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# Introduction

The documents in agenda item 6.10.2.3 focus on the following topic

* Topic #1: PUCCH SCell activation/deactivation requirements

# Topic #1: PUCCH SCell activation/deactivation requirements

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| R4-2200071 | CATT | **Proposal 1: Spatial relation activation would not introduce additional delay time for Tactivation\_time for valid TA case.****Proposal 2: For Tactivation\_time , only define requirements for PL-RS known case. The known condition in 8.14.2 in TS 38.133 can be reused.** **Proposal 3: For Tactivation\_time of PL-RS known case, no extra delay will be introduced.** **Proposal 4: For the case that PL-RS is unknown, add a general clarification in the spec that longer activation delay is expected.****Proposal 5: The PUCCH SCell activation requirements for invalid TA case should be THARQ + Tactivation\_time + TCSI\_Reporting + TPDCCH + T1 + T2 + T3.****Proposal 6: TPDCCH is need in the PUCCH SCell activation requirements for invalid TA case.****Proposal 7: TCSI\_reporting is also needed in the PUCCH SCell activation requirements for invalid TA case.****Proposal 8: T2 is the delay for obtaining a valid TA command from the point that UE transmit PRACH (i.e. end of T1).****Proposal 9: The components of Tactivation\_time can be same as normal SCell activation.****Proposal 10: Confirm the applicability on interruption as in WF [1].****Proposal 11: The PDCCH order should be sent not earlier than THARQ+Tactivation\_time, and using TPDCCH in requirements for calculating delay of PDCCH order receiving.****Proposal 12: There is no need to bundle the PUCCH Scell with single/multiple TAGs or intra-/inter band cases.** |
| R4-2200072 | CATT | **Draft CR on PUCCH Scell activation delay requirements with multiple Scell** |
| R4-2200180 | MediaTek Inc. | **Proposal 1: No PUCCH SCell activation/deactivation requirements with unknown condition are defined, if UE does not support the new R17 RAN1-introduced UE capability.****Proposal 2: For the PUCCH SCell activation in FR1, PL-RS activation command should be considered except that only one SSB indicating by ‘ssb-PositionInBurst’ is actually transmitted.****Proposal 3: For Tactivation\_time, spatial relation indication will not introduce additional delay time.****Proposal 4: For Tactivation\_time, additional five samples for PL-RS indication should be considered when PL-RS is non-maintained.****Proposal 5: For Tactivation\_time, longer activation time is expected if the PL-RS is unknown.****Proposal 6: For the activation with known condition, the SSB associated to PL-RS indication, TCI state switch and spatial relation is the same.****Proposal 7: For the activation with unknown condition, the SSB or CSI-RS associated to PL-RS indication, TCI state switch and spatial relation is the same.****Proposal 8: For the applicability on PDCCH order receiving,*** **UE is only required to receive a PDCCH order to initiate RA procedure on the PUCCH Scell no earlier than n+THARQ + Tactivation\_time; otherwise, the longer PUCCH SCell activation time is expected.**
* **A delay uncertainty for reception of PDCCH order shall be accounted for in the activation timeline. The delay uncertainty for reception of PDCCH order starts from end of n + THARQ + Tactivation\_time until reception of PDCCH order.**

**Proposal 9: For PUCCH SCell activation in invalid TA case, the TCSI\_reporting is needed in the PUCCH SCell activation requirements.****Proposal 10: For the applicability on PDCCH order receiving, the PUCCH Scell activation requirements for invalid TA case is defined as THARQ + Tactivation\_time + TPDCCH + T1 + T2 + T3 + TCSI\_Reporting****Proposal 11: For PUCCH SCell activation in invalid TA case, T2 is the delay for obtaining a valid TA command from the point that UE transmits PRACH.****Proposal 12: For the applicability on interruption,*** **PUCCH SCell activation requirements are applied when no interruption occurs in same FR as the target PUCCH Scell during the PUCCH Scell activation procedure if UE supports per-FR MG, otherwise the PUCCH Scell activation delay can be extended, and**
* **PUCCH SCell activation requirements are applied when no interruption occurs during the PUCCH Scell activation procedure if UE does not support per-FR MG, otherwise the PUCCH Scell activation delay can be extended.**
* **The above interruption is caused by factor defined in TS38.133 section 8.2.1.1 for EN-DC, in TS38.133 section 8.2.2.1 for NR SA, in TS38.133 section 8.2.3.1 for NE-DC and in TS38.133 section 8.2.4.1 for NR-DC.**

**Proposal 13: There is no needed to bundle the PUCCH Scell with single/multiple TAGs. FFS: intra-/inter band cases.** |
| R4-2200181 | MediaTek Inc. | **Draft CR for PUCCH SCell deactivation delay requirements** |
| R4-2200291 | Apple | ***Proposal 1: RAN4 to introduce new R17 UE capability of CSI reporting cross PUCCH groups.******Proposal 2: RAN4 to not specify PUCCH SCell activation requirement for the scenarios in which beam information needs to be reported to network but UE cannot support CSI reporting cross PUCCH groups.******Proposal 3: For Tactivation\_time in FR2 PUCCH SCell activation requirement, spatial relation activation would not introduce additional delay time.******Proposal 4:*** ***For Tactivation\_time in FR2 PUCCH SCell activation requirement, only define detailed requirement for PL-RS known case, and 5 samples of PL-RS measurement time shall be considered.*** ***If the PL-RS of PUCCH on target SCell is unknown, in spec it can be clarified that “longer activation time is expected if the pathloss reference signal is unknown.”******Proposal 5: Regarding the PUCCH SCell activation requirements for invalid TA case,**** ***If UE does not have the valid TA on the PUCCH Scell being activated, an additional UL synchronization procedure to obtain the valid TA comparing to ( THARQ + Tactivation\_time +TCSI\_Reporting) shall be considered which including the following factors:***
	+ ***the delay uncertainty in acquiring the first available PRACH occasion in the PUCCH Scell(T1);***
	+ ***the delay for obtaining a valid TA command for the sTAG to which the Scell configured with PUCCH belongs(T2);***
	+ ***the delay for applying the received TA for uplink transmission(T3)***

***Proposal 6: In NR PUCCH SCell activation delay requirement with invalid TA, T2 is the delay from slot n + (THARQ + Tactivatation\_time +T1)/NR slot length until UE has obtained a valid TA command for the target PUCCH Scell being activated. Tactivatation\_time is defined in TS38.133 section 8.3.2. slot n is the slot when UE received PUCCH Scell activation MAC CE.******Proposal 7:*** ***Applicability on interruption is:**** ***PUCCH SCell activation requirements are applied when no interruption occurs in same FR as the target PUCCH Scell during the PUCCH Scell activation procedure if UE supports per-FR MG, otherwise the PUCCH Scell activation delay can be extended, and***
* ***PUCCH SCell activation requirements are applied when no interruption occurs during the PUCCH Scell activation procedure if UE does not support per-FR MG, otherwise the PUCCH Scell activation delay can be extended.***
* ***The above interruption is caused by factor defined in TS38.133 section 8.2.1.1 for EN-DC, in TS38.133 section 8.2.2.1 for NR SA, in TS38.133 section 8.2.3.1 for NE-DC and in TS38.133 section 8.2.4.1 for NR-DC.***

***Proposal 8: Applicability on PDCCH order receiving is:**** ***UE needs to receive a PDCCH order to initiate RA procedure on the PUCCH Scell no earlier than n+THARQ + Tactivation\_time, otherwise the longer PUCCH SCell activation time is expected.***
* ***A delay uncertainty for reception of PDCCH order shall be accounted for in the activation timeline. The delay uncertainty for reception of PDCCH order shall be the time from end of n+THARQ + Tactivation\_time until reception of PDCCH order.***

***Proposal 9:*** * ***RAN4 to only define the PUCCH SCell activation only for the case when target PUCCH SCell and existing active serving cells belong to the different TAGs.***
* ***There is no need to bundle the PUCCH Scell with intra-/inter band cases.***
 |
| R4-2200352 | NTT DOCOMO, INC. | **Proposal 1: For Tactivation\_time, spatial relation activation would not introduce additional delay time, including UL beam and transmit power level determination.****Proposal 2:** **The extra delay time of PL-RS determination for Tactivation\_time,** * **Only define detailed requirement for PL-RS known case**
	+ **The condition of “known PL-RS” means that SSB to be used for DL synchronization and so on for the PUCCH SCell activation shall be associated with PL-RS configured for the to-be activated PUCCH SCell.**
* **If PL-RS is maintained, no additional time shall be granted for determining pathloss i.e. NM=0 shall be applied in requirement in TS 38.133 clause 8.14.3.**
* **If PL-RS is not maintained, 5 samples of PL-RS measurement time shall be considered.**

**Proposal 3:** * **If UE does not have the valid TA on the PUCCH Scell being activated, an additional UL synchronization procedure to obtain the valid TA comparing to ( THARQ + Tactivation\_time + TCSI\_Reporting ) shall be considered which including the following factors:**
	+ **the delay uncertainty in acquiring the first available PRACH occasion in the PUCCH Scell(T1);**
	+ **the delay for obtaining a valid TA command for the sTAG to which the Scell configured with PUCCH belongs(T2);**
	+ **the delay for applying the received TA for uplink transmission(T3)**
* **Whether TCSI\_Reporting is needed for invalid TA case shall depend upon the CSI measurement configuration used in the PUCCH SCell.**

**Proposal 4:*** **T2 is the delay from slot n + (Tactivate\_basic +T1)/NR slot length until UE has obtained a valid TA command for the target PUCCH Scell being activated. Tactivate\_basic is the normal Scell activation delay in TS38.133 section 8.3.2 (i.e. ( THARQ + Tactivation\_time +TCSI\_Reporting)/ NR slot length). Slot n is the slot when UE received PUCCH Scell activation MAC CE.**

**Whether TCSI\_Reporting is needed for invalid TA case shall depend upon the CSI measurement configuration used in the PUCCH SCell.** |
| R4-2200390 | vivo | **Proposal 1:For Tactivation\_time, spatial relation will not introduce extra delay time for known and unknown case when the TA is valid.** **Proposal 2: Issue 1-3-2b: For Tactivation\_time, whether the PL-RS will introduce extra delay time, suggest to use option 1.** **Proposal 3: Using option 2 as the baseline for PUCCH Scell activation delay requirement for invalid TA case****Proposal 4: for T2 definition, suggest to use option 2.** **Proposal 5: For issue 1-6-2, fine with option 4 and 3.** **Proposal 6: For issue how to indicate the beam information for PUCCH Scell activation for unknown cell, suggest to use option 1. Ok with option 2.**  |
| R4-2200418 | Qualcomm Incorporated | **Proposal 1**: RAN4 to add the following statement to clarify the timeline for downlink actions as a part of PUCCH SCell activation with invalid TA:* + UE shall be capable to perform downlink actions related to the SCell activation command as specified in TS38.321 for the SCell being activated on the PUCCH SCell from slot n+(T\_HARQ+T\_activation\_time)/(NR slot length) at the latest.
	+ FFS on multiple SCell activation with PUCCH SCell.

**Proposal 2**: Unknown PUCCH SCell activation requirements are defined and applied to UE supporting a new Rel-17 UE capability of CSI report across PUCCH groups.**Proposal 3**: PUCCH SCell activation delay requirements are defined as follows:* + If UE has a valid TA for the PUCCH SCell,
		- T\_activation\_time for PUCCH SCell is the same as legacy T\_activation\_time for SCell activation.
	+ If UE does not have a valid TA for the PUCCH SCell,
		- T\_activation\_time for PUCCH SCell is legacy T\_activation\_time for SCell activation plus ‘T1+T2+T3’ where
			* T1: the delay uncertainty in acquiring the first available PRACH occasion in the PUCCH Scell
			* T2: the delay for obtaining a valid TA command for the sTAG to which the Scell configured with PUCCH belongs
			* T3: the delay for applying the received TA for uplink transmission
		- And T\_CSI\_reporting is updated as below assuming CSI measurement can be carried out in parallel with UL TA acquisition (T1-T3):
			* T\_CSI\_reporting is the delay (in ms) including uncertainty in acquiring the first available downlink CSI reference resource after T\_activation\_time, UE processing time for CSI reporting and uncertainty in acquiring the first available CSI reporting resources after T3 as specified in TS 38.331
	+ For FR2 PUCCH SCell activation, 4 additional SSB samples (4\*T\_rs) are added for PL-RS measurement. And the following are assumed
		- PL-RS switch command is received together with PUCCH SCell activation command.
		- SSB to be used for DL time/frequency synchronization for the PUCCH SCell activation shall be associated with PL-RS configured for the to-be activated PUCCH SCell.
		- One SSB sample is used for both fine time/frequency synchronization and PL-RS measurement.
	+ For unknown PUCCH SCell with L1-RSRP based TCI activation procedure, if UE does not have a valid TA, the max function in requirements can be further modified to consider the case where semi-persistent or periodic CSI-RS resource set activation or configuration procedure can be carrier out in parallel with PDCCH order based RA procedure if needed.
 |
| R4-2200533 | Intel Corporation | **Proposal 1: Don’t define PUCCH SCell activation requirement for the unknown cell.****Proposal 2: For option 1, it’s better to clarify that 5 samples are still needed if it’s not maintained by UE. If it’s maintained by UE, there is no extra delay.****Proposal 3: T2 is the delay from slot n + (THARQ + Tactivatation\_time +T1)/NR slot length until UE has obtained a valid TA command for the target PUCCH Scell being activated.****Proposal 4:** **Tactivation\_time will only be defined for known cell.****Proposal 5: For applicability on PDCCH order receiving, support option 4.** |
| R4-2200639 | CMCC | ***Proposal 1: TCSI\_reporting is needed in the PUCCH SCell activation requirements for invalid TA case*** ***Proposal 2: for the case of SCell activation for deactivated PUCCH SCell with invalid TA, the SCell activation delay is: except THARQ + Tactivation\_time +TCSI\_Reporting, additional delay including following parts need to be considered:**** ***the delay uncertainty in acquiring the first available PRACH occasion in the PUCCH SCell (T1)***
* ***the delay for obtaining a valid TA command for the sTAG (T2)***
* ***the delay for applying the received TA for uplink transmission (T3)***

***Proposal 3: T2 is the delay from slot n + (THARQ + Tactivatation\_time +T1)/NR slot length until UE has obtained a valid TA command for the target PUCCH Scell being activated. Tactivatation\_time is defined in TS38.133 section 8.3.2. Slot n is the slot when UE received PUCCH Scell activation MAC CE***  |
| R4-2200674 | Xiaomi | **Proposal 1: If UE does not have the valid TA on the PUCCH SCell being activated, an additional UL synchronization procedure to obtain the valid TA shall be considered which including the following factors:**1. **the delay uncertainty in acquiring the first available PRACH occasion in the PUCCH SCell (T1);**
2. **the delay for obtaining a valid TA command for the sTAG to which the SCell configured with PUCCH belongs (T2);**
3. **the delay for applying the received TA for uplink transmission (T3).**

**Where:*** **T1 is up to the summation of SSB to PRACH occasion association period and 10 ms. SSB to PRACH occasion associated period is defined in the table 8.1-1 of TS 38.213;**
* **T2 is the delay from slot n + (Tactivate\_basic +T1)/NR slot length until UE has obtained a valid TA command for the target PUCCH SCell being activated. Tactivate\_basic is the normal SCell activation delay in TS38.133 section 8.3.2. slot n is the slot when UE received PUCCH SCell activation MAC CE;**
* **T3 is the delay for applying the received TA for uplink transmission on target PUCCH SCell being activated, and greater than or equal to k+1 slot, where k is defined in clause 4.2 in TS 38.213.**

**Proposal 2: RAN4 not to consider TPDCCH in the PUCCH SCell activation requirements for invalid TA case.****Proposal 3: TCSI\_reporting is needed in the PUCCH SCell activation requirements for invalid TA case.****Proposal 4: The applicability on PUCCH SCell activation delay requirement is defined as:*** **PUCCH SCell activation requirements are applied when no interruption occurs in same FR as the target PUCCH Scell during the PUCCH Scell activation procedure if UE supports per-FR MG, otherwise the PUCCH Scell activation delay can be extended, or**
* **PUCCH SCell activation requirements are applied when no interruption occurs during the PUCCH Scell activation procedure if UE does not support per-FR MG, otherwise the PUCCH Scell activation delay can be extended.**

**Proposal 5: The delay requirement for PUCCH SCell activation is applied provided that the UE has received a PDCCH order to initiate RA procedure on the PUCCH SCell within slot n+(THARQ+Tactivation\_time+TCSI\_Reporting)/(NR slot length), otherwise additional delay to activate the SCell is expected.** |
| R4-2200741 | ZTE Corporation | **Proposal 1: Take option 2 in WF[1].** **If UE does not have the valid TA on the PUCCH Scell being activated, an additional UL synchronization procedure to obtain the valid TA comparing to ( THARQ + Tactivation\_time +TCSI\_Reporting) shall be considered which including the following factors:*** + - **the delay uncertainty in acquiring the first available PRACH occasion in the PUCCH Scell(T1);**
		- **the delay for obtaining a valid TA command for the sTAG to which the Scell configured with PUCCH belongs(T2);**
		- **the delay for applying the received TA for uplink transmission(T3)**

**Proposal 2:** * **TPDCCH is not needed in the PUCCH SCell activation requirements for invalid TA case.**
* **TCSI\_reporting is needed in the PUCCH SCell activation requirements for invalid TA case.**

**Proposal 3: Take option 2 in WF[1].** * + **T2 is the delay from slot n + (THARQ + Tactivatation\_time +T1)/NR slot length until UE has obtained a valid TA command for the target PUCCH Scell being activated. Tactivatation\_time is defined in TS38.133 section 8.3.2. slot n is the slot when UE received PUCCH Scell activation MAC CE.**
 |
| R4-2200893 | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | **Proposal 1: A relaxation margin [X] needs to be introduced to the PUCCH SCell activation delay, to reflect the potential CSI processing timeline relaxation. The value of [X] can be set based on RAN1 discussion.** **Proposal 2: The relaxation margin [X] applies when the beam information of the PUCCH SCell needs to be indicated on any active serving cells belonging to primary PUCCH group in the following cases:** * **unknown FR2 PUCCH SCell activation with a valid TA**
* **unknown FR1 PUCCH SCell activation without a valid TA**
* **unknown FR2 PUCCH SCell activation without a valid TA**

**Proposal 3: If the UE has a valid TA for transmitting on an SCell then the UE shall be able to transmit valid CSI report and apply actions related to the SCell activation command for the SCell being activated on the PUCCH SCell no later than in slot , where****- THARQ (in ms) is the timing between DL data transmission and acknowledgement as specified in TS 38.213 [3]****- Tactivation\_time is the SCell activation delay as defined in section 8.3.2.****- TCSI\_Reporting is specified in clause 8.3.2.****- [X] is the relaxation margin for reporting L1-RSRP of the target being-activated PUCCH SCell on any active serving cells belonging to primary PUCCH group, when the PUCCH SCell is unknown in FR2. Otherwise, it is set to 0.****Proposal 4: The downlink actions can be performed immediately after Tactivation\_time and should not be deferred by TCSI\_reporting.****Proposal 5: If the UE does not have a valid TA for transmitting on an SCell, the UE shall be capable to perform downlink actions related to the SCell activation command for the SCell being activated on the PUCCH SCell no later than in slot .****Proposal 6: If the UE does not have a valid TA, the activation delay requirement for PUCCH SCell shall be defined assuming no dedicated time for CSI measurements and UE processing of CSI reporting.** **Proposal 7: If the UE does not have a valid TA for transmitting on an SCell, the UE shall be capable to perform uplink actions related to the SCell activation command for the SCell being activated on the PUCCH SCell no later than in slot , where*** **Tdelay\_PUCCH\_SCell = Tactivation\_time + [X] + T1 + T2 + T3, and**
* **TCSI\_Reporting\_PUCCH is the time uncertainty in acquiring the first available CSI reporting resources after RACH completion.**

**Proposal 8: T2 is defined as the delay from slot n + (THARQ + Tactivation\_time +[X]+T1)/NR slot length until UE has obtained a valid TA command for the target PUCCH SCell being activated.** |
| R4- 2200894 | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | **draftCR on PUCCH SCell activation delay requirements** |
| R4-2201136 | OPPO | ***Proposal 1: A unified TCSI\_Reporting could be definedbased on the relaxed CSI processing delay requirements for UEs capable of cross-CG CSI reporting.******Proposal 2: For Tactivation\_time, spatial relation activation would not introduce additional delay time.*** ***Proposal 3: Only define detailed requirement for PL-RS known case, and 5 samples of PL-RS measurement time shall be considered. If the PL-RS of PUCCH on target SCell is unknown, in spec it can be clarified that “longer activation time is expected if the pathloss reference signal is unknown.”******Proposal 4: The additional delay for NR PUCCH SCell activation with invalid TA should be considered:*** * ***T1: the delay uncertainty in acquiring the first available PRACH occasion in the PUCCH SCell, up to the summation of SSB to PRACH occasion association period and 10 ms. SSB to PRACH occasion associated period is defined in the table 8.1-1 of TS 38.213***
* ***T2 is the delay from slot n + (THARQ + Tactivatation\_time +T1)/NR slot length until UE has obtained a valid TA command for the target PUCCH SCell being activated. Tactivatation\_time is defined in TS38.133 section 8.3.2. slot n is the slot when UE received PUCCH SCell activation MAC CE.***
* ***T3: the delay for applying the received TA for uplink transmission on target PUCCH SCell being activated, and greater than or equal to k+1 slot, where k is defined in clause 4.2 in TS 38.213****.*
 |
| R4-2201204 | Huawei, HiSilicon | **Proposal 1: Requirements for unknown PUCCH SCell activation applies to UE supporting the Rel-17 capability of cross PUCCH group CSI reporting provided that UE has been configured with L1-RSRP reporting of the target PUCCH SCell on SpCell.****Proposal 2: Wait RAN2 to determine whether to define requirements for unknown PUCCH SCell activation for UE not supporting cross PUCCH group CSI reporting.****Observation 1: According to RAN1 specification about PUCCH power control, UE doesn’t need to wait for the PL-RS activation MAC CE to determine the PL-RS.****Proposal 3：There is no need to consider uncertainty of MAC CE for PL-RS activation in PUCCH SCell activation delay requirements.****Proposal 4: 5 samples of PL-RS measurement time shall be considered provided that PL-RS is based on latest L3 measurement report for known PUCCH SCell and latest L1 measurement report for unknown PUCCH SCell; otherwise, longer delay is expected.****Proposal 5:** **If UE does not have the valid TA on the PUCCH Scell being activated, an additional UL synchronization procedure to obtain the valid TA comparing to ( THARQ + Tactivation\_time +TCSI\_Reporting) shall be considered which including the following factors:*** + - **the delay uncertainty in acquiring the first available PRACH occasion in the PUCCH Scell(T1);**
		- **the delay for obtaining a valid TA command for the sTAG to which the Scell configured with PUCCH belongs(T2);**
		- **the delay for applying the received TA for uplink transmission(T3)**

**Proposal 6: There is no need to have applicability statement of interruption for PUCCH SCell activation requirements.****Proposal 7a: The UE has received a PDCCH order to initiate RA procedure on the PUCCH SCell within THARQ+ Tactivation\_timeotherwise additional delay to activate the SCell is expected;****Proposal 7b:****UE needs to receive a PDCCH order to initiate RA procedure on the PUCCH Scell no earlier than n+THARQ + Tactivation\_time, otherwise the longer PUCCH SCell activation time is expected.****A delay uncertainty for reception of PDCCH order shall be accounted for in the activation timeline. The delay uncertainty for reception of PDCCH order shall be the time from end of n+THARQ + Tactivation\_time until reception of PDCCH order.****Proposal 8: Not to define applicability of single/multiple TAGs or intra-/inter band for PUCCH activation requirements.****Observation 2: No PUCCH Scell requirements for NR-DC according to RAN2 restiction on numebr of PUCCH group in each cell group.** |
| R4-2201205 | Huawei, HiSilicon | **Draft CR on interruption of PUCCH SCell activation** |
| R4-2201382 | Ericsson | **Proposal 1: When DL-RS associated with UL beam to use for random access is known to UE, no additional time shall be granted for determining transmit power level.****Proposal 2: For Tactivation\_time, spatial relation activation would not introduce any additional delay time.** **Proposal 3: When DL-RS configured as PL-RS is known to UE, no additional time shall be granted for determining pathloss i.e., NM=0 shall be applied in requirement in TS 38.133 clause 8.14.3.****Proposal 4: RAN4 to agree that UL synchronisation (T1, T2, T3) and CSI measurement and reporting (TCSI\_Reporting) are performed in parallel.** **Proposal 5: RAN4 to agree on following.*** **T1 is the delay uncertainty in acquiring the first available PRACH occasion in the PUCCH SCell after slot n + (THARQ + Tactivatation\_time)/NR slot length.**
* **T2 is the delay from slot n + (THARQ + Tactivatation\_time +T1)/NR slot length until UE has obtained a valid TA command for the target PUCCH SCell being activated. Tactivatation\_time is defined in TS38.133 section 8.3.2. slot n is the slot when UE received PUCCH SCell activation MAC CE.**
* **T3: the delay for applying the received TA for uplink transmission. Start time of T3 is slot n + (THARQ + Tactivatation\_time +T1 + T2)/NR slot length.**

**Proposal 6: A delay uncertainty for reception of PDCCH order shall be accounted for in the activation timeline. When PDCCH order is received within Tactivation\_time, the net effect on the timeline shall be an added delay of 0. When PDCCH order is received after Tactivation\_time, the net effect shall be an added delay that represents the time from end of Tactivation\_time until reception of PDCCH order.** |
| R4-2201383 | Ericsson | **Draft CR on Interruption requirements to LTE serving cell** |
| R4-2200286 | Apple | **Initial views on R17 feature list** |

## Open issues summary

###  Sub-topic 1-1 PUCCH SCell activation requirements for unknown cell

RAN1 reply LS (R4-2200049)

|  |
| --- |
| **Q1:** Whether UE can report CSI (e.g. L1-RSRP) of the target being-activated PUCCH SCell belonging to secondary PUCCH group by configuring CSI report setting (e.g. CSI-ReportConfig) on any active serving cells belonging to primary PUCCH group**Answer**: There is **no restriction** in the current RAN1 specification that would not allow UE to report CSI of a SCell belonging to secondary/primary PUCCH group by PUSCH or PUCCH of active serving cells belonging to primary/secondary PUCCH group. But there is no RAN1 consensus on whether all UEs supporting NR-CA with dual PUCCH-groups for the BC support such CSI report in Rel-15 and Rel-16. Support of such CSI report is indicated in **Rel-17 with a new UE capability**. Potential CSI processing timeline relaxation for UEs reporting the new UE capability can be discussed.**Q2:** Whether the above observation is correct, i.e. the identified four cases are not supported by the current RAN1 and RAN2 specification.**Answer**: RAN1 is not able to answer the question on whether the identified four cases are supported or not by current RAN1 specification.**Q3:** Whether the above identified cases can be supported by RAN1 and RAN2 spec updates within Rel-17 timeframe.**Answer**: RAN1 is not able to answer the question. However, RAN1 expects that reporting CSI (e.g. L1-RSRP) of the target being-activated PUCCH SCell belonging to secondary PUCCH group by configuring CSI report setting (e.g. *CSI-ReportConfig*) on any active serving cells belonging to primary PUCCH group supports the identified four cases. |

**Issue 1-1-1: Whether to define PUCCH SCell activation requirements for unknown cell case for UE supporting the Rel-17 capability of cross PUCCH group CSI reporting?**

Proposals

* Option 1: (vivo, Qualcomm, Huawei, Nokia, OPPO)
	+ Yes
* Option 1a: (vivo)
	+ The downlink beam information of PUCCH Scell can only be indicated via SpCell by UE before PUCCH Scell activation for unknown cell case.
* Option 1b: (Qualcomm, Huawei)
	+ Unknown PUCCH SCell activation requirements are defined and applied to UE supporting a new Rel-17 UE capability of CSI report across PUCCH groups.
* Option 1c: (Nokia)
	+ A relaxation margin [X] needs to be introduced to the PUCCH SCell activation delay, to reflect the potential CSI processing timeline relaxation. The value of [X] can be set based on RAN1 discussion.
	+ The relaxation margin [X] applies when the beam information of the PUCCH SCell needs to be indicated on any active serving cells belonging to primary PUCCH group in the following cases:
		- unknown FR2 PUCCH SCell activation with a valid TA
		- unknown FR1 PUCCH SCell activation without a valid TA
		- unknown FR2 PUCCH SCell activation without a valid TA
* Option 1d: (OPPO)
	+ A unified TCSI\_Reporting could be definedbased on the relaxed CSI processing delay requirements for UEs capable of cross-CG CSI reporting.
* Option 2: (Intel, vivo)
	+ Don’t define PUCCH SCell activation requirement for the unknown cell.
* Recommended WF
	+ *Need more discussion*

|  |
| --- |
| **Issue 1-1-1: Whether to define PUCCH SCell activation requirements for unknown cell case for UE supporting the Rel-17 capability of cross PUCCH group CSI reporting?** |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Huawei | Support option 1. For option 1b, it is not our original motivation. At least we can say **for UE supporting Rel-17 cross PUCCH group CSI reporting, unknown PUCCH SCell activation applies provided that UE has been configured with L1-RSRP reporting of the target PUCCH SCell on SpCell.**For UE not supporting this capability, whether to define unknown requirements are discussed in next issue. |
| Mediatek | Support option 1. If UE supports the cross PUCCH group reporting, then the PUCCH SCell should be no problem. |
| Apple | Support option 1. For option 1b, there could be one case that unknown PUCCH SCell activation doesn’t need beam indication to network, and therefore the requirement could still be defined without UE capability of cross PUCCH group CSI reporting, e.g., the following agreed cases:If the target PUCCH Scell is unknown cell in FR2:* If there is at least one active serving cell on that FR2 band (following the same conditions in TS38.133 section 8.3.2 for intra-band FR2 Scell activation), no need to indicate the beam information to network for determining the associated SSB in PDCCH order for RA.

If the target PUCCH Scell is unknown cell in FR1:* If it is contiguous to an active serving cell in the same band (following the same conditions in TS38.133 section 8.3.2 for intra-band contiguous FR1 Scell activation), no need to indicate the beam information to network for determining the associated SSB in PDCCH order for RA.
 |
| Ericsson | Support option 1. |
| QC | Support Option 1. |
| NTT DOCOMO, INC. | Support option 1. The case which UE does not have a new Rel-17 UE capability of CSI report across PUCCH groups should be discussed in Issue 1-1-2.For option 1c, according to current definition of TCSI\_reporting, CSI processing time is not explicitly defined thus the necessity of relaxation margin is doubtful.Cited from TS38.133:*TCSI\_reporting is the delay (in ms) including uncertainty in acquiring the first available downlink CSI reference resource, UE processing time for CSI reporting and uncertainty in acquiring the first available CSI reporting resources as specified in TS 38.331 [2].* |
| vivo | Support option 1a. For the case when UE supporting the Rel-17 capability of cross PUCCH group CSI reporting, we are ok to define requirements.  |
| Intel | Fine with option 1. We can discuss requirement if UE can support cross PUCCH group reporting. |
| CMCC | Option 1 |
| Nokia  | Option 1, and also 1c. RAN1 has confirmed the feasibility to transmit beam information over SpCell hence we need to define the requirements for this case if the UE supports the capability. We also share with Apple on the concerns on Option 1b. The applicable cases shall be clearly defined in spec.About Option 1c, our intention is to take into account the time relaxation as indicated in RAN1 reply LS. We believe the solution is up to RAN1/2 discussion, and RAN4 can define a generalized relaxation factor to reflect the impact on SCell activation delay.  |
| CATT | Fine with option 1. The requirement is defined based on the assumption in option 1a.  |
| OPPO | Option 1 and 1d TCSI\_Reporting could be defined for UEs capable of cross-PUCCH group CSI reporting. Whether relaxed CSI processing delay can be further discussed. |

**Issue 1-1-2: Whether to define PUCCH SCell activation requirements for unknown cell case for UE not supporting the Rel-17 capability of cross PUCCH group CSI reporting?**

Proposals

* Option 1a: (Intel, vivo)
	+ Don’t define PUCCH SCell activation requirement for the unknown cell.
* Option 1b: (MTK)
	+ No PUCCH SCell activation/deactivation requirements with unknown onditio are defined, if UE does not support the new R17 RAN1-introduced UE capability.
* Option 1c: (Apple)
	+ RAN4 to introduce new R17 UE capability of CSI reporting cross PUCCH groups.
	+ RAN4 to not specify PUCCH SCell activation requirement for the scenarios in which beam information needs to be reported to network but UE cannot support CSI reporting cross PUCCH groups
* Option 2: (Huawei)
	+ Wait RAN2 to determine whether to define requirements for unknown PUCCH SCell activation for UE not supporting cross PUCCH group CSI reporting.
* Recommended WF
	+ *Need more discussion*

|  |
| --- |
| **Issue 1-1-2: Whether to define PUCCH SCell activation requirements for unknown cell case for UE not supporting the Rel-17 capability of cross PUCCH group CSI reporting?** |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Huawei | We support option 2. RAN2 will discuss whether RAN2 solutions are needed based on RAN1 LS reply (this meeting). If RAN2 agreed no other RAN2 impact, than we can agree not to have unknown requirements for UE not supporting this capability.  |
| MediaTek | We are ok to option2. To wait for the confirm from RAN2. |
| Apple | Option 1c. For some special unknown Scell cases, requirement could still be applied without capability of cross PUCCH CSI reporting, like followings:If the target PUCCH Scell is unknown cell in FR2:* If there is at least one active serving cell on that FR2 band (following the same conditions in TS38.133 section 8.3.2 for intra-band FR2 Scell activation), no need to indicate the beam information to network for determining the associated SSB in PDCCH order for RA.

If the target PUCCH Scell is unknown cell in FR1:* If it is contiguous to an active serving cell in the same band (following the same conditions in TS38.133 section 8.3.2 for intra-band contiguous FR1 Scell activation), no need to indicate the beam information to network for determining the associated SSB in PDCCH order for RA.

Thus we propose: “RAN4 to not specify PUCCH SCell activation requirement for the scenarios in which beam information needs to be reported to network but UE cannot support CSI reporting cross PUCCH groups” |
| Ericsson | We agree with Apple analysis and ok with option 1c. |
| QC | Apple’s comment looks okay with us. Anyway, the key here is whether CSI reporting across PUCCH group is needed to activate PUCCH SCell rather than known vs. unknown. |
| NTT DOCOMO, INC. | We are fine with option 1c. |
| vivo | Ok with Apple’s suggestion |
| Intel | Fine with option 2 and 1c. |
| Huawei2 |  We prefer not to abandon unknown case when the cross PUCCH group CSI reporting is not supported in this meeting, when the requirements can be discussed in parallel. |
| CMCC | Option 1c |
| Nokia | Option 2. We understood RAN2 is discussing if the capability is conditional mandatory and if not how the UE transmits the beam information on SpCell. Would be good to wait for RAN1/2 discussion.  |
| CATT | Fine with the second bullet of option 1c. And we think whether to define requirements should be within RAN4 scope.  |
| OPPO | Option 1c is fine. |

### Sub-topic 1-2 PUCCH Scell activation delay requirement for valid TA case

*Agreements in GTW (11.3) in last meeting:*

* + No additional delay time is needed if UL spatial relation and PL-RS activation command and TCI activation command are received in the same MAC PDU.
	+ For both valid TA and invalid TA cases in FR2 PUCCH SCell activation, the uncertainty for receiving UL spatial relation and PL-RS activation command and TCI activation command could be defined as below,
		- Tuncertainty\_MAC is the time period between reception of the last activation command for PDCCH TCI, PDSCH TCI (when applicable), UL spatial relation and PL-RS relative to
			* SCell activation command for known case;
			* First valid L1-RSRP reporting for unknown case.

**Issue 1-2-1: Whether to consider the time uncertainty of MAC CE for PL-RS activation?**

* Option 1: (MTK)
	+ For the PUCCH SCell activation in FR1, PL-RS activation command should be considered except that only one SSB indicating by ‘ssb-PositionInBurst’ is actually transmitted.
* Option 2: (Huawei)
	+ There is no need to consider uncertainty of MAC CE for PL-RS activation in PUCCH SCell activation delay requirements.
* Recommended WF
	+ *Need more discussion*

|  |
| --- |
| **Issue 1-2-1: Whether to consider the time uncertainty of MAC CE for PL-RS activation?** |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Huawei:  | Support option 2. As analysis in our paper, according RAN1spec, it seems there is no need to waiting for MAC CE for PL-RS only. We didn’t see other cases apart from the listed ones where UE needs additional MAC CE for PL-RS:* If the UE is not provided pathlossReferenceRSs
* If the UE is provided pathlossReferenceRSs and PUCCH-SpatialRelationInfo
* If the UE is provided pathlossReferenceRSs and is not provided PUCCH-SpatialRelationInfo
* If the UE is not provided pathlossReferenceRSs, and is not provided PUCCH-SpatialRelationInfo, and is provided enableDefaultBeamPL-ForPUCCH
 |
| MediaTek | Thanks for the analysis, more time is needed to check the necessity of the PL-RS indication for PUCCH SCell activation. We also want to hear other companies’ view on this issue. |
| Apple | We would like to keep the last meeting agreement unchanged. For option 1, if CSI-RS is used for RL-RS, UE still needs to be indicated to perform measurement on CSI-RS rather than that one SSB. Even though the SSB is associated/QCLed with CSI-RS, but the PL measurement result based on SSB and CSI-RS might not be exactly the same due to different beam types (e.g., CSI-RS with fine beam, SSB with rough beam).For option 2, RAN1 defined some cases without *pathlossReferenceRS* for active BWP on a primary cell but it cannot directly apply for the being activated SCell in RAN4 case. In FR2 the Tx power is important to be aligned with the Tx beam used for PUCCH transmission, but UE has no idea which DL RS could be the PL-RS for power estimation associated with such uplink spatial relation, and therefore it would be reasonable for network to indicate such information to UE to avoid any ambiguity.  |
| Ericsson | We tend agree with Apple comments that RAN1 text is primarily for primary cell and not sure if it is applicable for secondary cell also. Need more time to check internally. Update 2:After further checking following can be found in TS38.213 further, based on following we support option 2.*If the UE is configured with a PUCCH-SCell, the UE shall apply the procedures described in this clause for both primary PUCCH group and secondary PUCCH group.**- When the procedures are applied for the primary PUCCH group, the term 'serving cell' in this clause refers to serving cell belonging to the primary PUCCH group.**- When the procedures are applied for the secondary PUCCH group, the term 'serving cell' in this clause refers to serving cell belonging to the secondary PUCCH group.* ***The term 'primary cell' in this clause refers to the PUCCH-SCell of the secondary PUCCH group.*** *If pdsch-HARQ-ACK-Codebook-secondaryPUCCHgroup-r16 is provided, pdsch-HARQ-ACK-Codebook is replaced by pdsch-HARQ-ACK-Codebook-secondaryPUCCHgroup-r16.* May be if companies think otherwise, to expediate things we suggest checking with RAN1 by sending LS in this meeting. |
| QC | Share the same comment as Ericsson that the RAN1 text is primarily for PCell. And we do not think RAN4 needs to go into this level of details. The parameter can be simply set to zero when not applicable or received together with SCell activation command. |
| NTT DOCOMO, INC. | We are fine with Apple’s comment |
| Intel | We prefer option 2. Same view as the updated Ericsson’s comment. UE can use other RS to calculate pathloss if PL-RS is not configured. |
| Huawei2 | According to spec shown by Ericsson. There is no unclear case where UE can not determine the PL-RS. |
| QC2 | We still think not all cases cannot be directly applicable to PUCCH SCell. For example, the following is only for SpCell.If we want RAN1 to clarify this, we don’t oppose it. |
| Apple2 | Some further clarification on PL-RS assumption. Firstly, RAN1 spec defined the assumption for active BWP on a primary cell but it cannot directly apply for the being activated SCell (no active BWP) in RAN4 case, duplicated as below.Graphical user interface, text, application  Description automatically generatedSecondary, UE is not necessary to read MIB for a SCell in our understanding, and the following assumption(the SSB used for MIB reading) cannot apply to target SCell either.But we are also fine if companies would like to check with RAN1 by LS. |
| Nokia | Option 2.We share Huawei’s understanding above.  |
| CATT | Suggest to keep the agreement in last meeting.  |

**Issue 1-2-2: For Tactivation\_time, whether spatial relation will introduce extra delay time?**

* Option 1: (CATT, MTK, Apple, DOCOMO, vivo, OPPO, Ericsson)
	+ For Tactivation\_time, spatial relation activation would not introduce additional delay time.
* Recommended WF
	+ *Agree on option 1.*

|  |
| --- |
| **Issue 1-2-2: For Tactivation\_time, whether spatial relation will introduce extra delay time?** |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Huawei | Support recommended WF. |
| MediaTek | Option 1. |
| Apple | Option 1 |
| Ericsson | Option 1 |
| NTT DOCOMO, INC. | Option 1 |
| vivo | Option 1 |
| ZTE | Option 1. |
| Intel | Option 1 |
| Nokia | Option 1 |
| CATT | Option 1.  |
| OPPO | Option 1. |

**Issue 1-2-3: For Tactivation\_time, whether the PL-RS will introduce extra delay time?**

* Option 1: (CATT)
	+ Only define requirements for PL-RS known case. The known condition in 8.14.2 in TS 38.133 can be reused.
	+ For PL-RS known case, no extra delay will be introduced
	+ For PL-RS unknown case, add a general clarification in the spec that longer activation delay is expected.
* Option 2: (MTK)
	+ For Tactivation\_time, additional five samples for PL-RS indication should be considered when PL-RS is non-maintained.
	+ For Tactivation\_time, longer activation time is expected if the PL-RS is unknown.
* Option 3: (Apple, vivo, OPPO)
	+ For Tactivation\_time in FR2 PUCCH SCell activation requirement, only define detailed requirement for PL-RS known case, and 5 samples of PL-RS measurement time shall be considered.
	+ If the PL-RS of PUCCH on target SCell is unknown, in spec it can be clarified that “longer activation time is expected if the pathloss reference signal is unknown.”
* Option 4: (DOCOMO, Intel)
	+ Only define detailed requirement for PL-RS known case:
		- If PL-RS is maintained, no additional time shall be granted for determining pathloss i.e. NM=0 shall be applied in requirement in TS 38.133 clause 8.14.3.
		- If PL-RS is not maintained, 5 samples of PL-RS measurement time shall be considered.
* Option 4a: (DOCOMO)
	+ - The condition of “known PL-RS” means that SSB to be used for DL synchronization and so on for the PUCCH SCell activation shall be associated with PL-RS configured for the to-be activated PUCCH SCell.
* Option 5: (Qualcomm)
	+ 4 additional SSB samples (4\*T\_rs) are added for PL-RS measurement. And the following are assumed
		- PL-RS switch command is received together with PUCCH SCell activation command.
		- SSB to be used for DL time/frequency synchronization for the PUCCH SCell activation shall be associated with PL-RS configured for the to-be activated PUCCH SCell.
		- One SSB sample is used for both fine time/frequency synchronization and PL-RS measurement.
* Option 6: (Huawei)
	+ 5 samples of PL-RS measurement time shall be considered provided that PL-RS is based on latest L3 measurement report for known PUCCH SCell and latest L1 measurement report for unknown PUCCH SCell; otherwise, longer delay is expected.
* Option 7: (Ericsson)
	+ When DL-RS configured as PL-RS is known to UE, no additional time shall be granted for determining pathloss i.e., NM=0 shall be applied in requirement in TS 38.133 clause 8.14.3.
* Recommended WF
	+ For Tactivation\_time in FR2 PUCCH SCell activation requirement, only define detailed requirement when PL-RS of target PUCCH SCell is known.
	+ If the PL-RS of target PUCCH SCell is unknown, clarify that “longer activation time is expected if the pathloss reference signal is unknown.” in the spec.
	+ FFS the known condition of PL-RS.
	+ FFS the detailed requirements when PL-RS of target PUCCH SCell is known.

|  |
| --- |
| **Issue 1-2-3: For Tactivation\_time, whether the PL-RS will introduce extra delay time?** |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Huawei | Agree with the recommended WFThe known conditions are suggested to be defined as option 6 based on the agreement in last meeting that:* + For known PUCCH SCell,
		- TCI sate, PL-RS and spatial relation indication are assumed to be based on the L3 measurement.
	+ For unknown PUCCH SCell,
		- TCI sate, PL-RS and spatial relation indication are assumed to be based on L1-RSRP measurement.

And 5 samples time are always needed as it can not be assumed that the PL-RS is maintained before the SCell is activated. |
| MediaTek | Agree with recommended WF.Besides, five samples are needed for PUCCH SCell activation as HW’s comments. |
| Apple | Support Option 3 and agree with recommended WF. Known condition of PL-RS could be similar as in legacy PL-RS switching requirement, but only replace the L1-RSRP measurement report of PL-RS by “L3 measurement report of PL-RS”. We are open to further discuss on details of this known condition. |
| Ericsson | We are OK with recommended WF.Regarding the known condition and unknown condition, HW suggested proposal is OK.However, we prefer specifying requirement for both maintained and not maintained case for known PUCCH SCell. |
| QC | We are okay with 5 SSB samples. |
| NTT DOCOMO, INC. | Agree with recommended WF and HW’s suggestion of known condition. We think, at least in following cases, PL-RS can be maintained before SCell is activated.* For FR1, if it is contiguous to an active serving cell in the same band (following the same conditions in TS38.133 section 8.3.2 for intra-band contiguous FR1 Scell activation)
* For FR2, if there is at least one active serving cell on that FR2 band (following the same conditions in TS38.133 section 8.3.2 for intra-band FR2 Scell activation)
 |
| vivo | OK with recommended WF |
| ZTE | Agree with the recommended WF. |
| Intel | Fine with the recommended WF. We agree that 5 sample are needed before SCell is activated since UE will not maintain it. |
| Nokia | Agree with recommended WF.We’d like to understand why 5 samples are still needed when PL-RS is known? If PL-RS is known, the simple understanding is the measurement results are available hence no need to measure it again.  |
| CATT | Support the recommended WF. For the known condition, suggest to use the same condition in PL-RS switching delay requirements. For the detailed requirements, fine to use 5 samples for non-maintained case.  |
| Apple | Support Option 3 and agree with recommended WF.  |

**Issue 1-2-4: Relation between the associated RS for TCI state, PL-RS and spatial relation indication?**

* Option 1: (MTK)
	+ For the activation with known condition, the SSB associated to PL-RS indication, TCI state switch and spatial relation is the same.
	+ For the activation with unknown condition, the SSB or CSI-RS associated to PL-RS indication, TCI state switch and spatial relation is the same..
* Recommended WF
	+ *Need more discussion*

|  |
| --- |
| **Issue 1-2-4: Relation between the associated RS for TCI state, PL-RS and spatial relation indication?** |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Huawei | Probably option 1 is valid in real scenarios. But we are wondering whether such restriction is needed in spec, as there is no such restrictions in RAN1/RAN2 spec. |
| MediaTek | Support option 1. To our understanding, during the activation procedure, network only can indicate the TCI state, PL-RS and spatial relation based on L1/L3 measurement report. We do not think network has the intention to indicate the RS having highest RSRP to TCI state and RS having 2nd high RSRP to PL-RS or spatial relation.Besides, for no such restriction defined in RAN1/2, because, after the activation, UE is allowed to switch the TCI state, PL-RS and spatial relation based on other RS, e.g., SRS can be used for spatial relation.  |
| Apple | We can agree with option 1 for simplicity but also need to check network vendor’s view if it could be a common case. |
| Ericsson | Observation may be fine but we do not think such restrictions are needs to be captured in spec. Especially with unified TCI state indication framework introduced in Rel-17.  |
| QC | Okay with Option 1. |
| NTT DOCOMO, INC. | We are fine with option 1 in principle but need to check network vendor’s view. |
| Intel | Fine with Option 1. |
| Nokia | We prefer NOT specifying any restriction to network configuration.  |
| CATT | Fine with option 1 and we think the requirements are based on this assumption. Since it has been reflected in the requirements, there is no need to separately defined in the spec.  |

**Issue 1-2-5: How to consider the Tx power of target PUCCH in PUCCH SCell activation requirement?**

* Option 1: (Ericsson)
	+ When DL-RS associated with UL beam to use for random access is known to UE, no additional time shall be granted for determining transmit power level.
* Recommended WF
	+ *Need more discussion*

|  |
| --- |
| **Issue 1-2-5: How to consider the Tx power of target PUCCH in PUCCH SCell activation requirement?** |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Apple | Need more discussion. DL RS is known but UE has no idea if this DL-RS would be used as PL-RS before network indication, so after network indicates this DL RS to be the PL-RS to UE, UE still needs to perform measurement on it to determine the Tx power, like in the legacy PL-RS switching requirement(in current spec, known PL-RS means UE report L1-RSRP on that DL RS before the switching command, but UE still needs 5 samples for measurement on this DL RS after receiving the PL-RS switching command). |
| Ericsson | In RAN4#100e it was agreed that *Tx power of target PUCCH should be considered in PUCCH SCell activation requirement*. This agreement is somewhat vague as it does not state how, if at all, to account for it in the activation timeline. we would like to clarify it. |
| NTT DOCOMO, INC. | Similar with issue 1-2-3. We think, at least in following cases, the DL-RS can be used as PL-RS and no additional time shall be granted.* For FR1, if it is contiguous to an active serving cell in the same band (following the same conditions in TS38.133 section 8.3.2 for intra-band contiguous FR1 Scell activation)
* For FR2, if there is at least one active serving cell on that FR2 band (following the same conditions in TS38.133 section 8.3.2 for intra-band FR2 Scell activation)
 |
| Huawei | Need further discussion. If it means no need for 5 sample, we think it is similar as 1-2-3. Filtering time is still needed. |
| Nokia | Option 1.This seems relevant to Issue 1-2-3. If PL-RS is known, the UE has reported L1-RSRP as indicated by Apple, then why can’t the UE determine the Tx power based on the available reports? We wonder if the following 5 samples are really necessary.  |
| CATT | We think this issue can be resolved by issue 1-2-3. The agreement in RAN4#100e meeting is pointed to PL-RS discussion. When we say Tx power need to be considered, it means we are going to consider whether additional delay will be introduced due to PL-RS.  |

**Issue 1-2-6: The PUCCH Scell activation delay requirements for valid TA case?**

* Option 1: (Nokia)
	+ If the UE has a valid TA for transmitting on an SCell then the UE shall be able to transmit valid CSI report and apply actions related to the SCell activation command for the SCell being activated on the PUCCH SCell no later than in slot , where
		- THARQ (in ms) is the timing between DL data transmission and acknowledgement as specified in TS 38.213 [3]
		- Tactivation\_time is the SCell activation delay as defined in section 8.3.2.
		- TCSI\_Reporting is specified in clause 8.3.2.
		- [X] is the relaxation margin for reporting L1-RSRP of the target being-activated PUCCH SCell on any active serving cells belonging to primary PUCCH group, when the PUCCH SCell is unknown in FR2. Otherwise, it is set to 0.
* Option 2: (QC)
	+ Tactivation\_time for PUCCH SCell is the same as legacy Tactivation\_time for SCell activation.
* Recommended WF
	+ *Need more discussion*

|  |
| --- |
| **Issue 1-2-6: The PUCCH Scell activation delay requirements for valid TA case?** |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Huawei | Fine with option 1 and option 2. |
| MediaTek | For option 1, we are open to discuss.For option 2, it is unclear to us. Does that mean we do not consider the PL-RS related procedures in valid TA case? |
| Apple | Agree to use option 1 as starting point but some bullet needs to be revised/clarified.Based on the following agreements in RAN4 #100e and #101e, the Tactivation\_time in option 1 needs to be revised to take into account the “time uncertainty of the single MAC CE for both UL spatial relation and PL-RS activation of PUCCH in target being-activated Scell” for FR2. And for [X], we need to check if L1-RSRP measurement/report time inside legacy Tactivation\_time is sufficient or not. * In FR1, reuse the Rel-15 Scell activation delay requirement which is (( THARQ + Tactivation\_time +TCSI\_Reporting)/ NR slot length).
* In FR2, use normal Scell activation delay (i.e., (THARQ + Tactivation\_time +TCSI\_Reporting)/ NR slot length ) in TS38.133 section 8.3.2 as baseline, but the time uncertainty of the single MAC CE for both UL spatial relation and PL-RS activation of PUCCH in target being-activated Scell shall be considered in the baseline Tactivation\_time.
	+ For Tactivation\_time,
		- TCI state indication would not introduce additional delay time
		- For known PUCCH SCell,
			* TCI sate, PL-RS and spatial relation indication are assumed to be based on the L3 measurement.
		- For unknown PUCCH SCell,
			* TCI sate, PL-RS and spatial relation indication are assumed to be based on L1-RSRP measurement.
 |
| Ericsson | Though both options look same, option 1 considers cross group PUCCH CSI reporting, hence option 1 can be considered for further discussion.Our view is X can be captured with in Tactivation\_time just like legacy SCell activation L1-RSRP reporting. |
| QC | Response to MTK’s comment: When you look at our proposal (Proposal 3 in our contribution), “same as legacy” is for FR1, and it was proposed to add 4 additional SSB samples for FR2.We do not support ‘the relaxation margin’ in Option 1. If UE supports a new capability of supporting CSI report across PUCCH group, there is no need to relax requirements compared to the legacy. Therefore, we support Option 2 with a clarification that additional [5] SSB samples are added for FR2 PL-RS measurement. |
| NTT DOCOMO, INC. | As same as issue 1-1-1, according to current definition of TCSI\_reporting, CSI processing time is not explicitly defined thus the necessity of relaxation margin is doubtful. We understood that option 1 and 2 are same if margin X is removed. |
| Huawei2 | With further clarification. We agree to take option as based line. As commented by Apple, some extra delay will be captured in Tactivation\_time . For margin [X], we think it is related to the LS reply from RAN1, and it can be kept with more RAN1 input. |
| Nokia | Option 1. And we are open to discuss the details on time uncertainty of MAC, [X].  |
| CATT | We are fine to take option 1 as baseline and update the Tactivation\_time based on the other issues in sub-topic 1-2. And whether [X] is needed need further study for unknown cell case.  |

### Sub-topic 1-3 PUCCH Scell activation delay requirement for invalid TA case

**Issue 1-3-1: The PUCCH SCell activation requirements for invalid TA case**

Proposals

* Option 1: (CATT, MTK)
	+ The PUCCH SCell activation requirements for invalid TA case is defined as THARQ + Tactivation\_time + TCSI\_Reporting + TPDCCH + T1 + T2 + T3
* Option 2: (Apple, DOCOMO, vivo, CMCC, Xiaomi, ZTE, OPPO, Huawei, Ericsson)
	+ If UE does not have the valid TA on the PUCCH Scell being activated, an additional UL synchronization procedure to obtain the valid TA comparing to ( THARQ + Tactivation\_time +TCSI\_Reporting) shall be considered which including the following factors:
		- the delay uncertainty in acquiring the first available PRACH occasion in the PUCCH Scell(T1);
		- the delay for obtaining a valid TA command for the sTAG to which the Scell configured with PUCCH belongs(T2);
		- the delay for applying the received TA for uplink transmission(T3)
* Option 2a: (DOCOMO)
	+ Whether TCSI\_Reporting is needed for invalid TA case shall depend upon the CSI measurement configuration used in the PUCCH SCell.
* Option 2b: (Ericsson)
	+ RAN4 to agree that UL synchronisation (T1, T2, T3) and CSI measurement and reporting (TCSI\_Reporting) are performed in parallel.
* Option 3: (Qualcomm)
	+ The UE shall be capable to perform uplink actions related to the SCell activation command for the SCell being activated on the PUCCH SCell no later than in slot .
	+ And TCSI\_reporting is updated as below assuming CSI measurement can be carried out in parallel with UL TA acquisition (T1-T3):
		- TCSI\_reporting is the delay (in ms) including uncertainty in acquiring the first available downlink CSI reference resource after Tactivation\_time, UE processing time for CSI reporting and uncertainty in acquiring the first available CSI reporting resources after T3 as specified in TS 38.331
	+ For unknown PUCCH SCell with L1-RSRP based TCI activation procedure, if UE does not have a valid TA, the max function in requirements can be further modified to consider the case where semi-persistent or periodic CSI-RS resource set activation or configuration procedure can be carrier out in parallel with PDCCH order based RA procedure if needed.
	+ FFS on multiple SCell activation with PUCCH SCell.
* Option 4: (Nokia)
	+ If the UE does not have a valid TA for transmitting on an SCell, the UE shall be capable to perform downlink actions related to the SCell activation command for the SCell being activated on the PUCCH SCell no later than in slot .
	+ If the UE does not have a valid TA for transmitting on an SCell, the UE shall be capable to perform uplink actions related to the SCell activation command for the SCell being activated on the PUCCH SCell no later than in slot , where
		- Tdelay\_PUCCH\_SCell = Tactivation\_time + [X] + T1 + T2 + T3, and
		- TCSI\_Reporting\_PUCCH is the time uncertainty in acquiring the first available CSI reporting resources after RACH completion.
	+ The downlink actions can be performed immediately after Tactivation\_time and should not be deferred by TCSI\_reporting.
	+ If the UE does not have a valid TA, the activation delay requirement for PUCCH SCell shall be defined assuming no dedicated time for CSI measurements and UE processing of CSI reporting.
* Recommended WF
	+ The UE shall be capable to perform downlink actions related to the SCell activation command for the SCell being activated on the PUCCH SCell no later than in slot .
	+ The UE shall be capable to perform uplink actions related to the SCell activation command for the SCell being activated on the PUCCH SCell no later than in slot .
	+ FFS: whether [X] which is the relaxation margin for unknown cell case is needed.
	+ FFS: whether [] which is the delay uncertainty for PDCCH order receiving is needed.
	+ FFS: whether [] is needed and FFS the definition of [] if applicable.

|  |
| --- |
| **Issue 1-3-1: The PUCCH SCell activation requirements for invalid TA case** |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Huawei | Fine with recommended WF. And for Tcsi\_reporting, we are fine with the revision from QC in option 3. |
| MediaTek | Fine with the recommended WF |
| Apple | Option 2, and agree to clarify the DL/UL action as in recommended WF. We can also compromise to consider TPDCCH in option 2 as we proposed in issue 1-5-2. |
| Ericsson | OK with recommended WF with slight change. As commented in previous issue, X can be captured in activation time. |
| Xiaomi | Option 2. Prefer to use option 2 as baseline, and the remaining issues can be discussed case-by-case. |
| QC | We do not support the idea of having non-zero [x]. And we don’t think T\_PDCCH needs to be additionally defined. Option 2 and Option 3 look sufficient to us. |
| NTT DOCOMO, INC. | Fine with recommended WF. But we think X and TPDCCH can be captured in Tactivation\_time and T1 respectively. |
| vivo | Option 2 |
| ZTE | Support option 2. |
| Intel | Fine with option 2. |
| CMCC | Support option 2, but also fine with the recommended WF. |
| Nokia | Agree with the recommended WF. We can further discuss the FFSs. |
| CATT | Support the recommended WF. we think TPDCCH\_order is needed based on issue 1-5-2. For TCSI\_reporting, we think the processing time can be parallel with RA procedure. So we can compromise to update the TCSI\_reporting as the uncertainty in acquiring the first available downlink CSI reference resource after Tactivation\_time, and uncertainty in acquiring the first available CSI reporting resources after T3.  |
| CMCC | Support option 2, and fine with the recommended WF. |

**Issue 1-3-2: the delay for obtaining a valid TA command for the sTAG to which the SCell configured with PUCCH belongs (i.e. T2)**

Proposals

* Option 1: (CATT, MTK)
	+ T2 is the delay for obtaining a valid TA command from the point that UE transmit PRACH (i.e. end of T1).
* Option 2: (Apple, vivo, Intel, CMCC, ZTE, Ericsson, Xiaomi)
	+ T2 is the delay from slot n + (THARQ + Tactivatation\_time +T1)/NR slot length until UE has obtained a valid TA command for the target PUCCH Scell being activated. Tactivatation\_time is defined in TS38.133 section 8.3.2. slot n is the slot when UE received PUCCH Scell activation MAC CE.
* Option 2a: (Nokia)
	+ T2 is defined as the delay from slot n + (THARQ + Tactivation\_time +[X]+T1)/NR slot length until UE has obtained a valid TA command for the target PUCCH SCell being activated.
* Option 3: (DOCOMO)
	+ T2 is the delay from slot n + (Tactivate\_basic +T1)/NR slot length until UE has obtained a valid TA command for the target PUCCH SCell being activated. Tactivate\_basic is the normal SCell activation delay in TS38.133 section 8.3.2 (i.e. ( THARQ + Tactivation\_time +TCSI\_Reporting)/ NR slot length). slot n is the slot when UE received PUCCH SCell activation MAC CE.
* Option 3a: (DOCOMO)
	+ Whether TCSI\_Reporting is needed for invalid TA case shall depend upon the CSI measurement configuration used in the PUCCH SCell.
* Recommended WF
	+ *Moderator: The starting point of T2 is related to the discussing in issue 1-3-1, please check whether the following definition can be accepted i.e. not mention the detailed formula of starting point which does not impact the definition of T2 and can be reflected in the final requirements.*
		- T2 is the delay for obtaining a valid TA command for the target PUCCH SCell being activated from the point that UE transmit PRACH (i.e. end of T1).

|  |
| --- |
| **Issue 1-3-2: the delay for obtaining a valid TA command for the sTAG to which the SCell configured with PUCCH belongs (i.e. T2)** |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| MediaTek | Fine with the recommended WF |
| Apple | Agree Option 2 and recommended WF. |
| Ericsson | Ok with recommended WF. |
| Xiaomi | Support option 2 and fine with the recommended WF |
| QC | Support Recommended WF. |
| NTT DOCOMO, INC. | Fine with recommended WF |
| vivo | Ok with recommended WF. |
| ZTE | Agree with the recommended WF. |
| Intel | Fine with recommended WF. |
| CMCC | OK with the recommended WF |
| Nokia | Agree with the recommended WF. |
| CATT | Support the recommended WF.  |
| OPPO | Fine with recommended WF. |

**Issue 1-3-3: The components of Tactivatation\_time**

Proposals

* Option 1: (CATT, Qualcomm)
	+ The components of Tactivation\_time can be same as normal SCell activation.
* Option 2: (Intel)
	+ Tactivation\_time will only be defined for known cell
* Recommended WF
	+ *Included in the discussion of sub-topic 1-2.*

|  |
| --- |
| **Issue 1-3-3: The components of Tactivatation\_time** |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Huawei | Not very clear about the issue. Option 2 we believe is related to issue 1-1-1.  |
| MediaTek | Same view as HW. |
| Apple | Option 1 needs to revised to contain the following agreements in RAN4#100e.In FR2, use normal Scell activation delay (i.e., (THARQ + Tactivation\_time +TCSI\_Reporting)/ NR slot length ) in TS38.133 section 8.3.2 as baseline, but the time uncertainty of the single MAC CE for both UL spatial relation and PL-RS activation of PUCCH in target being-activated Scell shall be considered in the baseline Tactivation\_time. |
| Ericsson | Single MAC-CE may be enough to trigger PUCCH SCell activation, PL-RS activation, UL spatial relation switch for known PUCCH SCell case.For unknown PUCCH SCell case, based on the capability (for UE supports cross PUCCH reporting and other cases where L1-RSRP reporting is not needed), existing requirements can be reused.We do not see additional components are needed, and option 1 looks fine.  |
| Xiaomi | The same views as Apple. |
| QC | For clarification: We agree to what Apple pointed out, and that is in line with what we wrote in our proposal. But unfortunately, some details are missing here. So perhaps, Option 1 should be clarified as follows;The components of Tactivation\_time can be same as normal SCell activation except that time uncertainty of the single MAC CE for both UL spatial relation and PL-RS activation of PUCCH in target being-activated Scell shall be additionally considered for FR2. |
| Intel | Our original idea is that only requirement for known case is defined, that’s why we propose option 2. Here, we are fine with option 1 with some update. |
| Huawei2 | According to explanation from Apple and QC, we think also extra delay for PL-RS (5 samples) should be considered as discussed in issue 1-2-3.  |
| Nokia | This can be discussed in Issue 1-3-1?  |
| CATT | Agree with Apple and we think the components of Tactivation\_time is discussed in sub-topic 1-2 and no need to repeat the discussion.  |
| OPPO | Option 1 with some updates to align with the agreements of issue 1-2-1. |

**Issue 1-3-4: The TPDCCH**

Proposals

* Option 1: (Xiaomi)
	+ RAN4 not to consider TPDCCH in the PUCCH SCell activation requirements for invalid TA case.
* Recommended WF

|  |
| --- |
| **Issue 1-3-4: The TPDCCH** |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| MediaTek | Disagree with option 1. Suggest to consider the TPDCCH in activation procedure.  |
| Apple | Up to the discussion in issue 1-5-2. We need to check if the uncertainty of PDCCH order reception (PDCCH is received after UE complete the DL actions on target SCell) shall be considered additionally. |
| Ericsson | Agree with Apple. Uncertainty of PDCCH reception may not be considered in T1. Need to check if it is needed in the delay requirement.  |
| Xiaomi | This issue can be discussed in issue 1-5-2. |
| QC | Support Option 1. With clarification on downlink action timing, we don’t think T\_PDCCH needs to be additionally captured. That will be part of T1. |
| NTT DOCOMO, INC. | Agree with Apple’s comment and how to capture should be discussed in issue 1-3-1. |
| ZTE | Support option 1.TPDCCH is covered by T1. |
| Nokia | Option 1.About [TPDCCH], the requirements were defined in LTE assuming PDCCH order is transmitted with Tactivation\_time. As Tactivation\_time comprises the MAC uncertainty delay considering the CSI configuration etc., we believe the network has sufficient time to trigger PDCCH order so [TPDCCH] may be captured by Tactivation\_time. We are open to discuss the necessity.  |
| CATT | Not support option 1. Based on issue 1-5-2, the uncertainty for PDCCH order receiving is needed.  |

**Issue 1-3-5: The TCSI-RS\_reporting**

Proposals

* Option 1: (Xiaomi)
	+ TCSI\_reporting is needed in the PUCCH SCell activation requirements for invalid TA case.
* Recommended WF

|  |
| --- |
| **Issue 1-3-5: The TCSI-RS\_reporting** |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| MediaTek | Agree with option 1. |
| Apple  | fine with option 1 |
| Ericsson | Ok with option 1 |
| Xiaomi | Support option 1 |
| QC | Option 1. |
| NTT DOCOMO, INC. | This issue should be discussed within issue 1-3-1 |
| ZTE | Support option 1. |
| Intel | Fine with option 1 |
| CMCC | OK with option 1 |
| Nokia | We’d like to add another option below. ***Option 2: TCSI\_Reporting\_PUCCH is the time uncertainty in acquiring the first available CSI reporting resources after RACH completion.*** This option comes from the assumption of CSI measurements in parallel with RACH procedure. As the CSI-RS resources are available to be measured after Tactivation\_time, the UE has opportunity to measure CSI-RS while performing RACH. We’d like to understand UEs’ implementation if possible.  |
| CATT | Agree with option 1. But the definition may be needed to be updated.  |
| OPPO | Ok with option 1 |

### Sub-topic 1-4 Interruption requirements for PUCCH SCell activation

**Issue 1-4-1: The scenarios of interruption requirements for PUCCH Scell activation?**

Proposals

* Option 1: (Huawei)
	+ No PUCCH Scell requirements for NR-DC according to RAN2 restiction on numebr of PUCCH group in each cell group.
* Recommended WF
	+ *Need more discussion*

|  |
| --- |
| **Issue 1-4-1: The scenarios of interruption requirements for PUCCH Scell activation?** |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Huawei | Support option 1. According to RAN2 restriction, it seems there is no needed to considered PUCCH Scell in NR-DC. |
| MediaTek | Support option 1. |
| Apple | Agree with option 1. |
| Xiaomi | Fine with option 1 |
| QC | Option 1. |
| ZTE | Support option 1. |
| Intel | Fine with option 1. |
| Nokia | Fine with Option 1.  |
| CATT | Option 1.  |
| OPPO | Fine with Option 1. |

### Sub-topic 1-5 Applicability of PUCCH SCell activation requirements

**Issue 1-5-1 Applicability on interruption:**

Proposals

* Option 1: (CATT, MTK, Apple, Xiaomi)
	+ PUCCH SCell activation requirements are applied when no interruption occurs in same FR as the target PUCCH Scell during the Scell activation procedure if UE supports per-FR MG, otherwise the PUCCH Scell activation delay can be extended, and
	+ PUCCH SCell activation requirements are applied when no interruption occurs during the Scell activation procedure if UE does not support per-FR MG, otherwise the PUCCH Scell activation delay can be extended.
	+ The above interruption is caused by factor defined in TS38.133 section 8.2.1.1 for EN-DC, in TS38.133 section 8.2.2.1 for NR SA, in TS38.133 section 8.2.3.1 for NE-DC and in TS38.133 section 8.2.4.1 for NR-DC.
* Option 2: (Huawei)
	+ There is no need to have applicability statement of interruption for PUCCH SCell activation requirements.
* Recommended WF
	+ *Agree on option 1. FFS whether to capture it in the spec.*

|  |
| --- |
| **Issue 1-5-1 Applicability on interruption:**  |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Huawei | We support option 2.We would like to ask the following questions regarding option 1:If capture such statements for PUCCH SCell activation in spec, what about normal SCell activation? Are we also going to add such statement in normal SCell activation? If so, what about all other RRM requirements which don’t have such applicability rules currently? |
| Apple | Option 1, same justification as for LTE requirement. |
| Ericsson | Agree with Huawei and support option 2 |
| Xiaomi | Fine with option 1, but we also agree with HW’s comments, should RAN4 need to add such applicability for other RRM requirements? |
| Nokia | Option 1. We can follow the same as in LTE. |
| CATT | Support the option 1 and recommended WF.  |

**Issue 1-5-2: Applicability on PDCCH order receiving:**

Proposals

* Option 1: (CATT, MTK, Apple, vivo, Intel, Huawei)
	+ UE is only required to receive a PDCCH order to initiate RA procedure on the PUCCH Scell no earlier than n+THARQ + Tactivation\_time; otherwise, the longer PUCCH SCell activation time is expected.
	+ A delay uncertainty for reception of PDCCH order shall be accounted for in the activation timeline. The delay uncertainty for reception of PDCCH order starts from end of n + THARQ + Tactivation\_time until reception of PDCCH order.
* Option 2: (Xiaomi)
	+ The delay requirement for PUCCH SCell activation is applied provided that the UE has received a PDCCH order to initiate RA procedure on the PUCCH SCell within slot n+(THARQ+Tactivation\_time+TCSI\_Reporting)/(NR slot length), otherwise additional delay to activate the SCell is expected.
* Option 4: (Ericsson)
	+ A delay uncertainty for reception of PDCCH order shall be accounted for in the activation timeline. When PDCCH order is received within Tactivation\_time, the net effect on the timeline shall be an added delay of 0. When PDCCH order is received after Tactivation\_time, the net effect shall be an added delay that represents the time from end of Tactivation\_time until reception of PDCCH order.
* Option 5: (QC)
	+ The UE shall be capable to perform downlink actions related to the SCell activation command for the SCell being activated on the PUCCH SCell no later than in slot .
* Recommended WF
	+ UE is only required to receive a PDCCH order to initiate RA procedure on the PUCCH Scell no earlier than n+THARQ + Tactivation\_time; otherwise, the longer PUCCH SCell activation time is expected.
	+ A delay uncertainty for reception of PDCCH order shall be accounted for in the activation timeline. The delay uncertainty for reception of PDCCH order starts from end of n + THARQ + Tactivation\_time until reception of PDCCH order.
	+ FFS whether and how to capture the delay uncertainty for reception of PDCCH order in the PUCCH Scell activation delay requirements (which can be included in issue 1-3-1).

|  |
| --- |
| **Issue 1-5-2: Applicability on PDCCH order receiving:**  |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Huawei | Fine with Recommended WF. |
| MediaTek | Fine with the recommended WF. |
| Apple  | Agree with option 1 and recommended WF. UE is required to be ready on DL no later than n+THARQ + Tactivation\_time, but network has no idea how fast UE could complete the DL action and therefore the PDCCH transmission shall be assumed to be not earlier than n+THARQ + Tactivation\_time. |
| Ericsson | After further checking internally, we would like to change our position to below.Update 2:~~May be a clarification question.~~ ~~When gNB schedules PDCCH order before the activation time, UE may receive it or may not receive it. If it does not receive it, we may not need sentence “otherwise, the longer PUCCH SCell activation time is expected.”, as UE anyway did not receive PDCCH order or know that PDCCH order is sent.~~ ~~If it does receive PDCCH order, delay uncertainty for PDCCH order is not required. Our understanding is UE can only receive PDCCH order if PDCCH order is not overlapping with any RS required for SCell activation. In this case too extra delay for PUCCH SCell activation is not required.~~~~Considering above, we still feel option 4 is reasonable.~~Since gNB do not know when UE completes SCell activation, gNB do not schedule PDCCH order before Tactivation\_time (we agree that gNB can schedule PDCCH order before also and if gNB do not receive preamble it can reschedule PDCCH order again. It may be slow compared waiting for UE to complete DL activation). With this assumption, we do not require “otherwise, the longer PUCCH SCell activation time is expected.” As UE is not expected to receive PDCCH order before Tactivation\_time anyway.Considering this, to make UE behaviour clear to gNB, we suggest following modification to the recommended WF.* UE is not expected to receive a PDCCH order to initiate RA procedure on the PUCCH SCell earlier than n+ THARQ + Tactivation\_time;
* A delay uncertainty for reception of PDCCH order shall be accounted for in the activation timeline. The delay uncertainty for reception of PDCCH order starts from end of n + THARQ + Tactivation\_time until reception of PDCCH order.
* FFS whether and how to capture the delay uncertainty for reception of PDCCH order in the PUCCH SCell activation delay requirements (which can be included in issue 1-3-1)
 |
| Xiaomi | Fine with the recommended WF. |
| QC | In terms of wording, we support Option 5. It should not be said that ‘UE is only required to XXX no earlier than YYY”. It should be “UE shall XXXX no later than YYY”.Regarding the second and third bullets of the recommended WF, we do not want to create more parameters. |
| vivo | Fine with the recommended WF |
| Intel | Fine with recommended WF. |
| Huawei2 | For the wording, It is better to say “ UE shall be capable to receive PDCCH order…” instead of “UE is only required to ” |
| Nokia | In the recommended WF, the first bullet is a bit misleading. This sounds excluding the possibility of receiving PDCCH order within Tactivation\_time, which is likely to happen. In our understanding, there should be no delay due to PDCCH order in this case. To Apple’s comments, Tactivation\_time already includes some time relaxation considering MAC uncertainty. This allows the network to trigger the PDCCH order within Tactivation\_time. We are open to discuss additional delay due to PDCCH order if it is triggered after Tactivation\_time, but the requirements shall also apply when PDCCH order is received within Tactivation\_time.  |
| CATT | Support the recommended WF and fine with Ericsson’s suggested wording. For option 5, it is technically fine but it doesn’t solve the issue about PDCCH order receiving. The time uncertainty of PDCCH order receiving is not included in the downlink actions. So the recommended WF is not conflicted with option 5. To Nokia, UE cannot receive PDCCH order within Tactivation\_time since the downlink is not ready.  |
| OPPO | Fine with the recommended WF. |

**Issue 1-5-3: Applicability on use cases:**

Proposals

* Option 1: (CATT, MTK, Huawei)
	+ There is no needed to bundle the PUCCH Scell with single/multiple TAGs or intra-/inter band cases.
* Option 2: (Apple)
	+ RAN4 to only define the PUCCH SCell activation only for the case when target PUCCH SCell and existing active serving cells belong to the different TAGs.
	+ There is no need to bundle the PUCCH Scell with intra-/inter band cases.
* Recommended WF
	+ *Need more discussion*

|  |
| --- |
| **Issue 1-5-3: Applicability on use cases:**  |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Huawei | Support option 1. |
| MediaTek | Support option 1. |
| Apple | Support option 2. RAN2 defined that the PUCCH would be released on active serving cell if *timeAlignmentTimer* expires, and then it would cause problem for UE to report CSI for being-activated SCell. If target PUCCH SCell is in pTAG with PCell, there is problematic to test invalid TA case for PUCCH SCell.1> when a *timeAlignmentTimer* expires:2> if the *timeAlignmentTimer* is associated with the PTAG:3> flush all HARQ buffers for all Serving Cells;3> notify RRC to release PUCCH for all Serving Cells, if configured;3> notify RRC to release SRS for all Serving Cells, if configured;3> clear any configured downlink assignments and configured uplink grants; 3> clear any PUSCH resource for semi-persistent CSI reporting;3> consider all running *timeAlignmentTimer*s as expired;3> maintain NTA (defined in TS 38.211 [8]) of all TAGs.2> else if the *timeAlignmentTimer* is associated with an STAG, then for all Serving Cells belonging to this TAG: 3> flush all HARQ buffers;3> notify RRC to release PUCCH, if configured;3> notify RRC to release SRS, if configured;3> clear any configured downlink assignments and configured uplink grants; 3> clear any PUSCH resource for semi-persistent CSI reporting;3> maintain NTA (defined in TS 38.211 [8]) of this TAG. |
| Ericsson | Support option 1. Apple mentioned procedures are for activated serving cells. Once the PUCCH SCell is activated UE behaviour is defined as mentioned by Apple. If TAT expires, existing procedures can take place and if needed gNB can further add PUCCH SCell and activate at later stage.  |
| Nokia | Option 1. |
| CATT | Support option 1. Agree with Ericsson that the procedure is for activated serving cell and will not cause problem for PUCCH Scell to be activated.  |
| Apple2 | We would like to add further clarification on this issue.Yes, this procedure is an impact to all activated serving cell, but there is critical problem for our requirement design:Example 1, PCell and target being-activated PUCCH SCell are in the same pTAG, if we are going to define the PUCCH SCell activation requirement with invalid TA and we want UE to report CSI(beam information or L1-RSRP) via PCell PUCCH, how this requirement could be defined? In this case PCell PUCCH is released because the pTAG TAT is expired(invalid TA case)…Example 2, in EN-DC, PSCell and target being-activated PUCCH SCell are in the same sTAG, we are going to define the PUCCH SCell activation requirement with invalid TA and we want UE to report CSI(beam information or L1-RSRP) via PSCell PUCCH, how this requirement could be defined? In this case PSCell PUCCH is released because the sTAG TAT is expired(invalid TA case)…Could any company clarify? |
| Ericsson2 | @Apple:Isn’t this issue existing for normal SCell activation also right for CSI reporting. It may be an error/exceptional case and we did not discuss or restrict the requirements for SCell activation if I understood correctly.  |
| Apple3 | @EricssonThanks for your explanation! In legacy activation case we don’t need to define activation requirement of invalid TA case for the target SCell, but now for PUCCH SCell activation, invalid TA case is a key scenario for requirement design.  |

### Sub-topic 1-6 UE feature list for PUCCH Scell activation/deactivation requirements

**Issue 1-6-1: The UE feature for support of RRM requirement of PUCCH SCell activation.**

Proposals

* Option 1: (Apple, Intel)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Index | Feature group | Components | Prerequisite feature groups | Need for the gNB to know if the feature is supported | Applicable to the capability signalling exchange between UEs (V2X WI only)”. | Consequence if the feature is not supported by the UE | Type | Need of FDD/TDD differentiation | Need of FR1/FR2 differentiation | Capability interpretation for mixture of FDD/TDD and/or FR1/FR2 | Note | Mandatory/Optional |
| x-1 | PUCCH SCell activation | 1) Support of RRM requirement of PUCCH SCell activation |  | Yes | N/A | Network cannot know the PUCCH SCell activation delay and corresponding interruption length for this UE. There will be performance degradation when PUCCH SCell activation is commanded. | Per UE  | No | No  | N/A | Functionality of PUCCH SCell activation has already been supported since R15. RRM requirement is expected to be introduced in R17. Thus, R17 UE shall meet corresponding RRM requirement. | Optional with capability signalling |

* Recommended WF
	+ *Need more discussion*

|  |
| --- |
| **Issue 1-6-1: The UE feature for support of RRM requirement of PUCCH SCell activation.**  |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Huawei | As also commented in other thread. We prefer not to define dedicated UE capability to indicate whether UE can support certain requirement. |
| MediaTek | Same view as HW. |
| Apple | Option 1.  |
| Ericsson | Same views as HW, MTK. As agreed in Rel-16, our understanding is requirements cannot be optional once the UE supports feature.  |
| Xiaomi | The same view as HW. |
| QC | Share the same view as HW. |
| Intel | Open to further discuss. |
| CMCC | Same view as HW. No need to introduce UE capability for requirements. In Rel-16, we have similar discussion. And the conclusion is not to introduce UE capability for the requirements, and the requirements are only applied to Rel-16 UE and later release UE. It is preferred to follow the same approach. For PUCCH SCell activation, no need to introduce UE capability for requirements. Since the requirements are defined in Rel-17, it can be clarified that the requirements are only applied to R17 and future UEs. |
| Nokia | Agree with Huawei, MTK and Ericsson.  |
| CATT | Same view as Huawei.  |
| OPPO | Same view as HW.  |

**Issue 1-6-2: The UE feature for support of CSI reporting cross PUCCH groups.**

Proposals

* Option 1: (Apple)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Index | Feature group | Components | Prerequisite feature groups | Need for the gNB to know if the feature is supported | Applicable to the capability signalling exchange between UEs (V2X WI only)”. | Consequence if the feature is not supported by the UE | Type | Need of FDD/TDD differentiation | Need of FR1/FR2 differentiation | Capability interpretation for mixture of FDD/TDD and/or FR1/FR2 | Note | Mandatory/Optional |
| x-2 | CSI reporting cross PUCCH groups | 1) Support reporting CSI of a SCell belonging to secondary/primary PUCCH group by PUSCH or PUCCH of active serving cells belonging to primary/secondary PUCCH group |  | Yes | N/A | Network cannot know which serving cell could be used for CSI reporting of SCell belonging to secondary/primary PUCCH group. There will be performance degradation or activation failure when CSI reporting of being-activated SCell is configured during the PUCCH SCell activation. | Per UE | No | No  | N/A | The capability is to indicate whether UE could support reporting CSI of a being activated SCell belonging to secondary/primary PUCCH group by PUSCH or PUCCH of active serving cells belonging to primary/secondary PUCCH group during the PUCCH SCell activation. | Optional with capability signalling |

* Recommended WF
	+ *Need more discussion*

|  |
| --- |
| **Issue 1-6-2: The UE feature for support of CSI reporting cross PUCCH groups.**  |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Huawei | According to RAN1 LS reply, we agree that there will be a new UE capability for cross PUCCH group reporting. But from my understanding, RAN 1 is more responsible to define the details of the capability. |
| MediaTek | We would like to clarify that such cross PUCCH group CSI reporting is only used during activation or it can be used after activation? |
| Apple | Option 1.  |
| Ericsson | Agree with HW |
| QC | It should be discussed/defined in a different working group. |
| Nokia | We also think this shall be up to RAN1/2 discussion.  |
| CATT | We understand it is within RAN1 scope.  |
| OPPO | Same view as HW |

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

### CRs/TPs comments collection

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **Comments collection** |
| R4-2200072 (CATT)(draft CR for PUCCH Scell activation delay with multiple cell) | Nokia: Can come back after open issues are concluded.  |
| Company B |
|  |
| R4-2200181 (MTK)(draft CR for PUCCH Scell deactivation delay) | Nokia: Can come back after open issues are concluded |
| Company B |
|  |
| R4- 2200894 (Nokia)(draft CR for PUCCH Scell activation delay) | MediaTek: Suggest to wait for the conclusion in open issues summary.  |
| Nokia: Can come back after open issues are concluded |
|  |
| R4-2201205 (Huawei)(Draft CR on interruption of PUCCH Scell activation in 38.133) | MediaTek: Suggest to wait for the RAN1’s reply LS.  |
| Nokia: Can come back after open issues are concluded |
|  |
| R4-2201383 (Ericsson)(Draft CR on Interruption requirements to LTE serving cell in 36.133) | MediaTek: Suggest to wait for the RAN1’s reply LS.  |
| Nokia: Can come back after open issues are concluded |
|  |

## Summary for 1st round

### Open issues

Sub-topic 1-1 PUCCH SCell activation requirements for unknown cell

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Status summary**  |
| **Issue 1-1-1** | **Issue 1-1-1: Whether to define PUCCH SCell activation requirements for unknown cell case for UE supporting the Rel-17 capability of cross PUCCH group CSI reporting?***Tentative agreements:** RAN4 to define PUCCH SCell activation requirements for unknown cell case for UE supporting the Rel-17 capability of cross PUCCH group CSI reporting.
* The detailed requirements can be discussed in sub-topic 1-2 and sub-topic 1-3.

*Candidate options: None.* *Recommendations for 2nd round: None.* |
| **Issue 1-1-2** | **Issue 1-1-2: Whether to define PUCCH SCell activation requirements for unknown cell case for UE not supporting the Rel-17 capability of cross PUCCH group CSI reporting?***Tentative agreements: None.**Candidate options:** Option 1c: (Apple, Ericsson, QC, DOCOMO, vivo, Intel, CMCC, CATT, OPPO)
	+ RAN4 to not specify PUCCH SCell activation requirement for the scenarios in which beam information needs to be reported to network but UE cannot support CSI reporting cross PUCCH groups
* Option 2: (Huawei, MTK, Intel, Nokia)
	+ Wait RAN2 to determine whether to define requirements for unknown PUCCH SCell activation for UE not supporting cross PUCCH group CSI reporting.

*Recommendations for 2nd round: Further discuss.*  |

Sub-topic 1-2 PUCCH Scell activation delay requirement for valid TA case

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Status summary**  |
| **Issue 1-2-1** | **Issue 1-2-1: Whether to consider the time uncertainty of MAC CE for PL-RS activation?***Tentative agreements: None.**Candidate options:** Option 1: (CATT, Apple, DOCOMO)
	+ Keep the agreement in last meeting.
* Option 2: (Huawei, Ericsson, Intel, Nokia)
	+ There is no need to consider uncertainty of MAC CE for PL-RS activation in PUCCH SCell activation delay requirements.
* Option 3: (Ericsson, QC, Apple)
	+ Send LS to RAN1 to check the PL-RS configuration of PUCCH Scell to be activated.

*Recommendations for 2nd round: Discuss the draft LS.*  |
| **Issue 1-2-2** | **Issue 1-2-2: For Tactivation\_time, whether spatial relation will introduce extra delay time?***Tentative agreements:** For Tactivation\_time, spatial relation activation would not introduce additional delay time.

*Candidate options: None.* *Recommendations for 2nd round: None.*  |
| **Issue 1-2-3** | **Issue 1-2-3: For Tactivation\_time, whether the PL-RS will introduce extra delay time?***Tentative agreements:** For Tactivation\_time in FR2 PUCCH SCell activation requirement, only define detailed requirement when PL-RS of target PUCCH SCell is known.
* If the PL-RS of target PUCCH SCell is unknown, clarify that “longer activation time is expected if the pathloss reference signal is unknown.” in the spec.
* FFS the known condition of PL-RS.
* FFS the detailed requirements when PL-RS of target PUCCH SCell is known.

*Candidate options:***Issue 1-2-3a: the known condition of PL-RS*** Option 1: (Huawei, Ericsson)
	+ The known condition is to be defined as:
		- For known PUCCH SCell,
			* TCI sate, PL-RS and spatial relation indication are assumed to be based on the L3 measurement.
		- For unknown PUCCH SCell,
			* TCI sate, PL-RS and spatial relation indication are assumed to be based on L1-RSRP measurement.
* Option 2: (Apple)
	+ Similar as in legacy PL-RS switching requirement, but only replace the L1-RSRP measurement report of PL-RS by “L3 measurement report of PL-RS”
* Option 3: (CATT)
	+ Use the same condition in PL-RS switching delay requirements.

**Issue 1-2-3b: the detailed requirements when PL-RS of target PUCCH SCell is known**Tentative agreement: * + 5 samples time is considered when PL-RS is not maintained before SCell is activated.
	+ No additional delay is needed when PL-RS is maintained before SCell is activated.

*Recommendations for 2nd round: Further discuss issue 1-2-3a and issue 1-2-3b.*  |
| **Issue 1-2-4** | **Issue 1-2-4: Relation between the associated RS for TCI state, PL-RS and spatial relation indication?***Tentative agreements:** The PUCCH Scell activation requirements are defined based on the following assumption:
	+ For the activation with known condition, the SSB associated to PL-RS indication, TCI state switch and spatial relation is the same.
	+ For the activation with unknown condition, the SSB or CSI-RS associated to PL-RS indication, TCI state switch and spatial relation is the same.
* No need to capture it in the specification.

*Candidate options: None.* *Recommendations for 2nd round: Check the tentative agreement.*  |
| **Issue 1-2-5** | **Issue 1-2-5: How to consider the Tx power of target PUCCH in PUCCH SCell activation requirement?***Tentative agreements:** The issue can be covered by issue 1-2-3.

*Candidate options: None.* *Recommendations for 2nd round: None.* |
| **Issue 1-2-6** | **Issue 1-2-6: The PUCCH Scell activation delay requirements for valid TA case?***Tentative agreements:** If the UE has a valid TA for transmitting on an SCell then the UE shall be able to transmit valid CSI report and apply actions related to the SCell activation command for the SCell being activated on the PUCCH SCell no later than in slot , where
* THARQ (in ms) is the timing between DL data transmission and acknowledgement as specified in TS 38.213
* Tactivation\_time for FR1is the SCell activation delay as defined in section 8.3.2.
* Tactivation\_time for FR2 will be updated based on the conclusions of issue 1-2-1, issue 1-2-2 and issue 1-2-3.
* TCSI\_Reporting is specified in clause 8.3.2.
* FFS whether [X] which is the relaxation margin for unknown cell is needed.

*Candidate options:***Issue 1-2-6a: Whether [X] is needed for the PUCCH Scell activation delay requirements for valid TA case?*** Option 1:
	+ Yes, [X] is the relaxation margin for reporting L1-RSRP of the target being-activated PUCCH SCell on any active serving cells belonging to primary PUCCH group, when the PUCCH SCell is unknown in FR2.
* Option 2:
	+ No. X can be included within Tactivation\_time

*Recommendations for 2nd round: Further discuss issue 1-2-6a.*  |

Sub-topic 1-3 PUCCH Scell activation delay requirement for invalid TA case

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Status summary**  |
| **Issue 1-3-1** | **Issue 1-3-1: The PUCCH SCell activation requirements for invalid TA case***Tentative agreements:** The UE shall be capable to perform downlink actions related to the SCell activation command for the SCell being activated on the PUCCH SCell no later than in slot .
* The UE shall be capable to perform uplink actions related to the SCell activation command for the SCell being activated on the PUCCH SCell no later than in slot .
* FFS: whether [X] which is the relaxation margin for unknown cell case is needed.
* FFS: whether [] which is the delay uncertainty for PDCCH order receiving is needed.
* FFS: whether [] is needed and FFS the definition of [] if applicable.

*Candidate options: None.* *Recommendations for 2nd round: None. The discussion about [X] can be the same as issue 1-2-6a.*  |
| **Issue 1-3-2** | **Issue 1-3-2: the delay for obtaining a valid TA command for the sTAG to which the SCell configured with PUCCH belongs (i.e. T2)***Tentative agreements:** T2 is the delay for obtaining a valid TA command for the target PUCCH SCell being activated from the point that UE transmit PRACH (i.e. end of T1).

*Candidate options: None.* *Recommendations for 2nd round: None.*  |
| **Issue 1-3-3** | **Issue 1-3-3: The components of Tactivatation\_time***Tentative agreements:** Can be included in the discussion of issue 1-2-1, issue 1-2-2 and issue 1-2-3.

*Candidate options: None.* *Recommendations for 2nd round: None.* |
| **Issue 1-3-4** | **Issue 1-3-4: The TPDCCH***Tentative agreements:* *Copied from issue 1-5-2:* * UE is not expected to receive a PDCCH order to initiate RA procedure on the PUCCH SCell earlier than n+ THARQ + Tactivation\_time;
* A delay uncertainty for reception of PDCCH order shall be accounted for in the activation timeline. The delay uncertainty for reception of PDCCH order starts from end of n + THARQ + Tactivation\_time until reception of PDCCH order.
* FFS whether and how to capture the delay uncertainty for reception of PDCCH order in the PUCCH SCell activation delay requirements (which can be included in issue 1-3-4)

*Candidate options:***Issue 1-3-4: The TPDCCH*** Option 1: (Xiaomi, QC, ZTE, Nokia)
	+ RAN4 not to consider TPDCCH in the PUCCH SCell activation requirements for invalid TA case.
* Option 1a: (QC, ZTE)
	+ The uncertainty of PDCCH order reception should be part of T1.
* Option 2: (MTK, CATT)
	+ RAN4 need to consider TPDCCH in the PUCCH SCell activation requirements for invalid TA case.

*Recommendations for 2nd round: Further discuss.*  |
| **Issue 1-3-5** | **Issue 1-3-5: The TCSI-RS\_reporting***Tentative agreements:** TCSI\_reporting is needed in the PUCCH SCell activation requirements for invalid TA case.

*Candidate options:s***Issue 1-3-5a: FFS the definition of TCSI-RS\_reporting*** Option 1: (Nokia)
	+ TCSI\_Reporting\_PUCCH is the time uncertainty in acquiring the first available CSI reporting resources after RACH completion.
* Option 2: (QC)
	+ TCSI\_reporting is the delay (in ms) including uncertainty in acquiring the first available downlink CSI reference resource after Tactivation\_time, UE processing time for CSI reporting and uncertainty in acquiring the first available CSI reporting resources after T3 as specified in TS 38.331
* Option 3: (CATT)
	+ TCSI\_reporting is defined as the uncertainty in acquiring the first available downlink CSI reference resource after Tactivation\_time, and uncertainty in acquiring the first available CSI reporting resources after T3.

*Recommendations for 2nd round: Further discuss issue 1-3-5a.* |

Sub-topic 1-4 Interruption requirements for PUCCH SCell activation

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Status summary**  |
| **Issue 1-4-1** | **Issue 1-4-1: The scenarios of interruption requirements for PUCCH Scell activation?***Moderator: This issue is discussed in interruption requirements. But in moderator’s understanding, the conclusion should also be applied for delay requirements. Please check in the 2nd round.* *Tentative agreements:** No PUCCH Scell requirements (including interruption requirements and delay requirements) for NR-DC according to RAN2 restiction on numebr of PUCCH group in each cell group.

*Candidate options: None.* *Recommendations for 2nd round: Check the tentative agreement.*  |

Sub-topic 1-5 Applicability of PUCCH SCell activation requirements

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Status summary**  |
| **Issue 1-5-1** | **Issue 1-5-1 Applicability on interruption:** *Tentative agreements:** PUCCH SCell activation requirements are applied when no interruption occurs in same FR as the target PUCCH Scell during the Scell activation procedure if UE supports per-FR MG, otherwise the PUCCH Scell activation delay can be extended, and
* PUCCH SCell activation requirements are applied when no interruption occurs during the Scell activation procedure if UE does not support per-FR MG, otherwise the PUCCH Scell activation delay can be extended.
* The above interruption is caused by factor defined in TS38.133 section 8.2.1.1 for EN-DC, in TS38.133 section 8.2.2.1 for NR SA, in TS38.133 section 8.2.3.1 for NE-DC and in TS38.133 section 8.2.4.1 for NR-DC.

*Candidate options:***Issue 1-5-1a Whether to capture the agreement in the spec?*** Option 1: (Apple, Nokia)
	+ Yes, which is same as LTE.
* Option 2: (Huawei, Ericsson, Xiaomi)
	+ No.

*Recommendations for 2nd round: Further discuss issue 1-5-1a.*  |
| **Issue 1-5-2** | **Issue 1-5-2: Applicability on PDCCH order receiving:** *Tentative agreements:** UE is not expected to receive a PDCCH order to initiate RA procedure on the PUCCH SCell earlier than n+ THARQ + Tactivation\_time;
* A delay uncertainty for reception of PDCCH order shall be accounted for in the activation timeline. The delay uncertainty for reception of PDCCH order starts from end of n + THARQ + Tactivation\_time until reception of PDCCH order.
* FFS whether and how to capture the delay uncertainty for reception of PDCCH order in the PUCCH SCell activation delay requirements (which can be included in issue 1-3-4)

*Candidate options: None.* *Recommendations for 2nd round: Check the tentative agreement, and refine the wording.*  |
| **Issue 1-5-3** | **Issue 1-5-3: Applicability on use cases:** *Tentative agreements: None.* *Candidate options:** Option 1: (CATT, MTK, Huawei, Ericsson, Nokia)
	+ There is no needed to bundle the PUCCH Scell with single/multiple TAGs or intra-/inter band cases.
* Option 2: (Apple)
	+ RAN4 to only define the PUCCH SCell activation only for the case when target PUCCH SCell and existing active serving cells belong to the different TAGs.
	+ There is no need to bundle the PUCCH Scell with intra-/inter band cases.

*Recommendations for 2nd round: Further discuss.*  |

Sub-topic 1-6 UE feature list for PUCCH Scell activation/deactivation requirements

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Status summary**  |
| **Issue 1-6-1** | **Issue 1-6-1: The UE feature for support of RRM requirement of PUCCH SCell activation.** *Tentative agreements:** No need to introduce UE capability for the support of RRM requirements (i.e. UE feature x-1 which indicates the support of RRM requirement of PUCCH SCell activation is not needed.)
* R15/16 UEs who support PUCCH SCell are not required to meet R17 PUCCH SCell activation requirement.

*Candidate options: None.* *Recommendations for 2nd round: Check the tentative agreement.*  |
| **Issue 1-6-2** | **Issue 1-6-2: The UE feature for support of CSI reporting cross PUCCH groups.** *Tentative agreements:** The UE capability which indicates the support of CSI reporting cross PUCCH group is within RAN1/2 scope.

*Candidate options: None.* *Recommendations for 2nd round: None.* |

### CRs/TPs

## Discussion on 2nd round (if applicable)

### Sub-topic 1-1 PUCCH SCell activation requirements for unknown cell

**Issue 1-1-2: Whether to define PUCCH SCell activation requirements for unknown cell case for UE not supporting the Rel-17 capability of cross PUCCH group CSI reporting?**

*Candidate options:*

* Option 1c: (Apple, Ericsson, QC, DOCOMO, vivo, Intel, CMCC, CATT, OPPO)
	+ RAN4 to not specify PUCCH SCell activation requirement for the scenarios in which beam information needs to be reported to network but UE cannot support CSI reporting cross PUCCH groups
* Option 2: (Huawei, MTK, Intel, Nokia)
	+ Wait RAN2 to determine whether to define requirements for unknown PUCCH SCell activation for UE not supporting cross PUCCH group CSI reporting.

*Recommendations for 2nd round: Further discuss.*

|  |
| --- |
| **Issue 1-1-2: Whether to define PUCCH SCell activation requirements for unknown cell case for UE not supporting the Rel-17 capability of cross PUCCH group CSI reporting?** |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nokia | Option 2. If RAN4 concludes the capability as “conditional mandatory”, Option 1 would be invalid. We can focus on defining the requirements assuming the UE supports CSI reporting cross PUCCH groups and wait for RAN2 discussion on other cases. |
| Huawei | Option 2 but with different understanding as commented by Nokia. RAN4 can first define requirements for UE supporting this capability. For UE not support it, RAN4 can conclude on not to define requirements with more RAN2 inputs. I don’t see the reason that RAN4 to abandon this case in a hurry which will not impact defining requirements for valid case. |
| Ericsson | We are fine with option 2 also |
| Apple | We understand the views of proponents of option 2 but we are not sure when or whether RAN2 would reply our LS(next meeting is the last meeting for the WI). We propose following,* RAN4 to not specify PUCCH SCell activation requirement for the scenarios in which beam information needs to be reported to network but UE cannot support CSI reporting cross PUCCH groups if no RAN2 reply LS received in RAN4 #102e meeting.

  |
| CATT | We prefer option 1 to not further complicate the requirements since this is corner case. But we can accept Apple’s suggestion.  |
| Intel | Fine with the proposal suggested by Apple that no requirement will be defined if no reply LS is received from RAN2. |

### Sub-topic 1-2 PUCCH Scell activation delay requirement for valid TA case

**Issue 1-2-3: For Tactivation\_time, whether the PL-RS will introduce extra delay time?**

*Tentative agreements:*

* For Tactivation\_time in FR2 PUCCH SCell activation requirement, only define detailed requirement when PL-RS of target PUCCH SCell is known.
* If the PL-RS of target PUCCH SCell is unknown, clarify that “longer activation time is expected if the pathloss reference signal is unknown.” in the spec.
* FFS the known condition of PL-RS.
* FFS the detailed requirements when PL-RS of target PUCCH SCell is known.

*Candidate options:*

**Issue 1-2-3a: the known condition of PL-RS**

* Option 1: (Huawei, Ericsson)
	+ The known condition is to be defined as:
		- For known PUCCH SCell,
			* TCI sate, PL-RS and spatial relation indication are assumed to be based on the L3 measurement.
		- For unknown PUCCH SCell,
			* TCI sate, PL-RS and spatial relation indication are assumed to be based on L1-RSRP measurement.
* Option 2: (Apple)
	+ Similar as in legacy PL-RS switching requirement, but only replace the L1-RSRP measurement report of PL-RS by “L3 measurement report of PL-RS”
* Option 3: (CATT)
	+ Use the same condition in PL-RS switching delay requirements.

|  |
| --- |
| **Issue 1-2-3a: the known condition of PL-RS** |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nokia | Support Option 2. The known condition has been defined in TS 38.133 section 8.14.2. It seems we can reuse the existing definition and simply adapt to L3 measurements.  |
| Huawei | Support option 1. For option 2, for unknown PUCCH SCell, there maybe no L3 measurements, does it mean PL-RS are always unknown and the activation delay are unpredictable? |
| Ericsson | For known PUCCH SCell, option 1 and 2 are same.For unknown PUCCH SCell, since no L3 measurements available known condition determination is based on L1 measurements.  |
| Apple | For unknown SCell, we agree that there is no any L3 measurement for PL-RS before the activation, and then if L1-RSRP on PL-RS is measured and reported before PL-RS activation during the activation procedure, PL-RS could be considered as known. However, if there is an activated serving cell in the same band as target PUCCH SCell, the uplink spatial could be reused from that active serving cell and therefore L1-RSRP is not measured/reported before PL-RS activation, and then it shall be considered as unknown PL-RS case. So in general we can compromise to the option 1, but the option shall be revised below:* + - For known PUCCH SCell,
			* Similar as in legacy PL-RS switching requirement, but only replace the L1-RSRP measurement report of PL-RS by “L3 measurement report of PL-RS”
		- For unknown PUCCH SCell,
			* PL-RS is known if L1-RSRP measurement of PL-RS is reported before the PL-RS activation and PL-RS is remains detectable during the PUCCH SCell activation. Otherwise PL-RS is unknown.
 |
| CATT | We prefer to reuse the existing condition defined in TS 38.133. But since we have agreed that PL-RS is based on L3 measurement for known cell case, we can compromise to the following: For unknown cell case, reuse the existing condition in legacy PL-RS switching requirementFor known cell case, similar as in legacy PL-RS switching requirement, but only replace the L1-RSRP measurement report of PL-RS by “L3 measurement report of PL-RS”.  |
| Intel | Fine with option 1. |

**Issue 1-2-3b: the detailed requirements when PL-RS of target PUCCH SCell is known**

Tentative agreement:

* + 5 samples time is considered when PL-RS is not maintained before SCell is activated.
	+ No additional delay is needed when PL-RS is maintained before SCell is activated.

*Recommendations for 2nd round: Further discuss issue 1-2-3a and issue 1-2-3b.*

|  |
| --- |
| **Issue 1-2-3b: the detailed requirements when PL-RS of target PUCCH SCell is known** |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nokia | We think this depends on the discussion in Issue 1-2-3a. If following existing definition of “PL-RS is known” (as below), it is always assuming “PL-RS is maintained” so “when PL-RS is not maintained” is not considered as known. *- The target pathloss reference signal remains detectable during the pathloss reference signal switching period**- SNR of the target pathloss reference signal≥-3dB*We could agree with the 2nd bullet in the tentative agreements, but would leave the 1st bullet as open after there is conclusion on Issue 1-2-3a.  |
| Huawei | We can agree with the tentative agreement, but we don’t think 2nd bullet is valid. Company clarify in which case UE will “maintain” the PL-RS when it is deactivated? |
| Ericsson | Agree with tentative agreement. Just thinking out loud here, when a UE is configured to use same set of PL-RS as already activated cell, in that case PL-RS may be maintained even if the PUCCH SCell is deactivated. I am not sure if this scenario is possible. Need bit more time to check. Any views from other companies regarding this scenario possibility?  |
| Apple | Fine with the tentative agreement. The case raised by Ericsson might be possible case, we also need to check. In the RAN2 RRC, it seems the serving cell index could be explicitly indicated to UE, which means PL-RS could be a RS on another serving cell. We need to check.Text  Description automatically generated with low confidence |
| CATT | Fine with the recommended WF. To Nokia’s comments, we kindly agree, but we found even in existing PL-RS switching delay which is only for known PL-RS, there is still non-maintained case. So we are fine to check whether the case is valid.  |
| Intel | Agree with the tentative agreement. For the issue raised by Nokia, in legacy, it’s possible that PL-RS is known by L1 report while not maintain the PL-RS. We think it also needs to clarify whether the same assumption apply for L3 report.To the scenario proposed by Ericsson, if same set of PL-RS of already activated cell is configured, we are not sure whether the pathloss can be re-used. If other serving cell is co-located, we think it can be re-used. |

**Issue 1-2-4: Relation between the associated RS for TCI state, PL-RS and spatial relation indication?**

*Tentative agreements:*

* The PUCCH Scell activation requirements are defined based on the following assumption:
	+ For the activation with known condition, the SSB associated to PL-RS indication, TCI state switch and spatial relation is the same.
	+ For the activation with unknown condition, the SSB or CSI-RS associated to PL-RS indication, TCI state switch and spatial relation is the same.
* No need to capture it in the specification.

*Candidate options: None.*

*Recommendations for 2nd round: Check the tentative agreement.*

|  |
| --- |
| **Issue 1-2-4: Relation between the associated RS for TCI state, PL-RS and spatial relation indication?** |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nokia | We prefer NOT specifying any restriction to network configuration hence the tentative agreements are NOT agreeable to us. We believe the following is sufficient assumption. *Agreements:** *For Tactivation\_time,*
	+ *For known PUCCH SCell,*
		- *TCI sate, PL-RS and spatial relation indication are assumed to be based on the L3 measurement.*
	+ *For unknown PUCCH SCell,*
		- *TCI sate, PL-RS and spatial relation indication are assumed to be based on L1-RSRP measurement.*
 |
| Huawei | Similar views as Nokia |
| Ericsson | Similar view as Nokia. This looks like beam alignment condition of FeMIMO WI. Which is not in the scope of this WI.  |
| Apple | We agree the tentative agreement, but fine to accept network vendors’ comments. |
| CATT | Fine with the tentative agreement since we think the requirements we discussed are based on this assumption. But since this has already reflected in the requirements definition, we also agree with Nokia not to have further agreement.  |

**Issue 1-2-6: The PUCCH Scell activation delay requirements for valid TA case?**

*Tentative agreements:*

* If the UE has a valid TA for transmitting on an SCell then the UE shall be able to transmit valid CSI report and apply actions related to the Scell activation command for the Scell being activated on the PUCCH Scell no later than in slot , where
* THARQ (in ms) is the timing between DL data transmission and acknowledgement as specified in TS 38.213
* Tactivation\_time for FR1is the Scell activation delay as defined in section 8.3.2.
* Tactivation\_time for FR2 will be updated based on the conclusions of issue 1-2-1, issue 1-2-2 and issue 1-2-3.
* TCSI\_Reporting is specified in clause 8.3.2.
* FFS whether [X] which is the relaxation margin for unknown cell is needed.

*Candidate options:*

**Issue 1-2-6a: Whether [X] is needed for the PUCCH Scell activation delay requirements for valid TA case?**

* Option 1:
	+ Yes, [X] is the relaxation margin for reporting L1-RSRP of the target being-activated PUCCH Scell on any active serving cells belonging to primary PUCCH group, when the PUCCH Scell is unknown in FR2.
* Option 2:
	+ No. X can be included within Tactivation\_time

*Recommendations for 2nd round: Further discuss issue 1-2-6a.*

|  |
| --- |
| **Issue 1-2-6a: Whether [X] is needed for the PUCCH Scell activation delay requirements for valid TA case?** |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nokia | Option 1. The value can be up to RAN1/2 discussion.  |
| Huawei | Similar with as Nokia |
| Ericsson | Need bit more clarification on what is relaxation margin and why it is needed.  |
| Apple | In current activation requirement for unknown FR2, we have:“TL1-RSRP, report is delay of acquiring CSI reporting resources.” We think it could be reused for cross PUCCH group reporting, but could companies elaborate more why this X is different from existing TL1-RSRP, report? |
| CATT | Slightly prefer option 2.  |
| Intel | Fine with option 1. To apple, since in the reply LS from RAN1, it said, “ Potential CSI processing timeline relaxation for UEs reporting the new UE capability can be discussed.” Here, it mentioned some relaxation. |

### Sub-topic 1-3 PUCCH Scell activation delay requirement for invalid TA case

*Moderator: move the discussion of issue 1-5-2 here to facilitate the discussion issue 1-3-4. Companies are encouraged to provide comments on wording refinement on the following:*

**Issue 1-5-2: Applicability on PDCCH order receiving:**

* Option 1:
	+ UE is not expected to receive a PDCCH order to initiate RA procedure on the PUCCH SCell earlier than n+ THARQ + Tactivation\_time;
	+ A delay uncertainty for reception of PDCCH order shall be accounted for in the activation timeline. The delay uncertainty for reception of PDCCH order starts from end of n + THARQ + Tactivation\_time until reception of PDCCH order.
* Option 2:
	+ UE is only required to receive a PDCCH order to initiate RA procedure on the PUCCH SCell no earlier than n+ THARQ + Tactivation\_time;
	+ A delay uncertainty for reception of PDCCH order shall be accounted for in the activation timeline. The delay uncertainty for reception of PDCCH order starts from end of n + THARQ + Tactivation\_time until reception of PDCCH order.
* Option 3:
	+ UE shall be capable to receive a PDCCH order to initiate RA procedure on the PUCCH SCell no earlier than n+ THARQ + Tactivation\_time;
	+ A delay uncertainty for reception of PDCCH order shall be accounted for in the activation timeline. The delay uncertainty for reception of PDCCH order starts from end of n + THARQ + Tactivation\_time until reception of PDCCH order.

|  |
| --- |
| **Issue 1-5-2: Applicability on PDCCH order receiving:**  |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nokia | We think Option 1 is more clearly defining the expected UE behaviour.  |
| Xiaomi | Prefer option 1 |
| Huawei | Support option 2 or 3. The wording in option 1 is mainly used for scheduling/measurement availability, and it is seldom used in delay requirements. It is strange to define a timing point in RRM requirements using wording in option 1. As we only define minimum requirements, if UE can complete DL preparation faster, what is meaning by saying UE is not expected to… |
| Ericsson | Similar view as Nokia.May be to respond to Huawei, I think if it is the ending point the procedure we are defining, agree with Huawei’s suggestion. However, this is intermediate point where gNB need to know if it can send PDCCH order to UE. Even if UE can complete earlier than the requirement time specified, that may not be used by gNB as gNB do not know when UE can complete it.  |
| Apple | Option 1. Honestly, we didn’t see big difference among all three options. |
| CATT | Same view as Apple, we don’t see big difference among the options. * For Huawei’s comments, we understand this is not the wording for delay requirements but additional UE behavior clarification on the PDCCH order receiving to decide the requirements applicability or whether to add TPDCCH. The delay requirement is still defined as the following but not using the wording in option 1:
	+ The UE shall be capable to perform downlink actions related to the SCell activation command for the SCell being activated on the PUCCH SCell no later than in slot .
	+ The UE shall be capable to perform uplink actions related to the SCell activation command for the SCell being activated on the PUCCH SCell no later than in slot .
 |
| Intel | Prefer option 1 |

**Issue 1-3-4: The TPDCCH**

* Option 1: (Xiaomi, QC, ZTE, Nokia)
	+ RAN4 not to consider TPDCCH in the PUCCH SCell activation requirements for invalid TA case.
* Option 1a: (QC, ZTE)
	+ The uncertainty of PDCCH order reception should be part of T1.
* Option 2: (MTK, CATT)
	+ RAN4 need to consider TPDCCH in the PUCCH SCell activation requirements for invalid TA case.

*Recommendations for 2nd round: Further discuss.*

|  |
| --- |
| **Issue 1-3-4: The TPDCCH** |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nokia | Option 1. After DL activation is done, the network could have sufficient time to trigger PDCCH order during RACH procedure.  |
| Xiaomi | Our comments in 1st round is to consider TPDCCH under issue 1-5-2, and we are fine with the tentative agreements for issue 1-5-2:* A delay uncertainty for reception of PDCCH order shall be accounted for in the activation timeline. The delay uncertainty for reception of PDCCH order starts from end of n + THARQ + Tactivation\_time until reception of PDCCH order.
* FFS whether and how to capture the delay uncertainty for reception of PDCCH order in the PUCCH SCell activation delay requirements (which can be included in issue 1-3-4)

Given the agreement for issue 1-5-2, it is meaningless to continue to discuss this issue, we just focus on the FFS part in the agreement for issue 1-5-2. |
| Ericsson | Same view as Xiaomi |
| Apple | Agree with Xiaomi. |
| CATT | Support option 2. To Xiaomi, Ericsson and Apple, this issue is definitely the discussion on the FFS part, option 2 is a suggestion to capture the delay uncertainty in the delay requirements. I don’t understand your comments, if we don’t discuss this issue, how we decide the FFS part? |

**Issue 1-3-5: The TCSI-RS\_reporting**

*Tentative agreements:*

* TCSI\_reporting is needed in the PUCCH SCell activation requirements for invalid TA case.

*Candidate options:s*

**Issue 1-3-5a: FFS the definition of TCSI-RS\_reporting**

* Option 1: (Nokia)
	+ TCSI\_Reporting\_PUCCH is the time uncertainty in acquiring the first available CSI reporting resources after RACH completion.
* Option 2: (QC)
	+ TCSI\_reporting is the delay (in ms) including uncertainty in acquiring the first available downlink CSI reference resource after Tactivation\_time, UE processing time for CSI reporting and uncertainty in acquiring the first available CSI reporting resources after T3 as specified in TS 38.331
* Option 3: (CATT)
	+ TCSI\_reporting is defined as the uncertainty in acquiring the first available downlink CSI reference resource after Tactivation\_time, and uncertainty in acquiring the first available CSI reporting resources after T3.

*Recommendations for 2nd round: Further discuss issue 1-3-5a.*

|  |
| --- |
| **Issue 1-3-5a: FFS the definition of TCSI-RS\_reporting** |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nokia | Suggest adding below to the agreements to highlight it may not be the same as existing TCSI\_reporting. * FFS the definition of TCSI\_reporting.

And we prefer Option 1 assuming “uncertainty in acquiring the first available downlink CSI reference resource after Tactivation\_time, UE processing time for CSI reporting” can be captured in the time period for RACH procedure. We would like to understand if there is any particular implementation restriction to avoid parallel behaviour?  |
| Xiaomi | In legacy SCell activation requirement, RAN4 did not introduce the definition of TCSI\_reporting. Why do we need to define the definition of TCSI\_reporting for PUCCH SCell activation? |
| Huawei | Option 2. |
| Ericsson | Option 1.  |
| Apple | Option 2. |
| CATT | We can accept option 1. To Nokia, we have the following agreement in issue 1-3-1 which we think can address your concern. * FFS: whether [] is needed and FFS the definition of [] if applicable.
 |
| Intel | Option 2. |

### Sub-topic 1-4 Interruption requirements for PUCCH Scell activation

**Issue 1-4-1: The scenarios of interruption requirements for PUCCH Scell activation?**

*Moderator: This issue is discussed in interruption requirements. But in moderator’s understanding, the conclusion should also be applied for delay requirements. Please check in the 2nd round.*

*Tentative agreements:*

* No PUCCH Scell requirements (including interruption requirements and delay requirements) for NR-DC according to RAN2 restiction on umber of PUCCH group in each cell group.

*Candidate options: None.*

*Recommendations for 2nd round: Check the tentative agreement.*

|  |
| --- |
| **Issue 1-4-1: The scenarios of interruption requirements for PUCCH Scell activation?** |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nokia | Fine with the tentative agreements. |
| Xiaomi | Fine with the tentative agreements. |
| Ericsson | OK with tentative agreements |
| Apple | Fine with the tentative agreements. |
| CATT | Fine with the tentative agreement.  |
| Intel | Fine with the tentative agreements. |

### Sub-topic 1-5 Applicability of PUCCH SCell activation requirements

**Issue 1-5-1 Applicability on interruption:**

*Tentative agreements:*

* PUCCH Scell activation requirements are applied when no interruption occurs in same FR as the target PUCCH Scell during the Scell activation procedure if UE supports per-FR MG, otherwise the PUCCH Scell activation delay can be extended, and
* PUCCH Scell activation requirements are applied when no interruption occurs during the Scell activation procedure if UE does not support per-FR MG, otherwise the PUCCH Scell activation delay can be extended.
* The above interruption is caused by factor defined in TS38.133 section 8.2.1.1 for EN-DC, in TS38.133 section 8.2.2.1 for NR SA, in TS38.133 section 8.2.3.1 for NE-DC and in TS38.133 section 8.2.4.1 for NR-DC.

*Candidate options:*

**Issue 1-5-1a Whether to capture the agreement in the spec?**

* Option 1: (Apple, Nokia)
	+ Yes, which is same as LTE.
* Option 2: (Huawei, Ericsson, Xiaomi)
	+ No.

*Recommendations for 2nd round: Further discuss issue 1-5-1a.*

|  |
| --- |
| **Issue 1-5-1a Whether to capture the agreement in the spec?** |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nokia | Option 1. |
| Xiaomi | Option 2, since such clarification applies to many other requirement, do we need add this agreements for each requirements which are involved. If this clarification is agreed to be captured only in PUCCH Scell activation delay requirement, we do not support it. |
| Huawei | It is not that tough to say yes to option 1. But can companies answer following questions in 1st round:If capture such statements for PUCCH Scell activation in spec, what about normal Scell activation? Are we also going to add such statement in normal Scell activation? If so, what about all other RRM requirements which don’t have such applicability rules currently?Can company give an clear guidance on how to treat other requirements (existing and to be added in the further) before we agree on this? |
| Ericsson | Option 2 |
| Apple | Option1. Understand Huawei’s concern, but honestly, we don’t think there is such general principle for all cases/features, and we could discuss case by case. At least for this case, we just follow the way we did in LTE.  |
| CATT | No strong view. We are fine to follow LTE approach and we don’t think other RRM requirements be involved.  |

**Issue 1-5-3: Applicability on use cases:**

*Candidate options:*

* Option 1: (CATT, MTK, Huawei, Ericsson, Nokia)
	+ There is no needed to bundle the PUCCH Scell with single/multiple TAGs or intra-/inter band cases.
* Option 2: (Apple)
	+ RAN4 to only define the PUCCH SCell activation only for the case when target PUCCH SCell and existing active serving cells belong to the different TAGs.
	+ There is no need to bundle the PUCCH Scell with intra-/inter band cases.

*Recommendations for 2nd round: Further discuss.*

|  |
| --- |
| **Issue 1-5-3: Applicability on use cases:**  |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nokia | Option 1. |
| Huawei | Option 1 |
| Ericsson | I thinking the existing wording is bit confusing. Can Apple please clarify any particular scenarios the problem exists. |
| Apple | We propose the revised wording to clarify the problem,* RAN4 to not define the requirement for PUCCH SCell activation with invalid TA when target PUCCH SCell and existing active PUCCH serving cells belong to the same TAG.
* There is no need to bundle the PUCCH Scell with intra-/inter band cases.

Again, if the target Scell TA is invalid and PCell/PScell is in the same TAG as this Scell, then the TA for PCell/PSCell is also invalid, then the PUCCH of PCell/PSCell would be released, and we don’t think the PUCCH SCell requirement of invalid TA could be applied for this case. |
| CATT | Prefer option 1. For the case mentioned by Apple, I’m not sure whether it is a valid case, if serving cell have no valid TA, then UE cannot have any communication. In this case, is there still PUCCH Scell activation? |

### Sub-topic 1-6 UE feature list for PUCCH Scell activation/deactivation requirements

**Issue 1-6-1: The UE feature for support of RRM requirement of PUCCH SCell activation.**

*Moderator: Apple suggest to add the second bullet, companies are encouraged to check whether it is acceptable.*

*Tentative agreements:*

* No need to introduce UE capability for the support of RRM requirements (i.e. UE feature x-1 which indicates the support of RRM requirement of PUCCH SCell activation is not needed.)
* R15/16 Ues who support PUCCH SCell are not required to meet R17 PUCCH SCell activation requirement.

*Candidate options: None.*

*Recommendations for 2nd round: Check the tentative agreement.*

|  |
| --- |
| **Issue 1-6-1: The UE feature for support of RRM requirement of PUCCH Scell activation.**  |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nokia | Fine with the tentative agreements.  |
| Xiaomi | Fine with the tentative agreements. |
| Apple | Fine with the tentative agreements. |
| CATT | Fine with the tentative agreements.  |

# Recommendations for Tdocs

## 1st round

**New tdocs**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Title** | **Source** | **Comments** |
| WF on … | YYY |  |
| LS on … | ZZZ | To: RAN\_X; Cc: RAN\_Y |
| WF on further RRM enhancement for NR and MR-DC – PUCCH SCell activation/deactivation requirements | CATT | *WF to capture all the agreements and open issues.*  |
| LS on the PL-RS configuration of PUCCH Scell to be activated | Apple | *To: RAN1* |

**Existing tdocs**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Tdoc number** | **Title** | **Source** | **Recommendation**  | **Comments** |
| R4-210xxxx | CR on … | XXX | Agreeable, Revised, Merged, Postponed, Not Pursued |  |
| R4-2200072  | draft CR for PUCCH Scell activation delay with multiple cell | CATT | Postponed |  |
| R4-2200181 | draft CR for PUCCH Scell deactivation delay | MTK | Return to | *Note: There is no open issue related to this CR. Please check in the 2nd round, if no further comments, it will be endorsed.*  |
| R4- 2200894  | draft CR for PUCCH Scell activation delay | Nokia | Postponed |  |
| R4-2201205  | Draft CR on interruption of PUCCH Scell activation in 38.133 | Huawei | Postponed |  |
| R4-2201383  | Draft CR on Interruption requirements to LTE serving cell in 36.133 | Ericsson | Postponed |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Notes:

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

## 2nd round

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Tdoc number** | **Title** | **Source** | **Recommendation**  | **Comments** |
| R4-210xxxx | CR on … | XXX | Agreeable, Revised, Merged, Postponed, Not Pursued |  |
| R4-210xxxx | WF on … | YYY | Agreeable, Revised, Noted |  |
| R4-210xxxx | LS on … | ZZZ | Agreeable, Revised, Noted |  |
|  | WF on further RRM enhancement for NR and MR-DC – PUCCH SCell activation/deactivation requirements | CATT |  |  |
|  | LS on the PL-RS configuration of PUCCH Scell to be activated | Apple |  |  |

Notes:

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

# Annex

Contact information

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Name** | **Email address** |
| CATT | Qiuge Guo | guoqiuge@catt.cn |
| MediaTek | ChihKai Yang | ck.yang@mediatek.com |
| Apple | Jie Cui | Jie\_cui@apple.com |
| Ericsson | Venkat Gonuguntla | Venkatarao.gonuguntla@ericsson.com |
| Xiaomi | Xuhua Tao | taoxuhua@xiaomi.com |
| Qualcomm | CH Park | chparkqc@qti.qualcomm.com |
| CMCC | Jingjing Chen | chenjingjing@chinamobile.com |
| OPPO | Roy Hu | hurongyi@oppo.com |
| Huawei | Zhongyi Shen | shenzhong3@huawei.com |

Note:

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