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# Introduction

This contribution provides the summary of the following email discussion in RAN1#105-e, which was triggered by the draft CR in [R1-2105625](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_105-e/Docs/R1-2105625.zip) [1].

[105-e-NR-7.1CRs-06] Issue#16: Correction on channel properties assumption of UL transmission – Liqing (Sharp) by May 25

# Background

Channel properties assumption of UL transmission related to intra-slot frequency hopping (FH) is stated in clause 6.2 of TS38.211.

|  |
| --- |
| **TS38.211 V15.8.0**  If intra-slot frequency hopping is not enabled by higher layer parameter for a physical channel, the UE transmission shall be such that the channel over which a symbol on the antenna port used for uplink transmission is conveyed can be inferred from the channel over which another symbol on the same antenna port is conveyed if the two symbols correspond to the same slot.  If intra-slot frequency hopping is enabled by higher layer parameter for a physical channel, the UE transmission shall be such that the channel over which a symbol on the antenna port used for uplink transmission is conveyed can be inferred from the channel over which another symbol on the same antenna port is conveyed only if the two symbols correspond to the same frequency hop, regardless of whether the frequency hop distance is zero or not. |

According to the current description, whether intra-slot FH is enabled or not for a physical channel is based on higher layer parameter. However, as pointed out in [1], intra-slot FH can be enabled not only by higher layer parameter but also by a DCI field or by a predefined rule in specification. UL transmissions related to whether intra-slot FH is enabled or is not enabled in Rel-15 were summarised as below.

**Case 1:** PUSCH transmission scheduled by RAR UL grant and Msg3 retransmission. Intra-slot FH is or isn’t enabled for the PUSCH transmission NOT by higher layer parameter but by a ‘frequency hopping flag’ field in the RAR UL grant or DCI format 0\_0.

**Case 2:** PUSCH transmission scheduled by DCI format and Type 2 PUSCH transmission. Higher layer parameter would first enable one of two FH modes, i.e. intra-slot FH and inter-slot FH. Even if intra-slot FH is enabled by higher layer parameter, whether intra-slot FH is enabled or not for PUSCH transmission is eventually based on ‘frequency hopping flag’ field in scheduling DCI format or activation DCI format.

**Case 3:** Type 1 PUSCH transmission. Intra-slot FH is or isn’t enabled by higher layer parameter for Type 1 PUSCH transmission.

**Case 4:** Common PUCCH transmission. Intra-slot FH is always enabled for PUCCH transmission in common PUCCH resources. It has nothing to do with higher layer parameter.

**Case 5:** Dedicated PUCCH transmission. Intra-slot FH is or isn’t enabled by higher layer parameter for PUCCH transmission in dedicated PUCCH resources.

Therefore, the current description of channel properties assumption for UL transmission in clause 6.2 of TS38.211 only covers **Cases 3** and **5** (i.e. intra-slot FH is enabled or is not enabled by higher layer parameter) and fail to cover other **Cases** above (i.e. intra-slot FH is or is not enabled by DCI field or a predefined rule in specification). Consequently, the current specification would lead to unclear UE/gNB behaviors when intra-slot FH is enabled or is not enabled for a physical channel either by DCI field or by predefined rule in specification.

# Email Discussions

## First Round

As observed in [R1-2105625](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_105-e/Docs/R1-2105625.zip) [1], for a physical channel with UL transmission in Rel-15, intra-slot frequency hopping can be enabled by either higher layer parameter (i.e. **Case 3** and **Case 5**) or DCI field (i.e. **Case 1** and **Case 2**) or predefined rule in specification(i.e. **Case 4**). According to the current description in clause 6.2 of TS38.211, it seems that **Cases 1, 2** and **4**, i.e. those cases where intra-slot frequency hopping is enabled by DCI field or predefined rule in specification, are not covered by the current spec description. Consequently, the current specification would lead to unclear UE/gNB behaviours when intra-slot frequency hopping is enabled for a physical channel by DCI field or by a predefined rule in specification.

**Question 1: Companies please provide your views on whether you agree with the issue, i.e. some cases (i.e. Cases 1, 2 and 4) are not covered by the current spec description. If not, please explain why.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree or not** | **Comments** |
| NTT DOCOMO | Agree |  |
| ZTE | Agree |  |
| Intel | Agree |  |
| Nokia | Agree |  |
| vivo |  | We are fine with the update but we don’t think it is necessary to say that current specification misses anything. It just may create some ambiguity. |
| Samsung | Agree |  |
|  |  |  |

According to companies views during preparations phase, all companies agreed to discuss the issue. One company commented that draft CR might introduce potential NBC issue for Rel-15. According to current specification, **behaviour 1** is described for UL transmission for which the intra-slot frequency hopping is enabled by higher layer parameter while **behaviour 2** is described for UL transmission for which the intra-slot frequency hopping is not enabled by higher layer parameter. gNB side expects the UE implements corresponding behaviour for UL transmission and exploits corresponding properties of UE behaviour in channel estimation of UL transmission.

* **Behaviour 1**: The UE is required to keep the phase continuity for the UL transmission within each frequency hop and is not required to keep the phase continuity across frequency hops.
* **Behaviour 2**: The UE is required to keep the phase continuity for the UL transmission within a same slot.

Given the current specification only states properties of the signal the UE transmitted only for cases where intra-slot frequency hopping is enabled by higher layer parameter, it leads to unclear UE behaviours for cases where intra-slot frequency hopping is enabled by DCI field or by predefined rules in specification. In our understanding, as long as the frequency position of UL transmission is changed, phase discontinuity in the transmitted signal is expected and UE is not required to maintain the phase continuity across frequency hops of the UL transmission. The UE behaviour for UL transmission should be assumed to be same, regardless of how intra-slot frequency hopping is enabled. Therefore, it seems to us that the current specification description just fail to capture all the intended Cases related to intra-slot frequency hopping. However, different companies may have different interpretations for these cases (i.e. the intra-slot frequency hopping is enabled for a physical channel by DCI fields or predefined rules in specification) not covered by the current specification. Therefore, companies are encouraged to share their views on the questions below.

**Question 2: Do you agree that UE behaviour for UL transmission where intra-slot frequency hopping is enabled by DCI field or predefined rule in spec should be considered the same way as that for UL transmission where intra-slot frequency hopping is enabled by higher layer parameter. If not, please explain why and which UE behaviour is implemented for those cases which are not covered in the current Rel-15 specification.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree or not** | **Comments** |
| NTT DOCOMO | Agree | In my memory, the motivation of the text is to clarify when UE shall keep phase continuity and the main target was that frequency hopping = enabled and the hop distance = 0. In the discussions, there was no distinction among FH enabled by RRC parameter/DCI field/predefined.  In that sense, ‘by higher layer parameter’ is just an editorial issue, and UE would follow this rule in any case. |
| ZTE | Agree |  |
| Intel | Agree |  |
| Nokia | Agree | Have the same understanding as DOCOMO, the description was supposed to tell the UE that if there is a frequency hop, then phase continuity is not required, but when there is no frequency hop phase continuity is required. This text was not supposed to take any stand on what leads to the frequency hop. |
| Samsung | Agree |  |
|  |  |  |

**Question 3: Companies please provide your views on whether specification change is necessary to reflect all cases above related to intra-slot frequency hopping.**

* **If yes, whether the intention of the draft CR in** [**R1-2105625**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_105-e/Docs/R1-2105625.zip) **[1], i.e. remove unnecessary limitation ‘by higher layer parameter’, can be supported.**
* **If no, please explain why.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Spec change is necessary or not** | **Comments** |
| NTT DOCOMO | YES (necessary) | The draft CR seems OK. |
| ZTE | Yes | We think the CR just fixes the editorial issue without functionality change |
| Intel | Yes | We are fine with the draft CR. |
| Nokia | OK with the change | The draft CR makes sense, and goes to the direction of what the paragraphs are supposed to do. |
| vivo | Fine with the update. | The reason is to remove potential ambiguity. |
| Samsung | Necessary | We support to adopt the draft CR which can make the spec covering all conditions to enable intra-slot frequency hopping. |
|  |  |  |

## Second Round

To be updated after discussion of first round

# Conclusion

To be updated with the outcome of the email discussion.
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