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# 1 Introduction

This document provides a summary of the following RAN1 email discussion.

|  |
| --- |
| [105-e-LTE-eMTC5-02] Clarification of UE procedure for UL multi-TB scheduling in TDD for LTE-MTC – Johan (Ericsson)* Discuss and decide on the potential clarification in 36.213 discussed in these contributions:
	+ [R1-2105267](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_105-e/Docs/R1-2105267.zip), “Clarification on UE procedure for uplink MTB scheduling in TDD”, ZTE
	+ [R1-2105268](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_105-e/Docs/R1-2105268.zip), “Discussion on UE procedure for uplink MTB scheduling in TDD”, ZTE
* Discussion and decision by May 24, TPs by May 27
 |

# 2 Discussion

Contribution [2] discusses a potential need to clarify the UE procedure for UL multi-TB scheduling in CE mode A in TDD UL/DL configuration 0. In this TDD UL/DL configuration, the ‘UL index’ field in the DCI achieves dual-TB scheduling already since Rel-13. Section 2.1 in [2] makes the following observations and proposal:

*Observation 1: For TDD configuration 0, when repetition number N = 1 and UL index = ‘11’, the corresponding HARQ process number for the two scheduled TBs are consecutive.*

*Observation 2: When 2 TBs are scheduled, the HARQ process number determined by ‘UL index’ and ‘Scheduling TBs for Unicast’ field are conflicted.*

*Observation 3: When more than 2 TBs are scheduled, the 2 HARQ process number determined by UL index is conflicted with the HARQ process number indicated by ‘Scheduling TBs for Unicast’ field if multi-TB scheduling feature is configured.*

*Proposal 1: When ce-PUSCH-MultiTB-Config is configured and ‘UL index’ in DCI format 6-0A is set as ‘11’, if multiple TBs are scheduled, further clarification is needed on how to determine the HARQ process number for each TB.*

**Question 1: Companies are invited to comment on the observations and proposal listed above.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Lenovo, MotoM | We agree the observation 1-3For the proposal part:When *ce-PUSCH-MultiTB-Config* is configured, no matter how many TBs are scheduled, even only one TB is scheduled, the UL index in DCI format 6-0A should not set as “11”.If one TB is scheduled by ‘Scheduling TBs for Unicast’ field, and we use “UL index = ‘11’” to schedule 2 TB, this is another confliction. |
| Qualcomm | We agree with the analysis. We think the simplest way would be to disallow ‘11’ when multiple TBs are scheduled. |
| FL (Ericsson) | Companies are invited to comment on the statement in Lenovo’s response above that even scheduling of a single TB will be problematic when *ce-PUSCH-MultiTB-Config* is configured and ‘UL index’ is set to ‘11’. |
| Lenovo, MotoM | Let me clarify moreIf *ce-PUSCH-MultiTB-Config* is configured, eNB can use ‘Scheduling TBs for Unicast’ field to schedule 2TB without HARQ process number restriction, do we still need to use legacy Rel.13 method to use UL index=11 to schedule 2TB in subframe n+k and n+7 with HARQ process number restriction?If ‘Scheduling TBs for Unicast’ field indicate one TB is scheduled, and UL index=11, 2TB in subframe n+k and n+7 are scheduled. Although this can work well, and all procedure should follow N\_TB=1 case (e.g., uplink power control, adopted to 1 TB or 2 TB), which seems not a good understanding.If so, we hope to remove “*if multiple TBs are scheduled,*” in the proposal. |
| Qualcomm | Although we do not have a terribly strong view, we think we can allow ‘11’ with HARQ process restriction to be kept. One potential advantage is that, if one of the two subframes are invalid, ‘11’ allows to override the invalid subframe mask (although there may be a mistake in 36.213, the condition shouldn’t be “N>1”, but “N N\_TB > 1”). |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are OK to remove “*if multiple TBs are scheduled,*” in the proposal to obtain a better understanding. In this case, when multi-TB is configured, 2TB scheduling with the full scheduling flexibility can be provided.Regarding N>1, this condition is set for the repetition case. So, maybe we can keep it there. |
| FL (Ericsson) | Qualcomm has proposed the following TP above. From Lenovo’s comments above, it seems that this solution might have some problems. Companies are invited to comment further.- for TDD UL/DL configuration 0 and a BL/CE UE in CEModeA, if the MSB of the UL index in the MPDCCH with DCI format 6-0A is set to 1, the value of *x* isgiven as the value of *k* in Table 8-2 for the corresponding TDD UL/DL configuration; if the LSB of the UL index in the MPDCCH with DCI format 6-0A is set to 1, *x = 7.* The UE is not expected to receive DCI format 6-0A with both the MSB and LSB of the UL index set to 1 when *NTBN>1*. In case both the MSB and LSB of the UL index are set to 1, the HARQ process number of the PUSCH corresponding the MSB of the UL index is  and the HARQ process number of the PUSCH corresponding the LSB of the UL index is , where  is determined according to the *HARQ process number* field in DCI format 6-0A |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

Section 2.2 in [2] lists the following potential solutions and proposes to adopt Option 1. A draft 36.213 CR corresponding to Option 1 has been provided in [1].

* *Option 1: UE is not expected to receive DCI format 6-0A with both the MSB and LSB of ‘UL index’ set to 1 if multiple TBs are scheduled when ce-PUSCH-MultiTB-Config is configured.*
* *Option 2: When ce-PUSCH-MultiTB-Config is configured, the ‘UL index’ field is ignored.*
* *Option 3: The multi-TB scheduling feature is not supported for TDD configuration 0.*
* *Option 4: When UL index = 11 and ce-PUSCH-MultiTB-Config is configured, only single TB scheduling is supported.*

**Question 2: Please comment on the options listed above and express your preference, if any.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Lenovo, MotoM | Based on the observation, if we want to down select from the 4 options above, we prefer option 1 in general.  |
| Qualcomm | We think Option 1 is preferred (it is not clear to us what is the difference with Option 4, though). We think the CR can be simplified as follows:with both the MSB and LSB of the UL index set to 1 when *N>1* or . |
| FL (Ericsson) | Companies are invited to comment on the options listed above in the light of the statement in Lenovo’s response to Question 1 above that even scheduling of a single TB will be problematic when *ce-PUSCH-MultiTB-Config* is configured and ‘UL index’ is set to ‘11’.  |
| Lenovo, MotoM | We agree with the CR by [1] removing the following part.The UE is not expected to receive DCI format 6-0A with both the MSB and LSB of the UL index set to 1 when *N>1* or ~~multiple TBs are scheduled when~~ *ce-PUSCH-MultiTB-Config* isconfigured. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | The modification from Lenovo is fine with us, which corresponds to option1.The revision from Qualcomm is similar with the original version since the formula can be described as “multiple TBs are scheduled when *ce-PUSCH-MultiTB-Config* isconfigured”. |
| FL (Ericsson) | Are there any further comments on the following TP?- for TDD UL/DL configuration 0 and a BL/CE UE in CEModeA, if the MSB of the UL index in the MPDCCH with DCI format 6-0A is set to 1, the value of *x* isgiven as the value of *k* in Table 8-2 for the corresponding TDD UL/DL configuration; if the LSB of the UL index in the MPDCCH with DCI format 6-0A is set to 1, *x = 7.* The UE is not expected to receive DCI format 6-0A with both the MSB and LSB of the UL index set to 1 when *N>1* or *ce-PUSCH-MultiTB-Config* isconfigured. In case both the MSB and LSB of the UL index are set to 1, the HARQ process number of the PUSCH corresponding the MSB of the UL index is  and the HARQ process number of the PUSCH corresponding the LSB of the UL index is , where  is determined according to the *HARQ process number* field in DCI format 6-0A |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
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