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# Introduction

This document provides the summary for the following email discussion in RAN1#106-e:

[105-e-NR-7.1CRs-08] Issue#15: Discussion on HARQ-ACK multiplexing on PUSCH without PUCCH – Kome (Apple) with contributions [7],[8],[9],[10], and [11] (see the Appendix in Section 5 for a list of the proposals).

In RAN1 #105-e, there was a discussion on the topic with a summary of the status of the discussion, is as follows [6].:

(1) There was consensus to continue discussions for Rel-16 in next meeting.

(2) There is a discussion on the way forward for Rel-15:

* Option 1: Discuss in the next meeting - ZTE, CATT and Samsung
* Option 2: Declare that there is no consensus and leave to UE implementation - Qualcomm, MediaTek.

At the end of the meeting, the chairman’s concluded that we should continue the discussion for both Rel-15 and Rel-16 in RAN1#106-e. A detailed background on the issue can be found in the Appendix in Section 4.

# 1st Round

### Problem Statement

In the case of multiple overlapping PUSCHs with overlapping PUCCH, the understanding is that the UE uses PUSCH prioritization rules to select a PUSCH and multiplexes HARQ-ACK information in the PUSCH according to the indicated value of DAI field in DCI format 0\_1. This means that the UE would multiplex on at most one PUSCH. However, if the UE misses the DL DCI, then the UE behavior needs to be clarified. To assist in the discussion, the following example could be used. In the example, the UE misses the DL DCI and its associated PUCCH. On CC1, the UL TDAI can be set to X where X = 4 or X = {1, 2 or 3} while on CC2, UL DCI2 is set to 1.
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Figure 1: HARQ-ACK Transmission with overlapping PUSCH and no PUCCH

### Rel-15 UEs Behavior

In the discussion during RAN1 #105-e, for a Rel-15 UE the following positions were taken:

* 11 companies **support** leaving this scenario to UE implementation: Oppo, QC, CATT, LG, Intel, Spreadtrum, MediaTek, Nokia, Apple, Ericsson, Huawei/HiSilicon
* 3 companies **do not support** leaving this scenario to UE implementation: Samsung, NTT DOCOMO, ZTE
* 1 company highlights that the  case of one PUSCH (no CA) vs multiple overlapping PUSCH (CA-case) needs clarification as well: Vivo

Based on the contributions to this meeting, the following are the current company positions:

* UE implementation: Qualcomm, NTT DOCOMO, Apple
* the UE does not multiplex HARQ-ACK information in any PUSCH since there is no overlapping PUCCH and PUSCH (Alt 1 from RAN1 #105-e): MediaTek
* the UE selects a PUSCH and multiplexes HARQ-ACK information in the PUSCH according to the indicated value of DAI field in DCI format 0\_1 (Alt 3 from RAN1 #105-e): Huawei

|  |
| --- |
| **Position 1: UE implementation:** Qualcomm, NTT DOCOMO, Apple  Qualcomm [7]:  *Proposal 1: Without updating Rel-15 specification, leave it up to UE implementation to handle the case of HARQ-ACK multiplexing on a group of PUSCHs without HARQ-ACK PUCCH. RAN1 aim to find a solution for this case in Rel-16 specification.*  NTT Docomo [11]  Proposal 1:   * *In Rel-15, UE behavior in the situation illustrated in Fig.1 is not defined.*   Apple [10]:  *Proposal 1:*   * *For Rel-15 UEs, in the case of multiple overlapping PUSCHs with no overlapping PUCCH, the UE behavior is left to UE implementation.* |
| **Position 2: the UE does not multiplex HARQ-ACK information in any PUSCH since there is no overlapping PUCCH and PUSCH (Alt 1 from RAN1 #105-e):** MediaTek  MediaTek [8]  *Proposal 1: For both Rel-15 and Rel-16, when the value of DAI field in DCI format 0\_1 is for Type 1 HARQ-ACK codebook in PUSCH (or for Type 2 HARQ-ACK codebook in PUSCH), the UE does not multiplex HARQ-ACK information in any PUSCH if there is no overlapping PUCCH and PUSCH.* |
| **Position 3: the UE selects a PUSCH and multiplexes HARQ-ACK information in the PUSCH according to the indicated value of DAI field in DCI format 0\_1 (Alt 3 from RAN1 #105-e):** ~~Huawei~~ |

Based on these inputs, please answer the following question:

#### Q1: . In the case of multiple overlapping PUSCHs with no overlapping PUCCH, what is the UE behavior in Rel-15?

* **Alt #1**: the UE does not multiplex HARQ-ACK information in any PUSCH since there is no overlapping PUCCH and PUSCH.
* **Alt #2:** the UE multiplexes HARQ-ACK information in a PUSCH if UL-TDAI n.e. 4 (for Type 2 codebook) or UL-TDAI e.g. 1 (for Type 1 codebook) in DCI Format 0\_1 otherwise it does not multiplex i.e. the UL UL-TDAI indicates which PUSCH to be multiplexed on.
* **Alt #3:** the UE selects a PUSCH and multiplexes HARQ-ACK information in the PUSCH according to the indicated value of DAI field in DCI format 0\_1.
  + **Please detail rules to select PUSCH**
  + **NOTE: There are no PUSCH prioritization rules specified in Rel 15 without an overlapping PUCCH**
* **Alt #4:** This is left to UE implementation.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| ZTE | Our preference is Alt#2, while we are also ok with Alt#3.  Alt#1 is against the principle to define TDAI, and it would cause ambiguity at gNB side. Because gNB cannot be aware of whether the UE would miss the DCI. It would require gNB always perform blind decoding of PUSCH with or without UCI, regardless there is one or multiple overlapping PUSCHs.  Regarding Alt#3, the legacy PUSCH prioritization rules are applied. In case of non-CA case, no ambiguity would be caused. For CA case, it would have ambiguity between gNB and UE for the example shown in Figure 1. However, we can conclude such case, i.e., gNB should avoid a PUCCH only overlaps with some of the PUSCHs in the PUCCH slot. |
| QC | I expect we will repeat the same discussion in last meeting. At the end, different companies will have different interpretations of the spec for this case. For Rel-15, as many UEs/gNBs from different vendors are already deployed in the field, it is really impractical to introduce NBC change to spec. Therefore, we don’t see other way out of this issue rather than leaving this to UE implementation for Rel-15. |
| MTK | According to R15 current spec, from UE’s perspective there is no overlapping PUCCH and PUSCH. Hence, our preference is Alt. 1. |
| Nokia, NSB | We agree with the basic proposal of Huawei’s. There is no requirement for overlapping PUCCH and PUSCH for the UE to multiplex HARQ-ACK bits on PUSCH if the Vtdai so indicates. Our understanding is that this is intentional and covers the case where the PDSCH-scheduling DCI was lost.  It maybe so that due to lack of definition on which PUSCH to select for HARQ-ACK in Rel-15 we have no other choice but to leave Rel-15 up to UE implementation, but we would prefer agreeing to a rule. |
| vivo | We think the R15 current spec is clear and it is Alt 1. We can accept Alt 4 if different companies still have different interpretations of the spec for this case. As pointed by QC, many UEs/gNBs from different vendors are already deployed in the field, it is really impractical to introduce NBC change to spec. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Alt 4.  Of course agreeing a rule is our first preference. But at least for Rel-15, deciding rule would be impossible since companies have different views on UE behavior. In that sense, UE implementation is only the possible way. |
| CATT | Although we are open to discuss Alt #2, our understanding is that the current specification is aligned with Alt #1. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Since Rel-15 UE are widely used now, any spec change is not preferred. So we think Alt 4 is the best choice so far. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | There may be some misunderstanding. We agree with the analysis from QC that Alt#4 is probably the only choice for Rel-15. Alt#3 as proposed in our paper is intended for Rel-16.  For Alt#1, the DAI mechanism is introduced to solve the problem of UE missing DCI. And if the UE does not transmit UCI, the gNB may not decode the PUSCH successfully.  For Alt#2, it may cause multiple PUSCHs transmission carrying the same UCI simultaneously if multiple PUSCHs overlap with one PUCCH. |
| Intel | Although our understanding is Alt. 1 based on current specification, we understand this is for Rel-15 and it is expected that different UEs may have different implementations.  We are fine with Alt. 4 to leave UE implementation. |
| Samsung | We understand current situation. It is okay with alt. 4 if there is no common understanding in Rel-15. |
| Sharp | Current Rel-15 specification doesn’t specify any behavior for it. In that sense, introducing any UE behavior is NBC change. Therefore, we support Alt.4. |
| Ericsson | We share the same view as Nokia and HW/HiSi.  We understand any changes for Rel-15 is too late.  However, Huawei proposal is their contribution is aligned with our view and we would be supportive of that approach (Alt#3) for Rel-16. |
| Apple | We prefer Alt. 1. However, given the different interpretations we observed so far, we believe the only possible outcome would be to agree to Alt. 4 |
| Spreadtrum | Our preference is Alt 1. We can live with Alt 4. |
| Moderator | @ Huawei: We will make the correction to Huawei’s company position based on their comment. |

### Rel-16 UEs

In the discussion during RAN1 #105-e, for a Rel-16 UE the following positions were taken:

* Alt1: Oppo (2nd Choice), CATT, LG, Intel, Vivo, MediaTek, Apple (7)
* Alt 2:  Oppo (1st Choice), ~~NTT DOCOMO~~, ZTE (2)
* Alt 3: Qualcomm (Alt 4/5) (1)
* Question on CC Case: Qualcomm, Samsung (2)
* Discuss Next Meeting: Spreadtrum, Nokia, Ericsson, NTT DOCOMO, Huawei/HiSilicon (5)

Based on the contributions to this meeting, the following are the current company positions:

|  |
| --- |
| **Alt #1: the UE does not multiplex HARQ-ACK information in any PUSCH since there is no overlapping PUCCH and PUSCH:** MediaTek, NTT Docomo (Type 2 codebook only), Apple  MediaTek [8]  *Proposal 1: For both Rel-15 and Rel-16, when the value of DAI field in DCI format 0\_1 is for Type 1 HARQ-ACK codebook in PUSCH (or for Type 2 HARQ-ACK codebook in PUSCH), the UE does not multiplex HARQ-ACK information in any PUSCH if there is no overlapping PUCCH and PUSCH.*  NTT Docomo [11]  Proposal 2: *In Rel-16,*   * + *For Type 2 HARQ-ACK CB, UE does not multiplex HARQ-ACK on a PUSCH if the UE does not have a PUCCH transmission that is including HARQ-ACK and is overlapped with the PUSCH even when UL DAI corresponding to the PUSCH indicates HARQ-ACK multiplexing.*   + *For Type 1 HARQ-ACK CB, FFS.*   Apple [10]:  *Proposal 2: For Rel-16 UEs, in the case of multiple overlapping PUSCHs with no overlapping PUCCH, the UE does not multiplex HARQ-ACK information in any PUSCH since there is no DL DCI/PDSCH received overlapping PUCCH and PUSCH.* |
| **Alt #3: the UE selects a PUSCH and multiplexes HARQ-ACK information in the PUSCH according to the indicated value of DAI field in DCI format 0\_1:** Qualcomm , Huawei  Qualcomm [7]:  *Proposal 2: In Rel-16 specification, solve the issue of HARQ-ACK multiplexing on a group of PUSCHs without HARQ-ACK PUCCH by taking one of the following options.*   * *Option 1: define a default/reference PUCCH resource, and use that default/reference PUCCH to start the UCI multiplexing procedure.* * *Option 2: Follow the tDAI in the lastly received UL grant for the group to multiplex HARQ-ACK on the PUSCH scheduled by the lastly received UL grant, and ignore the tDAIs in other UL grants scheduling other PUSCHs in the group.*   Huawei [9]:  *Proposal 2: In case of multiple overlapping PUSCHs with no overlapping PUCCH*   * *Select one PUSCH within multiple PUSCH with DAI=1 following the same PUSCH prioritization rules for UCI multiplexing with PUCCH for type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook.* * *Select one PUSCH within multiple PUSCH with DAI≠4 following the same PUSCH prioritization rules for UCI multiplexing with PUCCH for type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook.*   *The DAI field value of multiple PUSCH should be the same* |

Based on these inputs, please answer the following question:

#### Q2: . In the case of multiple overlapping PUSCHs with no overlapping PUCCH, what is the UE behavior in Rel-16?

* **Alt #1**: the UE does not multiplex HARQ-ACK information in any PUSCH since there is no overlapping PUCCH and PUSCH.
* **Alt #2:** the UE multiplexes HARQ-ACK information in a PUSCH if UL-TDAI n.e. 4 (for Type 2 codebook) or UL-TDAI e.g. 1 (for Type 1 codebook) in DCI Format 0\_1 otherwise it does not multiplex i.e. the UL UL-TDAI indicates which PUSCH to be multiplexed on.
* **Alt #3:** the UE selects a PUSCH and multiplexes HARQ-ACK information in the PUSCH according to the indicated value of DAI field in DCI format 0\_1.
  + **Please detail rules to select PUSCH**
  + **NOTE: There are no PUSCH prioritization rules specified in Rel 15 without an overlapping PUCCH**
* **Alt #4:** This is left to UE implementation.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| ZTE | Same as Q1, our preference is Alt#2, while we are also ok with Alt#3. |
| QC | Our understanding is current Rel-16 spec does not define a UE behavior for this case. So our interpretation of current RAN16 spec is Alt 4. But we think for Rel-16, RAN1 should define a reasonable UE behavior for this case.  Based on the above, in general, we agree with the spirit of Alt 3, although the details on how to select **THE** PUSCH for multiplexing can be further discussion. For Alt 1, it is against the purpose to introduce UL DAI so it does not make sense to us. For Alt 2, it requires UE to do replicate multiplexing on every PUSCH, it creates unnecessary complexity to UE and degrades PUSCH performance. |
| MTK | According to R16 current spec, from UE’s perspective there is no overlapping PUCCH and PUSCH. Hence, our preference is Alt. 1. We are not sure what’s the difference between R15 & R16 spec so there should be different UE behaviors. |
| Nokia, NSB | We do agree with the Qualcomm assessment of the current situation.  If we can’t agree on the PUSCH selection rule for Rel-15, then we could still do that for Rel-16 and that could lead to a different way of 3GPP handling of Rel-15 and Rel-16. |
| vivo | According to R16 current spec, it is Alt1. For Rel-15, considering that many UEs/gNBs from different vendors are already deployed in the field, we can compromise to Alt 4. But for Rel-16, we think the current spec does not need any change for Alt 1. To align companies’ understanding, a conclusion is enough. Both alt 2 and alt 3 have to change the current spec. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Our first preference is Alt 1. Alt 4 is acceptable.  Alt 3 would need large specification efforts, which is not good in CR phase. (We do not prefer the situation of discussions for PUSCH DG skip...)  One note is that in type 2 HARQ-ACK CB, if multiplexed HARQ-ACK payload size is one or two, gNB can receive any UL-SCH without blind detection under Alt 1 (and Alt 4?) since the multiplexing is performed in a puncture manner. That is, the real issue is only more than 2 bits case but no DL assignments, which would not be a typical situation. Of course this is not the case in type 1 HARQ-ACK CB, but FYI. |
| CATT | The benefit of Alt #1 is minimal or no specification impact. But as indicated above, we are also open to discuss Alt #2. Our understanding of Alt #2 is that T-DAI=0 for Type-1 HARQ-ACK CB and T-DAI=4 for Type-2 HARQ-ACK CB are used to indicate that there is no HARQ-ACK to be multiplexed on PUSCH. Therefore, there will be some scheduling restriction at gNB side. In this way, we do not think UE would multiplex HARQ-ACK in every PUSCH since it is expected that only one PUSCH is indicated to multiplex HARQ-ACK. Alt #3 is not quite clear to us. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We prefer Alt#3 and we can live with Alt#1.  In Alt 1, T-DAI in UL grant should be followed; otherwise, the ambiguity between gNB and UE will be caused and the scheduled PUSCH can’t be correctly decoded.  In Alt 3, UE can select the latest scheduled PUSCH for multiplexing the HARQ-ACK information bits based on T-DAI in case there are multiple overlapping PUSCHs in the slot. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Our preference is Alt#3.  The issues for Alt#1 and Alt#2 are illustrated in Q1.  For Alt#3, the legacy prioritization rules can be reused. And the DAI field in the DCI can be used to identify the PUSCHs that are overlapped with the PUCCH. Therefore, the existing PUSCH prioritization rules can be reused as much as possible. |
| Intel | We share similar view as other companies that if we follow current specification, Alt. 1 is correct UE behavior as there is no overlapping PUCCH and PUSCH.  We prefer Alt. 1. |
| Samsung | Alt. 1 can be acceptable due to minimum specification impact. Since this is not general case since DCI missing event is rarely happened, optimization such as alt. 3 should be avoided in Rel-16. |
| Sharp | Specification should handle the issue. For the detailed solution, we should discuss Pros/Cons for each alternative. For Alt.2, we are negative with the same reason indicated by Qualcomm that multiplexing HARQ-ACK in all the PUSCH in the slot is inefficient. |
| Ericsson | We share the same view as Huawei |
| Apple | We prefer Alt.1 or Alt. 4. We don’t support Alt. 2, as it may lead to multiple UCI multiplexing in a slot. |
| Spreadtrum | Our preference is Alt 1. |

### Effect of CA vs non-CA operation

In RAN1 #105-e, there was a discussion on differentiating the CA and non-CA cases. However, multiple companies identified that (a) there is no differentiation between the two cases in the current specification with (b) some companies point out that they would prefer unified behavior in both cases. In [11], it was pointed out that two non-overlapping PUSCHs with a common overlapping PUCCH may have the same issue and as such, there should be a common solution for both.

#### Q3: Should we differentiate the solutions for the CA and non-CA cases ?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| ZTE | If possible, we of course support to define a unified solution for CA and non-CA cases. Otherwise, we think we should at least clarify and reach a same understanding about the most typical case (i.e., non-CA case) for Rel-16, with leaving to UE implementation for both cases for Rel-15 and CA case for Rel-16.  We would like to highlight that HARQ-ACK multiplexing on PUSCH in a single CC is a very typical case in real deployment. Leaving to UE implementation for such case would increase gNB complexity for blind decoding. |
| QC | No. We strongly object different solutions for CA vs non-CA. If RAN1 want to find a solution, let’s find a unified solution. We don’t see the motivation to introduce separate solutions for CA vs non-CA. |
| MTK | No. We do not see the necessity to introduce two different solutions here. |
| Nokia, NSB | Single uplink with more than 1 PUSCH in the same slot would have a similar problem, but it is not exactly the same problem as with the CA PUSCH selection as here the multiple PUSCH are always non-overlapping and never on different carriers, whereas in CA case the PUSCH are (obviously) on different carriers and at least typically time-overlapping. An unified solution that takes both the time and the frequency component into account could of course be envisioned. |
| Vivo | No. We do not see the necessity to introduce two different solutions. |
| NTT DOCOMO | No. Even in non-CA case, two TDMed PUSCH can be scheduled and one PUCCH can be overlapped with the two PUSCH. When the DL assignment is missed, the situation is the same as CA case. |
| CATT | No. A unified solution is desired. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We think the problem happens in both CA case and non-CA case as long as there are multiple PUSCHs in same slot. So a unified solution is preferred from our side. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We prefer to use a unified solution for CA and non-CA case. |
| Intel | No. We also prefer a unified solution for non-CA and CA case. |
| Samsung | No. we don’t see any difference of them. |
| Sharp | We don’t see the motivation to handle them differently. |
| Ericsson | No. We prefer unified solution for Rel-16.  In fact, our view is that for non-CA case, for dynamic HARQ-ACK CB, when UL DAI=1, if the UE misses DL assignment, the UE should multiplex one NACK in PUSCH based on the spec (both Rel-15 and Rel-16). However, as we mentioned before, we have to find ways to manage the Rel-15 situation , since it is too late for any change. |
| Apple | No, we prefer a unified solution. Further optimization between single CC vs CA for R16 is not desirable at this stage. |
| Spreadtrum | Same solution for CA and non-CA. |

# 1st Round Summary

### Rel-15 UEs Behavior

#### Q1: In the case of multiple overlapping PUSCHs with no overlapping PUCCH, what is the UE behavior in Rel-15?

A summary of the positions of different companies is as follows:

* Alt 1: MTK, Vivo (1st choice), CATT, Apple (1st choice), spreadtrum (1st choice) (5 companies, 5 1st choice companies)
* Alt 2: ZTE (1st choice) : (1 company, 1 1st choice company)
* Alt 3: ZTE (2nd choice), Nokia/NSB(1st choice): (2 companies, 1 1st choice company)
* Alt 4: Qualcomm, Nokia/NSB(2nd choice), Vivo (2nd choice), NTT DOCOMO, Lenovo/Motorola Mobility, Huawei/HiSilicon, Intel, Samsung, Sharp, Ericsson, Apple (2nd choice), Spreadtrum (2nd choice) (12 companies, 8 1st choice companies)

Given the company positions, we suggest that Alt. 4 be selected for Rel-15.

**Proposal 1:**

For Rel-15, in the case of multiple overlapping PUSCHs with no overlapping PUCCH, the UE behavior is left to UE implementation.

### Rel-16 UEs

#### Q2: . In the case of multiple overlapping PUSCHs with no overlapping PUCCH, what is the UE behavior in Rel-16?

A summary of the positions of different companies is as follows:

* Alt 1: MTK, Vivo, NTT DOCOMO (1st choice) CATT (1st choice), Lenovo (2nd choice), Intel, Samsung, Apple (1st choice), Spreadtrum (9 companies, 8 1st choice companies)
* Alt 2: ZTE (1st choice), CATT (2nd choice) : (2 companies, 1 1st choice company)
* Alt 3: ZTE (2nd choice), QC, Nokia/NSB, Lenovo (1st choice), Huawei, Ericsson (6 companies, 5 1st choice company)
* Alt 4: Apple (2nd choice), NTT DOCOMO (2nd choice) (2 companies, no 1st choice company)

Given the outcome of the discussion, we suggest that **we down-select to Alt-1 and Alt-3**.

For Alt-3, we also need to clarify the specific method by which the PUSCH to be multiplexed on is selected. As at now, we have the following methods proposed:

* *Alt 3-1: define a default/reference PUCCH resource, and use that default/reference PUCCH to start the UCI multiplexing procedure.*
* *Alt 3-2: Follow the tDAI in the lastly received UL grant for the group to multiplex HARQ-ACK on the PUSCH scheduled by the lastly received UL grant, and ignore the tDAIs in other UL grants scheduling other PUSCHs in the group.*
* *Alt 3-3:* 
  + *Select one PUSCH within multiple PUSCH with DAI=1 following the same PUSCH prioritization rules for UCI multiplexing with PUCCH for type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook.*
  + *Select one PUSCH within multiple PUSCH with DAI≠4 following the same PUSCH prioritization rules for UCI multiplexing with PUCCH for type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook*
* *Alt 3-4: Any other method*

For Alt 3-1, we would need to **clarify what the default PUCCH reference would be**. For Alt 3-3, we will need to **clarify the current PUSCH prioritization rules**. Some of these rules are captured in Section 5.3 in the Appendix but it would be good to verify that there are the rules being proposed.

### Effect of CA vs non-CA operation

#### Q3: Should we differentiate the solutions for the CA and non-CA cases ?

A summary of the positions of different companies is as follows:

* No: Qualcomm, MediaTek, Nokia/NSB, Vivo, NTT DOCOMO,CATT, Lenovo/Motorola Mobility, Huawei/Hisilicon, Intel, Samsung, Sharp, Ericsson, Apple, ZTE (if possible) (13 companies)
* Clarify behavior: ZTE (1)

Based on the outcome, there seems to be a consensus that we should have the same solutions for both.

Conclusion:

We can consider both during the discussion but RAN1 should find a unified solution.

# 2nd Round

### **Proposal #1:**

*For Rel-15, in the case of multiple overlapping PUSCHs with no overlapping PUCCH, the UE behavior is left to UE implementation.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| QC | We just noticed the proposal only covers multiple PUSCHs, should not the proposal cover a single PUSCH as well?  Another comment: The conditioning of the UL DAI value, “if UL-TDAI n.e. 4 (for Type 2 codebook) or UL-TDAI e.g. 1 (for Type 1 codebook)”, is missed in the proposal. I think for UL-TDAI = 4 (for Type 2 codebook) or UL-TDAI = 0 (for Type 1 codebook), spec is clear (UE does not multiplex) and it is not an error case. |
| CATT | Regarding Qualcomm’s 1st comment, our understanding of the issue is that if there are multiple PUSCHs, UE do not know which PUSCH to select for multiplexing. For single PUSCH, there should be no problem unless we take UL DCI miss into account. So is the intention to consider this case?  We support Qualcomm’s 2nd comment.  In addition, we would like to clarify that the PUCCH include PUCCH for SPS HARQ-ACK. |
| MTK | We still prefer Alt. 1, but we can be ok for Alt. 4 (current moderator proposal) if we are the only company objecting this. |
| Sharp | We are OK with the proposal. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Generally fine with us.  Rewording may be needed to address UL DAI=1 or 4 case as mentioned by Qualcomm. |
| Nokia, NSB | We are OK with the proposal in principle, but agree that Qualcomm’s “Another comment” should be taken in the proposal.  @QC: What is the issue with single PUSCH?  @MTK: Alt1 formulation was inaccurate as it asserted that the HARQ-ACK is not sent because there was no overlapping PUCCH, when the lack of overlapping PUCCH is not of an issue, the selection of the PUSCH is. |
| vivo | We can accept Alt 4. Regarding Qualcomm’s 1st comment, we share the same view, the proposal should cover a single PUSCH as well. |
| ZTE | Still prefer Alt 2/3. But we would be also fine with the proposal, and agree with Qualcomm’s second comment. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are fine with this proposal.  For single PUSCH, whether and how HARQ-ACK shall be multiplexed on PUSCH has already been clearly defined in current specification. The problematic case is multiple PUSCHs where the UE does not know which one to choose.  We agree with QC’s second comment. |
| QC2 | For single PUSCH, let’s consider two cases. Case 1: There is a single standalone PUSCH, while there are other PUSCHs in the slot, but the standalone PUSCH does not overlap with other PUSCHs. Case 2: there is a single PUSCH in a slot on a CC, and there are other PUSCH on other CCs in the same slot. For those two cases, I assume this situation is the same as overlapping PUSCHs – UE still does not know choose which PUSCH to multiplex. That is why I suggest to cover single PUSCH as well in this proposal. |
| Moderator | @ Qualcomm  Thank you for the comments. We have modified the proposal to account for the 2nd comment.  On the first comment (the single PUSCH), it seems there are multiple positions and I have added a question + an extra proposal (#1a-1) to account for this.  @ CATT, for the PUCCH for SPS HARQ ACK, my interpretation is that since the specification accounts for HARQ ACK in response to an SPS PDSCH reception as shown in the text “and the UE does not have HARQ-ACK information in response to a SPS PDSCH reception to multiplex in the PUSCH” the PUCCH includes the PUCCH for SPS HARQ-ACK. |

### **Proposal #1a:**

*For Rel-15, in the case of multiple overlapping PUSCHs with no overlapping PUCCH and if UL-TDAI n.e. 4 (for Type 2 codebook) or UL-TDAI e.g. 1 (for Type 1 codebook) the UE behavior is left to UE implementation.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Ok |
| Samsung | Okay, but same situation can be happened even when multiple PUSCHs are not overlapped in a slot. Since a UE would not know which PUSCH group are overlapped with a PUCCH. So, here overlapping PUSCHs is not exactly wording. |
| QC | We support the spirit of this proposal.  Just a low level comment: Since there are multiple PUSCH, should the condition on UL DAI modified to “and if any UL-TDAI n.e. 4 (for Type 2 codebook) or UL-TDAI e.g. 1 (for Type 1 codebook)”, to be more precise? |
| NTT DOCOMO | OK |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support |
| vivo | Fine in principle |
| MTK | It seems we are the only company objecting, so we can accept this proposal. QC’s suggestion on adding “any” seems reasonable to us. |
| CATT | OK |
| ZTE | Fine |
| Apple | Support |
| Moderator | There seems to be consensus for this. Thank you MTK for being flexible. |

### Discussion #1a:

It seems there is a lack on consensus on whether the proposal should be applicable to the single PUSCH case. As at now we have the following positions

Applicable to single PUSCH: Qualcomm,Vivo

Not applicable to single PUSCH case: ~~CATT,~~ Nokia (?), Huawei

Based on this, I am creating an additional proposal to see if this is acceptable.

#### Proposal #1a-1:

*For Rel-15, in the case of a single PUSCH with no overlapping PUCCH and if UL-TDAI n.e. 4 (for Type 2 codebook) or UL-TDAI e.g. 1 (for Type 1 codebook), the UE behavior is left to UE implementation:*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Not support. |
| Samsung | We don’t see any UE implementation issue here. Just one clarification, this case is only for a single PUSCH in a slot. Is it correct understanding? |
| QC | Support the proposal.  In our view, for the single PUSCH and multiple PUSCH, the situation is the same. The problem here is: how do we define a single PUSCH? Let’s consider the following cases:  Case 1: There is a single standalone PUSCH, while there are other PUSCHs in the slot, but the standalone PUSCH does not overlap with other PUSCHs. Should we call case 1 single PUSCH or multiple PUSCH?  Case 2: In uplink CA, there is a single PUSCH in a slot on a CC, and there are other PUSCH on other CCs in the same slot. Should we call case 2 single PUSCH or multiple PUSCH?  Case 3: in uplink CA, PCC is FR1(30Khz), SCC is FR2 (120Khz). On SCC, each slot has a PUSCH. Consider the missing PUCCH can overlap with 4 PUSCHs cross 4 slots on SCC, should we call case 3 single PUSCH or multiple PUSCH  Case 4: The simplest case, no uplink CA. In one slot, UE only received one PUSCH. However, due to potential of UE missing UL grant, should UE treat this as single PUSCH or multiple PUSCH case? |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support.  Companies have different understanding on the current Rel-15 spec, so possible outcome would only be up to UE implementation. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Not support.  The issue QC raised is that the UE cannot identify whether it is single PUSCH or multiple PUSCH in some cases. However, this does not mean for all single PUSCH cases, this should be left to UE implementation. As an example, for non-CA case with slot based PUSCH, the UE can still figure out how A/N shall be multiplexed following the current specification. It is a bit overkill to say that for all single PUSCH cases, this is left to UE implementation. |
| vivo | Support.  According to the current spec, we think this issue is applicable to both single PUSCH and multiple PUSCHs cases. From our understanding, if there is overlapping HARQ-ACK PUCCH, UE multiplex HARQ-ACK on the single PUSCH or one of the multiple PUSCHs based on the T-DAI of the PUSCH to be multiplexed. But unfortunately, people have different understandings. That’s why we have this conclusion and leave the UE behavior up to UE implementation. |
| MTK | Companies seem to have different understandings on the definition of “single PUSCH”. We suggest to first clarify the definition before decision. QC gives some nice cases illustration in previous comment, maybe a figure would further help companies to better understand the motivation. |
| CATT | OK |
| ZTE | Not support.  We share similar view as Huawei. The most typical case is there is only one PUSCH in a slot for non-CA case. In such case, UE should follow the indication from gNB, and there would be no UCI multiplexing issues based on current specification. |
| Apple | Support the proposal  As has been mentioned, there seems to be a different understanding of the UE behavior in any of these cases and as such it should be up to UE implementation. |

### **Proposal #2:**

*For Rel-16, focus on Alt #1 and Alt #3 where:*

* **Alt #1**: the UE does not multiplex HARQ-ACK information in any PUSCH since there is no overlapping PUCCH and PUSCH.
* **Alt #3:** the UE selects a PUSCH and multiplexes HARQ-ACK information in the PUSCH according to the indicated value of DAI field in DCI format 0\_1.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| QC | We are fine with the proposal. But it seems the proposal is not complete – meaning the “ in case of …” is missing in the sentence above the two bullets. |
| CATT | Between Alt #1 and 3, we support Alt #1 and we do not agree with Alt #3. It is clear that Alt #3 is not maintenance but a new feature. It is not within the scope of the discussion. In addition, if proposal #1 is acceptable for Rel-15, why is a new feature needed for Rel-16? |
| MTK | Our preference is Alt .1, but we can accept this proposal to narrow down candidates for progress. |
| Sharp | We are OK with the proposal. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We prefer Alt#3 and we can live with Alt#1.  In Alt 1, T-DAI in UL grant should be followed; otherwise, the ambiguity between gNB and UE will be caused and the scheduled PUSCH can’t be correctly decoded.  In Alt 3, UE can select the latest scheduled PUSCH for multiplexing the HARQ-ACK information bits based on T-DAI in case there are multiple overlapping PUSCHs in the slot. |
| Nokia, NSB | In principle OK to focus on Alt1 and Alt 3, but:  **Not OK with Alt1 formulation**, as it implies that the issue is that there is no overlapping PUCCH, when that is not the issue, the PUSCH selection is the issue. |
| Vivo | We support Alt 1. For alt 3, it will have large spec impact. As summarized in 3.2.1.1, we still need to clarify the specific method by which the PUSCH to be multiplexed on is selected. |
| ZTE | Fine with proposal, and our preference is Alt 3.  We share similar views as Nokia about the formulation of Alt 1. As the problem statement described in section 2.1, it is in case of more than one PUSCHs. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Okay with the proposal and we prefer Alt#3. |
| Moderator | @ Qualcomm/@ Nokia:  Updated the proposals to be more precise based on your comments.  @ MTK As you have mentioned, the goal it to narrow the proposals to make some progress. |

### **Proposal #2a:**

*For Rel-16, focus on Alt #1 and Alt #3 where:*

* ***Alt #1****: in the case of multiple overlapping PUSCHs with no overlapping PUCCH, and if UL-TDAI n.e. 4 (for Type 2 codebook) or UL-TDAI e.g. 1 (for Type 1 codebook) the UE does not multiplex HARQ-ACK information in any PUSCH. ~~Since there is no overlapping PUCCH and PUSCH.~~*
* **Alt #3**: *in the case of multiple overlapping PUSCHs with no overlapping PUCCH, and if UL-TDAI n.e. 4 (for Type 2 codebook) or UL-TDAI e.g. 1 (for Type 1 codebook) the UE selects a PUSCH and multiplexes HARQ-ACK information in the PUSCH according to the indicated value of DAI field in DCI format 0\_1.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Alt-3 |
| Samsung | Alt. 1. |
| QC | We support Alt-3 in principle. But we also think for any options under Alt #3, details need to be studied such as what is the procedure to select THE PUSCH? Is there any impact to UCI multiplexing timeline, etc. We are open to discuss those details within the group. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Alt 1  If Alt 3 can be agreed easily, Alt 3 is also fine. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Alt.3. |
| vivo | Alt 1. |
| MTK | We prefer Alt. 1, but we are fine to narrow down to two alternatives as proposed by the moderator. |
| CATT | Alt 1. |
| ZTE | Alt.3. |
| Apple | We are fine with narrowing the options down but prefer Alt 1. |

### **Proposal #3:**

*For Alt-3, the PUSCH to be multiplexed on is selected by:*

* *Alt 3-1: define a default/reference PUCCH resource, and use that default/reference PUCCH to start the UCI multiplexing procedure.* 
  + *Please give specifics on how the specific PUCCH resource is defined.*
* *Alt 3-2: Follow the tDAI in the lastly received UL grant for the group to multiplex HARQ-ACK on the PUSCH scheduled by the lastly received UL grant, and ignore the tDAIs in other UL grants scheduling other PUSCHs in the group.*
* *Alt 3-3:* 
  + *Select one PUSCH within multiple PUSCH with DAI=1 following the same PUSCH prioritization rules for UCI multiplexing with PUCCH for type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook.*
  + *Select one PUSCH within multiple PUSCH with DAI≠4 following the same PUSCH prioritization rules for UCI multiplexing with PUCCH for type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook*
  + *Please detail the current PUSCH prioritization rules e.g. by agreements or specification reference*
  + *NOTE: There are no PUSCH prioritization rules specified in Rel 15 without an overlapping PUCCH (See Appendix* 5.3)
* *Alt 3-4: Any other method*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| QC | We support this proposal. For Alt 3-1, to keep it simple, the reference PUCCH can be a PUCCH of 14 OFDM symbols cross the slot.  We are also interested to see how the one PUSCH is selected with Alt 3-3. |
| CATT | As commented above, we do not agree with Alt-3. |
| MTK | We are open for further discussion in this proposal although we prefer Alt.1. |
| Sharp | We are OK with the proposal. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We prefer Alt 3-2. |
| Nokia, NSB | We are OK with the proposal |
| ZTE | Support the proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are OK with the proposal. For Alt 3-3, there are two steps:   * Step 1: UE identifies “the multiple PUSCHs” that overlap with a PUCCH based on the value of UL DAI. Take Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook as an example, the UE identifies the multiple PUSCHs that overlap with a PUCCH if the value of UL DAI is equal to 1. * Step 2: UE selects a PUSCH among the multiple PUSCHs identified in Step 1, and apply legacy rules.   The legacy rules are based on the agreement from RAN1#97:   * First priority: PUSCH with A-CSI as long as it overlaps with Z * Second priority: earliest PUSCH slot(s) based on the start of the slot(s) * If there are still multiple PUSCHs overlap with Z in the earliest PUSCH slot(s), follow the following priorities (sequentially from high to low)   + Third priority: Dynamic grant PUSCHs > PUSCHs configured by respective ConfiguredGrantConfig or semiPersistentOnPUSCH   + Fourth priority: PUSCHs on serving cell with smaller ~~CC~~ serving cell index > PUSCHs on serving cell with larger serving cell index   + Fifth priority: Earlier PUSCH transmission > later PUSCH transmission |
| Moderator | @ Qualcomm:  Will add this to the proposal as an example as this is the only idea we have: **the reference PUCCH can be a PUCCH of 14 OFDM symbols cross the slot**  @ Huawei:  In Alt 3-3, given that there is no PUCCH resources identified, and the UL TDAI just identifies the fact that we need to multiplex HARQ-ACK, how do we identify the multiple PUSCHs ? **Are you implicitly assuming that the PUSCHs will have the same UL-TDAI value and you will group all of these into the set of PUSCHs to be used in step 2** ? |

### **Proposal #3a:**

*For Alt-3, the PUSCH to be multiplexed on is selected by:*

* *Alt 3-1: define a default/reference PUCCH resource, and use that default/reference PUCCH to start the UCI multiplexing procedure.* 
  + *Please give specifics on how the specific PUCCH resource is defined.*
  + *e.g. the reference PUCCH can be a PUCCH of 14 OFDM symbols across the slot*
* *Alt 3-2: Follow the tDAI in the lastly received UL grant for the group to multiplex HARQ-ACK on the PUSCH scheduled by the lastly received UL grant, and ignore the tDAIs in other UL grants scheduling other PUSCHs in the group.*
* *Alt 3-3:* 
  + *Select one PUSCH within multiple PUSCH with DAI=1 following the same PUSCH prioritization rules for UCI multiplexing with PUCCH for type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook.*
  + *Select one PUSCH within multiple PUSCH with DAI≠4 following the same PUSCH prioritization rules for UCI multiplexing with PUCCH for type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook*
  + *Please detail the current PUSCH prioritization rules e.g. by agreements or specification reference*
  + *NOTE: There are no PUSCH prioritization rules specified in Rel 15 without an overlapping PUCCH (See Appendix* 5.3)
* *Alt 3-4: Any other method*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Alt 3-3 (1st choice), Alt 3-2 (2nd choice).  No to Alt 3-1 |
| Samsung | Without any full details, selecting one of options is pointless. |
| QC | To HW: A question to Alt 3-3, for type 2 codebook, if UE received 6 PUSCHs (just an example) in a slot, two of them have UL TDAI=1, two of them have UL TDAI =2, two of them have UL DAI = 3, UE will do HARQ-ACK multiplexing three times in that slot, right? The first multiplexing is on one of the PUSCHs with TDAI=1. The second multiplexing is on one of the PUSCH with TDAI=2. The third multiplexing is on one of the PUSCH with TDAI=3. Is that the correct understanding of Alt 3-3? If so, we don’t support Alt 3-3 because it increases UCI multiplexing complexity too much. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Prefer Alt 3-3.  For Alt 3-1, the reference PUCCH might be different from the actual PUCCH. That is, the outcome of PUCCH/PUSCH multiplexing might be different. If the reference PUCCH shall be same as the actual PUCCH or similar in order to get the same outcome, it is scheduling restriction.  For Alt 3-2, if UE receives DL assignment, the HARQ-ACK is multiplexed on a PUSCH determined by the current spec. if not, the HARQ-ACK is multiplexed on the PUSCH corresponding to the last UL grant. Is it correct? If correct, I think still gNB needs blind decoding…  To QC: For Alt 3-3, DL assignment cannot be transmitted after UL scheduling for a slot. And only one HARQ-ACK is allowed for each slot. In this sense, all UL DAI of PUSCHs overlapped with the PUCCH will have same value, is it incorrect? |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | @ Moderator Yes, we assume that the multiple PUSCHs overlapping with the PUCCH shall have the same UL DAI. There is no clear reason why they shall be set differently due to the reason raised by DCM.  @ Qualcomm We would like to clarify a bit under what circumstance this will happen. One example we can think of is when PUCCH has a larger SCS, e.g. 120kHz, and the overlapping PUSCHs have smaller SCS, e.g. 15KHz. In this case, there may be multiple PUCCHs potentially overlapping multiple PUSCHs. In this case, the UE has to multiplex A/N on different PUSCHs since this is intended behavior that the gNB is expecting. On the other hand, I would assume that the probability of missing three DL DCI but still detecting 6 UL DCIs is small. In summary, we don’t think this would be an issue for Alt.3-3. |
| MTK | Same position, we do not like Alt. 3 series, but fine for this proposal to pin down some details for Alt. 3. |
| CATT | We have a general question on Alt 3. According to Alt 3, UE may multiplex HARQ-ACK is a PUSCH different from the one expected at gNB side. From gNB side, when should gNB try to receive UCI in another PUSCH different from the target PUSCH? If gNB can judge that UE does not multiplex HARQ-ACK in the target PUSCH, why would gNB bother to receive HARQ-ACK in a different PUSCH which would be all NACKs even if detected? Otherwise if gNB cannot determine whether UCI is multiplexed or not in the target PUSCH, why/when would gNB try to receive HARQ-ACK in another PUSCH?  In addition, we would like to understand what the benefit of the second option of Alt 3-3 over Alt 2 which has been excluded is. |
| ZTE | Open to Alt 3-2 and Alt 3-3 now. |

### Q4:

***To enable an understanding of the different choices, companies should detail pros and Cons of Alt-1 and Alt-3****:*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** | |
| QC | **Alt 1 Pros** |  |
| **Alt 1 Cons** | This is against the purpose to introduce UL DAI. gNB need to do blind detection for PUSCH decoding. |
| **Alt 3-1 Pros** | With a reference PUCCH, the Rel-15 multiplexing procedure can be reused. It is unified UCI multiplexing behavior between nominal case (where PUCCH exist) and this special case (where PUCCH is absent). To keep it simple, the reference PUCCH can be a PUCCH of 14 OFDM symbols cross the slot. |
| **Alt 3-1 Cons** |  |
| **Alt 3-2 Pros** | Always multiplexing on the last received UL grant allow gNB make “last minute” change of scheduling decision. It also simplified UE multiplexing procedure. |
| **Alt 3-2 Cons** |  |
| **Alt 3-3 Pros** |  |
| **Alt 3-3 Cons** | Tripled UCI multiplexing complexity. |
| MTK | The pros of Alt. 1 is minimal (or even zero) spec impact.  The pros of Alt. 3 is an enhancement for UL DAI usage.  For Rel-16, to change spec to apply Alt. 3, we would expect some simulation or analytical results to demonstrate the achievable gain (should be evident enough to apply a R16 spec change for enhancement) from the proponents of Alt. 3, since to our understanding DCI missing event is rarely happened (as also mentioned by Samsung).  Hence, currently we prefer Alt. 1 for Rel-16. | |
| Sharp | **Alt 1 Pros** |  |
| **Alt 1 Cons** | Blind decoding by gNB side is required even when expected HARQ-ACK bits are 1 or 2 if P-CSI also overlaps with the PUSCHs. |
| **Alt 3-1 Pros** |  |
| **Alt 3-1 Cons** | It is not clear how to perform UCI multiplexing for multiple PUCCH when a reference resource defined for it overlaps with P-CSI. In that case, new PUCCH resource is determined based on 0+Y bits where the reference resource assumes 0 bit UCI and P-CSI is Y bits? |
| **Alt 3-2 Pros** | No issue found so far. |
| **Alt 3-2 Cons** |  |
| **Alt 3-3 Pros** | No issue found so far. |
| **Alt 3-3 Cons** |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | For Alt 1, T-DAI in UL grant does not be followed so that the ambiguity between gNB and UE will be caused.  For Alt 3, a predefined rule is needed for the UE to select one PUSCH. Always following the latest UL DAI seems simple and gives gNB scheduling flexibility. | |
| Nokia, NSB | **Alt1:** Behaviour is not what it is supposed to be – there should be HARQ-ACK in one of the PUSCH  **Alt3-1:** We see this as a workable and potentially simple approach.  **@Sharp**: If there is P-CSI then wouldn’t there be a PUCCH resource for that P-CSI as well and the reference resource would be meaningless?  **Alt3-2:** No issue found so far  **Alt3-3**: No issue found so far, but on the face of it appears a bit more complex | |
| vivo | Alt 3 Cons  For alt 3, how to define the overlapping PUSCH group/ or “the multiple PUSCHs” needs further discussion. If I understand correctly, if there is no any PUCCH (include CSI PUCCH), the multiple PUSCHs is defined as the overlapped PUSCHs. But if there is a CSI PUCCH, where the CSI PUCCH overlaps with multiple non-overlapped PUSCHs, how to determine the multiple PUSCHs is not clear. | |
| ZTE | Alt1: Share similar view as Qualcomm.  **Alt3-1**: Not clear for now about the detailed design. It may need more discussion if there is another PUCCH overlapping the reference PUCCH.  **Alt 3-2:** It sounds simple, and no additional rules are needed.  **Alt3-3**: No issue found so far. | |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | **Alt1 cons**: This is against motivation of UL-DAI design. The UL DAI mechanism is introduced to solve the problem of UE missing DL DCI. And if the UE does not multiplex A/N in PUSCH, the gNB may not decode PUSCH successfully.  **Alt3-1 cons:** A default PUCCH reference resource may have different PUCCH formats as well different symbol lengths compared to the actual PUCCH, it may lead to misalignment between UE and gNB.  **Alt3-2 cons:** The latest DCI may not be the one with the highest priority which leads to misunderstanding between gNB and UE. Besides, this is not consistent with the legacy rules for multiple overlapping PUSCHs with PUCCH, which introduces additional complexity for UE implementation.  **Alt3-3 pros**: The legacy PUSCH prioritization rules can be used as much as possible, only the selection of overlapping PUSCHs is needed which is according to the UL DAI field in the UL DCI, which we believe is straightforward. | |
| Samsung | **Alt. 3 cons**  It is noted that all PUCCH and PUSCH multiplexing should be operated based on processing timeline in NR. However, if a UE doesn’t know exact PUCCH resource, UE and gNB have different understandings on calculating multiplexing/cancellation timeline. So, all Alt. 3 cannot fix the fundamental problem. It is also impacting UL skipping behavior. So, it may also have potential impact on RAN2. | |
| QC2 | To Samsung: Thanks for bring up the timeline issue. Of course I still need to check the spec more carefully, but I think the UCI multiplexing timeline is for gNB to follow. UE actually does not check the timeline. UE just assume gNB scheduler should give UE enough time to process. On gNB side, timeline is not an issue, because gNB know where is the “missing” PUCCH. | |
| NTT DOCOMO | Alt 1 pros: No spec impact, no issue in typical situations of Type-2 HARQ-ACK CB.  For Alt 3-1/3-2 cons, please see our comment in the last section. | |
| Huawei, HiSilicon2 | To Samsung: My understanding of processing timeline is to put some scheduling restriction at the gNB. In case the gNB violates the timeline, the UE behaviors are undefined. Regarding the potential impact to RAN2, we would like to understand what exactly it is. | |
| Apple | **Alt 1 Pros** | Minimal spec impact  No timeline issues  gNB performs hypothetical decoding of 1 PUSCH (PUSCH it expects the UE to transmit HARQ-ACK on) |
| **Alt 1 Cons** |  |
| **Alt 3-1 Pros** |  |
| **Alt 3-1 Cons** | **Timeline squeeze:** if default PUCCH is over all 14 symbols, then by default the UE will multiplex on PUSCH on smallest serving cell index “the UE multiplexes the UCI in a PUSCH of the serving cell with the smallest *ServCellIndex* subject to the conditions in Clause 9.2.5 for UCI multiplexing being fulfilled”. Unlike existing specification, there will be no timeline guarantees e.g. if we miss the DL PDCCH but the PUCCH is overlapping with a later PUSCH, only the later PUSCH timeline is guaranteed. The others are not.  Diagram  Description automatically generated    gNB performs hypothetical decoding of 2 PUSCH (PUSCH it expects the UE to transmit HARQ-ACK on if everything is received and PUSCH it expects the UE to transmit on if it uses the default PUCCH) |
| **Alt 3-2 Pros** |  |
| **Alt 3-2 Cons** | Timeline squeeze if the PUSCH scheduled by the last UL grant is not transmitted with the timeline limiations in mind.  UE may have to wait till it is sure that it has received the last UL grant to start encoding the PUSCH.  gNB may have to perform hypothetical decoding on at least 2 PUSCHs. More if it assumes that a PUSCH may be missed. |
| **Alt 3-3 Pros** |  |
| **Alt 3-3 Cons** | Limits gNB to set TDAI to specific value. It needs to be verified that this is current NR behavior  May result in a timeline squeeze if the UE will be selecting PUSCH on smallest serving cell index.  gNB may have to perform hypothetical decoding on at least 2 PUSCHs.  What is the duration for the UE to check for a PUSCHs with the same TDAI ? Is it across a slot or multiple slots? How does this work in a mixed numerology scenario ? |

# 2nd Round Summary

### **Proposal #1 Summary:**

From the replies, there is a consensus to leave this to UE implementation.

Recommendation [Stable]: I would recommend the following conclusion to the chair:

**Proposal:**

*For Rel-15, in the case of multiple overlapping PUSCHs with no overlapping PUCCH and if any UL-TDAI n.e. 4 (for Type 2 codebook) or UL-TDAI e.g. 1 (for Type 1 codebook) the UE behavior is left to UE implementation.*

### **Proposal #1a-1 Summary**

The current company positions are as follows:

* Support: Qualcomm, NTT DOCOMO, Vivo, CATT, Apple (5 companies)
* Do not Support: Ericsson, Samsung, Huawei, ZTE (4 companies)
* Understand Further: MTK (1 company)

From the replies, we may need more discussion on this topic.

Recommendation: Needs further discussion e.g. identify what is meant by “single PUSCH” with diagrams and identify the expected UE behavior.

### **Proposal #2a Summary**

Companies are fine in general with focusing the discussion on Alt-1 and Alt-3. Based on this we have the following positions:

* Alt 1: Samsung, ~~Qualcomm (2~~~~nd~~ ~~choice)~~, NTT DOCOMO (1st Choice), Vivo, MTK, CATT, Apple (6~~7~~ companies with 6 as first choice)
* Alt 3: Ericsson, Qualcomm (1st choice), NTT DOCOMO (2nd choice), Huawei, ZTE (5 companies with 4 as 1st choice)

Recommendation [Stable]:

**Proposal:**

*For Rel-16, down-select to Alt #1 and Alt #3 where:*

* ***Alt #1****: in the case of multiple overlapping PUSCHs with no overlapping PUCCH, and if UL-TDAI n.e. 4 (for Type 2 codebook) or UL-TDAI e.g. 1 (for Type 1 codebook) the UE does not multiplex HARQ-ACK information in any PUSCH*
* **Alt #3**: *in the case of multiple overlapping PUSCHs with no overlapping PUCCH, and if UL-TDAI n.e. 4 (for Type 2 codebook) or UL-TDAI e.g. 1 (for Type 1 codebook) the UE selects a PUSCH and multiplexes HARQ-ACK information in the PUSCH according to the indicated value of DAI field in DCI format 0\_1.*

### **Proposal #3a Summary**

This section analyzes the discussion on the method to select a single PUSCH in Alt-3. Note that the # of companies here is a sub-set of the total # as some companies are not in support of this alternative. In the against column, I put in companies that support Alt-3 but specifically say that they do not support the specific alternative to help in identifying a method for Alt-3.

* Alt 3-1: define a default/reference PUCCH resource and use that default/reference PUCCH to start the UCI multiplexing procedure.
  + *[Qualcomm]:****Reference PUSCH definition:*** *the reference PUCCH can be a PUCCH of 14 OFDM symbols across the slot*
  + *For: Qualcomm, Nokia (?) (2 companies)*
  + *Against: Ericsson, NTT DOCOMO (2 companies)*
* *Alt 3-2: Follow the tDAI in the last received UL grant for the group to multiplex HARQ-ACK on the PUSCH scheduled by the last received UL grant, and ignore the tDAIs in other UL grants scheduling other PUSCHs in the group.*
  + *For: Qualcomm, Ericsson (2nd choice), ZTE, Lenovo(?) (4 companies)*
  + *Against: NTT DOCOMO (1 company)*
* *Alt 3-3:* 
  + *Select one PUSCH within multiple PUSCH with DAI=1 following the same PUSCH prioritization rules for UCI multiplexing with PUCCH for type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook.*
  + *Select one PUSCH within multiple PUSCH with DAI≠4 following the same PUSCH prioritization rules for UCI multiplexing with PUCCH for type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook*
  + *[Huawei]* ***PUSCH selection method:*** *All PUSCHs with DAI = 1 for type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook and DAI≠4 for type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook.* ***The DAI field value of multiple PUSCH should be the same***
    - *For: Ericsson, Huawei, NTT DOCOMO*
    - *Against: Qualcomm(?)*

From the discussion, we can eliminate Alt 3-1 and focus on Alt 3-2 and Alt 3-3.

Recommendation: Companies supporting Alt-3 should focus on Alt 3-2 and Alt 3-3.

**Proposal:**

For Alt-3, RAN1 to down-select from one of the following:

* *Alt 3-2: Follow the tDAI in the last received UL grant for the group to multiplex HARQ-ACK on the PUSCH scheduled by the last received UL grant, and ignore the tDAIs in other UL grants scheduling other PUSCHs in the group.*
* *Alt 3-3:* 
  + *Select one PUSCH within multiple PUSCH with DAI=1 following the same PUSCH prioritization rules for UCI multiplexing with PUCCH for type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook.*
  + *Select one PUSCH within multiple PUSCH with DAI≠4 following the same PUSCH prioritization rules for UCI multiplexing with PUCCH for type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook*
  + *PUSCH selection method: The DAI field value of multiple PUSCH should be the same*

Combining this discussion with the positions in Section 3.2.1.1, we have:

* Alt 1: Samsung, NTT DOCOMO (1st Choice), Vivo, MTK, CATT, Apple, Intel, Spreadtrum, Lenovo (2nd choice), ~~Qualcomm (2~~~~nd~~ ~~choice)~~ (9~~10~~ companies with 8 as first choice)
* Alt 3: Ericsson, Nokia/NSB, Huawei, ZTE, Qualcomm (1st choice), Lenovo (1st choice), NTT DOCOMO (2nd choice) (7 companies with 6 as 1st choice)
  + Alt 3-1: QC, Nokia/NSB ( 2 companies)
  + Alt 3-2: Qualcomm, Ericsson (2nd choice), ZTE, Lenovo (?) (4 companies)
  + Alt 3-3: : Ericsson, Huawei, NTT DOCOMO ( 4 companies)

### **Q4 Summary**

In the table below, we summarize the pros and cons of the different schemes. This information can be used in deciding whether to down-select between Alt-1 and Alt-3. Please review as we can use this information in the down-selection from Atl-1 and Alt-3.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Alt 1 - Pros | [MTK][NTT DOCOMO][Apple] minimal (or even zero) spec impact.  [NTT DOCOMO] no issue in typical situations of Type-2 HARQ-ACK CB.  [Apple] No timeline issues and no increased restriction on gNB scheduling  [Apple] gNB performs hypothetical decoding of only one PUSCH (PUSCH it expects the UE to transmit HARQ-ACK on) |
| Alt 1 - Cons | [QC] [Lenovo, Motorola/Mobility][Huawei][Nokia] This is against the purpose to introduce UL DAI.  [QC] [Sharp] Blind decoding by gNB side is required. |
| Alt 3-1 - Pros | [QC] With a reference PUCCH, the Rel-15 multiplexing procedure can be reused. It is unified UCI multiplexing behavior between nominal case (where PUCCH exist) and this special case (where PUCCH is absent). To keep it simple, the reference PUCCH can be a PUCCH of 14 OFDM symbols across the slot.  [MTK] enhancement for UL DAI usage  [Nokia] **Alt3-1:** We see this as a workable and potentially simple approach. |
| Alt 3-1 - Cons | [MTK] No simulation or analytical results to demonstrate achievable gain as DCI missing event rarely happens.  [Sharp] It is not clear how to perform UCI multiplexing for multiple PUCCH when a reference resource defined for it overlaps with P-CSI. In that case, new PUCCH resource is determined based on 0+Y bits where the reference resource assumes 0 bit UCI and P-CSI is Y bits?   * [Nokia] If there is P-CSI then wouldn’t there be a PUCCH resource for that P-CSI as well and the reference resource would be meaningless?   [Vivo] if there is a CSI PUCCH, where the CSI PUCCH overlaps with multiple non-overlapped PUSCHs, how to determine the multiple PUSCHs is not clear  [Huawei] A default PUCCH reference resource may have different PUCCH formats as well different symbol lengths compared to the actual PUCCH, it may lead to misalignment between UE and gNB  [Samsung] It is noted that all PUCCH and PUSCH multiplexing should be operated based on processing timeline in NR. However, if a UE doesn’t know exact PUCCH resource, UE and gNB have different understandings on calculating multiplexing/cancellation timeline. So, all Alt. 3 cannot fix the fundamental problem. It is also impacting UL skipping behavior. So, it may also have potential impact on RAN2.  [Apple] **Timeline squeeze:** if default PUCCH is over all 14 symbols, then by default the UE will multiplex on PUSCH on smallest serving cell index “the UE multiplexes the UCI in a PUSCH of the serving cell with the smallest *ServCellIndex* subject to the conditions in Clause 9.2.5 for UCI multiplexing being fulfilled”. Unlike existing specification, there will be no timeline guarantees e.g. if we miss the DL PDCCH but the PUCCH is overlapping with a later PUSCH, only the later PUSCH timeline is guaranteed. The others are not.  Diagram  Description automatically generated    gNB performs hypothetical decoding of 2 PUSCH (PUSCH it expects the UE to transmit HARQ-ACK on if everything is received and PUSCH it expects the UE to transmit on if it uses the default PUCCH) |
| Alt 3-2 - Pros | [QC] [Lenovo, Motorola/Mobility] Always multiplexing on the last received UL grant allow gNB make “last minute” change of scheduling decision. It also simplified UE multiplexing procedure.  [MTK] enhancement for UL DAI usage |
| Alt 3-2 - Cons | [MTK] No simulation or analytical results to demonstrate achievable gain as DCI missing event rarely happens  [Vivo] if there is a CSI PUCCH, where the CSI PUCCH overlaps with multiple non-overlapped PUSCHs, how to determine the multiple PUSCHs is not clear  [Huawei] The latest DCI may not be the one with the highest priority which leads to misunderstanding between gNB and UE. Besides, this is not consistent with the legacy rules for multiple overlapping PUSCHs with PUCCH, which introduces additional complexity for UE implementation.  [Samsung] It is noted that all PUCCH and PUSCH multiplexing should be operated based on processing timeline in NR. However, if a UE doesn’t know exact PUCCH resource, UE and gNB have different understandings on calculating multiplexing/cancellation timeline. So, all Alt. 3 cannot fix the fundamental problem. It is also impacting UL skipping behavior. So, it may also have potential impact on RAN2.  [NTT DOCOMO] [Apple] gNB may have to perform hypothetical decoding on at least 2 PUSCHs. More if it assumes that a PUSCH may be missed.  [Apple] Timeline squeeze if the PUSCH scheduled by the last UL grant is not transmitted with the timeline limitations.  UE may have to wait till it is sure that it has received the last UL grant to start encoding the PUSCH. This may impact the N2 processing timeline. |
| Alt 3-3 - Pros | [MTK] enhancement for UL DAI usage  [Huawei] The legacy PUSCH prioritization rules can be used as much as possible, only the selection of overlapping PUSCHs is needed which is according to the UL DAI field in the UL DCI, which we believe is straightforward. |
| Alt 3-3 - Cons | [QC] Tripled UCI multiplexing complexity. A question to Alt 3-3, for type 2 codebook, if UE received 6 PUSCHs (just an example) in a slot, two of them have UL TDAI=1, two of them have UL TDAI =2, two of them have UL DAI = 3, UE will do HARQ-ACK multiplexing three times in that slot, right? The first multiplexing is on one of the PUSCHs with TDAI=1. The second multiplexing is on one of the PUSCH with TDAI=2. The third multiplexing is on one of the PUSCH with TDAI=3. Is that the correct understanding of Alt 3-3? If so, we don’t support Alt 3-3 because it increases UCI multiplexing complexity too much.   * [HUAWEI]: we assume that the multiple PUSCHs overlapping with the PUCCH shall have the same UL DAI. There is no clear reason why they shall be set differently due to the reason raised by DCM * [DCM] For Alt 3-3, **DL assignment cannot be transmitted after UL scheduling for a slot**. And only one HARQ-ACK is allowed for each slot. In this sense, all UL DAI of PUSCHs overlapped with the PUCCH will have same value   [MTK] No simulation or analytical results to demonstrate achievable gain as DCI missing event rarely happens  [Vivo] if there is a CSI PUCCH, where the CSI PUCCH overlaps with multiple non-overlapped PUSCHs, how to determine the multiple PUSCHs is not clear  [Samsung] It is noted that all PUCCH and PUSCH multiplexing should be operated based on processing timeline in NR. However, if a UE doesn’t know exact PUCCH resource, UE and gNB have different understandings on calculating multiplexing/cancellation timeline. So, all Alt. 3 cannot fix the fundamental problem. It is also impacting UL skipping behavior. So, it may also have potential impact on RAN2.  [NTT DOCOMO] DL assignment cannot be transmitted after UL scheduling for a slot. And only one HARQ-ACK is allowed for each slot. In this sense, all UL DAI of PUSCHs overlapped with the PUCCH will have same value  [Apple] Limits gNB to set TDAI to specific value. It needs to be verified that this is current NR behavior. What is the duration for the UE to check for a PUSCHs with the same TDAI ? Is it across a slot or multiple slots? How does this work in a mixed numerology scenario ?  May result in a timeline squeeze if the UE will be selecting PUSCH on smallest serving cell index.  gNB may have to perform hypothetical decoding on at least 2 PUSCHs. |

# 3rd Round

### Rel-15 UEs Behavior

On the issue of the “single PUSCH”, there seems to be no clear definition of what “single PUSCH” is. One company has proposed the following:

The problem here is: how do we define a single PUSCH? Consider the following cases:

* Case 1: There is a single standalone PUSCH, while there are other PUSCHs in the slot, but the standalone PUSCH does not overlap with other PUSCHs. Should we call case 1 single PUSCH or multiple PUSCH?
* Case 2: In uplink CA, there is a single PUSCH in a slot on a CC, and there are other PUSCH on other CCs in the same slot. Should we call case 2 single PUSCH or multiple PUSCH?
* Case 3: in uplink CA, PCC is FR1(30Khz), SCC is FR2 (120Khz). On SCC, each slot has a PUSCH. Consider the missing PUCCH can overlap with 4 PUSCHs cross 4 slots on SCC, should we call case 3 single PUSCH or multiple PUSCH
* Case 4: The simplest case, no uplink CA. In one slot, UE only received one PUSCH. However, due to potential of UE missing UL grant, should UE treat this as single PUSCH or multiple PUSCH case?
* Case 5: Any other cases

A picture containing timeline

Description automatically generated

#### Q5: Please consider the cases above and identify if they are “single” or “multiple PUSCH”. Alt-1: Rel-15 behavior; Alt-2: UE implementation. Please identify the expected UE behavior by using agreements or specification text.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| QC | It is very hard to distinguish what is single PUSCH case and what is multiple PUSCH case, based on our analysis of the above 4 cases. So we support UL implementation for both cases of single and multiple PUSCH. |
| MTK | In Rel-15, we already agreed that the case for multiple PDSCHs is left for UE implementation. **We prefer a unified solution to take “left for UE implementation” for both single and multiple PUSCH cases in Rel-15**. Otherwise, if we take Alt. 3 series, we need to first clarify each of the case (1~4) is single or multiple PDSCH (to us all of them can be counted as multiple PUSCH), and also clarify which PUSCH should be used to multiplex the HARQ-ACK in each case (while we are not even sure whether these are all the possible cases). Taking Alt. 3 also has spec impact on Rel-15 to our understanding. |
| Samsung | As we commented before, it is a little bit confused what multiple PUSCH case is and what single PUSCH case is. Anyhow, multiple PUSCH agreed the related conclusion, we are open to have same conclusion regardless of single or multiple PUSCH since definition of single PUSCH is still unclear to us. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We think that to distinguish single and multiple is not good way. Just the same conclusion should be agreed. |
| CATT | Even for the simplest case of non-CA with a slot-level PUSCH, if we consider repetition of PUSCH, if UE does not the PUCCH slot, UE does not know which PUSCH is selected for UCI multiplexing.  We support to have the same conclusion for single and multiple PUSCH cases. |
| ZTE | In our view, at least for the simplest and most typical case, i.e., Case 4, the UE should treat it as single PUSCH. We would like to check whether this is acceptable for other companies. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Our views is that Case 1~3 can be categorized as multiple PUSCHs case while for Case 4, it belongs single PUSCH case given that probability of missing a DCI is small. In typical operations, UE shall multiplex HARQ-ACK on PUSCH according to the UL-DAI field in the UL DCI. If this simple case is also left to UE implementation, the function of UL T-DAI become crippled |
| Apple | We think that we should have the same conclusion for both. |

### Rel-16 UEs Behavior

To address the Rel-16 behavior solution, please reply to the following proposal:

#### *Proposal 4:*

*For Rel-16, RAN1 to down-select from one of the three options: Alt #1 and Alt #3 where:*

* ***Alt #1****: in the case of multiple overlapping PUSCHs with no overlapping PUCCH, and if UL-TDAI n.e. 4 (for Type 2 codebook) or UL-TDAI e.g. 1 (for Type 1 codebook) the UE does not multiplex HARQ-ACK information in any PUSCH.*
* **Alt #3-2**: *in the case of multiple overlapping PUSCHs with no overlapping PUCCH, and if UL-TDAI n.e. 4 (for Type 2 codebook) or UL-TDAI e.g. 1 (for Type 1 codebook) the UE selects a PUSCH and multiplexes HARQ-ACK information in the PUSCH according to the indicated value of DAI field in DCI format 0\_1.*
  + *Follow the tDAI in the lastly received UL grant for the group to multiplex HARQ-ACK on the PUSCH scheduled by the lastly received UL grant, and ignore the tDAIs in other UL grants scheduling other PUSCHs in the group.*
* **Alt #3-3**: *in the case of multiple overlapping PUSCHs with no overlapping PUCCH, and if UL-TDAI n.e. 4 (for Type 2 codebook) or UL-TDAI e.g. 1 (for Type 1 codebook) the UE selects a PUSCH and multiplexes HARQ-ACK information in the PUSCH according to the indicated value of DAI field in DCI format 0\_1.*
  + *Select one PUSCH within multiple PUSCH with DAI=1 following the same PUSCH prioritization rules for UCI multiplexing with PUCCH for type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook.*
  + *Select one PUSCH within multiple PUSCH with DAI≠4 following the same PUSCH prioritization rules for UCI multiplexing with PUCCH for type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook*
  + *PUSCH selection method:****The DAI field value of multiple PUSCH should be the same.***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| QC | We don’t support this proposal. We think so far only a few companies expressed views on different options with Alt#3, removing Alt #3-1 just based only 4 companies input on Alt #3-1 is a premature decision. Alt #3-1 actually has minimum spec impact and UE implementation impact. We should make the decision after more companies expressed their views. |
| Moderator | @ Qualcomm: All the companies that supported Alt-3 have expressed their opinion on which sub-alternative they preferred. Other companies expressed preference for Alt-1 and did not have any input here:   * Alt 3: Ericsson, Nokia/NSB, Huawei, ZTE, Qualcomm (1st choice), Lenovo (1st choice), NTT DOCOMO (2nd choice) (7 companies with 6 as 1st choice)   + Alt 3-1: QC, Nokia/NSB ( 2 companies)   + Alt 3-2: Qualcomm, Ericsson (2nd choice), ZTE, Lenovo (?) (4 companies)   Alt 3-3: : Ericsson, Huawei, NTT DOCOMO ( 4 companies) |
| MTK | We are generally fine to narrow down the candidates as in this proposal. As RAN1 chair is suggesting to further choose the final solution, we prefer Alt. 1 (as said before), and it seems Alt.1 is the majority view. If we take Alt. 3 series, we need to clarify each of the case (1~4) is single or multiple PDSCH (to us all of them can be counted as multiple PUSCH), and also clarify which PUSCH should be used to multiplex the HARQ-ACK in each case (while we are not even sure whether these are all the possible cases). |
| Samsung | Proposal is not that accurate since no alt. 3 in the candidates. It seems all companies’ position has not been changed so far, also not sure we can converge one solution in next meeting. So, we prefer to conclude one majority solution in this meeting, if possible. |
| QC2 | Alt 3-3 introduced unnecessary scheduling restriction to gNB, which is all the PUSCH in a slot must use the same UL DAI value. This restriction basically prohibits gNB schedule PDSCH between two UL grants, as showing below figure. It is quite often that gNB use a later grant to schedule a PUSCH on another CC while the later grant needs to update the UL DAI due to a previous DL grant in between two UL grants. Please note the two PUSCHs can be on different CCs, while the two HARQ-ACK have to be on the same PCC.    In the above scenario, with Alt 3-3, UE needs to do HARQ-ACK multiplexing twice on these two PUSCHs, which is not reasonable.  To Docomo: I guess the above figure explained why PUSCHs with different UL DAI values are needed in practice. We do not think this statements “DL assignment cannot be transmitted after UL scheduling for a slot. And only one HARQ-ACK is allowed for each slot. In this sense, all UL DAI of PUSCHs overlapped with the PUCCH will have same. Value” actually holds.  To Samsung and Apple: I can see the timeline issue. Thanks for brought it up. However, I just want to mention that the timeline issue even exists in nominal case where UE does not miss all DL DCI. Suppose UE missed the last DL DCI but it received all the previous DL DCIs, due to the HARQ-ACK size mismatch, UE picked a wrong PUCCH resource. In this case, the same timeline mismatch issue exists. By the way, prob of missing all DL DCI is actually smaller than missing only the last DCI. So the problem in the nominal case is even larger 😊.  Anyway, in my view, we are trying to fix some corner cases here. Are the Alt 3 solutions perfect? Of course not. But do we need perfect solutions (without any hold) for those corner cases? Maybe not neither. Finding a reasonable and simple solution should be the goal. Alt 1 is simple, which I agree. But the problem is that it against the basic principle to having UL DAI.  At the end, if no consensus can be achieved, we are fine to leave this case to UE implementation in Rel-16 too. As we stated above, missing DL DCI anyway is a corner case. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We prefer to conclude in this meeting.  Support either Alt 1 or Alt 3-3.  To QC, we do not think the illustration case is valid. At the slot with DL grant 2, gNB does not know whether there is the 2nd UL grant or not. That is, at the timing of the slot with DL grant 2, gNB needs to assume HARQ-ACK 2 on PUSCH1. And as you know, this is not feasible situation. Even if we should consider “so so smart” gNB, the situation would be a corner case. |
| CATT | We also prefer to conclude in this meeting.  We are not fine with Alt 3 before our comments/questions in section 4.1.7 are addressed. |
| ZTE | We support either Alt 3-2 or Alt 3-3, at least providing some ways for gNB to handle this issue.  @CATT, could you elaborate in which case the following may happen for Alt 3-2 or Alt 3-3?  ‘UE may multiplex HARQ-ACK is a PUSCH different from the one expected at gNB side.’ |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support Alt 3-3.  For Alt 3-2, the UE needs to implement a new PUSCH prioritization rule for UCI multiplexing on PUSCH, which is not consistent with the legacy rules. In addition, as pointed out earlier, the PUSCH scheduled by the lastly received UL grant may not be the one with the highest priority. This will lead to misunderstanding between gNB and UE, and increases the gNB blind detection complexity.  @ Qualcomm The example provided by QC does not exist due to the restrictions in current specification quoted below. Basically you cannot schedule PDSCH after scheduling a PUSCH if the HARQ-ACK for the PDSCH is to be multiplexed on PUSCH.  *A UE does not expect to detect a DCI format scheduling a PDSCH reception or a SPS PDSCH release, a DCI format 1\_1 indicating Scell dormancy, or a DCI format including a One-shot HARQ-ACK request field with value 1, and indicating a resource for a PUCCH transmission with corresponding HARQ-ACK information in a slot if the UE previously detects a DCI format scheduling a PUSCH transmission in the slot and if the UE multiplexes HARQ-ACK information in the PUSCH transmission.*  Therefore, the UL DAI of PUSCHs overlapped with the PUCCH should have the same value and this can be utilized to determine the multiple PUSCHs that are overlapped with the PUCCH which is essentially Alt.3-3. |
| Apple | We are fine with narrowing down the options and support Alt-1. |
| QC3 | To Docomo: I did not pay attention to the timeline when I draw previous figure. Now I moved the PDSCH2 a little forward. Hopefully this new figure below can illustrate my point. This should be allowed.    To Huawei: I disagree that the spec prohibits the above scheduling. What spec disallowed is multiplexing the two HARQ-ACKs on PUSCH 1, because DL grant 2 arrive later than UL grant 1. However, if the two HARQ-ACK are multiplex on PUSCH 2, all the DL grants arrives earlier than UL grant 2, which is allowed by spec. |

#### Q6: For the “single PUSCH” case, what is the preferred Rel-16 behavior

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| MTK | Our preference is also Alt. 1. Otherwise (Alt. 3 series), we need to clarify each of the case (1~4) is single or multiple PDSCH (to us all of them can be counted as multiple PUSCH), and also clarify which PUSCH should be used to multiplex the HARQ-ACK in each case (while we are not even sure whether these are all the possible cases). |
| QC | For Rel-16, we prefer a unified solution between single and multiple PUSCH. The reason, again, is due to that in many cases, it is even not clear how to distinguish a case is single PUSCH or multiple PUSCH – see the 4 cases we mentioned before. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Same mechanism would be better. |
| CATT | A unified solution is preferred. |
| ZTE | OK to have unified solution for Rel-16. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Alt.3-3 can still be applied which is actually same as Rel-15. |
| Apple | We prefer a unified solution |

# 3rd Round Summary

### Rel-15 UEs Behavior

#### Q5 Summary

For the question “Please consider the cases above and identify if they are “single” or “multiple PUSCH”. Alt-1: Rel-15 behavior; Alt-2: UE implementation. Please identify the expected UE behavior by using agreements or specification text”, the company positions are as follows:

* Case 1, Case 2, Case 3
  + All companies support Alt-2 (i.e. UE implementation) for Rel-15 behavior
* Case 4:
  + Alt-1 (Multiplex based on UL TDAI) : ZTE, Huawei/HiSilicon (2 companies)
  + Alt-2 (UE implementation) : Qualcomm, MediaTek, Samsung, NTT DOCOMO, CATT, Apple (6 companies)

From the positions, there is consensus on the Rel-15 UE behavior as Alt-2 (UE implementation) for Case 1, Case 2 and Case 3. As such, the recommendation will be that for these cases, the Rel-15 behavior is left to UE implementation.

For case 4, a majority of the companies support Alt-2 over Alt-1. Also, the UE may not be able to wait until the end of the slot to find out if the scenario belongs to case 1 or case 4. Given that any change in the rules will result in a NBC change and the majority prefers Alt-2, the recommendation will be that for this case, the Rel-15 behavior is left to UE implementation.

### Rel-16 UEs Behavior

#### Q6 Summary

For the question “For the single PUSCH case, what is the preferred Rel-16 behavior” the positions of the companies are as follows:

* Alt 1: MTK (1)
* Alt 3-3: Huawei/HiSilicon (1)
* Unified Solution: Qualcomm, NTT DOCOMO, CATT, ZTE, Huawei/Hisilicon, Apple (6)

From the positions, we can conclude that companies desire a unified solution for Rel-15 and Rel-16. The recommendation will be to have a unified solution for both “single” and “multiple” PUSCHs.

#### Proposal 4:

For proposal 4, the company positions are as follows:

* Do not support: Qualcomm (1)
* Support : MTK, NTT DOCOMO, ZTE, Apple (5)
* Conclude this meeting: Samsung, Qualcomm (?), NTT DOCOMO, CATT, Apple (5)

From the company positions, we can see that in general there is some support to conclude on this issue this meeting. This coupled with the Chairman’s reminder that there is no maintenance in the next meeting means that we should select from one of the 4 options in this meeting. As pointed out by Samsung, there has been no change in the companies positions. As such, I will list out the positions of all 4 alternatives (Alt 1, Alt-3-1, Alt 3-2, and Alt 3-3) and pass it up to the Chairman assist in making the decision.

A summary of the positions of different companies at the end of the 1st round is as follows (See Section 3.2.1.1):

* Alt 1: MTK, Vivo, NTT DOCOMO (1st choice), CATT (1st choice), Lenovo (2nd choice), Intel, Samsung, Apple (1st choice), Spreadtrum (9 companies, 8 1st choice companies)
* Alt 2: ZTE (1st choice), CATT (2nd choice) : (2 companies, 1 1st choice company)
* Alt 3: ZTE (2nd choice), QC, Nokia/NSB, Lenovo (1st choice), Huawei, Ericsson (6 companies, 5 1st choice company)
* Alt 4: Apple (2nd choice), NTT DOCOMO (2nd choice) (2 companies, no 1st choice company)

A summary of the positions of different companies at the end of the 2nd round is as follows (See Section 5.1.3)

* Alt 1: Samsung, ~~Qualcomm (2~~~~nd~~ ~~choice)~~, NTT DOCOMO (1st Choice), Vivo, MTK, CATT, Apple (6~~7~~ companies with 6 as first choice)
* Alt 3: Ericsson, Qualcomm (1st choice), NTT DOCOMO (2nd choice), Huawei, ZTE (5 companies with 4 as 1st choice)

A summary of the positions of Alt-3 companies at the end of the 2nd round is as follows (See Section 5.1.4)

* Alt 3-1: define a default/reference PUCCH resource and use that default/reference PUCCH to start the UCI multiplexing procedure.
  + ***Reference PUSCH definition:*** *the reference PUCCH can be a PUCCH of 14 OFDM symbols across the slot*
  + *For: Qualcomm, Nokia (?) (2 companies)*
  + *Against: Ericsson, NTT DOCOMO (2 companies)*
* *Alt 3-2: Follow the tDAI in the last received UL grant for the group to multiplex HARQ-ACK on the PUSCH scheduled by the last received UL grant, and ignore the tDAIs in other UL grants scheduling other PUSCHs in the group.*
  + *For: Qualcomm, Ericsson (2nd choice), ZTE, Lenovo(?) (4 companies)*
  + *Against: NTT DOCOMO (1 company)*
* *Alt 3-3:* 
  + *Select one PUSCH within multiple PUSCH with DAI=1 following the same PUSCH prioritization rules for UCI multiplexing with PUCCH for type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook.*
  + *Select one PUSCH within multiple PUSCH with DAI≠4 following the same PUSCH prioritization rules for UCI multiplexing with PUCCH for type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook*
  + ***PUSCH selection method:*** *All PUSCHs with DAI = 1 for type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook and DAI≠4 for type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook.* ***The DAI field value of multiple PUSCH should be the same***
    - *For: Ericsson, Huawei, NTT DOCOMO*
    - *Against: Qualcomm(?)*

# 4th Round

#### *Proposal 5:*

*For Rel-15, in the following cases and if any UL-TDAI n.e. 4 (for Type 2 codebook) or UL-TDAI e.q. 1 (for Type 1 codebook) the UE behavior is left to UE implementation.*

* *Case 1: There is a single standalone PUSCH, while there are other PUSCHs in the slot, but the standalone PUSCH does not overlap with other PUSCHs. The single standalone PUSCH has no overlapping PUCCH.*
* *Case 2: In uplink CA, there is a single PUSCH in a slot on a CC, and there are other PUSCH on other CCs in the same slot. The single standalone PUSCH has no overlapping PUCCH.*
* *Case 3: in uplink CA, PCC is FR1(30Khz), SCC is FR2 (120Khz). On SCC, each slot has a PUSCH. The missing PUCCH can overlap with 4 PUSCHs across 4 slots on SCC.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| MTK | Support |

#### *Proposal 6:*

*For Rel-15, in the following cases and if any UL-TDAI n.e. 4 (for Type 2 codebook) or UL-TDAI e.g. 1 (for Type 1 codebook) the UE behavior is left to UE implementation.*

* *Case 4: The simplest case, no uplink CA. In one slot, UE only received one PUSCH and there is no overlapping PUCCH.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| MTK | Support |

#### *Proposal 7:*

*For Rel-16, RAN1 shall have a unified solution for the “single PUSCH” and “multiple PUSCH” scenarios.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| MTK | Support |

#### *Rel-16 Solution Positions:*

* *Alt 1: Samsung, MTK, Vivo, CATT, Apple, Intel, Spreadtrum, NTT DOCOMO (1st Choice), , Lenovo (2nd choice) (9 companies, 8 1st choice companies)*
* *Alt 3-1: Qualcomm, Nokia/NSB (2 companies)*
* *Alt 3-2: Qualcomm, Ericsson (2nd choice), ZTE, Lenovo (4 companies)*
* *Alt 3-3: Ericsson (1st choice), Huawei, NTT DOCOMO (3 companies)*
  + *NOTE: Alt 3: ZTE, Qualcomm, Nokia/NSB, Huawei, Ericsson, Lenovo (1st choice), NTT DOCOMO (2nd choice) (7 companies, 6 1st choice companies)*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| MTK | Same position from our side (Alt 1). |

# [REVIEW] 4th Round Summary

#### Company Positions

The company positions are as follows:

* **Proposal 5:** Qualcomm, MTK, Huawei, ZTE, Ericsson, Apple (6)
  + No objections to key idea. Discussion on if it should be merged with Proposal 6 and if examples should be removed.
* **Proposal 6:** Qualcomm, MTK, ZTE(?), Apple
  + Oppose: Huawei, CATT, Ericsson
* **Proposal 7:** MTK, Huawei, Ericsson, Apple
  + No objections to key idea. Ericsson agrees with improved wording.
* **Merged proposal with no examples**: Qualcomm, MTK, Samsung, CATT, Ericsson, NTT DOCOMO, Apple

#### Discussion: Proposals 5 and 6

Quite a few companies have pointed out that (a) we do not need example cases and (b) Proposal 6 for the case with non-overlapping PUCCH is not completely clear in the specification. Huawei, Ericsson and ZTE raised the issue that case 4 is currently covered by the specifications but Qualcomm, NTT DOCOMO and Samsung show that the specifications cover the case that there is a an overlapping PUCCH with a single PUSCH but do not cover the case where there is no overlapping PUCCH. This highlights a lack of consensus for Rel-15 that may need to be addressed. Finally, the UE may not be able to wait until the end of the slot to find out if the scenario belongs to case 1 or case 4. As such, merging the two cases may be unavoidable. As such, Proposals 5 and 6 will be merged into Proposal 8 as shown below:

**Proposal 5a: For Rel-15, in the case of a single PUSCH with no overlapping PUCCH or PUSCH and if any UL-TDAI not equal to 4 (for Type 2 codebook) or UL-TDAI equal to 1 (for Type 1 codebook) the UE behavior is left to UE implementation.**

|  |
| --- |
| **Detailed Comments** |
| **@ Qualcomm:  why not combine proposal 5 and 6 and reformulate it by removing those 4 cases ?**  From Moderator: There seems to be a favorable response to merging Options 5 and 6. I have added the words “*with no overlapping PUCCH”* after the single PUCCH phrase to make sure that it is clear |
| **@ Huawei: is Proposal 6 NBC ?**  From QC: the spec starts with “If a UE multiplexes HARQ-ACK information in a PUSCH transmission …”. However, in the case we are discussing, It is not clear whether UE should multiplex HARQ-ACK information on a PUSCH. So UE behavior is not clear in current spec.  From NTT DOCOMO: Current spec starts “If a UE multiplexes HARQ-ACK information in a PUSCH transmission …”, but the condition is only that there is a overlapping PUCCH in the current spec. But now we are discussing the case that there is no overlapping PUCCH. Whether multiplexing performs or not is completely unclear in the current spec. This is our understanding. So no NBC issue is assumed for proposal 6 as well.  From Samsung: Furthermore, although case 4 might be simple as Huawei pointed out, it might be different understanding between gNB and UE if a UE misses one of scheduling UL grants. |
| **@ CATT: Why 30kHz+120kHz is a special case compared with other cases with larger SCS on SCC?**  From Moderator: It is just an example. It is intended to cover any case with a larger SCS on the SCC. This comment agrees with comments made by multiple companies that we may not need to call specific cases (See new Proposal 5a)  **@ CATT: In Case 3, HARQ-ACK is supposed to be multiplexed in the first PUSCH overlapping with the PUCCH according to the current specification. Is the problem because gNB set the UL-TDAI to n.e. 4 for Type 2 CB or 1 for Type 1 CB in the DCI scheduling PUSCH(s) which do not overlap with the PUCCH?**  From Moderator: Yes. An in addition, the PUSCH in question does not overlap with any other PUSCH. Note that it also covers the case that the gNB does send a downlink grant that indicates an overlapping PUCCH but the UE misses it.  **@ CATT: , we are also fine with Alt 3-3 but we are not fine with Alt 3-1 and 3-2**    From Moderator: Added CATT to Alt 3-3. |
| **@ ZTE: we support both Alt 3-2 and Alt 3-3 for Rel-16. So, could you please add ZTE as the supporting company also for Alt 3-3.**  From Moderator: Added to Alt-3-3 |
| **@ Ericsson:** we can be supportive of Proposals 5 and 7 (with improved wording). |

On the issue of the Rel-16 solution, CATT brings up the option of deciding up to UE implementation if we cannot reach consensus while Huawei brings up the option of a Rel-17 TEI. I will also highlight the companies that are against specific solutions to help clear the deadlock.

# 5th Round

#### *Proposal 5a:*

*For Rel-15, in the case of a single PUSCH with no overlapping PUCCH* or PUSCH*and if any UL-TDAI not equal to 4 (for Type 2 codebook) or UL-TDAI equal to 1 (for Type 1 codebook) the UE behavior is left to UE implementation.*

#### *Proposal 5a-1:*

* *For Rel-15 with more than one non-overlapping PUSCH and no overlapping PUCCH within a span on one slot (both single carrier and UL CA) and if* the UL-TDAI for the PUSCH *UL-TDAI not equal to 4 (for Type 2 codebook) or UL-TDAI equal to 1 (for Type 1 codebook), the UE behavior is up to the UE implementation*
* *For Rel-15 with one PUSCH and no overlapping PUCCH within a span of one slot and if* the UL-TDAI for the PUSCH *UL-TDAI not equal to 4 (for Type 2 codebook) or UL-TDAI equal to 1 (for Type 1 codebook), there is no consensus ~~for any conclusion or spec change~~ on one aligned UE behavior according to current spec.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| MTK | Support |
| QC | Support  A minor editorial comment: “any UL-TDAI” -> “the UL-TDAI for the PUSCH” |
| Nokia, NSB (26.8)  updated | We are not OK with this proposal.  With regard to Cases 1-3 (proposal 5): We are fine as the PUSCH selection criteria are missing  With regard to Case 4 (proposal 6): We still fail to see why something that has a specified functionality would be left to UE implementation. Furthermore, we can’t just make such an agreement in the chairman’s notes when the spec is sill there and defines the UE behaviour. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We still think for the simplest case, e.g. case 4, the UE shall multiplex HARQ-ACK on PUSCH. It is clear that when gNB indicates an UL T-DAI with a value not equal to 1 for type-1 codebook or not equal to 4 for type-2 codebook, the gNB expects that HARQ-ACK bits should be multiplexed on PUSCH. The UE can follow the existing behavior defined in the specification. |
| Ericsson | We do not support this proposal.  Similar concerns as Nokia. |
| Moderator | Given (1) short time available to decide, (2) there is consensus on proposal 5 but none on 6 and (3) the current trend in the comments, I am adding Proposal 5a-2 to the list.  Please indicate if you can support 5a or 5a-1 or both. If there is no consensus for 5a, I would suggest we go with 5a-1 as that seems to be the status so far. |
| Nokia, NSB (26.8 v63) | We’d be OK with the 1st bullet of the proposal 5a-1  We can accept the 2nd bullet as it seems to be the current status of the discussion even though our view is that the HARQ-ACK bits should be muxed on the PUSCH and the spec was designed to do so. |
| MTK | We support 5a. For 5a-1, if that is the only way to go, then we suggest the following modification for the second bullet:   * *For Rel-15 with one PUSCH within a span of one slot and if* the UL-TDAI for the PUSCH *UL-TDAI not equal to 4 (for Type 2 codebook) or UL-TDAI equal to 1 (for Type 1 codebook), there is no consensus ~~for any conclusion or spec change~~ on one aligned UE behavior according to current spec.*   The original wording may give the wrong impression that current spec is already clear and no conclusion/spec change is needed. |
| CATT | For proposal 5a-1, we think it covers more cases than intended. To be more specific, if the PUSCH is with slot aggregation and PUCCH is not, HARQ-ACK is expected to be multiplexed in one or more PUSCH repetition(s). If UE does not know where PUCCH is, UE has no idea which PUSCH(s) should be selected. But we are not sure if we want to be that accurate and we are open to discuss. But at least for the proposal, we should add “with no overlapping PUCCH”. |
| Moderator | Updated 2nd bullet of 5a-1 based on MTK and CATT comment. |
| Ericsson | * Proposal 5a-1   + We agree with CATT comment that the proposal should be more accurate and include that condition “with no overlapping PUCCH for HARQ-ACK transmission” for both bullets.     - First bullet would be OK with us with the update above suggested by CATT.     - Second bullet, would be OK with us with only update above suggested by CATT. We don’t support the modification suggested by MTK for the reason that UE behavior in spec is clear from our perspective. A conclusion that implies spec is not clear, is not reflecting all companies’ view. |
| ZTE | Not Ok with Proposal 5a. We can live with Proposal 5a-1 with only CATT’s update. |
| Nokia, NSB (26.8 v69) | We are OK with the CATT update, and agree with Ericsson wrt. the clarity of the spec and can’t agree to the MTK update. |
| Moderator | Would an update as follows be fine with both camps ? We remove all references to spec change. This is true and avoids the issue of deciding if there is a spec change needed or not.  *“or UL-TDAI equal to 1 (for Type 1 codebook), there is no consensus for any conclusion ~~or spec change~~ ~~on one aligned UE behavior according to current spec.”~~* |
| QC | We support proposal 5a.  For proposal 5a-1, for the case (4) corresponding to the last bullet, in case of PUSCH repetitions (as CATT mentioned) or UE missed another PUSCH UL grant, UE behavior is indeed not defined in spec. Also, the current spec starts with “If a UE multiplexes HARQ-ACK information in a PUSCH transmission …”. So current spec does not define UE behavior for case (4), which is without PUCCH. So MTK’s suggested wording fairly reflected current situation in this discussion. We support MTK’s proposal.  FL’s current wording can be interpreted as spec is clear and no further discussion is needed, which is not acceptable to us. We can accept the following “*“or UL-TDAI equal to 1 (for Type 1 codebook), there is no consensus for any conclusion on one aligned UE behavior*” |
| Intel | We are fine with first bullet in proposal 5-1a.  For a single PUSCH case, given “If a UE multiplexes HARQ-ACK information in a PUSCH transmission” in the spec, our view is that such case, PUSCH + non-overlapping PUCCH are not defined. For the 2nd bullet, we are fine with “*there is no consensus for any conclusion or spec change*” |
| Samsung | We tend to agree that current specification is not that clear. That’s why we discuss this issue continuously. So, we are fine with moderator’s revised proposal. |

#### *Proposal 7a:*

*For Rel-16, RAN1 shall have a unified solution in the case of a “single PUSCH with no overlapping PUCCH* or PUSCH”*and “multiple overlapping PUSCHs with no overlapping PUCCH” and if any UL-TDAI not equal to 4 (for Type 2 codebook) or UL-TDAI equal to 1 (for Type 1 codebook) ~~, for the “single PUSCH” and “multiple PUSCH” scenarios~~*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| MTK | Support |
| QC | Support |
| ZTE | Support  On the other hand, if we cannot conclude on which unified solution should be chosen for Rel-16 and we would not discuss this issue for Rel-16 in the future meetings, we may no need this proposal anymore. |
| Nokia, NSB (26.8) | This is a good goal and we support that in principle, it seems agreeing on a goal is not helpful if we can’t actually reach the goal, and it is not adding any value if we can reach the goal. So we don’t think this proposal actually adds value. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Okay |
| Ericsson | Not support.  After further thoughts (although we are fine with a unified solution), we see the risk with this proposal where it makes them dependent on each other. The reason is as follows:  Firstly, for single PUSCH, we don’t see problem in Rel-15. That means that we don’t see problem for Rel-16 either. Therefore, we do not think the outcome of multi PUSCH should affect the status of single PUSCH. To be very clear, if companies do not converge on an alternative below for multi-PUSCH, the status of single PUSCH should not be affected.  Moreover, as Nokia mentioned, it is more of a goal and intention of the group.  Therefore, we don’t think we need such Proposal 7a. |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal. |

#### *[ACTIVE] Rel-16 Solution Positions:*

*Please identify any alternatives that you are against:*

* *Alt 1: Samsung, MTK, Vivo, CATT, Apple, Intel, Spreadtrum, NTT DOCOMO (1st Choice), , Lenovo (2nd choice) (9 companies, 8 1st choice companies)* 
  + *Against: Huawei, Qualcomm Ericsson, ZTE*
* *Alt 3-1: Qualcomm, Nokia/NSB (2 companies)*
  + *Against: Ericsson, NTT DOCOMO, CATT, Samsung(?),MTK(?), Nokia*
* *Alt 3-2: Qualcomm, Ericsson (2nd choice), ZTE, Lenovo (4 companies)*
  + *Against: NTT DOCOMO, CATT, Samsung(?), MTK(?)*
* *Alt 3-3: Ericsson (1st choice), Huawei, NTT DOCOMO, CATT (2nd choice), ZTE (5 companies)*
  + *Against: Qualcomm, Samsung(?), MTK(?)*
* *NOTE: Alt 3: ZTE, Qualcomm, Nokia/NSB, Huawei, Ericsson, Lenovo (1st choice), NTT DOCOMO (2nd choice), CATT (2nd choice) (8 companies, 7 1st choice companies)*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| MTK | Per current status, to our understanding, we may not be able to select the final solution in RAN1 #106e for Rel-16. Therefore, leaving for UE implementation for Rel-16 and a Rel-17 TEI to address this issue may be a way forward. Discussing this issue in RAN1 #107e is also one way, but I have the hunch that we may end up with the same deadlock. |
| QC | Agree with MTK that leaving it for UE implementation for Rel-16 and solve it in Rel-17 TEI could be a WF. Suggest moderator adding this option as Alt 4 into the above list. And QC can support Alt 4. |
| ZTE | We are also not in favor of Alt 1.  We share the view that we may not be able to conclude to one solution in this meeting, and we don’t think the situation would change much in the next meeting.  So, we would be fine to leave it as it is for Rel-16. Discussing this issue as a Rel-17 TEI is also attractive for us. That is, we support Alt 4 raised by QC. |
| Samsung | It was good discussion to share companies’ views for Rel-16 in this meeting. This is the first meeting to share extensive views on how to address the problem within Rel-16 scope with details. We would like to have another chance for further discussion in next RAN1 meeting based on discussion in this meeting.  One controversial point that we have observed is how to interpret following specification text. At least, Qualcomm and Huawei have different understanding. So, we would like to discuss this aspect together in next meeting since it may be another metric to decide one way or another.  *A UE does not expect to detect a DCI format scheduling a PDSCH reception or a SPS PDSCH release, a DCI format 1\_1 indicating Scell dormancy, or a DCI format including a One-shot HARQ-ACK request field with value 1, and indicating a resource for a PUCCH transmission with corresponding HARQ-ACK information in a slot if the UE previously detects a DCI format scheduling a PUSCH transmission in the slot and if the UE multiplexes HARQ-ACK information in the PUSCH transmission.* |
| Nokia, NSB (26.8) | We are not in favour of Alt 1.  We recognize the problem with Alt 3-1 (Thanks to Sharp), and would be OK with both 3-2 and 3-3.  We would find it somewhat unfortunate if we have to push the solution to Rel-17 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We don’t think Alt.1 is the right way to go. We still prefer Alt 3-3.  Given the discussion so far, it will be undesirable to further delay it to Rel-17. We also share the view from Samsung that there may be different interpretations of the current specification which may have an impact on the choice of solutions. We would be okay to discuss this further in the future meeting for Rel-16. |
| Ericsson | We do not support Alt 1.  We are fine with Alt 3-2 and 3-3.  We also believe this should be resolved in Rel-16. |
| Apple | We prefer Alt 1 and are against Alt-3 for the reasons listed in the Cons section. |

#### *Way Forward:*

*If there is no consensus reached in this meeting, please indicate your preferred Way Forward:*

* *Alt-4: Rel-16 UE implementation and Rel-17 TEI: Qualcomm, ZTE, MTK, Intel*
  + *Against:*
* *Alt 5: Future Discussion in RAN 107-e: Samsung, Huawei*
  + *Against:*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Moderator | Based on the discussion so far, I have added “Alt 4 i.e. Rel-16 UE implementation” and R17 TEI” and “Alt 5, discuss in RAN1 #107-e” as Way Forward options. I have also updated some of the “against” companies with track changes on. Please continue the discussion. |
| Nokia, NSB (26.8 v63) | We prefer Alt5 over Alt4. |
| MTK | We prefer Alt 4 over Alt 5, but can live with Alt 5 if majority of companies want to continue the discussion in RAN1 #107e. |
| CATT | We are not quite clear about Alt 4. It is our understanding that whether a feature will be included as part of TEI is subject to the discussion of AI 8.17 and we cannot decide here. Therefore, Alt-4 should be Rel-16 implementation only.  If companies are all interested in continued discussion, we are fine with Alt 5. But in that case, it is proposed to do some down-selections in this meeting (e.g. remove one or two Alternatives) to help the further discussion. |
| Ericsson | We share the same view as CATT. Our preference is Alt-5. |
| ZTE | Ideally, Alt-5 could be better assuming we can reach consensus on one solution for Rel-16 in RAN1 #107e. However, we are afraid it would not be the case. So, we prefer Alt 4 (with changing ‘Rel-16 UE implementation’ to ‘Extend Proposal 5a-1 for both Rel-15 and Rel-16’), but are also ok with Alt 5.  Regarding CATT’s comment, we understand that whether a Rel-17 TEI should be approved or not is subject to the discussion of AI 8.17. But, maybe we could make a recommendation or observation here, e.g.,  *RAN1 observes it is desirable to have a unified solution in the case of a “single PUSCH with no overlapping PUCCH or PUSCH” and “multiple overlapping PUSCHs with no overlapping PUCCH” and if any UL-TDAI not equal to 4 (for Type 2 codebook) or UL-TDAI equal to 1 (for Type 1 codebook) in Rel-17, which is subject to final decision under AI 8.17.* |
| Intel | We prefer Alt. 4. It is not clear whether this issue can be resolved in next meeting given current situation. We may target to solve this in Rel-17 TEI. |
| Apple | We prefer Alt-4 but can go with Alt 5 if there is a down-selection |

# Summary

#### *[REVIEW] Proposal 5a:*

The following are the company positions:

* Support: MTK, QC, Apple
* Not support: Nokia/NSB, Huawei/HiSilicon, Ericsson, ZTE

##### Recommendation 1: Do not agree to Proposal 5a

#### *[REVIEW] Proposal 5a-1:*

* First bullet: Consensus on supporting this bullet

##### Recommendation 2: Agree to first bullet

**Proposal 5a-1-1**

* *For Rel-15 with more than one non-overlapping PUSCH and no overlapping PUCCH within a span on one slot (both single carrier and UL CA) and if* the UL-TDAI for the PUSCH *UL-TDAI not equal to 4 (for Type 2 codebook) or UL-TDAI equal to 1 (for Type 1 codebook), the UE behavior is up to the UE implementation*
* Second bullet: No consensus on behavior with Case 4. New language to indicate this.
  + Support: Nokia/NSB (with update), MTK (with update), CATT (with update), Ericsson (with update), ZTE (with update), Qualcomm (with update), Intel, Samsung, Apple

**Recommendation 3:** agree to the proposal with the following update:

**Proposal 5a-1-2:**

* *For Rel-15 with one PUSCH and no overlapping PUCCH within a span of one slot and if* the UL-TDAI for the PUSCH *UL-TDAI not equal to 4 (for Type 2 codebook) or UL-TDAI equal to 1 (for Type 1 codebook), there is no consensus* ***for any conclusion*** *~~or spec change~~* ***on one aligned UE behavior*** *~~according to current spec~~.*

This captures the status as we have it today but de-emphasizes the role of the specification as desired by Nokia/Ericsson, while not giving the impression that the spec is clear as desired by MTK/Qualcomm

#### *[REVIEW] Proposal 7a:*

The company positions are as follows:

* Support: MTK, QC, ZTE, Huawei/HiSilicon
* Against: Ericsson
* Support in principle/Good Goal: Nokia

It seems there is no consensus to agree to this proposal.

##### Recommendation 4: No agreement on this proposal. RAN1 has common understanding between companies that our goal is the same solution for single and multiple PUSCH scenarios.

#### *[REVEIW] Rel-16 Solution Positions:*

* *Alt 1: Samsung, MTK, Vivo, CATT, Apple, Intel, Spreadtrum, NTT DOCOMO (1st Choice), , Lenovo (2nd choice) (9 companies, 8 1st choice companies)* 
  + *Against: Huawei, Qualcomm Ericsson, ZTE*
* *Alt 3-1: Qualcomm, ~~Nokia/NSB~~ (~~2~~ 1 companies)*
  + *Against: Ericsson, NTT DOCOMO, CATT, Samsung(?),MTK(?), Nokia, Apple*
* *Alt 3-2: Qualcomm, Ericsson (2nd choice), ZTE, Lenovo, Nokia/NSB (~~4~~ 5 companies)*
  + *Against: NTT DOCOMO, CATT, Samsung(?), MTK(?), Apple*
* *Alt 3-3: Ericsson (1st choice), Huawei, NTT DOCOMO, CATT (2nd choice), ZTE, Nokia/NSB (~~5~~ 6 companies)*
  + *Against: Qualcomm, Samsung(?), MTK(?), Apple*
* *NOTE: Alt 3: ZTE, Qualcomm, Nokia/NSB, Huawei, Ericsson, Lenovo (1st choice), NTT DOCOMO (2nd choice), CATT (2nd choice) (8 companies, 7 1st choice companies)*

##### Recommendation 5: Down-select Alt 3-1 as there is only one company supporting this with many companies against.

#### *[ACTIVE] Way Forward:*

Company positions are as follows:

* *Alt-4: Rel-16 UE implementation and Rel-17 TEI: Qualcomm, ZTE, MTK, Intel, Apple*
  + *Against: Nokia. Huawei, Ericsson*
* *Alt 5: Future Discussion in RAN 107-e: Samsung, Huawei, Nokia, MTK (2nd choice), CATT (with down-selection), Ericsson (with down-selection), Apple (with down-selection)*
  + *Against:*

##### Recommendation 6: Alt-5 i.e. future discussion in RAN1 #107-e is agreed.

In addition, a controversial point for discussion in RAN1 #107-e to be resolved is based on the following specification text:

*A UE does not expect to detect a DCI format scheduling a PDSCH reception or a SPS PDSCH release, a DCI format 1\_1 indicating Scell dormancy, or a DCI format including a One-shot HARQ-ACK request field with value 1, and indicating a resource for a PUCCH transmission with corresponding HARQ-ACK information in a slot if the UE previously detects a DCI format scheduling a PUSCH transmission in the slot and if the UE multiplexes HARQ-ACK information in the PUSCH transmission.*
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# Appendix: Background

### Type 1 HARQ ACK Codebook [2]

In Section 9.1.2.2 of [3], it is specified that a UE multiplexes HARQ-ACK information in a PUSCH transmission scheduled by DCI format 0\_1 when the DAI field in DCI format 0\_1 is set to ‘1’ (which is corresponding to ).

#### 9.1.2.2 Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook in physical uplink shared channel

If a UE multiplexes HARQ-ACK information in a PUSCH transmission that is scheduled by DCI format 0\_1, the UE generates the HARQ-ACK codebook as described in Clause 9.1.2.1 when a value of the DAI field in DCI format 0\_1 is  except that *harq-ACK-SpatialBundlingPUCCH* is replaced by *harq-ACK-SpatialBundlingPUSCH*. The UE does not generate a HARQ-ACK codebook for multiplexing in the PUSCH transmission when  unless the UE receives only a SPS PDSCH release, or only a SPS PDSCH, or only a PDSCH that is scheduled by DCI format 1\_0 with a counter DAI field value of 1 on the PCell in the  occasions for candidate PDSCH receptions in which case the UE generates HARQ-ACK information only for the SPS PDSCH release or only for the PDSCH reception as described in Clause 9.1.2.  if the DAI field in DCI format 0\_1 is set to '0'; otherwise, .

The spirit of HARQ-ACK information feedback is that a UE generates and feedbacks ACK/NACK information to let network know whether the SPS PDSCH release or the transport block is successfully received or not. It should be clarified whether the value of DAI field in DCI format 0\_1 is allowed to be for Type 1 codebook (or  for Type 2 codebook) if the network does not transmit any DL DCI/PDSCH. The purpose of such indication is not clear and may lead to meaningless HARQ-ACK information feedback.

On the other hand, if the network has the freedom to assign any value of DAI field regardless of whether there is DL DCI/PDSCH or not, then the corresponding UE behavior is ambiguous. Two possible interpretations are as follows.

* **Interpretation #1**: the UE does not multiplex HARQ-ACK information in a PUSCH since there is no DL DCI/PDSCH received.
* **Interpretation #2:** the UE multiplexes HARQ-ACK information in a PUSCH according to the indicated value of DAI field in DCI format 0\_1.

In Section 9.1.2.2 of [3], it says that a UE generates HARQ-ACK codebook as described in Clause 9.1.2.1 ***IF*** a UE multiplexes HARQ-ACK information in a PUSCH transmission. ***Then, in this case, it is not clear whether the UE needs to generate HARQ-ACK information if there is no DL DCI/PDSCH received.***

## 9.1 HARQ-ACK codebook determination

If a UE receives a PDSCH without receiving a corresponding PDCCH, or if the UE receives a PDCCH indicating a SPS PDSCH release, the UE generates one corresponding HARQ-ACK information bit.

If a UE is not provided *PDSCH-CodeBlockGroupTransmission*, the UE generates one HARQ-ACK information bit per transport block.

For a HARQ-ACK information bit, a UE generates an ACK if the UE detects a DCI format 1\_0 that provides a SPS PDSCH release or correctly decodes a transport block, and generates a NACK if the UE does not correctly decode the transport block.

### Type 2 HARQ ACK Codebook [1]

In Section 9.1.3.2 of [3], the UE behavior for Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook in PUSCH is specified as follows:

|  |
| --- |
| If a UE would multiplex HARQ-ACK information in a PUSCH transmission that is not scheduled by a DCI format or is scheduled by DCI format 0\_0, then  - if the UE has not received any PDCCH within the monitoring occasions for DCI format 1\_0 or DCI format 1\_1 for scheduling PDSCH receptions or SPS PDSCH release on any serving cell  and the UE does not have HARQ-ACK information in response to a SPS PDSCH reception to multiplex in the PUSCH, as described in Subclause 9.1.3.1, the UE does not multiplex HARQ-ACK information in the PUSCH transmission;  - else, the UE generates the HARQ-ACK codebook as described in Subclause 9.1.3.1, except that *harq-ACK-SpatialBundlingPUCCH* is replaced by *harq-ACK-SpatialBundlingPUSCH*.  If a UE multiplexes HARQ-ACK information in a PUSCH transmission that is scheduled by DCI format 0\_1, the UE generates the HARQ-ACK codebook as described in Subclause 9.1.3.1, with the following modifications:  - For the pseudo-code for the HARQ-ACK codebook generation in Subclause 9.1.3.1, after the completion of the  and  loops, the UE sets  where  is the value of the DAI field in DCI format 0\_1 according to Table 9.1.3-2  - For the case of first and second HARQ-ACK sub-codebooks, DCI format 0\_1 includes a first DAI field corresponding to the first HARQ-ACK sub-codebook and a second DAI field corresponding to the second HARQ-ACK sub-codebook  *- harq-ACK-SpatialBundlingPUCCH* is replaced by *harq-ACK-SpatialBundlingPUSCH*.  If a UE is not provided *PDSCH-CodeBlockGroupTransmission* and the UE is scheduled for a PUSCH transmission by DCI format 0\_1 with DAI field value  and the UE has not received any PDCCH within the monitoring occasions for PDCCH with DCI format 1\_0 or DCI format 1\_1 for scheduling PDSCH receptions or SPS PDSCH release on any serving cell  and the UE does not have HARQ-ACK information in response to a SPS PDSCH reception to multiplex in the PUSCH, as described in Subclause 9.1.3.1, the UE does not multiplex HARQ-ACK information in the PUSCH transmission. |

### PUCCH Prioritization Rules for Rel-15:

In the case of overlapping PUCCH resources and PUSCHs, determination of whether or not the UE multiplexes information in a PUSCH transmission was discussed in the following conclusion in RAN1 #97 [4][5]:

|  |
| --- |
| **conclusion**  For the issue raised in the draft CR [R1-1906302](https://www.3gpp.org/Users/komeoteri/Documents/3GPP/Meetings/2021%20April%20RAN1%20%20104bis-e%20Meeting/Docs/R1-1906302.zip), the intended UE behavior per specification is commonly understood as follows:   * For UCI multiplexing, within a PUCCH group, on PUSCH, the following two steps are performed with step 1 first, then followed by step 2:   + Step 1: UCI in overlapped PUCCH transmissions is multiplexed into one PUCCH resource (resource Z). This step is done per PUCCH slot.   + Step 2: UCI, that doesn’t include SR, in Z is multiplexed into one PUSCH, if Z overlaps with at least one PUSCH, following the priorities (sequentially from high to low) as listed below.     - First priority: PUSCH with A-CSI as long as it overlaps with Z     - Second priority: earliest PUSCH slot(s) based on the start of the slot(s)     - If there are still multiple PUSCHs overlap with Z in the earliest PUSCH slot(s), follow the following priorities (sequentially from high to low)       * Third priority: Dynamic grant PUSCHs > PUSCHs configured by respective ConfiguredGrantConfig or semiPersistentOnPUSCH       * Fourth priority: PUSCHs on serving cell with smaller ~~CC~~ serving cell index > PUSCHs on serving cell with larger serving cell index       * Fifth priority: Earlier PUSCH transmission > later PUSCH transmission   Note: The clarification applies to both cases with the same (except the second priority part) and different numerologies among PUCCH and PUSCHs. |

The UCI multiplexing on PUCCH is specified in Section 9.2.5 of [3] and the PUSCH prioritization rule for UCI multiplexing on PUSCH is specified in Section 9 of [3]:

|  |
| --- |
| If a UE transmits multiple PUSCHs in a slot on respective serving cells and the UE would multiplex UCI in one of the multiple PUSCHs and the UE does not multiplex aperiodic CSI in any of the multiple PUSCHs, the UE multiplexes the UCI in a PUSCH of the serving cell with the smallest *ServCellIndex* subject to the conditions in Clause 9.2.5 for UCI multiplexing being fulfilled. If the UE transmits more than one PUSCHs in the slot on the serving cell with the smallest *ServCellIndex* that fulfil the conditions in Clause 9.2.5 for UCI multiplexing, the UE multiplexes the UCI in the earliest PUSCH that the UE transmits in the slot. |

However, there may be scenarios in which the PUSCH UL-TDAI indicates HARQ-ACK bits are present but there is no DL DCI received by the UE indicating a PUCCH resource. As such, there is no PUCCH overlapping or colliding with the PUSCH(s). We would like to clarify the UE behavior in these cases.

# Appendix: Contribution Proposals

### Qualcomm: R1- 2017310 [7]

|  |
| --- |
| ***Proposal 1: Without updating Rel-15 specification, leave it up to UE implementation to handle the case of HARQ-ACK multiplexing on a group of PUSCHs without HARQ-ACK PUCCH. RAN1 aim to find a solution for this case in Rel-16 specification.***  ***Proposal 2: In Rel-16 specification, solve the issue of HARQ-ACK multiplexing on a group of PUSCHs without HARQ-ACK PUCCH by taking one of the following options.***   * ***Option 1: define a default/reference PUCCH resource, and use that default/reference PUCCH to start the UCI multiplexing procedure.*** * ***Option 2: Follow the tDAI in the lastly received UL grant for the group to multiplex HARQ-ACK on the PUSCH scheduled by the lastly received UL grant, and ignore the tDAIs in other UL grants scheduling other PUSCHs in the group.*** |

### MediaTek : R1-2107506 [8]

|  |
| --- |
| Based on the discussion in Section 2, we have the following proposals.  **Proposal 1: For both Rel-15 and Rel-16, when the value of DAI field in DCI format 0\_1 is for Type 1 HARQ-ACK codebook in PUSCH (or for Type 2 HARQ-ACK codebook in PUSCH), the UE does not multiplex HARQ-ACK information in any PUSCH if there is no overlapping PUCCH and PUSCH.**  **Proposal 2: Support unified UE behaviour for both CA and non-CA cases.** |

### Huawei: R1-2107672 [9]

|  |
| --- |
| ***Proposal 1: A UE multiplexes HARQ-ACK in PUSCH if the UE does not receive PDSCH/PDCCH that needs HARQ-ACK feedback following the indication of UL DAI filed in DCI.***   * ***For type-1 HARQ codebook, the DAI field is equal to 1*** * ***For type-2 HARQ codebook, the DAI filed is equal to 1/2/3***   ***Observation: A UE cannot distinguish whether there is one single overlapping PUSCHs group or not according to UL DCI with DAI field value equaling to 1 under the multiple DL DCI missing case, mixed numerology case, URLLC case.***  ***Proposal 2: In case of multiple overlapping PUSCHs with no overlapping PUCCH***   * ***Select one PUSCH within multiple PUSCH with DAI=1 following the same PUSCH prioritization rules for UCI multiplexing with PUCCH for type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook.*** * ***Select one PUSCH within multiple PUSCH with DAI≠4 following the same PUSCH prioritization rules for UCI multiplexing with PUCCH for type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook.***   + ***The DAI field value of multiple PUSCH should be the same***   ***Proposal 3: Same rules of multiple overlapping PUSCHs UCI multiplexing without PUCCH should be reused for multiple overlapping PUSCHs UCI multiplexing with PUCCH for both type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook and type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook.*** |

### Apple : R1-2107711 [10]

|  |
| --- |
| ***Proposal 1:***   * *For Rel-15 UEs, i****n the case of multiple overlapping PUSCHs with no overlapping PUCCH,*** *the UE behavior is left to UE implementation.*   ***Proposal 2:***   * *For Rel-16 UEs, i****n the case of multiple overlapping PUSCHs with no overlapping PUCCH,*** *the UE does not multiplex HARQ-ACK information in any PUSCH since there is no DL DCI/PDSCH received overlapping PUCCH and PUSCH.* |

### NTT DOCOMO: R1-2107835 [11]

|  |
| --- |
| **Observation 1:**   * *Current specifications do not define UE behavior in the situation illustrated in Fig.1.*   **Proposal 1:**   * *In Rel-15, UE behavior in the situation illustrated in Fig.1 is not defined.*   **Observation 2:**   * *When HARQ-ACK payload size multiplexed on a PUSCH is 1 or 2 bits, the multiplexing is performed in a puncture manner. In this case, gNB can detect UL-SCH and/or CSI without blind detection in the situation illustrated in Fig.1.* * *For Type 2 HARQ-ACK CB, multiplexing more than 2 bits HARQ-ACK on a PUSCH in the situation illustrated in Fig.1 would be a corner case.* * *For Type 1 HARQ-ACK CB, multiplexing more than 2 bits HARQ-ACK on a PUSCH in the situation illustrated in Fig.1 would be a typical case.*   **Proposal 2:**   * *In Rel-16,*   + *For Type 2 HARQ-ACK CB, UE does not multiplex HARQ-ACK on a PUSCH if the UE does not have a PUCCH transmission that is including HARQ-ACK and is overlapped with the PUSCH even when UL DAI corresponding to the PUSCH indicates HARQ-ACK multiplexing.*   + *For Type 1 HARQ-ACK CB, FFS.*   **Observation 3:**   * *It seems that separate discussion between CA case and non-CA case is not valid.* |