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# **Introduction**

This contribution summarizes the following email discussion in AI 7.2.11.5 regarding UE features for URLLC/IIoT.

[100b-e-NR-UEFeatures-URLLC/IIoT-02] Email discussion/approval on the feature groups structure related to UCI enhancements for URLLC (20th-24th April) – Hiroki (DCM)

* Confirm to keep 11-3/4
* Discuss following on 11-3
  + Whether to introduce separate FGs for the simultaneous use of CBG-based UL transmission and minimum processing capability 2 (e.g., 11-3a/3b/3c/3d/3e)
* Discuss following on 11-4
  + Whether or not to merge 11-4 with 12-1
    - If not merged, whether or not to introduce separate UE capabilities for DCI format 0\_1 and DCI format 0\_2 based on 12-1
  + Whether or not to introduce separate UE capabilities for DL priority and UL priority for component 4)
  + Whether or not to introduce separate UE capabilities for DCI format 0\_1/1\_1 and DCI format 0\_2/1\_2 for component 4)
* Discuss whether or not to keep FG11-4x for two sub-slot based HARQ-ACK codebook construction
* Discuss whether or not to keep FG11-4a, and if yes, whether to split it into two rows, one for DL and one for UL

# **11-3: More than one PUCCH for HARQ-ACK transmission within a slot**

In [1], FG11-3 is captured as below.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Features | 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**  **(the ‘type’ definition from UE features should be based on the granularity of 1) Per UE or 2) Per Band or 3) Per BC or 4) Per FS or 5) Per FSPC)** | Need of FDD/TDD differentiation | Need of FR1/FR2 differentiation | Capability interpretation for mixture of FDD/TDD and/or FR1/FR2 | Note | Mandatory/Optional |
| 11.  NR\_L1enh\_URLLC | 11-3 | More than one PUCCH for HARQ-ACK transmission within a slot | 1) Supports sub-slot based HARQ-ACK feedback procedure.  • A UL slot consists of a number of sub-slots. No more than one transmitted PUCCH carrying HARQ-ACKs starts in a sub-slot.• At least one sub-slot configuration for PUCCH can be UE specifically configured to a UE.  • Supports a single configuration for PUCCH resource for all sub-slots in a slot. The starting symbol of a PUCCH resource is defined with respect to the first symbol of sub-slot. Any sub-slot PUCCH resource is not across sub-slot boundaries.  2) Supported sub-slot configuration  [3) Supported combinations of (A, B), where A is the minimum gap between sub-slots containing actual PUCCH transmissions measured from beginning to beginning of the sub-slots, including across slots, and B is the sub-slot duration, with both A and B in units of symbols] |  | Yes | N/A |  | [Per UE] | [No] | [No] | [support mixture of FDD/TDD and/or FR1/FR2] | Candidate value set for component 2):  { 7-symbol\*2,  2-symbol\*7 and 7-symbol\*2}  [Candidate value set for component 3):  (A, B) =  {(7, 7),  (4, 2) and (7, 7),  (2, 2) and (7, 7)}]  FFS: Whether to keep component 3) and accordingly the above note for component 3)  FFS: Any relationship between FG 11-3 and CBG-based PUSCH with minimum processing time capability #2? | Optional with capability signalling |

Following feedbacks are provided in contributions for the RAN1#100bis-e meeting.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| [2] | ZTE | * There is no need to report additional pattern to the one supported by component 2 i.e. 2-symbol\*7 and 7-symbol\*2.   + Current component 3), 2 back-to-back PUCCHs across two different slots cannot be supported by reporting (4,2) or (7,2) while such case is supported in Rel-15.  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | ***Suggested revision #3 on FG 11-3*** | | | | | Index | Feature group | Components | **Note** | | 11-3 | More than one PUCCH for HARQ-ACK transmission within a slot | 1) Supports sub-slot based HARQ-ACK feedback procedure.  • A UL slot consists of a number of sub-slots. No more than one transmitted PUCCH carrying HARQ-ACKs starts in a sub-slot.• At least one sub-slot configuration for PUCCH can be UE specifically configured to a UE.  • Supports a single configuration for PUCCH resource for all sub-slots in a slot. The starting symbol of a PUCCH resource is defined with respect to the first symbol of sub-slot. Any sub-slot PUCCH resource is not across sub-slot boundaries.  2) Supported sub-slot configuration  ~~3) Supported combinations of (A, B), where A is the minimum gap between sub-slots containing actual PUCCH transmissions measured from beginning to beginning of the sub-slots, including across slots, and B is the sub-slot duration, with both A and B in units of symbols~~ | Candidate value set for component 2):  { 7-symbol\*2,  2-symbol\*7 and 7-symbol\*2}  ~~[Candidate value set for component 3):~~  ~~(A, B) =~~  ~~{(7, 7),~~  ~~(4, 2) and (7, 7),~~  ~~(2, 2) and (7, 7)}]~~  ~~FFS: Whether to keep component 3) and accordingly the above note for component 3)~~  ~~FFS: Any relationship between FG 11-3 and CBG-based PUSCH with minimum processing time capability #2?~~ | |
| [3] | vivo | * For 11-3, to clarify the necessity of following FFS   + FFS: Whether to keep component 3) and accordingly the above note for component 3)   + FFS: Any relationship between FG 11-3 and CBG-based PUSCH with minimum processing time capability #2? |
| [3] | OPPO | * For 11-3, for component 3), it is deleted due to it is not discussed and agreed in RAN1. * It is not necessary due to component 2) defines sub-slot configuration clearly.  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | 11-3 | More than one PUCCH for HARQ-ACK transmission within a slot | 1) Supports sub-slot based HARQ-ACK feedback procedure.  • A UL slot consists of a number of sub-slots. No more than one transmitted PUCCH carrying HARQ-ACKs starts in a sub-slot.• At least one sub-slot configuration for PUCCH can be UE specifically configured to a UE.  • Supports a single configuration for PUCCH resource for all sub-slots in a slot. The starting symbol of a PUCCH resource is defined with respect to the first symbol of sub-slot. Any sub-slot PUCCH resource is not across sub-slot boundaries.  2) Supported sub-slot configuration | |
| [5] | Ericsson | Component 3) of feature group 11-3 should not be included. UE performs the sub-slot based HARQ-ACK transmission according to RRC configuration. |
| [7] | Media Tek Inc. | For FG11-3, remove the brackets from component 3) “*[3) Supported combinations of (A, B), where A is the minimum gap between sub-slots containing actual PUCCH transmissions measured from beginning to beginning of the sub-slots, including across slots, and B is the sub-slot duration, with both A and B in units of symbols]*”. |
| [8] | LGE | On FG 11-3, suggest to remove the component 3) and the corresponding note. |
| [9] | Intel | * On component 3), this component is not necessary. Technical reasons below:   + We don’t see a similar situation as for PDCCH monitoring cases for PUCCH transmissions. For PDCCH monitoring the associated processing for the PDCCH and any corresponding channels as indicated in the DCI occurs starting from the PDCCH symbols, and may consume additional time beyond the last symbol of the PDCCH. Thus, consideration on minimum gap between two consecutive PDCCH monitoring spans can help how fast the processors in the UE may be freed up for the next monitoring span.   + On the other hand, for PUCCH transmission, once the PUCCH ends, the corresponding processing resources at the UE can be freed up. It is not clear exactly how the gap between two PUCCH transmissions makes a difference as long as PUCCHs are limited to respective non-overlapping sub-slots. |
| [10] | CATT | The necessity of component 3) is not clear.   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | 11-3 | More than one PUCCH for HARQ-ACK transmission within a slot | 1) Supports sub-slot based HARQ-ACK feedback procedure.  • A UL slot consists of a number of sub-slots. No more than one transmitted PUCCH carrying HARQ-ACKs starts in a sub-slot.• At least one sub-slot configuration for PUCCH can be UE specifically configured to a UE.  • Supports a single configuration for PUCCH resource for all sub-slots in a slot. The starting symbol of a PUCCH resource is defined with respect to the first symbol of sub-slot. Any sub-slot PUCCH resource is not across sub-slot boundaries.  2) Supported sub-slot configuration  ~~[3) Supported combinations of (A, B), where A is the minimum gap between sub-slots containing actual PUCCH transmissions measured from beginning to beginning of the sub-slots, including across slots, and B is the sub-slot duration, with both A and B in units of symbols]~~ |  | Yes | N/A |  | [Per UE] | [No] | [No] | [support mixture of FDD/TDD and/or FR1/FR2] | Candidate value set for component 2):  { 7-symbol\*2,  2-symbol\*7 and 7-symbol\*2}  ~~[Candidate value set for component 3):~~  ~~(A, B) =~~  ~~{(7, 7),~~  ~~(4, 2) and (7, 7),~~  ~~(2, 2) and (7, 7)}]~~  ~~FFS: Whether to keep component 3) and accordingly the above note for component 3)~~  FFS: Any relationship between FG 11-3 and CBG-based PUSCH with minimum processing time capability #2? | Optional with capability signalling | |
| [11] | Samsung | * No need for component 3   + UE should be able to transmit PUCCH at least as often as receive PDSCH/transmit PUSCH. For 120 kHz, it is similar to transmitting PUCCH every 2 symbols for 15 kHz/30 kHz. * It is preferable to have “Supported maximum number of actual PUCCH transmissions for HARQ-ACK within a slot” instead of component 3). |
| [12] | Apple | * Support to introduce component 3) in FG 11-3 by modifying it to the following: “Supported combinations of (A, B), where A is the minimum gap between sub-slots ~~containing~~ within which the actual PUCCH transmissions start, measured from beginning to beginning of the sub-slots, including across slots, and B is the sub-slot duration, with both A and B in units of symbols”.   + It would allow UEs to implement the feature with reduced complexity, similar to the span pattern that has been introduced for PDCCH. |
| [14] | Nokia, NSB | No need for CBG-related restrictions, and hence we are fine with removing component 3.. |
| [15] | Qualcomm | Following updates are proposed.   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | 11-3 | More than one PUCCH for HARQ-ACK transmission within a slot | 1) Supports sub-slot based HARQ-ACK feedback procedure.  • A UL slot consists of a number of sub-slots. No more than one transmitted PUCCH carrying HARQ-ACKs starts in a sub-slot.  • At least one sub-slot configuration for PUCCH can be UE specifically configured to a UE.  • Supports a single configuration for PUCCH resource for all sub-slots in a slot. The starting symbol of a PUCCH resource is defined with respect to the first symbol of sub-slot. Any sub-slot PUCCH resource is not across sub-slot boundaries.  2) Supported sub-slot configuration  3) Supported combinations of (A, B), where A is the minimum gap between sub-slots containing actual PUCCH transmissions measured from beginning to beginning of the sub-slots, including across slots, and B is the sub-slot duration, with both A and B in units of symbols |  | Yes | N/A |  | PerBand | N/A | N/A |  | Candidate value set for component 2):  { 7-symbol\*2,  2-symbol\*3 and 7-symbol\*2,  7-symbol\*2 and 2-symbol\*3 and 2-symbol\*4,  7-symbol\*2 and 2-symbol\*3 and 2-symbol\*4 and 2-symbol\*7}  Candidate value set for component 3):  (A, B) =  {(7, 7),  (4, 2) and (7, 7),  (3,2) and (4,2) and (7,7),  (2, 2) and (3,2) and (4,2) and (7, 7)} | Optional with capability signalling |   In addition, the proposed FG 11-3a-e would allow for capability signalling for the simultaneous use of CBG-based UL transmission and minimum processing capability 2.   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | 11-3a | CBG based transmission for UL with 1 unicast PUSCHs per slot per CC for different TBs with UE processing time Capability 2 | CBG based transmission for UL with 1 unicast PUSCHs per slot per CC for different TBs with UE processing time Capability 2 | 5-5a or 5-5b | Yes | N/A |  | Per UE | No | FR1 only |  | [Modification of Rel-15 capability] | Optional with capability signalling | | 11-3b | CBG based transmission for UL with up to 2 unicast PUSCHs per slot per CC for different TBs with UE processing time Capability 2 | CBG based transmission for UL with up to 2 unicast PUSCHs per slot per CC for different TBs with UE processing time Capability 2 | 5-13 | Yes | N/A |  | Per UE | No | FR1 only |  | [Modification of Rel-15 capability] | Optional with capability signalling | | 11-3c | CBG based transmission for UL with up to 7 unicast PUSCHs per slot per CC for different TBs with UE processing time Capability 2 | CBG based transmission for UL with up to 7 unicast PUSCHs per slot per CC for different TBs with UE processing time Capability 2 | 5-13a | Yes | N/A |  | Per UE | No | FR1 only |  | [Modification of Rel-15 capability] | Optional with capability signalling | | 11-3d | CBG based transmission for UL with up to 4 unicast PUSCHs per slot per CC for different TBs with UE processing time Capability 2 | CBG based transmission for UL with up to 4 unicast PUSCHs per slot per CC for different TBs with UE processing time Capability 2 | 5-13c | Yes | N/A |  | Per UE | No | FR1 only |  | [Modification of Rel-15 capability] | Optional with capability signalling | | 11-3e | CBG based transmission for UL with up to 3 unicast PUSCHs per slot per CC for different TBs with UE processing time Capability 2 | CBG based transmission for UL with up to 3 unicast PUSCHs per slot per CC for different TBs with UE processing time Capability 2 | 5-13d | Yes | N/A |  | Per UE | No | FR1 only |  | [Modification of Rel-15 capability] | Optional with capability signalling | |
| [16] | Huawei, HiSilicon | * It seems Component 3) is necessary for FG 11-3.   + Compared to 7-symbol sub-slot configuration, 2-symbol sub-slot configuration will impose much larger implementation complexity to UE. From UE implementation perspective, even the sub-slot duration is 2, some separation between the actual PUCCH transmissions is needed. Configuring 2 symbol sub-slot configuration is to enable fast starting of PUCCH transmission. If due to the requirement of separation between two actual PUCCH transmissions, then only 7 symbol sub-slot configuration can be configured, it is not good from latency perspective. |

## 2.1 [Finished] Discussion 1

The proposal is to confirm that FG11-3 is kept.

Companies are encouraged to provide views if there is a concern or comment on the proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

In Monday UE features session, following is agreed.

**Agreements**:

FG11-3 is kept.

## 2.2 [Finished] Discussion 2

~~Companies are encouraged to provide views on whether or not to introduce separate FGs for the simultaneous use of CBG-based UL transmission and minimum processing capability 2 (e.g., 11-3a/3b/3c/3d/3e in [15]).~~

~~Introducing separate capabilities supported by:~~

~~Objected (i.e., not introducing them) by:~~

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

In Monday UE features session, following conclusion is made.

**Conclusion:**

Following is discussed in AI 7.2.11.13.

* Whether to introduce separate FGs for the simultaneous use of CBG-based UL transmission and minimum processing capability 2 (e.g., 11-3a/3b/3c/3d/3e)

# **11-4: Two HARQ-ACK codebooks [with up to one sub-slot based HARQ-ACK codebook] simultaneously constructed for supporting PDSCH reception with different priorities at a UE**

In [1], FG11-4 is captured as below.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Features | 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**  **(the ‘type’ definition from UE features should be based on the granularity of 1) Per UE or 2) Per Band or 3) Per BC or 4) Per FS or 5) Per FSPC)** | Need of FDD/TDD differentiation | Need of FR1/FR2 differentiation | Capability interpretation for mixture of FDD/TDD and/or FR1/FR2 | Note | Mandatory/Optional |
| 11.  NR\_L1enh\_URLLC | 11-4 | Two HARQ-ACK codebooks [with up to one sub-slot based HARQ-ACK codebook] simultaneously constructed for supporting PDSCH reception with different priorities at a UE | 1) Supports two HARQ-ACK codebooks with different priorities to be simultaneously constructed [with the restriction up to one sub-slot based HARQ-ACK codebook].  2) Supports separate PUCCH configuration for different HARQ-ACK codebooks  3) Supports 2-level priority of HARQ-ACK for dynamically scheduled PDSCH and SPS PDSCH.  [4) Supports a DCI format (from the formats 0\_1/1\_1/0\_2/1\_2) scheduling PDSCH with different HARQ-ACK priorities or PUSCH with different priorities when only DCI format 0\_1/1\_1 is configured or only DCI format 0\_2/1\_2 is configured per BWP]  5) Supports separate configuration of parameters PDSCH-HARQ-ACK-Codebook, UCI-OnPUSCH and ‘codeBlockGroupTransmission” for different HARQ-ACK codebooks.  [6) Supported maximum number of actual PUCCH transmissions for HARQ-ACK within a slot] |  | Yes | N/A |  | [Per UE]  FFS: FS | [No] | [No] | [support mixture of FDD/TDD and/or FR1/FR2] | FFS: Whether and how to combine FG 11-4 and FG 12-1  FFS: For component 4), whether to separate DL priority and UL priority, and whether to separate DCI format 0\_1/1\_1 and DCI format 0\_2/1\_2 | Optional with capability signalling |

Following feedbacks are provided in contributions for the RAN1#100bis-e meeting.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| [2] | ZTE | For FG 11-4/FG 11-4x, it needs to first clarify whether the limitation of one PUCCH transmission in one slot/sub-slot is per HARQ-ACK codebook or not. |
| [3] | vivo | * Do not merge 11-4 with 12-1   + There could be a use case where UE has mixed eMBB and URLLC in DL while only eMBB in UL, in such case UE can only implement 11-4 without 12-1. * For component 4), make separate features for DL priority and UL priority indication. * For component 4), do not separate the DCI format x\_1 and x\_2 |
| [4] | OPPO | * The condition that when only DCI format 0\_1/1\_1 is configured or only DCI format 0\_2/1\_2 is configured in USS per BWP can be deleted due to the same solution is applied. Similarly, for 11-4a, it is not necessary. * HARQ-ACK codebook is associated with DCI format 1\_1 and 1\_2 only, so DCI format 0\_1 and 0\_2, PUSCH with different priorities need to be deleted in this feature group.  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | 11-4 | Up to two HARQ-ACK codebooks simultaneously constructed for supporting different service types for a UE | 1) Supports up to two HARQ-ACK codebooks with different priorities to be simultaneously constructed.  2) Supports separate PUCCH configuration for different HARQ-ACK codebooks  3) Supports 2-level priority of HARQ-ACK for dynamically scheduled PDSCH and SPS PDSCH.  4) Supports a DCI format (from the formats /1\_1/1\_2) scheduling PDSCH with different HARQ-ACK priorities  5) Supports separate configuration of parameters PDSCH-HARQ-ACK-Codebook, UCI-OnPUSCH and ‘codeBlockGroupTransmission” for different HARQ-ACK codebooks. | |
| [5] | Ericsson | * For FG 11-4 component 4), there is no need to separate DL priority and UL priority. * For FG 11-4 component 4), DCI format 0\_1/1\_1 and DCI format 0\_2/1\_2 should be separated, with different dependency of FG 11-1. * For FG 11-4 component 6) (in bracket), it should not be introduced. |
| [7] | Media Tek Inc. | For FG11-4, the following suggestions are made;   * Clarify if FG11-3 is prerequisite for FG11-4 or not. * Change the capability type to FS. * Remove the brackets in component 1) “*[with the restriction up to one sub-slot based HARQ-ACK codebook]*”. * Component 6) “*Supported maximum number of actual PUCCH transmissions for HARQ-ACK within a slot*” can be removed. If the UE is not supporting FG11-3, the maximum number of PUCCHs per slot will be 2. If the UE supports FG11-3 and FG11-4, the maximum number of PUCCH slot will be what is reported in FG11-3 plus 1. * There is no need to have separate UE capabilities for scheduling PDSCH with different HARQ-ACK priorities or PUSCH with different priorities by DCI format 1\_1/0\_1 and DCI format 1\_2/0\_2. Supporting FG11-4 doesn’t imply the support of DCI format 1\_2/0\_2. * There is no need to add separate DL priority and UL priority. |
| [8] | LGE | * On FG 11-4, the description of FG needs to be updated as there is no definition on priority of “PDSCH reception”. It can be updated as “Two HARQ-ACK codebooks simultaneously constructed supporting PDSCH reception with different priorities of the corresponding HARQ-ACK feedback at a UE”. * Regarding the separation of UE capability for different combinations based on slot-based HARQ-ACK codebook and sub-slot based HARQ-ACK codebook, it is preferable to set the following combinations: (1) One is slot-based and one is sub-slot-based, (2) Both are slot-based, and (3) Both are sub-slot-based. However, if the test efforts really need to be considered, it is fine with the compromised option from Rapporteur: (1) At least one is slot-based, and (2) Both are sub-slot-based. * For the component 4), the bracket needs to be removed. * For the component 6), considering this FG 11-4 would entail multiple PUCCHs with different priorities in a slot, it would be reasonable to have the component. * Regarding “FFS: Whether and how to combine FG 11-4 and FG 12-1”, it can be understood that two HARQ-ACK codebook construction is related to intra-UE prioritization. In fact, the component 3) of FG 11-4 may be a part of FG 12-1. However, the other components of FG 11-4 would be just to support two HARQ-ACK codebooks with different priorities itself rather than only intra-UE prioritization. In this context, the benefit and methodology are a bit questionable to merge two FGs into a FG. * Regarding “FFS: For component 4), whether to separate DL priority and UL priority, and whether to separate DCI format 0\_1/1\_1 and DCI format 0\_2/1\_2”, we think there is no need for separation between DL and UL priorities. |
| [9] | Intel | * There is no notion of PDSCHs with different priorities. In FG description, text should be changed to “… supporting PDSCH reception with different priorities **of the corresponding HARQ-ACK feedback** at a UE”. * For component 4), the parts related to priorities for PUSCH should be deleted from FGs # 11-4 and 11-4x and moved to FG 12-1. |
| [10] | CATT | * Component 4) should be included in FG 11-4   + UE supports FG 11-4 should also support prioritization between UL channels/signals with different PHY priority levels and the prioritization/cancellation timelines as defined in FG 12-1. However, for a UE supporting FG 12-1, FG 11-4 may not be supported. * FG 11-4 does not need to include PUSCH and its scheduling DCI formats DCI format 0\_1 and DCI format 0\_2.  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | 11-4 | Two HARQ-ACK codebooks [with up to one sub-slot based HARQ-ACK codebook] simultaneously constructed for supporting PDSCH reception with different priorities at a UE | 1) Supports two HARQ-ACK codebooks with different priorities to be simultaneously constructed [with the restriction up to one sub-slot based HARQ-ACK codebook].  2) Supports separate PUCCH configuration for different HARQ-ACK codebooks  3) Supports 2-level priority of HARQ-ACK for dynamically scheduled PDSCH and SPS PDSCH.  [4) Supports a DCI format (from the formats ~~0\_1~~/1\_1/~~0\_2~~/1\_2) scheduling PDSCH with different HARQ-ACK priorities ~~or PUSCH~~ with different priorities when only DCI format 0\_1/1\_1 is configured or only DCI format 0\_2/1\_2 is configured per BWP]  5) Supports separate configuration of parameters *PDSCH-HARQ-ACK-Codebook*, *UCI-OnPUSCH* and ‘*codeBlockGroupTransmission”* for different HARQ-ACK codebooks.  [6) Supported maximum number of actual PUCCH transmissions for HARQ-ACK within a slot]  7) Prioritization between UL channels/signals with different PHY priority levels  8) Additional number of symbols (d1) needed beyond the PUSCH preparation time for cancelling a low priority UL transmission.  9) Additional number of symbols (d2) needed beyond the PUSCH preparation time for scheduling a high priority UL transmission that cancels a low priority UL transmission |  | Yes | N/A |  | [Per UE]  FFS: FS | [No] | [No] | [support mixture of FDD/TDD and/or FR1/FR2] | FFS: Whether and how to combine FG 11-4 and FG 12-1  ~~FFS: For component 4), whether to separate DL priority and UL priority, and whether to separate DCI format 0\_1/1\_1 and DCI format 0\_2/1\_2~~ | Optional with capability signalling | |
| [11] | Samsung | * Component 6) should be removed here and can be moved into 11-3. * For the first FFS, no need to combine. * For the second FFS, OK to separate DCI format 0\_1/1\_1 and DCI format 0\_2/1\_2. |
| [12] | Apple | * Keep separate UE FGs for the support of two-level HARQ-ACK priority and the support of two-level PUSCH/SR priority. Update FG 11-4 to include the multiplexing/prioritization between UL channels so that it becomes a complete and independent FG. * Define separate UE FGs for DCI format 0\_1 and DCI format 0\_2 for the support of dynamic PUSCH priority indication. * Define separate UE FGs for DCI format 1\_1 and DCI format 1\_2 for the support of dynamic HARQ-ACK priority indication. * Introduce FG 11-4x for two sub-slot-based HARQ-ACK codebooks, and update FG 11-4 to be up to one sub-slot-based HARQ-ACK codebook. Clarify for FG 11-4 that if a UE does not support 11-3 but supports 11-4, it means the UE can only support two slot-based HARQ-ACK codebooks. * Split FG 11-4a into two FGs, one for HARQ-ACK priority indication in DCI formats 1\_1/1\_2, and another one for PUSCH priority indication in DCI formats 0\_1/0\_2. |
| [13] | Panasonic | * Fine to define two UE capabilities, with sub-slot based HARQ-ACK codebook and sub-slot based HARQ-ACK codebook as a separate UE capability. * There is no need to introduce separate UE capabilities for scheduling PDSCH with different HARQ-ACK priorities or PUSCH with different priorities by DCI format 1\_1/0\_1 and DCI format 1\_2/0\_2.   + DCI format 1\_2/0\_2 are applicable to eMBB and URLLC as the superset function of DCI format 1\_1/0\_1. |
| [14] | Nokia, NSB | * Merge 11-4 with 12-1   + These feature groups are strongly related. One cannot operate 11-4 (having PUSCH & 2 CBs of different HARQ-Ack priorities) without the related multiplexing / prioritization which is part of 12-1. * For component 4), no need for separate capability here, same applies to the related FFS for 11-4a. * For 11-4 / 11-4X, no need to have separate capability of slot or sub-slot based CB   + Note that for subslot HARQ-ACK we have the independent capability 11-3 already. From our understanding, a UE supporting 11-3 and 11-4 should support slot or subslot based codebook for either of the two codebooks. * No need identified for separate capability 6. |
| [15] | Qualcomm | Following updates are proposed.   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | 11-4 | Two HARQ-ACK codebooks simultaneously constructed for supporting PDSCH reception with different priorities at a UE with restriction | 1) Supports two HARQ-ACK codebooks with different priorities to be simultaneously constructed  2) Supports separate PUCCH configuration for different HARQ-ACK codebooks  3) Supports 2-level priority of HARQ-ACK for dynamically scheduled PDSCH and SPS PDSCH.  4) Only one of the HARQ-ACK codebooks can have a sub-slot based PUCCH configuration  5) Supports separate configuration of parameters *PDSCH-HARQ-ACK-Codebook*, *UCI-OnPUSCH* and ‘*codeBlockGroupTransmission”* for different HARQ-ACK codebooks.  [6) Supported maximum number of actual PUCCH transmissions for HARQ-ACK within a slot]  7) If both processing time capability 1 CC(s) and processing time capability 2 CC(s) are configured, and both slot-based and sub-slot based PUCCH are configured, then HARQ-ACK feedback for a processing time capability 1 CC can only take place in the slot-based PUCCH and HARQ-ACK feedback for a processing time capability 2 CC can only take place in the sub-slot based PUCCH | 11-3 | Yes | N/A |  | FS | N/A | N/A |  |  | Optional with capability signalling | |
| [16] | Huawei, HiSilicon | * Prefer to set separate UE capability for “slot based + slot based”, “sub-slot based + slot based” and “sub-slot based + sub-slot based” from UE implementation perspective. As a compromise, we are fine to only set separate capability for “sub-slot based + sub-slot based”. * Prefer to set separate UE capabilities for scheduling PDSCH with different HARQ-ACK priorities or PUSCH with different priorities by DCI format 1\_1/0\_1 and DCI format 1\_2/0\_2   + i.e. capability 1 for scheduling PDSCH with different HARQ-ACK priorities or PUSCH with different priorities by DCI format 1\_1/0\_1 and capability 2 for scheduling PDSCH with different HARQ-ACK priorities or PUSCH with different priorities by DCI format 1\_2/0\_2. * No need to separate DL priority and UL priority. Similar views for FG 11-4a. * Open to merge FG 11-4 and FG 12-1 into one single UE feature group. Alternatively, we can just put some note in both FG 11-4 and FG 12-1 to show the relationship between these two FGs, e.g. put a note “A UE supporting this feature shall also support FG 12-1” to FG 11-4. |

## 3.1 Discussion 3

**The proposal is to confirm that FG11-4 is kept.**

**Companies are encouraged to provide views if there is a concern or comment on the proposal.**

**Support: HW, HiSi, Nokia, NSB, Intel, Apple, Ericsson, Futurewei, ZTE**

**Not support (split into two rows: one with restriction and another without restriction): Qualcomm**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | Agree with the proposal.  As to the proposal from Qualcomm to construct the FGs in the manner of “with restriction” and “without restriction”, in our understanding the “with restriction” FG is equal to the current FG 11-4, while “without restriction FG” is equal to the current FG 11-4 + the new added FG 11-4x. |
| Nokia, NSB | The FG itself needs to be kept, but it should be merged with 12-1. |
| Qualcomm | We propose to split this row into two rows: (1) with restriction and (2) without restriction. The restrictions under the first FG is (a) one of the two codebooks is slot-based and (b) in case the DL carriers have a mixed processing timelines, i.e., some are cap#1 and some are cap#2, then the HARQ-ACK bits of the cap#1 carriers are mapped to the slot-based codebook and the HARQ-ACK bits of the cap#2 carriers are mapped to the sub-slot based codebook. |
| Apple | Agree with the proposal.  Still trying to understand the QC’s proposal better: if the UE reports “with restriction”, it is clear that the UE can support the described case. But does it mean that this UE cannot support any other case? E.g. a single carrier with two HARQ-ACK codebooks with at least one being slot-based, or multiple carriers with the same processing timelines with two HARQ-ACK codebooks with at least one being slot-based… |
| Spreadtrum | We support the proposal. And we also fine with Qualcomm’s proposal. |
| Ericsson | Support keeping the FG. However, we do not agree with the limitation in bracket in the feature group name. That is, the feature group name should be:  “Two HARQ-ACK codebooks ~~[with up to one sub-slot based HARQ-ACK codebook]~~ simultaneously constructed for supporting PDSCH reception with different priorities at a UE” |
| Intel | Agree with the proposal.  We do not agree to introducing new components and behavior based on UE minimum processing times as suggested by Qualcomm in part (b). |

## 3.2 Discussion 4

**Companies are encouraged to provide views on whether or not to merge 11-4 with 12-1.**

**Merging 11-4 with 12-1 supported by: Nokia, NSB, ZTE**

**Objected (i.e., not merging them) by:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | There is some relationship between FG 11-4 and FG 12-1, but we don’t need to merge both into one FG, instead we can include some necessary components from FG 12-1 into FG 11-4, which seems the views from many companies also.  That is, we can update FG 11-4 as below:    And also some update to the “mandatory/optional” column as below: |
| Nokia, NSB | The separation of the two is not technically necessary and it just reflects the way the WIs have been created. Basically, one cannot operate 11-4 (having PUSCH & 2 CBs of different HARQ-Ack priorities) without the related multiplexing / prioritization which is part of 12-1. |
| Qualcomm | No need to merge 11-4 with 12-1. |
| Apple | We prefer to keep 11-4 and 12-1 separate, so that we allow the separation of DL and UL operation. We agree with Huawei’s proposal in principle that some components of 12-1 should be also copied here (such as the related multiplexing/prioritization behavior) to make 11-4 complete. In addition, PUSCH priority related component should be removed from 11-4. |
| Spreadtrum | No need to merge. A UE still can support 12-1 and without support 11-4. |
| Ericsson | We are fine not to merge 11-4 with 12-1 |
| Intel | We don’t agree to merge 11-4 and 12-1.  Currently, FG #11-4 and FG #12-1 are mutually exclusive (#11-4 is about prioritization of HARQ-ACK, while #12-1 covers other applicable channels/procedures). Thus, these should not be coupled from a functionality perspective either. |

## 3.3 Discussion 5

**If 11-4 and 12-1 are not merged, companies are encouraged to provide views on whether or not to introduce separate UE capabilities for DCI format 0\_1 and DCI format 0\_2 based on 12-1.**

**Introducing separate capabilities supported by:**

**Objected (i.e., keeping it as single FG) by:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | The question is related to whether to keep or update component 4) in FG 11-4. In our understanding, it is ok to only keep DCI format 1\_1 and DCI format 1\_2 in FG 11-4 since FG 11-4 is mainly for PDSCH with different HARQ-ACK priorities, though we don’t think it is necessary. Therefore we can do the following update for component 4) in FG 11-4:  [4) Supports a DCI format (from the formats ~~0\_1/~~1\_1/~~0\_2/~~1\_2) scheduling PDSCH with different HARQ-ACK priorities ~~or PUSCH with different priorities~~ when only DCI format 0\_1/1\_1 is configured or only DCI format 0\_2/1\_2 is configured per BWP]  Simultaneously we can add the following component to FG 21-1:  6) Supports a DCI format (from the formats 0\_1/0\_2) scheduling PUSCH with different priorities when only DCI format 0\_1/1\_1 is configured or only DCI format 0\_2/1\_2 is configured per BWP  As to whether to set separate UE capabilities for DCI format 0\_1 and DCI format 0\_2, we are ok not to set separate capability here, as there is no difference from the functionality perspective. |
| Nokia, NSB | Keep as single FG. No separate capability for DCI format 0\_1 and 0\_2 required. |
| Qualcomm | Removing the PUSCH related part as proposed by HW is fine, but as for the last part of the sentence, “…only DCI format 0\_2/1\_2 is configured per BWP”, we can decide after 11-1 is agreed. If the support of DL DCI and UL DCI is separated, this part needs to be reworded too. |
| Apple | We agree with moving PUSCH priority related component to FG 12-1, as we also commented in Discussion 4. We have a preference of separating the capabilities for DCI format 1\_1 and 1\_2 (and also separate for DCI format 0\_1 and 0\_2 for PUSCH). This allows the UE to implement the dynamic priority indication for the new DCI formats only without impacting the existing DCI formats. |
| Spreadtrum | We also support separate FG for DCI format x\_1 and DCI format x\_2. Thus, a UE can support one DCI formats pair for simultaneous two HARQ-ACK codebooks. |
| Ericsson | Do not support introducing separate capabilities for DCI formats 0\_1 and 0\_2. Even though the UE may have different capabilities for DCI format, the UE operation for HARQ-ACK codebooks with different priorities is the same regardless of DCI format. |
| Intel | Move the parts related to UL/PUSCH priority in component 4) from 11-4 to 12-1 as suggested by HW.  Also, no need to separate UE capability for DCI formats 0\_1 and 0\_2. This can be dependent on support of the new DCI formats. |

## 3.4 Discussion 6

**Companies are encouraged to provide views on whether or not to introduce separate UE capabilities for DL priority and UL priority for component 4).**

**Introducing separate capabilities supported by:**

**Objected (i.e., not introducing them) by:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | As the views shown under discussion 5, if we will move DCI format 0\_2/0\_1 related description to FG 12-1, then the issue doesn’t exist any more. |
| Nokia, NSB | No need for separate capabilities. |
| Qualcomm | Not sure why uplink priority is needed for supporting HARQ-ACK codebooks. |
| Apple | As commented in Discussion 4, we think DCI format 0\_1/0\_2 should be moved to FG12-1. So this issue is somewhat overlapping with Discussion 4, or tightly related. |
| Ericsson | Do not introduce separate capabilities. We are fine to delete the part about PUSCH since it’s not relevant for HARQ-ACK codebooks:  “[4) Supports a DCI format (from the formats 0\_1/1\_1/0\_2/1\_2) scheduling PDSCH with different HARQ-ACK priorities ~~or PUSCH with different priorities~~ when only DCI format 0\_1/1\_1 is configured or only DCI format 0\_2/1\_2 is configured per BWP]” |
| Intel | UL priority needs to be moved to FG 12-1. Nothing else to be done related to UL priority in 11-4 |

## 3.5 Discussion 7

**Companies are encouraged to provide views on whether or not to introduce separate UE capabilities for DCI format 0\_1/1\_1 and DCI format 0\_2/1\_2 for component 4).**

**Introducing separate capabilities supported by:**

**Objected (i.e., not introducing them) by:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | If we move DCI format 0\_1/0\_2 to FG 12-1, then the question here is changed to “whether or not to introduce separate UE capabilities for DCI format 1\_1 and DCI format 1\_2 for component 4 for FG 11-4” and “whether or not to introduce separate UE capabilities for DCI format 0\_1 and DCI format 0\_2 for component 6 for GF 12-1”, the second question is answered under discussion 5, for the first question, similar as the answer to discussion 5, we are ok not to set separate capability. |
| Nokia, NSB | No need for separate capabilities. |
| Qualcomm | The same as our response to Discussion #5. |
| Apple | This seems to be the same as Discussion 5. Please see our response above. |
| Ericsson | Do not introduce separate capabilities. Even though the UE may have different capabilities for DCI format, the UE operation for HARQ-ACK codebooks with different priorities is the same regardless of DCI format. |
| Intel | Just moving UL priority parts from component 4) is sufficient. |

# **11-4x: [Two sub-slot based HARQ-ACK codebooks simultaneously constructed for supporting PDSCH reception with different priorities at a UE].**

In [1], FG11-4x is captured as below.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Features | 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**  **(the ‘type’ definition from UE features should be based on the granularity of 1) Per UE or 2) Per Band or 3) Per BC or 4) Per FS or 5) Per FSPC)** | Need of FDD/TDD differentiation | Need of FR1/FR2 differentiation | Capability interpretation for mixture of FDD/TDD and/or FR1/FR2 | Note | Mandatory/Optional |
| 11.  NR\_L1enh\_URLLC | [11-4x] | [Two sub-slot based HARQ-ACK codebooks simultaneously constructed for supporting PDSCH reception with different priorities at a UE]. | 1) Supports two sub-slot based HARQ-ACK codebooks with different priorities to be simultaneously constructed.  2) Supports separate PUCCH configuration for different HARQ-ACK codebooks  3) Supports 2-level priority of HARQ-ACK for dynamically scheduled PDSCH and SPS PDSCH.  4) Supports a DCI format (from the formats 0\_1/1\_1/0\_2/1\_2) scheduling PDSCH with different HARQ-ACK priorities or PUSCH with different priorities when only DCI format 0\_1/1\_1 is configured or only DCI format 0\_2/1\_2 is configured in USS per BWP  5) Supports separate configuration of parameters *PDSCH-HARQ-ACK-Codebook*, *UCI-OnPUSCH* and ‘*codeBlockGroupTransmission”* for different HARQ-ACK codebooks. | 11-3 | Yes | N/A |  | [Per UE] | [No] | [No] | [support mixture of FDD/TDD and/or FR1/FR2] | FFS: whether to add this FG and the contents of this FG | Optional with capability signalling |

Following feedbacks are provided in contributions for the RAN1#100bis-e meeting.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| [2] | ZTE | For FG 11-4/FG 11-4x, it needs to first clarify whether the limitation of one PUCCH transmission in one slot/sub-slot is per HARQ-ACK codebook or not. |
| [5] | Ericsson | FG [11-4x] is not introduced. FG 11-4 is revised to include the support of up to two sub-slot based HARQ-ACK codebooks. |
| [7] | Media Tek Inc. | For FG11-4x, the maximum number of PUCCHs per slot for this feature should be clarified. The feature is acceptable if the understanding is that the maximum number of PUCCHs per slot for this feature is equal to the number reported in FG11-3 (i.e. the supported number of PUCCHs in FG11-3 is divided between the two HARQ codebooks). On the other hand, this feature group can’t be acceptable if the total number of PUCCHs is expected to be double compared to what was reported in FG11-3.   1. For FG11-4x, we have the following suggestions:  * Remove the brackets from FG11-4x. * Change the capability type to FS. * Add the following component “*Supported maximum number of actual PUCCH transmissions for HARQ-ACK within a slot*”. |
| [9] | Intel | For component 4), the parts related to priorities for PUSCH should be deleted from FGs # 11-4 and 11-4x and moved to FG 12-1. |
| [10] | CATT | Following updates are proposed.   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | [11-4x] | [Two sub-slot based HARQ-ACK codebooks simultaneously constructed for supporting PDSCH reception with different priorities at a UE]. | 1) Supports two sub-slot based HARQ-ACK codebooks with different priorities to be simultaneously constructed.  2) Supports separate PUCCH configuration for different HARQ-ACK codebooks  3) Supports 2-level priority of HARQ-ACK for dynamically scheduled PDSCH and SPS PDSCH.  4) Supports a DCI format (from the formats ~~0\_1~~/1\_1/~~0\_2~~/1\_2) scheduling PDSCH with different HARQ-ACK priorities ~~or PUSCH~~ with different priorities when only DCI format 0\_1/1\_1 is configured or only DCI format 0\_2/1\_2 is configured in USS per BWP  5) Supports separate configuration of parameters *PDSCH-HARQ-ACK-Codebook*, *UCI-OnPUSCH* and ‘*codeBlockGroupTransmission”* for different HARQ-ACK codebooks.  6) Prioritization between UL channels/signals with different PHY priority levels  7) Additional number of symbols (d1) needed beyond the PUSCH preparation time for cancelling a low priority UL transmission.  8) Additional number of symbols (d2) needed beyond the PUSCH preparation time for scheduling a high priority UL transmission that cancels a low priority UL transmission | 11-3 | Yes | N/A |  | [Per UE] | [No] | [No] | [support mixture of FDD/TDD and/or FR1/FR2] | FFS: whether to add this FG and the contents of this FG | Optional with capability signalling | |
| [11] | Samsung | It is not necessary to have this feature since the combination of 11-3 and 11-4 can support this operation without introducing additional signaling. |
| [14] | Nokia, NSB | * For 11-4 / 11-4X, no need to have separate capability of slot or sub-slot based CB   + Note that for subslot HARQ-ACK we have the independent capability 11-3 already. From our understanding, a UE supporting 11-3 and 11-4 should support slot or subslot based codebook for either of the two codebooks. |
| [15] | Qualcomm | Following updates are proposed.   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | 11-4x | Two HARQ-ACK codebooks simultaneously constructed for supporting PDSCH reception with different priorities at a UE without restriction | 1) Supports two HARQ-ACK codebooks with different priorities to be simultaneously constructed.  2) Supports separate PUCCH configuration for different HARQ-ACK codebooks  3) Supports 2-level priority of HARQ-ACK for dynamically scheduled PDSCH and SPS PDSCH.  5) Supports separate configuration of parameters *PDSCH-HARQ-ACK-Codebook*, *UCI-OnPUSCH* and ‘*codeBlockGroupTransmission”* for different HARQ-ACK codebooks. | 11-3, 11-4 | Yes | N/A |  | FS | N/A | N/A |  |  | Optional with capability signalling | |

## 4.1 Discussion 8

**Companies are encouraged to provide views on whether the bracket for FG11-4x is removed or FG11-4x is removed.**

**Keeping the FG[11-4x] (removing bracket) supported by:**

**Objected (i.e., support removing FG[11-4x]) by:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | We support keeping the FG 11-4x (i.e. removing the bracket).  As to the proposal from Qualcomm to construct the FGs in the manner of “with restriction” and “without restriction”, in our understanding the “with restriction” FG is equal to the current FG 11-4, while “without restriction FG” is equal to the current FG 11-4 + the new added FG 11-4x.  We agree in order to support FG 11-4x, a UE needs to support FG 11-3 also. However, supporting FG 11-3 doesn’t mean the support of FG 11-4x, because one HARQ-ACK codebook can be used with FG 11-3. The key point for FG 11-4x is to support two sub-slot HARQ-ACK codebooks for different priorities. Therefore, in addition to FG 11-3, we need this FG 11-4x also.  As to whether to add a component for “*Supported maximum number of actual PUCCH transmissions for HARQ-ACK within a slot*”, original we was thinking component 3) in FG 11-3 is already there, thus no need to additional adding a new component here. But we support MTK that we need to clarify when two HARQ-ACK codebooks are configured, whether component 3) given in FG 11-3 covers the PUCCHs for both HARQ-ACK codebook or not. |
| Nokia, NSB | We do not see a need to split 11-4X from 11-4. Please note that for subslot HARQ-ACK we have the independent capability 11-3 already. From our understanding, a UE supporting 11-3 and 11-4 should support slot or subslot based codebook for either of the two codebooks. |
| Qualcomm | As mentioned earlier, we propose to have two separate FGs: one with restriction and one without restrictions. |
| Apple | We support keeping FG 11-4x. |
| Spreadtrum | We support keeping the FG [11-4x]. And we also fine with Qc’s proposal.  A UE can support 1-3 and 11-4, or 11-3 and 11-4x. The difference is the maximum number of sub-slot HARQ-ACK codebooks. |
| Ericsson | We do not see a need of [11-4x], i.e., we support deleting [11-4x]. It is sufficient to have FG 11-4. |
| Intel | We are open to keeping FG 11-4x, but not any further bifurcation. |

# **11-4a: Monitoring a DCI format (from the formats 0\_1/1\_1/0\_2/1\_2) scheduling PDSCH with different HARQ-ACK priorities or PUSCH with different priorities when both DCI format 0\_1/1\_1 and DCI format 0\_2/1\_2 are configured to be monitored per BWP**

In [1], FG11-4a is captured as below.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Features | 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**  **(the ‘type’ definition from UE features should be based on the granularity of 1) Per UE or 2) Per Band or 3) Per BC or 4) Per FS or 5) Per FSPC)** | Need of FDD/TDD differentiation | Need of FR1/FR2 differentiation | Capability interpretation for mixture of FDD/TDD and/or FR1/FR2 | Note | Mandatory/Optional |
| 11.  NR\_L1enh\_URLLC | 11-4a | Monitoring a DCI format (from the formats 0\_1/1\_1/0\_2/1\_2) scheduling PDSCH with different HARQ-ACK priorities or PUSCH with different priorities when both DCI format 0\_1/1\_1 and DCI format 0\_2/1\_2 are configured to be monitored per BWP |  | 11-1a, 11-4 | Yes | N/A | FFS | Per UE | [No] | [No] | [support mixture of FDD/TDD and/or FR1/FR2] | FFS: Whether to split 11-4a into two rows as below:  11-4x: DL priority indication in DCI with mixed DCI formats  11-4y: UL priority indication in DCI with mixed DCI formats | Optional with capability signalling |

Following feedbacks are provided in contributions for the RAN1#100bis-e meeting.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| [3] | vivo | * FG 11-4a can be removed if there is no new priority indication mechanism agreed for the case when both DCI formats are configured.   + if there is no new mechanism agreed for the case when both DCI formats are configured, e.g. priority determination based on DCI format, there seems no need to keep 11-4a.   + since 11-4a includes also the priority indication for UL, which has overlap with IIOT UE feature 12-1 component 1 (i..e Configuration of PHY priority level for CG PUSCH and SR, and dynamic indication of priority level for dynamic PUSCH), which needs to be clarified if 11-4a is to be kept. |
| [4] | OPPO | For FFS, no need to introduce separate capabilities. |
| [8] | LGE | * On FG 11-4a, this FG can be further separated into two FGs: one for DCI format 0\_1/1\_1 and another for DCI format 0\_2/1\_2.   + more flexibility can be ensured such that DCI format 0\_1/1\_1 can schedule two priorities while DCI format 0\_2/1\_2 can schedule only one priority. * Prerequisite FG of FG 11-4a would be 11-1 and 11-4 rather than 11-1a and 11-4. * Regarding the FFS on separation between DL and UL (11-4x/11-4y), no essential need for further separation. |
| [15] | Qualcomm | Following updates are proposed.   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | 11-4a | DL priority indication in DCI with mixed DCI formats | When both DCI format 1\_1 and DCI format 1\_2 are configured to be monitored per BWP, only one DCI format (from the formats 1\_1/1\_2) can be used to schedule PDSCH with low priority HARQ-ACK and only one can be used to schedule PDSCH with high priority HARQ-ACK. | 11-1, 11-4 | Yes | N/A |  | Per UE | Yes | Yes | The differentiation is from the perspective of the scheduling cell. |  | Optional with capability signalling | | 11-4b | UL priority indication in DCI with mixed DCI formats | When both DCI format 0\_1 and DCI format 0\_2 are configured to be monitored per BWP, only one DCI format (from the formats 0\_1/0\_2) can be used to schedule PUSCH with low priority and only one can be used to schedule PUSCH with high priority. | 11-1, 11-4 | Yes | N/A |  | Per UE | Yes | Yes | The differentiation is from the perspective of the scheduling cell. |  | Optional with capability signaling | |

## 5.1 Discussion 9

**Companies are encouraged to provide views on whether or not to keep FG11-4a.**

**Keeping the FG11-4a supported by:**

**Objected (i.e., support removing FG11-4a) by:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | We support keeping FG 11-4a.  The priority indication capability under FG 11-4 or FG 12-1 is only for the case that only DCI format 0\_1/1\_1 is configured to monitor, or only DCI format 0\_2/1\_2 is configured to monitor. Here the capability is to support priority indication when both DCI format 0\_2/1\_2 and DCI format 0\_1/1\_1 are configured to monitor. The capability is not only on the priority indication mechanism itself, but also all the following procedure. |
| Qualcomm | We agreed to have UE capabilities for the case that DCI formats 0\_1/1\_1 and 0\_2/1\_2 are configured such that only one of the DL DCI formats can indicate a high priority transmission, and the other one can only indicate a low priority transmission, and only one of the UL DCI formats can indicate a high priority transmission and only of the UL DCI formats can indicate a low priority transmission.  Hence, as proposed before too, we suggest to split this FG into two; one for DL and one for UL to capture the RAN1 agreement. |
| Apple | We support the proposal, because this was part of the earlier RAN1 agreements. |
| Spreadtrum | We support keeping FG 11-4.  When a UE do not support this FG, a fixed priorities can be applied to DCI x\_1 and DCI x\_2. |
| Ericsson | Support to keep FG 11-4a |
| Intel | Keep FG 11-4a. Also, we don’t agree with the interpretation from Qualcomm that we agreed to support UE capabilities that only one of the DL DCI formats can indicate high priority and the other one low, etc. The agreement is to support UE capabilities: (1) UE that can support dynamic switching (for both DL and UL) using both pairs of DCI formats 0\_1/1\_1 and 0\_2/1\_2 when both pairs are configured for monitoring in a DL BWP; and (2) UE that cannot support dynamic switching using both pairs of DCI formats 0\_1/1\_1 and 0\_2/1\_2 when both pairs are configured for monitoring in a DL BWP. For 2nd category of UEs, it does not mean that it cannot support dynamic indication of PDSCH/PUSCH priorities via either of the DCI formats. |

## 5.2 Discussion 10

**If 11-4a is kept, companies are encouraged to provide views on whether or not to introduce separate UE capabilities for DL and UL based on 11-4a.**

**Introducing separate capabilities supported by:**

**Objected (i.e., keeping it as single FG) by:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | We don’t see strong motivation to do the split, but we are open with it. If we will split it in the end, the prerequisite for DL can be FG 11-4 and FG 11-1a, while the prerequisite for UL can be FG 12-1 and FG 11-1a. |
| Nokia, NSB | Keep as single FG.We do not see a need for splitting UL and DL priority indication capabilities here. |
| Qualcomm | Similar to our response to Dicussion 9, we propose to split. |
| Apple | There may not be absolute need to split DL and UL here if the description clearly defines the condition on the prerequisites. However, with FG 11-4 and 12-1 separate, it seems cleaner (with better readability) to also separate DL and UL for 11-4a. |
| Ericsson | Do not support to split for DL and UL. |
| Intel | No need to split FG 11-4a between UL and DL. |

# **Conclusion**

Following agreements and conclusions were made.

**Agreements**:

FG11-3 is kept

**Conclusion:**

Following is discussed in AI 7.2.11.13.

* Whether to introduce separate FGs for the simultaneous use of CBG-based UL transmission and minimum processing capability 2 (e.g., 11-3a/3b/3c/3d/3e)

**FL proposals:**

* Following FGs are included in UE features list for URLLC.
  + 11-3 More than one PUCCH for HARQ-ACK transmission within a slot (already agreed)
  + 11-4 Two HARQ-ACK codebooks with up to one sub-slot based HARQ-ACK codebook simultaneously constructed for supporting PDSCH reception with different priorities at a UE
  + 11-4x Two sub-slot based HARQ-ACK codebooks simultaneously constructed for supporting PDSCH reception with different priorities at a UE.
  + 11-4a DL[/UL] priority indication in DCI with mixed DCI formats
  + [11-4b UL priority indication in DCI with mixed DCI formats]

TBD
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