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# Introduction

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

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

Section 2 summarizes the key aspects of TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH based on companies’ contributions submitted under AI 8.8.1.2 to RAN1 #107-e [3]-[29].

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

Previous Rel-17 agreements are listed in Appendix B, for reference.

# Summary of contributions on TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH

Contributions submitted under AI 8.8.1.2 discussed several aspects of TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH (referred to as TBoMS in this document, for simplicity). A systematic categorization will be used to summarize the content of all contributions. This is done according to both the number of submitted proposals on the different aspects and on the relevance the latter have for designing the feature, from FL’s perspective. Concerning the second criterion, its rationale is given by the natural relationship of consequentiality which exists between different aspects. In the remainder of the document, aspects are thus categorized as follows:

* **High priority aspects**
  + Time domain resource determination
    - Use of the TDRA table and configuration options
    - Time domain resource determination for TBoMS for CG-PUSCH Type 2
    - Use of non-consecutive physical slots for paired spectrum
  + Single TBoMS structure
  + Rate matching
    - Time unit of the bit interleaving
    - Starting bit in each slot for the single TBoMS
  + UCI multiplexing
* **Mid priority aspects**
  + Time domain resource determination
    - Candidate values for N
    - Candidate values for M
  + Data rate calculation and UE behavior related to TBS determination
    - How to handle configuration of TBS larger than the size one CB
  + Retransmissions
* **Other aspects**
  + Time domain resource determination
    - Time domain resource determination for TBoMS for CG-PUSCH Type 1
  + Relationship with other channels and signals
    - Dropping rules
    - Timeline requirements
  + TBoMS repetitions
    - Slot mapping for TBoMS repetitions
  + FDRA
  + Transmission power determination
  + Frequency hopping
  + Application of DM-RS bundling to TBoMS
  + Interlaced TBoMS transmissions

The categorization above will determine the initial priority order for the discussions to be held for AI 8.8.1.2. In this context, sections 2.1 and 2.2 will focus on discussions which will (2.1 and some parts of 2.2) and may (remaining parts of 2.2) be discussed during RAN1 #107-e. Section 2.3 will collect all other aspects.

Tags [OPEN], [CLOSED] and [PAUSED] will be used to identify the status of the discussion at any moment of the meeting. New sections for specific aspects will be open during the meeting, should discussions for the higher priority aspects progress fast.

## High priority aspects

Seven high priority aspects are identified at the beginning of the meeting:

1. Time domain resource determination
   1. Use of the TDRA table and configuration options
   2. Time domain resource determination for TBoMS for CG-PUSCH Type 2
   3. Use of non-consecutive physical slots for paired spectrum
2. Single TBoMS structure
3. Rate matching
   * + 1. Time unit of the bit interleaving
       2. Starting bit in each slot for the single TBoMS
4. UCI Multiplexing

Most companies have discussed at large about such aspects in the submitted contributions. Summary, discussion, and proposals on these aspects are provided in the following different sub-sections. Sub-section numbers follow the list above, for simplicity.

### [CLOSED] Time domain resource determination

Most contributions acknowledged the fundamental nature of this aspect and discussed it in detail. Three high-level sub-aspects can be isolated as illustrated above. The summary of companies’ preferences and opinions based on the contributions is organized accordingly.

#### [CLOSED] **Use of the TDRA table and configuration options**

Companies’ preferences concerning the use of the TDRA table and possible configuration options are as follows:

* Dynamic switching between PUSCH Type A and TBoMS is not supported **[2]**:
  + *All entries in the table are either for PUSCH Type A repetition or TBoMS* **[2]**:
    - vivo [6], Ericsson [22]
* Dynamic switching between PUSCH Type A and TBoMS is supported **[4]**:
  + *Table entries can be partitioned to differentiate single-slot PUSCH and TBoMS transmission* **[1]**:
    - Intel [15]
  + *Dynamic switching of PUSCH Type A repetitions and TBoMS is supported (default)* ***[3]****:* 
    - CMCC [12], Qualcomm [17], Nokia/NSB [21].

Furthermore:

* One company (Nokia/NSB [21]) proposed that a condition to enable TBoMS is that available slot counting is also enabled.

FL’s comments on November 11

The following observations can be made from FL’s perspective:

* The following agreement for enabling the TBoMS feature and activate single-slot or multi-slot TBS determination for PUSCH already implies that N=1 is an agreed and supported value for TBoMS in Rel-17. In this sense, I am not sure further discussion is needed here, and we may simply defer it to a quick check in RRC parameters discussion next week.

|  |
| --- |
| **Agreement**  For TBoMS transmission in Rel-17:   * TBoMS feature is enabled (or disabled) by configuring (or not) the number of allocated slots for a single TBoMS (N) in a row of the TDRA table.   + TBoMS transmission is enabled when N>1, where N is the number of allocated slots for a single TBoMS.   + Single-slot PUSCH transmission is enabled when N=1.   + Supported combinations of N and M that can be configured in the TDRA table, these combinations are constrained by retransmission are to be further discussed |

* Given the existing uncertainly related to how to handle the paired spectrum and SUL case (with reference to the discussions about the TS 38.214 CR, and companies’ proposals for #107-e), a discussion may be needed on the role of the RRC parameter *AvailableSlotCounting* for TBoMS.
* According to my understanding, only a minority of companies would like to introduce restrictions on the dynamic switching between PUSCH Type A repetition and TBoMS. The arguments brought forward to justify this position are:
  + If N=1 and N>1 are configured in a single TDRA table, it may limit the flexibility for NW scheduling on combinations of SLIV and number of repetitions.
  + gNB chooses one type over another on the basis of performance and implementation factors, instead of dynamic factors, such as radio condition, which may impact N and M for TBoMS or K for PUSCH repetition.

Conversely, at least 14 companies were in favour of such switching during #106b-e.

Consequently, FL proposes to start the discussion with two questions.

**2.1.1.1-Q1**. *Should dynamic switching between PUSCH type A repetition and TBoMS be prevented, i.e., all rows of the TDRA table can only have either N=1 or N>1? Please provide a justification to your position and, whenever possible, refer to the views expressed by companies who do not agree with you.*

**2.1.1.1-Q2**. *Should the TBoMS transmission be performed only subject to enabling AvailableSlotCounting at the UE?*

##### **First round of discussion**

FL’s recommendation is to have a first round of discussion among companies about **2.1.1.1-Q1** and **2.1.1.1-Q2**. Two tables are added below to this end.

**2.1.1.1-Q1**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Company’s name for the answer to 2.1.1.1-Q1 |
| **Yes** | LG, vivo, Ericsson (clarify that only {N=1,M=1} and {N>1,M>1} are allowed) |
| **No** | DCM, QC, Sharp, Nokia/NSB, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, Intel, Panasonic,[SS], ZTE, Huawei, Hisilicon, CATT,TCL, Xiaomi |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Additional comments related to 2.1.1.1-Q1. |
| QC | The TDRA framework provides this flexibility. Its up to the gNB on whether it wants to make use of it or not. |
| Sharp | From specification perspective, putting such a restriction is unnecessary. |
| LG | We don’t see the strong motivation of dynamic switching between PUSCH rep type A and TBoMS. Semi-static switching seems sufficient. |
| Nokia/NSB | It is too restrictive if the gNB has to make a decision on using either PUSCH repetition type A or TBoMS when configuring TDRA table. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Such restriction is not needed and gives gNB the flexibility to dynamically indicate a row |
| Intel | It is not necessary to consider restriction for dynamic switching. |
| Panasonic | We don’t see the need to have restriction in the specification. It is just up to the network implementation. |
| SS | We think there is no need for the restriction. The TDRA table is enlarged rather than kept as 16 rows, so keep both N=1 and N>1 in the table is not a big problem now. We just want to align the understanding of FL’s question, specifically, “*all rows of the TDRA table can only have either N=1 or N>1?*” I guess, this is the case regardless of Q1, right? Because each of the row is anyway is configured with either N=1, or N>1, not both; so that both N=1 and N>1 can exist in one single table, this is not to prevent the switching, right?  FL: yes. |
| vivo | In our understanding, the motivation of TBoMS is to achieve better coverage compared with type-A PUSCH repetition. Only when repetition type-A cannot fulfil the expected coverage, NW may enable TBoMS feature semi-statically. Hence, prefer semi-static switching between type-A and TBoMS. |
| ZTE | For different TBs, there is no need to introduce such limitation for gNB scheduling. |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | In RAN1#106bis-e, dynamic switching between type A PUSCH repetition and TBoMS is supported naturally based on the agreement of TDRA design.  There is no clear motivation and no obvious advantage to prevent it. So we support the dynamic switching. |
| CATT | Assuming this will not cause additional UE complexity, there is no need (and no benefit) to have such restriction.  Note that, even if there is no restriction by spec, the gNB can still only configure either TBoMS or repetition type A by implementation, if desired. |
| Ericsson | To share our understanding of the current situation: according to the agreement provided here by the FL, TBoMS is enabled when the TDRA table is configured with an entry with N>1, while PUSCH repetition Type A is not mentioned, and therefore it is still to be discussed if Type A and the combinations of N and M needed for Type A, can be dynamically indicated. If gNB configures both types in the TDRA table and postpones the choice to be made by dynamic signaling, the scheduling flexibility (number of rows in TDRA table) for both types is reduced compared with when only one type is configured in TDRA table.  As for retransmission, as we found in R1- 2112036 that only 4 out of 36 TBSs for N={2, 4, 8} and MCS indexes ranging from 0 to 9 can be configured with different combinations of N and MCS index. Thus, retransmission of a single TBoMS by TBoMS of a different N value or PUSCH repetition with the same TBS is only possible with very few configurations.  Also, TBoMS should perform as well as or outperform repetition type A, so we see no need to additionally configure repetition type A with TBoMS from a performance perspective. Therefore, configuring one transmission type between PUSCH repetition Type A and TBoMS (where single slot with {N=1,M=1} is supported as a fall back in TBoMS) is sufficient for both initial transmission and retransmission: it has lower overhead and the same or better performance |
| TCL | The restriction is not necessary, more flexible TDRA is needed. |
| Xiaomi | It is not necessary to restrict the flexibility of gNB scheduling. |

**2.1.1.1-Q2**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Company’s name for the answer to 2.1.1.1-Q2 |
| **Yes** | Nokia/NSB |
| **No** | QC, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, vivo, ZTE, Huawei, Hisilicon, Ericsson, TCL |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Additional comments related to 2.1.1.1-Q2, if any. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Supporting TBoMS implies the support of available slot counting for TboMS, because TboMS is always counted on the basis of available slots. We are not sure why we need the parameter *AvailableSlotCounting* for TboMS. |
| QC | We should follow whatever counting method is configured for Type A repetitions and put it to use for TBOMS as well. |
| Sharp | It depends on decision at AI8.8.1.1. If available slot counting is not supported for FDD/SUL, availability of TboMS shouldn’t depend on whether available slot counting is enabled or not.  On the other hand, if available slot counting is supported for FDD/SUL, it’s straight forward to enable TboMS only when available slot counting is enabled. Our preference in AI 8.8.1.1 is that available slot counting is supported for FDD/SUL as well. |
| LG | We agree that TboMS transmission is supported with available slot based counting method only.  In order not to cause a configuration error issue (i.e., N>1 with disabling *AvailableSlotCounting*), we prefer that the UE always assume that *AvailableSlotCounting* is enabled when *N*>1, instead TboMS is enabled when N>1 and enabling *AvailableSlotCounting*. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | In our view, TboMS is based on available slot counting, so no need to explicit have this parameter |
| Intel | We share similar view as NTT DOCOMO. It is already agreed that TboMS transmission is based on available slots. Additional parameter is not needed. |
| Panasonic | We share similar view as DOCOMO. |
| Vivo | Since TboMS is always transmitted based on available slot, the parameter *AvailableSlotCounting* seems not necessary when TboMS is enabled. Probably available slot counting UE feature can be a precondition of the TboMS UE feature in the UE feature discussions, we’re open to discuss this in UE feature agenda. |
| ZTE | We share similar view as NTT DOCOMO. |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | No explicit signaling is needed to enable TBoMS counting based on available slot. |
| CATT | The current situation is whether ‘*AvailableSlotCounting*’ is ‘only applied to repetition type A’ or ‘applied to both repetition type A and TBoMS’.  We tend to prefer ‘*AvailableSlotCounting*’ is defined as ‘only applied to repetition type A’. We have already agreed that the slot of TBoMS must be counted based on available slot.  This is similar to the case of Msg3 PUSCH repetition in AI 8.8.3. Obviously there will not be RRC configuration of ‘*AvailableSlotCounting*’ when UE is transmitting Msg3, but the UE still transmit Msg3 repetition based on counting on available slot. |
| Ericsson | According to the following agreement in RAN1#106e, transmission of TBoMS is based on available slots, rather than physical slots. The RRC parameter *AvailableSlotCounting* only applies for Rel-17 PUSCH repetition Type A, if it is be configured in the TDRA table.  Agreement  The number of slots allocated for TBoMS is counted based on the available slots for UL transmission.   * The determination of available slots for PUSCH repetition type A, as defined in AI 8.8.1.1, is reused.   Note: Available slots for FDD or SUL could be revisited according to discussion in AI 8.8.1.1 |
| TCL | For TBoMS, the parameter of *AvailableSlotCounting is no need.* |
| Xiaomi | Share the same view as NTT DOCOMO. Additional parameter is not needed. |

FL’s comments on November 12

Thank you all for your comments. With reference to 2.1.1.1-Q1, the situation is clear. An overwhelming majority of companies think that stating explicitly in the specification that *AvailableSlotCounting* does not apply to TBoMS is not needed. This aspect will not be discussed in Rel-17 anymore.

Conversely, a large majority exists in favor of not introducing any restriction to the use of the TDRA table for TBoMS. In this sense, I think that Ericsson’s understanding is not correct. In RAN1 #106b-e we agreed that “Supported combinations of N and M that can be configured in the TDRA table, these combinations are constrained by retransmission are to be further discussed”. This does not imply that the presence of rows with N=1 and rows with N>1 in the same table is prohibited. This implies that RAN1 is to discuss if such restriction is needed or not. This is what we are doing here. @Ericsson: as you can see, most companies think that no restriction is needed. If RAN1 agrees that no restriction is needed then specification will not introduce any restriction and NW can configure the table as NW deems fit.

@Samsung: the answer to your question is **yes**.

Given the above, I propose to endorse the following conclusion and close this discussion. We must be pragmatic, and it is evident that RAN1 cannot reach consensus on introducing restrictions on the combinations of N and M that can be configured in the TDRA table. NW would have full flexibility in this sense and specification will not include any restrictions.

**FL’s proposal 7**

|  |
| --- |
| **Conclusion**  **There is no consensus in RAN1 to introduce any restriction on the combinations of N and M that can be configured in the TDRA table.** |

Companies can add views on FL’s proposal 7 only **if strong concerns** exist with it.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Views on FL’s proposal 7 |
| Intel | We already agreed N\*M <= 32. It is not clear to us whether any restriction includes this? |
| CATT | Better to clarify that the already agreed ‘N\*M<=32’is an exception from this conclusion. |
| Ericsson | We fail to see any benefit from dynamic switching between Type A and TBoMS.  However, our principal concern is if dynamic switching introduces new behaviors, especially those that we have not discussed yet. Since retransmission seems to be the only mechanism that could be affected by dynamic switching, and since the current FL proposal 6-v2 (or the default assumed by the FL) resolves this, we will not object to this conclusion. |
| CMCC | Support the conclusion with the clarification that N\*M<=32. |

FL’s comments on November 15

Thank you for all your comments. The following conclusion was made during the GTW scheduled on November 15. The discussion is closed.

**FL’s proposal 7-v2**

|  |
| --- |
| **Conclusion**  **There is no consensus in RAN1 to introduce any restriction on the combinations of N and M that can be configured in the TDRA table, other than the already agreed N\*M <= 32 restriction.** |

#### [CLOSED] **Time domain resource determination for TBoMS for CG-PUSCH Type 2**

Several companies commented on this aspect. From FL’s perspective, two sub-aspects exist and are worth analyzing:

1. Whether the time duration for the transmission of a single TBoMS or TBoMS repetitions can be larger than the duration given by P.
2. The start of the initial transmission of a TB for a single TBoMS.

Companies’ preferences in these regards are as follows.

**Whether** **the time duration for the transmission of a single TBoMS or TBoMS repetitions can be larger than the duration given by P.**

* The time duration for the transmission of a single TBoMS or TBoMS repetitions larger than the duration given by P, where:
  + *if N\*M is larger than the number of available slots in a CG period, the UE is expected to transmit K TBoMS transmission occasions where K<M.*
  + *If the UE cannot find N available slots in a CG period, the UE does not transmit TBoMS* **[1]**.
    - Interdigital [14].
* The UE is not expected to be configured with the time duration for the transmission of a single TBoMS or TBoMS repetitions larger than the duration given by P **[3]**:
  + - Ericsson [22], Nokia/NSB [21], Panasonic [18].

**The start of the initial transmission of a TB for a single TBoMS.**

* An initial transmission of a transport block for TBoMS can start in a single TBoMS other than the first single TBoMS for a configured grant with startingFromRV0 not set to ‘off’ **[1]**:
  + - Sharp [24]
* The initial transmission of a transport block for TBoMS is restricted to begin from the first slot of a single TBoMS associated with RV0 **[1]**:
  + - Qualcomm [17]
* The initial transmission of a transport block for TBoMS can be performed according to legacy Rel-16 restrictions as defined in Clause 6.1.2.3.1 of TS 38.214 **[1]**:
  + - Nokia/NSB [21]
* Any slot associated with RV#0 can be deemed as an initial transmission position/slot **[1]**:
  + - Xiaomi [13]
* The initial transmission of a transport block for TBoMS does not start in the middle of the single TBoMS **[1]**:
  + - Panasonic [18]
* For TBoMS repetition with configured grant, a UE can be configured as startingFromRV0 = ‘off’ for the initial TO determination. Otherwise, only RV sequence {0, 0, 0, 0} can be configured even if startingFromRV0 is not provided or configured as startingFromRV0 = ‘on’ **[1]**:
  + - WILUS [7]

FL’s comments on November 11

From FL’s perspective, the following situation can be observed:

* **Whether the time duration for the transmission of a single TBoMS or TBoMS repetitions can be larger than the duration given by P.**
  + A clear majority exists for the companies who expressed a view on this aspect, however very limited number of preferences have been expressed overall.
* **The start of the initial transmission of a TB for a single TBoMS.**
  + Companies, preferences are all different but display some overlap.

Given the above, it may be best to propose three questions on these sub-aspects as well, before formulating any proposal.

**2.1.1.2-Q1**.  *Should the time duration for the transmission of a single TBoMS or TBoMS be repetitions larger than the duration given by P? Please provide a justification to your position and, whenever possible, refer to the views expressed by companies who do not agree with you.*

**2.1.1.2-Q2**. *Should the RRC parameter startingFromRV0 impact the determination of the time domain resource for the initial transmission of a transport block for TBoMS?*

**2.1.1.2-Q3**. *Which of the following options (only one) should be supported for the start of the initial transmission of a TB for a single TBoMS? Please provide a justification to your position and, whenever possible, refer to the views expressed by companies who do not agree with you.*

* 1. *The initial transmission of a transport block for TBoMS is restricted to begin from the first slot of a single TBoMS.*
  2. *The initial transmission of a transport block for TBoMS is restricted to begin from the first slot of a single TBoMS associated with RV0.*
     1. *FFS: implications related to whether and how the RRC parameter startingFromRV0 is set for TBoMS.*
  3. *Any slot can be deemed as a starting slot for an initial transmission of a transport block for TBoMS*
  4. *Any slot associated with RV0 can be deemed as a starting slot for an initial transmission of a transport block for TBoMS*
     1. *FFS: implications related to whether and how the RRC parameter startingFromRV0 is set for TBoMS.*
  5. *The initial transmission of a transport block for TBoMS can be performed according to legacy Rel-16 restrictions as defined in Clause 6.1.2.3.1 of TS 38.214*
  6. *Others [please describe in the Table below]*

##### **First round of discussion**

FL’s recommendation is to have a first round of discussion among companies about **2.1.1.2-Q1** and **2.1.1.2-Q2** and **2.1.1.2-Q3**. Corresponding tables are added below to this end. Companies are invited to be constructive, given the very limited available time and the relevance of this matter. Thank you.

**2.1.1.2-Q1**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Company’s name for the answer to 2.1.1.2-Q1 |
| **Yes** | InterDigital, TCL |
| **No** | QC, Sharp, LG, Nokia/NSB, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, Intel, Panasonic,[SS], vivo, ZTE, CATT, Ericsson, WILUS |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Additional comments related to 2.1.1.2-Q1, if any. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We have trouble getting the question due to typo.  The time duration for the transmission of a single TBoMS or TBoMS with repetitions should be shorter than the duration given by P. |
| QC | We pushed to change this in 8.8.1.1. but due to a sustained objection this change did not go through. As things stand currently a UE does not expect to be configured Type A repetitions that go past the period P. This same restriction should now apply to TBOMS as well irrespective of counting method.  If it does not apply, we ask that we agree to a change in 8.8.1.1 first for consistency. |
| LG | We would like to apply the aligned approach of PUSCH repetition type A to this issue.  In the last meeting, regarding the PUSCH repetition Type A with a configured grant based on available slot counting method, it was agreed that “The UE is not expected to be configured with the time duration for the transmission of K repetitions larger than the time duration derived by the periodicity P”. We prefer to apply the same mechanism for TBoMS with a configured grant. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | It doesn’t make sense or provide any benefit to have the TBoMS longer than P |
| Intel | We prefer same mechanism as defined for PUSCH repetition type A |
| Panasonic | For time domain resource determination including limitation of overall duration of TBoMS, the mechanism for PUSCH repetition Type A should be reused. |
| InterDigital | We identify several issues that creates difficulties to fit TBoMS repetitions in a CG period. There needs to be a number of available slots that is larger than multiples of N. In case CG period duration is short, all TBoMS repetitions may not fit in a period. Thus, duration for the transmission of TBoMS repetitions can be larger than the duration given by P to allow flexibility, allowing to transmit as many TBoMS occasions as possible in a given CG period. |
| Samsung | We can see the intention. Just hesitate to directly agree this, because the impact will be different. For repetitions, if it’s over the P, they can do drop easily; however, for TBoMS, if some of the slots are dropped, it will impact whole TB decoding. |
| Vivo | This discussion is similar to that in AI 8.8.1.1 for PUSCH repetition type-A in previous meetings, the same mechanism can be reused. I.e. the total number of slots including those for repetitions of a TBoMS should be within the CG period. |
| ZTE | Similar restriction as defined in AI 8.8.1.1 for PUSCH repetition type A can be applied to TBoMS. |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | The question may need some clarification. One possible case is that when the configured available slot number N\*M is smaller than the periodicity P, however, according to the available slot counting, some of slots are out of the periodicity P. And for different periodicity, there may different available slot. And when configure N\*M slots for TBoMS transmission, in some of the periodicities, the transmission duration is within the periodicity, however in some of the periodicities, the available slots may be outside of the periodicity. How to address this case? |
| CATT | Similar discussion already happened in AI 8.8.1.1. The conclusion is this case is not allowed, which follows the legacy behavior. |
| Ericsson | We base our position considering two commonalities between TBoMS and Rel-17 PUSCH repetition Type A based on available slots. TBoMS is based on available slots too, and the maximum value of M\*N for TBoMS is no larger than the increased maximum number of repetitions for Rel-17 PUSCH repetition Type A. |
| TCL | For CG TBoMS, if some of slots is dropped, the capability of TBoMS will be decreased, thus, ensuring the total number of slots for TBoMS should be needed. |
| WILUS | Same view with majorities. Common rule with PUSCH repetition Type A can be applied. |

**2.1.1.2-Q2**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Company’s name for the answer to 2.1.1.2-Q2 |
| **Yes** | DCM, QC, Sharp, LG, Nokia/NSB, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, Intel, Panasonic, vivo, Huawei, Hisilicon, CATT,TCL, WILUS，Xiaomi |
| **No** | Ericsson |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Additional comments related to 2.1.1.2-Q2, if any. |
| NTT DOCOMO | If RRC parameter *startingFromRV0* is enabled, an initial transmission of a transport block for TBoMS can be only the first transmission occasion on each single TBoMS associated with RV0. |
| QC | Don’t see a strong need to introduce a new parameter. Open to considering this if it brings better clarity and is considered a good practice. |
| LG | Regarding the start of the initial transmission of a TB for a single TBoMS, we think that it is sufficient to follow the rule of PUSCH repetition Type A with a configured grant in the existing Rel-15/16.  In case of Rel-15/16 PUSCH repetition Type A with a configured grant, if a configured grant configuration is configured with *startingFromRV0* set to 'off', the initial transmission of a transport block may only start at the first transmission occasion of the *K* repetitions. Otherwise, the starting slot can be different with the first transmission occasion if the configured RV sequence is {0,3,0,3} or {0, 0, 0, 0}.  Thus, if the same mechanism is applied to TBoMS with a configured grant, the parameter *startingFromRV0* impact the determination of the time domain resource for the initial transmission of a transport block for TBoMS. |
| Panasonic | In Rel.16, if a configured grant configuration is configured with *startingFromRV0* set to ‘off’, the initial transmission of a transport block may only start at the first transmission occasion of the K repetitions. The same principle could be used such that if a configured grant configuration is configured with *startingFromRV0* set to ‘off’, the initial transmission of a transport block may only start at the first single TBoMS. Otherwise, the initial transmission of a transport block may start at other than the first single TBoMS depending on configured RV sequence. |
| Vivo | The same mechanism as that for type-A PUSCH repetition can be reused. |
| ZTE | In our view, *startingFromRV0* can only be applied for cases that using RV cycling. For single TBoMS, only a single RV0 is used. We don’t see the need of applying *startingFromRV0.* For repetition of TBoMS, *startingFromRV0* should be applied following legacy rules. |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | The legacy principle should be reused. |
| CATT | We think following current mechanism is a natural choice, if no clear benefit can be brought by new mechanism. |
| Ericsson | We prefer that the UE transmits an entire TBoMS (with a given RV) each time. The setting of startingFromRV0 should not affect this behavior. |
| Xiaomi | For PUSCH repetition type A in rel-16, if a configured grant configuration(both type-1 and type 2 CG) is configured with *startingFromRV0* set to ‘*off*’, the transmission of a TB can only start ate the first transmission occasion of the K repetitions. Otherwise the initial transmission of a TB may start at the transmission occasions associated with RV#0 if the RV sequence is {0, 3, 0, 3} or {0, 0, 0, 0}.  For single TBoMS without repetition, only RV#0 is applied, one issue needs to be considered is whether the TBoMS will be transmitted if it is arriving at other than the first slot, just as the following figure shows. This issue is more like a PUSCH dropping rule, i.e. whether the subsequent slots will also be transmitted if the transmission on some of the first few slots is omitted due to the resources collision. From our point of view, if the subsequent slots can be always transmitted regardless of whether the first few slots are dropped, the transmission of a single TBoMS with a configured grant can also start at the non-first slot.  C:\Users\qiaoxuemei\Pictures\single tboms.png  For TBoMS with repetition, the RV cycling across repetitions is applied. The legacy rule in Rel-16, and the determination of the start slot associated with RV#0 mentioned above can be applied together. |

**2.1.1.2-Q3**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Company | A | B | C | D | E | F | Justification | |
| DCM |  | ✓ |  |  |  |  |  |
| QC |  | ✓ |  |  |  |  | Systematic bits are important. Partial transmissions without systematic bits don’t make much sense. Also the logic to execute starting bit determination needs to run before the first slot. This imposes restrictions on when we can start a single TBOMS transmission. |
| Sharp | ✓ | ✓ |  |  |  |  | Sharp’s intention of Option A is the same as Option B.  A single TBoMS should be treated as a set of transmission from the UE perspective. TboMS transmission at the middle of the single TboMS may put extra implementation effort without reasonable gain.  Specifically, we need to discuss them for each RV sequence.  For RV sequence {0,2,3,1}, the initial transmission of a TB can start at only a first slot of a first single TboMS among TboMS repetitions.  For RV sequence {0,3,0,3} or {0,0,0,0}, the initial transmission of a TB can start at a first slot of a single TboMS associated with RV0. |
| LG |  |  |  |  | ✓ |  | We think a transmission occasion in 6.1.2.3.1 can be interpreted as N slots of a single TboMS.  If the transmission occasion for the initial transmission is determined, TboMS transmission is started in the first slot of the transmission occasion. |
| Nokia/NSB |  |  |  |  | ✓ |  | We prefer to reuse the legacy ehaviour for CG-PUSCH type 2. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility |  | ✓ |  |  |  |  | Share similar view as QC |
| Intel |  |  |  |  | ✓ |  | Share similar view as Nokia. |
| Panasonic |  | ✓ |  |  |  |  | If TboMS starts in the middle of the single TboMS, a lot of systematic bits may not be transmitted. |
| Vivo |  |  |  |  | ✓ |  | It’s enough to reuse legacy rules since compared to single slot TB, the whole TboMS PUSCH can be treated as a single transmission occasion already specified in 38.214. |
| ZTE |  | ✓ |  |  |  |  | We have similar views as QC. Partial transmission of one single RV should be avoided as it may cause loss of systematic bits. |
| Huawei, Hisilicon |  | ✓ |  |  |  |  | B: Considering that the systematic bits are covered in RV0, if CG-TBoMS is transmitted from RV0, it can improve the possibility of successful decoding at the first TBoMS repetition, and reduce the burden of blind detection.  A: Compared with B, it has more time domain resources to transmit CG-TBoMS through increasing positions of initial transmission. However, it may slightly increase the burden of blind detection and reduces the possibility of successful decoding at the first TBoMS transmission because the initial transmission may not be associated with RV0. Furthermore, it may also results in that there is no TBoMS transmission associated with RV0, and it cannot be decoded.  C/D: It will lead to that a single TBoMS lacks of some slots. In this case, how to coding/decoding should be further discussed. And it will greatly increase the burden of blind detection.  E: Considering that the definition of transmission occasion for TBoMS has not been defined, it will lead to different understanding, e.g., transmission occasion of TBoMS defined as physical slot, available slot, or all the slots during a single TBoMS transmission, will lead to different understanding. |
| CATT |  |  |  |  | ✓ |  | We acknowledge that system bits are important. But in our understanding, legacy Rel-16 restrictions is able to restrict that the TBoMS can only start with initial slot of RV0 by configuring *startingFromRV0*, i.e. avoid losing system bits. |
| Ericsson |  | x |  |  |  |  | While we think option E could work in principle, it is not crystal clear what reusing the restrictions in Clause 6.1.2.3.1 of TS 38.214 means. There the ‘K repetitions’ are probably meant to be the N slots of a TBoMS, but when there are multiple repetitions of the TBoMS, the situation becomes unclear. Also, the need for the *startingFromRV0* set to *'on'* that allows a start anywhere in the period P associated with RV0 is not so clear to us.  Therefore, we prefer option B. |
| TCL |  | ✓ |  |  |  |  | We have similar view as QC. |
| WILUS |  |  |  | ✓ |  |  | Regarding the TBoMS with repetitions, restriction on the first slot can cause long latency when the first slot associated with RV0 is invalid and the value of N\*M is large. Therefore, any slot associated with RV0 can be determined as a starting slot.  Additionally, it is unclear of UE behavior with Option E since legacy restrictions only cover single-slot PUSCH with repetitions. For now, both Option B and D seems to be interpreted as an extension of legacy restrictions to TBoMS. |
| Xiaomi |  |  |  |  |  |  | There is one issue need to be clarified to avoid misunderstanding: In rel-16, if the RRC parameter *startingFromRV0* is configured and set to ‘*off*’ then only the first transmission occasion in one CG period is determined as the initial transmission; while, if the RRC parameter is not configured or it is configured but set to ‘off’, the initial transmission occasion can be the transmission occasions associated with RV#0. Thus, we can’t choose from Option A and Option B, more clarification on the proposal may be needed.  Besides, just as our comment in **2.1.1.2-Q2,** if the TBoMS dropping rule is that the subsequent slots can always be transmitted regardless of whether the first few slots are dropped, then option D is our first choice. |

FL’s comments on November 12

Thank you for all your comments.

I will address the three questions following the original order and then propose corresponding proposals at the end.

**2.1.1.2-Q1**

An overwhelming majority of companies think that the time duration for the transmission of a single TBoMS or TBoMS with repetitions should not be larger than the duration given by P. It is argued that, given the commonalities of the time domain resource determination, available slot determination and dropping rules, it is unclear why different rules should apply in AI 8.8.1.1 and 8.8.1.2. This seems a reasonable argument. Now, in #106b-e RAN1 agreed for AI 8.8.1.1 that:

|  |
| --- |
| * The existing restriction “The UE is not expected to be configured with the time duration for the transmission of K repetitions larger than the time duration derived by the periodicity P” applies to both the counting based on physical slots and the counting based on available slots. * The above “the time duration for the transmission of K repetitions” means the time duration between the start of the 1st slot of the K repetitions and the end of the last slot of the K repetitions for any instance of a CG period. |

This can be easily adapted to TBoMS as follows:

|  |
| --- |
| * For PUSCH transmissions of TBoMS, the UE is not expected to be configured with the time duration for the N\*M transmissions larger than the time duration derived by the periodicity P. * The above “time duration for the N\*M transmission” means the time duration between the start of the 1st slot of the N\*M available slots for TBoMS and the end of the last slot of the N\*M available slots for TBoMS, for any instance of a CG Type 2 period. |

I believe this reflects what an overwhelming majority of companies prefer, which seems reasonable from FL’s respective, while addressing the question of one company with doubts (Samsung). I would kindly ask the only two companies who expressed concerns on this to reconsider their position, given the current situation.

**2.1.1.2-Q2 & 2.1.1.2-Q3**

A very large majority of companies acknowledge the importance of starting from RV0 in case of TBoMS, due to the importance of systematic bits in this case. From FL’s perspective, this seems reasonable. Micro-optimizations could always be performed in this case, of course, however I think that their use case is considered by many companies as a corner case. Given the limited available time we have before the end of the Rel, I would warmly recommend focusing on the relevant use cases. In this context, I observe that, w.r.t. 2.1.1.2-Q3, companies are almost equally split between answer B and answer E, with very few preferences expressed for other answers.

This brings me to think that a small modification to legacy rules, to accommodate the peculiarity of TBoMS over PUSCH repetition Type A may be sufficient to find middle ground between most preferences and companies.

From my perspective the situation is as follows:

* When M=1, it is important for the TBoMS to start from the first transmission occasion of the N\*K transmissions, regardless of whether the startingFromRV0 is set to ‘on’ or ‘off’
* When M>1, it is important for the TBoMS to start from any transmission associated to RV0 or RV3. In this case, even if the first slot of a group of N available slots is not transmitted due to dropping rules, for instance, the repetitions will allow gNB to get back to systematic bits easily.

Please note that the above would also guarantee that minimal changes, if any, are needed at gNB w.r.t current logic for PUSCH Type A repetitions. Indeed, we should note that the fact of forcing the transmission to start form a slot associated to RV0 (or RV3) allows gNB to reduce the number of slots in a periodicity P that are monitored for PUSCH reception of TBoMS (or, PUSCH type A repetitions, for that matter).

Given all the above observations, the following approach would seem the most suitable way to progress on this aspect.

|  |
| --- |
| For a configured grant type 2, if , or if and the configured grant is configured with startingFromRV0 set to 'off', the initial transmission of a single TBoMS may only start at the first transmission occasion of the N transmissions. Otherwise, the initial transmission of a transport block may start at  - the first transmission occasion of the N\*M transmissions if the configured RV sequence is {0,2,3,1},  - any of the transmission occasions of the N\*M transmissions that are associated with RV=0 if the configured RV sequence is {0,3,0,3},  - any of the transmission occasions of the N\*M transmissions if the configured RV sequence is {0,0,0,0}.  Note: concerning the last bullet, legacy rules stipulate that the bullet holds with the following exception: “except the last transmission occasion when N\*K≥8”. It is unclear if such restriction should apply to TBoMS as well. This would need to be further discussed. |

Accordingly, the following two proposals are formulated, where corresponding tables are added below each column.

**FL’s proposal 8**

* **For PUSCH transmissions of TBoMS, the UE is not expected to be configured with the time duration for the N\*M transmissions larger than the time duration derived by the periodicity P.**
* **The above “time duration for the N\*M transmission” means the time duration between the start of the 1st slot of the N\*M available slots for TBoMS and the end of the last slot of the N\*M available slots for TBoMS, for any instance of a CG Type 2 period.**

Companies are invited to express their views below. Please comment **only if you have strong concerns**. If you do so, please also ensure you provide an alternative formulation of the proposal which captures the current spirit. Once again, it is very important for everyone to be **pragmatic and constructive**. Thank you.

**FL’s proposal 8**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Company name |
| **Support FL’s Proposal 8** | CATT, Ericsson, DCM, WILUS, Nokia/NSB, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility |
| **Do not support FL’s Proposal 8** |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Additional comments related to FL’s Proposal 8, if any. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**FL’s proposal 9**

**For a configured grant type 2, if , or if and the configured grant is configured with startingFromRV0 set to 'off', the initial transmission of a single TBoMS may only start at the first transmission occasion of the N transmissions. Otherwise, the initial transmission of a transport block may start at**

**- the first transmission occasion of the N\*M transmissions if the configured RV sequence is {0,2,3,1},**

**- any of the transmission occasions of the N\*M transmissions that are associated with RV=0 if the configured RV sequence is {0,3,0,3},**

**- any of the transmission occasions of the N\*M transmissions if the configured RV sequence is {0,0,0,0}.**

**Note: concerning the last bullet, legacy rules stipulate that the bullet holds with the following exception: “except the last transmission occasion when N\*K≥8”. It is unclear if such restriction should apply to TBoMS as well. This would need to be further discussed.**

Companies are invited to express their views below. Please comment **only if you have strong concerns**. If you do so, please also ensure you provide an alternative formulation of the proposal which captures the current spirit. Once again, it is very important for everyone to be **pragmatic and constructive**. Thank you.

**FL’s proposal 9**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Company name |
| **Support FL’s Proposal 9** | Spreadtrum, CATT, WILUS, vivo, Nokia/NSB |
| **Do not support FL’s Proposal 9** | Ericsson (need clarification), Huawei, HiSilicon |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Additional comments related to FL’s Proposal 9, if any. |
| ZTE | The following is not very clear to us. Does it mean, for each repetition of TBoMS, the initial transmission may only start at the first transmission occasion of the N transmissions of the each repetition of TBoMS or it should be the first transmission among all N\*M transmissions as startingFromRV0 is set to 'off'? Our understanding is the latter.  **if and the configured grant is configured with startingFromRV0 set to 'off', the initial transmission of a single TBoMS may only start at the first transmission occasion of the N transmissions.**  If we understand correctly, we suggest the following updates to make it clearer.  **For a configured grant type 2, if ~~, or if and the configured grant is configured with startingFromRV0 set to 'off',~~ the initial transmission of a single TBoMS may only start at the first transmission occasion of the N transmissions. If and the configured grant is configured with startingFromRV0 set to 'off', the initial transmission of a transport block ~~single TBoMS~~ may only start at the first transmission occasion of the N\*M transmissions.**  For the ‘Otherwise’ parts, it seems a combined approach of Option B and Option E is used. We can understand the intention but there is still inconsistency exits. Take M=4 for instance, why it can only start at the first transmission occasion among all transmissions for {0, 2, 3, 1} while it can start at any of the N transmission occasions that are associated with the **second** RV0 for {0, 3, 0, 3}? For the two cases, there is only one RV3 left for compensating the systematic bits. Preferably, we can simply apply Option B for all cases, i.e., the first transmission occasion of the N transmissions that are associated with RV=0. This is simpler and could ensure the best performance.  Regarding the note, it seems K should be replaced by M? |
| Panasonic | We agree with ZTE’s clarification and fine with ZTE’s suggested modification. |
| Intel | Based on the comments, it seems companies may have different understandings on the definition of “transmission occasion” for TBoMS. If this corresponds to one whole TBoMS transmission in case of repetitions, we are fine with the proposal. However, if this is for a single slot for TBoMS, then we think it should be aligned with the first transmission occasion of the TBoMS. |
| CATT | Support the proposal. We think a clarification on ‘transmission occasion of TBoMS’ will help companies align the understanding. It is our understanding that the definition is the same with legacy one, i.e. slot. |
| Ericsson | As written, ‘only start at the first transmission occasion of the N transmissions’ could mean that only all slots of each RV of a TBoMS are transmitted, but the UE could start with other than RV0. However, if ‘only start at the first transmission occasion of the N\*M transmissions’ is intended only complete TBoMS transmissions, including all repetitions are transmitted (starting with RV0).  Also, if UE starts TBoMS transmission in a slot other than the first of the N slots, are the prior bits in the circular buffer dropped, or does the UE start in the later slots and truncate any bits remaining?  Is something like the following intended?  **FL’s proposal 9**  **For a configured grant type 2, if , or if and the configured grant is configured with startingFromRV0 set to 'off', the initial transmission of a single TBoMS may only start at the first transmission occasion each of the ~~N transmissions~~ M repetitions. Otherwise, the initial transmission of a transport block may start at**  **- the first transmission occasion of the N\*M transmissions if the configured RV sequence is {0,2,3,1},**  **- the first of the N transmissions, in any of the ~~transmission occasions of the N\*~~M ~~transmissions~~ repetitions that are associated with RV=0 if the configured RV sequence is {0,3,0,3},**  **- the first of the N transmissions, in any of the transmission occasions of the N\*M transmissions if the configured RV sequence is {0,0,0,0}.**  **Note: concerning the last bullet, legacy rules stipulate that the bullet holds with the following exception: “except the last transmission occasion when N\*K≥8”. It is unclear if such restriction should apply to TBoMS as well. This would need to be further discussed.** |
| NTT DOCOMO | Our first preference is ZTE’s proposal, which to restrict the initial transmission only at the first transmission occasions among TBoMS associated RV0. However, if no agreement related to it is reached, we are fine with the current proposal to reuse the current spec. |
| WILUS | We are fine with the FL’s proposal. In our understanding, “transmission occasion” in proposal clearly denote “slot” since we already concluded that new concept of transmission occasion (i.e., TOT) will not be used in further discussion.  Nevertheless, if initial TO determination is limited on the first slot with RV=0, we still have concern when *startingFromRV0* is not provided or set to ‘on’ at least for M>1 case.    Refer to the above example that assumes N=4, M=4, {0, 2, 3, 1}, and only the first slot among slots associated with RV=0 can be determined as initial TO. If the first TO associated with RV=0 is dropped, a UE cannot transmit TBoMS within the corresponding periodicity (16 slots). Compared to legacy CG-PUSCH transmission, latency would be too enlarged that may be critical even for CE UE.  For M=1 case, we are fine to restrict initial TO as the first slot to guarantee the systematic bits as much as possible. |
| LG | If we understand the legacy Rel-16 restrictions correctly, when *startingFromRV0* set to *'off'*, the initial transmission of a transport block may only start at the first transmission occasion of the *K* repetitions. Thus, if TBoMS follows the legacy rule, the main bullet of the proposal should be modified as follows,  **For a configured grant type 2, if , or if and the configured grant is configured with startingFromRV0 set to 'off', the initial transmission of a single TBoMS may only start at the first transmission occasion of the N\*M transmissions. Otherwise, the initial transmission of a transport block may start at**  For the sub-bullets related to ‘otherwise’, we have the same view with Intel. |
| vivo2 | Fine with FL proposal in general. One minor comment, “, or if and” seems not necessary since this covers all cases. Our understanding of the transmission occasion of TBoMS includes all slots for one TBoMS transmission (one repetition only). |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | We do not support this proposal. It is ambiguity for us. So we think a clear expression or clarification is needed.  First, the definition of “transmission occasion for TBoMS” is not clear. From the wording “first transmission occasion of N transmission”, we think the transmission occasion for TBoMS is defined as an available slot. And a slot based transmission occasion is a better choice because it can reuse legacy power control, UCI multiplexing, dropping/cancelation rules, thus facilitating the design. If we have a right understanding, it is better to add a note to clarify it.  Second, regarding to the expression of “any of the transmission occasions of the N\*M transmissions that are associated with RV = 0”, we think there are two different understanding based on that “a transmission occasion for TBoMS is defined as an available slot”.   * First, only the first transmission occasion of a single TBoMS transmission with N transmission occasions is associated with RV = 0; * Second, all the transmission occasions of a single TBoMS transmission with N transmission occasions are associated with RV = 0.   Our understanding is that the first option is the appropriate choice. This is because 1) if N transmission occasions are all associated with RV = 0, the index of starting bit selected form circular buffer on each transmission occasion should be indicated by RV0 in terms of the legacy behaviour in Rel-15/16, which is controversial with the discussion in section 2.1.2.3; 2) the initial transmission for CG-TBoMS can be started form each transmission occasion among N transmission occasions; it will result in a high implementation complexity, such as increasing the burden of blind detection.  As discussed above, we suggest to add two Notes into the proposal as follows:  Note: an available slot is considered as a transmission occasion for TBoMS.  Note: only the first transmission occasion among N transmission occasions of a single TBoMS transmission is associated with a RV.  And we also OK with the Ericsson’s revision. |
| TCL | Fine with the proposal in general. We think a clear clarification for “transmission occasion for TBoMS” is needed. In our understanding, a transmission occasion for TBoMS is defined based on an available slot. |

FL’s comments on November 15

Thank you for your comments. I must apologize, since a typo in FL’s proposal 9 mislead many companies and triggered a discussion that was not meant to be triggered. Indeed, in the sentence below the number of transmissions should have been N\*M and not N, as pointed out correctly by LG (Thank you!).

**For a configured grant type 2, if , or if and the configured grant is configured with startingFromRV0 set to 'off', the initial transmission of a single TBoMS may only start at the first transmission occasion of the M\*N transmissions.**

The reasons are:

* No agreement made so far revised the notion of transmission occasion in TS 38.214, which is the same for TBoMS and PUSCH repetitions Type A.
* For TBoMS we agreed that that concept of TOT would not have been used in Rel-17.

Once again, I am sorry for the misunderstanding. I confirm that the intention is not to revise the notion of transmission occasion, given that this would have specification impact that cannot be managed at this stage. For this reason, it is probably better not to refer to transmission occasion for TBoMS as such but rather refer to slots determined as available for PUSCH transmission for TBoMS, which seems more precise and respectful of existing agreements.

I processed all other comments carefully. I notice that most companies agree that the first slot of any of the M groups of N available slots associated to RV0 is a fundamental slot to start the transmission on, since it carries most of it not all the systematic bits. Therefore, it makes sense for the initial transmission of the TBoMS to start from the first slot of such group, in general.

Furthermore, I also observed that if we follow this logic then RV sequences {0,3,0,3} or {0,0,0,0} should be handled in the same way.

Fl’s proposal 9 is then modified as follows.

**FL’s proposal 9-v2**

**For a configured grant type 2, if , or if and the configured grant is configured with startingFromRV0 set to 'off', the initial transmission of the transport block may only start at the first slot of the N\*M slots determined as available for PUSCH transmission of TBoMS.** **Otherwise, the initial transmission of the transport block may start at**

**- The first slot of the N\*M slots determined as available for PUSCH transmission of TBoMS if the configured RV sequence is {0,2,3,1},**

**- The first slot of any of the M groups of N slots determined as available for PUSCH transmission of TBoMS associated with RV=0, if the configured RV sequence is {0,3,0,3} or {0,0,0,0}.**

**Note: It is up to Editor to decide how to capture these rules.**

Companies are invited to express their views and **strong concerns**, if any, on **FL’s proposal 9-v2** in the corresponding tables below. Constructive attitude is greatly appreciated. Please remember the available time for completing the feature is very limited. Thank you.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Company name |
| **Support FL’s Proposal 9-v2** | Panasonic, CATT, Sharp, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, Apple, DCM, LG, Intel, ZTE, Nokia/NSB, Spreadtrum, Ericsson |
| **Do not support FL’s Proposal 9-v2** |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Additional comments related to FL’s Proposal 9-v2, if any. |
| WILUS | We are fine with the proposal in principle. Our concern is the case when M>1 and *startingFromRV0* is not provided or set to ‘on’ as described in the previous round as follows:    Refer to the above example that assumes N=4, M=4, {0, 2, 3, 1}, and only the first slot among slots associated with RV=0 can be determined as initial TO. If the first TO associated with RV=0 is dropped (according to Rel-15/16 dropping rule), a UE cannot transmit TBoMS within the corresponding periodicity (16 slots). Compared to legacy CG-PUSCH transmission, latency would be too enlarged that may be critical even for CE UE.  Thus, we propose to support any slot associated with RV=0 of the N\*M slots when M>1 and *startingFromRV0* is not provided or set to ‘on’. For the case M=1, or M>1 and *startingFromRV0* is set to ‘off’, we are fine to restrict initial TO as the first slot to guarantee the systematic bits as much as possible. |
| Nokia/NSB | @WILUS: For URLLC application, the {0,3,0,3} or {0,0,0,0} RV sequences should be used instead of {0,2,3,1}. It’s unclear to us why would the gNB configure {0,2,3,1} sequence and expect low latency service. In addition, the gNB can ensure that the periodicity P and RV sequence can be selected such that the above scenario does not happen. |
| FL | @WILUS: I understand the concern, however I would really appreciate if we could avoid touching the proposal, given that you seem to be in the “Can live with” area. Nokia/NSB’s gave an answer to you, which in my view is reasonable. I understand that this may not fully address your concern, however I would highlight the fact that latency has never been a KPI of this AI. Thus, if alternative solutions already exist for NW to ensure lower latency of TBoMS, if needed, the need for micro-optimizing FL’ proposal 9-v2 seems very low, if any. I hope you can agree with me on this.  @ALL: given that the proposal seems agreeable to all companies who added their name in the table above, I would like to ask all to refrain from requesting further micro-optimizations of the proposal from now on, unless strong concerns exist, of course. **Please note that if I do not see any further objection, I would ask Chairman to endorse FL’s proposal 9-v2 via email.** We are running out of time and we cannot afford using online time for all the topics, I hope I can count on your understanding of the situation. |

FL’s comments on November 17

Thank you all for your comments. The proposal looks stable and will be copied in the reflector for email approval. The discussion is closed.

#### [CLOSED] **Use of non-consecutive slots for paired spectrum**

One company commented explicitly on this aspect. More precisely, it is proposed that if no further agreement is made under AI 8.8.1.1 on how to handle the available slot counting for paired spectrum and SUL band, then only consecutive physical slots are supported for TBoMS in paired spectrum and SUL band.

FL’s comments on November 11

From FL’s perspective it is fair to say that some uncertainty may exist with respect to the available slot counting for paired spectrum and SUL band, given the questions companies asked to Editor of TS 38.214 during the CR review phase.

Available agreements and conclusion in this regard are as per Table below

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:   * Consecutive physical slots for UL transmission can be used for TBoMS for unpaired spectrum.   + To resolve in RAN1#104b-e whether to support non-consecutive physical slots for UL transmission for TBoMS for unpaired spectrum. * Consecutive physical slots for UL transmission can be used for TBoMS for paired spectrum and the SUL band.   + FFS if non-consecutive physical slots for UL transmission are also supported for paired spectrum and the SUL band.   Agreement:  Non-consecutive physical slots for UL transmission can be used to transmit TBoMS at least for unpaired spectrum.   * How TBoMS is transmitted over non-consecutive physical slots for UL transmission for unpaired spectrum is to be discussed further. * Whether and how non-consecutive physical slots for UL transmission can be used to transmit TBoMS for paired spectrum and SUL band as well, is to be discussed further.   Agreement  The number of slots allocated for TBoMS is counted based on the available slots for UL transmission.   * The determination of available slots for PUSCH repetition Type A, as defined in AI 8.8.1.1, is reused. * Note: Available slots for FDD or SUL could be revisited according to discussion in AI 8.8.1.1   **Agreement**  The UE determines whether or not to drop a slot determined as available for TBoMS transmission according to Rel-15/16 PUSCH dropping rules, where the dropped slot is still counted in the N allocated slots for the single TBoMS transmission.  FFS: Rel-17 PUSCH dropping rules are also applied if introduced in other WI(s)  **Conclusion**  The N allocated slots for the single TBoMS are defined as the number of slots after available slot determination for a single TBoMS transmission, before dropping rules are applied.  Note: the number of final transmitted slots for the single TBoMS may be lower than N, depending on dropping rules for TBoMS transmission. |

It can be inferred from the above that indeed, as of today:

* Only consecutive slots for UL transmissions cam be used for TBoMS in case of paired spectrum and SUL band.
* Available slots for FDD or SUL cannot be identified using the two-step procedure unless the discussion in AI 8.8.1.1 clarifies this aspect. For instance, how the first step of the available slot determination procedure works in case of paired spectrum and SUL band may be considered unclear, unless it is assumed that available slots for TBoMS in this case are all the consecutive physical slots over which the same symbol allocation is applied (Rel-15/Rel-16 dropping rules then are used to identify the final transmitted slots).

At this stage of the discussion and given that this is the last meeting of WI, it may be then appropriate to adopt a conservative behavior, without relying that any further agreement will be made in AI 8.8.1.1 concerning the notion of available slots in case of paired spectrum and SUL. The idea would be to clarify this aspect among companies such that, if not further agreement is made for AI 8.8.1.1, an agreement can be made for TBoMS later during #107-e.

I would start with the following question.

**2.1.1.3-Q1***. Assuming no further agreement is made concerning the available slot determination in case of paired spectrum and SUL, would you agree with the following description of TBoMS ?*

*For paired spectrum or supplementary uplink band, the same symbol allocation is applied across the N\*K consecutive slots and the PUSCH is limited to a single transmission layer. The UE shall transmit the TB across the N\*K consecutive slots applying the same symbol allocation in each slot.*

*(If you do not agree with the above, please provide an alternative description for other companies to consider)*

##### **First round of discussion**

FL’s recommendation is to have a first round of discussion among companies about **2.1.1.3-Q1**. Companies are invited to input their answer below, provide comments (if applicable) and be constructive.

**2.1.1.3-Q1**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Company’s name for the answer to 2.1.1.3-Q1 |
| **Yes** | DCM, Nokia/NSB, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, Intel, SS, vivo, TCL |
| **No** | QC, Ericsson (OK if clarified) |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Additional comments related to 2.1.1.3-Q1s, if any. |
| QC | As things stand in 8.8.1.1, and after discussions on Redcap half-duplex UEs, our understanding is that R17 Cov Enh will impose no restrictions on the applicability of available slot counting to paired spectrum/SUL. This was also the reason why we steered clear of using the terms “paired” and “unpaired” in 8.8.1.3 when specifying the procedure to determine TDWs. |
| Sharp | We think further agreement for paired spectrum and SUL should be made in AI 8.8.1.1. Therefore, we’d like to suggest waiting the decision in AI 8.8.1.1. |
| LG | We share the view with Sharp. |
| Nokia/NSB | We share the same view with Sharp that a decision should be made in AI 8.8.1.1. However, the interpretation from the FL seems to be correct if “*no further agreement is made*” in any AI. |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal. Our understanding is that for paired spectrum and SUL, consecutive slots are allocated for TBoMS. |
| Panasonic | If no further agreement is made in AI.8.8.1.1, i.e., available slot counting is not supported for paired spectrum and SUL, we agree with the proposed description. If AI. 8.8.1.1 concludes that available slot counting is also applied to paired spectrum and SUL, non-consecutive slot allocation should be supported. Therefore, it is better to wait the conclusion in AI 8.8.1.1. In our view, current conclusion is sufficient at this stage. |
| Samsung | I think for QC’s concern, the handling of the HD-FDD UE, some of the slots will not be transmitted, e.g., dropped. But it won’t impact the resource availability. |
| Vivo | According to following agreements on available slot determination for Type A PUSCH repetition, the FL conclusion seems obvious to us, and we do not think a separate proposal or agreement on this is necessary.  Agreement   * Only *tdd-UL-DL-ConfigurationCommon*, *tdd-UL-DL-ConfigurationDedicated* and *ssb-PositionsInBurst* are considered for the determination of available slots.   + Any other RRC configuration is not considered for the determination of available slots.   Agreement  The number of slots allocated for TBoMS is counted based on the available slots for UL transmission.   * The determination of available slots for PUSCH repetition type A, as defined in AI 8.8.1.1, is reused. * Note: Available slots for FDD or SUL could be revisited according to discussion in AI 8.8.1.1   Agreement:  Time domain resource determination for TBoMS can be performed only via PUSCH repetition Type A like TDRA.   * FFS: details * FFS: whether or not optimizations for time domain resource determination are necessary for allocating resource in the S slots (for the unpaired spectrum case) |
| ZTE | The mechanisms we defined could apply for all spectrum. And we share with QC and vivo that there is no need additional agreements in this agenda. |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | No further agreement is needed. The mechanism should be applicable to all spectrum. |
| CATT | FL’s proposal shall at least be ‘applied’ to FD-FDD UE, regardless counting based on available slot is ‘defined’ in paired spectrum or SUL or not.  In our understanding, even if counting based on available slot is ‘defined’ in paired spectrum, it can only be ‘applied’ to HD-FDD UE. |
| Ericsson | We agree with FL’s inferring that “available slots for TBoMS in this case are all the consecutive physical slots over which the same symbol allocation is applied (Rel-15/Rel-16 dropping rules then are used to identify the final transmitted slots).”  Regarding the proposed description, we would like to clarify that, while the ‘K’ may be used in 38.214 as the number of repetitions, in the context of TBoMS it is ‘M’.  Also, “The UE shall transmit the TB across” is not about available slot determination, but about PUSCH transmission (and since slots can be dropped, transmission is not the same thing as available slot determination). Therefore, we suggest the following refinement to the FL proposal:  For paired spectrum or supplementary uplink band, the same symbol allocation is applied across the ~~N\*K~~ M\*N consecutive slots and the PUSCH is limited to a single transmission layer. ~~The UE shall transmit the TB across the N\*K consecutive slots applying the same symbol allocation in each slot.~~ |
| Xiaomi | We share the same view as Sharp. |

FL’s comments on November 12

Thank you for all your comments. I see that most companies agree with FL’s proposal, while:

* Some companies would like to wait for the outcome of the discussions in AI 8.8.1.1 before assessing if a TBoMS-specifc agreement is necessary.
* One company does not prefer the differentiation between paired and unpaired spectrum case for determining the slots for PUSCH transmission of TBoMS.
* One company would be fine with the spirit of FL’s proposal and propose modifications.

Concerning the comments made by Qualcomm, i.e., the company who prefers avoiding the differentiation of the two cases, I would like to reiterate the following comment. According to current agreements, how the first step of the available slot determination procedure would work in case of paired spectrum is unclear. That procedure has no ambiguity for unpaired spectrum but does not seem applicable “as in” to the paired spectrum case. I have commented on this in my first comment but did not receive any clarification on this aspect. Most companies seem to agree with this understanding.

Concerning the comments made by Ericsson, I think they are related to how spec is written and how to discuss in the AI. Herein, we have always used M and not K. I’d stick to this notation, if possible, to avoid confusion (we used K for other purposes throughout the release). Conversely, your last comment makes sense.

At this stage, I think that the most sensible way forward is to set a deadline for this discussion, with a possible agreed outcome, if the deadline is not met, as follows:

|  |
| --- |
| * RAN1 waits until 4 PM UTC on November 17 before resuming this discussion, to give time to discussions in AI 8.8.1.1 to possibly converge on a clarification on the paired spectrum case. * If clarification occurs, and corresponding agreements are made in AI 8.8.1.1, RAN1 reuses them with no modifications for AI 8.8.1.2, and corresponding agreements in this sense are made. * If no clarification occurs, and no agreement is made in AI 8.8.1.1., RAN1 takes action in AI 8.8.1.2 to ensure the completion of the feature, and agree on the following:   + For paired spectrum or supplementary uplink band, the same symbol allocation is applied across the M\*N consecutive slots and the PUSCH is limited to a single transmission layer. |

**2.1.1.3-Q2***. Is the procedure above acceptable?*

I would like to have a very quick check on the above to make sure we are all on the same page. Please input your answer below and be constructive.

**2.1.1.3-Q2**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Company’s name for the answer to 2.1.1.3-Q2 |
| **Yes** | OPPO: We are OK. We kind of agree to not optimize HD-FDD, looked UL/DL conflicting as dropping. But we don’t object a availability rules agreeable in 8.8.1.1.  Apple: we are ok with the proposed procedure. According to our understanding, there was no agreement to introduce the UL/DL pattern for RedCap HD FDD UE under RedCap WI. In this sense, the consecutive slots are allocated for TBoMS for paired spectrum and SUL.  Panasonic: We are fine with the suggested procedure.  Spreadtrum: support.  Intel: We have not agreed whether RedCap UE would support TBoMS. If not supported, we are fine with the proposal.  CATT: Fine with the procedure.  Ericsson: Support  DCM: We are fine with the above procedure.  Nokia/NSB: The procedure above is acceptable to us.  CMCC: fine with the procedure. But the conclusion should be updated with how to support the HD-FDD. |
| **No** | QC: Okay to wait for clarity from 8.8.1.1. Dont agree to the text in blue since we want to leave the door open for Redcap HD-FDD UEs. We suggest the following alternative:  For any carrier, the slot counting method used for PUSCH Type A repetitions is reused to identify slots for potential transmission of TBOMS.  (This may be agreeable even now I think.)  Sharp: It should be clarified in the above statement that whether/how to support HD-FDD is FFS. |

FL’s comments on November 15

Thank you all for the comments. During the GTW on November 15, agreements were made in AI 8.8.1.1. Consequently, and according to previous proposed procedure, the following proposal is made, where the suggestion made by Qualcomm has been retained (the same available slot determination procedure is used in AI 8.8.1.1 and AI 8.8.1.2, regardless of the considered carrier).

**FL’s proposal 10**

**For any carrier, available slot determination for PUSCH transmission of TBoMS is according to agreements made in AI 8.8.1.1 on available slot determination for PUSCH transmission of PUSCH repetition Type A.**

Companies are invited to add their preference on FL’s proposal 10, in the table below. If **strong concerns** still exist, can be added in the second table below.

**FL’s proposal 10**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Company |
| **Support FL’s proposal 10** | Panasonic, WILUS, CATT, Sharp, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, QC, Apple, DCM, LG, Intel, ZTE, vivo, Nokia/NSB, |
| **Do not support FL’s proposal 10** |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Concerns on FL’s proposal 10 |
| Apple | Editorial comments to avoid confusion, ‘for ~~any carrier~~ unpaired spectrum, paired spectrum and SUL, available slot….’ |
| FL | @Apple: I am not sure your suggestion covers all cases, e.g., HD-FDD.  @ALL: Given that the agreement below did not stipulate that the determination of available slots for PUSCH repetition Type A, as defined in AI 8.8.1.1, is reused for TBoMS only for specific cases (in fact, only an informative note was added, with no normative power), I am now thinking we can simplify our life and stop the discussion here. Either way, the understanding is clear and the same for all companies, so there is no need to restate what RAN1 has already agreed in this sense. The discussion is thus closed.  Agreement  The number of slots allocated for TBoMS is counted based on the available slots for UL transmission.   * The determination of available slots for PUSCH repetition Type A, as defined in AI 8.8.1.1, is reused. * Note: Available slots for FDD or SUL could be revisited according to discussion in AI 8.8.1.1 |
|  |  |

### [CLOSED] Single TBoMS structure

Two contributions ([5] and [22]) proposed to confirm the working assumption made on the single TboMS structure, given its relevance and importance in the context of the CRs which have been prepared, and will be updated, by Editors.

FL’s comments on November 11

From FL’s perspective, it is important to confirm the WA on the single TboMS structure, especially considering that this is being used to build all other aspects of the feature. That WA was made several meetings ago and was as follows:

|  |
| --- |
| Working Assumption  Single TboMS structure of Option 3 is selected   * **Option 3**: Multiple TOTs are determined for a TboMS. The TB is transmitted on the multiple TOTs using a single RV.   + FFS: how the single RV is rate matched across single or multiple TOTs, e.g., rate matched for each TOT, rate matched for all the TOTs, rate matched for each slot and so on. |

Subsequently, other working assumptions, agreements and conclusions were made, which clarified that the concept of TOT would not be used anymore, that the bit interleaving per slot is assumed, that RV cycling is used in case of TboMS repetitions and so on. For all these reasons, I think it would be cleaner to stick to the important point and simply confirm that a single RV is used to transmit a single TboMS and avoid confusion to Editors. The following proposal is then made.

**FL’s proposal 1**

**A single RV is used to transmit a single TboMS.**

From FL’s perspective, the above proposal should not require any discussion to be approved and will thus be brought online during the GTW scheduled on November 11. I expect no discussion to occur, and I would appreciate if all companies avoided commenting further online about it, for the sake of an efficient use of the already very limited available time. Thank you.

FL’s comments on November 12

FL’s proposal 1 was endorsed with a small modification. This discussion is closed.

### [OPEN] Rate Matching

This aspect has been discussed in detail in several contributions, with specific focus on the index of the starting coded bits in each slot for TboMS. Irrespective of this, we still have two high-level sub-aspects that can be isolated as illustrated above. The reason is that the WA made during RAN1 #106b-e would need to be confirmed for it to be captured in the CRs of TS 38.212 and TS 38.214. The summary of companies’ preferences and opinions based on the contributions is organized accordingly.

#### [CLOSED] **Time unit of the bit interleaving**

Nine companies ([8], [9], [10], [12], [13], [16], [19], [20], [21]) proposed to confirm the WA made during RAN1 #106b-e, given its relevance and importance in the context of the CRs which have been prepared, and will be updated, by Editors.

FL’s comments on November 11

From FL’s perspective, it is important to confirm the WA on the time unit of the bit interleaving, especially considering that this is being used to build other aspects of the feature. That WA was made several meetings ago and was as follows:

|  |
| --- |
| **Working Assumption**  For TboMS in Rel-17, the following is supported:   * Bit interleaving is performed per slot.          The index of the starting coded bit for each transmitted slot is predetermined prior to the start of the TboMS transmission.   * Transmission is limited to one CB only. * FFS: whether UCI multiplexing bits or cancellation/dropping of coded bits, if any, have to be known prior to the determination of the index of the starting coded bit for each transmitted slot or not * FFS: Performance with UCI multiplexing on single and multiple slots of a single TboMS     Note: How UCI multiplexing and cancellation/dropping of coded bits influence the sequence of coded bits transmitted in each slot of a single TBOMS is to be further discussed. Some knowledge on UCI to be multiplexed or cancellation/dropping of coded bits in each slot of a single TBOMS may be known prior to the start of a single TBOMS transmission. How this is to be handled is to be discussed further. |

Given that the FFS are still open and the note still applies, FL’ suggestion is to confirm the WA as is.

**FL’s proposal 2**

**Confirm the following working assumption:**

**Working Assumption**

**For TboMS in Rel-17, the following is supported:**

* **Bit interleaving is performed per slot.**

**·       The index of the starting coded bit for each transmitted slot is predetermined prior to the start of the TboMS transmission.**

* **Transmission is limited to one CB only.**
* **FFS: whether UCI multiplexing bits or cancellation/dropping of coded bits, if any, have to be known prior to the determination of the index of the starting coded bit for each transmitted slot or not**
* **FFS: Performance with UCI multiplexing on single and multiple slots of a single TboMS**

**Note: How UCI multiplexing and cancellation/dropping of coded bits influence the sequence of coded bits transmitted in each slot of a single TBOMS is to be further discussed. Some knowledge on UCI to be multiplexed or cancellation/dropping of coded bits in each slot of a single TBOMS may be known prior to the start of a single TBOMS transmission. How this is to be handled is to be discussed further.**

From FL’s perspective, the above proposal should not require any discussion to be approved and will thus be brought online during the GTW scheduled on November 11. I expect no discussion to occur, and I would appreciate if all companies avoided commenting further online about it, for the sake of an efficient use of the already very limited available time. Thank you.

FL’s comments on November 12

FL’s proposal 2 was endorsed. This discussion is closed.

#### [OPEN] **Starting bit in each slot for the single TboMS**

Companies’ preferences concerning the starting bit in each for the single TboMS are as follows:

* Option B: the index of the starting coded bit in the circular buffer is the index continuous from the position of the last bit selected in the previous allocated slot **[7]**:
  + Interdigital [14], Huawei/HiSi [3], ZTE [5], China Telecom [11], Intel [15], OPPO [9], LGE\* [28].
* Option C: the index of the starting coded bit in the circular buffer is the index continuous from the position of the last bit selected in the previous allocated slot, regardless of whether UCI multiplexing occurred in the previous allocated slot or not **[16]**:
  + CMCC [12], NEC [25], Samsung [19], Sharp [24], Ericsson [22], NTTDOCOMO [26], Apple [16], Qualcomm [17], MediaTek [20], Nokia/NSB [21], vivo [6], Spreadtrum [23], Fujitsu [10], CATT [8], Panasonic [16], LGE\* [28].

Three companies ([16], [25] and [24]) provided alternative but equivalent ways of calculating the index of the starting coded bit according to Option C.

One company describes an alternative way to calculate the starting coded bits in each slot that may or may not result in a continuous extraction of bits from the circular buffer, depending on how a scaling parameter is configured by NW [17]. As such, it does not seem fully aligned with the scope of the previous agreement, nor with the spirit of the single RV transmission for the single TboMS.

Finally, 5 companies expressed views on whether the index of the starting coded bit for each transmitted slot is expressed as a multiple integer of the lifting size Zc, as follows:

* Expressing the index of the starting coded bit as a multiple integer of the lifting size Zc is not necessary **[2]:**
  + vivo [6], Samsung [19].
* Expressing the index of the starting coded bit as a multiple integer of the lifting size Zc is necessary **[2]:**
  + Huawei/HiSi [3], NTTDOCOMO [26].
* Decision on this aspect should be left to the Editor **[1]**:
  + CATT [8].

FL’s comments on November 11

From FL’s perspective, the views expressed by companies so far show a clear majority in favor of Option C, which has the merit of being able to be fully compatible with existing UCI multiplexing rules and timeline requirements. Indeed, companies’ opinions concerning the impact on existing UCI multiplexing rules and timeline requirements of Option B. This aspect has been discussed for more than 1 meeting already and I doubt further technical discussions may result in all 15 (+1) companies in favor of Option C to change their opinion and support Option B.

Conversely, if we focus on Option B, we see that that main argument used to support this option is related to the possible performance degradation that Option C would entail as compared to Option B. However, if we look closely at the obtained and results, and companies comments we observe the following:

* Performance difference between Option B and Option C, when observed, is almost always in the order of few tenths of dB.
* The possibility of configuring TboMS repetitions can recover such very limited performance loss, if present at all, rather effectively.

In this sense, from FL’s perspective, it seems fair to state that Option C is a very good way of reducing specification and implementation impact, while not impairing the success of TboMS in terms of performance. I would urge companies in favor of Option B to reconsider their position, given all the above.

Switching the focus now on whether the index of the starting coded bit in each slot should be expressed as a multiple integer of the lifting size , I think that it is also fair to say that no clear majority exists in favor of or against it. Once again, companies’ opinions differ in this regard and do not seem to vary over time (they are the same as for the last meeting). From FL’s perspective it may make sense to ask one last question to companies about this to understand what the preference of companies is who did not express an opinion on this aspect yet. If a clear majority is not formed for either of the two directions, I would suggest dropping this discussion in the interest of an efficient use of our time. In this context, it is worth noting that I will not propose companies to express a preference in favor of “leave the decision up to the Editor”, because such decision may imply that an additional rounding operation is to be performed at least at the UE (at least according to some companies). As a result, it needs an agreement to be supported (or not).

Finally, and irrespective of the decision on “”, I would assume that any decision related to how to describe the continuous bit extraction from the buffer may be left up to the Editor, given that no ambiguity exists in this sense, and several equivalent formulations/descriptions can be found.

Given all the above, the following proposal and question are made.

**FL’s proposal 3**

**For the bit selection for each transmitted slot for TboMS, the index of the starting coded bit in the circular buffer is the index continuous from the position of the last bit selected in the previous allocated slot, regardless of whether UCI multiplexing occurred in the previous allocated slot or not.**

***2.1.3.2-Q1.*** *Should the index of the starting coded bit for each transmitted slot be expressed as a multiple integer of the lifting size Zc?*

##### **First round of discussion**

FL’s recommendation is to have a first round of discussion among companies about **FL’s proposal 3** and ***2.1.3.2-Q1***.

Concerning**FL’s proposal 3**.I understand that this may not be a preferred outcome for the companies who expressed preference for Option B, however I’d like to invite all these companies to be pragmatic and acknowledge that solid arguments have been brought in favour of Option C, for which a very large majority exists. As I was saying before, performance difference may exist, but it does not seem significant and can be effectively nulled by simply configuring TboMS with repetitions. It should be noted that RAN1 decided to support TboMS repetitions exactly to ensure that systematic bits could be recovered via repetitions, irrespective of dropping/collisions/puncturing.

**FL’s proposal 3**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Company name |
| **Support FL’s Proposal 3** | DCM, QC, Sharp, Nokia/NSB, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, Panasonic, SS, vivo, CATT, Ericsson, Xiaomi |
| **Do not support FL’s Proposal 3** | LG, Intel, ZTE, Huawei, Hisilicon |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Additional comments related to FL’s Proposal 3, if any. |
| LG | As shown in our evaluation results, the performance loss of Option C due to UCI multiplexing is never negligible, and we think it is necessary to try to minimize the performance loss of TboMS by applying Option B.  However, in our understanding, adopting Option C can reduce specification and implementation impact while not cause error propagation problem as the FL descripted kindly.  In our view, while enjoying the benefits of Option C, it is necessary to make an effort to minimize the performance degradation issue.  Multiplexing of aperiodic CSI may be the biggest cause of Option C performance loss because it may be transmitted in the first slot of the first transmission of TboMS. On the other hand, multiplexing of aperiodic CSI on TboMS does not have a timeline issue and there is no possibility of misalignment of aperiodic CSI multiplexing.  Therefore, in the case of aperiodic CSI, it is considered that the starting bit of each slot of TboMS should be determined in consideration of UCI multiplexing. On the other hand, in the case of other UCI types, the starting bit can be determined without considering UCI multiplexing. |
| Intel | We do not agree that performance loss is negligible as shown in our results due to puncturing of some systematic bits in some slots. At least based on our simulation results, in some cases, consistent decoding failure can be observed for Option C. Regarding TboMS with repetition, we do not agree that subsequent repetition can recover performance loss due to cancellation of big portion of systematic bits in the initial transmission.  For coverage enhancement, our view is that the performance is important to determine which option is adopted for TboMS. |
| ZTE | We do not support the proposal based on the following reasons as also commented in GTW.   * Option C would introduce new UCI multiplexing procedures for UCI of more than 2 bits, with replacing rate-matching by puncturing. This would cause performance loss as commented by other companies, and also complicate both UE and gNB implementation as they need to handle two different UCI multiplexing procedures. * The main motivation of Option C is to resolve the error propagation issue due to missing DL DCI associated with a HARQ-ACK to be multiplexed on the TboMS. However, missing detection of DL DCI are corner cases thanks to the existing DAI mechanism. We should not introduce a scheme trying to solve the issues of corner cases while cause performance loss for most typical cases. This would make TboMS less attractive in practice. * UCI bits could always be known before the first transmission of TboMS at least for DG PUSCH. * Regarding the comments that if gNB knows there would be UCI multiplexing, it can leave to gNB implementation by scheduling lower MCS etc. We are not convinced. If gNB would know there could be UCI multiplexing, it is more reasonable for gNB to try to ensure no DCI missing and reuse legacy UCI multiplexing procedure.   Our proposal is to go with legacy multiplexing rules, i.e., puncturing for 1-2 bits UCI and rate-matching for more than 2 bits UCI, and reuse legacy multiplexing timeline for both DG and CG. This would not cause any issue for DG PUSCH, and the missing DCI issue could be regarded as corner case for CG PUSCH.  If we have to make some differentiation, instead of differentiating for different UCI types, we think it is more reasonable to differentiate between DG PUSCH and CG PUSCH. |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | In our understanding, the misalignment issue is only occurred by missing detection of DCI scheduling HARQ-ACK. For CSI report, there is no misalignment issue, as follows.   1. P-CSI reporting is configured by RRC. There is thus no misalignment issue. 2. Regarding to SP-CSI reporting, it can be carried on PUCCH or PUSCH.    * If SP-CSI reporting is carried on PUCCH, it is activated by MAC-CE. There is also no misalignment issue.    * If SP-CSI reporting is carried on PUSCH, it is triggered by DCI. In this case, SP-CSI reporting cannot be multiplexed with uplink data on PUSCH. And if the first PUSCH carrying on the SP-CSI reporting is overlapped in time with the second PUSCH that includes an UL-SCH, the first PUSCH carrying on the SP-CSI reporting should be dropped. So there is also no misalignment issue. 3. Regarding to A-CSI reporting, it is carried on PUSCH as triggered by DCI. There are two possible scenarios as follows.    * A-CSI reporting is triggered by DCI scheduling PUSCH which includes uplink data. In this case, A-CSI reporting will be multiplexed with uplink data on PUSCH. However, if DCI is missed, the PUSCH will also cannot be transmitted. So there is no misalignment issue.    * It is not a valid case that the first PUSCH carrying on A-CSI triggered by a DCI overlaps in time with the second PUSCH with dynamic and configured grant.   Furthermore, we considering the scenario that A-CSI reporting is triggered by DCI scheduling PUSCH repetition which includes uplink data. In this case, A-CSI will be multiplexed on the first repetition. For TboMS, a lot of systematic bits are included in the first slot. So if A-CSI is multiplexed on the first slot allocated for TboMS transmission by puncturing, its performance will be dramatically lost.  As discussed above, Option B with HARQ-ACK puncturing is a better method. It not only solves the misalignment issue of option B, but also has a better performance than option C.  Reference:  TS 38.214 Section 5.2.3: CSI reporting on PUSCH can be multiplexed with uplink data on PUSCH except that semi-persistent CSI reporting on PUSCH activated by a DCI format is not expected to be multiplexed with uplink data on the PUSCH. CSI reporting on PUSCH can also be performed without any multiplexing with uplink data from the UE.  TS 38.214 Section 5.2.5: If a UE would transmit a first PUSCH that includes semi-persistent CSI reports and a second PUSCH that includes an UL-SCH and the first PUSCH transmission would overlap in time with the second PUSCH transmission, the UE does not transmit the first PUSCH and transmits the second PUSCH. The UE expects that the first and second PUSCH transmissions satisfy the above timing conditions for PUSCH transmissions that overlap in time when at least one of the first or second PUSCH transmissions is in response to a DCI format detection by the UE.  TS 38.214 Section 6.1: For any HARQ process ID(s) in a given scheduled cell, the UE is not expected to transmit a PUSCH that overlaps in time with another PUSCH. For any two HARQ process IDs in a given scheduled cell, if the UE is scheduled to start a first PUSCH transmission starting in symbol *j* by a PDCCH ending in symbol *I*, the UE is not expected to be scheduled to transmit a PUSCH starting earlier than the end of the first PUSCH by a PDCCH that ends later than symbol *i*. The UE is not expected to be scheduled to transmit another PUSCH by DCI format 0\_0, 0\_1 or 0\_2 scrambled by C-RNTI or MCS-C-RNTI for a given HARQ process until after the end of the expected transmission of the last PUSCH for that HARQ process.  C:\Users\l00519916\AppData\Roaming\eSpace_Desktop\UserData\l00519916\imagefiles\229EE648-F868-462A-9198-8589899097FA.png |
| Ericsson | When we simulated with a reasonable number of CSI bits and with MCS states and TBS that are we think representative of TboMS use cases, we did not find excessive loss from Option C as compared to Option B. Furthermore, Option B will have error propagation issues if there are missed DCIs, so Option B is not necessarily better performing than Option C. Option C is clearly less complex than Option B.  So in our view, Option C is the best choice. |
| Xiaomi | Since the performance gain can be obtained by TboMS combining with other methods, such as PUSCH repetition type A, joint channel estimation, etc., the performance is not the main issue in the design of rate matching of TboMS. Option B has non-negligible spec impact, that is, two different rate matching mechanisms should be maintained separately for single-slot TB and TboMS when UCI multiplexing occurs. It will influence the complexity of UE’s implementation, and is not supported by us. |

Additionally, companies are invited to provide an answer to **2.1.3.2-Q1** in the table below. If you add any additional comment, it is very much appreciated if discussion is kept at technical level, for the sake of an efficient use of the limited time RAN1 has. Constructive attitude is warmly recommended.

**2.1.3.2-Q1**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Company name |
| **Yes** | DCM, Huawei, Hisilicon |
| **No** | QC(from UE perspective), Sharp, Nokia/NSB, Intel,SS, vivo, ZTE, CATT, Ericsson, Xiaomi |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Additional comments related to 2.1.3.2-Q1, if any. |
| QC | We have checked internally on whether there are any benefits to doing this from an implementation standpoint and we have not been able to identify any from a UE Tx standpoint. Open to hearing views from gNB perspective. |
| Sharp | Rounding operation by Zc puts complexity without reasonable gain. |
| Nokia/NSB | We also share similar views with Qualcomm and Sharp that further restriction based on lifting size Zc is unnecessary. In addition, rounding with Zc may violate the WA that only a single RV is used for a single TboMS, since it can be argued that any overlapping of the bits mapped on the slots allocated for a single TboMS can be considered as using different RVs. |
| Intel | Share similar view as Nokia that it seems not aligned with the previous agreements. |
| Samsung | At least for us, we have identify the necessity to have this alignment from both UE and gNB perspective. Again, TboMS is an independent transmission scheme. Some of the implementation is deemed to be modified to fit this transmission scheme, and we only reuse and add the necessary one. |
| Vivo | Since only one CB is transmitted in a TboMS, the coded bits in multiple slots is regarded as a whole at both encoder and receiver. Neither encoder nor receiver can see the boundary of coded bits caused by slot boundary. Hence, such restriction is not necessary. |
| ZTE | We also don’t identify any clear benefits by limiting the starting bits as an integer of Zc. From gNB perspective, no matter Option B or Option C, gNB will know the exact starting bit for each slot once scheduling TboMS. Using contiguous bits slot by slot could be even simpler for implementation. |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | First of all, looking at the current specification and UE implementation, rounding is a necessary steps to calculate the starting bit of each slot, regardless of retransmission or repetition type A or repetition type B, because for each slot transmission, the TBS and code blocks are with different size, the starting bit index needs to be calculated for each slot with rounding operation. From this point of view, we do not observe any complexity increase compared with the current specification, and implementation.  Secondly, this can reuse the type A repetition implementation as much as possible. (note: the index of the starting bit of each slot is multiple of the LDPC lifting size Zc in type A repletion is ). Otherwise, the index of the starting bit of each slot will be within 0 to 25344, which complicated the implementation and this will requires modification of the chipset in gNB side. To reuse the type A repletion decoding at the gNB side, the starting bit should be the integer of the lifting size.  Thirdly, for each slot bit selection and interleaving, the starting bit will be anyway calculated and this calculation is already implemented by the gNB.  Fourthly, as commented online, the bits for each slot are already not continuous in reality due to the UCI multiplexing and starting bit calculation of option C. Then the bit selection and interleaving are performed slot by slot. From this point of view we do not see any difference complexity difference between with and without the rounding operation.  Finally if the rounding is operated by floor operation, then some of the bit punctured in the last slot will be transmitted in the current slot. There will be some coding gain due to less punctured systematic bits of bit selection option C. |
| CATT | To clarify, for the rounding function, we share the same views with many above companies that it is unnecessary.  For how to capture continuous bit mapping between slots, we think this can be up to editor. |
| Ericsson | Our understanding is that restricting the starting coded bit to be an integer of the lifting size can degrade performance. Also, it is not clear to us why gNB implementation would require this integer lifting size constraint presuming that gNB decodes after all slots of a TboMS.  So at this stage, we do not see the benefit of the lifting size constraint. |

FL’s comments on November 12

Thank you for all your comments. I will start from 2.1.3.2-Q1. After reading answers given by companies to 2.1.3.2-Q1, it is evident that most companies think that expressing the index of the starting coded bits in each slot for TboMS as an integer multiple of Zc is not needed. Two companies think otherwise. We have been discussing this aspect for a while. Further discussion in this sense would not help, hence FL suggests not to continue discussion any longer and keep Option B and Option C as they are. Companies are invited not to propose that the index of the starting coded bits in each slot for TboMS in Rel-17 should be expressed as an integer multiple of Zc, due to clear lack of consensus (or even majority).

Concerning the discussion on Option B and Option C, the situation is more complex. Different companies have different understandings of whether information related to UCI multiplexing can always be available to the UE before the determination of the starting coded bit index of each slot for TboMS. This is indeed the contentious aspect at hand here.

Now, I think it is fair to state that:

* Most of the simulation results showing large performance difference between Option B and Option C:
  + Seem to focus on situations in which TboMS repetitions are not enabled (when they could) and when the UCI multiplexing occurs in the first slot, without accounting for the probability of this event to occur. To be fair, we should acknowledge that this implies that NW scheduler may have a bias which leads to the UCI multiplexing to occur always, or often, in the first slot of many for TboMS. This is not realistic, and may very well be a corner case, in practice (or better, a not so smart gNB…).
  + Do not consider the peculiarity of coverage limited scenarios. In these cases, UCI (no matter which type) will hardly have a payload size larger than 10-15 bits in the very worst case. Conversely, TBS for TboMS will very likely be in order of few hundreds of bits or more in most cases. When this is taken int account, then the performance difference becomes negligible, if any.
* Some of statements related to UCI multiplexing timeline for CSI may not be accurate. According to TS 38.213, timeline requirements for SP-CSI and A-CSI do not seem to involve timing relationship between DCI or MAC-CE scheduling the CSI report and the DCI scheduling the PUSCH, but rather between the last symbol of the DCI or MAC-CE scheduling the CSI report and first symbol of the PUSCH over which the CSI report would be multiplexed. Additionally, in case of presence of CSI part 1 and part 2, UE may not know the actual size of the CSI report at the time of the determination of the index of the starting coded bit in each slot for TboMS. From FL’s understanding, several companies think that the above would make it impossible for the UE to determine such index of the of the starting coded bit in each slot for TboMS, prior to the transmission of the first slots, especially in case of CG type 2. Accordingly, it may not be possible to predict the need to multiplex CSI beforehand nor to anticipate the exact size of the CSI report (due to variability of part 2 size).
* Some companies commented that supporting DG-PDSCH-ACK on CG-TboMS may also be problematic. In this case, the stringent multiplexing rules that currently exist for DG-PUSCH, on which companies agree, do not apply to CG-PUSCH. Therefore, it may not be possible to infer the size of the UCI payload beforehand for all the slots.

All the above bring me to say that it is very unlikely that the very large number of companies supporting Option C may decide to support Option B, unless evidence is given that current UCI multiplexing timeline can ensure that all information on UCI multiplexing can be made available before the determination of the index of the starting coded bit in each slot for TboMS. For this reason, the following two additional questions are asked.

**2.1.3.2-Q2**.

* For Proponents of Option B:
  + *Please provide evidence that current UCI multiplexing timeline ensures that any information related to exact UCI payload size for UCI multiplexing over PUSCH is known prior to the determination of the index of the starting coded bit for each allocated lot for TboMS, in case of semi-persistent and aperiodic CSI.*
* For Proponents of Option C:
  + *Please provide evidence that current UCI multiplexing timeline cannot ensure that any information related to exact UCI payload size for UCI multiplexing over PUSCH is known prior to the determination of the index of the starting coded bit for each allocated slot for TboMS, in case of semi-persistent and aperiodic CSI.*

**2.1.3.2-Q3**.

* For Proponents of Option B:
  + *Please provide evidence that current UCI multiplexing timeline ensures that any information related to exact UCI payload size for UCI multiplexing over PUSCH is known prior to the determination of the index of the starting coded bit for each allocated slot for TboMS, in case of DG-PDSCH-ACK on CG PUSCH (with TboMS).*
* For Proponents of Option C:
  + *Please provide evidence that current UCI multiplexing timeline cannot ensure that any information related to exact UCI payload size for UCI multiplexing over PUSCH is known prior to the determination of the index of the starting coded bit for each allocated lot for TboMS, in case of DG-PDSCH-ACK on CG PUSCH (with TboMS).*

Companies are invited to provide an answer to **2.1.3.2-Q2** and **2.1.3.2-Q3** in the tables below. If you add any additional comment, it is very much appreciated if discussion is kept at technical level, for the sake of an efficient use of the limited time RAN1 has. Constructive attitude is warmly recommended.

**2.1.3.2-Q2**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company / Supported Option | Answer to 2.1.3.2-Q2. |
| QC (support Option C) | Consider the case where spCSI on PUCCH is activated midway through a 32 slot TBOMS. spCSI activation is via MAC-CE and could not have been predicted beforehand. If PUCCH carrying this CSI ends up overlapping with PUSCH carrying TBOMS, we now need to multiplex this CSI payload. It impossible to predict before hand that such things will not occur unless we impose additional restrictions on gNB scheduler.  Second, even if sp-CSI on PUCCH was activated beforehand, CSI-Part2 payload size is a variable payload that is dependent on the rank chosen by the UE. Rank is embedded within CSI-Part1, which is a fixed size payload and the gNB needs to recover CSI-Part1 to infer the size of CSI-Part2. For this reason, an accurate accounting of CSI-Part2 does not seem possible.  Third, there is the case of UE missing the sp-CSI activation/deactivation (PDSCH grant is missed, or PDSCH decode fails). If these events occur close to the start of TBOMS, then again some ambiguity could arise until the UE and gNB realign themselves. |
| OPPO | Generally, we think the network can ensure the same CSI payloads understanding of UE side to successfully decoded the pigbacked CSI. Even assuming the CSIs are tiggered by the different DCIs than the one scheduling the TboMS.  In Rel-15/16, the CSI is always rated matched to the PUSCH resourced in the slot by the beta factor. Also, the CSI-part2 should have make sure with the resource to determine the information bits it will be carry.  If we assume TboMS can not ensure the CSI payload, then the current CSI schemes seems cannot work reliably.  Further we think the CSI report should not happen frequently, e.g. several different report carried during TboMS and the rat- matching have to adapted slot by slot. |
| Sharp | For DG-PUSCH and CG-PUSCH, at least the PDSCH with MAC-CE for activation of SP-CSI reporting on PUCCH can be transmitted in the middle of the TboMS transmission. There is no such restriction for SP-CSI on PUCCH in the specification. |
| ZTE | It seems HW has already provided why there is no misalignment issue for SP-CSI/A-CSI on PUCCH/PUSCH in the first round of discussion.  @QC, Sharp, Regarding SP-CSI on PUCCH, it is activated by MAC-CE. UE will only report CSI on PUCCH after the UE sends HARQ-ACK for the PDSCH carrying activation command. So, there seems no misalignment of the number of UCI bits between gNB and UE.  Regarding CSI part-2, Rank 1 is assumed when determining the number of bits. This is the same as legacy, and we don’t see any issue here.  *A UE shall perform semi-persistent CSI reporting on the PUCCH applied starting from the first slot that is after slot when the UE would transmit a PUCCH with HARQ-ACK information in slot n corresponding to the PDSCH carrying the activation command described in clause 6.1.3.16 of [10, TS 38.321] where  is the SCS configuration for the PUCCH.* |
| Spreadtrum | Agree with QC, we support Option C.  For the SP-CSI on PUCCH activation, we also find there would be cases that SP-CSI on PUCCH is activated during the transmission of TboMS. As shown below, which also obey the timeline in 38213 mentioned by ZTE.    For CSI part 2, the discussion in [107-e-NR-7.1CRs-01] can help. It is majority view that an actual number of part 2 CSI reports determined by 9.2.5.2 in a PUCCH resource. Thus, CSI part 2 bits can only be known after the decoding the CSI part 1. |
| Intel | Share similar view as ZTE. For SP-CSI, it is triggered by MAC-CE. The payload size should be available before multiplexing on TboMS.  For A-CSI on PUSCH, it is triggered by DCI without or with data. If this is carried by TboMS, there is no issue as if UE misses the DCI, UE will miss the whole TboMS transmission. |
| Ericsson | Qualcomm’s points on SP-CSI activation timing make sense to us.  Again, it is unclear to us why gNB would schedule large CSI payloads that could conflict with TboMS transmissions. Furthermore, as we show in R1-2112611, if PUSCH is repeated, then the few tenths dB difference we observed between Options B and C disappears. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We share the same view with QC and Sharp. The semi-persistent CSI can be activated even after the first transmission of TboMS, which cannot guarantee the exact UCI payload prior to the index of staring points in bit selection. |
| LG | In our understanding, multiplexing of SP-CSI with Option B may require some specification enhancements but A-CSI multiplexing does not cause any problems to apply Option B.  P/SP-CSI   * There is a timeline requirement between the last symbol of PDCCH transmission for PUSCH scheduling and the first symbol of PUSCH for P/SP-CSI multiplexing. Thus, it may or may not available to determine the UCI payload size prior to the start of the TboMS transmission. * P/SP-CSI can be multiplexed in any slot within a single TboMS transmission. Depending on the slot position in which the CSI is multiplexed, the problem of systematic bits loss may not occur. * In coverage limited case which requires lots of resources for CSI, CSI can be transmitted using PUCCH with repetitions.  1. CSI  * There is no timeline issue for A-CSI multiplexing on TboMS. * There is no misalignment issue. * A-CSI is always multiplexing in the first slot of the TboMS transmission. It is likely to causes systematic bit loss problem. * In coverage limited case, then large value of beta-offset can be indicated so lots of resources can be required for CSI multiplexing. Since it is not available to transmit A-CSI using PUCCH, many resources of the A-CSI multiplexing slot can be used for A-CSI transmission.   In that sense, we support to apply Option B for A-CSI multiplexing, and Option C for other UCI types including SP-CSI. |
| Vivo2 | Agree with QC’s analysis. And on top of SP-CSI, A-CSI has similar issue with respect to the CSI part 2 size determination. Thus, we support option C. |
| Nokia/NSB | Agree with QC’s analysis. In addition, on the one hand, S0 in the current UCI multiplexing timeline determination is the first symbol of the earlies PUCCH or PUSCH among a group of overlapping PUCCHs and PUSCHs in the overlapping slot. On the other hand, it has been agreed that the index of the starting coded bit for each transmitted slot is predetermined prior to the start of the TboMS transmission. The latter cannot be guaranteed when applying the legacy timeline condition on top of Option B. In other words, S0 should be modified if Option B is adopted. Therefore, we support option C. |

**2.1.3.2-Q3**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company / Supported Option | Answer to 2.1.3.2-Q3. |
| QC | Currently, no scheduling restrictions on HARQ multiplexing on CG-PUSCH exist besides following the N2 timeline. This is quite attractive to gNB scheduler design and is in fact being pursued for DG-PUSCH as well in R17 TEI.  Thus, if we consider a 32-slot TBOMS, its not possible to predict the sequence of HARQ payloads that get generated and need to be multiplexed on the latter slots. I am assuming we don’t want to impose DG-PUSCH style restrictions on CG-PUSCH as well.  @ZTE: Regarding this comment: “Option C would introduce new UCI multiplexing procedures for UCI of more than 2 bits, with replacing rate-matching by puncturing. This would cause performance loss as commented by other companies, and also complicate both UE and gNB implementation as they need to handle two different UCI multiplexing procedures.  No changes to UCI handling are necessary for Option C. We simply follow the existing procedures as they are. Only when it comes to starting bit determination, we assume that no UCI multiplexing is going to occur. Also the main motivation is not just error propagation, but more fundamentally, an inability to predict future UCI payloads.  **To proponents of Option B:** would it help if we amend Option C to say that we nominally reserve a certain percentage of resources in anticipation of UCI and only use the remaining resources towards starting bit calculation? This lets us sidestep some of error propagation and UCI payload prediction issues while also being a little mindful of UCI multiplexing. It decouples the dynamics of UCI multiplexing from TBOMS operation. The nominal percentage can be left to gNB discretion, so if you don’t want to use it, you don’t have to use it. |
| OPPO | It was commonly used since the beginning of NR that the DAI can correct the missing of PDSCH-HARQ ACK bits missing. So that will ensure the same understanding of ACK/NACK bits to be multiplexed.  In Rel-15 2<= bits are punctured and otherwise is rate-matched. The reason is comprised solution. Some companies worry about they can not have sufficient time to know the HARQ bits, and they have to prepare the data coding in the parallel. |
| Sharp | For CG-PUSCH, PDCCH triggering a HARQ-ACK PUCCH can be transmitted in the middle of the TboMS. There is no such restriction in the specification. |
| ZTE | We share with OPPO that the existing DAI mechanism could correct the number of HARQ-ACK bits due to missing DCI in practice. It was a common sense that there is no need in RAN1 to pursue any optimization for the cases that cannot be resolved by existing DAI mechanism, i.e., the following two corner cases in case of no UL total DAI:   * More than 3 DCIs are missed at the same time. Assuming the possibility of missing one DL DCI is about 1%, **then missing 4 DCIs would be 10E-8. Do companies think we should address this corner case?** * The last DCI is missed. In such case, it would cause lots of problems even in Rel-15/16. **Because gNB and UE would even have a different understanding about which PUCCH resource is chosen. Do companies think we should address this corner case?**   **Again, do we really need to resolve such corner cases with sacrificing the performance?**  @QC, I can understand your point. But, if the starting bit is not changed by UCI, it is equivalent with using puncturing for UCI multiplexing, including the case for more than 2 bits. That’s the reason why the performance would be degraded as it may puncture the systematic bits. If rate-matching is used for all slots of TboMS as a whole, such performance loss could be avoided.  In addition, as commented above, UCI bits could always be predicted for SP/A-CSI and also HARQ-ACK if we don’t consider the corner cases.  @ FL,Please let me reply your comments made in the email reflector.   * Regarding the timeline, we have the same view as the majority that there is no need to change legacy timeline. * Regarding the comments that TboMS repetition can be relied on to resolve the performance loss due to UCI multiplexing, I really don’t think so. Firstly, not all UEs may support TboMS repetition, according to the views from a large majority companies in UE feature agenda. Secondly, it is not efficient to enable TboMS repetition to solve the performance loss just because of UCI multiplexing. * Regarding the comments that the same problem affects legacy PUSCH repetitions Type A, we think it is clear that we use only single RV with continuous starting bit across slots for TboMS, which is different from legacy where different RVs are used. In addition, we didn’t solve the missing DCI issue for PUSCH repetition in legacy. Why we should resolve for TboMS? Note that, even there is no error propagation issue in legacy, gNB may also fail to decode PUSCH very likely if gNB and UE has different understanding of UCI bits in one repetition. Because, gNB would perform joint decoding of all repetitions together (i.e., gNB would not try to blindly choose only some of repetitions for decoding). * Regarding your following comments, the possibility of UCI multiplexing on the first slot is 1/N, which is clearly much higher than missing DCI. If we don’t think UCI payload would be very large in coverage limited scenario, then the same can apply to Option B. Note that, in case of 1-2 bits UCI multiplexing, there is no difference between Option B and Option C as they are both using puncturing for UCI multiplexing.   *‘Assuming that UCI multiplexing would always occur during the first slot, and that the UCI payload would always be large enough to impact the decodability of the TboMS, i.e., the TBS is small, is also a corner case. ’*  *@*Sharp*,* We agree it is allowed for CG PUSCH. And we also don’t think we need to introduce any restriction for CG TboMS in Rel-17. Because, as commented above, the misalignment issue is not typical to deserve any further optimization especially if it could degrade the performance. |
| Panasonic | Based on TS38.213, if one of the PUCCH transmissions or PUSCH transmissions is in response to a DCI format detection by the UE, the UE expects that the first symbol of the earliest PUCCH or PUSCH, among a group overlapping PUCCHs and PUSCHs in the slot, satisfies the following timeline conditions  - is not before a symbol with CP starting after after a last symbol of any corresponding PDSCH  There is no timing condition for PUSCH transmission by the UE is not in response to a DCI format detection (i.e., CG PUSCH). Then, exact UCI size for UCI multiplexing over PUSCH would not be known prior to the determination of the index of the staring coded bit for each allocated slot for TboMS. |
| Spreadtrum | We agree with QC and Sharp that dynamic HARQ-ACK on CG-PUSCH would be a problem. |
| Intel | As mentioned by other companies, the timeline on multiplexing HARQ-ACK on PUSCH is specified in Section 9.2.5 in 213, which is only based on N2 value for DG-HARQ-ACK on CG-TboMS. For 2-bit HARQ-ACK feedback, A/N bits punctures the PUSCH, so there is no issue for multiplexing on TboMS. For > 2 bit HARQ-ACK feedback, as mentioned by OPPO and ZTE, existing DAI mechanism when scheduling PUSCH can ensure there is no mis-understanding between gNB and UE in term of UCI payload size. |
| Ericsson | Agree with Qualcomm that CSI can occur in a slot after the first slot of a CG-TboMS. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Even though DAI can help the size of HARQ-ACK, DCI scheduling HARQ-ACK itself can be missed.  Also, if puncturing is applied instead of rate-matching even for UCI of more than 2 bits, the performance of Option B is no longer better than that of Option C. This handling procedure according to UCI payloads should not be modified from the current procedure. |
| Samsung | First of all, we fully agree FL’s assessment on the necessity of splitting the UCI types for this starting bit determination issue, which is not necessary.  Second, pls also note, such issue is really impacting the UE implementation aspect, e.g., option C allows the bits to be self-contained in each slot while option B requires UE to adaptively adjust the bit size and bit starting positioning. This is a new requirement to UE, which could require additional assessment and evaluation.  More importantly, we have following WA/agreement saying that :   * Bit interleaving is performed per slot.          The index of the starting coded bit for each transmitted slot is predetermined prior to the start of the TboMS transmission.  So this limits us the choice to have very dynamic adjusting for the bit starting position. If any UCI multiplexing could not be known before the TboMS transmission, it will be invalid cases. **However, there is indeed some cases cannot be handled by option B if we need to consider the UCI multiplexing, and violates above agreement.** For example, for a TboMS transmission, with CSI UCI and potential SR request, since UE did not even know the whether there is SR prior to the TboMS, so the existence of SR will impact the CSI multiplexing bits in the PUSCH, UE cannot know the exact number of bits to be multiplexed. Then UE determine the starting coded bits for each transmitted slot prior to the start of the TboMS transmission.  Last, It has been emphasized by FL and some companies that such performance loss is really a questionable situation, it happens with multiple conditions to be satisfied: the coding rate should be related large or the UCI bits should be relatively large, it has to happen in the first slot, it also need there should be no repetition of TboMS. So it is not worthy to do such over-optimization considering the real situation from our point of view. |
| Vivo2 | For HARQ-ACK multiplexed on CG-PUSCH, the timeline is checked per slot, as shown in following text and figure   |  | | --- | | - is not before a symbol with CP starting after after a last symbol of any corresponding PDSCH, is given by maximum of where for the i-th PDSCH with corresponding HARQ-ACK transmission on a PUCCH which is in the group of overlapping PUCCHs and PUSCHs, |     The PDSCH may arrive in between PUSCH repetitions in Rel-16, and HARQ-ACK can be multiplexed to later slots. For TboMS, if UCI multiplexed in later slots, starting bit in the slot after the slot with multiplexed HARQ-ACK is determined according previous slot, and it cannot be known prior to the first slot of CG-TboMS. |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | In the current specification, for the UCI multiplexing, the maximum REs can be used for UCI multiplexing is controlled by the parameter *scaling*, and the minimum value for *scaling* is 0.5, which means, at most 50% of the resources for a PUSCH can be occupied by UCI multiplexing. Then it is hard to say that there is minor performance impact by calculating the starting bit without considering the UCI multiplexing. One alternative is that we could reserve some bits for the UCI multiplexing by calculating the starting bit, similar with the comments from QC. The base station can control the portion of the reserved bits for potential CSI multiplexing based. |
| Nokia/NSB | Agree with Qualcomm and same additional comments as for Q2. At the same time, we do not agree that reserving some bits in each slot when calculating the starting bit in each slot is a good way forward. This would basically bring us back to RV cycling within the single TboMS, de facto invalidating the agreements we had so far.  @ZTE: we are not sure the probability of the UCI multiplexing to occur in the first slot is 1/N. The calculation is more complicated than that, since we need to condition it to all the events that may result in UCI multiplexing to occur. Thus, it is in our view much lower than that. Furthermore, it does not really make a lot of sense to focus only on this probability without considering the ratio between UCI payload size and systematic bits in the first slot, the configuration or not of TboMS repetitions, and so on… |

FL’s comments on November 15

The discussion in previous round can be summarized as follows:

**Summary of companies’ views on question 2.1.3.2-Q2:**Answers from proponents of Option B:

* The network can ensure the same CSI payloads understanding of UE side to successfully decoded the piggy-backed CSI. If we assume TboMS cannot ensure the CSI payload, then it sems that the current CSI schemes cannot work reliably.
* The CSI report should not happen frequently, e.g., several different reports carried during TboMS and the rate-matching have to adapted slot by slot.
* UE will only report CSI on PUCCH after the UE sends HARQ-ACK for the PDSCH carrying activation command. Hence, no misalignment of the number of UCI bits between gNB and UE. The payload size should be available before multiplexing on TboMS.
* No issue with CSI part-2 payload determination since Rank 1 is assumed when determining the number of bits.

Answers from proponents of Option C:

* There is no restriction for SP-CSI on PUCCH in the specification. It impossible to predict beforehand that overlapping of TboMS and PUCCH carrying CSI for SP-CSI will not occur unless we impose additional restrictions on gNB scheduler.
* CSI part2 payload size is a variable payload that is dependent on the rank carried in CSI part 1. Therefore, an accurate accounting of CSI part 2 does not seem to be possible since the gNB needs to recover CSI part 1 to infer the size of CSI part 2.
* Ambiguity exists in case of missing SP-CSI activation/deactivation (PDSCH grant is missed or UE fails to decode PDSCH) and the UE and gNB cannot realign before the start of TboMS.
* R1-2112611 shows that if PUSCH is repeated, then the few tenths dB difference observed between Options B and C disappear
* The SP-CSI can be activated even after the first transmission of TboMS, which cannot guarantee the exact UCI payload prior to the index of staring points in bit selection.
* A-CSI has similar issue with respect to CSI part 2 size determination.
* On the one hand, S0 in the current UCI multiplexing timeline determination is the first symbol of the earliest PUCCH or PUSCH among a group of overlapping PUCCHs and PUSCHs in the overlapping slot. On the other hand, it has been agreed that the index of the starting coded bit for each transmitted slot is predetermined prior to the start of the TboMS transmission. The latter cannot be guaranteed when applying the legacy timeline condition on top of Option B. In other words, S0 should be modified if Option B is adopted.

In addition, one company (LG) proposed to apply Option B for A-CSI multiplexing, and Option C for other UCI types including SP-CSI.

**Summary of companies’ views on question 2.1.3.2-Q3:**Answers from proponents of Option B:

* DAI can correct the missing of PDSCH-HARQ ACK bits missing. So that will ensure the same understanding of ACK/NACK bits to be multiplexed.
* Not all UEs may support TboMS repetition.
* It is not efficient to enable TboMS repetition to solve the performance loss just because of UCI multiplexing.
* The possibility of UCI multiplexing on the first slot is 1/N, which is clearly much higher than missing DCI

Answers from proponents of Option C:

* No scheduling restrictions on HARQ multiplexing on CG-PUSCH exist besides following the N2 timeline currently.
* If we consider a 32-slot TBOMS, it’s not possible to predict the sequence of HARQ payloads that get generated and need to be multiplexed on the latter slots.
* There is no timing condition for PUSCH transmission by the UE in response to a DCI format detection (i.e., CG PUSCH). Then, exact UCI size for UCI multiplexing over PUSCH would not be known prior to the determination of the index of the staring coded bit for each allocated slot for TboMS.
* Even though DAI can help calculating the size of HARQ-ACK, DCI scheduling HARQ-ACK itself can be missed.
* If puncturing is applied instead of rate-matching even for UCI of more than 2 bits, the performance of Option B is no longer better than that of Option C. This handling procedure according to UCI payloads should not be modified from the current procedure.
* There are some cases that cannot be handled by option B if we need to consider the UCI multiplexing, and may also violate the agreement that the index of the starting coded bit for each transmitted slot is predetermined prior to the start of the TboMS transmission.
* Performance loss is really a questionable situation, it happens with multiple conditions to be satisfied: the coding rate should be relatively large, or the UCI bits should be relatively large, it has to happen in the first slot, it also need there should be no repetition of TboMS

Two companies (Qualcomm, Huawei/HiSi) proposed amending Option C to say that a certain percentage of resources is reserved in anticipation of UCI and only use the remaining resources towards starting bit calculation.

One company (Nokia/NSB) did not agree to reserve resource for UCI when calculating the starting bit. It was argued that this would basically bring us back to RV cycling within the single TboMS, de facto invalidating the agreements we had so far.

From FL’s perspective, the common understanding seems to be that, for UCI payload size less than or equal to 2 bits, Option B and Option C are identical. For UCI payload greater than 2 bits, the main issue is whether the UCI payload size is known prior to the start of the TboMS transmission or not, given the current agreement that “*The index of the starting coded bit for each transmitted slot is predetermined prior to the start of the TboMS transmission*”.

It appears that, regardless of how much time we spend discussing the issue, and how much effort is made to create consensus, companies’ opinions diverge both in terms of preference and understanding of the specification (from FL’s perspective, the latter is very strange since understanding of the spec should be the same for everyone…is the spec broken? I do not think it is likely).

Given the current situation, I would like to try building a bridge (again) and propose the **FL’s proposal 12** to find a middle ground between different preferences. I understand that this proposal is not fully compatible with the previous agreement on down-selecting only one Option B or Option C. However, I hope that companies can accept it for the sake of progress. If **FL’s proposal 12** is not acceptable to everyone then I am afraid that the only way forward is a hard decision made online based on companies’ preferences.

**FL’s proposal 12:**

* **The following procedure is applied for the determination of the index of the starting coded bit in each transmitted slot for a single TboMS:For UCI payload size less than or equal to 2 bits,**
  + **The index of the starting coded bit in the circular buffer is the index continuous from the position of the last bit selected in the previous allocated slot, regardless of whether UCI multiplexing occurred in the previous allocated slot or not.**
    - **Informative note to be removed: Option B and Option C are identical in this case.**
* **For UCI payload size greater than 2 bits,**
  + **If the UCI payload size is known prior to the start of the TboMS transmission, the index of the starting coded bit in the circular buffer is the index continuous from the position of the last bit selected in the previous allocated slot.**
    - **Informative note to be removed: Option B.**
  + **Otherwise, the index of the starting coded bit in the circular buffer is the index continuous from the position of the last bit selected in the previous allocated slot, regardless of whether UCI multiplexing occurred in the previous allocated slot or not.**
    - **Informative note to be removed: Option C.**
* **A UCI payload size is considered as known prior to the start of the TboMS transmission if the UCI multiplexing timeline requirements defined in Section 9.2.5 of TS 38.213 are satisfied prior to the start of the TboMS transmission.**

Companies are invited to express their views and **strong concerns**, if any, on **FL’s proposal 12** in the corresponding tables below. Please remember that without an agreement on this aspect, the TBoMS feature will be incomplete. It is extremely important that we find a way to break the deadlock. Constructive attitude in this sense is greatly appreciated. Thank you.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Company name |
| **Support FL’s Proposal 12** | Sharp, ZTE, Nokia/NSB, |
| **Do not support FL’s Proposal 12** | Panasonic, CATT, Huawei, Hisilicon, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, DCM, vivo |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Additional comments related to FL’s Proposal 12, if any. |
| Panasonic | We think the design is now complex more than necessary to achieve TboMS. Our view that is simply to take majority view is better. |
| CATT | We doubt that it is a practical and efficient exercise to specify two different bit mapping mechanisms for TboMS, and apply one at one time (and maybe the other one in another time) according to whether UCI payload size can be known prior to the start of TboMS or not. Unified solution is preferred. We can compromise to either one for the sake of progress (although our 1st preference is Option C). |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | It is complicating the design.  If both UCI taken into account or not in one TboMS transmission, we think it is simpler to apply the different starting bit calculation methods to the first TboMS slot and the other slots, because for the first slot, everything is ready according to the legacy behaviour. And this can address the performance degradation to some extent due to the UCI payload as commented by other companies that the system bits are more sensitive and the system bits are usually at the starting slots of the TboMS. Hence for compromise, our proposal is that:  **The index of the starting coded bit in the circular buffer is the index continuous from the position of the last bit selected in the previous allocated slot, only the UCI multiplexing in the first TboMS slot is considered. ~~Regardless of whether UCI multiplexing occurred in the previous allocated slot or not.~~** |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | The design is more complex with the proposal. We would also prefer a unified solution |
| QC | We really appreciate the FL’s effort to collect the various diverse opinions and to formulate a compromise solution.  The current proposal however is very difficult to specify and also quite difficult to write code for on the UE side.  What makes us uncomfortable about Option B is that it’s a fundamental departure from how we handle the dynamics of PUCCH/PUSCH/RACH/SRS. A general philosophy followed in the spec is to let these channel processes play out in parallel, and finally resolve them via the collision handling/prioritization/multiplexing framework.  What we are proposing with Option B is that we depart from this behavior and instead let these processes influence each other right from the beginning. It is also asking the UE to look up to 40 slots ahead (assuming DDDSU slot pattern) to resolve the various dependencies. Current UEs do not plan this far ahead and we assume neither do gNBs look this far ahead.  While our preference remains Option C we are open to a slightly different compromise:  **Compromise 1 (similar to HW proposal):** We follow Option B for the first slot of a single TBOMS, followed by Option C for subsequent slots.  This should address some concerns on systematic bits not being transmitted. This also lets us sidestep timeline issues. For the first slot, an accurate accounting of UCI should be possible.  **Compromise 2**: If compromise 1 is not acceptable, lets try if we can find some consensus around setting aside a fixed percentage (determined by RRC) of resources for UCI in each slot. We don’t think this proposal violates any previous agreement.  Also, given that we are in the final stages of this meeting, we should really be pinning down the exact equations to use.  This is clear for Option C: The index of the starting coded bit for the kth slot of a single TBOMS is given by , where  and  ,  where is the modulation order and is the number of REs available in the (k-1)th slot for transmission. is set to be the starting bit index of the RV associated with the single TBOMS.  Proponents of Option B need to clarify exactly what equations they have in mind. |
| NTT DOCOMO | The design is unnecessarily complicated. We prefer just Option B or C for simplicity, albeit we had hard time to make a consensus. If difficult, we can accept compromise 2 proposed by Qualcomm. |
| LG | We appreciate the FL’s effort.  FL’s proposal, HW’s proposal (i.e., Option B for the UCI multiplexed in the first slot, Option C for others), or LG’s proposal (i.e., Option B for A-CSI multiplexing, Option C for others) solves the performance degradation problem of UCI multiplexing.  For the sake of progress, we can accept FL’s proposal. Also, we are fine with HW’s proposal. |
| Intel | We appreciate FL’s great effort for handling this difficult topic.  We share similar view as other companies that the updated FL’s proposal seems to complicate the design quite substantially. We also prefer a simple solution for handling all different cases. From this perspective, it seems that the proposal from HW would be a good way forward as performance issue mainly exists when UCI is multiplexed in the first slot and systematic bits are dropped. Further, there is no issue for the timeline checking for UCI multiplexing on PUSCH, which is same as legacy behaviour. |
| ZTE | Very appreciate the FL’s great effort. We are fine with FL proposal which makes sense from our side. Basically, if the UCI bits can be known prior to the start of TBoMS, there is no reasoning to perform puncturing.  Based on the discussion, for sake of progress, we can also live with HW’s proposal. |
| vivo3 | Thanks for the effort. We share similar view the current proposal is too complicated. We Still prefer option C.  For QC’s compromise 1, it seems that it does not solve ambiguity on number UCI bits on first slot and has impacts on determination of starting bit in later slots.  For QC’s compromise 2, the performance would be degraded compared with type-A PUSCH repetition with same number of slots, when UCI multiplexing does not happen. Hence, also not preferred. |
| Nokia/NSB | We share similar view as ZTE. We can live with Huawei’s or Qualcomm’s Compromise 1 for the sake of progress. |

FL’s comments on November 16

Thank you all for your comments. I have the feeling that FL’s proposal has been appreciated but not all companies would be ready to support it, given its implications. Conversely, I believe that that middle ground proposal brought forward by Huawei/HiSi, and echoed by Qualcomm, received very promising feedback. I should say I find it balanced and I would like to thank proponents for their effort, which is very appreciated. For this reason, I think it’s worth giving it a try more officially to see if we can find a solution to this big issue. Please note that at present this is our most promising candidate! If this attempt fails, I doubt we’ll have other alternatives. I hope you can all be reasonable.

In this context, I would like to address a special comment to **@vivo**. I do not agree with your understanding of the solution proposed by Huawei/HiSi. From my perspective, it can in fact be phrased as follows:

1. For the first slot, legacy operations apply.
2. For all the other slots, puncturing is used for all UCI types in case of UCI multiplexing.

Therefore, if we agree that 1) cannot be problematic given that this is legacy operation, thus the determination of the bits for the first slot of TBoMS is not problematic. Then the question is about 2). In this regard, 2) is nothing more than Option C, for which the determination of the bits of any slot is not problematic by design, that you support (then I guess you agree that it is not problematic). So, the alternative proposal by Huawei/HiSi is not problematic for the first slot **and** is not problematic for any other slot. It is indeed an extremely promising candidate companies should consider very carefully. I hope that, given my explanation, you can reconsider your position. Thank you.

Having said all this, I’d like to add that I think that all the above applies in case of single TBoMS (without repetitions). I would assume that what Huawei/HiSi and Qualcomm had in mind when proposing this alternative was implicitly assuming that this also applies in case of TBoMS repetitions, given that timeline considerations and restrictions would be identical.

Given the above, FL’s proposal 12 is updated as follows.

**FL’s proposal 12-v2**

**For the determination of the index of the starting coded bit in a transmitted slot for TBoMS:**

* + **For the first TBoMS repetition:**
    - **For the first allocated slot for the first TBoMS repetition, Option B is used.**
    - **For the -th slot allocated for the first TBoMS repetition, with , sOption C is used.**
  + **For all other TBoMS repetitions, if any:**
    - **Option C is used.**

Companies are invited to express their views and **strong concerns**, if any, on **FL’s proposal 12-v2** in the corresponding tables below. Please remember that without an agreement on this aspect, the TBoMS feature will be incomplete. It is extremely important that we find a way to break the deadlock. Constructive attitude in this sense is greatly appreciated. In this context, if you object the proposal, please provide technical evidence! Do not simply state concepts like “this is problematic” but rather provide a clear example that shows why and how this is problematic. Thank you.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Company name |
| **Support FL’s Proposal 12-v2** | Spreadtrum, Intel, Panasonic, Sharp, Ericsson (if clarified), Huawei, Hisilicon (with clarification) |
| **Do not support FL’s Proposal 12-v2** | DCM, [SS], OPPO |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Additional comments related to FL’s Proposal 12-v2, if any. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Thanks for all your effort. However, the current proposal is not acceptable to us. The misalignment between gNB and UE on the first slot causes the most severe error propagation, because all starting points in subsequent slots are subjective to it. We do not prefer using OptionB on the first slot of TBoMS for this reason. |
| Spreadtrum | We support the proposal for progress.  The starting coded bit in the second transmitted slot considers the UCI multiplexing. For the other slots after second slot, starting coded bit does not consider the UCI multiplexing. It is a good balance between Option C and Option B. |
| Intel | We support this proposal as a good compromise for performance and implementation.  For mis-alignment issue, as commented by other companies, UL T-DAI can ensure same number of HARQ-ACK bits between gNB and UE side, so the mis-alignment issue rarely exists. For A-CSI, it is triggered with or without UL-SCH, so if UE misses the grant, the UE will not transmit TBoMS.  Minor editorial comment: “**~~s~~Option C**” |
| LG | We appreciate to FL to update the proposal, but we are not sure it captures HW’s proposal correctly.  When Option B is applied and UCI is multiplexed in the first slot of the TBoMS, it affects the determination of the starting coded bit of the second slot, not the first slot of the TBoMS. The starting coded bit of the first slot of the TBoMS transmission is the same regardless of whether UCI multiplexing is performed. Therefore, it seems to be the correct expression that Option B is applied to determine the starting coded bit of the second slot and Option C is applied to determine the starting coded bit in the remaining slots.  Based on our understanding, we reformulate the FL's proposal as follows,  **For the determination of the index of the starting coded bit in a transmitted slot for TBoMS:**   * + **For the first TBoMS repetition:**     - **For the first allocated slot for the first TBoMS repetition, the index of the starting coded bit in determined based on the applied redundancy version.**     - **For the ~~first~~second allocated slot for the first TBoMS repetition, Option B is used.**     - **For the -th slot allocated for the first TBoMS repetition, with , ~~s~~Option C is used.**   + **For all other TBoMS repetitions, if any:**     - **For the first allocated slot for the all other TBoMS repetitions, the index of the starting coded bit in determined based on the applied redundancy version.**     - **For the -th slot allocated for the all other TBoMS repetitions, with , Option C is used.** |
| CATT | We appreciate the effort from FL, and also HW and QC. Trying to understand the proposal better before we agree on it.  Both Option B and Option C are about the index of the starting bit in a slot. According to our understanding, the starting bit in the first slot of first TBoMS repetition should always be the first bit of the circular buffer (and no ‘previous slot’ to follow), regardless Option B or Option C. If this is the correct understanding, we do not see big difference between this compromised proposal and the original Option C, and why not just take Option C for simplicity.  Also a little confused by Spreadtrum and LG’s comment. Our understanding on the compromised proposal is differentiating the first slot and other slots. Not sure the proposal is differentiating the second (and first?) slot(s) and other slots. |
| Samsung | The proposed solution seems only prioritizing the first slot of first repetition with considering RV 0 is used so that systematic bit in the first slot. But we don't care the systematic bit in other repetition in other slots, it is not really reasonable. Because in overall, it’s just systematic bit in one repetition. so we are kind of hesitating for the compromise.  More importantly, I did not find the answer to my previous concern on option B, pasted below:   * Bit interleaving is performed per slot.          The index of the starting coded bit for each transmitted slot is predetermined prior to the start of the TboMS transmission.  **However, there is indeed some cases cannot be handled by option B if we need to consider the UCI multiplexing, and violates above agreement.** For example, for a TboMS transmission, with CSI UCI and potential SR(PUCCH) request with repetition, since UE did not even know the whether there is SR prior to the TboMS, so the existence of SR repetition could lead the drop of the CSI multiplexing bits in the PUSCH, so UE cannot know the exact number of bits to be multiplexed prior the start of TBoMS transmission, or to say, UE has to adjust the bit starting index even after transmission.  CSI SR TBoMS PUSCH |
| Panasonic | We support the proposal since it is a good balanced design between Option B and Option C. Our understanding is that the starting coded bit in the first allocated slot is determined based on RV index. Therefore, we interpret the intention of the proposal as follows:   * The index of the starting coded bit in the circular buffer **for the second allocated slot** is the index continuous from the position of the last bit selected in the previous allocated slot. * The index of the starting coded bit in the circular buffer **after the second allocated slot** is the index continuous from the position of the last bit selected in the previous allocated slot regardless of whether UCI multiplexing occurred in the previous allocated slot or not |
| OPPO | We don’t think the this is the good compromised. Simple solution of Option B should be applied. We think downlink DAI can avoid the problem of miss detection. And this solution is not found with problem.  Also, the roughly proposed comprised have problem. In option B and C it all says “the index of the starting coded bit in the circular buffer is the index continuous from the position of the last bit selected in the previous allocated slot …” That means for the first slot option B and C are same, since there is no slot before the first slot. We don’t think this is a good way to solution. So commented by DoCoMo. |
| Ericsson | We can also support the proposal in principle, but want to clarify regarding the second slot as follows. Note that we have ‘1< i <N’ rather than ‘1 < i <= N’  **the determination of the index of the starting coded bit in a transmitted slot for TBoMS:**   * + **For the first TBoMS repetition:**     - **For the first allocated slot for the first TBoMS repetition, Option B is used to determine the index of the starting bit of the second slot**     - **For the -th slot allocated for the first TBoMS repetition, with , Option C is used to determine the index of the starting bit of the i+1th slot.**   + **For all other TBoMS repetitions, if any:**     - **Option C is used.**   If this is the intention of the proposal, we can support. |
| NTT DOCOMO | @FL and all We would like to clarify if the miss-detection can be completely avoided by DAI. In our understanding, UE cannot know which slot UE should multiplex UCI on PUSCH by DAI, when DCI scheduling HARQ-ACK itself is not detected. It results in the misalignment between gNB and UE anyway. If this is wrong and DAI can solve the issue, we are fine with the proposal. |
| QC | Agree that it’s the second slot that’s impacted. We’ll need to revise. Okay to go with any of revisions offered by other companies.  @vivo, DCM, and others: We concede that missing the last DL DCI is an issue for CG-TBOMS. This is a weakness of the current proposal. Yes, it could derail all the subsequent transmissions. We don’t know of an easy fix, besides going with Option C. An alternative is offered at the bottom.  @SS: For this process to work, we need to compute “nominal resources used by UCI” based on a virtual UCI multiplexing process. I say “nominal” and “virtual” because, eventually the first slot PUSCH transmission could get dropped due to various prioritization rules. High priority SR can cancel low priority PUSCH, but we don’t intend to factor this in.  We may have to hash out more details and describe the procedure using equations to make sure it is water tight.  Here is a first cut (assuming no repetitions):  **Proposal:** The index of the starting coded bit for the kth slot of a single TBOMS without repetitions is given by , where  and  for ,  and  for  where:   * is the modulation order * is the number of REs available in the (k-1)th slot for transmission and is given by . is the scheduled bandwidth of the TBOMS transmission, expressed as a number of subcarriers. is the number of symbols allocated per slot of TBOMS as per the indicated/configured row of TDRA table. (This follows the logic and notation already used in 38.212) * is set to be the starting bit index of the RV associated with the single TBOMS. * , , and are the resources set aside for ACK and CSI payloads in the first slot and follow the definitions in Section 6.3.2.4 of 38.212. if .   Key question is whether , , and can be computed by the UE before the first transmission and whether there is a chance for misalignment.  If it helps vivo/DCM, we are okay to drop from the above equation since its unlikely to make a big impact. We can leave this in square brackets for now. But then, if we take this route, to compute the remaining two terms, we need to make some nominal assumptions. We can assume no ACK bits are to be multiplexed, i.e., assume . This should sidestep the missing DCI issue. |
| Apple | The first allocated slot could be invalid; thus the first transmission slot seems more appropriate. |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | We share the same comments from LG and Ericsson. And if the first slot has the problem of UCI misalignment, it also exists in case of single slot scheduling. And this issue is an issue of the legacy behavior. From this point of view, we think the FL’s proposal with the clarification is the better compromise. |

Comments on November 17

Thank you all for your comments.

@Samsung: QC provided an answer to your question. I hope this can be sufficient. Concerning your comment on the fact that we give priority to the first repetition, I think it is fair, however most companies think this may not be an issue after all.

@NTT DOCOMO / OPPO: my understanding is that UL T-DAI can address the issue you highlight, unless NW configures it poorly (and this is not something a smart NW would do).

@Apple: what you propose would significantly change they way available slot determination works. While I acknowledge that what you suggest makes sense technically, I am not sure most companies would agree to that change.

@Huawei/HiSi: you make a good point concerning the legacy behaviour.

@Qualcomm: I would avoid equations, since this is something the Editor can do according to what the Editor plans to do in TS 38.212. This helps us talking about the high-level modelling without risking excluding some cases from our analysis, e.g., yours is just (although, deliberately, of course) for the single TBoMS.

@All: If we cannot agree to this middle ground direction, the only option is to raise hands. I do not think this is beneficial for anyone, so please be open minded.

Having said all this, I will change FL’s proposal 12 according to suggestions proposed by Ericsson.

**FL’s proposal 12-v3**

**For the determination of the index of the starting coded bit in a transmitted slot for TBoMS:**

* + **For the first TBoMS repetition:**
    - **For the first allocated slot for the first TBoMS repetition, the index of the starting coded bit is determined based on the applied redundancy version.**
    - **For the ~~first~~second allocated slot for the first TBoMS repetition, Option B is used.**
    - **For the -th slot allocated for the first TBoMS repetition, with , ~~s~~Option C is used.**
  + **For all other TBoMS repetitions, if any:**
    - **For the first allocated slot for all other TBoMS repetitions, the index of the starting coded bit in determined based on the applied redundancy version.**
    - **For the -th slot allocated for all other TBoMS repetitions, with , Option C is used.**

This proposal could not be discussed during today’s GTW, hence I am copy-pasting the table with company’s names and adding a new table for any further comments. I would like to invite companies to update their position in the first table (I hope to see more companies in the “Support” list, of course…), and add comments in the second table **only if you cannot live** with FL’s proposal 12-v3.

I am sorry to repeat myself here. **Please be constructive**. The current proposal is already very inclusive and can help us avoiding very unpleasant discussions. If you can live with it, please do no object it. Thank you.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Company name |
| **Support FL’s Proposal 12-v3** | Spreadtrum, Intel, Panasonic, Sharp, Ericsson (if clarified), Huawei, Hisilicon (with clarification), QC(with note below), LG |
| **Do not support FL’s Proposal 12-v3** | DCM, [SS], OPPO |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Additional comments related to FL’s Proposal 12-v3, if any. |
| QC | FL, I was hoping we could get two chances at this --- first to agree to the above, and second to flesh out the equations. But unfortunately, this did not get treated in today’s GTW session. Too much of the design remains unfinished in the above proposal and we are afraid we cannot leave it to the editor’s discretion on this.  Can we add the following note:   * Note: Exact details on how Option B accounts for UCI multiplexing (e.g., explicity or implicitly) in the first slot is to be finalized before end of R1-107-e meeting.   SS, Vivo, DCM and others have raised valid concerns, and we want to arrive at a more carefully drafted solution. In particular, we are worried about CG-TBOMS and want to make sure we do not compromise this feature too much.  Since Option B inherits all the existing ambiguities of UCI multiplexing on PUSCH to TBOMS, it makes this feature less robust. Note that there still are CRs being discussed on this very topic. **We are looking for ways to encapsulate this feature in such a way that ambiguity in one slot does not impact ambiguity in the next slot.**  CG-TBOMS in particular could be very vulnerable to HARQ payload mismatches.  From our perspective, there are two ways to handle Option B --- explicit or implicit calculation of overhead. The two options are presented in the following proposal as Option B1 and Option B2:  **Proposal:** The index of the starting coded bit for the 2nd slot of the first single-TBOMS transmission is given by , where  where   * **Option B1**:   OR   * **Option B2:** , where is a higher layer parameter (can reuse existing RRC parameter in PUSCH-Config), * is the modulation order * is the number of REs available in the (k-1)th slot for transmission and is given by . is the scheduled bandwidth of the TBOMS transmission, expressed as a number of subcarriers. is the number of symbols allocated per slot of TBOMS as per the indicated/configured row of TDRA table. (This follows the logic and notation already used in 38.212) * is set to be the starting bit index of the RV associated with the single TBOMS. * , , and are the resources set aside for ACK and CSI payloads in the first slot and follow the definitions in Section 6.3.2.4 of 38.212. if .   Option B2 would be an elegant want to handle this without getting drawn into the issues with UCI multiplexing. It also addresses company concerns on CG-TBOMS. It is also easier to implement.  Further, if in future NR-U folks get interested in TBOMS, we don’t need an elaborate redesign of the feature to account for CG-UCI. **In a way, Option B2 is future-proof and encapsulates this feature from changes to other parts of the spec.**  Please ensure this gets discussed and finalized in this meeting. At the very least please seek company input on Option B1 and Option B2. We are worried there is no common understanding between the companies. |
| FL | @Qualcomm: Thanks for your further comments. From my perspective, B1 is what the Editor would pick and that’s why I said that in my view this is an editorial problem. Indeed, it takes current definitions and maps them to Option B. It would seem a natural way forward, and certainly not less elegant than B2, in my view at least (it is subjective, I guess…). Conversely, B2 opens the door to several questions on “how do we handle reserved resources”, on “whether this introduces a gap in the continuous bit selection from the circual buffer”, on “how to configure it”, on th “whether exceptions exist” and so on. In this context, please note that the current reservation framework applies only to one UCI type, with payload restrictions. Some companies even claim this does not help completely unless specific assumptions are made un the UL T-DAI (and even there, there does not seem to be consensus on this understanding). I wonder how it could be claimed that it helps completely in the case of TBoMS. I am not saying it cannot work, or that it’s very hard. I am simply saying it is less natural and would open further questions and discussions.  Now, aside from the above, what would the note add to the picture? There is only one GTW left, and there is no time for email approval. I do not think that is a road we can take. Conversely, I have no issue with your idea of asking companies to express their views on B1 and B2. If anything, new can be worked out quickly, we can endorse the proposal with the new piece. If we do not manage to do so, I guess companies will have to take responsibility for the lack of progress.  **@ALL: please ensure to add to your comments to FL’s proposal 12-v3, if any, also a feedback on what Qualcomm refers to as B1 and B2. If consensus exists on one of the two ways, it will be accounted for at the next update. If consensus does not exist, I am afrait only two options exist: we either go with the current proposal or we do not complete the feature.** |
| Panasonic | We support the FL’s proposal 12-v3. In our view, semi-static reservation can be achieved via lower MCS. |
| QC | @FL thanks for your consideration.  @all: Our concern with Option B1 is that we take the existing issues with ambiguity on UCI multiplexing and make it worse by letting it impact (N-1) other slots.  Again, CG-TBOMS is the one most impacted as it doesn’t have any of the safeguards provided by uplink-tDAI.  We are trying to avoid this while adhering to the basic tenets of Option B.  We already have a scaling factor in the spec, lets put it to use here. It will put us in a better position. Else, I can already see a long CR phase for TBOMS. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support Option B2 proposed by Qualcomm. This Option can simply reuse the existing scaling. |
| Samsung | To FL and QC, the answer from QC is not actually targeting our question. Our question was the SR repetition could lead to drop of CSI, and then impact the CSI bit multiplexed in PUSCH. This is directly impacting the QC’s mentioned key question: “*Key question is whether Q\_ACK^' , Q\_(CSI-1)^', and Q\_(CSI-2)^' can be computed by the UE before the first transmission and whether there is a chance for misalignment*.” We are not asking higher priority SR to cancel PUSCH.  To FL’s proposed B2, so we understand it as kind of pre-configuration of a group of bits to be multiplexed by UCI. It can help to avoid the tedious and unclear discussion for different UCI. But it causes more issues, current UCI multiplexing behaviour is also comparing the atual UCI RE to be mutiplexied and the number can be multiplexed (which is almost same as the here). So do you then propose different handling to this behaviour, e.g., there is no comparision, the multiplexed UCI bits are always decided by this , and the actual UCI bits are rate matched. And if there is no UCI bits, or less bits to implemented, does the preconfigured bit size will be kept as padding bits, zero, or can be used for PUSCH transmission? If the front one, it seems still impacts the performance; if the later one, it seem still dynamically change the bit starting. So to us, this B2 is no better than C.  To be honest, as we consulted with UCI experts, there will be many cases realted to the actual bits to be multiplexed, we don't even touch the high or low priority, different and multiple PUCCH with PUSCH, different SCS etc. so we realy doublt we can design a solution can well handle all the potential cases, which is even problematic to UCI people. So option C is quite safe for us, as whatever UCI multiplexing is done can be self-contained in the given slot. |

### [OPEN] UCI multiplexing

Most contributions acknowledged the fundamental nature of this aspect and discussed it in detail. The summary of companies’ preferences and opinions based on the contributions is organized accordingly.

**Whether UCI multiplexing on PUSCH is supported for TBoMS**

* Support UCI multiplexing in TBoMS PUSCH **[3]**:
  + NEC [25], Samsung [9], InterDigital [14],

**Where and how to apply the UCI multiplexing**

* Legacy UCI multiplexing behaviour for PUSCH repetition type A is reused for TBoMS (UCI is multiplexed on the overlapping slot) **[11]**:
  + NEC [25], Samsung [9], LGE [28], Ericsson [21], NTT Docomo [26], Qualcomm [17], MediaTek [20], WILUS [7], China Telecom [11], Panasonic [18], Xiaomi [13]
* UCI repetition on multiple slots of TBoMS **[3]**:
  + InterDigital [14], Ericsson (for CSI or HARQ-ACK, if multiplexing in multiple slots is supported) [21], TCL [4]
* The REs occupied by UCI are evenly divided and mapped in each of the overlapped slots **[2]**:
  + CATT (the current UCI mapping rules can be reused for UCI multiplexing in one slot) [8], OPPO [9]
* One company (LGE [28]) proposed that, in case of aperiodic CSI reporting with TBoMS transmission, it is necessary to clarify the location of the slot resource for aperiodic CSI multiplexing among the N allocated slots of TBoMS.

**The number of coded modulation symbols per layer calculation**

* Two companies (LGE, Sharp) proposed that, for the determination of the number of coded modulation symbols per layer, is further multiplied by N, where N is the number of slots allocated for TBoMS.
* One company (Huawei/HiSi) proposed that the parameter should be redefined to compensate the coding rate as follows:
  + for HARQ-ACK;
  + for CSI part 1;
  + for CSI part 2;

where is the scaling factor to calculate for TBS determination, and the parameters , , and are the coding rate compensation parameters for HARQ-ACK, CSI part 1, and CSI part 2, respectively, configured in RRC.

* One company (NTT Docomo) proposed that how to calculate the number of coded modulation symbols for UCI in TBoMS PUSCH should be discussed.
* One company (WILUS) proposed that the number of coded modulation symbols for the UCI in a slot (Q’ACK, Q’CSI-1, and Q’CSI-2) can be determined with following methods for UCI multiplexing on single slot for a single TBoMS.
  + Alt 1: TBS, i.e., is scaled by 1/N, where N is the number of slots allocated for a single TBoMS.
  + Alt 2: The number of coded modulation symbols for the UCI in a slot is determined based on the number of available PUSCH resource across N slots, i.e., .
* One company (vivo) proposed using the following equation for calculating the number of symbols for UCI multiplexing on a single TBoMS.

Where is the total number of OFDM symbols of the PUSCH across N slots for a single TBoMS, including all OFDM symbols used for DMRS; and is the total number of OFDM symbols of the PUSCH within one slot for TBoMS, including all OFDM symbols used for DMRS.

* One company (CATT) proposed that the number of available slots for TBS determination can be used to determine the data rate for UCI resource computation and the number of available overlapping slots between PUCCH and TBoMS can be used to determine the upper bounder of UCI resource on TBoMS.
* One company (Panasonic) proposed that and should be calculated per slot basis and for the calculation of , TB size before multiplying scaling factor K should be used.
* One company (NEC) proposed that, when calculating ratio of resources for UCI in PUSCH in a slot, additional scaling factor based on scaling factor K used for TBoMS TB size determination should be considered.
* One company (LGE) proposed that is the number of symbols for TBoMS in a corresponding slot in which UCI is multiplexed for determination of the values of , , , and .

FL’s comments on November 11

From FL’s perspective, two major aspects can be isolated in this discussion:

* How UCI is multiplexed on PUSCH for TBoMS (e.g., according to legacy approach or not)
* Whether the number of coded modulation symbols per layer for UCI multiplexing on a single TBoMS should be calculated differently from its PUSCH repetition Type A counterpart (and how, if applicable)

I suggest discussing the two aspects in this order, and one conditioned to the other. In other words, I would first discuss about the how UCI is multiplexed on PUSCH for TBoMS, to then move to the second aspect, if needed.

In this context, it is rather evident to me that most companies (i.e., 11) prefer reusing existing approaches for UCI multiplexing on PUSCH for TBoMS, with no specific optimizations. From FL’s perspective, this approach is not only reasonable but also more aligned with the scope of the WID, for the following reasons:

* Time domain resource determination for TBoMS is built upon its PUSCH repetition Type A counterpart. Signalling and logics are reused. Why would TBoMS need to handle UCI multiplexing differently from PUSCH repetition Type A is unclear, especially considering the specification impact of such change.
* The scope of AI 8.8.1.2 is to specify the support of TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH:
  + Enhancing coverage/structure of UCI is not within the scope of AI 8.8.1.2
  + Performance of UCI over multiple slots has not been studied in detail during the SI nor ever considered to be a possible candidate for inclusion in the WID.
  + All other enhancements related to control channel in AI 8.8.2 are related to dynamic repetition factor indication and DM-RS bundling.

Given all the above, it is rather natural from FL’s perspective to propose reusing the existing legacy UCI multiplexing behaviour for PUSCH repetition type A is reused for TBoMS (UCI is multiplexed on the overlapping slot). The following proposal is made.

**FL’s proposal 4**

**Existing legacy UCI multiplexing behaviour for PUSCH repetition type A is reused for TBoMS (UCI is multiplexed on the overlapping slot).**

**FFS: details on the calculation of the number of coded modulation symbols per layer for UCI multiplexing on a single TBoMS**

##### **First round of discussions**

FL’s recommendation is to have a first round of discussion about **FL’s proposal 4**. Companies are invited to input their views in the corresponding table below. Constructive attitude in this regard is greatly appreciated. In this sense, if you cannot support the proposal, please propose an alternative formulation which considers the current spirit of the proposal. If you do so, I’d like to invite you to be pragmatic and acknowledge that focus on the scope of the WID and on the prioritization of the completion of the feature over the micro-optimizations which cannot be immediately agreed by everyone.

**FL’s proposal 4**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Company name |
| **Support FL’s Proposal 4** | DCM, QC, Sharp, Nokia/NSB, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, Panasonic, SS, vivo, Ericsson, WILUS, Xiaomi |
| **Do not support FL’s Proposal 4** |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Additional comments related to FL’s Proposal 4, if any. |
| Sharp | With the above proposal, no timeline related discussion would be required. |
| LG | We’d like to clarify that the ‘existing legacy UCI multiplexing behaviour’ in the proposal is only for ‘UCI is multiplexed on the overlapping slot’ or include other aspects on UCI multiplexing. We are ok with the proposal if the first sentence means ‘UCI is multiplexed on the overlapping slot’ only.  In addition, we suggest to clarify the slot resource for aperiodic CSI multiplexing. |
| Intel | Need clarification on the “Existing legacy UCI multiplexing behaviour” whether timeline is included in the proposal. If this is the case, suggest to defer the discussion once the agreement for single TBoMS structure is made. |
| InterDigital | We have the same clarification question as LG, i.e., whether we are agreeing on the part "UCI is multiplexed on the overlapping slot" or the PUSCH type A repetition multiplexing is to be reused. |
| ZTE | We think all the following legacy UCI multiplexing behaviors could be reused, including   * UCI is multiplexed on the overlapping slot * Legacy UCI multiplexing timeline for both DG and CG * Puncturing for 1-2 bits UCI and rate-matching for more than 2 bits UCI. |
| CATT | Considering the limited time left, we can compromise to this proposal.  FL: Thank you for being constructive! |

FL’s comments on November 12

The discussion in previous round can be summarized as follows:

* 12 companies support FL’s proposal 4. No company expressed objections.
* One company (Intel) suggests postponing the discussion on timeline.
* Two companies (LGE, InterDigital) suggest further clarifying the “Existing legacy UCI multiplexing behavior”
* Two companies (Sharp, ZTE) suggest that all legacy UCI multiplexing behaviors, including the timeline, should be included.

From FL’s perspective, all aspects related to how resources for UCI multiplexing over the PUSCH are allocated (via puncturing or rate-matching) and timeline requirements cannot be included in the discussion/proposal, yet. Indeed, a decision and an agreement in Section 2.1.3.2 (Option B or Option C) would be needed, before being able to take any decision on these two aspects.

The intention of FL’s proposal 4 in this context was to agree that regardless of the outcome of the discussion in Section 2.1.3.2, UCI is multiplexed on the overlapping slot. I think we can afford agreeing on other aspects of UCI multiplexing, when discussion in Section 2.1.3.2 is stable, without pausing this discussion in the meantime. I thus suggest taking a step-by-step approach.

Given the above, FL’s proposal 4 is reformulated as follows to capture the outcome from previous round and provide the necessary clarifications.

**FL’s proposal 4-v2**

**~~Existing legacy UCI multiplexing behaviour for PUSCH repetition type A is reused f~~For TBoMS, ~~(~~UCI is multiplexed on the overlapping slot~~)~~.**

**FFS: how resources for UCI multiplexing over the PUSCH are allocated (via puncturing or rate-matching) and timeline requirements**

**FFS: details on the calculation of the number of coded modulation symbols per layer for UCI multiplexing on a single TBoMS.**

Companies are invited to update their preference, if applicable, and input their views in the corresponding table below. Constructive attitude in this regard is greatly appreciated. Please comment **only if you have strong concerns**. In this sense, if you cannot support the proposal, please propose an alternative formulation which considers the current spirit of the proposal. If you do so, I’d like to invite you to be pragmatic and acknowledge that focus on the scope of the WID and on the prioritization of the completion of the feature over the micro-optimizations which cannot be immediately agreed by everyone.

**FL’s proposal 4-v2**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Company name |
| **Support FL’s Proposal 4** | DCM, QC, Sharp, Nokia/NSB, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, Panasonic, SS, vivo, Ericsson (with clarification), WILUS, Xiaomi, ZTE, Apple, Spreadtrum, Intel, CATT, LG, Huawei, Hisilicon, |
| **Do not support FL’s Proposal 4** | OPPO |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Additional comments related to FL’s Proposal 4-v2, if any. |
| OPPO | We wonder if the timeline can be multiplexing can be TBoMs based (e.g per N slots). The considering is the TBoMS can perform the timeline of multiplexing based on the TBoMS level, and then there is no problem for the option B and C.  Note, we interprate the timeline based TBoMS level is still reusing the current rules. Only the granularity changed. |
| Ericsson | While we are fine with the intent of the proposal, the new FFS is a bit unclear. The puncturing or rate matching should refer to Options B vs. C, but ‘puncturing’ could also refer to the up to 2 bit Rel-15/16 puncturing used to carry HARQ-ACK (Step 5 in section 6.2.7 in 38.212). The simplest way would be to avoid this, i.e. we suggest:  **FFS: how resources for UCI multiplexing over the PUSCH are allocated ~~(via puncturing or rate-matching)~~ and timeline requirements** |
| Samsung | Some comments for E/// change, for our understanding we should not introduce new behaviour for UCI multiplexing besides what we already have, i.e., puncturing and rate matching. What E/// has mentioned is also one of the discussion point if they want to limit the case of applying puncture or rate matching. Although we think there should be no difference for slot for option C. thus, we suggest following note:  **FFS: how resources for UCI multiplexing over the PUSCH are allocated ~~(via puncturing or rate-matching)~~ and timeline requirements**  **Note: there is no new UCI multiplexing mechanism introduced other than existing puncture or rate-matching.** |

FL’s comments on November 15

Thank you all for the comments. The following agreement was made during the GTW on November 15.

|  |
| --- |
| **Agreement**   * For TBoMS, UCI is multiplexed on the individual overlapping slot for UL transmission in one carrier * FFS: timeline requirements * FFS: details on the calculation of the number of coded modulation symbols per layer for UCI multiplexing on a single TBoMS. * Note: no new UCI multiplexing mechanism other than existing puncturing or rate-matching is introduced for TBoMS in Rel-17. |

We have two FFS points to solve.

Both cannot be solved until an agreement is made in Section 2.1.3.2, hence this discussion is paused until then.

**FL’s comments on November 17**

Given that available time is scarce, I am afraid we cannot postpone this discussion any longer and we have to discuss about this aspect in parallel with the discussion in Section 2.1.3.2, at least for what concerns the second FFS point of the agreement above (whereas the first one can only be solved after an agreement is made in Section 2.1.3.2).

According both to FL’s understanding and to the proposals of most companies, the number of coded modulation symbols (or, equivalently, RE) per layer for UCI multiplexing on a single TBoMS could then be calculated straightforwardly for , , , and , using the Rel-16 equations in TS 38.212 as follows:

* is the number of symbols in an available slot for TBoMS in which UCI is multiplexed.
* The CB size (which for TBoMS corresponds to the TBS) is scaled by , where N is the number of slots allocated for TBoMS (and the only supported TBS scaling factor for TBoMS in Rel-17). In other words, becomes . It would then be up to Editor to decide how to capture this scaling in the specification.

The following proposal is then made.

**FL’s proposal 11**

**For UCI multiplexing on an available slot for TBoMS, the following are supported in Rel-17 for calculating , , , and :**

* **is the number of symbols in an available slot for TBoMS in which UCI is multiplexed.**
* **The CB size is scaled by , where N is the number of slots allocated for TBoMS, i.e., becomes .**

**Note: It is up to the Editor to decide how to capture the scaling in the specification.**

Companies are invited to express their views and **strong concerns**, if any, on **FL’s proposal 11**, in the corresponding tables below. Constructive attitude is greatly appreciated. Thank you.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Company name |
| **Support FL’s Proposal 11** | LG, Panasonic, QC, DCM, WILUS |
| **Do not support FL’s Proposal 11** |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Additional comments related to FL’s Proposal 11, if any. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## Mid priority aspects

Five mid priority aspects are identified at the beginning of the meeting:

1. Time domain resource determination
   * 1. Candidate values for N
     2. Candidate values for M
2. Data rate calculation and UE behavior related to TBS determination
   * 1. How to handle configuration of TBS larger than the size of one CB
3. Frequency hopping
4. Retransmission

Significant attention has been given by several companies to such aspects in the submitted contributions. Although arguably less paramount at this stage of the discussion, they have been included here and will be discussed when need arises, regardless of how many high priority aspects are still being discussed. Summary, discussion, and FL’s comments/proposals on these aspects are provided in the following different sub-sections, whose numbers are given in the list above.

### [CLOSED] Time domain resource determination

#### [CLOSED] **Candidate values for N**

Companies’ preferences concerning other candidate values for N are as follows.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Candidate value | Support | Not support |
| **1** | InterDigital [14], Huawei/HiSi [3], OPPO [9], CMCC [12] | CATT [8] |
| **3** | CMCC [12], Ericsson [22], | CATT [8] |
| **5** | CMCC [12], | CATT [8] |
| **6** | CMCC [12], Ericsson [22], | CATT [8] |
| **12** | Ericsson [22], | CATT [8] |
| **16** | Ericsson [22], ChinaTelecom [11], | CATT [8] |

In addition, one company (Huawei/HiSi [3]) proposed that N=1 should be the default value if N is not configured.

FL’s comments on November 11

From FL’s perspective, the usage of N = 1 was already agreed in RAN1#106bis-e meeting, implicitly via this agreement.

|  |
| --- |
| **Agreement**  For TBoMS transmission in Rel-17:   * TBoMS feature is enabled (or disabled) by configuring (or not) the number of allocated slots for a single TBoMS (N) in a row of the TDRA table.   + TBoMS transmission is enabled when N>1, where N is the number of allocated slots for a single TBoMS.   + Single-slot PUSCH transmission is enabled when N=1.   + Supported combinations of N and M that can be configured in the TDRA table, these combinations are constrained by retransmission are to be further discussed |

Given that discussions on supporting the above remaining candidate values for N were carried out during RAN1#106bis-e meeting without reaching consensus and that discussions on this aspect for TBoMS may not be as paramount as discussions on the higher priority aspects in Section 2.1, FL suggests postponing discussions on this topic until need arises.

#### [OPEN] **Candidate values for M**

Companies’ preferences concerning other candidate values for N are as follows.

* All combination for N\*M should be supported **[6]**:
  + CMCC [12], Samsung [19], Sharp [24], ~~Panasonic [18],~~ ZTE [5], vivo [6],
* N\*M does not exceed 32 **[5]**:
  + ZTE [5], Huawei/HiSi [3], vivo [3], CATT [8], CMCC [12], Panasonic [18]
* For Rel-17 TBoMS transmission in both dynamic grant and configured grant, if the parameter *numberOfRepetitions* is not configured in the TDRA table, then the number of repetitions M of a single TBoMS is equal to 1 **[1]**:
  + Nokia/NSB [21]

FL’s comments on November 11

No restriction to the values that that combination of N\*M can take have been proposed by companies. This leaves the only agreed limitation to be that N\*M does not exceed 32. On the other hand, one company focuses the attention on a configuration implication which may need to be worked out in view of the upcoming update of the CR for TS 38.214, i.e., the default value of M when *numberOfRepetitions* is not configured in the TDRA table. The following proposal is thus formulated.

**FL’s proposal 5**

**For TBoMS repetitions, if the parameter *numberOfRepetitions* is not configured in the TDRA table, then the number of repetitions M of a single TBoMS is equal to 1.**

##### **First round of discussions**

FL’s recommendation is to have a first round of discussion about **FL’s proposal 5**. Companies are invited to input their views in the corresponding table below. Constructive attitude in this regard is greatly appreciated. In this sense, if you cannot support the proposal, please propose an alternative formulation which considers the current spirit of the proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Company name |
| **Support FL’s Proposal 5** | DCM, LG, Nokia/NSB, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, Intel, Panasonic, SS, vivo, ZTE, Huawei, Hisilicon, CATT, Ericsson,TCL, WILUS |
| **Do not support FL’s Proposal 5** |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Additional comments related to FL’s Proposal 5, if any. |
| QC | Needs discussion/clarification.  Are we envisioning a scenario where N is included in the TDRA table but not M?  Is this trying to clarify behavior when R15 TDRA tables are used? Our assumption was that if the UE does not support enhanced TDRA tables, then TBOMS cannot be used. |
| Sharp | We are fine with the proposal. On the other hand, it can be up to RAN2 since it is just a default value of a RRC parameter. |
| Panasonic | Our preference on N\*M is updated. Our view is that all combinations of and with are supported. |
| Xiaomi | Why RRC parameters *pusch-aggregationFactor* and *repK* designed in Rel-15 can’t be applied for TBoMS? We suggest the following proposal:  **For TBoMS, if the parameter *numberOfRepetitions* is not configured in the TDRA table, and the RRC parameter *pusch-aggregationFactor* for DG is not configured or *repk* for CG is equal to 1, then the number of repetitions M of a single TBoMS is equal to 1.** |

FL’s comments on November 12

The discussion in previous round can be summarized as follows:

* 15 companies support FL’s proposal 5.
* One company (Qualcomm) suggests further discussing the issue on whether the presence of *numberOfRepetitions* is mandatory when *numberOfSlotsTBoMS-r17* is present.
* One company (Xiaomi) proposes considering also *pusch-aggregationFactor* and *repK* for the indication of M.

From FL’s perspective, the issue on how to indicate M has been discussed extensively in the previous meetings, which resulted in the agreement that M is indicated by *numberOfRepetitions*. In this proposal, we discuss the default value of M when *numberOfRepetitions* is not configured. Given the request from Qualcomm, I would like to collect companies view on question 2.2.1.2-Q1 below. It’s FL understanding that the feature is not broken if there is no further agreement on this aspect. Therefore, **please note that if there is no consensus on this aspect in the next round, we can simply close the discussion here.**

**2.2.1.2-Q1**

*Which of the following options should be considered (please select only one) for numberOfRepetitions parameter in case of TBoMS repetitions?*

* *Option 1 (FL’s proposal 5):* *if the parameter numberOfRepetitions is not configured in the TDRA table, then the number of repetitions M of a single TBoMS is equal to 1.*
* *Option 2: the presence of numberOfRepetitions is mandatory when numberOfSlotsTBoMS-r17 (N) is present.*

Companies are invited to input their views in the corresponding table below. Constructive attitude in this regard is greatly appreciated given that no objection to FL’s proposal 5 was received in the previous round.

**2.2.1.2-Q1**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Company name |
| **Option 1** | ZTE, Apple, Panasonic, Spreadtrum, Intel, CATT, DCM, WILUS, LG,SS, Nokia/NSB, CMCC,  Apple: we support Option 1 in general. One clarification question on *numberOfRepetitions*, here it refers to number of repetitions for TBoMS. Another similar parameter *numberOfRepetitions-r17* is defined in AI8.8.1.1. how to use these two parameters? Or just one parameter is enough. If N>1, then M is for TBoMS repetition; If N=1, M is for single-slot PUSCH repetition. We think there is only one Rel-17 TDRA table applying to both enhanced repetition type A and TBoMS.  Ericsson: As proposed in UE feature discussion, repetition of TBoMS can be a separate UE capability. So absence of M could an apply to a UE capable of single TBoMS, incapable of repetition of TBoMS. |
| **Option 2** | OPPO, ZTE (can live with), DCM (can live with it) |

FL’s comments on November 15

Thank you for your comments. Only one company prefers only Option 2, with other 2 companies who could live with it. Now, given that Option 1 is reusing the content of FL’s proposal 5, which had plenty of support, I would suggest confirming FL’s proposal 5. Please consider my answer to Ericsson to have further reason to support FL’s proposal 5.

@Apple: my understanding is that RAN2 would add a -r17 to any parameter that has -r17 peculiarities, regardless of how RAN1 calls the parameter in RAN1. What RAN1 needs to do is to provide a description of what the parameter does. RAN2 can then decide how to call the parameter. This has been done already. There will be only one parameter (used by AI 8.8.1.1 and AI 8.8.1.2). I hope this can clarify your doubt.

@Ericsson: I think what you say shows even more why Option 1 is more natural choice. Going for Option 1 ensures clarity of the spec, without if the column carrying the number of repetitions must always be present (even for UEs who do not support TBoMS repetitions). Option 2 would imply that NW shall include the column and explicitly set some values to M=1. This is much less natural logically.

@Qualcomm: The intention is not to support R15 tables for TBoMS but rather to assume that R16/R17 Tables can be configured by NW without the IE *numberOfRepetitions.* Think for instance to cases in which PUSCH repetition type A uses *repK* to configure the number of repetitions using R16 Table and CG-PUSCH Type 2, and *numberOfRepetition* is not present. According to agreements for AI 8.8.1.2, such tables could still be used for TBoMS, provided that the IE *numberOfSlotsForTBoMS* is configured. FL’s proposal 5 aims at providing spec clarity for this case, for which M would be equal to 1 by default.

@Sharp: I do not think this is something RAN2 should decide since it impacts how NW would configure the table (according to Option 1 or Option 2).

@Xiaomi: neither pusch-AggregationFactor or repK ae supported for configuring the number of TBoMS repetitions in Rel-17. RAN1 already agreed that an IE is added to the TDRA table to this end, i.e., *numberOfRepetitions.*

**FL’s proposal 5**

**For TBoMS repetitions, if the parameter *numberOfRepetitions* is not configured in the TDRA table, then the number of repetitions M of a single TBoMS is equal to 1.**

Companies are invited to update their views on **FL’s proposal 5** in the corresponding table below, if applicable. Constructive attitude in this regard is greatly appreciated. In this sense, if you cannot support the proposal, please propose an alternative formulation which considers the current spirit of the proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Company name |
| **Support FL’s Proposal 5** | DCM, LG, Nokia/NSB, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, Intel, Panasonic, SS, vivo, ZTE, Huawei, Hisilicon, CATT, Ericsson,TCL, WILUS, Sharp, Spreadtrum, OPPO, Apple |
| **Do not support FL’s Proposal 5** |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Additional comments related to FL’s Proposal 5, if any. |
| FL | @ALL: given that the proposal seems agreeable to all companies who added their name in the table above (no update was made), I would like to ask all to refrain from requesting further micro-optimizations of the proposal from now on, unless strong concerns exist, of course. **Please note that if I do not see any further objection, I would ask Chairman to endorse FL’s proposal 5 via email.** We are running out of time and we cannot afford using online time for all the topics, I hope I can count on your understanding of the situation. |
|  |  |
|  |  |

FL’s comments on November 17

Thank you all for your comments. The proposal looks stable and will be copied in the reflector for email approval. The discussion is closed.

### [OPEN] Data rate calculation and UE behaviour related to TBS determination

#### [OPEN] **How to handle configuration of TBS larger than the size one CB**

One company (LGE [28]) proposed that the UE behaviour when the calculated TBS exceeds the maximum TBS for single CB transmission should be discussed.

FL’s comments on November 11

From FL’s perspective, the discussion on this topic is relevant given that UE behavior in case the calculated TBS exceeds the maximum TBS for single CB transmission should be clarified to complete the feature. For instance, one natural consequence of the WA RAN1 made on rate-matching is that the case for which the calculated TBS exceeds the maximum TBS for a single CB transmission could be considered as an error case, i.e., the UE does not expect to be scheduled with TBoMS transmission and the TBS exceeding the maximum TBS for a single CB transmission. FL suggests starting this discussion after the WA has been confirmed, as per discussion in 2.1.3.1.

FL’s comments on November 17

This discussion is now open. Only one company commented explicitly on this, however I think it may be important to decide on this aspect which may affect UE behavior. Given that the evident argument exists in favor of creating special handling of this case, my suggestion is to simply agree that the above is an error case. The following proposal is thus formulated.

**FL’s proposal 13**

**The UE does not expect NW to indicate a TBoMS configuration which results in a TBS which exceeds the maximum TBS for single CB transmission.**

Companies are invited to express their views on FL’s proposal 13 and express strong concerns, if any, in the second table below. Please avoid commenting just to propose wording optimizations if you are fine with the spirit of the proposal. Thank you.

**FL’s proposal 13**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Company name |
| **Support FL’s Proposal 13** | LG, Panasonic, QC, DCM, SS, WILUS |
| **Do not support FL’s Proposal 13** |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Additional comments related to FL’s Proposal 13, if any. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

### [OPEN] Retransmissions

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

Four companies (Ericsson [22], Nokia/NSB [21], CATT [8], Intel [15]) proposed that partial retransmission is not supported for TBoMS (i.e., only TB-based retransmission is supported for TBoMS).

Two companies (Lenovo/Motorola [27], TCL [4]) proposed that retransmission procedure and signaling should be enhanced to support retransmission of only partial slots from the TBoMS. If retransmission for duration shorter than the overall duration of TBoMS is supported, then implicit/explicit configuration of the portion (duration) should be supported with portion indication in the retransmission DCI. Exact duration of the portion can be as follows:

* Explicitly configured to the UE
* Implicitly determined by UE depending on the duration of TBoMS, number of TOTs, duration of TOTs

One company (CMCC [12]) proposed that at least single slot PUSCH and TBoMS with and without repetition could be used for the retransmission of TBOMS.

One company (Apple [16]) proposed that it’s up to gNB scheduling to determine the TBoMS re-transmission is by TBoMS, or by repetition, or by single slot transmission.

FL’s comments on November 11

From FL’s perspective, the discussion on this topic is relevant given that RAN1 should decide on one approach on the retransmission of TBoMS in Rel-17 to complete the feature. If no further enhancement for the retransmission of TBoMS is agreed, it is a natural consequence to adopt the TB-based retransmission approach for TBoMS, i.e., gNB reschedules resource for the retransmission of the single TBoMS with or without repetition. Therefore, it is FL’s recommendation to adopt this approach as a baseline. Whether other approaches for TBoMS retransmission are also considered or not can be further discussed. Therefore, **FL’s proposal 6** and **question 2.2.3-Q1** are formulated as follows.

**FL’s proposal 6**

**The following approach is used as a baseline for the retransmission of a single TBoMS with or without repetition in Rel-17:**

* **The whole TB is scheduled for retransmission following at least Rel-17 TBoMS transmission with or without repetition.**
* **The gNB reschedules resource for the retransmission of the TB.**

A question is also added to start the discussion on whether other approaches for TBoMS retransmission are also considered or not.

**2.2.3-Q1** *Should the following additional retransmission schemes be supported for TBoMS?*

* *A TB initially transmitted by TBoMS is later retransmitted by a single-slot PUSCH*
* *A TB initially transmitted by TBoMS is later retransmitted by PUSCH repetition type A*
* *A TB initially transmitted by TBoMS is later partially retransmitted by resending only a portion of the slots from the initial transmission.*

##### **First round of discussions**

FL’s recommendation is to have a first round of discussion about **FL’s proposal 6** and **2.2.3-Q1**. Companies are invited to input their views in the corresponding table below. Constructive attitude in this regard is greatly appreciated. In this sense, if you cannot support the proposal, please propose an alternative formulation which considers the current spirit of the proposal.

**FL’s proposal 6**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Company name |
| **Support FL’s Proposal 6** | DCM, LG, Nokia/NSB, Intel, Panasonic, vivo, ZTE, CATT, Ericsson, Xiaomi, CMCC, Spreadtrum |
| **Do not support FL’s Proposal 6** | QC, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, TCL |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Additional comments related to FL’s Proposal 6, if any. |
| QC | Why do we need this? Are there any such restrictions between Type A and Type B repetitions? Lets leave it up to gNB.  FL: In several contributions submitted to #107-e and as you can see in the answers for question 2.2.3-Q1 below as well, a non-negligible number of companies do not support any retransmission schemes other than retransmission using TBoMS. The FL’s proposal 6 was formulated to capture these views and at least provide a workable and agreeable retransmission scheme to complete the feature. |
| Sharp | Intention of “the whole TB is scheduled” is not clear to us. Does it just exclude CBG-based scheduling? If so, we don’t need to agree Proposal 6 since it’s clear given we agreed only one CB is supported for TBoMS. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We don’t think it is efficient to retransmit entire TBoMS, but rather partial retransmission is more suitable, Similar concept as CBG could be applied, where the minimum unit of retransmission can be one slot. |
| TCL | Partial retransmission is more efficient. |
| CMCC | Though we propose to use single slot PUSCH for the retransmission, our thinking is that for the retransmission should be scheduled by gNB, with normal PUSCH without repetitions. Then it belongs to the 2nd bullet that gNB could re-schedule the re-transmission of the TB as legacy behavior. |

**2.2.3-Q1**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Support | Not support |
| A TB initially transmitted by TBoMS is later retransmitted by a single-slot PUSCH | DCM, QC, Sharp, Nokia/NSB, Intel, Panasonic, InterDigital, CATT, Spreadtrum | LG, Ericsson, Xiaomi |
| A TB initially transmitted by TBoMS is later retransmitted by PUSCH repetition type A | DCM, QC, Sharp, Nokia/NSB, Intel, Panasonic, CATT, Spreadtrum | LG, Ericsson, Xiaomi |
| A TB initially transmitted by TBoMS is later partially retransmitted by resending only a portion of the slots from the initial transmission. | Sharp, ~~LG~~, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, InterDigital, TCL | DCM, Nokia/NSB, Intel, Panasonic, [SS], vivo, ZTE, CATT, Ericsson, Xiaomi, Spreadtrum |

**Further comments on 2.2.3-Q1**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Views |
| QC | For retransmission, gNB must be allowed to pick any of the TDRA rows it wishes to use. No further restrictions are necessary. Rest is left to gNB discretion. We are assuming the use of implicit MCS here. No need to recalculate TBS.  If implicit MCS is not used, then the onus is on the gNB to make sure that the TBS calculation results in the same TBS as the first tx. Ensuring this works out is up to gNB. If gNB is able to make this work using Type A repetitions/single slot PUSCH, it should be allowed. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Same comment as for Proposal 6 |
| SS | Question to the 3rd methods, the CRC is not inserted to each slot, how to do the only portion of the slots to be transmitted? To us, for TBoMS, either it’s entirely decoded correctly and declared to be wrong. Then Re-tx is for the whole TB. |
| Vivo | Depending on discussion in section 2.1.1.1, if dynamic switching between N>1 and N=1 is supported in a single TBoMS and dynamic switching between TBoMS and slot based PUSCH is supported, mixed TBoMS and slot based PUSCH in initial transmission and restransmission can be supported. |
| LG2 | We have a clarification question on the third one. We think the value of N for retransmission of TBoMS can be changed depending on the network indication, since resource allocation for the retransmission is independent with the initial transmission in Rel-15/16 PUSCH. However, we don’t support slot level retransmission which allow retransmission of a part of slots selectively.  Thus, if the question implies slot level retransmission, we’d like to be excluded from the supporting company since slot level retransmission and independent indication of N for retx are different in our understanding.  FL: Your understanding of the question is correct that the last bullet in the question implies slot level retransmission. The independent indication of N is included in the second sub-bullet of FL’s proposal 6. In addition, if the gNB can change the value of N, then when N=1, it’s single-slot PUSCH as per the agreement. Then why such scenario cannot be supported? |
| ZTE | Regarding the first two cases, we don’t have strong preference but would like to hear companies’ views about the benefits of enabling such scheduling since it seems gNB cannot perform joint decoding by using both initial and re-transmission in these cases. |
| CATT | For the allocated resource of retransmission, we think it should be up to gNB scheduling. Just similar to Rel-16. No need to introduce restriction.  For the 3rd sub-bullet, we have the same understanding with LG. We think it only means retransmitting part of the TB is not supported. But the gNB is free to schedule a different N for retransmission than initial transmission, while keeping TBS unchanged. (Align with current principle)  FL: Please see my reply to LG above. |
| Ericsson | As we show in R1- 2112036, there are very few MCS states that would allow retransmission with a different N than the one used in original transmission. We do not see the need to support retransmissions of TBoMS using single slot and repetition Type A, or in general to use a different value of N in a retransmission.  Regarding partial transmission of a TB, this seems pretty complex, and we are not so clear on its need given that HARQ operation with smaller values of N is possible rather than retransmission of part of a large N. |
| Xiaomi | We think the first 2 restrictions are not needed which can be achieved by the gNB’s scheduling.  FL: It seems to me that there is a misunderstanding. The three bullets in 2.2.3-Q1 are not the restriction. The question in 2.2.3-Q1 is that whether the scenarios in these three bullets are additionally supported on top of retransmission using TBoMS as in FLs proposal 6 or not. |

FL’s comments on November 12

The discussion in previous round can be summarized as follows:

* 3 companies do not support FL’s proposal 6 because of the following reasons:
  + Restriction of retransmission approach is not needed.
  + Partial retransmission is more suitable/sufficient.
* 3 companies do not support the scenario “A TB initially transmitted by TBoMS is later retransmitted by a single-slot PUSCH”.
* 3 companies do not support the scenario “A TB initially transmitted by TBoMS is later retransmitted by PUSCH repetition type A”.
* 10 companies do not support the scenario “A TB initially transmitted by TBoMS is later partially retransmitted by resending only a portion of the slots from the initial transmission.”

From FL’s perspective, it’s fair to say that the majority does not support partial retransmission by resending only a portion of the slots. I then suggest not to continue proposing this approach any longer, given that it is far from reaching consensus. In addition, it is important to note that the feature would not be broken if no further decision is made for TBoMS retransmission. Indeed, the situation is very clear in this regard, If there is no consensus on whether specific optimizations/restrictions should be introduced for retransmitting TBoMS, then it is up to the gNB to reschedule the TB. Given that only one TB is considered for TBoMS, and only one CB is supported for TBoMS in Rel-17, no other issue is envisioned for the retransmission.

Given the current situation, I made a modification to FL’s proposal 6. Companies are invited to provide their view in the table below, **only if very strong concerns exist**.

|  |
| --- |
| **Please note that if FL’s proposal 6-v2 is not agreeable to everyone then we can conclude that there is no consensus to introduce any enhancement or restriction on the retransmission of TBoMS.** |

**FL’s proposal 6-v2**

**For the retransmission of a single TBoMS with or without repetition in Rel-17:**

* **~~The whole TB is scheduled for retransmission following at least Rel-17 TBoMS transmission with or without repetition.~~**
* **gNB schedules retransmission of the TB according to existing mechanisms.**

Companies are invited to input their views in the corresponding table below. Constructive attitude in this regard is greatly appreciated. In this sense, if you cannot support the proposal, please propose an alternative formulation which considers the current spirit of the proposal.

**FL’s proposal 6-v2**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Company name |
| **Support FL’s Proposal 6-v2** | QC, OPPO, Sharp, ZTE, Apple, Panasonic, Spreadtrum, CATT, Ericsson, DCM, LG,SS, Huawei, Hisilicon, Nokia/NSB, |
| **Do not support FL’s Proposal 6-v2** |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Additional comments related to FL’s Proposal 6-v2, if any. |
| Intel | Need clarification on the “according to existing mechanisms”. TBoMS is a new feature, and it is not clear to us what is the existing mechanism?  We are fine to leave this to scheduler decision in case of retransmission, e.g., dynamic change between TBoMS and single-slot PUSCH w/ and w/o repetition, different number of repetitions for TBoMS. We do not think restriction is needed. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Considering the majority and sake of progress, we are fine to accept the proposal 6-v2 and not consider partial retransmission |
|  |  |

FL’s comments on November 15

The discussion in previous round can be summarized as follows:

* 15 companies supported the FL’s proposal 6-v2.
* One company requested for further clarification.

In addition, the following version of proposal 6 was discussed during the GTW on November 15, and only one company expressed concern/requested for further clarification. From FL’s perspective, given that the wording of this version seems to be stable, it will be used for further discussion. Therefore, please consider the following proposal, which according to FL has no specification impact. This is one of the reasons which bring me to invite all of you not to suggest micro-optimizations and focus on the important aspects.

**FL’s proposal 6-v3**

**For the retransmission of a single TBoMS with or without repetition in Rel-17:**

* **The retransmission of the entire TB is up to gNB, e.g, could be single slot PUSCH retransmission or TBoMS retransmission, etc.**

**Note: this has no specification impact.**

Companies are invited to update their view, if applicable, and provide comments in the corresponding table below **only if you have strong concerns**. Constructive attitude in this regard is greatly appreciated. In this sense, if you cannot support the proposal, please propose an alternative formulation which considers the current spirit of the proposal. If you do so, I’d like to invite you to be pragmatic and acknowledge that focus on the scope of the WID and on the prioritization of the completion of the feature over the micro-optimizations which cannot be immediately agreed by everyone.

**FL’s proposal 6-v3**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Company name |
| **Support FL’s Proposal 6-v3** | QC, OPPO, Sharp, ZTE, Apple, Panasonic, Spreadtrum, CATT, Ericsson, DCM, LG,SS, Huawei, Hisilicon, Nokia/NSB, Intel, vivo |
| **Do not support FL’s Proposal 6-v3** |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Additional comments related to FL’s Proposal 6-v3, if any. |
| CATT | OK with the updated proposal. One more clarification: ‘with or without repetition’ shall not only apply to initial transmission but also apply to retransmission.  Eventually, the gNB shall feel free to use any of ‘single slot PUSCH without repetition’, ‘single slot PUSCH with repetition’, ‘TBoMS without repetition’, ‘TBoMS with repetition’ in initial transmission or retransmission, and no restriction is specified. |
| Apple | We have the same understanding as CATT on this proposal. |
| Intel | Share similar view as CATT as commented in GTW. |
| FL | @CATT, Apple, Intel: I confirm that your understanding is correct. The proposal is written with respect to TBoMS, since this is what we are working on in this AI. However, if no restrictions are agreed (as it is the case), this is valid for all the PUSCH scheduling possibilities, as you say. Furthermore, the proposal explicitly states that there is not specification impact associated to it, which is another confirmation of the understanding above.  @ALL: given that the proposal seems agreeable to all companies who added their name in the table above (no update was made), I would like to ask all to refrain from requesting further micro-optimizations of the proposal from now on, unless strong concerns exist, of course. **Please note that if I do not see any further objection, I would ask Chairman to endorse FL’s proposal 6-v3 via email.** We are running out of time and we cannot afford using online time for all the topics, I hope I can count on your understanding of the situation. |
| OPPO | Although we agree the proposal, we think the conclusion is somehow partial.  What we had agreed for TBoMS is a framework based on multiple TDRA entries. The, entry you selected for each transmission and retransmission is independent to each other. If the above can be agree, we can also allow the initial transmission is with TDRA entry of N=1, but the retransmission will be N>1.  In general, this is also the “existing” allowed behaviour we mean in the previous version of proposals. |
| Ericsson | We are OK with the proposal in principle, but are concerned that it could be misread. ‘The retransmission of the entire TB is up to gNB’ could mean that it is up to gNB to indicate to UE to retransmit a portion of a TB or not.  Also, while we would be fine if retransmitting an entire TBoMS can be guaranteed without specification impact, we are not clear on how this can be. We suggest the following:  **FL’s proposal 6-v3**  **For the retransmission of a single TBoMS with or without repetition in Rel-17:**   * **The gNB schedules only complete retransmissions of TBs.**   + **How t~~TT~~he retransmission of the entire TB is done is up to gNB, e.g, could be single slot PUSCH retransmission or TBoMS retransmission, etc.**   **~~Note: this has no~~ FFS: specification impact, if any.** |

FL’s comments on November 17

Thank you for the additional views. @Ericsson: I have to say I was not expecting your comment, given that:

* The original formulation does not state anything about partial retransmission.
* No signaling framework has been discussed for allowing partial retransmission.
* All proponents of partial retransmission have kindly reconsidered their position for the sake of progress.
* No spec impact is expected if the retransmission framework is not modified to include special treatment of TBoMS.

In this context, I am sorry to say that this comment is only delaying progress. Now, I hope you can understand that modifications to the Note are unjustified. Hence, I will not accept them. Conversely, and given what I wrote above I will accept your other modifications since they do not change the meaning and the spirit of the proposal in any way. I hope other companies can accept this, and that we can aim at email approval of this proposal without any need for further online time for it.

FL’s proposal 6 is modified as follows.

**FL’s proposal 6-v4**

**For the retransmission of a single TBoMS with or without repetition in Rel-17:**

* **The gNB schedules only complete retransmissions of TBs.**
  + **How the retransmission of the entire TB is done is up to gNB, e.g., could be single slot PUSCH retransmission or TBoMS retransmission, etc.**

**Note: this has no specification impact.**

I hope no concern/objection exists at this stage on **FL’s proposal 6-v4**. If any, please input it in the table below at your earliest convenience. Thank you. **If no comment is received in the next 24h, I will assume the proposal is stable and ask for email approval**.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Additional comments related to FL’s Proposal 6-v4, if any. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## Others

As discussed at the beginning of Section 2, discussions on different aspects of TBoMS have been prioritized to ensure that constructive discussions and effective progress can be achieved during RAN1 #107-e. Priority has been given to the aspects and topics discussed in sections 2.1 and 2.2. All other aspects are listed in this section, i.e, 2.3, where proposals made by companies in their contributions are reported and described in detail.

These aspects may not be handled during RAN1 #107-e, unless technical need arises during the discussion on other aspects. For this reason, no specific FL’s proposal or recommendation is formulated at this stage. Should discussions for 2.1 and 2.2 progress fast and converge to agreements, sections for specific aspects, currently in 2.3, may be open for discussions and corresponding FL’s proposals and recommendations may be made.

### [CLOSED] Time domain resource determination

#### [CLOSED] **Time domain resource determination for TBoMS for CG-PUSCH Type 1**

One company (Xiaomi [13]) proposed reusing the RRC parameters pusch-aggregationFactor and repK to indicate the number of repetitions of TBoMS.

One company (Huawei/HiSi [3]) proposed that, for TBoMS transmission with type 1 configured grant, a new field should be introduced in IE ConfiguredGrantCofig to indicate the number of allocated slots for a single TBoMS transmission.

* For TBoMS transmissions with type 1 and type 2 configured grant, is provided by a new field in IE ConfiguredGrantConfig and is provided by the indexed row in the TDRA table if it is present in the TDRA table, respectively.
* When TBoMS transmission is enabled, the field repK is used to indicate the number of TBoMS repetitions.

FL’s comments on November 11

From FL’s perspective, discussions on these aspects may not be as paramount as discussions on the higher priority aspects in Sections 2.1-2.2. In addition, relevant discussions on this topic may be needed under AI 8.8.1.1 first. Therefore, FL suggests postponing discussions on this topic until need arises.

### [CLOSED] Relationship with other channels and signals

#### [CLOSED] **Dropping rules**

One company (InterDigital [14]) proposed that, in case of uplink cancellation, the UE resumes the TBoMS transmission in the next allocated slot.

One company (Ericsson [22]) proposed that:

* PUCCH repetition can override the transmission of a single TBoMS or repetitions of TBoMS in the overlapping slot(s).
* Rel-17 PUSCH dropping rules include the case that one particular slot is determined as an available slot for multiple time-overlapping UL channels or signals (including TBoMS, Type A PUSCH repetition enhancement option 2, A-SRS, or SPS HARQ-ACK). RAN1 is to define the priority of the multiple time-overlapping UL transmissions. The UE only transmits the channel or signal with the highest priority in overlapping symbols in the slot.

One company (TCL [4]) proposed that only dropping the overlapped slot(s) should be considered for TBoMS transmission when collision happen.

One company (OPPO [9]) proposed that slot dropping can puncture those slots after interleaving and bit selection.

One company (Intel [15]) proposed that TBoMS is considered as low priority uplink transmission.

FL’s comments on November 11

From FL’s perspective, the basic framework of dropping rules applied for TBoMS was agreed in RAN1#106bis-e meeting as in the following agreement.

|  |
| --- |
| **Agreement**  The UE determines whether or not to drop a slot determined as available for TBoMS transmission according to Rel-15/16 PUSCH dropping rules, where the dropped slot is still counted in the N allocated slots for the single TBoMS transmission.  FFS: Rel-17 PUSCH dropping rules are also applied if introduced in other WI(s) |

Given that discussions on this aspect for TBoMS may not be as paramount as discussions on the higher priority aspects in Sections 2.1 and 2.2, FL suggests postponing discussions on this topic until need arises.

#### [CLOSED] **Timeline requirements**

Timeline requirement is applied for the overlapping slot (legacy timeline requirement): Samsung [19], InterDigital [14], Huawei/HiSi [3], vivo [6], Spreadtrum [23]

One company (Intel [15]) proposed that two options can be considered for UCI multiplexing timeline.

* Option 1: UCI multiplexing timeline is determined based on the first symbol of TBoMS transmission.
* Option 2: UCI multiplexing timeline is determined based on the first symbol of the overlapped slot for TBoMS transmission.

FL’s comments on November 11

From FL’s perspective, discussions on these aspects would already occur in Sections 2.1.3.2 and 2.1.4, if needed. FL suggests postponing further elaborations on the timeline to a later time, should any specific need arise.

### [CLOSED] TBoMS repetitions

#### [CLOSED] **Slot mapping for TBoMS repetitions**

One company (InterDigital [14]) proposed that both non-interleaved and interleaved slot mapping are applied for TBoMS repetitions when DM-RS bundling is enabled and disabled, respectively.

### [CLOSED] FDRA

Three companies (Samsung [19], TCL [4], Xiaomi [13]) proposed that the maximum number of PRBs for TBoMS is limited.

FL’s comments on November 11

From FL’s perspective, albeit relevant in general, discussions on this aspect for TBoMS may not be as paramount as discussions on the higher priority aspects in Sections 2.1-2.2. In addition, relevant discussions on this topic may be carried out under Section 2.2.2.1. Therefore, FL suggests postponing discussions on this topic until need arises.

### [CLOSED] Transmission power determination

One company (InterDigital [14]) proposed that the transmission power determination of TBoMS is based on all the REs allocated in the N available slots for the TBoMS transmission, excluding the overhead of reference signals.

One company (Ericsson [22]) proposed reusing Rel-16 transmission occasion of power determination for TBoMS.

One company (Huawei/HiSi [3]) proposed that each available slot identified by UE is considered as a transmission occasion for TBoMS transmission, and the transmission occasion-based power control, UCI multiplexing, rate matching in the current specification is reused.

FL’s comments on November 11

In RAN1#106bis-e meeting, the following agreements were made:

|  |
| --- |
| **Agreement**   * For transmission power determination of TBoMS transmission in Rel-17, RAN1 to down-select one of the following two options: * Option 1: The transmission power determination of TBoMS should be based on all the REs allocated in one available slot for the TBoMS transmission, excluding the overhead of reference signals * Option 2: The transmission power determination of TBoMS should be based on all the REs allocated in the N available slots for the TBoMS transmission, excluding the overhead of reference signals. * FFS: details on BPRE   **Agreement**  BPRE for TBOMS is calculated as  where N is the number of slots allocated for a single TBOMS and  is the number of allocated REs in one allocated slot of a single TBOMS.  Note: How this equation or its equivalent is captured in the specification is left to the editor |

Given that a definition of the BPRE for TBoMS has been agreed, the need to discuss the definition of transmission occasion for power control of TBoMS is unclear. Given that the relevance of this definition is w.r.t. to the DM-RS bundling / JCE, it would seem more reasonable to discuss it in the corresponding AIs. Now, since no discussion is occurring in AI 8.8.1.3 and 8.8.2 about this, then FL does not see any urgency to complicate the discussion and introduce “noise” that does not seem to be needed to have a clean and working feature. Given that two comments out of three with comments seem to support this understanding, FL’s recommendation is not to discuss this aspect any longer and reuse the available definition in the specification.

### [CLOSED] Frequency hopping

Many contributions acknowledged the importance of this aspect and discussed details in their contributions. Expressed preferences are summarized in the following table.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Support | Not support |
| Inter-slot frequency hopping with inter-slot bundling for a single TBoMS with DM-RS bundling | CATT [8], China Telecom [11], Panasonic [18], Intel [15] |  |
| Inter-slot frequency hopping with inter-slot bundling for a single TBoMS without DM-RS bundling | TCL [4] |  |
| Inter-repetition FH for TBoMS repetitions | Intel [15] | Vivo [6] |
| Intra-TB frequency hopping for TBoMS | Xiaomi [13] |  |

FL’s comments on November 11

From FL’s perspective, it is more relevant to discuss the inter-slot frequency hopping with inter-slot bundling for a single TBoMS with DM-RS bundling (which was proposed by four companies as summarized above) under AI 8.8.1.3 and/or AI 8.8.2. In addition, discussions on supporting the above remaining frequency hopping scenarios were carried out during RAN1#106bis-e without reaching consensus. Given that the legacy inter-slot and intra-slot FH schemes were agreed to be supported for TBoMS in RAN1#106bis-e already, discussions on FH may not be as paramount as discussions on the high and mid priority aspects in Sections 2.1 and 2.2.

### 2.3.7 [CLOSED] Application of DM-RS bundling to TBoMS

One company (InterDigital [14]) proposed that joint channel estimation for TBoMS repetition is supported.

### 2.3.8 [CLOSED] Interlaced TBoMS transmission

One company (Qualcomm [17]) proposed that interlaced TBoMS transmissions (carrying different TBs) are not permitted. A UE does not expect a TBoMS transmission in a component carrier to begin before the completion of an ongoing TBoMS transmission in the same component carrier.

# 3 Proposals for GTW

**FL’s proposal 1**

**A single RV is used to transmit a single TBoMS.**

**FL’s proposal 2**

**Confirm the following working assumption:**

**Working Assumption**

**For TBoMS in Rel-17, the following is supported:**

* **Bit interleaving is performed per slot.**

**·       The index of the starting coded bit for each transmitted slot is predetermined prior to the start of the TBoMS transmission.**

* **Transmission is limited to one CB only.**
* **FFS: whether UCI multiplexing bits or cancellation/dropping of coded bits, if any, have to be known prior to the determination of the index of the starting coded bit for each transmitted slot or not**
* **FFS: Performance with UCI multiplexing on single and multiple slots of a single TBoMS**

**Note: How UCI multiplexing and cancellation/dropping of coded bits influence the sequence of coded bits transmitted in each slot of a single TBOMS is to be further discussed. Some knowledge on UCI to be multiplexed or cancellation/dropping of coded bits in each slot of a single TBOMS may be known prior to the start of a single TBOMS transmission. How this is to be handled is to be discussed further.**

**FL’s proposal 3**

**For the bit selection for each transmitted slot for TBoMS, the index of the starting coded bit in the circular buffer is the index continuous from the position of the last bit selected in the previous allocated slot, regardless of whether UCI multiplexing occurred in the previous allocated slot or not.**

**FL’s proposal 4**

**Existing legacy UCI multiplexing behaviour for PUSCH repetition type A is reused for TBoMS (UCI is multiplexed on the overlapping slot).**

**FFS: details on the calculation of the number of coded modulation symbols per layer for UCI multiplexing on a single TBoMS**

**FL’s proposal 5**

**For TBoMS repetitions, if the parameter *numberOfRepetitions* is not configured in the TDRA table, then the number of repetitions M of a single TBoMS is equal to 1.**

**FL’s proposal 6**

**The following approach is used as a baseline for the retransmission of a single TBoMS with or without repetition in Rel-17:**

* **The whole TB is scheduled for retransmission following at least Rel-17 TBoMS transmission with or without repetition.**
* **The gNB reschedules resource for the retransmission of the TB.**
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# Appendix A: Proposals from contributions aggregated by topic

## A.1 Time domain resource determination

**TDRA Table**

|  |
| --- |
| **R1-2112036 Ericsson**  **Proposal 3.** All the entries in a Rel-17 TDRA list are either for PUSCH repetition or for TBoMS. An exception is N=1 and M=1 for single-slot PUSCH is included in the TDRA table for TBoMS.  **R1-2111508 Intel**  **Proposal 2**   * TDRA table partitioning can be employed to differentiate single-slot PUSCH and TBoMS transmission.   Number of rows allocated for single-slot PUSCH transmission can be configured as part of TDRA table. |

**Candidate values for N**

|  |
| --- |
| **R1-2111621 CMCC**  **Proposal 3:**  Slot number of 3,5,6 should be supported for TBoMS.  **R1-2111793 Interdigital**  **Proposal 1**: A TDRA table can include the value N=1 along with values of N>1.  **R1-2112036 Ericsson**  **Proposal 5.** {3, 6, 12, 16} can be considered for the candidate numbers of slots for a single TBoMS.  **R1-2110790 Huawei/HiSi**  **Proposal 1:** should be supported as a candidate value of the number of allocated slots for a single TBoMS transmission.   * should be the default value if is not configured.   **R1-2111272 CATT**  **Proposal 7:** No other values beyond {2, 4, 8} is supported for number N of allocated slots for a single TBoMS.  **R1-2111329 OPPO**  **Proposal 2:** For Rel-17 N=1 is also supported in addition to N>1 for the TRRA table, and its TBoMS transmission feature is enabled or disabled by N.  The TB size determination, Rate matching, RE mapping, PC and others can be process based on N with one framework.  **R1-2111427 ChinaTelecom**  **Proposal 1:** The maximum value of allocated slots for the single TBoMS is at least 16. |

**Candidate values for M**

|  |
| --- |
| **R1-2111621 CMCC**  **Proposal 4:**  All the combinations that N\*M below 32 should be supported for TBoMS.  **R1-2111752 Samsung**  **Proposal 1**: no further limitation on the combination of N\*M.  **R1-2112020 Sharp**  **Proposal 4**: No other values other than 1,2,3,4,7,8,12,16 are not supported for indicating M.  **Proposal 5**: No other restriction on the combination of N and M is necessary.  **R1-2110790 Huawei/HiSi**  **Proposal 2:** The further constraints on are not supported besides is no more than the maximum repetition factor supported in AI 8.8.1.1, e.g., is a valid value of repetition factor supported in AI 8.8.1.1.  **R1-2110919 ZTE**  **Proposal 4:** On top of existing agreed values for N and M, there is no need to restrict the combination of M and N in TDRA table, except for the condition of N\*M 32.  **R1-2111028 vivo**  **Proposal 1:** All combinations of N\*M based on candidate values of N and M can be supported, as long as N\*M is not greater than 32.  **R1-2111272 CATT**  **Proposal 8:** No other constraint is specified for combination of {N, M} beyond the restriction of N\*M≤32.  **R1-2111438 Panasonic**  **Proposal 1:** No further constraints on is necessary.  **R1-2110864 Nokia/NSB**  **Proposal 7.** For Rel-17 TBoMS transmission in both dynamic grant and configured grant, if the parameter numberOfRepetitions is not configured in the TDRA table, then the number of repetitions M of a single TBoMS is equal to 1. |

**Time domain resource determination for TBoMS for CG-PUSCH Type 2**

|  |
| --- |
| **R1-2111793 Interdigital**  **Proposal 8**: For TBoMS repetitions, the UE can be configured with N\*M is larger than the number of available slots in a CG period  **Proposal 9**: For TBoMS repetitions, if N\*M is larger than the number of available slots in a CG period, the UE is expected to transmit K TBoMS transmission occasions where K<M.  **Proposal 10**: If the UE cannot find N available slots in a CG period, the UE does not transmit TBoMS.  **R1-2112020 Sharp**  ***Proposal 6***: The UE should be possible to start an initial transmission of a transport block in a single TBoMS other than the first single TBoMS for a configured grant with startingFromRV0 not set to ‘off’.  **R1-2112036 Ericsson**  **Proposal 12.** The UE is not expected to be configured with the time duration for the transmission of a single TBoMS or TBoMS repetitions larger than the time duration derived by the periodicity P.  **R1-2112231 Qualcomm**  **Proposal 8:** For CG-TBOMS with or without repetitions, the transmission is restricted to begin from the first slot of a single TBOMS associated with RV0.  **R1-2112390 WILUS**  **Proposal 3**: For TBoMS repetition with configured grant, a UE can be configured as startingFromRV0 = ‘off’ for the initial TO determination.   * + Otherwise, only RV sequence {0, 0, 0, 0} can be configured even if startingFromRV0 is not provided or configured as startingFromRV0 = ‘on’.   **R1-2110864 Nokia/NSB**  **Proposal 5.** For a single TBoMS or TBoMS repetitions with configured grant, the UE is not expected to be configured with the time duration for N\*M transmissions larger than the time duration derived by the periodicity P.  **Proposal 6.** For TBoMS repetitions with configured grant, the legacy Rel-16 restrictions as defined in Clause 6.1.2.3.1 of TS 38.214 at least on the initial transmission of a transport block are applied.  **R1-2111438 Panasonic**  **Proposal 8:** For TBoMS for CG-PUSCH, the domain resource determination including limitation of overall duration for PUSCH repetition Type A is reused.  **Proposal 9:** TBoMS for CG-PUSCH does not start in the middle of the single TBoMS.  **R1-2111585 Xiaomi**  **Proposal 6:** Each slot associated with RV#0 can be deemed as an initial transmission position/slot. |

**Time domain resource determination for TBoMS for CG-PUSCH Type 1**

|  |
| --- |
| **R1-2111585 Xiaomi**  **Proposal 3:** Reuse the RRC parameters pusch-aggregationFactor and repK to indicate the number of repetitions of TBoMS.  **R1-2110790 Huawei/HiSi**  **Proposal 3:** For TBoMS transmission with type 1 configured grant, a new field should be introduced in IE ConfiguredGrantCofig to indicate the number of allocated slots for a single TBoMS transmission.   * For TBoMS transmissions with type 1 and type 2 configured grant, is provided by a new field in IE ConfiguredGrantConfig and is provided by the indexed row in the TDRA table if it is present in the TDRA table, respectively.   When TBoMS transmission is enabled, the field repK is used to indicate the number of TBoMS repetitions. |

**Use of non-consecutive physical slots for paired spectrum**

|  |
| --- |
| **R1-2110864 Nokia/NSB**  **Proposal 4.** If no further agreement is made under AI 8.8.1.1 on how to handle the available slot counting for paired spectrum and SUL band, then only consecutive physical slots are supported for TBoMS in paired spectrum and SUL band. |

**Others**

|  |
| --- |
| **R1-2112036 Ericsson**  Proposal 1. Reuse resource determination and signaling of Rel-15/16 PUSCH repetition as much as possible to avoid specifying duplicate functionality.  **R1-2111508 Intel**  **Proposal 4**   * For out of order handling for TBoMS:   + Consider Case A), B) and C) in Figure 2 as out of order scheduling.     Figure . Out of order handling between TBoMS and single-slot PUSCH |

## A.2 Single TBoMS structure

|  |
| --- |
| **R1-2110864 Nokia/NSB**  **Proposal 1**. RAN1 to confirm the working assumption on adopting Option 3 for a single TBoMS structure, i.e., the TB is transmitted using a single RV.  **R1-2110919 ZTE**  **Proposal 1:** Confirming the WA on single TBoMS structure of Option 3, i.e., a single RV is used. |

## A.3 Rate-matching

**Bit interleaving time unit**

|  |
| --- |
| **R1-2111621 CMCC**  **Proposal 6:**  Single slot level bit interleaving is preferred.  **R1-2111752 Samsung**  ***Proposal 3****: the above working assumption is confirmed.*  **R1-2111888 Apple**  **Proposal 1**: Confirm the working assumption on bit interleaving for TBoMS.  **R1-2112316 MediaTek**  **Error! Reference source not found.**  For TBoMS in Rel-17, the following is supported:   * Bit interleaving is performed per slot.   + The index of the starting coded bit for each transmitted slot is predetermined prior to the start of the TBoMS transmission. * Transmission is limited to one CB only.   **R1-2110864 Nokia/NSB**  **Proposal 2.** RAN1 to confirm the working assumption made in RAN1#106bis-e meeting on bit interleaving size and CB segmentation, i.e., bit interleaving is performed per slot and transmission is limited to one CB only.  **R1-2111149 Fujitsu**  **Proposal 1:**  Confirm the working assumption that bit interleaving is performed per slot, and reuse the existing rules for UCI multiplexing.  **R1-2111272 CATT**  **Proposal 3:** Confirm the working assumption of performing bit interleaving per slot for TBoMS.  **R1-2111329 OPPO**  **Proposal 3:** Bit interleaving and selection are performed per slot and in order of physical slots, based on the available slots  **R1-2111585 Xiaomi**  **Proposal 1:** Support rate-matching per slot for TBoMS. |

**How the index of the starting bit in each slot for the single TBoMS is chosen**

|  |
| --- |
| **R1-2111621 CMCC**  **Proposal 7:**  The option C without consideration UCI multiplexing is preferred as it is uncertain whether UCI multiplexing will happens in the later part of TBoMS.  **R1-2111693 NEC**  ***Proposal 4***: For the bit selection for each transmitted slot for TBoMS, support option C.   * More specifically, the starting position of circular buffer for rate matching of TBoMS in slot n should be RV + n\*E, where n = 0,1,…, is the logical slot index in TBoMS, RV is starting position provided by RV indication, and E is number of bits for a code block assuming no UCI is multiplexing with data.   ***Proposal 5***: RAN1 should further discussion whether date rate calculation of TBoMS will be changed based on number of slots N for TBoMS.  **R1-2111752 Samsung**  ***Proposal 4****: option C is preferred.*  ***Proposal 5****: the index of the starting coded bit for each transmitted slot is not needed to be expressed as a multiple integer of the lifting size Zc.*  **R1-2111793 Interdigital**  **Proposal 6**: For the bit selection for each transmitted slot for TBoMS, the index of the starting coded bit in the circular buffer is the index continuous from the position of the last bit selected in the previous allocated slot (Option B).  **R1-2111888 Apple**  **Proposal 2**: Option C is adopted for bit selection for each transmitted slot for TBoMS.  **R1-2111979 LGE**  **Proposal 1**: To apply Option B, timeline requirement for A/N multiplexing on TBoMS needs to be modified so that it can be determined whether or not to transmit UCI before the start of TBoMS transmission.  **Proposal 2**: To apply Option C, it is necessary to consider aperiodic CSI multiplexing to determine the starting coded bit in each slot of TBoMS transmission.  **Proposal 3**: Discuss the UE behavior when the calculated TBS exceeds the maximum TBS for single CB  **R1-2112020 Sharp**  ***Proposal 1***: The index of the starting coded bit kn-10 in the circular buffer for nth slot in a single TBoMS is the next bit of the last bit for (n-1)th slot. The last bit for (n-1)th slot is represented by kn-10+En-1 where En-1 is the rate-matching sequence length in (n-1)th slot.  ***Proposal 2***: The UE assumes no HARQ-ACK bits multiplexed in any slot in a single TBoMS in determination of the starting coded bit index kn0 for nth slot in the single TBoMS.  **R1-2112036 Ericsson**  **Proposal 2.** From the perspective of gNB scheduling flexibility and error propagation, Option C is preferred.  **R1-2112120 NTT DOCOMO**  **Proposal 3**: Support continuous bit selections with ignoring UCI multiplexing effects (Option C) to avoid the error propagation issue caused by DCI miss-detection.  **Proposal 4**: The starting point of each bit selection should be floored with a LDPC lifting size.  **R1-2112231 Qualcomm**  **Proposal 1:** The following principles are used to predetermine the starting bit location:   1. The same behavior is specified for CG-TBOMS and DG-TBOMS 2. To avoid error propagation, any dynamic information or behavior is not taken into account for starting bit determination    * 1. For e.g., sp-CSI activation/deactivation is a dynamic event that could cause misalignment, and any information related to sp-CSI multiplexing should be discouraged from being included in the procedure for starting bit determination. 3. The overall design should be forward compatible to future changes to UCI multiplexing rules.    * 1. R17 TEI is discussing changes to relax HARQ ACK/NACK multiplexing on DG-PUSCH repetitions. TBOMS design should be amenable to such changes in the future   **Proposal 2:** TBOMS for shared spectrum is not triggered through configured grants. CG-UCI is not taken into account for starting bit determination of TBOMS.  **Proposal 3:** With forward compatibility and a unified design across CG-TBOMS and DG-TBOMS in mind, it is suggested that the overhead of ACK-NACK UCI not be directly taken into account to determine the starting bit indices for TBOMS.  **Proposal 4:** Due to variation in the size of CSI Part 2, the overhead due to CSI Part 2 cannot be determined beforehand for all slots of TBOMS. It is suggested that the overhead of CSI Part 2 not be directly taken into account to determine the starting bit indices for TBOMS.  **Proposal 5:** Due to the dynamic nature of spCSI activation, it is suggested that UCI overhead due to sp-CSI not be directly taken into account to determine the starting bit indices for TBOMS.  **Proposal 6:** The index of the starting coded bit for the kth slot of a single TBOMS is given by where  and  ,  where is the modulation order and is the number of REs available in the (k-1)th slot for transmission and . represents the nominal fraction of resources that are likely to be available for SCH transmission after allocation of resources for UCI multiplexing. The value of is configured via RRC. is set to be the starting bit index of the RV associated with the single TBOMS.  **R1-2112316 MediaTek**  Error! Reference source not found.  **R1-2110790 Huawei/HiSi**  **Proposal 5:** For the determination of starting bit for TBoMS transmission, option B (the index of the starting bit in the circular buffer is the index continuous from the position of the last bit selected in the previous allocated slot) is preferred with minor modifications as follows:   * HARQ-ACK is multiplexed on TBoMS transmission by puncturing.   **Proposal 6:** The index of the starting bit should be defined as multiple integer of LDPC lifting size that is nearest to but not exceed the position of the last bit selected in the previous allocated slot.  **R1-2110864 Nokia/NSB**  **Proposal 3**. For the bit selection for each transmitted slot for TBoMS, the index of the starting coded bit in the circular buffer is the index continuous from the position of the last bit selected in the previous allocated slot, regardless of whether UCI multiplexing occurred in the previous allocated slot or not.  **R1-2110919 ZTE**  **Proposal 2:** For bit selection for each transmitted slot for TBoMS, Option B is preferred, i.e., the index of the starting coded bit in the circular buffer is the index continuous from the position of the last bit selected in the previous allocated slot.   * No other optimization is considered compared to the legacy UCI multiplexing procedure for PUSCH repetition type A.   **R1-2111028 vivo**  **Proposal 4:** The index of the starting coded bit in the circular buffer is the index continuous from the position of the last bit selected in the previous allocated slot, regardless of whether UCI multiplexing occurred in the previous allocated slot or not.  **Proposal 5:** Restricting the index of the starting coded bit in each slot of TBoMS to be multiples of lifting size Zc is not necessary.  **R1-2111107 Spreadtrum**  **Proposal 1.** UCI multiplexing bits do not have to be known prior to the determination of the index of the starting coded bit for each transmitted slot. They have to obey the legacy timeline reference to the allocated slot that is overlapping with PUCCH.  **Proposal 3.** Support Option C: the index of the starting coded bit in the circular buffer is the index continuous from the position of the last bit selected in the previous allocated slot, regardless of whether UCI multiplexing occurred in the previous allocated slot or not.  **R1-2111149 Fujitsu**  **Proposal 2:** The index of the starting coded bit in the circular buffer is the index continuous from the position of the last bit selected in the previous allocated slot, regardless of whether UCI multiplexing occurred in the previous allocated slot or not.  **R1-2111272 CATT**  **Proposal 1:** For the bit selection for each transmitted slot for TBoMS, Option C is supported.   * The index of the starting coded bit in the circular buffer is the index continuous from the position of the last bit selected in the previous allocated slot, regardless of whether UCI multiplexing occurred in the previous allocated slot or not.   **Proposal 2:** It is up to editor whether the index of the starting coded bit for each transmitted slot is expressed as a multiple integer of the lifting size Zc.  **R1-2111427 ChinaTelecom**  **Proposal 2:**   * Option B: the index of the starting coded bit in the circular buffer is the index continuous from the position of the last bit selected in the previous allocated slot.   **R1-2111438 Panasonic**  **Proposal 2:** For the bit selection for each transmitted slot for TBoMS, take Option C.   * Option C: The index of the starting coded bit in the circular buffer is the index continuous from the position of the last bit selected in the previous allocated slot, regardless of whether UCI multiplexing occurred in the previous allocated slot or not.   **Proposal 3:** For the realization of Option C, following method is supported.   * The index of starting coded bit in the subsequent slots in a single TBoMS is based on the number of REs determined in the first L symbols over which the TBoMS transmission is allocated.   + For example, the index of starting coded bit in the circular buffer on -th slot in a single TBoMS can be given by , where is the reference number of bits based on the number of REs determined in the first L symbols over which the TBoMS transmission is allocated.   **R1-2111508 Intel**  **Proposal 1**   * For the bit selection for each transmitted slot for TBoMS, Option B is supported.   **R1-2111329 OPPO**  **Proposal 6:** UCI multiplexing bits of coded bits is known prior to the determination of the index of the starting coded bit for all transmitted slots of TBoMS. |

**Others**

|  |
| --- |
| **R1-2110790 Huawei/HiSi**  **Proposal 4:** Each available slot identified by UE is considered as a transmission occasion for TBoMS transmission, and the transmission occasion based power control, UCI multiplexing, rate matching in the current specification is reused. |

## A.4 Data Rate calculation and UE behavior related to TBS determination

**Data rate calculation**

|  |
| --- |
| **R1-2111693 NEC**  ***Proposal 5***: RAN1 should further discussion whether date rate calculation of TBoMS will be changed based on number of slots N for TBoMS.  **R1-2110919 ZTE**  **Proposal 3:** The maximum TBS can be limited by the conditions of data rate limitations DataRate and DataRateCC.  **R1-2111204 TCL**  **Proposal 3:** The maximum TBS for TBoMS should be limited based on DataRateCC.  **R1-2111272 CATT**  **Proposal 9:** No need to specify other constraints to limit the TBS of a single TBoMS, due to the restriction on one CB, single layer and maximum 8 slots for a single TBoMS. |

**Others**

|  |
| --- |
| **R1-2111979 LGE**  **Proposal 3**: Discuss the UE behavior when the calculated TBS exceeds the maximum TBS for single CB transmission. |

## A.5 FDRA

|  |
| --- |
| **R1-2111752 Samsung**  **Proposal 2**: The maximal number of PRB allocated in time domain is reduced for TB over multi-slot.  **R1-2111204 TCL**  **Proposal 4:** The maximum number of PRBs can be limited when TBoMS is enabled.  **R1-2111585 Xiaomi**  **Proposal 4:** Limit the number of RBs allocated for TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH by gNB scheduling. |

## A.6 TBoMS repetitions

**Slot mapping for TBoMS repetitions**

|  |
| --- |
| **R1-2111793 Interdigital**  **Proposal 12**:Support type 1(non-interleaved) when DMRS bundling is enabled and type 2 (interleaved) mapping for TBoMS repetitions when DMRS bundling is disabled shown in Figure 1    Figure 1 Examples of TBoMS repetition mapping : Type 1 (non-interleaved mapping) vs. Type 2 (interleaved mapping) for N=4, M=2 |

**Others**

|  |
| --- |
| **R1-2111329 OPPO**  **Proposal 1:** The TBoMS repetition should apply fixed RV sequence cycling among different actual repetitions of TBoMS.  The cycling unit is based on TBoMS instead of slot. |

## A.7 Transmission power determination

|  |
| --- |
| **R1-2111793 Interdigital**  **Proposal 7**: The transmission power determination of TBoMS is based on all the REs allocated in the N available slots for the TBoMS transmission, excluding the overhead of reference signals.  **R1-2112036 Ericsson**  **Proposal 11.** Reuse Rel-16 transmission occasion of power determination for TBoMS.  **R1-2110790 Huawei/HiSi**  Proposal 4: Each available slot identified by UE is considered as a transmission occasion for TBoMS transmission, and the transmission occasion-based power control, UCI multiplexing, rate matching in the current specification is reused. |

## A.8 Frequency hopping

|  |
| --- |
| **R1-2111028 vivo**  **Proposal 2:** Inter-repetition frequency hopping is not supported for TBoMS.  **R1-2111107 Spreadtrum**  **Proposal 4.** Support Inter-slot FH (same as the legacy PUSCH repetition Type A) for TBoMS.  **R1-2111585 Xiaomi**  **Proposal 5:** Support intra-TB frequency hopping for TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH.  **R1-2111204 TCL**  **Proposal 8:** The bundling of inter-slot frequency hopping should be supported for TBoMS**.**  **R1-2111272 CATT**  **Proposal 11:** Inter-bundling hopping is supported for TBoMS for the case when DMRS bundling is applied.  **R1-2111427 ChinaTelecom**  **Proposal 4:** Both inter-slot frequency hopping and inter-slot frequency hopping with inter-slot bundling to enable joint channel estimation should be supported for TBoMS.  **R1-2111438 Panasonic**  **Proposal 7:** The determination of inter-slot frequency hopping pattern and precoder cycling pattern for PUSCH repetition Type A is reused for TBoMS.   * For TBoMS with joint channel estimation, the inter-slot frequency hopping is performed per configured TDW which is determined based on configured/indicated TDW length and semi-static TDD configuration. The details including configured or actual TDW determination is according to discussion in AI 8.8.1.3 and/or 8.8.2.   **R1-2111508 Intel**  **Proposal 5**   * In case of DMRS bundling, inter-slot frequency hopping with inter-slot bundling is supported for TBoMS. * For repetition of a single TBoMS transmission, inter-repetition frequency hopping is supported. |

## A.9 Retransmissions

|  |
| --- |
| **R1-2111621 CMCC**  **Proposal 5**:  At least single slot PUSCH and TBoMS with and without repetition could be used for the retransmission of TBOMS.  **R1-2111888 Apple**  **Proposal 3**: It’s up to gNB scheduling to determine the TBoMS re-transmission is by TBoMS, or by repetition, or by single slot transmission.  **R1-2111949 Lenovo/Motorola**  **Proposal 1**: For PUSCH coverage enhancements in NR Rel-17 with TBoMS, retransmission procedure and signaling should be enhanced to support retransmission of only partial slots from the TBoMS.  **Proposal 2**: For PUSCH coverage enhancements in NR Rel-18 with TBoMS, if retransmission for duration shorter than the overall duration of TBoMS is supported, then implicit/explicit configuration of the portion (duration) should be supported with portion indication in the retransmission DCI. Exact duration of the portion can be as follows:   * Explicitly configured to the UE * Implicitly determined by UE depending on the duration of TBoMS, number of TOTs, duration of TOTs   **R1-2112036 Ericsson**  **Proposal 6.** Only TB-based retransmission is supported for TBoMS.  **R1-2110864 Nokia/NSB**  **Proposal 8.** Discussion on partial retransmission should be deprioritized, given the limited available time before the end of the discussions for Rel-17.  **R1-2111204 TCL**  **Proposal 2.** A slot or a set of slots retransmission for TBoMS should be supported.  **R1-2111272 CATT**  **Proposal 10:** For retransmission, reuse the current principle that the TBS of TBoMS follows the TBS of initial transmission.  **Proposal 12:** For TBoMS retransmission, retransmitting the whole single TBoMS should be supported as the baseline.  **R1-2111508 Intel**  **Proposal 3**   * CBG based transmission is not supported for TBoMS. * In case of TBoMS retransmission, partial TB based transmission is not supported. |

## A.10 UCI multiplexing and dropping rules

**UCI multiplexing**

|  |
| --- |
| **R1-2111693 NEC**  ***Proposal 1***:Support TBoMS and UCI multiplexing. Legacy PUSCH repetition and UCI multiplexing behavior can be baseline.  ***Proposal 2***:When PUCCH transmission without PUCCH repetition overlaps with PUSCH TBoMS transmission, UCI multiplexed with TBoMS within a slot.  ***Proposal 3***: When to calculate ratio of resources for UCI in PUSCH in a slot, additional scaling factor based on scaling factor K used for TBoMS TB size determination should be considered.  **R1-2111752 Samsung**  **Proposal 6**: UCI multiplexing in TBoMS PUSCH is supported in Rel-17 CE,  **Proposal 7**: The timeline requirement is applied for the actual overlapped slot in the TBoMS.  **Proposal 8**: Re-use only legacy UCI multiplexing behavior (rate-matching and puncturing).  **R1-2111793 Interdigital**  **Proposal 2**: Support UCI multiplexing with TBoMS transmission.  **Proposal 3**: Support UCI repetition on multiple slots of TBoMS.  **Proposal 4**: Timeline constraint to multiplex UCI is based on the start of a slot within the allocated slots of TBoMS.  **R1-2111979 LGE**  **Proposal 4**: In case of collision between TBoMS and PUCCH without repetition, UCI is multiplexed on the TBoMS in the overlapped slot.  **Proposal 5**: In case of aperiodic CSI reporting with TBoMS transmission, it is necessary to clarify the location of the slot resource for aperiodic CSI multiplexing among the N allocated slots of TBoMS.  **Proposal 6**: is the number of symbols for TBoMS in a corresponding slot in which UCI is multiplexed for determination of the values of , , , and .  **Proposal 7**: To determine the values of , , , and , is multiplexed by N, where N is the number of slots allocated for TBoMS.  **R1-2112020 Sharp**  ***Proposal 3***: In determination of Q’, the reciprocal number of the effective coding rate is multiplied by the beta offset and N.  **R1-2112036 Ericsson**  **Proposal 9.** Reuse Rel-16 UCI multiplexing on PUSCH by puncturing for TBoMS.  **Proposal 10.** If UCI multiplexing in multiple slots of TBoMS is supported, CSI or HARQ-ACK can be repeated in all slots of a TBoMS.  **R1-2112120 NTT DOCOMO**  **Proposal 1**: Reuse legacy Rel-15/Rel-16 framework for UCI multiplexing with PUSCH as much as possible for TBoMS, unless new rules are necessary to operate TBoMS PUSCH.  **Proposal 2**: How to calculate the number of coded modulation symbols for UCI in TBoMS PUSCH should be discussed.  **R1-2112231 Qualcomm**  **Proposal 9:** Reuse R15/R16 framework for UCI multiplexing on PUSCH for each slot of a single TBoMS as well.  **R1-2112316 MediaTek**  Error! Reference source not found.  **R1-2112390 WILUS**  **Proposal 1**: UCI multiplexing is performed on single slot for a single TBoMS.  **Proposal 2**: The number of coded modulation symbols for the UCI in a slot (Q’ACK, Q’CSI-1, and Q’CSI-2) can be determined with following methods for UCI multiplexing on single slot for a single TBoMS.   * + Alt 1: TBS, i.e., is scaled by 1/N, where N is the number of slots allocated for a single TBoMS.   + Alt 2: The number of coded modulation symbols for the UCI in a slot is determined based on the number of available PUSCH resource across N slots, i.e., .   **R1-2110790 Huawei/HiSi**  **Proposal 4:** Each available slot identified by UE is considered as a transmission occasion for TBoMS transmission, and the transmission occasion based power control, UCI multiplexing, rate matching in the current specification is reused.  **Proposal 7:** The legacy UCI multiplexing in Rel-15/16 should be reused as much as possible, and at least the basic principles below should be followed:   * UCI should be multiplexed on only one slot. * Legacy timeline for UCI multiplexing should be followed.   + where is defined as the earliest symbol of PUCCH and PUSCH in the overlapped slot.   **Proposal 8:** For UCI multiplexing on TBoMS transmission, the parameter should be redefined to compensate the coding rate as follows:   * for HARQ-ACK; * for CSI part 1; * for CSI part 2;   where is the scaling factor to calculate for TBS determination, and the parameters , , and are the coding rate compensation parameters for HARQ-ACK, CSI part 1, and CSI part 2, respectively, configured in RRC.  **R1-2111028 vivo**  **Proposal 1:** Following equation is used to calculate the number of symbols for UCI multiplexing on a single TBoMS.   * Where is the total number of OFDM symbols of the PUSCH across N slots for a single TBoMS, including all OFDM symbols used for DMRS; and is the total number of OFDM symbols of the PUSCH within one slot for TBoMS, including all OFDM symbols used for DMRS.   **R1-2111204 TCL**  **Proposal 5:** UCI multiplexing is performed by puncturing or rate-matching depending on the determination time is before or latter the starting time of PUSCH preparation.  **Proposal 6:** If UCI multiplexing is performed by puncturing， may differ from rate-matching for UCI multiplexing.  **Proposal 7:** If UCI multiplexing in TBoMS is supported, UCI repetition should be considered.  **R1-2111272 CATT**  **Proposal 4:** To determine the number of REs for UCI multiplexing on TBoMS, the following are supported:   * The number of available slots for TBS determination can be used to determine the data rate for UCI resource computation; * The number of available overlapping slots between PUCCH and TBoMS can be used to determine the upper bounder of UCI resource on TBoMS.   **Proposal 5:** The UCI should be coded and rate matched based on the total number of REs for UCI multiplexing on TBoMS.  **Proposal 6:** For UCI multiplexing in multiple slots of TBoMS, the REs occupied by UCI are evenly divided and mapped in each of the overlapped slots and the current UCI mapping rules can be reused for UCI multiplexing in one slot.  **R1-2111329 OPPO**  **Proposal 5:** UCI is equally multiplexed into all slots of TBoMS transmission.  **R1-2111427 ChinaTelecom**  **Proposal 3:** Legacy R15/R16 framework for UCI multiplexing with PUSCH should be reused as much as possible. Other enhancements can only be considered, if justified necessary.  **R1-2111438 Panasonic**  **Proposal 4:** The legacy Rel.15/16 framework of UCI multiplexing on PUSCH should be reused as a baseline (i.e., reuse the per slot UCI multiplexing).  **Proposal 5:** For UCI resource determination for TBoMS, and should be calculated per slot basis.  **Proposal 6:** For UCI resource determination for TBoMS, for the calculation of , TB size before multiplying scaling factor K should be used.  **R1-2111585 Xiaomi**  **Proposal 2:** Reuse the UCI multiplexing rule designed for PUSCH repetition in Rel-16 for TBoMS. |

**Dropping rules, e.g., collision handling**

|  |
| --- |
| **R1-2111793 Interdigital**  **Proposal 5**: In case of uplink cancellation, the UE resumes the TBoMS transmission in the next allocated slot.  **R1-2112036 Ericsson**  **Proposal 7.** PUCCH repetition can override the transmission of a single TBoMS or repetitions of TBoMS in the overlapping slot(s).  **Proposal 8.** Rel-17 PUSCH dropping rules include the case that one particular slot is determined as an available slot for multiple time-overlapping UL channels or signals (including TBoMS, Type A PUSCH repetition enhancement option 2, A-SRS, or SPS HARQ-ACK). RAN1 is to define the priority of the multiple time-overlapping UL transmissions. The UE only transmits the channel or signal with the highest priority in overlapping symbols in the slot.  **R1-2111204 TCL**  **Proposal 1:** Only dropping the overlapped slot(s) should be considered for TBoMS transmission when collision happen.  **R1-2111329 OPPO**  **Proposal 4:** Slot dropping can puncture those slots after interleaving and bit selection.  **R1-2111508 Intel**  **Proposal 7**   * TBoMS is considered as low priority uplink transmission. |

**Timeline requirements**

|  |
| --- |
| **R1-2111028 vivo**  **Proposal 6**: The same timeline for UCI multiplexing on type-A PUSCH repetition, as that in Rel-16, is reused for UCI multiplexing on TBoMS.  **R1-2111107 Spreadtrum**  **Proposal 1.** UCI multiplexing bits do not have to be known prior to the determination of the index of the starting coded bit for each transmitted slot. They have to obey the legacy timeline reference to the allocated slot that is overlapping with PUCCH.  **Proposal 2.** Cancellation/dropping of coded bit do not have to be known prior to the determination of the index of the starting coded bit for each transmitted slot. They have to obey the legacy timeline reference to the starting symbol in the allocated slot that is cancelled.  **R1-2111508 Intel**  **Proposal 6**   * Two options can be considered for UCI multiplexing timeline.   + Option 1: UCI multiplexing timeline is determined based on the first symbol of TBoMS transmission.   + Option 2: UCI multiplexing timeline is determined based on the first symbol of the overlapped slot for TBoMS transmission. |

## A.11 Additional indicators and configuration options

|  |
| --- |
| **R1-2111621 CMCC**  **Proposal 1:**  It is proposed that the dynamic switching between TBoMS and single slot PUSCH with and without repetition.  **Proposal 2:**  N=1 should be supported for the switching between TBoMS and single slot PUSCH.  **R1-2112036 Ericsson**  **Proposal 3.** All the entries in a Rel-17 TDRA list are either for PUSCH repetition or for TBoMS. An exception is N=1 and M=1 for single-slot PUSCH is included in the TDRA table for TBoMS.  **R1-2112231 Qualcomm**  **Proposal 7:** Impose no restrictions on dynamic switching between legacy (R15/R16) PUSCH repetitions and TBOMS. Allow the desired mode of transmission to be chosen based on the signaled or configured row index of the TDRA table.  **R1-2110864 Nokia/NSB**  **Proposal 9.** In Rel-17, single-slot PUSCH transmission is enabled when N = 1 and M =1. PUSCH repetition Type A is enabled when N = 1 and M > 1, where N and M are configured in TDRA table as agreed the context of Rel-17 TBoMS, at least for the case in which UE is configured for counting based on available slots for PUSCH repetition Type A.  **Proposal 10.** TBoMS feature is enabled when the number of allocated slots for a single TBoMS (N) is configured in a row of the TDRA table and the parameter AvailableSlotCounting is configured and set to enable, at least for unpaired spectrum.  **R1-2111028 vivo**  **Proposal 3:** N=1(type-A PUSCH repetition) and N>1(TBoMS) cannot be configured simultaneously in a single TDRA table.  **R1-2111508 Intel**  **Proposal 2**   * TDRA table partitioning can be employed to differentiate single-slot PUSCH and TBoMS transmission.   + Number of rows allocated for single-slot PUSCH transmission can be configured as part of TDRA table. |

## A.12 Application of DM-RS bundling to TBoMS

|  |
| --- |
| **R1-2111793 Interdigital**  **Proposal 11**: Support joint channel estimation for TBoMS repetition. |

## A.13 Interlaced TBoMS transmissions

|  |
| --- |
| **R1-2112231 Qualcomm**  **Proposal 10:** Interlaced TBoMS transmissions (carrying different TBs) are not permitted. A UE does not expect a TBoMS transmission in a component carrier to begin before the completion of an ongoing TBoMS transmission in the same component carrier. |

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

Working assumption: 🡪 Agreement:

For TBS determination of TBoMS:

* *NohPRB* is configured by xOverhead and represents the overhead per slot.
* *NohPRB* is assumed to be the same for all the slots over which the TBoMS transmission is allocated.

Note: xOverhead configuration is as per Rel-15/16.

Agreement:

The following 2 options for time domain resource determination for TBoMS are considered for down-selection during RAN1 #105-e:

* Option 1: Time domain resource determination for TBoMS can be performed only via PUSCH repetition Type A like TDRA.
* Option 2: Time domain resource determination for TBoMS can be performed via PUSCH repetition Type A like TDRA or via PUSCH repetition Type B like TDRA.
  1. The use of PUSCH repetition Type B like TDRA for time domain resource determination is according to an additional UE capability for a TBoMS capable UE.
  2. FFS DMRS pattern for PUSCH repetition Type B like TDRA

**Working assumption**

A transmission occasion for TBoMS (TOT) is constituted of at least one slot or multiple consecutive physical slots for UL transmission

* FFS: whether the concept of TOT will be used for designing aspects related to signal generation, e.g., rate-matching, power control, etc.
* FFS: whether such concept will be specified or not.

Agreement:

* The structure of TBoMS will be according to only one of these two options (to be down-selected in RAN1#106-e)
  + Option 3, if a design based on single RV is adopted.
  + Option 4, if a design based on different RVs is adopted.
* FFS: other details, e.g., rate-matching, TBS determination, collision handling, etc.
* The single RV is not constrained to have only the same coded bits in each slot or in each TOT
* The concept of TOT as per the corresponding Working assumption is used to define Option 3 and Option 4 and may or may not be used to design other details, e.g., rate-matching, TBS determination, collision handling and so on.

Agreement:

Time domain resource determination for TBoMS can be performed only via PUSCH repetition Type A like TDRA.

* FFS: details
* FFS: whether or not optimizations for time domain resource determination are necessary for allocating resource in the S slots (for the unpaired spectrum case)

**Working assumption**

Allocating resources for TBoMS in the special slot in TDD is possible according to the agreed time domain resource determination for TBoMS.

Agreement:

The following three options for rate-matching for TBoMS are considered for down-selection during RAN1 #106-e, where only one option will be selected:

* Option a: Rate-matching is performed per slot;
* Option b: Rate matching is performed continuously across all the allocated slot(s) per TOT;
* Option c: Rate matching is performed continuously across all the allocated slots/TOTs for TBoMS

Note: “rate-matching is performed per X” means that the time unit for the bit selection and bit interleaving is X.

Note2: the above 3 options imply that the UL resource in the time unit may or may not be consecutive (depending on the given option)

Agreement:

Number of slots allocated for TBoMS is determined by using a row index of a TDRA list, configured via RRC.

* FFS: details.

Agreement:

The following approach is used to calculate NInfo for TBoMS:

* Approach 2: Based on the number of REs determined in the first L symbols over which the TBoMS transmission is allocated, scaled by K≥1.
  + FFS: the definition of K.

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

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

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

Agreement:

Non-consecutive physical slots for UL transmission can be used to transmit TBoMS at least for unpaired spectrum.

* How TBoMS is transmitted over non-consecutive physical slots for UL transmission for unpaired spectrum is to be discussed further.
* Whether and how non-consecutive physical slots for UL transmission can be used to transmit TBoMS for paired spectrum and SUL band as well, is to be discussed further.

Working Assumption

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

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

Agreements**:**

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

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

Agreement:

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

Agreement:

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

Agreement:

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

Agreement:

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

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

Agreement:

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

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

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

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

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

Agreement:

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

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

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

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

Agreement

The number of slots allocated for TBoMS is counted based on the available slots for UL transmission.

* The determination of available slots for PUSCH repetition Type A, as defined in AI 8.8.1.1, is reused.
* Note: Available slots for FDD or SUL could be revisited according to discussion in AI 8.8.1.1

Agreement

Allocating resources for TBoMS in the special slot in TDD is possible according to the agreed time domain resource determination for TBoMS.

* No further optimization to allocate resources for TBoMS in the special slot is supported.

Agreement

TBoMS is supported for both configured grant and dynamic grant.

Working Assumption

Single TBoMS structure of Option 3 is selected

* **Option 3**: Multiple TOTs are determined for a TBoMS. The TB is transmitted on the multiple TOTs using a single RV.
  + FFS: how the single RV is rate matched across single or multiple TOTs, e.g., rate matched for each TOT, rate matched for all the TOTs, rate matched for each slot and so on.

**Agreement**

To calculate for TBS determination, at least the scaling factor value K=N is supported, where N is the number of allocated slots for a single TBoMS.

FFS: whether further values 1<K<N are supported.

FFS: details related to the indication of K.

Note: No supporting the case K=1 for a single TBoMS.

**Agreement**

Repetitions of a single TBoMS are supported, where:

* The number of repetitions is denoted by M, i.e., the total number of allocated slots for TBoMS repetition is M\*N.
  + Note: M\*N is no more than the max number of repetitions agreed for repetition Type A enhancement in agenda 8.8.1.1
* Available slot determination is according to existing agreements.
* The number and location of allocated symbols within an allocated slot for TBoMS transmission are the same among all repeated single TBoMS.
* FFS other aspects of TBoMS repetitions, e.g.:
  + Details of time domain resource indication.
  + Supported values for the number of TBoMS repetitions.
  + How to indicate the number of TBoMS repetitions.
  + Interactions with frequency hopping and precoder cycling across the M groups of N allocated slots for each single TBoMS repetition.
  + Whether RV indices should be cycled across the M groups of N allocated slots for each single TBoMS repetition.
  + Details of TBoMS retransmissions.
  + Potential MAC layer impact, but should be decided by RAN2

Note: No additional dropping rule optimization will be introduced other than dropping rules for single TBoMS transmission.

**Agreement**

The UE determines whether or not to drop a slot determined as available for TBoMS transmission according to Rel-15/16 PUSCH dropping rules, where the dropped slot is still counted in the N allocated slots for the single TBoMS transmission.

FFS: Rel-17 PUSCH dropping rules are also applied if introduced in other WI(s)

|  |
| --- |
| **Conclusion**  Bit interleaving performed per ToT is precluded, and ToT will not be used in further discussion. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Conclusion**  The N allocated slots for the single TBoMS are defined as the number of slots after available slot determination for a single TBoMS transmission, before dropping rules are applied.  Note: the number of final transmitted slots for the single TBoMS may be lower than N, depending on dropping rules for TBoMS transmission. |

**Agreement**

* For transmission power determination of TBoMS transmission in Rel-17, RAN1 to down-select one of the following two options:
* Option 1: The transmission power determination of TBoMS should be based on all the REs allocated in one available slot for the TBoMS transmission, excluding the overhead of reference signals
* Option 2: The transmission power determination of TBoMS should be based on all the REs allocated in the N available slots for the TBoMS transmission, excluding the overhead of reference signals.
* FFS: details on BPRE

**Agreement**

The number of MIMO layers (rank) for TBoMS transmission in Rel-17 is limited to 1.

**Agreement**

For a single TBoMS transmission and TBoMS repetitions in Rel-17, at least the legacy Rel-15/16 inter-slot frequency hopping framework used in PUSCH repetition Type A is supported.

* FFS: other frequency hopping schemes.

**Agreement**

* The number *N* of allocated slots for TBoMS is indicated via a new column added to the TDRA table configured via *PUSCH-TimeDomainAllocationList*. The ~~existing~~column for configuring the number of repetitions in the TDRA for Rel-17 PUSCH repetition Type A, i.e., *numberOfRepetitions,*is used for indicating the number of repetitions *M* of a single TBoMS, when TBoMS transmission is enabled.
* FFS: supported values of *N* and *M.*
* FFS: how to enable the TBoMS transmission
* FFS: details of retransmission of TBoMS

**Agreement**

For the repetition of a single TBoMS transmission, redundancy versions (RVs) are cycled across the TBoMS repetitions. The legacy Rel-15/16 RV sequences and RV index indication are reused.

|  |
| --- |
| **Conclusion**  Values 1<K<N for the scaling factor to calculate N\_info for TBS determination for TBoMS transmission in Rel-17 are not supported. |

**Agreement**

At least the following values are supported in Rel-17 for the number*N* of allocated slots for the single TBoMS:

* 

FFS: whether *N*=1 is also supported depends on how TBoMS transmission feature is enabled (or disabled)

FFS: other values, if any.

FFS: further constraints on N\*M

**FL’s proposal 13**

The following values are supported in Rel-17 for the number*M*of repetitions of the single TBoMS:

* 

FFS: further constraints on N\*M, e.g., N\*M is a valid value according to agreements in AI 8.8.1.1

**Agreement**

BPRE for TBOMS is calculated as  where N is the number of slots allocated for a single TBOMS and  is the number of allocated REs in one allocated slot of a single TBOMS.

Note: How this equation or its equivalent is captured in the specification is left to the editor

**Agreement**

For a single TBoMS transmission and TBoMS repetitions in Rel-17, the legacy Rel-15/16 intra-slot frequency hopping framework used in PUSCH repetition Type A is supported.

* FFS: other frequency hopping schemes.

**Working Assumption**

For TBoMS in Rel-17, the following is supported:

* Bit interleaving is performed per slot.

       The index of the starting coded bit for each transmitted slot is predetermined prior to the start of the TBoMS transmission.

* Transmission is limited to one CB only.
* FFS: whether UCI multiplexing bits or cancellation/dropping of coded bits, if any, have to be known prior to the determination of the index of the starting coded bit for each transmitted slot or not
* FFS: Performance with UCI multiplexing on single and multiple slots of a single TBoMS

Note: How UCI multiplexing and cancellation/dropping of coded bits influence the sequence of coded bits transmitted in each slot of a single TBOMS is to be further discussed. Some knowledge on UCI to be multiplexed or cancellation/dropping of coded bits in each slot of a single TBOMS may be known prior to the start of a single TBOMS transmission. How this is to be handled is to be discussed further.

**Agreement**

For the bit selection for each transmitted slot for TBoMS, one of the following is to be down selected in RAN1 #107-e for determining the index of the starting coded bit in the circular buffer:

* Option B: the index of the starting coded bit in the circular buffer is the index continuous from the position of the last bit selected in the previous allocated slot.
* Option C: the index of the starting coded bit in the circular buffer is the index continuous from the position of the last bit selected in the previous allocated slot, regardless of whether UCI multiplexing occurred in the previous allocated slot or not.

FFS: whether the index of the starting coded bit for each transmitted slot is expressed as a multiple integer of the lifting size Zc

Note: Dropping/cancellation rules are not considered for the starting bit position determination in both Option B and Option C.

**Agreement**

For TBoMS transmission in Rel-17:

* TBoMS ~~transmission~~feature is enabled (or disabled) by configuring (or not) the number of allocated slots for a single TBoMS (N) in a row of the TDRA table.
* ~~Dynamic switching between at least TboMS transmission and the legacy single-slot PUSCH transmission, by using a row in the TDRA table, is supported.~~
  + TBoMS transmission is enabled when N>1, where N is the number of allocated slots for a single TBoMS.
  + Single-slot PUSCH transmission is enabled when N=1.
  + Supported combinations of N and M that can be configured in the TDRA table, these combinations are constrained by retransmission are to be further discussed