how does the bitmap work if more than one set of co-scheduled cells are configured for a scheduling cell?  Also, suggest to remove the FFS. |
| Ericsson2 | Clarify Option 2 as follows: The indicator in a DCI 0\_X/1\_X is a bitmap corresponding to a set configured cells that can be scheduled by the DCI 0\_X/1\_X |
| MTK | We are fine with the FL proposal |
| Moderator | @Nokia @Apple @LG: this FFS is proposed by Intel. The intention is to study whether co-scheduled cells and BWPs can be joint indicated. If we just say “FFS BWP indication”, would it be OK?  @NTT DOCOMO: Yes.  @Samsung: I think both cases may be possible. As you mentioned, it depends on detailed design whether the bitmap is corresponding to all the cells configured to the UE or a sub-set of configured cells.  @Ericsson: your update is fine.  @All: Please kindly check below changes on FFS part. Proposal 3-3:  * For multi-cell scheduling, the co-scheduled cells are indicated by an indicator in the DCI format 0\_X/1\_X. At least below two options are considered: * Option 1: the indicator points to one row of a table defining combinations of scheduled cells.   + The table is configured by RRC signaling.   + FFS: Separate tables can be configured for multi-cell PDSCH scheduling and multi-cell PUSCH scheduling. * Option 2: the indicator is a bitmap corresponding to a set configured cells that can be scheduled by the DCI 0\_X/1\_X |
| CMCC | We are OK with the proposal. |
| Fujitsu | We are OK with the updated proposal. |
| Langbo | OK with the updated proposal. |
| Qualcomm | We are OK with the updated proposal. |
| CATT | We are ok with the proposal. But we suggest to clarify the FFS about the intention/motivation to introduce a separate tables in additional to the table defining combinations of scheduled cells. The current FFS in the proposal may not be clear. |
| Nokia/NSB | We support option 1.  On the added FFS to the separate tables: the reason to have separate tables (and potentially different bit-width) is coming from the fact that the number of UL serving cells may be smaller than in DL, so definitely this would need to be independent to take the UL & DL CA capability of the UE into account. The 0\_X & 1\_X operation should be fully independently especially as a smaller number of UL cells is to be expected. |
| ZTE | We are fine with the updated proposal. |
| Moderator2 | @CATT: since UL and DL may have different CA capability, separate tables may be necessary for DL and UL respectively. |
| LG | Fine with the updated P3-3. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Ok |
| Vivo2 | since UL and DL may have different CA capability, it seems we also need a FFS for option2? E.g.,  FFS: separate set of configured cells for for multi-cell PDSCH scheduling and multi-cell PUSCH scheduling. |
| Samsung3 | OK with the proposal. Editorial comment for Option 2: “a set of configured cells”. |
| FGI | Generally okay with the proposal, but we would like to add another option for companies to discuss. Both Option 1 and Option 2 may have larger RRC overhead compared to reusing the current cross carrier scheduling configuration framework. The following option is therefore proposed.  Option 3: the indicator points to scheduled cells with the same indicated CIF value configured via CrossCarrierSchedulingConfig. |
| Moderator3 | @vivo: Ok to add the FFS.  @FGI: Your proposal is not quite clear. What do you refer to “same CIF for scheduled cells”? (Updated) Proposal 3-3:  * For multi-cell scheduling, the co-scheduled cells are indicated by an indicator in the DCI format 0\_X/1\_X. At least below two options are considered: * Option 1: the indicator points to one row of a table defining combinations of scheduled cells.   + The table is configured by RRC signaling.   + FFS: Separate tables can be configured for multi-cell PDSCH scheduling and multi-cell PUSCH scheduling. * Option 2: the indicator is a bitmap corresponding to a set of configured cells that can be scheduled by the DCI 0\_X/1\_X   + FFS: Separate sets of configured cells for multi-cell PDSCH scheduling and multi-cell PUSCH scheduling. |
| FGI | @Moderator  Thanks for the question for clarification. Please find our polished wording for our propsed option 3 as below:  **Option 3**: the indicator reuse at least the current CIF field and other field (e.g., FDRA)) of the scheduling DCI.  NOTE: The scheduled cells identified by CIF value configured via CrossCarrierSchedulingConfig. |
| LG | Fine with the re-updated P3-3. |
| MTK | We are fine with **(Updated) Proposal 3-3**. |
| China Telecom | We think the proposal proposes a dedicated explicit field to indicate the co-scheduled cells in the DCI. For the DCI overhead saving, another option that does not require such an explicit field is also suggested to be further studied. As the example, when the bits of separate field(s) are set to a specific value, it indicates the corresponding cell is not scheduled. Or the cell is scheduled or not is jointly encoded with other separate information (e.g. BWP, FDRA) of the cell as considered by some companies. Thus, we propose the following update of the proposal.   * For multi-cell scheduling, the co-scheduled cells are indicated by ~~an indicator in the~~ DCI format 0\_X/1\_X dynamically. At least below two options are considered: * Option 1: An ~~the~~ indicator in the DCI points to one row of a table defining combinations of scheduled cells.   + The table is configured by RRC signaling.   + FFS: Separate tables can be configured for multi-cell PDSCH scheduling and multi-cell PUSCH scheduling. * Option 2: An ~~the~~ indicator in the DCI is a bitmap corresponding to a set of configured cells that can be scheduled by the DCI 0\_X/1\_X   + FFS: Separate sets of configured cells for multi-cell PDSCH scheduling and multi-cell PUSCH scheduling. * Option 3: Use specific value of a field(s) in the DCI to indicate the corresponding cell(s) are not scheduled.   **Option 3**: the indicator reuse at least the current CIF field and other field (e.g., FDRA)) of the scheduling DCI.  NOTE: The scheduled cells identified by CIF value configured via CrossCarrierSchedulingConfig. |
| Moderator4 | @China Telecom: @FGI: I think your proposals are similar. Can I merge them as below:  Option 3: using existing CIF field or FDRA field to indicate whether one or more cells are scheduled or not  @ALL: Please provide your comments directly in next section for new round of discussions. |

### 3rd round of discussions

#### Proposal 3-3:

* For multi-cell scheduling, the co-scheduled cells are indicated by ~~an indicator in the~~ DCI format 0\_X/1\_X dynamically. At least below two options are considered:
* Option 1: An ~~the~~ indicator in the DCI points to one row of a table defining combinations of scheduled cells.
  + The table is configured by RRC signaling.
  + FFS: Separate tables can be configured for multi-cell PDSCH scheduling and multi-cell PUSCH scheduling.
* Option 2: An ~~the~~ indicator in the DCI is a bitmap corresponding to a set of configured cells that can be scheduled by the DCI 0\_X/1\_X
  + FFS: Separate sets of configured cells for multi-cell PDSCH scheduling and multi-cell PUSCH scheduling.
* Option 3: using existing field (e.g., CIF, FDRA) to indicate whether one or more cells are scheduled or not
* Other options are not precluded.

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Apple | OK  Editorial: remove “two” in the main bullet. |
| Spreadtrum | We prefer to add a “FFS the relationship with CCE indexes of PDCCH candidates” as a bullet.  In Rel-15, the CCE index of a PDCCH candidates depends on  if CCS is applied, and is also the carrier indicator field in the DCI to indicate which carrier is scheduled. However, if the new method is used for the indication of co-scheduled cells, how to decide the CCE indexes of PDCCH candidates, i.e. the parameter in the hash function, need to be discussed. We prefer different combinations of scheduled cells share the same CCE indexes, i.e. there is no different value in the hash function to differ the co-scheduled cell combinations. |
| Qualcomm | We think Option 3 is one way of Option 1. It is not clear why it is an isolated Option.  On Option 1, suggest to change as “one row of a table defining combinations of scheduled cell(s)”  We agree with Spreadtrum: “FFS the relationship with CCE indexes of PDCCH candidates” can be added. Our preference is opposite from Spreadtrum’s – a UE shall be able to know which set of CCEs or PDCCH candidates has to be processed for a particular cell or for a particular set of cells. This allows a UE to make some prioritization for PDCCH in its internal process taking into account which candidates are for which cells. This is currently possible in legacy cross-carrier scheduling and should be available for multi-cell scheduling. |
| FGI | We are fine with current proposals |
| Moderator | @Qualcomm: In option 3, existing CIF is reused and there is no RRC configured scheduled cell combination. So Option 3 is separate.  @Spreadtrum: In current proposal, we don’t use “CIF” or “carrier indicator “ in the main bullet is to avoid confusion with existing CIF or n\_CI. CCE determination is anyways necessary on how to interpret n\_CI. I prefer discussing n\_CI in next step. The current proposal can be focused ooh wo to indicate scheduled cells. |
| Vivo | OK |
| Intel | Our original proposal was missing. Suggest the following update: Proposal 3-3:  * For multi-cell scheduling, the co-scheduled cells are indicated by ~~an indicator in the~~ DCI format 0\_X/1\_X dynamically. At least ~~below two~~ the following options are considered: * Option 1: An ~~the~~ indicator in the DCI points to one row of a table defining combinations of scheduled cells.   + The table is configured by RRC signaling.   + FFS: Separate tables can be configured for multi-cell PDSCH scheduling and multi-cell PUSCH scheduling. * Option 2: An ~~the~~ indicator in the DCI is a bitmap corresponding to a set of onfigure cells that can be scheduled by the DCI 0\_X/1\_X   + FFS: Separate sets of configured cells for multi-cell PDSCH scheduling and multi-cell PUSCH scheduling. * Option 3: using existing field (e.g., CIF, FDRA) to indicate whether one or more cells are scheduled or not * Option 4: An indicator in the DCI points to one row of a table defining combinations of scheduled cells and BWP.   + The table is configured by RRC signaling.   + FFS: Separate tables can be configured for multi-cell PDSCH scheduling and multi-cell PUSCH scheduling. * Other options are not precluded. |
| Xiaomi | Fine |
| New H3C | OK |
| Nokia/NSB | OK Agree with apple to remove the ‘below ~~two~~ options’ as we now have more than two |
| LG | OK |
| Fujitsu | OK with the proposal. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support this proposal. We are also fine with the moderator’s suggestion that the relation between n\_CI and CCE index determination would be discussed in the next step. |
| MTK | OK with the proposal. |
| ZTE | Fine with this proposal. |
| CMCC | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Langbo | OK with the proposal. |
| Samsung4 | OK with the proposal. Support QC that the indication should be such that the UE will know, prior to DCI decoding, which cell or which set of co-scheduled cells the DCI format can possibly schedule. |
| Moderator | @Intel: I understand your point. Can we discuss cell level scheduling indication first then BWP level? On the other hand, opt 4 seems covered by opt1 except BWP indication.  Considering majority companies prefer current proposal, I tend to keep it with minor change on main bullet. (Update)Proposal 3-3:  * For multi-cell scheduling, the co-scheduled cells are indicated by ~~an indicator in the~~ DCI format 0\_X/1\_X dynamically. At least ~~below two~~ the following options are considered: * Option 1: An ~~the~~ indicator in the DCI points to one row of a table defining combinations of scheduled cells.   + The table is configured by RRC signaling.   + FFS: Separate tables can be configured for multi-cell PDSCH scheduling and multi-cell PUSCH scheduling. * Option 2: An ~~the~~ indicator in the DCI is a bitmap corresponding to a set of configured cells that can be scheduled by the DCI 0\_X/1\_X   + FFS: Separate sets of configured cells for multi-cell PDSCH scheduling and multi-cell PUSCH scheduling. * Option 3: using existing field (e.g., CIF, FDRA) to indicate whether one or more cells are scheduled or not * Other options are not precluded. |
| CATT | We are fine with the proposal. One clarification is that ‘the indicator in the DCI’ in Option1includs the method of using existing filed (e.g. CIF). |
| Apple | Even though we are not against Option 3, Option 3 seems to be handling different dimensions from Option 1/2. Theoretically, Option 3 can be used in combination with either Option 1 or Option 2. Maybe Option 3 could be listed as FFS bullet under both Option 1 and Option 2. |
| Ericsson4 | OK. |
| Moderator2 | @CATT @Apple: I think the main difference between Option 1 and Option 3 is there is no RRC configured table for defining scheduling cell combinations. |
| China Telecom | We are fine with the proposal. |
| LG | Fine with the updated P3-3. |
| Qualcomm | We still fail to see why Option 3 has to be captured. Option 3 requires RRC configured table to work. But we can live with this for now. |
| MTK | Fine with the proposal. |
| China Telecom2 | @ Qualcomm, our understanding of option 3 is the existing field may be separate field or joint indication field. If separate field is used, each separate field is mapped to the RRC configured maximum number of cells that can be scheduled by the multi-cell scheduling DCI. When the bits of separate field are set to a specific value, it can indicate the corresponding cell is not scheduled. If joint indication field is used, the jointly encoded separate information for each cell can also include the information the cell is scheduled or not. All of the above does not require RRC configured table for defining scheduling cell combinations. |
| Moderator3 | @China Telecom: is separate FDRA used in option 3 for indicating PRB allocation on a cell if the cell is scheduled or zero RB on the cell if the cell is not scheduled? If yes, what are you referring to “each separate field is mapped to the RRC configured maximum number of cells that can be scheduled by the multi-cell scheduling DCI”? Furthermore, in case of joint indication, how does joint encoded information correspond to each cell without RRC signaling? |
| Samsung6 | OK in general with the updated proposal. Just would like clarification about “dynamically” in the main bullet. It is a bit confusing and probably not necessary. |
| Moderator3 | @Samsung: I understand “dynamically” means the scheduled cells or combinations can be changed from one multi-cell DCI to another. It is similar to CIF in legacy DCI. I think it is OK to keep the word. |
| New H3C | OK with updated proposal |
| China Telecom3 | Thanks Moderator3 for the questions. The answer to the first question is yes, and zero RB can be indicated for type 0 RA. For the second question, the actually co-scheduled cells are not known before decoding the DCI, the DCI size should be determined based on the maximum number of cells can be scheduled by the DCI. We think each cell within the maximum number of cells to be scheduled by the DCI has its corresponding separate field. There is a mapping between a separate field and a cell within the maximum number of cells that can be scheduled by the DCI. For the joint indication, the table may not need to be configured by RRC, if the joint indication can indicate one combination of separate information among all the possible combinations. |

## Other related issues

|  |
| --- |
| * **ZTE** * *Proposal 9: The fields for Rel-16/17 feature is supported and can be configurable in the multi-cell scheduling DCI.* * **Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell** * *Proposal 3.5.2: For mixed SCS multi-cell DCI scheduling operation, apply the Rel-16 processing timelines as if the multi-DCI represented individual single-cell DCI, each scheduling a different carrier.* * **Spreadtrum Communications** * *Proposal 12: The gap between PDCCH end symbol and the starting position of PDSCH defined in 38.214 should be applied for multi-cell scheduling with a single DCI when the SCS of scheduled cell is different from the scheduling cell.* * **Vivo** * *Proposal 4. For FDRA in mc-DCI, the FDRA granularity may be scaled or determined considering the BW of all the scheduled cells to reduce DCI size.* * **NEC** * *Proposal 3: RRC can configure additional scheduling cell group. Within scheduling cell groups, DCI bit field is shared by cells in scheduling cell groups. Among scheduling cell groups, DCI bit fields are specific for each scheduling cell groups.* * **Langbo** * *Proposal 1: Per scheduled cell configuration or per scheduling cell configuration can be considered for multi-cell PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling.* * *Proposal 2: Co-scheduled cells are considered jointly as a virtual cell for search space design when multi-cell PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling is configured.* * *Proposal 4: Both absolute indication and differential indication are supported by the DCI fields pdateted for multi-cell PUSCH/PDSCH scheduling.* * **Intel** * *Proposal 3* * *A number of cells can be grouped for multi-cell scheduling, where some DCI fields may not be shared between different groups.* * *Proposal 5* * *For multi-cell scheduling, a row of the TDRA table can configure separate resource allocation in time for all the configured cells.* * *Repetition is not supported if more than one PDSCHs or PUSCHs are scheduled for multi-cell scheduling.* * *Proposal 6* * *For multi-cell scheduling, a resource allocation type is configured or dynamically indicated in the DCI, which is commonly applied for the scheduled PDSCHs/PUSCHs.* * *A reference cell is defined to determine the FDRA size in the DCI.* * *Proposal 7* * *2 TBs are supported for multi-cell PDSCH scheduling.* * *For multi-cell PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling,*    + - *MCS is commonly applied for the scheduled PDSCHs (1st and 2nd TB), and PUSCHs, respectively.*     - *RV and NDI bitmap is defined, where each bit in the bitmap is used to indicate the RV and NDI for each scheduled PDSCH (1st and 2nd TB) and PUSCH, respectively.* * *Proposal 8* * *HARQ process number is commonly applied for the scheduled PDSCHs (1st and 2nd TB), and PUSCHs, respectively.* * *Proposal 10* * *Single PRI and K1 per DCI are included per DCI.* * *HARQ-ACK information corresponding to PDSCHs in one codebook scheduled by the DCI is multiplexed in a single PUCCH in a slot that is determined based on K1, where K1 is the slot offset between the last PDSCH (with the last ending symbol) and the PUCCH.* * *Proposal 13* * *Both Rel-15/16 TCI framework and Rel-17 unified TCI framework are supported for multi-cell scheduling.* * *With Rel-15/16 TCI framework, different PDSCHs scheduled by a DCI may use default TCI state or DCI-indicated TCI state depending on the delay between DCI and scheduled PDSCH.* * *With Rel-15/16 TCI framework, UE may also expect the activated TCI states are not changed in the span from first PDSCH to last PDSCH that are scheduled by the same DCI.* * **Charter Communications** * *Proposal 1: Consider enhanced multi-carrier operation where a single DCI can schedule PDSCH on three or more cells, including Scells with a dormant BWP, for energy-efficient and low-latency NR performance.* * **Qualcomm** * *Proposal 8:* * *Support Scell deactivation and Scell dormant BWP for a subset or all of cells configured with multi-cell scheduling with a single DCI* * *FFS spec impact e.g., application delay, DCI sizing/parsing, etc* * *Proposal 9:* * *Support power efficiency operation for CA with multi-cell scheduling with a single DCI, e.g.:*   + - *Opt.1: Minimum scheduling offset for power efficiency adaptation* * *So that the UE (and possibly NW) can adapt BB/RF bandwidth(s) dynamically* * *FFS: Necessary min scheduling offset for bandwidth(s) adaptation*   + - *Opt.2: Scheduling cell switch* * For example: * *State 1: DCI for scheduling FR2 cells is monitored/received on a FR1 cell* * *State 2: DCI for scheduling FR2 cells is monitored/received on FR2 cell(s)* * *The UE determines state 1 or state 2 depending on NW signalling or condition(s)* * *FFS: Necessary time gap for scheduling cell switch* |

# HARQ enhancements

Based on contributions submitted by companies, below issues are prioritized for discussion in this meeting. Within each sub-section, the summary from moderator’s perspective is listed and followed by draft proposals for further discussion round by round.

## Background and submitted proposals

Regarding this issue, companies’ views are summarized as below:

|  |
| --- |
| * **Huawei, HiSilicon** * *Proposal 9: Design of HARQ-ACK codebook needs be discussed in the case of multi-cell scheduling by a single DCI.* * **ZTE** * *Proposal 8: Shared or separate indication for the fields of HARQ-ACK feedback should be determined considering both overhead reduction and spec impact.* * **Vivo** * *Proposal 8. For type 1 HARQ-ACK codebook, an extension depending on the TDRA indication for multi-cell scheduling to the K1 set should be considered. Moreover, further enhancement on top of the legacy K1 set extension may be needed.* * *Proposal 9. For type 2 HARQ-ACK codebook, the multi-cell scheduling is not expected to be configured with CBG-based or multi-PDSCH scheduling simultaneously for any serving cell within a same PUCCH cell group.* * *Proposal 10. For the type 2 HARQ-ACK codebook, HARQ-ACK bits corresponding to mc-DCI should be contained in a separate sub-codebook apart from the sub-codebook for sc-DCI.* * *Proposal 11. For the type 2 HARQ-ACK sub-codebook, the C-DAI/T-DAI can be counted per mc-DCI.* * **Lenovo** * *Proposal 10: For Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook determination, the number of HARQ-ACK information bits for each multi-cell PDSCH scheduling DCI is determined based on the maximum number of carriers scheduled by the multi-cell PDSCH scheduling DCI.* * *Proposal 11: The carriers scheduled by a single DCI are included in same cell group.* * **Samsung** * *Proposal 8: Define a reference PDSCH for determination of the PUCCH resource/slot with HARQ-ACK corresponding to multiple PDSCHs scheduled on multiple serving cells by a multi-cell scheduling DCI format.* * *Proposal 9: Consider requirements for supporting Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook for co-scheduled PDSCHs on a set of co-scheduled cells with different SCS configurations and joint or separate TDRA tables.* * *Proposal 10: Determine counter DAI definition and ordering of HARQ-ACK information bits in a Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook for multi-cell scheduling.* * *Proposal 11: Don’t support HARQ bundling corresponding to multiple scheduled PDSCHs on a set of co-scheduled cells.* * *Proposal 12: Support generation of a Type-3 HARQ-ACK codebook corresponding to both individual cells and sets of co-scheduled cells.* * *Proposal 13: Out-of-order (OoO) scheduling requirement for the case of multi-cell scheduling is applicable for each corresponding PDSCH/PUSCH.* * **Apple** * *Proposal 2: Multi-cell scheduling DCI shall not introduce out-of-order PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling or out-of-order HARQ-ACK for any scheduled cell at least for single-TRP operation.* * *Proposal 5: Use the Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook construction mechanism for above 52.6GHz as the starting point for the Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook construction with multi-cell scheduling DCI.* * **NTT DOCOMO** * *Proposal 11: RAN1 should discuss the following aspects related to HARQ feedback for multi-carrier PDSCH scheduling with a single DCI;* * *applicable HARQ-ACK codebook and required enhancements for each type of codebook if any* * *HARQ feedback timing determination* * *PUCCH cell group limitation* * **LG Electronics** * *Proposal #8: Discuss how to align HARQ-ACK slot timing corresponding to multiple PDSCH receptions on the cells scheduled by a same multi-cell DCI.* * *Proposal #9: Discuss how to construct Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook in case with multi-cell PDSCH scheduling, in terms of following two aspects.* * *SLIV pruning procedure for the cell schedulable by the multi-cell DCI* * *Determination of K1 set for the cell schedulable by the multi-cell DCI* * *Proposal #10: Discuss how to construct Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook in case with multi-cell PDSCH scheduling, in terms of the following aspects.* * *DAI counting (and corresponding sub-codebook construction) is performed separately between multi-cell scheduling case and single-cell scheduling case.* * *Determination on the number of HARQ-ACK bits per DAI (and the ordering of HARQ-ACK bits within a DAI) for the multi-cell scheduling case needs to be considered.* * *Proposal #11: Discuss some other aspects related to the multi-cell PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling, including the followings.* * *How to indicate TB disabling for PDSCH* * *How to handle scheduled but deactivated Scell* * *How to handle the out-of-order HARQ issue* * **Intel** * *Proposal 11* * *Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook is generated according to extended K1 based on K1 for reference PDSCH and slot offset between reference PDSCH and PDSCH in different CCs.* * *Further study on how to derive slot offset between reference PDSCH and PDSCH in different CCs.* * *Proposal 12* * *Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook considers at least two sub-codebooks for single PDSCH and multi-cell PDSCH scheduling.*   + - *Further study the case with CBG transmission*     - *Further study reference PDSCH for serving cell index to determine DAI order* * **Qualcomm** * *Proposal 7:* * *Support HARQ-ACK codebook that contains HARQ-ACK bits for PDSCH reception(s) scheduled by DCIs for single-cell scheduling and by DCIs for multi-cell scheduling* * *Support all HARQ-ACK codebook types* * *For Type-2, consider re-using HARQ-ACK codebook construction for multi-slot PDSCH scheduling*   + - *Concatenating two sub-codebooks:* * *1st sub-codebook is for PDSCH(s) scheduled by DCI(s) for single-cell scheduling* * *2nd sub-codebook is for PDSCH(s) scheduled by DCI(s) for multi-cell scheduling* * *DAI counting is independent for the sets of DCI(s) for single-cell scheduling and multi-cell scheduling*   + - *CBG based re-transmission is not supported* |

## Moderator summary and proposals based on contributions

Regarding HARQ-ACK feedback timing determination, if a single field of PDSCH-to-HARQ\_ACK feedback timing indicator is included in the multi-cell scheduling DCI, it is not clear which one of the co-scheduled PDSCHs is regarded as the reference PDSCH so as to determine the PUCCH slot based on the reference PDSCH and the indicated K1 value. This issue is mentioned by 5 companies [vivo, Samsung, NTT DOCOMO, LGE, Intel] and moderator thinks it is necessary to have one agreement to make it clear. How to define the reference PDSCH can be FFS since some companies prefer the last PDSCH while other companies prefer the PDSCH on one scheduled cell with highest or lowest serving cell index.

For Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook, as mentioned by 3 companies [vivo, LG, Samsung], the determination of the Type-1 codebook is related to the design of TDRA indication in the multi-cell PDSCH scheduling DCI. If common TDRA field is included in the multi-cell scheduling PDSCH where a TDRA table is defined for the co-scheduled cells with each row indicating multiple SLIVs for the multiple scheduled cells, then SLIV pruning and K1 set extension need to be considered. For time being, moderator propose suspending this issue until the common TDRA indication with a TDRA table defined with each row indicating multiple SLIVs for the multiple scheduled cells is agreed.

For Type 2 HARQ-ACK codebook, as mentioned by 7 companies [Huawei, vivo, Lenovo, Samsung, LG, Intel, Qualcomm], there are several issues need to be resolved: a first issue is the DAI counting whether it is updated per DCI or per PDSCH or per multi-cell scheduling DCI; a second issue is whether CBG-based transmission can be configured with multi-cell scheduling in same cell group; a third issue is how to generate 2 sub-codebooks as Rel-17 multi-slot PDSCH scheduling, where a first sub-codebook comprises HARQ-ACK information bits for PDSCHs scheduled by single-cell scheduling DCIs and a second sub-codebook comprise HARQ-ACK information bits for PDSCHs scheduled by multi-cell scheduling DCIs; a fourth issue is how to generate HARQ-ACK information bits for a multi-cell scheduling DCI considering the DCI may be missed by UE; a fifth issue is how to order the HARQ-ACK information bits for PDSCHs scheduled by a same DCI in case a single DAI included in the DCI. Moderator thinks such issues are not controversial and can be discussed in the first meeting.

For Rel-15/16/17 Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook, there are at most two sub-codebooks. The first sub-codebook comprises TB-based HARQ-ACK information bits for PDSCHs scheduled by single slot scheduling DCI. The second sub-codebook comprises CBG-based HARQ-ACK information bits for single-slot PDSCH scheduling or TB-based HARQ-ACK information bits for multi-slot PDSCH scheduling in a same serving cell. This is because CBG-based transmission and multi-slot PDSCH scheduling cannot be configured simultaneously in a same PUCCH cell group. Considering limited TU for Rel-18 multi-carrier enhancements, for simplicity, we need restriction of simultaneous configuration of the multi-cell scheduling, CBG-based transmission and single-cell multi-slot PDSCH scheduling within a same cell group. As a result, there are at most two sub-codebooks for the Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook, one for single-cell scheduling and another for multi-cell scheduling.

## 1st round of discussions

#### Proposal 4-1:

* PDSCH-to-HARQ\_timing indicator in the multi-cell PDSCH scheduling DCI indicates a slot level offset between a reference PDSCH of the co-scheduled PDSCHs and the PUCCH slot.
* FFS: the reference PDSCH
* FFS: different SCS between reference PDSCH and other co-scheduled PDSCHs

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Qualcomm | P4-1: OK |
| OPPO | This proposal depends on a common/shared PDSCH-to-HARQ timing indicator as Type-1 field in Proposal 3-2. Our preference is to keep the HARQ timing relation the same way as if the PDSCH’s are scheduled by separate DCIs, which can work even if PDSCH-to-HARQ timing indicator is not a common/shared field. |
| Xiaomi | Fine with the proposal. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support this proposal. |
| Langbo | Support |
| LG | OK |
| Nokia/NSB | Support |
| ZTE | We are fine with this proposal. |
| MTK | Similar view as OPPO. But we can accept the proposal if there is a clear majority. |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal 4-1. |
| Vivo | We support this proposal. |
| Ericsson1 | The intention of the proposal is OK, but the formulation needs to be improved. We suggest the following:   * PDSCH-to-HARQ\_timing indicator in the multi-cell PDSCH scheduling DCI indicates a slot level offset between a PUCCH slot with reference PDSCH of the co-scheduled PDSCHs and ~~the~~ a PUCCH slot with the PUCCH carrying co-scheduled PDSCHs HARQ-ACKs. |
| Samsung | Generally OK with the proposal. Suggest to add an FFS as follows.   * FFS for a unified solution of a reference PDSCH for PUCCH slot determination, last DCI format determination, and DAI counting |
| CATT | We are fine with the proposal 4-1. |
| Moderator | @OPPO: yes, we can discuss this proposal after the decision on single K1 indicator is made.  @Ericsson: Further change from my side. Please check it below:   * PDSCH-to-HARQ\_timing indicator in the multi-cell PDSCH scheduling DCI indicates a slot level offset between a slot where reference PDSCH of the co-scheduled PDSCHs is transmitted and ~~the~~ a PUCCH slot with the PUCCH carrying HARQ-ACK feedback for co-scheduled PDSCHs. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | OK with the proposal. |
| Moderator2 | @OPPO @MTK: I add “if a single PDSCH-to-HARQ\_timing indicator is included in the multi-cell PDSCH scheduling DCI, it indicates…”. Hope it is fine with you.  @Samsung: for your suggested FFS, I think it is a baseline principle. |
|  |  |

#### Proposal 4-2:

* All HARQ-ACK codebook types (Type-1/2/3) are applicable when multi-carrier PDSCH scheduling is configured.

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Qualcomm | P4-2: OK but if there is a concern, we can make this as a working assumption. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support this proposal. |
| Langbo | Support |
| Nokia/NSB | Support |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| LG | OK |
| ZTE | We are open to this proposal. |
| MTK | Prefer QC’s suggestion as a working assumption. |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Vivo | We support QC’s suggestion to make it as a working assumption |
| Ericsson1 | Support. |
| Samsung | Support |
| CATT | Support |
| Moderator | @all: we can make it as working assumption. |
| Huawei | OK to make it as working assumption. |

#### Proposal 4-3:

* For Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook, UE does not expect the multi-cell scheduling is configured with CBG-based transmission or multi-slot scheduling simultaneously within a same PUCCH cell group.

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Qualcomm | P4-3: OK |
| OPPO | Agree. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support this proposal. |
| Langbo | Support |
| LG | OK for CBG-based transmission, but it is better to put FFS on multi-slot scheduling at this stage. |
| Nokia/NSB | Support |
| ZTE | First, we think CBG-based transmission and the multi-slot scheduling should be discussed separately. We are open to the CBG-based transmission because it can improve the efficiency, which can be applied when a few cells are scheduled.  For the multi-slot scheduling, we prefer it can be enabled together with Rel-18 MC scheduling because they have the same benefit, i.e., control overhead reduction. |
| MTK | Support |
| Intel | We do not support this proposal.  Our view is that at least when multi-cell scheduling DCI only schedules a single cell, CBG based transmission can be considered, which is beneficial for spectrum efficiency at least for FR1. The same mechanism as defined for Rel-16 multi-PUSCH scheduling can be reused for multi-cell scheduling.  For multi-slot scheduling, we share similar view as ZTE that it is beneficial for FR2-2 given that multi-slot PDCCH monitoring was defined. |
| Vivo | Support |
| Ericsson1 | OK. |
| Samsung | OK with the proposal. Can clarify that proposal is for PDSCHs, and for all serving cells within the PUCCH group and not only for those corresponding to the MC-DCI, so suggesting a revision as below. Proposal 4-3:  * For Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook, UE does not expect the multi-cell scheduling of PDSCHs is configured with CBG-based transmission or multi-slot scheduling simultaneously of PDSCHs for serving cells within a same PUCCH cell group. |
| CATT | Support |
| Moderator | @LG @ZTE @Intel: Ok to separate multi-slot scheduling and CBG-based transmission.  @Intel: In this proposal, multi-cell scheduling means more than one cell is scheduled. (Updated) Proposal 4-3:  * For Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook, UE does not expect the multi-cell scheduling is configured with CBG-based transmission simultaneously within a same PUCCH group. * FFS simultaneous configuration of multi-cell scheduling and multi-slot scheduling within a same PUCCH group |
| Huawei | OK with the updated proposal. |

#### Proposal 4-4:

* For Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook, two sub-codebooks are generated with a first sub-codebook comprising HARQ-ACK information bits for PDSCH(s) scheduled by single-cell scheduling DCI(s) and a second sub-codebook comprising HARQ-ACK information bits for PDSCH(s) scheduled by multi-cell scheduling DCI(s).
  + Separate DAI counting for single cell scheduling DCI(s) and multi-cell scheduling DCI(s)
  + Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook is generated by concatenating the first sub-codebook and the second sub-codebook.
  + FFS: Number of HARQ-ACK information bits for each multi-cell scheduling DCI
  + FFS: HARQ-ACK information bits ordering for co-scheduled PDSCHs

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Qualcomm | 4-4: OK |
| OPPO | Agree. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support this proposal. |
| Langbo | Support |
| LG | One clarification is needed on whether the single-cell scheduling DCI(s) in the proposal means the DCI that actually schedules one cell, since multi-cell DCI can schedule one cell.  If this clarification is correct, we are OK with the proposal 4-4. |
| Nokia/NSB | Do not support.   As soon as the number of scheduled cells is not the same for each MC-DCI, the envisioned operation here would not be working. Therefore, we think it would be better to have a single C/T-DAI operation for SC-DCI and MC-DCI in a codebook (without sub-codebooks). |
| ZTE | we are OK with proposal if the additional condition is added because we think the single cell scheduling DCI is not needed if the multi-cell scheduling DCI can schedule single cell as discussed above. Proposal 4-4(revised):  * For Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook, two sub-codebooks are generated with a first sub-codebook comprising HARQ-ACK information bits for PDSCH(s) scheduled by single-cell scheduling DCI(s) and a second sub-codebook comprising HARQ-ACK information bits for PDSCH(s) scheduled by multi-cell scheduling DCI(s).   + Separate DAI counting for single cell scheduling DCI(s) and multi-cell scheduling DCI(s)   + Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook is generated by concatenating the first sub-codebook and the second sub-codebook.   + FFS: Number of HARQ-ACK information bits for each multi-cell scheduling DCI   + FFS: HARQ-ACK information bits ordering for co-scheduled PDSCHs   + Each scheduled cell is only configured by single cell scheduling or multi-cell scheduling |
| MTK | Same view as LG. |
| Intel | We suggest to postpone the discussions on Proposal 4-4 before we reach consensus on Proposal 4-3. |
| Vivo | Support |
| Ericsson1 | Do not support.  We share same view as Nokia.  The proposed approach actually complicates the operation where the T-DAI for SC-DCI and MC-DCI can’t be used together for correcting the CB size.  Also, the appending approach when both CB have variable sizes causes more issues as compared to the case that one of the CB has fixed size. |
| Samsung | We are OK with the general principle in the proposal (two sub-codebooks, separate DAI), but agree with LGE/MTK that more clarification is needed for the case that an MC-DCI can schedule a single cell, if supported, which is based on the outcome of the discussion for Proposal 2-6. |
| CATT | OK |
| Moderator | @Nokia @Ericsson: the intention of two sub-codebooks is aligned with existing CBG-based transmission or multi-slot scheduling is configured. If a single DAI for SC-DCI and MC-DCI is used, how can UE solve the HARQ-ACK ambiguity if one DCI is missed? Should UE assume the DCI schedules a single cell or 2 or 4?  @LG @MTK @ZTE: since whether the multi-cell scheduling DCI can be used to schedule a single cell is FFS, I made below update to address your concern. (Updated) Proposal 4-4:  * For Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook, two sub-codebooks are generated with a first sub-codebook comprising HARQ-ACK information bits for PDSCH(s) scheduled by DCI(s) with each scheduling a single cell and a second sub-codebook comprising HARQ-ACK information bits for PDSCH(s) scheduled by DCI(s) with each scheduling more than one cell.   + Separate DAI counting for DCI(s) with each scheduling a single cell and DCI(s) with each scheduling more than one cell   + Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook is generated by concatenating the first sub-codebook and the second sub-codebook.   + FFS: Number of HARQ-ACK information bits for each multi-cell scheduling DCI   + FFS: HARQ-ACK information bits ordering for co-scheduled PDSCHs |

## 2nd round of discussions

#### Proposal 4-1:

* If a single PDSCH-to-HARQ\_timing indicator is included in a DCI format 1\_X, it indicates a slot level offset between a slot where the reference PDSCH of the co-scheduled PDSCHs is transmitted and ~~the~~ a PUCCH slot with the PUCCH carrying HARQ-ACK feedback for co-scheduled PDSCHs.
* FFS: the reference PDSCH
* FFS: different SCS between reference PDSCH and other co-scheduled PDSCHs

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| New H3C | OK with proposal 4-1 |
| Nokia/NSB | WE prefer the original formulation (without the ‘*If a single*’, as having having the option the HARQ of different cells with different PUCCH slots will create other issues as well. |
| Apple | A few comments:  - We prefer not to have the condition added. But if we have to have the condition, it should mean that if we agree to use a single indicator, not if a single indicator is included (which could mean that we agree to support multiple indicators but in case of a single indicator).  If I understand the intention correctly, the reference PDSCH should be one of the co-scheduled PDSCHs.  The last FFS is not clear to us. If it is to be included, we would like to understand what the FFS aspects we are referring to here. Proposal 4-1:  * If a single PDSCH-to-HARQ\_timing indicator is agreed to be supported for DCI format 1\_X, it indicates a slot level offset between a slot where the reference PDSCH of the co-scheduled PDSCHs is transmitted and ~~the~~ a PUCCH slot with the PUCCH carrying HARQ-ACK feedback for co-scheduled PDSCHs. * The reference PDSCH is one of the co-scheduled PDSCHs   + FFS: which one * ~~FFS: different SCS between reference PDSCH and other co-scheduled PDSCHs~~ |
| LG | OK |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support this proposal. The discussion for the 2nd FFS can be integrated to the FFS in Proposal 1-7, thus we are fine to remove this FFS from this proposal. |
| Intel | We are generally fine with the proposal. However, the update from FL may need further revision, given that K1 is not the offset between DL slot and UL slot carrying PUCCH, it is the offset between a UL slot overlapping with PDSCH DL slot and UL slot carrying PUCCH.   * If a single PDSCH-to-HARQ\_timing indicator is included in a DCI format 1\_X, it indicates a slot level offset between a PUCCH slot with ~~where~~ the reference PDSCH of the co-scheduled PDSCHs ~~is transmitted~~ and ~~the~~ a PUCCH slot with the PUCCH carrying HARQ-ACK feedback for co-scheduled PDSCHs. * FFS: the reference PDSCH * FFS: different SCS between reference PDSCH and other co-scheduled PDSCHs   We also share view as other companies that we can remove “if” in the main bullet. |
| Samsung2 | Agree with Nokia that the condition “If a single…” is not needed and should be removed. Also, can clarify that the SCS for K1 timing is as in Rel-17 per PUCCH cell, so suggest the following modification: “… a slot level offset, in the SCS of PUCCH, between…” |
| Ericsson2 | Thanks for the update. But we should keep “PUCCH” here .otherwise would be understood that the slot is DL slot.   * If a single PDSCH-to-HARQ\_timing indicator is included in a DCI format 1\_X, it indicates a slot level offset between a slot where the reference PDSCH of the co-scheduled PDSCHs is transmitted and ~~the~~ a PUCCH slot with the PUCCH carrying HARQ-ACK feedback for co-scheduled PDSCHs.   Basically, for K1, the slots we are considering are all PUCCH slots. So, we count from the PUCCH slot that PDSCH ends K1 step. |
| MTK | We are fine with the FL proposal. |
| Moderator | @Apple: your understanding is correct.  @Intel: “ a PUCCH slot with ~~where~~ the reference PDSCH of the co-scheduled PDSCHs” is not clear to me. What do you mean “a PUCCH slot with the reference PDSCH”?  @ALL: based on companies’ comments, I made below update to address your concern, (Updated)Proposal 4-1:  * PDSCH-to-HARQ\_timing indicator in a DCI format 1\_X indicates a slot level offset, in the SCS of PUCCH, between a slot where the reference PDSCH of the co-scheduled PDSCHs is transmitted and ~~the~~ a PUCCH slot with the PUCCH carrying HARQ-ACK feedback for co-scheduled PDSCHs. * FFS: the reference PDSCH |
| Langbo | We are generally OK with the updated proposal. We are wondering why this only applies to HARQ-ACK feedback carried by PUCCH, not including the case where HARQ-ACK is piggybacked on PUSCH? In our understanding, the slot offset is applicable for the timing between PDSCH and the corresponding HARQ-ACK, regardless whether the HARQ-ACK is carried by PUCCH or PUSCH. We suggest to replace “a PUCCH slot with the PUCCH carrying HARQ-ACK feedback for co-scheduled PDSCHs” with “a slot containing the corresponding HARQ-ACK feedbacks for co-scheduled PDSCHs”. |
| Qualcomm | We prefer Ericsson’s language. Or, maybe we can refer to the language from RAN1 spec. The only delta from the existing spec should be the use of reference PDSCH, rather than the scheduled PDSCH. |
| CATT | Share same view with Intel and Ericsson. The K1 indicates the slot offset between the last UL slot overlapping with the PDSCH slot and the PUCCH slot carrying corresponding HARQ-ACK feedback. Thus, we suggest to add the ‘last UL’ before the slot in the pdate proposal. Otherwise, the definition of K1 will be unclear when the SCS of co-scheduled PDSCH cell is smaller than the SCS of UL cell. Updated)Proposal 4-1:  * PDSCH-to-HARQ\_timing indicator in a DCI format 1\_X indicates a slot level offset, in the SCS of PUCCH, between a **last UL** slot where the reference PDSCH of the co-scheduled PDSCHs is transmitted and ~~the~~ a PUCCH slot with the PUCCH carrying HARQ-ACK feedback for co-scheduled PDSCHs. * FFS: the reference PDSCH |
| Nokia/NSB | This looks good.  Thanks for the updates and taking our comments into account. |
| ZTE | We are fine with the updated proposal. |
| Moderator | Based on the comments by CATT, Intel, Ericsson and QC, below update is made to follow existing spec: (Updated)Proposal 4-1:  * PDSCH-to-HARQ\_timing indicator in a DCI format 1\_X indicates a slot level offset, in the SCS of PUCCH, between a last UL slot overlapping with the slot where the reference PDSCH of the co-scheduled PDSCHs is transmitted and ~~the~~ a PUCCH slot with the PUCCH carrying HARQ-ACK feedback for co-scheduled PDSCHs. * FFS: the reference PDSCH |
| LG | OK with the update P4-1 (although we think the original P4-1 doesn’t seem to have problem). |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Ok |
| Vivo2 | OK |
| Samsung3 | Thanks to Moderator for the response to first-round our comment. Since the FL agrees “*@Samsung: for your suggested FFS, I think it is a baseline principle*”, we suggest to add a note on this baseline principle. Also, an editorial comment that reference PDSCH is received from UE point of view, so we suggest the following modification: (Updated)Proposal 4-1:  * PDSCH-to-HARQ\_timing indicator in a DCI format 1\_X indicates a slot level offset, in the SCS of PUCCH, between a last UL slot overlapping with the slot where the reference PDSCH of the co-scheduled PDSCHs is ~~transmitted~~ received and ~~the~~ a PUCCH slot with the PUCCH carrying HARQ-ACK feedback for co-scheduled PDSCHs. * FFS: the reference PDSCH * Note: The reference PDSCH is used for PUCCH slot determination, last DCI format determination, and DAI counting. |
| MTK | We are fine with **(Updated) FL Proposal 4-1**. Also fine with Samsung’s version. |

#### Proposal 4-2 (Working assumption):

* All HARQ-ACK codebook types (Type-1/2/3) are applicable when multi-carrier PDSCH scheduling is configured.

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| New H3C | We are fine with proposal 4-2 |
| Nokia/NSB | Support |
| Apple | OK |
| LG | OK |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Samsung2 | Support |
| Ericsson2 | OK. |
| MTK | OK |
| Langbo | OK |
| CATT | OK |
| ZTE | OK |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Ok |
| Vivo2 | OK |

#### Proposal 4-3:

* For Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook, UE does not expect the multi-cell scheduling is configured with CBG-based transmission simultaneously within a same PUCCH group.
* FFS simultaneous configuration of multi-cell scheduling and multi-slot scheduling within a same PUCCH group

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| New H3C | We are fine with proposal 4-3 |
| Nokia/NSB | Would have preferred the original formulation (i.e. exclude combination with multi-slot scheduling) |
| Apple | Clarification question: for the first bullet, does it only mean that multi-cell scheduling and CBG-based transmission cannot be configured on the same cell? Or the case with multi-cell scheduling for one cell and CBG-based transmission for another cell is also not allowed? Our understanding is the latter, and would suggest the following:   * For Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook, UE does not expect the multi-cell scheduling and CBG-based transmission are configured simultaneously on the same or different cell within a same PUCCH group. |
| LG | OK |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support this proposal and also fine with the updates by Apple. |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Samsung2 | Agree with Nokia that excluding multi-slot scheduling is preferred to avoid complicated HARQ CB specification. Also, fine with updates from Apple. |
| Ericsson2 | We are fine. Also, fine with original wording that is covered by FFS now. |
| MTK | We tend to share similar understanding as Apple and prefer Apple’s version. |
| Moderator | @Apple: yes, your understanding is correct. The intention is not to allow CBG configuration and multi-cell scheduling on same or different cells within same PUCCH group. Your update is fine with me. (Updated)Proposal 4-3:  * For Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook, UE does not expect the multi-cell scheduling and CBG-based transmission are configured simultaneously on the same or different cell within a same PUCCH group. * FFS simultaneous configuration of multi-cell scheduling and multi-slot scheduling within a same PUCCH group |
| Langbo | OK with updated proposal. |
| Qualcomm | OK with the proposal. |
| CATT | We are fine with the proposal. |
| ZTE | OK with the proposal. |
| LG | Fine with the updated P4-3. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Ok |
| Samsung3 | OK with the Updated proposal 4-3, and fine to add the FFS into the main bullet. |
| MTK | We are fine with **(Updated)Proposal 4-3**. |

#### Proposal 4-4:

* For Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook, two sub-codebooks are generated with a first sub-codebook comprising HARQ-ACK information bits for PDSCH(s) scheduled by DCI(s) with each actually scheduling a single cell and a second sub-codebook comprising HARQ-ACK information bits for PDSCH(s) scheduled by DCI(s) with each actually scheduling more than one cell.
  + Separate DAI counting for DCI(s) with each actually scheduling a single cell and DCI(s) with each actually scheduling more than one cell
  + Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook is generated by concatenating the first sub-codebook and the second sub-codebook.
  + FFS: Number of HARQ-ACK information bits for each multi-cell scheduling DCI
  + FFS: HARQ-ACK information bits ordering for co-scheduled PDSCHs

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| New H3C | We are fine with proposal 4-4 |
| Nokia/NSB | Do not support  We thank the moderator for the replies on the comments from the 1st round. If we really use the HARQ-ACK bits given by the maximum number of cells the DCI can schedule then this should be stated – but still we think this is not needed and rather sub-optimal.  Moreover, in 4-1 we have the ability to include separate k1 values based on the changes there (i.e.HARQ in different PUCCH slots), then the DAI would again not be working or would need to be again for each k1 value indicated a separate DAI!? And each DAI would then indicate HARQ of e.g. 4 cells? |
| Apple | Support |
| LG | OK |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Samsung2 | Prefer to decide on this proposal after making progress on Proposal 2-6. |
| Ericsson2 | Do not support.  Thanks Moderator for the feedback. In addition to Nokia’s comment, if one DCI is missing, the correction is done using total DAI. This doesn’t change with introduction of mc-DAI, meaning that the same problem for single DCI still exists.  Another issue that we raised is appending two CBs, each with dynamic size. If a DCI is missed (s-DCI or mc-DCI), the whole CB is lost.  Anyway, we think there are more issues that needs to be addressed. This topic can be discussed later with proper analysis. |
| MTK | We have similar concern as Nokia. |
| Moderator | @Nokia: Yes, I agree with you that using the max number of carriers scheduled by a DCI for determining the number of HARQ-ACK bits is not optimal. However, that is the common way for LTE and NR to avoid ambiguity on HARQ-ACK codebook size between UE and gNB. As for the method to determine the number of HARQ information bits for each DCI 1\_X, FFS is put there so we can discuss detailed method in next step.  Regarding your 2nd comment, do you intend to propose multiple PUCCHs for the co-scheduled PDSCHs? Such issue has been discussed in Rel-17 above52.6 and not agreed. Considering Rel-18 MCE has very limited Tus, I don’t think we have enough time to go with that way.  @Ericsson: for your first comment, based on total DAI, a UE can identify one DCI is missed, how can UE know the number of scheduled cells by the DCI? For your second comment, with separate DAI for each sub-codebook, such issue will not happen. Similar mechanism is used in Rel-15 CBG-based transmission and Rel-17 above 52.6. |
| Langbo | We support separate sub-codebook and separate DAI. However, the details need further discussions. |
| Qualcomm | OK with the proposal. |
| CATT | We have concern about this proposal.  As mentioned in the main bullet, the first sub-codebook comprising HARQ-ACK information bits for PDSCH(s) scheduled by DCI(s) with each actually scheduling a single. It means that first sub-codebook may be generated according to the legacy DCI scheduling or DCI format 1\_X scheduling that only schedule one cell. If the DCI format 1\_X is defined as a new DCI format other than DCI format 1\_1 in the future, it is better to generate separate HARQ-ACK information as a sub-codebook, regardless of how many cells are actually scheduled by DCI format 1\_X. |
| ZTE | We prefer the original version that the first sub-codebook comprise the HARQ-ACK information bits for the PDSCHs scheuduled by the single cell scheduling DCI and the second sub-codebook comprise the HARQ-ACK information bits for the PDSCHs scheduled by the multi-cell scheduling DCI since the UE may not the actual number of the cells scheduled by the DCI if the DCI is missed.  Another issue is DAI counting, the DAI in MC-DAI should be counted per DCI not actually scheduled PDSCCH. |
| Moderator2 | @CATT: If DCI 1-X is used for scheduling a single cell, I believe its DAI should be counted together with other legacy single-cell scheduling DCI. So there is no issue for separate sub-codebook.  @ZTE: with separate DAIs for DCIs scheduling single cell and DCIs scheduling multiple cells, the DCI missing is not a problem. |
| FGI | Generally okay with the proposal. One thing needs to be clarified is that whether CBG based transmission is not allowed for SC-DCI. Proposal 4-3 seems not precluding the possibility of CBG based transmission for SC-DCI. However, there is only one sub-codebook for SC-DCI in the formulation of Proposal 4-4. |
| Moderator3 | @FGI: based on P4-3, CBG-based transmission for SC-DCI is excluded as long as the SC-DCI and mc-DCI are within same cell group; otherwise, there will be 3 sub-CBs, one for SC-DCIs with TB-based feedback, one for MC-DCIs with TB-based feedback, and one for SC-DCIs with CBG-based feedback  @ALL: Please provide your comments directly in next section for new round of discussions. |

## 3rd round of discussions

#### Proposal 4-1:

* PDSCH-to-HARQ\_timing indicator in a DCI format 1\_X indicates a slot level offset, in the SCS of PUCCH, between a last UL slot overlapping with the slot where the reference PDSCH of the co-scheduled PDSCHs is ~~transmitted~~ received and ~~the~~ a PUCCH slot with the PUCCH carrying HARQ-ACK feedback for co-scheduled PDSCHs.
* FFS: the reference PDSCH
* Note: The reference PDSCH is used for PUCCH slot determination, last DCI format determination, and DAI counting.

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Apple | Can we add a sub-bullet saying “the reference PDSCH is one of the co-scheduled PDSCHs”? I think this is the common understanding. If not, I would like to understand what other possibilities are.  The note is confusing to me. PUCCH slot determination is already covered by the first bullet. But I don’t get the point regarding last DCI format determination and DAI counting. Would appreciate some clarification. |
| Spreadtrum | Share the same question as Apple, how to understand last DCI format determination? |
| Qualcomm | Regarding the note, tend to agree with Apple – we can discuss last DCI format determination and DAI counting separately. Most likely we would prefer a unified definition as proposed by note here, but no need to agreeing them under the P4-1. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree |
| vivo | Same view as apple. For PUCCH determination, the main bullet is straightforward. But we don’t see how is last DCI/DAI relevant to the reference PUCCH. |
| Intel | In our view, last UL slot is not accurate. It is better to use “PUCCH slot” based on the existing design.  For the note, we’d like to clarify the meaning of DAI counting. Does it mean serving cell index of the reference PDSCH is used to determine the DAI order for type-2 codebook? We are fine with this if this is correct understanding. But it is still not clear to us “last DCI format determination” means in the Note. Suggest to remove it. Proposal 4-1:  * PDSCH-to-HARQ\_timing indicator in a DCI format 1\_X indicates a slot level offset, in the SCS of PUCCH, between a ~~last UL~~ PUCCH slot overlapping with the slot where the reference PDSCH of the co-scheduled PDSCHs is ~~transmitted~~ received and ~~the~~ a PUCCH slot with the PUCCH carrying HARQ-ACK feedback for co-scheduled PDSCHs. * FFS: the reference PDSCH * Note: The reference PDSCH is used for PUCCH slot determination, ~~last DCI format determination~~, and DAI counting. |
| Nokia/NSB | OK with the first two bullets.  As Apple pointed out on the Note, it is a bit unclear how the reference PDSCH has anything to do with DAI counting or last DC format determination – **the Intel change on this could be fine**. If not clarified, better to take an agreement on the first two bullet points and remove the note.  On the reference PDSCH, agree with Apple that it would need to be one of the co-scheduled PDSCHs. |
| LG | We also think DAI counting and other aspects can be discussed separately, thus it is better to remove the last Note or leave it as FFS for now.   * Note: whether I reference PDSCH is used for both PUCCH slot determination~~, last DCI format determination,~~ and DAI counting. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Regarding the note, share the same view with Apple. It needs more clarification how reference PDSCH is used for last DCI format determination/DAI counting. |
| MTK | Share similar concern as Apple/QC/vivo |
| ZTE | We think that it should be PUCCH slot instead of ‘UL slot’, since there may be no UL slot overlapping with the slot where the reference PDSCH of the co-scheduled PDSCHs received.  In addition, for the reference for DAI counting, we think more discussion is needed since we haven’t decided the DAI counting rule for multiple scheduling. We think it should be removed or FFS. |
| Samsung4 | Regarding the concern from several companies on the Note, the intention is to use the reference PDSCH to determine PUCCH slot, last DCI format and DAI counting as a unified solution because all the three issues are related to a reference PDSCH/cell. The intention was confirmed by FL that it should be a baseline principle. For multi-cell scheduling, since a DCI can schedule one PDSCH per cell, there is a one-to-one mapping between a PDSCH and a cell. If the reference PDSCH is determined, the cell of the reference PDSCH is determined as well. Using the last DCI format to determine the PUCCH resource and the determination of the last DCI format is based on the cell index for multiple DCI ormat received in a same PDCCH MO. DAI counting is also based on the cell index for multiple DCI formats received in a same PDCCH MO. If a reference cell/PDSCH is determined, we can reuse existing rules of single-cell scheduling for determining PUCCH slot, last DCI format and DAI counting in a unified manner for simplicity.  Also, we have two more comments/suggestions:   * It appears that current wording of K1 timing in the Proposal is assuming slot-based transmission of PUCCH. We would like to understand whether sub-slot-based PUCCH transmission is supported for multi-cell scheduling. * Suggest to replace “last UL slot” with “last PUCCH slot” to make the wording more consistent. |
| Langbo | OK with the first two bullets. The note could be left for further discussion. |
| Moderator | @Apple: “where the reference PDSCH of the co-scheduled PDSCHs is ~~transmitted~~ received” has covered the reference PDSCH is one of co-scheduled PDSCHs.  @Intel @ZTE @Samsung: “last UL slot” is cited from TS38.213. It should be accurate.  @ALL: I tend to update the note to avoid any ambiguity. (Updated)Proposal 4-1:  * PDSCH-to-HARQ\_timing indicator in a DCI format 1\_X indicates a slot level offset, in the SCS of PUCCH, between a last UL slot overlapping with the slot where the reference PDSCH of the co-scheduled PDSCHs is ~~transmitted~~ received and ~~the~~ a PUCCH slot with the PUCCH carrying HARQ-ACK feedback for co-scheduled PDSCHs. * FFS: the reference PDSCH * Note: The reference PDSCH is used at least for PUCCH slot determination. |
| Apple | Maybe it is just us who think it is entirely clear the reference PDSCH may or may not be one of the co-scheduled PDSCHs. If this is the common understanding, can we do a minor addition as highlighted below?  PDSCH-to-HARQ\_timing indicator in a DCI format 1\_X indicates a slot level offset, in the SCS of PUCCH, between a last UL slot overlapping with the slot where the reference PDSCH from the set of the co-scheduled PDSCHs is ~~transmitted~~ received and ~~the~~ a PUCCH slot with the PUCCH carrying HARQ-ACK feedback for co-scheduled PDSCHs. |
| Ericsson4 | To support this proposal, one needs to know what reference PDSCH is, since it is mentioned in main bullet. But it is FFS in 2nd bullet. And the Note, is based on reference PDSCH.  So, we suggest to clarify the reference PDSCH first. Without know what it is , it is difficult to support the proposal since all bullets depend on that. |
| Samsung5 | We don’t think “last DCI format determination, and DAI counting.” In the Note should be removed. We have clarified the intention of the note, all these issues exist because the reference PDSCH/cell is not clear, why not use a unified solution?  As commented by FL in the first round, this should be the baseline principle. If companies think different solutions should be considered, could you please clarify the benefit of using different solutions? |
| LG | OK with the updated P4-1, but prefer to remove Note since it is already covered by the first bullet.  Regarding DAI counting and other related aspects, those can be discussed further/ separately as companies commented. |
| Qualcomm | OK with the updated P4-1. |
| MTK | OK with the updated P4-1. |
| Nokia/NSB | OK with the updated P4-1  On the note: we are fine to have it there based on the current wording (but should NOT include DCI format determination or DAI counting) |
| Samsung6 | As compromise, we are OK to include “last DCI format determination, and DAI counting” in an FFS instead of the note. This will provide a unified design, and should be considered as baseline principle as mentioned by the FL in the first round. So, we suggest the following modification: (Updated)Proposal 4-1:  * PDSCH-to-HARQ\_timing indicator in a DCI format 1\_X indicates a slot level offset, in the SCS of PUCCH, between a last UL slot overlapping with the slot where the reference PDSCH of the co-scheduled PDSCHs is ~~transmitted~~ received and ~~the~~ a PUCCH slot with the PUCCH carrying HARQ-ACK feedback for co-scheduled PDSCHs. * FFS: the reference PDSCH * Note: The reference PDSCH is used at least for PUCCH slot determination. * FFS: re-using the same reference PDSCH for last DCI format determination and DAI counting   Also, looks like our previous question was missed: The current wording of Proposal is assuming slot-based transmission of PUCCH. We would like to understand whether sub-slot-based PUCCH transmission is supported for multi-cell scheduling. |
| Moderator2 | @Samsung: I think it makes progress if we can agree the main bullet and FFS reference PDSCH. Since majority companies are OK with the updated P4-1 from my side, adding more FFS/note may bring new round of discussions on how to understand your point. Considering we have two days for this meeting, let’s agree the main point. Anyway, we have “FFS reference PDSCH” there. Is it OK with you?  Regarding your question on sub-slot PUCCH, do you see any essential issue which is relevant to multi-cell scheduling and has standard impact? |
| Qualcomm | Agree with Moderator2. Regarding sub-slot PUCCH pointed out by Samsung6, perhaps here we are focusing on slot-level PUCCH. We can clarify this as follows.   * If the UE is NOT provided *subslotLengthForPUCCH*, PDSCH-to-HARQ\_timing indicator in a DCI format 1\_X indicates a slot level offset, in the SCS of PUCCH, between a last UL slot overlapping with the slot where the reference PDSCH of the co-scheduled PDSCHs is ~~transmitted~~ received and ~~the~~ a PUCCH slot with the PUCCH carrying HARQ-ACK feedback for co-scheduled PDSCHs. |

#### Proposal 4-3:

* For Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook, UE does not expect the multi-cell scheduling and CBG-based transmission are configured simultaneously on the same or different cell within a same PUCCH group.
* FFS simultaneous configuration of multi-cell scheduling and multi-slot scheduling within a same PUCCH group

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Apple | OK |
| Qualcomm | OK |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Ok |
| vivo | Regarding the FFS, The WID states ‘a solution for multi-cell PUSCH/PDSCH scheduling (one PDSCH/PUSCH per cell) with a single DCI’. I am sure if multi-slot scheduling is out of scope as there are multi repetitions on a scheduled cell. But we are fine with the majority view. |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal, although we still think it is beneficial to support CBG transmission. |
| Nokia/NSB | OK in principle  On the FFS point, maybe could be clarified better to say:   * FFS if simultaneous configuration of multi-cell scheduling and multi-slot scheduling within a same PUCCH group is supported |
| LG | OK |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support this proposal. For the FFS, in our understanding, it intends that multi-cell scheduling with a single DCI and multi-slot scheduling with another single DCI can be configured simultaneously within a same PUCCH group, and it does not mean multiple PDSCH/PUSCH per cell can be scheduled by the MC-DCI.  If such multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling per cell by MC-DCI is supported, WID objective needs to be updated while we are open to discuss. |
| MTK | OK |
| ZTE | Just for clarification, if a scheduled cell can be scheduled by DCI format 1\_X and single cell scheduling DCI, does it means that CBG-based transmission cannot be configured for the PDSCH scheduled by single cell scheduling DCI as well? In our understanding, it is only applied to multiple cell scheduling? |
| Samsung4 | OK with the proposal. We can clarify the FFS as follows: Proposal 4-3:  * For Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook, UE does not expect the multi-cell scheduling and CBG-based transmission are configured simultaneously on the same or different cell within a same PUCCH group. * FFS whether simultaneous configuration of multi-cell scheduling and multi-slot scheduling on different cells within a same PUCCH group is supported. * Note: simultaneous configuration of multi-cell scheduling and multi-slot scheduling in same cell within a same PUCCH group is not supported per WID. |
| Langbo | OK with the proposal. Also fine with Samsung’s clarifications. |
| Moderator | @ZTE:  CBG-based transmission for SC-DCI is excluded as long as the SC-DCI and mc-DCI are within same cell group; otherwise, there will be 3 sub-CBs, one for SC-DCIs with TB-based feedback, one for MC-DCIs with TB-based feedback, and one for SC-DCIs with CBG-based feedback.  @Nokia: The update is fine.  @Samsung: Your suggested note has been covered by FFS. I tend to think the note is not needed. (Updated)Proposal 4-3:  * For Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook, UE does not expect the multi-cell scheduling and CBG-based transmission are configured simultaneously on the same or different cell within a same PUCCH group. * FFS whether simultaneous configuration of multi-cell scheduling and multi-slot scheduling within a same PUCCH group is supported |
| Apple | OK with the updated P4-3. |
| Ericsson4 | OK in principle. Fine with Samsung’s update. |
| LG | OK with the updated P4-3, and also fine with the Note from Samsung. |
| Moderator2 | @All: further update to add the note proposed by Samsung. (Updated)Proposal 4-3rev:  * For Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook, UE does not expect the multi-cell scheduling and CBG-based transmission are configured simultaneously on the same or different cell within a same PUCCH group. * FFS whether simultaneous configuration of multi-cell scheduling and multi-slot scheduling on different cells within a same PUCCH group is supported. * Note: simultaneous configuration of multi-cell scheduling and multi-slot scheduling in same cell within a same PUCCH group is not supported per WID. |
| MTK | OK with the proposal |
| Samsung6 | Fine with the updated proposal |
| Ericsson5 | OK |
| ZTE2 | We suggest to remove the note.  Regarding the objective in this WID, it mentioned one PDSCH/PUSCH per cell indeed. Our understanding is that it means the Rel-18 enhanced method should not indicate the more than one PDSCH/PUSCH in a scheduled cell. However, multi-slot scheduling is by R16/17 method, e.g., TDRA. Maybe the Rel-16/17 indication and Rel-18 indication can co-exist. Therefore, we don’t think the multi-slot scheduling is precluded in the WID. At least, this should be discussed. We think we should remove the note, and discuss this in the FFS. |

#### Proposal 4-4:

* For Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook, two sub-codebooks are generated with a first sub-codebook comprising HARQ-ACK information bits for PDSCH(s) scheduled by DCI(s) with each actually scheduling a single cell and a second sub-codebook comprising HARQ-ACK information bits for PDSCH(s) scheduled by DCI(s) with each actually scheduling more than one cell.
  + Separate DAI counting for DCI(s) with each actually scheduling a single cell and DCI(s) with each actually scheduling more than one cell
  + Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook is generated by concatenating the first sub-codebook and the second sub-codebook.
  + FFS: Number of HARQ-ACK information bits for each multi-cell scheduling DCI
  + FFS: HARQ-ACK information bits ordering for co-scheduled PDSCHs

Companies are encouraged to provide comments in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Apple | OK |
| Qualcomm | OK |
| vivo | OK |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Nokia/NSB | Not OK as noted earlier  We think we first need more information on the supported cases before being able to make this agreement (e.g. multi-slot PDSCH support) and the clarification on the number of HARQ-ACK bits would be needed together with taking this agreement to have the full operation clarified (i.e. the 2nd last bullet). The ordering of bits of course will need also clarification, but we don’t see this as crucial in terms of the P 4-4 here. |
| LG | OK |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support this proposal. |
| MTK | We have similar concern as Nokia. Maybe this can be postponed until the supported cases are confirmed. |
| Samsung4 | As mentioned before, we would like to defer discussion of this proposal until after more progress is made for high-level design principles, including Proposal 2-6. |
| Langbo | OK with the proposal. |
| Moderator | @Nokia @MTK @ Samsung: RAN1 spent much time to fully discuss the same issue in Rel-15 CBG-based transmission and Rel-17 above52.6G. Now, we just reuse Rel-15/17 mechanism with FFS on number of bits and bit ordering per multi-cell DCI.  I’d like to check any technical concern from your side. |
| Ericsson4 | Not OK as we mentioned before.  We keep on receiving the same proposals and we repeat our answer. |
| Nokia/NSB | @Moderator – you state above: *Now, we just reuse Rel-15/17 mechanism with FFS on number of bits and bit ordering per multi-cell DCI.*  Then please complete the proposal to cover also the number of bits and the bit ordering here to have a full solution available. As long as at least the number of bits is not defined, we cannot agree to this (as the proposal is unclear in its operation how to handle changing number of HARQ bits depending on the number of scheduled cells). |
| Moderator | @Ericsson: Below questions has not been answered so I didn’t make any update on the proposal.  To Ericsson: for your first comment, based on total DAI, a UE can identify one DCI is missed, how can UE know the number of scheduled cells by the DCI? For your second comment, with separate DAI for each sub-codebook, such issue will not happen. Similar mechanism is used in Rel-15 CBG-based transmission and Rel-17 above 52.6.  @Nokia: Please check below update to make the proposal complete: (Updated to make solution complete)Proposal 4-4:  * For Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook, two sub-codebooks are generated with a first sub-codebook comprising HARQ-ACK information bits for PDSCH(s) scheduled by DCI(s) with each actually scheduling a single cell and a second sub-codebook comprising HARQ-ACK information bits for PDSCH(s) scheduled by DCI(s) with each actually scheduling more than one cell.   + Separate DAI counting for DCI(s) with each actually scheduling a single cell and DCI(s) with each actually scheduling more than one cell   + Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook is generated by concatenating the first sub-codebook and the second sub-codebook.   + Number of HARQ-ACK information bits for each DCI format 1\_X that schedules more than one cell is determined based on the maximum number of cells scheduled by a DCI format 1\_X for the UE.   + HARQ-ACK information bits for co-scheduled PDSCHs by a DCI format 1\_X is ordered based on serving cell indices associated with co-scheduled PDSCHs. |
| LG | Fine with the updated P4-4 in principle.  But, it is better for now to make working assumption on the third and last sub-bullets for more considerations. In addition, small clarification is needed on the third sub-bullet as below.  (Working assumption)   * + Number of HARQ-ACK information bits for each DCI format 1\_X that schedules more than one cell is determined based on the maximum number of cells co-scheduled by a DCI format 1\_X for the UE.   + HARQ-ACK information bits for co-scheduled PDSCHs by a DCI format 1\_X is ordered based on serving cell indices associated with co-scheduled PDSCHs. |
| Moderator2 | @LG: Thanks for the addition. It is fine with me.  Maybe we can make the whole proposal as working assumption for time being. (Working assumption)Proposal 4-4:  * For Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook, two sub-codebooks are generated with a first sub-codebook comprising HARQ-ACK information bits for PDSCH(s) scheduled by DCI(s) with each actually scheduling a single cell and a second sub-codebook comprising HARQ-ACK information bits for PDSCH(s) scheduled by DCI(s) with each actually scheduling more than one cell.   + Separate DAI counting for DCI(s) with each actually scheduling a single cell and DCI(s) with each actually scheduling more than one cell   + Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook is generated by concatenating the first sub-codebook and the second sub-codebook.   + Number of HARQ-ACK information bits for each DCI format 1\_X that schedules more than one cell is determined based on the maximum number of cells co-scheduled by a DCI format 1\_X for the UE.   + HARQ-ACK information bits for co-scheduled PDSCHs by a DCI format 1\_X is ordered based on serving cell indices associated with co-scheduled PDSCHs. |
| Qualcomm | We consider HARQ-ACK bundling for PDSCHs scheduled by DCI format 1\_X based on grouping of cells can be further discussed. This is also similar to Rel-15 CBG or Rel-17 multi-slot PDSCH scheduling. Since the mechanism is already clear, no need to exclude it for now. Therefore, we suggest following update:   * For Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook, two sub-codebooks are generated with a first sub-codebook comprising HARQ-ACK information bits for PDSCH(s) scheduled by DCI(s) with each actually scheduling a single cell and a second sub-codebook comprising HARQ-ACK information bits for PDSCH(s) scheduled by DCI(s) with each actually scheduling more than one cell.   + Separate DAI counting for DCI(s) with each actually scheduling a single cell and DCI(s) with each actually scheduling more than one cell   + Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook is generated by concatenating the first sub-codebook and the second sub-codebook.   + At least following is supported: Number of HARQ-ACK information bits for each DCI format 1\_X that schedules more than one cell is determined based on the maximum number of cells co-scheduled by a DCI format 1\_X in the PUCCH-group for the UE.   + HARQ-ACK information bits for co-scheduled PDSCHs by a DCI format 1\_X is ordered based on serving cell indices associated with co-scheduled PDSCHs. |
| MTK | Fine with the proposal now. Also fine with QC’s version. |
| Samsung6 | We prefer to discuss this proposal in the next meeting. There are quite a number of issues to be resolved, such as the following:   * Whether a DCI that schedule 2 PDSCHs on two cells when one PDSCH collides with conflicting semi-static DL/UL TDD configuration (and thereby dropped) is considered as part of DCI(s) actually scheduling a single cell or DCI(s) actually scheduling more than one cell – this situation was considered in Rel-17 multi-PDSCH scheduling and decided as part of the latter * Whether/How the maximum number of cells co-scheduled is determined in the case of 2-TB scheduling * DAI determination and ordering of HARQ-ACK bits |
| Moderator3 | @Samsung: Regarding your first question, this issue has been extensively discussed in Rel-17 above52.6 and is not a new issue to Rel-18 multi-cell scheduling. My understanding is UE just generates the number of HARQ-ACK info bits based on the max number of cells which can be scheduled by a single multi-cell DCI. For a co-scheduled cell dropped due to conflicting semi-static UL-DL configuration, NACK is generated.  For your second question, I think spatial bundling is needed otherwise there may be three sub-codebooks which should be avoided. With that said, FFS 2-TB scheduling with spatial bundling not configured is needed.  Regarding your third question, I think the proposal has clarified DAI and bit ordering. |
| Ericsson5 | We do not support the proposal.  @Moderator: We share the same concern as Nokia.  We explained from the first round that we disagree to support to have two sub-codebooks of type-2 and APPEND them to each other. We explained, since both can have variable sizes, APPENDING two such CBs is not a good approach.  The same issue remains no matter if the proposal is changed to Working assumption. |
| Moderator4 | @Ericsson: I don’t understand why you think “both can have variable sizes, APPENDING two such CBs is not a good approach”. Let me explain again: the first sub-codebook comprises A/N bits for PDSCH(s) scheduled by DCI(s) with each actually scheduling a single cell and a second sub-codebook comprising A/N bits for PDSCH(s) scheduled by DCI(s) with each actually scheduling more than one cell. Number of HARQ-ACK bits for each PDSCH is predetermined, e.g., each bit in 1st sub-codebook for one DCI actually scheduling a single cell, and M bits in 2nd sub-codebook for one DCI actually scheduling more than one cell, where M is the max number of cells scheduled by a DCI format 1-X. The size is not variable. The two sub-codebook method is already used in Rel-15 CBG-based transmission and Rel-17 above52. It does make sense following the legacy method here.  On the other hand, I’d like to check your solution for Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook and below question has not been answered so I didn’t make any update on the proposal.  To Ericsson: for your first comment, based on total DAI, a UE can identify one DCI is missed, how can UE know the number of scheduled cells by the DCI? For your second comment, with separate DAI for each sub-codebook, such issue will not happen. Similar mechanism is used in Rel-15 CBG-based transmission and Rel-17 above 52.6. |

# Proposals for GTW session:

## Proposals for 1st GTW session:

Based on the feedback from companies on the possible way forward, below proposals are prepared for online discussion:

#### Proposal 1-1:

* Agree the following terminologies only for convenience of discussion:
* DCI format 0\_X is used for scheduling multiple PUSCHs on multiple serving cells with one PUSCH per serving cell
* DCI format 1\_X is used for scheduling multiple PDSCHs on multiple serving cells with one PDSCH per serving cell.

#### Proposal 1-2:

* Different TBs are scheduled on different cells by DCI format 0\_X.
* Different TBs are scheduled on different cells by DCI format 1\_X.

#### Proposal 1-3:

* Fallback DCI (i.e., DCI formats 0\_0 and 1\_0) does not support multi-cell scheduling.

#### Proposal 1-4:

* The DCI for multi-cell scheduling is monitored only in USS set.

#### Proposal 1-5:

* PDSCH cannot be scheduled by DCI format 0\_X.
* PUSCH cannot be scheduled by DCI format 1\_X.

#### Proposal 1-6:

* All the co-scheduled cells by a DCI format 1\_X and the scheduling cell are included in same PUCCH group.
* FFS: All the co-scheduled cells by a DCI format 0\_X and the scheduling cell are included in same cell group.

#### Proposal 1-7:

* At least support same SCS among co-scheduled cells and different SCS between co-scheduled cells and the scheduling cell in case of same SCS for co-scheduled cells by a DCI format 0\_X/1\_X.
* FFS: Whether to support different SCS among co-scheduled cells
* At least support same carrier type among co-scheduled cells by a DCI format 0\_X/1\_X
* FFS: Whether to support different carrier types (e.g., FDD+TDD, licensed + unlicensed) among co-scheduled cells

#### Proposal 1-8:

* DCI format 0\_X/1\_X on a scheduling cell can be used to schedule PUSCHs/PDSCHs on multiple cells including the scheduling cell.
* DCI format 0\_X/1\_X on a scheduling cell can be used to schedule PUSCHs/PDSCHs on multiple cells not including the scheduling cell.

#### Proposal 1-9:

* DCI format 0\_X/1\_X can be transmitted on PCell.
* DCI format 0\_X/1\_X can be transmitted on a SCell if the SCell is not configured to schedule PUSCH/PDSCH on PCell.
* FFS whether a DCI format 0\_X/1\_X can be transmitted on an SCell if the SCell is configured to schedule PUSCH/PDSCH on PCell.

#### Proposal 2-1:

* The maximum number of cells scheduled by a DCI format 0\_X in Rel-18 standards is down-selected from {3, 4, 8}.
* The maximum payload size of a DCI format 0\_X (excluding CRC) should be no larger than 140 bits.
* For a UE, the maximum number of cells scheduled by a DCI format 0\_X can be smaller than or equal to the maximum number supported in Rel-18 standards.

#### Proposal 2-2:

* The maximum number of cells scheduled by a DCI format 1\_X in Rel-18 standards is down-selected from {3, 4, 8}.
* The maximum payload size of a DCI format 1\_X (excluding CRC) should be no larger than 140 bits.
* For a UE, the maximum number of cells scheduled by a DCI format 1\_X can be smaller than or equal to the maximum number supported in Rel-18 standards.

#### Proposal 2-3:

* For a UE, the maximum number of cells scheduled by a DCI format 0\_X can be same or different to the maximum number of cells scheduled by a DCI format 1\_X.

#### Proposal 2-4:

* For each scheduled cell, at most one scheduling cell can be configured for a UE to monitor multi-cell scheduling DCI.

#### Proposal 2-5:

* For a scheduled cell, both multi-cell scheduling and single cell scheduling can be supported from a same scheduling cell.
* FFS whether there is only one scheduling cell for each scheduled cell.
* FFS below options if more than one scheduling cell for each scheduled cell
  + Option 1: support multi-cell scheduling from one scheduling cell and single cell scheduling from the scheduled cell via self-scheduling.
  + Option 2: support multi-cell scheduling from one scheduling cell and single cell scheduling from another scheduling cell for the scheduled cell via cross-carrier scheduling.

#### Proposal 2-6:

* New DCI formats are introduced for multi-cell PUSCH/PDSCH scheduling by single DCI for UL and DL respectively.
* The new DCI formats can be used for single cell PUSCH/PDSCH scheduling.

#### Proposal 2-7:

* Further study DCI size budget based on below options if new DCI format is introduced for multi-cell scheduling:
* Option 1: Existing DCI size budget is maintained per scheduled cell and DCI size budget of DCI format 0\_X/1\_X is considered for each of the co-scheduled cells.
  + Alt 1-1: DCI size budget is maintained via DCI size alignment
  + Alt 1-2: DCI size budget is maintained via configured size for multi-cell scheduling DCI
* Option 2: Existing DCI size budget is not necessarily maintained per scheduled cell.
  + Alt 2-1: DCI size budget of multi-cell scheduling DCI is counted only in one scheduled cell.
  + Alt 2-2: DCI size budget of multi-cell scheduling DCI is not counted per serving cell and not considered in the related serving cell specific DCI size alignment procedure, e.g., for K co-scheduled cells, gNB guarantee the total budget of 3\*K DCI sizes is not exceeded.
  + Alt 2-3: voiding the “3+1” limit for multi-cell scheduling
* Other options could be considered.

#### Proposal 2-8:

* Further study BD/CCE budget for multi-cell scheduling DCI based on below options:
* Alt 1: follow legacy BD/CCE budget for each scheduled cell
* Alt 2: counted only in one scheduled cell
* Alt 3: scaled down to each of co-scheduled cell according to the number of co-scheduled cells
* Alt 4: counted as part of the scheduling cell instead of each scheduled cell
* Other alternatives could be considered.

#### Proposal 2-9:

* Single-stage DCI format is supported for multi-cell PDSCH or PUSCH scheduling.

#### Proposal 3-3:

* For multi-cell scheduling, the co-scheduled cells are indicated by an indicator in the DCI format 0\_X/1\_X. At least below two options are considered:
* Option 1: the indicator points to one row of a table defining combinations of scheduled cells.
  + The table is configured by RRC signaling.
  + FFS: Separate tables can be configured for multi-cell PDSCH scheduling and multi-cell PUSCH scheduling.
* Option 2: the indicator is a bitmap corresponding to configured cells.
* FFS whether the co-scheduled cells and BWPs can be jointly indicated

#### Proposal 4-1:

* PDSCH-to-HARQ\_timing indicator in the multi-cell PDSCH scheduling DCI indicates a slot level offset between a slot where reference PDSCH of the co-scheduled PDSCHs is transmitted and a PUCCH slot with the PUCCH carrying HARQ-ACK feedback for co-scheduled PDSCHs.
* FFS: the reference PDSCH
* FFS: different SCS between reference PDSCH and other co-scheduled PDSCHs

#### Proposal 4-2 (Working assumption):

* All HARQ-ACK codebook types (Type-1/2/3) are applicable when multi-carrier PDSCH scheduling is configured.

#### Proposal 4-3:

* For Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook, UE does not expect the multi-cell scheduling is configured with CBG-based transmission simultaneously within a same PUCCH group.
* FFS simultaneous configuration of multi-cell scheduling and multi-slot scheduling within a same PUCCH group

## Proposals for 2nd GTW session:
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# List of agreements:

## Agreements made in RAN1#109-e

**Agreement**

Agree the following terminologies ONLY for convenience of discussion:

* DCI format 0\_X is used for scheduling multiple PUSCHs on multiple cells with one PUSCH per cell
* DCI format 1\_X is used for scheduling multiple PDSCHs on multiple cells with one PDSCH per cell.

The above does not imply introducing new DCI format(s) at this point.

**Agreement**

* Different TBs are scheduled on different cells by DCI format 0\_X.
* Different TBs are scheduled on different cells by DCI format 1\_X.

**Agreement**

Fallback DCI (i.e., DCI formats 0\_0 and 1\_0) does not support multi-cell scheduling.

**Agreement**

The DCI for multi-cell scheduling is monitored only in USS set.

**Agreement**

* PDSCH cannot be scheduled by DCI format 0\_X.
* PUSCH cannot be scheduled by DCI format 1\_X.

**Agreement**

* All the co-scheduled cells by a DCI format 1\_X and the scheduling cell are included in the same PUCCH group.
* FFS: All the co-scheduled cells by a DCI format 0\_X and the scheduling cell are included in the same [cell or PUCCH group].

**Agreement**

* DCI format 0-X/1-X on a scheduling cell can be used to schedule PUSCHs/PDSCHs on multiple cells including the scheduling cell.
* DCI format 0-X/1-X on a scheduling cell can be used to schedule PUSCHs/PDSCHs on multiple cells not including the scheduling cell.

**Agreement**

* For a UE, the maximum number of cells scheduled by a DCI format 0\_X can be same or different to the maximum number of cells scheduled by a DCI format 1\_X.

**Working Assumption**

* All HARQ-ACK codebook types (Type-1/2/3) are applicable when multi-carrier PDSCH scheduling is configured.

**Agreement**

* One value for the maximum number of co-scheduled cells by a DCI format 0\_X in Rel-18 is selected from {3, 4, 8}.
* For a UE, the maximum number of co-scheduled cells by a DCI format 0\_X can be smaller than or equal to the maximum number supported in Rel-18.

**Agreement**

* One value for the maximum number of co-scheduled cells by a DCI format 1\_X in Rel-18 is selected from {3, 4, 8}.
* For a UE, the maximum number of co-scheduled cells by a DCI format 1\_X can be smaller than or equal to the maximum number supported in Rel-18.

**Agreement**

* **(Working assumption)** DCI format 0\_X/1\_X is a new DCI format for multi-cell scheduling
* DCI format 0\_X can be used for single cell PUSCH scheduling.
* DCI format 1\_X can be used for single cell PDSCH scheduling.
* FFS: UE monitors one of or both multi-cell scheduling DCI and legacy single cell scheduling DCI for a scheduled cell.