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1. Introduction

In RAN #90 e-meeting, a new Rel-17 work item on NR coverage enhancements was approved [1] and was revised in [2]. The objective of this work item is to specify enhancements for PUSCH, PUCCH and Msg3 PUSCH for both FR1 and FR2 as well as TDD and FDD.

The detailed objectives are as follows.

* *Specification of PUSCH enhancements [RAN1, RAN4]*
  + *Specify the following mechanisms for enhancements on PUSCH repetition type A [RAN1]*
    - *Increasing the maximum number of repetitions up to a number to be determined during the course of the work.*
    - *The number of repetitions counted on the basis of available UL slots.*
  + *Specify mechanism(s) to support TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH [RAN1]*
    - *TBS determined based on multiple slots and transmitted over multiple slots.*
  + *Specify mechanism(s) to enable joint channel estimation [RAN1, RAN4]*
    - *Mechanism(s) to enable joint channel estimation over multiple PUSCH transmissions, based on the conditions to keep power consistency and phase continuity to be investigated and specified if necessary by RAN4 [RAN1, RAN4]*
      * *Potential optimization of DMRS location/granularity in time domain is not precluded*
    - *Inter-slot frequency hopping with inter-slot bundling to enable joint channel estimation [RAN1]*
* *Specification of PUCCH enhancements [RAN1, RAN4]*
  + *Specify signaling mechanism to support dynamic PUCCH repetition factor indication [RAN1]*
  + *Specify mechanism to support DMRS bundling across PUCCH repetitions [RAN1, RAN4]*
    - *When applicable, based on similar mechanism(s) for enabling joint channel estimation for PUSCH*
* *Specify mechanism(s) to support Type A PUSCH repetitions for Msg3 [RAN1, RAN2]*

This contribution is a summary of the following email discussion:

[106-e-NR-R17-CovEnh-03] Email discussion regarding joint channel estimation for PUSCH – Jianchi (China Telecom)

* 1st check point: August 19
* 2nd check point: August 24
* Final check: August 27

1. Summary of contributions

## 2.1 Conditions to keep power consistency and phase continuity

An LS [3] was sent to RAN4 asking the conditions for UE to keep power consistency and phase continuity among PUSCH transmissions. The reply LS was send by RAN4 [4]. Based on the reply LS, if the conditions for phase continuity among PUSCH transmissions are fulfilled, the same power level (with certain tolerance level) can also be achieved. The certain tolerance level is still under discussion in RAN4.

For back-to-back transmissions with zero gap in-between adjacent transmissions, in order to maintain phase continuity, the following conditions should be met:

* Modulation order does not change.
* RB allocation in terms of length and frequency position should not be changed, and intra-slot and inter-slot frequency hopping is not enabled within a repetition bundle.
* No change on transmission power level of its own CC, i.e., no change on the power control parameters specified in TS 38.213, and also when own CC is not impacted by other concurrent CC(s) that are configured for inter-band CA or DC for same UE with dynamic power sharing and no change in any configured CC s that are part of configured intra-band uplink CA or DC.
* No UL beam switching for FR2 UE occurs

For non-back-to-back transmission with non-zero gap in-between adjacent transmissions, RAN4 concluded that at least following additional condition also need to be met in addition to the above conditions:

* No downlink reception in-between the PUSCH or PUCCH repetition in the same band for TDD case.

In scenario of no more than *X* un-scheduled OFDM symbols in-between the PUSCH or PUCCH repetition (e.g., *X* = 0, 1, 2, …, 14), and scenario of other physical signals/channels in-between PUCCH or PUSCH repetitions from the UE perspective, e.g., SRS or PUCCH transmission in-between the PUSCH repetition for the UE, RAN4 is still discussing if *X* can be non-zero value and UE can maintain phase continuity.

Another LS [5] was sent by RAN4 about non-back-to-back transmissions. RAN4 confirms the feasibility of phase continuity and power consistency for non-zero un-scheduled gap case for a gap less than 14 symbols when UE is not required to meet the existing off power requirements. Whether new or existing off power requirements for shorter duration than 1 msec as well as the maximum value of X un-scheduled symbols will be introduced are pending on further RAN4 discussions. For the case with other UL channels in between repetitions, at least if the other scheduled signals/channels during the non-zero gap have the same settings in antenna port, occupied PRBs and UL power than the repeated transmission signals/channels, it is feasible to maintain the phase continuity and power consistency across the repetitions.

In [6], RAN1 asked RAN4 to provide answers to the following questions.

Question 1: In addition to the conditions provided in R4-2103393, can RAN4 please confirm that “Applying the same TPMI precoder across PUSCH transmissions” is also a necessary condition to keep phase continuity across PUSCH transmissions?

Question 2: Whether “no TA adjustment in between PUCCH transmissions or PUSCH transmissions” is another necessary condition to keep phase continuity across PUCCH repetitions or PUSCH transmissions?

Question 3: There are two different interpretation in RAN1 regarding the “downlink reception” in “No downlink reception in-between the PUSCH or PUCCH repetition in the same band for TDD case” (in R4-2103393)

1. “downlink reception” refers to downlink symbols with actual DL transmission from gNB to UE.
2. “downlink reception” refers to downlink symbols with actual DL transmission from gNB to UE and/or downlink symbols without actual DL transmission from gNB to UE and/or no DL monitoring occasions configured.

Can RAN4 please confirm which interpretation is correct?

The latest LS from RAN4 [7]:

* RAN4 has continued discussing the un-scheduled gap consisting of unscheduled symbols between two PUCCH repetitions or PUSCH transmissions and reached a conclusion that it is feasible for UE to maintain phase continuity when the gap is 13 symbols or less. RAN4 is still discussing the feasibility of 14 symbols or 1 ms for different SCSs for the un-scheduled gap. Main drawback RAN4 sees with long gaps is UE energy efficiency since it needs to maintain TX parts active but UE is not transmitting and the issue of existing OFF power requirements not being satisfied for less 1ms duration. If new RF requirements for UE during the gap are needed, is under discussion in RAN4.
* Regarding whether “*Applying the same TPMI precoder across PUSCH transmissions*” is also a necessary condition to keep phase continuity across PUSCH transmissions, RAN4 answer is that applying the same TPMI precoder across PUSCH transmissions is a necessary condition to apply joint channel estimation.
* Regarding whether “*no TA adjustment in between PUCCH transmissions or PUSCH transmissions*” is another necessary condition to keep phase continuity across PUCCH repetitions or PUSCH transmissions, RAN4 answer is that TA adjustment and UE uplink timing autonomous adjustments cause the phase to change. RAN4 is still investigating the full impacts of the detailed scenarios, and will provide a final view about this at the next RAN4 meeting.
* Regarding “*downlink reception*” related questions, RAN4 answer is as follows:

1) The “downlink reception” means downlink symbols with actual DL transmission from gNB to UE and/or DL monitoring with the assumption that UE is receiving information.

2) Regarding whether “downlink reception” include downlink symbols without actual DL transmission from gNB to UE and without DL monitoring, it would be helpful if RAN1 could provide more information on the exact scenario.

3) Phase discontinuity tolerance LLS is ongoing in RAN4 study and conditions of whether the phase continuity can be maintained in TDD case that has downlink reception in-between the PUSCH or PUCCH repetition could be revisited in future meeting with consideration of phase discontinuity tolerance. RAN4 is also still checking whether there are any optional UE antenna configurations where a UE could overcome this problem and still gain from using the feature

## 2.2 Use cases for joint channel estimation

RAN1 has identified the potential use cases for joint channel estimation for PUSCH.

* Use case 1: back-to-back PUSCH transmissions within one slot.
* Use case 2: non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions within one slot.
  + Use case 2a: no uplink transmission in the middle of two PUSCH transmissions
  + Use case 2b: other uplink transmissions in the middle of two PUSCH transmissions
* Use case 3: back-to-back PUSCH transmissions across consecutive slots.
* Use case 4: non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions across consecutive slots.
  + Use case 4a: no uplink transmission in the middle of two PUSCH transmissions
  + Use case 4b: other uplink transmissions in the middle of two PUSCH transmissions
* Use case 5: PUSCH transmissions across non-consecutive slots.
  + Use case 5a: no uplink transmission in the middle of two PUSCH transmissions
  + Use case 5b: other uplink transmissions in the middle of two PUSCH transmissions

Note: RAN1 assumes “back-to-back PUSCH transmission” has zero gap in-between adjacent PUSCH transmissions.

Note: intervening “other uplink transmissions” can be either on the same component carrier or a different component carrier.

In the past RAN1 meetings, it was discussed whether joint channel estimation can be applied to the above uses cases. Based on the discussion and agreements so far, the situation is summarized in the following table.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Use cases | Repetition type A for the same TB | Repetition type B for the same TB | Transmissions with different TBs | TBoMS |
| 1: B2B PUSCH transmission within one slot | / | Support | Not support | / |
| 2: Non-B2B PUSCH transmission within one slot | / | Not support | Not support | / |
| 3: B2B PUSCH transmissions across consecutive slots | Support | Support | To be determined | Working Assumption |
| 4: Non-B2B PUSCH transmissions across consecutive slots | Working Assumption  (4a) | Working Assumption  (4a) | To be determined | To be determined |
| To be determined  (4b) | To be determined  (4b) |
| 5: PUSCH transmissions across non-consecutive slots | To be determined | To be determined | To be determined | To be determined |

**It can be observed that use case 3/4/5 still need further discussion. For use case 4b & 5, we should wait for RAN 4’s feedback. Thus, FL suggests focusing on use case 3 and 4a in this meeting.**

### 2.2.1 Use case 3: back-to-back PUSCH transmissions across consecutive slots

For use case 3, based on the contributions in RAN1 #106-e, companies’ views on transmissions with different TBs and TBoMS are summarized as follows.

* **Transmissions with different TBs**

**Support:** CTC, TCL, Nokia, NSB, HW, HiSilicon, CMCC, Sierra Wireless, ZTE

**Not support:** Qualcomm, Intel, Ericsson, Samsung

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Positive arguments** | **Negative arguments** |
| * There are many simulation results of joint channel estimation among different TBs with large gains are provided by companies, which are captured in TR 38.830, e.g. R1-2008626, R1-2007583, R1-2008874, R1-2008026, R1-2008559, etc. * Huawei/HiSilicon: By joint channel estimation across consecutive PUSCH transmissions of different TBs, 1.4 dB and 2.1 dB SNR gains are obtained at 10% BLER for 2 and 3 slots joint channel estimation, respectively. * Vivo: about 0.6 dB for PUSCH transmissions with different TBs. * As long as the the condition of power consistency and phase continuity can be maintained, joint channel estimation can be applied. * A higher data rate is required for PUSCH transmission in coverage enhancement, e.g. 1Mbps for eMBB, where the number of repetitions is limited; Also, A medium or low date rate is required for PUSCH transmission in coverage enhancement, e.g. 12.2 kbps for VoIP, where different TBs with repetitions are transmitted across consecutive slots. Thus it’s a very common case of joint channel estimation among different TBs to meet the medium-to-high data rate requirements in uplink coverage enhancement. | * Not targeted for coverage enhancement. * Additional complexity and significant restrictions on the base station scheduler, and the fact that its unlikely to benefit a cell-edge UE. * Restrictions on scheduling of multiple TBs, same number of PRBs/same frequency location, same transmission power, same TPMI precoder etc. |

* **TBoMS**

In RAN1 #104b-e, 24 companies (Huawei, HiSilicon, vivo, CATT, LG, InterDigital, CMCC, Samsung, Xiaomi, China Telecom, NTT DOCOMO, Sony, Intel, ZTE, Sharp, Panasonic, Apple, Nokia, NSB, WILUS, OPPO, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, Ericsson) support to confirm the following working assumption. In RAN1 #105-e, two more companies (TCL, Spreadtrum) support to confirm the following working assumption. Based on the contributions in RAN1 #106-e, 5 companies (ZTE, Apple, InterDigital, Panasonic, NTT DOCOMO) support to confirm the following working assumption.

|  |
| --- |
| **Working assumption:**   * For back-to-back PUSCH transmissions across consecutive slots, support necessary design aspects (under the condition of power consistency and phase continuity) to enable joint channel estimation for the following case:   + Over back-to-back PUSCH transmissions for one TB processed over multiple slots     - It’s subject to UE capability |

### 2.2.2 Use case 4: non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions across consecutive slots.

* **Use case 4a: no uplink transmission in the middle of two PUSCH transmissions**

For use case 4a, Companies’ views are summarized as follows.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Detailed cases** | **Companies’ views** |
| Repetition type A for the same TB (WA) | **Confirm the working assumption:** TCL, LG, WILUS, Nokia, NSB, HW, HiSilicon, ZTE, Sierra Wireless |
| Repetition type B for the same TB (WA) | **Confirm the working assumption:** TCL, LG, WILUS, Nokia, NSB, HW, HiSilicon, ZTE, Sierra Wireless |
| Transmissions with different TBs | **Support:** Spreadtrum, CTC, Nokia, NSB, HW, HiSilicon, ZTE, Sierra Wireless  **Not support:** Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, Qualcomm, Intel, Ericsson |
| TBoMS | **Support:** HW, HiSilicon, ZTE |

**Other considerations for use case 4a:**

**Nokia/NSB:** When there is no “DL reception” in-between the two successive PUSCHs, support PUSCH transmissions with different TBs if the following constraints are satisfied:

* Constraints for joint channel estimation in case of back-to-back PUSCHs;
* The duration between the two successive PUSCHs is not greater than the maximum “non-zero unscheduled gap” provided by RAN4.
* The UE does not expect to receive or monitor any DL transmission within the “non-zero unscheduled gap”.

When there is “DL reception” in-between the two successive PUSCHs, for non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions, the gNB indicates whether and which DL reception occasion should be monitored by the UE.

**MediaTek:** Support JCE for non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions with short gap symbols (e.g., 1 or 2 symbols) can be up to UE implementation; No need to support JCE for non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions with long gap symbols (e.g., >2 symbols)

* **Use case 4b: other uplink transmissions in the middle of two PUSCH transmissions**

For use case 4b, companies’ views are summarized as follows.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Detailed cases** | **Companies’ views** |
| Repetition type A for the same TB | **Support:** Nokia, NSB (other UL transmission have the same settings), HW, HiSilicon (when other UL is SRS)  **Not support:** Qualcomm |
| Repetition type B for the same TB | **Support:** Nokia, NSB (other UL transmission have the same settings) , HW, HiSilicon (when other UL is SRS)  **Not support:** Qualcomm |
| Transmissions with different TBs | **Support:** Nokia, NSB (other UL transmission have the same settings), Sierra Wireless, HW, HiSilicon (when other UL is SRS)  **Not support:** Qualcomm, Intel, Ericsson |
| TBoMS | **Support:** HW, HiSilicon (when other UL is SRS)  **Not support:** Qualcomm |

**Other considerations for use case 4b:**

**HW, HiSilicon:** If SRS has same transmission power and antenna port with PUSCH transmissions, phase continuity can be ensured between two PUSCH transmissions with same RB allocation, even a SRS with different RB allocation is transmitted in-between two PUSCH transmissions.

**Nokia/NSB:** The same settings include: antenna port, occupied PRBs and UL power as the PUSCH repetitions. When the “other UL transmission” has different settings than PUSCHs, the gNB indicates one of the following options to the UE:

* Option 1: Adapt the settings of the other UL transmission to make it be the same as PUSCHs.
* Option 2: Multiplex the data of the other UL transmission on PUSCH.
* Option 3: Drop the other UL transmission with different settings.
* Option 4: Transmit the other UL transmission with different settings and break the phase continuity.

|  |
| --- |
| Option 1 Option 2 Option 3 |

### 2.2.3 Other considerations

**Vivo:** For joint channel estimation among PUSCHs with different TBs, the time domain window configured per UE is preferable.

**Sony:** For non-back-to-back PUSCH transmission, A UE shall be able to signal its capability of supporting ‘no UL’, ‘other UL’, or ‘DL’ transmissions between successive PUSCH transmissions.

**LG:** To support joint channel estimation for different TBs, all of power control parameters between those different TBs should be aligned to satisfy requirements for joint channel estimation.

**Lenovo, Motorola Mobility:** For PUSCH coverage enhancement in NR Rel-17, JCE is applied to PUSCH repetition type B within a slot only when actual repetitions are back-to-back, and no specific enhancements are needed on top of enhancements for PUSCH repetition type-A; Moreover, JCE is applied to PUSCH repetition type B across consecutive slots with similar enhancements as for PUSCH repetition type A, i.e., no specific enhancements are needed on top of enhancements for PUSCH repetition type-A.

**ZTE:** Joint channel estimation is supported in case of UL CA.



**Panasonic:** For multiple TBs scheduled by a DCI, joint channel estimation should wait for the progress of the discussion of NR from 52.6GHz to 71 GHz.

**LG:** Rules for uplink collision handling and power sharing in CA/DC scenarios are required.

## 2.3 Time domain window for joint channel estimation

In RAN1 #104b-e meeting, a time domain window (TDW) was agreed to be specified, during which **UE is expected to** maintain power consistency and phase continuity among PUSCH transmissions subject to power consistency and phase continuity requirements. In RAN1 #105-e meeting, the maximum duration is defined to facilitate the discussion (whether it is specified is up to RAN4), during which **UE is able** to maintain power consistency and phase continuity subject to power consistency and phase continuity requirements. It is understood that for a UE, the maximum duration is no less than the time domain window duration.

### 2.3.1 The maximum duration

In RAN1 #105-e, an LS was sent to RAN4 asking the following questions:

* For joint channel estimation, is there a maximum duration during which UE is able to maintain power consistency and phase continuity under certain tolerance level? If any, how long is it?
  + What factors determine the maximum duration?
  + Whether the maximum duration should be the same for different cases for both PUSCH and PUCCH?
  + Whether the maximum duration is dependent on the modulation order of transmission, e.g., QPSK, 16QAM, 64QAM?
  + Whether the maximum duration is dependent on UL waveform (DFT-s-OFDM vs. OFDM)?
  + Whether the maximum duration is band specific?
  + Besides the factors listed above, whether or not the maximum duration is further dependent on UE capabilities (e.g., multiple possible values for a given set of factor(s)), and if so, whether the UE should report such a duration

Based on the contributions in RAN1 #106-e, companies’ views about maximum duration are summarized below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Specify the maximum duration in RAN1 | **Support:** CMCC, InterDigital |
| UE report the maximum duration | **Support:** Spreadtrum, Sony (a specified one), Xiaomi (in initial access), CMCC, InterDigital |

**Other considerations**

**CATT:** Whether the maximum duration should be reported by UE or not is up to the number of the maximum duration determined by RAN4 (if there are more than one candidate values of the maximum duration determined by RAN4, UE should report one of the maximum durations used as a reference for gNB when configuring the time domain window size).

**Sharp:** The term maximum duration should be reserved for signalling UE capability (if supported). A new parameter (maximum time domain window length) should be indicated by the gNB for adaptation of the time domain window.

**CMCC:** The time domain window during which a UE is expected to maintain power consistency and phase continuity among PUSCH transmission should be at least a UE capability. It should be defined in RAN1 and the specific values should be studied in RAN4.

### 2.3.2 Time domain window design

In RAN1 105-e, two alternatives related to TDW were agreed to be down selected for JCE for PUSCH repetition type A of PUSCH repetitions of the same TB. Based on the contributions in RAN1 #106-e, companies’ views are summarized as follows:

* Alt 1: All the repetitions are covered by one single time domain window

**Support:** Sony, vivo, Sierra Wireless, InterDigital

* Alt 2: All the repetitions are covered by one or multiple time domain windows

**Support:** Spreadtrum, CATT, CTC, TCL, Apple, Sharp, WILUS, Nokia, NSB, HW, HiSilicon, Samsung, Qualcomm, Intel, Panasonic, NTT DOCOMO, (ZTE?), (LG?)

Details of Alt.1 and Alt.2 are summarized as follows:

* **Alt 1: All the repetitions are covered by one single time domain window**

For Alt.1, one single time domain window is configured, the illustrations of Alt.1 for paired and unpaired spectrum are shown as follows:



Illustration of Alt.1 for paired spectrum



Illustration of Alt.1 for unpaired spectrum

**Start of TDW**

Regarding the start of TDW, following options can be considered:

* Option 1a: The first available slot for PUSCH transmissions.
* Option 1b: The first available symbol for PUSCH transmissions.
* Option 2a: The first physical slot allocated for PUSCH transmissions.
* Option 2b: The first physical symbol allocated for PUSCH transmissions.

**Segmentation of TDW**

If some events, which break the prerequisite of JCE, happen in-between the configured TDW, the TDW may be fragmented into multiple sub windows. These events are summarized as follows based on companies’ contributions:

* DL/UL configuration for unpaired spectrum;
* The TDW exceeds the maximum duration;
* The maximum unscheduled gap between two successive PUSCHs is exceeded;
* DL reception/monitoring occasion for unpaired spectrum during the TDW;
* High priority transmission, dynamic SFI for unpaired spectrum, CI and etc. during the TDW.

**Sub windows**

Regarding the start and end of the sub windows, companies’ views are summarized as follows:

1) The start of the other sub windows

* Option 1: The first available slot for PUSCH transmission after the previous sub window.
* Option 2: The first available symbol for PUSCH transmission after the previous sub window.

2) The end of sub windows (except the last sub window)

* Option 1: The last slot of the PUSCH transmission right before an event such that the power consistency and phase continuity are broken.
* Option 2: The last symbol of the PUSCH transmission right before an event such that the power consistency and phase continuity are broken.

3) The end of the last sub window

* The end of the last sub window is the end of the last PUSCH transmission.
* **Alt 2: All the repetitions are covered by one or multiple time domain windows**

For Alt.2, there can be two kinds of TDW configurations based on companies’ contributions as follows:

1) **Alt 2-A: multiple consecutive windows with same window length**

For Alt 2-A, although multiple windows are configured, only the start of the first window and one common window length needs to be configured. TDW is then repeated within the transmission duration. The start of the other TDWs and the length of the last TDW can be derived without explicit configuration. The illustrations of Alt.2-A for paired and unpaired spectrum (if use case 5 is supported) are shown as follows:



Illustration of Alt.2-A for paired spectrum



Illustration of Alt. 2-A for unpaired spectrum (if use case 5 is supported)

**Start of TDW**

Regarding the start of the first TDW, following options can be considered:

* Option 1a: The first available slot for PUSCH transmissions.
* Option 1b: The first available symbol for PUSCH transmissions.
* Option 2a: The first physical slot allocated for PUSCH transmissions.
* Option 2b: The first physical symbol allocated for PUSCH transmissions.

**Length of TDW**

Regarding the length of one window, it can be configurable but no longer than the maximum duration.

**Segmentation of TDW**

If some events, which break the prerequisite of JCE, happen in-between the configured TDW, the TDWs may be fragmented into multiple sub windows. These events are summarized as follows based on companies’ contributions:

* DL/UL configuration for unpaired spectrum;
* The maximum unscheduled gap between two successive PUSCHs is exceeded;
* DL reception/monitoring occasion for unpaired spectrum during the TDW;
* High priority transmission, dynamic SFI for unpaired spectrum, CI and etc. during the TDW.

2) Alt 2-B: multiple windows (consecutive or non-consecutive)

For Alt 2-B, it needs to define the **start of each window** as well as **the end of each window**. The illustration of Alt.2-B for unpaired spectrum is shown as follows:



Illustration of Alt.2-B for unpaired spectrum

**Start of TDW**

Regarding the start of the first TDW, following options can be considered:

* Option 1a: The first available slot for PUSCH transmissions.
* Option 1b: The first available symbol for PUSCH transmissions.
* Option 2a: The first physical slot allocated for PUSCH transmissions.
* Option 2b: The first physical symbol allocated for PUSCH transmissions.

**Start of the other TDWs**

Regarding the start of other TDWs, companies’ views are summarized as follows:

* Option 1: The first available slot for PUSCH transmission after the previous TDW.
* Option 2: The first available symbol for PUSCH transmission after the previous TDW.

**End of TDWs**

Regarding the end of TDWs, companies’ views are summarized as follows:

* Option 1: The last slot of the PUSCH transmission right before an event such that the power consistency and phase continuity are broken.
* Option 2: The last symbol of the PUSCH transmission right before an event such that the power consistency and phase continuity are broken.
* The end of the last TDW is the end of the last PUSCH transmission.

The event mentioned above can be:

* DL/UL configuration for unpaired spectrum;
* The TWD exceeds the maximum duration;
* The maximum unscheduled gap between two successive PUSCHs is exceeded;
* DL reception/monitoring occasion for unpaired spectrum during the TDW;
* High priority transmission, dynamic SFI for unpaired spectrum, CI and etc. during the TDW.

**Other considerations:**

**Nokia/NSB:** For Alt 1, within the repetition duration, there could be one or more than one “actual duration” wherein the UE is able to maintain the power consistency and phase continuity.

In case TDW is defined for any PUSCH transmissions, RAN1 to further discuss on whether to define a time-duration which can be dynamically indicated and used as “repetition duration” (similar to the case of JCE across PUSCH repetitions).

**Samsung:** Support an indication to a UE to apply power consistency and phase continuity conditions over a number of repetitions or slots (i.e. window size) for a PUSCH transmission with repetitions.

**Qualcomm:** Within each window, if conditions for bundling, as specified by RAN4, are violated, then bundling is not resumed within that window.

**NTT DOCOMO:** Time domain window size should be determined dynamically according to the channel quality.

**LG:** Further clarification is needed for one or multiple time domain window. In our understanding: single time domain window case means that when joint channel estimation is indicated, a window of a single size is (repeatedly) applied until it is disabled, and multiple time domain window case means that when joint channel estimation is indicated, windows of various sizes can be applied until disabled.

**Ericsson:** Windows are implicitly determined according to continuity/consistency requirements

* If Alt 1 is pursued, the UE is expected to maintain continuity/consistency for repetitions meeting the requirements, which can be one or more portions of the repetitions
* If Alt 2 is pursued, the windows covering the repetitions can have different lengths, and all repetitions within each window meet continuity/consistency requirements.

**Sharp:** Adaptation of the time domain window length by the gNB should be supported. (For a high-speed UE, the gain of joint channel estimation may be limited. In that case, the gNB may configure multiple time domain windows with short length (e.g., 2 or 4 slots) such that frequency diversity or spatial diversity (e.g., precoder cycling) can be exploited. On the other hand, for a low speed UE, time domain window length can be set to longer to fully exploit joint channel estimation gain. Therefore, depending on the UE condition, time domain window length should be adapted.)

**Lenovo, Motorola Mobility:** If the maximum duration is greater than or equal to the entire duration of the scheduled PUSCHs, then Alt 1 should suffice, otherwise more than one time domain windows are needed. For the case of frequency hopping, multiple TDW can be specified where the duration of the time domain window can be equal to the hop duration

**CMCC:** If a large number of consecutive slots are indicated for the joint channel estimation, the phase of the later part transmissions could drift significantly compared with the first few transmissions. The impact of phase drifting should be considered for the performance of joint channel estimation.

**Panasonic:** When inter-slot frequency hopping and/or inter-slot precoder cycling are applied, the length of time domain window should be the subset of the time domain resource allocation. Proposal 7: When some slot(s) are dropped by the other dynamic signaling (e.g., UL CI, DCI for high priority channel), the length of time domain window should be the subset of the time domain resource allocation.

### 2.3.3 Enable/disable of Joint channel estimation and time domain window

In RAN1 #105-e, it was agreed that JCE for PUSCH transmissions is enabled or disabled via RRC configuration. Based on companies’ contribution in RAN1 #106-e, companies’ views on whether the TDW needs to be separately enabled/disabled are summarized as follows:

* Option 1: Joint enabling/disabling between JCE and TDW.

**Support:** Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, CMCC, CATT, TCL, ZTE

* Option 2: Separate enabling/disabling between JCE and TDW.

**Support:** vivo (DCI or configured grant)

Regarding whether additional dynamic signaling is needed to enable/disable joint channel estimation for PUSCH transmissions, companies’ views are summarized as follows:

* Dynamic signaling to enable/disable JCE for PUSCH transmissions.

**Support:** InterDigital, Sierra Wireless (UL grant), Samsung

**Not support:** Spreadtrum, OPPO, Intel

### 2.3.4 Coherent transmission indication

Based on companies’ contributions, two companies (Nokia, NSB) proposed that UE indicates via suitable DMRS configuration whether the transmission is coherent with respect to the other PUSCH transmissions. One company (Qualcomm) proposed that UE signals a bundling indication in the UCI multiplexing with PUSCH transmission to indicate whether a PUSCH transmission is coherent with respect to the other PUSCH transmission. The motivation of the coherent transmission indication is due to the fact that some events on the UE side may impact the phase continuity but such change may not be known to the gNB. These events may include: frequency error correction, timing correction, RF calibration, antenna virtualization and etc. One company (LG) proposed to consider UE reporting when the UE cannot transmit by satisfying the requirement for joint channel estimation during the configured time window. One company (InterDigital) proposed a grant-type dependent index which indicates which PUSCH(s) to bundle.

### 2.3.5 The unit of time domain window

For the unit of time domain window, companies’ views are summarized as follows:

* Option 1: The unit of the time domain window is defined separately for the following PUSCH transmissions:
  + PUSCH repetition type A
  + PUSCH repetition type B
  + TBoMS, if agreed
  + Different TB, if agreed

**Support:** Xiaomi, OPPO, TCL

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Cases | Companies’ views about the unit of time domain window |
| PUSCH repetition type A | * In unit of repetitions   + Ericsson, Samsung * In unit of slots   + OPPO, Apple, Xiaomi, Intel, Samsung |
| PUSCH repetition type B | * In unit of repetitions   + OPPO, Intel, NTT DOCOMO, Ericsson, Samsung * In unit of symbols   + Xiaomi, * In unit of slots   + Apple |
| TBoMS | * In unit of slots   + Xiaomi, Ericsson |
| Different TB | - |

* Option 2: The unit of the time domain window is the same for the following PUSCH transmission:
  + PUSCH repetition type A
  + PUSCH repetition type B
  + TBoMS, if agreed
  + Different TB, if agreed

**Support:** CATT (Slot), ZTE (Slot for maximum time duration and nominal TDW configured by gNB), CMCC (slot or symbol), Qualcomm (Physical slot)

**Other considerations:**

**TCL:** A uniform set of TDW unit for each PUSCH transmission pattern should be used for paired spectrum and unpaired spectrum. (We don’t support that the time domain window is implicitly determined by DL/UL configuration).

* + For PUSCH repetition type A: slot, repetition
  + For PUSCH repetition type B: slot, nominal repetition and/or actual repetition
  + For different TBs: slot, TB
  + For TBoMS: slot, or a single time domain window across the entire TB

Different TDW units are applied to each PUSCH transmission pattern.

**LG:** For the unit of time domain window for joint channel estimation, it would be appropriate to be a slot or repetition.

## 2.4 Inter-slot frequency hopping with inter-slot bundling

In RAN1 #104b-e meeting, two options were agreed to be down selected about the bundle size of inter-slot frequency hopping with inter-slot bundling:

* Option 1: The bundle size (time domain hopping interval) equals to the time domain window size.

**Support:** Apple, Samsung, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, CMCC, NTT DOCOMO

* Option 2: The bundle size (time domain hopping interval) can be different from the time domain window.
  + FFS: Whether the bundle size (time domain hopping interval) is explicitly configured or implicitly determined.
  + FFS: Whether/How the bundle size (time domain hopping interval) is defined separately for FDD and TDD.
  + FFS: relation between the bundle size (time domain hopping interval) and the time domain window size

**Support:** CTC, OPPO, LG, Xiaomi, vivo, CMCC, Intel, ZTE, CATT, NTT DOCOMO

**Other considerations:**

**CATT:** Further study how to indicate UE to adopt the inter-slot frequency hopping with inter-slot bundling. (e.g. 1. add a candidate option in *PUSCH-config* when configuring the frequency hopping method; 2. UE can be implicitly indicated to enable the inter-bundling hopping when the UE is configured with RRC parameters related to joint channel estimation (e.g. enabling/disabling joint channel estimation and/or time domain window size.))

**OPPO:** The bundle size is explicitly informed to the UE.

**Sharp:** A new hopping pattern other than an alternating pattern on hopping bundles can be considered to maximize frequency hopping gain.

**Xiaomi:** Support time window split mechanism when there are more than X un-scheduled OFDM symbols/slots exists in a nominal time window and the effect on DMRS bundle size should be taken into consideration. Moreover, support inserting DMRS into DMRS bundle if there is no available DMRS after splitting.



**WILUS:** For inter-slot frequency hopping with inter-slot bundling, up to M’ consecutive UL slots are determined as the same frequency hop index (Option 3), where M’ is no more than the configured/indicated number of slots for an inter-slot bundling.



**Nokia/NSB:** For inter-slot frequency hopping with inter-slot bundling to enable joint channel estimation, the UE switches frequency hop for the PUSCH repetitions whenever one of the following happens:

* The “maximum capable duration” is exceeded.
* The “maximum unscheduled gap” between two successive PUSCHs is exceeded.
* The UE is expected to monitor/receive a DL reception occasion.
* The UE is expected to transmit an UL transmission with different settings than PUSCH repetitions.

If the “repetition duration” is less than “the maximum capable duration”, and no other event that breaks phase continuity occurs, then the number of repetitions can be split in two halves, each transmitted on one frequency hop.



**vivo:** The actual time domain window derived for joint channel estimation should be less than N slots, where N is configured bundle size of inter-slot bundling.

**ZTE:** For the determination of inter-slot bundling size for inter-slot FH, RAN1 down-selects from the two options below.

* Option 1: Inter-slot bundling size is implicitly determined by the number of repetitions K within one actual time domain window.
* Option 2: Inter-slot bundling size is RRC configured or dynamically indicated to a UE.

**Samsung:** A UE performs PUSCH frequency hopping per number of M>1 PUSCH repetitions. The number M can be predetermined or RRC configured as either M=constant value or as a fraction of the number of repetitions N (e.g., M=N/2 or M=N/4 and so on).



**Qualcomm:** Consider the following procedure for inter-slot frequency hopping with DMRS bundling:

* Identify available slots for PUSCH/PUCCH reps
* Determine frequency hopping index for each available slot based on the configured hopping pattern for DMRS bundling
* Determine TDWs for DMRS bundling assuming frequency hop allocations made in Step 2. UE ensures that no two slots with different hop indices are bundled together.



**CMCC:** According to the reply from RAN4, *X* consecutive slots could be configured for the joint channel estimation. And the inter-slot frequency hopping could be configured every *X* consecutive slots.

**Ericsson:** Allowing the gNB to independently control the frequency hopping pattern and time domain windows separately can potentially avoid unnecessarily restricting and complicating network scheduling.

* The bundle size is gNB implementation and follows from the hopping pattern and time domain window size, and so frequency hopping bundling size does not need explicit configuration.
* Not all UEs may benefit from, or support, DMRS bundling, but such UEs should be able to hop with the same patterns used by DMRS bundling UEs in the same cell.

## 2.5 Optimization of DMRS location in time domain

Companies’ vies on additional DMRS located in special slots are summarized as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Pros | Cons |
| * Although the special slot can be used for PUCCH or SRS transmission, which makes it unavailable for PUSCH joint channel estimation occasionally, it’s worthwhile to further study the utilization mechanism of special slot, where a significant gain can be obtained from the utilization of either 1 or 2 DMRS located special slot. | * The practical benefit of using DMRS located in special slot for joint CE is not evident. * Significant spec impact may be needed to support such an enhancement as follows:   1) Need to define where to place the DMRS and how to do that because allocating DMRS without data is not compatible with the current DMRS allocation procedure.  2) Need to agree on how many DMRS symbols can be allocated if there is more than one available UL symbol in the S slot.  3) Need to agree on a concept of enabling and disabling the allocation of DMRS on the S slots, which should be a separate discussion from the enabling/disabling of the Joint-CE feature.  4) Impacts on the processing timeline for PUSCH should also be resolved.  5) Impacts on the definition/indication of the time-domain window, which also needs to include, at least the DMRS symbols in the special slots.  6) How to handle the collision of the DMRS symbols in the S slot with any other UL channels is not clear. |

Simulation results on additional DMRS located in special slots are summarized below.

One company (HW) shows JCE w/ 1/2 DMRS located in special slot can improve the performance of PUSCH transmissions by 0.75/1.3dB at 10% BLER in typical TDD mode ‘DDDSUDDSUU’ compared to the baseline of UL slot with 1 DMRS w/o JCE. Additionally, JCE w/ 1/2 DMRS located in special slot can improve the performance of PUSCH transmissions by 0.45/0.65dB at 10% BLER in typical TDD mode ‘DDDSUDDSUU’ compared to the baseline of UL slot with 2 DMRS w/o JCE.

One company (InterDigital) shows JCE w/ 1 DMRS located in special slot can provide 0.5 and 0.8dB gain at 10% BLER in TDD configuration ‘DDDSU’, with 2 DMRS in the UL slot with the baseline and optimized DM-RS placement in the uplink slot, respectively, compare to the baseline DM-RS placement in the uplink slot in TDD configuration ‘DDDDU’.

One company (vivo) shows JCE w/ 1 DMRS located in special slot can provide 0.7dB gain at 10% BLER with 2 repetitions, TDD configuration ‘DDSUU’ and 1 DMRS symbol per UL slot. Moreover, the performance gain is not sensitivity to the DMRS pattern.

One company (Intel) shows JCE w/ 1 DMRS located in special slot can provide ~0.5 dB gain at 10% BLER with 2 and 4 repetitions, TDD and 2 DMRS symbol per UL slot.

One company (Ericsson) observes jointly estimated DMRS in special slot can theoretically improve channel estimation performance slightly, but in a fair comparison, where the total amount of system resources used by the UE is kept unchanged and 14% of the UL is needed for A/N or SRS, no net gains from having DMRS in special slot are observed in the simulations.

## 2.6 Others

**PTRS:**

**InterDigital:** Support to include PTRS in a DMRS bundle. Parameters of PTRS in the DMRS bundle depend on duration of the time window, SCS, bandwidth for PUSCH, and MCS used with DMRS bundling

**Qualcomm:** Support different criteria for activation of PTRS or its density for the case of joint channel estimation.

**TPC command:**

**Samsung:** Support a same power, precoding, RV, and frequency position within time domain window. A UE updates the CLPC adjustment state per time domain window.



**Illustration of power control method over multiple PUSCH repetitions for joint channel estimation**

**HW:** In order to maintain power consistency and phase continuity, the power adjustments need be disabled during a time domain window, which may include multiple transmission occasions. However, in Rel-15/Rel-16, the PUSCH power control is performed per transmission occasion.



When joint channel estimation is enabled, a larger window size means a longer adjustment period and convergence time of power control, which maybe lead to larger power control deviation. To obtain correct transmit power for each time domain window, some optimization of power control adjustment mechanism for joint channel estimation may be necessary. The following solutions can be considered:

- Alt 1: Receiving and accumulating TPC commands without taking effect during the current time domain window.

- Alt 2: Modifying the TPC commands accumulation range so that power control is performed per timw domain window.

**LG:** In relation to power control, power consistency can be maintained only if close loop power control is not indicated or not applied even if indicated.

**Phase correction at gNB**

**Ericsson:** proposed further study the benefit of gNB estimated inter-slot relative phase correction for PUSCH, addressing how frequency selective such phase corrections would need to be for UEs and/or conditions that do not sufficiently support maintaining inter-slot relative phase.

**TA adjustment**

**LG:** In reply LS of RAN4, it was answered that TA adjustment affects phase continuity. Therefore, the UE should not perform TA adjustment when the DMRS bundling is configured.

**Ericsson:** The UE should not apply TA updates between transmissions belonging to the same DMRS bundle.

**Power consistency for high power UE**

**vivo:** For high power UE, according to Section 6.2.1 in TS 38.101-1, if the number of uplink symbols transmitted in a certain evaluation period exceeds the duty cycle, UE need to reduce the transmission power. However, how the duty cycle is counted is not specified. That means, NW is not aware of the transmission power change for a high power UE once the duty cycle exceeds the threshold. Thus, for high power UE, if the uplink duty cycle exceeds the threshold during the time domain window for joint channel estimation, and UE changes the transmission power, the power consistency across repetitions cannot be fulfilled.



1. Email discussion (1st round)

## 3.1 Use cases

### 3.1.1 PUSCH transmission with different TBs

**FL comments: It has been intensively discussed on the use case of PUSCH transmissions with different TBs. From FL understanding, there may additional specification impact compared with the case of PUSCH transmissions with the same TB, e.g., time domain window. As we have only three RAN1 meetings left, we have to make decision in this meeting.**

**Proposal 1:** **Make down selection on the following two alternatives in RAN1 #106-e.**

Alt 1:

* For back-to-back PUSCH transmissions across consecutive slots, support necessary design aspects (under the condition of power consistency and phase continuity) to enable joint channel estimation for the following cases:
  + Over back-to-back PUSCH transmissions with different TBs
* For non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions across consecutive slots, support necessary design aspects (under the condition of power consistency and phase continuity) to enable joint channel estimation for the following cases:
  + Over non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions with different TBs

Alt 2:

* Joint channel estimation over back-to-back PUSCH transmissions with different TBs is not supported in Rel-17.
* Joint channel estimation over non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions with different TBs is not supported in Rel-17.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Panasonic | Our view is Alt.2 because we would like to prioritize to complete a general design concept of joint CE for PUSCH repetition type A/B with the same TB in Rel. 17. Based on that, we would discuss joint CE for different TBs in Rel. 18 because we foresee additional specification impact that needs to be considered in this case, as compared with the case of PUSCH transmissions with the same TB. For instance, if multiple TBs are indicated by multiple DCIs, how to indicate these DCIs needs to be jointly identified by UE, how gNB managed one of false/miss detected DCI needs to be resolved. Moreover, if multiple TBs are indicated by single DCI, the similar design can be obtained from the discussion for 52.6GHz to 71 GHz but the design is not concluded. |
| ZTE | Fine with the proposal with Alt 1 preferred. As well summarized by FL, joint channel estimation can provide clear performance gain for different TB case as shown by several companies. As for the scheduling restriction of gNB, we think a separate RRC signaling for enabling joint channel estimation dedicated for different TB case could be considered. In such case, it will not impact the scheduling of other cases, e.g., repetition or TBoMS. And it’s always up to the network implementation considering both the performance gain and scheduling restriction. |
| Apple | Alt 2 is preferred. (non-) or back-to-back PUSCH transmissions with different TBs are out of the target of coverage enhancement. The potential gain and scheduling restrictions should be studied carefully. If possible, these can be discussed in future Release. |
| Nokia/NSB | Alt. 2. We agree with the FL’s understanding that supporting JCE across PUSCHs of different TBs may introduce additional specification impacts on top of what are needed for PUSCHs of the same TB. Given the time constraint and the progress on this topic so far, Alt. 2 is a suitable way-forward. |
| CMCC | Support the Alternative 1 or at least the first bullet in the Alt 1. The joint channel estimation can provide the benefits to improve the data rate with different TBs.  For the 2nd bullet in the Alt 1, there needs more clarification on what would be transmitted in-between PUSCH transmissions. |
| Intel | We support Alt. 2.  It was extensively discussed in the previous meetings. In our view, PUSCH transmission with different TBs is not targeted for coverage enhancement, i.e., UE is in good channel conditions. The motivation is not clear to us for joint channel estimation of different TBs. Further, if joint channel estimation for different TBs is supported, this would pose certain restriction at gNB scheduler, i.e., same MCS, TPC, FDRA, which is not desirable from system operation’s perspective. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Considering the limited time and the low priority of multiple TB with joint channel estimation, we support Alt 2 i.e., no joint channel estimation for PUSCH transmissions with different TBs |
| Qualcomm | Support Alt 2. JCE across different TBs requires several additional design considerations. Will be good to put JCE across PUSCH repetitions on a stable footing first. |
| Samsung | Our concern on the joint channel estimation over back-to-back/non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions with different TBs is that for different TBs is difficult to maintain the prerequisites for joint CE and is too restrictive for gNB scheduling aspects. |
| LG | According to RAN4’s replay, RAN4 is still discussing the feasibility of 14 symbols or 1 ms for different SCSs for the un-scheduled gap. Therefore it is reasonable for RAN1 to postpone decision whether to support non-back-to-back PUSCH transmission across consecutive slots until at least RAN4’s requirement is settled. |
| InterDigital | We support Alt. 1. |
| Sharp | We support Alt 2 because window design is more complicated. |
| OPPO | support |
| Xiaomi | Support alt 1. Different TBs cases should be supported for higher data rate as long as UE can meet the power consistency and phase continuity requirements. |
| Spreadtrum | Support Alt2. |
| TCL | Support Alt1. |
| CATT | OK to make down-selection.  We originally prefer Alt 1 for better performance and wilder application for JCE. From technical point of view, for joint channel estimation, it does not matter whether the same or different TBs are carried on the multiple PUSCHs as long as the requirement from RAN4 is satisfied.  But we can live with Alt 2 if proven to be a disaster to the UE. |
| Sony | Support Alt 1 |
| WILUS | Support Alt 2. Allocation of same MCS, RB allocation, and UL transmission power may cause scheduling restriction over PUSCH transmissions with different TBs. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | Alt .1 is preferred for the following reasons,   * As shown in the TR 38.830 and our contribution, with joint channel estimation across consecutive PUSCH transmissions of different TBs, a large coverage gain can be achieved as compared to the baseline of PUSCH transmissions without joint channel estimation, i.e., 1.4 dB and 2.1 dB SNR gains are obtained at 10% BLER for 2 and 3 slots joint channel estimation, respectively. * Additionally, there are concerns that scheduling limitations among different TBs to enable joint channel estimation might degrade diversity gain, such as same RB allocations of different TBs for phase continuity might cost diversity gain in frequency domain. However, given a large number of scheduled RBs with a requirement of target data rate 1Mbps, minor frequency diversity gain can be achieved by different RB allocations of different TBs, because for 1Mbps, up to 20 RBs for FDD and 32 RBs for TDD are scheduled as assumed in TR 38.830. * It is surely in the scope of coverage enhancement because it is very valuable and essential for practical network operation to increase UL throughput at a given SINR as commented by multiple operators. However, limiting the applicability of JCE to PUSCH repetition Type A does not increase UL throughput due to decreased effective coding rate. * According to RAN4 reply, the conditions to achieve Tx Phase contiguity are independent of whether different TBs or same TB   Thus, considering the great benefit of joint channel estimation among different TBs with very low cost, alt.1 should be supported. |
| MediaTek | Support Alt.2 |
| Ericsson | Prefer Alt 2. Agree with the comments above that different TBs will bring significant additional specification impact and scheduling restrictions. Furthermore, if the same REs, power, MCS, etc are used, PUSCH repetition type A or TBoMS can be used instead. |

**FL comments: Per Chair’s guidance, companies are encouraged to provide specification impacts on joint channel estimation over PUSCH transmissions with different TBs.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Specification impacts may include the power control part, e.g. the UE cannot adjust the power between different PUSCH (different TB) if they are within the same TDW, regardless any TPC is received. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | We see very small spec impact to enable the feature of different TBs on top of the feature of single TB, according to the analysis below.   1. Since RAN4 replied phase contiguity can be achieved irrespective of single TB or different TB duration, it is not additional spec impact but straightforwardly that a time domain window can cover the durations of different TBs. As a result, regarding the issue of effective TPC during a time domain window, it is very similar to the case of single TB, because even in the case of single TB, TPC received for SRS transmission can still impact on the PUSCH slots during a time domain window, which requires a solution anyway. No spec impact specific to an optimization of different TBs can be expected on this issue. 2. Because RAN4 spec on the condition of phase contiguity are independent of whether different TBs or single TB, it can be referred in RAN1 spec, so that RAN1 spec impact on time domain window and any window splitting functionality, if any, are generic to both single TB case and different TB case. 3. The RRC signalling of enabling/disenabling JCE can be the same for both cases, unless it is preferred to indicate separate signalling for enabling/disabling the case of different TBs. 4. The issue of potential UE events raised in S2.3.4 is the only potential unique issue for different TBs. It may or may not have additionally assistant signalling for the UE. |
| Nokia/NSB | Additional specification impacts may come from the way time-domain window (TDW) is determined. For PUSCH repetitions, the reference time duration for TDW determination is the repetition duration such that, one or more TDWs can be determined implicitly during the reference time duration. For PUSCHs with different TBs, at least dynamic indication of a duration that is similar to repetition duration is needed. Otherwise, the UE doesn’t know during which time reference it should apply the implicit determination of TDW. RAN1 should avoid such dynamic indication of the reference time duration (or TDW), if it is just introduced to accommodate for PUSCHs with different TBs. |
| Intel | So far all the LS from RAN4 for joint channel estimation is targeted for PUSCH and PUCCH repetitions with the same TB. If we support joint channel estimation for different TBs, RAN4 first needs to define a new set of requirements for phase continuity and power consistency for different TBs.  From RAN1 perspective, it may need additional handling of TDW for joint channel estimation for different TBs, e.g., UE may need to check whether the modulation order is changed, frequency domain resource allocation is changed for different TBs, etc., while for PUSCH repetitions, this is not needed as same modulation order, FDRA, etc., is allocated for different repetitions. We also share similar view as Nokia that dynamic indication of TDW may be needed to allow UE to determine the start time/ending time of TDW. However, for joint channel estimation of PUSCH repetitions, this is not needed. |
| Panasonic | Regarding specification impact of enabling joint CE of multiple TBs, our understanding is shown in the following   * Except NR-U, the design principle of NR is one DCI schedules one TB transmission. If joint channel estimation for multiple TBs is supported, it needs to conclude whether one DCI indicates multiple TBs on a TDW or multiple DCIs to indicates multiple TBs on a TDW. * One DCI schedule multiple TBs in a TDW: We think the design for 52.6GHz to 71 GHz can be probably largely reused. On the other hand, there is no conclusion yet. After the design is completed, specific aspect for coverage extension needs to be evaluated and updated. * Multiple DCIs schedule multiple TBs in a TDW: Some signalling mechanism needs to inform UE such that which DCIs are used to realize in the TDW. This may be similar to what Nokia said as separate dynamic TDW indication. Some restriction or timing relations may be required to be specified for these DCIs. Some processing time restriction may be required as well. For gNB perspective, if one of DCI is miss-detected or false-detected by a UE, one of multiple TBs in a TDW is not sent. Some blind detection is required. The complexity analysis for gNB is required for this case. |
| Ericsson | When repetition is used, there is a single grant or the parameters are configured, so the same MCS, FDRA, power, etc., are all used. With multiple TBs, there are generally multiple grants, and extra specification seems needed to constrain parameters to meet the RAN4 requirements.  Also, the time domain window design may have to be customized to support the different TB case, as pointed out above by Nokia and Intel. |
| Samsung | We share similar view with Nokia regarding the need of dynamic indication. From our perspective, semi-static RRC configuration for joint CE may not be enough to determine the start/end of TDW between two PUSCHs with different TBs. To support joint CE with different TBs, a dynamic signalling to clearly indicate the start/end of TDW seems to be needed. Therefore, we need to discuss first whether or not to support the dynamic indication for joint channel estimation. We also need to verify the feasibility from RAN4 perspective. |
| CMCC | The specification impact for JCE of different TBs could be very small considering that the TDW have been defined for the JCE.  When UEs are configured to work under the mode of JCE (which may be through the RRC configuration), the PUSCHs with different TB under the indicated TDW in the consecutive slots could work.  The conditions of JCE are mostly using the same modulation order, same PRBs, same precoding, same power and consecutive uplink slots without downlink in between. Those conditions could be based on the scheduling of gNB. For the UE who need coverage enhancements, and in the consecutive slots, there is no need to change the modulation order, PRB allocations, and precoding schemes. And the TPC issues are the same for both same TBs and different TBs.  For the dynamic indication of the starting point, our initial thinking is that it could be a similar situation. For the multiple PUSCH repetitions which covers multiple uplink and downlink slots, only one set of consecutive uplink slots within the TDW could be used for the joint channel estimation. The 2nd set of consecutive UL slots could use the joint channel estimation within itself. But it cannot be used for the JCE between the 2 sets of the slots, since the downlink transmission would be inserted in-between.  The JCE would be interrupted or broken as the consecutive uplink slots ends. And for the different TBs case, the JCE would be interrupted if different PRBs, modulations or others are scheduled by Gnb. |
| ZTE | Firstly, we think what we need to do is to clarify the potential additional spec impacts specific for different TBs.  We share with Huawei and CMCC that the requirements for maintaining the phase continuity can be applied for both single TB and different TBs. So, the spec impacts regarding the requirements about MCS, power, FDRA etc., are the same as single TB case. No additional optimization is needed for these aspects.  Regarding the comments about TDW, it depends on the discussion for TDW definition for single TB in Proposal 7.   * For Alt. 2-A and Alt. 2-C, gNB can configure the TDW, which at least including the length of the TDW, and length of TDW for other alternatives can be implicitly determined. Then, at least the duration during which the UE is expected to maintain the phase continuity can be determined the same as the single TB case. For the start of the first TDW for different TBs, it may or may not need additional spec impact, which depends on further discussion on Proposal 7. |

### 3.1.2 TBoMS

**Proposal 2:** **Confirm the following working assumption.**

**Working assumption:**

* For back-to-back PUSCH transmissions across consecutive slots, support necessary design aspects (under the condition of power consistency and phase continuity) to enable joint channel estimation for the following case:
  + Over back-to-back PUSCH transmissions for one TB processed over multiple slots
    - It’s subject to UE capability

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Panasonic | We agree with the proposal. |
| ZTE | Support. We don’t identify any additional specification efforts to support this use case compared to PUSCH repetition. |
| Apple | One clarification question on this working assumption, this working assumption is only applied to TBoMS with one ToT. If TBoMS is configured with multiple ToT, this WA is not applied, right? |
| Nokia/NSB | Basic design aspects of TBoMS are still discussed under AI 8.8.1.2 and have not been finalized yet. We are not ready to confirm this working assumption at this stage and need to wait for further progress under 8.8.1.2. In addition, if RAN1 can design a JCE framework that can be applicable for any use case, discussion on the confirmation of this WA could be easy. |
| CMCC | General fine with the proposal, as it is emphasized that power consistency and phase continuity could be fulfilled in the round bracket. But we think it needs more clarifications and discussions for what would be transmitted in-between the PUSCH transmissions. |
| Intel | We are fine to confirm the working assumption |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support the proposal to confirm the working assumption |
| Qualcomm | We could revisit towards end of this meeting after waiting for further progress under AI 8.8.1.2. (expecting that it should be okay to confirm) |
| Samsung | We agree with the above WA. |
| LG | Although the details of TBoMS have not been decided yet, it is questionable for us how to decide whether to support it. It is also recommended to discuss after the details of TBoMS are decided. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support the proposal. Because type A PUSCH repetition like TDRA is supported for TBoMS and this proposal confines the back-to-back PUSCH transmissions, the same mechanism as type A PUSCH repetition can be reused for TBoMS. |
| InterDigital | We support to confirm the working assumption |
| Sharp | Support |
| vivo | We support the proposal. |
| OPPO | Support |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| Spreadtrum | Support |
| TCL | Support |
| CATT | We support the proposal. |
| Sony | Support |
| WILUS | We support the proposal. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | Support. |
| MediaTek | Support |
| Ericsson | Agree the WA can be confirmed. |
|  |  |

### 3.1.3 Non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions across consecutive slots

**Proposal 3:** **Confirm the following working assumption.**

**Working assumption:**

* For non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions (at least for the case of the same TB) across consecutive slots, support necessary design aspects (under the condition of power consistency and phase continuity) to enable joint channel estimation for the following cases:
  + Over non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions (of the same TB) for repetition type A scheduled by dynamic grant or configured grant.
  + Over non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions (of the same TB) for repetition type B scheduled by dynamic grant or configured grant, if it reuses only those joint channel estimation specification enhancements defined to support repetition Type A.
    - FFS: additional specification enhancements on top of that defined to support repetition Type A
    - Only for single layer transmissions
    - Subject to UE capability
  + FFS: Over non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions with different TBs
  + FFS: Over non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions for TBoMS
  + For the non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions, it is defined as at least when there is no UL transmission between the two successive PUSCH transmissions
  + Subject to UE capability with details FFS (e.g., separate vs. joint capability for type A & type B, w.r.t. OFF power requirements, etc.)
* FFS: Joint channel estimation over non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions with other uplink transmissions between the two successive PUSCH transmissions across consecutive slot.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Panasonic | We agree with the proposal. |
| ZTE | Support  Based on RAN4 output, it is feasible for UE to satisfy the related requirements in case of non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions across consecutive slots. |
| Apple | We are ok to confirm the working assumption. |
| Nokia/NSB | Support the FL’s proposal. |
| Intel | We are fine to confirm the working assumption |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support the proposal to confirm the working assumption |
| Qualcomm | Support |
| Samsung | We agree with the above WA in principle.  1st FFs - FFS: additional specification enhancements on top of that defined to support repetition Type A – it needs to be resolved before confirming the WA since the support of type B is conditioned to reusing “only” specification enhancement for type A. We would be ok to support repetitions type B but there might be a need to make other changes for type A.  2nd and 3rd FFs’s – suggest to resolve them in this meeting |
| LG | Support it. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support the proposal. |
| InterDigital | We support the FL’s proposal. |
| Sharp | Support |
| vivo | We support the proposal. |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| Spreadtrum | Support |
| TCL | Support |
| CATT | We support the proposal. |
| Sony | Support |
| WILUS | We support the proposal. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | Support |
| MediaTek | Support |
| Ericsson | Support |
|  |  |

## 3.2 Time domain window

### 3.2.1 Time domain window design

**FL comments: In RAN1 #105-e, two candidate alternatives were discussed. It seems there are different understanding on the two alternatives. Before making down selection between the two alternatives of the time domain window, we need to discuss the details for each alternative.**

* Alt 1: All the repetitions are covered by one single TDW
  + The TDW may be fragmented into multiple sub windows due to the following events such that the power consistency and phase continuity are violated.
    - DL/UL configuration for unpaired spectrum;
    - The TDW exceeds the maximum duration;
    - The maximum unscheduled gap between two successive PUSCHs is exceeded;
    - DL reception/monitoring occasion for unpaired spectrum during the TDW;
    - High priority transmission, dynamic SFI for unpaired spectrum, CI and etc. during the TDW.
  + The start of the TDW or first sub window is the first PUSCH transmission
    - Option 1a: The first available slot for PUSCH transmissions.
    - Option 1b: The first available symbol for PUSCH transmissions.
    - Option 2a: The first physical slot allocated for PUSCH transmissions.
    - Option 2b: The first physical symbol allocated for PUSCH transmissions.
  + The start of one sub window (except the first sub window) is,
    - Option 1: The first available slot for PUSCH transmission after the previous sub window.
    - Option 2: The first available symbol for PUSCH transmission after the previous sub window.
  + The end of one sub window (except the last sub window) is,
    - Option 1: The last slot of the PUSCH transmission right before an event such that the power consistency and phase continuity are violated.
    - Option 2: The last symbol of the PUSCH transmission right before an event such that the power consistency and phase continuity are violated.
  + The end of the TDW or the last sub window is the end of the last PUSCH transmission.
  + FFS: frequency hopping and precoder cycling

Companies are encouraged to provide views on the above details for Alt 1.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Panasonic | It looks that the current formulation of Alt.1 generally converges to Alt.2 because sub-window in Alt.1 corresponds to TDW in Alt.2. According to the past agreements, the power consistency and phase continuity are kept in TDW. On the other hand, in Alt.1, the period to keep the power consistency and phase continuity are only within sub-window, which need to revise the past agreements. Therefore, our view is to take Alt.2. |
| ZTE | We would like to first clarify the following understanding:   1. Is the single TDW configured by gNB? 2. If the answer above is yes, is it possible gNB configure a TDW with length smaller than the duration of all PUSCH repetitions? If possible, does it mean the UE does not expect to keep phase and power continuity for the rest of repetitions that out of the single TDW? If the answer is yes, it seems contradicting with the second last bullet. If the answer is no, what’s the difference with Alt2?   In addition, we are not sure whether we need to list all detailed events that would violate the power consistency and phase continuity. It could be sufficient to say it is under the requirements defined by RAN4. |
| Apple | Trying to understand Alt 1, the power consistency and phase continuity are assumed within the sub-window, right? |
| CMCC | Share the similar views as ZTE and Panasonic. The Alt 1 and Alt 2 are similar if we replace the sub-window with TDW in the Alt2. And once a DL happens during the window, the phase continuity and power consistency cannot be guaranteed, which is conflicted with definition of the time domain window. |
| Intel | We share similar view as other companies that alt. 1 and 2 have some similarity. In our view, single time domain window does not work for some cases. One typical example is that when inter-slot frequency hopping with inter-slot bundling is employed, UE cannot maintain phase continuity between two frequency hops. If we further divide this into two time domain windows, this simply leads to Alt. 2. In our view, we do not support Alt. 1. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | In our view, the further detail that are added above for Alt 1 are not in line with the agreed definition of TDW. Within a TDW, IE is expected to maintain power consistency and phase continuity. Therefore, we don’t think that this definition of sub TDW should be introduced to justify discontinuity. As mentioned in our contribution, if the maximum duration of the TDW cannot contain the scheduled duration of the transmission, then multiple TDWs are needed. But the concept of sub-TDW should not be considered |
| Qualcomm | As others point out, the differences between Alt 1 and Alt 2 seem cosmetic. We may be able to merge them. |
| Samsung | Not support. As the number of repetitions increases to extend coverage, we don’t think a single TDW can cover all the repetitions. |
| LG | Before discussing the detailed options of single window/ one or multiple window, definitions of terms and units is needed to align level of understanding. First of all, discussion regarding the unit of time domain window should be preceded. Depending on this, it will be decided whether the unit of the start and end of the window will be a slot or a symbol.  Also, even assuming the unit is agreed to be a slot, the understanding of the companies are different according to whether the slot consists of only an uplink slot or a physical slot that includes a downlink slot. To us, this makes huge difference which leads so many options on alternatives.  Addition to that, it is quite confusion about sub window since the term sub window is not agreed. Our understanding is that when a configured time domain window is segmented, it become another time domain window which is sub window, or when a given (configured) time domain window is separated by the UE by a segmentation rule or UE capability is called a sub window.  For these detailed terms, a discussion to align the views between companies should be preceded. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We think that FL’s intention of this proposal is whether multiple nominal time domain windows can be indicated or configured. Only one nominal time domain window can be indicated or configured in Alt1, while Alt2 can accommodate the case of multiple nominal time domain windows under the situation where even only one nominal time domain window can be applied. Please let us know if our understanding is wrong.  Even in that case, the sub windows should not be longer than necessary, as actual time domain windows could be constraints on power and frequency offset calibration. To design time domain windows satisfying this aspect, the available symbol should be the start and end of all sub windows. Hence, we would like to add the following option:  ‐ The end of one sub window (except the last sub window) is,  o Option 1: The last slot of the PUSCH transmission right before an event such that the power consistency and phase continuity are violated.  o Option 2: The last symbol of the PUSCH transmission right before an event such that the power consistency and phase continuity are violated.  o Option 3: The last available symbol of the PUSCH transmission before an event such that the power consistency and phase continuity are violated.  ‐ The end of the TDW or the last sub window is the end of the last available symbol of the PUSCH transmission. |
| InterDigital | We support one single TDW and we don’t see a need to define sub windows for Alt. 1. The single TDW indicates the beginning and end of the duration during which the UE is expected to maintain power consistency and phase continuity for the repetitions. For frequency hopping, the UE will expected to maintain power consistency and phase continuity during a hop but not across hops during the TDW. We don’t see a need to define multiple TDWs as suggested in Alt. 2. |
| Sharp | In our view, Alt 1 is 2-step approach that sub-windows are determined after determining the single TDW. Furthermore, for Alt 1, the TDW is duration UE tries to keep both phase continuity and power consistency, and gNB can perform JCE within one sub-window.  In our view, the necessity of the single TDW is unclear. |
| vivo | One or more configured window is not essential, but the actual window is the key point. There are always multiple actual windows in TDD system. In our understanding, Alt 1 means that all the repetitions are covered by one single configured TDW. Thus, from the signalling overhead, the one single configured TDW can be implicitly configured by the duration of repetition. The design of TDW should focus on the segmentation/splitting mechanism.  Further, another event can be added as followed,   * + - The TDW exceeds the bundle size for inter-slot bundling with frequency hopping;   For the start of the TDW or first sub window is the first PUSCH transmission, we prefer to support Option 1a, and with more specific description as followed.   * + - Option 1a: The first symbol in the first available slot for PUSCH transmissions.   For the start of one sub window (except the first sub window), we prefer Option 1.  For the end of one sub window (except the last sub window), we prefer Option 1, and with more specific description as followed.   * + - Option 1: The last symbol in the last slot of the PUSCH transmission right before an event such that the power consistency and phase continuity are violated. |
| FL | @Panasonic, From FL understanding, the definition of TDW is during the TDW UE is expected to maintain power consistency and phase continuity, but it does not consider the events which may violate the power consistency and phase continuity. The key point is whether these events are allowed during the TDW.  @ZTE, For Alt 1, the single TDW may be explicitly configured or implicitly determined. The length equals to the duration of all PUSCH repetitions. From FL understanding, the difference between Alt 1 and Alt 2 is that for Alt 1, only single TDW is configured, while for Alt 2, multiple TDWs are configured. This may have impact on the signaling design. Particular for Alt 2-A, the window length can be configurable. The events listed here is for discussion.  @Apple, the power consistency and phase continuity are assumed to be maintained during the whole TDW, but it may be violated by some events.  @CMCC, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, As replied to ZTE, there are differences on signalling design between Alt 1 and Alt 2. In addition, for Alt 2-A, the the window length can be configurable. From FL understanding, the definition of TDW is during the TDW UE is expected to maintain power consistency and phase continuity, but it does not consider the events which may violate the power consistency and phase continuity. The key point is whether these events are allowed during the TDW.  @Intel, As explained above, there is indeed similarity between Alt 1 and Alt 2. But there is also difference between Alt 1 and Alt 2. Regarding the frequency hopping, this can be deems as one kind of event.  @Qualcomm, If companies have aligned the understandings, we can focus one of them.  @LG, It’s a bit complicated. In RAN1 #104b-e, we discussed the unit of the TDW, but it seems companies’ views were quite divergent and companies suggested to discuss the framework of TDW first. From FL understanding, we can figure out the basic structure of TDW then we can discuss other issues which may have dependency on TDW later. Regarding the definition of sub window, at present, it is for discussion, since companies have different understandings.  @DOCOMO, yes, the difference between Alt 1 and Alt 2 is whether multiple nominal time domain windows can be indicated or configured.  @InterDigital, If sub window for Alt 1 is not introduced, how to handle non-consecutive slots DL/UL configuration? How to handle the events that can violate the power consistency and phase continuity? For frequency hopping, from FL understanding, one sub window (or actual window) should be introduced to each hop, as UE cannot maintain power consistency and phase continuity during the whole window. |
| OPPO | We think we need to wait for RAN4’s further feedback. If the UE can maintain phase continuity during the whole repetition, one TDW is enough. Considering the impact the TDD configuration and other factors, the single TDW may be divided into several sub-TDWs, but we think TDW and sub-TDWs are not inconsistent with each other since sub-TDWs are under the framework of single TDW. |
| CATT | We have concern in this direction. The details design of Alt 1 seems to have only one more (nominal) window. Does it mean that the allowed repetition number should be small enough, and hence all the repetitions can be covered by a RRC configured TDW? But if the joint channel estimation would perform to the PUSCH transmissions in sub-windows, it seems no need to introduce the definition of single window covering all of the repetitions. |
| Panasonic | We are not sure about FL's reply to us in this statement "The key point is whether these events are allowed during the TDW". Particularly, in RAN1#104bis-e, it was agreed that  “For joint channel estimation, specify a time domain window during which a UE is expected to maintain power consistency and phase continuity among PUSCH transmissions subject to power consistency and phase continuity requirements.”  In our understanding, above means TDW is defined for the period "to maintain power consistency and phase continuity among PUSCH transmissions" after the segmentation by the events like DL reception/monitoring occasion, etc. The possible difference of the interpretation can be how to interpret "is expected to". Our interpretation of the reason to add "is expected to" is to address " subject to power consistency and phase continuity requirements" and not to take into account the event like DL reception/monitoring occasion, etc. |
| InterDigital2 | @FL  Thank you very much for your detailed reply. We have the same understanding that during FH, the UE is expected to maintain phase continuity and power consistency during each hop, but not across hops, as we stated. We also understand the intention of the sub-window. |

* Alt 2: All the repetitions are covered by one or multiple TDWs
  + Alt 2-A: All the repetitions are covered by one or multiple consecutive TDWs
    - All the TDWs have the same window length (expect the last TDW).
    - The window length can be configurable but no longer than the maximum duration.
    - The start of the first TDW is the first PUSCH transmission.
      * Option 1a: The first available slot for PUSCH transmissions.
      * Option 1b: The first available symbol for PUSCH transmissions.
      * Option 2a: The first physical slot allocated for PUSCH transmissions.
      * Option 2b: The first physical symbol allocated for PUSCH transmissions.
    - In case the power consistency and phase continuity are violated within one TDW due to the events,
      * Option 1: This TDW is fragmented into multiple sub windows.
        + FFS: details of sub windows
      * Option 2: DM-RS bundling is not assumed during this TDW.
      * The events may include.
        + DL/UL configuration for unpaired spectrum;
        + The maximum unscheduled gap between two successive PUSCHs is exceeded;
        + DL reception/monitoring occasion for unpaired spectrum during the TDW;
        + High priority transmission, dynamic SFI for unpaired spectrum, CI and etc. during the TDW.
    - FFS: frequency hopping and precoder cycling
  + Alt 2-B: All the repetitions are covered by one or multiple TDWs
    - Multiple TDWs can be consecutive or non-consecutive.
    - The start of the first TDW is the first PUSCH transmission
      * Option 1a: The first available slot for PUSCH transmissions.
      * Option 1b: The first available symbol for PUSCH transmissions.
      * Option 2a: The first physical slot allocated for PUSCH transmissions.
      * Option 2b: The first physical symbol allocated for PUSCH transmissions.
    - The start of one TDW (except the first window)
      * Option 1: The first available slot for PUSCH transmission after the previous TDW.
      * Option 2: The first available symbol for PUSCH transmission after the previous TDW.
    - One TDW is ended due to the events,
      * The end of one TDW (except the last TDW) is,
        + Option 1: The last slot of the PUSCH transmission right before an event such that the power consistency and phase continuity are violated.
        + Option 2: The last symbol of the PUSCH transmission right before an event such that the power consistency and phase continuity are violated.
      * The event may include.
        + DL/UL configuration for unpaired spectrum;
        + The TWD exceeds the maximum duration;
        + The maximum unscheduled gap between two successive PUSCHs is exceeded;
        + DL reception/monitoring occasion for unpaired spectrum during the TDW;
        + High priority transmission, dynamic SFI for unpaired spectrum, CI and etc. during the TDW.
      * The end of the last TDW is the end of the last PUSCH transmission.
    - FFS: frequency hopping and precoder cycling

Companies are encouraged to provide views on the above details for Alt 2.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Panasonic | We support Alt.2 as it keeps the power consistency and phase continuity over the TDW. |
| ZTE | We would like to first clarify the following understanding:   1. Are the one or multiple TDWs configured by gNB? 2. If the answer above is yes, how could gNB configure non-consecutive TDWs? Is it correct understanding that the TDW in Alt-2A is similar to the back-to-back nominal repetition configured for PUSCH repetition time B, while the TDW in Alt-2B is similar to the potential non-back-to-back actual repetition implicitly determined for PUSCH repetition time B?   In addition, we are not sure whether we need to list all detailed events that would violate the power consistency and phase continuity. It could be sufficient to say it is under the requirements defined by RAN4. |
| Apple | For Alt2 -A, “All the repetitions are covered by one or multiple consecutive TDWs”, we are not so clear about the multiple consecutive TDWs, does it mean the DL slots could be included in TDW for this alternative?  For Alt2-B, “One TDW is ended due to the events”, one TDW could be divided into two sub-TDW, are the power consistency and phase continuity are assumed for this TDW (i.e., the first sub-TDW)? How about the left slot(s) in this window? |
| Nokia/NSB | We agree with Panasonic that there is some similarity between Alt. 1 and Alt. 2-B, wherein Alt. 2-B seems to be more technically correct, according to the previous agreements. However, it would be very appreciated if the FL can help to clarify the difference between Alt. 1 and Alt. 2-B? Whether Alt. 2-B means that the one or multiple TDWs should be configured/indicated and cannot be determined from the repetition duration? |
| CMCC | Thanks for the FL’s further detailed proposal.  From our understanding, the TDW is used to require the UE to maintain the phase continuity and power consistency. There is no need to require the UE to keep the TDW in a same size. Two or three slots, in which the conditions could be maintained for JCE, could be the TDWs, if they are below the maximum window size. As the power consistency and phase continuity could be interrupted by the DL, there is no need to require the TDWs are consecutive.  For the TDWs are divided into two, within the sub-TDW the consistency could be maintained. And the JCE could be carried out within the divided TDW.  Only the consecutive slots/symbols should be required that below the maximum window size. For those are divided into multiple windows, only the single window or consecutive windows which carry out the JCE together, should be required below the maximum window size. The maximum window size should be a UE capability. |
| Intel | We support Alt. 2-B in principle. However, some further clarifications are needed:   1. For “The start of the first TDW is the first PUSCH transmission”, is the intention to down-select Option 1x and 2x? Our view is that this may depend on whether counting is based on physical slots or available slots for PUSCH repetition type A. For counting based on available slots, it is natural outcome to consider option 1a or 1b for start of the first TDW is the first PUSCH transmission. 2. For “The end of one TDW”, we see in some cases, UE may continue to perform DMRS bundling if the remaining number of slots for repetitions is large after some events as listed above. One example is shown in the figure below: 2nd PUSCH repetition is cancelled due to the events. In this case, UE may still maintain phase continuity and power consistency in the 3rd and 4th repetition. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | In our view, multiple TDWs should only be allowed if the maximum duration of the TDW cannot contain the scheduled duration or of continuity cannot be maintained within the TDW.  Basically, a maximum duration of TDW is specified and the number of TDWs can be determined based on the maximum duration of TDW and the scheduled duration.  With this understanding, we can support multiple TDWs |
| Qualcomm | Just as we handle PUSCH repetitions in two phases, where first phase involves identifying available slots and the second phase involves resolving collisions/prioritization, a similar framework could be adopted for DMRS bundling. We would like to make a full determination of DMRS bundling immediately after a UE identifies the available slots. This provides UE the time to plan ahead. Executing transmissions within each TDW can take RAN4 considerations into account.  A UE assigns nominal TDW locations based on available slots. The UE plans around these TDW locations and reprograms its TA, FTL, Power control loops to operate around these TDW boundaries. As each PUSCH repetition occurs or alternately gets cancelled, the UE evaluates the state of DMRS bundling in each TDW. Our preference would be to not resume bundling if at any point within a TDW the RAN4 conditions for bundling are violated.  With these principles in mind, we think Alt 2-B is closest to the approach outlined above.  We think the following two bullets are also applicable to Alt 2-B:   * + - All the TDWs have the same window length (expect the last TDW).     - The window length can be configurable but no longer than the maximum duration.   For clarity we would like to add the following sub-bullet:   * TDW locations are determined prior to the start of the first PUSCH repetition and not revised in case some repetitions are dropped/cancelled or intervening uplink/downlink occurs that violates RAN4 conditions. |
| Samsung | We support Alt.2-A in principle. For the start of the first TDW, we think both Option 1a and Option 1b can be considered. In case power consistency and/or phase continuity conditions are violated by the above events, we consider that the start of the next time domain window with same length can be re-configured as the closest available slot for PUSCH transmission. Frequency hopping should be supported. |
| LG | Same comments on Alt 1. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Same comment as the case where all repetitions are covered by single time domain window. |
| InterDigital | Our view of a TDW is that it indicates the start & end of the duration during which the UE is expected to maintain power consistency and phase continuity.  We have one question is about how multiple TDWs are generated in Alt. 2. It seems like multiple TDWs are generated under some scenarios such as, DL/UL configuration for unpaired spectrum, the maximum unscheduled gap between two successive PUSCHs is exceeded, etc. However, aren’t these scenarios already excluded from the past agreements, i.e., gNB will configure a TDW only if the agreed scenarios (e.g., back-to-back transmission for consecutive slots/within a slot) are realized? If, due to dynamic events, a single TDW is broken and a gap is created, won’t the gNB expect phase discontinuity/power inconsistency already between the gap but phase continuity and power consistency are maintained within each broken piece of the TDW, i.e., there is no need to define multiple TDWs?  Another question: Regarding the violation condition “high priority transmission, dynamic SFI for unpaired spectrum, CI and etc. during the TDW”, if this occurs, is there a need to indicate multiple TDWs dynamically?  Single TDW can be viewed as a collection of multiple TDWs. However, if the general understanding is that phase continuity and power consistency maintenance should be done within a window under agreed scenarios, isn’t having a single TDW enough? It seems like fragmenting a TDW adds more complexities to TDW configuration. |
| Sharp | We prefer Alt 2 to Alt 1. |
| vivo | Same comments on Alt 1. |
| FL | @ZTE, the TDWs may be explicitly configured or implicitly determined. The non-consecutive TDWs is due to DL/UL configuration and events that may violate the power consistency and phase continuity.  @Apple, In RAN1 #105-e, companies suggested to consider a unified framework of TDW for FDD and TDD. From FL understanding, Alt 2-A can be applied to FDD or use case 5 (of course, if depends on RAN4). For Alt 2-B, if one TDW is ended, another TDW will be created, not divided into two sub-windows. The power consistency and phase continuity are assumed for each TDW.  @Nokia, NSB, As explained above, the difference between Alt 1 and Alt 2 is that for Alt 1, only single TDW is configured, while for Alt 2, multiple TDWs are configured. This may have impact on the signaling design. But explicit signaling may not be needed. In this case, for Alt 1 and Alt 2-B, if TDWs or sub-windows are implicitly derived, the final effect is the same.  @CMCC, Thanks CMCC for the explanation. In addition, the differences between Alt 2-A and Alt 2-B are that for Alt 2-A, TDWs are consecutive, which can be applied to FDD or use case 5 (if supported). For Alt 2-B, TDWs can be consecutive or non-consecutive, considering DL/UL configuration as explained by CMCC.  @Intel, Regarding “Option 1x and 2x”, we may make down selection or we can have different options for different uses cases, e.g., repetition, type A or type B. In the illustrated figure, if 2nd PUSCH repetition is cancelled due to the events, a new TDW can be created for the 3rd and 4th repetition.  @ Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, If we only consider “multiple TDWs should only be allowed if the maximum duration of the TDW cannot contain the scheduled duration or of continuity cannot be maintained within the TDW.” Then how to handle non-consecutive slots DL/UL configuration? Do we need to handle other events that can violate the power consistency and phase continuity? And how to handle frequency hopping?  @ InterDigital, do you mean that all the events that may violate the power consistency and phase continuity should be avoided during the TDW? From FL understanding, if such events are not prohibited, multiple TDWs or sub-windows (actual windows) are necessary, since UE can only maintain power consistency and phase continuity during part of the TDW. For option 2-B, if events occur, multiple TDW can be implicitly determined, no dynamic signalling seems necessary. |
| OPPO | We think we need to wait for RAN4’s further feedback. If the UE can maintain phase continuity during the whole repetition, one TDW is enough. Considering the impact the TDD configuration and other factors, the single TDW may be divided into several sub-TDWs, but we think TDW and sub-TDWs are not inconsistent with each other since sub-TDWs are under the framework of single TDW. |
| Xiaomi | Prefer alt 2. |
| Spreadtrum | We support Alt.2-A. |
| TCL | Prefer Alt 2. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | We support Alt 2-B if maximum duration is introduced by RAN4 confirmation. We agree with CMCC, it is unnecessary to introduce a restriction of the same size for all TDWs, if any, because a TDW is used to require the UE to maintain the phase continuity and power consistency. |
| InterDigital 2 | @FL  Thank you very much for the detailed explanations. I understand that when multiple TDWs are generated they can be implicit. |
|  |  |

**FL comments: Based on the discussion so far, Alt 1, Alt 2-A and Alt 2-B are updated. In addition, Alt 2-C is added to reflect Qualcomm’s proposal.**

**Proposal 7:**

For joint channel estimation for PUSCH repetition type A of PUSCH repetitions of the same TB, down select one of the following alternatives for the time domain window.

* Alt 1: All the repetitions are covered by one single TDW
  + The TDW is implicitly determined
    - The start of the TDW is the first PUSCH transmission
      * FFS: The first available slot/symbol, or the first physical slot/symbol for the first PUSCH transmission.
    - The end of the TDW is the end of the last PUSCH transmission.
      * FFS: The last available slot/symbol, or the last physical slot/symbol for the last PUSCH transmission.
  + UE is expected to maintain the power consistency and phase continuity during the TDW. In case that the power consistency and phase continuity are violated due to the events during the TDW, the TDW is segmented into multiple sub-windows.
    - FFS: The events may include e.g., DL/UL configuration for unpaired spectrum, the TDW exceeds the maximum duration, DL reception/monitoring occasion for unpaired spectrum, high priority transmission, frequency hopping.
    - UE is expected to maintain the power consistency and phase continuity during each sub-window.
    - FFS: details of sub-windows
* Alt 2-A: All the repetitions are covered by one or multiple consecutive TDWs
  + All the TDWs have the same window length (expect the last TDW) and the window length is no longer than the maximum duration.
    - FFS: The window length can be explicitly configured or implicitly derived based on the number of repetitions.
  + The start of the first TDW is the first PUSCH transmission
    - FFS: The first available slot/symbol, or the first physical slot/symbol for the first PUSCH transmission.
  + The end of the last TDW is the end of the last PUSCH transmission.
    - FFS: The last available slot/symbol, or the last physical slot/symbol for the last PUSCH transmission.
  + UE is expected to maintain the power consistency and phase continuity during each TDW. In case that the power consistency and phase continuity are violated due to the events during one TDW,
    - Option 1: This TDW is segmented into multiple sub-windows.
      * UE is expected to maintain the power consistency and phase continuity during each sub-window.
      * FFS: details of sub-windows
    - Option 2: DM-RS bundling is not assumed during this TDW.
    - FFS: The events may include e.g., DL/UL configuration for unpaired spectrum, DL reception/monitoring occasion for unpaired spectrum, high priority transmission, frequency hopping.
* Alt 2-B: All the repetitions are covered by one or multiple consecutive/non-consecutive TDWs
  + All TDWs are implicitly determined.
  + The start of the first TDW is the first PUSCH transmission
    - FFS: The first available slot/symbol, or the first physical slot/symbol for the first PUSCH transmission.
  + After one TDW starts, UE is expected to maintain the power consistency and phase continuity until the end of the last PUSCH transmission or the power consistency and phase continuity are violated due to the events,
    - The TDW is ended,
      * FFS: The end of the window is the last available slot/symbol of the PUSCH transmission right before an event such that the power consistency and phase continuity are violated.
    - One new TDW is created,
      * FFS: The start of the new TDW is the first available slot/symbol for PUSCH transmission after the previous TDW.
    - The end of the last TDW is the end of the last PUSCH transmission.
      * FFS: The last available slot/symbol, or the last physical slot/symbol for the last PUSCH transmission.
    - FFS: The events may include e.g., DL/UL configuration for unpaired spectrum, the TDW exceeds the maximum duration, DL reception/monitoring occasion for unpaired spectrum, high priority transmission, frequency hopping.
* Alt 2-C: All the repetitions are covered by one or multiple consecutive/non-consecutive TDWs
  + All the TDWs have the same window length (expect the last TDW) and the window length is no longer than the maximum duration.
    - The window length can be explicitly configured.
  + The start of the first TDW is the first PUSCH transmission
    - FFS: The first available slot/symbol, or the first physical slot/symbol for the first PUSCH transmission.
  + The start of other TDWs can be explicitly configured or implicitly determined.
  + The end of the last TDW is the end of the last PUSCH transmission.
    - FFS: The last available slot/symbol, or the last physical slot/symbol for the last PUSCH transmission.
  + UE is expected to maintain the power consistency and phase continuity during each TDW. In case that the power consistency and phase continuity are violated due to the events during one TDW, DM-RS bundling is not assumed during this TDW.
    - FFS: The events may include e.g., DL/UL configuration for unpaired spectrum, DL reception/monitoring occasion for unpaired spectrum, high priority transmission, frequency hopping.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Alt 2-B and Alt 2-C are most preferred by us. For the event resulting in the end of each TDW may also include the hopping point in the case of inter-slot frequency hopping with inter-slot bundling. |
| Sony | In general, we are fine with any Alt. Regarding DL for TDD, gap, and high priority transmissions. RAN4 is still discussing those topics. We promote the idea of having a capability signal indicating if a UE support DL, UL with same config, any UL, gap only etc. and would like to see this being further discussed. |
| WILUS | Support. Alt 2-B is aligned with our understanding. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | Support Alt 2-B as commented before. |
| Nokia/NSB | Support Alt. 2-B. We don’t see how Alt. 2-A and Alt. 2-C with the same window length would work since the events such that power consistency and phase continuity are broken may not be equally distributed. The gNB should have full flexibility to schedule any DL/UL transmission in between the repetitions and break the phase continuity. |
| MediaTek | Alt. 2-C is more preferred for the simplicity and efficiency. |
| Intel | We slightly prefer Alt. 2-B in principle, but need some further clarification:   * + When “One new TDW is created”, what is the size of new TDW? Our view is that the size of original TDW and new TDW would be explicitly configured, similar to Alt. 2-C?   + “FFS: The start of the new TDW is the first available slot/symbol for PUSCH transmission after the previous TDW”. Should not be “FFS: The start of the new TDW is the first available slot/symbol for PUSCH transmission after the ~~previous TDW~~ event”?   + Can you clarify the meaning of “The end of the last TDW is the end of the last PUSCH transmission”? is this for “the end of the new TDW”? |
| Sharp | For Alt 1, without using the single TDW, the UE can determine sub-windows based on the events during the all repetitions. Therefore, we prefer Alt 2-A and Alt 2-C because precoder cycling can be used by explicitly indicating the window length. If the events may include the TDW exceeds the duration indicated by the gNB in Alt 2-B, we also prefer Alt 2-B.  Additionally, we think “UE is expected to maintain the power consistency and phase continuity during each TDW” in Alt 2-A and Alt 2-C can be removed to avoid ambiguity. |
| Ericsson | **Our first and second preferences are Alt-1 and Alt 2-B, respectively. We suggest to downselect to these two, and then refine and/or merge these two.**  All Alts must address cases where a subset of the repetitions can have consistency/continuity, i.e. sub-windows or multiple windows. For us, a main consideration is if the subset is determined according to the RAN4 requirements or is configured. If multiple windows are configured, and therefore e.g. have the same window length and/or is consecutive, then there is some possible mismatch between whether the transmissions actually meet the requirements or not, possibly reducing the number of transmissions for which continuity/consistency is expected, while windows are implicitly determined, then the transmission for which continuity/consistency is expected can be more variable and more complex to determine. We expect this complexity is manageable, and so prefer that windows are implicitly determined.  Alt 2-B adds the extra step splitting into windows, and then segmenting those. The benefit of this two step splitting is not clear to us at this stage. |
| InterDigital | Our understanding of Alt. 1 is that a single window is explicitly configured. Internal sub-windows (generated due to events) are generated implicitly. Alt 1 and Alt 2B are the same if the single window is configured implicitly in Alt. 1 (TDWs in Alt 2B are configured implicitly). |
| Samsung | We support Alt. 2-A and Alt. 2-C in principle.  Regarding the event which violates the power consistency and phase continuity, it needs to be added in both Alt. 2-A and Alt. 2.C as another exception for a different window size in parenthesis such as “(expect the last TDW and the event)”. |
| CMCC | Alt 2-B is slightly preferred.  For the Alt 2-A and 2-C, our concern is same as in the last round. For the indication of TDW, a same window size could be used. But for the real transmission, the actual window size could be different considering different number of consecutive uplink slots.  To FL, please further clarify the option 2 under Alt 2-B. Is that means the JCE will not be used under that TDW ?  From our consideration, those Alt 2-A, 2-B and 2-C needs some kind of optimizations. For example, the Alt2-B do not have any description about how to indicate the TDW to the UE. Or there needs some further detailed descriptions, such as implicit determined based on something. If there is any misunderstanding, please correct me. |
| ZTE | Support Alt. 2-A and Alt. 2-C, with more preference on Alt. 2-A.  We think it is important for gNB to configure a TDW which could be smaller than the repetition duration, taking into account both performance and gNB complexity for joint channel estimation. |
| vivo | Alt 2-B is slightly preferred, with the followed modification,   * + All TDWs are implicitly determined. * Note: NW provide a configured window length is not precluded.   ……   * + - FFS: The events may include e.g., DL/UL configuration for unpaired spectrum, the TDW exceeds the maximum duration, DL reception/monitoring occasion for unpaired spectrum, high priority transmission, frequency hopping, the configured window length. |

### 3.2.2 Enabling/disabling of joint channel estimation and time domain window

**FL comments: It seems the majority support joint enabling/disenabling of joint channel estimation and the time domain window.**

**Proposal 4:**

* Joint channel estimation for PUSCH transmissions and the time domain window are jointly enabled or disabled via RRC configuration for a UE.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Panasonic | We agree with the proposal. |
| ZTE | Support. |
| Apple | OK with Proposal 4. |
| Nokia/NSB | We would like to add the following FFS to the proposal:   * “FFS: signaling on whether or not the UE should skip monitoring DL monitoring occasions or skip transmitting other UL transmissions with different settings to maintain the power consistency and phase continuity.” |
| CMCC | Support. The time domain window is only used for the joint channel estimation. Once the TDW(s) are configured, that means the JCE will be used when the condition is fulfilled. |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support the proposal |
| Qualcomm | Support |
| Samsung | We are fine with the FL’s proposal. |
| LG | Support. Separating configuration of time domain window and joint channel estimation can cause unnecessary ambiguity. For example, it is unclear the UE behaviour with joint channel estimation enabled but not configured with a time domain window or with a time domain window with joint channel estimation disabled. Especially for latter case, it is confusing to us how UE should interpret this time domain window. Therefore it would be desirable to be jointly configured. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support the proposal. In the last meeting, it was agreed that enabling/disabling of joint channel estimation means the enabling/disabling of DMRS bundling for PUSCH transmissions. Also, DMRS bundling for PUSCH transmission is performed during the time domain window, as the definition of time domain window specifies. Therefore, the joint channel estimation and the time domain window should be jointly enabled or disabled via RRC configuration. |
| InterDigital | We support the proposal. |
| Sharp | We support the proposal. |
| vivo | Considering the unexpected non-zero power emission and additional interference, the separate and flexible enabling/disabling of the time domain window should be supported. |
| OPPO | support |
| Xiaomi | support |
| Spreadtrum | support |
| TCL | Support |
| CATT | We support the proposal. |
| Sony | Support |
| WILUS | Support |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | We are not sure if any spec impact to RRC description for time domain window now, it is better to make it as a conclusion only and avoid a wording like “jointly”. We suggest a revision as below  **Proposal 4-rev:**   * As a conclusion, time domain window is enabled/disabled once Joint channel estimation for PUSCH transmissions is enabled/disabled via RRC configuration for a UE, respectively. |
| MediaTek | Support |
| Ericsson | Support the proposal. |
|  |  |

### 3.2.3 Additional dynamic signaling to enable/disable joint channel estimation

**FL comments: Regarding whether additional dynamic signaling is needed to enable/disable joint channel estimation for PUSCH transmissions, companies are encouraged to provide further views.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Panasonic | Depending on the event, the power consistency and phase continuity are violated. The DCI assignment may result not to satisfy the power consistency and phase continuity condition. In such case, it results disable joint channel estimation. We don't see the need of "explicit" disable joint channel estimation by DCI. |
| ZTE | At least for PUSCH with repetitions or TBoMS, we don’t identify any additional dynamic signaling for enable or disable joint channel estimation. |
| Nokia/NSB | As confirmed by RAN4, other UL transmissions with different settings or DL monitoring occasions in between PUSCHs would break the power consistency and phase continuity. Therefore (and as commented in our answer for Proposal 4 above), for the determination of TDW, the UE needs to know whether or not the UE should skip monitoring DL monitoring occasions or skip transmitting other UL transmissions with different settings to maintain the power consistency and phase continuity. The gNB should have full flexibility of signaling this information to the UE.  On the other hand, if PUCCH suffers coverage shortage, so would PUSCH (and vice versa). Therefore, scenarios in which repeated PUCCH and PUSCH transmissions form a pattern where a PUCCH repetition occurs between two PUSCH repetitions in non-back-to-back slots seem to be very likely. If we did not support the use case of non-back-to-back PUSCHs with other UL transmissions in between PUSCHs, neither PUSCH nor PUCCH repetitions would be able to enjoy from the benefits of JCE. Therefore, the point here is not whether to support the scenario or not but should be how to handle this scenario. Given that the other UL transmission having the same setting as PUSCHs is acceptable according to RAN4, the gNB should be able to signal one of the following options to the UE to handle the scenario:   * Option 1: Adapt the settings of the other UL transmission to make it be the same as PUSCHs. * Option 2: Multiplex the data of the other UL transmission on PUSCH. * Option 3: Drop the other UL transmission with different settings. * Option 4: Transmit the other UL transmission with different settings and break the phase continuity. |
| CMCC | As we mentioned before, an indication within DCI could be used to indicated that the JCE would be used for the scheduled PUSCH repetitions. And for the consecutive slots which fulfil the requirement of power consistency and phase continuity, the JCE could be used. And for the none consecutive slot sets, there is no need to carry out the JCE between the non-consecutive slots. And for each set of consecutive slots, the length should not exceed the maximum window size. |
| Intel | We do not see the need to consider dynamic signalling for enabling/disabling joint channel estimation for PUSCH transmission. For UE that needs coverage enhancement, it is expected that they are in relatively stationary conditions. In this case, semi-static RRC configuration of enabling/disabling joint channel estimation would be sufficient. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We also don’t see the need for additional dynamic signalling to enable/disable joint channel estimation |
| Samsung | Dynamic signalling can be useful in some channel conditions, such as when it can be beneficial for a UE to apply received TPC commands. In general, it allows a gNB to control whether or not restrictions associated with a TDW for joint channel estimation are beneficial for a given transmission. |
| LG | Not support. The use case that requires additional dynamic signalling and benefit of it are not clear. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Dynamic signalling to indicate time domain window size can be supported, as the gNB changes the duration of time domain window according to channel quality. Hence, if enable/disable joint channel estimation for PUSCH transmissions depends on time domain window size, introducing dynamic signalling to enable/disable joint channel estimation is preferred. |
| InterDigital | To support efficient usage of DMRS bundling in time-varying environments, we support usage of dynamic signalling to enable/disable joint channel estimation. |
| Sharp | We don’t support the additional dynamic signaling because mis-understanding between gNB and UE occurs when the UE failed to detect the dynamic signaling. |
| vivo | Considering the unexpected non-zero power emission and additional interference, the separate and flexible enabling/disabling of the time domain window should be supported. There is no need for joint channel estimation to introduce additional dynamic signalling. |
| OPPO | Not support, we don’t see the necessity to use dynamic DCI to enable/disable JCE. |
| Xiaomi | There is no need to introduce extra dynamic DCI to enable/disable JCE. |
| Spreadtrum | Not needed at least for PUSCH repetitions. |
| TCL | Not support. No need to use dynamic DCI to enable/disable JCE. |
| CATT | We share the same view as Panasonic. Enabling joint channel estimation via RRC signalling is a prerequisite. We do not see clear benefit to dynamically indicate JCE is enabled or not.  Note that the benefit of JCE is mainly achieved in a semi-static scenario. The channel varying should not be large. |
| Sony | Dynamic signalling would require more overhead and therefore needs to be well motivated. We are not sure about the impact of delaying, e.g. frequency error correction, timing correction, RF calibration, antenna virtualization and etc., to outside a coherent transmission. |
| WILUS | We do not see the necessity of additional dynamic signalling to enable/disable JCE. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | For joint channel estimation with single TB, it seems unnecessary because the same transmission parameters for a UE are applied for the whole TB duration anyway, including the same MCS, Tx power, scheduled PRBs. For joint channel estimation with different TBs, it may be beneficial to inform UEs when gNB does not perform JCE across TBs at the receiver side so that the UE has more freedom to manage the UE transmission parameters, including the phase contiguity and Tx power across TBs. |
| MediaTek | No need of dynamic signalling. Because it complicates the implementation with no clear benefit on the performance. |
| Ericsson | The performance gains of dynamic signaling vs. its overhead and additional gNB scheduler complexity are not clear to us. RRC seems enough at this stage. |

### 3.2.4 Coherent transmission indication

**FL comments: Companies are encouraged to provide views on whether coherent transmission indication is necessary and the potential solutions summarized in section 2.3.4.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Panasonic | Current view is not necessary, but we can wait RAN4 reply on the maximum length where UE can keep the power consistency and phase continuity. |
| ZTE | No need. Our understanding is, a UE is expected to maintain power consistency and phase continuity among PUSCH transmissions within a TDW, as long as a UE reports corresponding capability, e.g., the maximum duration. Thus, it would be an error case if the UE cannot maintain the power consistency and phase continuity within a TDW, i.e., no need additional transmission indication from UE side. In addition, even such indication is reported, it’s unclear what’s the benefits it could bring to gNB. |
| Nokia/NSB | As mentioned in our contribution and nicely summarized by the FL, some events on the UE side may impact the phase continuity. These events may not be known by the gNB, hence solutions to address this issue should be discussed. |
| CMCC | It seems not necessary, since within the TDW, the phase continuity and power consistency is required. It should not be interrupted once the UE is required to maintain. If there is such kind of cases, it should be clarified. |
| Intel | It is also not clear to us the motivation to introduce coherent transmission indication. Or is this some form of UE capability? In our view, UE needs to maintain phase continuity and power consistency during the time domain window. If there are some events to interrupt it, UE does not need to maintain the phase continuity before and after the events. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | No, we don’t think that it is needed to indicate coherent transmission, |
| Qualcomm | As Nokia mentions, there could be unforeseen events that cause a disruption in DMRS bundling. It helps for a UE to convey this to the gNB so that the gNB can then pursue per-slot channel estimation.  Besides this, we are concerned about a UE having to comply with the various constraints placed by DMRS bundling over long periods of time especially in the case of configured grants. A mechanism whereby a UE indicates that it can no longer adhere to DMRS bundling requirements will be useful to have. This is especially useful in extreme scenarios such as large temperature variations leading to inability or difficulty in maintaining phase across multiple slots. Considerations on power savings at the UE could also act as a motivation. A UE-driven activation/deactivation mechanism may become a critical requirement and warrants further discussion. |
| Samsung | It seems premature to discuss before clarifying an implication of the above mentioned events by RAN4, which may impact the phase continuity on UE side but such change may not be known to the gNB. |
| LG | Support. It should be supported for common understanding between gNB and UE no matter how.  The gNB would expect the UE to perform specific behaviours at the window boundary which is limited within the time domain window to satisfy power/phase continuity, it would lead performance degradation at receiver side or gNB will misunderstand UE’s behaviour. For example, when the time domain window of gNB’s perspective is larger than that of UE’s, it would harm combining gain of receiver, and when the time domain window of gNB’s perspective is shorter than that of UE’s, gNB would expect UE to apply specific behaviours like TA adjustment and TPC command, which is not applied actually. Therefore it should be supported for common understanding of time domain window between gNB and UE. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We do not think coherent transmission indication is needed, because it requires additional overhead. Several factors are listed as potential triggers to interrupt coherent transmission, such as frequency error correction and timing correction. However, these factors are not problem if time domain window is not too long. For this reason, selecting appropriate time domain window size can make this issue negligible. |
| InterDigital | We support usage of a grant-dependent indicator to indicate which PUSCHs the UE should bundle. |
| Sharp | We think it is not needed because the event impacting phase continuity by UE can be prevented by the TDW. |
| vivo | It can be up to NW to determine whether JCE is enabled at the receiver, no further indication at UE is needed. If the phase continuity can not be ensured due to dynamic signalling, NW implementation can perform channel estimation in a conservative manner. |
| OPPO | We don’t think it is needed. Proper time domain window can be used to avoid the impact of the interrupt coherent events. |
| Xiaomi | No needed. The introduction of time domain window can prevent the impact. |
| CATT | We do not see strong need. In most of the case, gNB should know whether phase continuity and power consistency can be fulfilled or not (e.g. due to UCI multiplexing).  For other case, since a TDW is configured, UE is expected to maintain the JCE during the TDW. If the UE cannot, it should not report such capability at the beginning.  To say the least, the gNB can perform fallback channel estimation (e.g. per slot) any way. |
| Sony | Dynamic signalling may require more processing and therefore needs to be well motivated. We are not sure about the impact of delaying, e.g. frequency error correction, timing correction, RF calibration, antenna virtualization and etc., to outside a coherent transmission. |
| WILUS | We do not see the necessity of additional indication at UE side. The TDW seems enough to align same understanding between gNB and UE, remaining is up to gNB implementation. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | In our understanding, for the case of JCE with single TB, it is impossible to have any UE event as the proponent described, because the same UE transmission parameters are applied for the same TB. Therefore, this discussion can be postponed until the discussion on the case with different TBs has any progress. |
| MediaTek | This could be discussed together with TDW. If the ambiguity between UE and BS on whether/how to support JCE operation in some cases can be solved, such signalling may not be needed. Otherwise, such signalling from UE side may solve the ambiguity issue. |
| Ericsson | We prefer not to have dynamic indication of coherence. gNB needs to do link adaptation based on some assumed performance, and that performance should be reasonably stable over time. Moreover, the spec impact could be high, since some new physical layer indication of coherence is needed. |
|  |  |

## 3.3 Optimization of DMRS location in time domain

**FL comments: It has been intensively discussed on DMRS located in special slots. As we have only three RAN1 meetings left and considering the potential specification impacts, we have to make decision in this meeting.**

**Proposal 5:** **Make down selection on the following two alternatives in RAN1 #106-e.**

**Alt 1:**

* For joint channel estimation over PUSCH transmissions, DMRS located in special slots is supported in the following cases,
  + Additional DMRS is located in special slots for repetition type A, in case special slots cannot used for PUSCH transmission.
  + FFS: optimization of DMRS location in special slots for repetition type A
  + FFS: Transmission of different TBs

**Alt 2:**

* Optimization of DMRS location in time domain for PUSCH is not considered for joint channel estimation in Rel-17.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Panasonic | Our view is Atl.2 as the TU is limited. |
| ZTE | Fine with the proposal, with preference on Alt2. |
| Apple | Alt 2 is preferred. |
| Nokia/NSB | We support Alt. 2. |
| Intel | We support Alt. 2.  As mentioned in our tdoc, although we observed performance gain, i.e., ~0.5dB when DMRS is allocated in the special slot for PUSCH repetition, substantial spec impact is expected as listed in the summary document. Considering the limited time left for Rel-17 and given that there are still many open issues for coverage enhancement to be resolved, we support Alt. 2, i.e., optimization of DMRS location in time domain for PUSCH is not considered for joint channel estimation in Rel-17 |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support the proposal and fine with Alt 2 |
| Qualcomm | Alt 2 is preferred. |
| LG | Not support. It is not surprising that additional DMRS leads performance gain, however the amount is not meaningful and expected spec impact is quite large. For example, it should be discussed first what the DMRS in special slot is defined to be. In case it is defined to be a part of PUSCH, the TDRA of PUSCH should be enhanced to be extension outside of slot. On the other hand, when it is defined to be whatever uplink transmission other than PUSCH, it becomes the joint channel estimation of PUSCH and other uplink transmission. Therefore, we do not support DMRS in special slot. |
| InterDigital | We support Alt. 1. |
| Sharp | We prefer Alt 2. |
| OPPO | Alt2 is preferred. |
| Xiaomi | Alt 2 is prefered |
| Spreadtrum | Support Alt.2 |
| CATT | Fine to make down-selection. |
| Sony | Alt 2 |
| WILUS | We support Alt 2. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | We support Alt. 1 because special slots are very common in TDD carriers and has not been fully utilized by the R16 style of TDRA indication for PUSCH repetition. As companies’ comments, gains are observed for this case. |
| MediaTek | Support Alt.2 |
| Ericsson | We prefer Alt 2. Resources needed to carry PUCCH and SRS should also be considered, which limits the ability to use the special slot for coverage. Furthermore, the DMRS in the special slot may experience different interference than in the normal UL slot, which may degrade the performance if interference suppressing receivers. |
|  |  |

## 3.4 Others

### 3.4.1 TPC command

**FL comments: It is understood that the transmission power cannot be changed during the time domain window. There can be following alternatives.**

* Alt 1: UE is not expected to receive TPC commands during the current time domain window or sub window.
* Alt 2: UE Receives and accumulates TPC commands without taking effect during the current time domain window or sub window.
* Alt 3: Modifying the TPC commands accumulation range so that power control is performed per time domain window or sub window.

Companies are encouraged to provide views on the above alternatives.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Panasonic | We think Alt.2 is a reasonable design as it allows to apply power control after the current time domain window or sub window. |
| ZTE | Alt 1 or Al 2 is more preferred as it would not change current power control granularity based on each PUSCH transmission. |
| Apple | Alt 2 is preferred. The accumulated TPC commands are applied to PUSCH in the next TDW. |
| Nokia/NSB | We prefer Alt. 2. It seems that Alt. 1 may not work since the accumulation may come from PUSCH transmissions even before the current TDW. Alt. 3 may lead to significant specification impacts. |
| CMCC | Alt 1 and Alt 2 are more preferred. For the absolute TPC, there is no need to taking effect during the time domain window. But for the accumulated TPC, the TPC could be accumulated and could be used when the time domain window closed. |
| Intel | We support Alt. 1. Given that sub-window should be a part of time domain window and we do not have formal agreement of sub-window, we suggest to modify this as  “UE is not expected to receive TPC commands during the current time domain window ~~or sub window~~”  Given the fact that gNB is aware of UEs that perform DMRS bundling for PUSCH repetition, gNB can simply disable TPC command (DCI format 2\_2) during the time domain window for the corresponding UEs.  Another issue is that it is not clear to us why UE needs to monitor DCI format 2\_2 during time domain window for TDD. In this case, our understanding is that UE cannot maintain the phase continuity during PUSCH repetition. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Alt 2 is preferred |
| Qualcomm | May need a little more discussion. Need to separately handle cases where tpc-accumulation is enabled or disabled. If tpc-accumulation is disabled, then the TPC commands that arrive within a certain duration may be discarded. |
| Samsung | We support Alt.2.  A UE updates the closed-loop power control(CLPC) adjustment state per time domain window. Within time domain window, the UE skips application of TPC commands and does not update the CLPC adjustment state to maintain the power consistency and the phase continuity. The UE can accumulate TPC commands, update the CLPC adjustment state and apply a latest updated value to determine a power for repetitions of the PUSCH transmission when the time domain window changes. |
| LG | We basically agree with the idea that the power continuity within the time domain window should not be affected by the TPC command. However, this differs depending on whether the unit of the time domain window is a physical slot or an uplink slot. When the unit of the time domain window is a physical slot, the UE can receive the TPC command within the window, so it is natural that at least the application of the TPC command is performed outside the time domain window. On the other hand, in a time domain window consisting of only uplink slots, the UE cannot receive the TPC command within the window. Therefore, it is right to define and discuss the unit of the time domain window first. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support Alt 2 or Alt 3. Since Alt 1 takes away the opportunity to receive TPC commands, it causes delay to update the optimal transmission power. |
| Sharp | We support Alt 1 to reduce spec impacts. |
| vivo | Support Alt 1. |
| OPPO | Support Alt 1. |
| Xiaomi | Support Alt 2, which works well whether the time domain window is explicit or implicit configured. |
| Spreadtrum | Support Alt.1 |
| CATT | Alt 1 and Alt 2 are preferred. Alt 1 can at least be the baseline without modification on power control behaviour. |
| Sony | It’s not clear if the UE can receive at-all within a time window. If it can (which we think is doable), we have no strong view on the alternatives as long as they are not applied within the coherent transmission. |
| WILUS | Alt 1 or Alt 2. Alt 3 may introduce large specification impact. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | When joint channel estimation is enabled, a larger window size means a longer adjustment period and convergence time of power control, which maybe lead to larger power control deviation. To obtain correct transmit power for each time domain window, some optimization of power control adjustment mechanism for joint channel estimation may be necessary. Therefore, Alt. 2 is preferred.. |
| MediaTek | It may depend on FDD or TDD. In case of TDD, Alt.1 may be true since we may not expect any DL during the TDW so far. For FDD, there could be overlapping between TPC reception in DL and TDW in UL. In that sense, Alt.2 may be slightly preferred since Alt.1 may not give the sufficient time for TPC in some cases. |
| Ericsson | We prefer Alt 1. Similar to Intel, we wonder if we need to optimize for DCI 2\_2. Also, for where DCI 2\_2 is not used, can companies clarify when there would be more than one closed loop power control command for PUSCH repetition? (Apologies if I miss something here.) |
|  |  |

### 3.4.2 TA adjustment

**FL comments: It is understood that the UE should not perform TA adjustment during the time domain window.**

**Proposal 6:**

* UE should not perform TA adjustment during the time domain window or sub window.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Panasonic | We agree with the proposal. |
| ZTE | Fine with the proposal in general, while it seems better to align with the decision on TPC command. |
| Apple | Ok with this proposal. |
| Nokia/NSB | We are fine with the proposal if this is aligned with the final view from RAN4. |
| CMCC | Fine with the proposal. |
| Intel | Similar to the TPC command, UE is not expected to receive TA adjustment command during the time domain window. We suggest to modify this proposal similar to Alt. 1 for transmit power. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support the proposal |
| Qualcomm | Agree |
| Samsung | RAN4 reply addresses this – no TA adjustment to maintain phase continuity. |
| LG | Generally fine with FL's Proposal 6. We agree that at least TA adjustment should not be applied within the time domain window, and further study on details of UE behaviour is needed. Regarding TA adjustment, two cases can be considered: gNB indicated TA adjustment and DL reception timing adjustment of UE. For the latter case, when the UE adjusts the DL reception timing, the effective TA is changed even if the TA value itself does not change. Accordingly, the boundary between the previously transmitted symbol and the later transmitted symbol is different, and the base station does not know this. Therefore, further study on the details of UE behaviour for the above two cases is required. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support the proposal. |
| Sharp | We are fine UE is not expected to receive or ignore TA commands during the TDW. |
| vivo | Support the proposal. |
| OPPO | support |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| Spreadtrum | Support |
| CATT | Support. We think RAN4 LS already confirmed that TA should not change for phase continuity. |
| Sony | Support |
| WILUS | Support |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | In our understanding, better to let RAN4 make such decision. According to RAN4 LS reply (R1-2106423), phase discontinuity tolerance are being discussed in RAN4. It is non-zero tolerance in the definition of phase continuity. As a result, although TA adjustment impacts on phase contiguity but small TA adjustment may be still within the tolerance and can be allowed. As long as phase contiguity can be achieved, it is better to allow UE to have small enough TA adjustment.  More importantly, RAN4 has replied that further investigation on TA adjustment is still on-going. Therefore, it is neither right time to make such decision. |
| MediaTek | Support. |
| Ericsson | Support the proposal. |
| Qualcomm | Support |

1. Email discussion (2nd round)

## 4.1 Use cases

### 4.1.1 PUSCH transmission with different TBs

**FL comments: Companies’ views on joint channel estimation over PUSCH transmission with different TBs are summarized below.**

**Proposal 1:** **Make down selection on the following two alternatives in RAN1 #106-e.**

Alt 1:

* For back-to-back PUSCH transmissions across consecutive slots, support necessary design aspects (under the condition of power consistency and phase continuity) to enable joint channel estimation for the following cases:
  + Over back-to-back PUSCH transmissions with different TBs
* For non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions across consecutive slots, support necessary design aspects (under the condition of power consistency and phase continuity) to enable joint channel estimation for the following cases:
  + Over non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions with different TBs

Support: ZTE, CMCC, InterDigital, Xiaomi, TCL, CATT, Sony, Huawei, HiSilicon, Sierra Wireless

Alt 2:

* Joint channel estimation over back-to-back PUSCH transmissions with different TBs is not supported in Rel-17.
* Joint channel estimation over non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions with different TBs is not supported in Rel-17.

Support: Panasonic, Apple, Nokia, NSB, Intel, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, Qualcomm, Samsung, Sharp, Spreadtrum, CATT, WILUS, MediaTek, Ericsson,OPPO

**FL comments: Additional specification impacts for different TBs are summarized in the following table.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Specification impact for single TB** | **Additional specification impacts for different TBs** |
| RAN4 requirements | No (only scheduling restriction to gNB) |
| TPC/TA | May have impact on open loop power control |
| RRC signalling | No |
| Time domain window (TDW can be implicitly determined) | Maybe (Dynamic indication of the TDW is needed) |
| Events to violate the power consistency and phase continuity | Additional events may be needed, e.g., different MCS, FDRA during the window. |
| Single DCI | Need to discuss whether single DCI or multiple DCI  For multiple DCI: Some restriction or timing relations may be required to be specified for these DCIs. |

**Companies are encouraged to provide further comments, if any.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | Support. |
| CMCC | Thanks for FL’s summary.  From our understanding, the MCS, FDRA are all based on gNB scheduling. If the gNB want to use JCE to enhance the UE’s performance, a same MCS and FDRA will be indicated. As this issue could be solved through gNB’s scheduling, we do not think it have specification impact.  For the DCI issue, the multiple-DCI scheme (one DCI schedules one PUSCH) which has less spec impact and used for the most scenarios is preferred. Single DCI for multiple TBs has more specification impact.  For the issues of some restrictions and timing relations, we need more clarifications on the specific issues. In the current typical configurations, only a limited consecutive uplink slots could be used for JCE. It seems two or three slots’ joint channel estimation will not introduce too much delays. And as discussed in the section 4.2.1, the TDW could be configured or indicated by gNB. If the concern is from the process delay of JCE, it could be solved through the configuration of TDW. |
| CATT | We are fine with the summary, if majority think that the gNB shall not change TPC by implementation and no additional spec impact.  And if so, we think TPC command discussion in 4.4.1 can apply Alt 1. |
| Intel | As mentioned previously, we think RAN4 still needs to define requirements in case of joint channel estimation for different TBs. So far it was only defined for PUSCH/PUCCH repetitions with same TB. |
| Nokia/NSB | We are fine with the FL’s proposal of down-selection. Our preference is Alt. 2 considering the remaining time for the WI. The conclusion of not having additional impact in some aspects at this stage doesn’t mean that additional efforts are not needed to design a unified solution to accommodate also the scenario of different TBs. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support FL’s proposal and have preference for Alt 2 as captured |
| Sierra Wireless | Support proposal.  We prefer Alt 1 as it will certainly improve coverage.  However, we do share the concerns regarding the potential complexity of Alt 1. Given the time limitation we have for rel 17, we can live with Alt 2 if a simple method to support Alt 1 is not agreeable. |
| InterDigital | We support the FL’s proposal and prefer Alt. 1. |
| Samsung | Support the FL’s proposal. |
| Sharp | Support the proposal. |
| TCL | Support the proposal. |
| Ericsson | Agree with the need to down select at this meeting.  We prefer Alt 2. We think the additional spec impacts listed for multiple TBs are significant, and again would like to point out that the multiple TB case with same REs, MCS, etc, is difficult to differentiate from TBoMS or repetition. Therefore, we prefer to focus on designing for the primary use case in the short time we have left in the WI. |
| WILUS | Support the proposal. |
| Xiaomi | Support the proposal. |
| Sony | Support |
| LG | We also agree that it needs to be down selected.  We support Alt 2 since joint channel estimation with different TBs will lead significant specification impact and impact on the proposals we are trying to agree in this meeting. For example, considering time domain window for different TBs and if joint channel estimation with different TBs is supported, a single time domain window should include transition of TBs between starting/end of it.  Considering power consistency should be kept during the DMRS bundle, every single power control parameter should be aligned between different TBs to support joint channel estimation. For same TB, it would be naturally aligned since they are within repetition of same TB, which has same grant and corresponding SRS.  To be specific, open loop power control parameter of PUSCH is different according to dynamic/configured grant, and further DCI format including SRI or not. To support different TBs, no matter how it should be aligned which leads huge specification impact. |
| Panasonic | We support to down select in this meeting. Our preference is Alt. 2. |
| FL | @CMCC, As we are discussing the events that may violate the power consistency and phase continuity, different MCS, FDRA may be one kind of event.  @Intel, From FL understanding, RAN4 requirements on power consistency and phase continuity cover both same TB and different TBs. No specific RAN4 requirements for different TBs are needed. |

### 4.1.2 TBoMS

**FL comments: Considering some companies would like to postpone the confirmation, let’s revisit it next week.**

**@Apple: From FL understanding, it is not relevant with TOT. It’s applied to single TBoMS transmission. Whether one TOT or multiple TOTs depends on the structure of TBoMS.**

**Proposal 2:** **Confirm the following working assumption.**

**Working assumption:**

* For back-to-back PUSCH transmissions across consecutive slots, support necessary design aspects (under the condition of power consistency and phase continuity) to enable joint channel estimation for the following case:
  + Over back-to-back PUSCH transmissions for one TB processed over multiple slots
    - It’s subject to UE capability

Support: Panasonic, ZTE, CMCC, Intel, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, Samsung, NTT DOCOMO, InterDigital, Sharp, vivo, OPPO, Xiaomi, Spreadtrum, TCL, CATT, Sony, WILUS, Huawei, HiSilicon, MediaTek, Ericsson, Sierra Wireless

Postpone: Nokia, NSB, Qualcomm, LG

### 4.1.3 Non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions across consecutive slots

**FL comments: The majority support to confirm the working assumption, while one company has come concerns on the FFS part.**

**@Samsung, From FL understanding, the FFS bullets can be discussed separately. It does not have impact on confirmation of the WA. FL would like to encourage Samsung to be flexible.**

**Proposal 3:** **Confirm the following working assumption.**

**Working assumption:**

* For non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions (at least for the case of the same TB) across consecutive slots, support necessary design aspects (under the condition of power consistency and phase continuity) to enable joint channel estimation for the following cases:
  + Over non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions (of the same TB) for repetition type A scheduled by dynamic grant or configured grant.
  + Over non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions (of the same TB) for repetition type B scheduled by dynamic grant or configured grant, if it reuses only those joint channel estimation specification enhancements defined to support repetition Type A.
    - FFS: additional specification enhancements on top of that defined to support repetition Type A
    - Only for single layer transmissions
    - Subject to UE capability
  + FFS: Over non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions with different TBs
  + FFS: Over non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions for TBoMS
  + For the non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions, it is defined as at least when there is no UL transmission between the two successive PUSCH transmissions
  + Subject to UE capability with details FFS (e.g., separate vs. joint capability for type A & type B, w.r.t. OFF power requirements, etc.)
* FFS: Joint channel estimation over non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions with other uplink transmissions between the two successive PUSCH transmissions across consecutive slot.

Support: Panasonic, Apple, Nokia, NSB, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, Qualcomm, LG, NTT DOCOMO, InterDigital, Sharp, vivo, Xiaomi, Spreadtrum, TCL, CATT, Sony, WILUS, Huawei, HiSilicon, MediaTek, Ericsson,OPPO

Agree in principle: Samsung

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Support. |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Nokia/NSB | Support. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support |
| Sierra Wireless | Support |
| InterDigital | Support |
| Samsung | Ok with the FL proposal |
| Sharp | Support |
| TCL | Support |
| Ericsson | Support |
| FL | It seems Proposal 3 is stable, please refrain from any further comments. |
| OPPO | Support |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| Sony | Support |
| Panasonic | Support |

## 4.2 Time domain window

### 4.2.1 Time domain window design

**FL comments:**

**@OPPO, Based on FL’s understanding about the progress in RAN4, RAN4 may not be able to decide the maximum duration in this meeting. Moreover, there is only one more meeting in Q4 for RAN4, thus, we may have no time to wait for RAN4s’s feedback. FL thinks we should make some progress on TDW in this meeting.**

**@Panasonic, It seems companies have different understanding on whether TDW needs to take into account the events which may violate the power consistency and phase continuity. That’s why we have different alternatives.**

**@Sony, we think we can discuss the capability signal later. Now, the most important thing is to figure out the details of each alternative and companies’ understandings are aligned on each alternative.**

**@ Intel, For the 1st question: the difference between Alt 2-B and Alt 2-C is: all TDWs are implicitly determined for Alt 2-B, which means the length is not explicit configured but depend on the “events”; for Alt 2-C, the window length can be explicitly configured and all the TDWs have the same length. For the 2nd question: we think both of the description are fine. For the 3rd question: the conditions for the end of other TDWs and the last TDW are a little bit different, for other TDWs, as in the FFS part, the end of the window is the last available slot/symbol of the PUSCH transmission right before an event such that the power consistency and phase continuity are violated; but for the last TDW, the end of it is the end of the last PUSCH transmission.**

**@Sharp, In fact, “the TDW exceeds the duration” is also included in the events for Alt 2-B. As for your suggestion to remove “UE is expected to maintain the power consistency and phase continuity during each TDW”, there may or may not be such events which violate the power consistency and phase continuity, if there is no such events, we think this sentence is necessary.**

**@Ericsson, From FL understanding, there is only one step to decide the TDW for Alt 2-B.**

**@CMCC, Do you mean option 2 under Alt 2-A? If so, yes it means JCE is not performed under that TDW. As for Alt 2-B, all TDWs are implicitly determined. From FL understanding, the determination including start and end of each TDW is clear, based on whether events occur or not.**

**@vivo, From FL understanding, all TDWs are implicitly determined for Alt 2-B. If the window length can be explicitly configured, then it is Alt 2-A or Alt 2-C.**

**Companies’ views on each alternative are summarized in the table below.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Alternatives | Support companies |
| Alt 1 | Ericsson (1st ), InterDigital (?), Sierra Wireless |
| Alt 2-A | Sharp, Samsung, ZTE(1st ) |
| Alt 2-B | CATT, WILUS, Huawei/HiSilicon, Nokia/NSB, Intel, Sharp, Ericsson (2nd), CMCC, InterDigital (?), Sierra wireless (2nd), vivo,OPPO |
| Alt 2-C | CATT, MediaTek, Sharp, Samsung, ZTE(2nd ), Qualcomm (?)~~,vivo(?)~~ |

**FL comments: Based on companies’ comments, majority companies support Alt 2-B or Alt 2-C. In addition, it seems companies who support Alt 1 or Alt 2-A can also accept Alt 2-B or Alt 2-C. Thus, FL suggests we focus on Alt 2-B and Alt-2C.**

**Proposal 7: For joint channel estimation for PUSCH repetition type A of PUSCH repetitions of the same TB, down select one of the following alternatives for the time domain window.**

* Alt 2-B: All the repetitions are covered by one or multiple consecutive/non-consecutive TDWs
  + All TDWs are implicitly determined.
  + The start of the first TDW is the first PUSCH transmission
    - FFS: The first available slot/symbol, or the first physical slot/symbol for the first PUSCH transmission.
  + After one TDW starts, UE is expected to maintain the power consistency and phase continuity until the end of the last PUSCH transmission or the power consistency and phase continuity are violated due to the events,
    - The TDW is ended,
      * FFS: The end of the window is the last available slot/symbol of the PUSCH transmission right before an event such that the power consistency and phase continuity are violated.
    - One new TDW is created,
      * FFS: The start of the new TDW is the first available slot/symbol for PUSCH transmission after the previous TDW.
    - The end of the last TDW is the end of the last PUSCH transmission.
      * FFS: The last available slot/symbol, or the last physical slot/symbol for the last PUSCH transmission.
    - FFS: The events may include e.g., DL/UL configuration for unpaired spectrum, the TDW exceeds the maximum duration, DL reception/monitoring occasion for unpaired spectrum, high priority transmission, frequency hopping.
* Alt 2-C: All the repetitions are covered by one or multiple consecutive/non-consecutive TDWs
  + All the TDWs have the same window length (except the last TDW) and the window length is no longer than the maximum duration.
    - The window length can be explicitly configured.
  + The start of the first TDW is the first PUSCH transmission
    - FFS: The first available slot/symbol, or the first physical slot/symbol for the first PUSCH transmission.
  + The start of other TDWs can be explicitly configured or implicitly determined.
  + The end of the last TDW is the end of the last PUSCH transmission.
    - FFS: The last available slot/symbol, or the last physical slot/symbol for the last PUSCH transmission.
  + UE is expected to maintain the power consistency and phase continuity during each TDW. In case that the power consistency and phase continuity are violated due to the events during one TDW, DM-RS bundling is not assumed during this TDW.
    - FFS: The events may include e.g., DL/UL configuration for unpaired spectrum, DL reception/monitoring occasion for unpaired spectrum, high priority transmission, frequency hopping.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | Alt 2-C would be closest to our preference. We think implicit determination suffices.  On the last sub-bullet, we would like to make the following edit:  UE is expected to maintain the power consistency and phase continuity during each TDW. In case that the power consistency and phase continuity are violated due to the events during one TDW, DM-RS bundling is not ~~assumed~~ resumed during this TDW.  The goal is to prioritize simplicity of the procedure rather than squeezing out the last bit of optimization. |
| CATT | OK to list these two options here for further down-selection. |
| Intel | Thanks for the clarification to our previous questions.  For Alt 2-B, if there is no configured window length for TDW, how can UE determine the ending position of a TDW if there is no event as mentioned in the proposal? Does that mean UE would always use the maximum TDW duration to determine the TDW? It is not clear to us whether this is the intention.  Regarding “FFS: The start of the new TDW is the first available slot/symbol for PUSCH transmission after the previous TDW”. We still suggest to update this as “FFS: The start of the new TDW is the first available slot/symbol for PUSCH transmission after the ~~previous TDW~~ event”? In our view, the event may cancel one PUSCH repetition and then the new TDW would resume after the cancelled PUSCH repetition, rather than the previous TDW. Hops this clarify. |
| Nokia/NSB | We are fine with the FL’s proposal for listing the two options. Our preference is Alt. 2-B. Again, we think that the gNB should have full flexibility on whether to schedule something in between the TDW and break the phase continuity. The events that break phase continuity may not be equally distributed, how can we guarantee that the window size should be the same across all TDWs?  We also support the modification from Intel.  @Intel, @FL: For “how can UE determine the ending position of a TDW if there is no event as mentioned in the proposal?”, we also share the same understanding with Intel that in that situation the window size will equal to the maximum duration, if any. In other words, exceeding the maximum duration is also one of the events. Details of the events are still FFS, so that we can further discussed once we agree on the general framework. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Our preference is Alt 2-B. In our understanding of Alt 2-B, always the maximum TDW duration is used, unless the power consistency or phase continuity are violet due to one of the listed events.  In Alt 2-C, we don’t see the need to explicitly indicate smaller TDW durations (than maximum duration). Smaller TDW durations should be determined based on violation events |
| Sierra Wireless | We prefer to still wait for more progress from RAN4 and on use cases before making this down selection as we feel Alt 1 is simplest and thus our preference.  Assuming JCE across TDD cycles (i.e. use case 5) will not be support then I think this all gets much simpler where only in FDD with non-back to back (use case 4) will there be long’ish transmissions that would exceed UE’s TDW capability.  RAN4 is still of course discussing this topic of TDW UE capability. If it works out that most UE’s can support a long’ish TDW (i.e. longer than most transmissions) then we don’t need to get complicated here and Alt 1 will do (single TDW).  Also, If RAN4 indicates UE can’t support phase continuity over gaps > X, and if the transmission has a gap > X then the UE can adjust timing and phase during that gap (creating an implicit sub-TDW).  If delaying is not possible then our 2nd choice is Alt 2-B with the understanding Alt 2-B always uses the maximum TDW duration (i.e. one TDW), unless an “event” occurs which breaks the TDW up into sub-TDW. |
| InterDigital | For Alt-2B, it seems to make more sense if window length (duration limit) is explicitly configured, i.e., all TDWs have the same window length. A window ends either the window reaches the duration limit or an event happens which breaks the window.  For Alt-2C, our proposal is to make configuration/determination of each TDW FFS since in the currently wording it is not clear how TDWs are configured/determined, i.e.,  FFS Whether the start of other TDWs can be explicitly configured or implicitly determined.  For both Alt-2B and Alt-2C, it takes one event (e.g., repetition is cancelled) to break the window. Do we have correct understanding? Or do multiple factors contribute to breaking a window? If we have correct understanding we suggest the following change in Alt 2-B and Alt 2-C.  “....that the power consistency and phase continuity are violated due to ~~the~~ an event~~s~~ during one TDW..”  Ultimately, the difference between Alt 2-B and Alt-2C is whether UE resumes power consistency/phase continuity maintenance if an event breaks the window.  We slightly prefer Alt-2C with the above modifications. |
| Samsung | We prefer Alt 2-C.  As mentioned in 1st round, in Alt. 2-C the event that violates the power consistency and phase continuity needs to be added as another potential exception for a different window size – it should be “(except last TDW and **TDW affected by the event**)”.  In Alt 2-B, it is not clear to us how the TDW size can be determined implicitly and resulting in a same understanding between gNB and UE. |
| Sharp | Support the proposal. We prefer Alt 2-B to Alt 2-C if the events include the duration explicitly indicated by the gNB. |
| InterDigital 2 | We have an additional suggestion for Alt2-C. Regarding below, would it be sufficient to state that All TDWs have the same length. It is stated that “The end of the last TDW is the end of the last PUSCH transmission” so the actual length of the last PUSCH transmission will be either the configured length or shorter than the configured length.   * + All the TDWs have the same window length (expect the last TDW) and the window length is no longer than the maximum duration.     - The window length can be explicitly configured.   For Alt 2-C, we suggest to make the following modification regarding the window length.   * + The configured length of all the TDWs have the same window length and the window length is no longer than the maximum duration. |
| TCL | Support this proposal for further down-selection. |
| Ericsson | @FL: Thanks for clarifying that there is one step in Alt 2-B. I was reading the bullet ‘All TDWs are implicitly determined.’ As a first step determining the windows, and then the ‘After one TDW starts’ bullet with its subbullets could create additional windows. It might be more clear to move ‘All TDWs are implicitly determined’ to the main bullet, i.e. ‘All the repetitions are covered by one or multiple consecutive/non-consecutive TDWs, where all TDWs are implicitly determined.’ However, if it is crystal clear to everyone that there is only one step, I’m fine.  We also think Alt 2-B should be revised as Intel suggests.  Regarding Alt 2-C, if the window sizes are all the same, can proponents clarify how a DDDSUDDSUU pattern will be supported? |
| Vivo | @FL, we support Alt 2-B.  Furthermore, for Alt 2-C, it is difficult for TDD system to make “All the TDWs have the same window length”. For example, considering TDD frame structure, DDDSUDDSUU,    How to ensure all the TDWs with the same window length? As we know, the time domain window means during which UE is expected to maintain power consistency and phase continuity among PUSCH transmissions subject to power consistency and phase continuity requirements. That means, in order to meet that, DL slots during the window should be muted, which is undesirable. So, we are doubtful for “All the TDWs have the same window length”.  If Alt 2-C has not “All the TDWs have the same window length”, in our understanding, Alt 2-B and Alt 2-C share the similar meaning. |
| FL | @Intel, From FL understanding, if no event occurs, UE is expected to maintain power consistency and phase continuity during all the repetition. The maximum TDW duration can be deems as one event to violate the power consistency and phase continuity. Fine to update as “FFS: The start of the new TDW is the first available slot/symbol for PUSCH transmission after the ~~previous TDW~~ event”  @ Sierra Wireless, We have only three RAN1 meetings left including this meeting. Thus, we may not have sufficient time to wait for RAN4’s feedback to all use cases before making progress on the time domain window. From FL understanding, either Alt 2-B or Alt 2-C does not preclude any use cases. What indeed has impacts on uses cases is the events, which still need further discussion. For Alt 1, there are also events may violate the power consistency and phase continuity during the window, which results multiple sub-windows, such as non-consecutive slots due to DL/UL configuration. As pointed out by some companies, if TDW or sub-windows are implicitly determined for Alt 1 and Alt 2-B, the final effect of these two alternatives is the same.  @InterDigital, For Alt 2-B, it seems not useful to restricted all TDWs the same window length. If a window ends either the window reaches the duration limit or an event happens which breaks the window, this may cause two-step window determination as pointed out by Ericsson, since one TDW may segmented into multiple sub-windows. For Alt 2-C, fine to add FFS “FFS Whether the start of other TDWs can be explicitly configured or implicitly determined.” Fine with the revision: “....that the power consistency and phase continuity are violated due to ~~the~~ an event~~s~~ during one TDW..”  @Samsung, regarding the revision “(except last TDW and TDW affected by the event)”, From FL understanding, only value of window length is configured, even the TDW is affected by the event, the window length is still as configured, while DM-RS bundling is not resumed during this TDW. It does not mean multiple values of window length can be configured. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We also feel ‘All the TDWs have the same window length’ is not the best phrases. If I guess the FL’s intention is “All the explicitly indicated TDWs have the same window length”. Even in Alt3, each actual time domain window size can be different due to some events like TDD patterns (please let us know if it is wrong).  Likewise, it is confusing to use the time domain window for two meanings, actual time domain window and nominal time domain window. Based on the agreement, out first intuitive of time domain window means only actual time domain window, because UE is expected to maintain power consistency and phase continuity during that time. Hence, we prefer specifying explicitly indicated TDW when nominal TDW is implied. |
| OPPO | At least for TDD, alt2-b creates more chances for JCE. |
| WILUS | Support the proposal. |
| Xiaomi | Support the proposal for further down-select |
| Sony | Support |

**FL comments: Regarding companies’ comments on the same window length for all TDW, from FL understanding, if an event occurs, the TDW can be ended earlier, which means the ending of one TDW depends on both the events and the window length. With this understanding, Alt 2-C’ is formulated based on Alt 2-C. Alt 2-B is rephrased in the similar manner of Alt 2-C’ for better comparison between these two alternatives. Alt 2-C is updated based on companies’ comments. The main differences among these three alternatives are summarized below and highlighted in red.**

* **For Alt 2-B: All TDWs are implicitly determined. The ending of one window depends on the events. One new TDW is created after the event.**
* **For Alt 2-C: The window length L can be explicitly configured with a single value. The start of other TDWs can be explicitly configured or implicitly determined. In case an event occurs, DM-RS bundling is not resumed during this TDW.**
* **For Alt 2-C’: The window length L can be explicitly configured with a single value. The start of other TDWs can be explicitly configured or implicitly determined. The ending of one window depends on the events and the configured window length.**

**Proposal 7-v2: For joint channel estimation for PUSCH repetition type A of PUSCH repetitions of the same TB, down select one of the following alternatives for the time domain window.**

* Alt 2-B: All the repetitions are covered by one or multiple consecutive/non-consecutive TDWs, where all TDWs are implicitly determined
  + The start of the first TDW is the first PUSCH transmission
    - FFS: The first available slot/symbol, or the first physical slot/symbol for the first PUSCH transmission.
  + After one TDW starts, UE is expected to maintain the power consistency and phase continuity until one of the following conditions is met, then the TDW is ended.
    - The TDW reaches the end of the last PUSCH transmission
      * FFS: The end of the window is the last available slot/symbol, or the last physical slot/symbol for the last PUSCH transmission.
    - The power consistency and phase continuity are violated due to an event,
      * FFS: The events may include e.g., DL/UL configuration for unpaired spectrum, the TDW exceeds the maximum duration, DL reception/monitoring occasion for unpaired spectrum, high priority transmission, frequency hopping.
      * FFS: The end of the window is the last available slot/symbol of the PUSCH transmission right before an event such that the power consistency and phase continuity are violated.
  + If the power consistency and phase continuity are violated due to an event, one new TDW is created after the event,
    - FFS: The start of the new TDW is the first available slot/symbol for PUSCH transmission after the event.
* Alt 2-C: All the repetitions are covered by one or multiple consecutive/non-consecutive TDWs
  + The window length *L* can be explicitly configured with a single value and *L* is no longer than the maximum duration
  + The start of the first TDW is the first PUSCH transmission
    - FFS: The first available slot/symbol, or the first physical slot/symbol for the first PUSCH transmission.
  + FFS Whether the start of other TDWs can be explicitly configured or implicitly determined
  + The end of the last TDW is the end of the last PUSCH transmission.
    - FFS: The end of the window is the last available slot/symbol, or the last physical slot/symbol for the last PUSCH transmission.
  + UE is expected to maintain the power consistency and phase continuity during each TDW. In case that the power consistency and phase continuity are violated due to an event during one TDW, DM-RS bundling is not resumed during this TDW.
    - FFS: The events may include e.g., DL/UL configuration for unpaired spectrum, DL reception/monitoring occasion for unpaired spectrum, high priority transmission, frequency hopping.
* Alt 2-C’: All the repetitions are covered by one or multiple consecutive/non-consecutive TDWs
  + The window length *L* can be explicitly configured with a single value and *L* is no longer than the maximum duration
  + The start of the first TDW is the first PUSCH transmission
    - FFS: The first available slot/symbol, or the first physical slot/symbol for the first PUSCH transmission.
  + FFS Whether the start of other TDWs can be explicitly configured or implicitly determined
  + After one TDW starts, UE is expected to maintain the power consistency and phase continuity until one of the following conditions is met, then the TDW is ended.
    - The TDW reaches the end of the last PUSCH transmission
      * FFS: The end of the window is the last available slot/symbol, or the last physical slot/symbol for the last PUSCH transmission.
    - The TDW duration reaches *L*
    - The power consistency and phase continuity are violated due to an event,
      * FFS: The events may include e.g., DL/UL configuration for unpaired spectrum, the TDW exceeds the maximum duration, DL reception/monitoring occasion for unpaired spectrum, high priority transmission, frequency hopping.
      * FFS: The end of the window is the last available slot/symbol of the PUSCH transmission right before an event such that the power consistency and phase continuity are violated.

Companies are encouraged to provide views on each alternative.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Support | Not support |
| Alt 2-B | Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, Panasonic |  |
| Alt 2-C |  |  |
| Alt 2-C’ |  |  |

Companies are encouraged to provide additional comments, if any.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | For Alt 2-C’, we don’t see any technical benefit to explicitly configure TDW size smaller than the maximum duration. Anyways, if the concern is that power consistency and phase continuity cannot be maintained for maximum duration, then it should be considered as violation event and this will result in early termination of TDW window.  Similarly, for Alt 2-C, explicitly configuring TDW length may still not ensure that power consistency and phase continuity across all TDWs, if violation event occurs. So the motivation is not clear for explicit configuration |
| CMCC | From our understanding, the TDW should be configured by the gNB. This could provide the flexibility for gNB to choose a window size which could fit the TDD DL/UL configurations. And it gives the priority to gNB to determine the TDW size, considering the gNB could have a control for the uplink reception delay. So we still think the 2-B needs a window size configuration or indications.  For the alt-2B, we share a similar idea that a TDW size should be indicated by gNB. And it also seems that the gNB cannot choose when to stop the JCE or the TDW, as all the TDW are implicitly determined by the certain window size and the interruption event. And we also do not think one new TDW should not be created immediately after the dynamic interruption/event of the JCE  Share the similar idea that, the same window size in Alt 2-C and 2-C’ only facilitate the indication. There is a need to further discuss the actual window size, for example, the DL/UL configuration could be one factor to affect the actual window size. And the DL/UL configuration is different from other event, such as high priority transmissions. Through the DL/UL configuration, one window size could be determined and the power consistency and phase continuity could be maintained within the actual window. Then it is not proper to list the DL/UL configuration below “DM-RS bundling is not assumed during this TDW”.  The TDD DL/UL configuration are configured through RRC, the JCE could work within the actual TDW window. But for the dynamic interruptions, as even the data may not be transmitted completely, there is no need to maintain or resume the JCE for the rest part. For the dynamic interruptions, the DM-RS bundling should not be assumed. |
| Intel | We think the TDW duration should be configured by the network.  For Alt. 2-B, if UE always use maximum TDW duration for PUSCH/PUCCH repetitions, in most extreme case, if there is no event during the maximum TDW duration, UE has to maintain phase continuity and power consistency during this long duration, which may not be desirable from UE power assumption. In addition, different UEs may have different maximum TDW duration, from gNB perspective, it may be good to configure a value which can be more flexible for receiver implementation.  For the Alt 2-C’, is it correct understanding that the main difference between Alt 2-C’ and Alt 2-C is whether UE would resume the TDW after the event during the configured TDW duration? For Alt 2-C, it is clear that DMRS bundling is not resumed after the event. How about the Alt 2-C’? It would be good to clarify. |
| LG | For those options, it is confusing for us to have consecutive/non-consecutive TDWs. The PUSCH transmission of the non-consecutive slot has not been determined in the use case to be supported by the current agenda. Also, whether this case is supported or not is being discussed in RAN4, it should not be included. However this non-consecutive TDW seems it is including use cases which is not supported for now.  The reason we mentioned that the unit should be defined first in the previous comment was to remove this kind of ambiguity. Our understanding of “non-consecutive TDW” is that the unit of it is a physical slot (no matter it is uplink or downlink), and “consecutive TDW” is that the unit is an uplink slot. Therefore, it is necessary to clarify what the unit is when listing for these TDW options. |
| Panasonic | We support Alt. 2B because the lengths of time domain windows can be different depending on the violation events and Alt. 2B is also applicable for PUSCH repetition type B to have a unique design for joint CE. On the other hand, Alt. 2C and Alt. 2C’ configure the same length for all windows, they cannot be applicable for PUSCH repetition type B. |
| FL | @CMCC, As summarized above the proposal, for Alt 2-B, all TDWs are implicitly determined including the start and the length of the window. If the window length is configured by gNB, it’s not Alt 2-B, it becomes Alt 2-C or Alt 2-C’. For All 2-C’ the configured window length is one condition to end the TDW. For Alt 2-C or Alt 2-C’, do you propose gNB can configure different length for the TDWs?  “DM-RS bundling is not assumed during this TDW” has been revised to “DM-RS bundling is not resumed during this TDW” based on Qualcomm’s suggestion. I think after the revision, it is aligned with your views, that power consistency and phase continuity can still be maintained before the events, including DL reception/monitoring in DL slots.  Regarding “dynamic interruptions”, I’m not sure if I understand your point correctly. In order to harvest the gain of joint channel estimation, DM-RS bundling should be performed as much as possible.  @Intel, For Alt 2-B, it UE has and reports the capability the maximum duration, and if there are UL transmissions, why can UE not maintain phase continuity and power consistency during the maximum duration? Even if the window length can be configured by gNB, gNB can still configure the window length as the maximum duration, right? Regarding “different UEs may have different maximum TDW duration”, from FL understanding, don’t see there is any problem for Alt 2-B.  For Alt 2-C’, in case an event occurs, the TDW is ended. For Alt 2-C, in case an event occurs, DMRS bundling is not resumed after the event, but the TDW is not ended. Maybe Qualcomm can clarify more about it.  @LG, regarding “consecutive/non-consecutive TDWs”, it does not mean use case 5. It means the TDWs can be consecutive or non-consecutive. If the wording cause ambiguity, we can remove “consecutive/non-consecutive”. |
| Qualcomm | We would like to arrive at a procedure for TDW location determination that adhers to the following two principles:   1. All TDW locations are all determined prior to start of PUSCH repetitions --- ideally, right after available slots are determined. 2. In the event of any events violating conditions for bundling during a TDW, UE does not resume bundling.   (a) is required so that UE can plan ahead and all control loops can be programmed to ensure bundling is not violated. (a) also tries to sidestep the issue of UE having to determine where a gap between transmissions is truly unoccupied or not --- this test can be quite tricky to specify and execute, and we would like to avoid it.  A test to check on whether to terminate a TDW based on certain events, and then starting a new TDW would add a lot of dynamics to this procedure, and we are afraid it could lead to UE-gNB misalignment. Additionally, it complicates UE loop management.  To the extent that I understand, 2-B seems to take an on-the-fly approach to TDW placement. We would like to avoid this and instead go with a more straightforward implicit approach.  In short, we are once again borrowing a lot from the PUCCH/PUSCH repetitions framework --- adopt a 2-step procedure where the first step lays out a tentative plan for bundling that is decoupled from the dynamics of other processes and then the second step that handles all the dynamic aspects.  This approach has worked out pretty well so far. And considering we are designing for a cell-edge UE, we prefer to reuse these principles once again.  This is also the reason we prefer 2-C over 2-C’. 2-C’ seems to revisit the original decisions on TDW locations. We don’t want to do this --- an early termination of a TDW must have a localized impact. If 2-C’ is intended to behave this way, and I am misunderstanding, please feel free to correct us. |

### 4.2.2 Enabling/disabling of joint channel estimation and time domain window

**FL comments: The majority support Proposal 4, while one company supports separate signaling design.**

**@Nokia/NSB, Regarding the added FFS, from FL understanding, it can be separated discussed. The key point of this proposal is whether joint enabling/disenabling of joint channel estimation and the time domain window is supported.**

**@Huawei/HiSilicon, I think the revised proposal 4 and the original proposal 4 have the same meaning. Considering that almost all the companies support the original proposal, let’s keep as it is.**

**@vivo, FL would like to encourage vivo to be flexible.**

**Proposal 4:**

* Joint channel estimation for PUSCH transmissions and the time domain window are jointly enabled or disabled via RRC configuration for a UE.

Support: Panasonic, ZTE, Apple, CMCC, Intel, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, Qualcomm, Samsung, LG, NTT DOCOMO, InterDigital, Sharp, OPPO, Xiaomi, Spreadtrum, TCL, CATT, Sony, WILUS, MediaTek, Ericsson

Not support: vivo

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Support. |
| Intel | Support |
| Nokia/NSB | @FL: Thank you for the clarification! We can then support the FL’s proposal. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support |
| Sierra Wireless | Support .  But consider that JCE is not a UE function to be enabled/disable. Phase continuity is the UE function which can be enabled/disabled. |
| InterDigital | Support |
| Samsung | Support |
| Sharp | Support |
| TCL | Support |
| Ericsson | Agree with Sierra that the agreement might be made more clear. We had the following note in our prior agreements:  Note: Enabling/disabling of joint channel estimation for PUSCH transmissions means enabling/disabling of DMRS bundling for PUSCH transmissions under the condition of power consistency and phase continuity.  We could either add that note here again or reword the proposal something like:   * DMRS bundling for Joint channel estimation ~~for~~ of PUSCH transmissions and the time domain window are jointly enabled or disabled via RRC configuration for a UE. |
| FL | Fine to add the note again if it makes clearer. Then proposal 4 is updated as follows:  **Proposal 4-v2:**   * Joint channel estimation for PUSCH transmissions and the time domain window are jointly enabled or disabled via RRC configuration for a UE. * Note: Enabling/disabling of joint channel estimation for PUSCH transmissions means enabling/disabling of DMRS bundling for PUSCH transmissions under the condition of power consistency and phase continuity. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support the updated proposal. |
| WILUS | We support the updated proposal. |
| Xiaomi | Suppor |
| LG | Fine with modified proposal. |
| Panasonic | We support the updated proposal 4-v2. |

### 4.2.3 Additional dynamic signaling to enable/disable joint channel estimation

**Regarding whether additional dynamic signaling is needed to enable/disable joint channel estimation, companies’ views are summarized. Considering the current situation, let’s discuss it later after we make more progress in TDW.**

Not needed: Panasonic, ZTE, Intel, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, LG, Sharp, vivo, OPPO, Xiaomi, Spreadtrum, TCL, CATT, Sony, WILUS, MediaTek, Ericsson

Needed: Nokia, NSB, CMCC, Samsung, NTT DOCOMO, InterDigital, Sierra Wireless

### 4.2.4 Coherent transmission indication

**Regarding whether coherent transmission indication is necessary, companies’ views are summarized. Considering the current situation, let’s discuss it later after we make more progress in TDW.**

Not needed: Panasonic, ZTE, CMCC, Intel, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, NTT DOCOMO, Sharp, vivo, OPPO, Xiaomi, CATT, WILUS, Huawei, HiSilicon, Ericsson

Needed: Nokia, NSB, Qualcomm, LG, InterDigital, Sierra Wireless

## 4.3 Optimization of DMRS location in time domain

**FL comments: Companies’ views on DMRS located in special slots. It seems the majority support Alt 2. Considering the situation, FL suggests to take Alt 2 as a possible agreement. Propose 5 is revised accordingly.**

**Proposal 5:** **Make down selection on the following two alternatives in RAN1 #106-e.**

**Alt 1:**

* For joint channel estimation over PUSCH transmissions, DMRS located in special slots is supported in the following cases,
  + Additional DMRS is located in special slots for repetition type A, in case special slots cannot used for PUSCH transmission.
  + FFS: optimization of DMRS location in special slots for repetition type A
  + FFS: Transmission of different TBs

Support: InterDigital, Huawei, HiSilicon

**Alt 2:**

* Optimization of DMRS location in time domain for PUSCH is not considered for joint channel estimation in Rel-17.

Support: Panasonic, ZTE, Apple, Nokia, NSB, Intel, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, Qualcomm, LG, Sharp, OPPO, Xiaomi, Spreadtrum, Sony, WILUS, MediaTek, Ericsson, Sierra Wireless

**Revised proposal 5:**

* Optimization of DMRS location in time domain for PUSCH is not considered for joint channel estimation in Rel-17.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| CATT | OK |
| Intel | Support |
| Nokia/NSB | Support. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support |
| Sierra Wireless | Support |
| Sharp | Support |
| Ericsson | Support |
| WILUS | Support |
| Sony | Support |
| LG | Support |
| Panasonic | Support |

## 4.4 Others

### 4.4.1 TPC command

**FL comments: Regarding TPC commands during the TDW, companies’ views are summarized the table below.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Alternatives** | **Supporting companies** |
| **Alt 1** | **ZTE, CMCC, Intel, Sharp, vivo, OPPO, Spreadtrum, CATT, WILUS, Ericsson** |
| **Alt 2** | **Panasonic, ZTE, Apple, Nokia, NSB, CMCC, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, Samsung, NTT DOCOMO, Xiaomi, CATT, WILUS, Huawei, HiSilicon, MediaTek** |
| **Alt 3** | **NTT DOCOMO** |

**Based on companies’ comments, it seems majority support Alt 1 or Alt 2, FL has the following proposal:**

**Proposal 8: Make down-selection between the following two alternatives:**

* Alt 1: UE is not expected to receive TPC commands during the current time domain window.
* Alt 2: UE receives and accumulates TPC commands without taking effect during the current time domain window.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| CMCC | Support FL’s proposal.  One further question, do we need to discuss the Pro and Cons and do the down slection at this round ? |
| CATT | Support this proposal for further down-selection.  And, if we agree in Section 4.1.1 that the gNB should guarantee the TPC unchanged by implementation, we now slightly prefer Alt 1 than Alt 2. |
| Intel | We are fine for the FL’s proposal. We support Alt. 1 |
| Nokia/NSB | Support the FL’s proposal for listing the two alternatives. Alt. 2. is preferred. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support FL proposal and prefer Alt 2 |
| Sierra Wireless | Support proposal. |
| InterDigital | We are ok with the FL’s proposal and prefer Alt. 2. |
| Samsung | We are fine with the FL’s proposal in principle. We support Alt. 2. |
| Sharp | Support. We slightly prefer Alt 1. |
| Ericsson | Support. Would appreciate further clarification from Alt 2 proponents of when multiple power control commands for repetitions can happen. |
| FL | @CMCC, the intention is to go step by step. It the first step, we preclude Alt 3. Then we can discuss pros and cons for further down selection. |
| NTT DOCOMO | As long as either Alt2 or Alt3 is included as an option, we are fine with the proposal.  For clarification, I would like to ask if UE is expected to receive the TPC commands during TDW. I would like to know how UE receives TPC command during TDW, because the reception including PDCCH should not be expected during TDW. I understand the situation where UE receives TPC commands before the start of TDW but not applies TPC commands before TDW due to processing timeline. If only this case is assumed, it is better to specify it in the proposal. |
| WILUS | Support the proposal. |
| Xiaomi | Support the proposal and prefer alt2 . |
| CMCC2 | Thanks FL for the clarification. Besides we think DOCOMO has raise a good question. During the JCE window which could be a consecutive uplink slots, there may be no chance to receive a DL indication. |
| Sony | Support further down selection between Alt 1 and Alt 2, prefer Alt 2 |
| LG | Fine with the proposal and we support Alt. 2.  @NTT DOCOMO, @ CMCC  From our understanding, UE can receive TPC command during the TDW at least in case of FDD. However we basically agree that UE cannot receive TPC command in case of TDD. |
| Panasonic | We support the proposal. Our preference is Alt. 2. |

### 4.4.2 TA adjustment

**FL comments: Regarding TA adjustment, it seems majority support proposal 6. But some companies mentioned it may be up to RAN4 to make decision. Companies are encouraged to answer whether we need to wait for RAN4’s feedback or RAN1 can make decision.**

**Proposal 6:**

* UE should not perform TA adjustment during the time domain window ~~or sub window~~.

**Support: Panasonic, ZTE, Apple, Nokia/NSB, CMCC, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, Qualcomm, Samsung, LG, NTT DOCOMO, Sharp, vivo, OPPO, Xiaomi, Spreadtrum, CATT, Sony, WILUS, MediaTek, Ericsson,** Sierra Wireless

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| CMCC | General fine with the proposal.  But from my understanding, when the TDWs are indicated to the UEs, there could be actual TDWs considering the uplink and downlink slots. During those actual TDWs, the TA adjustments should not be performed. And also discussed in the section 4.2.1, many TDWs could be consecutive. Once the indicated TDW is used in this proposal, UE would not perform the TA adjustment in a long time. |
| CATT | RAN4 has confirmed that TA adjustment will break the phase continuity in R1-2106423(R4-2107880):   |  | | --- | | * *RAN1 Question 2:*    + *Whether “no TA adjustment in between PUCCH transmissions or PUSCH transmissions” is another necessary condition to keep phase continuity across PUCCH repetitions or PUSCH transmissions?*   RAN4 Answer is that TA adjustment and UE uplink timing autonomous adjustments cause the phase to change. RAN4 is still investigating the full impacts of the detailed scenarios, and will provide a final view about this at the next RAN4 meeting. |   We agree that TA adjustment may or may not make the phase change larger than the tolerance. However, we do not foresee there will be huge benefit from some conclusion like “Tiny TA change is allowed within a TDW even if JCE is applied, and the details allowable change is XX…”  So from our perspective, this proposal can be supported. |
| Intel | We do not support this proposal. We think similar discussion direction for TPC should be considered here, e.g., the following two alternatives. We support Alt. 1   * Alt 1: UE is not expected to receive TA adjustment commands during the time domain window. * Alt 2: UE should not perform TA adjustment during the time domain window |
| Nokia/NSB | We are fine with the proposal. Concerning the question from the FL, our understanding is that a final view may be communicated by RAN4 “RAN4 is still investigating the full impacts of the detailed scenarios, and will provide a final view about this at the next RAN4 meeting.” But as highlighted by CATT, the FL’s proposal can be agreed as it is. |
| Sierra Wireless | General fine with the proposal.  But I think there will be exceptions where UE can adjust TA – see TDW discussion so we might want to add FFS: “events” when UE can adjust TA during TDW. |
| Samsung | Fine with the FL’s proposal. |
| Ericsson | Support the proposal. Agree with CATT and Nokia that the RAN4 feedback we have so far should be sufficient to decide on the proposal. |
| FL | @Intel, we can list two options for further down selection as TPC. But it seems the majority support to go a step further.  @CATT, Nokia/NSB, Ericsson, Thanks for the confirmation!  @Sierra Wireless, From FL understanding, if an events occurs, UE cannot maintain power consistency and phase continuity, TDW will be ended, or segmented into multiple sub-windows according to the discussion in section 4.2.1. Proposal 6 stills applies during the TDW or sub-windows. |
| Xiaomi | Support the proposal |
| Sony | Support |
| LG | Fine with the proposal and further discussion regarding TA adjustment is needed as mentioned before. For example, details of UE behaviour regarding skipping TA adjustment and DL reception timing adjustment of UE. |
| Panasonic | Support |

1. Email discussion (3rd round)

## 5.1 Use cases

### 5.1.1 PUSCH transmission with different TBs

**Proposal 1:** **Make down selection on the following two alternatives in RAN1 #106-e.**

Alt 1:

* For back-to-back PUSCH transmissions across consecutive slots, support necessary design aspects (under the condition of power consistency and phase continuity) to enable joint channel estimation for the following cases:
  + Over back-to-back PUSCH transmissions with different TBs
* For non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions across consecutive slots, support necessary design aspects (under the condition of power consistency and phase continuity) to enable joint channel estimation for the following cases:
  + Over non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions with different TBs

Support: ZTE, CMCC, InterDigital, Xiaomi, TCL, CATT, Sony, Huawei, HiSilicon, Sierra Wireless

Alt 2:

* Joint channel estimation over back-to-back PUSCH transmissions with different TBs is not supported in Rel-17.
* Joint channel estimation over non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions with different TBs is not supported in Rel-17.

Support: Panasonic, Apple, Nokia, NSB, Intel, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, Qualcomm, Samsung, Sharp, Spreadtrum, CATT, WILUS, MediaTek, Ericsson, OPPO, Sierra Wireless(Can live with), LG

**FL comments: Additional specification impacts for different TBs are summarized in the following table.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Specification impact for single TB** | **Additional specification impacts for different TBs** |
| RAN4 requirements | No (only scheduling restriction to gNB) |
| TPC/TA | May have impact on open loop power control |
| RRC signalling | No |
| Time domain window (TDW can be implicitly determined) | Maybe (Dynamic indication of the TDW is needed)  May be more complicated for the interaction with frequency hopping and precoder cycling |
| Events to violate the power consistency and phase continuity | Additional events may be needed, e.g., different MCS, FDRA during the window. |
| Single DCI | Need to discuss whether single DCI or multiple DCI  For multiple DCI: Some restriction or timing relations may be required to be specified for these DCIs. |

**FL comments: Please take a look at the discussion the section 4.1.1. We aim to make down selection during the GTW session next week. If companies have further comments, please provide it in the following table.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Panasonic | On RAN4 requirement, UE Tx side may be as described. Rx of gNB performance may be required to be specified separately for multiple TBs case.  On RRC signalling, some configuration would be required depending on L1 functionality.  On time domain window, the interaction with frequency hopping and precoder cycling would be more complicated as each of TB needs to be mapped to different hopping and precoder beam. |
| LG | We support to down select and prefer Alt2.  In order to support joint channel estimation for different TB, it is observed that at least specifications for power control and TDW should be added. From our understanding, joint channel estimation for different TB is enhancing feature rather than enabling, however the performance gain compared to the effort to support it does not seem to be large. |
| Nokia/NSB | We support the FL’s proposal and prefer Alt. 2. We also agree with the above observations from LG. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support the proposal and our preference is Alt 2. The specification impacts to joint channel estimation are considerable and this is not a high priority. |
| WILUS | We support the proposal with preference on Alt 2. TDW for the case with different TBs should be additionally specified, and it may have some issues such as DTX. |
| TCL | Support to down select and prefer Alt 1. |
| Ericsson | Also support FL proposal with Alt 2. Multiple TB with same resource allocation seems to largely duplicate specification effort vs. TBoMS and/or PUSCH repetition. We share similar views with respect to potential extra complexity of the time domain window, and again are concerned with overall spec impact vs. the gain of this feature. |
| Samsung | We are fine with the FL’s proposal, prefer Alt 2. |
| Intel | We are fine with the FL’s proposal and prefer Alt. 2  As we mentioned in 2nd round of discussion, RAN4 requirements need to be defined for joint channel estimation for different TBs. So far it was only defined for PUSCH/PUCCH repetitions with same TB. |
| Sharp | We support the proposal and prefer Alt 2. |
| CMCC | If the down selection should be made at this meeting, the Alt 1 is preferred. From our understanding, most issue in the table could be based on gNB scheduling. And the TDW is still under discussion. |
| ZTE | Support to down select and prefer Alt 1.  The use case is promising while the additional spec impacts could be minor. |
| MediaTek | We support the proposal and prefer Alt 2. |
| Apple | We support FL’s proposal and prefer Alt 2. The performance gain fo different TBs JCE is not clear, due to the MCS and frequency location are the same for TBs with different TB size, link adaptation gain is lost. For the specification impacts, RAN4 test case need to be defined for two TBs JCE to fulfil the target demodulation requirement, e.g., the gap of TB size is large between two TBs. UE behaviour need to define for the case of DCI missing. |
| Qualcomm | We support the proposal and prefer to go with Alt 2. |
| Sony | Support down selection and prefer Alt 1. |
| OPPO | We support the proposal and prefer alt2. |

### 5.1.2 TBoMS (on hold)

## 5.2 Time domain window

### 5.2.1 Time domain window design

**Proposal 7-v2: For joint channel estimation for PUSCH repetition type A of PUSCH repetitions of the same TB, down select one of the following alternatives for the time domain window.**

* Alt 2-B: All the repetitions are covered by one or multiple consecutive/non-consecutive TDWs, where all TDWs are implicitly determined
  + The start of the first TDW is the first PUSCH transmission
    - FFS: The first available slot/symbol, or the first physical slot/symbol for the first PUSCH transmission.
  + After one TDW starts, UE is expected to maintain the power consistency and phase continuity until one of the following conditions is met, then the TDW is ended.
    - The TDW reaches the end of the last PUSCH transmission
      * FFS: The end of the window is the last available slot/symbol, or the last physical slot/symbol for the last PUSCH transmission.
    - The power consistency and phase continuity are violated due to an event,
      * FFS: The events may include e.g., DL/UL configuration for unpaired spectrum, the TDW exceeds the maximum duration, DL reception/monitoring occasion for unpaired spectrum, high priority transmission, frequency hopping.
      * FFS: The end of the window is the last available slot/symbol of the PUSCH transmission right before an event such that the power consistency and phase continuity are violated.
  + If the power consistency and phase continuity are violated due to an event, one new TDW is created after the event,
    - FFS: The start of the new TDW is the first available slot/symbol for PUSCH transmission after the event.
* Alt 2-C: All the repetitions are covered by one or multiple consecutive/non-consecutive TDWs
  + The window length *L* can be explicitly configured with a single value and *L* is no longer than the maximum duration
  + The start of the first TDW is the first PUSCH transmission
    - FFS: The first available slot/symbol, or the first physical slot/symbol for the first PUSCH transmission.
  + FFS Whether the start of other TDWs can be explicitly configured or implicitly determined
  + The end of the last TDW is the end of the last PUSCH transmission.
    - FFS: The end of the window is the last available slot/symbol, or the last physical slot/symbol for the last PUSCH transmission.
  + UE is expected to maintain the power consistency and phase continuity during each TDW. In case that the power consistency and phase continuity are violated due to an event during one TDW, DM-RS bundling is not resumed during this TDW.
    - FFS: The events may include e.g., DL/UL configuration for unpaired spectrum, DL reception/monitoring occasion for unpaired spectrum, high priority transmission, frequency hopping.
* Alt 2-C’: All the repetitions are covered by one or multiple consecutive/non-consecutive TDWs
  + The window length *L* can be explicitly configured with a single value and *L* is no longer than the maximum duration
  + The start of the first TDW is the first PUSCH transmission
    - FFS: The first available slot/symbol, or the first physical slot/symbol for the first PUSCH transmission.
  + FFS Whether the start of other TDWs can be explicitly configured or implicitly determined
  + After one TDW starts, UE is expected to maintain the power consistency and phase continuity until one of the following conditions is met, then the TDW is ended.
    - The TDW reaches the end of the last PUSCH transmission
      * FFS: The end of the window is the last available slot/symbol, or the last physical slot/symbol for the last PUSCH transmission.
    - The TDW duration reaches *L*
    - The power consistency and phase continuity are violated due to an event,
      * FFS: The events may include e.g., DL/UL configuration for unpaired spectrum, the TDW exceeds the maximum duration, DL reception/monitoring occasion for unpaired spectrum, high priority transmission, frequency hopping.
      * FFS: The end of the window is the last available slot/symbol of the PUSCH transmission right before an event such that the power consistency and phase continuity are violated.

**FL comments: To facilitate the discussion, examples of each alternative w/ and w/o events for both FDD and TDD are illustrated below.**







**FL comments: Companies are encouraged to provide views on each alternative.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Support | Not support |
| Alt 2-B | Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, Panasonic, Nokia/NSB, WILUS, Ericsson, Sharp, Sierra Wireless, vivo, TCL, CATT, Samsung, CMCC, LG, Apple, Sony, OPPO |  |
| Alt 2-C | Qualcomm, ZTE | Nokia/NSB |
| Alt 2-C’ | NTT DOCOMO, vivo, TCL, CATT, ZTE, CMCC, MediaTek | Nokia/NSB |

**FL comments: Companies are encouraged to check the discussion in section 4.2.1. In order to make progress, constructive comments are welcome while duplicate questions or comments are discouraged.** **Companies are encouraged to provide additional comments, if any. If you have suggestions, please provide concrete comments on how to revise the description of the proposal. But Please do NOT revise the basic characteristics of each alternative below. If none of the alternatives you are in favor of, you can propose a new one.**

* **For Alt 2-B: All TDWs are implicitly determined. The ending of one window depends on the events. One new TDW is created after the event.**
* **For Alt 2-C: The window length L can be explicitly configured with a single value. The start of other TDWs can be explicitly configured or implicitly determined. In case an event occurs, DM-RS bundling is not resumed during this TDW.**
* **For Alt 2-C’: The window length L can be explicitly configured with a single value. The start of other TDWs can be explicitly configured or implicitly determined. The ending of one window depends on the events and the configured window length.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Panasonic | Our reason to take Alt. 2-B is the interaction with frequency hopping and precoder cycling. The TDW needs to be aligned with one length of frequency hop and one precoder cycle to have the frequency/spatial diversity gain. If the length of frequency hopping and precoder cycling is to be determined explicitly by RRC, hence TDW is implicitly determined. In this manner, it can provide similar result as configured by Alt 2-C or 2-C'. In our view, the design concepts of joint CE with and without considering frequency hopping/precoder cycling can lead to two separate designs. Separately, Alt. 2B is also applicable for PUSCH repetition type B to have a unique design for joint CE for both PUSCH repetition type A and B.  On the figures described above, TDW and actual TDW are used. Our understanding is the term "TDW" corresponds to the final length of " UE is expected to maintain power consistency and phase continuity among PUSCH transmissions". Therefore, the actual TDW used in the figures are our usage of TDW. Hence, TDW is determined by the event like UL slots as described.  Separately, we agree with Qualcomm comment on following two points from UE complexity perspective.  (a) All TDW locations are all determined prior to start of PUSCH repetitions --- ideally, right after available slots are determined.  (b) In the event of any events violating conditions for bundling during a TDW, UE does not resume bundling. |
| Nokia/NSB | Many thanks to the FL for the great efforts on clarifying the three alternatives!  It is rather obvious from the above figures that:   * Alt. 2-B works well in all scenarios and shows a clear advantage in FDD for both with or without the events that break phase continuity and power consistency. * Alt. 2-B does NOT require an additional RRC parameter for “configured window length”, which is required by Alt. 2-C and Alt. 2-C’.   Aside from the above observations from the figures, it is also worth mentioning that:   * We are designing TDW for PUSCH repetitions. Within this repetition duration, the longer TDW the better performance could be achieved by JCE. Therefore, there is no reason for the gNB to configure the “configured window length” to be less than the “the maximum duration”. Note that PUSCH repetitions are happening within this repetition duration. Therefore, concern on power consumption when there is no PUSCH transmission doesn’t exist. * The “repetition duration” is used by all alternatives to determine the window size of the last TDW. Otherwise, another parameter to configure the number of “configured windows” should be introduced for Alt. 2-C and Alt. 2-C’, which is not needed in Alt. 2-B. Therefore, concern on “the UE doesn’t know where to stop the TDW” doesn’t exist. * The notion of “events that break phase continuity and power consistency” is needed in all alternatives, not only Alt. 2-B. Therefore, concern on discrepancy doesn’t exist. |
| Sierra Wireless | Many thanks to FL for creating the diagrams which are very helpful!  We still prefer Alt 2-B but have one questions for clarification. For Alt 2B given this diagram,    Although the TDW’s are implicitly defined, the “Maximum [TDW] Duration” parameter still explicitly configured (which IMO, is somewhat similar to “configured window length” for the other two options)? If yes, perhaps we should add this text to Alt 2-B description:  The Maximum TDW Duration “L” can be explicitly configured with a single value. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We agree with both Panasonic’s and Nokia’s arguments described above for supporting Alt 2B.  For both Alt 2-C and 2-C’, we don’t think that explicit configuration of TDW solves any purpose, as we can have irregular violation of power consistencies and phase continuity. |
| InterDigital | We have several questions and proposals.  @FL/Qualcomm, we have one question regarding 2C/2C’.   * When is the window length configured? Is it the same window length configured per bundle of slots as illustrated in the figures? And how is the window length determined?   @FL/Proponents of 2-B   * Also for 2-B, is it correct understanding that even a repetition is cancelled in TDD, the UE is expected to resume phase/power maintenance?   For clarity, we propose the following modification:  Modification #1:  Insert the following paragraph in Alt 2-C’, explaining the UE is not expected to perform phase continuity/power consistency maintenance if the time window is broken by an event.  “UE is expected to maintain the power consistency and phase continuity during each TDW. In case that the power consistency and phase continuity are violated due to an event during one TDW, DM-RS bundling is not resumed during this TDW.   * + FFS: The events may include e.g., DL/UL configuration for unpaired spectrum, DL reception/monitoring occasion for unpaired spectrum, high priority transmission, frequency hopping.”   Modification #2 (Alt 2-B):  The length of TDW in Alt 2-B is the maximum duration. (agree with Sierra)  One of the conditions for termination of the TDW in Alt 2-B is when it reaches the maximum duration (TDW length). |
| WILUS | We are fine with the proposal. Additionally, it is not decided yet whether or not each window consists of at least two adjacent physical slots for UL transmission. Therefore, we propose to add a FFS, which is applied to all alternatives.   * + **FFS: Each window consists of at least two adjacent physical slots for UL transmission.** |
| vivo | Support Alt-2B or Alt-2C’.  The Alt-B can work well in TDD spectrum and TDW can be at least periodically created by UL/DL configuration.  While for FDD, we are not sure how long the maximum duration could be, which is up to RAN4 discussion. If it is quite a long duration, UE may not have chance to initiate multiple TDWs in FDD, if no additional TDW length is configured. UE may not allowed to apply the received TPC command before all the repetitions are finished, not sure whether it would lead to coverage loss. |
| TCL | Support this proposal, and prefer Alt 2-B or Alt 2-C’. |
| Ericsson | For Alt 2-C and 2-C’, the example cases assume a short window of 4 slots. RAN4 feedback on the maximum duration is not available, and if the maximum duration is larger than needed to contain the repetitions, the need for a short configured duration of L=4 is not so clear. Furthermore, recalling that the number of repetitions can be e.g. 7 in Rel-16, it is not clear with Alts 2-C and 2-C’ how to handle the case where L does not evenly divide the number of repetitions and/or the number of slots needed for the repetitions, since there is only one configured window size. Also, how to determine the start of the windows in the TDD examples of Alts 2-C and 2-C’ are not so clear, e.g. why is there a gap of two DL slots? Moreover, since Alt 2-B could include exceeding a configured window length as an event, we think Alt 2-B is a safer choice, and allows better performance as in the FL’s example for FDD. |
| Panasonic | Due to an interruption of providing inputs from companies. Input of Qualcomm in v070 is missed in this file; hence we copy it in below box for your convenience.   |  | | --- | | Question to Panasonic and Nokia:  We will likely have to handle the case of PUSCH repetitions with unscheduled gaps in between. So consider the case of 4 PUSCH repetitions of 12 symbols each in back-to-back slots (think of an FDD band).  As per your thinking, when/how does a UE make a determination that the 2-symbol gap is truly unoccupied/unused? Can this determination be made prior to start of all repetitions? What if a PUCCH carrying HARQ ACK/NACK bits gets scheduled in the last two symbols of the 2nd slot? How does the UE react to this event? Note that UE is unlikely to be able to anticipate such transmissions too far ahead of time. |   Our reply to question of Qualcomm is shown in the following.  For the available slot determination (of step 1), it determines which slots are bundled based on SLIV in TDRA table. Similar to PUSCH repetition type A discussion, in the step 2, some slots transmission may be dropped by SFI or higher priority transmissions. We have not decided our view whether a short PUCCH in the gap is handled based on the following options   * Option 1: UE can assume short PUCCH transmission in the gap never happens. * Option 2: UE prioritizes short PUCCH. The remaining PUSCH in the current window is discarded, as similar to the 2nd step. * Option 3: UE transmits short PUCCH. The remaining PUSCH in the current window is transmitted but it is not bundled before short PUCCH.   For the similarity with NB-IoT/eMTC, Option 1 is sufficient. Option 3 can be attractive for more advanced operation. Option 2 is assumed for short PUCCH, and it is only transmitted when there is strongly necessary for higher priority transmission so that is a rare event. |
| CATT | Thanks FL for the detailed examples. Fine to further down-select the alternatives.  Our first preference would be Alt-2B and Alt-2C’. In fact, we consider Alt-2B as the special case with TDW always fixed to maximum duration before reaching the end of repetition. |
| Samsung | We slightly prefer the Alt 2-B in principle. We support that a new TDW is created after the event.  As the default value, the window length ‘L’ can be equal to the maximum window duration and then the gNB can optimize the window length depending on frequency error (e.g. CFO) and channel condition and explicitly configured a value of window length as needed. |
| Intel | Thanks for the updated proposals. We have the following comments:   * What is difference between Alt. 2-C and 2-C’? it seems that based on the figures, "DM-RS bundling is not resumed during this TDW" is equivalent to "The ending of one window depends on the events and the configured window length". Can you please clarify the difference between these two? * As we mentioned before, we would like to add one alternative to include the case when event happens, UE may resume the DMRS bundling with the configured TDW. As shown in the following figure. UE may still perform DMRS bundling in the 2nd configured TDW after the event in the first UL slot. This would create more opportunity for joint channel estimation for better performance. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support Alt2-C’. If the maximum duration is long, Alt2-B might cause low-interval frequency calibrations. Since how often frequency calibration is needed depends on UE mobility, TDW should be explicitly determined per UE on top of implicit determination.  Also, Alt2-C’ in the second figure that FL showed is not what we expected. After the first event is triggered on the 5th slot, TDW should re-start from the 6th slot in Alt2-C’ so that joint channel estimation can be applied for 6th-8th UL slots. It is from the fact that Alt2-C’ does not have characteristic “DM-RS bundling is not resumed during this TDW” as Alt2-C. |
| ZTE | We support the spirit of Option 2-C and 2-C’, with gNB configuring a time domain window length. If UE can support a very long duration, it is desirable for gNB to configure a time domain window with a smaller duration, especially in FDD case e.g,, 32 PUSCH repetitions. Otherwise it would increase gNB’s complexity for JCE across that long duration In addition, It would impact TPC/TA accumulation as also mentioned by vivo.  In our view, the intention of Alt 2-C’ is to introduce a configured time domain window on top of Alt 2-B. So could we simplify Alt 2-C’ as follows?   * Alt 2-C’: All the repetitions are covered by one or multiple configured consecutive/non-consecutive TDWs   + The window length *L* can be explicitly configured with a single value and *L* is no longer than the maximum duration   + The start of the first TDW is the first PUSCH transmission     - FFS: The first available slot/symbol, or the first physical slot/symbol for the first PUSCH transmission.   + FFS Whether the start of other TDWs can be explicitly configured or implicitly determined   + Within each configured time domain window, Alt 2-B applies. |
| CMCC | Support Alt 2-B and 2-C’, as both cases provide a solution of actual TDW, in which maintaining phase continuity and power consistency in the DL cannot be realized. And for the Alt 2-C’, it could provide a flexibility of indication of TDW. The Alt 2-B seems more base on the RRC configuration. |
| LG | We are deeply appreciated to FL for clarifying three options. Thank you for the effort as a FL. Those figures and shortened version seems clear to us.  For the enhancement of uplink coverage, it is our understanding that longer DMRS bundling is desirable due to the combining gain of it. In that sense, Alt. 2-B seems appropriate since it can achieve the longest and the most frequent time domain window at the same time since the window after the event is started immediately.  Regarding the event, we are aligned with Nokia that the notion of “events that break phase continuity and power consistency” is needed in all alternatives. |
| MediaTek | Our preference is close to Alt 2-C’. But for the starting slot, it can be started later and then ended by the event or TDW boundary (i.e., the ending slot of TDW). So similarly, the starting slots can be determined by the events or the TDW boundary (i.e., the starting slot of TDW). In case of multiple events within TDW, JCE is only applied for the consecutive slots. |
| Apple | Alt 2-B is preferred.  For Alt2-C and Alt 2-C’, it’s highly depending on the network configuration, whether L is suitable will impacts the JCE performance. As showing in illustration figure, if L=3 or L=5 the continuous UL slots could not perform JCE for Alt 2-C and Alt2-C’. In addition, whether the DM-RS bundling is resumed after the event is not defined for Alt 2-C’. |
| Qualcomm | We prefer to go with Alt 2-C (or 2-C’, with the condition that bundling is not resumedin case of a violation). The procedure is straightforward and the chance of misalignment between UE and BS is minimized.  Determining Nominal TDW locations using available slots and then reacting to dynamic events is a core principle that’s also reused in other uplink features. |
| Sony | We prefer Alt 2-B  If there is no clear benefit with explicit signaling, we think that shall be avoided. |
| FL | @Sierra Wireless, The maximum duration is subject to UE capability and it is not configured by gNB. To be clearer, FL updates the illustrations and sets the value of maximum duration as an assumption, it is applied to all the alternatives.  @Interdigital, For your first question, the window length is configured before the first PUSCH transmission. There is only one configured window length for Alt 2-C and Alt 2-C’, it’s up to gNB on how to determine the window length. For your second question, for Alt 2-B, the TDWs are implicitly determined, if a repetition is canceled due to some event, the current TDW in ended and one new TDW is created after the event.  @WILUS, suggest not adding this FFS, since it is agreed that “all PUSCH repetitions are covered by one single / one or multiple time domain windows”. As illustrated in the figure, there may be some cases that one window covers a single slot, if these cases are precluded, it may not align with the previous agreement.  @Intel, For your first question, from the FL understanding, the original intension for Alt 2-C’ is that, some companies think the TDW should not include downlink slot as it is not aligned with the definition of TDW. For Alt 2-C, although DMRS bundling is not resumed, the window still include downlink slot or some events. For Alt 2-C’, the TDW is ended if some events occur. Based on companies comments, FL updates Alt 2-C’ as: in case that the power consistency and phase continuity are violated due to an event during one TDW, this TDW is segmented into multiple sub-windows, and UE is expected to maintain the power consistency and phase continuity during each sub-window. This also aligns with your second comment.  @ NTT DOCOMO @ZTE @ Intel @ MediaTek, Please check the updated Alt 2-C’.   * Revised Alt 2-C’: All the repetitions are covered by one or multiple consecutive/non-consecutive TDWs   + The window length *L* can be explicitly configured with a single value and *L* is no longer than the maximum duration   + The start of the first TDW is the first PUSCH transmission     - FFS: The first available slot/symbol, or the first physical slot/symbol for the first PUSCH transmission.   + FFS Whether the start of other TDWs can be explicitly configured or implicitly determined   + The end of the last TDW is the end of the last PUSCH transmission.     - FFS: The end of the window is the last available slot/symbol, or the last physical slot/symbol for the last PUSCH transmission.   + UE is expected to maintain the power consistency and phase continuity during each TDW. In case that the power consistency and phase continuity are violated due to an event during one TDW, this TDW is segmented into multiple sub-windows, and UE is expected to maintain the power consistency and phase continuity during each sub-window.     - FFS: The events may include e.g., DL/UL configuration for unpaired spectrum, DL reception/monitoring occasion for unpaired spectrum, high priority transmission, frequency hopping.     - FFS: details of sub-windows   The illustrative figures are updated as follows: |
| OPPO | Thanks jianchi for your great effort.  We support alt2-B. and we have a proposal to make it clear.   * Alt 2-B: All the repetitions are covered by one or multiple consecutive/non-consecutive TDWs, where all TDWs are implicitly determined   + The start of the first TDW is the first PUSCH transmission     - FFS: The first available slot/symbol, or the first physical slot/symbol for the first PUSCH transmission.   + After one TDW starts, UE is expected to maintain the power consistency and phase continuity until one of the following conditions is met, then the TDW is ended.     - The TDW reaches the end of the last PUSCH transmission       * FFS: The end of the window is the last available slot/symbol, or the last physical slot/symbol for the last PUSCH transmission.     - The power consistency and phase continuity are violated due to an event,       * FFS: The events may include e.g., a DL slot occur during PUSCH repetition based on DL/UL configuration for unpaired spectrum, the TDW exceeds the maximum duration (if supported), DL reception/monitoring occasion for unpaired spectrum, high priority transmission, frequency hopping.       * FFS: The end of the window is the last available slot/symbol of the PUSCH transmission right before an event such that the power consistency and phase continuity are violated.   + If the power consistency and phase continuity are violated due to an event, one new TDW is created after the event,     - FFS: The start of the new TDW is the first available slot/symbol for PUSCH transmission after the event. |
| FL | @OPPO, regarding the revisions, since they are under FFS, I think we don’t need to make such fine refinements at this stage. |

### 5.2.2 Additional dynamic signaling to enable/disable joint channel estimation

**FL comments: In order to avoid duplicate discussion, after offline coordination, dynamic signaling to enable/disable DMRS bundling will be handled under AI 8.8.2 covering both PUCCH and PUSCH.**

### 5.2.3 Coherent transmission indication

Companies are encouraged to answer the following questions:

1. Under what circumstances UE may lose transmission coherence (cannot perform DM-RS bundling) during the time domain window while gNB is not aware of this?
2. If UE loses transmission coherence during the time domain, is it necessary to indicate transmission coherence to gNB? What’s the consequence of no such indication from UE?
3. If UE loses transmission coherence during the time domain, are there any other solutions to address this issue?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| LG | 1. The gNB does not know that transmission coherence of UE is lost in case when transmission power drop due to dynamic power sharing of DC and when transmission is dropped due to uplink collision of CA/DC. If UE operates fine timing tracking to adjust FFT boundary when UE receive DL signal, UL transmission timing is also changed, consequently. For normal UL signal/channel transmission, it is not required that gNB is aware of this. However, in case of joint channel estimation, this UE fine time tracking could bring a performance degradation. In R1-2105490, we observed that PUSCH decoding performance is degraded, even if one time sample of UL transmission timing is changed within time domain window for DMRS bundling.  2. Misunderstanding of the gNB and the UE occurs for the application of the restricted operation within the window. For example, when the UE cannot maintain transmission coherence than the gNB expects, the combining gain of the gNB receiver will be degraded. Or conversely, there is a problem in the case where the UE maintains transmission coherence longer than the gNB expects. For example, the gNB expected the UE to apply the power adjustment (e.g., TPC command) and TA adjustment which was prohibited during the TDW, however the UE did not actually apply it, resulting in misunderstanding between them.  3. It seems that this can only be resolved by the UE's report. |
| Nokia/NSB | Agreed with the above observations from LG. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Also agree with LG’s obervsations |
| vivo | For CA cases, there is only one MAC entity for these two serving cells, NW should be aware of the events that may cause losing of transmission coherence. For DC, the serving cells may have different MAC entities, NW may not aware of the coherence lost. While it is not clear why NW would configure CA/DC for poor coverage UEs.  If the NW configuration lead to uncertainty on phase continuity, then NW have to perform JCE in a conservative way. For example, NW can first at least check power consistency after LS estimation and/or frequency domain filtering before time domain filtering on multiple slots. If large received power change is detected, NW can fallback to slot based time domain filtering by implementation. Therefore, no additional indication from UE is needed. |
| Ericsson | Examples where gNB may not be aware of loss of transmission coherence include during autonomous timing adjustment, open loop power control, and possibly other cases such as CA. Our first preference is that such loss of coherence unknown to gNB is precluded for bundled DMRS. If coherence can’t be reliably maintained, the benefit of joint channel estimation / DMRS bundling as a feature is not so clear. |
| CATT | Agree with LG. |
| Samsung | These questions can be revisited after we finalize the design in Sec.5.2.1. |
| Intel | Our understanding is that RAN4 needs to define such requirement for coherent transmission. If such coherence is not met, DMRS bundling is not continued as discussed in the event for TDW. |
| NTT DOCOMO | If appropriate TDW size is determined, TA adjustments after the TDW end is not a huge problem. In our views, most of problems can be solved by configuring the decent TDW size based on channel conditions of each UE.  Also, coherent transmission indication requires overhead or low flexibility, based on other company’s proposal. Therefore, we cannot evaluate coherent transmission indication at this stage, unless what mechanism is applied as coherent transmission indication. |
| ZTE | Similar view as Intel. |
| Apple | Share the similar view as Intel. |
| Qualcomm | Once a UE indicates support for DMRS bundling, it has no means of revising this capability. DMRS bundling is a rather sensitive feature and it imposes several restrictions on how UE tx chain operates. If at any point a UE is not able to ensure phase continuity and power consistency at the levels required for good performance, there needs to be a procedure to fall back to legacy mode of operation. Thermal considerations is one example where some feedback from UE is useful. |
| Sony | Agree with Intel’s view |

## 5.3 Others

### 5.3.1 TPC command

We have agreed to make down selection between the following two alternatives:

* Alt 1: UE is not expected to receive TPC commands during the current time domain window.
* Alt 2: UE receives and accumulates TPC commands without taking effect during the current time domain window.

Companies are encourage to provide pros and cons for the two alternatives.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | We prefer to have more flexibility for gNB, and to allow gNB to trade off power control versus joint channel estimation. Therefore, it would be good to understand why it is insufficient for gNB to avoid sending extra power control commands (group common or UE specific) during PUSCH repetition and during the time domain window. If the benefit of joint channel estimation is sufficiently small, then it may be better for the gNB to send a power control command, and lose the benefit of joint channel estimation. In this case, the power control command change can be an event that truncates the time domain window, and the UE can adust the transmit power.  Therefore, we would like to clarify Alt 1 as:   * Alt 1: UE is not expected to receive TPC commands during the current time domain window. * If the UE does receive a TPC command during the current time domain window, this constitutes an event |
| Samsung | We prefer Alt 2.  If a UE receives a TPC command, it does not make sense not to use it and for the NW to not be able to reach the UE to adjust the power just because the UE is transmitting with repetitions.  We interpret Alt. 1 to mean that a UE discards TPC commands because otherwise Alt. 1 is not even possible (e.g. a UE can be configured to monitor DCI format 2\_2 periodically and it is not even possible for a NW to arrange the scheduling and the repetitions around DCI format 2\_2) – there is no reason for a UE to discard TPC commands and, if the NW so prefers, the NW can even achieve that behavior by setting the TPC command to 0 dB. |
|  |  |
|  |  |

Regarding the comments by LG about TPC command, companies are encourage to provide views on the following proposal:

**Proposal:**

* If UE receives TPC command before the start of one time domain window, TPC commands takes effect during the time domain window.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Panasonic | We support the updated proposal. |
| LG | Thanks FL to address our concern. It is really appreciated. However I think there was a misunderstanding.  According to the current spec, the received TPC command is accumulated for a certain time and applied to UE’s transmission. In other words, the TPC command received before a certain time period can be applied to the current transmission of PUSCH. That is, the received TPC command affects transmission for a predetermined time later. Therefore, even if the UE does not receive the TPC command within the time domain window (which is the first alternative of agreement), that is, even if it receives the TPC command outside the time domain window, it is our understanding that the application can be made within the window according to the current spec.  Even if UE receives TPC command before the start of one time domain window, UE should not apply accumulated TPC command value during time domain window after the first PUSCH within time domain window is transmitted in order for power consistency. |
| Nokia/NSB | We share the same understanding as LG that even if there is no TPC command after the first repetition in the TDW, the accumulation still continues. Therefore, the next repetition in the window can still suffering from power update. This is the main reason why we think that Alt. 2 should be a better choice (basically Alt. 1 doesn’t completely solve the issue). It is worth if companies can share their understanding on TPC accumulation before we continue discussing this issue. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support the updated proposal |
| CATT | According to the previous discussion, Alt.1 is a general restriction for both TDD and FDD case while Alt.2 seems only consider FDD case.  Regarding this proposal, it seems an update of Alt.2. We are not sure whether the current wording is accurate enough based on the LG and Nokia’s explanation. |
| Samsung | We are fine with proposal. The accumulated/received TPC value can take effect on the next TDW, so basically CLPC can be applied per TDW. |
| Intel | Our understanding is that there are two issues we need to resolve. 1) when TPC command is received before the start of TDW and 2) when TPC command is received during the TDW. For the first issue, we think UE should not update the TPC accumulated value during the TDW.  For the 2nd issue, we think UE is not expected that TPC command is sent from gNB as this is for joint channel estimation. TPC command would cause power inconsistency. |
| Sharp | In our view, the UE can apply the TPC command in a first slot for PUSCH within the TDW but the UE should not apply the TPC command in other slots for PUSCH within the TDW. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support the proposal. |
| ZTE | We are fine to treat as error case as Alt 1 above or support this proposal (i.e., this can be an even that truncates the time down window). |
| CMCC | Similar view as Sharp that, the TPC command should be applied to the 1st slot for PUSCH and don’t change for the following PUSCHs. But the TPC command could be received during the TDW and taking effect in the next transmission. |
| MediaTek | Agree with the principle, but the wording may need to be changed to avoid confusing, i.e.,   * If UE receives TPC command before the start of one time domain window, TPC commands takes effect in the beginning of  ~~during~~ the time domain window once. |
| Qualcomm | TPC power update is applied at the beginning of a transmission occasion. UE accumulates all TPC commands received between a prior occasion and the current one. Accumulation does not occur if indicated so by tpc-accumulation RRC parameter, and absolute TPC values are provided.  At the beginning of every transmission occasion, a UE can check whether a TDW is ongoing, if so the power update can be deferred to the next transmission occasion. Suggest the following revision:  **Proposal:** Transmit power update (based on TPC commands) at the beginning of a PUSCH transmission occasion is deferred to the next PUSCH transmission occasion if a TDW for DMRS bundling contains the current occasion and started prior to the current occasion. UE continues to accumulate TPC commands received between the current transmission occasion to the next transmission occasion and apply them on top of the deferred power update. |
| Sony | Agree with the proposal and with MediaTek that the wording can be improved. |

### 5.3.2 TA adjustment

**Based on the 2nd round discussion, some companies confirmed that RAN1 can make decision. From FL understanding, if it is common understanding, we can make decision in RAN1.**

**Proposal 6:**

* UE should not perform TA adjustment during the time domain window.

**Support: Panasonic, ZTE, Apple, Nokia/NSB, CMCC, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, Qualcomm, Samsung, LG, NTT DOCOMO, Sharp, vivo, OPPO, Xiaomi, Spreadtrum, CATT, Sony, WILUS, MediaTek, Ericsson, Sierra Wireless.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| LG | Support proposal 6. |
| Nokia/NSB | Support. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support the proposal 6 |
| WILUS | Support the Proposal 6. |
| Ericsson | Support |
| CATT | Support in principle.  But we also recognize that such proposal is a kind of high level one. Do we have the same understanding on the interpretation? For example:  (1) UE does not expect to receive TA command to indicate TA adjustment during the TDW.  (2) UE ignores any TA command which indicates TA adjustment during the TDW.  (3) UE performs TA adjustment after the TDW if it receives any TA command indicating TA adjustment during the TDW.  If the detailed interpretation is still unclear, we may need further discussion. |
| Samsung | Support the FL’s proposal. |
| Intel | We share similar view as CATT that further discussion is needed. Current proposal does not seem to cover all discussions. |
| Sharp | Support |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support the proposal. |
| ZTE | Support |
| CMCC | Support |
| MediaTek | Support |
| Apple | Support |
| Qualcomm | Support |
| Sony | Support |

1. Email discussion (4th round)

## 6.1 Use cases

### 6.1.1 PUSCH transmission with different TBs

**FL comments: It seems no further discussion via email is needed. Let’s discuss during the GTW session.**

### 6.1.2 TBoMS (on hold)

## 6.2 Time domain window

### 6.2.1 Time domain window design

**Proposal 7-v3: For joint channel estimation for PUSCH repetition type A of PUSCH repetitions of the same TB, down select one of the following alternatives for the time domain window.**

* Alt 2-B: All the repetitions are covered by one or multiple consecutive/non-consecutive TDWs, where all TDWs are implicitly determined
  + The start of the first TDW is the first PUSCH transmission
    - FFS: The first available slot/symbol, or the first physical slot/symbol for the first PUSCH transmission.
  + After one TDW starts, UE is expected to maintain the power consistency and phase continuity until one of the following conditions is met, then the TDW is ended.
    - The TDW reaches the end of the last PUSCH transmission
      * FFS: The end of the window is the last available slot/symbol, or the last physical slot/symbol for the last PUSCH transmission.
    - The power consistency and phase continuity are violated due to an event,
      * FFS: The events may include e.g., DL/UL configuration for unpaired spectrum, the TDW exceeds the maximum duration, DL reception/monitoring occasion for unpaired spectrum, high priority transmission, frequency hopping.
      * FFS: The end of the window is the last available slot/symbol of the PUSCH transmission right before an event such that the power consistency and phase continuity are violated.
  + If the power consistency and phase continuity are violated due to an event, one new TDW is created after the event,
    - FFS: The start of the new TDW is the first available slot/symbol for PUSCH transmission after the event.
* Alt 2-C: All the repetitions are covered by one or multiple consecutive/non-consecutive TDWs
  + The window length *L* can be explicitly configured with a single value and *L* is no longer than the maximum duration.
  + The start of the first TDW is the first PUSCH transmission
    - FFS: The first available slot/symbol, or the first physical slot/symbol for the first PUSCH transmission.
  + FFS Whether the start of other TDWs can be explicitly configured or implicitly determined
  + The end of the last TDW is the end of the last PUSCH transmission.
    - FFS: The end of the window is the last available slot/symbol, or the last physical slot/symbol for the last PUSCH transmission.
  + UE is expected to maintain the power consistency and phase continuity during each TDW. In case that the power consistency and phase continuity are violated due to an event during one TDW, DM-RS bundling is not resumed during this TDW.
    - FFS: The events may include e.g., DL/UL configuration for unpaired spectrum, DL reception/monitoring occasion for unpaired spectrum, high priority transmission, frequency hopping.
* Alt 2-C’: All the repetitions are covered by one or multiple consecutive/non-consecutive TDWs
  + The window length *L* can be explicitly configured with a single value and *L* is no longer than the maximum duration
  + The start of the first TDW is the first PUSCH transmission
    - FFS: The first available slot/symbol, or the first physical slot/symbol for the first PUSCH transmission.
  + FFS Whether the start of other TDWs can be explicitly configured or implicitly determined
  + The end of the last TDW is the end of the last PUSCH transmission.
    - FFS: The end of the window is the last available slot/symbol, or the last physical slot/symbol for the last PUSCH transmission.
  + UE is expected to maintain the power consistency and phase continuity during each TDW. In case that the power consistency and phase continuity are violated due to an event during one TDW, this TDW is segmented into multiple sub-windows, and UE is expected to maintain the power consistency and phase continuity during each sub-window.
    - FFS: The events may include e.g., DL/UL configuration for unpaired spectrum, DL reception/monitoring occasion for unpaired spectrum, high priority transmission, frequency hopping.
    - FFS: details of sub-windows

**FL comments: To facilitate the discussion, examples of each alternative w/ and w/o events for both FDD and TDD are illustrated below.**







**FL comments: There are following observations based on companies’ comments.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Observations |
| Alt 2-B | * It can achieve the best performance for joint channel estimation. * It does not require additional signalling to explicit configure the length of TDW. * It is beneficial for the interaction with frequency hopping and precoder cycling. * If the maximum duration is quite a long duration, UE may not have chance to initiate multiple TDWs in FDD, if no additional TDW length is configured. Then, UE may not be allowed to apply the received TPC command before all the repetitions are finished. |
| Alt 2-C | * The position and length of each TDW are known to a UE before the first PUSCH transmission. UE implementation would be simpler if the UE could determine the windows before the first PUSCH repetition transmission. * The procedure is straightforward and the chance of misalignment between UE and BS is minimized. * If some events which violate the power consistency and phase continuity during the TDW, the DMRS bundling is not resumed during this TDW, which may cause performance loss in some cases. * It depends on the network configuration, whether *L* is suitable will impact the JCE performance. |
| Alt 2-C’ | * If some events which violate the power consistency and phase continuity during the TDW, this TDW is segmented into multiple sub-windows, and UE is expected to maintain the power consistency and phase continuity during each sub-window. It’s more complicated due to 2-step determination of the windows. * It can provide better performance than Alt 2-C. * It depends on the network configuration, whether *L* is suitable will impact the JCE performance |

**FL comments: Companies are encouraged to provide views on each alternative.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Support | Not support |
| Alt 2-B | Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, Panasonic, Nokia/NSB, WILUS, Ericsson, Sharp, Sierra Wireless, vivo, TCL, CATT, Samsung, CMCC, LG, Apple, Sony, Xiaomi, Samsung |  |
| Alt 2-C | Qualcomm, ZTE | Nokia/NSB |
| Alt 2-C’ | NTT DOCOMO, vivo, TCL, CATT, ZTE, CMCC, MediaTek, Sharp, Xiaomi, Samsung, Intel | Nokia/NSB |

**FL comments: Companies are encouraged to provide further comments, if any.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| NTT DOCOMO | We prefer Alt2-C’. If the configured TDW size is the same as maximum duration, Alt 2-C’ turns out to be Alt2-B. Hence, Alt2-B can be considered one scenario of Alt2-C’ in our view (please correct us if it is wrong). In Alt2-C’, it is possible to configure appropriate TDW size based on the preferred update frequency of power and TA. In this sense, Alt2-C’ can provide more choices according to channel quality and usage. |
| Panasonic | As we described before, our understanding of the term “TDW” corresponds to the final length of “UE is expected to maintain power consistency and phase continuity among PUSCH transmissions”. We support that TDW is determined in an implicit manner by violation events or deriving from another signalling/configuration. Hence, we think “sub-window” in option C’ as actual TDW should be called as just “TDW”. Separately, based on current formulations of 3 Alts., we think there are 2 main discussion points that need to be addressed   * The 1st discussion point between Alt. 2-B and Alt. 2-C/2-C’ is whether we introduce “the window length L” (not call it as TDW) or not * The 2nd discussion point between Alt. 2-C and Alt. 2-C’ is whether the remaining slots in the window length L forms new TDW or not   Regarding these two discussion points, our thinking is expressed in the following   * **Whether we introduce “the window length L” (not call it as TDW) or not** * We are positive to introduce this parameter as far as it is not called as TDW. This period is used for frequency hopping and precoder cycling. With this parameter, we ensure to say “it is beneficial for the interaction with frequency hopping and precoder cycling”. * Depending on the UE velocity and so on the proper length of frequency hopping and precoder cycling are different. Therefore, with this parameter, we ensure to say “it can achieve the best performance for joint channel estimation”. * Moreover, this parameter can also be used for a purpose of disabling/enabling joint CE. * We think this parameter can be obtained from the length of the repetitions that is divided by 2 or 4; or it can be obtained from RRC parameter; or it can be given in TDRA table. * **Whether the remaining slots in the window length L forms new TDW or not after some events** * If event is semi-static information like semi-static DL/UL configuration, the remaining slots should form new TDW. * If event is dynamic information like SFI, higher priority information, ideally it should still form new TDW. On the other hand, we also understand this also increase the complexity. Therefore, it can be discussed as UE feature/capability in later phase. |
| CATT | Fine with this proposal and support further down selection.  Specifically, similar view as DOCOMO, Alt 2-B seems to be the sub-case of Alt 2-C’ when TDW=maximum duration. Configuring a TDW smaller than maximum duration may still be useful, e.g. simplify gNB implementation to enable unified channel estimation procedure when different UEs support JCE with different maximum duration.  For Alt 2-C, we admit that this option has lowest risk in mis-alignment between gNB and UE, for example, when ‘event’ is dynamically triggered by a signal/channel but the UE may no correctly detect the signal/channel. But creating a sub-window after the break point and maintaining the phase/power condition within the sub-window seems reasonable since the phase/power is only interrupted by the ‘event’ before. |
| FL | @DOCOMO, CATT, From FL understanding, even if the configured TDW size is the same as maximum duration, Alt 2-C’ is NOT exactly the same as Alt2-B. Please look at the following example.    @Panasonic, Thanks for the summary of the main different points for the three alternatives. Regarding the sub-windows in Alt 2-C’, since the determination of the windows is based on 2-step, we can use the terms “nominal TDW” and “actual TDW” or “TDW” and “sub-window”. From FL perspective, as long as we clearly describe each alternative, it does not matter which terms we use. |
| Qualcomm | Alt 2-C remains our preferred choice.  Regarding Alt 2-B, the following is mentioned:   * + If the power consistency and phase continuity are violated due to an event, one new TDW is created after the event,     - FFS: The start of the new TDW is the first available slot/symbol for PUSCH transmission after the event.   If a new TDW is created, then planned FTL updates, power control updates, etc. need to be deferred. This takes a certain amount of time and is not instantaneous. Loop management becomes a lot more complicated. The other alternatives are striving to fix this issue.  We prefer to go with a solution that provides clarity to the UE as soon as available slots are determined. UE may not be in a position to dynamically react to events/violations and immediately start a new TDW. Prior planning is required. This is the reason we prefer to not go with 2-C’ as well --- starting a TDW after an event requires some time gap. |
| Panasonic | @FL, thanks for your reply. As we have a definition of TDW in the past agreement shown in the following box, we believe that using the agreed definition of TDW can avoid any miss-alignment of understanding between companies during the discussion. We also believe that the agreed definition is applied only for “actual TDW” or “sub-window” in alt 2-C and alt 2-C’, not for “nominal TDW” or “TDW” in Alt. 2-C and Alt. 2-C’. We have no plan to change the agreed definition. However, it is better to explicitly introduce the new term/terminology for further good discussion.   |  | | --- | | For joint channel estimation, specify a time domain window during which a UE is expected to maintain power consistency and phase continuity among PUSCH transmissions subject to power consistency and phase continuity requirements. | |
| FL | @ Panasonic, Understand your point. Due to the 2-step determination of TDW for Alt 2-C’, if we only use the term “TDW”, it seems complicated to describe Alt 2-C’. From FL perspective, if companies share the understanding that it is necessary to use the term “sub-window” or “actual window”, we can introduce it. Otherwise, we may have to work out how to use only one term “TDW”. |
| Sharp | Currently, we prefer either Alt 2-B or Alt 2-C’ through observations. Rather than, if Alt 2-B does not require additional signalling to explicit configure the length of TDW, we change preference to Alt 2-C’. This is because precoder cycling can be used. |
| Panasonic | @FL, thanks for your reply. We fully agree that using only one term is quite complicated to describe Alt 2-C’. That why we propose to use “window length L” (or any name is fine) to replace the current usage of TDW in Alt 2-C. Then sub-window in Alt 2-C is based on the existing agreement of usage of “TDW”. That can avoid a complicated description by just changing the terminology.  @Qualcomm, we agree “UE may not be in a position to dynamically react to events/violations and immediately start a new TDW”. That’s why we described it can be UE feature as described in our above reply. |
| Xiaomi | We prefer alt 2-B and 2-C’ |
| FL | @Sharp, From FL understanding, precoder cycling can be deems as one kind of events for Alt 2-B.  @Panasonic, Thanks for the further explanation! It seems you propose “window length L” plus “TDW”, it is still 2-step, right? The only difference is the name of the terms. Regarding your previous comment “Whether the remaining slots in the window length L forms new TDW or not after some events”, it seems not clear why there are remaining slots in the window length? Is it still kind of window? In addition, how to handle “FFS the start of other TDWs” for Alt 2-C’ using the term “window length L”? To address your concerns, maybe we can add notes for Alt 2-C’.  *Note 1: The term “time domain window” may need to be revised taking into account that power consistency and phase continuity may be violated due to certain events.*  *Note 2: The term “sub-window” needs to be defined.*  If you still have concerns, could you please provide the concrete revisions for Alt 2-C’? |
| CMCC | Alt 2-C’ is slightly preferred. For the Alt 2-B, the length of TDW is still not clear. Is that based on the UE capability of how long can the UE maintain ? In some cases of FDD, it could be too long if we always use the maximum length of TDW.  Share similar idea that the 2-B could be the sub-case of 2-C’. For the implicit determination of actual TDW, the 2-B could be as a reference.  For the terminology, we prefer and propose to use the “TDW” and the “actual TDW” to facilitate the discussion. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We still support Alt 2-B  For Alt 2-C, still there is a possibility of violation events and it will have similar implications as for Alt 2-B, so we don’t agree that Alt 2-C is less complex and straightforward compared to Alt 2-B. |
| Panasonic | @FL, thanks so much for your reply. Yes, we propose “window length L” plus “TDW”. It is still 2-step. We agree the only difference is the name of the terms. By just using other name helps to avoid any confusion in the further discussion because adding “ Note 1: The term “time domain window” may need to be revised taking into account that power consistency and phase continuity may be violated due to certain events”, we think it helps to the progress of 3gpp as TU is limited.  As we said, we do not stick to the term “window length L”, and according to your explanation, we understand “window length L” is not so suitable. We can use “pre-TDW” or something like this. For the detailed description of Alt. 2-C’, we can use the term of “XXXX” as an example in following. If “pre-TDW” is acceptable to everyone, just replace “XXXX” by “pre-TDW”.   * Alt 2-C’: All the repetitions are covered by one or multiple consecutive/non-consecutive TDWs   + The window length *L* can be explicitly configured with a single value and *L* is no longer than the maximum duration   + The start of the first XXXX is the first PUSCH transmission     - FFS: The first available slot/symbol, or the first physical slot/symbol for the first PUSCH transmission.   + FFS Whether the start of other XXXXs can be explicitly configured or implicitly determined   + The end of the last XXXX is the end of the last PUSCH transmission.     - FFS: The end of the XXXX is the last available slot/symbol, or the last physical slot/symbol for the last PUSCH transmission.   + UE is expected to maintain the power consistency and phase continuity during each TDW. In case that the power consistency and phase continuity are violated due to an event during one XXXX, this XXXX is segmented into multiple TDW, and UE is expected to maintain the power consistency and phase continuity during each TDW.     - FFS: The events may include e.g., DL/UL configuration for unpaired spectrum, DL reception/monitoring occasion for unpaired spectrum, high priority transmission, frequency hopping.     - ~~FFS: details of sub-windows~~ |
| Samsung | We are fine with Alt 2-B and updated Alt 2-C’, slightly prefer Alt 2-B.  As commented in FL’s observation, when the maximum duration is long, UE may adopt only an initial configuration over all the repetitions. We don’t think it is an efficient design. Also, the maximum duration was the extreme UE capability regardless of gNB capability (e.g. frequency error) or channel condition. Therefore, in practice a gNB may not even apply joint CE across the maximum duration. Thus, for Alt 2-B, we propose to add an FFS to take into account the case when the maximum duration and the number of repetition are both quite long.   * + - FFS: Whether the window length ‘L’ can be implicitly determined as the maximum duration, or as a fraction of the number of repetitions, etc. |
| NTT DOCOMO2 | @FL Thank you for providing good example. After reading your comment, we think the constraint that *L* is no longer than the maximum duration is not necessary in the below sub-bullet Alt2-C’   * + The window length *L* can be explicitly configured with a single value ~~and~~ *~~L~~* ~~is no longer than the maximum duration~~   Without this constraint, Alt2-B can be the same as Alt2-C’ if *L* is equal to the number of all slots allocated for PUSCH. Even when configured window length is longer than maximum duration, the event is triggered when TDW size reaches maximum duration as Alt2-B. We propose this because all companies can be happy if their preferred TDW design can be achieved in one Option.  Also, in the example FL showed, the event is assumed to be detected. However, if UE does not detect the event interrupting TDW correctly, UE and gNB result in misalignment of all TDWs after the miss-detected event in Alt2-B. On the other hand, Alt2-C’ can re-assure the starting point of TDW again even after the misdetection of events, thanks to explicitly pre-determined length. For this reason, we prefer Alt2-C’. |
| Nokia/NSB | Thank you, the FL, for the great efforts on clarifying the understanding among options by drawing figures. In principle, we are fine with listing options as proposed by the FL. However, it would be better if we can work on the wording of each option before agreeing to down select, this may help us to converge faster. With this in mind, we have the following comments:  @**proponents of Alt 2-C’**:   * It seems that your common observation is that Alt 2-B is a special case of Alt 2-C’ when L = “maximum duration”. This is actually not accurate, as illustrated in the figure in FL’s comment. Indeed, when L = “maximum duration”, Alt 2-B offers more flexibility by dynamically refreshing the window length again after the event, instead of statically fixing the windows before reacting to the event. The same observation is also valid if you replace “maximum duration” in Alt 2-B by L (which is RRC configured). * For your concern on precoder cycling, one way to address this in Alt 2-B is to consider it as one of the events as suggested by the FL. Another better way is to cycle across the final windows but “TDW exceeds a length L configured in RRC” will be added in the list of events. This also helps to address any concern on the size of the “maximum duration”, which may be too large.   From the above observations, we would like to slightly modify Alt 2-B as follows (modified parts are highlighted in blue), if this modification could help to address concern from Alt 2-C’ proponents and making a common design for Alt 2-B and Alt 2-C’:   * “Alt 2-B: All the repetitions are covered by one or multiple consecutive/non-consecutive TDWs, where all TDWs are implicitly determined   + The start of the first TDW is the first PUSCH transmission     - FFS: The first available slot/symbol, or the first physical slot/symbol for the first PUSCH transmission.   + After one TDW starts, UE is expected to maintain the power consistency and phase continuity until one of the following conditions is met, then the TDW is ended.     - The TDW reaches the end of the last PUSCH transmission       * FFS: The end of the window is the last available slot/symbol, or the last physical slot/symbol for the last PUSCH transmission.     - The power consistency and phase continuity are violated due to an event,       * the TDW exceeds a length L, which can be explicitly configured with a single value and L is no longer than the maximum duration.       * FFS: The events may include e.g., DL/UL configuration for unpaired spectrum, ~~the TDW exceeds the maximum duration,~~ DL reception/monitoring occasion for unpaired spectrum, high priority transmission, frequency hopping.       * FFS: The end of the window is the last available slot/symbol of the PUSCH transmission right before an event such that the power consistency and phase continuity are violated.   + If the power consistency and phase continuity are violated due to an event, one new TDW is created after the event,     - FFS: The start of the new TDW is the first available slot/symbol for PUSCH transmission after the event.”   The above modification is also aligned with the proposed FFS from Samsung, I hope that Samsung and proponents of Alt 2-B can be fine with it too, if this can help to remove concerns from Alt 2-C’ proponents.  @**proponents of Alt 2-C**: it seems that your concern is on preparation timeline before starting a new TDW. Could you please clarify on how many symbols are needed for this timeline? In addition, we have the following observations/questions concerning this timeline:   * If the event happens in the last slot of the “nominal TDW” in Alt. 2-C, the next TDW is the next “nominal TDW” as well. How the timeline is satisfied by Alt. 2-C in this case? * If the required timeline is practically small, stopping entirely the JCE after the event is an overkill. * In TDD, it is most likely that the timeline will be satisfied since the gap between the two non-consecutive U slots will give enough time for such preparation time. * Would adding the timeline as part of the event duration in Alt. 2-B work for you? |
| Vivo | We support Alt 2-B and 2-C’. In our understanding, we agree that when the configured size L equals to the maximum duration, Alt 2-B and Alt 2-C’ are equivalent. If addition DMRS bundling window configuration is introduced, NW can flexibly control the TDW size according to time domain filtering size at NW receiver, and TPC/apply new measured pathloss/TA adjustment after the configured TDW can be allowed with finer granularity, especially for FDD spectrum, in which case the restart of a new TDW may not happen frequently.  As for Alt 2-C, “DM-RS bundling is not resumed during this TDW” could lead to that some UL transmission occasion after an event could not be used for joint channel estimation, as depicted, which results in performance loss.    As shown in above figure, it is feasible to ensure phase continuity within the last 3 UL slots in first TDW for JCE, while it is forbidden by Alt 2-C, which seems an unnecessary restriction.  Besides, according to the definition of TDW in RAN1 #104 e-meeting, the remaining 3 slots without DMRS bundling seems to unaligned with the definition.   |  | | --- | | For joint channel estimation, specify a time domain window during which a UE is expected to maintain power consistency and phase continuity among PUSCH transmissions subject to power consistency and phase continuity requirements. | |
| Intel | We support Alt. 2-C’. We share similar view as DCM that if there are misunderstanding between gNB and UE on the event, using a configured TDW duration can enable re-alignment between gNB and UE in terms of joint channel estimation. For Alt 2-B, if one event is mis-aligned between gNB and UE, it would cause error propagation, i.e., joint channel estimation for all the subsequent TDWs may not be aligned.  For Alt 2-B, we also think configured TDW duration is needed. Different UEs may have different maximum TDW durations based on UE capability. gNB may not need to always use the maximum TDW duration for a given UE for joint channel estimation. Depending on gNB implementation, gNB may configure appropriate TDW size for joint channel estimation. |

### 6.2.2 Coherent transmission indication

**FL comments: Based on companies’ comments, the following observation can be drawn. We are not going to agree on this observation. The intention of the discussion on this observation is trying to seek whether there are any valid scenarios. Companies are encouraged to provide views on the observation and whether the following scenarios are valid.**

* Observation: There are following scenarios that UE may lose transmission coherence (cannot perform DM-RS bundling) during the time domain window while gNB is not aware of it.
  + transmission power drop due to dynamic power sharing of DC
  + transmission is dropped due to uplink collision of CA/DC
  + UE operates fine timing tracking to adjust FFT boundary when UE receive DL signal
  + autonomous timing adjustment
  + open loop power control
  + large temperature variations

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| NTT DOCOMO | If simultaneous transmission is enabled, power sharing of CA/DC could be a problem to interrupt phase continuity. However, simultaneous transmission is not useful for coverage enhancements in our views, because the transmitted power needs to be split and coverage performance gets worse. As NW should avoid these scheduling, it is not going to be a problem,  Open loop power control and timing adjustment can be postponed until TDW ends, and they should be solved in 4.4.2. If UE breaks phase continuity without gNB intention, coherent transmission indication is necessary to align awareness between gNB and UE. However, TA and Open loop PC can be common understanding between UE and gNB with some rules without coherent transmission indication. |
| Panasonic | We agree that some of the events are not detected by the gNB. However, some of them would not happen very frequently. We are not aware of feasible method to inform these cases in advanced.  Regarding "UE operates fine timing tracking to adjust FFT boundary when UE receive DL signal", "autonomous timing adjustment" and "open loop power control" in above observation, they should be removed from the list as we think they would not be prevented in a TDW. The UE can accumulate them without taking effect during the current TDW. |
| CATT | CA/DC is not a typical scenario when UL coverage is limited. And gNB should aware of the potential risk if it still configures CA/DC to the UE without indication.  For timing tracking, for TDD, this is not a serious issue since any way DL will ‘break’ a TDW and the UE is not require to maintain phase/power, but just generate a new one (Option 2-B or 2-C’) or abandon DMRS bundling (Option 2-C). For FDD, even if UL transmission may be impacted, the tracking can be done after a complete TDW.  Similarly, timing/open loop power adjustment can be conducted after a complete TDW.  For temperature, we are not sure how fast the temperature can change which leads to phase/power breaking issue within several milliseconds. If the UE situation is too difficult to maintain phase/power, it seems reasonable for the UE to just report DMRS bundling is not supported. |
| Sharp | In our view, CA/DC is not typical as coverage enhancement scenario. Additionally, TDW can be used to prevent the above scenarios. |
| LG | From our understanding, DC under uplink shortage is feasible scenario. Considering DC is configured and coverage mismatch between DL and UL may occur in each carrier, therefore UL coverage enhancement can be performed in each carrier. In addition, we still see problem with respect to the above-mentioned scenarios. However, since the current single/multiple time domain window design in 6.2.1 is the most important, so it would be ok to revisit after this is decided. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Share similar views as Panasonic |
| Sony | Share the views of Panasonic and Lenovo/Motorola Mobility |
| Nokia/NSB | We agree with the observation from the FL. |
| vivo | No additional indication from UE is needed.  It is unclear why NW would configure CA/DC for poor coverage UEs.  If the NW configuration lead to uncertainty on phase continuity, then NW have to perform JCE in a conservative way. For example, NW can first at least check power consistency after LS estimation and/or frequency domain filtering before time domain filtering on multiple slots. If large received power/phase change is detected, NW can fallback to slot based time domain filtering by implementation. Therefore, no additional indication from UE is needed. |
| Intel | We are not sure whether gNB is not aware of some of the events as listed above.   * + transmission power drop due to dynamic power sharing of DC   + transmission is dropped due to uplink collision of CA/DC   + UE operates fine timing tracking to adjust FFT boundary when UE receive DL signal   + open loop power control   In our view, the above scenarios should be included as part of events that were discussed in the TDW determination. For other two, UE may need to guarantee the phase continuity and power consistency even for these two scenarios. In our view, no additional indication from UE is needed. |

## 6.3 Others

### 6.3.1 TPC command

**FL comments: As commented by Intel there are two issues we need to resolve.**

**1) When TPC command is received before the start of TDW**

**2) When TPC command is received during the TDW.**

**For 2), we have agreed to make down selection between the following two alternatives:**

* Alt 1: UE is not expected to receive TPC commands during the current time domain window.
* Alt 2: UE receives and accumulates TPC commands without taking effect during the current time domain window.

**For 1) Based on companies’ comments, it seems we have two cases, i.e., larger than K symbols before the start of one TDW, and within K symbols before the start of one TDW.**

**For the case UE receives TPC commands larger than K symbols before the start of one TDW, TPC commands takes effect at the beginning of the time domain window.**

**For the case UE receives TPC commands within K symbols before the start of one TDW, there also can be two alternatives**

* Alt 1: UE is not expected to receive TPC commands within K symbols before the start of one time domain window.
* Alt 2: UE receives TPC commands within K symbols before the start of one time domain window and accumulates TPC commands without taking effect during the current time domain window.

**Proposal:**

* If UE receives TPC commands larger than K symbols before the start of one time domain window, TPC commands takes effect at the beginning of the time domain window.
* Make down-selection between the following two alternatives:
  + Alt 1: UE is not expected to receive TPC commands within K symbols before the start of one time domain window.
  + Alt 2: UE receives TPC commands within K symbols before the start of one time domain window and accumulates TPC commands without taking effect during the current time domain window.
* FFS: K

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support the proposal and prefer Alt2. |
| Panasonic | We agree with the proposal. Our preference is Alt. 2. |
| CATT | Support the spirit of the proposal and slightly prefer Alt1 for simplicity.  May be better to replace ‘larger than’ into ‘earlier than’ or ‘no later than’ for more accuracy. |
| Qualcomm | We are beginning to define new rules of accumulation with the introduction of K. This seems unnecessary given that the spec clearly lays out how many symbols prior to a transmission occasion a TPC command can arrive and be accumulated and applied in a given transmission occasion. Can we avoid K and rephrase as follows:  **Proposal:** At the beginning of a TDW, any TPC command that would take effect as per legacy behavior is allowed and factored into the power update. TPC commands that would take effect after a TDW has already started, are deferred until end of TDW. |
| Sharp | We are fine with the proposal and prefer Alt 1 to reduce spec impacts. For Alt 2, 2 TPC loops are needed for actual power and accumulated power. |
| LG | Generally fine with the proposal. To be accurate, we can add the condition that “when ***tpc-Accumulation*** is enabled or absent” because that is the condition when UE accumulates the TPC command. Since the current single/multiple time domain window design in 6.2.1 is the most important, so it would be ok to revisit after this is decided. |
| Xiaomi | We are fine with the proposal and prefer alt 2. |
| CMCC | Support the Alt 2. And do not support to introduce the new defined K.  And share a similar idea with Qualcomm that there is no need to introduce a new K. Current spec have specified the process delay for e.g. DCI. This is exactly the same as the K value in the proposal. And for UE, how to deal with the TPC command and the accumulation is clear. Without taking effect is clear enough for UE behaviors. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support the proposal and prefer Alt 2 |
| Samsung | Support the FL’s proposal. |
| Sony | Support the proposal and prefer Alt 2 |
| Nokia/NSB | We prefer to stick to the two alternatives in the agreement to agree on the approach that we need to take first, before we can work out on further details of the approach. Looking at the two alternatives as written in the agreement, it’s clear that the timeline K before the start of TDW is needed for Alt. 1 but not Alt. 2. Obviously, further discussion on K is only needed if Alt. 1 is retained.  From the two alternatives described in the agreement, we prefer Alt. 2. |
| Vivo | Support the proposal and prefer Alt 2. |
| Intel | We support Alt. 1.  One question for clarification: what happens if UE receive the TPC command during the current time domain window? It seems this needs to be discussed in the proposal? |
| Apple | We support Alt 2 without introducing k. We have same understanding as QC and CMCC, the TPC command application timeline is defined in current spec already. |

### 6.3.2 TA adjustment

**FL comments: From FL understanding, the intention of proposal 6 is to preclude the case that UE can perform TA adjustment during the time domain window. Regarding the comments by CATT and Intel, we can add FFS for further discussion.**

**Proposal 6:**

* UE should not perform TA adjustment during the time domain window.
  + FFS: UE does not expect to receive TA command to indicate TA adjustment during the TDW.
  + FFS: UE ignores any TA command which indicates TA adjustment during the TDW.
  + FFS: UE performs TA adjustment after the TDW if it receives any TA command indicating TA adjustment during the TDW.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support the proposal. |
| Panasonic | We agree with the proposal. |
| CATT | We support the proposal. |
| Sharp | We support the proposal. |
| LG | Support the proposal. |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| CMCC | Support the main bullet. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support the proposal |
| Samsung | We are generally fine with the proposal. |
| Sony | Support |
| Nokia/NSB | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Vivo | Support |
| Intel | We still think we should follow similar discussion as for TPC command. But if majority of companies support this, we are fine with this for the sake of progress. |
| Apple | Suport |

1. Agreements at RAN1#106-e

**Agreement: Confirm the following working assumption.**

**Working assumption:**

* For non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions (at least for the case of the same TB) across consecutive slots, support necessary design aspects (under the condition of power consistency and phase continuity) to enable joint channel estimation for the following cases:
  + Over non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions (of the same TB) for repetition type A scheduled by dynamic grant or configured grant.
  + Over non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions (of the same TB) for repetition type B scheduled by dynamic grant or configured grant, if it reuses only those joint channel estimation specification enhancements defined to support repetition Type A.
    - FFS: additional specification enhancements on top of that defined to support repetition Type A
    - Only for single layer transmissions
    - Subject to UE capability
  + FFS: Over non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions with different TBs
  + FFS: Over non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions for TBoMS
  + For the non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions, it is defined as at least when there is no UL transmission between the two successive PUSCH transmissions
  + Subject to UE capability with details FFS (e.g., separate vs. joint capability for type A & type B, w.r.t. OFF power requirements, etc.)
* FFS: Joint channel estimation over non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions with other uplink transmissions between the two successive PUSCH transmissions across consecutive slot.

**Agreement:**

* Joint channel estimation for PUSCH transmissions and the time domain window are jointly enabled or disabled via RRC configuration for a UE.
  + Note: Enabling/disabling of joint channel estimation for PUSCH transmissions means enabling/disabling of DMRS bundling for PUSCH transmissions under the condition of power consistency and phase continuity.

**Conclusion:**

* Optimization of DMRS location in time domain for PUSCH is not considered for joint channel estimation in Rel-17.

**Agreement:**

**Make down-selection between the following two alternatives:**

* Alt 1: UE is not expected to receive TPC commands during the current time domain window.
* Alt 2: UE receives and accumulates TPC commands without taking effect during the current time domain window.

1. Agreements at RAN1#105-e

Agreement:

* Joint channel estimation over non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions within one slot is not supported.

Agreement:

* Definition of **the maximum duration**: a maximum time duration during which **UE is able to** maintain power consistency and phase continuity subject to power consistency and phase continuity requirements.
* FFS whether or not such a definition is necessary for RAN1 specifications.
  + Note: whether such a definition is to be specified in RAN4 specifications is up to RAN4.
* FFS the maximum duration may be reported by UE.
* Note: it is understood that for a UE, the maximum duration is no less than the time domain window duration

Agreement:Send LS to RAN4 asking the following questions

* For joint channel estimation, is there a maximum duration during which UE is able to maintain power consistency and phase continuity under certain tolerance level? If any, how long is it?
  + What factors determine the maximum duration?
  + Whether the maximum duration should be the same for different cases for both PUSCH and PUCCH?
  + Whether the maximum duration is dependent on the modulation order of transmission, e.g., QPSK, 16QAM, 64QAM?
  + Whether the maximum duration is dependent on UL waveform (DFT-s-OFDM vs. OFDM)?
  + Whether the maximum duration is band specific?
  + Besides the factors listed above, whether or not the maximum duration is further dependent on UE capabilities (e.g., multiple possible values for a given set of factor(s)), and if so, whether the UE should report such a duration

Agreement:

* Optimization of DMRS granularity in time domain for PUSCH is not considered for joint channel estimation in Rel-17.

Agreement:

* For back-to-back PUSCH transmissions within one slot, support necessary design aspects (under the condition of power consistency and phase continuity) to enable joint channel estimation for the following cases:
  + Over back-to-back PUSCH transmissions (of the same TB) for repetition type B scheduled by dynamic grant or configured grant, if it reuses only those joint channel estimation specification enhancements defined to support repetition Type A with consecutive slots
    - FFS: additional specification enhancements on top of that defined to support repetition Type A
    - Only for single layer transmissions
    - Subject to UE capability
* Joint channel estimation over back-to-back PUSCH transmissions with different TBs within one slot is not supported.

**Working assumption:**

* For non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions (at least for the case of the same TB) across consecutive slots, support necessary design aspects (under the condition of power consistency and phase continuity) to enable joint channel estimation for the following cases:
  + Over non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions (of the same TB) for repetition type A scheduled by dynamic grant or configured grant.
  + Over non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions (of the same TB) for repetition type B scheduled by dynamic grant or configured grant, if it reuses only those joint channel estimation specification enhancements defined to support repetition Type A.
    - FFS: additional specification enhancements on top of that defined to support repetition Type A
    - Only for single layer transmissions
    - Subject to UE capability
  + FFS: Over non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions with different TBs
  + FFS: Over non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions for TBoMS
  + For the non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions, it is defined as at least when there is no UL transmission between the two successive PUSCH transmissions
  + Subject to UE capability with details FFS (e.g., separate vs. joint capability for type A & type B, w.r.t. OFF power requirements, etc.)
* FFS: Joint channel estimation over non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions with other uplink transmissions between the two successive PUSCH transmissions across consecutive slot.

Agreement:

* Joint channel estimation for PUSCH transmissions is enabled or disabled via RRC configuration for a UE
  + FFS: whether additional dynamic signaling is needed to enable/disable joint channel estimation for PUSCH transmissions
  + Note: the enabling of such a feature is subject to certain prerequisites
  + FFS RRC parameter details (including explicit vs. implicit configuration)
* FFS For joint channel estimation for PUSCH, the time domain window is not explicitly enabled or disabled separately from joint channel estimation.

Note: Enabling/disabling of joint channel estimation for PUSCH transmissions means enabling/disabling of DMRS bundling for PUSCH transmissions under the condition of power consistency and phase continuity.

Agreement:

For joint channel estimation for PUSCH repetition type A of PUSCH repetitions of the same TB, down select one of the following alternatives for the time domain window.

* Alt 1: All the repetitions are covered by one single time domain window
  + The start of the window is the first PUSCH transmission
  + FFS: how to handle non-consecutive physical slots for UL transmission, e.g., due to DL/UL configuration for unpaired spectrum
  + FFS: frequency hopping and precoder cycling
* Alt 2: All the repetitions are covered by one or multiple time domain windows
  + For the start of each window,
    - The start of the first window is the first PUSCH transmission.
    - FFS: how to determine the start of other windows, e.g., whether multiple windows are consecutive or non-consecutive, whether the start of the window depends on DL/UL configuration for unpaired spectrum
  + For the length of each window,
    - FFS Each window consists of at least two adjacent physical slots for UL transmission.
    - The length of each window is no longer than the maximum duration.
    - FFS: how to determine the length of each window
    - FFS: whether the length of each window depends on DL/UL configuration for unpaired spectrum
  + FFS: how to handle non-consecutive physical slots for UL transmission, e.g., due to DL/UL configuration for unpaired spectrum.
  + FFS: frequency hopping and precoder cycling
* Other alternatives are not precluded.

1. Agreements at RAN1#104b-e

Agreements:

* For joint channel estimation, specify a time domain window during which a UE is expected to maintain power consistency and phase continuity among PUSCH transmissions subject to power consistency and phase continuity requirements.
  + FFS how the time domain window is determined (e.g., via explicit configuration and/or implicitly derived) and whether or not to have the possibility of enabling/disabling the time domain window
  + FFS the units the time domain window (e.g. repetitions, slots, and/or symbols)
    - FFS : association between the potential use case(s) and units of the time window
  + FFS: single or multiple time domain windows
* FFS: relation with UE capability
* FFS: whether the term "time domain window" is used in the specification or replaced by other technical terms
* FFS whether or not to further consider impacting of timing advance

**Agreements:**

* A new DMRS pattern equally spaced among PUSCH transmissions is not considered for joint channel estimation in Rel-17.

**Agreements:**

* For inter-slot frequency hopping with inter-slot bundling, down select on the following two options:
  + Option 1: The bundle size (time domain hopping interval) equals to the time domain window size.
  + Option 2: The bundle size (time domain hopping interval) can be different from the time domain window size.
    - FFS: Whether the bundle size (time domain hopping interval) is explicitly configured or implicitly determined.
    - FFS: Whether/How the bundle size (time domain hopping interval) is defined separately for FDD and TDD.
    - FFS: relation between the bundle size (time domain hopping interval) and the time domain window size

**Conclusion:**

* For optimization of DMRS granularity in time domain with joint channel estimation, the proponents are encouraged to provide more simulation results in next meeting

**Agreements:**

* For the time domain window for joint channel estimation, down select on the following two options:
  + Option 1: The unit of the time domain window is defined separately for the following PUSCH transmissions:
    - PUSCH repetition type A
    - PUSCH repetition type B, if agreed
    - TBoMS, if agreed
    - Different TB, if agreed
  + Option 2: The unit of the time domain window is the same for the following PUSCH transmission:
    - PUSCH repetition type A
    - PUSCH repetition type B, if agreed
    - TBoMS, if agreed
    - Different TB, if agreed

**Agreement:**

* For back-to-back PUSCH transmissions across consecutive slots, support necessary design aspects (under the condition of power consistency and phase continuity) to enable joint channel estimation for the following cases:
  + Over back-to-back PUSCH transmissions (of the same TB) for repetition type B scheduled by dynamic grant or configured grant, if it reuses only those joint channel estimation specification enhancements defined to support repetition Type A.
    - FFS: additional specification enhancements on top of that defined to support repetition Type A
    - Only for single layer transmissions
    - Subject to UE capability
  + FFS: Over back-to-back PUSCH transmissions with different TBs

1. Agreements at RAN1#104e

**Agreements**:

* Following potential use cases are considered for joint channel estimation for PUSCH:
  + Use case 1: back-to-back PUSCH transmissions within one slot.
  + Use case 2: non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions within one slot.
  + Use case 3: back-to-back PUSCH transmissions across consecutive slots.
  + Use case 4: non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions across consecutive slots.
  + Use case 5: PUSCH transmissions across non-consecutive slots.

Note: RAN1 assumes “back-to-back PUSCH transmission” has zero gap in-between adjacent PUSCH transmissions.

Agreements:

* For back-to-back PUSCH transmissions across consecutive slots, support necessary design aspects (under the condition of power consistency and phase continuity) to enable joint channel estimation at least for the following case:
  + Over back-to-back PUSCH transmissions (of the same TB) for repetition type A scheduled by dynamic grant or configured grant
  + FFS details (including possible other cases)

Agreements:

* For joint channel estimation, ~~define~~ a time domain window is introduced to facilitate further discussion, during which UE is expected to maintain power consistency and phase continuity among PUSCH transmissions subject to power consistency and phase continuity requirements.
  + FFS: whether the window should be specified
  + FFS: the length of the time domain window is defined by a set of repetitions/slots/symbols
  + FFS: single or multiple time domain windows
* FFS: relation with UE capability
* FFS: the time domain window may or may not be configured ~~or specified~~.
* FFS: whether the term "time domain window" is used in the specification or replaced by other technical terms
* FFS: Whether the window is determined by the power consistency and phase continuity requirements and/or by other factors is to be decided.

Agreements:

* Companies are encouraged to study optimization of DMRS granularity in time domain with joint channel estimation, including:
  + Use cases
  + Simulations results
  + Enhanced schemes, e.g.,
    - Different DMRS density for different PUSCH transmissions
    - No DMRS for some PUSCH transmissions
  + If applicable, impact of dynamic changes, e.g., cancellation of a repetition and companies report the evaluation method.
* Companies are encouraged to study optimization of DMRS location in time domain with joint channel estimation, including:
  + Use cases
  + Simulations results
  + Enhanced schemes, e.g.,
    - DMRS equally spaced among PUSCH transmissions
    - DMRS located in special slots
    - Orphan symbol上 used for DMRS
  + If applicable, impact of dynamic changes, e.g., cancellation of a repetition and companies report the evaluation method.
* Note: the simulation assumptions for DM-RS in TR 38.830 are used as baseline for performance evaluation on optimization of DMRS location/granularity in time domain.
  + Take into account impairments such as frequency offset, and report corresponding parametrization together with the results. Further discuss impairment details.

**Working assumption:**

* For back-to-back PUSCH transmissions across consecutive slots, support necessary design aspects (under the condition of power consistency and phase continuity) to enable joint channel estimation for the following case:
  + Over back-to-back PUSCH transmissions for ~~TB processing~~ one TB processed over multiple slots
    - It’s subject to UE capability

Agreements:

* For joint channel estimation.
  + Take into account the residual frequency error, e.g., +/- 0.1 ppm as upper bound.
  + Companies can report other values and frequency error model.
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