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# 1 Introduction

TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH was included as one of the enhancements, for both FR1 and FR2 as well as TDD and FDD, to be specified in the NR coverage enhancement work item approved in RAN1#90-e [1]:

* *Specification of PUSCH enhancements [RAN1, RAN4]*
  + *Specify mechanism(s) to support TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH [RAN1]*
    - *TBS determined based on multiple slots and transmitted over multiple slots.*

Section 2 summarizes the key aspects of TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH based on companies’ contributions submitted under AI 8.8.1.2 to RAN1#104-bis-e **错误!未找到引用源。**-**错误!未找到引用源。**.

All related proposals from different contributions, organized per aspect, are listed in Appendix A for reference.

# 2 Summary of Contributions on TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH

Contributions submitted under AI 8.8.1.2 discussed several aspects of TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH (referred to as TBoMS in this document, for simplicity). From FL’s perspective, laying down the bases for a constructive discussion is of utmost priority to ensure good progress is achieved. The same systematic categorization used for #104-e will be used in this document to summarize the content of all contributions. This is done according to both FL’s understanding and number of submitted proposals on the different aspects. The rationale of the categorization is given by the natural relationship of consequentiality which exists between different aspects. In the remainder of the document, aspects are thus categorized as follows:

* **Resource allocation aspects of TBoMS**
  + TDRA
  + FDRA
  + TBS determination
* **Basic design aspects of TBoMS**
  + Relationship between TBoMS and PUSCH repetitions
  + DM-RS
  + CB segmentation
  + Redundancy version and rate-matching
  + Interleaving
  + Link adaptation
* **Advanced design aspects of TBoMS**
  + Frequency hopping
  + Transmission power determination
  + Rank of TBoMS transmission
  + Channel estimation
  + Retransmissions
* **Signaling and interaction with other signals/channels**
  + Multi-slot/single-slot activation/switch
  + UCI multiplexing, SRS/DL collisions/cancellations
  + Service-like prioritization of TBoMS

The categorization above will be used to identify a priority order for the discussions to be held for AI 8.8.1.2. In this context, sections 2.1 to 2.3 will focus on aspects related to resource allocation for TBoMS, whereas Section 2.4 will collect all other aspects. In this context, during RAN1 #104-bis-e priority will be given to several aspects described in Sections 2.1 to 2.3, and two aspects described in Section 2.4 (namely the aspects discussed in Section 2.4.1, 2.4.2 and 2.4.5). Should discussions for the higher priority aspects progress fast, new sections for specific aspects, will be open.

## 2.1 TDRA

Five major sub-aspects of TDRA have been discussed by companies in the submitted contributions:

1. General framework for time domain resource determination
2. Indication of number of slots allocated for TBoMS
3. Constraints on how slots can be used for TBoMS
4. How to handle S slots
5. Definition of transmission occasion

Summary, discussion and proposals on these sub-aspects are provided in the following different sub-sections, whose numbers are given in the list above.

### 2.1.1 [OPEN] General framework for time domain resource determination

Most contributions acknowledged the fundamental nature of this aspect and discussed it in detail, with reference to the agreements made during RAN1 #104-e, where two major options were listed for future discussion. high-level summary companies’ preferences based on the contributions, is as follows:

* **Option 1**. PUSCH repetition type A like TDRA, i.e., the number of allocated symbols is the same in each slot. [11 companies]:
  + Type B like is not supported: Fujitsu [9], vivo [6], IITH [12], OPPO [4], ZTE [5], Apple [16], Qualcomm [17], Lenovo/Motorola [26], LGE [27].
  + Support of Type B like is FFS: Panasonic [18], Ericsson [21].
* **Option 2**. PUSCH repetition type B like TDRA, i.e., the number of allocated symbols in each slot can be different [4 companies]:
  + Huawei/HiSilicon [3], Xiaomi [13], Interdigital [14], Nokia/NSB [20].
* **Option 3**. Both PUSCH repetition type A like TDRA and PUSCH repetition type B like TDRA should be supported [7 companies]:
  + CMCC (slight preference for Type A like) [11], NTT DOCOMO [25], Intel [15], Sharp [23], NEC [24], Wilus [28], Samsung [19].
* **Option 4**. No preference expressed yet; down-selection is suggested [3 companies]:
  + China Telecom [10] (FFS for special slots in case of Type A) [10], CATT [7], Sierra Wireless (the ability to specify gaps should be taken into consideration when choosing a TDRA design) [22].

FL’s comments

A large majority of companies expressed preference for Option1, i.e., type A like TDRA. The rationale of this option is its potential to reuse most if not all the existing signalling and indication framework. It is argued that this could also simplify the design of other more advanced aspects. In this context, time domain resource indication would be supported by reinterpreting or adding possibly small modifications to Rel-16 PUSCH repetitions signalling structures (as discussed later).

Type B like TDRA has been proposed by a smaller number of companies, albeit non-negligible. The rationale in this case is that limitations of Type A like TDRA do not allow to exploit the time resource in the most effective way. It is argued that the most valuable resource for coverage enhancement is the time resource, and coverage can be maximized using repetition type B like TDRA resource allocation for TBoMS.

A significant amount of companies proposes to support both alternatives to have the maximum flexibility, without trading arguable simplicity for lower efficiency and coverage. This is the second most popular option according to proposals in contributions.

Three companies have not expressed a preference yet. Future down-selection between options should occur and some directions to perform the down-selection are sketched.

From FL’s perspective, supporting time domain determination in Type A like TDRA fashion, i.e., the same number of symbols is used in each slot, is an acceptable solution for most companies. On the other hand, the possibility of supporting time domain determination in Type B like TDRA fashion should not be excluded from the discussion at this stage, given the evident technical merits in terms of maximum flexibility and efficiency. The following proposal is then made:

***FL proposal 1. For time domain resource determination for TBoMS, at least PUSCH repetition type A like TDRA, according to which the number of allocated symbols for TBoMS is the same in each slot, is supported.***

***FFS: Whether PUSCH repetition type B like TDRA, according to which the number of allocated symbols for TBoMS in each slot can be different, is also supported for time domain resource determination for TBoMS.***

#### 2.1.1.1 First round of discussions

FL’s recommendation is to have a first round of discussion among companies about FL proposal 1. The goal is to identify the preferred direction RAN1 should pursue for defining and specifying time domain resource determination for TBoMS.

Companies are also invited to express additional views for defining and specifying TDRA determination for TBoMS, should they not agree with the proposal. In this case, it would be desirable if companies could also provide alternatives, if any, to give FL the possibility to find middle ground.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| vivo | Fine with the proposal.  Although type-B repetition may occupy more symbol for transmission, especially the symbols in special slots, the resources for other UL transmissions, e.g. PUCCH, SRS, should also be reserved. That is one of the motivations that invalid symbol pattern is introduced for Type-B repetition. If PUCCH resources and SRS resources are considered, the benefit of type-B like TDRA for TBoMS that taking advantage of UL symbols in special slots is minimized, compared with type-A like TDRA. |
| OPPO | We agree the TDRA from PUSCH repetition type A should be supported. The complexity is one of the major issues. Please note this is not limited to the Type A and Type B. The definition of “PUSCH repetition type A like” would also be good to be clarified. This is general and may bring more complexity.  We see it could be supported by directly apply PUSCH repetition type A configuration, including the TDRA, to the TBoMS. Minimum changes may need.  Or, we will define an independent TDRA configuration, using principle of type A.  To RAN1, we need also clarify that as the basic frame work we are discussing here. From our point of view, reusing the PUSCH repetition type A configuration as possible should be preferred. We can introduce few additional parameters for how many slots the TB is going to be determined on.  One suggestion is adding the sub-bullet: Reusing the PUSCH repetition type A configuration with necessary enhancement for TB determination on multiple slots.  For the FFS type B, we see it is much more complex if that reusing scheme is not considered. |
| CATT | OK with the proposal. We slightly prefer repetition type A like TDRA for simplicity.  But if consensus on non-consecutives UL slots in TDD is not reached, we should consider repetition type B like TDRA, which can at least provide the opportunity to utilize the UL symbols in the ‘S’ slots. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Ericsson | Support the proposal.  In our view, while we are not convinced of its benefit at this stage, the most straightforward use case for Type-B like TDRA is for the special slot. We share vivo’s concerns about where the SRS or PUCCH might be transmitted if it is not in the special slot, and also wonder about the net gain. However, we are open to further studying it. Type-B like TDRA where a PUSCH occupies part of a normal uplink slot fall into URLLC use cases, rather than coverage enhancement, since as much of a slot should be used for coverage as possible. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Fine with the proposal. We would like to support both type A and type B repetition like TDRA. However, type A repetition like TDRA can be assumed first to facilitate the discussion. |
| Samsung | One clarification point we want to make is that, in here, we are discussing the time domain resource determination of TBoMS PUSCH, which in a simple word is, to determine what the available slots/symbols for TBoMS transmission are. While the actual TBoMS transmission schemes (including TBS, RM, interleaving, etc) are separately discussed. If this is clear, we are then difficult to see why repetition type B like TDRA is somehow being deprioritized, which seems better to fit TBoMS purpose, trying to utilize the possible time-domain symbols as much as possible. From our understanding, the repetition type B TDRA should be supported, while type A somehow holds relatively more limitation.  Thus, we suggest both typeA/B-like TDRA methods to be supported. |
| Xiaomi | Repetition type B like TDRA provides more consecutive time domain resources without adding additional latency, which is essential for operation in unpaired spectrum. Besides, back-to-back transmission is helpful to maintain the phase continuity of PUSCH over multiple slots to facilitate the joint channel estimation to further improve the uplink coverage.  However, repetition type A like TDRA is more straightforward and simpler for TBoMS.  From our perspective, both PUSCH repetition type A and type B like TDRA should be supported for different use case of TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH. In short, we don’t support the proposal. |
| Apple | We are ok with this proposal in general. One concern is if we really intend to support both type of TDRA scheme. From our side, only supporting one scheme is preferred. |
| ZTE | Fine with the proposal. As commented by above companies, repetition type A like TDRA should be sufficient. |
| Sharp | We are fine with FL proposal. |
| China Telecom | As we stated in our contribution, it is very important to include UL symbols in special slots for TDD. We propose to add one sub-bullet “FFS for special slots” |
| InterDigital | We also agree with Samsung and Xiaomi that type B like repetition scheme can maximize efficiency for TBoMS. Our preference is to support both type A/B like TDRA methods. |
| LG | We support the FL proposal.  Adding ‘and location’ may make the proposal more clear.  ***the number and location of allocated symbols for TBoMS is the same in each slot*** |
| Nokia/NSB | We are fine with the proposal for the sake of progress, but we agree with CATT, NTT Docomo, Samsung, Xiaomi that, ideally, both type A and type B like TDRA options should be supported. In addition, we would like to point out that type A or type B like TDRA option is just the terminologies referring to the case “the number of allocated symbols is the same in each slot” or “the number of allocated symbols can be different across slots”, respectively, and the latter option also includes the former one. There is no relation between these terminologies with other design aspects for TBoMS, as pointed out by Samsung. |
| Intel | We share similar view as other companies that both repetition type A and type B based TDRA should be supported for TBoMS.  In our view, there is clear motivation to support PUSCH repetition type B based TDRA for TBoMS, especially for TDD system where UL symbols in special slot and subsequent uplink slots can be jointly used for TBoMS for coverage enhancement. Further, given that Rel-15/16 already supports both repetition type A and type B for PUSCH, we do not see the reason why only repetition type A based TDRA is supported for TBoMS. |
| Qualcomm | We are okay in principle. Just to clarify, when we say Type A TDRA, we are assuming it includes its notion of SLIV, transmission occasion, repetitions and RV cycling. If not, it will be good to know what aspects are likely to change.  Since many companies have indicated interest in supporting PUSCH transmissions across S+U slot, one addition of top Type A TDRA that we are open to is extending length (L) to be greater than 14. This then brings everything under a single umbrella and provides a more concrete way forward. We can get rid of the FFS.  Suggest the following revision with the option to solicit input from other companies.  ***FL proposal 1. For time domain resource determination for TBoMS, PUSCH repetition type A like TDRA is used. The following changes to the TDRA are considered:***  ***Option a:***  ***No changes to SLIV. Concepts of transmission occasion, repetition and RV cycling are exactly same as R15/R16 PUSCH Repetition Type A.***  ***Option b:***  ***SLIV: Allow L>14. Maximum value of L is TBD. Concepts of transmission occasion, repetition and RV cycling are TBD.***  ***Option c: …***  ***Option d: …***  This list can then be used to further downselect based on company inputs. Open to other inputs from companies.  We wish to also highlight that a strict interpretation of the WID would only allow Option (a) --- WID only mentions TBS determination for TBoMS and nothing about TDRA. Some clarity on this would be good to have. |
| Panasonic | We are fine with FL proposal. In our view, before the decision of the support of PUSCH repetition Type B like TDRA, TBS determination should be concluded as the different approaches have different interaction with time domain resource allocation. |
| Fujitsu | We support the proposal in principle. As enhancement of repetition type A is agreed in 8.8.1.1, we propose to add the following note in this proposal,  **Note: the agreed enhancement in 8.8.1.1 is supported when applicable.** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Sorry but not OK with the proposal. More consecutive time domain resources can be achieved by repetition type B like TDRA than repetition type A like TDRA which is more beneficial to the coverage enhancement. Therefore, either only repetition type B like or Both repetition type A and type B like TDRA should be supported. In our understanding, there is not much differences between repetition type A like TDRA and repetition type B like TDRA, except for the resource mapping. From implementation perspective, only a slight increase of complexity is obtained by repetition type B like TDRA than repetition Type A like TDRA, but it can achieve maximum flexibility and efficiency. Therefore, repetition type B like TDRA should be supported. |
| IITH, IITM, CEWIT, Reliance Jio, Tejas Networks | We support the proposal. Most companies have already mentioned the changes that may make the proposal clearer i.e., may be expand what Type-A like means. |
| TCL | We are fine with FL proposal. We would like to support repetition type A like TDRA for simplicity. |
| NEC | We are fine with FL proposal. And we think PUSCH repetition type B like TDRA should be supported. It can provide flexibility comparing to PUSCH repetition type A like TDRA in some special cases. |
| WILUS | Even if we are still seeing benefits of Type B like TDRA, we are fine with the proposal prioritizing Type A like TDRA for the sake of progress. Regarding Type A like TDRA, we share the same views with LG that the ‘location’ of allocated symbol for TBoMS in each slot is same. |
| CMCC | General fine with the proposal.  Repetition type A like TDRA is simple from the perspective of specification. But the issue is that it cannot indicate the uplink symbols in the special slot. That is the reason we also propose the type B like TDRA but with a slightly low priority. |
| Sierra Wireless | We are generally fine with the proposal and agree repetition type B should also be considered but for now, I think we should agree to repetition type A. As mentioned by others, I find the word “like” linking repetition type A to a TDRA in this clause “PUSCH repetition type A like TDRA” confusing. Sierra’s view is that we would like to support the case where “the number of allocated symbols is the same in each slot” (i.e. PUSCH repletion type A) with both TDRA mapping types A and B should be supported. Suggested text to make proposal clearer:  ***FL proposal 1. For time domain resource determination for TBoMS, at least, PUSCH repetition type A is supported with support for TDRA mapping type A and B ~~like TDRA is used~~.:***   * ***FFS TDRA mapping type changes*** * ***Option a: No changes to SLIV. Concepts of transmission occasion, repetition and RV cycling are exactly same as R15/R16 PUSCH Repetition Type A.*** * ***Option b: SLIV: Allow L>14. Maximum value of L is TBD. Concepts of transmission occasion, repetition and RV cycling are TBD.*** * ***FFS: Whether PUSCH repetition type B is supported*** |

FL comments on April, 14th

After the first round of comment, 19 companies expressed favourable opinion on FL proposal 1, 5 companies do not support it, and for two companies (Qualcomm, OPPO) I am not sure my inference correct so I prefer letting the two companies to add their name there they deem appropriate. Situation is as follows:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Preference | # of preferences | Company name |
| **Support FL proposal 1** | 19 | vivo, CATT, ZTE, NTT DOCOMO, Ericsson, Motorola/Lenovo, Sharp, ZTE, Apple, China Telecom, Panasonic, LG, Nokia/NSB, Fujitsu, IITH, TCL, NEC, Wilus, CMCC. |
| **Do not support FL proposal 1** | 5 | Huawei/HiSi, Xiaomi, Samsung, Interdigital, Intel |

Two proposals for minor modifications have been made by LG and China Telecom. From FL’s perspective they are acceptable and will be included in the proposal with some modifications, to preserve the original meaning (please see below).

I would also like to provide some answers/comments to specific observations/suggestions made by some companies, for the sake of clarity.

@Huawei/HiSi, Xiaomi, Samsung, Interdigital, Intel: you can see a lot of companies are not ready to accept Type B like TDRA at present. However, I think it is fair to ask such companies for Type B like to be part of the proposal as FFS. Most of them understood and agreed. I fully understand your position, and that is why I added the first FFS point. I would kindly ask you to reconsider your current position to ensure we can make some progress on this important aspect, while not discarding your preferred option. In this context, please feel free to propose amendments to the proposal, if applicable. However please refrain from suggesting changing it completely, since we already have 19 companies ok with it. Thank you.

@Qualcomm: this discussion and proposal is just about time domain resource determination, which is not bound to the notion of repetition. Hence no clear implication on RV cycling and rate matching exists. The need to have a mechanism for time domain resource determination exists regardless of whether TBoMS is designed as a standalone feature, which reuses some signalling of PUSCH repetition framework, or as a PUSCH repetition enhancement (please also see discussion in other sections, in particular 2.4.1 and 2.4.5). Indeed, a key paradigm in 3GPP is to compartmentalize discussions for the sake of efficiency and build features piece by piece as usual. Unfortunately, we cannot discuss complete packages. On the other hand, please note that the current proposal does not preclude any discussion on the aspects you proposed to include here, which indeed are being and will be discussed in other sections. So please do not consider my comments as dismissive but rather a kind request to consider the need of organizing the discussion in a manageable way for everyone. Concerning the comment on the “out of scope”, from my perspective time domain resource determination is an essential part of the part of the specification of the support for TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH. This does not mean a new determination mechanism needs to be agreed on, but that the mechanism needs to be agreed on. From my perspective this does not have implications other than the ones on time domain determination. All other aspects can be discussed separately (regardless of their mutual interplay, which may or may not be high depending on the implementation).

@Fujitsu: Enhancements discussed in AI 8.8.1.1 are related to number of PUSCH repetitions in the context of Type A repetition (and how they are counted). I do not think that we can claim that TBoMS would need the same numbers and logic. This was not studied during the SI. I would avoid adding the note for the time being. Of course, this does not mean we cannot have this discussion later in the Release, if applicable.

@OPPO. As replied to Qualcomm, herein we are only discussing time domain resource determination. This aspect needs to be discussed regardless of whether TBoMS is designed as a standalone feature, which reuses some signalling of PUSCH repetition framework, or as a PUSCH repetition enhancement. This aspect is actually discussed in 2.4.1 and 2.4.5, and I hope you can agree that those sections are the right context for discussing what you brought up in your comments.

Given all the above, I would update FL proposal 1 as follows:

***FL proposal 1-v1. For time domain resource determination for TBoMS, at least PUSCH repetition type A like TDRA, according to which the number and location of allocated symbols for TBoMS is the same in each slot, is supported.***

***FFS: Whether PUSCH repetition type B like TDRA, according to which the number and the location of allocated symbols for TBoMS in each slot can be different, is also supported for time domain resource determination for TBoMS.***

***FFS: how to handle special slots***

Companies are invited to express additional views only if they have strong concerns and cannot live with the current proposal. I would really appreciate if everyone could understand that compromises need to be made. The situation is quite clear looking at the numbers, hence **if you do not agree with the proposal, please propose an alternative which may at least partially address your concerns but does not change the content completely**.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Ericsson | Support |
| Sharp | We support FL proposal. |
| Samsung | Thx FL for the explanation, we understand the intention and your logic. For the sake of progress, we are willing to compromise. However, keeping the typeB like totally in FFS, it will make it quite difficult to use the special slot, while we have the second FFS to discuss how to handle special slots. So we have following suggested modification:  ***FL proposal 1-v1. For time domain resource determination for TBoMS, at least PUSCH repetition type A like TDRA, according to which the number and location of allocated symbols for TBoMS is the same in each slot by principle, is supported.***  ***FFS: Whether PUSCH repetition type B like TDRA, according to which the number and the location of allocated symbols for TBoMS in each slot can be different, is also supported for time domain resource determination for TBoMS.***  ***FFS: how to handle special slots for time domain resource determination for TBoMS using above PUSCH repetition type A like TDRA***  By adding above, at least from our understanding, we can pursue the resource allocation indication by using PUSCH repetition type A like, which is the “by principle”, and we can also further allow different handling/utilization of the symbols in special slots those may not meet the “L” in the resource allocation indication. |
| LG | Support the proposal |
| Xiaomi | Although we prefer PUSCH repetition type B like TDRA for TBoMS, we are willing to compromise for the sake of progress, |
| IITH, IITM, CEWIT, Reliance Jio, Tejas Networks | Support the FL proposal |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support |
| TCL | Support the proposal |
| Intel | We do not want to repeat our comments. It is rather clear the benefit of supporting repetition type B for TBoMS, especially for special slots in TDD. We fail to see the reason not to support it.  We do not think it is good to leave repetition type B as FFS. |
| ZTE | Support the proposal |
| CATT | Fine with the proposal. |
| Qualcomm | Support the proposal in principle. We think Samsung makes a good suggestion, but our take is a little different --- Type A TDRA with the enhancement to allow length (L) > 14 might eventually lead to a compromise solution that accommodates companies who wish to better utilize the S slot. It may be good to leave open a path for that option. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support the proposal |
| OPPO | Thanks Marco for the further explanation. At a second look of the question about the relationship of TBoMS and Repetition, now we think both Approaches 1&2 are actually reusing the most of necessary part of existing. Then, should we can conclude which part can be reusing and left the unfinished parts more clearer? To me, it will be better progress for that questions. It sounds like we will configure at least Type A or B repetition, before we configure TBoMS.  With that understanding, it is agreeable for us about the bullets.  (We also wish we can resume and reformulate the 2.4.1. In My second response, I think when I add supporting of approach 1, you interpret that we assume RV cycling “only”. Actually, think this can be changed to RV continuously mapping if TBoMS is “on”.) |
| Fujitsu | We are fine with the proposal. |
| WILUS | We support the FL’s proposal. |

FL comments on April 15th

After the first soft check point, the counter sees 14 companies in favour of FL proposal 1. So far, 1 company does not support it, and 1 company suggested modifications on the proposal. Some companies are still missing from the count. Situation is thus as follows:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Preference | # of preferences | Company name |
| **Support FL proposal 1** | 14 | Ericsson, Sharp, LG, Xiaomi, IITH, NTT Docomo, TCL, ZTE, CATT, Qualcomm, Lenovo/Motorola, OPPO, Fujitsu, WILUS |
| **Do not support FL proposal 1** | 1 | Intel |

Two proposals for minor modifications have been made by LG and China Telecom. From FL’s perspective they are acceptable and will be included in the proposal with some modifications, to preserve the original meaning (please see below).

I would also like to provide some answers/comments to specific observations/suggestions made by some companies, for the sake of clarity.

@Xiaomi: Thank you for the flexibility. This is extremely helpful for all of us to move forward.

@Samsung: Thank you for the compromise, this I very helpful. I think you raised a valid point in the second FFS, since how to handle S slots will definitely be discussed sooner or later, as summarized in Section 2.1.4. Indeed, given that this proposal is about using PUSCH repetition type A like TDRA as a starting point, it is fair to further study how this TDRA option can support S slots, if supported. This may also provide some guarantee to companies that would like to see Type B like TDRA in the main bullet instead of the FFS point. Concerning your suggestion on the “by principle”, I’d rather not touch anything in the main sentence unless more companies ask me so, or if we find mistakes. In this regard, and given how Type A like TDRA works, I do not think “by principle” adds anything and, even if not wrong, may create confusion to some company. I hope you can understand if I give priority to what looks “reasonable stable” already (but for the companies who do not agree, of course).

@Intel: I do acknowledge your concern on the use of S slots when PUSCH repetition type A like TDRA is adopted as a starting point. However, how to handle S slots will be discussed separately. If we agree to use also S slots, the two FFS points would be a reminder to the group that we need to see whether we need to further support PUSCH repetitions type B like TDRA as well (as in the first FFS) or we need to finetune the PUSCH repetition type A like TDRA to support the S slots (as in the second FFS with modifications from Samsung). I really hope that the two FFS points, especially with the modifications from Samsung, can address your concerns and that you can be flexible for the sake of progress.

@all: Please check my reply to Samsung and if you don’t have strong concern on the FFS, please be flexible for the sake of progress. I would like to mention once again that the discussion how to handle S slots will be carried out separately. For this reason, I added “if supported” in the last FFS.

Given all the above, I would update FL proposal 1 as follows:

***FL proposal 1-v2. For time domain resource determination for TBoMS, at least PUSCH repetition type A like TDRA, according to which the number and location of allocated symbols for TBoMS is the same in each slot, is supported.***

***FFS: Whether PUSCH repetition type B like TDRA, according to which the number and the location of allocated symbols for TBoMS in each slot can be different, is also supported for time domain resource determination for TBoMS.***

***FFS: how to handle special slots (if supported) for time domain resource determination of TBoMS using above PUSCH repetition type A like TDRA***

Companies are invited to express additional views **only if they have strong concerns** and cannot live with the current proposal. I would really appreciate if everyone could understand that compromises need to be made.

The situation is quite clear looking at the numbers, hence if you agree with the proposal, you do not need to state it again. Conversely, if there is no way you can agree with the proposal, **please propose an alternative which may at least partially address your concerns but does not change the content completely**.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Intel | We are still not convinced why repetition type B like TDRA cannot be supported for TBoMS. Quite many companies identified the issue on the TBoMS transmission in special slots in the TDD system. Repetition type B like TDRA mechanism can be simply applied to address this issue.  We suggest to update the proposal to support repetition type B like TDRA for TBoMS at least for TDD to make a compromise. We can FFS for FDD.  ***For time domain resource determination for TBoMS,***   * ***~~at least~~ PUSCH repetition type A like TDRA, according to which the number and location of allocated symbols for TBoMS is the same in each slot, is supported.***   ***~~FFS: Whether~~ PUSCH repetition type B like TDRA, according to which the number and the location of allocated symbols for TBoMS in each slot can be different, is ~~also~~ at least supported for TDD ~~for time domain resource determination for TBoMS~~.***   * ***FFS: support of PUSCH repetition type B like TDRA for TBoMS for FDD.***   ***~~FFS: how to handle special slots (if supported) for time domain resource determination of TBoMS using above PUSCH repetition type A like TDRA~~*** |
| Samsung | We can live with not adding “by principle”, because my understanding is anyway for the use of special slot.  However, we cannot accept adding “(if support)”, for our compromise to this proposal; we need to agree the use of special slot, just the details of how to use it should be discussed further.  ***FFS: how to handle special slots ~~(if supported)~~ for time domain resource determination of TBoMS using above PUSCH repetition type A like TDRA***  I thought this is clear by the proposal, if not, we hold our opinion to further explicit proposals that even for typeA case, the utilization of the symbols in special slots are allowed, FFS how to use it. |
| China Telecom | We support Samsung’s revision by removing “(if supported)”. |
| OPPO | FL’s update version is acceptable to us. I think the proposal is not mandate the type A like repetition must support to handle the special slots. The type B FFS may also support the special slots. That is the reason we would like to consider Type B FFS. It would be simpler if UE can support Type B repetition and if the TBoMS can reuse many Type B configuration, then the special slots been utilized. Thus, we agree FL’s version. |
| CMCC | Fine with the FL’s proposal, as FL mentioned that the special slot would be tackled separately.  But we also have no problem to remove “(if supported)”. |
| Nokia/NSB | We are fine with the FL’s proposal. We are also fine with the modification made by Samsung. Although we see that the support of PUSCH repetition type B like TDRA is necessary especially for handling the S slots, we can live with the current proposal and open to discuss it later, for the sake of progress. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We agree with Intel. Many companies support taking repetition type A like TDRA as a start point only under the premise that special slot must be used. But in our understanding, the term “allocated” in the main bullet “*the number and location of allocated symbols for TBoMS is the same in each slot*” has precluded special slot. Or it requires more specification efforts to efficiently use special slot, such as the SLIV may be redefined or reinterpreted for both special slot and UL slot, and so on. On the contrary, these issues can be simply solved by using repetition type B like TDRA, where an appropriate SLIV can use special slot in an efficient way.  Once again, repetition type B like TDRA can achieve maximum flexibility and efficiency with only a slight increase of complexity than repetition Type A like TDRA. It should be supported at this stage. |

FL’s comments on April 16th

Thank you for the comments. Unfortunately, we have not achieved middle ground yet. I think that the only way to ensure we can obtain an agreement on this very important topic during this meeting is by having a constructive attitude towards the discussion. What I mean is that, as I said yesterday, the discussion on how the S slots will be handled in the context of TBoMS will be carried out separately. That’s my FL intention since we need to decide how to handle them. The rationale of my statement is the following:

PUSCH can be configured to use S slots in NR (Mapping type B), and TBoMS is a new PUSCH feature to provide better coverage to the channel. In principle, all the resources that can be used by PUSCH can be used for TBoMS. Now, from FL perspective, it all depends on how time domain resource determination is carried out for TBoMS. Therefore, this will have to be discussed and companies will have to agree on how to handle this case, that cannot be excluded by principle, given that this resource is formally part of the resources over which PUSCH can be configured.

In this context, I see that some companies do not wish to use S slots, whereas others think it is important to use S slots. This is something that we will have to solve when we’ll discuss about the S slots, not here. What we need to do here is to decide on the TDRA and I think it is only fair if we agree on something which allows the discussion on how to handle the S slots to take place, possibly during RAN1 #105-e.

Now, it is a fact that a majority of companies wish to support Type A like TDRA. This is the purpose of the main sentence of the Proposal, i.e., at least Type A like TDRA is supported. However, the objection that is raised by companies who wish to ensure that S slots are not “off the table”, is that current formulation is not ensuring this. I think they have a point. For this reason, I propose (and I will explain why I think it is a fair approach) to modify FL proposal 1 as follows:

***FL proposal 1-v3****.* ***For time domain resource determination for TBoMS, at least PUSCH repetition type A like TDRA~~, according to which the number and location of allocated symbols for TBoMS is the same in each slot,~~ is supported.***

* ***How to handle special slots for time domain resource determination of TBoMS, e.g., based on PUSCH repetition type A like TDRA or type B like TDRA, is to be discussed.***

The reasons why I think this is a fair middle ground are the following:

* A discussion on how to handle the S slots, which can already be used for PUSCH in NR, will have to be carried out. Hence, adding “is to be discussed” is meant to provide this guarantee.
* However, even if a discussion about this aspect will occur, the main sentence of the proposal guarantees that at least Type A like TDRA is supported for TBoMS, regardless of the discussion on the S slots.
* The “e.g.” provides a list of possible examples of approaches which could be used to handle the S slots. However, by definition “e.g.” is the Latin equivalent of “for instance”, thus does not say anything more than “what follows is a list of possible options, but others are possible”. I think we should stop saying that it implies more than this, since **it does not**.
* On the top of my head, I can think of at least three way of handling the S slots:
  + Using Type A TDRA with type B PUSCH mapping, accepting a reduction in throughput and coverage for TBoMS.
  + Modification to Type A like TDRA to support L>14 symbols allocation (as mentioned by Qualcomm in Section 2.4.1).
  + Supporting Type B like TDRA.
* Finally, about the text I stroke through in the main sentence. That text:
  + Is redundant for Type A like TDRA since that’s the definition of Type A like TDRA (which can be found in a previous agreement as well). Hence it can be removed, as also suggested by come companies in the previous round of comments.
  + It would be formally in contradictions with any tweaked version of Type A like TDRA to accommodate allocations of L>14 symbols, since number of symbols per slot may not be the same after the tweak anymore.

Given all the above, companies are invited to express additional views **only if they have strong concerns** and cannot live with the current proposal. If you agree with the proposal, you do not need to state it again.

**It is evident that some companies cannot accept specific wording choices, thus please refrain from proposing them again since this does not help. If you propose something else, please let it be something different and forward looking.**

I would really appreciate if everyone could understand that compromises need to be made. We need to progress on this aspect.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Qualcomm | Appreciate the FL’s efforts to find a compromise. While this isn’t ideal, we are okay to go with the current formulation. There does seem to be a separate section to discuss how to handle S slot (Section 2.1.4).  Question to supporters of Type B: What is your plan to extend this feature to a TDD deployment with a DDDU slot pattern? How do you plan to jump across the multiple downlink slots? Type A framework lets me pool in resources from up to 16-32 slots (esp. with the enhancements in 8.8.1.1). |
| Ericsson | Support the proposal. In my understanding, this agreement is more inclusive than the current situation. Since we have agreed that either or both of Type A and Type B are starting points for TDRA, if we have no further agreements, since Type A is a subset of Type B, we by default will have Type A. |
| Intel | Thanks for the updated proposal. It seems that quite many companies would also like to address the issue on the support of special slot for TBoMS in TDD, as the technical benefit is very clear. In our view, repetition type B like TDRA would be a natural way to handle this issue.  QC’s earlier suggestion may be a good way to proceed, i.e., based on the support of L > 14 as TBoMS for repetition type A like approach in the proposal, which can resolve our concern. We suggest to modify the proposal as  ***FL proposal 1-v3****.* ***For time domain resource determination for TBoMS, at least PUSCH repetition type A like TDRA~~, according to which the number and location of allocated symbols for TBoMS is the same in each slot,~~ is supported.***   * ***~~How to handle special slots for time domain resource determination of TBoMS, e.g., based on PUSCH repetition type A like TDRA or type B like TDRA, is to be discussed.~~***   ***Support L > 14 symbol allocation for repetition type A like TDRA for TBoMS.*** |
|  |  |

### 2.1.2 [CLOSED] Indication of number of slots allocated for TBoMS

Observations on how the numbers of slots for transmitting TboMS should be indicated by gNB are provided in different forms in several contributions. Explicit proposals are made in 5 contributions. Several options are considered. A high-level summary of such options, including companies’ preferences based on the contributions, follows:

* **Option 1**. Number of slots indicated/configured by using a row index of a TDRA list, configured via RRC [4 companies]:
  + - Fujitsu [9], ZTE [5], Samsung [19], Ericsson [21].
* **Option 2**. Indication of number of slots via DCI [1 company]
  + Details are FFS:
    - Apple [16].
* **Option 3**. By means of L [3 companies]
  + Reinterpretation of the meaning of L:
    - Xiaomi [13].
  + Indicating a number of symbols that can be larger than 14 (symbol groups can be considered)
    - Samsung [19].
  + L value in the TDRA table is used to indicate the duration of PUSCH transmission occasion in the last slot:
    - * Repetition factor indicates the number of slots for multiple PUSCH transmission occasions where one slot contains only PUSCH transmission occasion.
      * Duration of PUSCH transmission occasions for all other slots is 14 symbols.
    - Lenovo/Motorola [26].

FL’s comments

Option 1 is slightly more popular. On the other hand, number of contributors is not large hence further observations on the situation may not be so relevant at this stage. The general understanding is that semi-static or dynamic indication solutions used in Rel-16 for other parameters can be used for this indicator as well. Further discussion is needed.

#### 2.1.2.1 First round of discussions

If and when this section is open, companies will be invited to express views on the Options provided above for defining and specifying constraints, if any, on how to define and indicate the number of slots for TboMS.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

### 2.1.3 [OPEN] Constraints on whether non-consecutive UL slots can be used for TboMS

Observations on whether non-consecutive UL slots can be used for transmitting TboMS are provided in different forms in several contributions, with reference to the agreements made during RAN1 #104-e. A high-level summary of companies’ preferences based on the contributions is as follows:

* **Option 1**: Non-consecutive U slots can be used to transmit TboMS with no specific condition (i.e., can be applied for paired spectrum, unpaired spectrum and the SUL band) [6 companies]:
  + - Fujitsu [9], Huawei/HiSi [3], Nokia/NSB [20], Sierra Wireless [22], LGE [27], MediaTek [8]
* **Option 2**: Non-consecutive U slots can be used to transmit TboMS at least for unpaired spectrum [11 companies]:
  + - China Telecom [10], CMCC [11] (whether to support for paired spectrum and SUL band should depend on the discussion on collision handling), NTT Docomo [25], IITH [12], OPPO [4], CATT [7], InterDigital [14], Intel [15], Samsung [19], Ericsson [21] (in TDD or FDD), IITH [12] (enhance PUSCH repetition type-A framework to support transmission over non-contiguous slots)
* **Option 3**: Define a transmission occasion as consecutive symbols/slots and support non-consecutive U slots for TboMS under the form of repeating the TB across transmission occasions [2 companies]:
  + - Vivo [6], Qualcomm [17]

Other than the above three main options, the following was also proposed:

* One company (Panasonic [18]) proposed that whether both consecutive and non-consecutive physical slot for UL transmission can be used or not for TboMS should be the requirement to determine TBS determination approach.

FL’s comments

A large majority of companies prefer supporting non-consecutive U slots at least for unpaired spectrum, i.e., Option 2. 6 companies would prefer to have support of non-consecutive UL slots, with no specific condition. 3 companies would tie the support of non-consecutive slots to the construction of TboMS as an enhanced Type A PUSCH repetition.

In this context, there is no consensus on the need of discussing possible definitions of transmission occasion for TboMS prior to any decision on the support of non-consecutive U slots for TboMS. From FL’s perspective, this is not unreasonable. The concept of transmission occasion is indeed tied to concept of PUSCH repetitions. It may or may not become a relevant concept if and when the support of TboMS repetitions, if any, will be discussed. The need of discussing such aspect in the context of support to non-consecutive U slots qualifies more as a preference than an evident technical need. Consequently, such need is not clear, and FL suggests to proceed according to the most straightforward logic flow, compartmentalizing discussions as conventionally done in RAN1 for the sake of efficiency.

From FL’s perspective, deciding that non-consecutive U slots can be used to transmit TboMS at least for unpaired spectrum, which is an extremely relevant use-case for TDD deployments, is an acceptable solution for most companies. The possibility of using non-consecutive U slots for transmitting TboMS should not be discarded at this stage, and discussion on this aspect should continue. The following proposal is then made:

***FL proposal 2. Non-consecutive U slots can be used to transmit TboMS at least for unpaired spectrum.***

***FFS: conditions, if any, on how TboMS is transmitted over non-consecutive U slots for unpaired spectrum.***

***FFS: whether and how non-consecutive U slots can be used to transmit TboMS for paired spectrum and SUL band as well.***

#### 2.1.3.1 First round of discussions

FL’s recommendation is to have a first round of discussion among companies about FL proposal 2. The goal is to resume the discussion RAN1 had, and could not conclude, during RAN1 #104-e, to take steps forward and clarify support of non-consecutive U slots for transmitting TboMS.

Companies can of course express their views. In case of negative feedback to FL proposal 2, it would be desirable if companies could also provide alternatives, if any, to give FL the possibility to find middle ground.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Vivo | Fine with the proposal. |
| OPPO | We can look at the supporting of the TboMS in non-consecutive UL slots. We suggest also clarify the condition. E.g. Restricting the TB sizes for TboMS … |
| CATT | Agree to reach a high-level consensus first. We can discuss if there are any the potential restrictions/conditions later. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Fine with the proposal |
| Ericsson | We are OK with the proposal. |
| Samsung | We are generally fine with proposals. Does the “U” stand for UL or a representative letter of a number? We assumes it’s for UL. |
| Xiaomi | Fine with the proposal. |
| Apple | As commented during the online. This discussion can be after the detailed TboMS scheme is determined, such as whether support transmission occasion, supporting TB segmentation or slot bundling. Different schemes have different level complexity increase to the implementation. |
| ZTE | Fine with the proposal. As for the wording, we slightly prefer to align with our previous agreements by using ‘non-consecutive physical slots for UL transmission’. |
| Sharp | To clarify, Option 3 can be captured as a candidate solution for utilizing non-consecutive U slots could be captured below FFS like,   * ***FFS: conditions, if any, on how TboMS is transmitted over non-consecutive U slots for unpaired spectrum.***   + ***e.g., define a transmission occasion as consecutive symbols/slots and support non-consecutive U slots for TboMS under the form of repeating the TB across transmission occasions*** |
| China Telecom | Support. Non-consecutive physical slots for UL transmission for TboMS should be supported for unpaired spectrum. Otherwise, operators may lose interests in TboMS. |
| InterDigital | We are ok with the FL’s proposal. |
| LG | We are ok with the FL proposal in general.  In our view, regardless of paired/unpaired spectrum, consecutive available U slots can be used for TboMS, where adjacent available U slots can be located in non-consecutive physical slots. |
| Nokia/NSB | Support the FL’s proposal. |
| Intel | We support the proposal. |
| Qualcomm | Support in principle. Suggest the following revision (change FFS to sub bullets):  ***FL proposal 2. Non-consecutive U slots can be used to transmit TboMS at least for unpaired spectrum.***   * ***conditions, if any, on how TboMS is transmitted over non-consecutive U slots for unpaired spectrum are to be discussed further.*** * ***whether and how non-consecutive U slots can be used to transmit TboMS for paired spectrum and SUL band as well are to be discussed further.*** |
| Panasonic | Although we support the FL proposal in principle, in our view, before the decision that whether non-consecutive physical slots for UL transmission can based or not for TboMS, TBS determination should be concluded as the different approaches have different interaction with this issue. For example, the potential concern to support non-consecutive physical slots would be latency for TB processing. The concern of the latency for TB processing can be resolved if TBS determination and rate matching process is not based on the resource across the slots over which the TboMS is allocated but only is based on per slot or per one transmission occasion. |
| Fujitsu | Fine with the proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We agree the proposal. |
| IITH, IITM, CEWIT, Reliance Jio, Tejas Networks | Support the proposal.  One clarification about why IITH name is put under Option 3. We said that TboMS transmission occasion is the set of all slots over which TboMS is performed. Seems to contradict with the Option-3. |
| TCL | Support the FL’s proposal. |
| NEC | We are fine with the FL proposal. |
| WILUS | We support the FL’s proposal. We suggest to use ‘slot’ instead of ‘U slot’ because S slot (containing flexible symbols and UL symbols) can be used for TboMS. |
| CMCC | Support the proposal |
| Sierra Wireless | Support the Proposal |

FL’s comments on April 14th

Companies’ preferences after the first round of discussion can be summarized as follows (where \* denotes a soft preference):

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Preference | # of preferences | Company name |
| **Support FL proposal 2** | 23 | vivo, OPPO, CATT, Motorola/Lenovo, ZTE, Xiaomi, Samsung, Ericsson, China Telecom, LG, Nokia/NSB, Interdigital, Intel, Huawei/HiSi, Fujitsu, IITH, TCL, NEC, Wilus, CMCC, Qualcomm, Panasonic\* |
| **Do not support FL proposal 2** | 2 | Apple, Sharp |

ZTE and Samsung provided suggestions/comments on the formulation of the proposal which have been accepted

Qualcomm’s suggestion does not seem to alter the spirit of the FFS points, even after changing them to bullets. From FL’s perspective the suggestion is acceptable, since it does not ask to RAN commit on the existence of additional constraints and conditions but clarifies that a discussion will take place (which was going to happen, anyway, given the interest many companies have for paired spectrum and SUL band). I hope this modification can be acceptable for other companies as well.

I would also like to provide some further answers/comments to specific observations/suggestions made by some companies, for the sake of clarity.

@Sharp: your suggestion has not been accepted since it implies a much stronger concept which may or may not be part of the direction RAN1 will decide to take for TboMS. The current formulation does not preclude that development; hence it does not seem necessary to state it explicitly. Indeed, Option 3 has been included in Section 2.4.5 for down selection (please check therein for understanding what I mean). Given that we are close to having a consensus in this section with the original proposal, and for the sake of progress, I would suggest keeping the text as it is and kindly ask for your flexibility here, if you don’t have strong concern. Progress in this section would help a lot for the discussion in Section 2.4.5.

@Apple: Most companies believe this is a fundamental aspect to be discussed at early stage, and FL agrees with them. We have already discussed it at large and it would be good to agree on something, with the corresponding FFS/sub-bullets, and move on. Also, to address your concerns, which you stated in other sections as well, I have started a hopefully constructive discussion on the concept of transmission occasion in Section 2.4.5 to facilitate the discussion on the definition of TboMS. I hope I can count on your flexibility in this sense. You may have noticed that many companies would not like to discuss the concept of transmission occasion before agreeing on other aspects of TboMS. Bridging the distance between companies may be hard in this case, but this can be possible if everyone is willing to compromise on something. I am trying to identify the middle ground to achieve this goal. Having said this, I think it is fair to say that discussion on transmission occasion cannot be considered a prerequisite for the discussion in this section. I would really appreciate if we could avoid using that concept to oppose any agreement in various sections. In contrast, consensus made in this section can improve progress in Section 2.4.5, for sure. Concerning your observation on TB segmentation, I think most companies agree (and FL with them) that it is a more advanced concept which we will discuss later on, once more fundamental blocks have been designed, given the impact such blocks may have on the TBS. Thus, I kindly ask you to reconsider your position for the sake of progress. The current wording is already a good middle ground in my view.

@Panasonic: Thank you for supporting the principle of the proposal. As you may have noticed, some companies suggested that the discussion on TBS determination should be done after we can make further progress on TDRA, which is arguably reasonable. This seems to be a “chicken and egg” problem and we really need to make a decision either in TDRA discussion or in TBS determination discussion. Given that we are close to a consensus here and that you are fine with the principle of the proposal, I really hope that you can agree to the wording of the proposal too, for the sake of progress.

@IITH: I apologize for the misunderstanding. I have corrected your original position, now indicated as Option 2.

@OPPO: The potential restriction of TBS size will be discussed separately, and it can be argued that this discussion can be done regardless of whether non-consecutive UL slots are considered for TboMS or not. Since you don’t have strong concern on the proposal, I really hope that you can agree to it for the sake of progress.

The updated version of FL proposal 2 follows.

***FL proposal 2. Non-consecutive physical UL slots can be used to transmit TboMS at least for unpaired spectrum.***

* ***conditions, if any, on how TBoMS is transmitted over non-consecutive physical UL slots for unpaired spectrum are to be discussed further.***
* ***whether and how non-consecutive physical UL slots can be used to transmit TBoMS for paired spectrum and SUL band as well, is to be discussed further.***

Companies are invited to express additional views on FL proposal 3, **only if they have strong concerns and cannot live with the current proposal**. I would really appreciate if everyone could understand that compromises need to be made. The situation is quite clear looking at the numbers, hence **if you do not agree with the proposal, please propose an alternative which may at least partially address your concerns but does not change the content completely**.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Ericsson | Support |
| Sharp | We support FL proposal. |
| LG | Support the proposal |
| Xiaomi | Support the proposal. |
| IITH, IITM, CEWIT, Reliance Jio, Tejas Networks | Support the FL proposal |
| TCL | Support the proposal |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal. |
| CATT | Support the proposal |
| Qualcomm | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support the proposal |
| OPPO | The proposal is OK. We think the “condition” would be kept.  We understand this will allow a feasible solution on how to map these non-contiguous slots with the coded bites.  The FFS bullet, we think the intention is: Conditions, if any, for allowing TBoMS to be transmitted over non-consecutive physical UL slots for unpaired spectrum are to be discussed further.  Then condition of mapping and transmitting TBoMS, RB/TB limitation and so on. But current bullet is still OK. |
| Panasonic | We support the proposal. |

FL comments on April 15th

Given the overwhelming support that already exists for Proposal 2. The discussion has been moved to the reflector. So far no one expressed concerns, but for what I see as mild concerns from OPPO, which I would try addressing here (and in the reflector).till

@OPPO: the current proposal has been simplified but its meaning is the same, according to FL’s understanding. This seems to be the understanding of all other companies as well. To be more specific, the sentence

**how TBoMS is transmitted over non-consecutive physical slots for UL transmission for unpaired spectrum is to be discussed further**

has the “is to be discussed further” part which according to me clearly implies that all aspects you mention will be discussed, e.g., the bit to RE mapping and so on. You may note that this is happening already in Section 2.4.5 (later in 2.4.1) and will have to be worked out in detail to ensure the design of the feature works. This is not only my understanding, but **my intention as FL**. I hope this can clarify and make you reconsider your position. So many companies are already in favour and, as I have just explained, the meaning is the same as before, but phrasing is simpler. I think that spending time discussing about the phrasing if the meaning is the same may not be that wise, given the very short time we have for the discussions. I hope you can understand. Thank you.

### 2.1.4 [CLOSED] How to handle S slots

Only one specific proposal was made about this aspect. Observations on how S slots should be handled in the context of TBoMS are provided in different forms in several contributions, mostly in the context of the discussion on time domain resource determination.

* One company (China Telecom [10]) proposed that the special slots for unpaired spectrum should be utilized for UL transmission.

FL’s comments

FL suggests not to discuss this topic during #104-bis-e, unless need arises.

#### 2.1.4.1 First round of discussions

If and when this section is open, companies will be invited to express views on the Options provided above for defining and specifying constraints, if any, on how to handle S slots in the context of TBoMS.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

### 2.1.5 [PAUSED] Definition of transmission occasion

The concept of “transmission occasion” in the context of TBoMS appears implicitly or explicitly in different forms in a small number of contributions. The content of the proposals therein can be summarized as follows.

* **Option 1**. TBoMS transmission occasion is specified in terms of the number of slots for one TB processed [1 company]:
  + - Apple [16];
* **Option 2**. A transmission occasion of a TBoMS transmission constitutes a set of contiguous resources (symbols) spanning one or more slots [3 companies]:
  + - Qualcomm [17] (a TBoMS transmission can constitute transmissions across one or more transmission occasions), Panasonic [18], vivo [6].

FL’s comments

As briefly discussed in Section 2.1.3, very few companies believe there is a technical need of discussing possible definitions of transmission occasion for TBoMS. Indeed, the concept of transmission occasion is tied to the concept of PUSCH repetitions. Consequently, such need is not clear until support of repetitions of TBoMS, if any, is discussed (please refer to Section 2.4.1). As stated above, FL suggests to proceed according to the most straightforward logic flow, compartmentalizing discussions as conventionally done in RAN1 for the sake of efficiency.

Having said this, a first round discussion will be open on this aspect to let companies express their views (once again) in favor or against the definition of transmission occasion for TBoMS.

#### 2.1.5.1 First round of discussions

From FL’s perspective, an opportunity for this discussion to take place has already been given during RAN1 #104-e. Most companies did not see any need for this discussion to take place. I think RAN1 cannot afford going back on forth on this “issue” during several meetings, so I would like to invite all interested companies to discuss it once again and provide views in constructive ways. If no agreement/convergence can be achieved, or novel elements to increase its relevance in the meantime arise, this discussion will be closed on 04/15.

Companies are invited to input their views below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| vivo | In vivo’s understanding, one of the motivations of define Tx occasion is to support PUSCH repetition for TboMS, and also may have impacts on TB size determination, if the resources for N\_info calculation is not the same as that the symbols allocated.  Furthermore, it also impacts the discussion on how to handle the collision between TboMS and other transmission. For example, if symbol for TboMS is indicated as not available by CI, SFI or a high priority transmission, should UE cancel part of the TboMS transmission or whole TboMS transmission. If transmission on part of the TboMS resources is cancelled, the time domain granularity for dropping need to be defined, which can be regarded as a transmission occasion.  Hence, we suggest to leave the door open for the concept of transmission occasion. |
| OPPO | We do not see the justification. We can come back to the issue in later stage. To us, it seems to be more signalling virtual concept. |
| CATT | We are open to discuss this feature, but we also think that TboMS is not kind of repetition. We have doubt that, is the concept of transmission occasion of TboMS (or similar things) essential to support this feature? If introduced, will it be applied to TDD only, or both TDD and FDD? |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | In our view, there is no clear motivation to explicitly define the TboMS transmission occasion and agree with FL’s comments that this is mainly tied to repetition of TboMS which is itself not yet agreed |
| Ericsson | This is not an easy discussion, as vivo points out. We would add that power control also uses the notion of a transmission occasion. One possibility is that we have different definitions of transmission occasion in different contexts, e.g. power control could be for one slot, while if an RV spans multiple slots, the transmission occasion for the RV would be multiple slots. |
| Samsung | The discussion on this new definition could wait a bit later. |
| Apple | We are considering the transmission occasion can facilitate the discussion, and makes the discussion easier. The pure TboMS gain is limited, to enhancement the coverage, repetition on top of TboMS is promising and discussing now. |
| ZTE | As this issue is related to repetition of TBoMS or potentially other detailed design, we could leave the definition open for now. |
| Sharp | We have similar view as Vivo and Ericsson. We think discussion in 2.4.1 and 2.4.4 should be discussed first. |
| InterDigital | We can prioritize the discussion in 2.4.1. |
| LG | In our understanding, transmission occasion for PUSCH is identified independently for PUSCH TB repetition and PUSCH transmission power control.  Regarding on the transmission occasion for PUSCH repetitions, the TB transmission occasion is a unit of rate-matching and repetition. If repetition of TboMS is supported, TboMS transmission occasion consists of time resources over multiple slots for a TboMS transmission. Otherwise, the definition of transmission occasion for TboMS seems not required. This discussion seems related to 2.4.2 and 2.4.5.  In terms of transmission occasion for PUSCH power control, the discussion can be handled in 2.4.8. |
| Intel | We share the similar view as other companies that we can first focus on 2.4.1 |
| Qualcomm | Given how widely the concept of transmission occasion is used in the spec to specify UE behavior from power control aspects to RV cycling, it is important that we have this definition in place before we proceed too far into other design details of TboMS.  Without this definition, even the language to be used in other proposals becomes very difficult to arrive at as was evidenced in the last meeting.  Eventually the specification for TboMS has to coexist with legacy PUSCH, so it is unlikely that we can completely sidestep this issue.  It appears that Type A TDRA is what is most preferred by other companies. If we go down this path, then we could use one transmission occasion as a collection of contiguous resources.  Request the FL to try to arrive at a consensus definition for this early in the meeting so that the rest of the items can proceed at a faster clip.  Can we try to pose the following question and solicit feedback?  Q: How should the transmission occasion of a TboMS be defined?   * Option (a):Same definition as PUSCH Repetition Type A * Option (b): The set of resources that use a single RV index * Option I: Resources constituting one repetition defines a transmissions occasion * Option (d): Custom condition defined in terms of S, L and K   Option I: … |
| Panasonic | We share the same view as other companies. Section 2.4.1 (relationship between repetition) and Section 2.4.5 (RV and rate matching) should be discussed first. |
| Fujitsu | We share the same view that section 2.4.1 should be discussed first. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | In current spec, the transmission occasion is defined by a slot or a nominal repetition for repetition type B. The RV mapping and power control for repetition are then proposed based on this definition. For TboMS, however, we have not decided whether the RV mapping and power control mechanisms are reused the ones of repetition. Hence, the definition of transmission occasion for TboMS should be further studied and discussed, together with RV mapping and power control for TboMS. |
| IITH, IITM, CEWIT, Reliance Jio, Tejas Networks | We prefer repetitions to not be mixed with TboMS. In this regard, TboMS transmission occasion is the set of all slots over which TboMS is performed. |
| TCL | We share the similar view as other companies, the discussion on 2.4.1 should be discussed first. |
| NEC | We share the same view as other companies. We can discuss this later if definition of Tx occasion is needed. |
| WILUS | Discussion on transmission occasion can be deferred till conclusions in Section 2.4.1 and 2.4.5. |
| CMCC | We share a similar view that we should first discuss the relationship between TboMS and repetition, if the concept of transmission occasion is based on the operation of repetitions. Tthe RV and power control could be discussed later which could be based on the definition of transmission occasions.  We could come back later for this topic. And another thinking is that this transmission occasion may facilitate the indication of un-consecutive time domain resources related to the special slots and collision issues. |
| Sierra Wireless | There is could be useful to help discussions especially in section 2.4.1. |

FL’s comments on April 14th

As observed during RAN1 #104-e, many companies do not agree that this discussion should be had before discussion in 2.4.1 and 2.4.5 stabilizes. FL acknowledges this. In the interest of an efficient use of time, I suggest pausing (again) this discussion and resume it later, if applicable.

On the other hand, as you will see in Section 2.4.5, the complete absence of even a loose definition of transmission occasion for TboMS may indeed be an unnecessary complication in our discussions. As I said, I will elaborate on this in 2.4.1 and 2.4.5. I would then invite all companies to keep an open mind about the principle and have a look at what is proposed in those sections.

### 2.1.6 [CLOSED] Constraint on the maximum number of slots for TboMS

Observations on constraints on the maximum number of slots for TBoMS are provided in different forms in several contributions, which can be summarized as follows.

* One company (IITH [12]) proposed that if N\_prb used for TBoMS is not restricted, then a restriction on the number of slots aggregated for TBoMS is required.
* One company (Ericsson [21]) proposed that if TBoMS with more than 2 slots is to be supported, TBoMS configuration uses the number of available slots, otherwise physical slots are used. As a starting point, consider 2 or 4 slots as the candidate numbers of slots for a TBoMS.
* One company (Sierra Wireless [22]) proposed that multi-slot encoding should be specified with a maximum of 2 slots of encoding.

FL’s comments

From FL’s perspective, this is a less fundamental topic RAN1 can afford discussing when more paramount aspects of TBoMS have been agreed on. FL suggests not to discuss this topic during #104-bis-e, unless need arises.

#### 2.1.6.1 First round of discussions

If and when this section is open, companies will be invited to express views on the Options provided above for the definition of constraints on the maximum number of slots that can be used for TboMS.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

### 2.1.7 [CLOSED] Other proposals for TDRA

Another proposal related to TDRA of TboMS, and not reported elsewhere in this section, was made. Its content can be summarized as follows.

* One company (NEC [24]) proposed that some enhancement to reduce segment within a slot for PUSCH repetition type B like TDRA should be consider TDRA for TBoMS.

FL’s comments

From FL’s perspective, this is a less fundamental topic RAN1 can afford discussing when more paramount aspects of TBoMS have been agreed on. FL suggests not to discuss this topic during #104-bis-e, unless need arises.

## 2.2 FDRA

### 2.2.1 [CLOSED] Maximum number of PRBs allocated for TboMS

Several contributions acknowledged the fundamental nature of this aspect and discussed it in detail. Discussions on the major reason behind the performance increase observed in case of multi-slot TB transmissions as compared to their single-slot counterpart are carried out therein.

It is argued that TBoMS is beneficial in terms of PSD boosting, since it concentrates transmission power in a narrow frequency resource and frequency domain resource multiplexing. Moreover, there seems to be no need to occupy more frequency domain resource to achieve a lower code rate, given that the TB can be transmitted over multiple slots. It is finally observed that restricting the number of PRBs for the FDRA of TboMS transmission may also reduce DCI size, which could positively impact the coverage of PDCCH as a by-product.

Several proposals are made in this regard. A high-level summary of all options, including companies’ preferences based on the contributions, follows:

* **Option 1**. FDRA for TboMS is limited to a small number of PRBs [5 companies]:
  + - ZTE [5], Xiaomi [13], Samsung [19], LGE [27], IITH [12] (if N\_prb used for TBoMS is not restricted, then a restriction on the number of slots aggregated for TBoMS is required);
* **Option 2**. No explicit limitation on number of PRBs for TBoMS FDRA [1 company]:
  + - Vivo [6] (limitation on number of PRBs for TboMS can be achieved by proper NW scheduling).

Partially different technical understandings on why TBoMS is expected to bring gains as compared to single-slot counterpart have been provided in other contributions submitted to this AI, even if no proposal was added therein. From FL’s perspective, this important aspect of FDRA for TBoMS deserves more discussion before commenting further. On the one hand, the reason why this aspect should not be left to gNB’s implementation is unclear. On the other hand, its relevance for subsequent discussions on TBS determination, link adaptation and (possibly) frequency hopping justify its presence in this section.

#### 2.2.1.1 First round of discussions

Companies are invited to express their views on this topic, considering the two Options above. The goal is to decide whether the max number of PRBs allocated to TboMS should be limited. FL’s proposal, if any, will be formulated after the first round of discussions.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| vivo | As we discussed in last meeting, limited PRB number can be achieved by proper NW scheduling.  For reduced DCI size brought by limited DCI size, the coverage of DCI is not bottleneck based on outcome of SI. Furthermore, it is not clear the whether the UL grant is provided by the same DCI format as that for regular PUSCHs or a new DCI format. If legacy DCI format is reused, the DCI size can not be reduced. For new DCI format, whether the benefit can be obtained also depends on the outcome of DCI size alignment, higher UE capability may be required if more DCI sizes need to be decoded. |
| OPPO | We think the TB size can be decided first. Then we can see if the PRB should be limited later. |
| CATT | Option 2 is preferred.  The gNB shall control and schedule the FDRA well according to its knowledge in link performance and network situation. It should be up to gNB implementation. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support Option 2 and agree with Vivo that NW scheduling can take care of the appropriate number of PRBs |
| Ericsson | In short, we are open to discuss if restrictions on the number of PRBs are needed, but it should be studied further especially with respect to performance as the feature lead points out.  From our results in R1-2103446, we observe that in the cases where TboMS shows some gain vs. a Rel-15/16 baseline, there is less with larger TBS than with smaller TBS. But it is not clear that these cases where the gain is found are configurations that make sense. So our view overall given this potentially limited gain of TboMS is that TboMS specification and implementation impact should be minimized, and if fewer PRBs support that goal, we are Ok with limiting the number of PRBs. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support option 2.  It is a better choice to let gNB to decide the number of PRBs in scheduling. It avoids to define the exact candidate PRB numbers, and provides more flexibility for TboMS. |

## 2.3 TBS determination

TBS determination was discussed by many companies. Indeed, it is an aspect which will have to be discussed and properly defined, regardless of how other aspects of TboMS are dealt with. Three major sub-aspects of TBS determination have been discussed by companies in the submitted contributions:

2.3.1 calculation

2.3.2 calculation

2.3.3 Constraint on maximum TBS for TBoMS

Summary, discussion and proposals on these sub-aspects are provided in the following different sub-sections, whose numbers are given in the list above.

### 2.3.1 [PAUSED] calculation

Most contributions acknowledged the fundamental nature of this aspect and discussed it in detail. The discussions focused on the two approaches identified in the agreement made in RAN1#104-e meeting for calculation. A high-level summary of companies’ preferences based on the contributions, is as follows:

* **Approach 1**: Based on all REs determined across the symbols or slots (FFS whether symbols or slots are used) over which the TboMS transmission is allocated [10 companies]:
  + Fujitsu [9], China Telecom [10], ZTE [5], InterDigital [14], Intel [15], Samsung [19], Nokia/NSB [20], Ericsson [21], Lenovo/Motorola [26],
  + CMCC [11] (Approach 1 should be further discussed based on the counting of slots. The symbols over which the TBoMS transmission is allocated can be different from the symbols over which the TBoMS transmission is performed due to collisions).
* **Approach 2**: Based on the number of REs determined in the first L symbols over which the TboMS transmission is allocated, scaled by K≥1 [10 companies]:
  + is equal to the total number of slots allocated for TboMS transmission:
    - IITH [12]
  + may or may not be equal to the total number of slots allocated for TBoMS transmission:
    - Panasonic [18], CATT [7], NEC [24] (as starting point), LGE [27], WILUS [28] (as a baseline), OPPO [4];
    - vivo [6] (K is number of slots in the first transmission occasion/repetition);
    - Sharp [23] (K is indicated through a DCI format for scheduling the PUSCH or RRC signaling);
    - Qualcomm [17] ( is the number of resource elements available in a transmission occasion of TBoMS. A new scaling factor S is introduced to scale the when computing ).

The following was also additionally proposed for the two approaches above:

* One company (CMCC [11]) proposed that considering the process delay, the slot number in Approach 1 and the K value in Approach 2 should be limited.
* One company (NTT Docomo [25]) proposed that NInfo calculation for TBoMS should be compatible for both PUSCH repetition type A and B like TDRA or discussed after concluding TDRA determination for TBoMS.
* One company (Apple [16]) proposed that the same PUSCH mapping type and SLIV are applied to slots for TB transmission.
* One company (OPPO [4]) proposed that TBS determination of TboMS is configured with PUSCH repetition operation. The enhanced Type A PUSCH repetition is included.

FL’s comments

The two approaches identified during RAN1 #104-e received equal support. From FL’s perspective, it is probably not so meaningful to provide a proposal at this stage, and further discussion should be carried out by companies.

#### 2.3.1.1 First round of discussions

Companies are invited to provide additional views on the two approaches above. Constructive attitude is highly appreciated, given the very balanced situation we have at present. The goal is to resume the discussion RAN1 had, and could not conclude, during RAN1 #104-e, to take steps forward and clarify how is calculated for TBoMS.

In this context, it would be desirable if companies could also indicate availability to support the two approaches, if applicable, highlighting first/second preference, to give FL the possibility to find middle ground.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Vivo | Approach 2 should be adopted.  Since, most companies support repetition on top of TboMS, as summarized in section 2.4.1, Approach 2 is preferred which can well support TboMS + repetition.  TboMS with repetition seems not supported by Approach 1, if TB size is determined based on all allocated REs and the coded bits are mapped to all of the allocated REs. |
| OPPO | Approach 2 can be preferred. We think it can be simply added in the current spec with a K parameter. |
| CATT | Slightly prefer Approach 2 for clear calculation reference. Also, if repetition type A/B like TDRA is agreed, these 2 approaches have no much inner difference. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | In our view, Approach 1 provides the calculation based on actual number of symbols (REs) on which the PUSCH is determined, where for Approach 2, the actual allocation might be different than that indicated by L and K. For this reasons, we support Approach 1. |
| Ericsson | The WID says the following, which we think gets us pretty far in the TBS determination design.   * + Specify mechanism(s) to support TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH [RAN1]     - TBS determined based on multiple slots and transmitted over multiple slots.   For us, the details of Ninfo calculation is something that should follow what we do with TDRA: if the number of symbols in a slot varies, then Approach 1 may work better. We note that the TBS is calculated ‘based on’ all of an allocation, so we don’t see why repetition has is precluded by Option 1. On the other hand, if we only have Type A, both approaches can work. So our suggestion would be to focus on TDRA and, if repetition impacts TBS determination, if repetition is supported. In the meantime, we have some guidance from the WID.  All that said, if we must choose now, we support approach 1 given its generality. |
| Samsung | Approach 1 is preferred.  No matter which TDRA method is decided, the consequence is that UE sees a group of REs to be used for TboMS transmission, while option2 to do some optimization on calculation which seems unnecessary, by either TDRA methods we are discussing, it will not affect eventually UE should know the complete RE number to be used for TBS determination. Although TBS determination/calculation is with mathematically quantization so that super precise may not be easy, approach 1 can clearly be closer to get what the resource practically to accommodate. |
| Xiaomi | Approach 1 is preferred. It is more accurate if PUSCH repetition type B like TDRA is used. In addition, no matter what TDRA method is adopted, it can always work well, which helps to postpone the meeting progress without waiting until the exact TDRA method is determined. |
| Apple | Approach 2 is preferred. We share the views as vivo and OPPO. |
| ZTE | Approach 1 is slightly preferred due to its simplicity. Then, we don’t need to further discuss how to determine the K value in approach 2.  In addition, we agree with Ericsson that approach 1 can also accommodate repetition of TBoMS. Note that, we have an FFS point in previous agreement clarifying that further details could be discussed if repetitions of TboMS is supported. |
| Sharp | It depends on whether a part of TboMS is punctured by SFI, CI or high priority PUSCH. If such dynamic puncturing is supported for TboMS, Approach 1 doesn’t work due to gNB/UE ambiguity on TBS calculation. Therefore, we prefer Approach 2 where K is explicitly signalled. |
| InterDigital | To maximize flexibility of TboMS, our preference is approach 1. |
| LG | Support Alternative 2, which can keep the current definition of *NRE*, *N’RE*, and *Ninfo*.  In the current specification, the scaling factor *S* is already defined for the PDSCH assigned by a PDCCH with DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by P-RNTI, or RA-RNTI, MsgB-RNTI. In this case, for the calculation of *Ninfo*, a scaling  is applied.  The same mechanism can be applied for TboMS. |
| Nokia/NSB | We prefer Approach 1 and share the same view with Samsung. |
| Intel | Our understanding is that this is highly dependent on the decision whether repetition type A and/or type B based TDRA is supported for TboMS. Regardless of the decision, in our view, Approach 1 can be applied for both repetition type A and/or type B like TDRA. Hence, we support Approach 1. |
| Qualcomm | Approach 2 is preferred. A separate scale factor lets us decouple TBS determination from total number of REs/repetitions used for TboMS. Suggest waiting for more progress on TDRA aspects. |
| Panasonic | Our preference is Approach 2. Approach 2 has following benefits.   * Easier support of non-consecutive physical slots including potential interaction between UL/DL direction   + Because of the modular processing of each slot/PUSCH, UE and gNB is not required to take into account the number of REs for non-consecutive physical slots for the determination of TB. * The handling of UCI multiplexing, interaction of high priority transmission, the reservation for SRS/PUCCH symbol in a slot are easier.   + UCI situation is not required to take into account for TB determination even only some slot contains UCI as rate matching itself would be carried out for each slot. The interruption of higher priority data is also not influenced. These merits are coming from modular processing. * When RV cycling is carried out in every slot, systematic bit would be mapped more equally over slots.   + The RE mapping procedure is modified to equally distributed over slots in Approach 1 is not required to have similar mapping. * Overall lower coding rate can be realized by just to have multiple slots transmission without introducing separate repetition procedure. |
| Fujitsu | Approach 1 is preferred. Current approach 2 contains various proposals for signalling L and/or K. We can focus on TboMS without repetition for the discussion here. Whether to support repetition+TboMS should be discussed separately. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Approach 1 is preferred. It achieves an accurate result for both of repetition type A and B like TDRA. But approach 2 achieves an inaccurate result for repetition type B like TDRA if the definition of K is not appropriate. |
| IITH, IITM, CEWIT, Reliance Jio, Tejas Networks | Support Approach 2. Seems the most straightforward solution to consider when Type-A like mechanism is supported. |
| TCL | Support Alternative 2, we share the same view with vivo. |
| NEC | We prefer approach 2. We wonder if approach 1 gives extra burden to guarantee the same TBS for retransmission by non-toggled NDI field in DCI. |
| WILUS | We have preference on Approach 2. This approach is aligned with Rel-15/16 where when the PDSCH assigned by a PDCCH with DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by P-RNTI, or RA-RNTI, or MsgB-RNTI is indicated with scaling factor *S*, *Ninfo* is scaled as. The difference is that the scaling factor is no larger than 1 in Rel-15/16 to decrease TBS, but the scaling factor is no smaller than 1 in TboMS to increase TBS. Thus, Approach 2 can be applied with less specification impact. |
| CMCC | Approach 2 is actually a more specific way to realize the Approach 1.  Our intention of proposing to use ‘slot’ as the unit in Approach 1 is to make some difference from the Approach 2. Otherwise, the Approach 1 is unquestionable right. |

FL’s comments on April 14th

Companies’ preferences after the first round of discussion can be summarized as follows:

* Approach 1 [10 companies]: Lenovo/Motorola, Ericsson, Samsung, Xiaomi, ZTE, InterDigital, Nokia/NSB, Intel, Fujitsu, Huawei/HiSi
* Approach 2 [12 companies]: vivo, OPPO, CATT, Apple, Sharp, LGE, Qualcomm, Panasonic, IITH, TCL, NEC, WILUS
* Unclear [1]: CMCC

Further comments/clarifications from FL follows:

@vivo: At present, we haven’t agreed yet that supporting repetition on top of a single TboMS transmission implies that a single TboMS is transmitted as multiple PUSCH repetitions. This discussion is occurring in section 2.4.1 (and in some way on Section 2.4.5 as well), as you pointed out. Having said this, even if assumed that TboMS is transmitted as an enhanced Type A PUSCH repetition, wouldn’t Approach 1 still viable, given current decisions RAN1 took so far? I would like to make sure our understanding is aligned.

@OPPO, CATT: I am not sure it is fair to say that Approach 2 is simpler in terms of specification works. It could be argued that Approach 1 may be simpler as it simply says that all allocated REs should be used, instead of introducing a scaling factor, which may require additional configuration/indication. I think that argument goes in both directions and we should focus on more structural aspects. At least, that’s what I think many companies consider a concern (according to other comments, at least)

@Panasonic: I think you are discussing about difference of TboMS according to the two possible designs which RAN1 is implicitly considering at present (please see my comments in Sections 2.4.1 and 2.4.5). I am not sure they impact directly Ninfo calculation, which can be performed according to Approach 1 as well, regardless of the TboMS design.

Summarizing the current status of the discussion, I think it is fair to say that:

* Companies’ preference may depend on which TboMS design philosophy is adopted (please see discussion in 2.4.1 and 2.4.5).
* No strong majority exists for one approach.

Therefore, in the interest of an efficient use of time, I propose to pause the discussion on Ninfo calculation and come back to it after discussion on 2.4.1 and 2.4.5 is more stable.

### 2.3.2 [OPEN] calculation

Most contributions discussed this aspect, which has a precise impact on TBS determination and, as such, needs to be discussed carefully. The discussions in the submitted contributions focused on the two options identified in the agreements made during RAN1 #104-e meeting. A high-level summary of companies’ preferences based on the contributions, is as follows.

* **Option 1**. is assumed to be the same for all the slots over which the TBoMS transmission is allocated and can be configured by xOverhead as in Rel-15/16 [9 companies].
  + - IITH [12], vivo [6], ZTE [5], Apple [16], Qualcomm [17], Ericsson [21], Lenovo/Motorola [26], LGE [27], WILUS [28] (baseline).
* **Option 2**. is calculated depending on both xOverhead and the number of symbols or slots (FFS whether symbol or slot are used) over which the TBoMS transmission is allocated [4 companies]:
  + - CMCC [11], CATT [7], Intel [15], Nokia/NSB [20].

The following was also additionally proposed for the two approaches above:

* One company (NTT Docomo [25]) proposed that NohPRB calculation for TBoMS should be compatible for both PUSCH repetition type A and B like TDRA or discussed after concluding TDRA determination for TBoMS.

FL’s comments

A majority of companies prefer Option 1, while only 4 companies support Option 2. It is worth observing that it was argued by one company [20], that Option 2 may also encompass Option 1, when is calculated depending on both *xOverhead* and the number of slots, adding that *xOverhead* would need to be scaled for the number of slots in Option 1 as well.

From FL’s perspective, the difference between the two options is that Option 2 can be compatible with both approaches discussed in Section 2.1.1 for time domain resource determination, whereas Option 1 seems compatible only with PUSCH repetition type A like TDRA. In this context, if only the latter is retained in Section 2.1.1, then agreeing on Option 1 should be a natural consequence. On the other hand, the observation in [20] highlights a possible middle ground between the two options and could be used as a starting point for the discussion if other companies agree with the assessment. The following proposal is thus formulated:

***FL proposal 3. is calculated depending on both xOverhead (configured as in Rel-15/16) and on at least the number of slots over which TBoMS is transmitted.***

***FFS: whether, and upon which conditions, can also be calculated depending on both xOverhead and the number of symbols over which TboMS is transmitted.***

#### 2.3.2.1 First round of discussions

FL’s recommendation is to have a first round of discussion among companies about FL proposal 3. The goal is to identify the preferred direction RAN1 should pursue for defining and specifying calculation for TBOMS.

Companies are also invited to express additional views, should they not agree with the proposal. In this case, it would be desirable if companies could also provide alternatives, if any, to give FL the possibility to find middle ground.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Vivo | We understand FL’s motivation. But the main sentence seems to exclude the case that TB is mapped to a **subset** of the slots allocated, i.e. TB mapped to a transmission occasion? So maybe we can make the following revision:  ***FL proposal 3. is calculated depending on both xOverhead (configured as in Rel-15/16) and on at least the number of slots or subset of the slots over which TBoMS is transmitted.***  ***FFS: whether, and upon which conditions, can also be calculated depending on both xOverhead and the number of symbols over which TboMS is transmitted.*** |
| OPPO | To be explicit, option 1. See the difficult to support 2 options for one purpose. |
| CATT | OK with the proposal. We also hope to reach convergence on TDRA to provide guidance to this proposal. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine with FL proposal as a compromise |
| Ericsson | Support the proposal. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support the proposal |
| Samsung | In rel15/16, the ***xOverhead*** is configured per PRB (regardless the number of OFDM symbols for a slot), so we can see for each slot, it should be same value. Although the total overhead for TBS determination for TBoMS will count the number of slot,won’t. so suggest to change to:  ***The total overhead for TBS determination in TBoMS is calculated depending on both xOverhead (i.e., configured as in Rel-15/16) and on ~~at least~~ the number of slots over which TBoMS is transmitted.*** |
| Xiaomi | Support the proposal. |
| Apple | We are fine with this proposal. |
| ZTE | Fine with the proposal. |
| Sharp | We support FL proposal. |
| LG | Support the proposal. |
| Nokia/NSB | Support the FL’s proposal, with the modifications from Samsung which are actually needed to ensure no ambiguity exists in the proposal. |
| Intel | Just a clarification for FL proposal 3: does that mean the value range for xOverhead for TboMS would be same as what was defined in Rel-15?  If this is the intention, we are fine with the proposal. |
| Qualcomm | Proposal 3 reads a lot like Option 2, while the major prefer Option 1.Suggest the following:  is assumed to be the same for all the slots over which the TBoMS transmission is allocated and can be configured by xOverhead as in Rel-15/16   * FFS: how this is used in TBS determination. |
| Panasonic | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Fujitsu | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Since the calculation depends on the time domain resource mapping, we think that it is better discuss the time domain resource allocation first. |
| IITH, IITM, CEWIT, Reliance Jio, Tejas Networks | Support Qualcomm proposal. |
| TCL | Support the proposal. |
| NEC | We are fine with the proposal. And we think overhead discussion in 2.3.2 should be determined based on the result of N\_info discussion in 2.3.1. |
| WILUS | We are fine with the proposal in principle. One comment is that the last agreements say “allocated” but the proposal says “transmitted.” We would keep the last agreements wording because the number of transmitted slots for TboMS may depend on the TDD configurations, ULCI, or high-priority channels/signals. |
| CMCC | Fine with the proposal.  It provides a good compromise of two options. And the considerations of option 2 which have less supports are put into FFS. Then we cannot support the modification from Qualcomm. |

FL’s comments on April 14th

Companies’ preferences after the first round of discussion can be summarized as follows (companies with \* may want to check if their preference is captured correctly):

* Support/fine with FL’s proposal [18 companies]: Samsung, CATT\*, Lenovo/Motorola, Ericsson, NTT Docomo, Xiaomi, Apple, ZTE, Sharp, LGE, Nokia/NSB, Intel, Panasonic, Fujitsu, TCL, NEC, WILUS, CMCC
* Suggest modifications [3 companies]: OPPO (prefer original wording of Option 1), Qualcomm, IITH, vivo\*
* Suggest discussing time-domain resource allocation first [2 companies]: Huawei/HiSi, CATT\*

From FL’s perspective, the proposed modifications from Samsung, and WILUS further clarify the proposal, while also accounting for preferences companies may have for other aspects of TboMS still under discussion. They are all accepted.

Conversely, @vivo’s proposal seems to go at least partially against the spirit of the original proposal given its implication on calculation. I am not sure companies who supported the original version would still agree to that. On the other hand, I think that that a minor modification to the main sentence and an additional FFS point could solve the issue (please see below).

@Qualcomm, OPPO, IITH: I would kindly ask you to consider the meaning and implication of the proposal (with the modifications suggested by other companies) more than the fact that it looks closer to original Option 2 than Option 1, in terms of wording. As Samsung pointed out, in current specification ***xOverhead*** is configured per PRB (regardless the number of OFDM symbols for a slot). Thus, it should always be the same value for each slot, as much as. The current proposal simply states that the total overhead for TBS determination for TBoMS will be a function of the number of slots (or a subset of them) over which the TBoMS is allocated, e.g., it is scaled by the number of slots. This seems fully aligned with the current operations **and** take into account preferences you expressed elsewhere.

@Intel: yes, this is the intention. For this reason, I added your name in the list of companies supporting the proposal.

@Huawei: I understand your concern. Indeed time-domain resource determination for TboMS is not finalized yet. However, according to what we saw so far, it is very likely that at least Type A like time domain determination will be used for TboMS. The current formulation of the proposal reflects this. Conversely, the first FFS point has been indeed included to account for the preferences on Type B like TDRA expressed by some companies, including you. Thus it is FL’s understanding that the FFS point can be solved after TDRA discussion is finalized, but that the main sentence of the proposal is already something RAN1 could rely on, given the current situation of the discussion in 2.1.1. Please have a look at the updated proposal, if this can suit you better.

FL proposal 3 is then updated as follows.

***FL proposal 3. The total overhead for TBS determination in TBoMS is calculated depending on both xOverhead (i.e., , configured as in Rel-15/16) and on a number of slots over which TBoMS is allocated.***

***FFS: whether, and upon which conditions, the total overhead for TBS determination in TBoMS can also be calculated depending on both xOverhead and on the number of symbols over which TboMS is allocated.***

***FFS: the number of slots used to calculate the total overhead for TBS determination in TboMS***

Companies are invited to express additional views on FL proposal 3, **only if they have strong concerns and cannot live with the current proposal**. I would really appreciate if everyone could understand that compromises need to be made. The situation is quite clear looking at the numbers, hence **if you do not agree with the proposal, please propose an alternative which may at least partially address your concerns but does not change the content completely**.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Ericsson | Support |
| LG | We are fine with FL’s proposal in general.  But, we don’t think there is a need to define the total overhead for TBS determination in TboMS in the specification. Instead, same as the current operation, *N’RE* and *NRE* can be obtained by maintaining the definition of , which means the overhead within a PRB. Then scaling can be applied to get *Ninfo* from this.  If the intension of the proposal is not to exclude such operation, we’d like to add a following note for clarification.  Note: It is not intended that the total overhead for TBS determination in TboMS is used for *Ninfo* calculation. |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support the proposal |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal in principle, but it is not clear to us the second FFS. In the main bullet, it is clear that the number of slots over which TBoMS is allocated is used for TBS determination. We suggest to remove the second FFS as  ***FL proposal 3. The total overhead for TBS determination in TBoMS is calculated depending on both xOverhead (i.e., , configured as in Rel-15/16) and on a number of slots over which TBoMS is allocated.***  ***FFS: whether, and upon which conditions, the total overhead for TBS determination in TBoMS can also be calculated depending on both xOverhead and on the number of symbols over which TboMS is allocated.***  ***~~FFS: the number of slots used to calculate the total overhead for TBS determination in TboMS~~*** |
| ZTE | Fine with the proposal. |
| CATT | We support the proposal. Also, LG’s suggestion seems reasonable, since it may or may not need a specific parameter that representing the ‘total overhead’ during the *Ninfo* calculation.  Regarding the issue raised by Intel, we think it may be originally from vivo’s concern. It seems indicating that the ‘actual transmitted resource’ and the ‘allocated resource’ can be different (due to several reasons, maybe)? But we have similar confusion as Intel. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support the proposal |
| OPPO | Original main bullet is OK. We see some confusion for the changed one “a number of slots” sounds like a set of slots. I should be good to say it is an integer factor. |
| WILUS | We share the similar view with LG. The total overhead can denote parameter other than . Also, we prefer Intel’s version of proposal. |

FL comments on April 15th

After the first soft check point, the counter sees 6 companies in favour of FL proposal 1. So far, 4 companies were fine with the principle of FL proposal and suggested modifications on the proposal. Some companies are still missing from the count. Situation is thus as follows:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Preference | # of preferences | Company name |
| **Support FL proposal 3** | 6 | Ericsson, Xiaomi, NTT Docomo, ZTE, Lenovo/Motorola, CATT |
| **Fine in principle and suggested modifications** | 4 | LGE, Intel, OPPO, WILUS |

Several proposals for modifications have been made. From FL’s perspective all stems from the fact that we have not yet agreed on how is calculated (but we still have two options). I will elaborate on this in my answers to companies:

@Intel and WILUS: The presence of the FFS is necessary to the fact that the main sentence states that “**a** number of slots” and not “**the** number of slots”. Indeed, as correctly guessed by @CATT, according to some TBoMS designs, the number of slots used for the calculation of the total overhead per PRB may not be the same as the number of slots over which the TBoMS transmission has been allocated (this is again about the usual differentiation we make between the directions to design TBoMS, please refer to Section 2.4.5). Thus leaving the “**a** number of slots” and the **FFS** can capture both this possibility and the possibility of calculating the overhead per PRB using exactly the number of slots allocated for transmitting the TBoMS. I realize this is not ideal from your perspective, but it is formally correct from my perspective and it does not invalidate your technical preference.

@LGE: thank you for your observation. Instead of putting the note I would try addressing your concern by referring to “total overhead per PRB”. Either way, According to Rel-15/16 this is what is used to calculate , i.e., includes the total overhead per PRB per slot, isn’t it?

@OPPO: I think my comments above may also provide an answer to your concerns, especially the one to Intel and WILUS.

FL proposal 3 is then updated as follows.

***FL proposal 3. The total overhead per PRB for TBS determination in TBoMS is calculated depending on both xOverhead (i.e., , configured as in Rel-15/16) and on a number of slots over which TBoMS is allocated.***

***FFS: whether, and upon which conditions, the total overhead per PRB for TBS determination in TBoMS can also be calculated depending on both xOverhead and on the number of symbols over which TboMS is allocated.***

***FFS: the number of slots used to calculate the total overhead per PRB for TBS determination in TboMS***

Companies are invited to express additional views **only if they have strong concerns** and cannot live with the current proposal. If you agree with the proposal, you do not need to state it again.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Panasonic | In “a number of slots over which TBoMS is allocated”, our understanding of the meaning of “allocated” does not necessary mean the actual allocation based on the discussion. In case of N\_info calculation Approach 2, “a number of slots over which TBoMS is allocated” can be scaling factor in spite it is not “allocation”. With such understanding, we support the proposal, although we prefer not to add “is allocated”. |
| Samsung | Clearly the English wording pulls the strings of the understanding the proposal. ☺  Reading above comments from vivo, intel, and catt, and also FL’s summary. I am afraid current phrase open too large window. Original vivo’s concern is the proposal might exclude the case with one-time configured resource, there could be “one or more TBoMS PUSCH”, e.g., repetition. But current wording in the proposal, it seems even for one TBoMS PUSCH, we need to discuss the number of slot. I don't think this is the intention and I don't think it is reasonable. so we are not ok with the second FFS, and suggested change in following.  Besides, in current NR, the overhead value is used in calculation of REs for one PRB, which also has the meaning on time domain (i.e., no larger than one slot); in fact, as we commented, this value is regardless the number of OFDM symbols in one slot; so we are not ok with “per PRB”  So we suggest following change:  ***FL proposal 3. The total overhead ~~per PRB~~ for TBS determination in TBoMS is calculated depending on both xOverhead (i.e., , configured as in Rel-15/16) and on ~~a~~ the number of slots over which one TBoMS is ~~allocated~~ transmitted.***  ***FFS: whether, and upon which conditions, the total overhead ~~per PRB~~ for TBS determination in TBoMS can also be calculated depending on both xOverhead and on the number of symbols over which TboMS is ~~allocated~~ transmitted.***  ***~~FFS: the number of slots used to calculate the total overhead per PRB for TBS determination in TboMS~~***  ***Note: whether one or multiple TBoMS PUSCH (e.g., by repetition) are allowed in the total configured resource is separately discussed.*** |
| Apple | We are ok with Samsung’s updates on Proposal 3 except removing per PRB, otherwise the proposal need to be updated in another way, such as,  ***. The total overhead ~~per PRB~~ for TBS determination in TBoMS is calculated depending on ~~both~~ xOverhead (i.e., , configured as in Rel-15/16), allocated PRBs and on ~~a~~ the number of slots over which one TBoMS is ~~allocated~~ transmitted.*** |
| LG | We still want to make sure that this proposal is not to conclude to define a new parameter (i.e., the total overhead for TBS determination in TBoMS) other than *NohPRB*. We believe the value *NohPRB*is sufficient for TBS determination, and suggest to add a following note.  Note: It is not intended that the total overhead for TBS determination in TBoMS is used for *Ninfo* calculation.  In addition, there is a discussion that the number of slots for TBS determination can be different with the number of allocated slots for TBoMS. Thus, we share the view with Panasonic and want not to add “is allocated”. |
| OPPO | Seems Apple also have the same concern on “a number of slots”, even in the further round.  We are fine to consider the case that a TBoMS may not occupay all the slots for that TB. We may call it one TBoMS repetition.  FFS point is ok for us  ***The total overhead per PRB for TBS determination in TBoMS is calculated depending on both xOverhead (i.e., , configured as in Rel-15/16) and on ~~a~~ the number of slots over which one TBoMS is allocated.*** |
| Ericsson | The proposal from the last round (without ‘per PRB’) was fine. It’s not clear to me what total overhead per PRB means. So unfortunately, I can’t support this version. |
| IITH, IITM, CEWIT, Reliance Jio, Tejas Networks | The first line of the proposal is not accurate I believe. Why is the overhead per PRB dependent on the total number of symbols used? Is the intention to calculate total overhead across entire allocation and then find a scaled value per PRB? We cannot support this proposal. |
| Nokia/NSB | We support the FL’s proposal with the understanding that: Currently, the number of REs () for calculating is determined per slot. Now with TBoMS, is no longer determined within a slot but could also be determined by the resource across multiple slots, as discussed in Section 2.3.2. The , which is now determined by the resource across multiple slots for TBoMS, is calculated by scaling by the number of PRBs, where is the number of REs per PRB. Therefore, should also be determined by resource across multiple slots for TBoMS. Consequently, (which is used for calculating ) should also be determined by resource across multiple slots and it is counted per PRB. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | The proposal is related to the discussion of TDRA, and assumes the same overhead for all assigned slots which can cause a negligible estimation bias for a repetition type B-like TDRA or for a scheduled special slot. |
|  |  |

FL’s comments on April 16th

@Panasonic: Thank you for supporting the proposal. I can confirm your understanding is correct that the bold text in “**a** number of slots over which TBoMS **is allocated**” was added to address concerns from some companies in previous round (WILUS) that the number of slots that is used for TBS determination may or may not be the total number of allocated slots and this is to be discussed. That is the reason why the second FFS was added to further discuss what is “**a** number of slots”. Given the situation, and the uncertainty on how will be eventually calculated (i.e., what the scaling factor will be) I still keep the “allocated” but I also add “not larger than” after “after a number of slots”. I think this should address your concern, and several other companies’.

@Apple: Thank you. Your suggestion has been considered in the rephrased proposal (please see below).

@Samsung: First, let me clarify that this is for a single TBoMS as currently discussed in Section 2.4.5. Now, on the one hand, I agree with you that is currently configured per slot. However, time-domain resource for TBoMS has multiple slots. Then, we can have two approaches for taking into account the overhead: either adding more values to the current set of possible values for xOverhead or we reuse the legacy values per slot and scale it with the number of slots that is used for calculating TBS. As several companies express their concern on the first approach, it seems that the second approach is a fair middle ground and that is the reason why we are discussing about this proposal. On the other hand, as pointed out by Apple and Nokia, is currently used for the calculation of , which is the number of REs per PRB. Therefore, I think that it is reasonable to add it, and compliant with current operations. In addition, as some companies do not want to introduce a new parameter (please see LG comment), it seems better to follow the same way of calculating as in Rel-15/16, i.e., we firstly calculate per PRB and then scale by the number of allocated PRBs for the transmission in a slot. Anyway, to avoid ambiguities, and as I explained to Ericsson below, I rephrased the proposal to account for the dependence of the total overhead on the number of allocated PRBs and removed per “per PRB” part.

@LG: With this proposal we are indeed trying to avoid introducing a new parameter (please check my reply to Samsung). I am not sure anyone proposed this so far, and my FL’s understanding is that this is indeed not needed. Indeed, according to the current version of the proposal would still be used to calculate which would then be used to calculate for calculation. Therefore, I am not sure we need that note. I hope that this can clarify your concern.

@OPPO: Thank you for your suggestion. Please check my reply to Panasonic and I hope that you are also fine with the revised proposal.

@Ericsson: As I replied to Samsung, currently the overhead is calculated per PRB. This is the reason behind the original phrasing. On the other hand, I accept your comment and I rephrased the proposal to ensure your, Samsung’s and Apple’s comments were considered (please see below).

@Huawei: The purpose of the FFS is to include also all cases based on the number of symbols and not on the number of slots, as per some companies’ proposal. Are you sure it does not cover Type B like TDRA? If not, could you please suggest an alternative wording I could use for the next update? Thank you.

@All: on the “**a** number of slots”. I am a bit surprised by all the comments I received about this, since I was hoping to be inclusive of all possible proposals by using the article “**a**” and not the article “**the**”. Since we have not decided how many slots will be used for calculation Ninfo, I figured that using “a number of slots” was much more general than “the number of slots”. This was meant to ensure to all companies that no options were discarded. For this reason, I would still keep it in the proposal. I hope this explanation can clarify the inention. If not, please feel free to ask again and we can work on it more.

New version of the proposal, accounting for all the above, follows:

***FL proposal 3-v1. The total overhead ~~per PRB~~ for TBS determination in TBoMS is calculated depending on the number of allocated PRBs, xOverhead (i.e., , configured as in Rel-15/16) and on a number of slots not larger than the number of slots over which TBoMS is allocated. ~~over which TBoMS is allocated.~~***

***FFS: whether, and upon which conditions, the total overhead for TBS determination in TBoMS can also be calculated depending on the number of allocated PRBs, xOverhead and on a number of symbols not larger than the number of symbols over which TboMS is allocated.***

***FFS: the number of slots used to calculate the total overhead for TBS determination in TboMS***

Companies are invited to express additional views in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Ericsson | Support |
| Intel | We have a clarification question for “***on a number of slots not larger than the number of slots over which TBoMS is allocated***”. It seems to us this contradicts previous agreement as “the number of symbols or slots (FFS whether symbol or slot are used) over which the TBoMS transmission is allocated.” Is this correct understanding? Hope to clarify this. |
|  |  |

### 2.3.3 [CLOSED] Constraint on maximum TBS for TBoMS

The potential constraint on maximum TBS for TBoMS was discussed in several submitted contributions and can be summarized as follows.

* Two companies (Huawei/HiSi [3], CATT [7]) proposed that further constraint on maximum TBS for TBoMS is not needed.
* One company (ZTE [5]) proposed that the maximum TBS can be limited by the conditions of data rate limitations DataRate and DataRateCC.
* One company (Qualcomm [17]) proposed to restrict TBoMS transmissions to TB sizes that permit single codeblock transmissions (i.e., entire TB can be encoded as a single codeblock).

FL’s comments

From FL’s perspective, this is a less fundamental topic RAN1 can afford discussing when more paramount aspects of TBoMS have been agreed on. FL suggests not to discuss this topic during #104-bis-e, unless need arises.

#### 2.3.3.1 First round of discussions

If and when this section is open, companies will be invited to express views on the constraints, if any, on the maximum TBS that can be used for TBoMS.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## 2.4 Others

As discussed at the beginning of Section 2, aspects and topics related to several aspects of TBoMS have been prioritized in order to ensure that constructive discussions and effective progress can be achieved during RAN1 #104-bis-e. In this context, priority has been given to the aspects and topics discussed in sections 2.1 to 2.3, which mostly focus on resource allocation for TBoMS and related matters. All other aspects are listed in this section, i.e, 2.4, where proposals made by companies in their contributions are reported and described in detail. Discussion on two of these aspects is open, i.e., the ones described in Sections 2.4.1, 2.4.2 and 2.4.5, and one FL proposal is also formulated.

No specific FL’s proposal or recommendation is formulated for other aspects at this stage, since such aspects may not be handled during RAN1 #104-bis-e. Should discussions for 2.1 to 2.3, 2.4.1, 2.4.2 and 2.4.5 progress fast, new sections for specific aspects, currently in 2.4, will be open for discussions and corresponding FL’s proposals and recommendations would be made.

### [PAUSED] Relationship between TBoMS and PUSCH repetitions

After the preliminary discussions occurred during the GTW scheduled on April, 13th, it became evident that a fundamental step to be taken is the clarification of the relationship between TBoMS and PUSCH repetitions. From FL’s perspective, two major directions can be identified:

* **Approach 1**: TBoMS is designed as a Type A PUSCH repetitions enhancement, in which TBS is determined based on the available resources over one or multiple slots.
  + Note1: This approach may have at least the following implications:
    - A transmission occasion of a TBoMS transmission constitutes a set of contiguous resources (symbols) spanning one or more slots.
    - TBoMS transmission is performed over one or more transmission occasions
    - RV cycling is applied across transmission occasions.
    - is the total number of REs available in a single transmission occasion of a TBoMS.
    - The PUSCH repetition type A and RV cycling framework in R15/R16 is repurposed for TBoMS transmission across multiple transmission occasions.
* **Approach 2**: TBoMS is designed as a new feature which shares several indicators with Type A/B PUSCH repetitions, e.g., TDRA, but that provides an alternative way of using the resource given by multiple slots.
  + Note1: This approach may have at least the following implications:
    - The TBS is determined based on the resources available over multiple slots.
    - TBoMS transmission is performed over multiple slots.
    - Different bit to resource mapping mechanisms are possible (RV cycling based or not).
    - is the total number of REs available in several slots.
    - Signaling used in the feature can reuse part of the existing PUSCH repetition Type A/B framework.
  + Note2: the expression “Type A/B” is used to capture the fact that RAN1 has not decided whether Type A and/or Type like TDRA are used by TBoMS for time domain resource determination. It does not imply any specific preference for Approach 2.

It has been noted that many discussions RAN1 is having in other sections of this document may be impacted by the decision on which Approach to use for the design TBoMS. Therefore, this discussion is to be carried out with high priority and a final decision should be made during this meeting.

A question I would like to add from FL’s perspective is also the following:

* If TBoMS is designed according to Approach 1 and becomes a Type A PUSCH repetitions enhancement, can we still claim that RAN1 is fulfilling what is mandated in the WID, where Type A PUSCH enhancements are supposed to be discussed and specified in AI 8.8.1.1?

#### 2.4.1.1 First round of discussions

FL’s recommendation is to have a first round of discussion among companies about Approach 1 and Approach 2 (and FL’s question). Companies are invited not to express preferences on specific aspects of the designs according to both approaches, but only preferences on the approaches. Specific design aspects can be discussed in other sections. Corrections to the notes can of course be suggested.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Ericsson | We lean toward approach 2, since our understanding of TBoMS is to provide more time domain resources for a transport block: the WID calls for TBS determined based on multiple slots. How the RV determination works, and if the TBS calculation is in line with the WID is not so clear to us in Approach 1. We therefore have a similar doubt as in the FL question. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Approach 1 is not qualified to be TBoMS. It is hard to find the motivation to just increase TBS as an enhancement of PUSCH repetition type A.  TBoMS is a technique to enhance coverage performance. It is not the enhanced technique of normal repetitions. Just some mechanisms of repetitions can be reused for TBoMS since they are the same in a sense that resources over multi-slot are assigned for one TB. We think this topic is very tied to 2.4.5 redundancy version and rate-matching. Concluding 2.4.5 can make it clear the difference between repetitions and TBoMS. |
| Samsung | Approach 2 is more aligned with our understanding. |
| Xiaomi | Generally support Approach 2. TBoMS is quite a different coverage enhancement method from PUSCH repetition. The purpose of use of TBoMS is to obtain the power boosting gain by limiting RBs in an OFDM symbol, and to obtain more coding gain by extending the time domain resource. While, the purpose of use of PUSCH repetition is to achieve a lower coding rate. Thus, TBoMS should be discussed as a new feature.  Besides, considering TBoMS and repetition are two features, a question need to be discussed is whether these two features can be used together and how to design the related signalling procedure. |
| Apple | Try to understand the proposal better, comparing the proposed Approach 1 and Approach 2, we don’t see the big difference. If we remove the “RV cycling is applied across transmission occasions” in Approach 1 and remove “the type B framework” in Approach 2, both approaches are almost the same. I think the key difference of two approaches is the whole TB is mapping to one slot (then perform the repetition) or mapping to multiple slots directly.   * **Approach 1**: TBoMS is designed as a Type A PUSCH repetitions enhancement, in which TBS is determined based on the available resources over ~~one or~~ multiple slots.   + Note1: This approach may have at least the following implications:     - A transmission occasion of a TBoMS transmission constitutes a set of contiguous resources (symbols) spanning ~~one or~~ more slots.     - The coded bits of the TB are mapping separately to each slots of the transmission occasion with RV cycling       * Each slot could be self-decodable     - TBoMS transmission is performed over one or more transmission occasions     - RV cycling is applied across transmission occasions.   Apple: above two bullets are related to repetition on top of TBoMS repetition, which can apply to both approaches. Or just remove these two bullets to discuss the TBoMS only.   * + - is the total number of REs available in a single transmission occasion of a TBoMS.     - The PUSCH repetition type A and RV cycling framework in R15/R16 is repurposed for TBoMS transmission across multiple transmission occasions. * **Approach 2**: TBoMS is designed as a new feature which shares several indicators with Type A/B PUSCH repetitions, e.g., TDRA, but that provides an alternative way of using the resource given by multiple slots.   + Note1: This approach may have at least the following implications:     - The TBS is determined based on the resources available over multiple slots.     - TBoMS transmission is performed over multiple slots.     - Different bit to resource mapping mechanisms are possible (RV cycling based or not).       * single slot is not self-decodable   Apple: Does this bullet mean “The coded bits of the TB are mapping to all the slots, which are used to determine the TBS”?   * + - is the total number of REs available in several slots.     - Signaling used in the feature can reuse part of the existing PUSCH repetition Type A/B framework.   Note2: the expression “Type A/B” is used to capture the fact that RAN1 has not decided whether Type A and/or Type like TDRA are used by TBoMS for time domain resource determination. It does not imply any specific preference for Approach 2. |
| Vivo | Approach 1 is preferred.  However, we do not think these two approaches are mutually exclusive based on above description. Approach 2 seems to be a more general description compared with approach 1, while approach 1 is a special case of Approach 2?  In our opinion, the core objective for TBoMS is to allow a TB mapped to more than 1 slot, this objective can also be achieved by Approach 1. The enhancement may have some similarity with PUSCH Type-A repetition, but it does not mean it is belongs to scope of AI 8.8.1.1, which focuses on number of repetitions and determination of available slots, rather than TB processing over multiple slots. |
| ZTE | We have no strong preference on the approaches, but feel important to make a decision for this issue. On one hand, approach 1 as a super set that includes approach 2 could provide potential benefits as it is specified in NB-IOT. On the other hand, it would require much more specification efforts, and if TBoMS only or enhanced repetition type A only is sufficient for coverage enhancement of PUSCH, approach 2 may be sufficient.  As for the question, we think it is clear that repetition type A enhancements only include two enhancement aspects as captured in the WID, TBoMS related design is under this agenda. There is no conflicts with the WID. |
| Sharp | Our first preference is Approach 1. Even with Approach 1, we can obtain the power boosting gain by limiting RBs in an OFDM symbol and obtain more coding gain by extending the time domain resource. Further, overhead reduction can be obtained. We may also consider Approach 2 as a further optimized solution. However, with Approach 2, some issue may need to be considered, e.g., collision handling.  Regarding WID confliction aspects, we agree with ZTE that no collision happens in the scope. |
| China Telecom | Approach 2. TBoMS is a new feature. It does not have to be related with repetition type A or type B. The motivation of repetition type A/B like TDRA for TBoMS is to reduce standardization efforts. |
| InterDigital | We support Approach 2. The intention of TBoMS is to spread TB over multiple slots so that we can focus energy on small number of PRBs and also attempt to gather time diversity from spreading. Repetition is another enhancement that may be considered on top of Approach 2 in the future discussion. |
| LG | We prefer Approach 2~~Approach 1~~.  In the current PUSCH repetition type A, TBS determination, RV cycling, and rate-matching is based on a transmission occasion of TB repetitions where a transmission occasion consists of *L* symbols within a slot.  In our view, a transmission occasion is extended to multiple slots in case of TBoMS. Thus, TBS determination, RV cycling, and rate-matching is based on multiple slots for TBoMS transmission. In case of TBoMS repetitions, TBoMS is repeated over multiple transmission occasions. |
| Nokia/NSB | We support Approach 2.  We share the same view as Ericsson and NTT Docomo that Approach 1 is simply an enhancement of PUSCH repetition type A with different TBS determination approach. As nicely commented by NTT Docomo, “this approach is not qualified for TBoMS” because of the following reasons:   * It is not aligned with the logic used when drafting the WID. Specifically, if TBoMS is defined as an enhancement of PUSCH repetition type A, it would have been included in 8.8.1.1 during WID drafting stage. Of course, now AI 8.8.1.1 is about enhancements in terms of number of repetitions, but it is rather clear that the original intention was to make it about PUSCH type A repetitions, whereas AI 8.8.1.2 and AI 8.8.1.3 are not. * If PUSCH repetition type A is repurposed to support TBoMS, then TBS is determined using multiple slots (i.e., Approach 1 is used) and the larger TBS (compared to legacy type A repetition) is transmitted on the legacy PUSCH repetition type A framework. This may lead to the case that none of the RVs is self-decodable since a lot of systematic and parity bits are punctured. This is actually quite problematic and defeats most of the purpose of Type A repetitions in the first place. We note that this problem would always occur when nominal code rate becomes larger than 1 (and this can easily happen with Approach 1, as also stated in some contributions) and TBS is larger than the number of bits that can be mapped to the resource within a slot, e.g., with a small number of allocated PRBs and high number of slots, as explained in Huawei [3] and Nokia [20] contributions. This problem can never occur with Approach 2. * It is worth observing that the excessive puncturing of systematic and parity bits does not happen only when high TBS are used, but also whenever the PUSCH configuration in terms of number of PRBs, MCS and number of symbols results in insufficient resources to carry the entire TBS prior to rate matching. For instance, if 2 PRBs, 2os and 4QAM is used, a TBS larger than 576 bits would already be too large and both systematic and parity bits would have to be significantly punctured. This shows an evident paradox of Approach 1. On the one hand, gNB may want to configure TBoMS with small number of PRBs to experience power gain and guarantee reasonably sized TBS to reduce impact of higher-layer overhead and maintain a reasonable throughput over PUSCH. On the other hand, TBS could not become larger than a rather small number, e.g., few hundreds of bits, (which is much smaller than 3824 bits, threshold for CB segmentation in case of BG2, for instance), which goes against the intuition underlying the concept of TBoMS. This would mandate gNB to consider a lot of constraints in terms of link adaptation and scheduler, given that the granularity of the possible configuration options could be much smaller. Once again, this problem never happens with Approach 2. * Considering TBoMS as an enhancement of PUSCH repetitions type A was not discussed and properly studied/evaluated during the SI phase. Again, that is the reason why TBoMS was not mentioned in WID as PUSCH repetition type A enhancement. **We do not think it is a good practice to study a technique according to one implementation/understanding and then specifying something else.**   Finally, we are puzzled by comments made by Apple. The two approaches are deeply different. In one case, we have multiple PUSCH Type A repetitions, where TBS is determined using resource of more than 1 slot and transmitted with RV cycling over multiple transmission occasions. In the other case we have a “single” PUSCH repetition/transmission, where TBS is determined using resource of more than 1 slots and transmitted over multiple slots, and single RV can be used. |
| Intel | We support Approach 2. In our view, Approach 1 is more like a combination of repetition + transmission occasion with finer granularity with continuous number of symbols.  If we consider Approach 2 + repetition, we do not see much difference between Approach 1 and 2 if contiguous number of symbols is allocated for a TBoMS. From this perspective, Approach 2 is more general than Approach 1 as it can support non-contiguous TDRA for a transmission occasion compared to Approach 2. |
| Qualcomm | Echoing vivo comments, we strongly prefer Approach 1.  Type A TDRA already provides support across nonconsecutive slots, and we wish to reuse this framework rather than built a new one from the ground up.  We want to minimize TDRA changes. This is neither a new traffic type (like URLLC, eMBB, etc) nor is it a new vertical of devices (NB-IoT, eMTC, etc). Introducing a new TDRA Type ‘C’ will have a huge specification and implementation impact. The feature at hand doesn’t call for such large changes.  Some companies have expressed the desire to support S+U slots. To accommodate this, and to pull in some aspects of Type B TDRA, we could consider supporting L>14 under Type A TDRA. This change may also be helpful for consecutive U slots as in the case of FDD.  The WID explicitly says TBS determination and makes no mention of TDRA changes. As such, a strict reading of the WID would imply that only TBS determination is to be specified. |
| Panasonic | Apple’s clarification/update on Approach 1 and 2 is more aligned with our understanding. Based on our link-level simulation results, both Approach 1 and 2 can provide almost the same performance assuming the majority usage is inter-slot frequency hopping is enabled. In our view, Approach 2 has more difficulty on UCI multiplexing, special slot, higher priority transmission interruption. Therefore, we prefer Approach 1. On Approach 1, “TBS is determined based on the available resources over one or multiple slots” would be based on Approach 1 in Section 2.3.1. We think over 1 slot with the scaling factor K is used for Approach 2 in Section 2.2.1. |
| LG(2) | We have misrepresented what we are supporting.  We prefer Approach 2, not Approach 1. We have also modified our previous comment.  Sorry for the inconvenience |
| CATT | In our view, Approach 2 is the common (or at least the major) understanding during the SI phase. Otherwise, TBoMS should be discussed in AI8.8.1.1, rather than having the independent agenda.  Approach 1 is not the design purpose, but may have advantage in implementation simplicity. However, as pointed out by Intel and other companies, if repetition (naturally using RV cycling and multiple TOs) can be applied on top of TBoMS (defined by Approach 2, single RV and TO for multiple slots), there is no much different between Approach 1 and 2.  So we tend to define TBoMS by Approach 2. Approach 1 can still be achieved by putting restrictions/combining repetitions based on Approach 2. |
| Fujitsu | We feel sympathy with the FL’s question. Approach 1 is not in the scope of AI 8.8.1.2. |
| Apple (2) | Before we decide Approach 1 or Approach 2, it could be better we can see the performance difference, but unfortunately there was no such comparison during the study. Regarding the terminology of TBoMS itself, China Telecom already raised this issue in their contribution R1-2008874 during the SI phase. And we tried to clarify the meaning of TBoMS in our contribution as well. So fair to say, TBoMB had different understandings since SI phase.  From our side, if there is no clear performance difference between Approach 1 and Approach 2, the standard impacts and implementation complexity shall be considered as criteria to move forward. We know the pros and cons for both approaches, the TB size could be the potential issue for approach1, but considering the target data rate defined in the study, we don’t see big issue here. For Approach 2, UCI multiplexing could be problematic, the retransmission could reduce the spectrum efficiency, supporting non-consecutive UL transmission is increasing the UE complexity.  In short, if there were no clear benefits of Approach 2 over Approach 1, we prefer Approach 1. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support approach 2.  For none-contiguous transmission, it is not clear how to define the PUSCH transmission occasion, and how to perform the RV cycling between the transmission occasions.  Furthermore, the TBoMS may not be used together with repetition, and bundling the TBoMS is not preferred. |
| IITH, IITM, CEWIT, Reliance Jio, Tejas Networks | We support Vivo and Qualcomm comments. However not all parts of Approach 1 are agreeable to us, especially considering the TBoMS transmission occasion, and mixing up of repetitions/rv cycling etc. In our view TBoMS is a single TB sent across no contiguous slots and this is one transmission occasion. |
| TCL | We support Approach 2. Approach 2 is a more general as it can support non-contiguous TDRA. |
| WILUS | Approach 2. Our understanding is that TBoMS is not an enhancement of PUSCH repetition, but a new feature to improve coverage. Even though TBoMS may use TDRA defined in Type-A or Tyep-B PUSCH repetition, it is only for minimizing standardization efforts. |
| CMCC | From our understanding, the TBoMS could use a limited PRB over multiple slots to gain the power boosting. And as the multiple slots are used for the single TB, we have a chance to utilize the gain of coding to extend the coverage. Base on that, a lower code rate could be achieved compared with the transmission of single TB over single slot. Then additional coding gain could be achieved compared with simple repetitions. Under this consideration, we do not see the necessity to do the repetitions based on TBoMS.  We cannot accept that the TBoMS is an extension of Type A repetition. However, beside the 1st sentence, we do not see much relationship with repetition Type A within the Approach 1. Maybe we misunderstand something.  Could FL provide more illustrations why TBoMS could have a chance to be the extension or enhancement of repetition Type A.  For the Approach 2, we share the view that TBoMS is a new feature. But currently we do not have any conclusion of TBoMS will share the indication of Type A/B.  The discussion related to RV should be in section 2.4.5. We can focus on the relations between TBoMS and repetitions in this section. |
| OPPO2 | We think the Approach 1 is the right within the Scope.  Seems there is a misunderstanding that the Approach 2 did not mention slot determination, TDRA and then, some companies believes that it is open for discussion. And it can be then “Re-designed”. Those are actually no trivial things.  Please note plenty of things are not mentioned in the bullet. RE mapping, Resource allocation. Don’t mention that does not means we have to redo those.  For technical issues, we also agree the vivo and QC’s comment. |
| Sierra Wireles | Both approaches are within scope. We generally agree with Qualcomm but do not have a strong view as it is not a matter of performance (as per Apple view) but more a principle of development and how the specification will be written. |

FL comments on April 14th

Companies expressed several views and comments.

According to FL’s understanding, situation is as follows:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Preference | # of preferences | Company name |
| **Approach 1** | 6 | Apple, vivo, Qualcomm, Sharp, Panasonic, Oppo |
| **Approach 2** | 17 | Ericsson, NTT DOCOMO, Xiaomi, Samsung, ZTE, China Telecom, Interdigital, LGE, Nokia/NSB, Intel, CATT, Fujitsu, Huawei/HiSi, IITH, TCL, Wilus, CMCC |

Some companies commented about the ambiguity or similarity of the two approaches, which I do not agree with. From my perspective it is rather clear that the two approaches refer to the **two different and alternative design directions** RAN1 has been implicitly discussing since RAN1 #104-e, which can be summarized as follows (where 1 and 2 are alternative to each other):

1. TBoMS is an enhanced/repurposed version of PUSCH repetition Type A, where TBS can be larger than the max TBS which could be transmitted over one slot, and where other minor adjustments may be made to accommodate the support of the S slots (for instance, but not necessarily, using aspects of Type B repetition framework).
2. TBoMS is an independent feature in which TBS is determined as a function of the resources of multiple slots (different options exist in this sense) in which some part of the signalling framework of PUSCH repetition Type A (and/or B) is reused for simplicity.

From my perspective, the situation above is quite clear. 17 companies think that TBoMS is and should be designed as an independent feature, and should not be designed as an enhancement/variant of Type A PUSCH repetition (in which TBS can be larger than the max TBS which could be transmitted over one slot). 6 companies prefer the other approach.

Middle ground may not be easy to find, given that the two directions are very different. On the other hand, the difficulty we are facing to find such middle ground may be also, at least partially due, to different terminologies used by different companies and, to some extent, misunderstandings.

Clarifying terminology and misunderstandings, if any, would be helpful for both the discussion in this section and in 2.4.5 (and, as consequence, in all other sections whose discussion may depend on those). For this reason, and also given suggestions many companies gave during the first round, I propose to address this “clarification issue” in 2.4.5, to avoid redundancies. Please refer to 2.4.5 for continuing the discussion. We will come back to 2.4.1 as soon as possible.

Before concluding, I’d like to provide some further answers/comments to companies:

@Oppo: I am positive all companies understand the implications of choosing Approach 2 over Approach 1. In most comments provided by companies supporting Approach 2, we can read sentences like “TBoMS is a new feature”, “it does not need to be related to PUSCH repetitions” and so on. In this regard, I think we can rely on all companies to be aware of pros and cons, at this stage.

@Apple: I think further comments by companies and FL may have already addressed your questions. If this is not the case, you may want to have a look at 2.4.5, where further details about the difference between Approach 1 and Approach 2 are given, e.g., w.r.t the bit to RE mapping as per your question.

@CMCC: besides what I wrote above, you may want to have a look at what I wrote in section 2.4.5 to have additional details on why TBoMS as per Approach 1 can be seen as an enhancement of PUSCH repetitions Type A. I hope this can clarify your doubt.

@All: concerning the “out of scope” comments, the rationale of question I asked, and of some of the answers I received is as follows. If TBoMS is designed as a special case / enhancement of Type A PUSCH repetitions, it could have been agreed in this form since the beginning, e.g., during SI and/or during WID phase, and it could have been included as part of AI 8.8.1.1, where Type A PUSCH repetition enhancements are discussed. Of course, with the current formulation, the objectives of the two AIs are not colliding. The question is more about the intentions during SI and WID drafting phase.

Discussion is now temporarily paused to avoid inefficient overlaps between 2.4.1 and 2.4.5.

### [CLOSED] Repetitions of TBoMS

Repetitions of TBoMS were discussed in several contributions, which can be summarized as follows:

* Eight companies (NTT Docomo [25], Xiaomi [13], Intel [15], Apple [16], Samsung [19], Sierra Wireless [22], Sharp [23], LGE [27]) proposed that repetition should be supported on top of TBoMS.
* Two companies proposed to support repetition of TBoMS with constraint:
  + One company (Panasonic [18]) proposed that repetition of TBoMS is considered only if overall coding rate lower than which has been specified in MCS table for URLLC is necessary.
  + One company (Huawei/HiSi [3]) proposed that repetition of TBoMS is supported, and the overall number of slots for TBoMS with repetition should be limited.
* One company (CMCC [11]) proposed that repetition of TBoMS should not be supported.
* Two companies (ZTE [5], Ericsson [21]) proposed further discussion on whether repetition of TBoMS should be supported or not.
* One company (China Telecom [10]) proposed down selection between setting the maximum number of aggregated slots for TBoMS to be the same as the maximum number of repetitions for PUSCH repetition type A or supporting repetition of TBoMS.

FL’s comments

Most companies prefer supporting repetitions of TBoMS. One company prefers not to support PUSCH repetitions for TBoMS. One company explicitly proposes to implement TBoMS as a special case of PUSCH repetitions type A (details are provided in [17]), whereas another company proposes not to consider TBoMS should as a PUSCH repetition type A and/or type B enhancement.

From FL’s perspective, the situation seems rather in favour of supporting repetitions of TBoMS. It is acknowledged that the technical need of repetitions of TBoMS may depend on how TBoMS feature is finally designed. In this regard, it may be worth observing that once such aspects are designed, adding support to repetitions of TBoMS would be an incremental effort, given that time-domain constraints, if any, would be clear by then. Thus, since more foundational aspects are still on the table, FL’s suggestion is to focus on these and “keep the door open” to repetitions of TBoMS. The following proposal is then formulated:

***FL proposal 4. Support of repetitions of TBoMS is considered FFS.***

#### 2.4.2.1 First round of discussions

FL’s recommendation is to have a first round of discussion among companies about FL proposal 4. The goal is to ensure that more foundational aspect of TBoMS are worked out before discussing repetitions of TBoMS.

Companies are invited to express additional views, should they not agree with the proposal. In this case, it would be desirable if companies could also provide alternatives, if any, to give FL the possibility to find middle ground.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| vivo | Since large majority prefer to support TBoMS with repetition, perhaps agree to support repetition of TBoMS may facilitate the discussion in TDRA determination and TBS determination? |
| OPPO | That depends on definition of TBoMS. Seems one definition have a TBoMS “span” in multiple slots and the repetitions are based on that “span”  It can also be looked as TBoMS have a TB slot determination parameter “K” slots. It is used when PUSCH repetition is configured. In this understanding, we see they are configured together. |
| CATT | OK with the proposal. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support the FL’s proposal |
| Ericsson | We are open to further study, but are not ready to agree to specify repetition at this stage. If the number of slots in a TBoMS transmission is somehow limited, then it is more likely that repetition could be beneficial. But since HARQ always outperforms repetition, repetition can be seen as a PDCCH overhead savings rather than a coverage enhancing feature. Then having TBoMS and repetition together, both of which reduce PDCCH overhead, may be overkill. |
| Xiaomi | We support the proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | In our understanding, the TBoMS may not be able to reduce the overall coding rate as repetition since it just aggregate multiple packets in several slots, to compare with the coverage performance of the repetition, repetition together with TBoMS should be supported. |
| CMCC | This may depend on the discussion in the section 2.4.1. As we replied in the last section, compared with 4 slot repetition, the TBoMS could have additional coding gain with the same resources. That is the reason we think there is no need to support the repetition of TBoMS. |

### [CLOSED] DM-RS

DM-RS allocation was discussed in several contributions, which can be classified into the following sub-topics:

**DM-RS allocation for TBoMS in general**

* One company (Ericsson [21]) proposed that the same DMRS configuration is used in all slots of TBoMS.
* Two companies (Sharp [23], MediaTek [8]) proposed that DMRS location can be slot specific as legacy operation.

**DM-RS allocation for TBoMS in case joint channel estimation is enabled**

* One company (Samsung [19]) proposed to further study time domain allocation of DM-RS considering joint channel estimation over multi-slot and transmissions (e.g. DM-RS allocation is determined per PUSCH transmission, or per slot).
* One company (Sharp [23]) proposed that DMRS configuration for length larger than 14 should be studied in joint channel estimation AI.

### [CLOSED] CB segmentation

Concerning TB processing for mapping the TB on a resource that spans across multiple slots, the following proposals about CB segmentation were discussed in several contributions:

* One company (Ericsson [21]) proposed that CB segmentation can be considered for TBoMS.
* One company (LGE [27]) proposed that the maximum TBS for TBoMS should be reduced so that CB segmentation does not occur.
* One company (Apple [16]) proposed that the TBoMS terminology should be clarified by down-selecting between TB segmentation and slot bundling.
* One company (Qualcomm [17]) proposed that RAN1 should prioritize design considerations for TBoMS that help prevent or reduce small payload segmentation.

### [OPEN] Redundancy version and rate-matching

Concerning TB processing for mapping the TB on the resource that spans across multiple slots, the following proposals on redundancy version and rate-matching were made:

* Four companies (China Telecom [10], OPPO [4], Nokia/NSB [20], Ericsson [21]) proposed that continuous rate-matching with a single RV should be considered for TBoMS.
* Three companies (Huawei/HiSi [3], Samsung [19], MediaTek [8]) proposed that continuous rate-matching and RV-based segmented rate-matching (RV cycling) should be further studied.
* Two companies (Qualcomm [17], Panasonic [18]) proposed that RV index for a transmission occasion that constitutes a set of contiguous resources (symbols) spanning one or more slots can be a single RV index or an updated RV index is used each time a slot boundary is crossed.
* One company (Sharp [23]) proposed that if a single PUSCH crossing slot boundaries without repetition is supported for TBoMS transmission, some reserved resources (e.g., DL region) which overlaps with the single PUSCH should be punctured or rate matched.
* One company (Qualcomm [17]) proposed repeating TBoMS across transmission occasion that constitutes a set of contiguous resources (symbols) spanning one or more slots using PUSCH repetition type A and RV cycling framework. FFS: limits on maximum duration of a transmission occasion.
* One company (Nokia/NSB [20]) proposed that RAN1 should specify TBoMS as an independent feature according to WID and TBoMS should not be considered as an enhancement of neither PUSCH repetition type A nor type B, regardless of how time domain resource determination is indicated.

FL’s comments

RV and rate matching could be considered as aspects which should be discussed only after decisions on aspects such as resource allocation (time and frequency domain) and TBS determination are taken. However, these aspects can be tied to other considerations affecting decisions and preferences companies have on resource allocation (time and frequency domain) and TBS determination. In this sense, discussing RV and rate matching could offer further opportunities to companies to better understand each other’s point of view and converge to acceptable outcomes and middle ground.

From FL’s perspective situation does not seem to offer clear directions for which consensus exists across companies, which could be used to draft a first FL proposal. Further discussion is necessary.

#### 2.4.5.1 First round of discussions

FL’s recommendation is to have first round of discussion among companies about RV and rate-matching.

Companies are invited to express views and preferences.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| OPPO | To ensure the performance 1 RV mapping to continuous slots should be supported at least for FDD. |
| CATT | In our understanding, single RV is the baseline of TBoMS. If RV-based segmented rate-matching (RV cycling) is applied, there seems no much difference between TBoMS and normal repetition mechanism. But we are open to discuss if RV cycling is proven to be critical for TBoMS. |
| Ericsson | We are not firmly opposed to e.g. multiple RVs in a TBoMS transmission, but think that a single RV is the most logical starting point. If a strong benefit to multiple RVs within a TBoMS can be demonstrated, we can be open to that. |
| NTT DOCOMO | In TBoMS, segmentations of a single RV should be assigned over all assigned resources for TBoMS. Otherwise, it is pretty much the same as repetition and hard to find the motivation of supporting TBoMS  Also, we think this topic should be discussed earlier than TDRA. TDRA of TBoMS depends on how rate-matching outputs are assigned to resources in time domain. |
| Samsung | It seems premature to make decision, as we proposed in the tdoc, we just list the possible operation on the table, and see more companies’ comments. |
| Xiaomi | We share the same view as Ericsson. |
| ZTE | We share similar views as above companies that a single RV should be the baseline. |
| Sharp | RV-based approach is beneficial in some cases. For example, when TBoMS transmission overlaps with other uplink signals with high priority, only single transmission occasion can be dropped.  If single RV-based solution (Approach 2 in 2.4.1) is supported, we need to discuss puncturing and rate matching should be adopted when a part of TBoMS transmission overlaps with high priority uplink signal. |
| LG | As we mentioned in 2.4.1, we think single RV and continuous rate-matching over multiple slots for TBoMS should be supported.  In our understanding, if the unit of RV cycling and rate-matching is performed in units of every slot for TBoMS, it seems not different with the current TB repetitions except TB size increasing.  If the rate-matching is based on single slot for TBoMS, rate-matched bits are obtained based on the number of REs within a slot, whereas the TB size is determined based on the increased resources over multiple slots. Then, the size of rate-matched bits may be too small compared to the size of all coded bits. This may result in not transmitting all coded bits and transmitting only some of the coded bits. |
| Nokia/NSB | The legacy RV cycling framework should not be considered for TBoMS, otherwise TBoMS is simply an enhancement of PUSCH repetition type A or type B, as pointed out by CATT, NTT Docomo and other companies. As mentioned in our comment in Section 2.4.1, RV cycling may lead to the case when none of the RVs is self-decodable. This happens when TBS is larger than the number of bits that can be mapped within a slot, e.g., when a small number of PRBs and a reasonably high number of slots are allocated, which is the main use case of TBoMS (i.e., gain in link-budget by reducing number of PRBs for increasing the Tx power per RE, and this gain is compensated by spanning resource in time-domain for achieving the target low coding rate). This is actually quite bad and invalidates most of the advantages of RV cycling. To solve this problem, many additional constraints should be specified, e.g., limitation on the TBS, the number of slots, the scaling of TBS size etc. which are unnecessary and can be avoided by using a single RV (or multiple back-to-back RVs starting from the first bit in circular buffer, depending on how interleaver is specified).  Multiplexing of UCI on TBoMS should be separately discussed, especially on the motivation of multiplexing UCI on TBoMS in coverage shortage. In addition, if the UE knows that multiplexing is going to happen prior to transmitting the first symbol of TBoMS then multiplexing can still be done with single RV TBoMS. In contrast, the motivation of gNB intentionally assigning UCI report for multiplexing within TBoMS transmission is unclear to us. Could any company with concerns of this type provide a convincing counterexample?  In addition, if we specify single RV case as multiple back-to-back RVs as mentioned above, then the multiplexing issue may not exist. However, how to specify single RV for TBoMS can be further discussed. |
| Intel | Single RV over continuous rate-matching should be supported for TBoMS. From performance perspective, it should outperform RV-based segmented rate-matching.  We share similar view as by CATT, NTT Docomo and Nokia that if multiple RVs are supported for TBoMS, it is simply extension of PUSCH repetition. |
| Qualcomm | Thanks for opening this important topic for discussion.  We view this discussion to have a huge impact on TDRA choices. Decisions on these principles can have a big impact on the spec and UE implementation. We don’t want to head down certain TDRA proposals that leave us with no implementation-friendly options. These aspects need to be highlighted so that all companies can spend sufficient time thinking about this before offering their take on TDRA options.  To further the discussion, can we use the following to collect input from companies:  Q1: When should RV index be refreshed for TBoMS?   1. Every slot boundary 2. Every time a transmission jumps across non-contiguous resources 3. Every repetition 4. Every transmission occasion of a TBoMS 5. … 6. …   Q2: How should rate matching be performed for TBoMS?   1. Per slot 2. Per transmission occasion 3. For every set of contiguous resources 4. … 5. … |
| Panasonic | Based on our link-level simulation results, both single RV based solution and multiple RV based solution can provide almost the same performance assuming the majority usage is inter-slot frequency hopping is enabled. In our view, single RV based solution has more difficulty on UCI multiplexing, special slot, higher priority transmission interruption. Therefore, we prefer multiple RV based solution.  On questions from Qualcomm, our view is as follows: Q1) Every slot boundary, Q2) per transmission occasion. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | For RV based solution, in our contribution, it is observed that, the part of the systematic bits may not have a chance to be transmitted. And for continuous mapping, the coded bit and collision handling may need a different solution compared with the current specification. The rate matching scheme should be further studied. |
| IITH, IITM, CEWIT, Reliance Jio, Tejas Networks | Support views from Ericsson. As mentioned in 2.4.1, we should not mix repetitions with TBoMS. TBoMS is 1 RV sent across non-contiguous slots. |
| TCL | We share similar views as above companies that single RV over continuous rate-matching for TBoMS should be supported. |
| NEC | We think RV cycling discussion considering not only performance but also implementation. We agree QC’s comment that we should collect companies’ views on RV refresh point and analysis the impact on implementation. |
| WILUS | To achieve higher coverage gain, we prefer to support single RV and continuous rate-matching over multiple slots for TBoMS as a baseline. Also, as we commented in 2.4.1, TBoMS is not an extension of PUSCH repetition where multiple RVs are applied. |
| CMCC | Single RV could be a staring point. As mentioned in section 2.4.1, we do not think the TBoMS is an extension or enhancement of repetition.  Rate matching should be discussed to deal with the collision issues. |

FL comments on April 14th

Companies expressed several views and comments. Not all comments explicitly express a preference, however some inference can still be done (companies are welcome to correct, of course).

According to FL’s understanding, situation is as follows (the \* after company name implies soft preference, as per understanding):

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Preference | # of preferences | Company name |
| **RV cycling and segmented rate-matching** | 4 | Sharp\*, Panasonic, Qualcomm, OPPO |
| **One RV and continuous rate-matching** | 13 | CATT\*, Ericsson\*, NTT DOCOMO, Xiaomi, ZTE, LG, Nokia/NSB, Intel, Huawei/HiSi, IITH, TCL, Wilus, CMCC |

One company thinks discussion can be postponed (Samsung) and position of one company is not clear (NEC).

After checking the content of all the [OPEN] sections, it is rather clear from FL’s perspective that the contentious problem in this case is the same as for all other sections. In other words, companies have different views of what TBoMS is or should be. According to my understanding of companies’ views and contributions, and as I have already stated elsewhere, two possibilities are being considered:

1. TBoMS is an enhanced/repurposed version of PUSCH repetitions Type A, where TBS can be larger than the max TBS which could be transmitted over one slot, and where other minor adjustments may be made to accommodate the support of the S slots (for instance, but not necessarily, using aspects of Type B repetition framework). This version of TBoMS would be characterized by at least the following aspects:
   * Definition of transmission occasion as a sub-set of all the allocated resources (i.e., contiguous symbols or slots) for TBoMS
   * The TB is repeated over different transmission occasions
   * RV cycling and segmented rate-matching is applied
   * PUSCH repetition signalling framework is reused to some extent, e.g., at least for time domain resource determination.
2. TBoMS is an independent feature in which TBS is determined as a function of the resources of multiple slots (different options exist in this sense), characterized by at least the following aspects:
   * The TB is rate matched continuously over the allocated resources, i.e., one RV is used.
   * The TB is not repeated unless the entire TBoMS is repeated (agreements on this have not been made)
   * PUSCH repetition signalling framework is reused to some extent, e.g., at least for time domain resource determination.

The commonality between the two versions of TBoMS is the fact that in both cases companies would aim at reusing PUSCH repetition signalling framework is reused to some extent, e.g., at least for time domain resource determination. However, they clearly differ for aspects related to bit to RE mapping, rate matching and so on.

In this context, companies have different suggestions on the priority with which aspects should be discussed. However, FL thinks that this is a typical case of “chicken and egg” problem, in which no order of priority could guarantee smooth progression of the discussion. An example of this fact is given by the questions that one company (Qualcomm) suggests using to start a new discussion and collect companies’ inputs. The two proposed questions are:

Q1: When should RV index be refreshed for TBoMS?

1. Every slot boundary
2. Every time a transmission jumps across non-contiguous resources
3. Every repetition
4. Every transmission occasion of a TBoMS
5. …
6. …

Q2: How should rate matching be performed for TBoMS?

1. Per slot
2. Per transmission occasion
3. For every set of contiguous resources
4. …
5. …

Several answers are offered, and companies are invited to suggest others. This approach may look inviting, but from FL’s perspective this would not give any guarantee to break the gridlock and progress smoothly. The “chicken and egg” nature of these questions is evident, though. For instance, according to Rel-16 specification, RV index is refreshed if a new PUSCH repetition is transmitted. Therefore, if we ask about refreshing RV index, we cannot have an answer unless we first decide what TBoMS is or should be, according to the two approaches outlined above. Consequently, it may seem more reasonable to:

* First decide if a TBoMS transmission is performed using (i) RV cycling and segmented rate-matching or rather (ii) one RV and continuous rate-matching.
* Then, if RV cycling and segmented rate-matching is adopted, we can discuss about when RV index is refreshed

Having said this, and still elaborating on Qualcomm’s proposal, I do think that the concept of transmission occasion may become useful in this sense. I am aware that many companies do not wish to discuss this aspect before discussion in 2.4.1 and 2.4.5 settles down, however once again I think we face a “chicken and egg problem”.

It is a fact that the definition of transmission occasion can be challenging in the context of TBoMS, also considering its impact on other PUSCH operations, e.g., power control (as pointed out by Ericsson). We have a proof difficulty by looking at the discussion in 2.1.5, where companies stated they would like to first agree on other aspects.

However, maybe agreeing on a loose working assumption on what transmission occasion for TBoMS is, could help building further proposals to characterize what TBoMS is (or should be) and continue other important discussions.

The following assumption is then proposed:

**Working Assumption**

* A transmission occasion (TO) for TBoMS is defined as a bundle of time domain resources which may or may not span multiple slots.
  + FFS: details.

With this working assumption the following proposal could be made, to define what TBoMS is or should be, and help us continuing other discussions in the AI:

**FL Proposal 5**

For the definition of a single TBoMS, down select the following options:

* **Option 1**: Only one TO is determined for a TBoMS. TBS is determined based on the resource within the TO. The TB is transmitted on the TO using a single RV.
* **Option 2**: Only one TO is determined for a TBoMS. TBS is determined based on the resource within the TO. The TB is transmitted on the TO using different RVs.
  + FFS: how RV index is refreshed within the TO, e.g. after each slot boundary, at every jump between two non-contiguous resources and so on.
* **Option 3**: Multiple TOs are determined for a TBoMS. TBS is determined based on the resource across multiple TOs. The TB is transmitted on the multiple TOs using a single RV.
* **Option 4**: Multiple TOs are determined for a TBoMS. TBS is determined based on the resource across multiple TOs. The TB is transmitted on the multiple TOs using different RVs.
* FFS: the exact TBS determination procedure.
* FFS: whether a single TBoMS can be repeated or not.

Companies are invited to express their view in the Table below, however:

* Please state if you agree with the proposal (or not) but do **not express preferences on the Options**. Either way Options would be down selected at a later stage, so stating that you prefer Option 1 or Option 3 would not matter at this stage.
* You can of course suggest modifications to the Options, however please refrain from suggesting minor wording modifications if there is no mistake.
* New Options can also be proposed for inclusion. As I said, we are not down selecting Options now, but we are (hopefully) agreeing to down select from a set of Options. If you propose a new option, please make sure you are really proposing something which cannot be represented by the current options.
* Please **do not propose FFS under single options**. If you wish to see a global FFS, you can propose to add an FFS at the end of the proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Ericsson | We’re OK to see if defining a transmission occasion can help progress. The options shown address TBS and RV, but not other usages of TO (e.g. power control). Suggest to clarify the working assumption to reflect this:   * A transmission occasion (TO) for TBoMS is defined for the purpose of TBS and RV determination as a bundle of time domain resources which may or may not span multiple slots.   + FFS: details and additional purposes. |
| Sharp | As per proposal 5, Option 3 and Option 4 determines multiple transmission occasions. So, we should clarify it in the proposed working assumption.   * ~~A~~One or more transmission occasion(s) (TO(s)) for a TBoMS is(are) defined as a bundle of time domain resources which may or may not span multiple slots.   + FFS: details.   Specifying the purpose of defining transmission occasion(s) mentioned by Ericsson seems premature. For RV determination, at least Option 2 and Option 3 don’t have one-to-one mapping between TO and RV. For TBS determination, we haven’t agreed that actual or reference resource amount should be used for TBS determination. In approach 2 at 2.3.1, several companies propose that “ may or may not be equal to the total number of slots allocated for TBoMS transmission”.  Regarding proposal 5, as discussed above, we haven’t agreed exact TBS determination procedure. Therefore, we propose to clarify in the FFS that both approaches for TBS determination are on the table.   * **Option 1**: Only one TO is determined for a TBoMS. ~~TBS is determined based on the resource within the TO.~~ The TB is transmitted on the TO using a single RV. * **Option 2**: Only one TO is determined for a TBoMS. ~~TBS is determined based on the resource within the TO.~~ The TB is transmitted on the TO using different RVs.   + FFS: how RV index is refreshed within the TO, e.g. after each slot boundary, at every jump between two non-contiguous resources and so on. * **Option 3**: Multiple TOs are determined for a TBoMS. ~~TBS is determined based on the resource across multiple TOs.~~ The TB is transmitted on the multiple TOs using a single RV. * **Option 4**: Multiple TOs are determined for a TBoMS. ~~TBS is determined based on the resource across multiple TOs.~~ The TB is transmitted on the multiple TOs using different RVs. * FFS: ~~the exact~~ whether TBS determination procedure is based on approach 1 or approach 2. * FFS: whether a single TBoMS can be repeated or not. |
| Samsung | We can see this concept of TO might be helpful in a way for our RAN1 discussion, whether directly specify it is not the intention. So suggestion as follows:  **Working Assumption**   * A concept of transmission occasion (TO) for TBoMS is utilized for discussion, as a bundle of time domain resources which may or may not span multiple slots.   + FFS: details.   + FFS: whether such concept to be specified. |
| Panasonic | For proposed working assumption, we are fine to either Ericsson’s or Samsung’s suggested update.  For Proposal 5, although we can live with current FL proposal, we share same view as Sharp on TBS determination and prefer Sharp’s modification. |
| InterDigital | We agree with the Samsung’s proposal. We have modified the proposal slightly. We are ok to have it as an agreement, not as a working assumption. Once we agree on the proposal below, we can discuss Proposal 5.   * A concept of transmission occasion (TO) for TBoMS is utilized for the purpose of discussion, where a TO is a bundle of time domain resources which may or may not span multiple slots.   + FFS: details.   + FFS: whether such concept to be specified. |
| LG | We are generally fine with the proposal.  Regarding Proposal 5, considering the possibility that the slot number to determine TBS is separated with the slot number composing a TBoMS, we’d like to propose modification of ‘TBS is determined’ to ‘TBS can be determined’.  Also, it feels more clear to us to make the following corrections:   * **Option 1**: Only one TO is ~~determined for~~ composed by time domain resources for a TBoMS. TBS ~~is~~can be determined based on the resource within the TO. The TB is transmitted on the TO using a single RV. * **Option 2**: Only one TO is ~~determined for~~ composed by time domain resources for a TBoMS. TBS ~~is~~can be determined based on the resource within the TO. The TB is transmitted on the TO using different RVs.   + FFS: how RV index is refreshed within the TO, e.g. after each slot boundary, at every jump between two non-contiguous resources and so on. * **Option 3**: Multiple TOs are ~~determined for~~ composed by time domain resources for a TBoMS. TBS ~~is~~can be determined based on the resource across multiple TOs. The TB is transmitted on the multiple TOs using a single RV. * Option **4**: Multiple TOs are ~~determined for~~ composed by time domain resources for a TBoMS. TBS ~~is~~can be determined based on the resource across multiple TOs. The TB is transmitted on the multiple TOs using different RVs. * FFS: the exact TBS determination procedure. * FFS: whether a single TBoMS can be repeated or not. |
| Xiaomi | If the definition of a TO can postpone the progress, we agree with the work assumption.  For proposal 5, we suggest the following modifications to option 4:   * **Option 4**: Multiple TOs are determined for a TBoMS. TBS is determined based on the resource across multiple TOs. The TB is transmitted on the multiple TOs using different RVs.   + Option 4-1: The TB is transmitted on a single TO using a single RV.   + Option 4-2: The TB is transmitted on a single TO using different RVs. |
| IITH, IITM, CEWIT, Reliance Jio, Tejas Networks | Support the FL proposal |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support the proposal. We think having all companies agree on the definition of TBoMS facilitates the discussion in all other topics. This topic should be discussed first. |
| TCL | Support the proposal |
| Intel | For the definition of transmission occasion, we share similar view as other companies that this may be only used for discussion purpose. For instance, if we agree Option 1 in proposal 5, we do not even need the definition of transmission occasion. In addition, we suggest to remove “~~a bundle~~”, as it is not clear to the meaning of the bundle, which is never defined before.  For the proposal 5, we are fine with Option 1 and 2. For option 3 and 4, “The TB is transmitted on the multiple TOs using a single RV”, this could be different interpretations. It could be 1) encoding with single RV is rate-matched over all the multiple TOs. 2) encoding with single RV is rate-matched over each TO. Our view is that this is for the case 2). It would be good to clarify this.  For Option 4, our understanding is that this can be viewed as Option 1 with repetition of TBoMS. If this is correct understanding, we suggest to add this as a sub-bullet   * **Option 4**: Multiple TOs are determined for a TBoMS. TBS is determined based on the resource across multiple TOs. The TB is transmitted on the multiple TOs using different RVs.   + This option can be considered as Option 1 with repetition. |
| ZTE | We are fine to define the concept of TO to facilitate the discussion if possible. But, we suggest to have the following changes on the definition.  **Working Assumption**   * A transmission occasion (TO) for TBoMS is defined as a bundle of time domain resources which ~~may or may not~~ spans at least two ~~multiple~~ slots.   + FFS: details.   The reasons are that:   1. If a TO spans only one slot, Option 1 and Option 2 would not be TBoMS. Instead, it is legacy single slot PUSCH transmission. 2. If a TO may or may not span multiple slots, Option 1 or Option 2 with a TO having multiple slots is equivalent to Option 3 or Option 4 with a TO having one slot. That is, it causes overlap among options.   If the proposed change on TO definition is considered, then Option 1 would be the option that majority supports (if I understand the situation correctly). Then, we may need to change Option 3 and Option 4 as follows.   * **Option 3**: Multiple TOs are determined for a TBoMS. TBS is determined based on the resource across ~~multiple~~ one TO~~s~~. The TB is transmitted on the multiple TOs using a single RV. * **Option 4**: Multiple TOs are determined for a TBoMS. TBS is determined based on the resource across ~~multiple~~ one TO~~s~~. The TB is transmitted on the multiple TOs using a single RV within one TO while different RVs across TOs. |
| CATT | We are fine with the WA and proposal in principle.  In our understanding, the concept of TO may be mixed with so many attempts, e.g. RV cycling, UCI multiplexing, usage of non-consecutive slots, power control, TBS calculation, and even HARQ retransmission. If we cannot list them exhaustively, we suggest to keep the TO definition simple and clean in the WA, which at least not precluding the potential usage.  Meanwhile, we have the same understanding with Samsung, InterDigital and Intel. A TO can be assumed during the discussion, but whether it is specified or not may be up to the outcome of the discussion. For example, Option 1 does not rely on any definition of TO and, if adopted, the TO seems unnecessary to be specified at the end. To address Intel’s concern, can we try:   * A concept of transmission occasion (TO) for TBoMS is utilized for the purpose of discussion, where a TO is constituted by time domain resources which may or may not span multiple slots.   + FFS: details.   + FFS: whether such concept to be specified. |
| Qualcomm | We are fine with the working assumption and are hoping that no major modifications are made to that proposal. We are okay to make it explicit that at this point its primarily intended to drive RAN1 discussion, and that eventually it may not necessarily get specified. Dont agree with ZTE’s change since some companies prefer to keep the current PUSCH repetition framework as it is and only work on TBS determination.  Regarding Proposal 5:  Echo Sharp’s comment on the removal of “TBS is determined based on the resource within the TO”. We would like TBS determination to be aware of TBoMS and its repetitions, so better to bring it up after 2.4.5 and 2.4.1 are settled.  Xiaomi’s addition to Option 4 is good to have.  Intel raises questions on rate matching. We do view RV determination and rate matching as two different steps, and it will be good to have clarity on this. But I suppose the FL’s intent may be to address this in subsequent proposals. Depending on the intent, the following FFS might be useful to add:  “FFS: rate matching choices for each of the options listed above.”  Intel’s comment on Option 4 is good to have. Suggest including it. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We prefer the rewording of the working assumption by Samsung and further updated by Interdigital  We support the FL’s Proposal 5 |
| Vivo | Agree with the working assumption. Definition of Tx occasion is needed.  For proposal 5, agree that options for TBoMS definitions would help the discussion.  More clarification on these options may be needed. For option 2, the FFS implies that the TO can be composed of non-consecutive slots. For other options, we are not sure whether the TO is composed of consecutive or non-consecutive slots or both? If TO in option 1 can be **non**-consecutive slots, and TO in option 3 is consecutive slots, it seems that the same signal could be generated using these two options, as shown by opt-1(b) and opt-3 below. Is the understanding correct?  We tried to draw pictures for the 4 options above based on our understanding as follows (we can put aside type-A or B like TDRA for now…). If we misunderstood FL’s intention, please point out. |
| Fujitsu | We prefer the rewording of the working assumption by Samsung and further updated by Interdigital. We are also fine with the proposal 5. |
| WILUS | We support the FL’s proposal. For the working assumption, we are fine with the modified version of InterDigital. |

FL’comments on April, 15th

Thanks for the comments. My answers follow:

@Ericsson: good point. I think it may be wiser to add an FFS in Proposal 5 for the time being, to avoid mixing too many concepts in the WA.

@Sharp: I prefer to the WA as simple as possible to use it as a building block. We may need to modify it later on, surely, but for now I’d like to define 1 TO only in main definition. Your observation on the TBS determination is accepted (please see below).

@Xiaomi: good point. However, I prefer to proceed step by step and solve your concern with an FFS similar to the one used for Option 2. In my view, this could be sufficient for the time being. I think we can focus on sub-options, after a first down selection of Options, I hope you can agree.

@Samsung: FFS has been added.

@Panasonic: reference to TBS determination has been removed

@Interdigital: I used your text (with very minor modification) but I am not sure if we should have a proposal on this at this stage, since you are the only one asking this for now. I would keep the WA format for now. Once it is stabilized, we can see if we can turn it into a Proposal (I see no harm in that, and other companies are invited to express their view on this as well)

@Intel: Thank you, I added two FFS points for addressing all your concerns but the very last one. I do not think that referring to repetition in any of the option is a good idea, for the moment, since that concept is still controversial. Being overly specific may not be necessary at this first step towards mutual understanding. I also rephrased the WA to address your concern on the “bundle”, using suggestion made by CATT.

@LGE: We have the definition of TO above which takes care of the definition you would like to see in the Proposal. Conversely, reference to TBS determination has been removed from each Option hence your issue seems to be addressed as well.

@CATT: your suggestion is accepted.

@ZTE: while I understand the intention, I think it is too early to converge smoothly to what you are suggesting writing. We may converge there eventually, yes, but as of today I think we need to proceed step by step. By the way, you may already spot some of your logic (together with vivo’s) in my comments below. Intersections and redundancies may indeed exist in the current formulation, and that’s also why we need down selection.

@Qualcomm: most of your observations have been retained, please see below.

@vivo: extremely useful exercise, thank you! No Hypotheses on contiguous and non-contiguous physical slots was explicitly made in the first formulation, on purpose, since I wanted to collect some inputs first. The diagrams you shared illustrate some redundancy in the current Options unless further hypotheses are made. I think this can be a good starting point for the next discussion (please see below).

As I stated above, I do not think that complicating the definition of TO we are trying to use as WA serves the purpose I set at the beginning of this discussion. However, it is true that if we do not make hypotheses on whether the resources within the TOs are consecutive or can be non-consecutive, then redundancy may be found in the Options.

First, let me clarify one aspect, for simplicity. What follows assumes that when we say “consecutive physical slots”, we mean that no gap exists between two consecutive physical slots, hence only consecutive slots can be used. Conversely, when we say “non-consecutive physical slots” we mean that a gap may or may not exist between two non-consecutive physical slots, hence both consecutive and non-consecutive slots can be used. This is convenient, in my view.

Now, I will analyse the implications of the 4 options from my perspective considering the two definitions above, making a hypothesis on the slots which may constitute a TO (as per vivo’s analysis).

If a TO can be constituted **only by consecutive physical slots,** then:

* Option 1 implies that TBoMS can be transmitted over one set of consecutive physical slots, i.e., the TO, using one RV.
* Option 2 implies that TBoMS can be transmitted over one set of consecutive physical slots, i.e., the TO, using multiple RVs (details about RV index refreshing and rate-matching are FFS).
* Option 3 implies that TBoMS can be transmitted over multiple sets of consecutive physical slots, using one RV across all sets, i.e., across all the TOs (details about the single RV is rate matched across the multiple TOs are FFS).
* Option 4 implies that TBoMS can be transmitted over multiple sets of consecutive physical slots, using one multiple RV indices across the sets, i.e., across the TOs (details about RV index refreshing and rate-matching are FFS).

In this case, all four options denote four different concepts, and do not seem to be overlapping. The “signal” produced according to the four options is indeed different.

If a TO can be constituted by **non-consecutive physical slots,** then:

* Option 1 implies that TBoMS can be transmitted over one set of consecutive and/or non-consecutive physical slots, i.e., the TO, using one RV.
* Option 2 implies that TBoMS can be transmitted over one set of consecutive and/or non-consecutive physical slots, i.e., the TO, using multiple RVs (details about RV index refreshing and rate-matching are FFS).
* Option 3 implies that TBoMS can be transmitted over multiple sets of consecutive and/or non-consecutive physical slots, using one RV across all sets, i.e., across all the TOs (details about the single RV is rate matched across the multiple TOs are FFS).
* Option 4 implies that TBoMS can be transmitted over multiple sets of consecutive and/or non-consecutive physical slots, using one multiple RV indices across the sets, i.e., across the TOs (details about RV index refreshing and rate-matching are FFS).

In this case, an overlap exists between Option 1 and Option 3, and between Option 2 and Option 4, as pointed out by vivo above:

* Indeed, if the TO as per Option 1 is large enough to include the multiple TOs as per Option 3, then the “signal” generated in the two cases can be the same (as per vivo’s diagrams). Thus, it could be argued that the reason of the existence of multiple TOs in this case is not justified, however this would not consider that:
  + Details about rate-matching across multiple TOs are still FFS, so even with single RVs, companies may have different preferences.
  + Power control considerations across TOs may apply. Please see Ericsson’s comment in this sense. We have not discussed this aspect yet.
* Similarly, if the TO as per Option 2 is large enough to include the multiple TOs as per Option 4, then the signal generate in the two cases can be the same. However, in this case as well details about rate-matching, and RV index refreshing, have not been defined, hence concluding that the two options are the same would not be accurate.

For this reason, I would propose to leave the structure of the 4 options as it is, and simply work on their content as suggested by companies. At the same time, I would add an FFS in the Working Assumption to state that whether the multiple slots which constitute a TO are consecutive or non-consecutive physical slots is FFS.

Updated WA and Proposal 5 follow:

**Working Assumption**

The concept of transmission occasion (TO) for TBoMS is utilized for the purpose of discussion, where a TO is constituted of time domain resources which may or may not span multiple slots

* FFS: whether multiple slots which constitute a TO are consecutive or non-consecutive physical slots
* FFS: other details.
* FFS: whether such concept will be specified or not.

**FL Proposal 5**

For the definition of a single TBoMS, down select the following options:

* **Option 1**: Only one TO is determined for a TBoMS. The TB is transmitted on the TO using a single RV.
* **Option 2**: Only one TO is determined for a TBoMS. The TB is transmitted on the TO using different RVs.
  + FFS: how RV index is refreshed within the TO, e.g. after each slot boundary, at every jump between two non-contiguous resources, if any, and so on.
* **Option 3**: Multiple TOs are determined for a TBoMS. The TB is transmitted on the multiple TOs using a single RV.
  + FFS: how the single RV is rate matched across the multiple TOs, e.g., rate matched for each TO, rate matched for all the TOs, rate matched for each slot and so on.
* **Option 4**: Multiple TOs are determined for a TBoMS. The TB is transmitted on the multiple TOs using different RVs.
  + FFS: how RV index is refreshed within the TO, e.g. after each slot boundary, at every jump between two non-contiguous resources, if any, and so on.
* FFS: the exact TBS determination procedure.
* FFS: whether a single TBoMS can be repeated or not.
* FFS: power control implications

Companies are invited to express their view in the Table below, following these guidelines:

* Options can be down selected at a later stage, after the FFS on “whether multiple slots which constitute a TO are consecutive or non-consecutive physical slots” is resolved, which may be quite straightforward if we can make an agreement soon on the Proposal 2. **However, if you want to state your “tentative preference” already, just for me to have a first check of the situation, please do it.** This may provide a first indicator of how many Options we should keep alive for the next round/meeting. I will not count preferences at the end (for now), but if an option does not receive any preference, I may already remove it from the pool.
* In principle, you can of course suggest modifications to the Options, however, please refrain from suggesting minor wording modifications if there is no mistake.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Qualcomm | One minor suggestion: Can we move the FFS that’s currently under Option 3 to be applicable to all options, i.e., as a fourth FFS in the main sequence of bullets, with a minor edit as show below?   * FFS: how a single RV is rate matched across single or multiple TOs, e.g., rate matched for each TO, rate matched for all the TOs, rate matched for each slot and so on. |
| Intel | We are fine with the updated proposals in principle. We are also fine with the update from QC.  One minor suggestion: it is not clear how “rate matched for each slot” would work. we suggest to update this as   * FFS: how a single RV is rate matched across single or multiple TOs, e.g., rate matched for each TO, rate matched for all the TOs, ~~rate matched for each slot and so on~~. |
| Panasonic | We are fine with the updated working assumption. We are fine with Proposal 5 and also fine with Qualcomm’s update. |
| Sharp | We are OK with FL proposal on the proposed working assumption and proposal 5. Incorporating Qualcomm and Intel’s suggestion seems better for clarification. |
| Samsung | We are fine with the updated proposals in principle as well as the update from QC.  However, we think Intel’s delete of the rate matched for each slot seems not necessary, because the TO could be determined per slot basis, then RM could be operated be slot basis as well; as it for now, it’s better to keep it in FFS. |
| CATT | We are fine with both of the proposal and the WA. Our preliminary preferences are Option 1, 3 and 4.  On the modifications suggested by Qualcomm, not sure it is suitable for Option 2 and Option 4 (even adding the word ‘single’), since they focus on the multiple RV case. Is the modification suggesting RV index refreshing and rate matching can be asynchronous even in the multi RV case? |
| Apple | We are ok with Intel’s update on the Proposal 5. With the Working Assumption, TO could be one or multiple slots, rate matching for each slot is covered already.  The Working Assumption can be formulated further.  The concept of transmission occasion (TO) for TBoMS is utilized for the purpose of discussion, where a TO is constituted of time domain resources which may or may not span multiple slots  FFS details, e.g,. whether multiple slots which constitute a TO are consecutive or non-consecutive physical slots, whether such concept will be specified in the spec or not. |
| Xiaomi | We are fine with the updated working assumption. For option 4, as described by FL, different RV is used across different TOs, and it needs to be FFS whether different RVs are applied within a single TO. So, we suggest to add the following FFS to option 4:   * + FFS: Whether RV index is refreshed within a TO |
| LG | We are fine with the updated working assumption and proposal. |
| Ericsson | Updated WA and proposal are OK |
| IITH, IITM, CEWIT, Reliance Jio, Tejas Networks | We support WA and Proposal. Our preferences are options 1 and 3. |
| InterDigital | We are ok with Intel’s update for Proposal 5 and FL’s WA. |
| Nokia/NSB | We support the FL’s WA and proposal. We are also fine with the suggested modifications from Qualcomm, concerning point 3 (and maybe 1, if we stretch it). However, we agree with CATT on its applicability to Option 2 and 4. We suggest avoiding micro-optimizations. For the modification from Intel, it may not be necessary because of the reasons mentioned by Samsung. We think that Xiaomi raised a valid point to cover all of the cases, therefore we suggest adding “whether/how” for the FFS under Options 2 and 4.  Finally, we would like to point out that from our perspective the four options currently seem to cover all of possible scenarios and allow companies to express their positions. This should be clear if we consider only consecutive physical slots for a TO (then the cases of non-consecutive physical slots are covered by Options 3 and 4). In contrast, if we consider both consecutive and non-consecutive slots for a TO, there are some overlap between Options 1&3 and 2&4 as pointed out by vivo in the previous round and also by the FL. However, for the time being, we are fine to leave that aspect as FFS and support both the WA and Proposal 5. We can down select options at a further stage. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are fine with the updated working assumption and proposal 5. For QC’s modification, we think it only applies to option 1 and 3, because these two options use single RV, but others use multiple RVs. |

FL’s comments on April 16th

Thanks for the comments. I think we are very close to a first convergence. My answers follow:

@Qualcomm: I am not sure that FFS would apply to all options, as it was pointed out by CATT, Huawei and Nokia. I prefer keeping some redundancy for now, to avoid future confusion. However, your suggestion is retained for Option 3, and it inspired modifications to the FFS of Option 1 and 4 (also thanks to @Xiaomi’s observation).

@Intel: Please see my reply to Qualcomm. I have not moved the FFS. I used “across” instead of “for” as you commented. Concerning your second suggestion, I have the same understanding as Samsung. We could consider it an overkill configuration; I will not deny this. On the other hand, given that we are simply listing examples, I do not think it is so relevant if we discuss about including or excluding possibilities after the “e.g.”. Either way, it would not preclude companies to propose something, right?

@Apple: I am a bit puzzled by your suggestion “specified in the spec”. Isn’t this redundant? I am fine including it if other companies agree (other companies are invited to comment on this), however for now I would think it is not adding anything to that sentence. Same goes for the suggestion of having a single FFS point. I understand the spirit, it is indeed more compact, but do you consider it necessary or “just” a decision about the wording style? If it is the latter, maybe we can leave everything as it is since all companies seem ok with it. Let me know.

@Xiaomi: your suggestion has been considered while modifying the FFS points.

@ALL: Most of you are suggesting modifications related to rate-matching. As I said above, if details are written down (as per current formulation), I prefer to keep a bit of redundancy to guarantee maximum clarity. All details will be worked out eventually, once down selection is performed and we converge to one option, so I would suggest not going for further micro-optimization, unless mistakes are found.

Confirmed WA and updated Proposal 5 follow:

**Working Assumption**

The concept of transmission occasion (TO) for TBoMS is utilized for the purpose of discussion, where a TO is constituted of time domain resources which may or may not span multiple slots

* FFS: details, whether multiple slots which constitute a TO are consecutive or non-consecutive physical slots
* FFS: other details.
* FFS: whether such concept will be specified or not.

**FL Proposal 5-v1**

For the definition of a single TBoMS, down select the following options:

* **Option 1**: Only one TO is determined for a TBoMS. The TB is transmitted on the TO using a single RV.
  + FFS: whether and how the single RV is rate matched across the TO, e.g., continuous rate-matching across the TO, rate matched for each slot and so on.
* **Option 2**: Only one TO is determined for a TBoMS. The TB is transmitted on the TO using different RVs.
  + FFS: how RV index is refreshed within the TO, e.g. after each slot boundary, at every jump between two non-contiguous resources, if any, and so on.
* **Option 3**: Multiple TOs are determined for a TBoMS. The TB is transmitted on the multiple TOs using a single RV.
  + FFS: how the single RV is rate matched across single or multiple TOs, e.g., rate matched for each TO, rate matched for all the TOs, rate matched for each slot and so on.
* **Option 4**: Multiple TOs are determined for a TBoMS. The TB is transmitted on the multiple TOs using different RVs.
  + FFS: whether and how RV index is refreshed within one TO, e.g. after each slot boundary, at every jump between two non-contiguous resources, if any, and so on.
* FFS: the exact TBS determination procedure.
* FFS: whether a single TBoMS can be repeated or not.
* FFS: power control implications

Both WA and proposal are now quite stable. Companies **with concerns** are invited to express them in the Table below. If no concern, or only minor wording concerns exist, please refrain from suggesting further modifications.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Qualcomm | Minor comment since CATT and a few other companies questioned applicability of our comment to Options 2 and 4.  Take Option 2 and assume the TO consists of 2 sets of 2 slots --- something like this DDD**UU**DDD**UU.** Now assume that RV0 is used for the first two U slots and RV2 is used for the next two U slots. The question then emerges how one rate matches across the first pair of U slots and the second pair of U slots. Do we treat them as one single entity and perform rate matching once per pair of slots, or do we resort to per-slot rate matching?  Hoping this better explains what we had mind. |
| CATT | Thanks FL and Qualcomm’s elaboration. That helps understand the alternative pools better. The example given by Qualcomm is what we have in mind by saying ‘RV index refreshing and rate matching can be asynchronous even in the multi RV case’ in the previous round. This case seems a little redundant as pointed out by other companies (also not sure whether there will be gains), but we are OK to keep it for further checking.  We are fine with the WA and proposal. |
| vivo | Support the working assumption.  Support the proposal with one minor revision. For the last FFS, we suggest also include collision handling issues, as we commented in previous rounds, i.e., TO concept may also be useful for collision handling. Hence, we suggest the following revision.  FFS: power control/collision handling implications. |
| Intel | We are not sure the FFS under Option 1. If there is only one TO for one TBoMS, it is not clear to us why we need to consider different RVs to map into a single TO. We suggest to remove the FFS as   * **Option 1**: Only one TO is determined for a TBoMS. The TB is transmitted on the TO using a single RV.   + ~~FFS: whether and how the single RV is rate matched across the TO, e.g., continuous rate-matching across the TO, rate matched for each slot and so on.~~   For Option 3, we still do not think we need to add “rate-matched for each slot”. To Samsung’s comment, if one TO is determined per slot basis, is that already covered by “rate-matched for each TO”? We suggest to remove this “~~rate-matched for each slot~~”. |

As a second request for input, I would like to renew my previous request to companies to express a tentative preference for the Options in Proposal 5, to see whether a first preliminary filter can be applied and reduce the number of Options next week.

**Please note that my goal is not to down select one option at the end of RAN1 #104-b-e, but to see whether we can have fewer options to work on during #105-e: the fewer options we have, the better.**

Please add your company name in column(s) corresponding to your preferred option(s). You can of course choose more than one option if you are still unsure. However, please refrain from adding them “just in case”, otherwise the exercise is useless! Furthermore, there is no need to add explanations at this stage, it is just a simple counter for my convenience. Thank you.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Option 1 | Option 2 | Option 3 | Option 4 |
|  | Panasonic |  | Panasonic |
| InterDigital |  | InterDigital |  |
| CATT |  | CATT | CATT |
|  | Sharp |  | Sharp |
| Ericsson (1st choice) |  | Ericsson: Should not be excluded for purposes other than TBS or RV determination (e.g. power control). | Ericsson (2nd choice) |
| Intel (1st choice) |  | Intel | Can be viewed as TBoMS + repetition |

### [CLOSED] Interleaving

One company (Samsung [19]) proposed that slot-based interleaving is supported for TBoMS.

### [CLOSED] Link adaptation

One company (Ericsson [21]) proposed that the same MCS index is used in all slots of TBoMS.

### [CLOSED] Frequency hopping

Frequency hopping (FH) aspects were discussed, and corresponding proposals were made, depending on whether joint channel estimation and repetition are supported for TBoMS:

* One company (Intel [15]) proposed that inter-slot FH should be supported for TBoMS.
* Four companies (Panasonic [18], Xiaomi [13], Intel [15], Lenovo/Motorola [26]) proposed that inter-slot FH with inter-slot bundling should be supported for TBoMS.

### [CLOSED] Transmission power determination

The transmission power determination was discussed in several contributions and can be summarized as follows:

* One company (ZTE [5]) proposed that the transmission power determination should be based on the multiple slots for TBoMS with excluding the overhead of reference signals.
* One company (Ericsson [21]) proposed that the transmission occasion of TBoMS for RV cycling and UL transmission power determination can be different. A transmission occasion of one slot is preferred for TBoMS transmission power determination. FFS: whether the power is fixed or how it can vary across slots.

### [CLOSED] Rank of TBoMS transmission

The rank of a TBoMS transmission (number of layers) was discussed in several contributions and can be summarized as follows.

* One company (Ericsson [21]) proposed that the same number of layers is used in all slots of TBoMS.
* Two companies (vivo [6], Qualcomm [17]) proposed that TBoMS should be limited to single-layer transmission.

### [CLOSED] Retransmissions

Details of retransmission of a TBoMS were discussed in several contributions and can be summarized as follows.

* One company (CMCC [11]) proposed that per-slot retransmission should be considered for the retransmission of TBoMS.
* One company (InterDigital [14]) proposed to support enhanced retransmission mechanisms to avoid the retransmission of the entire TBoMS.
* One company (Ericsson [21]) proposed that TB-based retransmission is considered for TBoMS, rather than CBG-based retransmission.

### [CLOSED] Collision handling

Details of collision handling between TBoMS PUSCH and PUCCH/SRS/DL symbols were discussed in several contributions and can be summarized as follows.

* Three companies (Fujitsu [9], ZTE [5], Ericsson [21]) proposed that repetition-like behaviour should be reused for collision handling between TBoMS and PUCCH.
  + One company (Ericsson [21]) proposed to add a constraint for the case when the number of symbols in each slot is the same for TBoMS that the above is applied if the number of physical slots is configured.
* One company (vivo [6]) proposed that for UCI multiplexing on TBoMS, the number of modulated symbols in the PUSCH for UCI multiplexing is determined based on the number of symbols for PUSCH in a slot that is overlapped with the PUCCH.
* One company (Samsung [19]) proposed that UCI multiplexing in TBoMS should be supported and parallel transmission of PUCCH and TBoMS is not preferred due to power splitting during CE situation.
* Seven companies (Huawei/HiSi [3], ZTE [5], CATT [7], Intel [15], Ericsson [21], LGE [27], WILUS [28]) proposed to further discuss collision handling of PUCCH vs. TBoMS PUSCH including the UCI multiplexing mechanism, e.g. how to determine the number of REs for UCI multiplexing.

### [CLOSED] TBoMS vs. single slot PUSCH transmission indication

The indication of TBoMS feature, i.e. indication on whether a PUSCH transmission should follow TBoMS or legacy PUSCH transmission, was discussed in several contributions. Corresponding proposals can be summarized as follows.

* One company (InterDigital [14]) proposed to support dynamic switching between TBoMS and single-slot PUSCH.
* One company (China Telecom [10]) proposed that dynamic switching between TBoMS and single slot transmission can be differentiated by the indication of number of slots in DCI.
* One company (IITH [12]) proposed to support semi-static switching between TBoMS and single slot transmission.
* One company (Xiaomi [13]) proposed to consider configuration and/or indication procedures when both repetition and TBoMS are supported for a single UE.
* One company (Nokia/NSB [20]) proposed to further study details of indication method, including introducing a new field or reusing the available field in the scheduling DCI (or RRC parameter in case of configured grant configuration), e.g., some rows in the TDRA table are used to configure for multi-slot TB transmission.

# 3 [CLOSED] Proposals for GTW

# 4 [CLOSED] Agreements
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# Appendix A: Proposals from contributions aggregated by topic

## A.1 TDRA

**Constraint on number of allocated symbols per slot and across slots**

|  |
| --- |
| **R1-2102718 Fujitsu**  Proposal 1: Consider Rel-17 PUSCH repetition type A like TDRA with the following features as the baseline for time domain resource allocation for TBoMS,   * The number of allocated symbols is the same in each slot. * The number of slots is indicated/configured by using a row index of a TDRA list which is configured by RRC.   **R1-2102861 China Telecom**  Proposal 4: Down select on the following options for the time domain resource determination of TBoMS.   * Option 1: PUSCH repetition type A like TDRA, i.e., the number of allocated symbols is the same in each slot, for normal slots. FFS: TDRA for special slots. * Option 2: PUSCH repetition type B like TDRA, i.e., the number of allocated symbols in each slot can be different.   **R1-2102894 CMCC**  Proposal 1: Both mechanisms of type A and type B like TDRA could supported. But if the prioritization is necessary, the type A should be prioritized.  **R1-2103208 Panasonic Corporation**  Proposal 1: Support PUSCH repetition Type A like TDRA, i.e., the number of allocated symbols is the same in each slot.   * + FFS whether to additionally support PUSCH repetition Type B like TDRA, i.e., the number of allocated symbols in each slot can be different.     - Before the decision of the support of PUSCH repetition type B like TDRA, TBS determination Approach 1 or 2 should be concluded as the different approaches have different interaction with time domain resource allocation.   **R1-2103588 NTT DOCOMO, INC.**  Proposal 1: Both PUSCH repetition type A and type B like TDRA should be considered for TDRA for TBoMS.  **R1-2102535 vivo**  Proposal 1: PUSCH repetition Type-A like TDRA is adopted for TBoMS.  **R1-2102913 INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECH (H)**  Proposal: Start with PUSCH repetition type A like TDRA, i.e., the number of allocated symbols in each slot is same.  **R1-2102314 Huawei, HiSilicon**  Proposal 1: Repetition type B like TDRA should be supported for TBoMS.  **R1-2102408 OPPO**  Proposal 2: At least PUSCH repetition type A like TDRA is used for TBoMS.  The existing PUSCH repetition type A TRRA can be the starting point.  **R1-2102498 ZTE**  Proposal 1: For time domain resource determination of TBoMS, PUSCH repetition type A like TDRA should be supported.  **R1-2102644 CATT**  Proposal 2: Down-select the TDRA method for TBoMS from the following options:   * PUSCH repetition type A like TDRA, i.e., the number of allocated symbols is the same in each slot. * PUSCH repetition type B like TDRA, i.e., the number of allocated symbols in each slot can be different   **R1-2102993 Xiaomi**  Proposal 1: PUSCH repetition type B like TDRA is preferred for TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH.  Proposal 2: Redesign or reinterpret “repetition number” and/ or “L” field in TDRA for multi-slot PUSCH.  **R1-2103008 INTERDIGITAL, INC.**  Proposal 3: The number of allocated symbols in each slot can be different in TBoMS.  **R1-2103043 Intel Corporation**  Proposal 1: Both repetition type A and type B based TDRA mechanisms are supported for TBoMS.  **R1-2103117 Apple**  Proposal 5: PUSCH repetition type A-like resource determination scheme is supported.  **R1-2103179 Qualcomm Incorporated**  Proposal 3: PUSCH repetition Type A serves as a starting point for time domain resource determination of TBoMS.  **R1-2103381 Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell**  Proposal 1: For the time-domain resource allocation of TBoMS, the number of allocated symbols in each slot can be different. The design of time-domain resource allocation for TBoMS should allow the feature to leverage as much as possible the UL resource in time-domain.  **R1-2103445 Ericsson**  Proposal 4: TBoMS with the same number of symbols in each slot can be prioritized.   * + Support for different numbers of symbols in slots can be further studied for TBoMS with special slots.   R1-2103480 Sharp  Proposal 1: PUSCH repetition type A and type B are supported for signaling time domain resource for TBoMS transmission.  R1-2103514 NEC  Proposal 1: Support both PUSCH repetition type A and PUSCH repetition type B like TDRA for TBoMS.  R1-2103616 Lenovo, Motorola Mobility  Proposal 1: For one TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH in NR coverage enhancements in Rel-17, support PUSCH repetition type A like time-domain resource allocation with following interpretation:   * Repetition factor indicates the number of slots for multiple PUSCH transmission occasions where one slot contains only PUSCH transmission occasion * L value in the TDRA table is used to indicate the duration of PUSCH transmission occasion in the last slot * Duration of PUSCH transmission occasions for all other slots is 14 symbols.   **R1-2103625 LG ELECTRONICS**  Proposal 1: The symbol allocation is applied in each slot for TBoMS PUSCH transmission.  Proposal 2: Consider to allow collision between TBoMS PUSCH and SRS resource.  **R1-2103700 WILUS INC.**  Proposal 1: Both PUSCH repetition type A-like TDRA and PUSCH repetition type B-like TDRA can be supported for time domain resource determination of TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH.   * Further study how to determine TDRA-related aspects such as RV, DMRS pattern, and UL transmission power. |

**The use of non-consecutive slots for TBoMS**

|  |
| --- |
| **R1-2102718 Fujitsu**  Proposal 3: Both consecutive and non-consecutive UL slots can be used to transmit TBoMS  **R1-2102861 China Telecom**  Proposal 2: Non-consecutive physical slots for UL transmission for TBoMS should be supported for unpaired spectrum.  Proposal 3: For TBoMS, the special slots for unpaired spectrum should be utilized for UL transmission.  **R1-2102894 CMCC**  Proposal 2: The non-consecutive physical slots for UL TBoMS should be supported for the unpaired spectrum at least.  Proposal 3: Whether the non-consecutive physical slots are supported for the paired spectrum and SUL band should depend on the discussion of collision solutions.  **R1-2103208 Panasonic Corporation**  Proposal 2: Whether both consecutive and non-consecutive physical slot for UL transmission can be used or not for TBoMS should be the requirement to determine TBS determination approach.  **R1-2103588 NTT DOCOMO, INC.**  Proposal 2: TB processing over non-consecutive physical slots for UL transmission should be supported for unpaired spectrum.  **R1-2102535 vivo**  Proposal 2: The TDRA for TBoMS is composed of multiple transmission occasions, and each transmission occasion can be composed of multiple slots.   * A TB is mapped to a Tx occasion, and the multiple slots in Tx occasion are consecutive slots; * UE transmits different repetitions on different occasions.   **R1-2102913 INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECH (H)**  Proposal: Support non-consecutive physical slots for UL transmission for TBoMS for unpaired spectrum.  Proposal: Enhance PUSCH repetition type-A framework to support transmission over non-contiguous slots.  **R1-2102314 Huawei, HiSilicon**  Proposal 2: Non-consecutive slots should be supported for TBoMS for unpaired spectrum, paired spectrum, and SUL band.  **R1-2102408 OPPO**  Proposal 3: TBoMS support non-consecutive physical slots for UL transmission in unpaired spectrum.  TBoMS support processing with simplified RV determination and TB size limit.  **R1-2102644 CATT**  Proposal 1: For unpaired spectrum, non-consecutive physical slots for UL transmission can be supported for TBoMS.  **R1-2103008 INTERDIGITAL, INC.**  Proposal 1: Support non-consecutive physical slots for UL transmission for TBoMS for unpaired spectrum  **R1-2103043 Intel Corporation**  Proposal 2   * Non-consecutive physical slots for UL transmission can be used for TBoMS for unpaired spectrum. * TBoMS can be transmitted on the basis of available UL slots.   **R1-2103252 Samsung**  Proposal 3: non-consecutive slots for UL transmission can be used for TBoMS for unpaired spectrum.  **R1-2103381 Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell**  Proposal 2. For the time-domain resource allocation of TBoMS, non-consecutive physical slots for UL transmission are also supported for paired spectrum, unpaired spectrum and the SUL band.  Proposal 3. For the time-domain resource allocation of TBoMS, if non-consecutive physical slots for UL transmission are not supported for paired spectrum, unpaired spectrum and the SUL band, then PUSCH repetition type B like TDRA must be supported for time domain resource determination.  **R1-2103445 Ericsson**  Proposal 7: Non-consecutive physical slots can be supported for TBoMS in TDD or FDD.  **R1-2103461 Sierra Wireless**   1. Multi-slot encoding with gaps between repeats should be specified.   FFS: sizes of gaps  **R1-2103625 LG ELECTRONICS**  Proposal 3: Consecutive available slots can be used for TBoMS for unpaired spectrum, where adjacent available slots can be located in non-consecutive physical slots.  **R1-2102691 MediaTek Inc.**  Proposal 2: At least the consecutive slots for multi-slot PUSCH should be supported. |

**TDRA indication/determination**

|  |
| --- |
| **R1-2102498 ZTE**  Proposal 2: For TBoMS, the number of slots is jointly coded with the TDRA table.  **R1-2103252 Samsung**  Proposal 1: Consider following two options for time domain resource for a single TB in TBoMS:   * Option 1: Indicating number of slot for one TB based on Type A and/or Type B PUSCH   + Number of occupied repetition/slots can be configured. * Option 2: Directly indicating a number of symbol L that can be larger than 14.   + A symbols group can be considered * Other options are not precluded.   **R1-2103117 Apple**  Proposal 4: The number of slots for scheduled TB is dynamic indicated via DCI.  **R1-2103445 Ericsson**  Proposal 1: Reuse resource determination and signaling of Rel-15/16 PUSCH repetition as much as possible to avoid specifying duplicate functionality.  Proposal 2: Type-A like TBoMS can reuse the definition of S, L, K of PUSCH repetition Type A, with the only exception being that UL symbols across K slots constitute one TB.  Proposal 3: The time domain resource determination of Type-B like TBoMS, if supported, can reuse the definition of S and K of PUSCH repetition Type B, with K being the number of slots of a TB. |

**Others**

|  |
| --- |
| **R1-2102913 INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECH (H)**  Proposal: If N\_prb used for TBoMS is not restricted, then a restriction on the number of slots aggregated for TBoMS is required.  **R1-2103117 Apple**  Proposal 1: Considering the maximum number of slots for TB transmission is 8.  Proposal 2: TBoMS transmission occasion is specified in terms of the number of slots for one TB processed.  **R1-2103179 Qualcomm Incorporated**  Proposal 2: Prioritize a modular approach to TBoMS transmission, i.e., when resources for TBoMS span across multiple contiguous/noncontiguous slots, view resources in each slot as one self-contained segment of a longer transmission.  Proposal 4: A transmission occasion of a TBoMS transmission constitutes a set of contiguous resources (symbols) spanning one or more slots. A TBoMS transmission can constitute transmissions across one or more transmission occasions. The PUSCH repetition type A and RV cycling framework in R15/R16 is repurposed for TBoMS transmission across multiple transmission occasions.   * FFS: limits on maximum duration of a transmission occasion of a TBoMS.   **R1-2103445 Ericsson**  Proposal 8: If TBoMS with more than 2 slots is to be supported, TBoMS configuration uses the number of available slots, otherwise physical slots are used.  Proposal 18: As a starting point, consider 2 or 4 slots as the candidate numbers of slots for a TBoMS.  **R1-2102691 MediaTek Inc**  Proposal 3: The number of slots for multi-slot PUSCH transmission can be configured by the network.  Proposal 4: The starting slot for multi-slot PUSCH transmission can be configured by the network or derived based on the timing of received uplink grant.  **R1-2103461 Sierra Wireless**   1. Multi-slot encoding should be specified with a maximum of 2 slots of encoding.   **R1-2103514 NEC**  Proposal 2: Some enhancement to reduce segment within a slot for PUSCH repetition type B like TDRA should be consider TDRA for TBoMS. |

## A.2 FDRA

|  |
| --- |
| R1-2102535 vivo  Proposal 7: Limitation on number of PRBs for TBoMS can be achieved by proper NW scheduling, and explicit limitation on number of PRBs for TBoMS is not needed.  R1-2102913 INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECH (H)  Proposal: N\_prb used for TBoMS should be limited to satisfy the TB constraints.  Proposal: If N\_prb used for TBoMS is not restricted, then a restriction on the number of slots aggregated for TBoMS is required.  R1-2102498 ZTE  Proposal 5: The maximum number of PRBs can be limited when TBoMS is enabled.   * FFS how to determine the maximum number of PRBs.   R1-2102993 Xiaomi  Proposal 3: Limit the number of RBs allocated for TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH by gNB scheduling.  R1-2103252 Samsung  Proposal 5: The maximal number of PRB allocated in time domain is reduced for TB over multi-slot.  R1-2103625 LG ELECTRONICS  Proposal 4: It is considerable to apply TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH when a PUSCH has a small number of PRBs. |

## A.3 TBS determination

***N*Info calculation**

|  |
| --- |
| **R1-2102718 Fujitsu**  Proposal 2: Unquantized intermediate variable (Ninfo) is obtained by the following:  **R1-2102861 China Telecom**  Proposal 5: For TBS calculation, NInfo for TBoMS is calculated Based on all REs determined across the symbols or slots over which the TBoMS transmission is allocated.  **R1-2102894 CMCC**  Proposal 4: The symbols over which the TBoMS transmission is allocated can be different from the symbols over which the TBoMS transmission is performed, considering collisions would happen between TBoMS and other transmissions.  Proposal 6: The Approach 1 should be further discussed based on the counting of slots.  Proposal 7: Considering the process delay, the slot number in Approach 1 and the K value in Approach 2 should be limited.  **R1-2103208 Panasonic Corporation**  Proposal 3: Support following approach for TBS determination and rate matching process for TBoMS.   * + TBS is calculated based on the number of REs determined in the first L symbols over which the TBoMS transmission is allocated, scaled by .   + Multiple rate matching output bit sequence can be generated for TBoMS. Different RV is applied across slot or one PUSCH transmission occasion.   **R1-2103588 NTT DOCOMO, INC.**  Proposal 4: NInfo and NohPRB calculation for TBoMS should be compatible for both PUSCH repetition type A and B like TDRA or discussed after concluding TDRA determination for TBoMS.  **R1-2102535 vivo**  Proposal 3: Approach 2 is adopted for NInfo determination i.e. NInfo is scaled by K, where K is number of slots in the first Tx occasion/repetition.  **R1-2102913 INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECH (H)**  Proposal: N\_info is calculated based on the number of REs determined in the first L symbols over which the TBoMS transmission is allocated, scaled by K≥1, where K is the number of slots over which TBoMS performed.  **R1-2102498 ZTE**  Proposal 7: Approach 1 is supported for determination of NInfo for TBoMS.  **R1-2102644 CATT**  Proposal 3: For TBoMS, NInfo is calculated based on the number of REs determined in the first L symbols over which the TBoMS transmission is allocated, scaled by K≥1, where L is the number of symbols determined.   * + FFS: the definition of K.   **R1-2103008 INTERDIGITAL, INC.**  Proposal 4: NInfo for TBoMS is calculated based on all REs determined across the symbols or slots over which the TBoMS transmission is allocated.  **R1-2103043 Intel Corporation**  Proposal 5   * For calculation of NInfo for TBoMS, approach 1 is adopted.   **R1-2103117 Apple**  Proposal 6: The same PUSCH mapping type and SLIV are applied to slots for TB transmission.  **R1-2103179 Qualcomm Incorporated**  Proposal 6: When determining for TBoMS, is the number of resource elements available in a transmission occasion of TBoMS.  Proposal 7: When determining for TBoMS, introduce a new scale factor to compute the intermediate number of information bits.  FFS: permitted values for the scale factor.  FFS: signaling aspects of the scale factor.  FFS: restrictions on when the scale factor can be used/signaled.  Note: No new TB sizes are introduced.  **R1-2103252 Samsung**  Proposal 6: NInfo for TBoMS is calculated based on all REs in all slots for the TB. NohPRB is assumed to be the same for all the slots over which the TBoMS transmission is allocated and can be configured by xOverhead as in Rel-15/16.  **R1-2103381 Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell**  Proposal 4: NInfo for TBoMS is calculated based on all REs determined across the symbols over which the TBoMS transmission is allocated.  **R1-2103445 Ericsson**  Proposal 5: Approach 1 is used to calculate .  **R1-2103514 NEC**  Proposal 3: Limit Ninfo upper bound to make sure that the maximum supported TBS not exceeds legacy maximum supported TBS in Rel-15/16 for TBoMS.  Proposal 4: Using approach 2 as a starting point to decide Ninfo as approach 2 can easily get the same TBS for initial transmission and retransmission.  R1-2103616 Lenovo, Motorola Mobility  Proposal 3: For one TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH in NR coverage enhancements in Rel-17, support calculation based on REs determined for all symbols across all the available slots.  **R1-2103625 LG ELECTRONICS**  Proposal 6: Ninfo for TBoMS PUSCH is obtained as where NRE is based on on the number of REs determined in the first L symbols over which the TBoMS transmission is allocated and K is a scaling factor.  **R1-2103700 WILUS INC.**  Proposal 2: We propose to support Approach 2 for Ninfo calculation as a baseline.   * If the accurate calculation of Ninfo is deemed necessary, Approach 1 can be further considered.   **R1-2102408 OPPO**  Proposal 1: In TBoMS, TB size determination is configured with PUSCH repetition operation.  The TB can be transmitted in the multi-slot configured in the PUSCH repetition.  The enhanced Type A PUSCH repetition is included.  Proposal 4: For coverage enhancement, TB size of PUSCH can be derived by a larger than 1 factor in case when PUSCH repetition is configured.  Ninfo can be multiplied by factor of 2, 4, 8 for determining TBS.  Proposal 5: A multi-slot TB size factor is introduced for TB size determination in case when PUSCH repetition is configured.  The multi-slot TB size factor is not larger than configured number of slots for repetition.  **R1-2103480 Sharp**  Proposal 6: A TBS scaling factor K is indicated through a DCI format for scheduling the PUSCH or RRC signaling. |

**NohPRB calculation**

|  |
| --- |
| **R1-2102894 CMCC**  Proposal 8: The overhead per PRB N\_oh\_PRB should be counted based on the actual used symbols and slots.   * For the integral, N\_oh\_PRB could be reused * For the symbols less than 14, the N\_oh\_PRB should be counted based on the actual used symbols.   + A mapping between N\_oh\_PRB and symbols could be considered   **R1-2103588 NTT DOCOMO, INC.**  Proposal 4: NInfo and NohPRB calculation for TBoMS should be compatible for both PUSCH repetition type A and B like TDRA or discussed after concluding TDRA determination for TBoMS.  **R1-2102535 vivo**  Proposal 4: Option 1 is adopted for NohPRB determination, i.e. NohPRB is assumed to be the same for all the slots over which the TBoMS transmission is allocated.  **R1-2102913 INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECH (H)**  Proposal: Same overhead is assumed for all the slots over which TBoMS transmission is performed.  **R1-2102498 ZTE**  Proposal 8: Option 1 is supported for determination of NohPRB for TBoMS.  **R1-2102644 CATT**  Proposal 4: For TBoMS, NohPRB is calculated depending on both xOverhead and the number of symbols or slots (FFS whether symbol or slot are used) over which the TBoMS transmission is allocated.   * + FFS: if either the number of symbols or the number of slots is used.   + FFS: if xOverhead is separately configured from the one in Rel-15/16.   **R1-2103043 Intel Corporation**  Proposal 6   * For determination of NohPRB for TBoMS, Option 2 is adopted.   **R1-2103117 Apple**  Proposal 7: Option 1 is supported for TBS determination.  **R1-2103179 Qualcomm Incorporated**  Proposal 8: For TBoMS, is assumed to be the same across an entire TBoMS transmission occasion is configured via xOverhead as in Rel-15/16.  **R1-2103381 Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell**  Proposal 5. For calculation for TBoMS, consider only Option 2, which also includes Option 1 (if the number of slots is used together with xOverhead to calculate ), and focus the discussion on whether the number of slots or symbols should be used to calculate .  Proposal 6. For calculation for TBoMS, is calculated depending on both xOverhead and the number of symbols over which the TBoMS transmission is allocated.  **R1-2103445 Ericsson**  Proposal 6: Option 1 is used to determine NohPRB, given the lower standardization effort needed.  R1-2103616 Lenovo, Motorola Mobility  Proposal 4: For one TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH in NR coverage enhancements in Rel-17, NohPRB is assumed to be the same for all the slots over which the TBoMS transmission is allocated and can be configured by xOverhead as in Rel-15/16 calculation.  **R1-2103625 LG ELECTRONICS**  Proposal 7: NohPRB is assumed to be the same for all the slots over which the TBoMS transmission is allocated and can be configured by xOverhead as in Rel-15/16.  **R1-2103700 WILUS INC.**  Proposal 3: We propose to support Option 1 for Noh calculation as a baseline.   * Option 2 can be further considered if the accurate calculation on Noh is deemed necessary. |

**Contraint on maximum TBS for TBoMS**

|  |
| --- |
| **R1-2102314 Huawei, HiSilicon**  Proposal 4: Further constraint on maximum TB size for TBoMS is not needed.  **R1-2102498 ZTE**  Proposal 9: The maximum TBS can be limited by the conditions of date rate limitations DataRate and DataRateCC.  **R1-2102644 CATT**  Proposal 5: For TBoMS, no restriction other than the maximum TBS is enforced by specification.  **R1-2103179 Qualcomm Incorporated**  Proposal 9: Restrict TBoMS transmissions to TB sizes that permit single codeblock transmissions (i.e., entire TB can be encoded as a single codeblock). Furthermore, restrict TBoMS transmission to single layer transmissions. |

## A.4 Relationship between TBoMS and PUSCH repetitions

|  |
| --- |
| **R1-2102861 China Telecom**  Proposal 6: Down selection on the following options for TBoMS:   * Option 1: The maximum number of aggregated slots for TBoMS is the same as the maximum number of repetitions for PUSCH repetition type A in Rel-17. * Option 2: PUSCH repetition on top of TBoMS is supported in Rel-17.   **R1-2102894 CMCC**  Proposal 5: There is no need to support the repetition of TBoMS.  **R1-2103208 Panasonic Corporation**  Proposal 4: Repetition of TBoMS is considered if overall coding rate lower than which has been specified in MCS table for URLLC is necessary.  **R1-2103588 NTT DOCOMO, INC.**  Proposal 3: Support a repetition for TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH.  **R1-2102314 Huawei, HiSilicon**  Proposal 5: Repetition is supported for TB over multiple slots, and the overall number of slot for TBoMS with repetition should be limited.  **R1-2102498 ZTE**  Proposal 4: Discuss whether to support PUSCH repetition together with TBoMS.  **R1-2102993 Xiaomi**  Proposal 6: TB processing over multi-slot can be transmitted in conjunction with repetitions.  **R1-2103043 Intel Corporation**  Proposal 3   * Repetition is supported for TBoMS.   **R1-2103117 Apple**  Proposal 3: For TB transmission over consecutive UL slots, repetition can be supported on top of TBoMS.  **R1-2103179 Qualcomm Incorporated**  Proposal 4: A transmission occasion of a TBoMS transmission constitutes a set of contiguous resources (symbols) spanning one or more slots. A TBoMS transmission can constitute transmissions across one or more transmission occasions. The PUSCH repetition type A and RV cycling framework in R15/R16 is repurposed for TBoMS transmission across multiple transmission occasions.   * FFS: limits on maximum duration of a transmission occasion of a TBoMS.   **R1-2103252 Samsung**  Proposal 2: Repetition is supported for TB over multi-slot.  **R1-2103381 Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell**  Proposal 1. RAN1 should specify TBoMS as an independent feature according to WID. It should not be considered as an enhancement of neither PUSCH repetition type A nor type B, regardless of how time domain resource determination is indicated.  **R1-2103445 Ericsson**  Proposal 11: The need for repetition of TBoMS is further considered.  **R1-2103461 Sierra Wireless**   1. Repetition of TBoMS should be specified.   R1-2103480 Sharp  Proposal 3: Repetition based TBoMS scheme should be supported.  Proposal 4: Repetition of a PUSCH crossing the slot boundary should be considered for utilizing non-consecutive physical slot allocation.  R1-2103625 LG ELECTRONICS  Proposal 8: Repetition of TBoMS PUSCH is supported. |

## A.5 DM-RS

|  |
| --- |
| **R1-2103252 Samsung**  Proposal 4: Further study the following method for time domain location of DMRS considering the joint channel estimation over multi-slot and transmissions:   * + DMRS time domain location is determinted per PUSCH transmission   + DMRS time domain location is determinated per slot   **R1-2103445 Ericsson**  Proposal 10: The same DMRS configuration, MCS index and number of layers are used in all slots of TBoMS.  **R1-2103480 Sharp**  Proposal 5: If cross slot channel estimation is not configured for TBoMS transmission, DMRS is configured per slot irrespective of PUSCH structure. DMRS configuration for length larger than 14 should be studied in joint channel estimation AI.  **R1-2102691 MediaTek Inc.**  Proposal 5: DMRS location can be slot specific as legacy operation. |

## A.6 CB segmentation, redundancy version, rate-matching and interleaving

CB segmentation

|  |
| --- |
| **R1-2103117 Apple**  Proposal 8: The terminology of TB processing over multiple slots needs to be clarified. It can down-select between TB segmentation and slot bundling.  **R1-2103179 Qualcomm Incorporated**  Proposal 1: RAN1 prioritizes design considerations for TBoMS that help prevent or reduce small payload segmentation.  **R1-2103445 Ericsson**  Proposal 12: CB segmentation can be considered for TBoMS.  **R1-2103625 LG ELECTRONICS**  Proposal 5: It is considerable to reduce the maximum TB size so that CB segmentation does not occur.  **R1-2103179 Qualcomm Incorporated**  Proposal 9: Restrict TBoMS transmissions to TB sizes that permit single codeblock transmissions (i.e., entire TB can be encoded as a single codeblock). Furthermore, restrict TBoMS transmission to single layer transmissions. |

Redundancy version/ Rate-matching and Interleaving

|  |
| --- |
| **R1-2102861 China Telecom**  Proposal 1: For TBoMS, TBS is determined based on multiple slots and different segment is transmitted in each slot.  **R1-2102314 Huawei, HiSilicon**  Proposal 3: Bit to resource mapping using RV cycling mechanism and continuous mapping mechanism need to be studied.  **R1-2102408 OPPO**  Proposal 6: Single RV scheme can be used across all the repetition slots in case of TB size over multi-slot and PUSCH repetition is configured.  Reducing the complexity of RE generation in each slot, e.g., restricting TB size.  **R1-2103179 Qualcomm Incorporated**  Proposal 5: Depending on the duration of the transmission occasion spanning contiguous resources, RV index for a transmission within a transmission occasion is chosen based on one of the following two options:   * A single RV index is used across the entire transmission occasion. * An updated RV index is used each time a slot boundary is crossed.   **R1-2103252 Samsung**  Proposal 7: Further study the rate matching operation by considering the continuous RM and RV based segmented RM.  Proposal 8: slot based interleaving is supported for TBoMS.  **R1-2103381 Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell**  Proposal 7: For rate-matching the encoded bits on the resource across multiple slots for TBoMS, the encoded bits are rate-matched on the total resource allocated for TBoMS across multiple slots.  **R1-2103445 Ericsson**  Proposal 14: Unless some strong benefit can be shown for more than one RV per TBoMS transmission, one RV is used across all slots of a TBoMS.  Proposal 15: The transmission occasion of TBoMS for RV cycling and UL transmission power determination can be different.  **R1-2103480 Sharp**  Proposal 2: If a single PUSCH crossing slot boundaries without repetition is supported for TBoMS transmission, some reserved resources (e.g., DL region) which overlaps with the single PUSCH should be punctured or rate matched.  **R1-2102691 MediaTek Inc.**  Proposal 1: The conditions to apply TBoMS should be studied for the gain compared to the RV cycling repetition.  **R1-2103208 Panasonic Corporation**  Proposal 3: Support following approach for TBS determination and rate matching process for TBoMS.   * + TBS is calculated based on the number of REs determined in the first L symbols over which the TBoMS transmission is allocated, scaled by .   + Multiple rate matching output bit sequence can be generated for TBoMS. Different RV is applied across slot or one PUSCH transmission occasion. |

## A.7 Link adaptation

***MCS index***

|  |
| --- |
| **R1-2103445 Ericsson**  Proposal 10: The same DMRS configuration, MCS index and number of layers are used in all slots of TBoMS. |

## A.8 Frequency hopping

|  |
| --- |
| **R1-2103208 Panasonic Corporation**  Proposal 5: Inter-slot frequency hopping with joint channel estimation should be supported for TBoMS.  **R1-2102993 Xiaomi**  Proposal 4: Support intra-TB frequency hopping for TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH.  **R1-2103043 Intel Corporation**  Proposal 4   * Inter-slot frequency hopping and inter-slot frequency hopping with inter-slot bundling are supported for TBoMS.   + FFS: intra-slot frequency hopping for TBoMS   R1-2103616 Lenovo, Motorola Mobility  Proposal 2: For one TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH in NR coverage enhancements in Rel-17, support multi-slot frequency hopping and multi-slot DM-RS bundling for joint channel estimation for entire hop:   * Association between frequency hop duration and DM-RS bundle duration should be supported |

## A.9 Transmission power determination

|  |
| --- |
| **R1-2102498 ZTE**  Proposal 11: For TBoMS, the transmission power determination should be based on the total number of REs within multiple slots for TB processing with excluding the overhead of reference signals.  **R1-2103445 Ericsson**  Proposal 15: The transmission occasion of TBoMS for RV cycling and UL transmission power determination can be different.  Proposal 16: Considering the standardization effort, a transmission occasion of one slot is preferred for TBoMS transmission power determination.   * Further discuss whether the power is fixed or how it can vary across slots of a TBoMS transmission |

## A.10 Rank of TBoMS transmission

|  |
| --- |
| R1-2102535 vivo  Proposal 6: PUSCH with TB processing over multiple slots should be limited to single transmission layer.  **R1-2103445 Ericsson**  Proposal 10: The same DMRS configuration, MCS index and number of layers are used in all slots of TBoMS.  **R1-2103179 Qualcomm Incorporated**  Proposal 9: Restrict TBoMS transmissions to TB sizes that permit single codeblock transmissions (i.e., entire TB can be encoded as a single codeblock). Furthermore, restrict TBoMS transmission to single layer transmissions. |

## A.11 Retransmissions

|  |
| --- |
| **R1-2102894 CMCC**  Proposal 9: Per slot retransmission should be considered for the retransmission of multiple slot PUSCH transmission.  **R1-2103008 INTERDIGITAL, INC.**  Proposal 5: Support enhanced retransmission mechanisms to avoid the retransmission of the entire TBoMS.  **R1-2103445 Ericsson**  Proposal 13: TB-based retransmission is considered for TBoMS, rather than CBG-based retransmission. |

## A.12 UCI multiplexing, SRS/DL collisions/cancellations

|  |
| --- |
| **R1-2102718 Fujitsu**  Proposal 4: Reuse repetition-like behaviour (option 2 in Figure 2) for collision handling between TBoMS PUSCH and PUCCH.  R1-2102535 vivo  Proposal 5: For UCI multiplexing on PUSCH with TB processing over multiple slots, the number of modulated symbols in the PUSCH for UCI multiplexing is determined based on   * the number of symbols for PUSCH in a slot, which is overlapping with the PUCCH.   **R1-2102314 Huawei, HiSilicon**  Proposal 6: Study multiplexing UCI and UCI multiplexing mechanism in case of overlapped PUCCH and TBoMS PUSCH transmissions.  **R1-2102498 ZTE**  Proposal 3: For collision handling of TBoMS, legacy collision handling rules for PUSCH repetition type A could be reused by replacing a repetition to a slot of the multiple slots for TB processing.  Proposal 10: Further discuss UCI multiplexing rules for TBoMS.  **R1-2102644 CATT**  Proposal 6: For TBoMS, further study UCI multiplexing based on the outcome of TDRA.  **R1-2103043 Intel Corporation**  Proposal 7   * FFS how to handle overlaps between TBoMS and other uplink transmission.   **R1-2103252 Samsung**  Proposal 9: Parallel transmission of PUCCH and TBoMS PUSCH is not preferred due to power splitting during CE situation.  Proposal 10: UCI multiplexing in TBoMS PUSCH is supported in Rel17 CE, RAN1 further study the details.  **R1-2103445 Ericsson**  Proposal 9: When the number of symbols in each slot is the same for TBoMS,   * If the number of physical slots is configured, reuse the Rel-15 PUSCH repetition collision rules for TBS determination * If the number of available slots is configured, TBS determination is according to the number of available slots.   **R1-2103445 Ericsson**  Proposal 17: RAN1 to decide how to multiplex UCI on TBoMS  **R1-2103625 LG ELECTRONICS**  Proposal 9: UE behavior for the overlapping between TBoMS PUSCH and PUCCH resource should be discussed.  **R1-2103700 WILUS INC.**  Proposal 4: It should be further discussed how to determine the number REs for UCI multiplexing in case of TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH. |

## A.13 Multi-slot/Single-slot switch/indication

|  |
| --- |
| **R1-2102861 China Telecom**  Proposal 7: The number of aggregated slots for TBoMS can be semi-statically configured by RRC and dynamically indicated by DCI. Dynamic switching between TBoMS and single slot transmission can be differentiated by the indication of number of slots in DCI.  **R1-2102913 INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECH (H)**  Proposal: Support semi-static switching between TBoMS and single slot transmission.  R1-2102993 Xiaomi  Proposal 5: Consider configuration and/or indication procedures when both repetition and TBoMS are supported for a single UE.  R1-2103008 INTERDIGITAL, INC.  Proposal 2: Support dynamic enabling/disabling of TBoMS transmission.  R1-2103381 Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell  Proposal 8. RAN1 to specify an indication method for enabling multi-slot TB transmission per PUSCH scheduling/configuration.   * FFS: Details of the indication method, including introducing a new field or reusing the available field in the scheduling DCI (or RRC parameter in case of configured grant configuration), e.g. some rows in the TDRA table are used to configure for multi-slot TB transmission. |

# Appendix B: Previous agreements on TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH

Agreement:

* Consider one or two of the following options as starting points to design time domain resource determination of TBoMS
  + PUSCH repetition type A like TDRA, i.e., the number of allocated symbols is the same in each slot.
  + PUSCH repetition type B like TDRA, i.e., the number of allocated symbols in each slot are different.

Agreement:

* Consecutive physical slots for UL transmission can be used for TBoMS for unpaired spectrum.
  + To resolve in RAN1#104b-e whether to support non-consecutive physical slots for UL transmission for TBoMS for unpaired spectrum.
* Consecutive physical slots for UL transmission can be used for TBoMS for paired spectrum and the SUL band.
  + FFS if non-consecutive physical slots for UL transmission are also supported for paired spectrum and the SUL band.

Agreement:

* The same number of PRBs per symbol is allocated across slots for TBoMS transmission.

Agreement:

For TBoMS, the maximum supported TBS should not exceed legacy maximum supported TBS in Rel-15/16, for the same number of layers.

* FFS: Details and further constraints on the applicability of TBoMS.

Agreement:

One or two of the following approaches will be considered as a starting point to decide how NInfo for TBoMS is calculated (aiming for down selection in RAN1 #104-bis-e):

* Approach 1: Based on all REs determined across the symbols or slots (FFS whether symbols or slots are used) over which the TBoMS transmission is allocated.
* Approach 2: Based on the number of REs determined in the first L symbols over which the TBoMS transmission is allocated, scaled by K≥1.
  + FFS: the definition of K.

Note: L is the number of symbols determined using the SLIV of PUSCH indicated via TDRA

FFS: impacts and further details if repetitions of TBoMS is supported.

FFS: whether the symbols over which the TBoMS transmission is allocated are the same or can be different from the symbols over which the TBoMS transmission is performed, and details on how to handle such scenarios.

Agreement:

One or two of the following options will be considered (aiming for down-selection in RAN1#104b-e) to calculate NohPRB for TBoMS:

* Option 1: NohPRB is assumed to be the same for all the slots over which the TBoMS transmission is allocated and can be configured by xOverhead as in Rel-15/16.
* Option 2: NohPRB is calculated depending on both xOverhead and the number of symbols or slots (FFS whether symbol or slot are used) over which the TBoMS transmission is allocated.
  + FFS: if either the number of symbols or the number of slots is used.
  + FFS: if xOverhead is separately configured from the one in Rel-15/16.

FFS: impacts and further details if repetitions of TBoMS is supported.

FFS: whether the symbols over which the TBoMS transmission is allocated are the same or can be different from the symbols over which the TBoMS transmission is performed.