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# Introduction

This contribution provides the summary for the following email discussion in RAN1#110bis-e:

[110bis-e-NR-R15-01] Discussion on PUCCH collision handling for more than two overlapped PUCCHs with repetition by Oct 17 – Sa (Samsung)

Section 3 provides the background information. Section 4 captures the detailed email discussions. Section 5 summarizes the outcome of the email discussion.

# Contact Points

Respondents to the email discussion are kindly asked to fill in the following table.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Name | Email |
| Moderator (Samsung) | Sa Zhang | sa.zhang@samsung.com |
| Qualcomm  | Yi Huang | yihuang@qti.qualcomm.com |
| Intel  | Yi Wang  | yi5.wang@Intel.com |
| OPPO | Yi Zhang | zhangy@oppo.com |
| CATT | Yanping Xing | xingyanping@catt.cn |
| ZTE | Junfeng Zhang | Zhang.junfeng@zte.com.cn |
| MTK | James Hsieh | CH.Hsieh@mediatek.com |
| Apple | Ali Fakoorian | sfakoorian@apple.com |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# Background

In RAN1#109-e, more than two overlapping PUCCHs with repetitions was discussed [1] and the following conclusions were made [2].

|  |
| --- |
| Conclusion:For resolving overlapping PUCCHs with and/or without repetitions in a slot in Rel-16, a UE first performs clause 9.2.6 (TS 38.213) to resolve overlapping PUCCHs where at least one PUCCH is with repetitions, and then UE performs clause 9.2.5 (TS 38.213) to resolve overlapping PUCCHs without repetitions.* Note: The above is performed per slot.

Conclusion:For resolving overlapping PUCCHs with repetitions in clause 9.2.6 of TS 38.213 in Rel-16, PUCCHs with repetitions and PUCCHs overlapping with a PUCCH with repetitions are considered. PUCCHs without repetitions that do not overlap with a PUCCH with repetitions are not considered.* Note 1: The above is for clarifying the determination of the overlapping PUCCHs resolved in clause 9.2.6 of TS 38.213 and does not impact the determination of “a set of overlapping PUCCHs” when performing clause 9.2.6 of TS 38.213 discussed in [109-e-NR-CRs-03].
* Note 2: The above has no spec impact. This is also assumed in discussion to solve issue in [109-e-NR-CRs-03].

Conclusion:For resolving the overlapping PUCCHs with repetitions in Rel-16, the procedure of 9.2.6 of TR38.213 only performs prioritization, multiplexing is not performed in 9.2.6 of TR38.213.* Note: the above has no spec impact.

ConclusionFor resolving overlapping PUCCHs of a same priority in Rel-16, a UE performs the following steps* Step1, the UE resolves overlapping PUCCHs with repetitions as described in TS 38.213 clause 9.2.6, if any.
	+ Step 1-1: the UE determines the PUCCHs involved in TS 38.213 clause 9.2.6.
		- o    PUCCHs with repetitions and PUCCHs overlapping with a PUCCH with repetitions are involved.
		- o    PUCCHs without repetitions that do not overlap with a PUCCH with repetitions are not involved.
	+ Step 1-2: the UE resolves overlapping PUCCHs determined in Step 1-1 by performing TS 38.213 clause 9.2.6.
		- o    Only prioritization is performed.
* Step2, the UE resolves overlapping PUCCHs without repetitions as described in TS 38.213 clause 9.2.5, if any.
	+ Step 2-1: the UE determines the PUCCHs involved in TS 38.213 clause 9.2.5.
		- PUCCHs without repetitions that do not overlap with a PUCCH with repetitions are involved.
		- Resulting PUCCHs without repetitions of resolving overlapping PUCCHs determined in Step 1-2 are involved.
	+ Step 2-2: the UE resolves overlapping PUCCHs determined in Step 2-1 by performing TS 38.213 clause 9.2.5.

Note: The above conclusion on the generic framework with high-level steps has no spec impact. The details of certain steps, e.g. step 1-2, may have spec impact subject to outcome of the ongoing and future discussion on the issues identified in email thread [109-e-NR-CRs-03].  |

In RAN1#110, the issue was further discussed and the following working assumption was made [4].

|  |
| --- |
| Working AssumptionFor resolving overlapping PUCCHs with repetitions of a same priority in Rel-16, a UE performs the following steps* Step 1-2-1: the UE determines a set of overlapping PUCCHs.
* Step 1-2-2: the UE performs prioritization among PUCCHs in the set of overlapping PUCCHs.
	+ The priority order for different UCI types is defined as: HARQ-ACK > SR > CSI with higher priority > CSI with lower priority
	+ For overlapping PUCCHs of the same UCI priority, the priority order for a same UCI type is defined as：PUCCH starting at an earlier slot > PUCCH starting at a later slot
* Step 1-2-3: the UE repeats step 1-2-1 and step 1-2-2 until the overlapping PUCCHs with repetitions is resolved.
 |

8 companies discuss the remaining issues of the overlapping PUCCHs with repetitions in the submitted contributions [5] ~ [13] and the proposals are summarized below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Proposal |
| HW | ***Proposal 1: For a group of more than two overlapping PUCCHs at Step 1-2-1, “a set of overlapping PUCCHs” is determined by the following two steps:**** ***Step i, a reference PUCCH is selected from all PUCCHs with repetition that overlap with at least one PUCCH in the current slot with the order of earliest symbol followed by longest duration.***
* ***Step ii, the “a set of overlapping PUCCHs” is determined as the reference PUCCH and all PUCCHs (with/without repetitions) that are overlapping with this reference PUCCH.***

***Proposal 2: For a group of more than two overlapping PUCCHs in Step 1-2-2, the PUCCH with the highest priority/earliest slot of “a set of overlapping PUCCHs” is transmitted, while the PUCCH with any lower priority/later slot of “a set of overlapping PUCCHs” is dropped.**** ***If there are at least two PUCCHs with the same highest priority in the “a set of overlapping PUCCHs”, the PUCCH starting at the earliest slot among the at least two PUCCHs is transmitted, while other PUCCHs are dropped.***
* ***UE does not expect any two PUCCHs of the “a set of overlapping PUCCHs” have the same UCI type as well as start at the same slot***

9.2.6 PUCCH repetition procedure< Unchanged parts are omitted >A UE does not multiplex different UCI types in a PUCCH transmission with repetitions over $N\_{PUCCH}^{repeat}>1$ slots. If a UE would transmit a first PUCCH over more than one slot and at least a second PUCCH over one or more slots, and the transmissions of the first PUCCH and the second PUCCH would overlap in a number of slots then, for each slot of the number of slots and with UCI type priority of HARQ-ACK > SR > CSI with higher priority > CSI with lower priority- the UE does not expect any two PUCCHs from the first PUCCH and the second PUCCHs to start at a same slot and include a UCI type with same priority - if the first PUCCH and each of the second PUCCHs include a UCI type with same priority, the UE transmits the PUCCH starting at an earliest slot and does not transmit the PUCCH starting at any later slot- if the first PUCCH and any of the second PUCCHs do not include a UCI type with same priority, the UE transmits the PUCCH that includes the UCI type with highest priority followed by starting at an earliest slot and does not transmit the PUCCH that include the UCI type with any lower priority or any later slot- the UE performs the above rules by selecting the first PUCCH with the order of earliest symbol followed by longest duration from the PUCCHs with repetition that overlap with at least one PUCCH, and the at least a second PUCCH includes all PUCCHs overlapping with the first PUCCH< Unchanged parts are omitted > |
| SPRD | 1. ***The reference PUCCH is a PUCCH with repetitions to determine a set of overlapping PUCCHs.***
2. ***The collision of all PUCCHs within the set of overlapping PUCCHs are resolved at a time, PUCCH resource with higher /highest priority or earlier/earliest slot is transmitted and the others are dropped in Step 1-2-2.***
 |
| OPPO | ***Proposal 1: In step 1-2-1 for determining a set of overlapping PUCCHs, the reference PUCCH should be a PUCCH with repetitions.******Proposal 2: In step 1-2-1, “a set of overlapping PUCCHs” can contain at least two PUCCHs including “a first PUCCH” with repetitions and “at least a second PUCCH” overlapping with the “first PUCCH”.******Proposal 3: In step 1-2-2, within “a set of overlapping PUCCHs”, UE transmits the PUCCH with UCI type with the highest priority or earliest starting slot (when same priority) and drops all other PUCCHs.******Proposal 4: In step 1-2-3, the UE repeats step 1-2-1 and step 1-2-2 until there is no PUCCH overlapping with a PUCCH with repetitions.******Observation 1: There exists ambiguity on the selection order of the “reference PUCCH/first PUCCH” when there are more than one PUCCH with repetitions in a slot.******Proposal 5: When there are more than one PUCCH with repetitions in a slot, RAN1 to discuss the following alternatives:******Alt 1:*** ***Step a: UE selects a PUCCH with rep as the “reference PUCCH/first PUCCH” that overlap with at least one PUCCH according to the order of earliest starting symbol followed by longest duration.*** ***Step b: “A set of overlapping PUCCHs” include the “reference PUCCH/first PUCCH” and all the PUCCHs overlapping with the “reference PUCCH/first PUCCH”. UE transmits the PUCCH with UCI type with the highest priority or earliest starting slot (when same priority) and drops all other PUCCHs.******Step c: repeat step a and step b until there is no PUCCH overlapping with a PUCCH with repetitions.******Alt 2:*** ***Step a: UE selects a PUCCH with rep as the “reference PUCCH/first PUCCH” that overlap with at least one PUCCH according to the order of UCI priority followed by earliest starting slot then by longest duration.*** ***Step b: “A set of overlapping PUCCHs” include the “reference PUCCH/first PUCCH” and all the PUCCHs overlapping with the “reference PUCCH/first PUCCH”. UE transmits the PUCCH with UCI type with the highest priority or earliest starting slot (when same priority) and drops all other PUCCHs.******Step c: repeat step a and step b until there is no PUCCH overlapping with a PUCCH with repetitions.******Alt 3:*** ***UE does not expect to be configured or scheduled more than one PUCCH with repetitions in a slot.*** |
| CATT | **Observation 1: UE behavior is not clear for Option 1, 2 and 6 for the case shown in Figure 1.****Observation 2: For the case shown in Figure 2, only Option 4 keeps both PUCCH 1 and PUCCH 3 and other options (i.e. Option 1/2/3/5/6) additionally drop PUCCH 3.****Observation 3: For the case shown in Figure 3, Option 4/5/6 keep both PUCCH 1 and PUCCH 3 and other options (i.e. Option 1/2/3) additionally drop PUCCH 1.****Observation 4: For the case shown in Figure 4, Option 4/5 keep both PUCCH 1 and PUCCH 3 and other options (i.e. Option 1/2/3/6) additionally drop PUCCH 1.****Proposal: For collision handling of more than two overlapping PUCCHs with repetition, consider following Option 4 and Option 5.*** **Option 4:**
* **Step 1-2-1: Determine a first PUCCH with repetition based on UCI priority followed by starting slot/sub-slot as defined in TS 38.213 clause 9.2.6 and “a set of overlapping PUCCHs” including the first PUCCH and all the PUCCHs overlapping with the first PUCCH;**
* **Step 1-2-2: Perform pair-wise prioritization between the first PUCCH and a second PUCCH until there is no overlapping between the first PUCCH and another PUCCH, where the second PUCCH is selected based on UCI priority followed by starting slot/sub-slot as defined in TS 38.213 clause 9.2.6 within “a set of overlapping PUCCHs”.**
* **Option 5:**
* **Step 1-2-1: Determine a first PUCCH based on UCI priority followed by starting slot/sub-slot as defined in TS 38.213 clause 9.2.6 and “a set of overlapping PUCCHs” including the first PUCCH and all the PUCCHs overlapping with the first PUCCH**
* **Step 1-2-2: Keep the first PUCCH and drop all the other PUCCHs within “a set of overlapping PUCCHs”.**
 |
| Intel | **Proposal 1: For resolving overlapping PUCCHs of a same priority in Rel-16, a UE performs the following steps*** **Step 1-2-1: the UE determines a set of overlapping PUCCHs according to existing pseudo-code in clause 9.2.5**
* **Step 1-2-2: the UE performs prioritization among PUCCHs in the set of overlapping PUCCHs with only one survived PUCCH**
	+ **The priority order for different UCI types is defined as: HARQ-ACK > SR > CSI with higher priority > CSI with lower priority**
	+ **For overlapping PUCCHs of the same UCI priority, the priority order for a same UCI type is defined as：PUCCH starting at an earlier slot > PUCCH starting at a later slot**
* **Step 1-2-3: the UE repeats step 1-2-1 and step 1-2-2 until the overlapping PUCCHs with repetitions is resolved.**
 |
| ZTE | ***Proposal 1:*** *To perform prioritization among PUCCHs in the set of overlapping PUCCHs, UE would transmit the highest priority channel(s) in the set of overlapping PUCCHs. If there are two or more non-overlapping PUCCHs with UCI of highest priority, all of them will be transmitted.****Proposal 2****: For the determination of reference PUCCH in the set of overlapping PUCCHs with repetitions, the reference PUCCH can be a PUCCH with or without repetitions.*  |
| Samsung | **Proposal: For resolving more than two overlapping PUCCHs of the same priority, reuse the pseudo-code in TS 38.213 9.2.5 with the restriction of selecting up to 2 PUCCH resources and apply the rules defined in clause 9.2.6 if there is repetition or clause 9.2.5, otherwise. Adopt the following TP for section 9.2.5 and 9.2.6 of TS38.213.**-------------------------------------------------- Start of text proposal ---------------------------------------------------**9.2.5 UE procedure for reporting multiple UCI types**<Unchanged text omitted>Set  to the cardinality of Set to be the first symbol of resource  in the slotSet  to be the number of symbols of resource  in the slotSet  - index of first resource in set Set  - counter of overlapped resourceswhile if  and resource  overlaps with resource  and the resources in set $Q$ do not include a PUCCH with repetitions, or $j<C\left(Q\right)-1$ and resource $Q(j-o)$ overlaps with resource $Q(j+1)$, $o=0$, and the resources in set $Q$ include at least one PUCCH with repetitionselseif determine a single resource for multiplexing UCI associated with resources  as described in clauses 9.2.5.0, 9.2.5.1, ~~and~~ 9.2.5.2 and 9.2.6set the index of the single resource to   % start from the beginning after reordering unmerged resources at next step % function that re-orders resources in current set Set  to the cardinality of elseend ifend ifend while<Unchanged text omitted>**9.2.6 PUCCH repetition procedure**<Unchanged text omitted>A UE does not multiplex different UCI types in a PUCCH transmission with repetitions over $N\_{PUCCH}^{repeat}>1$ slots. If a UE would transmit a first PUCCH over more than one slot and ~~at least~~ a second PUCCH over one or more slots, and the transmissions of the first PUCCH and the second PUCCH would overlap in a number of slots then, for each slot of the number of slots and with UCI type priority of HARQ-ACK > SR > CSI with higher priority > CSI with lower priority- the UE does not expect the first PUCCH and ~~any of~~ the second PUCCH~~s~~ to start at a same slot and include a UCI type with same priority - if the first PUCCH and ~~any of~~ the second PUCCH~~s~~ include a UCI type with same priority, the UE transmits the PUCCH starting at an earlier slot and does not transmit the PUCCH starting at a later slot- if the first PUCCH and ~~any of~~ the second PUCCH~~s~~ do not include a UCI type with same priority, the UE transmits the PUCCH that includes the UCI type with higher priority and does not transmit the PUCCH that include the UCI type with lower priority If a UE would transmit more than two overlapping PUCCH transmissions in a slot, where at least one PUCCH transmission is with repetitions over $N\_{PUCCH}^{repeat}>1$ slots, the UE resolves the overlapping for PUCCH transmissions in the slot using the pseudo-code in clause 9.2.5.<Unchanged text omitted>----------------------------------------------------- End of text proposal ------------------------------------------------ |
| QC | ***Proposal 1: Adopt the following TP for Rel-***9.2.6 PUCCH repetition procedure\*\*\*\* unchanged text omitted \*\*\*\*\*\*A UE does not multiplex different UCI types in a PUCCH transmission with repetitions over $N\_{PUCCH}^{repeat}>1$ slots. If a UE would transmit a first PUCCH over more than one slot and at least a second PUCCH over one or more slots, and the transmissions of the first PUCCH and the second PUCCH would overlap in a number of slots then, for each slot of the number of slots and with UCI type priority of HARQ-ACK > SR > CSI with higher priority > CSI with lower priority- the UE does not expect the first PUCCH and any of the second PUCCHs to start at a same slot and include a UCI type with same priority - if the first PUCCH and any of the second PUCCHs include a UCI type with same priority, the UE transmits the PUCCH starting at an earlier slot and does not transmit the PUCCH starting at a later slot- if the first PUCCH and any of the second PUCCHs do not include a UCI type with same priority, the UE transmits the PUCCH that includes the UCI type with higher priority and does not transmit the PUCCH that include the UCI type with lower priority If a UE would transmit a group of overlapping PUCCH channels {Q(j-o+1),…,Q(j)} with a same priority index as described in Clause 9.2.5 in a slot, and if at least one of the PUCCH in the group is repeated over more than one slots, the UE transmits the PUCCH with the highest priority in the group in the slot using the procedures described above and does not transmit the other PUCCH(s) in the group.  |

# Email Discussion

In RAN1#110e 7 candidate options were proposed by companies and companies’ preferences are quite diverse. It seems not possible to directly converge to a candidate option. In this meeting, moderator’s suggestion is separately discussing each of the remaining issues and try to better align companies’ view. Considering this is the late CR phase, the solution should aim for minimizing specification impact.

## First round

## Determination of a set of overlapping PUCCHs

All the submitted contributions [5] ~ [13] discussed the details of Step 1-2-1 of the following WA. The common understanding is that the set of overlapping PUCCHs consist of a reference PUCCH and PUCCH(s) overlapping with the reference PUCCH. A UE first determines a reference PUCCH and then determines the PUCCHs overlapping with the reference PUCCH.

|  |
| --- |
| Working AssumptionFor resolving overlapping PUCCHs with repetitions of a same priority in Rel-16, a UE performs the following steps* Step 1-2-1: the UE determines a set of overlapping PUCCHs.
* Step 1-2-2: the UE performs prioritization among PUCCHs in the set of overlapping PUCCHs.
	+ The priority order for different UCI types is defined as: HARQ-ACK > SR > CSI with higher priority > CSI with lower priority
	+ For overlapping PUCCHs of the same UCI priority, the priority order for a same UCI type is defined as：PUCCH starting at an earlier slot > PUCCH starting at a later slot
* Step 1-2-3: the UE repeats step 1-2-1 and step 1-2-2 until the overlapping PUCCHs with repetitions is resolved.
 |

One controversial issue is whether the reference PUCCH should be a PUCCH with repetitions. The input is summarized below.

Alt 1: The reference PUCCH is a PUCCH with repetitions.

 Proponents: HW, SPRD, OPPO, CATT

Alt 2: The reference PUCCH is a PUCCH with or without repetitions.

Proponents: CATT, Intel, QC, Samsung, ZTE

The proponents of Alt 1 think ‘the first PUCCH’ in clause 9.2.6 is the reference PUCCH, to align with clause 9.2.6 the reference PUCCH should be with repetitions. The proponents of Alt 2 would like to reuse the pseudo-code in clause 9.2.5 to minimize specification impact. However, the concern of Alt 2 is that the set of overlapping PUCCHs may not include a PUCCH with repetitions and UE may resolve overlapping PUCCHs without repetitions first. Alt 2 contradicts with the conclusion copied below.

|  |
| --- |
| Conclusion:For resolving overlapping PUCCHs with and/or without repetitions in a slot in Rel-16, a UE first performs clause 9.2.6 (TS 38.213) to resolve overlapping PUCCHs where at least one PUCCH is with repetitions, and then UE performs clause 9.2.5 (TS 38.213) to resolve overlapping PUCCHs without repetitions.* Note: The above is performed per slot.
 |

This issue was discussed in RAN1#110, Alt 1 was also supported by vivo and MTK. Moderator suggest to go with the majority view.

Another issue is whether up to one or all the PUCCHsoverlapping with the reference PUCCH should be included in the set of overlapping PUCCHs**.** The inputs are summarized below.

Option 1: All the overlapping PUCCH

Proponents: HW, SPRD, OPPO, QC, Intel

Option 2: Up to one overlapping PUCCH

Proponents: Samsung

Considering there is a clear majority view, moderator would suggest to go with Option 1.

#### **P1:**

**For resolving overlapping PUCCHs with repetitions of a same priority in Rel-16, a set of overlapping PUCCHs consist of a reference PUCCH and all the PUCCHs overlapping with the reference PUCCH.**

* **A UE first determines a reference PUCCH and then determines all the PUCCHs overlapping with the reference PUCCH.**
* **The reference PUCCH is a PUCCH overlaps with at least another PUCCH.**
* **FFS: The reference PUCCH is a PUCCH with repetitions.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Support or can live with | QC, Intel, OPPO, Apple, CATT, ZTE, Samsung (can live with), MTK, Huawei/HiSi |
| Object |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Apple | The last sub-bullet does not have to be an FFS. The reference PUCCH shall be a PUCCH with repetition otherwise we may end up a new procedure even for PUCCHs without repetition (for which spec is already clear in 9.2.5) |
| vivo | Agree with Apple to remove FFS in the last bullet. The reference PUCCH shall be a PUCCH with repetition. |
| Samsung | Although we prefer a pair-wise solution to determine the set of PUCCHs but we can live with the proposal to make progress. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

#### **Q1**

**Can you** **live with the restriction that the reference PUCCH is a PUCCH with repetitions? If not, please address the concern that Alt 2 may contradict previous conclusion.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| QC | We just want to minimize the spec. Therefore we prefer not restricting the reference PUCCH as a PUCCH with repetition. We actually don’t think Alt2 contracts with previous conclusion. Step 1-2-1/1-2-2/1-2-3 are all sub-steps of step 1-2, which is part of the following framework (conclusion agreed in RAN1 109e). As we can see, step 1-2 is part of step 1 which is for PUCCHs with repetitions. Actually, after step 1-1, the PUCCHs being processed by step 1-2 is either a PUCCH with repetition, or a PUCCH overlap with another PUCCH with repetitions, because a sub-bullet clearly states that “PUCCHs without repetitions that do not overlap with a PUCCH with repetitions are not involved”. In other words, this “However, the concern of Alt 2 is that the set of overlapping PUCCHs may not include a PUCCH with repetitions and UE may resolve overlapping PUCCHs without repetitions first” is not a correct statement. A set of overlapping PUCCHs determined in step 1-2-1 will always has a PUCCH with repetitions. **Conclusion (in RAN1 109e)**For resolving overlapping PUCCHs of a same priority in Rel-16, a UE performs the following steps* Step1, the UE resolves overlapping PUCCHs with repetitions as described in TS 38.213 clause 9.2.6, if any.
	+ Step 1-1: the UE determines the PUCCHs involved in TS 38.213 clause 9.2.6.
		- o    PUCCHs with repetitions and PUCCHs overlapping with a PUCCH with repetitions are involved.
		- o    PUCCHs without repetitions that do not overlap with a PUCCH with repetitions are not involved.
	+ Step 1-2: the UE resolves overlapping PUCCHs determined in Step 1-1 by performing TS 38.213 clause 9.2.6.
		- o    Only prioritization is performed.
* Step2, the UE resolves overlapping PUCCHs without repetitions as described in TS 38.213 clause 9.2.5, if any.
	+ Step 2-1: the UE determines the PUCCHs involved in TS 38.213 clause 9.2.5.
		- PUCCHs without repetitions that do not overlap with a PUCCH with repetitions are involved.
		- Resulting PUCCHs without repetitions of resolving overlapping PUCCHs determined in Step 1-2 are involved.
	+ Step 2-2: the UE resolves overlapping PUCCHs determined in Step 2-1 by performing TS 38.213 clause 9.2.5.

Note: The above conclusion on the generic framework with high-level steps has no spec impact. The details of certain steps, e.g. step 1-2, may have spec impact subject to outcome of the ongoing and future discussion on the issues identified in email thread [109-e-NR-CRs-03].  |
| Intel  | We share same view with QC to minimize standard impact. We think no need to restrict reference PUCCH as PUCCH with repetitions, because we think the case that ‘the set of overlapping PUCCHs may not include a PUCCH with repetitions’ is not a valid case to be considered here.  |
| OPPO | We support the reference PUCCH is a PUCCH with repetitions for the following three reasons:1. align with clause 9.2.6 the reference PUCCH is the first PUCCH and should be with repetitions;
2. Alt 2 may contradict previous conclusion, further clarification is as following:

In the following case: first UE selects PUCCH 1 and PUCCH 2 as “a set of overlapping PUCCHs”, then UE drop PUCCH 2. After that, UE will select PUCCH 3 and PUCCH 4 as “a set of overlapping PUCCHs” but PUCCH 3 and PUCCH4 are all without repetitions. 1. We see the spec impact for Alt 1 and Alt 2 is similar.
 |
| Apple | We share similar view as FL/OPPO |
| CATT | In general, we provided solutions to minimize the unnecessary PUCCH dropping. But based on the discussions, it seems that companies do not care the performance much but would like to go with the solution with minimal specification changes.In that case, for the reference PUCCH, we agree with OPPO and Apple that the first PUCCH should be a PUCCH with repetition as defined in current 9.2.6. The case identified by OPPO is also valid in our view. |
| ZTE | We support Alt.2. The concern on Alt.2 is not an issue as Qualcomm and Intel said. Even if that is so, if the set of overlapping PUCCHs does not include a PUCCH with repetitions and UE will skip the set and to find the next available set with PUCCH repetitions.There is another solution to solve the divergence between Alt.1 and Alt.2, but may affect the conclusion of the processing order of 9.2.6 and 9.2.5.For example, in a slot, UE determines the set according to the reference PUCCH, and then there may be PUCCH with repetitions in the set or there may not be PUCCH with repetitions in the set. If there is at least a PUCCH with repetition in the set, then process according to 9.2.6 (step 1), otherwise, process according to 9.2.5 (step 1). It is simpler than 2-step procedure but need additional interpretation of previous conclusion. |
| ZTE2 | To explain the less spec impact from Alt.2, the possible TP is shown below:----------------------------------------- Start of text proposal ------------------------------------------------**9.2.5 UE procedure for reporting multiple UCI types**<Unchanged text omitted>Set  to the set of resources for transmission of corresponding PUCCHs in a single slot ~~without repetitions~~ where- a resource with earlier first symbol is placed before a resource with later first symbol- for two resources with same first symbol, the resource with longer duration is placed before the resource with shorter duration- for two resources with same first symbol and same duration, the placement is arbitrary- the above three steps for the set  are according to a subsequent pseudo-code for a function - a resource for negative SR transmission that does not overlap with a resource for HARQ-ACK or CSI transmission is excluded from set  - if the UE is not provided *simultaneousHARQ-ACK-CSI* and resources for transmission of HARQ-ACK information include PUCCH format 0 or PUCCH format 2, resources that include PUCCH format 2, or PUCCH format 3, or PUCCH format 4 for transmission of CSI reports are excluded from the set  if they overlap with any resource from the resources for transmission of HARQ-ACK information- if the UE is not provided *simultaneousHARQ-ACK-CSI* and at least one of the resources for transmission of HARQ-ACK information includes PUCCH format 1, PUCCH format 3, or PUCCH format 4- resources that include PUCCH format 3 or PUCCH format 4 for transmission of CSI reports are excluded from the set - resources that include PUCCH format 2 for transmission of CSI reports are excluded from the set  if they overlap with any resource from the resources for transmission of HARQ-ACK informationSet  to the cardinality of Set to be the first symbol of resource  in the slotSet  to be the number of symbols of resource  in the slotSet  - index of first resource in set Set  - counter of overlapped resourceswhile if  and resource  overlaps with resource  elseif determine a single resource for multiplexing UCI associated with resources  as described in clauses 9.2.5.0, 9.2.5.1, ~~and~~ 9.2.5.2 and 9.2.6set the index of the single resource to   % start from the beginning after reordering unmerged resources at next step % function that re-orders resources in current set Set  to the cardinality of elseend ifend ifend while}For each PUCCH resource in the set  that satisfies the aforementioned timing conditions, when applicable,- the UE transmits a PUCCH using the PUCCH resource if the PUCCH resource does not overlap in time with a PUSCH transmission after multiplexing UCI following the procedures described in clauses 9.2.5.1, ~~and~~ 9.2.5.2 and 9.2.6.- the UE multiplexes HARQ-ACK information and/or CSI reports in a PUSCH if the PUCCH resource overlaps in time with a PUSCH transmission, as described in clause 9.3, and does not transmit SR. In case the PUCCH resource overlaps in time with multiple PUSCH transmissions, the PUSCH for multiplexing HARQ-ACK information and/or CSI is selected as described in clause 9. If the PUSCH transmission by the UE is not in response to a DCI format detection and the UE multiplexes only CSI reports, the timing conditions are not applicable- the UE does not expect the resource to overlap with a second resource of a PUCCH transmission over multiple slots if the resource is obtained from a group of resources that do not overlap with the second resource. <Unchanged text omitted>**9.2.6 PUCCH repetition procedure**<Unchanged text omitted>A UE does not multiplex different UCI types in a PUCCH transmission with repetitions over $N\_{PUCCH}^{repeat}>1$ slots. If a UE would transmit a first PUCCH over more than one slot and a second PUCCH over one or more slots, and the transmissions of the first PUCCH and the second PUCCH would overlap in a number of slots then, for each slot of the number of slots and with UCI type priority of HARQ-ACK > SR > CSI with higher priority > CSI with lower priority- the UE does not expect the first PUCCH and the second PUCCHs to start at a same slot and include a UCI type with same priority - if the first PUCCH and the second PUCCHs include a UCI type with same priority, the UE transmits the PUCCH starting at an earlier slot and does not transmit the PUCCH starting at a later slot- if the first PUCCH and the second PUCCHs do not include a UCI type with same priority, the UE transmits the PUCCH that includes the UCI type with ~~higher~~highest priority and does not transmit the PUCCH that include the UCI type with lower priority <Unchanged text omitted>---------------------------------------- End of text proposal ------------------------------------------------ |
| vivo | We share similar view as FL/OPPO/Apple.  |
| Samsung | Our preference is not to have such restriction but can live with it to make progress. |
| MTK | We can live with the restriction that the reference PUCCH is a PUCCH with repetitions |
| Huawei/HiSi | We support the reference PUCCH is PUCCH with repetition. If there is no such restriction, it is conflict with the agreement that 9.2.6 is performed in prior to 9.2.5, since if the reference PUCCH is w/o repetition, and all its overlapping PUCCHs are also w/o repetitions, then it will jump from 9.2.6 to 9.2.5; when performing a next reference PUCCH with repetition in the same slot, it will jump back to 9.2.6.

|  |
| --- |
| AgreementFor resolving overlapping PUCCHs and/or PUSCHs of a same priority in Rel-16, a UE performs the following steps* Step1, the UE resolves overlapping PUCCHs with repetitions as described in TS 38.213 clause 9.2.6, if any.
* Step2, the UE resolves overlapping PUCCHs without repetitions as described in TS 38.213 clause 9.2.5, if any.
* Step3, the UE resolves overlapping PUSCH(s) and PUCCH(s) with repetitions as described in TS 38.213 clause 9, if any.
* Step4, the UE resolves overlapping PUSCH(s) and PUCCH(s) without repetitions as described in TS 38.213 clause 9, if any.
 |

On the contrary, we think it is with smaller spec impact to restrict the reference PUCCH to be w/ repetitions. Our draft TP is in the following.=====================================================A UE does not multiplex different UCI types in a PUCCH transmission with repetitions over $N\_{PUCCH}^{repeat}>1$ slots. If a UE would transmit a first PUCCH over more than one slot and at least a second PUCCH over one or more slots, and the transmissions of the first PUCCH and the second PUCCH would overlap in a number of slots then, for each slot of the number of slots and with UCI type priority of HARQ-ACK > SR > CSI with higher priority > CSI with lower priority- the UE does not expect any two PUCCHs from the first PUCCH and the second PUCCHs to start at a same slot and include a UCI type with same priority - if the first PUCCH and each of the second PUCCHs include a UCI type with same priority, the UE transmits the PUCCH starting at an earliest slot and does not transmit the PUCCH starting at any later slot- if the first PUCCH and any of the second PUCCHs do not include a UCI type with same priority, the UE transmits the PUCCH that includes the UCI type with highest priority followed by starting at an earliest slot and does not transmit the PUCCH that include the UCI type with any lower priority or any later slot- the UE performs the above rules by selecting the first PUCCH with the order of earliest symbol followed by longest duration from the PUCCHs with repetition that overlap with at least one PUCCH, and the at least a second PUCCH includes all PUCCHs overlapping with the first PUCCH===================================================== |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

Another remaining issue is the order of reference PUCCH determination. The inputs are summarized below.

Alt 1: Earliest starting symbol followed by longest duration

Proponents: HW OPPO, QC, Samsung, Intel

Alt 2: UCI with the highest priority

Proponents: OPPO, CATT

Alt 3: UE does not expect to be configured or scheduled more than one PUCCH with repetitions in a slot.

Proponents: OPPO

The proponents of Alt 1 aim to minimize specification impact by reusing the rules defined in clause 9.2.5. Alt 2 has additional specification impact compared with Alt 1. Alt 3 is very restrictive for the scenario of multiple traffic types. For such scenario, a SR configuration can be associated with a logic channel and multiple SR configurations can be configured in a same slot. Alt 3 prevents such scheduling flexibility. Moderator suggest to go with the majority view.

#### **P2:**

**For resolving overlapping PUCCHs with repetitions of a same priority in Rel-16, the PUCCH resources are ordered as following for determining the reference PUCCH.**

**- a resource with earlier first symbol is placed before a resource with later first symbol**

**- for two resources with same first symbol, the resource with longer duration is placed before the resource with shorter duration**

**- for two resources with same first symbol and same duration, the placement is arbitrary**

**Note: the above does not imply that the reference PUCCH is with or without repetitions.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Support or can live with | QC, Intel, OPPO, Apple (see comments), CATT (can live with), ZTE, vivo, Samsung, MTK Huawei/HiSi |
| Object |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Apple | For the (for example) two overlapping PUCCHs both with repetitions, the reference is first determined based on UCI priority. Why the proposal does not consider different UCI priorities? |
| CATT | That is not our preference as we analyzed in our contribution, it would lead to unnecessary PUCCH dropping. But for the sake of progress, we can compromise with majority views. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## Prioritization among PUCCHs in the set of overlapping PUCCHs

There are two alternatives for determining the PUCCHs overlapping with the reference PUCCH. The inputs are summarized below.

Alt 1: UE transmit the PUCCH with the highest priority.

Proponents: HW, SPRD, OPPO, QC, Intel, CATT, Samsung

Alt 2: Perform pair-wise prioritization between the first PUCCH (reference) and a second PUCCH until there is no overlapping between the first PUCCH and another PUCCH, where the second PUCCH is selected based on UCI priority followed by starting slot/sub-slot.

Proponents: CATT

#### **P3:**

**For resolving overlapping PUCCHs with repetitions of a same priority in Rel-16, UE transmits the PUCCH with the highest priority when performing prioritization among PUCCHs in a set of overlapping PUCCHs.**

* **The priority order for different UCI types is defined as: HARQ-ACK > SR > CSI with higher priority > CSI with lower priority**
* **For overlapping PUCCHs of the same UCI priority, the priority order for a same UCI type is defined as: PUCCH starting at an earlier slot > PUCCH starting at a later slot**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Support or can live with | QC, Intel, OPPO, ZTE, vivo (can live with), Samsung, MTK, Huawei/HiSi |
| Object | Apple |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Apple | We tend to go with pair-wise solution which is more compliant with 9.2.6, in our view. Basically, once the set is determined, as long as the reference PUCCH (which has repetitions) is not dropped, it is compared in a pair-wise way with other PUCCHs within the set. If the reference PUCCH is dropped, all the PUCCH resources within the set (except the reference PUCCH) may survive (subject to the existing specification). |
| CATT | We agree with Apple that pair-wise solution is more compliant with 9.2.6. Pair-wise solution is also better from performance perspective thus we prefer pair-wise prioritization. But if majority companies want to go with one-shot approach, we can live with it for the sake of progress. |
| vivo | Although this alt may result in unnecessary dropping, we can live with it for the sake of progress. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

In addition, ZTE raised a case that there are more than one non-overlapping PUCCHs with the highest priority in a set of overlapping PUCCH, in this case, all the non-overlapping PUCCHs with the highest priority should be transmitted. Companies are encouraged to provide the view on this case.

#### **Q2:**

What is your option on the case that there are more than one non-overlapping PUCCHs with the highest priority in a set of overlapping PUCCH?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| QC | No strong view here. But I am not sure we have to solve all the corner case of a corner case, given that this issue that we have been discussed for a few meetings is already a corner case by itself… |
| Intel  | We share exactly same view with QC 😊 |
| CATT | We do not have a strong preference but we think we need a conclusion/agreement for this case. |
| ZTE | For this issue, we should have a conclusion or agreement even if it is a corner case as the behavior is not defined in case it happens. |
| vivo | This issue can be solved by changing P3 as UE transmits the PUCCH(s) with the highest priority when performing prioritization among PUCCHs in a set of overlapping PUCCHs where the PUCCHs with the highest priority are non-overlapped if any. Of course, we do not have a strong view. We are fine to treat it as an corner case and have a conclusion/agreement for it. |
| MTK | Similar view as QC. However, we are fine to adopt ZTE’s proposal if necessary. |
| Huawei/HiSi | UE does not expect. In the legacy spec, it already specifies that UE does not expect the first PUCCH and the second PUCCH does not expect to start at the same slot and include the same priority UCI. We can simply extend the rule to any two PUCCHs in the set of PUCCH of the first PUCCH and multiple second PUCCHs.As in our draft TP (“first PUCCH” in below denotes the reference PUCCH):- the UE does not expect any two PUCCHs from the first PUCCH and the second PUCCHs to start at a same slot and include a UCI type with same priority  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## Second round

In the first round discussion, companies view are quite aligned for P1~P3 except Apple raised a concern on P3. Pair-wise operation was discussed in the last meeting, however, companies had concerns on it. As clarified in previous meetings, in current spec, the second PUCCH can consist of multiple PUCCHs, some companies do not agree that pair-wise operation is the current behaviour. Hopefully, Apple could reconsider it and be flexible.

In the 2nd round, the discussion will focus on the FFS of P1.

Regarding the concern on whether Alt 2 contradicts with previous conclusion, moderator would like to clarify a bit more about the two conclusions below.

|  |
| --- |
| **Conclusion #1**For resolving overlapping PUCCHs with and/or without repetitions in a slot in Rel-16, a UE first performs clause 9.2.6 (TS 38.213) to resolve overlapping PUCCHs where at least one PUCCH is with repetitions, and then UE performs clause 9.2.5 (TS 38.213) to resolve overlapping PUCCHs without repetitions.* Note: The above is performed per slot.
 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Conclusion #2**For resolving overlapping PUCCHs of a same priority in Rel-16, a UE performs the following steps* Step1, the UE resolves overlapping PUCCHs with repetitions as described in TS 38.213 clause 9.2.6, if any.
	+ Step 1-1: the UE determines the PUCCHs involved in TS 38.213 clause 9.2.6.
		- o    PUCCHs with repetitions and PUCCHs overlapping with a PUCCH with repetitions are involved.
		- o    PUCCHs without repetitions that do not overlap with a PUCCH with repetitions are not involved.
	+ Step 1-2: the UE resolves overlapping PUCCHs determined in Step 1-1 by performing TS 38.213 clause 9.2.6.
		- o    Only prioritization is performed.
* Step2, the UE resolves overlapping PUCCHs without repetitions as described in TS 38.213 clause 9.2.5, if any.
	+ Step 2-1: the UE determines the PUCCHs involved in TS 38.213 clause 9.2.5.
		- PUCCHs without repetitions that do not overlap with a PUCCH with repetitions are involved.
		- Resulting PUCCHs without repetitions of resolving overlapping PUCCHs determined in Step 1-2 are involved.
	+ Step 2-2: the UE resolves overlapping PUCCHs determined in Step 2-1 by performing TS 38.213 clause 9.2.5.

Note: The above conclusion on the generic framework with high-level steps has no spec impact. The details of certain steps, e.g. step 1-2, may have spec impact subject to outcome of the ongoing and future discussion on the issues identified in email thread [109-e-NR-CRs-03]. |

Conclusion #2 further clarifies the details of Conclusion #1. The issue under discussion here belongs to the details of Step 1-2 of Conclusion #2. Please note the main bullet of P1 ‘For resolving overlapping PUCCHs with repetitions of a same priority in Rel-16’ is aligned with Step 1. According to the highlight part of Step 1-2, only prioritization is performed, there is no intention to change this behaviour. UE will not perform multiplexing during the procedure of Step 1. With this understanding, it does not contradict with Conclusion #1. Regarding Oppo’s example in Q1, UE will perform prioritization for PUCCH#3 and PUCCH#4. Although prioritization may result in PUCCH dropping, we should aim for minimizing spec impact instead of best performance in the CR phase. Besides, this is a very corner case, the performance loss should be acceptable. Moderator’s suggestion is not focusing on the extreme corner case. The impact of the extreme corner case should not be taken as essential in the CR phase.

#### **Q3:**

Do you agree that only prioritization is performed during the procedure of Step 1-2 of Conclusion #2? If not, please clarify the reason why the conclusion should be violated.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| vivo | Regarding FL’s following comment, we have different view.Regarding Oppo’s example in Q1, UE will perform prioritization for PUCCH#3 and PUCCH#4. Although prioritization may result in PUCCH dropping, we should aim for minimizing spec impact instead of best performance in the CR phase.Note that in Conclusion #2, in Step 1-1, it says that PUCCHs without repetitions that do not overlap with a PUCCH with repetitions are not involved. So, PUCCH 3 and PUCCH 4 should not be involved based on Conclusion #2.**Conclusion #2**For resolving overlapping PUCCHs of a same priority in Rel-16, a UE performs the following steps* Step1, the UE resolves overlapping PUCCHs with repetitions as described in TS 38.213 clause 9.2.6, if any.
	+ Step 1-1: the UE determines the PUCCHs involved in TS 38.213 clause 9.2.6.
		- o    PUCCHs with repetitions and PUCCHs overlapping with a PUCCH with repetitions are involved.
		- o    PUCCHs without repetitions that do not overlap with a PUCCH with repetitions are not involved.

…Regarding Q3, YES. |
| CATT | Yes, we agree that only prioritization is performed during the procedure of Step 1-2 of Conclusion #2.Regarding OPPO’s example, our understanding is that both PUCCH 3 and PUCCH 4 are involved in Step 1-2 because both PUCCH 3 and PUCCH 4 overlap with a PUCCH with repetition and are included in Step 1-1. But we are not sure whether proponents of Alt 2 consider prioritization or multiplexing for PUCCH 3 and PUCCH 4.  |
| OPPO | We share similar view with vivo and disagree FL’s following comment:“Regarding Oppo’s example in Q1, UE will perform prioritization for PUCCH#3 and PUCCH#4. Although prioritization may result in PUCCH dropping, we should aim for minimizing spec impact instead of best performance in the CR phase.”In the following conclusion and WA, UE performs step 1-2-1 under step 1-2 and step 1-2 says sth like “the UE resolves overlapping PUCCHs determined in Step 1-1 by performing TS 38.213 clause 9.2.6”. In our example, the prioritization (not sure of prioritization or multiplexing from point of proponent of Alt 2) of PUCCH 3 and PUCCH 4 is abviously not an issue which 9.2.6 intends to address and can not be implemented “by performing TS 38.213 clause 9.2.6” as the following conclusion, and this is a totally new behavior. At least to our understanding, current 9.2.6 targets at “a set of overlapping PUCCHs including at least one PUCCH with repetitions”. But PUCCH 3 and PUCCH 4 are all without repetitions.ConclusionFor resolving overlapping PUCCHs of a same priority in Rel-16, a UE performs the following steps* Step1, the UE resolves overlapping PUCCHs with repetitions as described in TS 38.213 clause 9.2.6, if any.
	+ Step 1-1: the UE determines the PUCCHs involved in TS 38.213 clause 9.2.6.
		- o    PUCCHs with repetitions and PUCCHs overlapping with a PUCCH with repetitions are involved.
		- o    PUCCHs without repetitions that do not overlap with a PUCCH with repetitions are not involved.
	+ Step 1-2: the UE resolves overlapping PUCCHs determined in Step 1-1 by performing TS 38.213 clause 9.2.6.
		- o    Only prioritization is performed.

Working assumption:For resolving overlapping PUCCHs with repetitions of a same priority in Rel-16, a UE performs the following steps* Step 1-2-1: the UE determines a set of overlapping PUCCHs.
* Step 1-2-2: the UE performs prioritization among PUCCHs in the set of overlapping PUCCHs.
	+ The priority order for different UCI types is defined as: HARQ-ACK > SR > CSI with higher priority > CSI with lower priority
	+ For overlapping PUCCHs of the same UCI priority, the priority order for a same UCI type is defined as：PUCCH starting at an earlier slot > PUCCH starting at a later slot

Step 1-2-3: the UE repeats step 1-2-1 and step 1-2-2 until the overlapping PUCCHs with repetitions is resolved.  |
| Moderator | Vivo’s comment ‘Note that in Conclusion #2, in Step 1-1, it says that PUCCHs without repetitions that do not overlap with a PUCCH with repetitions are not involved. So, PUCCH 3 and PUCCH 4 should not be involved based on Conclusion #2.’ is not correct according to the conclusion below. Because PUCCH 3/4 overlaps with a PUCCH with repetitions.

|  |
| --- |
| Conclusion:For resolving overlapping PUCCHs with repetitions in clause 9.2.6 of TS 38.213 in Rel-16, PUCCHs with repetitions and PUCCHs overlapping with a PUCCH with repetitions are considered. PUCCHs without repetitions that do not overlap with a PUCCH with repetitions are not considered.* Note 1: The above is for clarifying the determination of the overlapping PUCCHs resolved in clause 9.2.6 of TS 38.213 and does not impact the determination of “a set of overlapping PUCCHs” when performing clause 9.2.6 of TS 38.213 discussed in [109-e-NR-CRs-03].
* Note 2: The above has no spec impact. This is also assumed in discussion to solve issue in [109-e-NR-CRs-03].
 |

This case is a very corner case, it can be defined as corner case if companies insist on the concern. PUCCH repetition is used for coverage limited scenario, long PUCCH format will be used in such scenario for a typical case. In reality, the OPPO case will never happen, it requires the following conditions satisfied simultaneously* 5 partially overlapping PUCCH
* 2nd and 5th PUCCH are with repetitions
* 1st, 3rd and 4th PUCCH are without repetitions
* The priority of 1st PUCCH is larger than the 2nd PUCCH

If companies cannot align the understanding, let’s not discuss this case any further. There is no need to spend time on a case that will never happen. |
| Apple | We disagree with moderator’s reading of the conclusions. P1 is targeting to resolve Step 1-1, to determine the set of overlapping PUCCHs. From Conclusion #2,* + Step 1-1: the UE determines the PUCCHs involved in TS 38.213 clause 9.2.6.
		- o    PUCCHs with repetitions and PUCCHs overlapping with a PUCCH with repetitions are involved.
		- o    PUCCHs without repetitions that do not overlap with a PUCCH with repetitions are not involved.

In Q3, yes we agree that Step 1-2 is only concerned about prioritization.For OPPO’s example (although agree not to be example-specific, just for clarification), PUCCHs 1/2/3 form one set (where reference is PUCCH2) and PUCCHs 4/5 form another set (where reference is PUCCH5)  |
| ZTE | I think the answer to Q3 is “Yes” |
| Spreadtrum | Yes for Q3.  |
| Intel  | We think the answer to Q3 is “Yes”We share exactly same view with FL that OPPO case is extremely corner case, let’s stop spending time on that case.  |
| Huawei/HiSi | Yes. |
| MTK | Yes |

#### **Q4:**

If only prioritization is performed during the procedure of Step 1-2 of Conclusion #2, do you still think Alt 2 contradicts with Conclusion #1? If yes, please clarify.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| vivo | Yes. As comment in Q3. PUCCH 3 and PUCCH 4 should not be involved based on Conclusion #2. But Alt 2 would perform preoptimization between PUCCH 3 and PUCCH 4. |
| CATT | No. But as commented above, it is not clear that whether all the proponents of Alt 2 think that prioritization instead of multiplexing is performed between PUCCH 3 and PUCCH 4 in OPPO’s example. |
| OPPO | Yes, as our comment in Q3. |
| Apple | Yes. Step 1-2 is concerned about how to determine which PUCCH resources survive/dropped “after the set is determined”. Alt2 contradicts with Step 1-1 (and in our view also contradicts with current spec in 9.2.6), “how the set is determined”  |
| ZTE | No. I can’t see the contradiction with conclusion#1 or #2. For the set determination, it is no need to restrict the reference PUCCH to be a PUCCH with repetition. In step 1-1 of conclusion#2, the set is determined based on at least a PUCCH with repetition involved, not say the reference PUCCH should be with repetition. There is no issue to run the pseudo code even if the reference PUCCH is not with repetition as the example I gave in Q1. |
| Spreadtrum | Yes, Alt 2 contradicts with conclusion #1. Step 1-1 determines a set of PUCCH, and at least a PUCCH with repetition, and then Step 1-2 resolves overlapping PUCCHs determined in Step 1-1. |
| Intel  | No.  |
| Huawei/HiSi | Yes. |
|  |  |

From moderator’s understanding, the down-selection of Alt 1 and Alt 2 should mainly focus on the spec impact and UE implementation complexity. In previous meeting, the understanding of the spec below was clarified. A first PUCCH consists of only one PUCCH while the second PUCCH(s) consists of one or more PUCCHs. All the second PUCCH(s) overlap with the first PUCCH. Comparing with P1, a set of overlapping PUCCHs correspond to the first PUCCH and the second PUCCH(s), the first PUCCH is aligned with the reference PUCCH and the second PUCCH(s) is aligned with the PUCCH(s) overlapping with the reference PUCCH. With this understanding, ‘the reference PUCCH is a PUCCH with repetitions’ is aligned with clause 9.2.6.

|  |
| --- |
| A UE does not multiplex different UCI types in a PUCCH transmission with repetitions over $N\_{PUCCH}^{repeat}>1$ slots. If a UE would transmit a first PUCCH over more than one slot and at least a second PUCCH over one or more slots, and the transmissions of the first PUCCH and the second PUCCH would overlap in a number of slots then, for each slot of the number of slots and with UCI type priority of HARQ-ACK > SR > CSI with higher priority > CSI with lower priority- the UE does not expect the first PUCCH and any of the second PUCCHs to start at a same slot and include a UCI type with same priority - if the first PUCCH and any of the second PUCCHs include a UCI type with same priority, the UE transmits the PUCCH starting at an earlier slot and does not transmit the PUCCH starting at a later slot- if the first PUCCH and any of the second PUCCHs do not include a UCI type with same priority, the UE transmits the PUCCH that includes the UCI type with higher priority and does not transmit the PUCCH that include the UCI type with lower priority  |

#### **Q5:**

Do you agree that ‘the reference PUCCH is a PUCCH with repetitions’ is aligned with clause 9.2.6? If not, please clarify the reason.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| vivo | YES |
| CATT | Yes, we agree with FL. |
| OPPO | Yes. |
| Apple | Yes (from 9.2.6:” If a UE would transmit a first PUCCH over more than one slot…”) |
| ZTE | I think no.I am confused with the deduction above. The current specification doesn’t handle the case of more than 2 overlapping channels, and then no set concept is introduced in 9.2.6. And also the reference PUCCH concept is new which is not covered by 9.2.6.  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |
| Intel  | No. In our view, we first do step 1-2-1 by using 9.2.5, i.e., find a set of PUCCH (including find reference PUCCH and overlapping PUCCHs) using 9.2.5, then, we do step 1-2-2 by using 9.2.6 to resolve collision within the set. Frist and second PUCCH is only used for collision resolution in step 1-2-2.  |
| Huawei/HiSi | Yes. @ZTE to clarify, it is not accurate to say the current spec does no handle the situation of more than 2 overlapping channels. As shown in below, the overlapping is between “a first PUCCH” and “AT LEAST A second PUCCH”.From 9.2.6, the first PUCCH is “over MORE THAN ONE slot”, which can be regarded as the reference PUCCH, which is w/ repetition. The second PUCCH is “over one or more slots”, which can be regarded as other PUCCH w/ or w/o repetitions overlapping with the reference PUCCH. In this regard, taking the reference PUCCH as “the first PUCCH” in the current spec has minor spec impact.

|  |
| --- |
| A UE does not multiplex different UCI types in a PUCCH transmission with repetitions over  slots. If a UE would transmit a first PUCCH over more than one slot and at least a second PUCCH over one or more slots, and the transmissions of the first PUCCH and the second PUCCH would overlap in a number of slots then, for each slot of the number of slots and with UCI type priority of HARQ-ACK > SR > CSI with higher priority > CSI with lower priority- the UE does not expect the first PUCCH and any of the second PUCCHs to start at a same slot and include a UCI type with same priority - if the first PUCCH and any of the second PUCCHs include a UCI type with same priority, the UE transmits the PUCCH starting at an earlier slot and does not transmit the PUCCH starting at a later slot- if the first PUCCH and any of the second PUCCHs do not include a UCI type with same priority, the UE transmits the PUCCH that includes the UCI type with higher priority and does not transmit the PUCCH that include the UCI type with lower priority  |

 |
| MTK | Yes |

The proponents of Alt 2 aim for reusing the pseudo-code of 9.2.5 for determine a set of overlapping PUCCHs to minimize spec impact. The repetition is not considered when determining the reference PUCCH. On the contrary, for Alt 1, the pseudo-code of 9.2.5 needs to be changed at least with adding the repetition restriction for selecting a reference PUCCH. From moderator’s understanding, the pseudo-code of 9.2.5 may not be a must. The difference between prioritization and multiplexing is that the result PUCCH of multiplexing may overlap with other PUCCHs not in the selected set but for prioritization such situation does not exists. In the pseudo-code of 9.2.5 the result PUCCH is put back to the set Q and then redo the ordering. These steps can be avoided for prioritization operation because the result PUCCH would not overlap with other PUCCHs in Step 1-2.

#### **Q6:**

What is your preference on reusing the pseudo-code of clause 9.2.5 for resolving overlapping PUCCHs with repetitions?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Reuse | ZTE |
| NOT reuse | Apple Huawei/HiSi |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| CATT | For collision handling of PUCCH with repetition, the existing rules should be followed (i.e. the first PUCCH is a PUCCH with repetition and the second PUCCH(s) are the PUCCHs with or without repetition overlapping with the first PUCCH). What is missing is to define a processing order for multiple first PUCCHs within a slot. In this regard, we follow the same rule as in Clause 9.2.5.We should not break the existing rules just for reusing the pseudo-code of clause 9.2.5.  |
| OPPO | Agree with CATT. |
| Apple | Now we are moving to P3 which deals with Step 1-2. We understand that Apple is the only company with pair-wise solution but we have concern on adopting 9.2.5 to resolve the issue for this CR. |
| ZTE | The pseudo-code of clause 9.2.5 can be reused and minor change is needed as pointed in first round. The original pseudo-code doesn’t care the PUCCH with repetition or without repetition. |
| Intel  | I don’t know how to answer this question, because both options does not reuse all parts of pseudo-code of clause 9.2.5.We’d like to clarify our understanding on how to reuse pseudo-code of clause 9.2.5. For Alt 2, we use the part of 9.2.5 to determine a set of PUCCH resource in step 1-2-1. For Alt 1, it seems to combine only part of 9.2.5 for reference PUCCH determination to find 1st PUCCH in 9.2.6 and then use 9.2.6 to find overlapping PUCCHs to finally determine the set of PUCCH resource in step 1-2-1. Honestly speaking, it is a bit strange to combine both 9.2.5 and 9.2.6 for a singe step 1-2-1.  |
| Huawei/HiSi | As we can handle everything related with PUCCH repetition in 9.2.6, there is no need to tangle with 9.2.5 which only handles the PUCCH w/o repetitions. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

#### **Q7:**

What is your preference on the following two alternatives?

Alt 1: The reference PUCCH is a PUCCH with repetitions.

Alt 2: The reference PUCCH is a PUCCH with or without repetitions.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Alt 1 | Support or can live with | Vivo, CATT OPPO Apple, Spreadtrum Huawei/HiSi, MTK |
| Object | ZTE, QC(Object for now. Can reconsider if question in table below is answered)， Intel |
| Alt 2 | Support or can live with | ZTE, QC, Intel  |
| Object | CATT OPPO Apple Huawei/HiSi |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| ZTE | No need to restrict reference PUCCH to be a PUCCH with repetition. |
| QC | I know that proponents of Alt 2 support reusing Pseudo code in 9.2.5 to build a group of overlapping PUCCHs in step 1-2-1 (as below WA). I have a question for proponents of Alt 1: * **Do proponents of Alt 1 also support reusing Pseudo code in 9.2.5 to build a group of overlapping PUCCHs in step 1-2-1?**

If the answer is yes, I think that the difference between Alt 1 and Alt 2 is really very minor, and we could be flexible to take either alternative. But if the answer is no. Then I would be hesitated to go with Alt 1, before I understand how Alt 1 build a group of overlapping PUCCHs in step 1-2-1. So, can proponents of Alt 1 please clarify how Alt 1 build a group of overlapping PUCCHs in step 1-2-1?Working AssumptionFor resolving overlapping PUCCHs with repetitions of a same priority in Rel-16, a UE performs the following steps* Step 1-2-1: the UE determines a set of overlapping PUCCHs.
* Step 1-2-2: the UE performs prioritization among PUCCHs in the set of overlapping PUCCHs.
	+ The priority order for different UCI types is defined as: HARQ-ACK > SR > CSI with higher priority > CSI with lower priority
	+ For overlapping PUCCHs of the same UCI priority, the priority order for a same UCI type is defined as：PUCCH starting at an earlier slot > PUCCH starting at a later slot
* Step 1-2-3: the UE repeats step 1-2-1 and step 1-2-2 until the overlapping PUCCHs with repetitions is resolved.

By the way, in the first round discussion, ZTE provided full TP for Alt 2. While Alt 1 proponents did not provide full TP. Huawei’s TP did not include how Alt 1 do step 1-2-1. To be fair, I think Alt 1 proponents should provide full TP, so that the group can compare the spec impact.  |
| Apple2 | We can live with P2 and P3, SUBJECT that in P1+P2 from the first round (basically to determine a set of overlapping PUCCHs), we can agree on:1. The reference PUCCH is a PUCCH with repetition that in comparison with other PUCCHs with repetitions in that slot, starts in an earlier symbol (if two PUCCHs both with repetitions start at the same symbol, the one that ends later is the reference, if both start and end at the same time UE picks one randomly)
2. A set of overlapping PUCCHs consists of the reference PUCCH (as determined in 1) and all PUCCHs (with or without repetition) that overlap with the reference PUCCH.
 |
| Intel  | We share same concern with QC. As we commented in Q6, for Alt 1, it seems to combine only part of 9.2.5 for reference PUCCH determination to find 1st PUCCH in 9.2.6 and then use 9.2.6 to find overlapping PUCCHs to finally determine the set of PUCCH resource in step 1-2-1. It is a bit strange and complicate to combine both 9.2.5 and 9.2.6 for a step 1-2-1. |
| Huawei/HiSi | @QC In our TP, after the reference PUCCH is determined, it can reuse the legacy 9.2.6 text to determine “a set of overlapping PUCCHs”, i.e., the “at least a second PUCCH”. Also see the last bullet “the at least a second PUCCH includes all PUCCHs overlapping with the first PUCCH”, it is quite clear.

|  |
| --- |
| A UE does not multiplex different UCI types in a PUCCH transmission with repetitions over $N\_{PUCCH}^{repeat}>1$ slots. If a UE would transmit a first PUCCH over more than one slot and at least a second PUCCH over one or more slots, and the transmissions of the first PUCCH and the second PUCCH would overlap in a number of slots then, for each slot of the number of slots and with UCI type priority of HARQ-ACK > SR > CSI with higher priority > CSI with lower priority- the UE does not expect any two PUCCHs from the first PUCCH and the second PUCCHs to start at a same slot and include a UCI type with same priority - if the first PUCCH and each of the second PUCCHs include a UCI type with same priority, the UE transmits the PUCCH starting at an earliest slot and does not transmit the PUCCH starting at any later slot- if the first PUCCH and any of the second PUCCHs do not include a UCI type with same priority, the UE transmits the PUCCH that includes the UCI type with highest priority followed by starting at an earliest slot and does not transmit the PUCCH that include the UCI type with any lower priority or any later slot- the UE performs the above rules by selecting the first PUCCH with the order of earliest symbol followed by longest duration from the PUCCHs with repetition that overlap with at least one PUCCH, and the at least a second PUCCH includes all PUCCHs overlapping with the first PUCCH |

 |
| QC2 | @Huawei, thanks for the clarification – sorry I missed the last sentence when I read your TP. But I think there is still something missing. What if after you handled an overlapping group in 9.2.6. There are other overlapping groups. You need a for or while loop, right? Where is that loop in your TP? |
| OPPO2 | @QC, to my understanding, your concern for Huawei’s TP is for the loop and ending condition of the loop, if I understand correctly, can you check if the following TP (combine Huawei’s TP and TP1 from our contribution [TP1, R1-2208867]) can address your concern?

|  |
| --- |
| A UE does not multiplex different UCI types in a PUCCH transmission with repetitions over $N\_{PUCCH}^{repeat}>1$ slots. If a UE would transmit a first PUCCH over more than one slot and at least a second PUCCH over one or more slots, and the transmissions of the first PUCCH and the second PUCCH would overlap in a number of slots then, for each slot of the number of slots and with UCI type priority of HARQ-ACK > SR > CSI with higher priority > CSI with lower priority- the UE does not expect any two PUCCHs from the first PUCCH and the second PUCCHs to start at a same slot and include a UCI type with same priority - if the first PUCCH and each of the second PUCCHs include a UCI type with same priority, the UE transmits the PUCCH starting at an earliest slot and does not transmit the PUCCH starting at any later slot- if the first PUCCH and any of the second PUCCHs do not include a UCI type with same priority, the UE transmits the PUCCH that includes the UCI type with highest priority followed by starting at an earliest slot and does not transmit the PUCCH that include the UCI type with any lower priority or any later slot- the UE performs the above rules by selecting the first PUCCH with the order of earliest symbol followed by longest duration from the PUCCHs with repetition that overlap with at least one PUCCH, and the at least a second PUCCH includes all PUCCHs overlapping with the first PUCCH, until there is no PUCCH overlapping with a PUCCH with repetitions in the slot. |

 |
| Huawei/HiSi2 | We are fine with OPPO changes, and are open to other formats of wording (e.g., something like “the first PUCCH is selected by following the pseudo code of 9.2.5…”), as long as we contain the changes in only 9.2.6 with minimum spec effort. |
| Apple3 | Support HW+OPPP TPs (some editorial may be need for future clarification like in 3rd bullet “only” is added as “if the first PUCCH and any of the second PUCCHs do not include a UCI type with same priority, the UE only transmits the PUCCH that includes the UCI type with highest priority…” Although we know if the surviving PUCCH is without repetition, in the next step it will go through 9.2.5 and it may be transmitted or multiplexed with another PUCCH (so “UE transmits” is not necessarily always the case, but we are fine with this text, given that original spec comes with that wording and no need to complicate it at this stage) |

## Third round

The new agreement (P1) made in this meeting is copied below

|  |
| --- |
| AgreementFor resolving overlapping PUCCHs with repetitions of a same priority in Rel-16, a set of overlapping PUCCHs consist of a reference PUCCH and all the PUCCHs overlapping with the reference PUCCH.-        A UE first determines a reference PUCCH and then determines all the PUCCHs overlapping with the reference PUCCH.-        The reference PUCCH is a PUCCH overlaps with at least another PUCCH.-        FFS: The reference PUCCH is a PUCCH with repetitions. |

In the second round, the discussion focused on the FFS of P1.

It seems there is some misalignment here based on the comments in Q3. Some companies think P1 targets for resolving Step 1-1. This is not correct understanding. According to the conclusion below, it is clear which PUCCHs are involved in Step 1-1, there is no unclear UE behavior and there is no spec impact. The ‘involved PUCCHs in 9.2.6’ does not mean these PUCCHs are in a same set. The discussion in RAN1#109 [1] has clarified it. Instead, the details of Step 1-2 are not clear and can result in unclear UE behavior. The whole discussion focuses on the remaining issues of the WA which is related to the details to Step 1-2. The indexes of the sub-steps of the WA also imply this understand. Hopefully, it clarifies.

|  |
| --- |
| Conclusion: #3For resolving overlapping PUCCHs with repetitions in clause 9.2.6 of TS 38.213 in Rel-16, PUCCHs with repetitions and PUCCHs overlapping with a PUCCH with repetitions are considered. PUCCHs without repetitions that do not overlap with a PUCCH with repetitions are not considered.* Note 1: The above is for clarifying the determination of the overlapping PUCCHs resolved in clause 9.2.6 of TS 38.213 and does not impact the determination of “a set of overlapping PUCCHs” when performing clause 9.2.6 of TS 38.213 discussed in [109-e-NR-CRs-03].
* Note 2: The above has no spec impact. This is also assumed in discussion to solve issue in [109-e-NR-CRs-03].

Working AssumptionFor resolving overlapping PUCCHs with repetitions of a same priority in Rel-16, a UE performs the following steps* Step 1-2-1: the UE determines a set of overlapping PUCCHs.
* Step 1-2-2: the UE performs prioritization among PUCCHs in the set of overlapping PUCCHs.
	+ The priority order for different UCI types is defined as: HARQ-ACK > SR > CSI with higher priority > CSI with lower priority
	+ For overlapping PUCCHs of the same UCI priority, the priority order for a same UCI type is defined as：PUCCH starting at an earlier slot > PUCCH starting at a later slot
* Step 1-2-3: the UE repeats step 1-2-1 and step 1-2-2 until the overlapping PUCCHs with repetitions is resolved.
 |

Regarding whether using a PUCCH with repetitions as reference is more aligned with 9.2.6, the majority view is yes although Intel and ZTE showed different understanding. Regarding ZTE’s comment ‘The current specification doesn’t handle the case of more than 2 overlapping channels, and then no set concept is introduced in 9.2.6.’, moderator shares the same understanding as HW. It has been clarified in RAN1#109 [1] that a second PUCCH can insist more than one PUCCH. Regarding Intel’s comment ‘we first do step 1-2-1 by using 9.2.5, i.e., find a set of PUCCH (including find reference PUCCH and overlapping PUCCHs) using 9.2.5, then, we do step 1-2-2 by using 9.2.6 to resolve collision within the set.’, the current spec of 9.2.6 does not mention performing step 1-2-1 by using 9.2.5. From moderator’s understanding, this is a new feature proposed by Alt 2.

Based on the above understanding, a clear majority companies showed support of Alt 1 and three companies ZTE, QC and Intel showed concerns for Alt 1. Regarding ZTE’s comment ‘No need to restrict reference PUCCH to be a PUCCH with repetition.’, proponents of Alt 1 think removing the restriction is not aligned with current UE behavior defined in 9.2.6. Regarding QC’s suggestion on Alt 1 + pseudo-code in 9.2.5, from moderator’s understanding, the pseudo-code in 9.2.5 cannot be simply reused.

The pseudo-code takes the earliest PUCCH as reference and then select all the PUCCHs overlapping with the reference with the restriction that the selected overlapping PUCCHs ($\left\{Q(j-o+1),...,Q(j)\right\}$) are ordered after the reference PUCCH （$\left\{Q(j-o)\right\}$）. The difference is that for Alt 1 the reference PUCCH may not be the earliest for example in the case below. CSI is the reference, reusing the pseudo-code only SR will be selected as the overlapping PUCCH. But according to the new agreement both HARQ-ACK and SR should be selected as the overlapping PUCCH.



**Figure 1**

|  |
| --- |
| Set  to the cardinality of Set to be the first symbol of resource  in the slotSet  to be the number of symbols of resource  in the slotSet  - index of first resource in set  Set  - counter of overlapped resourceswhile if  and resource  overlaps with resource  elseif determine a single resource for multiplexing UCI associated with resources $\left\{Q(j-o),Q(j-o+1),...,Q(j)\right\}$ as described in Clauses 9.2.5.1 and 9.2.5.2 set the index of the single resource to   % start from the beginning after reordering unmerged resources at next step % function that re-orders resources in current set Set  to the cardinality of elseend ifend ifend while |

***j*** is the index of current resource

***o*** is number of the overlapping resource.

 is reference resource (the one with smallest index)

 is current selected resource

 is a PUCCH placed after 

Considering the majority view is that Alt 1 is aligned with current 9.2.6, moderator’s suggestion is to go with Alt1, i.e., the reference PUCCH is a PUCCH with repetitions. As request by QC, moderator prepares a TP for companies to check based on HW and OPPO’s TPs.

|  |
| --- |
| A UE does not multiplex different UCI types in a PUCCH transmission with repetitions over $N\_{PUCCH}^{repeat}>1$ slots. If a UE would transmit a first PUCCH over more than one slot and at least a second PUCCH over one or more slots, and the transmissions of the first PUCCH and the second PUCCH would overlap in a number of slots then, for each slot of the number of slots and with UCI type priority of HARQ-ACK > SR > CSI with higher priority > CSI with lower priority, the UE determines an earliest first PUCCH in a slot according to the ordering rule defined in 9.2.5 and performs the following until there is no PUCCH overlapping with a PUCCH with repetitions in the slot- the UE does not expect more than one PUCCH from the first PUCCH and the second PUCCHs to start at a same slot and include a UCI type with same priority - if more than one PUCCH from the first PUCCH and ~~any of~~ the second PUCCHs include a UCI type with the same highest priority, the UE transmits the PUCCH with the highest priority starting at an earlie~~r~~st slot and does not transmit the other PUCCHs, otherwise, the UE transmits the PUCCH that includes the UCI type with the highest priority and does not transmit the PUCCHs that include the UCI type with lower priority  |

From moderator’s understanding, the highlight yellow part is different for Alt 1 and Alt 2. The highlight green part should be the same for Alt 1 and Alt 2?

#### **Q8**

Do you agree with the highlight green part in the TP?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| YES | CATT OPPO Huawei/HiSi (in principle), Spreadtrum, Apple, QC(In general fine. Have some editorial comments and clarification questions), Samsung |
| NO |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| vivo | We think the highlight green part should be as following.- the UE does not expect the first PUCCH and any of the second PUCCHs to start at a same slot and include a UCI type with same priority - if the first PUCCH and all of the second PUCCHs include a UCI type with same priority, the UE transmits the PUCCH starting at an earliest slot and does not transmit the other PUCCHs, otherwise, - if the first PUCCH and any of the second PUCCHs do not include a UCI type with same priority, the UE transmits the PUCCH that includes the UCI type with the highest priority followed by starting at an earliest slot and does not transmit the other PUCCHs  |
| CATT | We appreciate FL’s efforts on preparing the TP.We agree with the TP which achieves one-shot prioritization based on highest UCI priority followed by earliest starting slot.The first bullet is intended to preclude the case that there are more than one PUCCH with the highest UCI priority and the same starting slot so the TP from FL is correct. But vivo’s TP does not preclude the case that there are multiple second PUCCHs with the highest UCI priority and the same starting slot, e.g. CSI with repetition overlapping with multiple TDMed SR as we discussed before.For the second bullet, vivo’s TP is not correct. For example, the second PUCCHs may have different UCI priority and one of them is the same as the first PUCCH and the UCI priority is the highest among the group. In this case, the second bullet should apply but it does not according to vivo’s TP.Similarly, vivo’s TP of the last bullet is not correct. |
| Moderator | Thank you CATT for helping clarification.Update the above TP with two editorial corrections1. Remove ‘any of’ in the second bullet.
2. Change ‘earlier’ to ‘earliest’
 |
| ZTE | Although we think in some cases, there are more than one PUCCHs have the highest priority can be both transmitted, for sake of progress, we can live with the green part (with editorial corrections) in TP proposed by moderator. |
| OPPO | Fine with the green part of the TP and the two modifications from moderator. |
| Huawei/HiSi (Upd) | One minor comment: the 2nd bullet should be a sub-bullet of the 3rd bullet?the UE transmits the PUCCH that includes the UCI type with the highest priority and does not transmit the PUCCHs that include the UCI type with lower priority - if more than one PUCCH from the first PUCCH and any of the second PUCCHs include a UCI type with the same highest priority, the UE transmits the PUCCH with the highest priority starting at an earlier slot and does not transmit the other PUCCHs, otherwise, Forgot to say - we are OK to the current wording also. |
| Intel  | We are fine with highlight green part of the TP.  |
| Vivo2 | After reading CATT’s explanation and offline discussion with FL, we now understand the TP better. We are fine with the TP with two editorial corrections |
| QC | Comment 1: regarding the definition of “first PUCCH”: If I recall correctly, in previous discussion, we were assuming the “first PUCCH” is a **single** PUCCH channel (with repetitions, if follows Alt 1). While the “at least a second PUCCH” are the PUCCHs overlap with the “first PUCCH”. But then in the yellow part of the TP, we define “an earliest first PUCCH”. Does this mean the definition of “first PUCCH” actually means **multiple** PUCCH channels, i.e., we could have multiple overlap groups of first and second PUCCHs in a slot? I guess the answer is yes. This can be clarified. [Moderator] Moderator shares the same understanding.Comment 2: In the last green bullet, we can clarify the dropping only occurs in the current overlapping group of channels, which include the currently earliest first PUCCH and the second PUCCHs overlap with the currently earliest first PUCCH. So, I suggest to clarify the TP like below (with my change highlighted): A UE does not multiplex different UCI types in a PUCCH transmission with repetitions over $N\_{PUCCH}^{repeat}>1$ slots. If a UE would transmit at least a first PUCCH over more than one slot and at least a second PUCCH over one or more slots, and the transmissions of the first PUCCH and the second PUCCH would overlap in a number of slots then, for each slot of the number of slots and with UCI type priority of HARQ-ACK > SR > CSI with higher priority > CSI with lower priority, the UE determines an earliest first PUCCH in a slot according to the ordering rule defined in 9.2.5 and performs the following until there is no PUCCH overlapping with a PUCCH with repetitions in the slot- the UE does not expect more than one PUCCH from the earliest first PUCCH and the second PUCCHs to start at a same slot and include a UCI type with same priority - if more than one PUCCH from the earliest first PUCCH and ~~any of~~ the second PUCCHs include a UCI type with the same highest priority, the UE transmits the PUCCH with the highest priority starting at an earlie~~r~~st slot and does not transmit the other PUCCHs, otherwise, the UE transmits the PUCCH that includes the UCI type with the highest priority and does not transmit the PUCCHs that include the UCI type with lower priority, in the set of the earliest first PUCCH and the second PUCCHs overlap with the earliest first PUCCH. [Moderator] Moderator shares the same understanding regarding the intention of the TP and would like to clarify a bit.For the text ‘If a UE would transmit a first PUCCH’, ‘first PUCCH’ here can be any one of the first PUCCH, but it doesn’t mean the slot only contains one ‘first PUCCH’ and the follow text applies for one first PUCCH which could be any one of the first PUCCH. With the new added ‘at least’, the following text ‘the transmissions of the first PUCCH and the second PUCCH would overlap in a number of slots’ becomes not clear, one explanation could be any of the second PUCCH overlaps with any of the first PUCCH, clearly, this is not the intention. Without adding ‘at least’, the original meaning is any of the second PUCCH overlaps with the first PUCCH. The original meaning has been clarified in RAN1#109.According to the yellow text, UE determines an earliest first PUCCH in a slot according to the ordering rule defined in 9.2.5 and performs the following (the green text), for the green text, UE has already determined the earliest first PUCCH, the green part is based on this condition, therefore, for the green text there is only one first PUCCH and ‘the first PUCCH’ refers the determined first PUCCH, i.e., the earliest first PUCCH. From moderator’s understanding, the update from QC is not necessary.If QC think the TP is not clear, one way could be moved the yellow part after the green part similar as in the TP proposed by Oppo.‘the UE determines the earliest first PUCCH with the order of earliest symbol followed by longest duration and then performs the above rules until there is no PUCCH overlapping with a PUCCH with repetitions in the slot.’Question 1: for the first green bullet, do we mean UE does not expect the more than 1 PUCCH from size of the joint set { the earliest first PUCCH, at least the second PUCCH }? I assume yes. But can FL confirm my understanding is correct? [Moderator] Yes.Question 2: for the second green bullet, I have the same question for clarification. [Moderator] Yes. |
| QC2 | @ Moderator, my point of adding “in the set of the earliest first PUCCH and the second PUCCHs overlap with the earliest first PUCCH” is that: In the original TP, the last green bullet only says transmit the highest priority channel, but did not say transmit the highest priority channel from **which set**. The point to add at least into this sentence “If a UE would transmit at least a first PUCCH over more than” is because a first PUCCH means only a PUCCH in English, at least that is the way I read it (English is not my native language so I could be wrong). If we want to use “a first PUCCH” to refer multiple PUCCHs, we need say “a first PUCCH(s)”. |

#### **Q9**

Do you agree with the highlight yellow part in the TP above if Alt 1 is adopted?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| YES | CATT OPPO Huawei/HiSi (in principle), Spreadtrum, Apple (in principle), Samsung |
| NO |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| vivo | Agree in principle. But we think according to the ordering rule defined in 9.2.5 may not be quite clear. Following formulation can be considered.the UE determines the first PUCCH in a slot with the order of earliest symbol followed by longest duration and performs the following until there is no PUCCH overlapping with a PUCCH with repetitions in the slot |
| CATT | Although the principle of ordering rule in Clause 9.2.5 is earliest symbol followed by longest duration, but if we go with vivo’s suggestion, I am not sure if it is clear for the case when there are multiple first PUCCHs with the same starting symbol and duration. So we prefer FL’s version. |
| ZTE | For sake of progress, we can live with the yellow part in TP proposed by moderator.  |
| OPPO | Fine with the yellow part of the TP from moderator, can also accept vivo’s version. |
| Huawei/HiSi | Though it is not our first choice (which part of clause 9.2.5 is used to 9.2.6 may not be fully self-explanatory), we can live with it as it is the common sense. We are also fine with vivo version. |
| Intel  | We don’t want to block the progress, we can live with Alt 1 and the TP. But honestly speaking, we still think Alt 2 using 9.2.5 for step 1-2-1 to determine the set of PUCCHs and then reuse whole paragraph of 9.2.6 for step 1-2-2 is cleaner than Alt 1 mixing 9.2.5 and yellow part of 9.2.6 for step 1-2-1 and use green part of the same paragraph of 9.2.6 for step 1-2-2 😊  |
| Vivo2 | Agree with HW that which part of clause 9.2.5 is used to 9.2.6 may not be fully self-explanatory, that is why we suggested to explicitly point out the rule in 9.2.6. But we can live with the yellow part for progress if it is the common understanding.  |
| Apple | We also think referring to 9.2.5 is a bit problematic, and a self-dependent explanation (similar to what Vivo proposed) is preferred with this addition for the sake of completeness the UE determines the first PUCCH in a slot with the order of earliest symbol followed by longest duration followed by arbitrary placement, and performs the following until there is no PUCCH overlapping with a PUCCH with repetitions in the slot[Moderator] It can be discussed to see companies’ preference. From moderator’s understanding ‘followed by arbitrary placement’ is not necessary, with/without the text, UE behavior is the same, i.e., up to UE. |
|  |  |
|  |  |

#### **P4:**

**For resolving overlapping PUCCHs with repetitions of a same priority in Rel-16, a set of overlapping PUCCHs consist of a reference PUCCH with repetitions and all the PUCCHs overlapping with the reference PUCCH.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Support or can live with | Vivo, CATT OPPO, Huawei/HiSi, Spreadtrum, Apple, Samsung |
| Object |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Huawei/HiSi | We think this part should be also captured to the spec so that how to determine “the second PUCCH” is self-explanatory. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## Fourth round

The follow agreements were made in this meeting.

|  |
| --- |
| AgreementFor resolving overlapping PUCCHs with repetitions of a same priority in Rel-16, a set of overlapping PUCCHs consist of a reference PUCCH and all the PUCCHs overlapping with the reference PUCCH.-        A UE first determines a reference PUCCH and then determines all the PUCCHs overlapping with the reference PUCCH.-        The reference PUCCH is a PUCCH overlaps with at least another PUCCH.-        FFS: The reference PUCCH is a PUCCH with repetitions.AgreementFor resolving overlapping PUCCHs with repetitions of a same priority in Rel-16, UE transmits the PUCCH with the highest priority when performing prioritization among PUCCHs in a set of overlapping PUCCHs.-        The priority order for different UCI types is defined as: HARQ-ACK > SR > CSI with higher priority > CSI with lower priority-        For overlapping PUCCHs of the same UCI priority, the priority order for a same UCI type is defined as: PUCCH starting at an earlier slot > PUCCH starting at a later slot |

According to the comments received in the previous discussion, P2 and P4 seem to be stable. The fourth round will focus on the discussion of the TP. In addition to the TP, the WA made in the previous meeting can also be confirmed considering the process of this meeting.

#### **P5:**

**Confirm the following working assumption.**

Working Assumption

For resolving overlapping PUCCHs with repetitions of a same priority in Rel-16, a UE performs the following steps

* Step 1-2-1: the UE determines a set of overlapping PUCCHs.
* Step 1-2-2: the UE performs prioritization among PUCCHs in the set of overlapping PUCCHs.
	+ The priority order for different UCI types is defined as: HARQ-ACK > SR > CSI with higher priority > CSI with lower priority
	+ For overlapping PUCCHs of the same UCI priority, the priority order for a same UCI type is defined as：PUCCH starting at an earlier slot > PUCCH starting at a later slot
* Step 1-2-3: the UE repeats step 1-2-1 and step 1-2-2 until the overlapping PUCCHs with repetitions is resolved.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Support or can live with | CATT, ZTE, Huawei/HiSi, Apple, vivo, Intel OPPO, QC |
| Object |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

A TP was proposed in the 3rd round discussion, a majority companies are fine with the TP. The following TP is updated from the TP proposed in 3rd round with the additional update marked in red

|  |
| --- |
| TP#1A UE does not multiplex different UCI types in a PUCCH transmission with repetitions over $N\_{PUCCH}^{repeat}>1$ slots. If a UE would transmit a first PUCCH over more than one slot and at least a second PUCCH over one or more slots, and the transmissions of the first PUCCH and the second PUCCH would overlap in a number of slots then, for each slot of the number of slots and with UCI type priority of HARQ-ACK > SR > CSI with higher priority > CSI with lower priority, the UE determines an earliest first PUCCH in a slot according to the ordering rule defined in 9.2.5 and then performs the following until there is no PUCCH overlapping with any PUCCH with repetitions in the slot- the UE does not expect more than one PUCCH from the first PUCCH and the second PUCCHs to start at a same slot and include a UCI type with same priority - if more than one PUCCH from the first PUCCH and the second PUCCHs include a UCI type with the same highest priority, the UE transmits the PUCCH with the highest priority starting at an earliest slot and does not transmit the other PUCCHs, otherwise, the UE transmits the PUCCH that includes the UCI type with the highest priority and does not transmit the PUCCHs that include the UCI type with lower priority  |

One comment is regarding the yellow part. Some companies think the yellow part is not crystal clear and would like to clarify it in 9.2.6. Two additional alternatives were proposed.

Alt 1: according to the ordering rule defined in 9.2.5

Alt 2: with the order of earliest symbol followed by longest duration

Alt 3: with the order of earliest symbol followed by longest duration followed by arbitrary placement

From moderator’s understanding, either one is fine, ‘followed by arbitrary placement’ seems not necessary, with/without ‘followed by arbitrary placement’, the result PUCCHs are the same. For simplicity, moderator would suggest to go with either Alt 1 or Alt 2.

#### **Q10**

**What is your preference on the above three alternatives?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Alt 1 | Support or can live with | QC |
| Object |  |
| Alt 2 | Support or can live with | CATT, ZTE Huawei/HiSi, Apple(2nd preference), vivo, (2nd preference) OPPO, QC |
| Object |  |
| Alt 3 | Support or can live with | Apple, Intel (1st preference), QC |
| Object |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| CATT | Alt 2 seems clearer compared with Alt 1. |
| Huawei/HiSi | 1st preference is Alt 2, but we can also live with the other two, as they address the same sense technically. |
| Apple | After all discussions RAN1 made on this topic, a self-explanation spec is preferred (so Alt1 shall be deprioritized). Alt3 is more complete than Alt2 |
| vivo | Alt 2 is our first preference. We can also accept alt 1/3 is it is the majority view.  |
| Intel  | If we go with a self-explanation spec, and we want to avoid any confusion caused by different description for similar issue (e.g., if 9.2.5 describes how to handle two PUCCHs with same staring symbol and duration while 9.2.6 does not describe), we think Alt 3 is better. Having said that, if everybody is happy with Alt 2, we are fine.  |
| OPPO | Our 1st preference is Alt 2, and can also accept Alt 1/3. |
| QC | We don’t have strong view. Either way is fine.  |

QC raised an issue about multiple sets in a slot. As clarified in the 3rd round, from moderator’s understanding, there can be multiple sets, the intention of the TP is to include such scenario with the text ‘until there is no PUCCH overlapping with a PUCCH with repetitions in the slot’. According to TP#1, UE first determines an earliest first PUCCH and then performs the sub-bullets. When performing the sub-bullets which are the details of step 1-2-2, a first PUCCH has been determined, there is only one first PUCCH in the procedure. Although from moderator’s understanding, TP #1 is clear. TP#2 is give below trying to address QC’s concern. The wording of TP#2 is more aligned with the WA, hopefully it can be acceptable for companies.

|  |
| --- |
| TP#2A UE does not multiplex different UCI types in a PUCCH transmission with repetitions over $N\_{PUCCH}^{repeat}>1$ slots. If a UE would transmit a first PUCCH over more than one slot and at least a second PUCCH over one or more slots, and the transmissions of the first PUCCH and the second PUCCH would overlap in a number of slots then, for each slot of the number of slots and with UCI type priority of HARQ-ACK > SR > CSI with higher priority > CSI with lower priority, the UE determines an earliest first PUCCH in a slot according to the ordering rule defined in 9.2.5 and - the UE does not expect more than one PUCCH from the first PUCCH and the second PUCCHs to start at a same slot and include a UCI type with same priority - if more than one PUCCH from the first PUCCH and the second PUCCHs include a UCI type with the same highest priority, the UE transmits the PUCCH with the highest priority starting at an earliest slot and does not transmit the other PUCCHs, otherwise, the UE transmits the PUCCH that includes the UCI type with the highest priority and does not transmit the PUCCHs that include the UCI type with lower priority The UE repeats the above procedure until there is no PUCCH overlapping with any PUCCH with repetitions in the slot. |

#### **Q11**

**What is your preference on TP1 and TP2 without considering the highlight yellow part?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| TP 1 | Support or can live with | CATT (2nd preference), ZTE Huawei/HiSi, vivo, Intel (2nd preference) OPPO |
| Object |  |
| TP 2 | Support or can live with | CATT (1st preference), ZTE Huawei/HiSi, vivo, Intel (1st preference) OPPO, QC |
| Object |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| CATT | We do not have a strong view. TP2 seems clearer. |
| Huawei/HiSi | Thanks the great effort of Moderator for preparing the two TPs. We are fine to both, as they address the same sense technically. |
| vivo | We didn’t find much difference between TP 1 and TP2. Either TP1 or TP2 is fine to us. |
| QC | We slightly prefer TP 2, although we don’t have strong opinion. For either TP 1 and TP 2, I think we need to clarify the 3 steps (3 bullets in the TP) are performed in the group of overlapping channels including the earliest first PUCCH and the second PUCCH overlapping with the it. After UE is done with the current overlapping group, UE will move to the next overlapping group and repeat the 3 bullets. So we suggest to add the following in TP2. Similar change can be add to TP1 as well. TP#2A UE does not multiplex different UCI types in a PUCCH transmission with repetitions over $N\_{PUCCH}^{repeat}>1$ slots. If a UE would transmit a first PUCCH over more than one slot and at least a second PUCCH over one or more slots, and the transmissions of the first PUCCH and the second PUCCH would overlap in a number of slots then, for each slot of the number of slots and with UCI type priority of HARQ-ACK > SR > CSI with higher priority > CSI with lower priority, the UE determines an earliest first PUCCH in a slot according to the ordering rule defined in 9.2.5 and the second PUCCHs overlapping with the earliest first PUCCH, then performs the following - the UE does not expect more than one PUCCH from the first PUCCH and the second PUCCHs to start at a same slot and include a UCI type with same priority - if more than one PUCCH from the first PUCCH and the second PUCCHs include a UCI type with the same highest priority, the UE transmits the PUCCH with the highest priority starting at an earliest slot and does not transmit the other PUCCHs, otherwise, the UE transmits the PUCCH that includes the UCI type with the highest priority and does not transmit the PUCCHs that include the UCI type with lower priority The UE repeats the above procedure until there is no PUCCH overlapping with any PUCCH with repetitions in the slot.  |
|  |  |
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