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# 1 Introduction

This document summarizes the contributions made under the “Enhancements for PUCCH Formats 0/1/4” agenda item of the Rel-17 work item "Supporting NR from 52.6GHz to 71 GHz."

The updated WID [1] contains the following objective related to this agenda item:

- Support enhancement for PUCCH format 0/1/4 to increase the number of RBs under PSD limitation in shared spectrum operation.

The following email thread is assigned for discussion of this topic:

[105-e-NR-52-71GHz-02] Email discussion/approval on PUCCH format 0/1/4 enhancements with checkpoints for agreements on May 25, May 27 – Steve (Ericsson)

The following is an outline of the summary:

2 Frequency Domain Resource Mapping

2.1 Maximum number of RBs for Enhanced PF0/1/4

2.1.1 <1st Round Comments> Defer since RAN4 LS reply pending

2.2 Configuration Granularity on Number of RBs

2.2.3 <2nd Round Comments> Proposal 1a

2.3 RE Mapping for Enhanced PF0/1/4 for 120 kHz SCS

2.3.3 <2nd Round Comments> Proposal 2

3 Sequence Construction for Enhanced PF0/1

3.1 <1st Round Comments> Defer since max (N\_RB) not yet known

4 Rate matching for enhanced PF4

4.3 <2nd Round Comments> Further discuss this meeting

5 PUCCH Resource Sets Prior to RRC Configuration

5.1 Indication of Number of RBs

5.1.3 <2nd Round Comments> Proposal 4 or 5

5.2 Subcarrier Spacing

5.2.1 <1st Round Comments> Defer since SCS for initial access not yet known

5.3 Frequency Hopping Distance

5.3.1 <1st Round Comments> Defer since max(N\_RB) not yet known

5.4 Handling Potential RB Shortage

5.4.1 <1st Round Comments> Defer since max(N\_RB) not yet known

# 2 Frequency Domain Resource Mapping

## 2.1 Maximum number of RBs for Enhanced PF0/1/4

The following agreements were made in RAN1#104bis-e:

Agreement:

* The maximum values for the configured number of RBs, NRB, for enhanced PF0/1/4 are at least:
	+ 12 RBs for 120 kHz SCS
	+ 3 RBs for 480 kHz SCS
	+ 2 RBs for 960 kHz SCS
* FFS: Whether or not the above values need to be revised to support larger values (and any associated signaling impact), e.g., to support lower UE Tx beamforming gain and/or larger UE EIRP and conducted power limits for different UE power classes, different from those in the agreed evaluation assumptions

Agreement:

For addressing the FFS from the prior agreement in RAN1#104bis-e on the maximum values for the configured number RBs, send an LS to RAN4 asking for feasible maximum values for UE\_EIRP and UE\_P for operation in 52.6-71 GHz.

The main open issue is whether or not the maximum number of RBs should be increased beyond the agreed values of 12/3/2 for 120/480/960 kHz SCS.

The following table provides a summary of company proposals on this topic.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Company Proposals** |
| Futurewei | ***Proposal 1: Once the final power limits and beamforming gains feedback from RAN4 are available, re-evaluation to capture the trends under different regional regulations is necessary, if the finalized values differ from the suggested values from RAN1.*** ***Proposal 2: The MIL trend not only varies according to the number of RBs used, but also according to the number of OSs. Therefore, evaluate different RB value sets for different number of OSs under PF1.******Proposal 3: For better coverage, the gNB can configure a larger number of RB to carry UCI if smaller number of OSs is selected.***  |
| Intel | **Proposal 2: Depending on the LS reply from RAN4, RAN1 should discuss whether a proper framework is needed for the UE to implicitly or explicitly indicate its nominal beamforming gain in addition to the power class to the gNB.** |
| CATT | **Proposal 3 If RAN4 agree to support a larger set of maximum configurable number of RBs, two sets of maximum values for enhanced PF0/1/4 can be used.** |
| ZTE | **Proposal 1: Wait for the reply LS from RAN4 on maximum UE\_EIRP and UE\_P to determine the maximum number of PRBs.** |
| NTT DOCOMO | ***Proposal 1:*** *PUCCH format 2/3 may need to be enhanced according to the updated evaluation assumption for UE power limits depending on LS response from RAN4.* |
| Nokia | ***Observation 1:*** *Determining maximum value for configured RBs solely based on bandwidth needed for reaching maximum EIRP or conducted power limit may lead to impractically large PUCCH allocations****Observation 2:*** *PUCCH format 2/3 configuration limit of 16 RBs can be seen as an upper limit for RB allocations considered for enhanced PUCCH format 0/1/4 with 120 kHz SCS* |
| OPPO | **Proposal 1: determine the maximum value for the UE conducted power and EIRP before determining the maximum values for the configured number of RBs.****Proposal 2: If RAN4 does not specify maximum values for UE conducted power and EIRP, regulatory power limits should be considered when determining the maximum values for the configured number of RBs.** |
| Huawei | ***Proposal 1: The maximum number of PRBs for the PUCCH is:**** ***For 120 kHz SCS: 32***
* ***For 480 kHz SCS: 8***
* ***For 960 kHz SCS: 4***
 |
| Apple | ***Proposal 3:*** *For PF2 and PF3, a restriction on the minimum number of RBs transmitted for each SCS should also be specified subject to waveform specific limitations for PF3.*  |
| Interdigital | ***Proposal 1:*** *It is preferred to hold the discussion on max(NRB) until receiving RAN4’s response on the LS.* |
| MediaTek | Proposal 1: The maximum values of $N\_{RB}$ for SCS of 120 KHz, 480 KHz, and 960 KHz are determined using $EIRP\_{max}$ and $TRP\_{max}$ values provided by RAN4, and under the assumption that $G\_{bf}=0dBi$. |
| Ericsson | Proposal 1 RAN1 should wait for feedback from RAN4 on feasible pairs of (UE\_EIRP, U\_P) values for the 52.6 – 71 GHz band before concluding on whether or not to increase the maximum number of RBs beyond 12 / 3 / 2. |

While some companies propose supporting larger values of N\_RB already now, many companies suggest to wait for feedback from the RAN4 before making a decision. Since RAN1 went to the trouble of sending an LS, and RAN4 will discuss it in their concurrent meeting, it is reasonable not to short circuit this process.

However, one discussion that we could have while awaiting feedback is whether or not RAN1 should try to narrow the scope of the potential increase to the number of RBs. For example, some companies have observed a relationship to PF2/3 for which the maximum number of RBs that can be configured is 16. While it is outside the scope of this WI to make enhancements to PF2/3, a natural question is whether or not it makes sense to support a value larger than 16 for enhanced PF0/1/4? It would be useful to discuss this while awaiting feedback.

**FL Recommendation Wait for feedback on the LS to RAN4 before making a decision on whether or not to increase the maximum number of RBs for enhanced PF0/1/4 beyond the values 12 / 3 / 2 agreed so far.**

### 2.1.1 <1st Round Comments>

Please provide your company view on the above FL recommendation as well as the following question:

**Question**: What is your view on the following alternatives, assuming that RAN1 still awaits feedback on the LS to RAN4

* Alt-1: RAN1 limits the discussion on potential increased max(N\_RB) to values no larger than 16 RBs (same maximum as for PF2/3 in Rel-15).
* Alt-2: RAN1 does not limit the discussion

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View/Position** |
| Intel | We prefer Alt-2, and we would refrain from posing any limitations. Perhaps, as discussed in the prior meeting, RAN1 could at least discuss the minimum and practical range of values for the Tx beamforming gain.  |
| LG | We support the Alt-2. We do not see the technical reasons to restrict the number of RB (N\_RB) as the same as the maximum for PF2/3 in Rel-15. It is important that the maximum N\_RB should be determined to support enough coverage of PF0/1 in the above 52.6GHz. |
| OPPO | Support Alt-2. The maximum PUCCH bandwidth should be calculated based on the maximum achievable transmit power. It is more reasonable to wait for RAN4 feedback. While 16 RB bandwidth limit for PF 2/3 was adopted in R15, which was not motivated by the same motivation that we talk about here. Therefore, we don’t think that 16 RB bandwidth limit for PF 2/3 should be aligned with bandwidth limit for PF 0/1/4. |
| Nokia, NSB | Support Alt-1. We do not see practical reasons to support wider allocations for PF0/1 carrying up to 2 UCI bits, while PF2/3 used for larger UCI payloads are limited to 16 RBs. |
| Futurewei | We prefer Alt-2 and it would need to wait for RAN4’s decision on whether or not to increase the number of RBs for enhanced PF0/1/4. Regarding the maximum RB 16 for PF2/3, the existing value is not motivated by the same reason for PF0/1/4, so it is not a deciding factor for the maximum RBs of PF0/1/4 to be determined. If necessary, the maximum value for all PF0/1/2/3/4 can be extended beyond 16.  |
| vivo | Our slight preference is Alt-1 as we don’t see a clear benefit with a larger than 16 N\_RB for PF0/1/4. |
| Apple | We prefer Alt. 2.  |
| Lenovo,MotorolaMobility | We prefer Alt.2 |
| Qualcomm | We support Alt-2. As Oppo pointed out, the motivation to support multi-RB PF 0/1 in the band of 60GHz is different from supporting 16-RB for PF 2/3 in Rel-15. Another point is that for common PUCCH resource set, which only contains PF 0/1 right now, limiting to 16-RB may have implication of coverage there. We also agree to make a final decision after feedback from RAN4 |
| InterDigital | We support Alt-2 and prefer to decide proper max(N\_RB) based on RAN4’Ss response.  |
| Samsung  | We slightly prefer Alt-2 to ensure maximum power can be achieved, if RAN4 responses larger value of (UE\_EIRP, U\_P) is feasible |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support Alt-2 to provide better coverage considering higher power class UE (which may need to be considered depending on LS reply from RAN4) unless the concerns about N\_RB exceeding 16 would be clarified. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We prefer Alt-2 since it’s better to achieve the maximum transmit power, and we can wait for RAN4’s reply LS. |
| Spreadtrum | We prefer Alt-2. As several company mentioned that the motivation of increase the number of RBs for PUCCH is to achieve the maximum transmission power, so we need to wait for the reply from RAN4.  |
| WILUS | We prefer Alt-2. And we need to wait for feedback on the LS to RAN4. The reason to have # of RB limitation of PF2/3 for PF0/1 is not clear to us.  |
| Huawei | Alt-2. We do not see the motivation for the limitation of Alt-1. Presumably, the values will be in the RRC spec. Optimization of RRC signalling is not a valid point in RAN1. The maximum value should be large enough to give sufficient flexibility for system operation.  |
| Sony | We prefer Alt-2. As already pointed out by several companies, this AI is concerned with ensuring that PF0/1 can be transmitted with maximum power. In any event, a decision can be made after the LS reply from RAN4. |
| CATT | We prefer to wait for ran4 feedback, at the same avoid putting any restriction, therefore Alt.2 is a better choice. |

### 2.1.2 <Summary of 1st Round>

There is a large majority of companies supporting Alt-2, which would mean we should just wait for RAN4's response before deciding on whether or not to increase the maximum number of RBs, and until then we should not restrict the maximum value that is discussed in RAN1.

**FL Recommendation**

Wait for RAN4 feedback on the LS sent in RAN1#104bis-e before deciding on maximum number of RBs. Until then, do not restrict discussion on the maximum value.

## 2.2 Configuration Granularity on Number of RBs

The following agreement was made in RAN1#104bis-e:

Agreement:

Down select to one of the following two alternatives for the configuration of the number of RBs, $N\_{RB}$, for enhanced PUCCH formats 0/1/4:

* Alt-1:
	+ For enhanced PF0/1
		- Support configuration of all integer values in the range [1 .. max($N\_{RB}$)] for each SCS
	+ For enhanced PF4
		- Support configuration of all integer values in the range [1 .. max($N\_{RB}$)] for each SCS that fulfill the requirement $N\_{RB}=2^{α\_{2}}∙3^{α\_{3}}∙5^{α\_{5}}$ where $α\_{2},α\_{3},α\_{5}$ is a set of non-negative integers.
* Alt-2:
	+ Same as Alt-1, but with coarser granularity, i.e., not all integer values of $N\_{RB}$ can be configured
	+ FFS: Which values of $N\_{RB}$ are supported values in the range [1 .. max($N\_{RB}$)]

The main open issue is what should be the granularity of the configured values, and two alternatives were identified in the last meeting.

The following table provides a summary of company proposals on this topic.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Company Proposals** |
| vivo | **Proposal 5: For the configuration of the number of RBs,** $N\_{RB}$**, for enhanced PUCCH formats 0/1/4, the alternative 1 is supported.** |
| Futurewei | ***Proposal 4: To address the dynamic HARQ-ACK codebook size it seems beneficial to consider the number of RBs be indicated by the DCI for better coverage or power saving. In this case, coarser granularity indication is beneficial for DCI overhead reduction consideration.***  ***Proposal 5: Support configuration with a coarser RB granularity for PF0/1/4. Recommend candidate RB value sets contain the following options:*** * ***Option 1: {1, 2, 4, 8, 16, 22} for SCS 120kHz, {1, 2, 4, 6} for SCS 480kHz, and {1, 2, 3} for SCS 960kHz.***
* ***Option 2: {1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 12, 16, 22} for SCS 120kHz, {1, 2, 4, 6} for SCS 480kHz, and {1, 2, 3} for SCS 960kHz.***
* ***Option 3: {1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 12, 16, 22} for SCS 120kHz, {1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6} for SCS 480kHz, and {1, 2, 3} for SCS 960kHz***
 |
| CATT | **Proposal 5 For enhanced PF0/1, Alt-2 with coarser granularity is preferred ulfils configuration ulfil number of RBs.** |
| ZTE | **Proposal 2: The allowed values of N\_RB within the range** [1 .. max($N\_{RB}$)] **can be flexible, Alt-1 is preferred in PRB number configuration.** |
| NTT DOCOMO | ***Proposal 4:*** *All integer values for PUCCH format 0/1 and all integer values that fulfill the requirement* $N\_{RB}=2^{α\_{2}}∙3^{α\_{3}}∙5^{α\_{5}}$ *where* $α\_{2},α\_{3},α\_{5}$ *is a set of non-negative integers for PUCCH format 4 (Alt-1 in RAN1#104bis-e agreement) should be supported.* |
| Nokia | ***Proposal 3:*** *In case of dedicated PUCCH resource configuration, Alt-1 is supported. In case of common PUCCH resource set, Alt-2 is supported.* |
| Qualcomm | **Proposal 2: For the configuration of the number of RBs,** $N\_{RB}$**, for enhanced PUCCH formats 0/1/4, we support Alt-2, and further propose:*** + **For enhanced PF0/1/4, supported number of RBs set is [1,2,3,4,6,8,12] for 120kHz SCS**
 |
| LGE | **Proposal #2: For the allowed values of NRB, the positive integer values between the min/max NRB can be used for PF0/1 while the allowed values of NRB between the min/max NRB for PF4 can be obtained by applying the DFT constraint.** |
| Huawei | ***Proposal 2: Adopt Alt. 1 for the granularity of the configuration of the number of RBs,*** $N\_{RB}$***, for enhanced PUCCH formats 0/1/4.*** |
| Apple | ***Proposal 1:*** *For enhanced PUCCH formats 0/1/4 the choice of selecting all valid integer values in the range [1 .. max( )] for each SCS vs a subset of the values should depend on the maximum value of N\_RB estimated after the reply from RAN4.* |
| Samsung | **Proposal 2: Support configuration of all integer values in the range of [1 .. max(**$N\_{RB}$**)] per SCS, for PUCCH format 0/1. Support configuration of all integer values in the range [1 .. max(**$N\_{RB}$**)] for each SCS that ulfils the requirement** $N\_{RB}=2^{α\_{2}}∙3^{α\_{3}}∙5^{α\_{5}}$ **where** $α\_{2},α\_{3},α\_{5}$ **is a set of non-negative integers for PUCCH format 4.**  |
| Interdigital | ***Proposal 2:*** *All integer values for PUCCH format 0/1 and all integer values which fulfill the requirement* $N\_{RB}=2^{α\_{2}}∙3^{α\_{3}}∙5^{α\_{5}}$ *for PUCCH format 4 (Alt-1) are supported.* |
| Spreadtrum | ***Proposal 1: Support the configuration of coarser granularity for the numbers of contiguous RBs for enhanced PUCCH format 0/1/4 for 120/480/960 kHz SCS.******Proposal 2: A set like {1, 2, 4, 6, 12} for 120 kHz SCS，{1, 2, 3} for 480 kHz SCS and {1, 2} for 960 kHz SCS can be supported as the candidate values.*** |
| Ericsson | **Proposal 2 Support Alt-1 in the agreement from RAN1#104bis-e on the granularity of the configuration of the number of RBs** |

The following is a summary of support for the two alternatives:

* Alt-1: vivo, ZTE, NTT DOCOMO, Nokia, LGE, Huawei, Samsung, Interdigital, Ericsson
* Alt-2: Futurewei, CATT, Qualcomm, Spreadtrum

Clearly a large majority of companies support Alt-1. Proponents of Alt-1 argue that there is a need for configuration flexibility due to operation in different regions and operation with different UE capabilities, and that the additional RRC overhead compared to Alt-2 is very small. Furthermore, for PF2/3, any values in the range 1 .. 16 can be configured. Proponents of Alt-2 argue that the transmit power scales with the log of N\_RB, so not all values of N\_RB are needed.

Do proponents of Alt-2 have a strong view? If not, then can the following proposal be acceptable as a step forward?

**Proposal 1 If RAN1 agrees that max(N\_RB) is no larger than 16, support Alt-1. Otherwise, further discuss Alt-1 vs. Alt-2.**

### 2.2.1 <1st Round Comments>

Please provide your company view on Proposal 1.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View/Position** |
| Intel | We are OK with the proposal, and to further consider Alt-2 if we conclude that the max{NRB}>16. |
| LG | We support the Proposal 1 and share the same view with Moderator. |
| OPPO | OK, but this proposal should be applied for UE dedicated RRC configuration. |
| Nokia, NSB | We are fine with the proposal when applied for UE dedicated RRC configuration.  |
| Futurewei | Agree with the moderator’s proposal. Consider extending the maximum number of RBs for all formats, i.e., PF0/1/2/3/4.  |
| Vivo | OK with the proposal. Our preference is Alt-1. We don’t see a strong motivation of Alt-2 as the overhead reduction is marginal but flexibility is reduced. |
| Apple | Okay with the proposal.  |
| Lenovo, Motoroloa Mobility | We support moderator’s proposal |
| Qualcomm | Even with current Max(N\_RB) as 12, we support Alt-2 with following reasons: 1) reducing testing effort, as we need to test all supported number of RBs; 2) while there is larger SINR(dB) gain from 1RB to 2RB, it is just marginal iprovment of SINR (dB) when BW increases from 10 to 11 RBs. That is why we propose a subset with more dense of small number of RBs and coarser for larger number of RBs.The reason for PF2/3 are fully flexible in # of RBs is to achieve different coding gain. But PF0/1 with 1-2 bits, we are only focusing on power gain. |
| InterDigital | We are fine with the proposal, but prefer Alt-1 even for the larger Max(N\_RB) larger than 12.  |
| Samsung | We support the proposal. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support Proposal1. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We support the proposal. And we also support Alt-1 if maximum RB number is larger than 16 due to the better flexibility. |
| Spreadtrum | We share the same view as Qualcomm. Furthermore, In current specification, from the UE side, both open-loop power control and closed-loop power control operate on the dB scale. From the gNB side, the remaining power of the UE is obtained through the power headroom report of the UE. In summary, the dB scale is sufficient in power control. However, the granularity of RB does not directly reflect the dB scale in power control. Specifically, the granularity of RB is overfull for power control. If majority company go with Alt-1, we can support this proposal as a compromise. |
| WILUS | We support the Proposal 1. |
| Huawei | Alt-1. We do not see a motivation for restricting the granularity. Presumably, the values will be in the RRC spec. Optimization of RRC signalling is not a valid point in RAN1. |
| Sony | We support the FL’s proposal. |
| CATT | We also think the decision should not be based on the number of max RB. But in the end one compromise could be the granuality could be configurable.  |

### 2.2.2 <Summary of 1st Round>

A large majority of companies either support Proposal 1 or can compromise to support Propsoal 1. Several companies recommend that the proposal applies to UE-specifically configured PUCCH resources, and that cell-specifically configured PUSCH resources can be discussed separately. One company suggests that the number of RBs for PF2/3 should also be extended. However, it is the moderator's understanding that enhancements to PF2/3 are not in the scope of the WID.

* Support or can compromise on Proposal 1:
	+ Intel, LG, OPPO, Nokia, Futurewei, vivo, Apple, Lenovo, Interdigital, Samsung, NTT DOCOMO, ZTE, Spreadtrum (compromise), WILUS, Huawei
* Oppose Proposal 1
	+ Qualcomm
* Alternative to Proposal 1:
	+ CATT (configurable granularity

Question to Qualcomm and CATT: Would you be willing to compromise and accept the following proposal?

**Proposal 1a Agree to the following:**

* If RAN1 agrees that max(N\_RB) is no larger than 16, support Alt-1 for UE-specifically configured PUCCH resources. Otherwise, further discuss Alt-1 vs. Alt-2.
* Note: Configuration granularity for N\_RB for cell-specifically configured PUCCH resources will be discussed separately.

### 2.2.3 <2nd Round Comments>

Please provide your company view on Proposal 1a

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View/Position** |
| Intel | We are OK with the proposal, but we are really reluctant about the message carried in the note. Our understanding is that this note could only apply to Alt-2, and we are not stating that regarding of the alternative agreed we will still discuss whether the granularity would be configurable or not. In this matter, we do not think the note would add any additional entropy, and therefore it is not needed. |
| LG | We still support the Alt-1 and we do not see the necessity to differentiate the granularity between the UE-specifically configured resource and the cell-specifically configured resource.  |
| OPPO | OK. |
| Samsung  | We are OK with the proposal |
| Nokia, NSB | We are fine with the actual proposal, but we do not see a need for the note. Instead, there is risk that it will create just confusion.  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are fine with the proposal. We also don’t see a need for the note. |
| Huawei | The proposal is OK but prefer to remove the note. |
| Qualcomm | We accept the proposal |
| Futurewei | We support the proposal. We think the note has a valid point to study and prefer the note to be an FFS for deciding if it is necessary to differentiate the granularity between the UE-specifically and the cell-specifically configured resources.  |
| vivo | We support the proposal 1a in principle. However, we suggest to modify “UE-specifically congigured” to “dedicated”, and “cell-specifically” to “PUCCH resource before dedicated resource” to align the current specification. The RB number indication is not decided yet, the “PUCCH resource before dedicated resource” can also be UE-specifically configured. |
| Apple | We are fine with the proposal |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine with the proposal, also agree with other companies that the additional note is not neccessary  |

## 2.3 RE Mapping for Enhanced PF0/1/4 for 120 kHz SCS

The following agreements were made at RAN1#104-e and RAN1#104bis-e:

Agreement:

For enhanced (multi-RB) PUCCH Formats 0/1/4 for 120/480/960 kHz SCS, support allocation of N\_RB contiguous RBs

* FFS: Values of N\_RB for each SCS
* For 480/960 kHz SCS, all REs within each RB are mapped
	+ Note: PRB and sub-PRB interlaced mapping is not considered further
* For 120 kHz SCS, further discuss the following two alternatives:
	+ Alt-1: All REs within each RB are mapped
		- Note: PRB and sub-PRB interlaced mapping is not considered further
	+ Alt-2: Subset of REs within each RB are mapped (sub-PRB interlaced mapping)

Agreement:

User-multiplexing can be considered but as lower priority compared to maximum isotropic loss for PUCCH as a design criterion.

The main open issue is for the case of 120 kHz SCS, which RE mapping approach should be supported:

* Alt-1: All REs within each RB are mapped
	+ Note: PRB and sub-PRB interlaced mapping is not considered further
* Alt-2: Subset of REs within each RB are mapped (sub-PRB interlaced mapping)

The following table provides a summary of company proposals on this topic.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Company Proposals** |
| vivo | Proposal 2: For enhanced PUCCH format 0/1, for 120 kHz SCS, we support alt 2 for RE mapping.Proposal 3: For UCI of enhanced PUCCH format 4, all REs within each RB are mapped is preferred for 120kHz SCS. Proposal 4: For DMRS of PUCCH format 4, the sub-PRB interlaced mapping should be supported.  |
| Intel | **Proposal 1: For the enhanced (multi-RB) PUCCH formats 0/1/4 for 120 kHz SCS all REs within each RB are mapped.** |
| ZTE | **Proposal 3: In 52.6GHz-71GHz frequency band, PUCCH should be mapped into all REs within the PRBs allocated.**  |
| Nokia | ***Proposal 2:*** *All REs within each RB are mapped for enhanced PUCCH format 0/1/4.* |
| OPPO | **Proposal 4: For 120 kHz SCS, adopt sub-PRB mapping instead of full-PRB mapping, where only 1 RE is mapped in a RB.**  |
| LGE | **Proposal #1: For enhanced PUCCH formats 0/1/4 for 120 kHz SCS, the PRB and sub-PRB interlaced mapping should not be considered further** |
| Huawei | ***Proposal 3: Sub-PRB interlaced mapping is not introduced for 120 kHz SCS.*** |
| Apple | ***Proposal 2:*** *To ensure consistent design across all SCSs, for 120 kHz SCS, all REs within each RB are mapped.* |
| Samsung | **Proposal 1: Support unified solution for enhanced PUCCH format 0/1/4 based on contiguous multi-full PRB allocation for 120/480/960KHz.**  |
| WILUS | * *Proposal 1: The interlaced or sub-PRB interlaced design for PUCCH format 0/1/4 seems not necessary to apply to 60GHz unlicensed spectrum from the perspective of power boosting in the new numerologies, i.e., 480kHz, 960kHz, and 120kHz SCS.*
* *Even for 120kHz SCS case, we support Alt-1.*
	+ *Alt-1: All REs within each RB are mapped.*
		- *Note: PRB and sub-PRB interlaced mapping is not considered further.*
 |
| Spreadtrum | ***Proposal 3: For enhanced (multi-RB) PUCCH Formats 0/1/4 for 120 kHz SCS, support allocation of N\_RB contiguous RBs in which all Res within each RB are mapped. Sub-PRB interlaced mapping is not considered further.*** |
| Ericsson | **Proposal 4 Do not support sub-PRB allocations for Rel-17 PUCCH.** |

The following is a summary of support for the two alternatives:

* Alt-1: Intel, ZTE, Nokia, LGE, Huawei, Apple, Samsung, WILUS, Spreadtrum, Ericsson
* Alt-2: vivo, OPPO

Clearly, there is an overwhelming majority of companies supporting Alt-1. Compared to last meeting, more companies have evaluated Alt-1 vs. Alt-2. The following is a high level summary of company evaluations:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Evaluation summary** |
| vivo | * PF0
	+ Evaluated multiplexing of 2 UEs
		- Alt 1-1: FDM (different PRBs)
		- Alt 1-2: Sequence multiplexing
		- Alt 2-1: FDM (different combs in Comb-2 pattern)
	+ Comparable MIL performance for Alt 1-2 and Alt 2-1 if UE powers are balanced
	+ Alt 2-1 vs. Alt-1-2 has a 2-3 dB MIL gain in US/SK if UE powers are imbalanced (Alt 2-1 and Alt 1-2 have comparable MIL in Europe)
* PF4
	+ Evalued a hybrid mapping scheme for PF4:
		- Full-PRB mapping for UCI (Alt-1) + Sub-PRB mapping for DMRS (Alt-2)
	+ MIL gain of -0.3 – 2 dB (dependent on payload, delay spread) compared to Alt-1
 |
| Intel | * PF0
	+ MIL evaluated in US, Europe, SK
	+ Compared Alt-1 vs. Alt-2 (Comb-2 pattern) for two different sequence constructions (single long sequence, repeated sequence + CSC)
	+ N\_RB ranges from 0 .. 40
	+ No gains found for Alt-2
 |
| ZTE | * PF0
	+ MIL evaluated in SK
	+ Compared Alt-1 vs. Alt-2 (1 or first 6 REs mapped per PRB)
	+ Showed larger MIL for Alt-1
 |
| OPPO | * PF0
	+ 12 RBs
	+ 1 RE per PRB mapped
	+ Comparable MIL between Alt-1 and Alt-2 (within 0.1 dB)
 |
| Ericsson | * PF0
	+ 2,4,6,8,10,12 RBs
	+ Comb-2 pattern for Alt-2
	+ At best (depending on # of RBs and delay spread), MIL of Alt-2 is comparable to Alt-1 in all regions (US,EU,SK)
 |

Observations based on reported evaluations:

* For PF0/1 using the agreed evaluation assumptions based on single user, it has been demonstrated that the MIL of Alt-1 and Alt-2 are generally comparable. Two companies have shown that MIL of Alt-1 can exceed the MIL of Alt-2.
* For PF0/1 with 2 multiplexed users, one company has demonstrated comparable MIL performance if the received powers of the 2 users are balanced. If the received powers are imalanced, Alt-2 can offer a gain in MIL.
* One company has evaluated PF4 with a hybrid RE mapping scheme: Alt-1 for UCI + Alt-2 for DMRS and found a gain in MIL.

Proponents of Alt-1 state the following:

* Alt-1 is preferred on the basis of having a uniform design for all SCSs (120, 480, 960 kHz)
	+ There are strong concerns about implementation complexity and specification complexity from supporting 2 different RE mapping approaches
	+ The moderator observes that if Alt-2 is supported for initial access, then it will be mandatory, i.e., it cannot be a UE capability
* While Alt-2 potentially offers improved user multiplexing, this should not be a design criterion due to the lack of opportunity to find users to multiplex in narrow beams used in 52.6 – 71 GHz
* While Alt-2 potentially offers improved spectral efficiency when compared to Alt-1 on the basis of the same number of RBs, if there are no users to multiplex, the unused REs of Alt-2 cannot be used for other purposes since sub-PRB interlacing is not supported for PUSCH, PRACH, and SRS
* Alt-2 is not preferred due to additional signaling overhead of indicating the resource mapping

Proponents of Alt-2 state the following:

* Alt-2 is preferred on the basis of improved user multiplexing
* Alt-2 is preferred on the basis of better spectral efficiency

In summary, since there is not a clear advantage in terms of coverage between Alt-1 and Alt-2, the decision point comes down to whether or not potentially improved user multiplexing is worth the cost in implementation/specification complexity of supporting two different RE mapping schemes. Given that companies have had two meetings to consider and evaluate the two alternatives, and that there has not been a shift in company positions, the FL recommends that a decision on down-selecting between Alt-1 and Alt-2 should be made in this meeting.

**Proposal 2 For enahanced PF 0/1/4 for 120 kHz, downselect to one of Alt-1 and Alt-2 in this meeting. The decision should be based on the consideration of implementation/specification complexity vs. user multiplexing.**

### 2.3.1 <1st Round Comments>

Please provide your company view Proposal 2.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View/Position** |
| Intel  | Our view is to support Alt-1 only. Another important thing that we would like to emphasize is that based on our simulation campaign Alt-2 does not bring any gain compared to Alt-1, and furthermore even if in some cases the related MILs are comparable the current calculation does not account for the potential maximum transmit power reduction due to inter-modulation distortions (IMD) from interlace design, which we expect would further increase the coverage loss of Alt-2. |
| LG | We support Alt-1 and share the view with Intel. The benefits of Alt-2 are unclear when compared to Alt-1, and the majority of companies support Alt-1 in observations based on the evaluation. Moreover, as Intel pointed out, the RAN4 work may be increased due to the intermodulation distortions (IMD) from interlace design. For PF4, the Alt-1 is also preferred in terms of the unified RE mapping scheme for PF0/1/4. |
| OPPO | We support Alt-2 with the following technical reasons. Alt-2 posseses multiple advantages over Alt-1 for initial access. **Advantage 1**: when N\_RB is large, Alt-1 will occupy more bandwidth of intial UL BWP to allocate PUCCH resource for PUCCH resource index rPUCCH ranging from 0 to 15. As shown in the figure below, for N\_RB=12, the PUCCH resource occupies 96 RB (assuming NCS=2), while for Alt-2, the occupied number of PRB can be reduced to 12, which is a factor of 8 redcution. The benefit becomes more significant when the PUCCH symbol length increases. This can nicely address the RB shortage issue raised in section 5.4. **Advantage 2**: with Alt-2, due to the multiplexing gain, one set of N\_RB resource can already support rPUCCH ranging from 0 to 15. In this case, the resulting frequency hopping distance between different UEs will remain equal. This is not the case with Alt-1, as illustrated in our figure. In this case, with Alt-1, the coverage is not balanced among differernt rPUCCH values. This issue has also been raised in section 5.3 and further enhancements are proposed by proponents. But the enhancement may unforturnately lead to a reduced hopping distance. The advantage of Alt-2 is that it can keep the maximum and balanced hopping distance among different UEs or among different rPUCCH values.In summary, Alt-2 has multiplexing benefits over Alt-1, many companies dispute that the multiplexing benefit is not important. However, the issues raised in section 5.3 and 5.4 are all originated from the issue due to the lack of UE multiplexing capacity. Thus, we truly believe that multiplexing benefit is very important. |
| Nokia, NSB | We support Alt-1 only. Alt-2 leads to simultaneous use of interlaced and non-interlaced mapping, which complicates multiplexing and was avoided even in Rel-16 NR-U.  |
| Futurewei | We prefer Alt-1 at least for PF0/1. The sub-PRB mapping for DMRS of PF4 may be an FFS for more inputs to be available.  |
| vivo | For PF 0/1, the MIL performance of both Alt-1 and Alt-2 are comparable for single UE. When UE multiplexing is considered, there’s MIL performance gain of Alt-2 over Alt-1 espeacially for power imbanlance case. We’d like to emphasize that power imbanlance case may be typical for edge UEs where MIL gain is much desired particulary for PF 0/1.On the argument against 2 RE mapping methods for different SCS, the point we want to make is that MIL (coverage) gain is more important for 120 kHz compared to other SCS. With the demonstrated MIL gain, we do think it justifiying different RE mapping for different SCS. On the criteria of a uniform design, it may be nice to have but we don’t think it should be the deciding factor as otherwise no need to spend two meetings evaluating all these MIL performance to begin with.On the argument of implementation/specification complexity, it would be better for us to understand if companies can provide some analysis of how much extra implementation complexity.With respect to UE multiplexing, during last meeting discussion, many companies assume it should be gNB choice whether to multiplex UEs. If system allows UE multiplexing and there’s a chance to multiplex UEs, then we found it difficult to understand the reason that a design should not consider UE multiplexing which is also against the agreement from last meeting. One more point, as we showed and proposed in our contribution, DMRS RE mapping for PF 4 should be sub-PRB interlaced based on the observed MIL gain. Note that UCI data need to go through DFT precoding and OCC before mapped to RE while DMRS will go directly to RE mapping. So DMRS sub-PRB RE mapping is actually aligned with UCI data (i.e. comb structure in frequency domain) for PF 4 as we illustrated in Figure 11 of R1-2106065. |
| Apple | Support Alt 1 only. In terms of implementation complexity, (a) adding a new mode for 1 specific SCS will by default imply a complexity difference compared with a common design (b) as Intel has pointed out, there may be RAN4 effects that have to be compensated for. In terms of specification complexity, there will need to be a decision on the sub-set of RBs to be mapped, and whether to make that subset configurable or not. On the advantage of being able to address the RB shortage, this will only be applicable to the 120 kHz SCS and additional methods may have to be used for other SCSs (if they are used) further fragmenting the design.  |
| Lenovo, Motoroloa Mobility | We support Alt.1, fine with Alt 2 if supported by the majority |
| Qualcomm  | We support Alt-1 with following reasons: 1) to have a unified solution to reduce implementation complexity across different SCSs. 2) we don’t see the benefits justify the increased specification effort. |
| InterDigital | We support Alt-1.  |
| Samsung | We prefer Alt-1 for less standard effort, considering the benefit is not convinced as shown by some other companies.  |
| NTT DOCOMO | Agree with Proposal 2. We share the same view that whether user multiplexing by sub-PRB interlaced mapping is beneficial or not in terms of spectral efficiency is not clear for 52.6 – 71 GHz band as described above. In addition, the frequency hopping distance issue described in section 5.3 can also be resolved by adjusting the value of PRB offset for 2nd hop, which can be simpler than the interlaced mapping implementation. Considering the implementation/spacification complexity, we support Alt-1. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We support Alt-1. According to our simulation, there is no performance gain for Alt-2 in terms of coverage. Except that, Alt-2 requires higher implementation complexity and spec effort, therefore we support Alt-1. |
| Spreadtrum | We prefer Alt-1 considering the less implementation/specification complexity. |
| WILUS | We support Alt-1 in terms of implementation complexity and specification impacts to support two (interlaced and non-interlaced) different mapping across different SCS. |
| Huawei | The intention of the proposal is fine but it does not seem necessary to make Proposal 2 as an intermediate agreement. Our view is still Alt-1, for all PF0/1/4.  |
| Sony | We prefer Alt-1 since it requires less implementation complexity and standardization effort.  |
|  |  |

### 2.3.2 <Summary of 1st Round>

There has not been a shift in support of Alt-1 vs. Alt-2, although one company (Lenovo) has indicated that they can support Alt-2 if there is a majority. The rationale provided by companies for supporting either Alt-1 or Alt-2 is similar to what is summarized in Section 2.3. The main discussion point seems to come down to user multiplexing vs. implementation/specification complexity.

* Alt-1:
	+ Intel, LG, Nokia, Futurewei, Apple, Lenovo (Alt-2 if there is a majority), Qualcomm, Interdigital, Samsung, NTT DOCOMO, ZTE, Spreadtrum, WILUS, Huawei, Sony, Ericsson
* Alt-2:
	+ vivo, OPPO

Regarding new discussion points provided in the 1st round, the moderator makes the following observations:

* Regarding OPPO's comments:
	+ Technical Advantage 1
		- It is claimed that Alt-2 can provide a factor of 8 reduction in the number of required RBs. However, this would seem to have a large impact on coverage
			* Could OPPO/others elaborate on the coverage impact?
	+ Technical Advantage 2
		- The diagram shown in the comments above implies that for Alt-1, the hopping distance is always unequal. However, some companies have discussed solutions to equalize the hopping distance, and thus coverage, amongst PUCCH resources in the same set used prior to RRC configuration. In fact the moderator provided an example diagram illustrating equalized hopping distance for Alt-1 in Section 5.
			* Could OPPO/others please elaborate if there is a fundamental issue preventing equalizing the hopping distance for Alt-1?
	+ The two advantages discussed for Alt-2 imply that sub-PRB interlacing would require mandatory UE support due to the fact that the PUCCH resources are used prior to RRC configuration, i.e., during initial access
		- Could OPPO/others elaborate if this is the intention?
* Regarding vivo's comments:
	+ It is suggested that if Alt-2 is adopted for the DMRS of PF4, then both DMRS and UCI end up following a comb structure
	+ For this proposal, the moderator's understanding is as follows:
		- If OCC2 is configured for the UCI symbols for multiplexing 2 users, and if comb-2 is used for the DMRS symbols, then no cyclic shifts are used for DMRS since the 2 users would occupy different comb-2's
			* This is in contrast to Rel-16 where DMRS uses 2 cyclic shifts
		- If OCC4 is configured for the UCI symbols for multiplexing 4 users, and if comb-4 is used for the DMRS symbols, then no cyclic shifts are used for DMRS since the 2 users would occupy different comb-4's. Alternatively, if comb-2 is used for the DMRS symbols, then two cyclic shifts would we used since 2 users whould share one comb-2 and the other users would share the other comb-2
			* This is in contrast to Rel-16 that uses 4 cyclic shifts
	+ Could vivo/others clarify that this is correct understanding?
	+ Also, it appears as though this proposal would conflict with the agreement from last meeting
		- Could vivo/others elaborate on this point?

Agreement:

For DMRS of enhanced PF4, a Type-1 low PAPR sequence of length equal to the total number of mapped REs of of the PUCCH resource is used. Cyclic shifts are defined in the same was as Rel-15/16 for PF4 (Alt-1 in agreement from RAN1#104-e).

### 2.3.3 <2nd Round Comments>

The FL recommendation is still to down-select to one of Alt-1 and Alt-2 by the end of this meeting as indicated in Proposal 2. Prior to that, please provide further input on the moderator observations made above in Section 2.3.2.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View/Position** |
| Intel | We support Alt.1. We indisputably agree that Alt.2 can lead to some multiplexing gain. However, this would come at the cost of reduced performance, implementation complexity, and high specification impact. As for equalizing the frequency diversity gain through a non-mirrored-like frequency hopping pattern, our view is that its support would really depend on the maximum number of PRBs that we support: for the current values agreed, we believe that the gain would be quite negligible and also in light of the spec impact a Rel.15 mirrored-like frequency hopping pattern could be used.As for the discussion related to PF4, we share same view with the FL regarding the applicability of the sub-PRB interlace to PF4 based on prior agreement made for the sequence design for DMRS for PF4. |
| LG | We support Alt 1 and share the same view with the FL for PF4. Moreover, we prefer to the unified RE mapping scheme for PF0/1/4. For the frequency hopping distance, there could be a significant variation of the hopping distance between the PUCCH resources depending on the value of $N\_{RB}$ for PF0/1 and the size of BWP and the diversity gain of frequency hopping may not be enough. Therefore, it is necessary to discuss how to configure the hopping distance to obtain hopping gain equally for each PUCCH resource. |
| OPPO | Thanks for FL’s careful analysis, and here we provide our answers to the questions* + Technical Advantage 1
		- It is claimed that Alt-2 can provide a factor of 8 reduction in the number of required RBs. However, this would seem to have a large impact on coverage
			* Could OPPO/others elaborate on the coverage impact?

Alt-2 does not have any coverage impact, as shown in our simulation result below [R1-2104766], **Alt-2 even has better MIL performance than Alt-1**. This was our claim at the beginning that Alt-2 has better MIL than Alt-1. Moreover, the observation seems have been confirmed by the initial FL summary already. In addition, Alt-2 has the the claimed advantage 1 and advantage 2. * + Technical Advantage 2
		- The diagram shown in the comments above implies that for Alt-1, the hopping distance is always unequal. However, some companies have discussed solutions to equalize the hopping distance, and thus coverage, amongst PUCCH resources in the same set used prior to RRC configuration. In fact the moderator provided an example diagram illustrating equalized hopping distance for Alt-1 in Section 5.
			* Could OPPO/others please elaborate if there is a fundamental issue preventing equalizing the hopping distance for Alt-1?

First of all, it should be made clear that un-equal hopping distance is a negative consequence from introducing full-PRB mapping. This issue is acknowledged in section 5. Then to resolve this issue, additional enhancement can be envisioned for full-PRB mapping, e.g. solution proposed in section 5. But from our understanding, when introducing sub-PRB mapping, this issue can be directly avoided.Secondly, for advantage 2, even compare with full-PRB employing the potential enhancement discussed in section 5, the advantage is still valid. This is because that more PUCCH indexes can be multiplexed in the same PUCCH bandwidth (thanks to the multiplexing gain). It is to say that even full-PRB with potential enhancement to achieve equal hopping distance, the resulting distance is much shorter than sub-PRB mapping. We give an example below for illustration purpose. It is important to note that for full-PRB mapping, the hopping distance is further scaled down when the N\_RB incrases or NCS decreases. The example given in section 5 assumes NCS=4, but the distance will strink when NCS goes down to 2, which is also an existing configuration case supported by current spec. Thirdly, some companies talked about the specification impact and claims that with sub-PRB the spec impact is significantly high. It is not a fair observation. For full-PRB mapping, there are also significant spec impacts, e.g. * enhancement for RB shortage
* enhancement for equal hopping distance
* potential restrictions on Ncs and CS values
* potential impact on PRB offset

From our viewpoint, all the above enhancements are targeting to resolve the source issue originated from the fact that full-PRB mapping is lack of multiplexing capacity. While sub-PRB mapping can nicely avoid this issue. Therefore, it is not fair to just put a label of high spec impact to sub-PRB mapping.  |
| Nokia, NSB | We prefer Alt 1 for the smaller specification and implemention impact and simpler operation due to unified RE mapping. The multiplexing benefits of Alt. 2 limited to PUCCH 0/1/4 do not justify for the additional specification and implementation efforts. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We support Alt1. In addition to coverage effect, spec and implementation impact of Alt 2 as mentioned before, increased signalling is needed to indicate for a UE which RE is occupied. Besides, we also don’t think the hopping distance unequality is a problem, because the hopping gain when small number of PRB is similar, and when the number of PRB is large, the hopping gain would be quite limited.And for the DMRS of PF4, we agree with FL. |
| Huawei | We prefer Alt 1. Sub-PRB interlacing is quite a big departure from NR design principles and we envisage that it would come with considerable impact on other channels/signals, if the flexibility/gain from it should be substantial. |
| Qualcomm | We support Alt-1 only. |
| Futurewei | We prefer Alt-1 considering the performance, signaling oveahead, and spec impact. While we are open to further discussions if additional simulation results showing sub-PRB mapping has advantage over MIL are available. Companies have shown one case on PF 0, 1 bit for certain number of symbol(s) (not shown). A more comprehensive comparison would need more of the cases across different formats, number of bits, symbol lengths, payloads, etc, in order to determine which of the two mapping type has the better MIL. We suggest to deprioritize multiplexing gain from the discussion given the prior agreement on priority of MIL and UE multiplexing.  |
| vivo | Respond to Moderator’s questions:1. The cyclic shifts defined in R15/16 for DMRS are used for DMRS multiplexing occupying the same REs. The motivation of our proposal of comb-based DMRS is to have better coverage and power boosting gain as illustrate in Figure 11 of R1-2106065. That is to say, the comb-based DMRS does not affect the cyclic shift configuration. We don’t see FDM of DMRS will prevent the usage of CDM. So a short answer to Moderator’s question, no. Your understanding of no cyclic shift for DMRS if comb structure is used is not correct. Our proposal is not in contrast to Rel-16 DMRS cyclic shift design. Actually, we’d like to ask the question back to Moderator, is there an issue when OCC is configured for UCI and cyclic shift is still used for comb DMRS?
2. We disagree with Moderator’s view that our proposal of comb DMRS for PF4 violate the agreement about DMRS for PF4 from last meeting agreement. If companies are arguing literally on the meaning of “in the same was as Rel-15/16”, then let me ask this question. For long sequence DMRS, the value of m0 in **Table 6.4.1.3.3.1-1** should be modified depending on the number of subcarrier. Does that violate the quoted agreement when that will not be the same as Rel-15/16?

In summary, we cannot agree with Proposal 2 as we strongly believe that at least sub-PRB mapping of DMRS for PF4 is beneficial and well justified. We disagree with the arguments that Alt-2 should be excluded since it is different from existing NR specification and hence some specification impact. If that were the criteria, I’m wondering why RAN1 made efforts evaluating/investigating enhancements from the beginning. We always think RAN1 discussion is technical merit oriented and hope that’s the case on this particular matter as well.  |
| Apple | We think that Alt 2 have additional implantation impact for the UE and would require additional signaling overhead. We would prefer Alt 1 |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support Alt 1. |
| vivo2 | We’d like to provide some further comments/questions as we didn’t get a chance to express ourselves during today’s GTW due to time limitation.1. To Moderator, we provided our clarification response to your questions above and would like to know if they clarified or you still have question on our proposal.
2. For PF0/1, as we showed in our contribution, we have concern on the performance (MIL/coverage) loss when UEs are multiplex if Alt-1 is adopted.
3. For PF4, all the evaluation results on RE mapping from different companies other than us are not for PF4 neither on DMRS as summarized by Moderator. This meeting is the 1st time we brought up and provided evaluation results of comb DMRS for PF4. So Moderator’s statement that this issue “RE mapping of DMRS for PF4 has been studied for 3 meetings” is not true.
4. Even if we only look at single UE case, sub-PRB/comb DMRS for PF4 provides up to 2 dB MIL gain. For companies argued coverage is more important than multiplexing, why that’s not justified?
5. We understand 3GPP is a consensus based group and willing to work with others to move forward as we commented in last week’s GTW. If that was misunderstand to Moderator/companies, we’d make it clear here. However, keep pushing one alternative while not addressing the concern from our side is not a fair compromise we can accept.

  |

# 3 Sequence Construction for Enhanced PF0/1

The following agreements were made in RAN1#104-e and RAN1#104bis-e:

Agreement:

* For enhanced PF0/1, support Type-1 low PAPR sequences. Further study and strive to select one of the following alternatives:
	+ Alt-1: A single sequence of length equal to the total number of mapped Res of of the PUCCH resource is used. Cyclic shifts for PF0/1 are defined in the same way as Rel-16 for the case that *useInterlacePUCCH-PUSCH* is not configured.
	+ Alt-2: A single sequence of length equal to the number of mapped Res per RB of the PUCCH resource is used, and the sequence is repeated in each RB. At least the following scheme is considered for PAPR/CM reduction:
		- Cycling of cyclic shifts across RBs in a similar way as for Rel-16 for PF0/1 for the case that *useInterlacePUCCH-PUSCH* is configured
* At least the following aspects should be considered in the study
	+ Coverage (maximum isotropic loss (MIL)), including
		- Required SNR to fulfil PUCCH detection criterion
		- PAPR/CM as a function of N\_RB
	+ Specification impact

Agreement:

User-multiplexing can be considered but as lower priority compared to maximum isotropic loss for PUCCH as a design criterion.

For the PF0/1 sequence, the main open issue is which sequence construction method should be supported:

* Alt-1: A single long sequence
* Alt-2: Sequence repeated in each RB + cyclic shift cycling for PAPR/CM mitigation

The following table provides a summary of company proposals on this topic.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Company Proposals** |
| vivo | **Proposal 1:** **For enhanced PUCCH format 0/1, the alt 1 of a single sequence of length equal to the total number of mapped Res of the PUCCH resource is preferred.****Proposal 10：For a single sequence of length equal to the total number of mapped Res of the PUCCH resource, the cyclic shift should be adapted with the length of the sequence at least for PUCCH format 0/1.** |
| Intel | **Proposal 3: For PUCCH format 0 and 1, the sequence is generated by using a Type-1 low PAPR sequence of length equal to the number of subcarriers over which the PUCCH spans across.** |
| Lenovo/MoM | ***Proposal 2: For NR operation between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz, Rel 15 based long sequence should be considered for PUCCH formats 0/1 for mapping to multiple RBs.*** |
| CATT | Proposal 2 For enhanced PUCCH format 0/1 sequence, Alt1 (a single long sequence) is preferred to keep similar CM for sequences with different lengths.Proposal 4 If a single long sequence is used for PUCCH format 0/1, multiplexing users with misaligned RB allocations can be avoided by Gnb to ensure the detection performance. |
| ZTE | **Proposal 5: Regarding the PUCCH format 0/1 sequence type selection, Alt1 (a single long sequence) is preferred****Proposal 4: For PUCCH format 0/1/4, PRB misalignment issue can be left to Gnb implementation.** |
| NTT DOCOMO | ***Proposal 2:*** *According to the evaluation results of Cubic Metric, required SNR on sequence detection and the MIL performance with sequence designs of Alt-1 and Alt-2, Alt-1* *should be supported as the PUCCH format 0/1 base sequence design with multiple RBs.* |
| Nokia | ***Proposal 1:*** *Support Alt-1 sequence construction: a single sequence of length equal to the total number of mapped Res for PUCCH Format 0/1 resources.****Observation 3:*** *We do not see a need for supporting multiplexing of users with misaligned RB allocations with enhanced PUCCH formats 0/1.* |
| Sony | **Proposal 1: Since the MIL criterion alone cannot be used to down select between Alt-1 and Alt-2, consider UE multiplexing for down selection between Alt-1 and Alt-2.****Proposal 2. Given that in practice, Alt-1 and Alt-2 display the very similar performance in terms of MIL, support Alt-2 to enable efficient multiplexing of Ues with different configured values of** $N\_{RB}$**.**  |
| OPPO | **Proposal 3: Adopt long sequence for PUCCH format 0 and format 1 when N\_RB>1.**  |
| Qualcomm | **Proposal 1: Support Alt-2 for base sequence type when PUCCH format 0/1 occupies more than one RB.** |
| LGE | **Proposal #4: Considering better MIL performance and improved coverage of multi-PRB based initial PUCCH for the specific RB range (e.g., NRB around 12-16), support Alt-2 (a single sequence of length equal to the number of mapped Res per RB with the step size ∆ = 5 for the cycling of cyclic shifts across RBs) for the sequence type for enhanced PUCCH format 0/1 in 60 GHz.** |
| Apple | ***Proposal 4:*** *For enhanced PF0/1, a single Type-1 low PAPR sequence of length equal to the total number of mapped Res of the PUCCH resource is used. Cyclic shifts for PF0/1 are defined in the same way as Rel-16 for the case that useInterlacePUCCH-PUSCH is not configured.* |
| Samsung | **Proposal 3: Support Alt-2 (Rel-16 NR-U short sequence with repetition) for PUCCH format 0/1.**  |
| WILUS | * *Proposal 2: For low PAPR sequence for enhanced PUCCH format 0/1 (PF0/1), we support Alt-2 that a single sequence of length equal to the number of mapped Res per RB of the PUCCH resource is used, and the sequence is repeated in each RB with cycling of cyclic shifts across RBs in a similar way as for Rel-16 for PF0/1.*
 |
| Interdigital | ***Proposal 3:*** *It is preferred to support a single sequence of length equal to the total number of mapped Res of the PUCCH resource (Alt-1) for PUCCH format 0/1* |
| Spreadtrum | ***Proposal 4: For enhanced PF0/1, Alt -2 should be supported in order to reduce the impact of the specification.*** |
| MediaTek | Proposal 2: Alternative 1 should be adopted as the base sequence design for enhanced PUCCH format 0/1. |
| Ericsson | Proposal 3 In the agreement from RAN1#104-e on sequence construction for enhanced PF0/1, support Alt-1, i.e., reuse the Rel-15 rules to select base sequences based on Low-PAPR sequence Type-1 defined in 38.211 Section 5.2.2. Do not support repeated sequences with cyclic shift cycling (Alt-2). |

The following is a summary of support for the two alternatives:

* Alt-1: vivo, Intel, Lenovo(?), CATT, ZTE, NTT DOCOMO, Nokia, OPPO, Apple, Interdigital, MediaTek, Ericsson
* Alt-2: Sony, Qualcomm, LGE, Samsung, WILUS, Spreadtrum

Clearly, there a majority of companies support Alt-1; however, consensus cannot be declared yet. The following is a high level summary of company evaluations comparing Alt-1 vs. Alt-2.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Evaluation summary** |
| ZTE | * Alt-1 and Alt-2 have comparable MIL performance for 120 kHz
* Alt-1 has larger MIL for 480/960 kHz
	+ 1.5 Db gain for 3 RBs for 480 kHz
	+ 1 Db gain for 2 RBs for 960 kHz
 |
| Intel | * Alt-2 performance never exceeds Alt-1 for 120 kHz
* For large number of RBs, Alt-1 performance significantly outperforms Alt-2
 |
| DOCOMO | * Alt-1 vs. Alt-2 MIL comparison varies – hard to draw a conclusion
* Moderator question: For 1 RB, it seems as though Alt-1 and Alt-2 should have the same performance?
 |
| Nokia | * Alt-1 shows 0.3 – 0.9 Db gain in coverage vs. Alt-2 for small RB allocations
	+ 120 kHz: Gain in Europe
	+ 480/960 kHz: Gain in all regions
 |
| Ericsson | * 480kHz:
	+ US/SK: Alt-1 has 1.5 Db (US) larger MIL for 3 RBs; comparable MIL for 1,2 RBs
	+ Europe: Alt-1 has 0.8 – 1.3 Db (Europe) larger MIL for 2 and 3 RBs; comparable MIL for 1 RB
 |
| Sony | * Comparable MIL for Alt-1 and Alt-2 for 120 kHz SCS
* For 480 kHz, Figure 3 shows that one can achieve approximately 1.5 Db larger coverage with Alt-1 compared to Alt-2 (difference in P\_max between intersection point of solid green / dash-dot black line and intersection point of solid green / dashed red line)
 |
| Qualcomm | * 120 kHz: Comparable achievable power for Alt-1 and Alt-2
* 480 kHz: Alt-1 can achieve 1.5 Db higher power for 3 RBs (comparable power for 1,2 RBs)
* 960 kHz: Alt-1 can achieve 0.7 Db higher power for 2 RBs (comparable power for 1 RB)
* For 120 kHz, if UE\_EIRP is increased to 40 dBm (with 6 dBi TxBF), Alt-2 can achieve ~1 Db larger Tx power if the maximum # of RBs is increased to 14
 |

Observations based on contributions and reported evaluations:

* Spec complexity
	+ Both Alt-1 and Alt-2 can be seen as extensions of Rel-15 or 16, so no real difference in spec complexity
	+ Alt-1: Used for DMRS of PF3 in Rel-15/16
	+ Alt-2: Used for PF0/1 in Rel-16 when interlacing configured
* Detection performance (required SNR to achieve target error rate)
	+ No real difference between Alt-1 and Alt-2
* MIL performance / achievable transmit power
	+ 120 kHz SCS
		- Alt-1 has <1 Db gain vs. Alt-2 for small number of RBs in Europe
		- Alt-1 and Alt-2 have comparable performance in US/SK for up to 12 RBs
	+ 480 kHz SCS
		- For 3 RBs in US/SK: Alt-1 has 1.5 Db gain vs. Alt-2
		- For 2 or 3 RBs in Europe: Alt-1 has ~1 Db gain vs. Alt-2
		- For 2 RBs in US/SK: Comparable performance between Alt-1 and Alt-2
	+ 960 kHz SCS
		- 2 RBs
		- 1 RB: Comparable performance
	+ If UE\_EIRP is increased to 40 dBm
		- For 120 kHz in US/SK: Alt-2 has ~1 Db gain vs. Alt-1 for 14 RBs
* User multiplexing
	+ Some companies observe that Alt-2 offers better opportunities for multiplexing users with misaligned RB allocations, where “misaligned” also includes users with different number of RBs.
	+ Other companies refer to the above agreement from RAN1#104bisi-e that user-multiplexing has lower priority as a design criterion compared to MIL

In summary, the decision point on Alt-1 vs. Alt-2 basically comes down to coverage vs. user multiplexing:

* Alt-1:
	+ Improved coverage vs. Alt-2 for 480/960 kHz SCS in all regions
	+ Comparable coverage vs. Alt-2 for 120 kHz SCS in all regions
* Alt-2:
	+ Improved user multiplexing possibility vs. Alt-1
	+ If UE\_EIRP increased to 40 dBm and max(N\_RB) is extended
		- Improved coverage vs. Alt-1 for 120 kHz SCS in US/SK for 12 .. 14 RBs
		- Degraded coverage vs. Alt-1 for 480/960 kHz in all regions

**Proposal 3 For enahanced PF 0/1 for 120 kHz, downselect to one of Alt-1 and Alt-2. The decision should be based on consideration of coverage vs. user multiplexing.**

## 3.1 <1st Round Comments>

Please provide your company view Proposal 3.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View/Position** |
| Intel | We support Alt-1, but we are OK to wait until we conclude that the max{NRB} needed is larger than 16. For larger NRB, Alt-2 is substantially impacted in terms of CM, and except for some limited cases, the loss compared to Alt-1 is constantly larger than 1/2 Db, and increases as the number of PRBs increases. |
| LG | It is important that the multi-PRB (i.e., NRB larger than 1) based PUCCH should be supported for the initial PUCCH resource considering the coverage of PUCCH format 0/1. Moreover, at least for 120 kHz SCS, the PAPR/CM performance of Alt-2 for the specific RB range (e.g., NRB around 12-16) is better than that of Alt-1. In this regard, we prefer to support Alt-2. However, if it is hard to downselect to one of Alt-1 and Alt-2, it may also be considered to configure both sequences and use one of sequence types according to the number of RB or the PUCCH resources. |
| OPPO | Support Alt-1. User multiplexing with misaligned RB allocations can be solved by sub-PRB interlaced mapping. Taking the following figure as an example, assuming the configured number of RBs is 12 and 24 for UE1 and UE2 respectively, and Alt-1 is adopted for sequence construction. Thus, user multiplexing with misaligned RB allocations can be realized by FDM multiplexing for RE interlaced mapping. |
| Nokia, NSB | We support down-selecting to one alternative, and prefer Alt-1 due to better coverage with limited number of RBs. |
| Futurewei | We prefer Alt 1. MIL is more important than UE mutliplexing. Regarding CM, it is better to wait ot he RAN4’s decision on the maximal RB to determine which ot he two alternatives have better CM ot he majority of RB values.  |
| Vivo | It seems our evaluation results/observations on the sequence Alt-1 vs. Alt-2 were not captured in the evaluation summary table above. To summarize our evalution results, we observed MIL gain of Alt-1 over Alt-2 for single UE. When multiplexing UE is considered, Alt-1 is still better than Alt-2 for aligned RB allocation; no clear gain of Alt-2 for misaligned RB allocation for either continuous PRB or sub-PRB RE mapping. Furthermore, Alt-1 maintains better CM performance for most of RB allocation number.On the UE multiplexing capacity, our understanding is that the maximum supported number of multiplexing users of Alt-1 is more than that of Alt-2. It is not clear to us Alt-2 has improved user multiplexing possibility vs. Alt-1 as claimed by the proponent.  |
| Apple | We support Alt. 1 especially given the agreement in the last meeting that says “User-multiplexing can be considered but as lower priority compared to maximum isotropic loss for PUCCH as a design criterion”.Note that from our results, in a 10 nsecs delay channel we find the following:* Alt-1 and Alt-2 have comparable MIL performance for 120 kHz
* Alt-1 has larger MIL for 480/960 kHz
	+ 2.18 Db gain for 3 RBs for 480 kHz
	+ 2.02 Db gain for 2 RBs for 960 kHz
 |
| Lenovo, Motoroloa Mobility | Our presference is Alt 1 due to the slight gain in the MIL comparing to Alt 2. Although, we understand from the previous agreement to strive to select one option but if a conclusion on the importance of UE multiplexing vs coverage could not be made, we still think that supporting both alternatives or a combination between them might be a good solution to achive better system flexibility in different scenarios, for example, Ues at the cell edge in one hand, and high cell load scenario in the other hand  |
| Qualcomm | From coverage point of view, 120kHz SCS makes more sense than higher SCS. Based on results from several companies, with 120kHz SCS, Alt-2 has similar MIL for 1-12 RBs, better MIL performance for 12 to 16RBs. So we support Alt-2 and we like to wait until a final Max(N\_RB) is decided upon RAN4’s feedback |
| InterDigital | As we provided in our contribution, we support Alt-1.  |
| Samsung  | We’d like to wait RAN4’s response for maximum power and progress in initial access agenda for SCS (whether SCS in addtion to 120KHz is supported), because Alt-2 has better CM from 10~17 PRBs, which ot he PRB range for 120KHz SCS. |
| NTT DOCOMO | To answer the question from Moderator, the difference between Alt-1 and Alt-2 for N\_RB=1 in our contribution might stem from the less number of samples. Even for N\_RB=1 where Alt 1 and Alt 2 generate the very same sequence, we have calibrated false alarm rates separately. For proposal 3, we are not sure the intention of the first sentence. Why is PF 4 included although we have already agreed on the sequence for PF4? Why is SCS limited to 120 kHz? We are also unsure what is the result by having the second sentence.  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We support Alt-1. From the observation of the simulation results, it’s clear that when the PRB number is small, such that for 480kHz/960kHz with 3/2 PRBs, Alt-1 has performance gain over Alt-2. And for 120kHz with maximum 12 PRBs, Alt-1 has comparable performance vs Alt-2. Some companies mention that we should wait for RAN4’s reply on PRB number, but with larger maximum PRB number, Alt 1 will have performance gain even for 120kHz, so there is no reason to defer this discussion. |
| Spreadtrum | According to the simulation results, Alt-1 has better CM performance in the range of 2-8 RB, and poorer CM performance in the range of 10-22 RB. Considering that coverage is important for initial UL BWP, we prefer Alt 2. |
| WILUS | We support Alt-2 which has comparable MIL performance under 12RBs allocation for 120kHz SCS and has better PAPR/CM, MIL performance for 12 to 16RBs. So we’d like to wait until we can conclude the maximum # of PRBs depending on RAN4’s feedback. |
| Huawei | The intention of the proposal is fine but it does not seem necessary to make Proposal 3 as an intermediate agreement. We can see merits of both alternatives, however, we would not find it reasonable that both are supported, only one alternative should be chosen. |
| Sony | We support Alt-2 due to better MIL performance in the 12-16 RBs range for SCS 120 KHz, which seems most critical from a coverage point of view. Furthermore, Alt-2 has MIL performance comparable to Alt-1 in other settings. If companies cannot agree on down-selecting one alternative, we can consider supporting both alternatives. It is clear from the discussion that no alternative is uniformly superior; which one of Alt-1 and Alt-2 that performs best depends on the scenario considered. |
| CATT | We prefer Alt 1. As has been agreed before,coverage is more important than UE mutliplexing.   |

## 3.2 <Summary of 1st Round>

There remains split support on Alt-1 vs. Alt-2, and there are several comments saying we should wait until RAN4 has provided feedback on the LS we sent in RAN1#104bis-e. Once feedback on UE\_P and UE\_EIRP is received and RAN1 can make a decision on the maximum number of RBs, then we will be in a better position to make a decision on Alt-1 vs. Alt-2. Some companies have suggested that both are supported; others have suggested that only one alternative is adopted.

@NTT DOCOMO I apologize, Proposal 3 should say PF0/1 (not PF0/1/4) since the sequence construction has already been agreed for PF4. I modified Proposal 3 to remove PF4.

**FL Recommendation**

Wait for RAN4 feedback on the LS sent in RAN1#104bis-e before deciding Alt-1 vs. Alt-2.

# 4 Rate matching for enhanced PF4

The following agreement was made in RAN1#104-e, and the moderator draws attention to the highlighted bullet

Agreement:

* The configured number of RBs for enhanced PF 0/1/4 is denoted NRB
	+ The minimum value of NRB is 1 for PF 0/1/4 for all subcarrier spacings
	+ The maximum value of NRB depends on subcarrier spacing
		- FFS: maximum value for each SCS and each of PF0/1/4
	+ FFS: Allowed values of NRB within the [min/max] range
	+ FFS: Details of indication of NRB by cell-specific (for PF0/1) and dedicated signaling (PF0/1/4)
	+ FFS: Whether or not multiplexing of users with misaligned RB allocations is supported, where “misaligned” also includes users with different # of RBs.
	+ For PF4:
		- The actual number of RBs used for a PUCCH transmission is equal to NRB, i.e., the actual number of RBs does not vary dynamically based on PUCCH payload
		- NRB fulfils the following: $N=2^{α\_{2}}∙3^{α\_{3}}∙5^{α\_{5}}$ where $α\_{2},α\_{3},α\_{5}$ is a set of non-negative integers
* Note: if frequency hopping is enabled, NRB is the number of RBs per hop

Note: decisions on the maximum value of NRB for each SCS and PUCCH format shall take into account link budgets

Given that the number of RBs does not vary dynamically based on PUCCH payload, it means that for a configured value of N\_RB, the effective code rate varies as a function of the payload.

The following table provides a summary of company proposals on this topic.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Company Proposals** |
| Huawei | ***Proposal 5: For PUCCH format 4, the following rate matching options can be considered:**** ***Alt-1: Rate matching to N PRBs, without changing UCI limitation***
* ***Alt-2: Copy UCI on each configured PRB and keep the legacy rate matching to 1 RB, without changing UCI limitation***
* ***Alt-3: Repeat UCI serval times and rate matching to N PRBs, without changing UCI limitation***
* ***Alt-4: Rate matching to N PRBs and remove UCI payload limitation***
 |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

This is a new topic that has not yet been discussed, and companies are invited to provide their views on this issue.

**FL Recommendation Further discuss rate matching for enhanced (multi-RB) PF4 under the constraint that the actual number of RBs does not vary dynamically based on PUCCH payload (as agreed in RAN1#104-e).**

## 4.1 <1st Round Comments>

Please provide your company view according to the above FL recommendation

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View/Position** |
| Intel | Alt-4 is preferred, but we are fine to discuss this topic further to have a better assessment of the pro and cons.  |
| Nokia, NSB | Further discussion on the topic is needed, but our initial view ot h prefer Alt-4. |
| Futurewei | We prefer Alt-4. Further study for detailed comparison between the alternatives is beneficial.  |
| Vivo | OK to FFS.  |
| Apple | Fine with an FFS |
| Lenovo, Motoroloa Mobility | We are fine to discuss this further |
| Qualcomm | Fine with FFS |
| InterDigtial | We are fine with the proposal.  |
| Samsung | Fine for further discussion. We’d like to share some initial views/questions as below. It seems there are two issues, * Issue 1: Whether remove UCI payload restriction.
* Issue 2: How to perform rate matching, Alt 1&4 uses exising rate matching mechanism (rate matching around N PRBs, same as Rel-15 PUCCH format 3/Rel-16 enhanced format 3), while Alt 2&3 are new mechanism (repetition).

We’d like to ot hederstand the relation between Issue 1 and Issue 2, i.e. why new rate matching mechanism would outperform existing rate matching mechanism when there is a payload restiction, while new rate matching mechanism is not beneficial if we remove payload restriction ? In our understanding, even without the payload restriction, it is still possible that the UCI payload for a PUCCH transmission ot he, e.g. just 3 bits, then, resources for PUCCH format 4 would be still ‘too much‘, the code rate would be very low. In this case, we expect similar performance for repetition and rate matching. So, we fail to see the motivation for new mechanisms based on repetition. In Rel-16 NR-U enhanced PF3 based on interlace, it is possible that the code rate is also very low for small UCI payload, because the minimum PRB can not be scaled down ot h less than one interlace. We agreed to perform rate matching over all PRBs rather than repetition. The same mechanism can be reused for Rel-17.  |
| NTT DOCOMO | We think the alternatives above should be discussed further e.g., ot he performance, specification impact and/or implementation perspective. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Fine with the FFS. |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine to further discuss this issue. |
| Huawei | As listed above, we think at least those alternatives could be a basis for further discussion. We also noted that in 38.214, it is stated that the UE is not expected to report CSI with a total number of UCI bits and CRC bits larger than 115 bits when configured with PUCCH format 4. |
| Sony | We are okay with the FL´s proposal. |
| LG | We prefer Alt-4 because the benefits of Alt-2 and Alt-3 are not identified over Alt-1 and Alt-4 which are already supported in Rel-15/16. However, let’s discuss further considering various aspects such as specification impact and implementation perspective. |

## 4.2 <Summary of 1st Round>

There is consensus that this topic needs further discussion. Some companies have commented on the 4 alternatives listed by Huawei, and there seems to be a preference leaning to Alt-1 or Alt-4. Some companies have questioned why a new rate matching scheme based on some form of repetition would be needed (i.e., Alt-2/3), since with existing rate matching, if the code rate is low enough, there the performance compared to repetition is similar.

To make sure we’re all on the same page, the moderator re-iterates the following agreement from RAN1#104e:

Agreement:

* The configured number of RBs for enhanced PF 0/1/4 is denoted NRB
	+ The minimum value of NRB is 1 for PF 0/1/4 for all subcarrier spacings
	+ The maximum value of NRB depends on subcarrier spacing
		- FFS: maximum value for each SCS and each of PF0/1/4
	+ FFS: Allowed values of NRB within the [min/max] range
	+ FFS: Details of indication of NRB by cell-specific (for PF0/1) and dedicated signaling (PF0/1/4)
	+ FFS: Whether or not multiplexing of users with misaligned RB allocations is supported, where “misaligned” also includes users with different # of RBs.
	+ For PF4:
		- The actual number of RBs used for a PUCCH transmission is equal to NRB, i.e., the actual number of RBs does not vary dynamically based on PUCCH payload
		- NRB fulfils the following: $N=2^{α\_{2}}∙3^{α\_{3}}∙5^{α\_{5}}$ where $α\_{2},α\_{3},α\_{5}$ is a set of non-negative integers
* Note: if frequency hopping is enabled, NRB is the number of RBs per hop

Note: decisions on the maximum value of NRB for each SCS and PUCCH format shall take into account link budgets

The highlighted part of the agreement says that N\_RB is a configured value (doesn’t change dynamically). Consequently, for a given PUCCH payload, the code rate needs to be adjusted based on the configured value of N\_RB. Larger N\_RB 🡺 lower code rate.

## 4.3 <2nd Round Comments>

Q1: Which of the following alternatives do you prefer?

* Alt-1a: Support same restriction (upper limit) on the UCI payload as in Rel-15/16 PF4
* Alt-1b: Support different restriction (upper limit). Please elaborate on the details.

Q2: Which of the following alternatives do you prefer?

* Alt-2a: Rate matching to the configured number of RBs N\_RB (similar to Rel-16 rate matching to the fixed number of RBs N = 10/11 of an interlace for PF3)
* Alt-2b: New rate matching mechanism, e.g., some form of repetition. Please elaborate on details.

Please provide feedback on at least the above questions:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View/Position** |
| Moderator View | Q1: Alt-1a since the goal of PF4 enhancement is to increase coverage for existing UCI data ratesQ2: Alt-2a since repetition doesn’t offer a performance advantage |
| Intel | Q1: Alt-1b: given that the number of PRBs over which the PUCCH spans is larger we do not need to restrict the payload to 115 bits, but a larger number of bits could be supported using the same code rate.Q2.Alt 2a – same view as moderator. |
| LG | Q1: Prefer Alt-1b.Q2: Prefer Alt-2a as the same view with Moderator. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Q1: We support Alt-1a. Whether transmitting larger payload size UCI such as more than 115 bits CSI by using PF4 is necessary or not is not clear for us and we think PF3 can be used for such UCI transmission.Q2: If larger number of RBs such as 30 is supported, the coding rate can be too low compared ot he single-PRB allocation. If there would be any concern from chip/UE implementation perspective with such low coding rate, Alt-2b can be supported. Otherwise, we support Alt-2a as moderator mentioned.  |
| OPPO | Q1: agree with moderator viewQ2: need further study |
| Samsung  | Q1: We are open to further discuss Alt-1a vs 1b. Slightly prefer Alt 1a. On one hand, we agree that keep same upper limit is benefical for coverage. On the other hand, by using multiple number of PRBs, there can be addtinal gain, e.g. channel frequency diverisity gain. So, a larger number of bits would be beneficial. Q2: We prefer Alt-2a. We don’t see clear benefit.  |
|  Nokia, NSB | Q1: We support Alt-1b. We see that larger UCI payloads can be supported as the number of Res may be increased an order of magnitude.Q2: We support Alt-2a. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Q1:We prefer Alt-1a. Because it’s beneficial for coverage.Q2:We prefer Alt-2a. We don’t see the benefit. |
| Huawei | Q1: We slightly prefer Alt-1b. Current UCI payload upper limit is obtained with 1 RB and max code rate on PUCCH. This restriction may not need to apply anymore.Q2: We prefer to consider Alt-2b further. Repetition of coded bits from 1 PRB to N PRBs would enable reusing current rate matching to 1 PRB. The trade-off between performance and specification impact should be studied. |
| Qualcomm | we share the same view as moderator. For Q1, we supprot Alt-1a; For Q2, We support Alt-2a |
| Futurewei | Q1: Alt-1a for now as the maximum RB is not determined, it is unsure whether the extended RBs are able to maintain the MIL performance if the upper limit of payload is extended. Additional simulation results on this very large payload would be beneficial to determine whether to remove the payload size upper load, or to impose a new and larger limit based on the potential observations.Q2: Alt-2a for now and suggest FFS Alt-2b.  |
| vivo | Q1: Alt-1b, we agree with Intel.Q2: Alt-2a, we agree with Moderator. |
| Apple | Q1: We support Alt-1a. Q2: We prefer Alt-2a |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Q1: We slightly prefer Alt-1b to remove the restriction of UCI payload upper limit. However, the coverage degradation due to the large payload needs to be studied Q2: We prefer Alt-2a  |

# 5 PUCCH Resource Sets Prior to RRC Configuration

The following table provides a summary of company proposals on this topic.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Company Proposals** |
| vivo | **Proposal 6: The indication of NRB for common PUCCH format 0/1 can be configured in the predefined table of PUCCH resource sets before dedicated PUCCH resource configuration or configured by SIB1.****Proposal 7: The PUCCH frequency resource and the first PRB index are dependent on the NRB.****Proposal 8: The sub-PRB interlace RE mapping pattern candidates should be configured by SIB1 and then dynamically indicated to UE by DCI format.****Proposal 11: The additional SLIV or OCC should be included in the PUCCH resource sets before dedicated PUCCH resource configuration.** |
| Intel | **Proposal 5: Enhance PUCCH resource sets before dedicated PUCCH resource configuration to support sufficient resource partitioning via either additional starting symbols or orthogonal cover codes.** |
| ZTE | **Proposal 6: The similar solution in NR-U in rel-16 can be considered for Rel-17 PUCCH enhancement before RRC connected, and the resource unit could be RBG or RB set.** |
| Lenovo/MoM | ***Proposal 5: For NR operation between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz, if both RB configuration options including long sequence/DFT and repetition are agreed to be supported for PUCCH formats 0/1/4, number of RBs and RB configuration/mapping type needs to be added to the PUCCH* *resource sets before dedicated PUCCH resource configuration*** |
| CATT | **Proposal 6 The number of RBs for PUCCH format0/1/4 can be cell specific or UE specific RRC configured.****Proposal 8 The gNB needs to indicate the UE with the configured number of RBs for PUCCH format0/1/4 during the initial access process.**Option 1: As part of table 9.2.1-1Option 2: Directly by SIB1 |
| NTT DOCOMO | ***Proposal 5:*** *For the PUCCH resource sets before dedicated PUCCH resource configuration,* the *number of RBs for PUCCH format 0/1 can be indicated by using a PUCCH resource sets table for the 60 GHz unlicensed band operation or SIB1.****Proposal 6:*** *More than one PRB should be supported even for PUCCH resource sets before dedicated PUCCH resource configuration considering the coverage during the initial access.****Proposal 7:*** *At least PRB offset values in PUCCH resource sets before dedicated PUCCH resource table should be enhanced based on the number of RBs for the PUCCH resource sets.****Proposal 8:*** *The potential shortage of PUCCH resource sets before dedicated should be discussed depending on the specified number of RBs for the PUCCH resource sets.* |
| Nokia | ***Proposal 4:*** *Some of the common PUCCH resource sets prior to dedicated configuration are modified with respect to RB allocation, first symbol, PRB offset, and PUCCH format 1 OCC codes, depending on the BWP SCS value.*  |
| Qualcomm | **Proposal 3: RAN1 should re-design common PUCCH resource set to support both legacy and wide-band PUCCH.****Proposal 4: RAN1 should study how to indicate UE's capability of supporting wide-band PUCCH during initial access.** |
| LGE | **Proposal #5: A number of RBs greater than 1 should be supported even for the initial PUCCH resource and the PRB offset value also needs to be scaled by NRB** **Proposal #6: To determine the value of NRB for the initial PUCCH resource, the following options can be considered:*** **Opt.1: Directly use the predefined maximum value of NRB for PF 0/1 in the specification.**
* **Opt.2: Use the value of NRB configured through RRC signalling (e.g., SIB1) by gNB.**
* **Opt.3: Calculate the value of NRB based on the size of the initial BWP and the required number of FDM resources for each PUCCH resource set.**

**Proposal #7: To address the potential shortage of PUCCH resources for the initial PUCCH resource set resulting from using multi-PRB to transmit PUCCH formats 0 and 1, consider the following alternatives:** * **Alt. 1: Use only valid resources in the frequency domain**
* **Alt. 2: Support additional starting symbol and OCC index**

**Proposal #8: Considering the available number of RBs in the initial BWP and more than 1 RB allocated for an initial PUCCH resource, discuss how to configure the hopping distance to obtain hopping gain equally for each initial PUCCH resource.** |
| Huawei | ***Proposal 4: The enhanced PUCCH formats 0/1 are applicable both with common and dedicated PUCCH resource. The enhanced PUCCH format 4 is applicable only with dedicated PUCCH resource.*** |
| Apple | ***Proposal 6:*** *For PUCCH Resource Sets prior to RRC configuration the UE should use the value of NRB configured through SIB1.* |
| Ericsson | **Proposal 5 For PUCCH resource sets prior to RRC configuration, support 120 kHz SCS only****Proposal 6 For PUCCH resource sets prior to RRC configuration, support indication via SIB1 of the number of RBs, NRB, for PUCCH format 0/1. If the number of RBs is not indicated, the UE assumes single RB. FFS: supported value(s) of NRB.****Proposal 7 For PUCCH resource sets prior to RRC configuration, RAN1 should discuss whether or not to design the hopping pattern for multi-RB PF0/1 so as to equalize the hopping distance (and thus frequency diversity) amongst all PUCCH resources within a set. The discussion should considering whether or not potential resource fragmentation is an issue.****Proposal 8 Assuming that the number of RBs is configurable in SIB1, RAN1 should use the Rel-15 PUCCH configuration table 9.2.1-1 as a starting point for discussion on configuration of PUCCH resource sets prior to RRC configuration in combination with an updated procedure on the starting RB indices of the multi-RB PUCCH resources in a set. It can be further discussed whether/how to enable additional PUCCH resources on top, with the constraint of no more than 16 per set.** |

Several issues have been raised in company contributions:

* Number of RBs
	+ Some companies propose to support configuration of the number of RBs via SIB1
	+ Other companies propose hardwiring the number of RBs in the table used to configure PUCCH resource sets prior to RRC configuration (see Rel-15/16 table in 38.213 Section 9.2.1 copied here for convenience):

**Table 9.2.1-1: PUCCH resource sets before dedicated PUCCH resource configuration**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Index** | **PUCCH format** | **First symbol** | **Number of symbols** | **PRB offset**  | **Set of initial CS indexes** |
| 0 | 0 | 12 | 2 | 0 | {0, 3} |
| 1 | 0 | 12 | 2 | 0 | {0, 4, 8} |
| 2 | 0 | 12 | 2 | 3 | {0, 4, 8} |
| 3 | 1 | 10 | 4 | 0 | {0, 6} |
| 4 | 1 | 10 | 4 | 0 | {0, 3, 6, 9} |
| 5 | 1 | 10 | 4 | 2 | {0, 3, 6, 9} |
| 6 | 1 | 10 | 4 | 4 | {0, 3, 6, 9} |
| 7 | 1 | 4 | 10 | 0 | {0, 6} |
| 8 | 1 | 4 | 10 | 0 | {0, 3, 6, 9} |
| 9 | 1 | 4 | 10 | 2 | {0, 3, 6, 9} |
| 10 | 1 | 4 | 10 | 4 | {0, 3, 6, 9} |
| 11 | 1 | 0 | 14 | 0 | {0, 6} |
| 12 | 1 | 0 | 14 | 0 | {0, 3, 6, 9} |
| 13 | 1 | 0 | 14 | 2 | {0, 3, 6, 9} |
| 14 | 1 | 0 | 14 | 4 | {0, 3, 6, 9} |
| 15 | 1 | 0 | 14 |  | {0, 3, 6, 9} |

* Subcarrier spacing
	+ It is not clear from all contributions what SCS(s) companies have in mind for PUCCH resource sets prior to RRC configuration. It is the moderator's understanding that these PUCCH resources are used only during initial access, e.g., for HARQ ACK of Msg4. Hence, the subcarrier spacing is the one configured for the initial UL BWP by SIB1.
	+ It seems there is a dependency on the initial access agenda item to have clarification on which SCS(s) are supported for the initial UL BWP
* RB indexing
	+ Several companies observe that updates to the formulas in 38.213 Section 9.2.1 for the RB index of the first and second hop need to be updated to account for PUCCH resources with multiple RBs
	+ It would make sense to define the lowest PRB index of a PUCCH resource such that this index along with the configured/specified value of N\_RB is sufficient for defining the PUCCH resource location within the BWP
* Frequency hopping distance
	+ For Rel-15/16, the formulas in 38.213 Section 9.2.1 for the RB indexes of the first and 2nd hop do not attempt to equalize the hopping distance for all 16 PUCCH resources in a set since a PUCCH resource consists of only a single RB per hop, and the PUCCH resource in each hop is located close to the edge of the BWP. For a large enough initial UL BWP, the achieved frequency diversity is roughly similar for all resources in the set.
	+ For enhanced (multi-RB) PUCCH depending on the BWP size and N\_RB, it can happen that the hopping distance can be quite small for some resources in the set. The question is should the hopping formulas be adjusted to achieve equal hopping distance for all resources in a set?
		- The following diagram from [6] illustrates an example when the hopping distance is equalized for all resources (using row 4 from Table 9.2.1 as an example). For non-equalized hopping distance, the same diagram applies, except for the 2nd hop, the red/green colors should be swapped and the blue/yellow colors should be swapped.



Figure 9: Example PUCCH resource configuration corresponding to row 4 of Table 9.2.1-1 extended to support enhanced (multi-RB) PUCCH Format 0/1, i.e., NRB > 1. Equal hopping distance for all resources is assumed.

* Shortage of RBs
	+ Depending on the size of the initial UL BWP, the number of RBs of a PUCCH resource (N\_RB), and the parameters in a given row of Table 9.2.1 (particularly the PRB offset) it can happen that there is a shortage of RBs that complicates defining 16 PUCCH resources in a set
	+ Several companies have suggested solutions for this problem, e.g.,
		- Allow gNB to configure an appropriate value of N\_RB to ensure there is no shortage for the desired row index.
		- UE calculates N\_RB based on the size of the initial BWP and the required number of FDM resources for each PUCCH resource set (row of the configuration table) to ensure there is no shortage
		- Specify additional OCCs and/or SLIVs for some rows of the table to allow a full set of 16 resources to be constructed
		- Disallow large PRB offsets in the table when multiple RBs are configured
		- Restrict allowed values of the PUCCH resource index r\_PUCCH so that for some rows of the configuration table a full set of 16 resources is not constructed
		- Combination of the above

Since this is a new topic, a number of questions are posed in the following sub-sections to try to structure the discussion.

## 5.1 Indication of Number of RBs

The indication of the number of RBs for PUCCH resource sets prior to RRC configuration is the first decision that should be made, since it will unlock progress on the overall design.

### 5.1.1 <1st Round Comments>

**Question**: How should the number of RBs be configured for PUCCH resource sets prior to RRC configuration, e.g.,

* **Alt-1**: Via a new parameter in SIB1
* **Alt-2**: Hardwired by specification
	+ Alt-2a: Single value applicable to all rows of PUCCH configuration table
	+ Alt-2b: Different value depending on row of the PUCCH configuration table
* **Alt-3**: Calculated by UE and gNB based on size of initial BWP and required number of RBs for a given row of the PUCCH resource set configuration table

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View/Position** |
| Moderator view | Alt-1 for most flexibility considering differing requirements for N\_RB in various regulatory regions and deployment scenarios. If parameter is not configured, the UE assumes N\_RB = 1 (legacy PUCCH). |
| Intel  | We share same view as the feature lead, and we prefer Alt-1. |
| LG | We prefer Alt-1 and Alt-3, but we are fine to further discuss this topic considering all alternatives. |
| OPPO | Support Alt-2. |
| Nokia, NSB | Support Alt-2b. We see that it can provide sufficient flexibility and there is no need to introduce new SIB1 parameter. |
| Futurewei | Support Alt-1 that SIB1 is used to configure the number of RBs for PUCCH prior to RRC. The PUCCH configuration table may need non-trivial modification effort to accomodate the multi-RB configuration.  |
| vivo | Our slight preference is Alt-1 and Alt-2b. |
| Apple | We prefer Alt-1 |
| Lenovo, Motoroloa Mobility | Support Alt 1, fine with Alt 2b more flexibility |
| Qualcomm | We support Alt-1 |
| Samsung | We’d like to hear companies view on, whether we consider UE-specific design for PRB number determination prior to RRC configuration, e.g. different UE type with different maximum transmission power thus different number of PRBs, and also different UEs in different geometry which require different SINR thus different number of PRBs ? If the answer is no, i.e. UE-specific PRB number is not supported, the resurce efficiency would be degraded, but it can work, e.g. gNB always configure the PRB number for the worst case. Then, cell-specific signaling would be sufficient. Considering flexibility, e.g. for different region and deployment, we prefer Alt-1. If the answer is yes, then, maybe other UE-specifi signaling is needed, e.g. different number of PRBs for different PUCCH resource within a same row, or, indication of number of PRBs in DCI scheduing Msg 4 PDSCH.  |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support Alt-1 considering that the required number of RB can be different depending on regions and it should be configured flexilbly.  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We prefer Alt-1 due to the better configuration flexibility. |
| Spreadtrum | We support Alt-1 for flexibility and simplicity. |
| WILUS | We slightly prefer Alt-1. But we are open to further discuss these alternatives. |
| CATT | Support Alt-2b for the trade of flexibility it provided vs the specification impact. |

### 5.1.2 <Summary of 1st Round>

The following is a summary of company views on the alternatives:

* Alt-1
	+ Intel, LG, Futurewei, vivo, Apple, Lenovo, Qualcomm, Samsung (question on UE specific), NTT DOCOMO, ZTE, WILUS, Ericsson
* Alt-2a
	+ OPPO (not clear if Alt 2a or 2b),
* Alt-2b
	+ OPPO (not clear if Alt 2a or 2b), vivo, Lenovo, Nokia, CATT
* Alt-3
	+ LG (in combination with Alt-1?)

Clearly, there is the strongest support for Alt-1 (12 companies). Of the 12, two companies also support Alt-2b. Of the 12, one company also supports Alt-3. 3 companies list Alt-2b as only preference.

Based on the above summary the moderator makes two alternative proposal to be discussed further (we need to select one of these).

**Proposal 4 Agree to the following**

* For a PUCCH resource set prior to RRC configuration, support configuration of the number of RBs, N\_RB, via SIB1.
* FFS: Supported values of N\_RB

**Proposal 5 Agree to the following**

* For a PUCCH resource set prior to RRC configuration, down-select to one of the following alternatives on the number of RBs, N\_RB:
	+ Alt-1: N\_RB is configured via SIB
	+ Alt-2: N\_RB is hardwired by specification, and is potentially different for different rows of the PUCCH configuration table
* FFS: Supported values of N\_RB

### 5.1.3 <2nd Round Comments>

Please provide your company view on the following two questions:

* Q1: Do you support Proposal 4 or 5?
	+ Can companies who previously supported Alt-2b (OPPO, Nokia, CATT) compromise and support Proposal 4 instead of Proposal 5 to make progress? It seems that this could simplify design of the PUCCH configuration table.
* Q2: What is your view on the question raised by Samsung in the 1st round (see table in Section 5.1.1)?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View/Position** |
| Intel | Q1: At this point we would be OK to support proposal 5, and discuss further the two alternatives.Q2: Prior to RRC configuration, we feel that cell-speciifc indication would be sufficient, and UE-specifc signalling may not be needed. However, this may really depends on the conclusion on the 2.1 discussion and whether capability signalling may be required by the UE.  |
| LG | Q1: We are fine with the Proposal 5. Q2: We share the similar view with Intel and we are open to discuss the UE-specific signaling and can be dependent on UE capability related discussion in Section 2.1. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Q1: We support Proposal 4.Q2: We think the number of RB can be decided depending on the regulatory by region and the cell specific indication via SIB1 would be sufficient, but this discussion may depend on how much the required number of RBs to achieve the maximum transmission power varies by UE power class, so it can be discussed after the LS reply from RAN4. |
| OPPO | Q1: we don't support proposal 4. We think for the initial access without the knowledge of UE capability, we don’t need that much of configuration flexibility. Otherwise, all the parameters in the hardcoded table should be revisited for the same purpose of flexibility. Q2: no need UE-specific indication, which reverts the R15 design principle.  |
| Samsung  | Q2: Support of UE-specific number of PRBs does not revert Rel-15 design principle. In Rel-15, though the PUCCH resource set is cell-specific, but gNB can indicate different PUCCH resource for different UEs, by PRI, and by different CCE index. In Rel-17, if we allow different PUCCH resource configured with different number of PRBs, e.g. if npucch <8, it is PRB number 1, otherwise, it is PRB number 2. Then, gNB can allocate different PRBs for different UEs by indicating different PRB. We don’t think it reverts Rel-15/16 design. On the contrary, we think it is quite similar to Rel-16 NR-U design.  |
| Nokia, NSB | Q1: We prefer proposal 5 to discuss the alternatives further..Q2: We see that cell-specific indication would be enough. It should be noted that cell-specific indication was seen sufficient also in Rel15, although UEs in different geometry could have used PUCCHs with different number of symbols. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Q1: We support proposal 4.Q2: For this question, we think cell-specific indication would be sufficient. |
| Qualcomm  | We support Proposal 4, as we think signalling in SIB1 offers more flexibility for different use scenarios compared to being hardcoded in specification.With regard to Samsung’s question, We think it would be beneficial that different UE may support/use different number of RBs within common PUCCH resource. We think this may be beneficial for following reasons: 1) different class of UE with different power limits; 2) if a UE is close to gNB, why should UE use more RBs; 3) this may be related to the topic of “ handling potential RB shortage”, out of 16 resource set, if some of them use fewer number of RBs, this may help to mitigate the RB shortage issue.So we propose FFS on the issue Samsung brought up. |
| Futurewei | Q1: We are fine with proposal 5 at this point. Q2: We also support further study on UE-specific signaling, which may be added as an FFS.  |
| vivo | We support proposal 4. We’re also okay with proposal 5.In regard to Samsung’s opinion on whether the PRB indication is UE-specific or not, we think it can be FFS. |
| Apple | Q1: We support proposal 4.Q2: We think this should be FFS |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Q1: We support proposal 5 and discuss further the two alternatives.Q2: Regarding Samsung’s question, we agree with Qualcomm’s proposal to further study the UE specific signaling for the purpose of efficient resource utilization since different power classes and different UE geometry conditions lead to different required number of RBs.  |

## 5.2 Subcarrier Spacing

### 5.2.1 <1st Round Comments>

**Question**: What is your view on the SCS(s) supported for PUCCH resource sets prior to RRC configuration, i.e., during initial access?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View/Position** |
| Modertor view | There is a dependency on decisions in the initial access agenda item. |
| Intel | We share the same view as the moderator and perhaps this could be postponed at a later time. |
| LG | Base on the agreements so far, only 120 kHz SCS is supported for the initial access. |
| OPPO | This can be discussed later when initial access discusison outcome beomes clear. |
| Nokia, NSB | We see also the dependency on the decisions made for initial access and that this topic can progress only after the relevant decisions on initial access subcarrier spacing(s) have been reached.  |
| Futurewei | Agree that there is a dependency on decisions in the initial access agenda item regarding this question.  |
| Apple | Should be de-prioritized till the initail access decisions are made |
| Lenovo, Motoroloa Mobility | Share the same view with the moderator that it depends on the progress of the initial acces discussion |
| Qualcomm | Share the same view as FL and think we should wait until outcome from 8.2.1 |
| InterDigital | This issue can be discussed after having decisions in initial access |
| Samsung | Agree with Moderator’s view. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We share the same view with moderator’s that the SCS would depend on which SCSs are agreed to support at initial access agenda item. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Agree with Moderator’s view. |
| Spreadtrum | We share the same view with moderator. |
| WILUS | We share the same view as FL and it should wait until the decisions are made under the initial access agenda. |

### 5.2.2 <Summary of 1st Round>

There appears to be consensus that the SCS(s) supported for PUCCH resource sets prior to RRC configuration, i.e., during initial access, depends on what SCS(s) are agreed for initial access in the Intital Access agenda item. Hence, we can revisit this topic once further progress is made in AI 8.2.1

**FL Recommendation**

Further discuss what SCS(s) are supported for PUCCH resource sets prior to RRC configuration, i.e., during initial access, once further progress is made in AI 8.2.1 on supported SCSs for initial access.

## 5.3 Frequency Hopping Distance

### 5.3.1 <1st Round Comments>

**Question**: What is your view on the frequency hopping distance (in RBs) between the 1st and 2nd hop of PUCCH resources within a PUCCH resource set?

* **Alt-1**: Hopping distance should be the same for all PUCCH resources within a PUCCH resourse set
* **Alt-2**: Hopping distance can be different for the different resources in a PUCCH resource set.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View/Position** |
| Moderator view | Alt-1 to enable equal frequency diversity (coverage) for all PUCCH resources within a set. |
| Intel | Alt-2 is supported. Given the number of PRBs for initial UL BWP is relatively large, performance difference between Alt-1 and Alt-2 may be minor. However, the spec impact on Alt-2 is smaller if mirrored pattern is agreed similar to Rel-15.  |
| LG | We support Alt-1. Considering the available number of RBs in the initial BWP and the multi-RB is used to transmit the initial PUCCH resource, the diversity gain of frequency hopping may not be enough. Therefore, it is necessary to discuss how to configure the hopping distance to obtain hopping gain equally for each PUCCH resource. |
| OPPO | This issue can be resolved nicely with sub-PRB mapping. Thus, we should not presume that full-PRB is adopted and intentionally create this issue. |
| Nokia, NSB | It may be necessary to agree on the number of supported PRBs first, before concluding this topic. We see that Alt-1 can be considered when the number RBs in the common PUCCH resource set is large enough to have considerable impact on the hopping distance. Otherwise Alt-2 can be continued to be used. |
| Futurewei | Share the view with Nokia that if the number of RBs is large enough, Alt-1 is considered, otherwise Alt-2.  |
| vivo | As commented by other companies, we think this issue is related to the discussion on the maximum number of RB and RE mapping. So we suggest to postpone the discussion on this matter. |
| Apple | Agree with Vivo |
| Lenovo, Motoroloa Mobility | We support Alt 1, same hoping distance for all PUCCH resources |
| Qualcomm | Agree to postpone. Depending on the decision of minimum Bandwidth,numerology, and N\_RB, we may decide if Alt-2 (current behavior) is acceptable or need improvement. |
| InterDigital | We agree to deprioritize this issue.  |
| Samsung | Alt-1 is slightly prefered for more equal frequency diversity gain.  |
| NTT DOCOMO | Alt-1 can be supported if there is big difference on gain. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We slightly prefer Alt-2 since it has less spec impact. |
| Spreadtrum | We support Alt-1. |
| Huawei | We would expect that freqeuency selectivity is not a major factor for radio channels in this frequency range. Simulation results should be provided before a decision could be made.  |
| CATT | Right now we don’t see big issue with different hopping difference.  |

The following is a summary of support for the various alternatives

* Alt-1:
	+ LGE, OPPO (using sub-PRB interlacing), Lenovo, Samsung, NTT DOCOMO, Spreadtrum, Ericsson
* Alt-2:
	+ Intel, ZTE, CATT
* Alt-1 + Alt-2:
	+ Nokia, Futurewei
* Postpone discussion until max(N\_RB) agreed
	+ Nokia, vivo, Apple, Qualcomm, Interdigital, Huawei

There is reasonably large support for equalizing the hopping distance between PUCCH resources in the same set; however, some companies question the diversity gain, and others propose to postpone the discussion until the maximum number of RBs is agreed.

**FL Recommendation**

Defer discussion on this topic in this meeting since max(N\_RB) is not yet known. However, companies are encouraged to further investigate and contribute to this topic in the next meeting.

## 5.4 Handling Potential RB Shortage

### 5.4.1 <1st Round Comments>

**Question**: What is your view on how a potential shortage of RBs should be handled based on a given size of the UL BWP, given configured/specified value of N\_RB, and given row index in the configuration table? Some examples provided by company contributions are the following:

* **Alt-1**: Allow Gnb to configure an appropriate value of N\_RB to ensure there is no shortage for the desired row index
	+ This is related to Alt-1 in Section 5.1
* **Alt-2**: Hardwired value(s) in specification ensure there is no shortage
	+ This is related to Alt-2 in Section 5.1
* **Alt-3**: UE calculates N\_RB based on the size of the initial BWP and the required number of FDM resources for each PUCCH resource set (row of the configuration table) to ensure there is no shortage
	+ This is related to Alt-3 in Section 5.1
* **Alt-4**: Specify additional OCCs and/or SLIVs for some rows of the table to allow a full set of 16 resources to be constructed
* **Alt-5**: Disallow large PRB offsets in the table when multiple RBs are configured
* **Alt-6**: Restrict allowed values of the PUCCH resource index r\_PUCCH so that for some rows of the configuration table a full set of 16 resources is not constructed
* Combination of the above alternatives
* Other alternatives?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View/Position** |
| Moderator view | Support at least Alt-1Further discuss whether/how to support Alt-4 in addition to Alt-1 to allow large N\_RB while still supporting 16 resources in a PUCCH resource set. Alt-4 may not be needed for all rows. |
| Intel  | We share same view as the moderator, and we support at least Alt-1, and Alt-4 should be considered for those resources sets for which frequency partitioning is not possible.  |
| LG | We support Alt-3 and Alt-4. Smilar to NR-U, the additional CDMed or TDMed PUCCH resources can be provided until 16 PUCCH resources can be available. For example, a method of applying additional starting symbol index or OCC index based on the value of (pre-defined or configured) NRB can be considered. Another way is that the value of NRB for initial PUCCH resource can be determined considering the available number of RB in the initial bandwidth part and the required number of FDM resources for each PUCCH resource set. |
| OPPO | RB shortage issue can be nicely resolved by sub-PRB mapping. Thus, we should not presume that full-PRB is adopted and intentionally create this issue.  |
| Nokia, NSB | Support at least Alt-4 and, depending on related number of RBs, Alt-5. We see that this discussion heavily depends on the supported maximum number of RBs as well as on the SCS values supported for initial access and, hence, benefits from waiting for decisions on these topics.  |
| Futurewei | Support at least Alt-1. While Alt-5 seems also a convenient solution.  |
| Vivo | Since this issue is related to indication of RB numbers, suggest to wait for the outcome of that discussion before this one. |
| Apple | Support Alt-4  |
| Lenovo, Motoroloa Mobility | We support Alt-1, in addition fine with Alt 4 |
| Qualcomm | We share the same view as vivo |
| Samsung | OK to discuss it later.  |
| NTT DOCOMO | We think that the motivation for multi-PRB allocation for PF 0/1(/4) is to ensure its coverage. So we believe that N\_RB should not be too small even to maintain the FDM capacity specified in current PUCCH resource table. Thus, we support Alt-6. Alt-1 could also be ok if N\_RB is not too small in terms of coverage. Additionally, Alt-4 can be considered if sufficient user multiplexing capacity is not provided. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We slightly prefer Alt-6, and can consider Alt 1 and Alt 4. Also fine to discuss it later. |
| Spreadtrum | Support at least Alt-1. |
| CATT | Prefer to discuss it later. |

The following is a summary of support for the various alternatives

* Alt-1
	+ Intel, Lenovo, NTT DOCOMO, ZTE, Spreadtrum, Ericsson
* Alt-3
	+ LGE
* Alt-4
	+ Intel, LGE, Nokia, Lenovo, NTT DOCOMO, ZTE, Ericsson (further discuss)
* Alt-5
	+ Nokia
* Alt-6
	+ NTT DOCOMO, ZTE
* Postpone discussion until max(N\_RB) agreed
	+ vivo, Qualcomm, Samsung, CATT
* Not an issue
	+ OPPO (use sub-PRB interlaced mapping)

There is reasonably large support for Alt-1 and Alt-4. However, several companies also suggest to postpone discussion until the maximum number of RBs is agreed.

**FL Recommendation**

Defer discussion on this topic in this meeting since max(N\_RB) is not yet known. However, companies are encouraged to further investigate and contribute to this topic in the next meeting providing views on at least the following two options:

* **Alt-1**: Allow gNB to configure an appropriate value of N\_RB to ensure there is no shortage for the desired row index
* **Alt-4**: Specify additional OCCs and/or SLIVs for some rows of the table to allow a full set of 16 resources to be constructed
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