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# 1 Introduction

In RAN plenary 98-e, the Rel-18 WI on eXtended Reality (XR) was agreed and was further revised in RAN#99, with the following objectives:

|  |
| --- |
| Specify the enhancements related to power saving:  - DRX support of XR frame rates corresponding to non-integer periodicities (through at least semi-static mechanisms e.g. RRC signalling) (RAN2).  Specify the enhancements related to capacity:  - Multiple Configured Grant (CG) PUSCH transmission occasions in a period of a single CG PUSCH configuration (RAN1, RAN2);  - Dynamic indication of unused CG PUSCH occasion(s) based on Uplink Control Information (UCI) by the UE (RAN1, RAN2);  - Buffer Status Report (BSR) enhancements including at least new Buffer Status Table(s) (RAN2);  - Delay reporting of buffered data in uplink (RAN2);  - Discard operation of PDU Sets for DL and UL (RAN2, RAN3);  Specify the enhancements for XR Awareness:  - Signalling by CN of semi-static information per QoS flow (e.g. PDU set QoS parameters), dynamic information per PDU set (PDU Set information and Identification) and End of Data Burst indication (RAN3, RAN2);  - Impact of identifying by UE of PDU Sets, Data bursts and PSI, as needed (RAN2);  - Provisioning by UE of XR traffic assistance information e.g. periodicity, UL traffic arrival information (RAN2, RAN3);  - Support signalling the congestion information from RAN to the CN in alignment with SA2 (RAN3); |

Among the above objectives, RAN1 is tasked to carry out the normative work for the enhancements defined by the following two objectives:

|  |
| --- |
| - Multiple CG PUSCH transmission occasions in a period of a single CG PUSCH configuration (RAN1, RAN2);  - Dynamic indication of unused CG PUSCH occasion(s) based on UCI by the UE (RAN1, RAN2); |

This document provides a summary of the contributions submitted to RAN1#112bis-e under Agenda item 9.8.1 regarding the normative work on the enhancement techniques for XR capacity improvements. It is also intended to facilitate the discussions regarding the topics under Agenda Item 9.8.1 with respect to the following assignment by the RAN1 Chair:

[112bis-e-R18-XR-02] Email discussion on XR-specific capacity enhancements by April 26 – Sorour (Ericsson)

* Check points: April 21, April 26

This document is updated version of R1-2304045.

# 2 Multiple transmission occasions per CG period

This section captures the summary of the discussions regarding the design aspects of the following WID objective:

|  |
| --- |
| - Multiple CG PUSCH transmission occasions in a period of a single CG PUSCH configuration (RAN1, RAN2); |

## 2.1 TDRA design

**Moderator summary:**

In previous meeting, the following agreement was made:

Agreement

For determination of the time domain resource allocation of CG PUSCHs associated to a multi-PUSCHs CG, the following alternatives for further study:

* Alt-A: TDRA determination based on repetition framework.
  + Alt-A1: Follow the time domain resource mapping of Type A repetition
    - N configured by higher layers or indicated by activation DCI
    - Single SLIV is determined from TDRA
    - The same SLIV in N PUSCH in consecutive slots per CG period
      * FFS for non-consecutive slots
    - FFS details, including related RRC parameters
  + Alt-A2: Follow the time domain resource mapping of Type B repetition
    - N configured by higher layers or indicated by activation DCI
    - Single SLIV is determined from TDRA
      * The SLIV used for 1st PUSCH per CG period.
    - N consecutive nominal PUSCHs with same duration per CG period
    - Note: N is not necessarily the repetition factor.
    - FFS details, including related RRC parameters
* Alt-B: TDRA determination based on NR-U framework
  + - N and M configured by higher layers
    - Single SLIV is determined from TDRA.
      * The SLIV used for 1st PUSCH per CG period.
    - M consecutive PUSCH TOs with same duration in slot. The M PUSCH TOs are used in N consecutive slots per CG period
    - Note: N and M are configured independently from *cg-nrofSlots-r16* and *cg-nrofPUSCH-InSlot-r16,* respectively*.* M and N configuration is independent from *cgRetransmissionTimer* configuration.
    - FFS details, including related RRC parameters
* Alt-C: TDRA determination based on single DCI scheduling multiple PUSCHs
  + Alt-C1: Follow Rel-16 single DCI scheduling multiple PUSCHs
    - TDRA configured by pusch-TimeDomainAllocationListForMultiPUSCH-r16 with k2-r16
    - A row of TDRA with N entries determines the time domain resources allocation of N PUSCH TOs per period
      * Note: N PUSCH TOs should be consecutive PUSCH TOs in consecutive slots.
    - FFS details, including related RRC parameters
  + Alt-C2: Follow Rel-17 single DCI scheduling multiple PUSCHs
    - TDRA configured by pusch-TimeDomainAllocationListForMultiPUSCH-r16 with extendedK2-r17
    - A row of TDRA with N entries determines the time domain resources allocation of N PUSCH TOs per period
      * Note: N PUSCH TOs can be non-consecutive PUSCHs and/or in non-consecutive slots.
    - FFS details, including related RRC parameters

**Companies’ view:**

* Alt-A (10): FW, CATT, Spreadtrum, TCL, OPPO, MTK, NEC, Panasonic, FGI, xiaomi
  + - * Alt-A1: Spreadtrum, OPPO, MTK, NEC, Panasonic, FGI
      * Alt-A2: Spreadtrum, TCL, NEC
* Alt-B (12+2): FW, IDC, HW/HiSi, Google, CMCC, Samsung, Apple; Nokia/NSB, NEC, DENSO, xiaomi, Intel (Type 1), Sony (Type 1), Lenovo
* Alt-C-2 (14+2): E///, QC, vivo, ZTE/Sanechips, Spreadtrum, LG, DCM, OPPO, ~~Nokia/NSB~~, Panasonic, DENSO, FGI, Sharp, CAICT, Intel(Type 2), Sony(Type 2), Lenovo

**Moderator’s observation:**

**Observation 1:** The supported alternatives are A, B and C2. Alt-C2 has the majority support. Proponents of Alt-A2 also support other alternatives (except TCL).

**Observation 2:** Some companies suggest modifying Alt-A or Alt-B approaches to support non-consecutive slots (e.g., CATT, MTK, CMCC, [Google]). Some companies suggest deferring the PUSCH transmission opportunities or consider available slots to support non-consecutive slots (e.g., Nokia, Panasonic). It is not clear to Moderator how that approach is different from Rel-17 MultiPUSCH TDRA if a configured/indicated row uses same SLIVs. More clarification is needed.

**Observation 3:** Some companies indicated different alternatives for Type-1 and Type-2 CG (e.g., Intel, Sony), while some companies emphasize on unified solution (e.g., ZTE).

Table 1: Summary of Contributions inputs for Section 2.1

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Contributions inputs** |
| Futurewei | **Observation 1**: Both the repetition framework (i.e., Alt-A) and NR-U framework in Rel-16 (i.e., Alt-B) can support the configuration of multiple CG PUSCH transmission occasions in a period of a single CG PUSCH in Rel-18 XR Enhancements.  **Proposal 1**: Support at least the same symbol allocation for the multiple CG PUSCH transmission occasions in a period of a single CG PUSCH configuration in Rel-18 XR Enhancements.  **Proposal 2**: The configured multiple CG PUSCH transmission occasions in a period of a single CG PUSCH configuration in Rel-18 XR Enhancements can take repetition framework (i.e., Alt-A) or NR-U framework in Rel-16 (i.e., Alt-B) as the baseline. |
| Ericsson | **Observation 1** Alt-A, Alt-B and Alt-C are comparable with respect to complexity and specification impacts are comparable, with slight differences.  **Observation 2** The design choice should ensure the usefulness of the feature for realistic scenarios.  \* For TDD operation, the UL opportunities occur in different slots, and typically, one CG PUSCH is used per slot.  \* For proper resource management, there may be a need of different sizes of UL resources in different slots.  **Observation 3** Alt-C2 provides the needed flexibility to make the feature useful for different scenarios, as oppose to Alt-A, Alt-B and Alt-C1 which inherit simplifications and restrictions by design.  **Proposal 1** Multi-PUSCHs scheduling by a single DCI in Rel-17 is considered as the baseline for the design of multi-PUSCHs CG in Rel-18 (i.e. Alt-C2).  **Proposal 2** A row with multiple SLIVs of a TDRA table determines the SLIVs associated to the PUSCHs within a period of a multi-PUSCHs CG.  \* Note: pdsch-TimeDomainAllocationListForMultiPDSCH-r16 is reused for the TDRA table as in Rel-17.  \* Note: For activation/release of a Type-2 multi-PUSCHs CG, the time domain resource assignment field in the DCI format can indicate a row with multiple SLIVs as opposed to Rel-17.  **Proposal 3** The activation/release DCI for Type-2 multi-PUSCH CG is based on the non-fallback DCI format 0\_1. |
| Qualcomm | **Proposal 1**: Support Alt-C2 for the determination of TDRA for multiple PUSCH occasions in the CG period  \* Alt-C2: Follow Rel-17 single DCI scheduling multiple PUSCHs  **Proposal 2**: TDRA for multiple PUSCHs in the CG period can be indicated in a similar way to that of multiple PUSCHs scheduled by a single DCI specified for Rel-17  \* timeDomainAllocation field in the rrc-ConfiguredUplinkGrant IE in the CG configuration indicates an entry with multiple {K2, SLIV}s of the TDRA table  **Proposal 5**: Support the following proposals. Discuss them in the following order of importance  \* Support activation DCI for multi-PUSCH CG configuration |
| CATT | **Proposal 1**: The Alt-A: TDRA determination based on repetition framework should be supported for the SLIV determination, in which  \* N PUSCH occasions in a CG period with the same SLIV can be configured by higher layers or indicated by activation DCI;  \* The configuration of consecutive and non-consecutive CG PUSCH occasions should both be supported to give the flexibility of gNB implementation for the adaptation of different XR traffic;  \* The time gap between the adjacent CG PUSCH occasions could be configured by higher signaling;  \* The single TB transmission over multiple CG occasions should be supported. |
| vivo | **Observation 1**: To serve XR UL traffic including that of pose/control stream and/or video stream, CG PUSCH occasions configured by one or multiple CG configurations, and from one or multiple serving cells may be needed.  **Proposal 1**: For multiple CG PUSCH occasions in a period of a single CG configuration, Alt-C2 is supported.  \* Alt-C2: Follow Rel-17 single DCI scheduling multiple PUSCHs  o TDRA configured by pusch-TimeDomainAllocationListForMultiPUSCH-r16 with extendedK2-r17  o A row of TDRA with N entries determines the time domain resources allocation of N PUSCH TOs per period  \* Note: N PUSCH TOs can be non-consecutive PUSCHs and/or in non-consecutive slots.  o FFS details, including related RRC parameters  **Proposal 2**: For multiple CG PUSCH occasions in a period of a single CG configuration, if Alt-C2 is supported, further discussion on the validation of DCI scrambled by CS-RNTI for activation/release of CG configuration(s) is needed, e.g., how to set the value of NDI field in case of multiple NDI bits. |
| ZTE/Sanechips | **Observation 1**: Flexible TDRA assignment for multiple CG PUSCH transmission occasions in a period has benefits on resource efficiency and minor spec impact.  **Observation 2**: Alt-C2: TDRA determination based on Rel-17 single DCI scheduling multiple PUSCHs for time domain resource allocation of multi-PUSCH CG is not applicable to CG Type 1.  **Proposal 1**: Support Alt-C: TDRA determination based on single DCI scheduling multiple PUSCHs for time domain resource allocation of enhanced CG configuration.  **Proposal 2**: Support Alt-C2: TDRA determination based on Rel-17 single DCI scheduling multiple PUSCHs for time domain resource allocation of multi-PUSCHs CG.  **Proposal 3**: An unified TDRA determination, including e.g. multiple{time offset, SLIV}, should be considered for multi-PUSCHs CG of CG Type 1 and CG Type 2.  **Proposal 4**: The mechanism of Rel-17 single DCI scheduling multiple PUSCHs can be reused for TDRA determination of multi-PUSCHs CG of CG Type 2, while extending timeDomainOffset field can be considered for TDRA determination of multi-PUSCHs CG of CG Type 1.  **Proposal 5**: Combining legacy field timeDomainOffset and the new parameter for intervals between two adjacent transmission occasions to achieve multiple {time offset, SLIV} can be considered for TDRA determination of multi-PUSCHs CG of CG Type 1. |
| Spreadtrum Comm. | **Proposal 1**: Two alternatives can be considered as starting point for determination of the TDRA associated to multiple CG PUSCH TOs based on the existing specifications:  \* Alt-A: configure multiple PUSCH following the time domain resource mapping of both PUSCH repetition Type A and Type B repetition framework can be considered.  \* Alt-C2: configure multiple PUSCH following Rel-17 single DCI scheduling multiple PUSCHs since N PUSCH TOs can be in non-consecutive PUSCHs and/or in non-consecutive slots. |
| TCL Comm. | **Observation 1**: XR services have the following characteristics.  - The non-integer periodicity  - Jitter of packet arrival time  - Low latency and large packet size  - Varying packet size  - Multiple flows  **Proposal 1**: Follow the time domain resource mapping of Type B repetition can be used for multiple TOs within a CG configuration.  - Single SLIV is determined from TDRA  o The SLIV used for 1st PUSCH per CG period.  - N consecutive nominal PUSCHs with same duration per CG period  **Proposal 2**: The number of multiple TOs within a CG configuration can be indicated by TDRA |
| IDC | **Observation 1**: Enhanced CG scheme with flexible (re)allocation of PUSCH occasions based on indication (UCI) on unused PUSCH occasions outperforms DG and baseline CG schemes. The performance improvement offered by enhanced CG over baseline CG is more pronounced for stringent PDB requirements (e.g. 10ms)  **Proposal 1**: Support TDRA based on NR-U framework as baseline for multi-PUSCH CG  **Proposal 2**: For multi-PUSCH CG configuration, reuse the following CG parameters from R16 NR-U CG:  Number of consecutive PUSCH occasions per slot  Number of slots per CG period |
| HW/HiSilicon | **Observation 1**: The framework based on NR-U can apply for both CG Type 1 and CG Type 2.  **Observation 2**: The framework based on PUSCH repetition type B may introduce unnecessary complexity and is not suitable for XR traffic.  **Observation 3**: The framework based on single DCI scheduling multiple CG PUSCH is not suitable for CG Type 1 and additional workload is needed.  **Observation 4**: The number of CG PUSCH occasions may vary in different CG periods due to TDD configuration, thus bring inaccuracy and difficulty for gNB configuration.  **Observation 5**: In a CG period, the MCS of TBs transmitted on the earlier CG PUSCH occasions can be larger than the later ones, since earlier transmitted TBs have more retransmission opportunities and larger MCS can increase resource efficiency.  **Observation 6**: In a CG period, the number of PRBs of the earlier CG PUSCH occasions can be larger than the later ones. Once the gNB has no enough time to re-allocate the resource, less resource would be wasted. |
| Lenovo | **Observation 1**: Indication of unused time units (e.g., slots) may simplify support of UCI indication for multiple CG configurations.  **Proposal 1**: Support Alt-C2 for time domain resource allocation of CG PUSCHs associated to multi-PUSCHs CG. |
| LG | **Proposal 1**: Support multiple CG occasions in a period based on a TDRA table where each row includes multiple SLIV values for CG.  \* FFS : DMRS mapping type, repetition type, numberOfRepetitions  **Proposal 2**: It is necessary to investigate how to support the repetition for each of multiple SLIVs in a same TDRA row.  **Proposal 3**: It is necessary to investigate how to determine TDRA table for Type-1 CG for new resource allocation method.  **Proposal 4**: Discuss how to apply the enhanced TDRA for Type-1 CG.  **Proposal 5**: Support separated K2 offset per SLIV for flexibility.  \* Each K2 starts from the slot where previous SLIV ends. |
| DCM | **Proposal 1**: Support Alt C-2 for TDRA of multiple CG PUSCHs in one CG period, i.e. following Rel-17 single DCI scheduling multiple PUSCHs.  **Proposal 2**: Relax the limitation for validation of CG PUSCH activation DCI, when the TDRA field in the activation DCI indicates multiple SLIVs. |
| Google | **Proposal 1**: The TDRA determination based on NR-U framework should be extended to XR with some enhancements.  **Proposal 2**: The legacy configuredGrantTimer can be used for each PUSCH occasion of the multiple CG PUSCH transmission occasions instead of the cg-RetransmissionTimer used in NR-U.  **Proposal 7**: The design of multiple CG-PUSCH transmission occasions should take into considertation the operation in TDD. |
| OPPO | **Proposal 1**: Down-select one from the following alternatives for determining the time domain resource allocation of CG PUSCHs within one multi-PUSCHs CG period:  \* Alt-A1: Follow the time domain resource mapping of Type A repetition.  \* Support non-consecutive-slot allocation.  \* Alt-C2: Follow Rel-17 single DCI scheduling multiple PUSCHs |
| MTK | **Observation 1**: XR UL video traffic characteristics based on large and varying packet size and strict latency requirements are the underlying motivations for XR-specific configured grant enhancements in Rel-18.  **Proposal 1**: TDRA framework uses PUSCH repetition type-A as baseline (Alt-A1).  **Proposal 2**: A time offset parameter configured semi-statically by the network indicates the time gap between the 1st and the 2nd PUSCH TOs in number of slots.  **Proposal 3**: The rest of the PUSCH TOs from the 2nd TO onwards (i.e., the 2nd, 3rd, etc. TOs) are assigned in back-to-back UL slots (based on Alt-A1 PUSCH repetition type-A framework as baseline). |
| CMCC | **Proposal 1**. Support Alt-B to use TDRA determination based on the NR-U framework for multi-PUSCHs CG.  **Proposal 2**. Support to configure N non-consecutive slots within a CG period and/or M non-consecutive PUSCH transmission occasions in a slot in TDD frame structure. |
| Samsung | **Observation 1:** Use of “multi-CG PUSCH” is expected to be associated with few transmissions.  **Proposal 1**: Extend the Rel-16 NR-U design using cg-nrofSlots and cg-nrofPUSCH-InSlot to non-shared spectrum to support "multi-CG PUSCH". No enhancement is necessary.  **Proposal 2**: TDRA, FDRA, and MCS are same for all CG-PUSCHs of a "multi-CG PUSCH". |
| Apple | **Observation**: as the tempo mismatch issue for configured grants may not be addressed through the support of new CG periodicity in Rel-18, it is expected that the start time of a CG period may not be aligned with the arrival of traffic.  **Proposal 6**: Consider both licensed spectrum access and unlicensed/shared spectrum access in the TDRA design. For unlicensed spectrum access, only those TDRA patterns allowed in NR-U design can be configured. |
| Nokia/NSB | **Observation 1**: Alt-C framework (TDRA determination based on single DCI scheduling multiple PUSCHs) is only applicable for Type 2 CG configuration. For Type 1 CG configuration, such framework will not work as it requires DCI to provide the entry to TDRA list.  **Observation 2**: The benefits of different SLIVs for each slot in Alt-C (TDRA determination based on single DCI scheduling multiple PUSCHs) are unclear.  **Observation 3**: In Alt B (TDRA determination based on NR-U framework), by transmitting over available slots and continue counting each slot, we can transmit over up to 8 UL slots per CG period, which shall be enough for video frame in UL (e.g., with max 40 slots per CG period as per current RRC specification, TDD structure DDDSU, and 30 kHZ).  **Observation 4**: The feature AvailableSlotCounting from repetition framework allows to count only available slots (e.g., UL slots) and can support transmission over non-consecutive UL slots in Alt-B (TDRA determination based on NR-U framework).  **Proposal 1**: Compare Alt-B (TDRA determination based on NR-U framework) and Alt-C (TDRA determination based on single DCI scheduling multiple PUSCHs) in terms of potential benefits and drawbacks and select one framework to support multi-PUSCHs per CG period in licensed band.  **Proposal 2**: Consider NR-U framework to support multi-PUSCHs per CG period in licensed band.  **Proposal 3**: To support non-consecutive transmission when configuring multi-PUSCHs per CG, consider the following solutions: (i) AvailableSlotCounting from repetition framework or (ii) transmitting over available slots (e.g., UL slot) and continue counting each slot.  **Proposal 8**: First decide on the framework to be adopted for multi-PUSCHs per CG period and solution to handle the non-consecutive slot transmission and then decide on the max number of PUSCHs per CG period. |
| NEC | **Proposal 1**: support consecutive time domain resource allocation based on existing repetition type A, type B or NR-U framework. |
| Panasonic | **Proposal 1**: A combination of Alt-A1 and Alt-C2 should be considered for designing the time domain resource allocations for multi-PUSCHs CG. An activation DCI can contain a single time domain resource assignment field and an entry in the RRC parameter pusch-TimeDomainAllocationList have multiple time resource allocations. Each PUSCH occasions can be deferred to a next available slot in case of a collision with DL slot. |
| DENSO Corp. | **Observation 1**: For determination of TDRA of CG PUSCHs associated to a multi-PUSCHs CG, the following options can be considered.  - Option.1: Reusing the framework for scheduling multiple PUSCHs by a single DCI  - Option.2: Reusing the framework for NR-U CG  **Observation 2**: TDRA determination based on single DCI scheduling multiple PUSCHs can provide more flexibility as it can configure different K2 or SLIV per each CG PUSCH occasion. |
| FGI | **Proposal 1**: Adopt Alt-A1 or Alt-C2 for determination of the time domain resource allocation of CG PUSCHs associated to a multi-PUSCHs CG. |
| Intel | **Proposal 1**: For TDRA determination of multi-PUSCHs CG at least for Type1 CG, NR-U framework (Alt-B) can be leveraged.  \* Single SLIV is determined from TDRA.  o The SLIV used for 1st PUSCH per CG period.  \* M consecutive PUSCH TOs with same duration in slot. The M PUSCH TOs are used in N consecutive slots per CG period. N and M configured by higher layers.  \* Note: N and M are configured independently from cg-nrofSlots-r16 and cg-nrofPUSCH-InSlot-r16, respectively.  **Proposal 2**: For Type 2 CG transmission based on activation DCI, leverage single DCI based Rel-17 FR2-2 multiple PUSCHs scheduling solution to indicate TDRA for the multiple PUSCHs in a CG period via the activation DCI. |
| xiaomi | **Proposal 12**: Alt-A and Alt-B should be prioritized for determination of the TDRA of CG PUSCHs associated to a multi-PUSCHs CG. |
| Sharp | **Proposal 1**: TDRA determination based on single DCI scheduling multiple PUSCHs in Rel-17 to allow non-consecutive PUSCHs and/or in non-consecutive slots.  **Proposal 2**: The configuration/indication parameters of CG PUSCHs in a multi-PUSCHs CG configuration are the same. |
| Sony | **Observation 1**: The non-integer and jitter characteristics of XR traffic (also known as a quasi-periodic traffic) may require enhancements of the existing NR.  **Observation 2**: CG-PUSCH transmission as in legacy NR may require enhancements to support XR traffic, particularly on supporting the payload of a quasi-traffic that may not be the same but varies within a range.  **Observation 3**: Different type of TDRA determination of CG PUSCHs associated to a multi-PUSCHs CG can be supported for CG Type-1 and CG Type-2.  The related proposals are given below:  **Proposal 1**: Support TDRA determination based on NR-U framework (Alt-B) and TDRA determination based on single DCI scheduling multiple PUSCHs (Alt-C2). ALT-B is supported for Multi-PUSCHs CG for Type-1 and ALT-C2 is supported for Multi-PUSCHs CG for Type-2. |
| CAICT | **Proposal 1**: Support Alt-C2 (Follow Rel-17 single DCI scheduling multiple PUSCHs) for determination of TDRA for multi-PUSCHs CG. |

### 2.1.1 Initial Discussions

**Moderator’s suggestions for initial discussion:**

This topic needs more discussions to narrow down the options. For the initial discussions, Moderator suggests companies to share the views on the following.

**Suggestion 1:** Focus on Alt-A1, Alt-B and Alt-C2. Note that Alt-A2 can be obtained from Alt-B (discarding the segmented PUSCH).

**Suggestion 2:** Discuss your view that which of the following properties are important to be accommodated by the final solution:

1. Need for back-2-back PUSCHs within a slot?
2. Need for SLIVs with different sizes?
3. Need for PUSCH transmission in non-consecutive slots?

**Suggestion 3:** Explain if one of the alternatives provides a desired property, why another alternative with modification should be used instead (please see **Observation 2** above).

**Questions:** Please provide your view in the table below regarding the following questions:

* **Q1:** What is your view regarding Moderator’s suggestions? What is your suggestion to facilitate a selection, including compromising/changing preferences?
* **Q2:** Discuss any clarification/correction/comment/question on Moderator’s summary and suggestions or any other aspect helping the discussion and needed decisions.

**Note: Please ensure the information in companies’ contributions are considered for discussions.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| **ZTE, Sanechips** | 1. For the questions listed in Suggestion 2: 2. As to back-2-back PUSCH within a slot, we share the intention of reducing latency herein, but given the large packet size of XR traffic, a CG PUSCH occasion may occupy most symbols within a slot, then it makes more sense to me to allocate two consecutive valid slots as CG PUSCH occasions. 3. For different SLIVs of CG occasions in a period, we see the benefit that it provides flexibility of TDRA determination for UE multiplexing in a cell, which also contributes to improving resource efficiency. However, we can be flexible to use same SLIV in a CG period. 4. PUSCH transmission in non-consecutive slots is one of the most important properties of UL transmission of large packet. In case of XR traffic, it should be very clear and understandable that different PUSCHs can be transmitted at different/non-consecutive slots for a TDD configuration (e.g., DDDSUDDDSU..). 5. For Suggestion 1: 6. We agree to focus on Alt-A1, Alt-B and Alt-C2 firstly. In our view, these three candidate schemes have comparable specification impact, wherein Alt-A1 and Alt-B should deal with the case of non-consecutive UL slots, and Alt-C2 should tackle the TDRA determination for CG Type 1.   In summary, we think Alt-C2 is best from the flexibility perspective, including configure flexible time offsets and multiple SLIVs. Moreover, if same SLIV is applied in a CG period, we think Alt-B is workable with necessary clarification/spec change, in which a number of consecutive CG occasions are determined. |
| **Nokia, NSB** | Thank you for providing a nice summary! \*We also edited the observations above. Please, find our views related to Q1 and Q2 below:  **A1:**  **Suggestion 1:** We are ok to focus on three alternatives as suggested by Moderator but we also think that the discussion shall be related to support of multiple PUSCHs per CG period, and not related to support TBoMs. Please, see the proposed modification in A2.  **Suggestion 2:**  **Suggestion 2.2:** We do not think that different SLIV for each slot will provide any benefits to XR capacity. The XR video frame size is unknown when CG is configured, the random guess on what will be the required SLIV for each slot in every CG period will not provide any benefits in our view. The proponents are suggested to motivate the need for different SLIVs per each slot.  **Suggestion 2.3:** We think that video frame will be transmitted in consecutive **available** slots, as the motivation of enhancing CG was to decrease the latency. Therefore, Alt-B with consecutive available slots will work. FFS: how to count the slots (e.g., count all slots, or count only available slots).  **Suggestion 3:** As commented in S 2.3, Alt-B with consecutive available slots will work. FFS: how to count the slots (e.g., count all slots, or count only available slots).  We see the following issues with Alt-C: Alt-C it is only applicable to Type-2 CG, there will be a need for changes in activation/deactivation DCI, another solution for Type-1 CG will be required, different SLIVs are not motivated as of yet. It is clear that Alt-C will provide much more spec impact than adopting already existing solution from unlicensed band (Alt-B).  **A2:**  **Please, find the modification to Suggestion 1:**  **Suggestion 1:** Focus on Alt-A1 (without TBoMs support), Alt-B and Alt-C2. Note that Alt-A2 can be obtained from Alt-B (discarding the segmented PUSCH).  We propose to add the following bullet to Suggestion 2 (important to be accommodated by the final solution)  **Suggestion 2:**  4. It is important that the solution will be applicable to both Type-1 and Type-2 CG (as we agreed to support both types during RAN1#112). |
| **CATT** | Suggestion 1:  Since we agreed that we supported both Type-1 and Type-2 CGs, we had to mark that Alt-C2 would only support Type-2 CGs in the summary of the proposal.  Suggestion 2:  The point (3) PUSCH transmission in non-consecutive slots is the most important aspect of multi-CG-PUSCH for XR. In particular, the configuration of UL CG-PUSCH is per slot in TDD semi-static configuration. There would not be exact alignment between the multi-CG-PUSCH configuration in TDD configuration and UL XR traffic arrival rate with 16.67 ms duty cycle.  For (1), the back-to-back slot is not the required condition of multi-CG-PUSCH for XR in particular the TDD system.  For (2), SLIV with different size would not work for Type-1 CGs. |
| **NewH3C** | A1:  Suggestion 1: We are fine with three alternatives as suggested by Moderator  A2.  For (1), back-2-back PUSCHs within a slot isn’t necessary for XR  For (2), SLIV with different size will increase complexity of implementation and signaling overhead |
| **Qualcomm** | We can focus on first suggestion 1. In particular, we are supportive of Alt C-2. This may provide the best scheduling flexibility.  Regarding suggestion 2, Alt C-2 can also achieve consecutive PUSCH occasions of existing NR-U or repetition features. Back-2-back does not seem necessary for XR traffic. Different SLIV and non-consecutive slots allow for more flexible network scheduling of multiple users.   1. Need for back-2-back PUSCHs within a slot? 2. Need for SLIVs with different sizes? 3. Need for PUSCH transmission in non-consecutive slots? |
| **Google** | We are OK with suggestion 1 by the moderator to focus on Alt-A1, Alt-B and Alt-C2  We don’t think there is need to have back-to-back PUSCHs within the slot and need for SLIVs of different sizes for XR. Also, we think that ideally a Data Burst would be transmitted in consecutive slots at the start of the CG period to reduce latency and allow for enough time for any retransmissions to meet the PSDB |
| **Samsung** | Thank you for the all the efforts!  Fine with suggestion 1.  For suggestion 2:   1. No need for back-2-back PUSCHs within a slot – XR is not URLLC with small TBs and symbol-level latency. The TBs for video frames are large, latency will not change from back-to-back PUSCHs within a slot, and spectral efficiency will be worse due to smaller coding gains and additional DM-RS overhead (which may also negatively impact latency). 2. No need for SLIVs with different sizes, especially in a semi-static manner after activation – it also doesn’t work for Type-1 CG. 3. No need for transmissions in non-consecutive slots. The whole objective for introducing that feature is to minimize latency – otherwise, SR+DG is always a far better alternative, especially for the large TBs of XR. Of course, transmissions colliding with DL symbols in TDD will be dropped – so, slots should be all consecutive *available* slots as for repetitions.   For suggestion 3, Alt-B with consecutive available slots is all that is needed. As also mentioned by others, there is no justification to complicate the specifications using Alt. C. |
| **Futurewei** | Firstly, we support down selecting one alternative which can be applied to both types of CGs (including Type 1 CG and Type 2 CG), otherwise, it will make the configuration more complicated and is not preferred.  We are ok with Suggestion 1: Focus on Alt-A1, Alt-B and Alt-C2. If considering large packet size of XR traffic, Alt-A2 may have lower priority compared with Alt-A1, because the XR packet may need to be transmitted via multiple uplink slots. Additionally, as FL mentioned, Alt-A2 can also be obtained from Alt-B if that case is necessary.  Regarding the 3 questions in Suggestion 2, we share our view as below:   1. Need for back-2-back PUSCHs within a slot?    * [FW]: For unlicensed carriers, it is really needed to increase LBT success opportunity with back-2-back PUSCHs with a slot. For licensed carrier, we don’t think it is mandatory, even it can reduce latency for XR traffic in some extent. However, if we considering large packet size for XR traffic, the back-2-back PUSCH within a lot may be a better choice, since it can carry as much as possible data for XR packet within a slot. So, we support back-2-back PUSCHs within a slot if multiple PUSCH occasions within a lot are needed. 2. Need for SLIVs with different sizes?    * [FW]: We support at least the same SLIV used for all PUSCH occasions as mentioned in our contribution-R1-2302317. Same SLIV is preferred to reduce configuration complexity of multiple PUSCH occasion in a period. 3. Need for PUSCH transmission in non-consecutive slots?    * [FW]: If considering to support different TDD frame structures, e.g., DDDSU etc., uplink slots are not contiguous, PUSCH transmission in non-consecutive slots need to be supported.   Suggestion 3: Explain if one of the alternatives provides a desired property, why another alternative with modification should be used instead (please see Observation 2 above).  **[**FW**]:** Both the repetition framework (i.e., Alt-A) and NR-U framework in Rel-16 (i.e., Alt-B) can support the configuration of multiple CG PUSCH transmission occasions in a period of a single CG PUSCH in Rel-18 XR Enhancements with slight enhancements. However, for Alt-C, it will inevitably increase physical layer signaling overhead and cannot be applied to Type 1 CG directly, which needs more standard efforts. |
| **InterDigital** | Q1: We think the moderator’s suggestions, as always, are quite constructive and useful.  Q2: Our views regarding the suggestions are:  **Suggestion 1:**   * Ok to focus on the listed alternatives   **Suggestion 2:**   1. Need for back-2-back PUSCHs within a slot?    * Having back-to-back PUSCHs in a slot would be sufficient to handle UL transmission of PDUs/PDU sets in the UE buffer. Do not see the need for having non-consecutive PUSCHs in a slot. 2. Need for SLIVs with different sizes?    * It is not clear to us what benefit having SLIVs with different sizes will provide from XR traffic characteristics perspective than having SLIVs with equal size. In fact, there could be further UE complexity for determining the number of unused PUSCHs when the SLIV sizes are unequal. 3. Need for PUSCH transmission in non-consecutive slots?    * We do not think there is a need to support non-consecutive slots in a CG period, assuming the non-consecutive slots here refer to some UL slots in a TDD frame (separated by a set of DL slots) which are not configured in the CG configuration.   **Suggestion 3:**  We are fine with an alternative that adequately addresses the issue of transmitting XR traffic within PDB/PSDB and results in low spec impact. We do not see the need for having high scheduling flexibility (e.g. non-consecutive PUSCHs, unequal SLIV sizes) if this comes with the expense of high spec effort. |
| **Xiaomi** | Thank you for your nice summary!  For Suggestion 1:  We are fine with the first suggestion to focus on Alt-A1, Alt-B and Alt-C2.  For Suggestion 2(2):  We find no motivation to configure SLIVs with different sizes for CG occasions within a CG period. The gNB can configure a reasonable SLIV for all CG occasions, each CG occasion can meet the maximum requirements of the XR traffic. Since unused CG can be represented by UE as "unused", the gNB can reallocate resources corresponding to the unused CG occasion(s) and there is no waste of the resources. |
| **Sharp** | Fine with Suggestion 1 for down-selection.  For Suggestion 2, we think 2.1 back-to-back PUSCH within a slot and 2.2. SLIV with different sizes are not necessary. And 2.3 PUSCH transmission in non-consecutive slots should be supported. |
| **Apple** | Back-to-back PUSCH within a slot or SLIV for different durations can be useful. |
| **vivo** | Q1: for Suggestion 1, we are fine. For Suggestion 2, we think the important properties depends on the usage of multi-PUSCH CG. For example, if it is used for XR service, e.g., UL video with large packet and variable packet size, the second bullet is important. If it is used to solve the issue of collision between configured PUSCH TOs and semi-static DL symbol, , the third bullet is important. Once multi-PUSCH CG is supported, it can be up to gNB to decide how to use it, that is why we think Alt-C2 is preferred, which can realize all the three properties depending on the usage. |
| **OPPO** | We are OK with suggestion 1.  Considering large packet size is one of main characteristics of XR services, large TB sizes should be used for XR transmission as much as possible, in order to minimize the redundant information and reduce the HARQ processes consumed in one CG period. Therefore, we think back-2-back PUSCHs within a slot is not necessary, i.e. Alt-B can be excluded for further studied.  On the other hand, we think PUSCH transmission in non-consecutive slots has at least the following benefits:   1. Avoid the unavailable CG PUSCH which conflicts with DL symbol(s) in TDD carrier; 2. Non-integer period can be solved by one CG configuration. For example, one CG configuration is used to support 60fps for UL video, the periodicity is configured as 50ms with 3 CG PUSCH occasions.     Therefore, we propose focus on Alt-A1and Alt-C2:   * Alt-A1 should support non-consecutive-slot allocation; * For Alt-C2, SLIVs with different sizes is not supported unless significant benefits can be provided. |
| **TCL** | Thank you for the great work!  For suggestion 1:  In previous meetings, it has been agreed that both CG type 1 and Type 2 can be support multiple-PUSCHs, however, Alt C does not workable for CG type 1.  For suggestion 2:   1. Back-2-back PUSCHs within slot is benefit for latency reduction. 2. No need for SLIV with different sizes, the packet size of XR is varying in time and the actual size does not know by gNB/UE in advanced, so in our understanding, different SLIVs within a CG cannot bring any benefit for XR.   For TDD configuration, PUSCH transmission in non-consecutive slots is naturally. |
| **DOCOMO** | Thanks for the good summary!  On suggestion 1, we support to focus on Alt-A1, Alt-B and Alt-C2.  On suggestion 2, we think back-to-back transmission is not needed. Regarding same/different SLIV and consecutive/non-consecutive slots, Alt-C2 can achieve both.  Regarding additional spec impact by Alt-C2 mentioned by some companies, we think the spec impact would be very little. For activation DCI, DCI 0\_1 supporting indicating a TDRA with multiple SLIVs is already supported. It only needs to relax the limitation on activation DCI validation. For type 1 and type 2 support, we think Alt-C2 is also applicable to type 1 CG PUSCH, by configuring a TDRA index including multiple SLIVs for the parameter *timeDomainAllocation* in *rrc-ConfiguredUplinkGrant*. |
| **LG** | We are fine with Suggestion 1 for down-selection.  Regarding suggestion 2, here are our views.   1. Back-to-back PUSCH could be useful for covering various traffic size efficiently. 2. SLIV with different size is also useful to cover mixed traffic or to fit TDD patterns. 3. PUSCH transmission in non-consecutive slots are useful to cover non-integer periodicity case with a single CG configuration   Regarding suggestion 3, we think Alt. C2 can cover most of cases, that’s why we proposed to support Alt. C2. We don’t see the clear reason to support other alternatives when one can cover all the case. |
| **MediaTek** | Suggestion 1:  We are fine with focusing on Alt-A1, Alt-B and Alt-C2. Perhaps, even a better approach is to merge Alt-A1 and Alt-B with an open sub-bullet to decide whether multiple back-2-back PUSCH within a slot is supported or not. Based on company inputs above, most companies who prefer Alt-B do not see a need to support back-2-back PUSCH within a slot. From our perspective, there are really two approaches: Alt-A1/Alt-B vs. Alt-C2  Suggestion 2:   1. Back-2-back PUSCH within a slot is not needed. XR traffic has large packet size and latency is not as strict as eURLLC. 2. Different SLIV configuration per PUSCH is not needed. We don’t see any benefit to have different SLIVs. Some companies consider slots with flexible DL/UL symbols as the motivation for different SLIV. But, if TDRA configures such slot, only the UL symbols will be valid anyways from UE perspective. 3. PUSCH TDRA should be in consecutive **UL** slots. That means, the allocated slots in time domain can be non-consecutive in TDD configurations. However, TDRA configuration can simply provide a number of slots for multiple PUSCH. Then, the slots that are “UL” will be the valid slots in non-consecutive manner. For example, if TDD pattern is “DDDSUDDDSU…” and TDRA configures 10 consecutive slots, There will be 2 valid UL slots.   Suggestion 3:  In our view, all alternatives require some modifications. For example, it’s not clear how Alt-C2 can be used for type-1 CG PUSCH or how it can be signaled via DCI 0\_0. |
| **Panasonic** | Q1: Regarding Suggestion 2, we should consider the need of handling the collision of a PUSCH occasion with DL slot or symbols. In our view, the periodicity of frame arrivals cannot be aligned with the slot configurations and the collisions are inevitable. Without considering the collisions, there is a chance that many occasions become unavailable. We suggest adding this to the discussing properties. The available/unavailable property from the design of repetition framework and the on-consecutive slots property from Rel-17 MultiPUSCH TDRA could be adopted. |
| **Spreadtrum** | For suggestion 1:  We are fine with Suggestion 1 to focus on Alt-A1, Alt-B and Alt-C2.  As both Type-1 and Type-2 CGs are supported in the last meeting, some enhancement for Alt-A1, Alt-B and Alt-C2 are needed. Alt-A1 and Alt-B should deal with the case of non-consecutive slots. While Alt-C2 has best flexibility to support Type-2 CGs, but not feasible for Type-1 CGs.  For suggestion 2:  1) No need to have back-to-back PUSCHs.  2) No need for SLIVs with different sizes, it’s not workable for Type-1 CGs.  3) We are confused with the non-consecutive slots refer to both of UL and DL slots in TDD frame, or only refer to UL slots. We think there is a need to support PUSCH transmission in non-consecutive slots (UL+DL) and in consecutive UL slots in a CG period. As UL slots may not consecutive in TDD, CG-PUSCH transmissions with consecutive slots in Alt-A1 and Alt-B may collide with some DL symbols. However, consecutive valid UL slots are needed to minimize latency. |
| **NEC** | Suggestion 1:  We are OK with the proposal.  Suggestion 2:  We do not see the benefit to support back-to-back PUSCH in one slot and the non-consecutive slots allocation for XR service. Considering the large packet size and stringent PDB requirement, it is more reasonable to allocate consecutive UL slots and one PUSCH occupy all available symbols in each slot. |
| **SONY** | We can support Suggestion 1.  On suggestion 2, we prefer to further study 2.2 (SLIV) and 2.3 (PUSCH – non-consecutive slots). |
| **CMCC** | Regarding Suggestion 1:  We suggest to focus on Alt-B and Alt-C2 because Alt-A1 can be achieved by configuring the RRC parameter *M*=1 in Alt-B.  Regarding Suggestion 2:   1. In our opinion, multiple back-2-back PUSCHs could be allocated within a slot, like that in Alt-B. While consider that a large TB size may be used for transmission of XR traffic, it seems unnecessary to allocate multiple PUSCH transmission occasions within a slot. However, this can be easily achieved by configuring the RRC parameter *M*=1. So, we think it is not a critical issue for down-selection of the alternatives. 2. The benefit of configuring different SLIV sizes is not clear to us, especially considering different MCS/FDRA configurations to adjust the PUSCH coding rate. From our point of view, the configuration of same SLIV sizes for multiple PUSCH occasions will facilitate the recycling of unused resources by the UE. 3. In the scenario of TDD transmission with typical DL/UL slot configurations, e.g., DDDSU, the UL slots are non-consecutive in most cases. So it is necessary to allocate PUSCH occasions in non-consecutive slots for a TDD configuration.   Regarding Suggestion 3:  To adapt the TDD frame structure, both Alt-B with modifications and Rel-17 Multi-PUSCH TDRA with the same SLIVs could be considered. The specification impact of these alternatives can be compared when making the down-selection. |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon** | **Suggestion 1:** We are ok to focus on Alt-A1, Alt-B and Alt-C2 firstly. And it should be clarified that only the repetition framework is borrowed. There is no need to consider repetition and TBoMS for XR traffic due to the large frame size and tight PDB.  **Suggestion 2.1**: The back-2-back PUSCHs within a slot is not needed for XR traffic, which may introduce unnecessary complexity.  **Suggestion 2.3**: We think that RAN1 should discuss whether/how to address TDD format firstly before the discussion of consecutive or non-consecutive slots. Because all three alternatives have this issue and it need to be solved.  For Alt A1 and Alt B, it can be solved by changing the consecutive slots to consecutive available uplink slots. But for Alt C2, it’s hard to ensure all the indicated CG PUSCH occasion(s) are in UL slots, and it is more complicated compared with Alt B on how to move CG PUSCH occasion to a valid location.  **Suggestion 3**: As explained in **Suggestion 2.3**, the TDD format issue for Alt C2 is difficult to solve, while for Alt A and Alt B, the consecutive available uplink slots can be adopted. Moreover, the similar issue exists and specified in R17 coverage WI, which can be utilized in Alt A and Alt B to handle the TDD configuration issue above and has less spec impact. Besides, for Alt C2, the predefined TDRA row table issue should be solved, which results in large specification modifications for CG Type 1. |
| **FGI** | For Suggestion 1: We are okay to focus on Alt-A1, Alt-B and Alt-C2.  For Suggestion 2:   1. Back to back PUSCH within a slot is not needed since the purpose of the enhancements is to transmit XR packets with large packet sizes which is more reasonable to be transmitted with one TB in each slot. 2. SLIV with different sizes are not necessary.   PUSCH transmission in non-consecutive slots is useful for some TDD configurations with non-consecutive UL slots. |
| **Lenovo** | Wondering how important criteria 2,3 are especially, if a single CG configuration (or limited number of CG configurations) is used for the XR traffic with non-integer periodicity and UL jitter.  Added our name in the corresponding supporting lists. |
| **Intel** | We are OK to focus on Alt-A1, Alt-B and Alt-C2.  Back-2-Back PUSCH in a slot may not be strongly needed.  Different SLIV sizes are not strongly needed, at least it is not clear how this can be optimized for CG traffic.  For some TDD configurations, allocation in non-consesutive slots maybe necessary. Available UL slots can be non consecutive.  We are OK to focus on Alt-B only, since it is not clear how Alt-C2 can be support Type 1 CG without modifications. We are ok to support Alt-C2 for type 2 CG PUSCH only, if the group wants the combination as a compromise. |
| **Ericsson** | Suggestion1 : OK  Suggestion 2:   * Not essential: B2b PUSCH witihn a slot is not motivated. For NR-U it was motivate dto increase the chance to access the channel and for URLLC, to reduce the latency in case of repetiiton. When there is a slot, better to use data in one PUSCH for better coverage. No need to send in more PUSChs within a slot. * Useful: to fit better with TDd and avaiable UL symbols in different slots * Yes: For TDD.   Suggestion 3: We think Alt-C2 provides the needed properties. Other alternatives can be obtained from C2, but not the other way round. |
| **Moderator** | **Summary of discussions:**  **Updated companies’ views:**   * Alt-A (10): FW, CATT, Spreadtrum, TCL, OPPO, MTK, NEC, Panasonic, FGI, xiaomi   + - * Alt-A1: Spreadtrum, OPPO, MTK, NEC, Panasonic, FGI       * Alt-A2: Spreadtrum, TCL, NEC * Alt-B (12+2): FW, IDC, HW/HiSi, Google, CMCC, Samsung, Apple; Nokia/NSB, NEC, DENSO, xiaomi, Intel (Type 1), Sony (Type 1), Lenovo * Alt-C-2 (14+2): E///, QC, vivo, ZTE/Sanechips, Spreadtrum, LG, DCM, OPPO, ~~Nokia/NSB~~, Panasonic, DENSO, FGI, Sharp, CAICT, Intel(Type 2), Sony(Type 2), Lenovo   **Suggestion 1:** Focus on Alt-A1, Alt-B and Alt-C2. Note that Alt-A2 can be obtained from Alt-B (discarding the segmented PUSCH).   * **OK:** ZTE/Sanechips (C2), Nokia/NSB, CATT, New H3C, QC (C2), Google, Samsung, FW, IDC, Xiaomi, Sharp, vivo, OPPO, TCL, DCM, LG, Spreadtrum, NED, Sony, CMCC, HW/HiSi, FGI, Lenovo, Intel, Ericsson   **@Nokia:** Yes. Intention was without TBoMs.  **@CATT:** Companies have solution for Type-1 based Alt. C2.  **@CMCC:** Agree with your comment.  **@HW/HiSi:** Repetition framework is borrowed for A1. Agree TBoMs and Repetiton are separately disuccsed (section 2.4).  **Moderator suggests to endorse Suggestion 1 (i.e. focus on Alt-A1, Alt-B and Alt-C2).**  **Suggestions 2 and 3:**  **@All:** Companies views regarding Suggestions 2 and 3 will be summarized after 1st GTW along with suggestion for the next round of discussions. |
| **Moderator** | **Outcome of online session:**  **Agreement:**  For TDRA design for multi-CG PUSCH, prioritize Alt-A1, Alt-B, and Alt-C2 for further downscoping and/or modification from corresponding agreement in RAN1#112.   * FFS: How to address TDD configuration issue   **@All:** Companies views regarding Suggestions 2 and 3 will be summarized after 1st GTW along with suggestion for the next round of discussions. |

### 2.1.2 Intermediate Discussions

TBC

## 2.2 HARQ process ID determination

**Moderator’s summary:**

In previous meeting, the following agreement was made:

**Agreement**

For determination of HARQ process IDs associated to PUSCHs in multi-PUSCHs CG assuming one TB per PUSCH, consider the following alternatives:

* **Alt. 1:** The HARQ process ID for the first configured/valid PUSCH in a period is determined based on the legacy CG procedure when cg-RetransmissionTimer is not configured, and applying "the period duration divided by X instead of the period duration.
  + The HARQ process ID of the remaining PUSCHs in the period is determined by incrementing the HARQ process ID of the preceding PUSCH in the period.
  + Alt 1-1; X = 1
  + Alt 1-2: X is the number of configured PUSCHs in a period
  + Alt 1-3: X is provided by RRC configuration.
  + FFS details
* **Alt. 2:** Support that UE can decide, as in NR-U, the HARQ IDs for the multiple CG PUSCH transmission occasions and indicate the decided HARQ IDs to gNB if multiple HARQ processes are used for the multiple CG PUSCH transmission occasions in a period of a single CG PUSCH configuration
  + FFS details
* **Alt. 3:** The HARQ process ID for the configured PUSCHs in a period is determined based on the legacy CG procedure when cg-RetransmissionTimer is not configured.
  + FFS on potential enhancements different from previous alternatives
  + Alt 3-1: Note: Same HP ID would be used for all PUSCHs within a period.
    - FFS details
  + Alt 3-2: Note: Different HP ID could be used for all PUSCHs within a period.
    - FFS details
* Alt. 4: The HARQ process ID for the first configured/valid PUSCH in a period is determined based on the legacy CG procedure when cg-RetransmissionTimer is not configured.
  + The HARQ process ID of the remaining PUSCHs in the period is determined by incrementing the HARQ process ID of the preceding PUSCH in the period
  + FFS on potential enhancements different from previous alternatives
* Alt 5: Support that UE can decide, as in NR-U, the HARQ IDs for the first CG PUSCH transmission occasions and indicate the decided HARQ IDs to gNB if multiple HARQ processes are used for the multiple CG PUSCH transmission occasions in a period of a single CG PUSCH configuration
  + The HARQ process ID of the remaining PUSCHs in the period is determined by incrementing the HARQ process ID of the preceding PUSCH in the period
  + FFS details
* Alt 6**:** FFS other solutions

Note: The case of one TB map to multiple PUSCHs is not considered here.

**Companies’ view:**

* **Alt. 1:** E///, QC, IDC, DCM, OPPO, MTK, DCM, OPPO, LG, TCL, Apple, Google, CATT, Nokia/NSB, CMCC, FGI, NEC, DENSO, FW (w time-offset), HW/HiSi (w time-offset)
  + **Alt. 1-1:** TCL, Apple
  + **Alt. 1-2:** E///, QC, IDC, HW/HiSi, DCM, OPPO, MTK, FW (w time-offset),HW/HiSi (w time-offset)
  + **Alt. 1-3:** DCM, OPPO, LG, FW (w time-offset)
* **Alt. 2**
  + Yes: FW, Vivo, OPPO, Spreadtrum, Samsung, DENSO
  + No: ZTE, HW/HiSi, Google, CATT
* **Alt. 3**
  + Yes: MTK (Alt. 3-2)
  + No: E///, vivo, HW/HiSi, MTK (Alt. 3-1)
* **Alt. 4:** vivo, HW/HiSi, Lenovo, Spreadtrum, Samsung, IDC, Sharp, CIACT, Intel, [MTK]
  + **Alt-4 without FFS (i.e. Alt 1-1):** 
    - Samsung, Lenovo, Spreadtrum, IDC, Sharp, CIATC, Intel
  + **Alt-4 with FFS (i.e. Alt. 1 w update):** 
    - vivo (Alt. 1-1 w increment Y)
    - HW/HiSi (Alt. 1-2 w time-offset)
* **Alt. 5**
  + **Yes:** FW
  + **No:** ZTE, E///, HW/HiSi, Google, CATT
* **Other comments:** MTK, Xiaomi, Panasonic
* **Proposal 7** : Legacy CG HARQ ID formula is modified to include the current PUSCH TO index to determine corresponding HARQ ID.
* **Proposal 11 (xiaomi)**: RAN1 should postpone discussing HP process IDs until the maximum number of TO that can b(MTK)e configured in a CG period is agreed.
* **Proposal 3 (Panasonic)**: To increase the HP ID utilization, a minimum time period should be defined for reusing the HP ID. The HP ID can be reused for a PUSCH occasions if the minimum time period has passed.

**Moderator’s observations:**

* **Observation 1:** Regarding Alt-2 and Alt-5 (UE based implementation), few companies expressed clearly that are not supporting such approach. While the supporting companies for Alt-2 and/or Alt-5, expressed support for other alternatives as well (Alt. 1 or Alt. 4).
* **Observation 2:** Regarding Alt-3, few companies expressed clearly that are not supporting such approach. A company that supports Alt. 3-2, also supports Alt. 4.
  + **From these two observations, Moderator suggests focusing on Alt. 1 and Alt.4.**
* **Observation 3:** Regarding Alt. 4, as shown above, a set of companies prefer Alt. 4 without any further changes that would be equivalent to Alt. 1-1. Another set, 2 companies’ proposal is modified version of Alt. 1. One company uses the same principal w different adjustment. Note that MTK has a proposal based on adjustment of the legacy proposal (without applying the increment rule). Hence, it is captured as Alt. 6 and not part of Alt. 1 or Alt.4
  + **Alt.4 can be merged in Alt.1.**
* **Observation 4:** Companies e.g., LG also can additionally express that X should be a configurable value different than 1, or number of PUSCHs in a period (i.e., Alt. 1-3). MTK also proposes to consider legacy proposal without increment and use other adjustment instead.
* **Observation 5:** Regarding xiaomi proposal, the proposed solution work for any number of maximum TOs per period. Hence, it is recommended to instead discuss to reach to a solution. Regarding Panasonic proposal, it is not clear how the corresponding solution should be formulated and whether the maximum number of HARQ IDs together with HARQID offset, somehow implicitly define a window.

**Based on above observations, the expressed views are re-arranged as the following:**

**Alt. 1:** E///, QC, IDC, DCM, OPPO, MTK, DCM, OPPO, LG, TCL, Apple, Google, CATT, Nokia/NSB, CMCC, FGI, NEC, DENSO, FW (w time-offset), HW/HiSi (w time-offset), Samsung, Lenovo, Spreadtrum, IDC, Sharp, CIATC, Intel

* **Alt. 1-1:** TCL, Apple, Samsung, Lenovo, Spreadtrum, IDC, Sharp, CIATC, Intel, vivo (increment w Y>1)
* **Alt. 1-2:** E///, QC, IDC, HW/HiSi, DCM, OPPO, MTK, FW (w time-offset), HW/HiSi (w time-offset)
* **Alt. 1-3:** DCM, OPPO, LG, FW (w time-offset)

**Alt. 6:** MTK (Proposal 7)

Table 2: Summary of Contributions inputs for Section 2.2

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Contributions inputs** |
| Futurewei | **Observation 2**: Due to the regular periodicity of the configured CG resources for CG PUSCH configuration being not guaranteed, the legacy HARQ process ID determination mechanism based on regular periodic resource allocation (i.e., Alt. 1, Alt. 3, and Alt. 4) can't be applied directly to the multiple CG PUSCH transmission occasions in a period of a single CG PUSCH configuration for uplink XR traffic.  **Proposal 3**: Support that the periodicity of CG resources in legacy HARQ process ID determination formula (i.e., Alt. 1, Alt. 3, and Alt. 4) can be replaced with non-integer periodicity of XR traffic or a nominal periodicity of CG resources which is the same as non-integer periodicity of XR traffic if formula based HARQ process ID determination supported.  **Observation 3**: To overcome (or reduce) jitter impacts on CG PUSCH resource allocation, a time offset value, between the regular arrival time of XR traffic and the CG PUSCH resource allocation, needs to be introduced, which may impact the HARQ process ID determination results for formula based HARQ process ID determinations (i.e., Alt 1-2 and Alt 1-3).  **Proposal 4**: Support that a time offset value is introduced for the formula based HARQ process ID determination (i.e., Alt. 1-2 and Alt. 1-3) to avoid jitter impacts on CG PUSCH resource allocation and HARQ process ID determination if formula based HARQ process ID determination supported (i.e., Alt. 1).  **Proposal 5**: Support that UE can decide, as in NR-U, the HARQ process ID(s) (i.e., Alt.2 and Alt.5) for the multiple CG PUSCH transmission occasions in a period of a single CG PUSCH configuration for uplink XR traffic and indicate the decided HARQ process ID(s) to gNB. |
| Ericsson | **Proposal 4** For HARQ process ID determination of multi-PUSCHs CG, prioritize Alt-1 and Alt-2 for further down-selection.  **Proposal 5** For HARQ process ID determination of multi-PUSCHs CG, prioritize Alt-1 over Alt-2 for further down-selection.  **Proposal 6** Support Alt. 1-2 for HARQ process ID determination of PUSCHs in multi-PUSCHs CG. |
| vivo | **Proposal 4**: For determination of HARQ process IDs associated to CG PUSCHs in multi-PUSCHs CG assuming one TB per CG PUSCH, consider the following alternatives:  \* Alt. 2: Support that the UE can decide, as in NR-U, the HARQ process IDs for the multiple CG PUSCH occasions and indicate the decided HARQ process IDs to the gNB if multiple HARQ processes are used for the multiple CG PUSCH occasions in a period of a single CG PUSCH configuration.  \* Alt. 4: The HARQ process ID for the first configured/valid PUSCH in a period is determined based on the legacy CG procedure when cg-RetransmissionTimer is not configured.  o The HARQ process IDs of the remaining CG PUSCHs in the period are determined by incrementing Y to the HARQ process ID of the preceding PUSCH in the same period  \* Y is an integer value larger than 1, e.g., Y is the number of configured CG PUSCHs in a period or is configured independently by RRC signalling |
| Qualcomm | **Proposal 4**: Support Alt 1-2 for HARQ Process ID determination for multiple PUSCH occasions in the CG period  \* HARQ process ID for the first valid PUSCH in a CG period is determined based on the legacy CG procedure when cg-RetransmissionTimer is not configured  \* Apply "the CG period duration divided by X = the number of configured PUSCH occasions in a CG period" instead of the CG period duration |
| ZTE/Sanechips | **Observation 3**: The principle of maximum gap between CG PUSCH occasions using the same HARQ process ID is beneficial to minimize the HARQ process ID congestion. While the principle of limited total number of HARQ process ID used by CG is help for avoiding HARQ process ID starvation.  **Observation 4**: Same HARQ process ID pattern for each CG period is capable of achieving maximum gap between CG PUSCH occasions using the same HARQ process ID and minimum total number of HARQ process ID used by CG, if all transmission occasions in each period are used.  **Observation 5**: A cyclic-shifted HARQ process ID pattern for each CG period is capable of achieving maximum gap among CG PUSCH occasions using the same HARQ process ID and having minimum total number of HARQ process ID used by CG, if unused transmission occasions exist in CG periods.  **Proposal 6**: Do not support HARQ process ID determination to be determined by UE implementation, including e.g., Alt 2 and Alt 5 in the agreement of HARQ process ID determination in RAN1#112 meeting.  **Proposal 7**: The unused HARQ process ID of the unused transmission occasion should be considered, if the determination of HARQ process IDs associated to PUSCHs in multi-PUSCHs CG is supported, including e.g., Alt 1, Alt 3 and Alt 4 in the agreement of HARQ process ID determination in RAN1#112 meeting. |
| TCL Comm. | **Proposal 4**: For XR, when multiple TOs within a CG is configured, the HARQ-ID for the first configured/valid PUSCH within a CG configuration is determined based on current mechanism which is defined in TS 38.321, then the HARQ-ID of the remaining TOs within a CG period is determined by incrementing the HARQ-ID of the preceding TO within a CG configuration. |
| IDC | **Proposal 3**: For multi-PUSCH CG, update the HPI formula to consider the number of PUSCH occasions in a CG period |
| HW/HiSi | **Observation 7**: The HARQ process IDs of each CG PUSCH in one period are the same according to the formula in Alt. 3, which would increases gNB scheduling complexity and decreases XR capacity.  **Proposal 4**: Further study HARQ process ID determination mechanism with the following principles  \* Minimize signalling overhead  \* Maximize the gap between CG PUSCH occasions using the same HARQ process ID, considering the number of unused occasions in a period  \* Minimize the total number of HARQ process used by CG  **Proposal 5**: The determination of the HARQ process ID of multi-PUSCHs CG is not left to UE implementation, i.e., do not support Alt 2 and Alt 5.  **Proposal 6**: On HARQ process ID determination, support enhancement based on Alt 4 or Alt 1-2 by skipping HARQ process ID increment over unused CG PUSCH occasion(s)  \* HARQ Process ID = [floor(CURRENT\_symbol/(periodicity/X)) + offset] modulo nrofHARQ-Processes  \* Where X is the number of configured PUSCH occasions in a CG period, and the 'offset' equals to the number of unused PUSCH occasion(s) of the last CG period. |
| NTT DOCOMO | **Proposal 4**: Support Alt 1 for HP ID determination of multiple CG PUSCHs in one CG period, i.e.  \* The HARQ process ID for the first valid PUSCH in a period is determined based on the legacy CG procedure when cg-RetransmissionTimer is not configured, and applying "the period duration divided by X instead of the period duration.  \* X is the number of configured PUSCHs in a period, or X is provided by RRC configuration.  \* The HARQ process ID of the remaining valid PUSCHs in the period is determined by incrementing the HARQ process ID of the preceding valid PUSCH in the period. |
| Google Inc. | **Proposal 3**: For the HPI determination, Alt-1 should be supported:  \* The HARQ process ID for the first configured/valid PUSCH in a period is determined based on the legacy CG procedure when cg-RetransmissionTimer is not configured, and applying "the period duration divided by X instead of the period duration.  **Proposal 4**: For the HPI determination, Alt. 2 and Alt. 5 where the UE is deciding on the HPI for its UL transmission should not be supported |
| OPPO | **Proposal 3**: For determination of HARQ process IDs associated to PUSCHs in a multi-PUSCHs CG configuration, solution is selected from {Alt.1-2, Alt.1-3, Alt.2}. |
| MTK | **Observation 2**: Existing HARQ process ID determination formula in TS38.321 does not work with multiple PUSCH transmission occasions as it does not assign different HARQ IDs for each PUSCH within one single GCG period.  **Proposal 4**: HARQ process ID determination is based on a modified version of the formula from the legacy CG procedure when cg-RetransmissionTimer is not configured (e.g., Alt-1, Alt-3-2, Alt-4).  **Proposal 5**: Assigning same HARQ ID to multiple PUSCH TOs (e.g., Alt-3-1) is NOT considered.  **Proposal 6**: When RAN1 reaches an agreement on HARQ ID determination, RAN1 shall send an LS to RAN2 to consult them about the feasibility of the RAN1 agreement on the HARQ ID determination formula modification.  **Proposal 7**: Legacy CG HARQ ID formula is modified to include the current PUSCH TO index to determine corresponding HARQ ID.  **Proposal 8**: The parameter "current PUSCH TO index" shall be formulated in a non-ambiguous manner. |
| CATT | **Proposal 3**: The following HPID determination method could be supported:  • The HPID for the multiple CG PUSCHs in a CG period determined and reported by UE should not be supported in Rel-18 XR work item.  • The HARQ process ID based on the Alt-1 would be enhanced that the HPID of first CG occasion can be calculated as the legacy method and the HARQ process ID of the remaining PUSCHs in the period is determined by incrementing the HARQ process ID of the preceding PUSCH in the period by an offset, e.g. 2.  • The single TB transmission mapping to one or more CG occasions could reduce the number of HARQ process ID and should be further studied based on the repetition framework. |
| Nokia/NSB | **Proposal 4**: RAN1 should investigate further Alt 1 for HARQ process ID determination and not consider other alternatives anymore. |
| Apple | **Proposal 7**: Alt. 1-1 is adopted for HPID determination. |
| IDC | **Proposal 3**: For multi-PUSCH CG, update the HPI formula to consider the number of PUSCH occasions in a CG period |
| xiaomi | **Proposal 11**: RAN1 should postpone discussing HP process IDs until the maximum number of TO that can be configured in a CG period is agreed. |
| LG | **Proposal 6**: Support Alt. 1-3 for HARQ process ID allocation for multiple CG occasions in a period. |
| Lenovo | **Proposal 2**: Support Alt. 4 for HARQ process ID determination.  \* A HARQ process ID is assigned to a configured CG PUSCH occasion. |
| Spreadtrum comm. | **Proposal 2**: Alt 2 and Alt 4 can be considered as a baseline for determination of HARQ process IDs associated to PUSCHs in multi-PUSCHs CG:  \* Alt 2: Support that UE can decide, as in NR-U, the HARQ IDs for the multiple CG PUSCH transmission occasions and indicate the decided HARQ IDs to gNB if multiple HARQ processes are used for the multiple CG PUSCH transmission occasions in a period of a single CG PUSCH configuration  \* Alt 4: The HARQ process ID for the first configured/valid PUSCH in a period is determined based on the legacy CG procedure when cg-RetransmissionTimer is not configured. |
| CMCC | **Proposal 4**. Support Alt. 1 for determination of HARQ process IDs associated to PUSCHs in multi-PUSCHs CG.  \* For the first configured/valid PUSCH in a CG period:  o HARQ Process ID = [floor(CURRENT\_symbol / (periodicity / X))] modulo nrofHARQ-Processes + harq-ProcID-Offset2, where X equals the number of configured PUSCHs in a CG period  \* For the remaining PUSCHs in the CG period:  o HARQ Process ID = (increment the HARQ process ID of the preceding PUSCH in the period) modulo nrofHARQ-Processes |
| Samsung | **Proposal 3**: For HPN determination for "multi-CG PUSCH", apply Alt-2 or Alt-4. |
| Sharp | **Proposal 4**: The HARQ process ID for the first configured/valid PUSCH in a period is determined based on the legacy CG procedure when cg-RetransmissionTimer is not configured.  \* The HARQ process ID of the remaining PUSCHs in the period is determined by incrementing the HARQ process ID of the preceding PUSCH in the period |
| FGI | **Proposal 2**: Adopt Alt. 1 for determination of HARQ process IDs associated to PUSCHs in multi-PUSCHs CG. |
| Panasonic | **Proposal 3**: To increase the HP ID utilization, a minimum time period should be defined for reusing the HP ID. The HP ID can be reused for a PUSCH occasions if the minimum time period has passed. |
| CAICT | **Proposal 2**: HARQ process IDs are allocated to valid PUSCHs other than configured PUSCH occasions in a period.  **Proposal 3**: The HARQ process ID for the first valid PUSCH in a period is determined based on the legacy CG procedure when cg-RetransmissionTimer is not configured. The HARQ process ID of the remaining PUSCHs in the period is determined by incrementing the HARQ process ID of the preceding PUSCH in the period. |
| DENSO CORP. | **Observation 3**: For determination of HARQ process ID of CG PUSCHs associated to a multi-PUSCHs CG, the following options can be considered.  - Option.1: As in DG scheduling multi-PUSCHs, the HARQ process ID is determined by incrementing the HARQ process ID of the preceding PUSCH in the CG period.  - Option.2: As in NR-U CG, the UE can select the HARQ process IDs for multiple CG PUSCH occasions and transmit them on the UCI.  **Observation 4**: Given that multi-PUSCHs CG may have some unused occasions due to the random jitter and various packet size of the XR service, it seems effective to allow the UE to select the HARQ process IDs, as in NR-U CG, so as not to reserve too many HARQ process IDs. |
| NEC | **Proposal 4**: regarding the HP ID determination, support Alt .1 for the semi-static method, and further study Alt .2 and Alt. 5 for UE determined method based on whether UCI can be transmitted multiple times in a CG period. |
| Intel | **Proposal 4**: Support Alt-4 for HARQ-ID determination of multi-PUSCHs CG.  \* The HARQ process ID for the first configured/valid PUSCH in a period is determined based on the legacy CG procedure when cg-RetransmissionTimer is not configured.  o The HARQ process ID of the remaining PUSCHs in the period is determined by incrementing the HARQ process ID of the preceding PUSCH in the period |

### 2.2.1 Initial Discussions

**Moderator’s suggestions for initial discussion:**

Considering the summary and observations above, Moderator suggests the following for discussion:

**Aim for decision at this meeting.**

* **Suggestion 1:** Focus on Alt. 1-1 and Alt. 1-2.
* **Suggestion 1-2:** Further discuss whether to include time-offset as proposed by HW/HiSi and FW for Alt. 1-2
* **Suggestion 1-3:** Further discuss whether to increment with Y>1 as proposed by vivo for Alt. 1-1.
* **Suggestion 2:** Discuss Atl. 6 to understand companies views.
  + In case of low interest after understanding its properties, Moderator suggests down-prioritizing this approach too.

**Questions:** Please provide your view in the table below regarding the following questions:

* **Q1:** What is your view regarding Moderator’s suggestions for progress on HARQ ID determination design?
* **Q2:** Please review the motivations for different solutions and answer the following:
  + **Regarding suggestion 1:** Please indicate/motivate your preference between Alt 1-1 and Alt 1-2.
  + **Regarding suggestion 1-2/1-3:** Please indicate/motivate your view on proposed adjustments.
  + **Regarding suggestion 2:** Please indicate/motivate your view on the proposed adjustment.
* **Q3:** Discuss any clarification/correction/comment/question on Moderator’s summary and suggestions or any other aspect helping the discussion and needed decisions.

**Note: Please ensure the information in companies’ contributions are considered for discussions.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| **ZTE, Sanechips** | * For Suggestion 1: We are fine with focusing on Alt 1-1 and Alt 1-2.   We also highlight that the HP ID of unused TO should be taken into account, in that respect, in fact **Alt 1-1** is more robust compared to the other.   * For Suggestion 1-2: Again, if the HP ID of unused TO was considered as unused for CG PUSCH TOs, adding time-offset into the formula would be necessary. In this case, we can maximize the time gap between the PUSCHs using same HP ID. Furthermore, the time offset can be the number of used transmission occasions, or the last used HP ID of the used transmission occasions in previous CG period. * For Suggestion 1-3: We’re fine to discuss and understand the intention and benefits of this approach. |
| **Nokia, NSB** | **Q1:** agree with moderator’s suggestion.  **Q2:**  **Regarding suggestion 1:** Our preference is Alt 1-2. It is understood that Alt 1-1 is simply re-using the current formula, based on the legacy CG procedure when cg-RetransmissionTimer is not configured. Alt 1-1 will lead to the same HARQ IDs across neighboring CG periods, which potentially will lead to the problems with ReTx or not available CG PUSCH occasion, thus it is not preferred.  **Regarding suggestion 1-2:** we do not see an issue if Alt 1-2 is not extended with time offset. However, considering the additional time offset will bring the ambiguity at gNB side as it is not clear, why gNB did not receive during the first/second/etc. occasion (jitter issues, UE skipped the UL, etc.).  **Regarding suggestion 1-3:** We are ok to further compare two options of modifying the formula, i.e., periodicity/X or increased IDs in one period by Y>1.  **Regarding suggestion 2:** The approach is also based on modification the formula. If the IDs will be distributed the same way as for Alt 1-2, we think Alt 1-2 is better as less modifications to formula. |
| **CATT** | We are OK on Suggestion 1-1 to focus on Alt 1-1 and 1-2.  Suggestion 1-2, CATT suggests an offset value between adjacent period of XR traffic generation duration to avoid collision. An “offset” value could be considered but not necessary “time offset”  We are OK with suggestion 1-3.  We don’t see the need to further discussion suggestion 2. |
| **New H3C** | We agree with suggestion 1-1 |
| **Qualcomm** | Support Alt 1-2 for HARQ Process ID determination for multiple PUSCH occasions in the CG period |
| **Google** | **Q1**: We agree with the moderator proposal to focus on Alt 1-1 and 1-2.  **Q2:**  **Regarding suggestion 1:** We support Alt 1-2. However, for simplicity and to avoid any future rounding issues, we prefer to multiply floor(CURRENT\_symbol/periodicity) by X instead of dividing the periodicity by X.  **Regarding suggestion 1-2:** introducing an offset to account for the unused occasions could create some mismatch between the UE and the gNB if the gNB misses the reception of the UCI indicating the unused occasions. Let’s assume we have 4 CG occasions per CG period and the UCI is transmitted on the 2nd occasion to indicate the 4th occasion as unused. In this case, the offset is equal to 1. If the gNB misses the reception of the 2nd occasion carrying the UCI, the gNB would consider the offset is equal to 0 in the following CG period and the UE would consider the offset is equal to 1.  **Regarding suggestion 2:** we support discussing it. Actually, In Alt 1-1, the HARQ process ID of the remaining PUSCHs in the period is determined by incrementing the HARQ process ID of the preceding PUSCH in the period and this can also be captured in the formula with CG occasion index *I* as below  HARQ Process ID = [X \* floor(CURRENT\_symbol/periodicity) + I ] modulo nrofHARQ-Processes |
| **Samsung** | In practice, having the UE indicate the HARQ process will be fine as it can be expected that the network will switch to DG PUSCH once BSR is available after first (very) few CG PUSCHs. That also avoids additional specification impact.  For progress, OK with suggestion 1 but there is no motivation to further discuss suggestion 1-1 or 1-2 if no problem is identified for the alternatives of suggestion 1. |
| **Futurewei** | For Q1: in Suggestion 1, Alt. 2 also needs to be focused on since it has the best flexibility for HARQ process ID determinations. For example, if a CG PUSCH transmission occasion, of the multiple CG PUSCH transmission occasions, is not used by UE, UE need not allocate HARQ process ID for the unused CG PUSCH transmission occasion. Furthermore, periodicity mismatch issue and jitter range issue have much less impacts on UE based HARQ process ID determination. We are ok with other FL suggestions.  For Q2: Please review the motivations for different solutions and answer the following:   * + **Regarding suggestion 1:** Please indicate/motivate your preference between Alt 1-1 and Alt 1-2.     - [FW]: We prefer Alt 1-2 between Alt 1-1 and Alt 1-2, since Alt 1-1 can introduce much more duplications for HARQ IDs of different PUSCH occasions, which will impact retransmission throughput for different PUSCH occasions.   + **Regarding suggestion 1-2/1-3:** Please indicate/motivate your view on proposed adjustments.     - [FW]: We think the finally adopted solution should be much flexible enough to support more possible traffic models/patterns of XR even in future, since XR is still an infantile field and new applications would continuously come out in the years ahead, meanwhile, new traffic model/pattern of XR more likely would also be introduced in future. For example, based on the latest RAN2 agreement in RAN2#121, RAN2 thinks uplink jitter may be present for XR (e.g., for tethering use cases). Therefore, the new introduced traffic model/pattern of XR in future should have as less standardization impacts on the finally adopted solution as possible. In that sense, we support that a time offset value is introduced for the formula based HARQ process ID determination (i.e., Alt. 1-2 and Alt. 1-3) to avoid jitter impacts on CG PUSCH resource allocation and HARQ process ID determination if formula based HARQ process ID determination supported (i.e., Alt. 1-2 and Alt. 1-3).   + **Regarding suggestion 2:** Please indicate/motivate your view on the proposed adjustment.     - [FW]: support that a time offset value is introduced for the formula based HARQ process ID determination (i.e., Alt. 1-2 and Alt. 1-3) to avoid jitter impacts.   For Q3: we revise suggestion 1 as below:  **suggestion 1:** Please indicate/motivate your preference between Alt 1-1, Alt 1-2 and Alt. 2. |
| **InterDigital** | Q1: We agree with moderator’s suggestions  Q2: Our preference is Alt 1-2, given that it can be supported with a simple update to the existing HPI and addresses the issue of HPI collision across CG periods to some extent by accounting for the number of PUSCHs in a CG period. |
| **Xiaomi** | Since most companies want to talk about HP ID directly, we agree with moderator’s suggestion. We’re fine to discuss benefits of the approach in suggestion 1-3. |
| **Sharp** | We support moderator’s suggestions, and are open with Alt 1-1 or Alt 1-2. |
| **Apple** | We support Alt. 1-1. |
| **vivo** | For Suggestion 1: We think alt 2 is the simplest alternative which is supported in the current specification. It should not be precluded.  For Suggestion 1-2: we think the unused HARQ process ID can be used for DG PUSCH, there is no need to introduce addition time-offset.  For Suggestion 1-3: between alt 1-1 and alt 1-2, we slightly prefer alt 1-1. For alt 1-1, with Y>1, the first configured/valid PUSCH in a period is determined based on the legacy CG procedure when cg-RetransmissionTimer is not configured without additional update regrading X. Meanwhile, it can avoid the collision of HARQ process ID for different CG PUSCHs in consecutive periods. |
| **OPPO** | We suggest focus on Alt. 1-2 and Alt. 2.  Alt 1-1 may lead scheduling limitation, because multiple HP ID will be used in adjacent periods, as shown in below. We think Alt.2 has least impact on the specification, since it has been supported in NR-U. |
| **TCL** | Q1: We agree with the moderator proposal to focus on Alt 1-1 and 1-2. In our views, the current mechanism can be reused as much as possible to mitigate the impact of spec, thus, we prefer Alt 1-1.  Q2: We are OK with suggestion 1-3. |
| **DOCOMO** | Q1: We agree with the suggestion.  Q2: Our preference is Alt 1-2. |
| **LG** | We can support Alt 1-2, and Alt. 1-3 can be considered as compromise solution between Alt. 1-1 and Alt 1-1  Regarding suggestion 1-2, we support to add time-offset which can help adjusting starting HARQ process ID when multiple CG configurations are configured.  Regarding suggestion 1-3, we don’t see the clear motivation to support incrementing with Y>1  Regarding suggestion 2, we prefer to focus on listed solution. |
| **MediaTek** | **Suggestion 1:** We are fine to focus on Alt 1-1 and Alt 1-2. We prefer Alt 1-2. As suggested by Google, it is safer to multiply by X after the floor operation rather than dividing the periodicity by X before the floor operation. This is better to avoid potential rational number issues.  **Suggestion 1-2:** If the HARQ ID assignment is skipped for unused TO, there will be potential misunderstandings between gNB and UE. This is a serious issue since it will impact HARQ re-transmission reliability. A HARQ ID should be assigned for all PUSCH TOs, even if they are not used by the UE.  **Suggestion 1-3:** Yes, HARQ ID should be incremented for each PUSCH. The formula should be as follows. Y is an integer that is equal to the PUSCH TO index in a CG period. So, such formulation would increment the HARQ ID by 1.  HARQ Process ID = [X \* floor(CURRENT\_symbol/periodicity) + Y ] modulo nrofHARQ-Processes  **Suggestion 2:** Our Proposal-7 is not actually a different alternative. It’s related to Alt 1-2. So, our suggestion to introduce “current PUSCH TO index” is basically to have the HARQ ID increments for each PUSCH TO, as defined by “Y” in the formula above. We need to formulate this parameter in the specifications as well. |
| **Panasonic** | Q1: We are fine with the suggestions.  Q2: Alt 1-1 may not allow to trigger the retransmission in time. While Alt 1-2 brings flexibility for the retransmission with the cost of using a large number of HP IDs. We think Alt 1-3 could be trade-off option, bringing the scheduling flexibility with a limited number of HARQ IDs. |
| **Spreadtrum** | For Suggestion 1: We are fine to focus on Alt 1-1, Alt 1-2. Alt 1-1 is preference for us.  For Suggestion 1-2: It is unnecessary to adding time-offset into the formula. |
| **NEC** | Suggestion 1:  We prefer Alt 1-2.  Suggestion 1-2:  We are open to further study whether an offset should be considered in the formula. |
| **CMCC** | Regarding Suggestion 1:  We are fine with this suggestion and we prefer Alt. 1-2 for HARQ ID determination.  Regarding Suggestion 1-2:  In the approach proposed by HW/HiSi, the “offset” equals to the number of unused PUSCH occasion(s) of the last CG period. Due to the variable frame size of XR traffic, the number of unused PUSCH occasion(s) varies in different CG periods, that is, the “offset” in this scheme varies in different CG periods. In this case, we wonder whether **the gap** between CG PUSCH occasions using the same HARQ process ID will **always become larger** by adopting the modified Alt. 1-2 with such a time offset. As illustrated in Figure 1 below, within the second and third CG periods, the gap between CG PUSCH occasions using the same HARQ process ID, e.g., HPID=0, 1 in HW’s approach becomes smaller than that in Alt. 1-2.  Besides, considering the UCI overriding, if supported, and the cases of UCI miss detection, the management of HARQ processes will become more complicated in this approach.    Figure 1. HARQ process IDs associated to PUSCHs in multi-PUSCHs CG with *nrofHARQ-Processes = 4* and *harq-ProcID-Offset2 = 0*  Regarding Suggestion 1-3/2:  The benefits of these approaches over Alt. 1-2 should be further clarified. In our opinion, Alt. 1-2 is the simplest approach to ensure different HARQ IDs for multiple PUSCH occasions in a CG period. |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon** | **Suggestion 1**: We are ok to focus on Alt 1-1 and Alt 1-2.  **Suggestion 1-2**: We support this suggestion. We propose that HPID is not increased over unused PUSCH occasion(s) of the last CG period. An offset can be added to the equation of Alt 1-2. This solution further expands the gap between CG PUSCH occasions using the same HARQ process ID, which provides gNB more flexibility to schedule the retransmission of the data. This is shown below.  HARQ Process ID = [floor(CURRENT\_symbol/(periodicity/X)) + offset] modulo nrofHARQ-Processes |
| **FGI** | For Suggestion 1, we prefer to focus on Alt. 1-2 only, since Alt. 1-1 is reusing current formula which will result in same HARQ process IDs being used in adjacent CG periods. |
| **Lenovo** | Q1: ok  Q2: Alt 1-1 (e.g., with Vivo’s suggestion) and 1-2 seem to be able to achieve a similar behavior. Further discussion maybe needed. It seems Alt 1-1 keeps the legacy formula, but needs an additional RRC parameter; while Alt 1-2 changes the legacy formula. |
| **Intel** | Ok with suggestion 1  We prefer to keep legacy formula, so support Alt 1-1 |
| **Ericsson** | Suggestion 1: OK  Suggestion 1-2/1-3: We dont see th eneed for addiitonal parameter as time offset. Also, not clear what is the issue with y=1.  Suggestion 2: other alternatives are sufficient. We rather to focus on Alt-1-1 and Alt 1-2. |
| **Moderator** | **Summary of views:**   * **Suggestion 1:** Focus on Alt. 1-1 and Alt. 1-2.   + **OK:** ZTE/Sanechips, Nokia/NSB, CATT, New H3C, QC, Google, Samsung, FW, IDC, Xiaomi, Sharp, Apple, vivo, OPPO, TCL, DCM, LG, MTK, Pana, Spreadtrum, NEC, CMCC, HW/HiSi, FGI, Lenovo, Intel, Ericsson   + **Other**:     - **OK if Alt-2 also included (3)**: FW, vivo, OPPO     - **Preferred Alt 1-1 (4):** Apple, TC, Spreadtrum, Intel     - **Preferred Alt 1-2 (12):** Nokia/NSB, QC, Google, FW, IDC, DCM, MTK, Pana, NEC, CMCC, FGI, Ericsson * **Suggestion 1-2:** Further discuss whether to include time-offset as proposed by HW/HiSi and FW for Alt. 1-2   + **OK:** ZTE/Sanechips, CATT (offset), FW, LG, MTK, NEC, HW/HiSi   + **Not OK:** Nokia/NSB, Google, Samsung, vivo, CMCC, Ericsson * **Suggestion 1-3:** Further discuss whether to increment with Y>1 as proposed by vivo for Alt. 1-1.   + **OK:** ZTE/Sanechips, Nokia/NSB, CATT, vivo, TCL, [MTK]   + **Not OK:** Samsung, LG, CMCC, Ericsson * **Suggestion 2:** Discuss Atl. 6 to understand companies views.   + In case of low interest after understanding its properties, Moderator suggests down-prioritizing this approach too.   + **OK:** Google, FW, xiaomi, MTK   + **Not OK**: Nokia/NSB, CATT, Samsung, LG, CMCC, Ericsson     - **MTK: It is a variant of Alt 1-2.**   **@FW, vivo, OPPO**: The reason for not suggesting to priorotized Alt-2 is the clear objection from some companies.  **@All:** The following proposal captures Alt. 1-1 and Alt. 1-2. For potential inclusion of Y>1 or Offset>0, corresponding FFs are included. Also, resolving FFSs are needed for final selection between Alt. 1-1 and Alt. 1-2.  **Proposal 1-2-1**  For determination of HARQ process IDs associated to PUSCHs in multi-PUSCHs CG assuming one TB per PUSCH:   * The HARQ process ID for the first configured/valid PUSCH in a period is determined based on the legacy CG procedure when cg-RetransmissionTimer is not configured, and applying the following formula, whichever is applicable   + HARQ Process ID = [floor(CURRENT\_symbol / (*periodicity/X)*) + offset] modulo *nrofHARQ-Processes*   + HARQ Process ID = [floor(CURRENT\_symbol / (*periodicity/X)*) + offset] modulo *nrofHARQ-Processes* + *harq-ProcID-Offset2*   + The HARQ process ID of the remaining PUSCHs in the period is determined by incrementing the HARQ process ID of the preceding PUSCH in the period by Y.     - FFS whether X=1 or X= the number of configured PUSCHs in the CG period     - Y=1. FFS whether Y should be larger than 1 instead.     - Offset =0. FFS whether non-zero offset should be used. |

### 2.2.2 Intermediate Discussions

**Moderator’s recommendation:**

Considering the discussion in initial round, Moderator proposes the following:

**Proposal 1-2-1**

For determination of HARQ process IDs associated to PUSCHs in multi-PUSCHs CG assuming one TB per PUSCH:

* The HARQ process ID for the first configured/valid PUSCH in a period is determined based on the legacy CG procedure when cg-RetransmissionTimer is not configured, and applying the following formula, whichever is applicable
  + HARQ Process ID = [floor(CURRENT\_symbol / (*periodicity/X)*) + offset] modulo *nrofHARQ-Processes*
  + HARQ Process ID = [floor(CURRENT\_symbol / (*periodicity/X)*) + offset] modulo *nrofHARQ-Processes* + *harq-ProcID-Offset2*
  + The HARQ process ID of the remaining PUSCHs in the period is determined by incrementing the HARQ process ID of the preceding PUSCH in the period by Y.
    - FFS whether X=1 or X= the number of configured PUSCHs in the CG period
    - Y=1. FFS whether Y should be larger than 1 instead.
    - Offset =0. FFS whether non-zero offset should be used.

**Questions:** Please provide your view in the table below regarding the above proposal:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| **New H3C** | **OK with FL proposal** |
| **Panasonic** | We think multi-PUSCHs could be configured in two ways, 1) TOs spread over a single frame window to address the jitter of frame arrival and 2) TOs spread over multiple frame windows to address the non-integer periodicity. For the first case, the TOs might be spread unevenly in time domain and there could be a sufficient delay between some of TOs that allows reusing the same HARQ ID. For the second case also, there could be sufficient delay between TOs of different frame windows. Hence, a set of HARQ IDs could be reused for TOs within each frame window.  To allocate HARQ IDs for both cases, the HARQ ID for the first PUSCH TO can be derived using the legacy approach. For the remaining TOs, an individual offset (Y) could be used for each occasion. Following figure illustrates the HARQ ID allocations for two different cases.    So, we suggest revising the proposal considering a set of offset values for the TOs. |
| **CATT** | We are generally OK with the proposal. However, we would like to keep the Y value FFS without the default value Y=1. Y=1 would have high probability of collision between adjacent XR periods when the number of HARQ processes is small. |
| **Nokia, NSB** | We propose to add the following note:  **Note: The equations will be updated accordingly when FFSs are clarified, e.g., if X=1, remove X, if non-zero offset is not supported, remove offset.**  Also X and offset should be in square brackets in the afore equations as they are still under FFS. |
| **ZTE, Sanechips** | * We share Nokia’s view to have the **Note**. * For “X“ in the formula, as companies commented, it’s better **multiply CURRENT\_symbol** **by X** rather than dividing the periodicity by X to avoid potential rational number issues. * For value of “Y”, surely Y = 1 should be the basic case. If Y > 1, it can be FFS, for example, total number of HP IDs for CG should be taken into account. * For “Offset”, it can be FFS, and **not prioritize Offset = 0**. * We have reasons of adding Offset for handling the case where there is unused CG PUSCH TO(s), wherein the allocated HP ID would be wasted/unused. In this regard, an example of HP ID with Offset in multiple CG periods is listed as [0, 1, 2, 3, 4], [3, 4, 0, 1, 2], [2, 3, 4, 0, 1], assuming the underlined HP IDs and corresponding CG PUSCH TOs are unused.   Moreover, if unused CG PUSCH was considered, maybe legacy formula (X = 1 and without adding offset) can be a sub-optimal approach, in that sense, the HARQ process ID can be distributed as [0, 1, 2, 3, 4], [1, 2, 3, 4, 0], [2, 3, 4, 0, 1]… |
| **OPPO** | We are generally OK with the proposal and support to add the Nokia’s note. |
| **vivo** | We are generally fine with the main bullet. Regarding the detailed value for X and Y, we think both X and Y should be FFS, because some combinations of X and Y would not be useful. Besides, for X, there is no default value. It is fair to put FFS on the value of Y to let people to think about how to set the values of X and Y to make the proposed solution work well. E.g., if X=1, Y should be larger than 1 to avoid the HARQ process ID collision issue between adjacent XR periods. |
| **Qualcomm** | We agree with Nokia addition. Also it is not clear why offset if needed. |
| **LG** | We share Nokia’s view.  In addition to this, there seems to be different understanding on *offset*. Based on Futurewei’s contribution, it is semi-static value given by gNB configuration. Meanwhile, according to Huawei’s comment, the offset is dynamically determined by status of previous periodicity.  The equation of HARQ process ID determination is basically for deterministic HARQ process ID. we think it should be addressed how the offset is given to UE in high-level. |
| **DOCOMO** | Generally fine with the proposal. Support to add Nokia’s note. |
| **Xiaomi** | We are fine with the proposal and share Nokia’s view. |
| **CMCC** | We are OK with the proposal and agree Nokia’s comment. |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon** | For the last sub-bullets, we suggest the following updates to leave more room for further study:   * + - FFS whether Offset =0. ~~FFS~~ or ~~whether~~ non-zero offset should be used. |
| **Futurewei** | If also considering the jitter impacts on starting HARQ ID and make the adopted solution flexible enough to cater current and future XR traffic models, we suggest revising the Proposal 1-2-1 as below and further introduce offset1:  **Proposal 1-2-1**  For determination of HARQ process Ids associated to PUSCHs in multi-PUSCHs CG assuming one TB per PUSCH:   * The HARQ process ID for the first configured/valid PUSCH in a period is determined based on the legacy CG procedure when cg-RetransmissionTimer is not configured, and applying the following formula, whichever is applicable   + HARQ Process ID = [floor((CURRENT\_symbol – offset1) / (*periodicity/X)*) + offset2] modulo *nrofHARQ-Processes*   + HARQ Process ID = [floor((CURRENT\_symbol – offset1) / (*periodicity/X)*) + offset2] modulo *nrofHARQ-Processes* + *harq-ProcID-Offset2*   + The HARQ process ID of the remaining PUSCHs in the period is determined by incrementing the HARQ process ID of the preceding PUSCH in the period by Y.     - FFS whether X=1 or X= the number of configured PUSCHs in the CG period     - Y=1. FFS whether Y should be larger than 1 instead.     - Offset 1 and offset 2 =0. FFS whether non-zero offsets should be used. |
| **InterDigital** | Ok with the proposal. Nokia proposed note is also reasonable |
| **Google** | We still prefer to multiply floor(CURRENT\_symbol/periodicity) by X instead of dividing the periodicity by X as explained before.  Also, regarding the added offset, it is dynamically changing so what would be the impact in a CG period if the gNB misses the UCI indicating the unused occasions of the previous CG period? |
| **Spreadtrum** | We are fine with the proposal and agree Nokia’s comment. |
| **Moderator** | **@All:**   * Please note that the intention is down-scoping 😊 * Note suggested by Nokia added. No need to add [] with the Note and FFS. * Removed defining default values for all parameters under discussion, but included the candidate values that discussed. * Kept X as it is. By including offset it would look complicated. It is basically the same. How it is captured at the end, we can work on it when the final agreement is in place. * **Important:** Good point by LG. Currently, it is not clear to me the proponents if they corresponding values are determined based on RRC or dynamically. I added 3 FFS. If any of them is irrelevant, please indicate to remove. Otherwise, it possible provide information for the case that the parameter is dynamically indicated.   + **ZTE, FW, HW/HiSi, vivo can you please check this bullet?**   **@All: Based on the comments, please see the updated proposal.**  **Proposal 1-2-1 (updated)**  For determination of HARQ process Ids associated to PUSCHs in multi-PUSCHs CG assuming one TB per PUSCH:   * The HARQ process ID for the first configured/valid PUSCH in a period is determined based on the legacy CG procedure when cg-RetransmissionTimer is not configured, and applying the following formula, whichever is applicable   + HARQ Process ID = [floor((CURRENT\_symbol – offset1) / (*periodicity/X)*) + offset2] modulo *nrofHARQ-Processes*   + HARQ Process ID = [floor((CURRENT\_symbol – offset1) / (*periodicity/X)*) + offset2] modulo *nrofHARQ-Processes* + *harq-ProcID-Offset2*   + The HARQ process ID of the remaining PUSCHs in the period is determined by incrementing the HARQ process ID of the preceding PUSCH in the period by Y.     - FFS whether X=1 or X= the number of configured PUSCHs in the CG period     - ~~Y=1.~~ FFS whether Y =1 ~~whether Y should be~~ or a value larger than 1, e.g. Y=2 ~~instead~~.       * FFS: If Y>2, how Y is determined (i.e., based on RRC or dynamically)     - FFS whether Offset 1= 0 or can be a non-zero value.       * FFS: If offset1 is non-zero, how offset1 is determined (i.e., based on RRC or dynamically)     - FFS whether Offset 2= 0 or can be a non-zero value.       * FFS: If offset2 is non-zero, how offset2 is determined (i.e., based on RRC or dynamically) * **Note: The equations will be updated accordingly when FFSs are clarified, e.g., if X=1, remove X; if Y=1, remove Y; if non-zero offset1 or Offset 2 is not supported, remove offset 1 or Offset 2.** |
| **MediaTek** | The value “X” should be multiplied after the floor function to avoid non-integer rounding errors. So, the HARQ process ID for the first configured/valid PUSCH in a period should be determined as such:  HARQ Process ID = [X \* floor(CURRENT\_symbol/(periodicity~~/X~~))] modulo nrofHARQ-Processes  We don’t support “offset” for unused CG PUSCH TOs. Unused TOs are dynamically indicated via UCI and HARQ ID mismatch will occur due to “offset” if gNB cannot detect the UCI. |
| **Samsung** | OK with the proposal.  We understand that RAN1 needs to agree to introduce RRC parameters for the X, Y, or offset variables instead of using the defaults that results from the formula. |
| **CATT** | We are OK with the proposal. |
| **Lenovo** | Ok with the proposal. |
| **Futurewei** | Offset1 is determined based on RRC, MAC CE, or DCI (e.g., used for CG activation), which can avoid the risk of HARQ ID exceeding the maximum value based on the incrementing rule, and can also flexiblely cater current and future XR traffic modes without standard impacts for later releases |
| **Intel** | Ok with updated proposal |
| **Panasonic** | The current proposal imposes using separate HARQ IDs for the TOs, as the HARQ ID is increased by Y. Also. It could also lead exceeding the maximum available HARQ IDs. As we explained earlier, a specific HARQ ID could be reused in some cases. We suggest removing the third sub bullet point and put FFS on determining the HARQ ID for the remaining TOs.   * + ~~The HARQ process ID of the remaining PUSCHs in the period is determined by incrementing the HARQ process ID of the preceding PUSCH in the period by Y.~~   + FFS How to determine the HARQ process ID of the remaining PUSCHs in the period. |
| **Moderator** | **Summary of views:**   * **OK:** Intel, FW, Lenovo, CATT, Samsung, Spreadtrum, IDC, FW, HW/hiSi, CMCC, Xiaomi, DCM, LG, QC, vivo, OPPO, ZTE, Nokia, CATT, New H3C, [MTK], [Google] * **Not OK/Maybe:** Panasonic   **@MTK/Google:** I sent few emails on reflector. I still don’t see the issue for the risk of non-integer round errors, since there is floor function. Of course, we can change it if we see it is erroneous. I added a note that in case of issues, to correct the formula.  **@Panasonic**: This sub-bullet is related to down-selecting with respect to alternatives. Putting the sub-bullet as FFS is a step back ward. At least, the current proposal reflects the interest from majority. I hope it can be acceptable.  **Proposal 1-2-1 (updated)**  For determination of HARQ process Ids associated to PUSCHs in multi-PUSCHs CG assuming one TB per PUSCH:   * The HARQ process ID for the first configured/valid PUSCH in a period is determined based on the legacy CG procedure when cg-RetransmissionTimer is not configured, and applying the following formula, whichever is applicable   + HARQ Process ID = [floor((CURRENT\_symbol – offset1) / (*periodicity/X)*) + offset2] modulo *nrofHARQ-Processes*   + HARQ Process ID = [floor((CURRENT\_symbol – offset1) / (*periodicity/X)*) + offset2] modulo *nrofHARQ-Processes* + *harq-ProcID-Offset2*   + The HARQ process ID of the remaining PUSCHs in the period is determined by incrementing the HARQ process ID of the preceding PUSCH in the period by Y.     - FFS whether X=1 or X= the number of configured PUSCHs in the CG period     - FFS whether Y =1 or a value larger than 1, e.g. Y=2.       * FFS: If Y>2, how Y is determined (i.e., based on RRC or dynamically)     - FFS whether Offset 1= 0 or can be a non-zero value.       * FFS: If offset1 is non-zero, how offset1 is determined (i.e., based on RRC or dynamically)     - FFS whether Offset 2= 0 or can be a non-zero value.       * FFS: If offset2 is non-zero, how offset2 is determined (i.e., based on RRC or dynamically) * **Note: The equations will be updated accordingly when FFSs are clarified, e.g., if X=1, remove X; if Y=1, remove Y; if non-zero offset1 or Offset 2 is not supported, remove offset 1 or Offset 2.** |

## FDRA and MCS determination

**Moderator’s summary:**

In previous meeting, the following agreement was made:

**Agreement**

For the PUSCHs parameters in a multi-PUSCHs CG configuration, the configuration/indication parameters except MCS and FDRA of CG PUSCHs in a multi-PUSCHs CG configuration are the same

* FFS: For MCS and FDRA, study further to decide whether/how to be different.
* FFS: Applicability to type-1 and type-2
* Note: TDRA and HP ID are not in this scope of the above statement.

Companies’ view regarding the FDRA and MCS design are summarized below:

* **MCS design**
  + Same MCS
    - E///, CATT, DCM, MTK, Panasonic, Intel, xiaomi, Lenovo, Samsung, OPPO
  + Different MCS
    - QC, ZTE, HW/HiSi, Nokia/NSB, Apple, CMCC, Sharp, Sony, TCL
* **FDRA design**
  + Same FDRA
    - E///, CATT, DCM, MTK, Nokia/NSB, Panasonic, Intel, xiaomi, Lenovo, Samsung, OPPO
  + Different FDRA
    - QC, ZTE, HW/HiSi, Apple, Sharp, Sony, TCL

**Moderator’s Observation:**

Majority of companies prefer the same MCS and FDRA. With respect to motivation both camps provided respective motivations (see respective contributions). However, regarding the design solutions to enable different MCS and/or FDRA parameters only ZTE, HW/HiSi and Nokia/NSB have elaborated somewhat regarding the preferred solutions as summarized below:

* **Solutions for different MCSs**
* For Type-1 CG, *mcsAndTBS* field in RRC signaling should be extended to a sequence for indicating multiple MCS levels
  + ZTE, HW/HiSi, ~~Nokia/NSB~~
* For Type-2 CG:
  + Extend MCS field in DCI signaling. FFS details to reduce overhead
    - ZTE, ~~Nokia/NSB~~
  + Combine DCI indication and RRC in indicate MCS. FFS details
    - HW/HiSi
  + A reference or baseline MCS is indicated in RRC ignaling (type 1 CG) or in activation DCI (type 2 CG). The MCS change is indicated in an implicit manner. Details FFS
    - Nokia/NSB
* **Solutions for different FDRAs**
* For Type-1 CG, *frequencyDomainAllocation* in RRC signaling should be extended to a sequence for indicating multiple FDRAs
  + ZTE, HW/HiSi
* For Type-2 CG
  + Extend FDRA field in DCI signaling. FFS details to reduce overhead
    - ZTE
  + Combine DCI indication and RRC in indicate FDRA. FFS details
    - HW/HiSi

Table 3: Summary of Contributions inputs for Section 2.3

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Contributions inputs** |
| Ericsson | **Proposal 7** The PUSCHs corresponding to a multi-PUSCHs CG apply the same FDRA and MCS index for both Type-1 and Type-2 CG. |
| Qualcomm | **Proposal 3**: Support different MCS and FDRA parameter values for multiple PUSCH occasions in the CG period |
| CATT | **Proposal 2**: The other parameters including MCS and FDRA in a multi-PUSCHs CG configuration should be the same. |
| ZTE/Sanechips | **Observation 6**: Flexibility of FDRA has benefits on frequency diversity as well as resource efficiency, and flexibility MCS level is helpful for successful data transmission in PDB limitation.  **Observation 7**: In Case 1, i.e., the transmission occasions in one CG period are used for transmitting a single XR packet, UCI is not able to indicate the transmission occasion usage in multiple CG periods, due to bare prior knowledge of packet size, TDRA/FDRA/MCS level in the following periods.  **Proposal 8**: The overhead of activation signaling should be considered, if multiple FDRAs and/or multiple MCS levels are supported for multi-PUSCHs CG. |
| HW/HiSi | **Proposal 3**: The MCS and number of PRBs for each CG PUSCH occasion in a CG period can be different |
| DCM | **Proposal 5**: Support same MCS/FDRA parameter indication/configuration for multiple CG PUSCHs in one CG period. |
| MTK | **Proposal 9**: Same MCS and FDRA values apply to all PUSCH Tos in a CG configuration with multiple PUSCH. |
| Nokia/NSB | **Observation 5**: Changing MCS over multi-PUSCHs does not necessarily lead to change of FDRA.  **Proposal 5**: RAN1 should target for common solution to support different MCS for multi-PUSCHs within a CG period which can be applied to both Type-1 CG and Type-2 CG.  **Proposal 6**: RAN1 should support different MCS schemes for multi-PUSCHs within a CG period and investigate different solution options (e.g., explicit vs. implicit manner). |
| Panasonic | **Proposal 2**: The same MCS/FDRA parameters should be considered for a multi-PUSCHs CG. |
| Intel | **Proposal 3**: MCS and FDRA indication parameters are the same for different PUSCHs in a CG period. |
| Apple | **Proposal 1**: study enhancement to CG-UCI to support indication of MCS and/or PRB adjustment for configured grant. |
| Xiaomi | **Proposal 13**: FDRA of CG PUSCHs in a multi-PUSCHs CG configuration should be same.  **Proposal 14**: MCS of CG PUSCHs in a multi-PUSCHs CG configuration should be same. |
| Lenovo | **Proposal 3**: Same MCS/FDRA is applied to CG occasions within a period. |
| CMCC | **Proposal 3**. Support different MCS configurations for different PUSCHs in a CG period. |
| Samsung | **Proposal 2**: TDRA, FDRA, and MCS are same for all CG-PUSCHs of a “multi-CG PUSCH”. |
| Sharp | **Proposal 3**: Additional mechanisms for MCS and FDRA adjustments can be considered. |
| Sony | **Proposal 2**: Support the configuration/indication of the parameters MCS and FDRA of CG PUSCHs in a multi-PUSCHs CG configuration can be different. |
| OPPO | **Proposal 2**: It is not supported to indicate different MCSs/FDRAs for the different CG PUSCHs in a multiple CG-PUSCHs configuration. |
| TCL | **Proposal 11**: Multiple Tos with different MCS within a CG configuration for XR can be considered. |

### Initial Discussions

**Moderator’s suggestions for initial discussion:**

Based on the views expressed and observations above, there are two options to choose from.

**Suggestion 1:** **Aim for decision at this meeting**.

**Suggestion 2:** Consider the following proposal.

**Proposal 1-3-1:**

Decide one of the options below. If Option 2 is select, choose the preferred alternative.

**Option 1:** For CG PUSCHs in a multi-PUSCHs CG configuration, MCS of the CG PUSCHs in the CG configuration are the same

**Option 2:** For CG PUSCHs in a multi-PUSCHs CG configuration, MCS of the CG PUSCHs in the CG configuration can be different as the following:

* For Type-1 CG, *mcsAndTBS* field in RRC signaling should be extended to a sequence for indicating multiple MCS levels
* For Type-2 CG:
  + Alt-1: Extend MCS field in DCI signaling. FFS details to reduce overhead
  + Alt-2: Combine DCI indication and RRC in indicate MCS. FFS details
  + Alt-3: A reference or baseline MCS is indicated in RRC ignaling in activation DCI. The MCS change is indicated in an implicit manner. Details FFS

**Proposal 1-3-2:**

Decide one of the options below. If Option 2 is select, choose the preferred alternative.

**Option 1:** For CG PUSCHs in a multi-PUSCHs CG configuration, FDRA of the CG PUSCHs in the CG configuration are the same

**Option 2:** For CG PUSCHs in a multi-PUSCHs CG configuration, FDRA of the CG PUSCHs in the CG configuration can be different as the following:

* For Type-1 CG, *frequencyDomainAllocation* in RRC signaling should be extended to a sequence for indicating multiple FDRAs
* For Type-2 CG
  + Alt-1: Extend FDRA field in DCI signaling. FFS details to reduce overhead
  + Alt-2: Combine DCI indication and RRC in indicate FDRA. FFS details

**Question:** Please provide your view in the table below regarding the following questions:

* **Q1:** Please indicate your view on moderator’s suggestions and **Proposal 1-3-1** and **Proposal 1-3-2** and motivate your preference.Proponents of Option 2 are requested to provide more details for Type-2 CG solutions in listed alternatives.
* **Q2:** Discuss any clarification/correction/comment/question on Moderator’s summary and suggestions or any other aspect helping the discussion and needed decisions.

**Note: Please ensure the information in companies’ contributions are considered for discussions.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| **ZTE, Sanechips** | For Proposal 1-3-1, as highlighted in the context, we see the benefit of flexibility and signaling impact as well, thus option 1 is preferable. But we can be flexible for option 1.  For Proposal 1-3-2, option 2 is preferable, and we can also be flexible for option 1. |
| **Nokia, NSB** | **\*We edited the observations above, highlighted in red.**  One potential problem due to the same MCS across multiple CG PUSCH occasions is the achievable reliability due to the reduced transmission time window for the later coming PDUs within the same PDU set. In order to simultaneously fulfil the requirements of PDU set delay budget (PSDB), without the introduction of support different MCS schemes, most likely we have to configure very robust MCS schemes for all TBs carrying the same PDU set. Clearly this will lead to reduced spectral efficiency. In our view, it would be beneficial to investigate options to support different MCSs over multi-PUSCHs within a CG period.  **Proposal 1-3-1:**  **We thus support Option 2 with modifications to be applicable to both type-1 and type-2 CG.**  **Option 2:** For CG PUSCHs in a multi-PUSCHs CG configuration, MCS of the CG PUSCHs in the CG configuration can be different as the following:   * For Type-1 CG: * *Alt-1: mcsAndTBS* field in RRC signaling should be extended to a sequence for indicating multiple MCS levels * *Alt-2:* A reference or baseline MCS is indicated in RRC ignaling (type 1). The MCS change is indicated in an implicit manner. Details FFS * For Type-2 CG:   + Alt-1: Extend MCS field in DCI signaling. FFS details to reduce overhead   + Alt-2: Combine DCI indication and RRC in indicate MCS. FFS details   + Alt-3: A reference or baseline MCS is indicated in activation DCI. The MCS change is indicated in an implicit manner. Details FFS   **Proposal 1-3-2:**  We think that different FDRA similar to different SLIV is not necessary as the video frame size will not be known in advance when configuring the CG. Thus, it is fine to have the same FDRA for each slot. Therefore, we support **Option 1.** |
| **CATT** | We are OK with moderator’s proposal.  We have questions on the proposal of different MCS and FDRA. Are the configuration value sets per slot or per XR traffic period by RRC semi-statically? How do they work in semi-static configuration? |
| **New H3C** | We are fine with moderator’s proposal. |
| **Qualcomm** | For both Proposal 1-3-1 and Proposal 1-3-2 we prefer Option 2. We can keep the details as FFS after deciding narrowing down the scope on which of the Options to support. |
| **Google** | We are OK with the moderator’s proposals. We support option 1 in Proposal 1-3-1 and option 1 in Proposal 1-3-2 to simplify the design. |
| **Samsung** | OK with the moderator’s proposal. However, it would be good to make more progress and conclude at this meeting as there is nothing requiring “further study” and nothing changed since last meeting.  In our opinion, proposals related to having different FDRA/TDRA/MCS for different CG-PUSCH Tos are ad-hoc and there is no justification for the network to operate XR with anything other than optimum settings for all CG-PUSCH Tos considering that latency is to be minimized, retransmissions are not deterministic, and that unused Tos will anyway be indicated as unused. Support Option 1. |
| **Futurewei** | For Proposal 1-3-1, we are ok with Option 1: For CG PUSCHs in a multi-PUSCHs CG configuration, MCS of the CG PUSCHs in the CG configuration are the same, which has much lower signaling overhead and lower complexity for UE and gNB.  For Proposal 1-3-2, we are ok with Option 1: For CG PUSCHs in a multi-PUSCHs CG configuration, FDRA of the CG PUSCHs in the CG configuration are the same, which has much lower signaling overhead and complexity for UE and gNB. |
| **InterDigital** | For both Proposals 1-3-1 and 1-3-2, we prefer Option 1 to keep the spec impact/effort low and manageable. However, we are open for considering Option 2, if further benefits/gains are well clarified. |
| **Xiaomi** | We agree with moderator’s proposal.  As mentioned in our contribution, gNB can configure the MCS for the UE based on the worst case. In this case, the time-frequency resources corresponding to CG occasion will be large. However, considering that unused CG occasions can be indicated as “unused” Ues and reused by the gNB, it will not cause serious waste of resources. Therefore, there is no need to configure different MCS.  Configuring different FDRA for different CG occasions within a CG period may cause some resource fragmentation, so we support option1. |
| **Sharp** | For both Proposals 1-3-1 and 1-3-2, we prefer Option2, and Alt-2 for Type 2 CG. |
| **Apple** | For both PRB and MCS, we support option 2. |
| **Vivo** | Proposal 1-3-1: option 1  Proposal 1-3-2: option 1  During the SI phase, simulations results were provided for different FDRA for different PUSCHs, but no obvious gain was observed., we think option 1 should be supported for simplicity unless significant gain are shown. |
| **OPPO** | We support Option 1 in both Proposal 1-3-1 and Proposal 1-3-2.  The CG PUSCH parameters should be configured based on long-term measurements, therefore different PUSCH parameters for CG PUSCHs in a multi-PUSCHs CG configuration seems not necessary. |
| **TCL** | For multiple-PUSCHs within a CG configuration configured for XR, the remaining delay for each TOs within a CG is different and some TOs located on the end of a CG may have not enough delay budget to enable re-transmission, thus, low MCS can be configured for the end of TOs within a CG to improve the reliability. Thus, we support option 2 in Proposal 1-3-1.  For Proposal 1-3-2, we prefer option 1, and we also accept option 2. |
| **DOCOMO** | We support Option 1 for both Proposal 1-3-1 and Proposal 1-3-2 for simplicity. |
| **LG** | We support Option 1 for both proposals. |
| **MediaTek** | We don’t see a clear need to have different MCS/FDRA per PUSCH. So, our preference is Option-1 in Proposal 1-3-1 and Option-1 in Proposal 1-3-2. |
| **Panasonic** | Q1: We support Option 1 for both proposals. |
| **Spreadtrum** | We agree with moderator’s proposal. We support Option 2 in both Proposal 1-3-1 and Proposal 1-3-2. |
| **SONY** | We support Option 2 in both proposals (Proposal 1-3-1 and Proposal 1-3-2) |
| **CMCC** | Regarding Proposal 1-3-1:  We prefer Option 2 because the configuration of different MCS is beneficial to transmission efficiency. For Type 2 CG, Alt-1 is the most straightforward solution but with the largest DCI overhead. So, we tend to support Alt-2 and Alt-3 with more details.  Regarding Proposal 1-3-2:  We support Option 1. Compared to configuring different MCS for multiple PUSCHs in a CG period, indicating different FDRA for multiple PUSCHs in a CG period has a bigger issue, e.g., it will significantly increase the DCI payload size for Type 2 CG. So, we support configuring the same FDRA for the CG PUSCHs in a CG period. |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon** | **Proposal 1-3-1:**  We support different MCSs are adopted for CG PUSCHs within a CG period (i.e., Option 2).  TBs transmitted in earlier CG PUSCH occasions within a CG period have more retransmission opportunities, thus can have larger MCS to increase resource efficiency. TBs transmitted in latter CG PUSCH occasions within a CG period have less retransmission opportunities, thus should have lower MCS to ensure transmission reliability and meet PDB requirement.  Regarding the detailed design, Alt 2 and Alt 3 can be merged, e.g., DCI or RRC indicates a reference MCS for the 1st CG PUSCH, and RRC configures a step. Then, UE can determine the MCS for other CG PUSCH based on the indicated MCS and step. Both CG type 1 and type 2 can have this unified design.  **Proposal 1-3-2:**  We support different number of PRBs for CG PUSCHs in the CG configuration are different. The signaling details can be similar as that for different MCS. |
| **FGI** | For Proposal 1-3-1, we support Option 1.  For Proposal 1-3-2, we support Option 1. |
| **Lenovo** | Q1: ok, for both 1-3-1 and 1-3-2 support option 1 (In case of UL jitter (e.g., in a tethered scenario), option 2 might lead to inefficient design (e.g., a conservative MCS).) |
| **Intel** | Proposal 1-3-1: option 1  Proposal 1-3-2: option 1 |
| **Ericsson** | Option 1 for both. |
| **Moderator** | **Summary of views:**  **Proposal 1-3-1 (MCS):**   * **Option 1 (same: 13+1):** ZTE/Sanechips (2nd), ~~Nokia/NSB~~, Google, Samsung, FW, IDC(1st), Xiaomi, vivo, OPPO, DCM, LG, MTK, Pana, Lenovo, Ericsson * **Option 2 (different: 10+1):** ZTE/Sanechips (1st), QC, IDC(2nd), Sharp, Apple, TCL, Spreadtrum, Sony, CMCC, HW/HiSi, Nokia/NSB   **Proposal 1-3-2 (FDRA):**   * **Option 1 (same: 16+1):** ZTE/Sanechips (2nd), Nokia/NSB, Google, Samsung, FW, IDC(1st), Xiaomi, vivo, OPPO, TCL (1st), DCM, LG, MTK, Pana, CMCC, Lenovo, Ericsson * **Option 2 (different: 7+2):** ZTE/Sanechips (1st), QC, IDC(2nd), Sharp, Apple, TCL (2nd), Spreadtrum, Sony, HW7HiSi   **@All:** Moderator observes that Option 1 camps are not convinded. It should be discussed in GTW to make a decision. |
| **Moderator** | **Outcome of online session:**  **Agreement:**  For CG PUSCHs in a multi-PUSCHs CG configuration, MCS of the CG PUSCHs in the CG configuration are the same between different PUSCH occasions  **Agreement:**  For CG PUSCHs in a multi-PUSCHs CG configuration, FDRA of the CG PUSCHs in the CG configuration are the same between different PUSCH occassions  **The discussion for this section is closed.** |

## 2.4 Other topics

**Moderator’s summary:**

With respect to the feature multi-PUSCHs CG, companies have raised other aspects for discussions and decisions similar to the previous meeting. The topics are listed below including the direction of expressed views:

**Topic 1) Retransmission of multiple TBs with a single DCI with corresponding initial transmissions with CG PUSCHs**

* Support: E///, vivo, Google
* Not Support: Samsung

**Topic 2) Repetition for a multi-PUSCHs CG configuration**

* Support: QC, Spreadtrum, TCL
* Not support: E///, DCM, Samsung

**Topic 3) CBG retransmission for multiple CG PUSCHs**

* Support: Samsung

**Topic 4) One TB over multiple slots**

* Not support: Nokia, Samsung

**Topic 5) Frequency hopping as legacy CG**

* Support: E///

**Topic 6) CG-DFI based retransmission for multi-CG PUSCH**

* Support: Google, FW, IDC

**Topic 7) Collision resolution for CG PUSCHs**

* Support: Samsung

Table 4: Summary of Contributions inputs for Section 2.4

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Contributions inputs** |
| Futurewei | **Proposal 6**: Retransmissions of the multiple CG PUSCH transmission occasions, in a period of a single CG PUSCH configuration, are based on dynamic uplink grant(s) via dynamic grant resources and UE assumes ACK(s) in absence of reception of feedback after a timer expires if retransmissions for the multiple CG PUSCH transmission occasions supported. |
| Ericsson | **Proposal 8** PUSCH repetition is not supported. The same redundancy version (i.e., RV=0) is applied for the configured grant PUSCHs.  **Proposal 9** PUSCH Intra-slot frequency hopping is supported. PUSCH Inter-slot frequency hopping is not supported.  **Proposal 10** Scheduling re-transmission of multiple TBs for corresponding initial transmission of the TBs by configured grant is supported for DCI format 0\_1 scrambled with CS-RNTI. |
| vivo | **Proposal 3**: Scheduling multiple PUSCHs for retransmission by a DCI scrambled by CS-RNTI can be considered. |
| Qualcomm | **Proposal 5**: Support the following proposals. Discuss them in the following order of importance  \* Support retransmission of TBs for multiple CG PUSCHs by a dynamic UL grant  \* Support PUSCH repetition for multi-PUSCH CG  \* Support CBG based retransmission for multiple CG PUSCHs by a dynamic UL grant |
| Nokia/NSB | **Observation 6**: One TB over multiple slots is related to coverage enhancements and not to capacity enhancements.  **Proposal 7**: Down prioritize one TB over multiple slots in Rel18 WI XR Enhancements for NR. |
| Spreadtrum Comm. | **Proposal 3**: PUSCH repetition is supported for multi-PUSCHs CG configuration. |
| TCL Comm. | **Proposal 3**: Repetition for multi-PUSCH transmissions within a CG configuration can be supported. |
| NTT DOCOMO | **Proposal 3**: Not support joint operation of multiple CG PUSCH occasions in a CG period and CG PUSCH repetitions.  \* For example, if rep-K is configured with value K in ConfiguredGrantConfig, and the TDRA field in the activation DCI indicates multiple SLIVs, UE may transmit on the multiple CG PUSCH occasions in one CG period, with each CG PUSCH occasion with single repetition. |
| Google | **Proposal 5**: Single DCI scheduling multiple PUSCH occasions retransmission should be used to reduce PDCCH signalling overhead and the UE monitoring effort.  **Proposal 6**: DCI format 0\_1 scrambled with CS-RNTI and with the DFI flag enabled and set to 1 can be used for the UL XR traffic to carry the HARQ-ACK bitmap for all HARQ processes transmitted in the CG periods. |
| Apple | **Proposal 8**: RAN1 discusses and decides whether retransmission of a transport block previously carried by CG-PUSCH can be sent by a CG-PUSCH. |
| Samsung | * Providing a single TB over multiple CG-PUSCHs may be beneficial for improving coding gains for very small individual TBs (and for some TB CRC overhead reduction) but that is not the case for the very large TBs associated with XR while TB retransmissions will be practically impossible to handle and a resulting TB size may be larger than what a UE can currently support. * Re-transmission of multiple TBs by a single DCI was effectively discussed during the SI and is not supported. * CBG retransmission for multiple CG PUSCHs was discussed during the SI and is not supported. Although in principle a beneficial enhancement, the low target BLER required to meet PDB would limit any potential gain. * There is no need to support repetitions as the PDB cannot be met in such cases.   **Proposal 7: Extend the collision resolution procedure for SPS PDSCHs to CG-PUSCHs.** |
| IDC | **Proposal 4**: HARQ design from R16 NR CG is used as baseline for multi-PUSCH CG  **Proposal 5**: For multi-PUSCH CG, the HARQ feedback for multiple PUSCHs and dynamic assignments for retransmissions are provided in single DCI  **Proposal 6**: For multi-PUSCH CG, the UE monitors for PDCCH carrying the HARQ feedback for multiple PUSCHs in the first DL slot that is K slots after the last used PUSCH occasion |

### 2.4.1 Initial Discussions

**Moderator’s suggestions for initial discussion:**

Considering the topics, Moderator’s observation and suggestions are as the following:

* **Topic 1)** Retransmission of multiple TBs with a single DCI with corresponding initial transmissions with CG PUSCHs
  + This topic can be discussed independently from the progress on the code feature design.
  + Moderator suggests seeking the group view for discussion on this topic.
* **Topic 2)** Repetition for a multi-PUSCHs CG configuration
  + It seems the direction can be correlated to the outcome of TDRA design. If Alt-B (NR-U based) is supported, it is more straightforward to inherit repetition as well. If Al-C (Multi-PUSCH TDRA) is supported, it is more straightforward to inherit no-repetition as well. If Alt-A (repetition based) is supported, not clear what to do. Regardless, it seems the design choice for TDRA gives more clarity how to proceed on this topic.
  + Note that this does not imply that the discussion to motivate repetition. However, a decision on TDRA provides better clarity for the design as whole.
  + Moderator suggests considering this discussion after TDRA design is settled. Note that a decision for repetition is needed for core design of feature.
* **Topic 3)** CBG retransmission for multiple CG PUSCHs
  + This topic can be discussed independently from the progress on the code feature design.
  + Moderator suggests seeking the group view for discussion on this topic.
* **Topic 4)** One TB over multiple PUSCHs
  + The baseline is one TB per CG PUSCH. It is helpful to know whether the design of multi-PUSCHs CG should accommodate one TB over multiple PUSCHs in a way that is different from TBoMs. Clarity on this aspect is important for the decisions regarding HARQ process ID, etc.
  + Moderator suggest seeking the group view whether this topic can be down-prioritized, considering the concerns raised.
* **Topic 5)** Frequency hopping as legacy CG
  + Moderator’s understanding is that considering the following agreement, the legacy FH should be applied (i.e. support intra-slot FH as oppose to inter-slot FH).

**Agreement**

For the PUSCHs parameters in a multi-PUSCHs CG configuration, the configuration/indication parameters except MCS and FDRA of CG PUSCHs in a multi-PUSCHs CG configuration are the same

* FFS: For MCS and FDRA, study further to decide whether/how to be different.
* FFS: Applicability to type-1 and type-2
* Note: TDRA and HP ID are not in this scope of the above statement.
  + Moderator suggests confirming this understanding to conclude this topic.
* **Topic 6)** CG-DFI based retransmission for multi-CG PUSCH
  + Enabling DFI based CG-DFI mechanism is only supported for NR-U.
  + Moderator suggests seeking the level of interest in the group.
* **Topic 7)** Collision resolution for CG PUSCHs
  + Moderator suggests proponents providing more information to check the level of interest

**Questions:** Please provide your view in the table below regarding the following questions:

* **Q1:** Please indicate your view regarding the **moderator’s suggestions** regarding the topics above.
* **Q2:** Discuss any clarification/correction/comment/question on Moderator’s summary and suggestions or any other aspect helping the discussion and needed decisions.

**Note: Please ensure the information in companies’ contributions are considered for discussions.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** | |
| **ZTE, Sanechips** | For Topic 2), I don’t think Alt C precludes the repetition for a multi-PUSCHs CG configuration, potential enhancement is still possible. Besides, we have more interests to discuss Topic 1) and Topic 3).  For other topics, we support moderator’s suggestions. | |
| **Nokia, NSB** | **Please, find our views related to topics above:**  **Topic 1:** In our view, this topic is out of scope of the WI as it is DG enhancement, we also see no benefits from the enhancement for capacity improvements. We propose to down-prioritize it in Rel18 XR WI.  **Topic 2:** Ok to discuss after TDRA design is agreed, however, we think that the support of repetition can be decided already now. We propose to down-prioritize repetition in XR WI Rel18 as this feature will not increase capacity and our objectives are aiming for capacity enhancements.  **Topic 3:** Ok to down-prioritize CBG support in Rel 18 XR WI.  **Topic 4:** we think that TBoMs shall be de-prioritized in XR WI Rel18 similar to repetition, it will not provide any capacity enhancements while the goal of this WI is particularly to enhance capacity.  **Topic 5:** Ok  **Topic 6:** motivation to support CG-DFI is unclear, there is no problem with channel access in licensed as in unlicensed. Support to down-prioritize.  **Topic 7:** It seems rather general CG enhancement and some resolution principles are already specified, so not clear what exactly need to be solved on top. | |
| **CATT** | **Topic 1:** There is no justification of benefit for this proposal  **Topic 2:** We need to support XR with coverage enhancement feature in Rel-17. Thus, this should be considered in the TDRA discussion.  **Topic 3:** No benefit is shown for CGB-based retransmission.  **Topic 4:** One TB mapping to more one CG occasions should be seriously discussed with the high variation of XR packet size. If the resource of CG is configured to be small to adapt to the variation of XR packet size, one TB mapping to one CG would suffer channel coding performance degradation for smaller codeblock size. If the resource of one CG is configured to be large, it would not fit to all variation of XR packet size. Thus, there would be lots of redundant to fill in the CG-PUSCH.  **Topic 5:** We didn’t see any performance benefits being shown with frequency hopping.  **Topic 6:** There is no justification of CG-DFI  **Topic 7:** There is no justification of the need of collision resolution. | |
| **New H3C** | we support moderator’s all of suggestions | |
| **Qualcomm** | Among all the Topics, Topic 7) is a critical one. The other ones are beneficial enhancements and can be discussed after the basic functions of the multi-PUSCH CG are sorted out. | |
| **Google** | We support discussing topic 1 as it reduces the signaling overhead for the CG PUSCH occasions retransmissions. We think it is still within the scope as it consists of enhancing the multiple-PUSCH CG scheme.  For topic 2, we agree with the moderator to discuss this after TDRA design is settled  For topic 3, we would be interested in CBG-based retransmission if it shows capacity gain for the XR traffic when used in combination with the multiple-PUSCH CG.  We don’t see any capacity or performance gain in topic 4 and topic 5.  We support exploring topic 6 and extending the NR-U DFI design to XR, it allows for fast feedback for multiple CG occasions and reusing the remaining CG PUSCH occasions for retransmissions if needed without the need for additional dynamic allocation  Topic 7 could be discussed with low priority | |
| **Samsung** | **Topic 1**: It is again the multi-PUSCH scheduling which has already been discussed. It would be good to not keep repeating the same discussions. The overall probability that retransmission of multiple TBs will be needed in a same HARQ-ACK feedback cycle is negligible and, even if it was not, DCI overhead savings are a non-issue for XR.  **Topic 2**: There is no justification for supporting repetitions with XR nor has there been any analysis showing that PDB can be met in case of repetitions for the scenarios that motivated the introducing of multi-PUSCH CG.  **Topic 3**: Already discussed during the SI and not agreed – same as for Topic 1 and no need to repeat the same discussions.  **Topic 4**: No need for TBoMS in XR. TBoMS is for very small TBs where coding gains can be obtained by having a larger TB spread over multiple PUSCHs. For XR, things would actually be worse with TBoMS as retransmission of huge TBs would be needed.  **Topic 5**: No need to further consider – the RB allocations for XR will anyway be large and frequency diversity will be inherent.  **Topic 6**: No need for DFI. Retransmissions will be atypical for XR and DCI-based ones are sufficient as there isn’t a DCI overhead issue even if BLER of ~10% was to be assumed.  **Topic 7**: Support. Collision resolution is specified for SPS PDSCH but not for CG-PUSCH as there was no corresponding use case. In XR, considering at a minimum pose control and a single stream of video frames, collisions will occur due to different periodicities. | |
| **Futurewei** | We support Topic 1 as mentioned in our proposal below,  **Proposal 6**: Retransmissions of the multiple CG PUSCH transmission occasions, in a period of a single CG PUSCH configuration, are based on dynamic uplink grant(s) via dynamic grant resources and UE assumes ACK(s) in absence of reception of feedback after a timer expires if retransmissions for the multiple CG PUSCH transmission occasions supported.  For Topic 6, CG-DFI is designed for unlicensed carrier, which is not applied for licensed carrier and should not be supported.  For other Topics, we are ok with FL suggestions. | |
| **InterDigital** | **Topic 1:** Ok to continue discussion. From our view, feedback associated with different PUSCH occasions provided in single DCI for retransmission can be beneficial from overhead reduction perspective.  **Topic 2:** Fine with moderator’s suggestion  **Topics 3 - 5:** Ok to down-prioritize in Rel-18, unless further benefits/gains can be shown.  **Topic 6:** Ok to consider once more progress is made on TDRA design aspects. | |
| **Xiaomi** | We support moderator’s suggestions except topic 3.The topic 3 can be down-prioritized. | |
| **Sharp** | Support moderator’s suggestions. | |
| **vivo** | For topic 1, if Alt-C is supported, we think it is simple to support retransmission of multiple TBs with a single DCI.  For topic 2, we think the motivation to support repetition is not clear. We are fine with moderator’s suggestion.  For topic 3, we think this topic should be deprioritized.  For topic 4, we think TBoMs is mainly for power saving and should be deprioritized.  For topic 5, we prefer to following FH for multi-PUSCH for DG.  For topic 6, enabling DFI based CG-DFI mechanism is only supported for NR-U. we prefer to keep this.  For topic 7, we think the issue needs more clarification. | |
| **OPPO** | Topic 1: Independent HARQ process is transmitted in multiple CG PUSCHs, so the benefits of retransmission of multiple TBs with a single DCI with corresponding initial transmissions with CG PUSCHs are unclear.  Topic 3: Legacy CGB retransmission can be reused for each of the multiple CG PUSCHs, and no additional enhancement is needed.  Topic 4: We suggest independent TB and HARQ process is transmitted in each CG PUSCH. This is the simplest and most efficient way. | |
| **TCL** | Topic 2: Ok to discuss after TDRA design is agreed, anyway, repetition is one of most straightforward way to improve the reliability of XR traffic.  For other topics, we support moderator’s suggestions | |
| **DOCOMO** | For topic 1, we are open to discuss this issue.  For topic 2, agree with moderator’s suggestion.  For topic 3, suggest to deprioritize this issue in this meeting.  For topic 4, agree with moderator’s suggestion to deprioritize this issue.  For topic 5, agree with moderator’s understanding on frequency hopping.  For topic 6, agree with moderator’s understanding that CG-DFI is supported in unlicensed spectrum. And even in unlicensed spectrum, we don’t think enhancement is needed.  For topic 7, we don’t’ think this issue needs enhancement. Legacy behavior is enough. | |
| **LG** | As moderator mentioned, Topic 2 and 5 seems necessary to clarify and finalize core design. We support to discuss Topic 2 and confirm Topic 5.  Regarding other topics, we don’t see the clear motivation or justification. | |
| **MediaTek** | Topic 1: This is DG enhancements, hence out of scope.  Topic 2: Not clear to us how TB repetitions can be beneficial to system capacity under agenda “XR-specific capacity enhancements”. This should also be out of scope from our perspective.  Topic 3: We don’t expect much gain from CBG retransmissions.  Topic 4: We can down-prioritize TBoMs.  Topic 5: No need for frequency hopping. | |
| **Panasonic** | We are fine with the suggestions. | |
| **Spreadtrum** | | Topic 3: we suggest to reuse the legacy framework with CBG retransmission. This topic should be down-prioritized.  Topic 4: The benefit for XR capacity is not clear for us to support one TB over multiple PUSCHs. We suggest to deprioritize this topic.  For other Topics, we are fine with moderator’s suggestions |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon** | | Suggest to deprioritize such discussions, which are not XR-specific and cannot increase XR capacity.  **Topic 1)** Do not support 1 DCI schedules re-transmission of multiple TBs. Multiple DCI scheduling multiple retransmission is enough.  **Topic 4)** There is no need to consider TBoMS for XR traffic, which may introduce unnecessary complexity. |
| **FGI** | | We support moderator’s suggestions. |
| **Lenovo** | | Topic 1) seems an optimization, can be checked later  Topic 2) agree to wait till TDRA design is high-level stable.  Topics 3 & 4 & 6) could make the design more complex, prefer to down prioritize  Topic 5) Agree with the moderator  Topic 7) needs further info about the setup; in general, can be discussed once high-level design aspects are agreed. |
| **Ericsson** | | We support moderator’s suggestions. |
| **Moderator** | | **@All:** Companies are encouraged to exhcnage views for better understanding of these topics. Moderator priorotizes design issues in sections 2.1 and 2.2.  **Please continue discussions.** |

## 2.5 Online sessions

### 2.5.1 1st online session

#### 2.5.1.1 TDRA design

|  |
| --- |
| **Updated companies’ views:**   * Alt-A (10): FW, CATT, Spreadtrum, TCL, OPPO, MTK, NEC, Panasonic, FGI, xiaomi   + - * Alt-A1: Spreadtrum, OPPO, MTK, NEC, Panasonic, FGI       * Alt-A2: Spreadtrum, TCL, NEC * Alt-B (12+2): FW, IDC, HW/HiSi, Google, CMCC, Samsung, Apple; Nokia/NSB, NEC, DENSO, xiaomi, Intel (Type 1), Sony (Type 1), Lenovo * Alt-C-2 (14+2): E///, QC, vivo, ZTE/Sanechips, Spreadtrum, LG, DCM, OPPO, ~~Nokia/NSB~~, Panasonic, DENSO, FGI, Sharp, CAICT, Intel(Type 2), Sony(Type 2), Lenovo   **Suggestion 1:** Focus on Alt-A1, Alt-B and Alt-C2. Note that Alt-A2 can be obtained from Alt-B (discarding the segmented PUSCH).   * **OK:** ZTE/Sanechips (C2), Nokia/NSB, CATT, New H3C, QC (C2), Google, Samsung, FW, IDC, Xiaomi, Sharp, vivo, OPPO, TCL, DCM, LG, Spreadtrum, NED, Sony, CMCC, HW/HiSi, FGI, Lenovo, Intel, Ericsson   **Proposal 1-1-1:**   * For TDRA design for multi-CG PUSCH, prioritize Alt-A1, Alt-B and Alt-C2 from corresponding agreement in RAN1#112. |

#### 2.5.1.2 HARQ process ID

|  |
| --- |
| **Summary of views:**   * **Suggestion 1:** Focus on Alt. 1-1 and Alt. 1-2.   + **OK: ZTE/Sanechips, Nokia/NSB, CATT, New H3C, QC, Google, Samsung, FW, IDC, Xiaomi, Sharp, Apple, vivo, OPPO, TCL, DCM, LG, MTK, Pana, Spreadtrum, NEC, CMCC, HW/HiSi, FGI, Lenovo, Intel, Ericsson**   + **Other**:     - **OK if Alt-2 also included (3)**: FW, vivo, OPPO     - **Preferred Alt 1-1 (4):** Apple, TC, Spreadtrum, Intel     - **Preferred Alt 1-2 (12):** Nokia/NSB, QC, Google, FW, IDC, DCM, MTK, Pana, NEC, CMCC, FGI, Ericsson   **Proposal 1-2-1:**   * For HARQ process Id determination for multi-CG PUSCH, prioritize Alt 1-1 and Alt 1-2 [and Alt-2] from corresponding agreement in RAN1#112. |

#### 2.5.1.3 MCS and FDRA

|  |
| --- |
| **Summary of views:**  **Proposal 1-3-1 (MCS):**   * **Option 1 (same: 14+1):** ZTE/Sanechips (2nd), Nokia/NSB, Google, Samsung, FW, IDC(1st), Xiaomi, vivo, OPPO, DCM, LG, MTK, Pana, Lenovo, Ericsson * **Option 2 (different: 9+1):** ZTE/Sanechips (1st), QC, IDC(2nd), Sharp, Apple, TCL, Spreadtrum, Sony, CMCC, HW/HiSi   **Proposal 1-3-2 (FDRA):**   * **Option 1 (same: 16+1):** ZTE/Sanechips (2nd), Nokia/NSB, Google, Samsung, FW, IDC(1st), Xiaomi, vivo, OPPO, TCL (1st), DCM, LG, MTK, Pana, CMCC, Lenovo, Ericsson * **Option 2 (different: 7+2):** ZTE/Sanechips (1st), QC, IDC(2nd), Sharp, Apple, TCL (2nd), Spreadtrum, Sony, HW7HiSi   **Proposal 1-3-1:**  Decide one of the options below. If Option 2 is select, choose the preferred alternative.  **Option 1:** For CG PUSCHs in a multi-PUSCHs CG configuration, MCS of the CG PUSCHs in the CG configuration are the same  **Option 2:** For CG PUSCHs in a multi-PUSCHs CG configuration, MCS of the CG PUSCHs in the CG configuration can be different as the following:   * For Type-1 CG, *mcsAndTBS* field in RRC signaling should be extended to a sequence for indicating multiple MCS levels * For Type-2 CG:   + Alt-1: Extend MCS field in DCI signaling. FFS details to reduce overhead   + Alt-2: Combine DCI indication and RRC in indicate MCS. FFS details   + Alt-3: A reference or baseline MCS is indicated in RRC ignaling in activation DCI. The MCS change is indicated in an implicit manner. Details FFS   **Proposal 1-3-2:**  Decide one of the options below. If Option 2 is select, choose the preferred alternative.  **Option 1:** For CG PUSCHs in a multi-PUSCHs CG configuration, FDRA of the CG PUSCHs in the CG configuration are the same  **Option 2:** For CG PUSCHs in a multi-PUSCHs CG configuration, FDRA of the CG PUSCHs in the CG configuration can be different as the following:   * For Type-1 CG, *frequencyDomainAllocation* in RRC signaling should be extended to a sequence for indicating multiple FDRAs * For Type-2 CG   + Alt-1: Extend FDRA field in DCI signaling. FFS details to reduce overhead   + Alt-2: Combine DCI indication and RRC in indicate FDRA. FFS details |

#### 2.5.1.4 Outcome of 1st online session

The following agreements related to sections 2.5.1.1 and 2.5.1.3 were made during the online session.

**Agreement:**

For TDRA design for multi-CG PUSCH, prioritize Alt-A1, Alt-B, and Alt-C2 for further downscoping and/or modification from corresponding agreement in RAN1#112.

* FFS: How to address TDD configuration issue

**Agreement:**

For CG PUSCHs in a multi-PUSCHs CG configuration, MCS of the CG PUSCHs in the CG configuration are the same between different PUSCH occasions

**Agreement:**

For CG PUSCHs in a multi-PUSCHs CG configuration, FDRA of the CG PUSCHs in the CG configuration are the same between different PUSCH occasions

### 2.5.2 2nd online session

#### 2.5.2.1 HARQ process ID

|  |
| --- |
| **Summary of views**:   * **OK:** Intel, FW, Lenovo, CATT, Samsung, Spreadtrum, IDC, FW, HW/hiSi, CMCC, Xiaomi, DCM, LG, QC, vivo, OPPO, ZTE, Nokia, CATT, New H3C, [MTK], [Google] * **Not OK/Maybe:** Panasonic   **Proposal 1-2-1 (updated)**  For determination of HARQ process Ids associated to PUSCHs in multi-PUSCHs CG assuming one TB per PUSCH:   * The HARQ process ID for the first configured/valid PUSCH in a period is determined based on the legacy CG procedure when cg-RetransmissionTimer is not configured, and applying the following formula, whichever is applicable   + HARQ Process ID = [floor((CURRENT\_symbol – offset1) / (*periodicity/X)*) + offset2] modulo *nrofHARQ-Processes*   + HARQ Process ID = [floor((CURRENT\_symbol – offset1) / (*periodicity/X)*) + offset2] modulo *nrofHARQ-Processes* + *harq-ProcID-Offset2*   + The HARQ process ID of the remaining PUSCHs in the period is determined by incrementing the HARQ process ID of the preceding PUSCH in the period by Y.     - FFS whether X=1 or X= the number of configured PUSCHs in the CG period     - FFS whether Y =1 or a value larger than 1, e.g. Y=2.       * FFS: If Y>2, how Y is determined (i.e., based on RRC or dynamically)     - FFS whether Offset 1= 0 or can be a non-zero value.       * FFS: If offset1 is non-zero, how offset1 is determined (i.e., based on RRC or dynamically)     - FFS whether Offset 2= 0 or can be a non-zero value.       * FFS: If offset2 is non-zero, how offset2 is determined (i.e., based on RRC or dynamically) * **Note: If division of periodicity by X is shown to be erroneous such as risk of non-integer values for HARQ ID, X can be multiplied by floor(.), i.e. X\*floor(…)** * **Note: The equations will be updated accordingly when FFSs are clarified, e.g., if X=1, remove X; if Y=1, remove Y; if non-zero offset1 or Offset 2 is not supported, remove offset 1 or Offset 2.** |

### 2.5.3 3rd online session

#### 2.5.3.1 HARQ process ID

The proposal is updated by considering X as multiplication, and not division, to address the numerical issues that was raised during the discussion.

|  |
| --- |
| **Summary of views**:   * **OK:** Intel, FW, Lenovo, CATT, Samsung, Spreadtrum, IDC, FW, HW/hiSi, CMCC, Xiaomi, DCM, LG, QC, vivo, OPPO, ZTE, Nokia, CATT, New H3C, [MTK], [Google] * **Not OK/Maybe:** Panasonic   **Proposal 1-2-1 (updated)**  For determination of HARQ process Ids associated to PUSCHs in multi-PUSCHs CG assuming one TB per PUSCH:   * The HARQ process ID for the first configured/valid PUSCH in a period is determined based on the legacy CG procedure when cg-RetransmissionTimer is not configured, and applying the following formula, whichever is applicable   + HARQ Process ID = [X\*floor( (CURRENT\_symbol – offset1) / *periodicity*) + offset2] modulo *nrofHARQ-Processes*   + HARQ Process ID = [X\*floor((CURRENT\_symbol – offset1) / *periodicity*) + offset2] modulo *nrofHARQ-Processes* + *harq-ProcID-Offset2*     - FFS whether in formuales above periodicity should be divided by X instead, i.e.       * HARQ Process ID = [floor( (CURRENT\_symbol – offset1) / (*periodicity/X)*) + offset2] modulo *nrofHARQ-Processes*       * HARQ Process ID = [floor((CURRENT\_symbol – offset1) / (*periodicity/X)*) + offset2] modulo *nrofHARQ-Processes* + *harq-ProcID-Offset2*   + The HARQ process ID of the remaining configured/valid CG PUSCHs in the period is determined by incrementing the HARQ process ID of the preceding PUSCH in the period by Y with module operation with *nrofHARQ-Processes* or (*nrofHARQ-Processes* + *harq-ProcID-Offset2*), whichever applicable.     - FFS whether X=1 or X= the number of configured PUSCHs in the CG period     - FFS whether Y =1 or a value larger than 1, e.g. Y=2.       * FFS: If Y>2, how Y is determined (i.e., based on RRC or dynamically)     - FFS whether Offset 1= 0 or can be a non-zero value.       * FFS: If offset1 is non-zero, how offset1 is determined (i.e., based on RRC or dynamically)     - FFS whether Offset 2= 0 or can be a non-zero value.       * FFS: If offset2 is non-zero, how offset2 is determined (i.e., based on RRC or dynamically) * **Note: The equations will be updated accordingly when FFSs are clarified, e.g., if X=1, remove X; if Y=1, remove Y; if non-zero offset1 or Offset 2 is not supported, remove offset 1 or Offset 2.** * Note: A configured CG PUSCH is invalid if the CG PUSCH is dropped due to collision with DL symbol(s) indicated by *tdd-UL-DL-ConfigurationCommon* or *tdd-UL-DL-ConfigurationDedicated*. |

# 3 Indication of unused transmission occasions

This section captures the summary of the discussions regarding the design aspects of the following WID objective:

|  |
| --- |
| - Dynamic indication of unused CG PUSCH occasion(s) based on UCI by the UE (RAN1, RAN2); |

## 3.1 What information the UCI contains? (UCI content)

**Moderator’s summary:**

In previous meeting, the following agreement was made:

**Agreement**

For dynamic indication of unused CG PUSCH transmission occasion(s) based on a UCI, the following options for further down-scoping, are considered for the information provided by the UCI:

* **Option 1:** The UCI determines the consecutive CG PUSCH TO(s) that are indicated as “unused”
  + **Option 1-1:** The UCI provides the number of consecutive TO(s) in time domain.
    - Applicable numbers can be determined from information obtained from configuration.
    - FFS details
  + **Option 1-2**: The UCI provides a time duration/range that includes the consecutive TO(s) in time domain.
    - Applicable time duration/range can be determined from information obtained from configuration
    - FFS details
* **Option 2:** The UCI determines the CG PUSCH TO(s) that are indicated as “unused” (consecutive/non-consecutive TO(s) in time domain)
  + **Option 2-1**: The UCI provides a bitmap where a bit corresponds to a TO within a time duration/range. The bit indicates whether the TO is “unused”.
    - Applicable time duration/range can be determined from information obtained from configuration
    - FFS details
  + **Option 2-2:** The UCI provides a bitmap where a bit corresponds to TOs within a time duration/range. The bit indicates whether all TOs within the time duration/range are “unused”.
    - Applicable time duration/range can be determined from information obtained from configuration
    - FFS details
* FFS whether/how the unused TO(s) can be associated to multiple CG configuration.
* Other options are not precluded. Proponent companies to provide details.

**Companies’ view:**

**Option 1 (~~12~~ 13):** FW, E///, HW/HiSi, vivo, ZTE, DCM, MTK, FGI, xiaomi, New H3C, NEC, Intel, Samsung

* **Option 1-1:** FW, HW/hiSi, DCM, MTK, xiaomi, Intel
* **Option 1-2:** E///, [ZTE], LG, DCM

**Option 2 (~~15~~, 16)** QC, CATT, vivo, Spreadtrum, IDC, Google, OPPO, Lenovo, Nokia/NSB, Panasonic, DENSO, [TCL], xiaomi, CMCC, CAICT, SONY

* **Option 2-1:** QC, Google, OPPO, xiaomi, CAICT
* **Option 2-2:** CATT, [Spreadtrum], Lenovo, Nokia/NSB, Panasonic, SONY
* **Option 2-3:** xiaomi (**Proposal 2**)

**Option 3:** Nokia/NSB (**Proposal 9**)

**Moderator’s observation:**

**Observation 1:** Option 2 has the majority of support.

**Observation 2:** Regardless of the option, the main part of the design related to design of corresponding RRC parameters. Therefore, it is important to converge to an option as soon as possible and start discussing the design details.

**Observation 3:** Some companies’ solutions are applicable only to multi-PUSCHs CG configuration. Solutions are needed to be generalized to be applicable to any CG configuration.

**Observation 4:** Some companies have provided other solutions as listed above.

Table 5: Summary of Contributions inputs for Section 3.1

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Contributions inputs** |
| Futurewei | **Proposal 8**: Support that bitfield of the UCI jointly indicates a quantity of unused CG PUSCH occasions starting from the last CG PUSCH transmission occasion of the multiple CG PUSCH transmission occasions (i.e., Option 1-1).  **Observation 4**: To guarantee the indicated unused CG PUSCH occasion(s) to be really recycled to other UEs, time offset between UCI and the indicated unused CG PUSCH occasion(s) should be equal to or greater than the PUSCH preparing time for at least one of the other UEs.  **Proposal 9**: Indicating unused CG PUSCH occasion(s) to gNB can be determined based on a time offset threshold, indicated by gNB, between UCI and the unused CG PUSCH occasion(s). |
| Ericsson | **Observation 4** The term "UTO" refers to "unused transmission occasion(s)" and is used only for convenience in the discussion.  **Observation 5** The term "UTO-UCI" refers to "unused transmission occasion(s) indicated by uplink control information (UCI)" and is used only for convenience in the discussion.  **Observation 6** A previous UCI has indicated a CG PUSCH TO as "unused". Overriding means that a later UCI indicates the CG PUSCH TO as NOT "unused".  **Proposal 11** For dynamic indication of unused CG PUSCH transmission occasion(s) based on a UCI, the CG PUSCH TO(s) that can be indicated as "unused" are consecutive (i.e., Option 1 from agreement in RAN1#112)  \* The UCI provides a time duration that includes the consecutive TO(s) in time domain (i.e., Option 1-2 from agreement in RAN1#112)  **Proposal 12** For a configured grant configuration, the UTO-UCI when indicated, provides a pattern that is used to determine the PUSCH resource(s) of the configured grant that the UE is not expected to use for transmission.  **Proposal 13** For a configured grant configuration, a new list (UTO table) is included in the configuration of the configured grant. The UTO table consists of a list of UTO patterns that the UE can select from. The UTO-UCI is an index to a row of the UTO table.  **Proposal 14** For a configured grant configuration, the following options can be considered for design of the UTO pattern structure:  \* Alt-A: A UTO pattern indicates an offset and duration to determine a time interval. The UE is not expected to use the CG PUSCH TOs within the time interval for CG PUSCH transmission.  \* The offset determines the start of the window from the end of the CG PUSCH that carries the corresponding UTO-UCI indicating the UTO pattern.  \* The duration determines the end of the window.  \* Alt-B: UTO pattern indicates a bitmap, each bit corresponding to a time interval or a set of consecutive TOs. The UE is not expected to use the CG PUSCH TOs within the time interval or the set of consecutive TOs corresponding to a bit in the bitmap with value '1' (or '0') for CG PUSCH transmission. The bitmap indicates consecutive '1's (or '0's), if any.  \* Any two consecutive bits in the bitmap corresponds to two consecutive time intervals or two sets of back-to-back consecutive TOs  \* The 1st time interval or set of consecutive TOs corresponding to the 1st bit in the bitmap start from the end of the CG PUSCH that carries the corresponding UTO-UCI indicating the UTO pattern after an offset value. The offset is determined based on e.g., configuration or a rule.  **Proposal 15** A UTO pattern can correspond to "no unused" configured grant PUSCH.  **Proposal 16** Prioritize Alt-A for design of the UTO pattern structure.  **Proposal 17** The UE is expected to provide consistent information when indicating the UTO patterns. |
| Qualcomm | **Observation 1**: The UCI indicating unused CG PUSCH occasion(s) is beneficial because  \* gNB can reallocate resources of the unused PUSCH occasion to other UEs  \* UE can save power by selecting a proper amount of resources for PUSCH transmission  \* gNB can save power by skipping PUSCH blind detection on the unused PUSCH occasion  **Proposal 8**: For multiple overlapping PUSCH occasions, a UE is allowed to utilize the CG PUSCH occasion with the smallest RB allocation that best fits the size of its buffered data  **Proposal 9**: For the dynamic indication of unused CG PUSCH occasion(s), RAN1 should consider the case that multiple PUSCH occasions overlap in time. The UE indicates at most one of the overlapping PUSCH occasions is not unused  **Proposal 10**: Support Option 2-1 that the UCI provides a bitmap where a bit corresponds to a TO within a time duration/range. The bit indicates whether the TO is "unused" (consecutive/non-consecutive in time domain)  **Proposal 14**: UE can send updated indication to indicate a different set of unused PUSCH occasions than those indicated by an early indication. gNB uses the most recent indication received from the UE  \* Support the case that a CG PUSCH occasion previously indicated as NOT unused is later indicated as unused  \* Do not support the case that the CG PUSCH occasion previously indicated as unused is later indicated as NOT unused |
| HW/HiSi | **Proposal 7**: Support Option 1-1 that UCI indicates the last M CG PUSCH occasion(s) within a CG period are unused.  **Proposal 12**: No need to consider the UCI indicate the unused occasions in multiple periods. |
| CATT | **Proposal 6**: Either of following alternatives could be supported:  • Alt-1: A UCI would multiplex with each transmitted CG PUSCH occasions, which provides a bitmap where a bit corresponds to a TO or a TO group within a time duration/range. The bit indicates whether the TO or TO group is "unused".  • Alt-2: A UCI would multiplex with the configured CG PUSCH occasions, which provides a bitmap where a bit corresponds to a TO or a TO group within a time duration/range. The bit indicates whether the TO or TO group is "unused". |
| vivo | **Proposal 5**: When a CG PUSCH occasion is indicated as "unused", the UE is expected not to transmit PUSCH on that CG PUSCH occasion. For any other CG PUSCH occasion that is NOT indicated as "unused", the UE is allowed to transmit or not to transmit PUSCH on that CG PUSCH occasion as per legacy specification.  **Proposal 8**: For dynamic indication of unused CG PUSCH occasion(s) based on UCI by the UE, RAN1 discusses whether/how to sort/index configured CG PUSCH occasions, e.g. sorting/indexing based on starting times of CG PUSCH occasions, as well as indexes of corresponding CG configurations, indexes of corresponding serving cells, etc., if necessary.  **Proposal 9**: For dynamic indication of unused CG PUSCH occasion(s) based on UCI by the UE, RAN1 discusses whether/how to determine sets of CG PUSCH occasions from the configured CG PUSCH occasions, where each of the sets is associated with the dynamic indication in a UCI, e.g. sets of CG PUSCH occasions is determined explicitly based on a configured periodicity and offset, or implicitly based on CG period.  **Proposal 10**: If the UCI provides a bitmap where a bit corresponds to CG PUSCH occasions within a time duration/range, to determine the time duration/range, the solution adopted in CBG grouping can be reused.  **Proposal 11**: For the information provided by the UCI about unused CG PUSCH occasions, both Option 1 (to indicate consecutive unused CG PUSCH occasion(s)) and Option 2 (to indicate unused CG PUSCH occasion(s) which may be consecutive or non-consecutive) can be considered. |
| ZTE/Sanechips | **Observation 8**: In Case 2, i.e., the transmission occasions in multiple CG periods are used for transmitting a single XR packet, UCI is able to indicate the transmission occasion usage in multiple CG periods. And the transmission occasions in multiple CG periods are used to transmit TBs for a single XR packet.  **Observation 9**: UCI indicating the usage of transmission occasions in a single period can be regarded as supporting UCI for unused transmission occasion(s) in multi-PUSCHs CG. While UCI indicating the usage of transmission occasions in multiple periods can be regarded as supporting UCI for unused transmission occasion(s) in legacy CG/Rel-16 multiple CG configurations.  **Proposal 9**: Suggest to specify the UCI indicates the unused transmission occasion(s) in one CG period.  **Proposal 12**: Support that the UCI can also indicate that all the transmission occasions are used in one time duration. |
| Spreadtrum Comm. | **Observation 1**: The bit field in the UCI to indicate the unused PUSCH TOs is related to the location of the unused PUSCH TOs and when to transmit CG PUSCH includes UCI in a time duration.  **Observation 2**: Due to the PUSCH preparation time and gNB processing delay, the remaining re-allocated PUSCH occasion(s) may be reduced if the UCI is carried in the last PUSCH to be used. |
| Lenovo | **Proposal 5**: UCI indicates a bitmap of unused status of CG PUSCH occasions.  \* If CG occasions are grouped for the sake of unused CG occasion indication, a CG occasion group is indicated as unused only if all CG occasions within the group (potentially excluding the CG occasion of the UCI) are unused CG occasions.  **Proposal 6**: UCI indicates whether a time unit (e.g., slot) is unused.  **Proposal 7**: UCI field indicating unused CG occasions has a fixed (configured) size.  o UCI can indicate unused past and future occasions  **Proposal 8**: UCI indicates unused CG occasions within a time duration defined by a length and a start time; wherein  \* the length is one (or multiple) period(s) of CG configuration in which UCI is transmitted  \* and the start time is the beginning of a CG period of the CG configuration  o FFS beginning is subject to a symbol offset >=0  **Proposal 9**: The applicable time window does not include symbols for reception of SS/PBCH blocks and/or DL symbols indicated by tdd-UL-DL-ConfigurationCommon and/or symbols corresponding to a measurement gap.  \* FFS: other symbols/CG occasions (e.g., cancelled by UL-CI or SFI) |
| LG | **Observation**: The re-scheduling time (in gNB side) should be guaranteed in between where UE transmit URI and the beginning of unused resources indicated by the URI.  **Observation**: The range of unused resource that can be indicated by URI might be limited without XR-awareness information.  **Proposal 9**: The range of unused resource that can be indicated by URI is determined based on where URI is transmitted.  \* The first CG PUSCH indicated by URI starts no earlier than X symbol after where URI transmission ends, where X is re-scheduling time required by gNB.  \* The last CG PUSCH starts no later than Y symbol after the beginning of the first CG PUSCH, where Y is provided by gNB configuration based on UE capability  \* FFS: How to define X and Y  **Proposal 10**: No URI information is created/constructed for a resource in a time window starting from the end of PUSCH where URI transmitted and which ends after X symbols, where X is re-scheduling time required by gNB,  **Proposal 11**: Support Alt. 1-2 to construct URI information.  **Proposal 12**: If URI indicate a time window or a CG occasion as unused, UE treats other PUSCHs overlapped in a time with the indicated time window or the indicated CG occasion as unused. |
| NTT DOCOMO | **Proposal 9**: For UCI indicating unused TOs, support option 1, i.e. the UCI indicates consecutive unused TOs.  **Proposal 10**: The first TO for the UCI indication range can be determined considering following two alternatives:  \* Alt 1: the first TO with X slots/symbols/TOs/CG periods after the ending/starting symbol of CG PUSCH carrying the UCI.  \* The definition of X may need to consider required time for gNB to utilize the unused CG occasion information for other UEs.  \* Alt 2: the first indicated TO is indicated by the UCI, e.g. Y slots/symbols/TOs/CG periods after the ending/starting symbol of CG PUSCH carrying the UCI.  \* Limitation on candidate values of the offset may be necessary, e.g. Y is no smaller than a certain value, in order to leave time for gNB to utilize the unused CG occasion information for other UEs. |
| Google Inc. | **Proposal 8**: Support Option 2-1 using a bitmap where a bit corresponds to a TO within a time duration/range. |
| IDC | **Proposal 7**: The UCI includes a bitmap for indicating the unused/used CG PUSCH occasions in one or multiple slots or CG periods (Option 2) |
| OPPO | **Proposal 6**: Support Option 2-1, i.e. the UCI provides a bitmap where a bit corresponds to a TO within a time duration/range. The bit in the bitmap only confirms a TO is "unused" but does not confirm the TO is "used". |
| MTK | **Observation 3**: Indicating UCI for the unused occasions at every transmission occasion has benefits in cases where large jitter occurs or in some DL-UL patterns in TDD configurations.  **Proposal 12**: UCI contains one bit field, which indicates the number of unused PUSCH transmission occasions by the UE as an integer value. The indication is limited to PUSCH TOs within current CG period (e.g., Option 1-2). |
| Samsung | **Proposal 6**: The UCI provides the number of consecutive CG-PUSCH TOs (Option 1-1). The indication is applicable to a single CG-PUSCH period.  **Observation 2**: There is no need to support indication of unused CG-PUSCH TOs for multiple CG configurations.  **Observation 3**: XR-related use cases and benefits need to first be concluded for a decision to support indication of unused CG-PUSCH TOs for a first CG-PUSCH configuration in CG-PUSCH transmissions of a second CG-PUSCH configuration. |
| Apple | **Proposal 10**: to support the use of occasion starting from any occasion within a CG period, consider  **3.** With a common reference timing for the provided information from multiple occasions (e.g., the common reference timing is the start of the first occasion in a CG period), the UCI payload is identical from multiple occasions.  a. Option 1-2: [the starting time of unused occasion, number of unused occasions], or [the end time of unused occasion, number of unused occasions]. We note SLIV encoding can be used for both.  b. Option 1-1: With Option 1-1, the reference timing is the last occasion in a CG period. The number of unused occasions is counted in reference to the last occasion. The counted value is zero if the last occasion is used. The counted value is ones if the last occasion is not used, but the second last occasion is used, etc.  c. Option 2-1: a N-bit bitmap is used where N is the number of occasions in a CG period. In the bitmap, "0" can be used to indicate unused occasions, "1" can be used to indicate used occasions. The kth bit in the bitmap corresponds to the kth occasion in a CG period.  **4.** With separate referencing timing for the provided information from multiple occasions, e.g., the reference timing is according to PUSCH carrying the UCI.  a. Option 1-2: [the starting time of unused occasion, number of unused occasions], or [the end time of unused occasion, number of unused occasions]. We note SLIV encoding can be used for both.  b. Option 1-1: With Option 1-1, the reference timing is the current occasion in a CG period. The number of unused occasions is counted in reference to the current occasion. The counted value is one if the next occasion is used. The counted value is zero if the next occasion is not used.  c. Option 2-1: a N-bit bitmap is used where N is the number of occasions in a CG period. In the bitmap, "0" can be used to indicate unused occasions, "1" can be used to indicate used occasions. The first bit in the bitmap corresponds to the current occasion.  **Proposal 11**: if indication of unused CG periods within a window is supported, to support the use of a CG period starting from any CG period within the window, consider:  **3.** With a common reference timing for the provided information from multiple occasions (e.g., the common reference timing is the start of the first occasion in a CG period), the UCI payload is identical from multiple occasions.  An M-bit bitmap is used where M is the number of CG periods within a window. In the bitmap, "0" can be used to indicate unused CG periods, "1" can be used to indicate used CG periods. The kth bit in the bitmap corresponds to the kth CG period in the window.  **4.** With separate referencing timing for the provided information from multiple occasions, e.g., the reference timing is according to PUSCH carrying the UCI.  An M-bit bitmap is used where M is the number of CG periods within a window. In the bitmap, "0" can be used to indicate unused CG periods, "1" can be used to indicate used CG periods. The first bit in the bitmap corresponds to the current CG period. |
| Nokia/NSB | **Proposal 9**: RAN1 should take into account the impacts of potential overlapping between UL channels (i.e., DG PUSCH and CG PUSCH) when designing UCI content. Possible options:  \* Option 2-2: The UCI provides one bit indication for the next TO (e.g., 0 - used or undefined; 1 - unused);  \* Option 3: UCI provides the number of needed CG occasions based on the configured TBS of the CG resources and the size of the buffered data that can be transmitted via the CG. NW figure out which ones are used/not used based on the number reported and the scheduled overlapped occasions. |
| Sony | **Proposal 5**: The UCI carries a bitmap where a bit corresponds to TOs within a time duration/range in the future. The bit indicates whether all TOs within the time duration/range are "unused" (known as Option 2-2). |
| Panasonic | **Proposal 7**: The unused indication of PUSCH occasions should be applied to all configured CGs. It should provide a bitmap to time durations, in which PUSCH occasions within them will not be used by the UE. |
| DENSO Corp. | **Proposal 1**: RAN1 to study introducing a bitmap into the UCI, where each bit can indicate whether the corresponding PUSCH occasion is unused or not.  **Proposal 2**: The bitmap size for the indication of unused occasion(s) can be equal to the number of configured PUSCH occasions, regardless of whether they are valid.  **Observation 5**: Considering UL jitter and the mismatch between CG periodicity and XR frame rate, the UE may not know the amount of UL data to indicate unused occasion(s) in the first configured PUSCH occasion within a CG period. |
| FGI | **Proposal 5**: The UCI indicates the number of the last CG PUSCH TO(s) that are unused. |
| TCL | **Proposal 5**: Both a set of unused TOs located in the front and the end of a CG configuration can be considered for CG enhanced for XR.  **Proposal 6**: The UCI determines the CG PUSCH TO(s) that are indicated as "unused" based on bitmap.  **Proposal 7**: A new UCI will be introduced in R-18 for indicating the un-used TOs within a CG configuration.  **Observation 2**:There is a gap between XR periodic UL traffic and CG configuration.  **Proposal 8**: A fixed transmission pattern of CG within an integer periodicity for XR can be considered.  **Proposal 9**: Additional TOs after the end of the configured TO within a CG period and activate more than one CG configurations simultaneously can be considered. |
| xiaomi | **Observation 1**: Option 1-2 provides unnecessary information in the process of indicating the information of the unused TO.  **Observation 2**: Option 2-2 will cause some indication errors when the indication granularity does not match the unused TO.  **Observation 3**: Option 1-1 has the problem of missing indication for the unused TO or error indication for the used TO.  **Observation 4**: Option 2-1 has a higher signaling overhead compared with option 1-1, especially if the time duration includes a large number of TO.  **Observation 5**: Option 2-3 can balance signaling overhead with indicating flexibility by configuring the appropriate pattern table.  **Observation 7**: The time-frequency resources corresponding to the reserved TO will be wasted if the usage status of the reserved TO cannot be updated.  **Observation 9**: The number of TO that can be configured in a CG period should be discussed before the discussion of the HP process ID  **Proposal 1**: For option 1-1, the following three potential alternatives require further discussion.  > Alt. 1: Start TO + Number of TO  > Alt. 2: Start TO + End TO  > Alt. 3: Start TO + Default end TO  **Proposal 2**: Option 2-3 should be taken into account as follows:  o Option 2-3: The UCI provides a table row index where the index corresponds to an unused TO pattern within a time duration/range. All TOs in the unused TO pattern within the time duration/range are "unused".  \* Applicable time duration/range can be determined from information obtained from configuration  \* FFS details  **Proposal 3**: Option 1-1, option 2-1 and option 2-3 should be prioritized for Multi-PUSCHs CG.  **Proposal 4**: The time duration/range corresponding to dynamic indication information should be discussed in RAN1.  **Proposal 7**: Three potential options can be considered to define the timeline for dynamic indication, as follows:  > Option 1: From the TO including the UCI to the time window  \* FFS details  > Option 2: From the TO including the UCI to the first TO in the time duration  \* FFS details  > Option 3: From the TO including the UCI to the first unused TO in the time duration  \* FFS details |
| CMCC | **Proposal 7**. Support Option 2, i.e., the UCI provides a bitmap where a bit indicates whether the corresponding CG PUSCH occasion(s) is "unused". |
| Sharp | **Proposal 5**: The UCI that provides information about unused CG PUSCH transmission occasions is defined as a new XR-specific CG UCI.  **Proposal 6**: A transmitted CG PUSCH includes the UCI, if it is transmitted in a transmission occasion determined satisfying given condition(s), e.g. a first transmitted PUSCH in a CG period, or a first PUSCH transmission within a multiple of CG periods.  **Proposal 7**: The UCI determines the CG PUSCH TO(s) that are indicated as "unused" (consecutive/non-consecutive TO(s) in time domain), and the UCI provides a bitmap where a bit corresponds to a TO within a time duration/range. The bit indicates whether the TO is "unused". |
| New H3C | **Proposal 3**: For dynamic indication of unused CG PUSCH transmission occasion(s) based on a UCI, Option 1: The UCI determines the consecutive CG PUSCH TO(s) that are indicated as "unused" is supported. |
| CAICT | **Proposal 4**: The UCI provides a bitmap where a bit corresponds to a TO within a time duration/range. The bit indicates whether the TO is "unused". |
| NEC | **Proposal 2**: support option 1 for the information provided by UCI, i.e., The UCI determines the consecutive CG PUSCH TO(s) that are indicated as "unused".  **Proposal 3**: consider repetition and retransmission mechanism for the UCI for unused CG occasions indication. |
| Intel | **Proposal 6**: Introduce a new UCI to indicate the number of unused PUSCH occasions.  \* Whether to multiplex the new UCI to CG PUSCH should be configurable  \* The UCI provides the number of consecutive unused TO(s) in time domain (Option 1-1).  o UCI may include ??log?\_(2 ) I? bits in a field, which is used to indicate I number of unused TO(s). |

From Moderator point of view, it is important to discuss the above aspects.

### 3.1.1 Initial Discussions

**Moderator’s suggestions for initial discussion:**

This topic needs more discussions to narrow down the options. For the initial discussions, Moderator suggests companies to share the views on the following.

**Suggestion:** As it is important to start the detailed design, companies are encouraged be flexible such that we can converge to one option, e.g., option 2.

**Question:** Please provide your view in the table below regarding the following questions:

* **Q1:** What is your view regarding Moderator’s suggestion? What is your suggestion to facilitate a selection, including compromising/changing preferences?
* **Q2:** Discuss any clarification/correction/comment/question on Moderator’s summary and suggestions or any other aspect helping the discussion and needed decisions.

**Note: Please ensure the information in companies’ contributions are considered for discussions.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| **ZTE, Sanechips** | 1. We should focus on the UCI indication in case of multi-PUSCH CG, which is the basic case for the topic of XR. (Not prioritize legacy CG configuration)   2. We support option 1-1 for simplicity. And for option 2-1, it should be clarified that in which case the non-consecutive unused transmission occasions occur in one CG period.  3. Considering the signaling overhead, solutions for reducing signaling e.g., option 2-2 can be further considered. |
| **Nokia, NSB** | As commented in our Tdoc, Option 1 and Option 2-1 (indication for N slots) have certain drawbacks. UE does not know well in advance which slots it is going to use due to potential overlapping between UL channels (i.e., DG PUSCH and CG PUSCH). So in most cases UE will be able to identify the Unused slot, when it used all slots required to transmit the video frame. Therefore, we suggest the following options:  • Option 2-2: The UCI provides one bit indication for the next TO (e.g., 0 – used or undefined; 1 - unused); FFS details.  • Option 3: UCI provides the number of needed CG occasions based on the configured TBS of the CG resources and the size of the buffered data that can be transmitted via the CG. NW figure out which ones are used/not used based on the number reported and the scheduled overlapped occasions. FFS details |
| **CATT** | CATT’s proposal is more closed to option 2-1. Each UCI bit is associated with one TO or one TO group when one TB mapping to multiple TOs in a TO group.  Since the overhead is not the main issue for UCI indication of unused CG occasions when UCI is multiplexed with CG-PUSCH, the number of available bits for UCI indication should be sufficient for bitmap without any confusion. |
| **New H3C** | We slightly prefer option 1 and open to discuss about option 2. |
| **Qualcomm** | We support Option 2, in particular 2-1. The reason non-consecutive can be useful is for future proof use- cases such as for example if there is UL jitter and the CG PUSCHs are used to transmit a mixture of traffics with different tempos such as video and pose. Then this will allow us not to be limited and have to come back in the future to revisit the design. The bitmap seems a straightforward way provide the indication of unused. |
| **Google** | We support Option 2-1 for its simplicity and its flexibility. Option 2-2 is not very optimal as you may need to indicate a group of CG occasions mapping to the same bit as used even if some of them are unused. |
| **Samsung** | We object to option 2 (Samsung also supports option 1-1). There is no reason to introduce a bitmap, particularly when the justification for introducing the feature of multi-PUSCH CG was to minimize latency. If there are TOs where the UE is semi-statically(!) configured to not transmit, the feature itself might as well not being supported and can always rely on SR+DG. |
| **Futurewei** | Option 2 has better flexibility, with the cost of higher signaling overhead, compared with Option 1, since the UCI in Option 2 can indicate non-consecutive TO(s) in time domain. However, in our understanding, this feature has no benefits or advantages for XR traffic because the data of XR packet generally occupies one or more consecutive PUSCH occasions in the front of the multiple PUSCH occasion in a period. In that sense, Option 1 is better choice with much less signaling overhead compared with Option 2, and it can indicate the consecutive unused TO(s) of the multiple TO(s) in a period. Option 1-2 is almost the same as Option 1-1, except for the additional concept of duration/range, which increases complexity of Option 1 and is not preferred. Therefore, we are ok with Option 1-1 with much less signaling overhead and lower complexity. |
| **InterDigital** | Ok with moderator’s suggestion. Although our preference is Option 2, we are open to consider other options, including Option 3 proposed by Nokia. |
| **Apple** | **In Apple’s contribution, we have the following proposals. A key consideration is to support the starting the transmission of a CG from an arbitrary TO in a CG period. Among all the options, we prefer Option 2-1.**  **Proposal 10**: to support the use of occasion starting from any occasion within a CG period, consider  **3.** With a common reference timing for the provided information from multiple occasions (e.g., the common reference timing is the start of the first occasion in a CG period), the UCI payload is identical from multiple occasions.  a. Option 1-2: [the starting time of unused occasion, number of unused occasions], or [the end time of unused occasion, number of unused occasions]. We note SLIV encoding can be used for both.  b. Option 1-1: With Option 1-1, the reference timing is the last occasion in a CG period. The number of unused occasions is counted in reference to the last occasion. The counted value is zero if the last occasion is used. The counted value is ones if the last occasion is not used, but the second last occasion is used, etc.  c. Option 2-1: a N-bit bitmap is used where N is the number of occasions in a CG period. In the bitmap, "0" can be used to indicate unused occasions, "1" can be used to indicate used occasions. The kth bit in the bitmap corresponds to the kth occasion in a CG period.  **4.** With separate referencing timing for the provided information from multiple occasions, e.g., the reference timing is according to PUSCH carrying the UCI.  a. Option 1-2: [the starting time of unused occasion, number of unused occasions], or [the end time of unused occasion, number of unused occasions]. We note SLIV encoding can be used for both.  b. Option 1-1: With Option 1-1, the reference timing is the current occasion in a CG period. The number of unused occasions is counted in reference to the current occasion. The counted value is one if the next occasion is used. The counted value is zero if the next occasion is not used.  c. Option 2-1: a N-bit bitmap is used where N is the number of occasions in a CG period. In the bitmap, "0" can be used to indicate unused occasions, "1" can be used to indicate used occasions. The first bit in the bitmap corresponds to the current occasion.  **Proposal 11**: if indication of unused CG periods within a window is supported, to support the use of a CG period starting from any CG period within the window, consider:  **3.** With a common reference timing for the provided information from multiple occasions (e.g., the common reference timing is the start of the first occasion in a CG period), the UCI payload is identical from multiple occasions.  An M-bit bitmap is used where M is the number of CG periods within a window. In the bitmap, "0" can be used to indicate unused CG periods, "1" can be used to indicate used CG periods. The kth bit in the bitmap corresponds to the kth CG period in the window.  **4.** With separate referencing timing for the provided information from multiple occasions, e.g., the reference timing is according to PUSCH carrying the UCI.  An M-bit bitmap is used where M is the number of CG periods within a window. In the bitmap, "0" can be used to indicate unused CG periods, "1" can be used to indicate used CG periods. The first bit in the bitmap corresponds to the current CG period. |
| **vivo** | We are fine to focus on option 2. It is helpful to narrow down the options.  For option 2, if bitmap to indicate consecutive or non-consecutive TOs can be supported, flexibility of UCI indication for the unused TOs can be achieved compared to option 1.  The signaling overhead for option 2 can be controlled by NW, i.e., the range of bitmap is configured by NW. |
| **OPPO** | We support Option 2-1 for flexibility. |
| **TCL** | We support option 2 for its flexibility. |
| **DOCOMO** | Though our first preference is option 1, option 2-1 is also fine for us. |
| **LG** | We are fine to have non-consecutive resource indication for this feature, however, it is necessary to further discuss on the detail approach. We would like to have general agreement to scope down to non-consecutive resource indication with FL’s observations. |
| **MediaTek** | We don’t see a need for non-consecutive TO indication. We support Option 1-1. Each UCI indication is limited to its current CG period only.  Our suggestion to facilitate progress within the group is to discuss what CG periodicity makes more sense. If one CG periodicity is 16ms (~similar to XR traffic periodicity), UCI can only indicate unused PUSCH TOs within the current CG period. Because UE cannot decide which PUSCH TOs will be needed before the next XR packet becomes available at higher layers. In this configuration, Option-1 (consecutive slot indication) makes more sense.  If one CG periodicity is 5ms as an example (~much smaller than XR traffic periodicity of 16.667ms), UCI can indicate unused PUSCH TOs for the next 2 slots. In this configuration either Option-1 (consecutive slot indication) or Option-2 (non-consecutive slot indication) would work. |
| **Panasonic** | Q1: We think it is important to initially discuss what features should be supported by the unused indications. Then we can down-select accordingly.  Q2: We think following features should be discussed first: 1) whether the unused indication is applicable to a single or multiple CG configurations, 2) whether the unused indication should be restricted to consecutive occasions (option 1) or not. |
| **Spreadtrum** | We are fine to focus on Option 2 with its flexibility. |
| **NEC** | We think indication of non-consecutive unused TOs is not needed, because it is more reasonable that UE always use consecutive available TOs. Therefore we prefer option 1 better than option 2.  In addition, we also have similar concern as Nokia, if the potential resource overlapping will be considered, we prefer the option 3 proposed by Nokia, i.e., UE reports the number of needed/unneeded CG occasions. |
| **SONY** | We support Option 2, in particular 2-2. Our main consideration is that Option 2 has better flexibility than Option 1. |
| **CMCC** | We agree with Moderator’s suggestion. Compared to Option 2, Option 1 has less signaling overhead when a large number of CG PUSCH transmission occasions are configured in a CG period, however, it can not indicate the unused CG PUSCH occasion(s) at the beginning of a CG period when the UL jitter of XR traffic is considered. On the other hand, Option 2 gives more flexibility for the indication of consecutive/non-consecutive unused CG PUSCH occasion(s), especially considering conducting the “overriding” procedure. So, we tend to support Option 2 for the information provided by the UCI. |
| **Huawei/HiSilicon** | We prefer option 1-1 for simplicity.  As for jitter, companies do not support enhancements on SPS due to jitter in R18 XR SI. Similarly, if jitter exists in UL, DG is better than CG. In addition, jitter causes a frame to arrive early or late as a whole. That is, the UE knows the frame size after frame arrival. It is better for the UE to use the earlier consecutive UL slots to transmit XR frame to avoid large latency. |
| **Xiaomi2** | Option 2-1 has the best flexibility, but the most signaling overhead. Option 1-1 can significantly reduce overhead, but the flexibility is limited. For Option 2-2, there is always the problem of misindication as long as the indication granularity is not on one CG occasion. We prefer Option 2-3, which can balance signaling overhead with indication flexibility. |
| **FGI** | We support Option 1-1. The flexibility of other options is not needed since the MAC layer of the UE cannot predict which specific TOs will or will not be used. |
| **Lenovo** | In our view, in addition to selecting a scheme with small specification impact, perhaps it would be good to first decide on structure of the UCI, e.g.,   * whether the bit-field for indication of unused occasions has a fixed size that does not change with CG occasion in which UCI is sent * whether the UCI indicates unused CG occasions of multiple CG configurations   We think option 2 maybe simpler, but can also accept option 1. |
| **Intel** | We do not see any reason to support bitmap, so object option 2 |
| **Ericsson** | We prefer Option 1-2 , but OK with Option 1-1 . We are also OK with Option 2.  In general, we think all option work and it is not a big deal to stuck for choosing an option. |
| **Moderator** | **Summary of views.**  **Option 1 (13):** FW, E///, HW/HiSi, vivo, ZTE, DCM, MTK, FGI, New H3C, NEC, Intel, Samsung, LG   * **Option 1-1:** FW, HW/HiSi, DCM, MTK, Intel, ZTE * **Option 1-2:** E///, LG, DCM   **Option 2 (17)** QC, CATT, vivo, Spreadtrum, IDC, Google, OPPO, Lenovo, Nokia/NSB, Panasonic, DENSO, TCL, xiaomi, CMCC, CAICT, SONY, Apple   * **Option 2-1:** QC, Google, OPPO, xiaomi, CAICT, CATT, Apple * **Option 2-2:** Spreadtrum, Lenovo, Nokia/NSB, Panasonic, SONY * **OK to compromise:** New H3C, FW, IDC, Lenovo, Ericsson, DCM, Spreadtrum, LG, [ZTE] * **Object to Option 2:** Samsung, Intel * **Support only Option 1:** Samsung, Intel, NEC, HW/HiSi * **Support only Option 2:** TCL, vivo, Spreadtrum, Sony, CMCC, xiaomi   **Moderator comments:**  **@All:** Regarding the underlying questions, i.e. indication of only consecutive TOs or not, views are different:   * **Proponents of Only consecutive (Option 1):** Simplicity, consecutive TOs is more reasonable, less signalling overhead, UL jitter can be handled by DG, better for minimize latency (justification of feature), … * **Proponents of including non-consecutive (Option 2):** Simplicity, flexibility, overhead not issue, suitable to handle UL jitter, suitable for realistic cases of mixed traffic, future proof design to handle UL jitter and mix of traffic, …   **@All:** The design is not limited to multi-PUSCH CG. Please in your arguments for your preferred option, consider a general solution.  **Some other comments:**  **@MTK:** The solution we develop according to WID is for CG. Having a solution workable for certain periodicities is very limiting.  **@Xiaomi:** The description of Option 2-2 is in fact detailed signalling of option 2-1/2-2 that we will address in the next step when we agree on an approach.  **@Nokia:** Can you please clarify? The CG PUSCH that are overridden by DG PUSCH, and hence not used, are not within the context of “unused CG PUSCH”. Regarding Option 3, even if UE provides such information to gNB, there is no guarantee that they won’t be used. However, gNB can uses that information, e.g. for overriding with DG PUSCH if needed. But it seems that is a different topic.  **@IDC/NEC:** Regarding Option 3, please see comment to Nokia.  **@Panasonic:** Discussion of multiple CG is covered in section 3.4. The current status is that more discussion is needed to decide on the support. Hence, the baseline design is for single CG. In case of support of multiple CG, we need to consider the extension that is different for different options here.  **@Lenovo:** Agree. Moderator understanding is that the UCI size would be fixed based on RRC configuration, either a bit map or a configured table. However, we need the details of RRC signalling.  **@All: Moderator suggests to discuss in GTW to decide between Option 1 or Option 2.** |

### 3.1.2 Intermediate Discussions

**Summary of views.**

**Option 1 (13):** FW, E///, HW/HiSi, vivo, ZTE, DCM, MTK, FGI, New H3C, NEC, Intel, Samsung, LG

* **Option 1-1:** FW, HW/HiSi, DCM, MTK, Intel, ZTE, Samsung
* **Option 1-2:** E///, LG, DCM

**Option 2 (17)** QC, CATT, vivo, Spreadtrum, IDC, Google, OPPO, Lenovo, Nokia/NSB, Panasonic, DENSO, TCL, xiaomi, CMCC, CAICT, SONY, Apple

* **Option 2-1:** QC, Google, OPPO, xiaomi, CAICT, CATT, Apple
* **Option 2-2:** Spreadtrum, Lenovo, Nokia/NSB, Panasonic, SONY
* **OK to compromise:** New H3C, FW, IDC, Lenovo, Ericsson, DCM, Spreadtrum, LG, [ZTE]
* **Object to Option 2:** Samsung, Intel
* **Support only Option 1:** Samsung, Intel, NEC, HW/HiSi
* **Support only Option 2:** TCL, vivo, Spreadtrum, Sony, CMCC, xiaomi

**Moderator comments:**

**@All:** Regarding the underlying questions, i.e. indication of only consecutive TOs or not, views are different:

* **Proponents of Only consecutive (Option 1):** Simplicity, consecutive TOs is more reasonable, less signalling overhead, UL jitter can be handled by DG, better for minimize latency (justification of feature), …
* **Proponents of including non-consecutive (Option 2):** Simplicity, flexibility, overhead not issue, suitable to handle UL jitter, suitable for realistic cases of mixed traffic, future proof design to handle UL jitter and mix of traffic, …

**@All:** The design is not limited to multi-PUSCH CG. Please in your arguments for your preferred option, consider a general solution.

**@All: Moderator suggests discussing in GTW to decide between Option 1 or Option 2.**

### 3.1.3 Final Discussions

**Moderator’s recommendation:**

**It was agreed to transmit UTO-UCI in every CG-PUSCH and also adopt Option 2 to be able to indicate both consecutive/non-consecutive TOs.**

Moderator recommends discussing more on detailed solutions of signalling of UTO-UCI.

First, which of the following options are preferred?

* **Option 2:** The UCI determines the CG PUSCH TO(s) that are indicated as “unused” (consecutive/non-consecutive TO(s) in time domain)
  + **Option 2-1**: The UCI provides a bitmap where a bit corresponds to a TO within a time duration/range. The bit indicates whether the TO is “unused”.
    - Applicable time duration/range can be determined from information obtained from configuration
    - FFS details
  + **Option 2-2:** The UCI provides a bitmap where a bit corresponds to TOs within a time duration/range. The bit indicates whether all TOs within the time duration/range are “unused”.
    - Applicable time duration/range can be determined from information obtained from configuration
    - FFS details
* FFS whether/how the unused TO(s) can be associated to multiple CG configuration.
* Other options are not precluded. Proponent companies to provide details.

Second, how to determine the timing/offset between a CG PUSCH that indicates a UTO-UCI and the corresponding CG PUSCHs (or the first CG PUSCH) that the UTO-UCI provides information for. Is it determined as a fixed offset, or is it determined from UTO-UCI in terms of time, or number of TOs, or other methods?

Also, it is important to understand the motivation of extension to multiple CG PUSCH configurations to decide whether the extension should be considered in the design.

As an additional note, it is not clear to Moderator what the word “range” in Option 2-1 and Option 2-2 is intended for. Clarifications is appreciated.

**Question:** Please provide your view in the table below regarding the following questions:

* **Q1:** What is your preferred option? Option 2-1 or Option 2-2? Please motivate in high level.
* **Q2**: Can you please clarify the meaning/intention of using the word “range” used in Option 2-1/2-2? If not, can be removed from the description?
* **Q3:** How the timing/offset between a CG PUSCH that indicates a UTO-UCI and the corresponding CG PUSCHs (or the first CG PUSCH) that the UTO-UCI provides information for, is determined? Please provide short but informative answers. For example as a fixed offset, or is it determined from UTO-UCI in terms of time, or number of TOs, etc.
* **Q4:** What is your view on that indicated UTO-UCI can be applicable to CG PUSCHs corresponding to multiple configurations? If you are supportive, please provide motivation and high-level insight how the design can be extended to multiple configurations.

**Note: Please ensure the information in companies’ contributions are considered for discussions.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| **Nokia, NSB** | Please, find our responses below:  **Q1:** Option 2-2 is preferred since less bits will be required and in case of unused indication the next occasions can be assumed as unused too without extra signalling. We are also open to support Option 2-1 if majority supports that.  **Q2:** The following is not clear to us: “within a time duration”. If we need to define some additional time window, then the number of TOs in that window may be different due to TDD configuration. It will lead to the varying number of bits for each UCI, which is not preferred as it complicates the decoding at gNB side. We prefer to keep “within a range” which is basically the Number of indicated TOs in our view. We are not sure why additional window need to be defined. It is ok to keep both at this point, but we prefer to have “within a range” only.  **Q3:** We think that this aspect (introducing the time offset or not) shall be studied further in terms of benefits/drawbacks. If we define the timing offset, it is better to have “fixed offset” obtained from RRC. There is no need to introduce a lot of various parameters in UCI besides bitmap that indicates unused TOs.  **Q4:** We do not support the indication for multiple CG configurations. The use case is not clear to us. What is the reason for transmitting XR video traffic over multiple different CG configurations? Other options such as single CG with one occasion per period or multi-PUSCH CG are more than sufficient in our view. |
| **Lenovo** | **Q1**: option 2-2. Indicating unused time slots/segments can simplify the specification particularly if a UCI indicates unused occasions of multiple CG configurations.  **Q2**: similar to UL cancellation indication, a time region can be defined, and the time region can be divided into segments; and 1 bit can indicate whether the corresponding segment is unused.  **Q3**: open to further discuss. We think without an offset, the indication can still work (less optimized), maybe some of the indicated time segments are not usable, but at least the specification becomes simple.  **Q4**: supportive, benefit can be less delay in notifying gNB regarding unused CG occasions. In our view, option 2-2 can also be used (with zero or minimal {e.g., which CG configurations can be included in the indication} specifications compared to option 2-2 for indication of unused CG occasions of a single CG configuration) to indicate unused CG occasions of multiple CG configurations. |
| **Samsung** | **Q1**: Option 2-1. It is simpler to specify/implement and complies with the agreement of indicating “unused TOs” and not something else and then figure out what “unused TOs” that something else includes. Overhead is not an issue (our non-preference to bit-map was not the overhead).  **Q2**: N/A. Unnecessary additional complications/specifications.  **Q3**: Do not support having a time offset. The bit-map covers the CG PUSCH TOs within a transmission period for a CG PUSCH configuration.  **Q4**: Do not support. No such use-case was studied/identified during the SI. The WI is based on the schemes identified in the SI (RP-223502). Justification The RAN Study Item on *XR Enhancements for* NR has identified several enhancements for the support for XR services. This work item aims at specifying those enhancements. |
| **ZTE, Sanechips** | Q1: We prefer Option 2-1. Compared to Option 2-2, Option 2-1 has finer granularity of indication of unused TO(s).  Q2: From our perspective, the range has same meaning with the time duration in this proposal. For clarification, I guess it’s ok to keep either ‘range’ or “duration” and remove the other one.  Q3: The meaning of ‘time offset’ in this question should be clarified and understood firstly. It seems it is linked to two approaches, one of them means **same content of UCI** within transmitted occasions, the other allows different content of UCI among transmitted occasions. Surely the former case (some content) is simpler.  Q4: Maybe the UCI for unused CG PUSCHs corresponding to multiple configurations has some benefits on signaling overhead, but it is more reasonable that we FFS it rather than hurry to conclude this topic (similar situation as the case of unlicensed spectrum). For this particular case, we can study detailed solutions and its complexity. |
| **CATT** | **Q1:** Option 2-1. The received bit sequence could indicate the “used” or “unused” of each TO. The gNB could use the multiple receptions of bit sequence for combining to increase the reliability of unused TOs indication. The sequence could also be updated if the number of unused TOs vary.  **Q2:** Range is the XR packet generation interval.  **Q3:** The time offset is not needed to specify. It would be gNB implementation to determine how to use the indication of unused TOs.  **Q4:** Not support. Each configuration in the Multiple configurations should be independently configured. |
| **Moderator** | @All: Based on the comments for Q2:  As Moderator explained on reflector, Moderator simply doesn’t remember the related discussion when it was added. The intention was to ask group to help to remember Can you please give some example, etc.?  @All: Based on the comments for Q3:  As Moderator explained on reflector, The intention is not to define explicitly offset. As it is written, how to determine the relationship when UTO-UCI is sent and when it is applied. That needs to be clarified and good to know the views. What is described in Option 2-1/Option2-2, is about TOs that the UTO-UCI are applied for. How do we determine from CG-PUSCH with UTO-UCI, those are the TOs. |
| **Xiaomi** | **Q1:** Option 2-1. Although Option 2-1 has higher signaling overhead, it can indicate each "unused" TO. In addition, since every transmitted CG PUSCH includes the UTO-UCI, the size of the UTO-UCI does not need to be too large to cover one CG period.  **Q2:** From our perspective, duration/range makes no difference, and both of them represent time domain granularity that includes a TO. Remove any of them, and we're ok for it.  **Q3:** Fine to further discuss it. If time offset is defined, it is mainly ensure that the gNB can have enough time to reallocate resources corresponding "unused" TO, so it is reasonable for the gNB to configure the time offset. (e.g. by RRC)  **Q4:** Fine to further discuss it. It can solves that the first TO within a CG period cannot be indicated by the UTO-UCI. We share ZTE’s views that we can FFS it rather than hurry to conclude this topic. |
| **InterDigital** | **Q1:** We are ok with option 2-1 for clarity and potentially lower spec impact. Regarding the ‘applicable time duration/range’, our understanding is that this time duration (associated with the bitmap) is configurable by network and can apply to, e.g. one or more CG periods.  **Q2:** Fine with either **‘**range’ or ‘duration’.  **Q3:** We don’t think a time offset, or in this case, a ’look ahead’ advance time, is needed since the UE is expected to include a UTO-UCI in every CG PUSCH, as per the agreement. If such time offset is applied, it is not clear what the UE will indicate in the UTO-UCI for the CG-PUSCHs that are within the advance duration indicated by the time offset.  **Q4:** We do not support the UTO-UCI for multiple CG configurations. First the motivation/use case for such approach is not clear, and secondly if different CG configurations have different periodicities and/or different number of PUSCHs per period, it is ambiguous how the UTO-UCI can apply for multiple configurations. |
| **vivo** | **Q1**: Option 2-1 is preferred due to finer granularity.  **Q2**: In our opinion “time duration” and “range” are almost identical based on the context, since within a time duration only configured/valid CG PUSCH occasions are considered to determine the corresponding UTO-UCI, and these configured/valid CG PUSCH occasions can also be regarded as a range of CG PUSCH occasions. It is not necessary to differentiate these two terminologies or concepts right now.  **Q3**: OK to further discuss whether time offset is needed between a CG PUSCH that indicates a UTO-UCI and the corresponding CG PUSCHs (or the first CG PUSCH) that the UTO-UCI provides information. It may depend on how much time the gNB requires to process the UCI and recycle the “unused” TO(s). If needed, a time offset configured by RRC signaling is preferred.  **Q4**: we support that the indicated UTO-UCI can be applicable to CG PUSCHs corresponding to multiple configurations. In general, we are fine to further discuss, but we don’t agree to hurry to conclude this topic.  The motivations are as follows.   1. XR UL video service with 30/60/90/120 FPS has non-integer periodicity. Currently the CG periodicities in the specification cannot aligned with the XR UL video traffic. It is necessary to address non-integer periodicity issue when CG is used for XR UL video traffic. In the SI phase, some enhancements were proposed to solve this issue. However, it turns out that it can be handled by the existing method of multiple CG configurations, e.g., multiple CG configurations can be configured with different start offsets. Note that since the discussion in Rel-16 URLLC, multiple CG configurations have been supported as one of the approaches to address non-integer periodicity issue. 2. XR UL video service has variable frame size across different periodicities. To address variable frame size, multiple CG occasions within a CG period can be configured. However, UTO-UCI should also be applicable to the case of CG configurations with single CG PUSCH occasion per CG period. It should be noted that there is no restriction that the UTO-UCI can only be used for CG configurations with multiple CG PUSCH occasions configured per CG period (i.e. multi-PUSCHs CG) according to the WID. Besides, XR UL video service has large packet size and high data rate is required. CA can afford high data rate with wider bandwidth, thus is beneficial for XR traffic. Therefore, these CG configurations may correspond to more than one serving cell as well. 3. Based on the above considerations, it is desirable that several CG configurations are configured to serve XR traffic. In our opinion, it is beneficial that only one or a subset of the several CG configurations are configured to convey UTO-UCI, to control overhead and complexity, e.g. resulting in a smaller number of UCIs.   To support UTO-UCI for multiple CG configurations, for example, if Option 2-1 is used, the following methods can be considered.   * Method 1: For multiple CG configurations, multiple sub-bitmaps can be used, where each sub-bitmap is constructed based on Option 2-1 for each CG configuration. All the sub-bitmaps are concatenated to get the whole bitmap for UTO-UCI, e.g. based on CG configuration indexes. * Method 2: CG PUSCH TOs from multiple CG configurations are mapped to bitmap based on predefined rule, e.g. similar to that for DAI counting.   Regarding the CG periodicity to determine the range for UTO-UCI, the periodicity of the CG PUSCH carrying the UTO-UCI can be used. |
| **CMCC** | Q1: During the online discussion, Option 2 is supported since it can provide more flexibility and the overhead of bitmap is not assumed to be a big issue. Hence, we support Option 2-1 because Option 2-2 reduces the bitmap overhead at the cost of flexibility, which seems not necessary.  Q3: In our opinion, to leave enough time for gNB to reallocate the unused CG PUSCH occasion(s), a time offset between a CG PUSCH that indicates a UTO-UCI and the corresponding CG PUSCHs (or the first CG PUSCH) that the UTO-UCI provides information for can be configured by RRC signaling. |
| **OPPO** | Q1: We support Option 2-1 for finer granularity.  Q3: We support to further discuss this aspect. Clear relationship between when UTO-UCI is sent and when it is applied may bring benefit on UTO-UCI payload size reduction. |
| **Intel** | Q1. Option 2-1. Since the motivation is to inform gNB which TOs can be freed from UE perspective, it is better to go with finer granularity. Overhead is not a concern if scope/time duration is one CG period. **We think in addition to selection of the option, we also need to confirm what is the time duration. This was briefly discussed in the last GTW.**  Q2. We do not think range terminology is needed here  Q3. Not needed. Each bit in the bitmap may have association to a TO within the CG period.  Q4. Not support |
| **Sharp** | Q1. Option 2-1 is simple and effective with finer granularity**.**  Q2. No need to define range terminology, e.g. it can be the same as the periodicity.  Q3. No need for the offset. Since UCI is in every transmitted CG-PUSCH, it can be updated dynamically based on real-time traffic load in a later CG-PUSCH.  Q4. Not support. Separate UCI should be applied for separate configured CG-PUSCHs for XR. |
| **LG** | Q1: Option 2-2.  Q2: In our view, Option 2-1 has a range and each bit is mapped to a TO in the range. Meanwhile, In Option 2-2, each bit are mapped to a time range. Thus, Option 2-2 should have a concept of entire time range and how to divide the range into small time window mapped to a bit.  In short, Option 2-1 is mapping a bit to a TO and Option 2-2 is mapping a bit to a time window. Thus, the definition of “range” is necessary at least for option 2-2.  Q3: It would be beneficial to have sufficient time offset to give processing time for re-allocate resource. We think fixed offset would be okay.  Q4: It is also beneficial to support UTO-UCI applicable to multiple configurations.  Considering various service and non-integer periodicities, multiple configurations are necessary for XR services. Also, if there are overlapped CG PUSCHs, it is necessary to have the way to indicate those PUSCHs as unused if at least one CG PUSCH need to be indicated as unused. (Otherwise, gNB should try to blind decode other PUSCHs except indicated PUSCHs, so that gNB cannot re-allocated the resources.  In high-level, UTO-UCI applicable to multiple configurations can be implemented by two approaches. One is to configure UTO-UCI with corresponding target CG configurations, which UTO UCI is applied to. The other is to consider time domain resource allocation. For example, if a UTO-UCI indicates a CG PUSCH as unused, other PUSCHs overlapped with the CG PUSCH are also treated as unused. |
| **Huawei/HiSilicon** | **For Q1**: support Option 2-1.  Option 2-2 has ambiguity issue due to the coarse indication granularity. Option 2-2 also has additional workload since RAN1 needs to discuss which level of indication granularity is suitable. If companies really care about signaling overhead, original Option 1 should be chosen.  **For Q3**:  A simple way would be: within one CG period, the UTO-UCI on each CG PUSCH has a bitmap to indicate the used/unused situation of subsequent CG PUSCH occasions within the same CG period.  For example:   * Assume there are 8 CG PUSCHs within 1 CG period. * Then, the UTO-UCI on 1st CG PUSCH has a bitmap with 7 bits, each bit indicate the used/unused situation of each one of subsequent CG PUSCH occasions within the same CG period. * Similarly, the UTO-UCI on 2nd CG PUSCH has a bitmap with 6 bits. And so on.   Considering gNB processing delay, we think it’s reasonable to introduce a fixed offset. E.g., if the current CG PUSCH#1 and subsequent CG PUSCH#2 are in two consecutive slots, then gNB probably has no time to re-allocate CG PUSCH#2 to other UEs after decoding UTO-UCI on CG PUSCH#1. So we are open for such discussion.  If offset is introduced, it should be in terms of absolute time (e.g., slots/ms, instead of TOs) since it mainly reflects gNB processing delay (which is in terms of absolute time).  **For Q4**: it is straightward that the indicated UTO-UCI can be applicable to CG PUSCHs corresponding to a single configuration. We are open to discuss how to extend to multiple configurations. |
| **Panasonic** | Q1) Our preference is Option 2-2 since it imposes less signaling overhead and it can be extended to cover multi-CG configurations.  Q2) We assume the unused duration indication can be defined by an offset value and a time duration.  Q3) The offset value can be considered with respect to the first PUSCH occasion within the CG period.  Q4) We are open to support it if it is justified. The multi-CG configurations could be used instead of having a CG with different FDRA. |
| **Spreadtrum** | **Q1:** Option 2-2 is preferred since less signaling overhead is needed, multi-CG configurations can be indicated under this option. We can accept to support Option 2-1 if majority companies prefer.  **Q2:** The difference between the duration and the range is not clear for us, we agree to remove any of them.  **Q3:** Fine to discuss the time offset to ensure that gNB can have enough time to reallocate unused PUSCH occasion. The fixed offset can be configured by RRC signaling.  **Q4:** We support to indicate UTO-UCI with multiple configurations. Option 2-2 can also be used to indicate unused CG occasions of multiple CG configurations. |
| **SONY** | **Q1:** Option 2-2 is our preference. It provides more flexibility and less overhead.  **Q2:** It is good to have a clarity on range. Whether it is the same as duration (time) or the number of occasion(s).  **Q3:** The timing offset is determined to cover the processing time at the UE side. It can be a fixed number.  **Q4:** We support indicated UTO-UCI can be applicable to CG PUSCHs corresponding to multiple configurations. It provides flexibilities, potentially reduced overhead. We can further study this. |
| **TCL** | **Q1:** Support Option 2-1, it seems coarse indication granularity can be achieved by Option 2-2 comparing with Option 2-1, with this way, the signaling overhead will be decreased, however, the flexibility is limited, in addition, as the UCI is carried by CG-PUSCH, the corresponding resources reserved for UCI transmission is minuscule within the PUSCH which is used for large packet transmission. Thus, Option 2-1 is preferred.  **Q2**: Fine with either ‘range’ or ‘duration’.  **Q3:** Ok to further discussion of time offset, it would be beneficial to have sufficient time offset for gNB to re-allocate the un-used TOs.  **Q4:** We support that the indicated UTO-UCI can be extended to multiple CG configurations. |

## 3.2 When the UCI is sent? (UCI transmission occasions)

**Moderator’s summary:**

In previous meeting, the following agreement was made:

**Agreement**

For dynamic indication of unused CG PUSCH occasion(s) based on a UCI, the following options for further down-scoping with possible revision, are considered for the transmission occasion of the UCI:

* **Option 1:** A transmitted CG PUSCH, includes the UCI.
  + FFS details
* **Option 2:** A transmitted CG PUSCH includes the UCI, if it is transmitted in an occasion determined by RRC.
  + FFS details
* **Option 3:** A transmitted CG PUSCH includes the UCI, if it is transmitted in a pre-defined transmission occasion.
  + FFS details
    - Example of a pre-determined occasion: 1st configured PUSCH TO in a CG period or 1st configured PUSCH TO in a multiple CG periods
* **Option 4:** A transmitted CG PUSCH includes the UCI, if it is transmitted in a transmission occasion determined satisfying given condition(s).
  + FFS details
    - Examples of a condition: A first transmitted PUSCH in a CG period, or a first PUSCH transmission within a multiple of CG periods.

Other options are not precluded. Proponent companies to provide details.

**Companies’ view:**

* **Option 1:**
  + **Yes:** E///, QC, vivo, ZTE, HW/HiSi, Nokia, Lenovo, Google (modification), MTK, Samsung, Apple, DENSO, Intel
  + **No:** DCM
* **Option 2:** FW , ZTE, IDC, xiaomi, DENSO
* **Option 3:** 
  + **Yes:** Spreadtrum, HW/HiSi, xiaomi, OPPO, New H3C, SONY
  + **No:** Nokia
* **Option 4:**
  + **Yes:** FGI, Intel, SONY
  + **No:** E///, Nokia, DCM
* **Other options:** FW (MAC CE/DCI), IDC (L1/L2)

**Moderator’s observation:**

**Observation 1:** Majority of companies support Option 1 and opposed by one companies. Option 4 has the least supporting companies while it is opposed by 3 companies.

**Observation 2:** Regarding Option 2 and 3, they are supported equally while a company opposes Option 3.

Table 6: Summary of Contributions inputs for Section 3.2

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Contributions inputs** |
| Futurewei | **Proposal 7**: Support that gNB can transmit, to UE, RRC message(s) (or MAC CE/DCI) indicating the candidate positions for UCI transmission (i.e., Option 2). |
| Ericsson | **Proposal 21** For dynamic indication of unused CG PUSCH occasion(s) based on a UCI, for the transmission occasion of the UCI, Option 4 is not supported.  **Proposal 22** For dynamic indication of unused CG PUSCH occasion(s) based on a UCI, for the transmission occasion of the UCI, any transmitted CG PUSCH, includes the UCI (i.e., Option 1). |
| Qualcomm | **Proposal 7**: For transmission occasions of the UCI indicating unused CG PUSCH occasion(s)  \* Support Option 1: A transmitted CG PUSCH includes the UCI  \* FFS: The first transmitted PUSCH over CG PUSCH occasions indicated by the same UCI includes the UCI |
| vivo | **Proposal 12**: For CG PUSCH(s) to include the UCI providing information about unused CG PUSCH occasions, each transmitted CG PUSCH includes the UCI. |
| ZTE/Sanechips | **Observation 11**: Considering the efficiency and reliability, transmitting the UCI in one CG PUSCH transmission occasion is more suitable.  **Proposal 10**: The signaling overhead of the UCI signaling should be considered for down selection of Option 1or Option 2.  **Proposal 11**: Support UCI signaling is transmitted in the first valid/transmitted CG PUSCH. |
| Spreadtrum Comm. | **Proposal 5**: For dynamic indication of unused CG PUSCH occasion(s) based on a UCI, support that a transmitted CG PUSCH includes the UCI, if it is transmitted in a pre-defined transmission, examples of a pre-determined occasion can be as following:  • 1st configured PUSCH TO in a CG period or 1st configured PUSCH TO in a multiple CG periods  • The last configured PUSCH TO in a CG period or last configured PUSCH TO in a multiple CG periods.  • Both the penultimate configured and last configured PUSCH TO in a CG period, or both the penultimate configured and last configured PUSCH TO in a multiple CG periods. |
| IDC | **Proposal 8**: The location for transmitting the UCI on unused PUSCH occasions is configured in RRC or indicated in L1/L2 signaling |
| HW/HiSi | **Proposal 8**: Regarding when to transmit the UCI, Option 3 and Option 1 (if UCI size is small) is preferred. |
| Nokia/NSB | **Proposal 10**: Do not support Option 3 and Option 4 for the possible transmission occasions of the UCI.  **Proposal 11**: Support Option 1, sending UCI indication every PUSCH and only once per slot.  \* FFS: The benefits of other UCI periodicities can be further discussed and if shown to be beneficial, RRC configured periodicities can be considered (Option 2). |
| Lenovo | **Proposal 4**: A transmitted CG PUSCH includes the UCI. |
| LG | **Proposal 7**: URI is transmitted on every CG occasion where UE sends PUSCH. (Option 1) |
| Google Inc. | **Proposal 9**: Support a modified version of Option 1:  \* A transmitted CG PUSCH within a confiurable time window includes the UCI. |
| MTK | **Proposal 11**: UCI is multiplexed in PUSCH at every transmission occasion (e.g., Option-1). The last PUSCH TO does not carry UCI if the unused TO indication is limited to PUSCH within the current CG period. |
| Samsung | **Proposal 5**: If a UE is configured to provide the UCI for a CG PUSCH configuration, there are no restrictions on the CG-PUSCH transmissions that include the UCI (Option 1). |
| FGI | **Proposal 4**: The UCI is multiplexed in the first transmitted PUSCH in a CG period. |
| Apple | **Proposal 9**: A transmitted CG PUSCH, includes the UCI (option 1). |
| xiaomi | **Observation 6**: Sending CG PUSCH carrying the dynamic indication based on UCI in the TO in the first half of CG period can better meet the timeline, and the UCI can also indicate more TOs in the CG period.  **Proposal 5**: Details of option 2 and option 3 should be updated as follows:  \* Option 2: A transmitted CG PUSCH includes the UCI, if it is transmitted in an occasion determined by RRC.  o A number N can be configured by RRC, and the first N PUSCH TOs within a CG period/ a multiple CG periods includes the UCI, and N=1  \* Option 3: A transmitted CG PUSCH includes the UCI, if it is transmitted in a pre-defined transmission occasion.  o A number N can be predefined by specification, and the first N PUSCH TOs within a CG period/ a multiple CG periods includes the UCI, and N=1 |
| NTT DOCOMO | **Proposal 7**: For determining which CG PUSCH includes the UCI, option 1 and option 4 are not supported. Support option 2 or option 3. |
| Panasonic | **Proposal 5**: The gNB should define the candidate PUSCH occasions for carrying the unused indication by RRC. |
| Sony | **Proposal 4**: Support a transmitted CG PUSCH includes the UCI, if it is transmitted in a pre-defined transmission occasion (known as Option 3) and if it is transmitted in a transmission occasion determined satisfying given condition(s) (known as Option 4). |
| OPPO | **Proposal 4**: The UCI is transmitted in the first N PUSCH TO(s) in a multi-PUSCHs CG period, where N is configured by RRC. |
| New H3C | **Proposal 2**: For dynamic indication of unused CG PUSCH occasion(s) based on a UCI, Option 3 on a transmitted CG PUSCH including the UCI, if it is transmitted in a pre-defined transmission occasion is supported. |
| DENSO Corp. | **Proposal 3**: RAN1 to study the following options regarding when the UCI is sent.  - Option.1: The UCI is multiplexed in the first transmitted CG PUSCH within a CG period.  - Option.2: The UCI is multiplexed in all transmitted CG PUSCHs. |
| Intel | **Proposal 5**: Consider the following two options for further discussion regarding TO(s) of UCI.  \* Option 1: A transmitted CG PUSCH includes the UCI.  \* Option 4: A transmitted CG PUSCH includes the UCI, if it is transmitted in a transmission occasion determined satisfying given condition(s).  o FFS details  \* Examples of a condition: A first transmitted PUSCH in a CG period, or a first PUSCH transmission within a multiple of CG periods. |
|  |  |

### 3.2.1 Initial Discussions

**Moderator’s suggestions for initial discussion:**

Based on the observations, the following is recommended.

**Moderator’s Suggestions: Aim to make decision at this meeting.**

* **Prioritize Option 1, 2, 3.**
* **Among this options, discuss whether it is possible to support Option 1.**

**Question:** Please provide your view in the table below regarding the following questions:

* **Q1:** What is your view regarding Moderator’s suggestions.
* **Q2:** Discuss any clarification/correction/comment/question on Moderator’s summary and suggestions or any other aspect helping the discussion and needed decisions.

**Note: Please ensure the information in companies’ contributions are considered for discussions.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| **ZTE, Sanechips** | For simple UL traffic of XR, jitter is considered as ignored (at least in the study item). In this case, we think Option 3 is sufficient, and can work well.  Whereas, we can also accept more conservative approach, i.e., option 1.(with multiple UCI transmissions) |
| **Nokia, NSB** | We agree with moderator’s suggestion to prioritize Option 1, 2, 3. Furthermore, Option 3 can be covered by Option 2 via configuring periodicities in RRC. Therefore, we propose to narrow down the scope to Option 1 and Option 2. Our preference is Option 1 as it is the most reliable and easy from spec point of view. If RRC configured periodicities (Option 2) are shown to be more beneficial than sending UCI in every CG-PUSCH, it is also ok to support Option 2. |
| **CATT** | Since overhead is not any issue, Option 1 to have UCI transmitted on every CG-PUSCH. When UCI indicated unused CG occasions are sent at every CG-PUSCH, the gNB could use the repetitive reception of UCI for confirmation with the same bitmap values of UCI. If the gNB receive different UCI values, the updated UCI values could be used for correction or over-write of previous values. |
| **New H3C** | We support option 3 is sufficient and there is different between option 2 and option 3 because option2 need RRC configuration and introduce signaling overhead. So we suggest focusing on option 1 and option 3. |
| **Qualcomm** | Support Option 1 at least. Option 1 is simple and more robust than the other solutions. |
| **Google** | We proposed to modify Option-1 to give flexibility to the gNB to configure the occasions where the UCI could be transmitted as shown below. This allows for a trade-off between reliability, flexibility and overhead.    Can the moderator please add this alternative under Option 1 to check the support, i.e.,   * **Option 1-1:** A transmitted CG PUSCH, includes the UCI. * **Option 1-2:** A transmitted CG PUSCH within a configured window, includes the UCI. |
| **Samsung** | Option 1 is superior. There is no issue with UCI overhead (few UCI bits vs. thousands of data bits in a CG-PUSCH), offers best reliability which is important for the purpose of that UCI, and does not unnecessarily complicate the specifications. |
| **Futurewei** | Option 1 has highest flexibility and robust. Even the signaling overhead of Option 1 is not a big problem as mentioned by some companies, the complexity for both UE side and gNB side is still too high, since UE needs to perform encoding and multiplexing for each of the TOs and gNB also needs to perform corresponding detection for each of the TOs. Another problem for Option 1 is that the UCI indication could not be used by gNB if the transmission occasion of the UCI is too close to the unused transmission occasion indicated by UCI. Hence, Option 1 is not preferred from our point of view.  Option 3 and Option 4 are almost similar, and have the lowest flexibility and robust compared with other options, especially in dynamic jitter impact situation for XR traffic, for instance, if considering jitter impacts on the 1st configured PUSCCH transmission occasion, the fixed 1st configured PUSCCH transmission occasion may be not a good choice to carry UCI.  In Option 2, the transmitted CG PUSCH including the UCI can be indicated by RRC, which are fully flexible and robust enough, except for some extra downlink indication signaling overhead. However, in our understanding, Option 2 is not necessary to be limited to only RRC signaling, and dynamic signaling including MAC CE and DCI (e.g., CG activation DCI) can also be considered as well. Therefore, from our point of view, Option 2 is preferred compared with other three options. |
| **InterDigital** | Ok with the suggestion to prioritize some options. We are ok with Options 1 and 2, with some preference towards Option 2 due to lower overhead and the possibility for the UE to provide info on unused PUSCHs when the network may need and make best use of the info. |
| **Xiaomi** | We are fine with moderator’s suggestion to prioritize Option 1, 2, 3.  A CG occasion later in a CG period carries the UCI, the CG occasion that is indicated as “unused” may not meet the timeline. Whichever option is adopted, it should be ensured that the UCI is transmitted in CG occasion in the first half of the CG period as possible. |
| Apple | **We support Option 1 for the reason provided in our contribution: 1. Simpleness for UE/gNB operation, 2. Robust operation, 3. Simpleness in specification development.** |
| **vivo** | We support option 1.  For other options, there would be issue of UCI transmission if the CG occasions for UCI are missed. For example, if packet arrival time is after the CG occasion for UCI, UE does not have the opportunity to transmit the UCI. Furthermore, if a UCI in the CG occasion that is configured for UCI transmission is missed by gNB, gNB has to blind detect all the sub-sequent TOs since these occasions may or may not be used. |
| **OPPO** | We support moderator’s suggestion to prioritize Option 1, 2, 3.  Among these three options, we do not recommend option 1, because redundant information is transmitted, especially in the last TO per CG period. |
| **TCL** | Option 1 is ok for us. |
| **DOCOMO** | We support moderator’s suggestion to prioritize Option 1, 2, 3.  We slightly prefer option 2/3. But option 1 is also fine for us. |
| **LG** | We support Option 1. It is simple and robust solution.  Option 2 or 3 would limiting the occasion where UE can start the transmission. |
| **MediaTek** | We are fine with the suggestion. We prefer Option-1. |
| **Panasonic** | Q1: We are fine with the suggestions.  Q2: We think again that the applicability of unused indication (to a single or multiple CG configuration) should be discussed first. If the unused indication is applicable to a single CG configuration, there is no need to send indication over the last occasion(s). |
| **Spreadtrum** | We are fine with moderator’s suggestion to prioritize Option 1, 2, 3. Option 1 and Option 3 is fine for us. |
| **SONY** | We are OK with moderator’s suggestion. Our preference is mainly Option 3. Considering overhead is not an issue (as identified by the majority of the companies) then we are OK with Option 1 as it is a simpler solution. |
| **CMCC** | Regarding the UCI transmission occasions, we support Option 1 because it achieves the highest reliability. Furthermore, in order to guarantee gNB has enough time to recycle the unused CG PUSCH transmission occasions, Option 1 can be further modified by introducing a time window such that only CG PUSCH occasions within the time window can be used to transmit the UCI. The time window can be pre-defined/configured to avoid gNB’s blind detection. |
| **Huawei/HiSilicon** | We suggest not consider jitter for CG enhancement.  So Option 3 is enough. |
| **FGI** | We are fine with moderator’s suggestion. We support Option 2 and Option 3 since the UCI is not needed to be repeatedly transmitted in every TO. |
| **Lenovo** | Agree with FL’s suggestion. Considering UCI size is generally small compared to a UL XR TB size, we suggest selecting option 1, which has less specification impact compared to other options. We can also support options 2/3. |
| **Intel** | Ok with Option 1 and to drop Option 4 based on majority view |
| **Ericsson** | Agree w Moderator’s suggestion and OK to support Option 1.  Option 4 is not acceptable to us. |
| **Moderator** | **Companies’ view:**   * **Option 1:**   + **Yes:** E///, QC, vivo, ZTE, HW/HiSi, Nokia, Lenovo, Google (modification), MTK, Samsung, Apple, DENSO, Intel   + **No:** DCM * **Option 2:** FW , ZTE, IDC, xiaomi, DENSO * **Option 3:**    + **Yes:** Spreadtrum, HW/HiSi, xiaomi, OPPO, New H3C, SONY   + **No:** Nokia * **Option 4:**   + **Yes:** FGI, Intel, SONY   + **No:** E///, Nokia, DCM * **Other options:** FW (MAC CE/DCI), IDC (L1/L2)   **Suggestion 1: Prioritize Option 1, 2, 3.**   * **OK:** ZTE/Sanechips (Opt 3), Nokia/NSB (opt1/opt2), New H3C (Opt1/Opt3), QC, Google, Samsung, FW, IDC (Opt1/opt2), xiaomi, Apple, vivo, OPPO, TCL, DCM, LG, MTK, Panasonic, spreadtrum (Opt1/opt3), Sony (Opt1/Opt3), CMCC, HW/HiSi (Opt3), FGI (opt2/Opt3), Lenovo, Intel, Ericsson * **Not OK: -**   **Suggestion 2: Among this options, discuss whether it is possible to support Option 1.**   * **OK to compromise:** ZTE/Sanechips, DCM, Spreadtrum, Sony * **OK:** Nokia/NSB, CATT, QC, Google (modified), Samsung, FW, Apple, vivo, TCL, LG, MTK, CMCC, Lenovo, Intel, Ericsson * **Not OK:** OPPO, HW/HiSi, FGI   **@Google**: Option 1 with a configured window is in fact not Option 1 any more, and more like Option 3.  **@HW/HiSi**: It is not clear if Option 1 is related to jitter. Companies reasoned that the benefits are simplicity and robustness, etc. Considering the status, could HW/HiSi compromise to Option 1?  **@OPPO/FGI**: True that redundant UCI would be transmitted, but on the other hand provides robustness in case of mis-detection such that gNB can benefit the unused indication. Considering the status, could FGI and OPPO compromise to Option 1?  **@All:** For online session, Moderator suggests to remove Option 4. Then, further suggests to compromise to Option 1. I hope companies supporting Option 2 and/or 3, can be flexible to consider the compromise for progress. Very appreciated!  **Proposal 2-2-1:**  For a CG PUSCH configuration, the UTO-UCI is included in any CG PUSCH that is transmitted (that is Option 1 in corresponding agreement in RAN1#112).   * FFS details * Note: The term “UTO-UCI” refers to the “UCI that provides information about unused CG PUSCH transmission occasions” for convenience. |

### 3.2.2 Intermediate Discussions

**Moderator’s recommendation:**

Considering the discussion in initial round, Moderator proposes the following:

**Proposal 2-2-1:**

For a CG PUSCH configuration, the UTO-UCI is included in any CG PUSCH that is transmitted (that is Option 1 in corresponding agreement in RAN1#112).

* FFS details
* Note: The term “UTO-UCI” refers to the “UCI that provides information about unused CG PUSCH transmission occasions” for convenience.

**Questions:** Please provide your view in the table below regarding the above proposal:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| New H3C | OK with FL proposal |
| **Panasonic** | We do not support. As we mentioned earlier, it is not clear whether the unused indication only applies to the PUSCH occasions within the current CG configuration or to multiple (or all) CG configurations. If it only applies to a current CG configuration, there is no need to send the unused indication over the last TO(s) |
| **CATT** | We support the proposal |
| **Nokia, NSB** | **Thank you for the proposal. We suggest modifying the wording as follows:**  **Proposal 2-2-1:**  For a CG PUSCH configuration, the UTO-UCI is included in ~~any~~ every CG PUSCH that is transmitted (that is Option 1 in corresponding agreement in RAN1#112).   * FFS details * Note: The term “UTO-UCI” refers to the “UCI that provides information about unused CG PUSCH transmission occasions” for convenience. |
| **ZTE, Sanechips** | We observed if we consider jitter cases for option 1, then whether or not detect first pre-configured PUSCH occasion also increses the gNB’s complexity(similar as option 4 actually), so could FL or anyone can clarify.  Option 1 is not perfect, but can be acceptable (e.g.,may exist mior waste of UE’s signalling of UCI as Panasonic commented, however, some limitations can be further considered from the timeline impact) |
| **OPPO** | We agree with Panasonic that the unused indication should not be transmitted in the last TO(s) per period. We think the UTO-UCI shoul be transmitted in the first N CG PUSCH TO(s) in a CG period, where N can be configured by RRC. Compared to option 1, there is no additional mis-detection but efficiency improvement. |
| **vivo** | Ok in principle (with Nokia’s update). However, we think by option 1, whether the unused indication only applies to the PUSCH occasions within the current CG configuration or to multiple (or all) CG configurations should be further discussed. We suggest to add more details for FFS in the sub-bullet to make it clear for the next step discussion. |
| **Moderator** | **@Panasonic/ZTE/OPPO:** Option 1 provides reliability and robustness. See for example Ericsson contirbutions that had previously preferred Option 2 and 3.  The issue with Jitter is not very clear. The information provided by UTO-UCI should be consistent. I guess the concern is for redundant information, but considering mis-detection at gNB the redundant information improves robustness. If we use Option 2 and 3, and gNB misses that occassion that UCI is reported, the whole benefit of skipping blind-detection for the unsued would be missed.  **Proposal 2-2-1:**  For a CG PUSCH configuration, the UTO-UCI is included in ~~any~~ every CG PUSCH that is transmitted (that is Option 1 in corresponding agreement in RAN1#112).   * FFS details * Note: The term “UTO-UCI” refers to the “UCI that provides information about unused CG PUSCH transmission occasions” for convenience. |
| **Qualcomm** | Agree with Nokia proposal suggestion |
| **LG** | Agree with the modifed proposal. |
| **DOCOMO** | Fine with the proposal. |
| **Panasonic** | The issue of miss-detection arises from the fact that UE may skip transmitting on some PUSCH occasions, it is not related to the sending an indication over a subset of PUSCH occasions (e.g., Option 2 or Option 3) when both the UE and the gNB are aware of them. The miss-detection still may happen for Option 1, if a UE sends an unused indication over an earlier PUSCH occasion that is not decoded correctly by the gNB and then the UE skips the later PUSCH transmission. Therefore, in our view there is no difference on the reliability and robustness among Option 1, 2, and 3.  In addition, it is not yet clear what kind of information could be carried by the unused indication. For instance, if the unused indication implies a duration within a maximum duration, there could be a case that there is no PUSCH occasion within the maximum duration (as shown in the following figure). So, there is no point to send an indication for such cases. That is why we think the gNB can configure a subset of PUSCH occasions that UE can send unused indication accordingly. This would reduce the signaling overhead and avoid unnecessary PUSCH transmission by the UE, reducing the power consumption.  Our suggestion is to first decide on the type of unused indication (e.g., the number of unused occasions or duration) and then decide when to send the indication. |
| **New H3C** | Fine with updated proposal. |
| **SONY** | We think the updated proposal from Nokia is essentially the same with the one from the FL. We are OK. |
| **Huawei/HiSilicon** | Our preference is Option 3 because it’s enough. Not considering the jitter, the first configured CG PUSCH would be used with high probability. In addition, the reliability can be improved by adjusting the Beta-offset.  However, considering the progress, if majority of companies prefer Option 1, we are OK to compromise to Option 1. |
| **TCL** | Fine with the modified proposal. |
| **Futurewei** | Even the signaling overhead of Option 1 is not a big problem as mentioned by some companies, the complexity for both UE side and gNB side is still too high, since UE needs to perform encoding and multiplexing for each of the TOs and gNB also needs to perform corresponding detection for UTO-UCI on each of the TOs. Another problem for Option 1 is that the UCI indication could not be used by gNB if the transmission occasion of the UCI is too close to the unused transmission occasion indicated by UCI. Hence, Option 1 is not preferred from our point of view.  In Option 2, the transmitted CG PUSCH including the UCI can be indicated by RRC, which are fully flexible and robust enough, except for some extra downlink indication signaling overhead. However, in our understanding, Option 2 is not necessary to be limited to only RRC signaling, and dynamic signaling including MAC CE and DCI (e.g., CG activation DCI) can also be considered as well. Therefore, from our point of view, Option 2 is preferred compared with other three options. |
| **InterDigital** | We prefer Option 2 given the benefit of sending the UCI only when the network expects it and lower complexity at UE for not having to encode/multiplex in each PUSCH.  We are fine to support Option 1 if majority of companies are ok. |
| **Google** | We don’t support the proposal. We prefer Option 2 or Option 3.  Regarding Option 1:   * As mentioned by Oppo and Panasonic, there is no need to transmit on the last TO, and maybe even the few last TOs as the timeline is probably not enough to recycle the CG occasions towards the end of the CG period and also the last TO is not useful anymore unless we agree to have cross-CG periods indication. * Also, as mentioned by ZTE and Huawei, the jitter can impact the first few TOs. * Also, Option 1 means more UCI overhead and more UE complexity to encode and send UCI with every CG PUSCH transmission.   We proposed to use a window configured by the gNB to address the issues above. |
| **Spreadtrum** | Our preference is Option 3 and share the same with Huawei.  We are fine to support Option 1 if majority of companies are ok. |
| **Moderator** | **@All:** It seems to companies currently are not OK to support/compromise Option 1 and prefer Option 2 (Spreadtrum Option 3, but also same view as HW, hope it is ok to include Opt. 2 additionally, and not Opt. 3). Therefore, I include both options to select from during the online session.  **Proposal 2-2-1 (updated):**  **Select on the options below:**   * **Option 1**: For a CG PUSCH configuration, the UTO-UCI is included in every CG PUSCH that is transmitted (that is Option 1 in corresponding agreement in RAN1#112).   + FFS details * **Option 2**: For a CG PUSCH configuration, the transmission occasion(s) that the corresponding CG PUSCH(s) should include UTO-UCI when it is transmitted, is determined by RRC (that is Option 2 in corresponding agreement in RAN1#112).   + FFS details * Note: The term “UTO-UCI” refers to the “UCI that provides information about unused CG PUSCH transmission occasions” for convenience. |
| **MediaTek** | We support Option-1. |
| **Samsung** | We support Option 1. There is no technical reason for Option 2. |
| **CATT** | We support Option 1. |
| **Lenovo** | OK (preference: option 1) |
| **Intel** | Support Option 1. Ok to move forward with **Proposal 2-2-1 (updated):** |
| **Panasonic** | Support the revised proposal. |
| **Moderator** | **Summary of views**   * **OK (Option 1)**: New H3C, Nokia, CATT, vivo, QC, LG, DCM, Sony, MTK, Samsung, CATT, Lenovo, Ericsson, Intel, ZTE (compromise), HW/HiSi (compromise), IDC (compromised), Spreadtrum (compromise) * **OK to compromise to Option 1**: ZTE, HW/HiSi, IDC, Spreadtrum * **Not OK (Option 1)**: Panasonic (Opt 2), OPPO, FW (opt 2), Google (2/3)   **Proposal 2-2-1 (updated):**  **Select on the options below:**   * **Option 1**: For a CG PUSCH configuration, the UTO-UCI is included in every CG PUSCH that is transmitted (that is Option 1 in corresponding agreement in RAN1#112).   + FFS details * **Option 2**: For a CG PUSCH configuration, the transmission occasion(s) that the corresponding CG PUSCH(s) should include UTO-UCI when it is transmitted, is determined by RRC (that is Option 2 in corresponding agreement in RAN1#112).   + FFS details * Note: The term “UTO-UCI” refers to the “UCI that provides information about unused CG PUSCH transmission occasions” for convenience. |

## 3.3 How the UCI is sent? (UCI type, encoding, mux)

**Moderator’s summary:**

In previous meeting, the following agreements were made:

**Agreement**

The physical channel that carries the UCI that provides information about unused CG PUSCH transmission occasions is CG PUSCH.

**Agreement**

Encoding and multiplexing for “the UCI that provides information about unused CG PUSCH transmission occasions” in a CG PUSCH applies encoding and multiplexing procedures for CG-UCI as baseline.

* FFS on details

**Agreement**

Consider the following alternatives for “the UCI that provides information about unused CG PUSCH transmission occasions” for down-selection or revision

* Alt. 1: “The UCI that provides information about unused CG PUSCH transmission occasions” is defined as a new UCI.
  + FFS on details
* Alt. 2: “The UCI that provides information about unused CG PUSCH transmission occasions” is added as new field(s) to the CG-UCI.
  + FFS on details
* Alt. 3: “The UCI that provides information about unused CG PUSCH transmission occasions” replaces/re-purposes some field(s) of the CG-UCI.
  + FFS on details

**Companies’ view:**

**UCI type:**

Regarding when the UCI type based on Alt. 1, 2 or 3, companies views are summarized as the following:

* **Alt. 1:** E///, QC (lic), vivo, ZTE/Sanechips, Spreadtrum, IDC, HW/HiSi, DCM (licensed), Nokia, Samsung, FGI, CMCC, Lenovo, CATT, Panasonic, H3C, Sony, CAICT, Intel
* **Alt. 2:** DCM (unlic.), QC (unlic), LG, MTK, Google
* **Alt. 3:** Spreadtrum, Nokia, MTK, xiaomi, CAICT, [Apple]

**Details of encoding and multiplexing the UCI:**

* Reuse the multiplexing and encoding rule of CG UCI signaling
  + E///, ZTE/Sanechips, CAITC, Samsung, DCM
* Priority of the UCI
* Same priority as corresponding configured grant CG PUCHs (similarly to CG-UCI)
  + E///
* Beta-offset
  + (CAICT): The beta-offset value of UTO-UCI could be the same as that of HARQ-ACK and/or CG-UCI.
  + (Samsung): The UCI indicating unused CG PUSCH transmission occasions is a new UCI that is encoded and multiplexed as HARQ-ACK. If operation on shared spectrum is to be supported and if CG-UCI is configured, the UCI is also appended to CG-UCI prior to encoding and multiplexing.
  + (Ericsson): Beta offset can be configured for UTO-UCI and reused instead of beta-offset for CG-UCI, when applicable.
    - If CG-UCI is not present, the beta offset for UTO-UCI is used in the procedures instead of CG-UCI beta offset, when applicable.
    - If UTO-UCI is jointly encoded with CG-UCI, the same beta offset is used in the procedures instead of CG-UCI beta offset, when applicable.

**Moderator’s observation:**

**Observation 1:** On UCI type, clearly majority of companies prefer Alt. 1. Some companies propose for use Alt. 1 for licensed band and Al.2/Alt. 3 for unlicensed band Moderator explains that for unlicensed, Alt.1 and Alt.2/Alt.3 are practically the same where the total UCI includes legacy CG-UCI and the UCI with “unused information”. This is obtained for Alt.1 by appending/cascading and for Alt. 2/Alt. 3 by extension, replacing. However, with Alt.1, from specification point of view, the properties of “the UCI for unused” can be independently maintained as it is a new feature and not mixed with legacy CG-UCI. Therefore, Moderator recommends Alt. 1.

**Observation 2**: for encoding and multiplexing, companies suggest to “reuse” CG-UCI procedures.

**Observation 3**: On priority, it seems to have the same priority as the corresponding CG PUSCH is a reasonable approach. That implies the priority of this UCI would be the same as CG-UCI if it is present. With respect to multiplexing with HARQ-ACK and CSI, the same rule as legacy would be reused.

**Observation 4**: On bets offset, there are two approaches that mainly different in case CG-UCI is not present: when CG-UCI is not present, configured a beta offset for new UCI (E///) or use HARQ-ACK beta-offset (CIATC, Samsung). When CG-UCI is present, use the same (E///, Samsung, CIATC). In moderator understanding, E/// reuses the CG-UCI framework when CG-UCI is present or not. Samsung and CAICT reuses CG-UCI framework when CG-UCI is present and HARQ-ACK when CG-UCI is not present (even if HARQ-ACK itself is not multiplexed in CG-PUSCH).

Table 7: Summary of Contributions inputs for Section 3.3

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Contributions inputs** |
| Ericsson | **Proposal 18** "The UCI that provides information about unused CG PUSCH transmission occasions" (i.e., UTO-UCI) is defined as a new UCI (Alt.1 is supported).  **Proposal 19** For a configured grant configuration, UTO-UCI if present has the same priority as the configured grant PUSCHs.  **Proposal 20** The existing CG-UCI encoding and multiplexing procedures are reused for encoding and multiplexing of UTO-UCI in a configured grant PUSCH in absence or presence of other UCIs being multiplexed in the PUSCH, by apply the following adjustments:  \* If CG-UCI is not present and/or not multiplexed in PUSCH, UTO-UCI is used instead of CG-UCI in the corresponding procedures for encoding of CG-UCI and/or HARQ-ACK and/or CSI, whichever is present.  \* If CG-UCI is present and is multiplexed in PUSCH, the jointly encoded UTO-UCI and CG-UCI (by appending UTO-UCI to CG-UCI) is used instead of CG-UCI in the corresponding procedures for encoding of CG-UCI and/or HARQ-ACK and/or CSI, whichever present.  \* Beta offset can be configured for UTO-UCI and reused instead of beta-offset for CG-UCI, when applicable.  \* If CG-UCI is not present, the beta offset for UTO-UCI is used in the procedures instead of CG-UCI beta offset, when applicable.  \* If UTO-UCI is jointly encoded with CG-UCI, the same beta offset is used in the procedures instead of CG-UCI beta offset, when applicable. |
| Qualcomm | **Proposal 6**: For the UCI that provides information of unused CG PUSCH transmission occasion(s)  \* When the UE is configured to transmit the CG-UCI, the UCI is added as new field(s) into the CG-UCI  \* Otherwise, it is transmitted in a new UCI |
| vivo | **Proposal 14**: The UCI that provides information about unused CG PUSCH transmission occasions is defined as a new UCI, i.e., a new table with field(s) dedicated to providing the information. |
| ZTE/Sanechips | **Observation 10**: Beta offset parameter can be adjusted to guarantee the reliability of the UCI.  **Proposal 13**: Support Alt 1: design new UCI signaling providing information about unused CG PUSCH transmission occasions.  **Proposal 14**: Reuse the multiplexing and encoding rule of CG UCI signaling for the new UCI signaling. |
| Spreadtrum Comm. | **Proposal 4**: A new field or replaces/re-purposes some field(s) in the CG-UCI to provide information about unused CG PUSCH TOs should be further studied. |
| IDC | **Proposal 9**: Define new UCI for providing information on unused CG PUSCH occasions (Alt-1) |
| HW/HiSi | **Proposal 10**: The UCI that indicates unused CG PUSCH TO(s) is defined as a new UCI (i.e., Alt 1).  **Proposal 11**: Different from CG-UCI, the encoding and multiplexing order of XR UCI should be lower than HARQ-ACK. |
| NTT DOCOMO | **Proposal 6**:  \* In licensed spectrum, support Alt 1, i.e. "The UCI that provides information about unused CG PUSCH transmission occasions" is defined as a new UCI.  \* Multiplexing/encoding of the new UCI on CG PUSCH can reuse multiplexing/encoding procedures for legacy CG-UCI on CG-PUSCH in unlicensed spectrum.  \* In unlicensed spectrum, support Alt 2, i.e. "The UCI that provides information about unused CG PUSCH transmission occasions" is added as new field(s) to the CG-UCI. |
| LG | **Proposal 15**: Support Alt. 2 to handle URI with CG-UCI.  **Proposal 16**: if cg-UCI-Multiplexing is configured, drop URI and HARQ-ACK is multiplexed into PUSCH when the HARQ-ACK PUCCH and PUSCH with URI are overlapped in a time. |
| Nokia/NSB | **Proposal 12**: Consider Alt1 or Alt3 and introduce a new UCI Table with indication of unused TOs (Alt 1) or replace/re-purpose some field(s) of the CG-UCI depending on the licensed/unlicensed operation (Alt 3).  **Proposal 13**: RAN1 to discuss/agree how UCI is sent after UCI table is agreed due to the dependency of UCI transmission on the UCI table. |
| MTK | **Proposal 10**: UCI that indicates the unused PUSCH occasions shall re-use the existing CG-UCI format (e.g., Alt-2 or Alt-3). |
| Samsung | **Proposal 4**: The UCI indicating unused CG PUSCH transmission occasions is a new UCI that is encoded and multiplexed as HARQ-ACK. If operation on shared spectrum is to be supported and if CG-UCI is configured, the UCI is also appended to CG-UCI prior to encoding and multiplexing. |
| FGI | **Proposal 3**: The UCI that provides information about unused CG PUSCH transmission occasions is defined as a new UCI. |
| CMCC | **Proposal 8**. Support Alt. 1 to define the UCI that provides information about unused CG PUSCH transmission occasions as a new UCI. |
| xiaomi | **Proposal 8**: Information about unused CG PUSCH transmission occasions can replace some field(s) of the CG-UCI. |
| Google | **Proposal 10**: Support Alt. 2  \* "The UCI that provides information about unused CG PUSCH transmission occasions" is added as new field(s) to the CG-UCI. |
| Lenovo | **Proposal 12**: New UCI type indicates unused CG occasions.  o FFS: beta offset and UCI priority |
| CATT | **Proposal 4**: For the UCI carried the unused CG TOs information (UTO-UCI), it could be multiplexed in PUSCH as following:  • The information bit of the UCI can be cascaded with HARQ-ACK and/or CG-UCI information bits for the simplicity.  • The beta-offset value of UTO-UCI could be the same as that of HARQ-ACK and/or CG-UCI.  **Proposal 5**: The Alt.1:"The UCI that provides information about unused CG PUSCH transmission occasions would be defined as a new UCI" should be supported. |
| Panasonic | **Proposal 4**: The unused indication of CG PUSCHs should be introduced as a new field to the CG-UCI. |
| New H3C | **Proposal 1**: For the UCI that provides information about unused CG PUSCH transmission occasions, Alt. 1: "The UCI that provides information about unused CG PUSCH transmission occasions" is defined as a new UCI is supported. |
| Sony | **Proposal 3**: Support a new UCI (i.e., Alt.1) to provide information about the unused CG PUSCH transmission occasions and also potentially other new parameters. |
| CAICT | **Proposal 5**: The UCI that provides information about unused CG PUSCH transmission occasions" is added as new field(s) to the CG-UCI, or replaces/re-purposes some field(s) of the CG-UCI. |
| Intel | **Proposal 6**: Introduce a new UCI to indicate the number of unused PUSCH occasions.  \* Whether to multiplex the new UCI to CG PUSCH should be configurable |
| Apple | Design examples   |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | HPID | NDI | Channel Access info | Occasion-usage indication | Other indication (e.g., M)S) | | Unlicensed access | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |  | | Licensed access | No (if HPID is determined from specification & retransmission over CG is not supported) | No (if retransmission over CG is not supported) | No | Yes |  | |

### 3.3.1 Initial Discussions

**Moderator’s suggestions for initial discussion:**

Based on the observations, the followings are suggested.

**Moderator’s Suggestions: Aim to make decision at this meeting.**

* Consider Atl.1
* “Reuse” CG-UCI multiplexing/encoding procedures
* Same priority as the corresponding CG PUSCH
* Discuss options for Beta-offset

**Proposals according to the suggestions above:**

**Note that moderator for convenience has used the term “UTO-UCI”.**

**Proposal 2-3-1:**

* The UCI that provides information about unused CG PUSCH transmission occasions is defined as a “new UCI” (i.e. Alt. 1 of previous agreement)

**Proposal 2-3-2:**

* For a configured grant PUSCH configuration, the “UTO-UCI” has the same priority level as the configured grant PUSCH.
* Note: The term “UTO-UCI” refers to the “UCI that provides information about unused CG PUSCH transmission occasions” for convenience.

**Proposal 2-3-3:**

The existing CG-UCI encoding and multiplexing procedures are reused for encoding the “UTO-UCI” in a configured grant PUSCH in absence or presence of other UCIs being multiplexed in the PUSCH, by apply the following adjustments:

* If CG-UCI is not present and/or not multiplexed in PUSCH, the “UTO-UCI” is used instead of CG-UCI in the corresponding procedures for encoding of CG-UCI and/or HARQ-ACK and/or CSI, whichever is present.
* If CG-UCI is present and is multiplexed in PUSCH, the “UTO-UCI” is appended to CG-UCI is used instead of CG-UCI in the corresponding procedures for encoding of CG-UCI and/or HARQ-ACK and/or CSI, whichever present.
* FFS on beta offset
* Note: The term “UTO-UCI” refers to the “UCI that provides information about unused CG PUSCH transmission occasions” for convenience.

**Proposal 2-3-4:**

For multiplexing of the “UTO-UCI” on CG-PUSCH, select one of the options below for determining the beta-offset:

* Option 1:
  + Beta offset can be configured for the “UTO-UCI” and reused instead of beta-offset for CG-UCI, when applicable.
    - If CG-UCI is not present, the beta offset for the “UTO-UCI” is used in the procedures instead of CG-UCI beta offset, when applicable.
    - If the “UTO-UCI” is jointly encoded with CG-UCI, the same beta offset is used in the procedures instead of CG-UCI beta offset, when applicable.
* Option 2:
  + Beta-offset for HARQ is reused for the “UTO-UCI”.
* Note: The term “UTO-UCI” refers to the “UCI that provides information about unused CG PUSCH transmission occasions” for convenience.

**Question:** Please provide your view in the table below regarding the following questions:

* **Q1:** What is your view regarding Moderator’s suggestions and corresponding **Proposal 2-3-1**, **Proposal 2-3-2, Proposal 2-3-3 and Proposal 2-3-4**.
* **Q2:** Discuss any clarification/correction/comment/question on Moderator’s summary and suggestions or any other aspect helping the discussion and needed decisions.

**Note: Please ensure the information in companies’ contributions are considered for discussions.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| **ZTE, Sanechips** | Proposal 2-3-1: We’re supportive to this proposal.  Proposal 2-3-2: We don’t support this proposal, since we think the CG-UCI for unlicensed spectrum should be separately discussed from the UTO-UCI. And that case is actually out of the scope of WID, it may be proper to be discussed in next release.  Proposal 2-3-3: we don’t support this proposal, the reason is same as for proposal 2-3-2. |
| **Nokia, NSB** | We generally agree with Proposal 2-3-1. However, it shall be noted that for unlicensed operation additional rules will be required in order to support both CG-UCI and new UCI. Therefore, we propose to modify the proposal   * The UCI that provides information about unused CG PUSCH transmission occasions is defined as a “new UCI” for licensed band (i.e. Alt. 1 of previous agreement) * FFS: for unlicensed band   **Proposal 2-3-2, Proposal 2-3-3: Generally ok**  **Proposal 2-3-4:**  We propose the same logic from CG-UCI beta-offset configuration, which is more or less Option 1 |
| **CATT** | We are OK with Proposals 2-3-1, 2-3-2, and 2-3-3. We support option 2 of Proposal 2-3-4. |
| **New H3C** | We are fine with Proposals 2-3-1, 2-3-2, and 2-3-3. |
| **Qualcomm** | We see benefits in having a new UCI and in reusing the UCI-CG. On one hand, a new UCI allows a clean slate design where new dropping can be considered such as when there giving this UCI less priority than HARQ-ACK. On the other hand having reusing the UCI-CG has less standards impact |
| **Google** | We are fine with Proposal 2-3-1 and Proposal 2-3-2 for the sake of progress.  However, for Proposal 2-3-3 and Proposal 2-3-4, it should be clarified if we are enabling the multiple PUSCH CG feature designed for XR for unlicensed as well as this may require more work and more details to be covered. |
| **Samsung** | As there is no study/agreement to support XR in shared spectrum, all statements relating to CG-UCI should be removed. Other than that, OK with the proposals. |
| **Futurewei** | For Proposal 2-3-1: We support FL proposal because the design is for licensed carrier.  For Proposal 2-3-2: We think “UTO-UCI” may have higher priority than the configured grant PUSCH for reliability and latency reasons. So, we don’t support this FL proposal.  For Proposal 2-3-3: We are ok with FL proposal.  For Proposal 2-3-4: We are ok with Option 1. |
| **InterDigital** | We support Proposal 2-3-1. We are generally fine with Proposals 2-3-2 and 2-3-3. |
| **Xiaomi** | We agree with Proposals 2-3-2 and 2-3-3. |
| **vivo** | Support all the 4 proposals. Regarding Proposal 2-3-4, Option 1 is slightly preferred for more flexibility. |
| **OPPO** | We support Proposal 2-3-1, Proposal 2-3-2, and Proposal 2-3-3. For Proposal 2-3-4, we prefer not introduce new Beta offset and the following option is proposed:   * Option 3:   + If CG-UCI is not present, HARQ-ACK beta offset is used in the procedures instead of CG-UCI beta offset, when applicable.   + If the “UTO-UCI” is jointly encoded with CG-UCI, the same beta offset is used in the procedures instead of CG-UCI beta offset, when applicable. |
| **TCL** | We are fine with Proposal 2-3-1 and Proposal 2-3-3. We support option 1 of Proposal 2-3-4. |
| **DOCOMO** | We are fine with Proposals 2-3-1, 2-3-2, 2-3-3, and 2-3-4.  For Proposal 2-3-4, we prefer option 1. |
| **LG** | For Proposal 2-3-1: We have similar view to Nokia. We are fine to have new UCI in licensed band, but we would like to remain as FFS for unlicensed band.  For Proposal 2-3-2: We are fine with proposal 2-3-2.  For Proposal 2-3-3: we think our proposal are missed due to our typos. It is not reasonable to have same multiplexing procedure with CG-UCI at least when cg-UCI-Multiplexing is not provided.  Based on the current specification, When a UE would multiplex HARQ-ACK information in a PUSCH transmission and *cg-UCI-Multiplexing* is not provided, CG PUSCH is dropped and HARQ-ACK is transmitted to PUCCH or another PUSCH. It is not suitable for UTO-UCI since gNB can receive CG PUSCH regardless of existence of UTO-UCI. We think it should be discussed.  Also, in licensed band, CG-UCI would not be present.  **Modified Proposal 2-3-3 by LG:**  The existing CG-UCI encoding and multiplexing procedures are reused for encoding the “UTO-UCI” in a configured grant PUSCH in absence or presence of other UCIs being multiplexed in the PUSCH, by apply the following adjustments:   * If CG-UCI is not present and/or not multiplexed in PUSCH, and if *cg-UCI-Multiplexing* is not provided, the “UTO-UCI” is used instead of CG-UCI in the corresponding procedures for encoding of CG-UCI and/or HARQ-ACK and/or CSI, whichever is present.   + If *cg-UCI-Multiplexing* is provided, When a UE would multiplex HARQ-ACK information in a PUSCH transmission that include UTO-UCI, UE multiplex HARQ-ACK in the PUSCH transmission and drop UTO-UCI. * FFS on beta offset * FFS: for unlicensed band,   + If CG-UCI is present and is multiplexed in PUSCH, the “UTO-UCI” is appended to CG-UCI is used instead of CG-UCI in the corresponding procedures for encoding of CG-UCI and/or HARQ-ACK and/or CSI, whichever present. * Note: The term “UTO-UCI” refers to the “UCI that provides information about unused CG PUSCH transmission occasions” for convenience.   For Proposal 2-3-4: we are generally fine with the proposal and support Option 1. For the case CG-UCI is present, it can be under “FFS: for unlicensed band” |
| **MediaTek** | Generally fine with the proposals.  Proposal 2-3-1 can also be discussed later, after we progress on UCI content and payload size.  For Proposal 2-3-4, we prefer Option-1.  HARQ feedback should have higher priority than UTO-UCI as HARQ UCI impacts PUSCH reliability. Separate beta-offset parameters needed for HARQ UCI and UTO-UCI. |
| **Panasonic** | Q1: We support the proposals. |
| **Spreadtrum** | Support all the 4 proposals. The third sub-bullet with “FFS on beta offset” in Proposal 2-3-3 should be deleted as it is discussed in Proposal 2-3-4.  For Proposal 2-3-4, we support Option-1. |
| **SONY** | Generally OK with the moderator’s proposal.  We are also OK with Proposal 2-3-1 and 2-3-2.  On Proposal 2-3-3: generally fine and need further discussion, especially on “*the “UTO-UCI” is appended to CG-UCI*” The question is should the UTO-UCI be decoded first? Or after CG-UCI decoding? |
| **CMCC** | We support Proposal 2-3-1, 2-3-2, and 2-3-3.  Regarding Proposal 2-3-4:  We suggest rewording this proposal because the current version is a bit confusing for us. First, it seems that Option 2 can be included in Option 1. For example, for the first bullet in Option 1, the beta offset used for the “UTO-UCI” also can be the beta offset for HARQ. Second, for the second bullet in Option 1, i.e., if the “UTO-UCI” is jointly encoded with CG-UCI, the same beta offset is used in the procedures instead of CG-UCI beta offset, we wonder why the CG-UCI beta offset can not be used for the jointly encoded “CG-UCI+UTO-UCI”. It will be appreciated if any clarifications can be provided. |
| **Huawei/HiSilicon** | For Proposal 2-3-1, we are OK.  For proposal 2-3-3: we suggest to “FFS priority between UTO-UCI and HARQ-ACK”.  In NR-U, in the UCI bit sequence, CG-UCI is before HARQ-ACK. If the reserved resource for HARQ ACK and CG-UCI is not enough, HARQ-ACK will be dropped first since NR-U CG-UCI is encoded before HARQ ACK. This is reasonable for NR-U since CG-UCI contains HARQ process ID field. The gNB needs to decode PUSCH according to the HARQ process ID.  However, for XR, the UCI indicating unused CG PUSCH TO(s) probably will not convey HARQ process ID. If this UCI is also encoded before HARQ ACK, HARQ ACK would be dropped first if the reserved resources are not enough, which would impact retransmission. Thus, the encoding and multiplexing order of the new UCI can be lower than HARQ-ACK.  **Proposal 2-3-3:**  The existing CG-UCI encoding and multiplexing procedures are reused for encoding the “UTO-UCI” in a configured grant PUSCH in absence or presence of other UCIs being multiplexed in the PUSCH, by apply the following adjustments:   * … * FFS on beta offset * FFS priority between UTO-UCI and HARQ-ACK * Note: The term “UTO-UCI” refers to the “UCI that provides information about unused CG PUSCH transmission occasions” for convenience. |
| **FGI** | We support Proposal 2-3-1, 2-3-2, and 2-3-3. For Proposal 2-3-4, Option 1 is preferred. |
| **Lenovo** | Ok with the first three proposals. For 2-3-4 we prefer option1 over option 2 (as HARQ-ACK might require different relative protection than UTO-UCI), but also open to other solutions, if any. |
| **Intel** | P 2-3-1: Support  P 2-3-2: Support  P 2-3-3, 2-3-4, more discussion is needed. |
| **Ericsson** | Support 2-3-1  Support 2-3-2  Support 2-3-3  Support 2-3-4 (our preferenc is Option 1) |
| **Moderator** | **Summary of views:**  **Proposal 2-3-1:**   * **OK: ZTE/Sanechips, Nokia/NSB (FFS unlic), CATT, New H3C, [QC], Google, Samsung (only lic), FW, IDC, vivo, OPPO, TCL, DCM, LG (FFS unlic), MTK, Pana, Spreadtrum, Sony, CMCC, HW/HiSi, FGI, Lenovo, Intel, Ericsson** * **Not OK: -**   **Proposal 2-3-2:**   * **OK: Nokia/NSB , CATT, New H3C, Google, Samsung (only lic), IDC, Xiaomi, OPPO, DCM, LG, MTK, Pana, Spreadtrum, Sony, CMCC, HW/HiSi (mod), FGI, Lenovo, Intel, Ericsson** * **Not OK: ZTE/Sanechips, FW, vivo,**   **Proposal 2-3-3:**   * **OK: Nokia/NSB, CATT, New H3C, [Google(only lic)], Samsung (only lic), FW, IDC, Xiaomi, vivo, OPPO, TCL, DCM, MTK, Pana, Spreadtrum, Sony, CMCC, FGI, Lenovo, Intel, Ericsson** * **Not OK: ZTE/Sanechips, LG (updated proposal), Intel**   **Proposal 2-3-4:**   * **OK: Nokia/NSB, CATT, [Google(only lic)], Samsung (only lic), FW, vivo, TCL, DCM, LG (FFS unlic), MTK, Pana, Spreadtrum, Sony, CMCC (mod), FGI, Ericsosn**   + **Option 1: Nokia/NSB, FW, vivo, TCL, DCM, MTK, Spreadtrum, FGI, Lenovo, Ericsson**   + **Option 2: CATT** * **Not OK: OPPO (Option 3), Intel**   **@All:** Regarding comments on applicability to unlicensed, we can separate the discussion for licensed and unlicensed.  **@ZTE:** The WID does not preclude unlicensed.  **@FW:** Regaridng comment on P2-3-2, it is not clear how CG-PUSCH and its UTO-UCI can have different prirotiy. Moderator understand that the discussion for different priorities is applied for the case that different UCIs/PUSCHs are originally carried by different channels. Is your intention is similar to HW/HiSi (please see below)?  **@MTK:** Do you intend to drop UTO-UCI when HARQ-ACK is multiplxed on PUSCH?  **@Spreadtrum:** FFS in P2-3-3 was added for completness and then, it is addressed by P2-3-4**.** OK to remove.  **@LG:** Good suggestion. But maybe easier at this stage separate licesned and unlicensed since cg-UCI-Multiplexing is only applicable to unlicensed, and at this stage, it is not clear to us ethe same or different RRc parameter for UTO-UCI. Also, for unlicesed, CG-UCI is always present,hence we can use that condition for differnetiation.  **@Sony:** Which one is decoded first, or they are jointly decode dis up to implementation. We have to specifiy how they are encoded.  **@HW/HiSi:** I understand your intention and that is different from two-level priroity.  **@CATT, Intel, OPPO:** Based on the feedback, could you consider to compromise to Option 1 in P2-3-4?  **@All: Based on the comments, the proposals are updated as the following:**  **Proposal 2-3-1 (updated):**   * The UCI that provides information about unused CG PUSCH transmission occasions is defined as a “new UCI” (i.e. Alt. 1 of previous agreement).   + If CG-UCI is configured, the “new UCI” is appended to CG-UCI.   **Proposal 2-3-2 (updated):**   * With respect to PHY two-level priority, for a configured grant PUSCH configuration, the “UTO-UCI” has the same priority level as the configured grant PUSCH. * Note: The term “UTO-UCI” refers to the “UCI that provides information about unused CG PUSCH transmission occasions” for convenience.   **Proposal 2-3-3 (updated):**  The existing CG-UCI encoding and multiplexing procedures are reused for encoding the “UTO-UCI” in a configured grant PUSCH in absence or presence of other UCIs being multiplexed in the PUSCH, by apply the following adjustments:   * For operation on licensed band:   + The “UTO-UCI” is used instead of CG-UCI in the corresponding procedures for encoding of CG-UCI and/or HARQ-ACK and/or CSI, whichever is present. * For operation on unlicensed band:   + The “UTO-UCI” is appended to CG-UCI is used instead of CG-UCI in the corresponding procedures for encoding of CG-UCI and/or HARQ-ACK and/or CSI, whichever present. * FFS on dropping rule between UTO-UCI and HARQ-ACK * Note: The term “UTO-UCI” refers to the “UCI that provides information about unused CG PUSCH transmission occasions” for convenience.   **Proposal 2-3-4 (updated) – OK to compromise to Option 1?:**  For multiplexing of the “UTO-UCI” on CG-PUSCH, select one of the options below for determining the beta-offset:   * Option 1:   + Beta offset can be configured for the “UTO-UCI” and reused instead of beta-offset for CG-UCI, when applicable.     - If CG-UCI is not present, the beta offset for the “UTO-UCI” is used in the procedures instead of CG-UCI beta offset, when applicable.     - If the “UTO-UCI” is jointly encoded with CG-UCI, the ~~same~~ beta offset for CG-UCI is used in the procedures instead of CG-UCI beta offset, when applicable. * [Option 2:   + Beta-offset for HARQ is reused for the “UTO-UCI”. * Option 3 (OPPO):   + If CG-UCI is not present, HARQ-ACK beta offset is used in the procedures instead of CG-UCI beta offset, when applicable.   + If the “UTO-UCI” is jointly encoded with CG-UCI, the ~~same~~ beta offset for CG-UCI is used in the procedures instead of CG-UCI beta offset, when applicable ] * Note: The term “UTO-UCI” refers to the “UCI that provides information about unused CG PUSCH transmission occasions” for convenience.   **Base don the** |

### 3.2.2 Intermediate Discussions

**Moderator’s recommendation:**

Considering the discussion in initial round, Moderator proposes the following:

**Proposal 2-3-1 (updated):**

* The UCI that provides information about unused CG PUSCH transmission occasions is defined as a “new UCI” (i.e. Alt. 1 of previous agreement).
  + If CG-UCI is configured, the “new UCI” is appended to CG-UCI.

**Proposal 2-3-2 (updated):**

* With respect to PHY two-level priority, for a configured grant PUSCH configuration, the “UTO-UCI” has the same priority level as the configured grant PUSCH.
* Note: The term “UTO-UCI” refers to the “UCI that provides information about unused CG PUSCH transmission occasions” for convenience.

**Proposal 2-3-3 (updated):**

The existing CG-UCI encoding and multiplexing procedures are reused for encoding the “UTO-UCI” in a configured grant PUSCH in absence or presence of other UCIs being multiplexed in the PUSCH, by apply the following adjustments:

* For operation on licensed band:
  + The “UTO-UCI” is used instead of CG-UCI in the corresponding procedures for encoding of CG-UCI and/or HARQ-ACK and/or CSI, whichever is present.
* For operation on unlicensed band:
  + The “UTO-UCI” is appended to CG-UCI is used instead of CG-UCI in the corresponding procedures for encoding of CG-UCI and/or HARQ-ACK and/or CSI, whichever present.
* FFS on dropping rule between UTO-UCI and HARQ-ACK
* Note: The term “UTO-UCI” refers to the “UCI that provides information about unused CG PUSCH transmission occasions” for convenience.

**Proposal 2-3-4 (updated) – OK to compromise to Option 1?**

For multiplexing of the “UTO-UCI” on CG-PUSCH, select one of the options below for determining the beta-offset:

* Option 1:
  + Beta offset can be configured for the “UTO-UCI” and reused instead of beta-offset for CG-UCI, when applicable.
    - If CG-UCI is not present, the beta offset for the “UTO-UCI” is used in the procedures instead of CG-UCI beta offset, when applicable.
    - If the “UTO-UCI” is jointly encoded with CG-UCI, the ~~same~~ beta offset for CG-UCI is used in the procedures instead of CG-UCI beta offset, when applicable.
* [Option 2:
  + Beta-offset for HARQ is reused for the “UTO-UCI”.
* Option 3 (OPPO):
  + If CG-UCI is not present, HARQ-ACK beta offset is used in the procedures instead of CG-UCI beta offset, when applicable.
  + If the “UTO-UCI” is jointly encoded with CG-UCI, the ~~same~~ beta offset for CG-UCI is used in the procedures instead of CG-UCI beta offset, when applicable ]
* Note: The term “UTO-UCI” refers to the “UCI that provides information about unused CG PUSCH transmission occasions” for convenience.

**Questions:** Please provide your view in the table below regarding the above proposals:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| New H3C | For proposal 2-3-1, Main bullet is good enough to us. The motivation of new subbullet isn’t clear to us.  For 2-3-2 and 2-3-3 ,we are fine with updated proposal  For 2-3-4. We support option 1. |
| **Panasonic** | We support the proposals. |
| **CATT** | We are OK with Proposals 2-3-1, 2-3-2 and 2-3-3.  We support Option 2 of Proposals 2-3-4 |
| **Nokia, NSB** | **Proposal 2-3-1 (updated):** Ok in general. But what does “the new UCI is appended to CG-UCI” mean? Does it mean we add new fields to CG-UCI or we jointly encode UTO-UCI and CG-UCI and for that we will need a new encoding rules?  **Proposal 2-3-2 (updated):** Ok  **Proposal 2-3-3 (updated):** We have a question related to the part below. What procedure is used in there? The CG-UCI procedure is re-used? The wording is a bit confusing. And similar to the comment above: “is appended” not clear.   * For operation on unlicensed band:   + The “UTO-UCI” is appended to CG-UCI is used instead of CG-UCI in the corresponding procedures for encoding of CG-UCI and/or HARQ-ACK and/or CSI, whichever present.   **Proposal 2-3-4 (updated):**  We are supportive of Option 1 with following modifications in order to be inline with current beta offset procedure defined when CG-UCI is present (e.g., when CG-UCI is jointly encoded with HARQ-ACK, the beta offset for HARQ-ACK is used):   * Option 1:   + When only UTO-UCI or UTO-UCI jointly encoded with CG-UCI are multiplexed, beta offset can be configured for the “UTO-UCI” and reused instead of beta-offset for CG-UCI, when applicable.     - If CG-UCI is not present, the beta offset for the “UTO-UCI” is used in the procedures instead of CG-UCI beta offset, when applicable.     - If the “UTO-UCI” is jointly encoded with CG-UCI, the ~~same~~ beta offset for CG-UCI is used in the procedures instead of UTO-UCI beta offset, when applicable.   + When UTO-UCI is jointly encoded with other UCI (e.g., HARQ-ACK), follow the rules defined for CG-UCI jointly encoded with other UCI. |
| **ZTE, Sanechips** | **For Proposal 2-3-1,**  We should clarify whether or not support CG-UCI(unlicensed band for XR) firstly for the sub-bullet, then the modification is suggested:   * The UCI that provides information about unused CG PUSCH transmission occasions is defined as a “new UCI” (i.e. Alt. 1 of previous agreement).   + FFS: If CG-UCI is configured, the “new UCI” is appended to CG-UCI. |
| **OPPO** | We support the proposals. |
| **vivo** | For proposal 2-3-1, we are generally fine. We think new UCI could be a new UCI type/format. And the sub-bullet seems to be related to the discussion in proposal 2-3-3. So we suggest to remove the sub-bullet in proposal 2-3-1 to separate the discussion for interaction with CG-UCI.  For proposal 2-3-2, we are fine.  For proposal 2-3-3, we are fine.  For proposal 2-3-4, we prefer option 1 |
| **Moderator** | **@ZTE;** I understand the intention is to treat unlicensed separately (not support). As I mentioned repeatedly, currently the WID doesn’t disallow unlicensed. If the plenary decides to operate on licensed only, then agreement related to unlicensed would be not applicable and overridden by plenary decision. For the progress, I recommend we separate the case of licensed and unlicensed, as I have tried and avoid unnecessary FFS. **Thanks!**  **@Nokia:**  **1) Regarding P2-3-1:** This proposal is more affects how UTO-UCI would be specified. I think, there will be a separate table for it, or a separate description for it in the spec. Then, if UE transmits both CG-UCI, let‘s say 12 bits following the current specification, and e.g. 4 bits UTO-UCI, then 4 bits are appended to 12 bits. One can even consider it as a new field for CG-UCI (like example shown by Apple). However, being specified like that means the properties of CG-UCI and UTO-UCI would impact each other, or at least need to be take care of from spec point of view.  **2) Regarding P2-3-3:** It refers to procedures in 38.212, for example the bit sequence reusing clause 6.3.2.1.3 for only UTO-UCI, or CG-UCI and UTO-UCI, etc. Other clauses in this spec coder encoding, rare-matching, etc.  **3) Regarding P2-3-4:** I tried to focus in this proposal on beta offset. The previous proposal is for encoding and multiplexing. In this proposal, we have to clarify what beta offset is used. I made some updates. Please note that using „when applicable“takes care of different cases , for example HARQ-ACK with UTO-UCI, etc., by reusing existing procedures according to P2-3-3. Hopefully it is more clear.  **@All: Pleas econsider this update**  **Proposal 2-3-4 (updated1) – OK to compromise to Option 1?**  For multiplexing of the “UTO-UCI” on CG-PUSCH, select one of the options below for determining the beta-offset:   * Option 1:   + Beta offset can be configured for the “UTO-UCI” and applied ~~reused instead of beta-offset for CG-UCI~~, when applicable.     - If CG-UCI is not present, the beta offset for the “UTO-UCI” is used in the procedures instead of CG-UCI beta offset, when applicable.     - If the “UTO-UCI” is jointly encoded with CG-UCI, the ~~same~~ beta offset for CG-UCI is used in the procedures ~~instead of CG-UCI beta offset~~, when applicable. * Option 2:   + Beta-offset for HARQ is reused for the “UTO-UCI”. * Option 3 (OPPO):   + If CG-UCI is not present, HARQ-ACK beta offset is used in the procedures instead of CG-UCI beta offset, when applicable.   + If the “UTO-UCI” is jointly encoded with CG-UCI, the ~~same~~ beta offset for CG-UCI is used in the procedures instead of CG-UCI beta offset, when applicable * Note: The term “UTO-UCI” refers to the “UCI that provides information about unused CG PUSCH transmission occasions” for convenience. |
| **Qualcomm** | Support the first three proposals. For proposal 2-3-4, Support option 1. Option 2 and 3 have unnessary spec impact to NR-U. |
| **LG** | Thanks for the considerable updates. We are fine with the proposals.  We are also Ok with Option 1 of 2-3-4. |
| **DOCOMO** | We support the four proposals.  For Proposal 2-3-4, we prefer option 1. |
| **Xiaomi** | Regarding proposal 2-3-1, we share ZTE’s views. Based on the discussion in sub-section 3.2.2, all transmitted CG occasions may carry the UTO UCI, and simply placing the UTO-UCI after the CG UCI may result in more severe signaling overhead situations. We need to clarify more before we discuss whether/how the “new UCI” is appended to CG-UCI once the CG-UCI is configured.  We are fine with proposal 2-3-2 and proposal 2-3-3. |
| **CMCC** | We support Proposal 2-3-1 and 2-3-2.  We are generally fine with Proposal 2-3-3. Maybe it will be better to modify the wording as follows.  **Proposal 2-3-3 (updated):**  The existing CG-UCI encoding and multiplexing procedures are reused for encoding the “UTO-UCI” in a configured grant PUSCH in absence or presence of other UCIs being multiplexed in the PUSCH, by applying the following adjustments:   * For operation on licensed band:   + The “UTO-UCI” is used instead of CG-UCI in the corresponding procedures for encoding of CG-UCI and/or HARQ-ACK and/or CSI, whichever is present. * For operation on unlicensed band:   + The “UTO-UCI” ~~is~~ appended to CG-UCI is used instead of CG-UCI in the corresponding procedures for encoding of CG-UCI and/or HARQ-ACK and/or CSI, whichever is present. * FFS on dropping rule between UTO-UCI and HARQ-ACK * Note: The term “UTO-UCI” refers to the “UCI that provides information about unused CG PUSCH transmission occasions” for convenience.   For Proposal 2-3-4, we prefer Option 1. |
| **New H3C** | Supporting down selection to option 1 for proposal 2-3-4 |
| **SONY** | We are OK with proposals 2-3-1, 2-3-2 and 2-3-3. |
| **Huawei/HiSilicon** | Proposal 2-3-1, we are OK.  Proposal 2-3-2: please could FL or other companies clarify whether this is same handling as CG-UCI? i.e., whether CG-UCI has the same priority as CG-PUSCH?  From TS 38.212, it seems CG-UCI has its own priority index.  For proposal 2-3-3: we suggest the following updates.  When UTO-UCI is jointly encoded with HARQ-ACK and the PHY priority is equal, the sequence generation order should be specified, i.e., whether UTO-UCI is at first or HARQ-ACK is at first.  FFS on ~~dropping rule~~ sequence generation order between UTO-UCI and HARQ-ACK |
| **TCL** | Fine with the proposals, for Proposal 2-3-4, we prefer Option 1. |
| **Futurewei** | For Proposal 2-3-1 (updated): We support FL proposal because the design is for licensed carrier.  For Proposal 2-3-2 (updated): Now it is clear for us, we are ok with FL proposal.  For Proposal 2-3-3 (updated): We are ok with FL proposal.  For Proposal 2-3-4 (updated): We are ok with Option 1. |
| **InterDigital** | We support Proposals 2-3-1, 2-3-2 and 2-3-3.  For Proposal 2-3-4, we prefer Option 1. |
| **Google** | Ok with all proposals. Also OK for Option 1 in Proposal 2-3-4 |
| **Spreadtrum** | We support the proposals.  For proposal 2-3-4, we prefer option 1. |
| **Moderator** | **@Xiaomi/ZTE**: Regarding suggestion to add FFS, Please see explanations to Nokia above Regarding P2-3-1 (and other proposals).  **@HW/HiSi:** I think your question was related to P2-3-3- Please see explanations provided to Nokia above Regarding P2-3-2 (and other proposals). Hopefully, that clarifies better. Will change the FFS as you suggested. Regarding P2-3-2, it is good to clarify that in general since CG PUSCH has a priority and the straightforward way is to assume the same PHY priority for UTO-UCI. This proposal is more for completeness and shouldn’t be controversial.  **@All:** Please see the updated proposals based on the comments.  **Proposal 2-3-1 (updated):**   * The UCI that provides information about unused CG PUSCH transmission occasions is defined as a “new UCI” (i.e. Alt. 1 of previous agreement).   + If CG-UCI is configured, the UTO-UCI ~~“new UCI”~~ is appended to CG-UCI. * Note: The term “UTO-UCI” refers to the “UCI that provides information about unused CG PUSCH transmission occasions” for convenience.   **Proposal 2-3-2 (updated):**   * With respect to PHY two-level priority, for a configured grant PUSCH configuration, the “UTO-UCI” has the same priority level as the configured grant PUSCH. * Note: The term “UTO-UCI” refers to the “UCI that provides information about unused CG PUSCH transmission occasions” for convenience.   **Proposal 2-3-3 (updated):**  The existing CG-UCI encoding and multiplexing procedures are reused for encoding the “UTO-UCI” in a configured grant PUSCH in absence or presence of other UCIs being multiplexed in the PUSCH, by applying the following adjustments:   * For operation on licensed band:   + The “UTO-UCI” is used instead of CG-UCI in the corresponding procedures for encoding of CG-UCI and/or HARQ-ACK and/or CSI, whichever is present. * For operation on unlicensed band:   + The “UTO-UCI” ~~is~~ appended to CG-UCI is used instead of CG-UCI in the corresponding procedures for encoding of CG-UCI and/or HARQ-ACK and/or CSI, whichever is present. * FFS on ~~dropping rule~~ sequence generation order between UTO-UCI and HARQ-ACK * Note: The term “UTO-UCI” refers to the “UCI that provides information about unused CG PUSCH transmission occasions” for convenience.   **Proposal 2-3-4 (updated1) – OK to compromise to Option 1?**  For multiplexing of the “UTO-UCI” on CG-PUSCH, select one of the options below for determining the beta-offset:   * Option 1:   + Beta offset can be configured for the “UTO-UCI” and applied ~~reused instead of beta-offset for CG-UCI~~, when applicable.     - If CG-UCI is not present, the beta offset for the “UTO-UCI” is used in the procedures instead of CG-UCI beta offset, when applicable.     - If the “UTO-UCI” is jointly encoded with CG-UCI, the ~~same~~ beta offset for CG-UCI is used in the procedures ~~instead of CG-UCI beta offset~~, when applicable. * Option 2:   + Beta-offset for HARQ is reused for the “UTO-UCI”. * Option 3 (OPPO):   + If CG-UCI is not present, HARQ-ACK beta offset is used in the procedures instead of CG-UCI beta offset, when applicable.   + If the “UTO-UCI” is jointly encoded with CG-UCI, the ~~same~~ beta offset for CG-UCI is used in the procedures instead of CG-UCI beta offset, when applicable * Note: The term “UTO-UCI” refers to the “UCI that provides information about unused CG PUSCH transmission occasions” for convenience. |
| **MediaTek** | We support all proposals. For proposal 2-3-4, we support Option-1. |
| **Samsung** | **Proposal 2-3-1**: Support with an FFS to the sub-bullet. Operation in shared spectrum was not part of any study, is not meaningful for the minimum latency objective of the design in RAN1, or something that the WI needs to consider. Further discussion is necessary instead of implicitly agreeing to extend the WI to shared spectrum.  **Proposal 2-3-2**: Support.  **Proposal 2-3-3**: Support with same comment regarding the sub-bullet for shared spectrum.  **Proposal 2-3-4**: Option 2 is preferable, Option 1 is acceptable but with same comment as above regarding shared spectrum/CG-UCI aspects. |
| **CATT** | We are OK with Proposals 2-3-1, 2-3-2, and 2-3-3.  Proposal 2-3-4: Option 2. Option 1 requires network to configure or specify a new beta value. This requires a lot of simulation works determining the beta values when it has different combinations. We don’t see the benefit of Option 1. |
| **Lenovo** | Ok with all proposals, and agree with Samsung on 2-3-1 (also applicable to 2-3-4).  For 2-3-4, it would be good to clarify “when applicable” in option 1. |
| **Intel** | We are OK with P 2-3-1 with sub-bullet removed or with FFS as Samsung suggested, P 2-3-2, and P 2-3-3.  For P 2-3-4, prefer Option 1. |
| **Moderator** | **Summary of views:**  **P2-3-1:**   * **OK:** H3C, Panasonic, CATT, Nokia/NSB, OPPO, ZTE, vivo, QC, LG, DCM, xiaomi, CMCC, Sony, HW/HiSi, TCL, FW, IDC, Google, Spreadtrum, Samsung, CATT, Lenovo, Intel * **Not OK**:- * **Samsung. ZTE, few others. Comment on unlic**   **P2-3-2:**   * **OK:** H3C, Panasonic, CATT, Nokia/NSB, OPPO, vivo, QC, LG, DCM, xiaomi, CMCC, Sony, TCL, FW, IDC, Google, Spreadtrum, Samsung, CATT, Lenovo, Intel, [HW/HiSi] * **Not OK**:   **P2-3-3:**   * **OK:** H3C, Panasonic, CATT, Nokia/NSB, OPPO, vivo, QC, LG, DCM, xiaomi, CMCC, Sony, HW/HiSi, TCL, FW, IDC, Google, Spreadtrum, CATT, Lenovo, Samsung, Intel * **Not OK**:- * **Samsung. Lenovo, Intel, few others. Comment on unlic.**   **P2-3-4:**   * **OK:** CATT, Samsung, Panasonic, H3C,Nokia/NSB, OPPO, vivo, QC, LG, DCM, CMCC, TCL, FW, IDC, IDC, Spreadtrum, MTK, Lenovo, Intel * **Not OK:-** * **Option 1:** H3C, Nokia/NSB, OPPO, vivo, QC, LG, DCM, CMCC, TCL, FW, IDC, IDC, Spreadtrum, MTK, Lenovo, Intel * **Option 2:** CATT, Samsung (Ok to compromise) * **Samsung. Lenovo, Intel, few others. Comment on unlic.**   **@All:**   * P2-3-1: I noticed the sub-bullet was redundant and had created confusion. * P2-3-2/2-3-3. Proposals are rephrased to address the concern on unlic. I hope it is acceptable.   **@All : The proposals are updated as the following :**  **Proposal 2-3-1 (updated2):**   * The UCI that provides information about unused CG PUSCH transmission occasions is defined as a “new UCI” (i.e. Alt. 1 of previous agreement).   + ~~If CG-UCI is configured, the UTO-UCI “new UCI” is appended to CG-~~ * ~~Note: The term “UTO-UCI” refers to the “UCI that provides information about unused CG PUSCH transmission occasions” for convenience.~~   **Proposal 2-3-2 (updated):**   * With respect to PHY two-level priority, for a configured grant PUSCH configuration, the “UTO-UCI” has the same priority level as the configured grant PUSCH. * Note: The term “UTO-UCI” refers to the “UCI that provides information about unused CG PUSCH transmission occasions” for convenience.   **Proposal 2-3-3 (updated):**  The existing CG-UCI encoding and multiplexing procedures are reused for encoding the “UTO-UCI” in a configured grant PUSCH in absence or presence of other UCIs being multiplexed in the PUSCH, by applying the following adjustments:   * For operation on licensed band:   + The “UTO-UCI” is used instead of CG-UCI in the corresponding procedures for encoding of CG-UCI and/or HARQ-ACK and/or CSI, whichever is present. * For operation on unlicensed band:   + The “UTO-UCI” ~~is~~ appended to CG-UCI is used instead of CG-UCI in the corresponding procedures for encoding of CG-UCI and/or HARQ-ACK and/or CSI, whichever is present.     - Note: The above bullet is not valid if operation on unlicensed is not supported. * FFS on ~~dropping rule~~ sequence generation order between UTO-UCI and HARQ-ACK * Note: The term “UTO-UCI” refers to the “UCI that provides information about unused CG PUSCH transmission occasions” for convenience.   **Proposal 2-3-4 (updated1) – OK to compromise to Option 1?**  For multiplexing of the “UTO-UCI” on CG-PUSCH, select one of the options below for determining the beta-offset:   * Option 1:   + Beta offset can be configured for the “UTO-UCI” and applied ~~reused instead of beta-offset for CG-UCI~~, when applicable.   + For operation on licensed band:     - ~~If CG-UCI is not present,~~ The beta offset for the “UTO-UCI” is used in the procedures instead of CG-UCI beta offset, when applicable.   + For operation on unlicensed band:     - If the “UTO-UCI” is jointly encoded with CG-UCI, the ~~same~~ beta offset for CG-UCI is used in the procedures ~~instead of CG-UCI beta offset~~, when applicable.       * Note: The above bullet is not valid if operation on unlicensed is not supported. * Option 2:   + Beta-offset for HARQ is reused for the “UTO-UCI”. * Option 3 (OPPO):   + For operation on licensed band:     - ~~If CG-UCI is not present,~~ HARQ-ACK beta offset is used in the procedures instead of CG-UCI beta offset, when applicable.   + For operation on unlicensed band:     - If the “UTO-UCI” is jointly encoded with CG-UCI, the ~~same~~ beta offset for CG-UCI is used in the procedures instead of CG-UCI beta offset, when applicable       * Note: The above bullet is not valid if operation on unlicensed is not supported. * Note: The term “UTO-UCI” refers to the “UCI that provides information about unused CG PUSCH transmission occasions” for convenience. |

## 3.4 Other topics

**Moderator’s summary:**

With respect to the feature supporting indication of unused PUSCHs by UCI, companies have raised other aspects for discussions and decision. Some of these topics were discussed last meeting. Few of them are listed below:

* Topic 1) Timeline impact and/or requirements
  + Introduce timeline for indication of “unused” TOs
    - Support: xiaomi, NEC
    - Not support: QC, Samsung
    - Needs study: vivo
  + Impact on existing timelines due to “unused” TOs
    - E///
* Topic 2) Introduce Overriding “unused” indications
  + Support: CMCC, Samsung
  + Not support: vivo, LG
  + Needs study: E///, Nokia
* Topic 3) Applicability to multiple CG configurations
  + Support: QC, vivo, TCL
  + Not support: DCM
  + Needs study: E///, Lenovo, Panasonic
* Other topics including
  + Interaction with uplink skipping (QC, Samsung with opposing views)
  + Restriction to licenced (HW/HiSi)
  + Applicability of feature to TBoM on Type-2 CG (QC, DCM)
  + Support for Non-integer periodicities (MTK)
  + Partial CG resource usage (Apple)
  + …

Table 8: Summary of Contributions inputs for Section 3.4

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Contributions inputs** |
| Futurewei | **Observation 4**: To guarantee the indicated unused CG PUSCH occasion(s) to be really recycled to other UEs, time offset between UCI and the indicated unused CG PUSCH occasion(s) should be equal to or greater than the PUSCH preparing time for at least one of the other UEs.  **Proposal 9:** Indicating unused CG PUSCH occasion(s) to gNB can be determined based on a time offset threshold, indicated by gNB, between UCI and the unused CG PUSCH occasion(s). |
| Ericsson | **Proposal 23** Revisit the existing timeline constraints due to configured grant PUSCH to ensure the corresponding constraints are not applicable when a configured grant PUSCH transmission occasion is indicated unused.  **Proposal 24** Whether to support overriding is conditioned on satisfying at least the following design principles:  \* Commitment to transmit: When a CG PUSCH TO is previously indicated "unused", if a later UCI overrides the previous indication corresponding to the CG PUSCH TO, the UE shall "use" that CG PUSCH for transmission.  \* Satisfying timeline: When a CG PUSCH TO is previously indicated "unused", if a later UCI overrides the previous indication corresponding to the CG PUSCH TO, the time between the end of a CG PUSCH carrying the later UCI and the start of the overridden CG PUSCH shall not be less than a time duration provided by configuration.  \* Simplicity: The key design choices regarding e.g., content and timing of UCI, should not complicate enabling overriding if supported.  \* FFS on other conditions and disciplines from UE  **Proposal 25** Whether to support capability of indication of unused CG PUSCH TOs for multiple CG configurations, study at least the following:  \* whether multiple CG configuration belong the same or different cells  \* whether the key design choices regarding e.g., content and timing of UCI, complicates support of multiple CG configurations.  \* Whether the UCI is carried by all CG PUSCHs associated to all the CG configurations or a sub-set of them.  \* FFS on other conditions. |
| Qualcomm | **Observation 2**: It is possible to configure the UE with multiple overlapping CG PUSCH occasions in current specs but the gNB has to blind detect the PUSCH  **Observation 3**: Indication of unused CG PUSCH occasion(s) of multiple overlapping PUSCH occasions is useful for UE power savings and for reducing blind decoding at gNB (network energy savings)  **Observation 4**: For the dynamic indication of the unused CG PUSCH occasion(s) among a set of PUSCH occasions, the CG PUSCH occasions can be overlapping in time. The overlapping PUSCH occasions allow for higher resource efficiency  **Observation 5**: If the gNB does not receive the indication of unused CG PUSCH occasion(s) early enough it can always do blind detection of PUSCH. The explicit timeline makes the spec and UE implementation complicated.  **Proposal 11**: An explicit timeline between the indication and the indicated unused CG PUSCH occasion(s) is not needed for the UE to transmit the indication  **Proposal 12**: For a CG PUSCH occasion of the multi-PUSCH CG configuration that is indicated as NOT "unused", the UE follows existing CG PUSCH skipping rule when there is a collision between the CG PUSCH occasion and other higher priority resource or operation such as semi-static DL symbol, DG scheduled DL symbol, SFI DL or flexible symbol, etc.  **Proposal 13**: Support a single UCI to jointly provide information of CG PUSCH occasions belonging to different CG configurations, TRPs, or CCs  **Proposal 15**: Do not support the explicit indication of "used" CG PUSCH occasion(s)  **Proposal 16**: Support the indication of unused CG PUSCH occasion(s) when TBoMS is configured for the multi-PUSCH CG configuration  \* Each CG PUSCH occasion contains the multiple slots for the same TB  **Proposal 17**: Consider adding rules when a UCI (e.g. HARQ-ACK) is supposed to be multiplexed and sent on the CG PUSCH which the UE is requesting to skip, e.g.:  - Alternative 1: Transmit UCI on PUCCH and drop PUSCH  - Alternative 2: Transmit UCI on PUSCH and drop PUCCH  - Alternative 3: Disable CG PUSCH skip capability on the TD resources with overlapping PUCCH and PUSCH and when a UCI is supposed to be sent |
| vivo | **Proposal 6**: A CG PUSCH occasion indicated as unused earlier is not expected to be changed as NOT unused subsequently.  **Proposal 7**: For dynamic indication of unused CG PUSCH occasion(s) based on UCI by the UE, the dynamic indication in a UCI can be applied to the configured CG PUSCH occasions corresponding to one or multiple CG configurations, and locating on one or multiple serving cells.  **Proposal 13**: For dynamic indication of unused CG PUSCH occasion(s) based on UCI by the UE, RAN1 discusses whether/how a minimum duration is assumed for gNB processing, e.g. decoding of the UCI, and recycling of unused time-frequency resources. |
| HW/HiSi | **Proposal 9**: The UCI that indicates unused CG PUSCH TO(s) is not applied to unlicensed band.  **Proposal 13**: No need to consider CG enhancements to address UL jitter. |
| Nokia/NSB | **Proposal 14**: Overriding previous indication from used to unused is allowed.  **Proposal 15**: Decide on whether overriding a previous indication from unused to used is supported after the solution related to what information UCI contains is clear. |
| MTK | **Observation 4**: In XR traffic context, the CG periodicity set to a larger value (e.g., as large as the XR traffic periodicity, such as 16.667ms) will have better latency (and therefore system capacity per number of supported users) performance. This is particularly true when multiple PUSCH TOs are positioned in back-to-back UL slots in a single CG period.  **Proposal 13**: Further discussions on multiple PUSCHs in single CG design shall optimize for CG configurations with CG periodicities as large as XR traffic periodicity (e.g., ~16ms). |
| Apple | **Proposal 2**: UCI signaling supports the indication of the starting occasion and the number of occupied occasion(s).  **Proposal 3**: support partial resource/occasion usage in the frequency domain to allow statistical multiplexing of UE traffics minimizing collision.  **Proposal 4**: support partial resource/occasion usage in the time domain to allow statistical multiplexing of UE traffics minimizing collision.  **Proposal 5**: CG PUSCH occasions with the same CG configuration can be associated different number of OFDM symbols. |
| Spreadtrum Comm. | **Proposal 6**: It need to further discuss how to handle HARQ process ID of the unused CG PUSCH occasion(s) in the CG period. |
| Lenovo | **Proposal 10**: If a UCI indicates unused CG occasions of only a CG configuration, decide whether handling of overlapped CG occasions across the CG configuration and another CG configuration is needed.  **Proposal 11**: Discuss invalid UCI indications. |
| NTT DOCOMO | **Proposal 8**: UCI indicates unused TOs of the same CG configuration as CG PUSCH carrying the UCI.  **Proposal 11**: Study whether/how to support such CG-UCI indication along with CG PUSCH configured with single TB processing over multiple slots. |
| LG | **Proposal 8**: Following two principles are to be considered for the URI indication for a same PUSCH occasion.  \* Once a PUSCH occasion has been indicated as unused, it cannot be indicated as non-unused by URI  \* Only the PUSCH occasion previously not indicated as unused, can be indicated as unused by URI  **Proposal 13**: Support to apply URI transmitted via a CG configuration to the other CG configuration.  \* A parameter indicating CG configuration to which URI applies can be provided by gNB.  **Proposal 14**: a PUSCH indicated by URI and other PUSCH overlapped with the PUSCH are assumed to be dropped.  \* No MAC PDU is generated for those CG PUSCHs. |
| CMCC | **Proposal 5**. Support to introduce a UCI overriding mechanism, which allows UE to re-transmit UCI to override the inaccurate indication of the unused CG PUSCH occasions in previous UCI.  **Proposal 6**. A field in UCI is introduced to indicate whether the UCI can be overridden (incredible) or not (credible). |
| Samsung | **Proposal 7**: Extend the collision resolution procedure for SPS PDSCHs to CG-PUSCHs.   1. One topic was the issue addressed by “Observation 2” above. 2. Another topic was a need for a timeline but that is unnecessary as a gNB is aware of the requirements for UE processing timelines and specifically of the PUSCH preparation timeline. 3. There is no reason to consider PUSCH skipping as such event will practically never occur for video frames (other than the indication for unused CG-PUSCH TOs). 4. ~~Providing a single TB over multiple CG-PUSCHs may be beneficial for improving coding gains for very small individual TBs (and for some TB CRC overhead reduction) but that is not the case for the very large TBs associated with XR while TB retransmissions will be practically impossible to handle and a resulting TB size may be larger than what a UE can currently support.~~ 5. ~~Re-transmission of multiple TBs by a single DCI was effectively discussed during the SI and is not supported.~~ 6. ~~CBG retransmission for multiple CG PUSCHs was discussed during the SI and is not supported. Although in principle a beneficial enhancement, the low target BLER required to meet PDB would limit any potential gain.~~ 7. ~~There is no need to support repetitions as the PDB cannot be met in such cases.~~ 8. Overriding a previous indication for unused CG-PUSCH TOs can be possible via providing UCI in every CG-PUSCH occasion where a later indication can be different from an earlier indication. |
| Panasonic | **Proposal 6**: It should be clear whether the unused indication is applicable to a single CG configuration or more CG configurations. |
| OPPO | **Proposal 5**: If a DG PUSCH overrides a CG PUSCH in the PUSCH TO which is determined to transmit a UCI, as allowed in R17, the UCI should be multiplexed in the DG PUSCH. |
| NEC | **Proposal 5**: study the timeline issues due to the multi-PUSCHs CG, including  a) how to handle the unused CG PUSCH occasion(s) and the UCI content if the time offset from the UCI to the unused CG PUSCH occasion(s) is smaller than the minimum preparation time for reusing the unused CG PUSCH occasion  b) if a high priority DG-PUSCH indicated by a scheduling DCI would overlap in time with a low priority CG-PUSCH occasion, how the PUSCH preparation time of the DG-PUSCH will be impacted if the low priority CG-PUSCH occasion is indicated as unused before the scheduling DCI. |
| xiaomi | **Observation 8**: The resource of the unused CG PUSCH transmission occasion can be allocated flexibly based on gNB's implementation.  **Proposal 6**: RAN1 should prioritize the discussion of the timeline for dynamic indication.  **Proposal 9**: Whether UE is allowed to send multiple dynamic indications with overlapping time windows should be discussed in RAN1.  **Proposal 10**: The gNB can allocate reusable resources to any UE, including the UE that sends UCI carrying the dynamic indication. |
| TCL | **Proposal 10**: When more than one CG configuration activation simultaneously, a UCI to indicate un-used TOs within more than one CG configurations can be considered. |

### 3.4.1 Initial Discussions

**Moderator’s suggestions for initial discussion:**

Considering the topics, Moderator’s observation and suggestions are as the following:

**General suggestion:** Prioritize the code feature design aspects (sections 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3). Use the discussion for better understanding of at least some of the topics in this section, 3.4.

* Topic 1) Timeline impact and/or requirements
  + 1-1) Introduce timeline for indication of “unused” TOs
  + 1-2) Impact on existing timelines due to “unused” TOs
    - Moderator’s observation/suggestion: Use the discussion for better understanding of the issues, motivations, solutions, and their necessity for each sub-topics1-1 and 1-2.
* Topic 2) Introduce Overriding “unused” indications
  + Moderator’s observation/suggestion: Use the discussion for better understanding of the issues, motivations, solutions, and their necessity.
* Topic 3) Applicability to multiple CG configurations
* Moderator’s observation/suggestion: Use the discussion for better understanding of the issues, motivations, solutions, and their necessity.
* Other topics including
  + Interaction with uplink skipping
    - Moderator’s observation/suggestion: Interaction with enhanced UL Skipping regarding UCI multiplexing needs clarification. Suggest discussing at a later stage.
  + Restriction to licenced
    - Moderator’s observation: The design is aimed to be generic and applicable to any CG.
  + Applicability of feature to TBoM on Type-2 CG
    - Moderator’s observation: The design is aimed to be generic and applicable to any CG.
  + Support for Non-integer periodicities
    - Moderator’s observation/suggestion: It was discussed during SI. Prefer not to re-open the topic.
  + Partial CG resource usage
    - Moderator’s observation/suggestion: It was discussed during SI. Prefer not to re-open the topic.
  + …

**Questions:** Please provide your view in the table below regarding the following questions:

* **Q1:** Please indicate your view regarding the **moderator’s observations/suggestions** regarding the topics above.
* **Q2:** Discuss any clarification/correction/comment/question on Moderator’s summary and suggestions or any other aspect helping the discussion and needed decisions.

**Note: Please ensure the information in companies’ contributions are considered for discussions.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| **ZTE, Sanechips** | For topic 1) I agree with moderator’s suggestion. And the timeline impact should be considered for multiple transmissions of the new UCI.  For topic 2) We are not clear with the use case. It should be clarified we assume that proper CG period is configured/adjusted when necessary)  For other topics, we’re fine with moderator’s suggestions. |
| **Nokia, NSB** | **We agree with general suggestion to prioritize the discussion on 3.1, 3.2, 3.3.**  **Please, find additional comments on topics above:**  **Topic 1:** agree that giving more time to distribute the resources is beneficial. However, the feature shall not be too complicated from spec point of view.  **Topic 2:** Overriding from Not Unused to Unused is fine, given that UE might not know in advance which occasion it will not use. However, changing from Unused to Not Unused need further study, i.e., how to ensure that gNB was not already distributed the resources, etc. In any case, both options will highly depend on the UCI design (e.g., if we choose the option that indicates the unused for the next occasion, the overriding might not be even needed). We propose to postpone the discussion after decision on: What information the UCI contains.  **Topic 3:** We have not seen a clear motivation to support indication for multiple CG configurations. The design will be complicated as we need to include another index for each indication. Therefore, we propose to down-prioritize it in Rel18 XR WI.  **Other topics:** generally,agree with moderator’s suggestion. However, the following moderator’s observation is not clear:   * + Applicability of feature to TBoM on Type-2 CG   Moderator’s observation: The design is aimed to be generic and applicable to any CG. |
| **CATT** | Topic 1: It is not necessary to define in the specification. UE should report the unused CG occasions any time. It is up to gNB implementation how to handle the resources of unused CG occasions.  Topic 2: This is an important issue for the late arrival of XR PDU within the duration of XR traffic. The over-write of the unused occasion indication would provide the gNB information when the XR traffic arrived and sent at an occasion which was marked as “unused” beforehand.  Topic 3: This is an implementation issue when multiple CG configurations are configured by gNB.  Topic 4: We need to identify the issues clearly before further discussion. |
| **New H3C** | We agree with FL’s suggestion |
| **Qualcomm** | Agree with moderators’ suggestion. For topic 1 we don’t think a timeline is necessary. The UE can still skip following legacy CG skipping.  For topic 3, we think indication of unused CG occasions for multiple CG configurations is very useful. In particular for the overlapping CG occasions, the gNB would avoid blind detection when the UE uses a certain occasion from the overlapping occasions. Besides, this allows the UE to send the UCI on the earliest CG PUSCH occasion across multiple configurations so that gNB has more time to reallocate the unused PUSCH resources to other UEs. |
| **Google** | Topic 1) We support discussing the timeline for the indication of unused TOs. The gNB needs time to receive the UCI indication, decode it and recycle the unused TOs to other UEs. A late indication may not be very beneficial for resource efficiency. However, network vendors could be reluctant to specify any timeline requirements as this is related to the gNB processing time.  Topic 2) we support discussing this topic and we agree with Nokia’s approach.  Topic 3) We think this should also be discussed. In UL XR, we can have multiple CG configurations, e.g., one for Pose/Control information, one for UL AR, one for UL audio, … Indication cross-CG configurations could be beneficial to reduce latency and signaling overhead. It also comes with low overhead cost by just adding an index of the targeted CG configuration. |
| **Samsung** | **Topic 1**: There is no reason to introduce a timeline. That makes assumptions on the gNB implementation/scheduler, a benefit from having the timeline does not exist, and specifications will be unnecessarily complicated.  **Topic 2**: Open to further discussion based on the comment from CATT.  **Topic 3**: A motivation is not clear and the proposal is not supported by the SI. It will only increase specification complexity. |
| **Futurewei** | We support Topic 1, especially for 1-1, as our observation and proposal below,  Observation 4: To guarantee the indicated unused CG PUSCH occasion(s) to be really recycled to other UEs, time offset between UCI and the indicated unused CG PUSCH occasion(s) should be equal to or greater than the PUSCH preparing time for at least one of the other UEs.  Proposal 9: Indicating unused CG PUSCH occasion(s) to gNB can be determined based on a time offset threshold, indicated by gNB, between UCI and the unused CG PUSCH occasion(s).  For Topic 3, we recall that it was discussed in study phase, but no conclusions, so we do not support rediscuss the same thing.  For other topics, we are ok with FL suggestions. |
| **InterDigital** | **Topic 1:** The discussion on timeline for sending UCI on unused PUSCHs can be reconsidered after making more progress on discussions in subsections 3.1 and 3.2.  **Topic 2:** We are open to discussing overriding the UCI on unused PUSCHs. At least the conditions under which the UE may be allowed to override the UCI can be discussed independent of other issues discussed in sections 3.1 and 3.2.  **Topic 3:** Although it can be beneficial if the UE is able to provide info on PUSCH usage across different CG configurations, it is not clear to us how or under what conditions can the UE determine such info on unused PUSCHs. |
| **Xiaomi** | We are fine to give more time to discuss topic 1 and 2.  **For Topic1:**  In our view, the most important purpose of the the discussion for XR-specific capacity enhancements is that unused CG occasions can be reallocated by the gNB. This requires ensuring that the gNB has sufficient time to perform this process. Therefore, the discussion of timeline is necessary.  **For Topic2:**  UE can reserve one or more CG occasions that are indicated to be used but actually unused. The main reason of this feature is that the UE does not know whether some CG occasions can be released to provide the gNB for reuse. And, overriding "unused" indications can reduce the waste of resources. |
| **vivo** | We think following topics need to be discussed together with the core features in 3.1~3.3. These topics may have impact on the detailed design for the core features.  For topic 1-1), how much processing time at gNB for the UCI indication of “unused” TO is needed can be further discussed.  For topic 2), it should be clarified what is the behaviour for a “unused” TO that is overridden as “NOT unused”. Is that mean a TO is to be “used” or may be “used”. If this behaviour would be allowed, UCI indication on “unused” TOs would not be useful since the TOs may or may not be “unused”.  For topic 3), we think the enhancement of UCI indication on unused TO should be applicable to multiple CG configurations. When CG is used for UL video traffic, not only variable packet size but also non-integer periodicity need to be handled. In such case, multiple CG configurations can be adopted. Besides, multiple CG configurations are supported since Rel-16. It is reasonable to apply the enhancement of UCI indication to multiple CG configurations case.   * Topic 1) Timeline impact and/or requirements   + 1-1) Introduce timeline for indication of “unused” TOs * Topic 2) Introduce Overriding “unused” indications * Topic 3) Applicability to multiple CG configurations |
| **TCL** | We are fine with FL’s suggestion. For topic 1, we support discussing the timeline for the indication of the un-used TOs due to some processing time will be needed.  For topic 2, we are not clear the motivation for this, as XR traffic is arrived with a periodic, then the CG configuration can be matched with the periodicity of XR.  For topic 3, We think this need to be discussed. In UL XR, multiple CG configurations can be used for XR to support multiple flows and reduce the latency when jitter is happened, indication un-used TOs within more than one CGs can be beneficial to signaling overhead, in addition, it’s also beneficial to avoid the resources waste for the CG configuration with no CG-UCI transmission chance, e.g. UE only choose one of CG configuration for one XR flow within more than one CG configurations. |
| **DOCOMO** | For topic 1, we don’t think it is necessary to introduce a new a timeline in the specification. It can be guaranteed by the offset between the UCI and the indicated TOs.  For topic 2, we are open to discuss this issue. We think at least “unused” overriding “used” can be supported.  For topic 3, we think the applicability for multiple CG applications may make the design more complicated and how much gain is not clear. We think it’s better to at least complete the design for only single CG configuration case.  For other topics, we are fine with moderator’ suggestion. |
| **LG** | We support to discuss topic 1/2/3  For Topic 1: it is true that certain time is necessary to apply UE’s decision at gNB side. To avoid transmitting unnecessary information, it is beneficial to discuss how to address the timeline. Regarding topic 1-1, we may need to consider the timeline for design on the information the UCI contains. We think it is unclear to discuss 1-2, which is relevant to PUSCH preparation time.  For Topic 2: it should be clarified how UE handle the duplicated indication.  For Topic 3: multiple configuration has various use cases in XR scenarios. It is definitely beneficial to discuss how the UCI is able to be applied to multiple configuration.  For other topics, we have a concerns on “restriction to licenced”. In terms of CG, the CG have lots of differences in between licensed and unlicensed. We are not sure that all we are discussing in this AI are applicable to unlicensed CG. We think it may necessary to take CG in licensed band as baseline. |
| **MediaTek** | We are open to discuss these topics more, but they should be low priority for now.  Our views:   * Topic 1: It would be worth to study the timeline impact. * Topic 2: We haven’t agreed to any “Not Unused” indication. So, overriding from “not unused” to “unused” should be possible anyways. * Topic 3: We don’t see a need for unused indication across multiple CG configurations.   One correction to moderator’s summary:   * Our proposal is not “Support for Non-integer periodicities”. We propose the following:   **Proposal 13**: Further discussions on multiple PUSCHs in single CG design shall optimize for CG configurations with CG periodicities as large as XR traffic periodicity (e.g., ~16ms).  So, our intention is to discuss and hopefully reach a conclusion on targeted CG periodicity values that companies should consider for XR-specific capacity enhancements. We see two possible approaches:   * Approach-1: The CG periodicity is about the same as XR traffic periodicity   + i.e., PUSCH TOs from one CG period are used to send one XR video frame.     - Example: CG period is set to 16ms * Approach-2: The CG periodicity is much smaller than XR traffic periodicity   + i.e., PUSCH TOs from multiple CG periods cab be used to send one XR video frame.     - Example: CG period is set to 4ms   Our proposal is to discuss the above two approaches and conclude one approach as the targeted configuration in our design discussions. So, we are not proposing non-integer periodicity. Apologies for being not clear with our proposal. |
| **Panasonic** | Q1: As we explained above, Topic 3 directly affects the design of unused indication. So, we suggest clarifying this topic through the discussions. |
| **Spreadtrum** | For topic 1, we agree to discuss the timeline impact to guarantee the unused CG PUSCH occasion(s) can be re-allocated to other UEs.  For topic 2, the benefit is not clear for us.  For other topics, we’re fine with moderator’s suggestions. |
| **NEC** | We are OK with the suggestion, and we think all the three listed topics are worth for further discussion. |
| **CMCC** | Regarding topic 2), i.e., introducing Overriding “unused” indications, we’d like to clarify motivations and provide solutions as follows.  **Motivation:**  Due to **UL jitter of XR** and the **misalignment between the non-integer periodicity of XR traffic** (e.g., 16.667ms) **and CG period** (e.g., 15ms or 17.5ms @30kHz DDDSU), it’s possible that the UL XR video frame has not been prepared by UE on a configured UCI transmission occasion, e.g., the first configured PUSCH transmission occasion in a CG period. In this case, UE could not precisely indicate the unused CG PUSCH occasions at the UCI transmission occasion. It should be noted that the presence of jitter has been identified by RAN2.  In addition, considering **traffic changes** caused by additional data generated from the application layer, the usage of CG PUSCH occasions may change. **Motivated by these two aspects of consideration, it is necessary to introduce a UCI overriding mechanism**, which allows UE to re-send UCI to override the inaccurate indication of the unused CG PUSCH occasions.  **Solutions:**  To support UCI overriding, it needs to allow UCI transmission on multiple CG PUSCH occasions. Meanwhile, to avoid gNB’s blind detection and guarantee gNB has time to recycle the unused CG PUSCH transmission occasions, a time window can be pre-defined/configured such that only CG PUSCH occasions within the time window can be used to transmit the UCI.  Figure 9 provides an example of this solution and three alternatives of the UCI overriding mechanism with the assumption that UCI bit value “1” means “used” and bit value “0” means “unused”. As shown in this figure, the UL XR packet has not prepared by UE on the first UCI transmission occasion.    Figure 9. Illustration of the UCI overriding within a pre-defined/configured time window  **Alt. 1: bit toggling based solution**   * Alt. 1-1: Unused convert to used: UE first sends a UCI that provides a bitmap “0 0 0 0 0 0” to indicate all the CG PUSCH occasions are “unused”. Then the UL XR packet arrives before the second UCI transmission occasion, and UE estimates that the following three PUSCH occasions will be used to transmit this XR packet, that is, the last two PUSCH occasions are unused. So on the second UCI transmission occasion, UE re-sends a UCI that provides a bitmap “1 1 1 1 0 0” to toggle the corresponding bits of the unused CG PUSCH occasions provided in the previous UCI. * Alt. 1-2: Used convert to unused: UE first sends a UCI that provides a bitmap “1 1 1 1 1 1” to indicate all the CG PUSCH occasions are “used”. And then UE sends “1 1 1 1 0 0” to toggle the corresponding bits of the unused CG PUSCH occasions provided in the previous UCI in second UCI transmission occasion. Compared with Alt. 1-1, this alternative can ensures that gNB correctly receives the used CG PUSCHs. While in Alt. 1-1, if UE provides “0 0 0 0 0 0” first, gNB may recycle the first several PUSCHs.   **Alt. 2: “credible” indication based solution**  A flag is used to indicate whether the UCI is credible or not in this alternative. On the first UCI transmission occasion, UE sends a UCI that provides a bitmap “0 1 1 1 1 1 1” where the first flag bit “0” indicates that this UCI is incredible and will be overridden. Then on the second UCI transmission occasion, UE re-sends a UCI that provides a bitmap “1 1 1 1 1 0 0” where the first flag bit “1” indicates that this UCI is credible and will not be overridden. |
| **Huawei/HiSilicon** | We agree with general suggestion to prioritize the discussion on 3.1, 3.2, 3.3.  For topic 1, we think the timeline is not necessary.  For topic 2, we are open to discuss overriding from Not Unused to Unused. But overriding from Unused to Not Unused is not reasonable since this cause gNB re-allocating very complicated. |
| **FGI** | We are fine to discuss Topic 1 and Topic 2. For Topic 3, whether the indication is needed depends on the ability of the UE to predict the XR traffic. We suggest to de-prioritize Topic 3 unless there is input from RAN2. |
| **Lenovo** | Topic 1) we are open to discuss the scenarios which might need a timeline. However, we would like to provide few general comments in this regard:   * if we have the view that the unused indication provides opportunistic scheduling occasions, some of the scenarios wherein a timeline is to be discussed might not necessarily need a timeline as in the worst case, the opportunistic scheduling occasion is not useful. * Number of UCI bits is negligible compared to number of UL XR bits, so may be saving few UCI bits by defining a timeline is not that useful. * It may be better to postpone this aspect till high-level design aspects are done (especially 3.1)   Topic 2) open to discuss scenarios; we should take into account that the gNB might have already scheduled UL transmissions by other UEs in the resources indicated as unused by a first UCI; so indicating those resources as used in a second subsequent UCI might not be useful.  Topic 3) one benefit of supporting multiple CG configuration could be the unused resources can be indicated faster to the gNB, and hence, maybe used to schedule other UEs. Indication of unused time units (e.g., slots) may simplify support of UCI indication for multiple CG configurations.  Agree with the FL to study interaction with enhanced UL skipping later.  Regarding applicability of the feature to unlicensed spectrum, wondering if such feature is applicable only to gNB-COT. For UE-COT, wondering if Cot-sharing is aimed to provide a similar functionality; also, gNB may not be able to schedule UL transmissions of other UEs in the UE-COT. |
| **Ericsson** | Agree with Moderator’s suggestions |
| **Moderator** | **@All:** Companies are encouraged to exhcnage views for better understanding of these topics. Moderator priorotizes design issues in sections 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3 at this meeting.  **Please continue discussions.** |

## 3.5 Online sessions

### 3.5.1 2nd online session

#### 3.5.1.1 What information the UCI contains

|  |
| --- |
| **Summary of views.**  **Option 1 (13):** FW, E///, HW/HiSi, vivo, ZTE, DCM, MTK, FGI, New H3C, NEC, Intel, Samsung, LG   * **Option 1-1:** FW, HW/HiSi, DCM, MTK, Intel, ZTE, Samsung * **Option 1-2:** E///, LG, DCM   **Option 2 (17)** QC, CATT, vivo, Spreadtrum, IDC, Google, OPPO, Lenovo, Nokia/NSB, Panasonic, DENSO, TCL, xiaomi, CMCC, CAICT, SONY, Apple   * **Option 2-1:** QC, Google, OPPO, xiaomi, CAICT, CATT, Apple * **Option 2-2:** Spreadtrum, Lenovo, Nokia/NSB, Panasonic, SONY   **Proposal 2-1-1:**  Section Option 1 or Option 2 (corresponding to the agreement in RAN1#112):   * For dynamic indication of unused CG PUSCH transmission occasion(s) based on a UCI, the indicated “unused” CG PUSCH TO(s), if any, by the UCI in a CG PUSCH: * **Option 1:** are consecutive CG PUSCH TO(s) in time domain. * **Option 2:** can be consecutive or non-consecutive CG PUSCH TO(s) in time domain * FFS whether/how the unused TO(s) can be associated to multiple CG configuration. * Note: FFSs and further details in corresponding agreement in RAN1#112 for the selected option are remained for further discussion, |

#### 3.5.1.2 When the UCI is sent

|  |
| --- |
| **Summary of views**   * **OK (Option 1)**: New H3C, Nokia, CATT, vivo, QC, LG, DCM, Sony, MTK, Samsung, CATT, Lenovo, Ericsson, Intel, ZTE (compromise), HW/HiSi (compromise), IDC (compromised), Spreadtrum (compromise) * **OK to compromise to Option 1**: ZTE, HW/HiSi, IDC, Spreadtrum * **Not OK (Option 1)**: Panasonic (Opt 2), OPPO, FW (opt 2), Google (2/3)   **Proposal 2-2-1 (updated):**  **Select on the options below:**   * **Option 1**: For a CG PUSCH configuration, the UTO-UCI is included in every CG PUSCH that is transmitted (that is Option 1 in corresponding agreement in RAN1#112).   + FFS details * **Option 2**: For a CG PUSCH configuration, the transmission occasion(s) that the corresponding CG PUSCH(s) should include UTO-UCI when it is transmitted, is determined by RRC (that is Option 2 in corresponding agreement in RAN1#112).   + FFS details * Note: The term “UTO-UCI” refers to the “UCI that provides information about unused CG PUSCH transmission occasions” for convenience. |

#### 3.5.1.3 How the UCI is sent

|  |
| --- |
| **Summary of views:**   * **OK:** H3C, Panasonic, CATT, Nokia/NSB, OPPO, ZTE, vivo, QC, LG, DCM, xiaomi, CMCC, Sony, HW/HiSi, TCL, FW, IDC, Google, Spreadtrum, Samsung, CATT, Lenovo, Intel * **Not OK**:- * **Samsung. ZTE, few others. Comment on unlic**   **Proposal 2-3-1 (updated2):**   * The UCI that provides information about unused CG PUSCH transmission occasions is defined as a “new UCI” (i.e. Alt. 1 of previous agreement). |
| **Summary of views:**   * **OK:** H3C, Panasonic, CATT, Nokia/NSB, OPPO, vivo, QC, LG, DCM, xiaomi, CMCC, Sony, TCL, FW, IDC, Google, Spreadtrum, Samsung, CATT, Lenovo, Intel, [HW/HiSi] * **Not OK**:-   **Proposal 2-3-2 (updated):**   * With respect to PHY two-level priority, for a configured grant PUSCH configuration, the “UTO-UCI” has the same priority level as the configured grant PUSCH. * Note: The term “UTO-UCI” refers to the “UCI that provides information about unused CG PUSCH transmission occasions” for convenience. |
| **Summary of views:**   * **OK:** H3C, Panasonic, CATT, Nokia/NSB, OPPO, vivo, QC, LG, DCM, xiaomi, CMCC, Sony, HW/HiSi, TCL, FW, IDC, Google, Spreadtrum, CATT, Lenovo, Samsung, Intel * **Not OK**:- * **Samsung. Lenovo, Intel, few others. Comment on unlic.**   **Proposal 2-3-3 (updated):**  The existing CG-UCI encoding and multiplexing procedures are reused for encoding the “UTO-UCI” in a configured grant PUSCH in absence or presence of other UCIs being multiplexed in the PUSCH, by applying the following adjustments:   * For operation on licensed band:   + The “UTO-UCI” is used instead of CG-UCI in the corresponding procedures for encoding of CG-UCI and/or HARQ-ACK and/or CSI, whichever is present. * For operation on unlicensed band:   + The “UTO-UCI” appended to CG-UCI is used instead of CG-UCI in the corresponding procedures for encoding of CG-UCI and/or HARQ-ACK and/or CSI, whichever is present.     - Note: The above bullet is not valid if operation on unlicensed is not supported. * FFS on sequence generation order between UTO-UCI and HARQ-ACK * Note: The term “UTO-UCI” refers to the “UCI that provides information about unused CG PUSCH transmission occasions” for convenience. |
| **Summary of views:**   * **OK:** CATT, Samsung, Panasonic, H3C,Nokia/NSB, OPPO, vivo, QC, LG, DCM, CMCC, TCL, FW, IDC, IDC, Spreadtrum, MTK, Lenovo, Intel * **Not OK:-** * **Option 1:** H3C, Nokia/NSB, OPPO, vivo, QC, LG, DCM, CMCC, TCL, FW, IDC, IDC, Spreadtrum, MTK, Lenovo, Intel * **Option 2:** CATT, Samsung (Ok to compromise) * **Samsung. Lenovo, Intel, few others. Comment on unlic.**   **Proposal 2-3-4 (updated1) – OK to compromise to Option 1?**  For multiplexing of the “UTO-UCI” on CG-PUSCH, select one of the options below for determining the beta-offset:   * Option 1:   + Beta offset can be configured for the “UTO-UCI” and applied when applicable.   + For operation on licensed band:     - The beta offset for the “UTO-UCI” is used in the procedures instead of CG-UCI beta offset, when applicable.   + For operation on unlicensed band:     - If the “UTO-UCI” is jointly encoded with CG-UCI, the beta offset for CG-UCI is used in the procedures, when applicable.       * Note: The above bullet is not valid if operation on unlicensed is not supported. * Option 2:   + Beta-offset for HARQ is reused for the “UTO-UCI”. * Option 3 (OPPO):   + For operation on licensed band:     - HARQ-ACK beta offset is used in the procedures instead of CG-UCI beta offset, when applicable.   + For operation on unlicensed band:     - If the “UTO-UCI” is jointly encoded with CG-UCI, the beta offset for CG-UCI is used in the procedures instead of CG-UCI beta offset, when applicable       * Note: The above bullet is not valid if operation on unlicensed is not supported. * Note: The term “UTO-UCI” refers to the “UCI that provides information about unused CG PUSCH transmission occasions” for convenience. |

#### 3.5.1.4 Outcome of 2nd online session

The following agreements corresponding to proposals in section 3.5.1.1, 3.5.1.2 and 3.5.1.3 were made:

Agreement

For dynamic indication of unused CG PUSCH transmission occasion(s) based on a UCI, the indicated “unused” CG PUSCH TO(s), if any, by the UCI in a CG PUSCH for a CG configuration

* can be consecutive or non-consecutive CG PUSCH TO(s) in time domain [in one CG period]
* FFS whether/how the unused TO(s) can be associated to multiple CG configuration.

Note: FFSs and further details in corresponding agreement in RAN1#112 for the selected option are remained for further discussion

Note: Above corresponds to Option 2 (w.r.t. agreement in RAN1#112)

**Agreement**

* **Option 1**: For a CG PUSCH configuration, the UTO-UCI is included in every CG PUSCH that is transmitted (that is Option 1 in corresponding agreement in RAN1#112)
  + FFS details
* Note: The term “UTO-UCI” refers to the “UCI that provides information about unused CG PUSCH transmission occasions” for convenience.

**Agreement**

The UCI that provides information about unused CG PUSCH transmission occasions is defined as a “new UCI” (i.e. Alt. 1 of previous agreement).

**Agreement**

* With respect to PHY two-level priority, for a configured grant PUSCH configuration, the “UTO-UCI” has the same priority level as the configured grant PUSCH.
* Note: The term “UTO-UCI” refers to the “UCI that provides information about unused CG PUSCH transmission occasions” for convenience.

### 3.5.1 3rd online session

#### 3.5.1.3 How the UCI is sent

Question raised to clarify “used in the procedures instead of CG-UCI beta offset, when applicable.” In P2-3-4. The context of this proposal was actually P2-3-4 that when the existing CG-UCI encoding and multiplexing procedures are reused, how to determine beta-offset. Therefore, it is better to keep these two proposal together.

|  |
| --- |
| **Summary of views (P2-3-3):**   * **OK:** H3C, Panasonic, CATT, Nokia/NSB, OPPO, vivo, QC, LG, DCM, xiaomi, CMCC, Sony, HW/HiSi, TCL, FW, IDC, Google, Spreadtrum, CATT, Lenovo, Samsung, Intel * **Not OK**:-   **Summary of views (P2-3-4 in red):**   * **OK:** CATT, Samsung, Panasonic, H3C,Nokia/NSB, OPPO, vivo, QC, LG, DCM, CMCC, TCL, FW, IDC, IDC, Spreadtrum, MTK, Lenovo, Intel * **Not OK:-** * **Option 1:** H3C, Nokia/NSB, OPPO, vivo, QC, LG, DCM, CMCC, TCL, FW, IDC, IDC, Spreadtrum, MTK, Lenovo, Intel * **Option 2:** CATT, Samsung (Ok to compromise)   **Proposal 2-3-3/2-3-4 (merged):**  The existing CG-UCI encoding and multiplexing procedures are reused for encoding the “UTO-UCI” in a configured grant PUSCH in absence or presence of other UCIs being multiplexed in the PUSCH, by applying the following adjustments:   * The “UTO-UCI” is used instead of CG-UCI in the corresponding procedures for encoding of CG-UCI and/or HARQ-ACK and/or CSI, whichever is present. * For determining the beta-offset, select one of the options below: * Option 1:   + ~~Beta offset can be configured for the “UTO-UCI” and applied when applicable.~~   + The beta offset for the “UTO-UCI” is used in the procedures instead of CG-UCI beta offset, when applicable. * Option 2:   + Beta-offset for HARQ is reused for the “UTO-UCI”. * Option 3:   + - HARQ-ACK beta offset is used in the procedures instead of CG-UCI beta offset, when applicable. * FFS on sequence generation order between UTO-UCI and HARQ-ACK * FFS on dropping rule between UTO-UCI and HARQ-ACK when joint encoding is not configured. * Note: The term “UTO-UCI” refers to the “UCI that provides information about unused CG PUSCH transmission occasions” for convenience. |

# 4 Conclusion

TBD
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