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# **Introduction**

In previous meeting, progress on HARQ related issues have been achieved. In this meeting, companies’ views to refine the details and on other remaining issues are summarized with corresponding observations/proposals on following aspects with detailed proposals from each company listed in Appendix.

* Enhanced HARQ process ID indication
* HARQ codebook enhancements
* PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling restriction
* Performance enhancement
* Performance Restriction on HARQ feedback disabling

# **Issue-1 Enhanced HARQ process ID indication**

In previous meeting, following agreements have been achieved:

Agreement:

* Enhanced HARQ process ID indication is supported for DCI 0-2/1-2 and DCI 0-1/1-1 by at least one of following:
  + Option 1: Slot index as the MSB
  + Option 1-a:Slot index as the LSB
  + Option 2: Reusing one bit from other bit field
  + Option 3: Extending the HARQ process ID field up to 5 bits
* FFS: DCI 0-0/1-0
* Note: 32 is taken as maximal supported HARQ processes number for both UL and DL

Agreement:

For enhancement on the HARQ process indication, extend the HARQ process ID field up to 5 bits for DCI 0-2/1-2

Agreement:

For enhancement on the HARQ process indication at least for DCI 0-1/1-1, the Option-1 and Option-1a are lower priority for further discussion.

Then, in this meeting, w.r.t to the enhancement on remaining DCI formats, i.e., DCI 0-1/1-1 and DCI 0-0/1-0, **following views are summarized as**:

* DCI 0-1/1-1:
  + Option 2: CATT, CAICT, Apple, ZTE
  + Option 3: Huawei, vivo, Spreadtrum, Baicells, Samsung, NEC,MTK, CAICT (2nd priority), FGI, Asia Pacific Telecom, III, ITRI, CMCC, Panasonic, LG, Ericsson, DCM, Xiaomi, ITL, Nokia
  + Others: OPPO (Option 1/1a)
* DCI 0-0/1-0
  + Option 2: Huawei (idle bit), vivo(LSB of MCS), Apple, ZTE
  + Option 3: MTK, CMCC, ITL, Nokia
  + No supported: vivo, Baicell, Samsung, NEC, CATT, CAICT, FGI, Asia Pacific Telecom, III, ITRI, CMCC, LG, Ericsson, DCM
  + Others: vivo (extend the number of scrambled CRC parity bits), CAICT (same as DCI 0-1/1-1), Xiaomi (Option 1/1a)

Also, as highlighted by [CATT, MTK, Xiaomi], supports on the larger HARQ process is up to UE’s capability and can be configured by gNB [Ericsson] or based on the UE assistance information report [Samsung]. However, [Nokia] prefers to take the 32 HARQ process default for NTN specific operation.

According to the above summary, it seems that majority is supportive to directly extent the bit field even for DCI 0-1/1-1, and following proposal is made:

**[Initial Proposal 1-1]:** For enhancement on the HARQ process indication, extend the HARQ process ID field up to 5 bits for DCI 0-1/1-1**.**

Please provide your views and justifications.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments and Views** |
| OPPO | Fine |
| Samsung | Support. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | We are OK with this proposal. |
| Apple | Disagree. In legacy DCI 0-1/1-1, the HARQ process ID field is fixed to 4 bits. By increasing to 5 bits, the specification and implementation complexity will be increased. |
| FGI | Support. Implementation would be like DCI 0-2/1-2. Bits are determined by higher layer parameters. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support. |
| vivo | Fine with the proposal in principle.  The HARQ process ID field is needed to extend up to 5 bits just when the HARQ processes number is configured to be 32. Therefore, we propose to rephrase as follows.  *For enhancement on the HARQ process indication, extend the HARQ process ID field up to 5 bits for DCI 0-1/1-1 when the maximum number of HARQ processes is configured to 32 by the high layer.* |
| ZTE | Not support. In legacy system, the principles for DCI design for 0-1/1-1 and DCI 0-2/1-2 are different. Keeping the same bit length is preferred with less impacts on the DCI generation. |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| Baicells | Support the proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree with the proposal. This keeps the approach consistent with DCI 0-2/1-2. |
| Ericsson | Support. |
| ITL | Support |
| QC | Support |
| Sony | Support |
| Panasonic | Agree. |
| Spreadtrum | Support |
| Lenovo/MM | Support. |
| Sharp | Support |
| LG | Support |
| CMCC | Support. The bit size of HARQ process number field can be configured by higher layer parameter. |
| NEC | Support |

For DCI 0-0/1-0, since the views from companies are still not converged, it’s preferred for companies to future share the views on following proposal with preference and justification:

**[Initial Proposal 1-2]:** Following options on HARQ process ID indication for DCI 0-0/1-0 can be considered:

* Option 2: Reusing one bit from other bit field
* Option 3: Extending the HARQ process ID field up to 5 bits
* Option 4: No enhancement

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments and Views** |
| OPPO | Option 4, no enhancement is the safest solution. Any other options will cause potential ambiguity between gNB and UE. |
| Samsung | Option 4 is sufficient for fall-back operation. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | As already outlined in our contribution, we have a preference for option 3. The UEs that are going to be used for operation with NR over NTN will anyway need to have new implementation in order to be able to perform advanced TA calculations based on newly implemented GNSS functionality. Hence we do not see any problems in also having the fallback DCI updated to accommodate the additional HARQ processes. If there is no consensus on option 3, we would rather go for option 4, even that it would impose scheduling restrictions during fallback. |
| Apple | Option 2.  Regarding Option 4, note that a UE is not always configured to receive DCI formats 0\_1/1\_1 or 0\_2/1\_2. If a UE needs to use 32 HARQ processes, then the UE has to be configured to receive non-fallback DCI formats. This increases the blind decoding efforts at UE, which is not preferrable.  Another possible solution is to introduce a new RNTI to indicate the HARQ process number 16-31. When a new RNTI is used to scramble the DCI CRC bits, then UE knows this is for HARQ process number 16-31. Comparing with other options, this solution does not affect the scheduling flexibility at all. |
| FGI | Option 4. No enhancement.  Fallback DCI may be used during initial access. It is problematic if not all NTN UEs support 32 HARQ. If enhancement is needed, at least NW shall not indicate an HARQ ID > 15 during initial access (or during RA in RRC connected) just in case some UEs cannot support 32 HARQ. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Option 4.  No motivation to enable more than 16 processes in fallback DCI. If more than 32 is needed, non-fallback DCI should be used. |
| vivo | Option 4 is the first priority, when 16 HARQ processes are sufficient to be used during initial access.  If the network needs to schedule 32 HARQ processes using DCI 0-0/1-0, the option 2 can be considered. |
| ZTE | Option 2.  For the DCI 0-0/1-0, there are still use case to enable scheduling with larger HARQ process number. Meanwhile, from specification perspective, it’s clear that legacy interpretation can be kept for the UE before RRC connected state. |
| Xiaomi | Option 3 is preferred.  We think it would be beneficial for DCI format 0-0/1-0 to support 32 HARQ processes. The fallback DCI can provide higher reliability which would be frequently used in NTN, lack of HARQ process number will limit the scheduling flexibility. Our first preference is slot index based HARQ process indication, per majority view, we can compromise to Option 3 which is aligned with other DCI formats. |
| Baicells | Option 4.  In NTN case, 16 HARQ processes are enough for fallback DCI 0\_0/1\_0 and the HARQ process ID field has a fixed size of 4bits. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option 2. We prefer to keep fallback DCI robust and not subject to blind decoding by the UE. |
| Ericsson | Support. |
| ITL | Support Option 3 |
| QC | Option 2 |
| Sony | Option 4 is fine |
| Panasonic | Option 4. No enhancement is sufficient for fallback DCI. Agree with OPPO that any other options will cause potential ambiguity between gNB and UE. |
| Lenovo/MM | Option 4 is preferred. |
| CAICT | Option 2 |
| Sharp | We support the proposal. Either Option 2 or Option 3 is OK. |
| LG | Option 4. |
| CMCC | Either Option 3 or Option 4 is OK.  Option 3 is considered to define a unified solution for all DCI formats.  Option 4 is also acceptable, since for fallback DCI which is temporarily used in initial access procedure and RRC reconfiguration procedure, current 4 bits seems enough. |
| NEC | Support option 4. |

# **Issue-2 HARQ codebook enhancements**

In the previous meeting, following agreements have been achieved:

Agreement:

HARQ codebook enhancement is supported as:

* For Type-2 HARQ codebook:
  + Option-1: Reduce codebook size with:
    - HARQ-ACK codebook only includes HARQ-ACK of PDSCH with feedback-enabled HARQ processes
      * FFS: the details of C-DAI and T-DAI counting for DCI of PDSCH with feedback-enable/disabled HARQ processes
    - FFS: at least DCI for SPS release/SPS PDSCH
  + Option-2: No enhancement
  + Other options are not precluded.
* For Type-1 HARQ codebook, further discuss is needed with down selection among following options:
  + Option-1: No enhancement;
  + Option-2: Report NACK on disabled process
  + Option-3: Reduce codebook size with criteria
* FFS: Enhancements for Type-3 HARQ codebook

Agreement:

For Type-2 HARQ codebook in NTN: Reduce codebook size with HARQ-ACK codebook only including HARQ-ACK of PDSCH with feedback-enabled HARQ processes

* FFS: The details of C-DAI and T-DAI counting for DCI of PDSCH with feedback-enable/disabled HARQ processes

Agreement:

For Type-2 HARQ codebook in NTN,

* For the DCI of PDSCH with feedback-enabled HARQ processes, the C-DAI and T-DAI are the count of only feedback-enabled processes
* FFS: Whether DCI for SPS release and any other DCIs are included in counting of C-DAI and T-DAI

Then, in this meeting, **following views are summarized for each topic as**:

# **Clarification on the consequence/intention to support the feedback-disabled HARQ process:**

In order to facilitate the progress for discussion, following proposals to clarify the consequence/intention after the introduction of feedback-disabled HARQ process are highlighted:

* If HARQ feedback is disabled for a HARQ process, NW and UE have a common understanding that the PHY layer does not **generate** acknowledgment of the data in this TB for the HARQ process. [FGI, Asia Pacific Telecom, III, ITRI]
* Enhancements to minimize the UL feedback for DL transmission with feedback-disabled process should be prioritized. [ZTE]

From moderator’s perspective, based on the previous agreement to enable the feedback-disabled HARQ process, we need to be constructive on the remaining enhancements to harvest the benefits. Otherwise, the usage/gain of previous progress will be limited.

Please provide your views below：

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments and Views** |
| OPPO | The intention for introducing HARQ-disable is to allow increase the DL transmission throughput. The RAN1 agreements (quoted below) at the current stage can already address this motivation. We think no further enhancement is needed to be discussed. Please note that reducing the PUCCH overhead is not the motivation of the HARQ-disabling feature.  Agreement:  For a DL HARQ process with disabled HARQ feedback, the UE is not expected to receive another PDSCH or set of slot-aggregated PDSCH scheduled for the given HARQ process that starts until X after the end of the reception of the last PDSCH or slot-aggregated PDSCH for that HARQ process.   * Working assumption: X = T\_proc,1 * FFS: Whether X should be changed to X = max(T\_proc,1, K1) where K1 is the minimum k1 if it is configured, otherwise k1 = 0 * Note: The TB of the two PDSCHs can be either same or different   Agreement:  Confirm the previous working assumption for X = T\_proc,1 where X is defined from the end of the reception of the last PDSCH or slot-aggregated PDSCH for a given HARQ process with disabled feedback to the start of the PDCCH carrying the DCI scheduling another PDSCH or set of slot-aggregated PDSCH for the given HARQ process. |
| Samsung | RAN1 needs to have a common understanding as to why a NW may disable HARQ-ACK feedback. Then, the cases where the UE does not provide HARQ-ACK feedback can follow based on feasibility and associated benefits. BTW, we do not agree that HARQ disabling increases DL throughout, the opposite is true. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | We see the main potential for this aspect of disabling the HARQ-ACK feedback in the way that the UE does not need to provide UL transmissions when they are not needed. The situation where this arises is when there is a long RTT (like GEO), where the gNB may schedule DL transmissions for the UE blindly, and for this case the benefit of the UE feedback may be seen as limited. The main purpose of this would be to conserve the UE power by potentially omitting the PUCCH transmissions when they are not needed. However, for cases where the UE is anyway performing transmission of PUCCH, the gNB may still have benefit of the UE transmitting the information, since the physical resources are anyway used. The UE would also need to perform CRC prior to forwarding any packets to higher layers, so the information on successful decoding would be available, and may be provided if resources are assigned/to be used. |
| Apple | The intention of introducing feedback-disabled HARQ process is to avoid the HARQ stalling issue due to large propagation delay in NTN. This could increase the throughput. |
| FGI | Share the same view as Apple. According to TR 38.811 and TR 38.821, HARQ-ACK disabling is used to prevent HARQ stalling.  Clarify for “the PHY does not **generate**”.  This is not agreed yet in RAN2, but the MAC entity may not instruct the physical layer to generate acknowledgement(s) of the data in this TB, if HARQ feedback is disabled for the HARQ process. See [R2-2108664](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_115-e/Docs/R2-2108664.zip) |
| NTT DOCOMO | The motivation of disabled feedback is to avoid waiting feedback to start another data transmission on the same process number. If the reliability can be same as enabled feedback e.g. by slot aggregation, it means that throughout is improved. |
| vivo | Agree with Apple. The intention of introducing disabled HARQ process is to avoid the HARQ stalling issue due to large propagation delay in NTN, the disabled HARQ processes can be scheduled to transmit another PDSCH without waiting for the HARQ-ACK feedback to utilize all the downlink transmission occasions to increase the throughput. Meanwhile the HARQ-ACK feedback for the transmission with disabled HARQ processes is also useful for the link adaptation. |
| ZTE | We share the views that disabling HARQ is for addressing the HARQ stabling issue. In addition, reduction on the UL feedback is also one benefit. |
| Xiaomi | We share similar view with Apple, HARQ feedback disabling is to avoid the HARQ stalling issue. |
| Baicells | Take the DL transmission for example, we think if a HARQ process is disabled then the UE will disable the ACK/NACK feedback of the corresponding HARQ process. As mentioned by DCM, the gNB could avoid waiting feedback to start another data transmission on the same process number. So the throughput could be increased and the feedback overhead may also be reduced if codebook enhancement is supported. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We consider the benefit of HARQ disabling in NR NTN being in avoiding HARQ stalling due to large RTT between the UE and gNB. |
| Ericsson | We share the view of Nokia. |
| ITL | We share the same view as Apple. In addition, it is also beneficial for a UE to omit the PUCCH transmissions for NTN scenarios when they are not needed. |
| ETRI | Same view as NTT DOCOMO. |
| QC | We share the views that feedback disabling is to address the HARQ stalling issue. We also agree that reducing UL HARQ feedback bits is beneficial and should be prioritized. |
| Sony | We share the Apple’s view. |
| Panasonic | The main intention of feedback-disabling is to avoid HARQ stalling (i.e. restriction of scheduling opportunity due to HARQ processes awaiting for HARQ feedback) in our understanding. We agree with Nokia that for cases where the UE is anyway performing transmission of PUCCH, UE transmission of HARQ-ACK may be beneficial. |
| Spreadtrum | We share the view of Apple. |
| Lenovo/MM | We share similar view as Apple. |
| CAICT | We also consider the benefit of HARQ disabling is to avoid HARQ stalling. Furthermore, skipping HARQ-ACK report for the disabled processes is beneficial. |
| LG | We share the view of Apple. |
| CMCC | We share the same view with ZTE, Qualcomm and CAICT that the main benefit of HARQ disabling is to avoid HARQ stalling. Furthermore, skipping HARQ-ACK report for the disabled processes is beneficial. |
| NEC | We also share the view with other companies that feedback disabling avoids HARQ stalling. Moreover, skipping HARQ-ACK report for the disabled processes can be beneficial. |

# **Enhancement on Type-1 Codebook (Semi-static codebook):**

For this topic, following views are shared in this meeting:

* + Option-1: No enhancement
* Supported by [Spreadtrum, CATT (2nd priority), OPPO, Nokia, Apple, Xiaomi, Panasonic]
  + As pointed by [Spreadtrum], for Type-1 codebook with semi-static size, the needs for enhancement is limited.
  + Option-2: Report NACK or ACK on disabled process
    - Supported by [DCM (NACK), Ericsson, MTK,ITRI]
  + Option-3: Reduce codebook size with additional limits
    - Supported by [Huawei, vivo Qualcomm, Ericsson, Sony, Samsung, NEC], more specifically, the detailed criteria can be :
    - Support configuration to a UE of a bitmap that indicates slots where the UE should generate HARQ-ACK information [Huawei, Samsung]
    - Skipping the feedback of PDSCH occasions from disabled HARQ processes [Baicell]
      * Skipping the feedback of PDSCH occasions if only disabled HARQ process are transmitted [vivo, CMCC, NEC]
      * Skipping the feedback of PDSCH occasions if only disabled HARQ process are transmitted for one cell [Sony, LG,ITL]
      * Skipping the feedback of PDSCH occasion if no DCI for a feedback-enabled HARQ process in any slot associated with the HARQ codebook is decoded [CATT, CAICT, Ericsson, CMCC, ZTE].
    - Others
      * Up to UE’s implementation on whether UE **sends** the codebook feedback if no DCI for a PDSCH with feedback enabled HARQ processes in the HARQ CB is decoded. [FGI, Asia Pacific Telecom, III, ITRI]
      * Introduce new codebook design for the limit of PDSCH transmissions less than candidate occasions for HARQ processes with feedback enabled [Qualcomm]
        + E.g., reporting the position(s) in which the UE received an ACK/NACK enabled
      * When HARQ-ACK for a HARQ process with disabled HARQ-ACK report is included in a Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook, the UE reports for the HARQ process: [Samsung]
        + HARQ-ACK with NACK value when the Type-1 codebook size is not larger than 11 bits, and
        + HARQ-ACK as in Rel-16 when the Type-1 codebook size is larger than 11 bits.
      * Restriction on the scheduling can be consider to reduce the codebook size [Sony]

Moreover, as highlighted by [DCM], for Type 1 HARQ-ACK CB, discussions on behaviour if no DCI for a PDSCH with a feedback-enabled HARQ processes in any slot (at least PUSCH case) is postponed till the corresponding Rel-15/16 CR is concluded.

Based on the inputs and previous discussion, it seems that companies’ views are still unchanged. From moderator’s perspective, there is clear benefits on UL overhead reduction with potential enhancement for Type-1 codebook, especially when only DCI carrying a feedback-disabled HARQ process is used and detailed condition can be future discussed with following proposal：

**[Initial Proposal 2-1]:**

For Type-1 HARQ codebook in NTN, the UE should skip the codebook feedback if only feedback-disabled HARQ processes is associated with PDSCH occasions:

* FFS: The case that DCI carrying a feedback-enabled HARQ process is not decoded at UE side
* FFS: Whether the principle is applied per serving cell
* FFS: Necessity on the indication of additional assistance information from gNB

Please provide your views below：

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments and Views** |
| OPPO | No new agreement is needed. We can discuss other high priority topics. We suggest to deprioritize this discussion. |
| Samsung | Support.  It is a reasonable proposal provided that one reason for HARQ disabling is to conserve UE power. It also does not have an impact on UE implementation. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | From our point of view it is crucial that the codebook size is deterministic, such that both UE and gNB have a common agreement on the expected codebook size. As we read the this proposal, it is targeted at an optimization which should rather be denoted “codebook dropping”, meaning that in case no feedback enabled processes have feedback, the entire codebook generation is dropped. We think this might cause a substantial problem – especially considering the first FFS, which is something that is not easy to address or solve, as it would potentially cause the UE and gNB to have the wrong understanding of the assignment of multiplexing for the UL transmission – for both UCI on PUCCH (multiplexing with other UCI) and UCI on PUSCH (multiplexing with both data and other UCI). According to our understanding it would be a waste of resources to not convey valuable information if the UE (a) has already generated the information (UE needs to test for CRC before delivering packet to higher layers), and (b) transmission resources may be available (for instance the gNB requesting the UE to provide HARQ feedback multiplexed with PUSCH).  Alternative proposal 2-1:  For Type-1 HARQ codebook in NTN, the UE should skip the codebook feedback if only feedback-disabled HARQ processes are detected and feedback-enabled HARQ processes are not indicated to be associated with PDSCH occasions |
| Apple | The principle of Type-1 HARQ codebook is the codebook size depends on the candidate PDSCH receptions and does not depend on DCI decoding. Hence, we think no enhancement/optimization is needed for Type-1 HARQ codebook. |
| FGI | Support. Nokia’s proposal is fine as well.  If NW and UE have a common understanding, UL overhead reduction is beneficial, especially considering limited UL resource in NTN. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Not support.  Same view with Nokia. The concept of type 1 HARQ-ACK CB is to keep codebook size irrespective of presence of DL assignments. For example, when 5 DL assignments are transmitted but only 4 are received. Even in this case, UE sends HARQ-ACK bits based on only RRC-configured parameters. No ambiguity is assumed. This concept should be kept.  Enhancement to reduce CB size is not main direction here. We are not sure why this direction is suggested. Even if this direction is preferable, note that if NACK is reported for PDSCH receptions with disabled feedback as Option 2, decoding performance can be improved at gNB side since the NACK bits are pre-known. We do not understand why companies supporting option 3 are not OK with Option 2...  In our view, main motivation of Option 2 is to avoid complicated rule of UE processing time. In option 1, UE will generate HARQ-ACK bit for PDSCH reception with disabled feedback. This means the corresponding processing time is needed. But at the last meeting, we agreed that required processing time is duration from PDSCH reception to PDCCH reception. This rule does not work in option 1, so option 2 is more reasonable way.  Note that Alternative proposal 2-1 proposed by Nokia is not OK to wait 7.1CR discussion. |
| vivo | Support the proposal. |
| ZTE | Support for this proposal and we can try to harvest the gain on UL overhead reduction with minimized spec impact, even for Type-1. |
| Xiaomi | We prefer ‘no enhancement’ for Type-1 HARQ codebook, here no enhancement means UE using legacy rules to generate the type-1 CB or inserting ACK/NACK for feedback-disabled HARQ processes. The size of Type-1 HARQ codebook should depend on the RRC configuration, while Initial Proposal 2-1 implying that the presentation of Type-1 HARQ codebook is depends on DCI decoding results. |
| Baicells | Support the proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Don’t agree with the proposal. This is a corner case we do not see a benefit for optimising on. It is very likely that at least one process would have HARQ feedback enabled (MAC CE signalling). |
| Ericsson | Support |
| ITL | Support.  It is desirable to skip the HARQ-ACK feedback when only disabled HARQ processes are associated, since it would be helpful to avoid the unnecessary UL transmission at a UE side and thus reduce UL interference as well. Also, it would bring us less specification impact and implementation complexity. |
| QC | Not sure the benefit of the proposed agreement as it covers only corner cases. If the majority believe this is useful, we support Nokia’s version. |
| Sony | Support in principle, the description can be polished to avoid misunderstanding.  We think codebook construction can also be optimized to reduce the overhead even in cases where not all HARQ processes are feedback-disabled and so codebook feedback cannot be skipped. We propose that UE does not reserve the ACK/NACK bits for a serving cell for which all the HARQ processes are feedback-disabled in this serving cell. |
| Panasonic | Agree with OPPO. No enhancement for type-1 codebook is needed. |
| Lenovo/MM | Support the proposal to harvest the gain. |
| CAICT | Support this proposal. |
| LG | Agree in principle. But, we prefer the clarification by Sony that the perspective of codebook generation should be addressed. |
| CMCC | Support with Nokia’s version.  We share the same understanding with Nokia that the optimization is not a “codebook generating” rule, but exactly a “codebook dropping” rule. |
| NEC | Support this proposal. Can also support alternative proposal from Nokia which also seems to imply the necessity of assistance information from gNB. |

# **Enhancement on Type-3 Codebook:**

For this topic, following views are shared in this meeting:

* 1. Supportive to enhancement: [Huawei, vivo, Xiaomi/Spreadtrum (if supported), CAICT, Baicell, LG Ericsson, ZTE, ITL]
     1. Solution 1: No feedback for HARQ process with disabled feedback
     2. Solution 2: Skipping the feedback of PDSCH occasions if only disabled HARQ process are transmitted for one cell [ITL]
  2. Negative to enhancement: [CATT, OPPO, Nokia, Samsung, DCM]

As pointed by [CATT, OPPO], supports on Type-3 codebook is not needed and can be deprioritized [FGI, Asia Pacific Telecom, III, ITRI]. Same view is shared by [DCM] with consideration on workload.

Based on the inputs above, from moderator perspective, the supports on the Type-3 can also be considered since it can also be used for licensed band. Meanwhile, only limited efforts are needed to specify the proposed enhancement. Then, following proposal is made based on majority views：

**[Initial Proposal 2-2]:** For Type-3 HARQ codebook in NTN, the UE should skip the codebook feedback for a feedback-disabled HARQ processes

Please provide your views below：

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments and Views** |
| OPPO | No new agreement is needed. We can discuss other high priority topics. We suggest to deprioritize this discussion. |
| Samsung | There is no apparent reason to optimize Type-3 for NTN.  Also, other enhancements for Type-3 are defined in Rel-17 URLLC, will be applicable in general, and can provide the functionality of the proposal. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | We are a bit puzzled on the wording of this proposal. What does “skip the feedback” mean here? Should the UE not generate the HARQ-ACK indication, or should the codebook be changed in size whenever a process is being reconfigured (either enabled or disabled)? In our opinion, the Type-3 HARQ codebook should remain constant in size, irrespective of whether or not the amount of HARQ processes with feedback is changed. Hence, we preferring to not touch the Type-3 HARQ codebook at all. After all, the Type-3 HARQ codebook is anyway the least efficient codebook that we have and we see no need to do optimizations here while there are better alternatives for any optimizations. |
| FGI | Support. Type-3 CB has been discussed for many meetings and no issues have been raised by companies. Although it has no good use cases in NTN, e.g., why NW configures Type-3 rather than Type-2 CB, it is expected to be applicable with minor spec changes. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Not support.  Agree with Nokia. |
| vivo | Support. For Type-3 HARQ-ACK codebook, HARQ-ACK codebook size is determined based on all the configured HARQ processes, which will cause large unnecessary redundancy for HARQ-ACK feedback if many HARQ processes are configured with disabled HARQ feedback and is not efficient for NTN, so the enhancement is necessary if the type-3 HARQ codebook is used in NTN. |
| ZTE | We are supportive to this proposal and the optimized performance can be ensured once the Type-3 is configured in NTN. |
| Xiaomi | Support.  Our first preference is don’t support Type-3 HARQ codebook in NTN. However, as the Type-3 CB is supported in licensed band, we think it is okay to reduce the UL overhead by omitting the feedback for feedback-disabled HARQ processes. |
| Baicells | Same view as ZTE. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support the initial proposal. Skipping the feedback for feedback disabled HARQ processes helps in reducing the codebook size. |
| Ericsson | Support |
| ITL | Support |
| Panasonic | Agree with OPPO. No enhancement is needed for type 3 codebook. |
| Spreadtrum | Support |
| Lenovo/MM | Support. |
| CAICT | Support this proposal. |
| LG | Support |

# **Enhancement on Type-2 Codebook:**

For the Type-2 Codebook (Dynamic codebook), based on the previous agreement, w.r.t the C-DAI and T-DAI counting of the PDSCH with feedback disabled HARQ process, following options are listed:

1. Option-1: The C-DAI and T-DAI are the count of feedback-enabled processes, despite they are not incremented [vivo, Baicell, CATT, CMCC, LG, Ericsson, Xiaomi, Huawei, HiSilicon]
2. Option-2: The C-DAI and T-DAI are ignored by the UE
   * No need to specify any value, i.e., any value can be used by gNB [Samsung, NEC, ZTE]
3. Option-3: The C-DAI/T-DAI are the count of feedback-disabled processes ~~[Huawei]~~
4. Option-4: The C-DAI is a reserved value that can be ignored by the UE and T-DAI is the count of feedback-enabled processes despite it not incremented [Apple].

Based on the inputs above and consideration of previous meeting, it seems that the views from companies are not changed. From moderator perspective, there is strong need to clarify the behaviour for the case with feedback disabled HARQ process. Then, following proposal is made according to the majority views：

**[Initial Proposal 2-3]:** For the DCI of PDSCH with feedback-enabled HARQ processes, the C-DAI and T-DAI are the count of feedback-enabled processes, despite they are not incremented

Please provide your views below. If you have strong concerns on this proposal, views on way-forward including justification are appreciated.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments and Views** |
| OPPO | No new agreement is needed. We can discuss other high priority topics. We suggest to deprioritize this discussion. |
| Samsung | Do not support.  A benefit from the proposal is none or, at best, marginal without any impact to system operation. A specification impact and gNB/UE adjustments in the Type-2 codebook construction are not justified.  It is preferable to remove all unnecessary bits from DCI 1\_1 in case of HARQ disabled process and align with DCI 0\_1. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | We would have a preference for option 1 on this matter. |
| Apple | Do not support. We could support only T-DAI is the count of feedback-enabled processes as it indicates the total number of HARQ feedback bits, which may be useful in some scenarios. |
| FGI | Support. Since spec change is needed for Type-2 CB, we prefer option 1 and 2 to minimize its impact. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We are OK with this proposal.  But no agreement is also fine since the DAI performance enhancement is not main target and system works well without this enhancement. |
| vivo | Support the proposal. |
| ZTE | We are supportive on this proposal. |
| Xiaomi | Our proposal seems not correctly captured, we support that the C-DAI/T-DAI are the count of feedback-disabled processes. Although the feedback for some HARQ processes is disabled, C-DAI/T-DAI counting for the HARQ disable processes still can bring some benefits as UE can check its data decoding performance using the C-DAI/T-DAI. |
| Baicells | We support option 1, and there might be editorial error of the proposal, the correction could be “for the DCI of PDSCH with feedback-disabled HARQ processes, the C-DAI and T-DAI are the count of feedback-enabled processes, despite they are not incremented.” |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support the proposal. Huawei also supports Option-1 as explained in our input contribution. |
| Ericsson | Support |
| ITL | Support |
| QC | Support. There is a type. It should be “For the DCI of PDSCH with feedback-disabled HARQ processes” |
| Panasonic | Our preference is option 4. Only T-DAI is the count of feedback-enabled processes would be sufficient for DCI with feedback-disabled process. C-DAI field should be reserved and can be used for other purposes if any. |
| Spreadtrum | Support |
| Lenovo/MM | Support the proposal. |
| CAICT | Not support.  Prefer HARQ-ACK feedback related bit fields including C-DAI/T-DAI are not included in the DCI with a feedback-disabled HARQ process. |
| LG | Support with QC’s correction. |
| CMCC | Our most preference is Option 4. Only T-DAI is the count of feedback-enabled processes would be sufficient for DCI with feedback-disabled process. C-DAI field should be reserved and can be used for other purposes if any.  Nevertheless, to make progress, we can also accept Option-1 and Option-2.  Regarding [Initial Proposal 2-3], as mentioned by Baicells and Qualcomm, there is a type: “For the DCI of PDSCH with feedback- **~~enabled~~ disabled** HARQ processes”. |
| NEC | We share similar views with Samsung and do not support this proposal. |

# **Discussion on SPS issue**

In this meeting, the following views are shared for SPS PDSCH activation/release and SPS transmission:

* For the SPS PDSCH activation/PDSCH release:
  + Option-1: No enhancement [Spreadtrum, Sony, CAICT, DCM, Spreadtrum, Samsung, Sony, CAICT, OPPO, ITL, Nokia]
    - E.g., the counter DAI, total DAI and DAI in DCI format 0\_1 count for PDCCH indicating SPS PDSCH activation/release when the related SPS PDSCH is HARQ feedback disabled.
    - E.g., For SPS activation/release, UE reports HARQ-ACK regardless of any configuration of enabling/disabling HARQ feedback.
  + Option-2: Additional scheduling restriction:
    - HARQ-ACK feedback for activation and release command should be enabled by one HARQ process with feedback [CATT, FGI, Asia Pacific Telecom, III, ITRI, Nokia]
    - UE feedbacks acknowledgement for the reception of SPS activation DCI, if the first PDSCH after reception of the SPS activation DCI is associated with disabled HARQ process. [LG]
* For SPS PDSCH transmission:
  + HARQ codebook generation:
    - For SPS PDSCH, the HARQ-ACK codebook includes only HARQ-ACK information for enabled HARQ processes [Samsung]
  + HARQ feedback configuration:
    - Enabling/disabling of HARQ feedback for DL SPS/UL CG is configured per configuration. [DCM,CAICT, Apple]
      * HARQ feedback-enabling/disabling configured per HARQ process is ignored for SPS.[DCM]
  + Others
    - SPS PDSCH with HARQ FB enabling with lowest configured sps-ConfigIndex should be firstly selected/prioritized when more than one SPS PDSCH configurations are in a slot [ITL]

In additional, [DCM, NEC] proposed to keep the DCI for SPS release and DCI for SCell dormancy (any other DCIs which are included in counting of C-DAI and T-DAI in Rel-16) are included in counting of C-DAI and T-DAI regardless of feedback-enabling/disabling. And for Scell dormancy, UE should report HARQ-ACK regardless of any configuration of HARQ feedback-enabling/disabling as highlighted by [DCM], other cases as PDSCH reception scheduled by a fallback DCI and PDSCH reception including successRAR: e.g. CFRA in a handover case, can be further discussed.

Based on the inputs above and consideration of previous meeting, it seems that at least views for SPS PDSCH activation/PDSCH release are converged with following proposal：

**[Initial Proposal 2-4]:** For the SPS PDSCH activation/release, one of following should be supported:

* Alt-1: The legacy behavior on HARQ-codebook feedback and DCI counting for SPS PDSCH activation/release is kept for the case that DCI is associated with either feedback-enabled or feedback-disabled HARQ process
* Alt-2: UE expects that SPS PDSCH activation/release information are transmitted using HARQ processes with feedback enabled.

Please provide your views below：

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments and Views** |
| OPPO | SPS PDSCH activation is related to a PDSCH reception. While SPS SPDCH release is independent of PDSCH reception. Thus, why these two things should be jointly discussed and have a joint UE behaviour. To us, SPS PDSCH release and activation should be separately discussed.  For SPS PDSCH activation: there is no need to separate SPS PDSCH activation and DCI dynamically scheduled PDSCH. In legacy system, they are not separated. And they are commonly defined as PDSCH reception scheduled by a DCI format. For NTN, there is no need to extract SPS PDSCH activation. The C-DAI/T-DAI interpretation can simply follow RAN1 agreement  Agreement:  For Type-2 HARQ codebook in NTN,   * For the DCI of PDSCH with feedback-enabled HARQ processes, the C-DAI and T-DAI are the count of only feedback-enabled processes * FFS: Whether DCI for SPS release and any other DCIs are included in counting of C-DAI and T-DAI     For SPS PDSCH release: it is independent of HARQ disabling and enabling, so naturally, it should follow legacy behaviour. |
| Samsung | Support Alt. 2.  Disagree that Alt. 1 is legacy behaviour – legacy behaviour is Alt. 2 which is what is currently specified and does not require any agreement. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | We are OK with the proposal. |
| Apple | We are fine with the proposal.  It seems only the SPS PDSCH activation/release is proposed here. Could the FL make a proposal on SPS PDSCH transmission? |
| FGI | Support. Prefer Alt-2. As shown in [R1-2107289](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_106-e/Docs/R1-2107289.zip), Alt-1 may make an RAN2 impact when HARQ feedback is disabled and TA timer is still running. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Let me ask a question for clarification:   * Alt 1 means that even when DCI for SPS activation/release uses a HARQ process number associated with disabled-feedback, UE shall transmit corresponding HARQ-ACK. Is it correct understanding?   We think this should be clarified in the proposal sufficiently. Otherwise, misunderstanding would be possible like that no feedback is assumed in process number with disabled-feedback.  On SPS PDSCH, we have same question as Apple. |
| Vivo | Not support.  The SPS PDSCH activation is related to a PDSCH reception and there is no need to define a new feedback acknowledgement for the reception of SPS activation DCI.  For the SPS release, which is independent of HARQ processes，no enhancement is needed. |
| ZTE | We are supportive on this proposal and Alt-2 is slightly preferred as simplest solution  For the Alt-1, it’s clear that UE shall transmit corresponding HARQ-ACK even the HARQ process number associated with disabled feedback. |
| Xiaomi | Support this proposal in general.  The Alt.2 needs more clarification. The HARQ process number field is unavailable in SPS activation and release. Does it mean reusing the formula of SPS PDSCH HARQ process ID calculation for SPS activation/release in Alt.2? Or does Alt.2 implying that UE always feedback for SPS activation/release? |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | In initial proposal 2-4 we prefer Alt-2. We would also like to see the FL proposal on SPS PDSCH transmission. |
| Ericsson | It is discussed in RAN2 whether HARQ processes for SPS PDSCH can be disabled or not. RAN1 should await RAN2 conclusion. |
| QC | Agree with Ericsson |
| Sony | Support Alt.2 |
| Panasonic | We have questions for clarification.  In Alt1, is it correct understanding that UE transmits HARQ-ACK feedback to the DCI for SPS activation/release regardless of the associated SPS PDSCH is feedback-enabled or disabled process? If yes, we support it.  In Alt2, does it imply feedback-disabled process can not be used for SPS PDSCH? If yes, we disagree with Alt2. |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Lenovo/MM | Fine with the proposal and prefer Alt 2. |
| CAICT | Alt-1  It is unnecessary to have the restriction that SPS PDSCH is with HARQ processes which feedback are enabled.  In the current spec, there is no special HARQ-ACK feedback for SPS activation PDCCH. Once HARQ-ACK or the first SPS PDSCH is received, gNB could assume SPS activation PDCCH is acknowledged by the UE. When HARQ-ACK feedback for the SPS PDSCH is disabled, HARQ-ACK for SPS activation is needed to have consistent assumptions about whether the SPS is activated at gNB and UE side. Correspondingly, the count of C-DAI and T-DAI in SPS activation PDCCH should be kept. |
| LG | Fine with proposal. |
| CMCC | Support. Prefer Alt-2. |

# **Additional limits on PDCCH construction:**

In this meeting, following proposals on the potential limits on PDCCH restriction are made by proponent to enhance the performance of PDCCH detection.

* A DCI format scheduling a PDSCH reception for a HARQ process with disabled HARQ-ACK does not include the PRI, a PUSCH-to-HARQ\_feedback timing, counter DAI, and TPC command fields. [Samsung]
* For Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook, HARQ-ACK feedback related bit fields including C-DAI/T-DAI are not included in the DCI with a feedback-disabled HARQ process. [CAICT]

From moderator’s perspective, it’s the first time to discuss this topic and benefits on corresponding proposal may need further justification. Then, views from companies are welcomed:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments and Views** |
| Samsung | A UE does not provide HARQ-ACK feedback for disabled HARQ processes (at least for the Type-2 CB) and corresponding fields for PUCCH transmission are redundant. For single TB scheduling, ~10 bits can be saved, the size of DCI 1\_1 can be same as the size of DCI 0\_1, and there is a ~0.5 dB gain in PDCCH BLER which is meaningful. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | We do not see a need for optimizing the DCI sizes. The main problem as we see it is that the UE will not in advance be aware of whether the DCI is associated to a feedback enabled or a feedback disabled HARQ process. So, the DCI size should be constant and independent on the HARQ feedback configuration. |
| Apple | It is unclear to us before UE decodes a DCI, how could UE know this DCI schedules PDSCH with HARQ feedback enabled or disabled? The DCI size depending on whether HARQ feedback is enabled or disabled will increase the blind detection at UE side. |
| FGI | Removing redundant bit fields may not be essential. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Not needed.  Agree with Nokia and Apple. And we have 3+1 rule of DCI size alignment. Removing some field would not provide any performance gain. |
| Vivo | The proposed limits on PDCCH construction are not essential which will increase the UE complexity to detect the DCI. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We don’t see the need for optimising DCI fields. |
| Ericsson | We do not support this. Removing fields depending on HARQ feedback enabled/disabled implies increased blind detection by the UE. |
| QC | Not needed |
| Sony | Share the Nokia’s view. |
| Panasonic | We don’t see the need of these optimization. These proposals would cause additional issues because DCI sizes for feedback enabled process and disabled process become different. |
| Lenovo/MM | Not needed for such kind of optimization. |
| CAICT | For type-2 codebook, HARQ-ACK for feedback disabled process is not included. The bit fields about HARQ-ACK feedback in the DCI is too much so that the efficiency impacts cannot be neglected. |
| LG | Share the view with Nokia. |
| CMCC | We share the same concern with Nokia and Apple that before UE decodes a DCI, how could UE know this DCI schedules PDSCH with HARQ feedback enabled or disabled? |

# **Issue-3 PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling restriction**

In RAN1#105-e meeting, the OOO issue (out of order HARQ feedback scheduling restriction for PDSCHS with different HARQ process IDs) has been identified for further discussion with consideration on the joint existence of feedback-enabled and feedback-disabled HARQ process. In this meeting, following views are shared by companies:

* In case of two PDSCHs are associated with different HARQ process ids, introduce default/virtual ACK/NACK timing or timing offset for feedback-disabled HARQ process. [LG]
* [Regarding the “out-of-order restriction” for transmission of different HARQ processes corresponding to different PDSCHs, RAN1 to down-select between following alternatives:](#_Toc79154036) [Ericsson]
  + [Alt-1: Preserve the same “out-of-order restriction” for (enabled) HARQ processes in specification for the disabled HARQ processes](#_Toc79154037)
  + [Alt-2: the “out-of-order restriction” for (enabled) HARQ processes does not apply to disabled HARQ processes.](#_Toc79154038)
* For joint scheduling with feedback enable and disabled process, the legacy restriction on the out-of-order HARQ timing restriction should be kept. [ZTE]

Based on the inputs above, it seems that it’s still feasible and available to keep the legacy restriction in NTN case and following proposal is made:

**[Initial Proposal 3-1]:** For transmission of different PDSCHs with different HARQ processes, the legacy restriction on the out-of-order for HARQ process should be kept for both feedback-enabled and feedback-disabled HARQ process.

Please provide your views below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments and Views** |
| OPPO | Legacy OOO restriction should be kept. The network should ensure that OOO is not happened by indicating a suitable value of K1. This is same as R15/R16. |
| Samsung | Agree for feedback-enabled. Need more discussion on the meaning of OoO for feedback-disabled. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | We are OK with the proposal. |
| Apple | We are fine with the proposal. |
| FGI | Support. RAN1 may not support DL blind retransmission in Rel-17. It is better to keep the legacy restriction. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We feel a bit invalid discussion since it is unclear why no feedback is involved with OOO, which is a restriction of relationship between PDSCH receptions and corresponding feedbacks.  But we are OK with this proposal if majority really want to keep this restriction. NW can provide appropriate K1 value. |
| Vivo | Support. |
| ZTE | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Since there is no feedback on disabled HARQ process we do not think that it is applicable to out-of-order restrictions. Can the FL clarify the intent behind the proposal for disabled HARQ process? |
| Ericsson | Support |
| ITL | Support |
| QC | Support |
| Sony | Support |
| Panasonic | The proposal looks reasonable because UE processing timeline for feedback-disabled PDSCH should be same as the one for feedback-enabled PDSCH. |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Lenovo/MM | Support the proposal. |
| Sharp | Support |
| LG | Share the view with Huawei that it is unclear how to handle the disabled HARQ process. In the legacy (all feedback-enabled processes) restriction applied based on their ACK/NACK timing. However, in case of HARQ feedback-disabled process, how to handle the ACK/NACK timing is unclear. Are we assuming that K1 value in DCI with disabled process is still valid? |

In RAN1#105-e meeting, following agreement is achieved on the processing time for PDSCH.

Agreement:

Confirm the previous working assumption for X = T\_proc,1 where X is defined from the end of the reception of the last PDSCH or slot-aggregated PDSCH for a given HARQ process with disabled feedback to the start of the PDCCH carrying the DCI scheduling another PDSCH or set of slot-aggregated PDSCH for the given HARQ process.

Then, in this meeting, potential updates for the SPS case is proposed with following proposal from DCM as

* *Update the RAN1#105-e agreement*
  + *Confirm the previous working assumption for X = T\_proc,1 where X is defined from the end of the reception of the last PDSCH or slot-aggregated PDSCH for a given HARQ process with disabled feedback to the start of the PDCCH carrying the DCI scheduling another PDSCH or set of slot-aggregated PDSCH or the PDSCH without corresponding PDCCH for the given HARQ process.*

Since it’s first time to discuss the related topic for SPS and whether additional enhancements on SPS case including HARQ codebook enhancement and potential restriction on HARQ feedback disabling for SPS are still pending in section 2, the discussion can be postponed and please your views below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments and Views** |
| OPPO | Proposal is reasonable, we propose the following updates.   * + *Confirm the previous working assumption for X = T\_proc,1 where X is defined from the end of the reception of the last PDSCH or slot-aggregated PDSCH for a given HARQ process with disabled feedback to the start of the PDSCH with SPS or the PDCCH carrying the DCI scheduling another PDSCH or set of slot-aggregated PDSCH for the given HARQ process.* |
| Samsung | Support. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | OK |
| Apple | Agree |
| FGI | Not sure. T\_(proc, 1) has N1 related to SCS of the PDCCH scheduling the PDSCH. See TS 38.214 Clause 5.3. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Agree.  Note that this is talking PDSCH reception without PDCCH (i.e. SPS). The previous agreement uses PDCCH, so it does not work in SPS case. |
| Vivo | Agree. |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | It is ok to wait a bit until the pending discussion is concluded. |
| Ericsson | We agree that the discussion can be postponed until other SPS related discussion is concluded. |
| ITL | Support |
| QC | OK |
| Sony | Agree |
| Panasonic | Support |
| Spreadtrum | Support |
| Lenovo/MM | Agree. |
| Sharp | Support |
| LG | This can be discussed after some conclusion related to SPS PDSCH is made. |

Moreover, in this meeting, same proposal from [Qualcomm] enable UE, which may receive a DCI scheduling a PUSCH of a given HARQ process before the end of the transmission of another PUSCH of that HARQ process as shown below.



[OPPO] also propose to define a minimum gap (e.g., T\_proc,2) between two PUSCHs of a HARQ process and clarify the PUSCH transmission constraint and PDSCH reception constraint for a given enabled UL and DL HARQ process, respectively.

From moderator perspective:

1. According to existing process, only HARQ feedback disabling for the DL transmission is agreed, no additional enhancement has been considered for UL transmission.

*Agreement:*

*Enabling/disabling on HARQ feedback for downlink transmission should be at least configurable per HARQ process via UE specific RRC signaling*

Agreement from RAN2#112e:

1. From RAN2 perspective, for dynamic grant, one possibility for “enabling”/”disabling” HARQ uplink retransmission at UE transmitter is without introducing an additional mechanism (i.e. gNB can send grant with NDI not toggled/toggled without waiting for decoding result of previous PUSCH transmission). FFS on the handling of RTT timers. Other solutions for enabling/disabling HARQ UL reTX are not precluded
2. In the existing specification, w.r.t the PUSCH scheduling, followings are defined in 38.214:

*The UE is not expected to be scheduled to transmit another PUSCH by DCI format 0\_0, 0\_1 or 0\_2 scrambled by C-RNTI or MCS-C-RNTI for a given HARQ process until after the end of the expected transmission of the last PUSCH for that HARQ process.*

*If the first uplink symbol in the PUSCH allocation for a transport block, including the DM-RS, as defined by the slot offset K2 and the start and length indicator SLIV of the scheduling DCI and including the effect of the timing advance, is no earlier than at symbol L2, where* *L2 is defined as the next uplink symbol with its CP starting*  *after the end of the reception of the last symbol of the PDCCH carrying the DCI scheduling the PUSCH, then the UE shall transmit the transport block.*

Moreover, following conclusion has been achieved in RAN1#104e to further clarify the potential ambiguity on the scheduling part for legacy spec. And further discussion on other cases are still discussed parallel in this meeting.

|  |
| --- |
| **Conclusion**  For the sentence “The UE is not expected to be scheduled to transmit another PUSCH by DCI format 0\_0 or 0\_1 scrambled by C-RNTI or MCS-C-RNTI for a given HARQ process until after the end of the expected transmission of the last PUSCH for that HARQ process.” In TS 38.214 Clause 6.1,   * The common understanding is that the DCI is expected to be received after the end of the last PUSCH. |

Then, based on the above analysis and discussion in previous meeting, it seems that no consensus to introduce corresponding enhancement and companies are still encouraged to justify the necessity.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments and Views** |
| OPPO | From the last meeting, we have expressed that the constraint that a second DCI should already be received after the previous PUSCH transmission is not necessary in NTN. Therefore, companies should provide justification on the necessity of having this constraint. Otherwise, this constraint is artificial and should be removed. |
| Samsung | Agree with the conclusion. |
| FGI | Support. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We are supportive of breaking the scheduling restriction. |
| Vivo | Agree with the conclusion. |
| Xiaomi | Support the moderator. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We agree with the moderator’s conclusion. |
| Ericsson | We agree with the conclusion |
| ITL | Support |
| QC | The restriction that a second DCI always arrived later than the previous PUSCH is not necessary and will impose limit on throughput in NTN and complications in HARQ scheduling. |
| Panasonic | Agree with OPPO and QC. Removal of this constraint is preferable for NTN if it is not crucial for UE implementation. |
| Spreadtrum | Agree with the conclusion. |
| Lenovo/MM | Agree with the conclusion. |
| LG | Support |

# **Issue-4 Performance enhancement**

In RAN1#105e meeting, following agreement has been achieved:

Agreement:

Discussion of enhancement(s) on the aggregated transmission (including repetition) is prioritized to improve the performance in NTN.

In this meeting, following enhancements related to the aggregated transmission are summarized as:

* + Enhancement for DL vs UL

As highlighted by [Samsung], there is on-going discussion in Coverage Enhancement WI to improve the UL performance and corresponding progress is also applicable for NTN. Then, only downlink related enhancement should be considered in Rel-17 NTN and solutions to improve the PRACH/PDCCH will be postponed in Rel-18.

* + Larger aggregation factor:

For this aspect, as highlighted by [CATT, ETRI, MTK, IDC, Nokia, Samsung, ZTE], supports of larger aggregation factor is considered to be beneficial for NTN case. More specifically, [IDC] prefers to enlarge the value from 16 to 32.

* + Indication/configuration of aggregation factor/repetition factor:

For this aspect, following solutions are proposed to enhance the indication/configuration of corresponding parameter for enhanced transmission:

* + - DCI based indication: [Huawei, IDC] prefer to indicate the value via DCI by reinterpreting the idle bits with configuration depending on the orbit parameters.
    - [OPPO, Ericsson, Apple, ETRI] prefer to introduce different configurations for the transmission via HARQ process with enabled or disabled feedback.

Moreover, UE recommended repetition number is also proposed by [LG].

* + Transmission scheme:

For the aggregated transmission, following solutions are proposed to optimize the transmission：

* DM-RS related enhancement:
  + DM-RS density reduction in frequency domain [ZTE]
  + DM-RS bundling in time domain [MTK]
* Time interleaved aggregated transmission [CATT]

But for this aspect, further investigation is preferred by [NEC]

In additional, others solutions, e.g., enhancements on CQI/MCS table with new BLER [Qualcomm, Interdigital] with concern from [CATT], new UCI feedback in case of scheduling with disabled HARQ feedback[ETRI, Xiaomi], UE assistant information [Huawei], introduction on the priority order for transmission [CAICT], RV limitation for DL scheduling and different configuration on transmission parameters [Qualcomm] are proposed by proponent.

According to the above discussion and corresponding consideration on the overlapping/progress of other WI (i.e., CE WI), it’s recommended from feature leader perspective that the enhancement on DL is prioritized with following proposal:

**[Initial Proposal 4-1]:**

The maximum number of supported aggregation factor (i.e., pdsch-AggregationFactor) for DL PDSCH is [X]

* FFS: X = 16 or 32
* FFS: Whether different configurations are considered for the transmission via feedback-enabled or feedback-disabled-HARQ process

Please provide your views below：

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments and Views** |
| OPPO | Fine |
| Samsung | OK with X=32.  Do not support different configurations for feedback-enabled/feedback-disabled – the reasoning is against a main purpose for feedback-disabled (UE power consumption) and would result to poor spectral efficiency. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | We are OK with this proposal. As outlined in our contribution, we find that aggregation factor of 16 should be sufficient for most cases. We do not see a need for the second FFS. The aspect of aggregation is mainly to ensure that the transmission pipeline for a single UE may be maintained. So it should be indifferent to whether or not the HARQ feedback is disabled. |
| Apple | We support the proposal. |
| FGI | Support. Share the same view with Nokia. 16 may be sufficient. |
| NTT DOCOMO | OK. |
| Vivo | Fine with the proposal, and prefer X=32. |
| ZTE | Support |
| Xiaomi | Support, and different configurations for feedback-disabled or feedback-enabled HARQ process are supported. |
| Baicells | OK and prefer X=32. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support the initial proposal. |
| Ericsson | Further study is needed. Increased aggregation factor to 16 or 32 should be justified by a need for improved coverage. |
| ITL | Support |
| ETRI | Support Initial Proposal 4-1 and  Prefer X=32 and  Support different configurations for feedback-disabled or feedback-enabled HARQ process.  Regarding different configurations,   different configurations for feedback-disabled or feedback-enabled HARQ process might be helpful to achieve the better adaptation on transmission parameter for both cases. Without the different configurations, the aggregation factor might be set excessively to satisfy more challenging target BLER for the HARQ feedback disabled case, then unnecessary transmissions (throughput loss) might occur in the HARQ feedback enabled case. |
| QC | OK |
| Sony | Support |
| Panasonic | Support  BTW, our proposal in R1-2107469 (TB size scaling based on the number of repetitions) was not captured in above summary. |
| Spreadtrum | Support |
| Lenovo/MM | Support and prefer X=32. |
| Sharp | We are OK with the proposal. |
| LG | We are Ok with the proposal. |
| CMCC | Support |
| NEC | Support |

# **Issue-5 Restriction on HARQ feedback disabling**

In RAN1#102e meeting, following agreement has been achieved:

Agreement:

Enabling/disabling on HARQ feedback for downlink transmission should be at least configurable per HARQ process via UE specific RRC signaling

However, in current specification, some mechanisms, i.e., delivering MAC CE command, depend on the ACK-NACK feedback. To avoid the potential misalignment between gNB’s and UE’s behaviour, corresponding enhancements have been discussed in past meetings. In this meeting, ***following views are summarized:***

1. Option 1: UE expects that MAC-CEs are transmitted using HARQ processes with feedback enabled.[CATT, MTK, CAICT, CMCC, DCM, Nokia, Sony, InterDigital]
2. Option 2: Up to gNB’s implementation for scheduling [vivo, Baicell, NEC, Panasonic]

In addition, [vivo] prefer to introduce semi-static configured and dynamically switched on the HARQ disabling for addressing these two issues.

Moreover, as pointed by [Nokia], to avoid the same ambiguity for DCI carrying SPS release signalling, it’s preferred to also mandate corresponding scheduling via feedback enabled HARQ process.

As mentioned before, this issue has been discussed for several meetings and it seems that views from minority is still not changed. However, from specification perspective, it’s better to complete the design to avoid potential error case in future commercial deployment at early stage. Then, from moderator perspective, Option-1 can be taken with following proposal for MAC related issue and the SPS part will treated along the discussion for the general HARQ codebook enhancement in section 3:

**[Initial Proposal 5-1]:** UE expects that MAC-CEs are transmitted using HARQ processes with feedback enabled.

Please provide your views below. If you have strong concerns on this proposal, views on way-forward including justification are appreciated.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments and Views** |
| OPPO | Not agree. It is up to gNB implementation. |
| Samsung | Do not support.  The proposal defines the NW operation when there is no UE impact. That is inappropriate and something that RAN1 has no authority to discuss/decide. The proposal is even detrimental as the NW would need to wait for a HARQ enabled process to become available before issuing the MAC CE. There are also many other more important configurations for which HARQ-ACK feedback would be even more meaningful but that should also be up to the NW. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | We are OK to take this as a conclusion (as outlined in our contribution) |
| FGI | Support. Potential error cases can be handled in Rel-18. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support. Otherwise, UE behaviour when MAC CE is received via HARQ process with disabled feedback is unclear. |
| vivo | Not support. The scheduling with a given HARQ process to enable/disable HARQ feedback to send MAC CE can be left to gNB implementation. |
| ZTE | Support |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support the initial proposal. |
| QC | The proposal is too restrictive. Only MAC-CE commands whose application time depends on HARQ feedback need to be transmitted with HARQ-feedback enabled process. |
| Sony | Support |
| Panasonic | Not support. As discussed in several meetings, whether to use feedback-enabled process or feedback-disabled process for MAC-CE transmissions should be network implementation matter. There are no reasons to restrict the usage of feedback enabled/disabled process. |
| Spreadtrum | Support |
| Lenovo/MM | Support the proposal to guarantee reliability of MAC CE. |
| CAICT | Support |
| Sharp | We do not support. It is up to implementation. |
| CMCC | Support |
| NEC | Do not support as such a restriction is unnecessary. |

# **Summary for the 1st round discussion**

# **Issue-1 Enhanced HARQ process ID indication**

For the [Initial Proposal 1-1], 22 companies provided their views, and 20 companies [OPPO, Samsung, Nokia, FGI, NTT DOCOMO, vivo, Xiaomi, Baicells, Huawei, Ericsson, ITL, Qualcomm, Sony, Panasonic, Spreadtrum, Lenovo/MM, Sharp, LG, CMCC, NEC] support this proposal. vivo also highlights that such solution is only applicable when the maximum number of HARQ processes is configured to 32.

However, 2 companies [Apple, ZTE] are negative on this proposal due to worry about impact on specification and implementation complexity. Then, from moderator’s perspective, as the compromise for progress, following updated proposal is agreed in GTW session:

Agreement:

For enhancement on the HARQ process indication, extend the HARQ process ID field up to 5 bits for DCI 0-1/1-1 when the maximum supported HARQ processes number is configured as 32.

For the [Initial Proposal 1-2], 2 companies [Ericsson, Sharp] support this proposal in general and other views are shown below:

* Option 2 is supported by 6 companies [Apple, ZTE, Huawei, Qualcomm, CAICT, Sharp]. It can be the 2nd choice for [vivo]
* Option 3 is supported by 5 companies [Nokia, Xiaomi, ITL, Sharp, CMCC]
* Option 4 is preferred by 12 companies [OPPO, Samsung, FGI, NTT DOCOMO, vivo, Baicells, Sony, Panasonic, Lenovo/MM, LG, CMCC, NEC]. It can be the 2nd choice for [Nokia].

Companies preferring the Option-4, mainly have concerns on the necessity to support 32 HARQ process for fallback DCI. But [ZTE] also points out that for DCI 0-0/1-0, there are still use case to enable scheduling with larger HARQ process number. Moreover, [OPPO, Panasonic] mention the enhancements might cause potential ambiguity between gNB and UE.

Besides, [Apple] also provides a solution as to introduce a new RNTI to indicate the HARQ process number 16-31. Since companies’ views are still diverse now, and from moderator perspective, following updates with slight narrow down of option can be considered with following updated version:

**[Initial Proposal 1-2]:**

For enhancement on the HARQ process indication, one of following options for DCI 0-0/1-0 can be considered:

* Option 2: Reusing one bit from other bit field
* Option 4: No enhancement

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments and Views** |
| Apple | We are fine with the proposal, and we support Option 2.  Option 4 has an issue that UE has to be configured to monitor non-fallback DCIs in order to support 32 HARQ processes. This increases UE PDCCH monitoring efforts and is not preferred. |
| NTT DOCOMO | OK with this proposal.  We support Option 4. No enhancement is needed for fallback DCI. We do not see the motivation/use case of more than 16 HARQ processes in fallback DCI. And if more than 16 processes are needed, i.e. higher throughput is required, then non-fallback DCI is used. Why only fallback DCI is available is quite unclear. Fallback DCI + non-fallback DCI would be normal configuration in practice in TN. We think NTN as well. |
| ZTE | Supportive and prefer Option-1 |
| Sony | We are fine with the proposal at this stage. |
| NEC | We are ok with this proposal. For further down selection, we support option 4. |
| Panasonic | Support Option 4 |
| vivo | Support the proposal. Option 4 is the first priority. |
| CMCC | In fact, we prefer Option 3 (Extending the HARQ process ID field up to 5 bits) and Option 4.  If only Option 2 and Option 4 for down selection, we support Option 4. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option 2, considering the scheduling flexibility of DCI0-0/1-0 |
| ETRI | We are fine with the proposal |
| Baicells | Both Option2 and Option4 are fine, and Option4 is more preferred due to simplicity.  To support Option2, we think more evidence on the throughput requirement of the fall-back DCI is welcome. |
| Ericsson | We are fine with the proposal. We prefer Option 4. |

# **Issue-2 HARQ codebook enhancements**

# **Enhancement on Type-1 Codebook (Semi-static codebook):**

For the [Initial Proposal 2-1], according to the feedback:

12 companies [Samsung, FGI,vivo, ZTE, Baicells, Ericsson, ITL, Sony, Lenovo/MM, CAICT, LG, NEC] are supportive for the proposal but 6 companies [OPPO, Apple, NTT DOCOMO, Xiaomi, Huawei, Panasonic] has concerns on this proposal. Moreover, [Nokia] comments it might cause a problem if the entire codebook generation is dropped in case no feedback enabled processes have feedback. And [Nokia] further provides a modified version, which is also supported by [Qualcomm, FGI, CMCC]. In addition, [NTT DOCOMO] mentions if NACK is reported for PDSCH receptions with disabled feedback, decoding performance can be improved. Then, from moderator’s perspective, for sake of progress, we can try to discuss this topic with following cases:

* Case-1: No DCI is detected by UE;
* Case-2: Only DCI carrying feedback-disabled HARQ process is detected by UE without unsuccessful detection of DCI carrying feedback-enable HARQ process
* Case-3: Only DCI carrying feedback-disabled HARQ process is detected by UE with unsuccessful detection of DCI carrying feedback-enable HARQ process
* Case-4: DCIs carrying the feedback-disabled and feedback-enabled HARQ processes are detected by UE.

Based on current spec, the behaviour is clear for Case-1 and for remaining cases. Based on the discussion, following agreement has been achieved in GTW session:

Agreement:

* For Type-1 HARQ codebook, if DCIs carrying the feedback-disabled and feedback-enabled HARQ processes are detected by UE, one of following options should be supported:
  + Option-1: The UE will report NACK only for the feedback-disabled HARQ process regardless of decoding results of corresponding PDSCH
  + Option-2: The UE will report NACK/ACK for the feedback-disabled HARQ process depending on the decoding results of corresponding PDSCH
* FFS: Other cases, e.g., if only DCI carrying feedback-disabled HARQ process is detected by UE

For accelerate the progress, I’d like to check company’s views for further down-selection on Option-1/Option-2, please provide your views below with consideration on the previous agreement on PDSCH processing time and pro/con for each Option.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Preference** | **Comments** |
| Apple | Option 1 | This option has the coding gain as some bits are known before Polar decoding.  Although Option 2 carries more information for the PDSCH with HARQ feedback disabled, these bits are not used in HARQ retransmission. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Option 1 | Motivation is the following:  1. Decoding performance  “NACK” bits are pre-known at gNB. The information can be used for the decoding, i.e. reliability performance is improved even in this option.  2. Processing time constraints  At the last meeting, processing time for disabled feedback was agreed, which is that processing time between the last PDSCH and the next PDCCH is ensured by gNB scheduler. Option 1 keeps this rule. However, Option 2 violates this agreement. Option 2 leads to further discussions on processing time constraints, which is not preferred.  We feel that companies supporting Option 2 should share views on issues of Option 2 that are raised by companies. Just “no enhancement is preferred” would not be good way... BTW, for us, both options are a kind of enhancement since disabled feedback is new feature. |
| ZTE | Option-1 | We prefer to take Option-1 to satisfy the processing time constraint |
| Xiaomi | Option 1 | Option 1 can relax the decoding timeline in the UE side and relax the scheduling timeline in the gNB side. |
| Sony | Option 1 | We prefer the option 1 which could improve reliability. |
| NEC | Option-1 | Option-1 is preferred to avoid misalignment with previous agreement on processing time. |
| Panasonic | Option 2 | Optimization is not necessary in our view. Existing behavior (i.e. option 2) would be preferable from spec impact and UE complexity point of view. With option 2, discussion on FFS point is not necessary. |
| vivo | Option-2 | The UEs need to decode the PDSCH to deliver packets to the higher layer regardless of HARQ-ACK feedback enabled or disabled, and the NACK/ACK information of disabled HARQ processes could provide some assistant information for the link adaptation. And how to utilize these NACK/ACKs based on Option-2, can be left to NW implementation. Thus, we prefer Option-2. |
| CMCC | Option 2 | Option 2 is preferred for no spec impact and it can provide more feedback information by free.  If Option 2 is supported and if NACK feedback is received for the feedback-disabled HARQ process, the gNB may not need to wait to RLC ARQ feedback, but to qucikly reschedule a new transmission carrying the old TB by network implementation. Thus, although the soft combination gain is lost, the retransmission delay may be significantly reduced if reliable transmission is still required. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option-1 | The detection performance of channel decoder can be improved for both Reed-Mueller code and polar code with some bit are known by the gNB. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Option 2 | This option will allow for the maximum amount of information to be conveyed from the UE to the gNB. If the UE is to provide Type-1 codebook we may as well carry the information that is available (as already pointed out during the online session). |
| Baicells | FFS | 1. Performance  For Option-1, the decoding gain in coodbook decoding using pre-known “NACK” bits may exit but is unclear.  For Option-2, better PDSCH performance can be obtained due to link adaptation based on actual NACK/ACK feedback.  2. Processing time constraints  We think both Option-1 and Option-2 do not violate the processing time constraints.  3. what is disabled for a disabled HARQ?  Maybe we shall change the wording “feedback-disabled” to “re-transmission disabled”. |
|  |  |  |

Meanwhile, w.r.t the following remaining issue,

* FFS: Other cases, e.g., if only DCI carrying feedback-disabled HARQ process is detected by UE

Views on from companies are welcomed on following proposal:

**[Initial Proposal 2-3]:**

* For Type-1 HARQ codebook, if only DCI carrying feedback-disabled HARQ process is detected by UE, one of following options should be supported:
  + Option-1: The UE’s behavior is same as the case if DCIs carrying the feedback-disabled and feedback-enabled HARQ processes are detected by UE
  + Option-2: The UE should skip the codebook feedback

Please be free to share your views and preference with justification.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Apple | Option 1. We do not think the “codebook dropping” optimization is worth to support. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Again, postponing is needed. Feedback on PUCCH can be agreed, but feedback on PUSCH is related to [106-e-NR-7.1CRs-07]. If we need to have some progress, we suggest to discuss only for PUCCH case, and put an FFS for PUSCH case. |
| ZTE | Option-2 can be considered |
| Xiaomi | Option 1. |
| Sony | We support option-2. |
| NEC | Option 2 for feedback on PUCCH. OK to put an FFS for PUSCH as suggested by DOCOMO. |
| Panasonic | Option 1. Existing behavior (i.e. reporting type 1 HARQ-ACK regardless of the contents of detected DCI) is sufficient. |
| vivo | We prefer Option-2.  For Case-2, within the  occasion, only disabled HARQ processes are transmitted, the HARQ-ACK feedback are not expected.  For Case-3, within the  occasion, both enabled and disabled HARQ processes are transmitted but only disabled HARQ processes are detected, the HARQ-ACK feedback are expected by gNB, if UEs do not feedback the HARQ-ACK, then PDCCH DTX can be detected by gNB.  For Case-2 and Case-3, the UE behavior can be the same as Case-1, therefore we prefer Option-2. |
| CMCC | We support Option 2.  Note that Option 2 is not a “codebook generating” rule, but exactly a “codebook dropping” rule.  In Case 1 (No DCI is detected by UE), no codebook is generated and reported.  In Case 2 (Only DCI carrying feedback-disabled HARQ process is detected by UE without unsuccessful detection of DCI carrying feedback-enable HARQ process), legacy codebook is generated but dropped. In this case, no ambiguity occurs since neither gNB nor UE expects for the report.  In Case 3 (Only DCI carrying feedback-disabled HARQ process is detected by UE with unsuccessful detection of DCI carrying feedback-enable HARQ process), legacy codebook is generated but dropped. In this case, ambiguity due to missing detection of DCI for a PDSCH with a feedback-enabled HARQ processes occurs, i.e., gNB expected a HARQ-ACK feedback but UE missed it. But luckily the above ambiguity may be not an issue, since gNB knows to retransmit PDSCH with feedback-enabled HARQ processes, even if it receives no HARQ feedback.  In Case 4 (DCIs carrying the feedback-disabled and feedback-enabled HARQ processes are detected by UE), legacy codebook is generated and reported.  Based on the above discussion, only in Case 3, there may be ambiguity due to missing detection of DCI for a PDSCH with a feedback-enabled HARQ processes occurs but it will cause no issue.  Furthermore, in Case 2, both PUCCH resource overhead for carrying HARQ-ACK feedback as configured by the gNB and UE battery consumption for sending PUCCH can be reduced.  In Case 3, UE battery consumption for sending PUCCH carrying HARQ-ACK feedback can be reduced.  Thus, Option 2 is beneficial at least for saving UE battery consumption in many cases. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option-1. The occasions when only feedback-disabled HARQ processes are carried by DCI are rare. Consistent behavior for the UE makes most sense and it should transmit the Type-1 HARQ codebook regardless of the DCI scheduling information. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | As we pointed out during the first round of comments, we would like to have clarified that this is only a viable solution for cases where the UE is not carried on the PUSCH, as it would otherwise crease a risk of gNB and UE not having the same understanding of the UL transmission configuration. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | As we pointed out during the first round of comments, we would like to have clarified that this is only a viable solution for cases where the UE is not carried on the PUSCH, as it would otherwise crease a risk of gNB and UE not having the same understanding of the UL transmission configuration. |
| Baicells | Option2 |
| Ericsson | We prefer Option-2. In case most HARQ processes are feedback-disabled in a large RTT scenario, it may commonly happen that no feedback-enabled processes are received in slots corresponding to a Type-1 codebook and in that case sending the feedback will waste UL resources and UE battery and generate unnecessary interference. But we also agree with Nokia that the issue of multiplexing with other UCI should be clarified. |

# **Enhancement on Type-3 Codebook:**

For the [Initial Proposal 2-2], according to the feedback from 17 companies.

12 companies [FGI, vivo, ZTE, Xiaomi, Baicells, Huawei, Ericsson, ITL, Spreadtrum, Lenovo/MM, CAICT, LG] are supportive.

But 5 companies [OPPO, Samsung, Nokia, NTT DOCOMO, Panasonic] object this proposal. [Nokia] comments Type-3 HARQ codebook should remain constant in size, and the Type-3 HARQ codebook is the least efficient codebook and there’s no need optimize it. Then, from moderator’s perspective, with consideration on the whole specification design, the argument to preclude the enhancement for Type-3 codebook due to the applicability in NTN is not reasonable since the usage of any feature defined in spec is purely implementation based choice. W.r.t the concern from Nokia, e.g., impact on constant size, optimization on the size can also be considered to reduce the overhead to improve the efficiency.

**[Initial Proposal 2-2]:** For Type-3 HARQ codebook in NTN, the UE should skip the codebook feedback for a feedback-disabled HARQ processes

Please be free to share your views if there is update on your positions or any other suggestion.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Apple | The statement of “skip the codebook” is unclear to us.  Does the proposal mean the Type-3 HARQ codebook only includes the feedback bits for HARQ process with feedback enabled, or does that mean that the whole Type-3 HARQ codebook is dropped when it only associated with HARQ processes with feedback disabled? |
| NTT DOCOMO | Not support.  Type-3 was introduced mainly for unlicensed spectrum. Although this is available in licensed spectrum as well, but the motivation is not well known. Firstly why type-3 is needed for NTN (licensed spectrum) should be clarified. We meet many similar situations, and if no enhancement works well in the situations, no enhancement tends to be agreed. For example, PRACH and beam/BWP operation in 8.4.4. There, necessity is clarified. The same work flow should be done. |
| Xiaomi | Support.  In our understanding, skip means omitting the feedback for feedback-disabled HARQ processes, and there are feedback bits for feedback-enabled HARQ processes in the Type-3 HARQ codebook. |
| NEC | Support the proposal. |
| Panasonic | Not support. Type-3 HARQ codebook is less useful in NTN although it may be supported as mentioned above by Moderator. Therefore, optimization is not necessary in our view. Furthermore, “skip the codebook feedback” is not clear to us. (drop the whole codebook or transmit the codebook but not include disabled process in the codebook) |
| vivo | Support the proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support the initial proposal 2-2. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Type-3 HARQ codebook was introduced with the sole purpose of providing HARQ-ACK for the all HARQ processes. As we see it, this codebook should be out of scope as we have two better alternatives for providing HARQ-ACK feedback. No need to waste time on a codebook that is not a realistic candidate for NTN operation. |
| Baicells | Positive. |
| Ericsson | Support. |

# **Enhancement on Type-2 Codebook:**

For the [Initial Proposal 2-3], 20 companies provided the feedback,

14 companies [Nokia, FGI, NTT DOCOMO, vivo, ZTE, Baicells, Huawei, Ericsson, ITL, Qualcomm, Spreadtrum, Lenovo/MM, LG, CMCC] are fine with this proposal.

But 5 companies [OPPO, Samsung, Apple, Panasonic, NEC] object this proposal.[Samsung] comments the benefit and A specification impact and gNB/UE adjustments in the Type-2 codebook construction need to be justified. [Samsung] also propose to remove all unnecessary bits from DCI 1\_1 in case of HARQ disabled process and align with DCI 0\_1. And [Apple, Panasonic] prefer only T-DAI is the count of feedback-enabled processes.

Besides, [Xiaomi] reminds when feedback for some HARQ processes is disabled, C-DAI/T-DAI counting for the HARQ disable processes still can bring some benefits. [CAICT] proposes C-DAI/T-DAI are not included in the DCI.

Then, from moderator’s perspective, companies are encouraged to compromise if there no serious problems raised. Since the details of each side is clear, I’d like to check following proposals with following alternatives:

**[Updated Proposal 2-3]:**

* For the DCI of PDSCH with feedback-disabled HARQ processes, only one of following is supported:
  + Option-1: the C-DAI and T-DAI are the count of feedback-enabled processes, despite they are not incremented
    - FFS: the UE’s behavior
  + Option-2: The C-DAI and T-DAI are ignored by the UE regardless of the value

It should be noticed, based on the 1st round discussion, **other options have already been precluded due to the limited support. Let’s focus on these two options only. Moreover, for proponent of Option-1, please also provide the details on the expected UE behavior as highlighted by the FFS:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Apple | We are against this proposal.  One main benefit of Option 1 over Option 2 is that the T-DAI is used to obtain the HARQ codebook size. We do not think C-DAI is really used in achieving this functionality. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support. Option 1 is preferred.  Misalignment between gNB and UE due to misdetection can be avoided by Option 1. We think reducing the field is possible only when all processes are configured with feedback-disabled. The gain is limited. |
| ZTE | Option-2 since the UE’s behavior is clearer. For Option-1, it seems that UE will eventually ignore the field for codebook generation. |
| NEC | We prefer option-2. |
| Panasonic | Just ignoring C-DAI and T-DAI like option 2 would make less sense. We support direction of option 1, but we prefer only T-DAI counts the feedback-enabled process while C-DAI should be reserved to allow to use it as other purpose because C-DAI is less useful. |
| vivo | We prefer Option-1.  The UEs determine the size of the type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook due to the DAI which are the count of feedback-enabled processes. If some PDCCH for enabled HARQ process are missed, the DAI in DCIs for disabled HARQ process can help the UE to detect the PDCCH miss, especially the PDCCH miss happened in the last slot of the  occasion. |
| CMCC | Same view with Apple and Panasonic that we prefer only T-DAI counts the feedback-enabled process. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option-1. As analyzed in our contribution, the values of C-DAI and T-DAI can be used as assistance information for UE to know the miss detection of PDCCH scheduling the HARQ feedback enabled PDSCH for some cases. It is beneficial that UE should read the information of C-DAI and T-DAI. In addition, UE will decode all the bits anyway as they are encoded by the same channel encoder, there is no extra complexity when the C-DAI and T-DAI are not ignored. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Probably the proposal should be updated to reflect that it is related to Type-2 HARQ codebook. As earlier stated, we have a preference for the option 1. It is not exactly clear to us what is expected in terms of describing the UE behaviour. |
| Baicells | Option1 |
| Ericsson | We prefer Option-1. UE should use the DAI in DCI of PDSCH with feedback-disabled HARQ process to detect if a previous DCI of PDSCH with feedback-enabled HARQ processes has been missed. |

# **Discussion on SPS issue**

For the [Initial Proposal 2-4], 8 companies [Nokia, Apple, ZTE, Xiaomi, Spreadtrum, Lenovo/MM, LG, CMCC] are fine with this proposal. 1 company [vivo] is negative on this proposal. Moreover, [Ericsson, Qualcomm] propose RAN1 should await RAN2 conclusion because it is discussed in RAN2 whether HARQ processes for SPS PDSCH can be disabled or not.

Regarding details on Alt-1 or Alt-2, 6 companies [Samsung, FGI, Huawei, Sony, Lenovo/MM, CMCC] prefer Alt-2. The concerns on Alt-1 include that Alt-1 may make an RAN2 impact when HARQ feedback is disabled and TA timer is still running. For Alt-1, [ZTE] clarifies that UE shall transmit corresponding HARQ-ACK even the HARQ process number associated with disabled feedback, and 2 company [Panasonic, CAICT] prefer Alt-1.

Besides, [OPPO] clarifies that SPS PDSCH release and activation should be separately discussed. And [OPPO] prefers same behaviour on HARQ-codebook feedback and DCI counting between SPS PDSCH activation and DCI scheduled PDSCH. [Xiaomi] asks to clarify whether UE always feedback for SPS activation/release. And [Apple, NTT DOCOMO, Huawei] point out whether SPS PDSCH transmission need to be considered.

Then, from moderator’s perspective, it seems that companies may still have different understanding on whether the previous agreement on HARQ disabling is also applicable for SPS. Then, before further discussion on other details, following proposal to clarify the situation is preferred.

**[Initial Proposal 2-5]**

For SPS PDSCH transmission, the feedback for the HARQ process associated to SPS PDSCH transmission can be disabled by RRC configuration.

Please provide your views below：

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments and Views** |
| Apple | Agree |
| NTT DOCOMO | Not support, and Question.  Configuration for disabled feedback is shared between dynamic PDSCH and SPS PDSCH? Or separate configuration?  If shared, a SPS-Config uses multiple HARQ processes and they are decided based on e.g. slot index. Then sometimes enabled, sometimes disabled. Is this reasonable behavior?  If separate, why configuration per HARQ process is needed for SPS? |
| ZTE | Agree, we need to firstly clarify whether the disabling for SPS is needed or not. Then, we can confirm whether it will be shared with DG or not. |
| Xiaomi | Agree. |
| Panasonic | Support. |
| vivo | Agree. |
| CMCC | Support. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We share the view from DOCOMO that the HARQ process number for SPS PDSCH are dependent on slot index.  On the other hand, the issue would not depend on whether the disabled HARQ-ACK configuration between dynamic PDSCH and SPS PDSCH is shared or not. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | This is better addressed in RAN2. |
| Baicells | Agree |
| Ericsson | This is an ongoing discussion in RAN2. RAN1 should await RAN2 conclusion. |

# **Additional limits on PDCCH construction:**

For this topic, 15 companies provide the feedback and more specifically, only one company is supportive to introduce the optimization on the DCI size. [Apple, Nokia] has concerns on the feasibility on the optimization since UE may not decode the DCI without information on whether the feedback of corresponding DCI is enable or disabled. Then, from moderator’s perspective, proponent of corresponding enhancement is preferred to conduct the offline discussion with others.

# **Issue-3 PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling restriction**

For [Initial Proposal 3-1], 19 companies provide their views, and 16 companies [OPPO, Nokia, Apple, FGI, NTT DOCOMO, vivo, ZTE, Xiaomi, Ericsson, ITL, Qualcomm, Sony, Panasonic, Spreadtrum, Lenovo/MM, Sharp] are fine with the proposal.

[Samsung] agrees to keep the legacy restriction on the OoO for feedback-enabled HARQ process, while meaning of OoO for feedback-disabled HARQ process is not clear. [NTT DOCOMO, Huawei, LG] also share similar concern. [Panasonic] responds that UE processing timeline for feedback-disabled PDSCH should be same as the one for feedback-enabled PDSCH.

With consideration on the discussion over reflector and GTW, it seems that companies has different understanding on the issues. Then, more detailed proposal (aligned with description in current spec, i.e., 38.214) is provided:

**[Updated proposal 3-1]:**

* For the case that either one or all of two PDSCHs is associated with feedback-disabled HARQ process
  + The following legacy restriction is applied:
    - In a given scheduled cell, the UE is not expected to receive a first PDSCH and a second PDSCH, starting later than the first PDSCH, with its corresponding HARQ-ACK assigned to be transmitted on a resource ending before the start of a different resource for the HARQ-ACK assigned to be transmitted for the first PDSCH, and the HARQ-ACK for the two PDSCHs are associated with the HARQ-ACK codebook of the same priority.
    - In a given scheduled cell, the UE is not expected to receive a first PDSCH, and a second PDSCH, starting later than the first PDSCH, with its corresponding HARQ-ACK assigned to be transmitted on a resource ending before the start of a different resource for the HARQ-ACK assigned to be transmitted for the first PDSCH if the HARQ-ACK for the two PDSCHs are associated with HARQ-ACK codebooks of different priority
  + **For the PDSCH associated feedback-disabled HARQ process, the determination of the resource assigned for the HARQ-ACK feedback is same as the case that this PDSCH is associated with feedback-enabled HARQ process regardless of whether the HARQ-ACK feedback is needed**.
    - **FFS: The HARQ-ACK feedback is true HARQ-ACK or an artificially generated value**

Please provide your views:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Apple | Agree |
| NTT DOCOMO | Again, why this restriction is necessary for feedback-disabled? At least several companies have concern on this, so clarification should be presented.  The issue is that basically UE has processors per cell, not per HARQ process and thus even when disabled process is involved to the situation assumed in the proposal, same rule is needed to keep PDSCH processing order. Is it correct?  If correct, we are fine with this proposal. |
| ZTE | Agree. In general, we try to keep the legacy UE’s behavior or processing order without additional changes. |
| Xiaomi | Agree. |
| Sony | Support. |
| NEC | Support the proposal. |
| Panasonic | Support. |
| vivo | Agree.  The HARQ-ACK feedback resource assigned can keep the legacy restriction on the OoO, whether the HARQ-ACK feedback is needed or what value to feedback depend on the strategy of the HARQ-ACK codebook type. |
| CMCC | Support. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We still don’t quite understand why the OoO restriction should be applied for feedback disabled HARQ process. Is the premise here that K1 is always present also for feedback-disabled HARQ processes? |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | We would be OK with this proposal. |
| Ericsson | We are fine with this proposal. |

# **Issue-4 Performance enhancement**

In RAN1#105e meeting, following agreement has been achieved:

Agreement:

Discussion of enhancement(s) on the aggregated transmission (including repetition) is prioritized to improve the performance in NTN.

For [Initial Proposal 4-1], 18 companies [OPPO, Apple, NTT DOCOMO, ZTE, Xiaomi, Baicells, Huawei, ITL, ETRI, Qualcomm, Sony, Panasonic, Spreadtrum, Lenovo/MM, Sharp, LG, CMCC, NEC] are fine with this proposal.

1 company [Ericsson] suggests that increased aggregation factor need to be further justified.

As to more details in FFS parts, in the first sub-bullet, companies [Samsung, Nokia, FGI, vivo, Baicells, ETRI] have different preferences on the values of X. For the different configuration for the transmission via feedback-enabled or feedback-disabled-HARQ process, [Samsung, Nokia] have some concerns e.g., that may waste UE power consumption, and would result to poor spectral efficiency. Then, from moderator’s perspective, the FFS part can be discussed with more details in next meeting, and companies are encouraged to achieve consensus based on the main sentence in this proposal. And the proposal 4-1 is updated for approval in the GTW session.

**[Initial Proposal 4-1]:**

The maximum number of supported aggregation factor (i.e., pdsch-AggregationFactor) for DL PDSCH is [X]

* FFS: X = 16 or 32
* FFS: Whether different configurations are considered for the transmission via feedback-enabled or feedback-disabled-HARQ process

Please provide your views if you have strong concerns:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments and Views** |
| Panasonic | Support |
| vivo | Fine with the proposal, and prefer 32. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | We would suggest to update the first FFS such that it includes the value 8 (meaning that no enhancements are applied – this would address Ericsson’s request for further justification). Still, we are uncertain what the “different configurations” is addressing here. So from our point of view, the second FFS could be dropped. |
| ETRI | We are fine with the proposal,  Regarding the larger aggregation factor, it is observed that some cases in NTN might suffer from the reliability issue even with the lowest MCS(=0) and the max. aggregation factor (=8).  We think that at least 1 (or more) transmission parameter(s) should be provided to satisfy the target reliability surely for each NTN case. |
| Ericsson | We do not support this proposal. The purpose of increasing the DL aggregation factor should be better understood. But with the addition proposed by Nokia we are fine with it. |

# **Issue-5 Restriction on HARQ feedback disabling**

For the [Initial Proposal 5-1], 16 companies feedback, and 10 companies [Nokia, FGI, NTT DOCOMO, ZTE, Huawei, Sony, Spreadtrum, Lenovo/MM, CAICT, CMCC] are fine with this proposal. Meanwhile, [Nokia] prefers to take it as a conclusion.

7 companies [OPPO, Samsung, vivo, Qualcomm, Panasonic, Sharp, NEC] have concerns on the initial proposal and prefer to take it as gNB’s implementation. [Samsung] also mentions the initial proposal defines the NW operation when there is no UE impact, and some limitation on using MAC CE would be introduced. And [Qualcomm] share similar view that it is too restrictive for use of MAC CE commands.

This issue has been discussed for several meetings and same views are still held by each companies. Then, from moderator perspective, we prefer to keep the original proposal to avoid potential error due to the unexpected scheduling. In general, we may need to strive to define a complete standard. W.r.t the concerns from QC, in current spec, the timing behavior is applied for MAC CE in general, then, same behavior can be expected for this restriction.

**[Initial Proposal 5-1]:** UE expects that MAC-CEs are transmitted using HARQ processes with feedback enabled.

Please provide your views if you have strong concerns:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments and Views** |
| Panasonic | Not support. This should be gNB’s implementation matter. This restriction would cause the situation where gNB has to wait MAC CE transmission for feedback-enabled process becoming available. Note that gNB would easily run out of all configured feedback-enabled processes in a scenario with long RTT and/or large SCS, e.g. LEO 1200km with 120kHz. |
| vivo | Not support. The scheduling with a given HARQ process to enable/disable HARQ feedback to send MAC CE can be left to gNB implementation. There is no need to introduce the restriction on the HARQ process to send MAC CE commends. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | We maintain the same view and would be OK with this. |

# **Conclusion**

In this summary, following proposals are made according to the contribution submitted in AI 8.4.3:

# **Appendix**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Contribution | Observation/Proposals |
| R1-2106484 Huawei | Observation 1: For DCI format 0\_0/1\_0, extending the HARQ process ID field would introduce extra complexity at UE side.  Observation 2: The case where all the scheduled HARQ processes are disabled is a rare corner case as there is a high likelihood that the HARQ codebook contains the feedback for TAC.  Observation 3: With disabling mechanism, if gNB still reserve all feedback resources based on the occasions, a large number of resources would be waste.  Observation 4: As long as one enabled HARQ process is scheduled, the gNB has to reserve feedback resources anyway as UE miss-detection is unpredictable.  Observation 5: For Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook, by skipping the feedback of PDSCH occasions from disabled HARQ process, the signalling overhead can be reduced as large as 32x.  Observation 6: UE can be configured to know whether a PDSCH occasion is for feedback disabled or enabled HARQ processes.  Observation 7: For Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook, when the only enabled DCI miss-detected, the benefit of skipping feedback to reduce signalling overhead is marginal.  Observation 8: For Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook, keeping the true values of C-DAI and T-DAI as the count of feedback-enabled HARQ processes can be useful to detect DCI missing at the UE.  Observation 9: If one serving cell is configured and only C-DAI is present in the DCI, C-DAI for the disabled HARQ process should not be reserved in order to detect DCI missing.  Proposal 1: For DCI format 0\_1/1\_1, the field of HARQ process number is extended to 5 bits in NTN.  Proposal 2: For DCI format 0\_0/1\_0, keep the fixed 4 bits of HARQ process number field and support indication of HARQ process ID via reusing idle bits of DCI.  Proposal 3: For Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook, a UE can be configured with a bitmap which indicates a set of PDSCH occasions for which HARQ-ACK feedback is provided.  Proposal 4: In Type-2 codebook, for the DCI of PDSCH with feedback-disabled HARQ process, give true values of C-DAI and T-DAI as the count of feedback-enabled processes.  Proposal 5: For Type-3 HARQ-ACK codebook, skip the feedback of PDSCH occasions from disabled HARQ processes.  Proposal 6: Aggregation/repetition transmission parameters can be configured depends on orbital height.  Proposal 7: Aggregation/repetition transmission parameters can be indicated via DCI.  Proposal 8: Reinterpret idle bits in DCI for indicating transmission parameters.  Proposal 9: UE assistance information reporting in reserved resource can be considered for NTN. |
| R1-2106593  vivo | Proposal 1：Support to indicate enhanced HARQ process ID by the following:   * For DCI 0-1/1-1, extend the HARQ process ID field to 5 bits if the maximum number of HARQ processes is configured to 32 by the high layer. * For DCI 0-0/1-0, at least the following alternatives can be considered:   + Alt 1: do not support 32 HARQ processes.   + Alt 2: re-interpret existing DCI field to indicate the extension of HARQ process ID, e.g. the LSB of the MCS indication.   + Alt 3：extend the number of scrambled CRC parity bits to indicate the MSB of the HARQ process ID.   Proposal 2: The scheduling with a given HARQ process to enable/disable HARQ feedback to send MAC CE is up to gNB implementation.  Proposal 3: The functionality of enabling/disabling HARQ feedback per HARQ process can be semi-static configured and dynamically switched.  Proposal 4：Support to enhance HARQ-ACK codebook as below:   * For Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook:   + If enabled HARQ processes or SPS PDSCH release are transmitted in the occasions, no enhancement.   + If only disabled HARQ processes are transmitted in the occasions, omit the HARQ-ACK report. * For Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook:   + DAI counts only PDSCH with enabled HARQ processes and SPS PDSCH release.     - The value of T-DAI in a DCI format denotes the total number of {serving cell, PDCCH monitoring occasion}-pair(s) in which PDSCH reception(s) with enabled HARQ and SPS PDSCH release associated with the DCI formats up to the current PDCCH monitoring occasion.     - The value of C-DAI in a DCI format denotes the accumulative number of {serving cell, PDCCH monitoring occasion}-pair(s) in which PDSCH reception(s) with enabled HARQ or SPS PDSCH release associated with the DCI formats up to the current serving cell and current PDCCH monitoring occasion. * For Type-3 HARQ-ACK codebook:   + HARQ-ACK codebook includes HARQ-ACK of all the enabled HARQ processes in one shot. |
| R1-2106703 Spreadtrum | Proposal 1: For enhancement on the HARQ process indication, extend the HARQ process ID field up to 5 bits for DCI 0-1/1-1 should also be supported.  Proposal 2: No enhancement is needed for the Type-1 codebook.  Proposal 3: PDCCH indicating SPS PDSCH activation when the related SPS PDSCH is HARQ feedback disabled should be included in counting of C-DAI and T-DAI.  Proposal 4: Enhancement for Type-3 HARQ codebook should be considered, if it is supported in NTN. |
| R1-2106756  Baicells | 1. If 32 HARQ processes are configured, extending the HARQ process ID field up to 5 bits for non-fallback DCI 0-1/1-1. 2. No HARQ enhancement for DCI 0-0/1-0 is needed. 3. Type 2 HARQ-ACK codebook can be optimized, and the C-DAI and T-DAI are the count of feedback-enabled processes, despite they are not incremented. 4. Type-1 codebook can be enhancement by ignoring the transmission occasions with disabled HARQ processes. 5. For Type-3 HARQ codebook, enhancement should be considered to reduce the unnecessary overhead. 6. The MAC-CEs are transmitted with enabled/disabled HARQ processes depending on the specific implementation of network operators. |
| R1-2106807  Sony | Observation 1: When HARQ feedback is disabled for some HARQ processes, the redundant feedback bits of Type-1 / semi-static HARQ-ACK codebook would be large based on current HARQ-ACK codebook design  Proposal 1: UE expects that any PDSCH carrying a MAC CE command, whose activation/deactivation time is coupled to the transmission time of the associated HARQ-ACK, is scheduled via a HARQ process with HARQ feedback enabled.  Proposal 2: HARQ codebook enhancement is supported as:   * For Type-1 HARQ codebook, reduce codebook size with keeping the codebook size semi-static.   + When all HARQ processes are feedback disabled for one secondary cell, the UE does not reserve HARQ ACK/NACK bits for that secondary cell.   + Reduce the Type-1 HARQ codebook size by restricting the scheduling occasion, e.g., restricted TDRA table of feedback enabled HARQ process. * For Type-2 HARQ codebook, the value of the counter/total DAI field in the DCI of PDSCH with feedback-disabled HARQ process are given the count value of {serving cell, PDCCH monitoring occasion}-pair(s) who’s associated PDSCH is HARQ feedback enabled.   Proposal 3: UE reports HARQ feedback information for the SPS PDSCH activation when the related SPS PDSCH is HARQ feedback disabled.  Proposal 4: The counter DAI, total DAI and DAI in DCI format 0\_1 count for PDCCH indicating SPS PDSCH activation when the related SPS PDSCH is HARQ feedback disabled.  Proposal 5: The UE reports HARQ feedback information for the SPS PDSCH release, either the related SPS PDSCH is HARQ feedback disabled or enabled.  Proposal 6: The counter DAI, total DAI and DAI in DCI format 0\_1 count for PDCCH indicating SPS PDSCH release, either the related SPS PDSCH is HARQ feedback disabled or enabled. |
| [R1-2106886](file:///D:\Documents\3GPP%20documents\RAN1\TSGR1_106-e\Docs\R1-2106886.zip)  Samsung | Proposal 1: For the Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook, support configuration to a UE of a bitmap that indicates slots where the UE should generate HARQ-ACK information.  Proposal 2: When HARQ-ACK for a HARQ process with disabled HARQ-ACK report is included in a Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook, the UE reports for the HARQ process:   * HARQ-ACK with NACK value when the Type-1 codebook size is not larger than 11 bits, and * HARQ-ACK as in Rel-16 when the Type-1 codebook size is larger than 11 bits.   Proposal 3: A DCI format scheduling a PDSCH reception for a HARQ process with disabled HARQ-ACK does not include the PRI, a PUSCH-to-HARQ\_feedback timing, counter DAI, and TPC command fields.  Proposal 4: For SPS PDSCH, the HARQ-ACK codebook includes only HARQ-ACK information for enabled HARQ processes.  Proposal 5: Support coverage enhancements in NTN based on the Rel-17 WI on coverage enhancements   * For PUCCH/PUSCH, the Rel-17 mechanisms are applicable for NTN. * For PDSCH, introduce larger repetition numbers. * Consider coverage enhancements for PRACH/PDCCH in Rel-18.   Proposal 6: When a UE is configured more than 16 UL/DL HARQ processes, the HPN field size in DCI formats 0\_1/1\_1 is 5 bits. The HPN field size in DCI formats 0\_0/1\_0 is as in Rel-16.  Proposal 7: A UE indicates a capability for a maximum number of UL HARQ processes.  Proposal 8: For the maximum number of HARQ processes, support one of the following options.   * Option 1. A gNB informs a maximum TBS to a UE and the UE reports its capability for a number of HARQ processes. * Option 2. A UE reports separate capabilities for a number of predefined pairs of {maximum number of HARQ processes, maximum TBS}.   Proposal 9: Consider UE assistance information to support up to 32 HARQ processes without increasing the soft buffer size.  Observation 1: HARQ-ACK feedback disabling offers marginal benefits for UE power savings in Rel-17 NTN.  Observation 2: Enhancements for Type-3 and enhanced Type-2 HARQ codebooks are not necessary for NTN in Rel-17.  Observation 3: There is no need to specify any value for the DAI in a DCI format scheduling PDSCH reception for a HARQ process having disabled HARQ-ACK.  Observation 4: There is no need to change the Rel-16 Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook construction that is for HARQ processes with enabled HARQ-ACK reports.  Observation 5: There is no need to change Rel-16 operation for HARQ-ACK report in response to SPS PDSCH release.  Observation 6: There is no need for PDSCH coverage enhancements to depend on whether a HARQ-ACK report for a respective HARQ process is enabled or disabled. |
| R1-2106969  CATT | Observation 1:Additional HARQ bit can be taken from second block DCI field if only one layer tansmission supported in NTN.   1. Consider to use DCI field of second block as additional HARQ bit indication to support 32 HARQ processes in DCI 0-1/1-1. 2. 16 HARQ processes for DCI 0-0 /1-0 can be supported. 3. 32 processes can be supported based on UE capabilities. 4. For Type-1 HARQ codebook in NTN, if no DCI for a PDSCH with a feedback-enabled HARQ processes in any slot associated with the HARQ codebook is decoded, the UE should not generate and send the codebook feedback. Otherwise, legacy behavior is assumed. 5. Type 2 HARQ-ACK codebook can be optimized, and the counter DAI and total DAI for a PDSCH with a feedback disabled HARQ process are the same as the previous PDSCH with a feedback enabled HARQ process. 6. For SPS case, the HARQ-ACK feedback for activation and release command can be enabled. 7. Type 3 HARQ-ACK codebook is not needed in NTN case. 8. UE expects that at least one HARQ process with feedback is configured for the scheduling of MAC-CE. 9. Slot aggregation factor can be extended to 16 for very low SINR case. 10. Support time interleaved slot aggregation to improve transmission reliability. 11. There is no need for MCS enhancement. |
| R1-2107015  NEC | Proposal 1: gNB can use any value for the C-DAI and T-DAI in the DCI of PDSCH with feedback-disabled HARQ process.  Proposal 2: DCI for SPS release and any other DCIs which are included in counting of C-DAI and T-DAI in Rel-16 should be treated as in current specification.  Proposal 3: When all HARQ processes for a UE are configured disabled, HARQ-ACK feedback is omitted.  Observation 1: Dynamic indication to inform the UE if HARQ-feedback is expected or not for MA,c occasions can be useful to reduce codebook size.  Observation 2: Codebook size reduction can be achieved if only HARQ disabled processes and SPS PDSCHs are scheduled in MA,c occasions.  Proposal 4: Type-1 codebook enhancement is supported as:   * Layer1/Layer2 signalling is used to indicate that only HARQ disabled processes are scheduled in MA,c occasions. * If there are no SPS PDSCH(s) configured within MA,c occasion, UE omits HARQ feedback. * If there are SPS PDSCH(s) configured within MA,c occasion, UE omits HARQ feedback for non SPS PDSCH occasions.   + UE reports HARQ feedback for all SPS PDSCH occasions irrespective of their HARQ process number.   Proposal 5: If 32 HARQ processes are configured, scheduling is carried out with non-fallback DCI formats:   * Support option 3 for HARQ process ID indication for DCI 0-1/1-1 * No enhancement is needed for DCI 0-0/1-0   Proposal 6: Whether to use HARQ enabled or disabled process for the transmission of MAC CE is left up to gNB implementation.  Proposal 7: Consider extension/modification of TDRA field to indicate number of repetitions to a UE.  Proposal 8: Interleaving factor for repetition transmission needs further investigation. |
| R1-2107066  MTK | Proposal 1: For enhancement on the HARQ process indication, extend the HARQ process ID field up to 5 bits for DCI 0-0/1-0.  Proposal 2: For enhancement on the HARQ process indication, extend the HARQ process ID field up to 5 bits for DCI 0-1/1-0.  Proposal 3: Support of 32 HARQ processes in the device is a UE capability in NR NTN.  Proposal 4: UE expects that MAC-CEs are transmitted using HARQ processes with feedback enabled.  Observation 1: In NR specifications, the MCS selection, time domain allocation, and frequency resource allocation type 0 and type 1 can be done first as in the specifications. Then, repetitions with values 2, 4, or 8 to increase the reliability of each transmissions as in URLLC can be done based on pdsch-AggregationFactor for DL or repK for UL based on RRC configuration. Increasing value for pdsch-AggregationFactor for DL or repK for UL to 16 has minimum impact on the specification.  Observation 2: With repetitions or aggregation slots, DMRS time bundling for channel estimation across slots could allow lower DMRS density without significant channel estimation performance loss compare to not using DMRS time bundling.  Proposal 5: Support higher level of slot aggregation / repetitions 16 for NTN NR.  Proposal 6: Support DMRS time bundling with level of slot aggregation / repetitions for NTN NR. |
| R1-2107168  CAICT | Proposal 1: For DCI 0-1/1-1, option 2 is used if scheduling flexibility is not impacted much. Reusing the bit field of TPC command for PUCCH/PUSCH is preferred. Otherwise, option 3 is also acceptable.  Proposal 2: For DCI 0-0/1-0, if it is used during TN/NTN identification period, keep the current 4 bits with no extension of HARQ process number. Otherwise, unified solution for DCI 0-0/1-0 as DCI 0-1/1-1.  Proposal 3: For Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook, the UE should not generate and send the codebook feedback if no DCI for a PDSCH with a feedback-enabled HARQ processes in any slot associated with the HARQ codebook is decoded.  Proposal 4: For Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook, HARQ-ACK feedback related bit fields including C-DAI/T-DAI are not included in the DCI with a feedback-disabled HARQ process.  Proposal 5: For Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook, the count of C-DAI and T-DAI in SPS activation/release PDCCH is kept when it is for HARQ-ACK feedback-disabled HARQ processes.  Proposal 6: Type-3 HARQ-ACK codebook could be used as a complement way if no more specification requirements are identified than removing HARQ-ACK for feedback-disabled HARQ processes in the codebook.  Proposal 7: At least one DL HARQ process with HARQ-ACK feedback enabled is configured for the scheduling of MAC-CE.  Proposal 8: Enabling/disabling of HARQ feedback for DL SPS/UL CG is configured per configuration.  Proposal 9: Provide higher priority order for the HARQ disabled transmission than the priority order for HARQ enabled transmission. |
| R1-2107245  OPPO | Proposal 1: The enabling/disabling of HARQ processes for both DL and UL scheduling via RRC or DCI should be supported.  Proposal 2: For Type-1 HARQ codebook, Option-1 is supported, i.e., HARQ-ACK information for disabled DL HARQ processes should be reported in Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook.  Proposal 3: For Type-2 HARQ codebook, DCI for SPS release and DCI for indicating SCell dormancy should be included in counting of C-DAI and T-DAI.  Proposal 4: Type-3 HARQ codebook is not supported in NR-NTN.  Proposal 5: PUSCH transmission constraint for a given disabled UL HARQ process should be considered.  Proposal 6: Enhancements to PDSCH/PUSCH with disabled HARQ process to achieve a higher reliability should be considered.   * Configure different aggregation factors for PDSCH reception with or without HARQ-ACK feedback.   Proposal 7: PUSCH processing time should be updated in NTN.  Proposal 8: Option 1 or Option 1a is slightly preferred for enhanced HARQ process ID indication for DCI format 0-1/1-1.  Proposal 9: PDSCH reception constraint for a given enabled DL HARQ process should be clarified in NTN.  Proposal 10: PUSCH transmission constraint for a given enabled UL HARQ process should be clarified in NTN.  Proposal 11: The size of the PDSCH-to-HARQ\_feedback timing indicator field in DCI should not be changed. |
| R1-2107289  FIG,APT,ITRI | [Observation 1 If PDCCH contents indicate an SPS PDSCH release, UE shall clear the configured DL assignment for this Serving Cell, thus the associated HARQ feedback shall be mandatory.](#_Toc79066285)  [Proposal 1 If HARQ feedback is disabled for a HARQ process, NW and UE have a common understanding that the PHY layer does not generate acknowledgment of the data in this TB for the HARQ process.](#_Toc79066278)  [Proposal 2 UE expects an SPS PDSCH release is transmitted using HARQ processes with feedback enabled.](#_Toc79066279)  [Proposal 3 For Type-1 HARQ CB, it can be up to UE implementation whether UE sends the codebook feedback if no DCI for a PDSCH with feedback enabled HARQ processes in the HARQ CB is decoded.](#_Toc79066280)  [Proposal 4 Deprioritize Type-3 HARQ CB enhancement for NTN in Rel-17, considering there might be no use case when Type-1 and Type-2 HARQ CBs can be supported in NTN.](#_Toc79066281)  [Proposal 5 Support Option 3: Extending the HARQ process ID field up to 5 bits, considering it has nearly no impact on the DCI size budget, i.e., a UE can monitor up to (3+1) different sizes of DCI formats.](#_Toc79066282)  [Proposal 6 For Fallback DCI format (0-0, 1-0), no extension is needed, regarding no need to support more than 16 HARQ processes for initial access.](#_Toc79066283)  [Proposal 7 Support on the maximal HARQ process number is up to UE capability and configure via UE-specific RRC signaling.](#_Toc79066284) |
| R1-2107343  Qaulcomm | Observation 1: Within a lookback window of size (corresponding to a PUCCH occasion), for up to PDSCHs of HARQ processes with feedback enabled (in any of the candidate occasions), codepoints are sufficient to construct a lossless semi-static ACK/NACK codebook.  Proposal 1: Consider new CQI BLER targets for HARQ processes without feedbacks.  Proposal 2: Support a new UCI feedback for reporting DL transmission disruption and/or requesting DL scheduling changes when HARQ feedback is disabled.   * To study the new UCI format and associated resource allocation.   Proposal 3: For DL HARQ processes with HARQ feedback disabled, initial transmissions shall use RV 0 and retransmissions shall not use RV 0.  Proposal 4: For Type-2 HARQ codebook, support spatial bundling of all feedback bits in a codebook if the number of feedback bits without bundling is less than or equal to N.   * FFS: the value of N.   Proposal 5: For semi-static HARQ ACK codebooks, within a lookback window of size PDSCHs candidate occasions, a UE may be scheduled with up to PDSCHs of HARQ processes with feedback enabled, where the PDSCHs may be scheduled in any of the candidate position(s) within the lookback window.   * The value of as a function of N are to be configured for the UE. * At least support M=1.   Proposal 6: RAN1 to consider semi-static HARQ codebook designs for the limit of PDSCH transmissions less than candidate occasions for HARQ processes with feedback enabled, with the aim of reducing the codebook size.  Proposal 7: Support different transmit parameters and/or configurations per HARQ process or per HARQ process type (retransmissions is enabled/disabled), including   * Power control * MCS table * UCI multiplexing parameters * FFS other parameters   Proposal 8: For NTN, UE may receive a DCI scheduling a PUSCH of a given HARQ process before the end of the transmission of another PUSCH of that HARQ process. |
| R1-2107401  CMCC | Observation 2: In the case of both DCIs of PDSCH with feedback-enabled/disabled HARQ processes are mixed transmitted by the gNB, skipping feedback transmission due to error cause may save UE battery consumption and reduce UL interference, but it can NOT bring any benefit on UL resources overhead saving at the gNB side.  Observation 3: In the case of only DCIs of PDSCH with feedback-disabled HARQ processes are transmitted by the gNB, skipping feedback transmission will save UE battery consumption, reduce UL interference, and save UL resources overhead at gNB side.  Proposal 1: Support extending the HARQ process ID field up to 5 bits for DCI 0-1/1-1.  Proposal 2: For DCI 0-0/1-0, one of the followings is considered   * Option 3: Extending the HARQ process ID field up to 5 bits * Option x: “no enhancement”, i.e., keep the HARQ process ID field up to 4 bits unchanged   Proposal 3: For Type-1 HARQ codebook in NTN, the UE should not generate and send the codebook feedback if no DCI for a PDSCH with a feedback-enabled HARQ processes in any slot associated with the HARQ codebook is decoded.  Proposal 4: For Type-2 HARQ codebook in NTN, for the DCI of PDSCH with feedback-disabled HARQ process, the counting of T-DAI is the count of feedback-enabled processes, despite they are not incremented.  Proposal 5: UE expects that MAC-CEs are transmitted using HARQ processes with feedback enabled. |
| R1-2107469  Panasonic | Proposal 1: 1 bit is added for HARQ process ID indication in DCI format 0\_1/1\_1.  Proposal 2: No enhancement for type 1 HARQ-ACK codebook  Proposal 3: For type 2 HARQ-ACK codebook, PDSCH for feedback-disabled HARQ processes should not be counted in both C-DAI and T-DAI.  Proposal 4: T-DAI field in the DCI of PDSCH with feedback-disabled process indicates the total DAI value while C-DAI field is reserved.  Proposal 5: DAI indication in the DCI of PDSCH with feedback-disabled process when the number of HARQ-ACKs is zero should be discussed.  Proposal 6: Whether to use feedback-disabled process or enabled process for SPS PDSCH is up to network implementation.  Proposal 7: Whether to use feedback-disabled process or enabled process for MAC CE transmission is up to network implementation. MAC CE action timing when feedback-disabled process is used is well covered by the current specification text.  Proposal 8: Enhancement of PDSCH/PUSCH transmission to improve user throughput without further increasing the number of HARQ processes should be discussed.  Proposal 9: Transport block size scaling in case of repetition should be considered to improve user throughput with a limited number of HARQ processes. Alternatively, it should be considered to apply the same solution as multi-slot PUSCH in coverage enhancement WI for both PUSCH and PDSCH in NTN. |
| R1-2107475  ETRI | Observation 1 : For NTN, DL geometry SINR might range from -5.9 dB to 9.2 dB   * For SC19 (worst case), DL geometry SINR might range from -5.9 dB (5%) to -2.1 dB (95%). * For SC3 (best case), DL geometry SINR might range from 6 dB (5%) to 9.2 dB (95%).   Observation 2 : For NTN, DL geometry SINR difference between 5% and 95% might range from 1 dB to 8.4 dB   * For SC{8,13} (narrowest), DL geometry SINR might range from 7.5 dB (5%) to 8.5 dB (95%). (1dB=8.5-7.5) * For SC28 (widest), DL geometry SINR might range from -1.4 dB (5%) to 7 dB (95%). (8.4dB=7+1.4)   Observation 3 : For NTN, UL geometry SINR might range from -13.9 dB to 14.8 dB.   * For SC19 (worst case), the UL geometry SINR might range from -13.9 dB (5%) to -9.3 dB (95%). * For SC23 (best case), the UL geometry SINR might range from 3 dB (5%) to 14.8 dB (95%).   Observation 4 : For NTN, UL geometry SINR difference might range from 3.4 dB to 13.4 dB.   * For SC5 (narrowest), the UL geometry SINR might range from 1.5 dB (5%) to 4.9 dB (95%). (3.4dB=4.9-1.5) * For SC26 (widest), the UL geometry SINR might range from -8.5 dB (5%) to 4.9 dB (95%). (13.4dB=4.9+8.5)   Observation 5 : The slot aggregation (aggregation factor>1) could enhance BLER and SE simultaneously within low S(I)NR ranges.  Observation 6 : The slot aggregation (aggregation factor> 1) might be inevitable for achieving target BLER.  Observation 7 : The change of aggregation factor might be needed for achieving optimal SE performance.  Observation 8 :BLER improvement by legacy low SE MCS index table is not enough to cover all NTN study cases   * for PUSCH : low SE MCS index table in legacy NR might be insufficient * for PDSCH :   + low SE MCS index table in legacy NR might be enough only if target BLER 0.1%   + otherwise, low SE MCS index table in legacy NR might be insufficient   Observation 9 :larger aggregation factor might be inevitable for NTN.   * for PUSCH : 8 aggregated transmission might be insufficient even if low SE MCS index is applied. * for PDSCH :   + if target BLER 0.1%, 8 aggregated transmission might be enough.   + otherwise, 8 aggregated transmission might be insufficient   Observation 10 : larger aggregation factor method has less specification impact and could be more effective than low SE MCS index table method.  Observation 11 : For optimal adaptation, different aggregation factor might be applied depending on the parameter (especially IMCS).  Observation 12 : For optimal adaptation, different aggregation factor should be applied depending on the target performance.  Observation 13 : In NR, various kinds of transport channels are multiplexed into PDSCH/PUSCH.   * Target performance of each transport channel might be distinguishable by checking the RNTI   + PDSCH related RNTI : {P,SI,RA,MSGB,TC,C,MCS-C,CS}-RNTI   + PUSCH related RNTI : {TC,C,MCS-C,CS}-RNTI   Observation 14 : In NTN, different target performance might be defined by the HARQ feedback availability.  Observation 15 : The value of aggregation factor should be determined properly if slot aggregation is used.   * Too un-reliable parameter : reliability/latency loss (might be unable to communicate) * Proper parameter : optimal adaptation * Too reliable parameter : throughput loss   Observation 16 : NR gNB cannot distinguish between just proper parameter and too reliable parameter, if the slot aggregation is used.   * 0 CRC OK in a bundle (too un-reliable parameter) : NACK * only 1 CRC OK in a bundle (proper parameter) : ACK * multiple(>1) CRC OK in a bundle (too reliable parameter) : ACK   Observation 17 : NR gNB cannot optimally react to some cases, if the slot aggregation is used.   * toward better reliability : possible (reaction for receiving NACK quite consistently) * maintain : possible (reaction for receiving ACKs quite consistently) * toward better throughput : (seems to be )impossible   Observation 18 : In NR, there is no feedback mechanism to guide aggregation factor into lower value for better throughput   * Once the aggregation factor value gets larger, it may be impossible to be reduced again   Observation 19 : If all the HARQ feedback are disabled, gNB cannot optimally react to all cases   * toward better reliability : (seems to be )impossible * maintain : (seems to be )impossible * toward better throughput : (seems to be )impossible   Observation 20 : UL feedback might be helpful to guide aggregation factor into optimal value   * Non-optimal value (fixed aggregation factor) might lead the throughput loss   + for PDSCH: from 20.8% to 45.7%.   + for PUSCH: from 16.2% to 51%   Observation 21 : UL feedback via MAC-CE/RRC might be preferred rather than UL feedback via UCI.   * specification impact would be minimized * soft combinable retransmission mechanism on PUSCH might be beneficial for compensating in low S(I)NR under NTN   Proposal 1 : Consider the enhancement via “larger aggregation factor” as the one of the NTN’s transmission enhancement solutions to achieve target BLER performance.   * for PUSCH : 8 aggregated transmission might be insufficient even if low SE MCS table is applied. * for PDSCH :   + 8 aggregated transmission might be enough only if both condition#1 and condition#2 are met.     - condition#1 : target BLER ≥ 0.1%     - condition#2 : low SE MCS table is applied,   + otherwise, 8 aggregated transmission might be insufficient   Proposal 2 : Consider the enhancement via “different aggregation factors” as the one of the NTN’s transmission enhancement solutions.   * the followings might be a start point for configuring different aggregation factors   + (a group of) MCS index   + (a group of) RNTI type (or search space)   + HARQ feedback availability (enabled/disabled)   + combinations of the above   + subsets of the above   Proposal 3 : Consider the enhancement on the aggregated transmission guidance via “UL feedback” for adaptive aggregated transmission as the one of the NTN’s transmission enhancement solutions to achieve better adaptation performance.   * UL feedback can include information such as   + request for guiding pdsch-AggregationFactor   + decoding statistics   + combination of the above * MAC-CE/RRC might be also acceptable, instead of UCI.   + for minimizing specification impact.   + for compensating low S(I)NR in NTN by using soft combinable retransmissions on PUSCH * if aggregation factor is not guided by UL feedback, fixed aggregation factor (non-optimal value) might cause the throughput loss   + for PDSCH: from 20.8% to 45.7% loss   + for PUSCH: from 16.2% to 51% loss |
| R1-2107450  LG | Proposal 1: For enhanced HARQ process id identification in NTN, support followings enhancement.   * For DCI format 0-1/1-1, increase the HARQ process ID field up to 5 bits * For DCI format 0-0/1-0, support no enhancement   Proposal 2. For transmission enhancement when HARQ feedback is disabled, consider following enhancements:   * Repetition number is recommended/reported by UE   Proposal 3. In case of two PDSCHs are associated with different HARQ process ids, introduce default/virtual ACK/NACK timing or timing offset for feedback-disabled HARQ process.  Proposal 4. For Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook, codebook is generated by excluding HARQ-ACK for serving cells not having any feedback-enabled HARQ process.  Proposal 5. For Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook, for the DCI of PDSCH with feedback-disabled HARQ processes, the C-DAI and T-DAI are the count of feedback-enabled processes, despite they are not incremented.  Proposal 6. For Type-3 HARQ codebook, the codebook is generated based only on feedback-disabled HARQ processes.  Proposal 7. UE feedbacks acknowledgement for the reception of SPS activation DCI, if the first PDSCH after reception of the SPS activation DCI is associated with disabled HARQ process. |
| R1-2107638  Ericsson | [Observation 1 Extending the HARQ process ID field in DCI formats 0\_1/1\_1 to support 32 HARQ processes minimizes the impacts on specification and scheduling.](#_Toc79154017)  [Observation 2 Reusing one bit from other bit field to indicate 32 HARQ processes is not a clean design approach. Such hack in the specification should in general be avoided, as it can easily cause confusion and complications in the specification.](#_Toc79154018)  [Observation 3 If a bit from the RV field, the MCS field or a field related to the second data block is reused, other functionality will be limited.](#_Toc79154019)  [Observation 4 It is not necessary to schedule 32 HARQ processes using fallback DCI format 0\_0/1\_0.](#_Toc79154020)  [Observation 5 If fallback DCI format 0\_0/1\_0 are extended to support 32 HARQ processes, blind decoding among two fallback DCI formats is needed to read SIB.](#_Toc79154021)  [Observation 6 If DCI scheduling feedback-enabled DL HARQ processes is transmitted but no Type-1 HARQ codebook is transmitted by the UE, the network can interpret that as implicit NACK for the feedback-enabled HARQ processes.](#_Toc79154022)  [Observation 7 RAN1 already agreed that Type-3 HARQ codebook can be applied in licensed spectrum.](#_Toc79154023)  [Observation 8 NR is a toolbox of features. Each feature should not be limited to a certain use case or deployment and it is up to implementation to use it as fit.](#_Toc79154024)  [Observation 9 There should not be some artificial restriction that Type-3 HARQ codebook is not applicable to NTN.](#_Toc79154025)  [Observation 10 Currently out-of-order HARQ timing restriction is defined for PDSCH scheduling based on the HARQ-ACK feedback in TS 38.214. It is not clear what UE should expect regarding PDSCH scheduling timing when HARQ feedback is disabled. Therefore, it is necessary to discuss the scheduling restriction when HARQ feedback is disabled.](#_Toc79154026)  [Proposal 1 Whether 32 HARQ processes are used or not in the uplink can be configured by RRC.](#_Toc79154027)  [Proposal 2 Whether 32 HARQ processes are used or not in the downlink can be configured by RRC.](#_Toc79154028)  [Proposal 3 If 32 HARQ processes are configured, the size of the HARQ process ID field in DCI formats 0\_1/1\_1 is extended to 5 bits.](#_Toc79154029)  [Proposal 4 Do not support 32 HARQ processes with fallback DCI.](#_Toc79154030)  [Proposal 5 RAN1 to discuss what parameters need to be configured differently for HARQ processes with feedback and HARQ processes without feedback. One example parameter is aggregation factor.](#_Toc79154031)  [Proposal 6 In case of Type-1 HARQ codebook, when HARQ processes are enabled/disabled on a per HARQ process basis, RAN1 to downselect among the following: 1) the UE inserts NACK in positions corresponding to PDSCHs associated with feedback disabled HARQ processes. 2) the UE inserts ACK or NACK in positions corresponding to PDSCHs associated with feedback disabled HARQ processes, depending on the decoding outcome.](#_Toc79154032)  [Proposal 7 In case of Type-1 HARQ codebook, when HARQ processes are enabled/disabled on a per HARQ process basis and the UE has not decoded DCI for a feedback-enabled HARQ process in any slot associated with the HARQ codebook, the UE omits sending the HARQ-ACK feedback to reduce UL interference and save UE battery consumption.](#_Toc79154033)  [Proposal 8 In case of Type-2 HARQ codebook, when HARQ processes are enabled/disabled on a per HARQ process basis, C-DAI/T-DAI count only PDSCH with feedback-enabled HARQ processes. In the DCI, the C-DAI and T-DAI are given their actual values (i.e., the count of feedback-enabled HARQ processes) regardless of whether a feedback-enabled or feedback-disabled HARQ process is scheduled.](#_Toc79154034)  [Proposal 9 In the case of the NR Type-3 HARQ codebook, when HARQ processes are enabled/disabled on a per HARQ process basis, the codebook size is dimensioned to include ACK/NACK information only for HARQ processes that are enabled.](#_Toc79154035)  [Proposal 10 Regarding the “out-of-order restriction” for transmission of different HARQ processes corresponding to different PDSCHs, RAN1 to down-select between following alternatives:](#_Toc79154036)  [a. Alt-1: Preserve the same “out-of-order restriction” for (enabled) HARQ processes in specification for the disabled HARQ processes](#_Toc79154037)  [b. Alt-2: the “out-of-order restriction” for (enabled) HARQ processes does not apply to disabled HARQ processes.](#_Toc79154038) |
| R1-2107738  Apple | Proposal 1: Enhanced HARQ process number indication is supported for DCI 0\_0/1\_0 or 0\_1/1\_1 by reusing one bit from another DCI bit field (e.g., RV field).  Proposal 2: In type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook construction, UE does not reduce the HARQ-ACK codebook size for HARQ processes with disabled HARQ feedback, even if no DCI for the PDSCH with feedback-enabled HARQ processes, associated with HARQ-ACK codebook, is detected.  Proposal 3: In type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook construction, for the DCI of PDSCH with feedback disabled HARQ processes, T-DAI is given its true value (i.e., the count of feedback-enabled processes) and C-DAI is given a reserved value.  Proposal 4: For type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook only for SPS PDSCH and for type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook for SPS PDSCH, consider whether to support the case where SPS configuration includes HARQ processes with different feedback settings.  Proposal 5: Support to have different configurations for HARQ processes with or without HARQ feedback. |
| R1-2107777  ZTE | Proposal 1: Re-interpretation of bits in DCI should be support to enable the HARQ process indication with extended maximum HARQ process number for DCI 0-1/1-1 and DCI 0-0/1-0.  Proposal 2: Enhancements to minimize the UL feedback for DL transmission with feedback-disabled process should be prioritized.  Proposal 3: In Type-2 codebook, for the DCI of PDSCH with feedback-enabled HARQ processes, the C-DAI and T-DAI value should be directly ignored by UE.  Proposal 4: In Type-1 codebook, the UE should not generate and send the codebook feedback if no DCI for a PDSCH with a feedback-enabled HARQ processes in any slot associated with the HARQ codebook is decoded.  Proposal 5: For Type-3 codebook, enhancement can be enabled by only allowing the ACK-NACK generation for HARQ process with enabled feedback.  Proposal 6: For joint scheduling with feedback enable and disabled process, the legacy restriction on the out-of-order HARQ timing restriction should be kept.  Proposal 7: Enlarged aggregation factor and reduced DM-RS density should be supported to improve the performance for NTN for aggregated transmission. |
| R1-2107857  NTT DCM | Observation 1:   * It seems that 16 HARQ processes indication is sufficient for DCI format 0\_0/1\_0.   Proposal 1:   * No enhancement on the indication of HARQ process number in DCI format 0\_0/1\_0.   Observation 2:   * Disadvantage of option 3 for DCI format 0\_1/1\_1 is quite small while option 3 can reduce RAN1 workload.   Proposal 2:   * For DCI format 0\_1/1\_1, extend the HARQ process ID field up to 5 bits.   Proposal 3:   * Disabling HARQ feedback is applicable to SPS PDSCH.   Observation 3:   * If the feedback-enabling/disabling configuration per HARQ process is used for SPS, many HARQ processes would be configured with enabling so that feedback enabling is applied to all of the SPS receptions.   + This aspect degrades flexibility of dynamic PDSCH scheduling with disabled feedback.   Proposal 4:   * For SPS, enabling/disabling HARQ feedback is configured per SPS-Config.   + HARQ feedback-enabling/disabling configured per HARQ process is ignored for SPS.   Proposal 5:   * For SPS activation/release, UE reports HARQ-ACK regardless of any configuration of enabling/disabling HARQ feedback.   Proposal 6:   * Update the RAN1#105-e agreement:   + Confirm the previous working assumption for X = T\_proc,1 where X is defined from the end of the reception of the last PDSCH or slot-aggregated PDSCH for a given HARQ process with disabled feedback to the start of the PDCCH carrying the DCI scheduling another PDSCH or set of slot-aggregated PDSCH or the PDSCH without corresponding PDCCH for the given HARQ process.   Observation 4:   * For Type 1 HARQ-ACK CB with disabled feedback,   + Option 1 is not reasonable since processing time constraints become quite complicated.   + Option 3 is not reasonable since this leads to CB size misalignment, which is not aligned with Type 1 concept.   Proposal 7:   * For Type 1 HARQ-ACK CB, take option 2, i.e. report NACK on disabled process.   Proposal 8:   * For Type 1 HARQ-ACK CB, discussions on behavior if no DCI for a PDSCH with a feedback-enabled HARQ processes in any slot (at least PUSCH case) is postponed till the corresponding Rel-15/16 CR is concluded.   Proposal 9:   * For Type 2 HARQ-ACK CB, DCI for SPS release and DCI for SCell dormancy are included in counting of C-DAI and T-DAI regardless of feedback-enabling/disabling.   Proposal 10:   * No further discussion on Type 3 HARQ-ACK CB.   Proposal 11:   * For SCell dormancy, UE reports HARQ-ACK regardless of any configuration of HARQ feedback-enabling/disabling. * Discuss whether disabling is applied for some specific cases or not, e.g.   + PDSCH reception scheduled by a fallback DCI   + PDSCH reception including successRAR: e.g. CFRA in a handover case   Proposal 12:  Specify that UE expects that MAC-CEs are transmitted using HARQ processes with feedback enabled. |
| R1-2107920  Xiaomi | Proposal 1: The number of supported HARQ processes is subject to the UE’s capability.  Proposal 2: Support option 1 or 1-a for DCI format 0-0 and 1-0.  Proposal 3: support option 3 for DCI format 0-1 and 1-1.  Proposal 4: The enhancement on the type 1 codebook design is not desired.  Proposal 5: For the type 2 codebook, the C-DAI and T-DAI in the DCI of PDSCH with feedback-disabled HARQ processes are the count of only feedback-disabled processes with their true values.  Proposal 6: For the type 3 codebook, the codebook should not include the HARQ feedback for a feedback-disabled HARQ processes if it is supported in NTN scenario.  Proposal 7: Enhancement on the UCI reporting such as the data decoding statistics should be introduced. |
| R1-2107993  ITL | Proposal 1. Support to indicate extended HARQ process ID by the followings:   * For both DCI 0-1/1-1 and DCI 0-0/1-0, extend the HARQ process ID field up to 5bits by higher layer signaling   Proposal 2. For both type-1 and type-3 HARQ-ACK codebook, it is at least supported to skip the HARQ-ACK feedback associated with PDSCH occasions if the PDSCHs on only disabled HARQ processes are transmitted.  Proposal 3. For type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook, it is supported that UE does not expect to multiplex in Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook HARQ-ACK information that is in response to a detection of the DCI format 1\_2 that does not include a DAI field.  Proposal 4. For SPS release for HARQ-ACK feedback, it is proposed to always perform the HARQ-ACK feedback corresponding to the PDCCH indicating SPS release.  Proposal 5. It is proposed to support explicit DCI signaling for skipping HARQ-ACK feedback by reusing PUCCH resource indication field in the DCI.  Proposal 6. It is proposed to support that SPS PDSCH with HARQ FB enabling with lowest configured sps-ConfigIndex should be firstly selected/prioritized when more than one SPS PDSCH configurations are in a slot |
| R1-2108033  InterDigital | Observation-1: lowering target BLER for PDSCH when HARQ feedback is disabled is beneficial in terms of resource utilization and latency as it can reduce the number of retransmissions in higher layer  Observation-2: use of a CQI table with a lower BLER target (e.g., 1%) could provide a better link adaptation with lower PDSCH BLER target when HARQ feedback is disabled  Proposal-1: the maximum number of aggregated slots is increased to 16 or 32  Proposal-2: slot aggregation number for a PDSCH is dynamically indicated in DCI  Proposal-3: a CQI table with a new target BLER (e.g., 1%) is considered when HARQ feedback is disabled  Proposal-4: HARQ feedback is enabled for at least one HARQ process number  Proposal-5: the PDSCH carrying MAC-CE command is transmitted in the HARQ process with HARQ feedback enabled |
| R1-2108092  Nokia | Observation 1: MAC procedures will generate an acknowledgement message for lower layers when detecting a SPS release message.  Observation 2: When a DL SPS resource is activated, a HARQ process ID is associated to the SPS resource.  Observation 3: gNB knows in advance which HARQ processes are assigned for DL SPS  Observation 4: Using option 1 or option 1-a would create scheduling impacts due to the time-wise dependency of the HARQ process ID.  Observation 5: Using option 1 or option 1-a may not be feasible if PDCCH is not monitored in all slots.  Observation 6: If UEs are not supporting the additional HARQ processes, there is a high risk of having HARQ stalling with reduced network performance as a consequence.  Proposal 1: UE should always provide acknowledgement for SPS release.  Proposal 2: Adopt the conclusion from FL summary: “Conclusion: UE expects that MAC CE and SPS release information is scheduled via one HARQ process configured with HARQ feedback.”  Proposal 3: No enhancements or optimizations are implemented for Type-1 HARQ codebook. The codebook size should not be depending on the configuration for HARQ-ACK feedback (feedback enabled or disabled).  Proposal 4: No enhancements or optimizations are implemented for Type-3 HARQ codebook. The codebook size should not be depending on the configuration for HARQ-ACK feedback (feedback enabled or disabled).  Proposal 5: Do a down-selection between option 2 and option 3 for indication of HARQ process ID such that only one option is specified.  Proposal 6: Enhanced HARQ process ID indication is supported for DCI 0-1/1-1 by extending the HARQ process ID field up to 5 bits when configured.  Proposal 7: Assign one additional bit for indicating the MSB of the HARQ process ID for DCI format 0-0 and DCI format 1-0.  Proposal 8: UEs supporting NTN should by default support the maximum number of HARQ processes to ensure network efficiency.  Proposal 9: Support slot aggregation for NR over NTN.  Proposal 10: For NTN operation, the maximum level of slot aggregation to be considered should be 16 slots. |