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# 1 Introduction

This document is to kick-off the following email discussion:

[105-e-NR-L1enh-URLLC-04] Email discussion/approval on remaining issues on intra-UE prioritization and multiplexing – Lihui (Vivo):

* Discuss whether to confirm RAN2’s working assumption on UL skipping vs. LCH-based prioritization.
* Discuss PHY impacts/behavior on intra-UE prioritization and multiplexing.
* Discussion and decision by May 24, TPs by May 27

**Note that the deadline for the email and the potential TP is set on May 27, ~~please provide your first-round feedback by UTC 11:59 am, May 21.~~**

**Please provide your second-round feedback by UTC 11:59 PM, May 24.**

# 2 Background

In RAN1#103-e and 104-e meeting, RAN1 received two LSs from RAN2 to confirm the intended UE behavior as below:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **RAN2 LS on Intra UE Prioritization Scenario (R1-2007523)**   |  | | --- | | RAN2 has agreed in RAN2#107 that  For the case when no PDU has been generated at all yet, and there are two grants where one will be de-prioritized (and there is data available for both grants), one PDU is generated by MAC.  This agreement means that in the collision scenario between CG and DG with same/different PHY-priority index, and only one transport block is delivered to PHY, PHY transmit on the grant for which a transport block is delivered and skip the transmission on the other grant.  It is not clear from the wording in the LS R1-2005078 if the PHY behavior described above is consistent with RAN1 understanding.  RAN2 respectfully asks RAN1 to clarify if the mentioned scenario is supported or not. |   **RAN2 LS on overlapped data and SR are of equal L1 priority (R1-2100026)**   |  | | --- | | RAN2 confirms the intended UE behavior: For the case of overlapping PUSCH and SR with equal L1 priority and MAC has not yet delivered MAC PDU for the PUSCH to PHY, if SR is prioritized in MAC, MAC shall not deliver the MAC PDU for the PUSCH and shall instruct PHY for SR transmission.  RAN2 respectfully asks RAN1 to confirm if the intended UE behavior mentioned above can be supported. | |

RAN1 provided the corresponding reply LSs as following:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **RAN1 Reply LS on Intra UE Prioritization Scenario (R1-2009680)**   |  | | --- | | RAN1 had a discussion and made following agreements:  **Agreement**   * For the collision scenario between CG and DG with same/different PHY-priority index, if there is no collision between PUCCH and the CG and there is no collision between PUCCH and the DG, the behaviour mentioned in the LS is consistent with RAN1’s understanding if taking into account the TP to Rel-16 TS 38.214, i.e., revision CR in R1-2008655. * When the MAC entity is configured with *lch-basedPrioritization*, for the collision scenario between CG and DG with same/different PHY-priority index, and when there is collision between PUCCH and the CG with the same priority and/or there is collision between PUCCH and the DG with the same priority, RAN1 is still discussing the related PHY layer behaviour. |   **RAN1 Reply LS on overlapped data and SR are of equal L1 priority (R1-2102244)**   |  | | --- | | Assumption: LCH based prioritization is configured. Rel-16 UL skipping is possible.  RAN1 respectfully asks RAN2 to provide their views on which understanding (understanding 1 or 2) is the intended MAC layer behavior or to provide an alternate understanding, for case 2-1, case 2-2, case 3 and case 4. | |

In RAN2#113-e and RAN2#113bis-e meeting, RAN2 discussed Rel-16 intra-UE prioritization with taking UL skipping agreement into account and achieved following agreements:

|  |
| --- |
| **Working assumption: When lch-BasedPrioritization is not configured and Rel-16 CG/DG PUSCH skipping is enabled, DG always overrides CG. This working assumption is not agreed until confirmed by RAN1.**  **Working assumption: The MAC entity does not generate a MAC PDU for a deprioritized uplink grant even when its associated PUSCH is overlapping with PUCCH. This working assumption is not agreed until confirmed by RAN1.**  **Confirm the WA that LCH based prio has higher priority than UL skipping still applies, and we expect that if there are issues, RAN1 will come-back.** |

In addition, for various SR/Data overlapping cases identified by RAN1, as captured in RAN2’s chairman notes in RAN2#113bis-e meeting, it seems both understandings 1) MAC does not have a knowledge of the UCI multiplexing and 2) MAC would have a knowledge of the UCI multiplexing are possible, and RAN2 postponed the discussions to the next meetings.

|  |
| --- |
| Chair: A TS can refer to a condition where the details are specified in another TS. This is usually done by fuzzy reference, so it seems that both interpretations are possible (without adding L1 specific details in MAC or vice versa).  Chair: Understanding 1: If we assume that MAC just generate SR and let L1 decide if/by what resource to transmit it, if the SR is not transmitted in the end then MAC may need to know this, in order to re-trigger the SR.  Chair: Understanding 2: If we assume that MAC (the UE) can first know whether SR can be transmitted or not, then the current TS works.  Chair propose to: Postpone this specific issue (MAC awareness of UCI for this case), invite for a more principal discussion on MAC L1 dependencies next meeting.  **Postpone this issue** |

# 3 Discussions

Basically, there are four scenarios as below for intra-UE prioritization/multiplexing, considering both MAC lch-basedPrioritization configuration and physical layer priorities:

* Scenario #1: lch-basedPrioritization is NOT configured, and SINGLE PHY priorities for UL transmission
* Scenario #2: lch-basedPrioritization is NOT configured, and TWO PHY priorities for UL transmission
* Scenario #3: lch-basedPrioritization is configured, and SINGLE PHY priorities for UL transmission
* Scenario #4: lch-basedPrioritization is configured, and TWO PHY priorities for UL transmission

Scenario #1 is under the discussion in agenda item 7.1 (NR Maintenance of Rel-15). In this document, let’s focus on the Scenario#2 ~ #4.

## 3.1 Discussion on Scenario#2 without LCH based prioritization

## First Round

[2] and [8] proposed to confirm RAN2’s WA for scenario#2. Therefore, following proposal is made:

* Proposal 3.1-1: When *lch-BasedPrioritization* is not configured and PHY is configured with two L1 priorities, RAN1 confirms RAN2’s working assumption that DG always overrides CG.

**Question 3.1-1: Do you agree above Proposal 3.1-1 in general?**

* **If no, please provide the reasons and your suggestions.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Nokia, NSB | Agree |
| Ericsson | Agree  Additionally, it should be clarified that “DG always overrides CG” does not mean that MAC always generate a PDU for DG. If there is data for the DG PUSCH, MAC generates PDU for the DG PUSCH. If there is no data for the DG PUSCH, MAC does not generate PDU for the DG PUSCH. |
| ZTE | We agree the RAN2 working assumption. When *lch-BasedPrioritization* is not configured, the MAC layer will only generate the MAC PDU for the DG PUSCH in case of overlapping between DG and CG if there is available data, which is exactly the Rel-15 behavior. The UE shall transmit the DG PUSCH.  However, when two L1 priorities are configured, the UE behavior is being discussed in Rel-17 (Actually it has been discussed in Rel-16 only with some potential agreements). The common understanding is that the HP PUSCH will be transmitted if both of the PUSCH have available data. It means the UE behavior are different, which also depends on the configuration of LCH based prioritization. In TS38.213, the UE behavior (dropping or transmission) only depends on the L1 priority. We prefer the RAN1 spec should not be affect by the RAN2 assumption. In addition, we don’t see the need that only the two L1 priorities are configured (i.e., without LCH based prioritization configured). The reasonable configuration is that both the L1 priority and the LCH based prioritization are not configured. |
| vivo | Agree.  **About Ericsson’s comments** on the additional clarification, it also depends on whether the DG overlaps with the PUCCH with the same L1 priority. So for simplicity, I think we can just confirm what RAN2 asked without listing all the conditions when MAC should and should not generate MAC PDU for the DG PUSCH.  **About ZTE’s comments**, I agree with you that the reasonable configuration is that both the L1 priority and the LCH based prioritization are not configured. But RAN agreed in RAN2#112-e meeting that   * [041] RAN2 confirm that LCH based prioritization and PHY based prioritization can be configured independently.   For Rel-16, the overlapping only for CG and DG, CG and CG. and also there are cancellation or overriding timeline defined so that MAC will deliver one MAC PDU considering the timeline requirement. |
| Qualcomm | Do not agree. The proposal is not aligned with the intra-UE prioritization design principle introduced in PHY in Rel-16, since it lets the UE to prioritize a LP DG over a HP CG. We see there’re several issues with the proposal:  **FL reply: which principle do you refer to? As we discussed in previous RAN1 meetings (#101-e, #102-e), the common understanding and the principle is for the collision between DG and CG, MAC should only deliver one MAC PDU to PHY as long as the timeline specified in TS 38.214 section 6.1 is respected and PHY will transmit whichever PDU delivered by MAC as long as MAC delivers only one PDU. We never have agreed that MAC should deliver the PDU corresponding to grant with High L1 priority, since it does not make sense to deliver one padding PDU if the grant with High L1 priority has no available data.**   * First , the L1 priority index is used by MAC in the LCP restriction procedure. In particular, the RRC parameter *allowedPHY-PriorityIndex* sets the allowed PHY priority index(es) of a dynamic grant for transmission. Therefore, the gNB could configure the UE to only use HP phy grants (e.g., HP CG and HP DG) to transmit high priority data. But if we allow LP DG to always overrides HP CG, then it could happen that the UE is not able to transmit high priority using the HP CG, and nor can it use the LP DG due to LCP restriction. This creates unnecessary delay for transmitting the HP data at the UE, and is clearly against the motivation of introducing two PHY priority levels.   **FL reply: For the 1st issue, the *allowedPHY-PriorityIndex* is only used for DG, cannot be used for CG. Then based on your example, no problem for High L1 priority data Tx since DG always override CG. In addition. If MAC made the WA that when lch-PriorityBasedPrioritization is NOT configured, DG will always override CG, I think it is kind of wrong/unreasonable operation that MAC maps the high priority data to CG when knowing DG will override the CG.**   * Second, this may create issues when UL skipping is configured and when there is UCI.   **FL reply: I cannot agree with you on this point. Now DG always override CG, the delivered DG is deterministic, there will be no UL skipping issue at both UE side and gNB side.**   * Lastly, there are separate discussions below on the UE behavior when LCH prioritization is configured. It is likely that the UE behavior will not be the same when LCH prioritization is configured. Having different UE behaviors based on LCH prioritization being configured or not complicates the UE implementation.   **FL reply: The MAC spec 321 is written as the way that there are different UE behaviors based on LCH prioritization for example, “if the MAC entity is configured with lch-basedPrioritization, xxx” and “if the MAC entity is configured with lch-basedPrioritization, xxx”. I did not get your point actually, isn’t it reasonable that MAC should have different behaviors between the LCH prioritization is configured and not configured as long as the timeline defined in 214 is respected?** |
| Intel | Agree. |
| CATT | In our understanding, DG does not always overrides CG when PHY is configured with two L1 priorities because if HP CG has data to transmit, firstly MAC should deliver PDU for HP CG and then PHY should transmit HP CG. Otherwise, if HP CG has no data (UL skipping), MAC can deliver PDU for LP DG to PHY.  From PHY perspective, if CG is high priority and receives PDU from MAC, PHY executes HP CG transmission.  **FL reply: See my replies to QC. 😊** |
| OPPO | We tend to agree the proposal but also acknowledge the issue of HP CG and LP DG. To our understanding, this issue may be avoided by gNB configuration, i.e. both *lch-BasedPrioritization* and PHY priority are configured simultaneously by gNB. |
| Samsung | Agree. |
| HW/HiSi | Agree |
| DOCOMO | We share the view with Qualcomm that the same PHY behavior irrespective of the configuration of LCH prioritization is preferred, but we can live with the proposal.  **FL reply: thank you for your understanding and compromise.** |
| Spreadtrum | We tend to agree with Qualcomm with the issue of HP CG and LP DG.  **FL reply: See my replies to QC. 😊** |

## Second Round

**Proposal 3.1-1: When *lch-BasedPrioritization* is not configured and PHY is configured with two L1 priorities, RAN1 confirms RAN2’s working assumption that DG always overrides CG.**

Companies’ views for proposal 3.1-1 are summarized as below.

* Agree proposal 3.1-1 in principle
* Nokia, NSB, Ericsson, ZTE, vivo, Intel, OPPO, Samsung, HW, HiSi, DCM (can accept)
* Do not agree proposal 3.1-1
* QC, *CATT?, Spreadtrum?*

@all, please check the **FL reply** to some companies in the first round discussion, given the majority views and the explanation provided below.

* RAN1 had the common understanding in previous meetings that for the collision between DG and CG, MAC should only deliver one MAC PDU to PHY as long as the timeline specified in TS 38.214 section 6.1 is respected and PHY will transmit whichever PDU delivered by MAC as long as MAC delivers only one PDU. We never have agreed that MAC should always deliver the PDU corresponding to grant with High L1 priority, since it does not make sense to deliver one padding PDU if the grant with High L1 priority has no available data.
* When lch-BasedPrioritization is not configured, DG always override CG, the delivered DG is deterministic, there will be no UL skipping issue at both UE side and gNB side.

Therefore, FL proposed to agree following proposal.

**Proposal 3.1-1:**

* When *lch-BasedPrioritization* is not configured and PHY is configured with two L1 priorities, RAN1 confirms RAN2’s working assumption that DG always overrides CG.

**FL Q2-1: If you have any strong concern on the above proposal 3.1-1, please provide your reasons and way forward.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Ericsson | Support Proposal 3.1-1. |
| CATT | For the sake of progress, we are also fine with Proposal 3.1-1. |
| Vivo | Support Proposal 3.1-1. |
| OPPO | Support Proposal 3.1-1. |
| ZTE | We are fine with this proposal in general.  In our understanding, the intention of the agreements in RAN2#112-e is NOT to introduce some configuration restrictions in RAN2 spec (e.g., 38.331). The question here is whether we need to discuss the potential issues under this configuration, if any, e.g., the concerns raised by some companies. To address this, maybe we can add a note. For example,  Note: This is only used to confirm the RAN2’s working assumption. RAN1 will not discuss the details under this configuration because it is assumed to be an unreasonable configuration.  **FL reply 2: I agree with your views. I tracked the RAN2 email discussion for this issue, details can be found in R2-2011058. RAN2 made the agreement of “LCH based prioritization and PHY based prioritization can be configured independently.” based on following:**   * **The UE capability on LCH based and PHY based prioritization is separate.** * **There are potential not complex solutions for only one of the two is configured.** * **It is up to gNB implementation to assure LCH based prioritization and PHY based prioritization configured together.**   **So many companies in RAN2, share the views that in practice it is the best to configure both of them, but from spec. point of view it does not need to mandate such joint configuration and by gNB implementation, some issues can be avoided.**  **Given RAN2 already discussed the configuration for two meetings (111 and 112-e), I think they well recognized the issue if the two do not configure jointly. So, better to not add the note to avoid the confusion/repeated discussions. 😊** |
| LG | Support Proposal 3.1-1 |
| Nokia, NSB | Support Proposal 3.1-1 |
| DOCOMO | We are fine with the proposal |
| Qualcomm | We still have concerns on the proposal, and can not agree with it.  We prefer to postpone the discussion on this issue once the UE behavior for the other cases (i.e., when ***lch-BasedPrioritization*** is configured) becomes more clear. As indicated in our first round comment, we prefer to have a unified UE behavior at PHY for CG/DG collision handling if possible.  To the FL comment:   * **FL reply: which principle do you refer to? As we discussed in previous RAN1 meetings (#101-e, #102-e), the common understanding and the principle is for the collision between DG and CG, MAC should only deliver one MAC PDU to PHY as long as the timeline specified in TS 38.214 section 6.1 is respected and PHY will transmit whichever PDU delivered by MAC as long as MAC delivers only one PDU. We never have agreed that MAC should deliver the PDU corresponding to grant with High L1 priority, since it does not make sense to deliver one padding PDU if the grant with High L1 priority has no available data.**   **[Qualcomm]: The problem is that, with the proposal, even if there’re high priority data to be transmitted, the UE can not use the HP CG. It’s not about delivering padding PDU if the grant with HP has no available data. And we don’t think our understanding violates the “MAC only deliver one PDU to PHY” principle.**   * **FL reply: For the 1st issue, the *allowedPHY-PriorityIndex* is only used for DG, cannot be used for CG. Then based on your example, no problem for High L1 priority data Tx since DG always override CG. In addition. If MAC made the WA that when lch-PriorityBasedPrioritization is NOT configured, DG will always override CG, I think it is kind of wrong/unreasonable operation that MAC maps the high priority data to CG when knowing DG will override the CG.**   **[Qualcomm]: Yes, allowedPHY-PriorityIndex is only used for DG. The problem is that, gNB could configure the UE to not use a low-L1-priority DG for certain LCH. In such cases, the UE can not use the low-L1-priority DG to transmit high priority data. If DG always override CG, then UE needs to wait till the next CG occasion in order to transmit the high priority data, if the CG in the current occasion overlaps with a DG.**   * **FL reply: The MAC spec 321 is written as the way that there are different UE behaviors based on LCH prioritization for example, “if the MAC entity is configured with lch-basedPrioritization, xxx” and “if the MAC entity is configured with lch-basedPrioritization, xxx”. I did not get your point actually, isn’t it reasonable that MAC should have different behaviors between the LCH prioritization is configured and not configured as long as the timeline defined in 214 is respected?**   **[Qualcomm]: we prefer to have unified behavior at least at PHY, e.g., when there’re UCI to overlap with the CG/DG, as will be discussed in Scenario 3 and 4. Note that, MAC is not aware of the UCI multiplexing complexities at PHY, and it is the PHY’s responsibility to figure out whether the different MAC behavior in handling CG/DG overlapping will incur UE implementation complexity. And this is also why MAC needs the confirmation from PHY as to whether the WA can be agreed or not.**  **[FL reply 2]: I share Samsung’s views “do not see any motivation such that a gNB schedules LP DG PUSCH which is overlapped with HP CG PUSCH without considering MAC behavior”.** |
| Samsung | Fine with the proposal. In high level perspective, we don’t see any motivation such that a gNB schedules LP DG PUSCH which is overlapped with HP CG PUSCH without considering MAC behavior. |
| Intel | Support the FL proposal. |
| Spreadtrum | Considering it does not make sense for a gNB schedules LP DG PUSCH overlapping with HP CG PUSCH, we support the proposal for the progress. |

## Third Round

Almost all companies except QC agree with the proposal 3.1-1. Therefore, I will suggest following to chairman with noted QC’s concern (maybe we do not need another round of discussions to repeat our views/arguments 😊).

**From companies’ input in 1st and 2nd round, following Proposal 3.1-1 is agreeable to almost all companies (Ericsson, CATT, vivo, OPPO, ZTE, LG, Nokia, NSB, DCM, Samsung, Intel, HW, HiSi, Spreadtrum), except QC. QC concerned by this proposal, the HP CG will be blocked by LP DG always, but as companies mentioned, it is up to gNB to do proper scheduling/configuration.**

**Proposal 3.1-1:**

* When *lch-BasedPrioritization* is not configured and PHY is configured with two L1 priorities, RAN1 confirms RAN2’s working assumption that DG always overrides CG.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Qualcomm | Do not support the proposal. We have three main concerns, repeated below:   * According to the proposal, HP CG will always be blocked by LP DG, which is not good for latency. We have provided our analysis in the first/second round of response. Another case which may cause this blocking is when LP DG is for retransmission of a low priority TB, in which case the MAC can not use the LP DG to transmit new/high priority data. If we understood correctly, several companies who are OK with the proposal had the understanding/assumption that gNB will not schedule an LP DG to overlap with a HP CG. If we believe that such configuration does not make sense in practice, why should we agree to it?   **FL reply 3: RAN2 made the agreement of “LCH based prioritization and PHY based prioritization can be configured independently.” based on following, please check R2-2011058:**   * **The UE capability on LCH based and PHY based prioritization is separate.** * **There are potential not complex solutions for only one of the two is configured.** * **It is up to gNB implementation to assure LCH based prioritization and PHY based prioritization configured together.**   **So many companies in RAN2, share the views that in practice it is the best to configure both of them, but from spec. point of view it does not need to mandate such joint configuration and by gNB implementation, some issues can be avoided.**   * There will be several issues related to the UE behavior when there is UCI that overlaps with the CG/DG. For example, suppose the LP DG is cancelled by a HP UCI, should the UE resume the HP CG? As another question, if the HP CG overlaps with a LP UCI, and the LP UCI doesn’t overlap with the LP DG, should the UE cancel the LP UCI? Any timeline considerations for the above two cases?   **FL reply 3: please check Nokia’s reply. In addition, PHY, it is defined the cancellation timeline to enable cancellation, if data delivered satisfying the timeline requirement, it can cancel the LP UCI.**   * Continuing from the above point, the UE behavior for the case lch-BasedPrioritization is configured is still under discussion in Scenario #3 and Scenario #4. If we agree to the WA, then it is necessary to have separate discussions of all related UE behaviors for the case with lch-BasedPrioritization configured and without lch-BasedPrioritization configured, and the end UE behavior will likely be quite different in the two cases. In our view, this should be avoided, and a unified UE behavior is preferred. We should at least wait for the discussion in Scenario #3 and #4 to become a bit clearer, before reaching a conclusion on this case.   **FL reply 3: please see Nokia’s reply.** |
| CATT | We are fine with proposal 3.1-1. |
| OPPO | Support. |
| DOCOMO | We are fine with the proposal |
| Nokia, NSB | Support the proposal  As a reply to QC comments:   * If gNB would not like to have LP DG PUSCH to override HP CG PUSCH, it just would not issue the UL grant for LP DG PUSCH. Here the assumption is, that the gNB might be sure there is no data available for the HP CG PUSCH (e.g. for periodic traffic etc. – overprovisioning of resources). * The multiplexing timelines should be applicable independent of the handling here, so at least we don’t see any issue here. * Common behavior for scenario #3 and #4 is possible, but not really a must here. We should choose the best from system perspective (of course also considering the UE implementation complexity), but as we have anyhow independent UE capabilities for the different features, this should not prevent potentially different handling. |
| HW/HiSi | Support |
| Ericsson | Support |
| Intel | Support. |
| vivo | Support |

## 3.2 Discussion on Scenario#3 and #4 with LCH based prioritization

## First Round

For scenario#3 and scenario#4 that when the MAC entity is configured with *lch-basedPrioritization*, for the collision scenario between CG and DG with the same/different PHY-priority index, and when there is collision between PUCCH and the CG with the same priority and/or there is collision between PUCCH and the DG with the same priority, RAN2 made WA in RAN2#113-e and confirmed that WA in RAN2#113bis-e meeting as below.

|  |
| --- |
| **@ RAN2#113-e**  **Working assumption: The MAC entity does not generate a MAC PDU for a deprioritized uplink grant even when its associated PUSCH is overlapping with PUCCH. This working assumption is not agreed until confirmed by RAN1.**  **@ RAN2#113bis-e**  **Confirm the WA that LCH based prio has higher priority than UL skipping still applies, and we expect that if there are issues, RAN1 will come-back.** |

Based on the contributions, in general, there are two views:

* V1: Working assumption should be confirmed. As for URLLC operation, for critical data, the LCH based prioritization should have higher priority than the UL skipping operation.
* V2: Working assumption should not be confirmed. Since the WA departs from the “UL skipping agreements” principle that the PUSCH with UCI multiplexing cannot be skipped.
  + [1] provides examples as shown in Figure 1(A) and 1(B), if the WA is confirmed, then issues of blind detection complexity for PUSCH with/without UCI and impacts on UE processing timeline will come back again.



Figure 1(A). If LCH based prioritization has higher priority than UL skipping, and MAC generates a PDU for DG PUSCH1, and does not generate a PDU for CG PUSCH 1 from [1].



Figure 1(B). If LCH based prioritization has higher priority than UL skipping, and MAC does not generate a PDU for DG PUSCH1, and but generate a PDU for CG PUSCH 1 from [1].

In addition, [1] also proposed another alternative that Rel-16 does not support a simultaneous configuration of the Rel-16 UL skipping and intra-UE prioritization. However, [2], [8] observed that from the collision cases as analyzed in RAN1#104-e email discussions in R1-2102151, it seems independently of the UL skipping operation, for Scenarios #3 and #4, when LCH based prioritization is configured, there will be cases that the MAC will not be able to deliver a MAC PDU for a PUSCH grant overlapping with a PUCCH carrying UCI, gNB still needs to do hypothesis testing of PUSCH-UCI multiplexing. It may be good to first clarify this point.

We can still take above Figure 1(A) and Figure 1(B) as examples. **Assuming UL skipping is NOT configured and LCH based prioritization is configured**, based on the LCH priority, **buffer status (note that from MAC perspective, the priority of the PUSCH without any available data is lower than the PUSCH with available data as specified in TS 38.321)**, and considering PHY can only handle one MAC PDU on the overlapped grants, then the PUSCH that will be delivered by MAC is still not deterministic (No PDU for CG PUSCH 1 in Figure 1(A) and No PDU for DG PUSCH 1 in Figure 1(B)). The same issue as for the case when UL skipping is configured and LCH based prioritization has higher priority than UL skipping still needs to be addressed on how to handle the PUCCH that overlaps with a PUSCH with the same L1 priority, but the PUSCH is not delivered by MAC.

**Question 3.2-1: In case UL skipping is NOT configured and LCH based prioritization is configured, do you agree that there are cases that the MAC will not be able to deliver a MAC PDU for a PUSCH grant overlapping with a PUCCH carrying the UCI of the same L1 priority? And RAN1 needs to discuss on how to handle the PUCCH?**

* **If no, what is your views/reasons?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Nokia, NSB | Agree |
| Ericsson | Agree  In case UL skipping is NOT configured and LCH based prioritization is configured, UE may skip a grant (either CG-PUSCH or DG-PUSCH), if there is no data for the grant, or the grant has a lower LCH-based priority than the overlapping PUSCH(s).  Physical layer multiplexing/prioritization procedure depends on if/which PUSCH grant receives a MAC PDU. |
| ZTE | Agree  We think the RAN2 working assumption is reasonable. When the LCH based prioritization is configured, whether the MAC layer generate a MAC PDU for a PUSCH depends on the LCH priority finally. If the priority for a PUSCH is low, the MAC does not generate MAC PDU. This is not known to the gNB. And how to handle the PUCCH should be discussed. |
| Vivo | Agree. |
| Intel | Agree.  If an uplink grant is deprioritized in MAC (i.e. having low LCH priority compared with overlapping UL grant), MAC will not deliver MAC PDU for the uplink grant. |
| CATT | We agree that there are cases that the MAC will not be able to deliver a MAC PDU for a PUSCH grant overlapping with a PUCCH carrying the UCI of the same L1 priority.  In this case, RAN1 need discuss about how to handle the PUCCH. |
| OPPO | Agree. |
| Samsung | Agree |
| HW/HiSi | When only LCH is configured, we agree that there will be cases where a MAC PDU for a PUSCH will not be sent to PHY, even for overlapping with PUCCH. And RAN1 needs to discuss this issue since it is related to gNB blind decoding about which/whether PUSCH carries UCI (especially for the CA case) |
| DOCOMO | Agree |
| Spreadtrum | Agree |

For Scenario#3 and #4 that LCH based prioritization is configured, contributions [1], [4], [5], [6], [8] more or less proposed to extend the principle of UL skipping agreements to address the concern of the hypothesis testing of PUSCH-UCI multiplexing due to UE internal procedure (MAC) of generating a TB or not for a given PUSCH. More specifically, following design principle was proposed:

**Proposal 2: For a given PHY priority level, the PUSCH#0 (DG or CG) expected to have UCI multiplexing is determined. The UCI is either multiplexed with PUSCH#0 or transmitted via PUCCH, but not to be multiplexed with another PUSCH.**

**Question 3.2-2: In case LCH based prioritization is configured, do you support above proposal 2?**

* **If no, what is your views/reasons?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Nokia, NSB | No  First, the proposal is slightly unclear (i.e. what is *PUSCH#0* – and what would be *another PUSCH*)? So clarification would be needed / appreciated in the proposal itself to be agreeable.  Secondly, it is not clear to us if this ‘another PUSCH’ would be on the same CC or a different CC (i.e. CA case discussed in Question 3.2-3, is there any relation between Question 3.2-2 and 3.2.-3). So clarification or more information of this proposal (e.g. by the proponent company – I guess Ericsson in [1]) would be appreciated. |
| Ericsson | Agree.  Our understanding in response to Nokia questions:   1. PUSCH#0 is the PUSCH expected to have UCI multiplexing, if the PUCCH/PUSCH overlapping scenario calls for UCI multiplexing on PUSCH. 2. “Another PUSCH” can be on the same CC or a different CC, i.e., the proposal should handle both non-CA and CA cases. |
| ZTE | This question is related to the next question.  When PUSCH#0 is canceled, the UCI shall be dropped if the timeline condition is not satisfied. The UCI should be transmitted on the PUCCH if the timeline condition is satisfied. However, there may be overlapping between the PUCCH and another. In this case, the UCI should be multiplexed in the another PUSCH if the timeline for multiplexing is satisfied. So we do not support proposal 2. |
| Vivo | Agree in principle. To make the proposal clearer, we can add note to define the PUSCH#0 and another PUSCH. For example:  **Note:**   * **The PUSCH#0 is defined as the PUSCH transmission occasion/resource that expected to multiplex the UCI based on the PUSCH selection rule for UCI multiplexing as defined in Clause 9 of TS 38.213 if the PUCCH containing the UCI overlaps with at least one PUSCH.** * **Another PUSCH is defined as the PUSCH other than PUSCH#0 and another PUSCH also overlaps with the PUCCH containing the UCI in the same or different carrier as PUSCH#0.** |
| Qualcomm | Agree with the proposal in principle. One suggestion on the second sentence of the proposal, would it be better to simplify it to:  **The UCI is not to be multiplexed with another PUSCH.**  Whether the final UCI is multiplexed on PUSCH#0 or transmitted on a PUCCH can be discussed separately (in the next question). |
| Intel | Given that the proposed principle is only used in next question, we think it is better to focus on next question instead of discussing the principle. |
| CATT | We support proposal 2. |
| OPPO | Agree with the proposal with FL’s clarification. |
| Samsung | Before deciding the proposal, we should have a common on PUSCH#0.  - How to indicate or configured PUSCH#0?  **FL reply to Q1**: No need to indicate or configure the PUSCH#0. The PUSCH#0 is defined as the PUSCH transmission occasion/resource that expected to multiplex the UCI based on the PUSCH selection rule for UCI multiplexing as defined in Clause 9 of TS 38.213 if the PUCCH containing the UCI overlaps with at least one PUSCH.  - Is there any MAC specification impact? Or it is purely PHY impact?  **FL reply to Q2**: it is purely PHY impact.  - In case of CA, if PUCCH are not overlapped with PUSCH#0 and overlapped with another PUSCH on the same CC or different CC, does a UE drop one of them? Or it needs to transmit simultaneous PUCCH and PUSCH?  **FL reply to Q3**: in such case, UE drops the PUCCH, see Figure 2c below.  - Why PUSCH#0 is only one? If the motivation is to reduce gNB blind detection, PUSCH#1, #2, … can be considered for relaxation of gNB blind detection?  **FL reply to Q4:** For high capable gNB, more BD is possible. But for tradeoff among avoiding always dropping the PUCCH, simplicity and acceptable number of BD, only one PUSCH#0 is proposed. |
| HW/HiSi | A clarification for the CA case is needed. If UCI is transmitted via PUCCH, but not multiplexed with another PUSCH, does it mean that the PUCCH in cell1 and PUSCH in cell 2 can be transmitted simultaneously? According to our understanding, this is not supported in Rel-16 and it is discussed in Rel-17. Should proposal 2 be clarified regarding this matter?  **FL reply: see my replies to Samsung for Q1 and Q3. 😊** |
| DOCOMO | Agree |
| Spreadtrum | We understand the intension is to avoid the reselection of PUSCH for UCI multiplexing.  Agree. |

About on how to handle the PUCCH that overlaps with a PUSCH of the same L1 priority if the PUSCH is not delivered by MAC, following options are proposed based on the contributions:

* Option 1: drop the PUCCH.
  + Which is relatively simple from UE implementation of view [5], [6].

However, [2] pointed out that “*if the UE would drop the UCI/PUCCH in the first place the UCI would be lost for any type of gNB implementation. If otherwise, the PUCCH / UCI would be transmitted a higher complexity gNB implementation could take advantage of the UCI whereas for simpler gNB implementation (not doing the blind PUCCH detection) the situation would be the same as if the PUCCH would not be transmitted (i.e. overlapping PUCCH/UCI is not received by the gNB). So there seems to be no real disadvantage of enabling the UE to transmit the related PUCCH*”. Some optimized options are proposed as in [2], [3], [4], [6], [8].

* From [2], [3], [6], [8]: the UCI may not always be transmitted on PUCCH after determining the PUSCH to be multiplexed with UCI is canceled. It depends on whether the UE has enough time to process PUCCH. The timeline condition which should be ensured by gNB for the case 1-6 in RAN1#104-e as summarized in R1-2102246 can be reused. Figure 2a, 2b and 2c give some examples.
  + Option 2: for the case that a PUSCH i.e., PUSCH#0 overlap with a PUCCH#0 with the same L1 priority on a same or different serving cell, a PUSCH i.e., PUSCH#1 overlaps with the PUSCH#0 on one serving cell and the PUSCH#1 does not overlap with the PUCCH#0, and if the PUSCH#0 is NOT delivered by MAC, when timeline condition is met,
    - If there is no other remaining PUSCH(s) on any serving cell(s) overlapping with the PUCCH#0 of the same L1 priority, the UCI is transmitted on the PUCCH.
    - Otherwise, the PUCCH#0 should be dropped.

Note: above timeline condition is ensured by gNB, i.e. the ending symbol of UL grant for the PUSCH#1 should be at least  symbols before the first symbol of the earliest PUCCH#0 or PUSCH#0.



Figure 2a: single CC case



Figure 2b: CA case when there is no other remaining PUSCH(s) on any serving cell(s) overlapping with the PUCCH



Figure 2c: CA case when there is other remaining PUSCH(s) on any serving cell(s) overlapping with the PUCCH

Figure 2 examples for LP PUCCH handling when LP PUSCH is not delivered by MAC and the timeline condition is met

* From [4], Option 3
  + In case LCH prioritization is configured and there is a single PHY priority for overlapped UL transmissions, when DG PUSCH overlaps with CG PUSCH on the same serving cell,
    - When the DG PUSCH overlaps with PUCCH and the CG PUSCH does not overlaps with the PUCCH, if the PUCCH is earlier than the CG PUSCH, MAC always delivers PDU to the DG PUSCH and UCI is multiplexed on the DG PUSCH; Otherwise, it is MAC ehaviour to deliver PDU for either the CG PUSCH or the DG PUSCH based on the Rel-16 LCH prioritization, and UCI is transmitted on the DG PUSCH when there is PDU for the DG PUSCH or transmitted on the PUCCH when there is no PDU for the DG PUSCH.
    - When the CG PUSCH overlaps with PUCCH and the DG PUSCH does not overlap with the PUCCH, if the PUCCH is earlier than the DG PUSCH, the same solution as for no Rel-16 LCH based prioritization could be reused, e.g. case 1-6 in RAN1#104-e as summarized in R1-2104322. Otherwise, it is MAC ehaviour to deliver PDU for either the CG PUSCH or the DG PUSCH based on Rel-16 LCH based prioritization, and UCI is transmitted on the CG PUSCH when there is PDU for the CG PUSCH or transmitted on the PUCCH when there is no PDU for the CG PUSCH.
  + In case LCH prioritization is configured and there are two PHY priorities for overlapped UL transmissions, when DG PUSCH overlaps with CG PUSCH on the same serving cell with different priorities, the first symbol of LP PUSCH should be no earlier than the first symbol of HP PUSCH.
    - When the DG PUSCH is LP and overlaps with LP PUCCH and the CG PUSCH is HP and it does not overlap with the LP PUCCH, if the LP PUCCH is earlier than the HP CG PUSCH, gNB should avoid scheduling such LP DG PUSCH overlapping with both the LP PUCCH and the HP CG PUSCH; Otherwise, it is MAC ehaviour to deliver PDU for either the HP CG PUSCH or the LP DG PUSCH based on the Rel-16 LCH prioritization, and UCI is transmitted on the LP DG PUSCH when there is PDU for the LP DG PUSCH or transmitted on the LP PUCCH when there is no PDU for the LP DG PUSCH.
    - When the DG PUSCH is HP and overlaps with HP PUCCH and the CG PUSCH is LP and it does not overlap with the HP PUCCH, if the HP PUCCH is earlier than the LP CG PUSCH, MAC always delivers PDU to the HP DG PUSCH and UCI is multiplexed on the HP DG PUSCH; Otherwise, it is MAC ehaviour to deliver PDU for either the LP CG PUSCH or the HP DG PUSCH based on the Rel-16 LCH prioritization, and UCI is transmitted on the HP DG PUSCH when there is PDU for the HP DG PUSCH or transmitted on the PUCCH when there is no PDU for the DG PUSCH.

**From moderator’s perspective, if there is/are solution(s) that can (1) confirm RAN2’s WA for data vs. data with the same/different L1 priorities when LCH based prioritization is configured, and (2) address the concern of the hypothesis testing of PUSCH-UCI multiplexing at certain level, then we should go for such solution(s). Therefore, above option 1 and option 2 is preferred compared to option 3, since for option 3, RAN2’s WA cannot be always applied for the case when there is a single PHY priority for overlapped UL transmissions.**

**Question 3.2-3: In case LCH based prioritization is configured and LCH based prioritization has higher priority than UL skipping operation, for the case that a PUSCH i.e., PUSCH#0 overlap with a PUCCH#0 with the same L1 priority on a same or different serving cell, a PUSCH i.e., PUSCH#1 overlaps with the PUSCH#0 on one serving cell with the same or different priorities and the PUSCH#1 does not overlap with the PUCCH#0, and if the PUSCH#0 is NOT delivered by MAC, which option do you prefer to handle the PUCCH#0?**

* **Option 1: Drop the PUCCH#0.**
* **Option 2: When timeline condition is met,** 
  + **If there is no other remaining PUSCH(s) on any serving cell(s) overlapping with the PUCCH#0 of the same L1 priority, the UCI is transmitted on the PUCCH.**
  + **Otherwise, the PUCCH#0 should be dropped.**

**Note: above timeline condition is ensured by gNB, i.e. the ending symbol of UL grant for the PUSCH#1 should be at least**  **symbols before the first symbol of the earliest PUCCH#0 or PUSCH#0.**

* **Option 3: Transmit PUCCH#0 and the UE does not expect that there is other remaining PUSCH(s) on any serving cell(s) overlapping with the PUCCH#0 of the same L1 priority.**
* **Option 4: Other options?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Nokia, NSB | Option 2  As discussed in our contribution, dropping the PUCCH as for Option 1 does not really provide any advantages (as gNB can still decide not to look for the PUCCH in case of Option 2 – i.e. not receive the UCI). Option 3 would lead to linking operation for different serving cells, which is clearly not preferred. |
| Ericsson | First, Question 3.2-3 scenario setup is misleading. It only describes one possible MAC decision ((A). PUSCH#0 PDU is NOT delivered by MAC), but MAC may very well take another decision ((B). PUSCH#0 PDU is delivered by MAC). Depending on (A) or (B), MAC decision affects PHY procedure of selecting a PUSCH to multiplex with PUCCH#0, if PUCCH#0 overlaps with PUSCH(s). This is the fundamental problem with WA “LCH based prioritization has higher priority than UL skipping operation”.  Second, Question 3.2-3 scenario setup sounds like “LCH based prioritization has lower priority than UL skipping operation” in fact, since it implies that only PUCCH#0 can potentially multiplex with PUSCH#0 (i.e., never another overlapping PUSCH), regardless of MAC decision on PUSCH#0 PDU.   * If changing Question 3.2-3 scenario setup to “LCH based prioritization has lower priority than UL skipping operation”, i.e., with the understanding that PUCCH#0 is not expected to multiplex with any PUSCH other than PUSCH#0, then Option 2 is reasonable.   **FL reply: Yes, only one possible MAC decision (A) that PUSCH#0 PDU is NOT delivered by MAC is discussed here since only for this decision (A), we need to discuss how to handle the PUCCH that overlaps with PUSCH#0 as analyzed for Question 3.2-1. As mentioned, if there is/are solution(s) that can (1) confirm RAN2’s WA for data vs. data with the same/different L1 priorities when LCH based prioritization is configured, and (2) address the concern of the hypothesis testing of PUSCH-UCI multiplexing at certain level, then we should go for such solution(s). All the three options can achieve above two goals. If you have other solutions to achieve above two goals, I can list and collect companies’ views.**  **One more clarification is needed on “If changing Question 3.2-3 scenario setup to “LCH based prioritization has lower priority than UL skipping operation”, i.e., with the understanding that PUCCH#0 is not expected to multiplex with any PUSCH other than PUSCH#0, then Option 2 is reasonable.” My understanding if LCH based prioritization has lower priority than UL skipping operation, then PUCCH#0 multiplexes on PUSCH#0, option 2 is not needed at all, right? If I miss something, please correct my understanding.** |
| ZTE | Option 2 is preferred since it allow the PUCCH is transmitted as possible. Option 3 may bring some restrictions on the scheduling. |
| Vivo | We are open for option 1, 2 and 3 as long as the solution can achieve the following two goals:   1. Confirm RAN2’s WA for data vs. data with the same/different L1 priorities that LCH based prioritization has higher priority than UL skipping 2. Address the concern of the hypothesis testing of PUSCH-UCI multiplexing at certain level   **For Ericsson’s comments,** Yes, only one possible MAC decision (A) is discussed here, but the key point is still MAC make the decision on which MAC PDU will be delivered, so MAC decision (A) will exist. The reason for only discuss the MAC decision (A) is as analyzed for Question 3.2-1 that if PUSCH#0 PDU is NOT delivered by MAC, we need to discuss solutions on how to handle the PUCCH#0 to address the BD concern at the gNB side to a certain level. If MAC decides to deliver the PUSCH#0, the PUCCH#0 multiplexes on PUSCH#0, there is no issue. But we cannot mandate MAC always generate the PUSCH#0 which is not aligned with RAN2’s working assumption.  One more clarification is needed on “If changing Question 3.2-3 scenario setup to “LCH based prioritization has lower priority than UL skipping operation”, i.e., with the understanding that PUCCH#0 is not expected to multiplex with any PUSCH other than PUSCH#0, then Option 2 is reasonable.” My understanding if LCH based prioritization has lower priority than UL skipping operation, then PUCCH#0 multiplexes on PUSCH#0, option 2 is not needed at all, right? If I miss something, please correct my understanding.  **About ZTE’s comments** for **Question 3.2-2, I would like to clarify the intention of option 2** here is even if there is PUSCH other than PUSCH#0 in other CCs overlapping with the PUCCH#0, the PUCCH#0 will be dropped to avoid BD complexity due to the UCI jumping on different carriers. |
| Qualcomm | Unfortunately, we do not see how the two goals listed by the FL can be achieved at the same time. LCH prioritization and MAC data availability are inherently invisible to the gNB, and the only thing that is visible to the gNB is the PHY priorities of each channel. Therefore, we don’t see how one can 1) configure RAN2 WA that LCH prioritization has higher priority than UL skipping and 2) avoiding BDs at gNB, at the same time.  **FL reply: firstly, the 2nd goal is not to avoid the BDs at gNB, it is to reduce hypothesis testing of PUSCH-UCI multiplexing to some acceptable level. It is not possible to completely avoid BD at gNB side. As analyzed in Question 3.2-1, even if UL skipping is not configured, as long as LCH based prioritization is configured, it is not avoidable for gNB to do blind detection for the data transmission. Considering the UCI multiplexing, the BD may be more complex, so what we can do is to reduce the BD, not to avoid.**  **From QC’s contribution, in step 4, it seems QC admit that there is the case where MAC does not deliver the PDU which is expected to multiplex the UCI. In such case, the UCI is dropped together with the PUSCH. See below:**  **“In case the PHY has indicated one PUSCH as non-droppable, and if there is another PUSCH overlapping with it on the same carrier, that PUSCH, including UCI that is expected to be multiplexed on it as part of step #1, are dropped.”**  **So, my question is based on your contribution, QC’s preference is option 1, right? If you have other solution that can achieve the two goals or you have other suggestions to solve the issue, I can list to collect companies’ views.** |
| Intel | We prefer Option 2 as it allows transmission of PUCCH in some cases, compared with Option 1. Option 3 is not consistent with MAC behavior to handle overlapping DG and CG grants when LCH based prioritization is configured: MAC decides whether DG or CG is transmitted based on comparison of LCH priority. |
| CATT | For Option 1, dropping PUCCH#0 isn’t preferred because UCI dropping increases DL transmission latency.  For Option 3， some scheduling restrictions are introduced.  For the sake of the progress and compared with Option1 and Option3, we slightly prefer to Option2.  **FL reply: Thank you very much for your compromise.** |
| OPPO | We share similar view with QC and questionable how the two goals are achieved at the same time and to our understanding, gNB needs to do hypothesis detection for both PUSCH #0 and PUSCH #1. (Please correct me if I miss something)  **FL reply: See my replies to QC. 😊 One more clarification for option 2: for data transmission, as long as LCG-based prioritization is configured, even if there is no PUCCH overlapping, BD the d**at**a (PUSCH #0 and PUSCH #1) is unavoidable for gNB. But the detection on the data existence is simpler e.g. DMRS detection. But the BD of PUSCH-UCI multiplexing is more complex, decoding PUSCH needs to assume UCI is or is not multiplexed. So the target is to reduce hypothesis testing of PUSCH-UCI multiplexing (not data) to some acceptable level, NOT to avoid.** |
| Samsung | We need to make more detailed scenario under this question.  If we understand correctly, assuming PUSCH#0, 1 and PUCCH#0 are all same priority, it looks like case 1-6 and it is agreed with option 3.  **FL reply: Case 1-6 discussed in AI 7.1 is under the assumption that LCH-based prioritization is NOT configured, DG always overrides CG irrespective the buffer status. But when LCH-based prioritization is configured, buffer status of the LCH for each grant needs to be taken into account, DG is not always override CG.**  If we consider different PHY priority, not sure this can be common regardless of which a PUSCH is higher priority than other PUSCH. For example, if PUSCH#1 is higher priority than PUSCH#0, PUCCH would be dropped based on intra-UE prioritization/multiplexing rule since LP channels are assumed to be multiplexed without considering HP channel. If PUSCH#1 is lower priority than PUSCH#0, PUCCH can be transmitted since PUSCH#0 has no data to be multiplexed which is delivered from MAC.  **FL reply: thanks a lot for your comments. OK I see, I can list one option to define the UE behavior depending on the PUSCH priority. So, is it correct understanding that if PUSCH#1 is higher priority than PUSCH#0 and PUSCH#0 is not delivered by MAC, PUCCH would be dropped, that is option 1; If PUSCH#1 is lower L1 priority than PUSCH#0, but PUSCH#0 is not delivered by MAC, option 2 is used. Right?** |
| HW/HiSi | For the single carrier case, Option 2 is the same as option 3, it transmits PUCCH#0. The difference between Option 2and Option 3 is that for CA, option 2 drops PUCCH#0 in order to transmit another PUSCH in a different cell if overlapping with PUCCH#0. But Option 3 does not allow another PUSCH in another cell to overlap with PUCCH#0.  For discussing this issue, we should also take into account that this may be easily resolved by transmitting PUCCH and PUSCH simultaneously which is already agreed in Rel-17. This can avoid the dropping of the PUCCH and also avoids gNB blind decoding. And in Rel-16 maybe we can leave it to implementation, since anyhow it is possible for the gNB to avoid the overlap.  **FL reply: is it correct understanding that your preference is option 4 that this will be error case?**  **Something like option 4: when there is collision scenario between CG and DG with same/different PHY-priority index, the UE does not expect to have a collision between PUCCH and the CG with the same priority and/or have a collision between PUCCH and the DG with the same priority. please feel free to correct the wording. I am not sure this is a good way, but I will list as one option to collect companies’ views.** |
| DOCOMO | We share the view with Ericsson that MAC has another choice that PUSCH#0 PDU is delivered by MAC and the MAC behavior highly affect PHY procedure. If LCH based prioritization has higher priority than UL skipping operation, there is no solution to avoid gNB blind decoding.  **FL reply: please see my replies to Ericsson. 😊 If you have other solutions to achieve above two goals, I can list and collect companies’ views.** |
|  |  |

**Other issues that you would like to discuss, please fill in the following table.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| ZTE | Issue 1:  Similar as the operation above that the UCI is not multiplexed in the PUSCH without corresponding MAC PDU, we think the high priority PUSCH without MAC PDU delivered from MAC should not cancel the LP PUSCH.  **FL reply: I agree with you. As we discussed in previous RAN1 meetings (#101-e, #102-e), the common understanding and the principle is for the collision between DG and CG, MAC should only deliver one MAC PDU to PHY as long as the timeline specified in TS 38.214 section 6.1 is respected and PHY will transmit whichever PDU delivered by MAC as long as MAC delivers only one PDU. So in your described case, MAC should deliver the LP PUSCH which has available data.**  Issue 2:  The UL skipping agreement principle is only applicable for the overlapping of PUSCH and PUCCH with the same L1 priority. In case of overlapping of PUSCH and PUCCH with the different L1 priority, the PUSCH can be skipped even if the UL skipping is configured.  **FL reply: Yes, I agree with you, the UL skipping agreement is made for the same L1 priority and without LCH based prioritization.** |

## Second Round

When LCH based prioritization is configured (i.e, Scenario#3 and #4),

**For Question 3.2-1,** 11 companies (Nokia, NSB, Ericsson, ZTE, vivo, Intel, CATT, OPPO, Samsung, HW/HiSi, DCM, Spreadtrum) provide the input and all companies agree that **even if the UL skipping is NOT configured, as long as the LCH-based prioritization is configured**, there are cases that the MAC will not be able to deliver a MAC PDU for a PUSCH overlapping with a PUCCH carrying the UCI of the same L1 priority and RAN1 needs to discuss on how to handle the PUCCH, how to reduce the blind detection efforts at the gNB side. Therefore, Rel-16 does not support a simultaneous configuration of the Rel-16 UL skipping and intra-UE prioritization is no longer a solution to solve the issue of hypothesis testing of PUSCH-UCI multiplexing.

Based on above e.g., the issue RAN1 need to handle is actually not tightly related to the UL skipping is configured or not, FL would like to collect companies’ views on whether RAN2’s WA can be confirmed or not.

**Proposal 1: RAN1 confirms RAN2’s working assumption that LCH based prio has higher priority than UL skipping.**

**FL Q2-2: Do you agree above proposal 1?**

* **If you have strong concern, please provide your reasons and way forward.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Ericsson | Do not support Proposal 1.  In our view, RAN1 should work out a procedure (for example, Updated Proposal 2 or similar), such that gNB blind decoding is minimized when UL skipping has higher priority than LCH based prioritization. If RAN2 WA is confirmed, updated Proposal 2 (or similar) cannot work. In summary, our view is: RAN1 works out updated Proposal 2 (or similar), and reply to RAN2 that RAN2 WA should be changed accordingly.  Regarding “Rel-16 does not support a simultaneous configuration of the Rel-16 UL skipping and intra-UE prioritization”:  In our view, this should be agreed if RAN2 WA **cannot** be changed. This removes the setting {UL skipping=true; *lch-basedPrioritization*=true}, which is useless since it does not provide the benefit intended by UL skipping=true. |
| CATT | We are fine with FL proposal. |
| vivo | Support Proposal 1.  From our understanding, the updated proposal 2 can work with confirming the RAN2’s working assumption since the deterministic PUSCH#0 is configured/scheduled resource/occasion, rather than the real data delivered by MAC.  In addition, **our understanding for the main benefit of UL skipping is to reduce latency, gNB preschedules the UL grant for the UE without knowing precisely of the UE buffer status, it is not for reducing BD for UCI multiplexing at gNB side.** Even if setting {UL skipping=true; *lch-basedPrioritization*=true} and confirm the RAN2 WA, if gNB has BD concern on UCI multiplexing, the gNB should avoid the PUCCH and PUSCH overlapping by proper scheduling/configuration. |
| OPPO | Support Proposal 1. |
| ZTE | We support this proposal. |
| LG | We support the FL proposal. |
| Nokia, NSB | Support Proposal 1 / FL proposal. |
| DOCOMO | Thanks FL for trying to address both RAN2 WA and BD minimization. While BD cannot be fully avoided, Proposal 2 can reduce the hypothesis testing of PUSCH-UCI multiplexing, and hence, we can live with the proposal |
| Qualcomm | Do not support Proposal 1.  We share the same view as Ericsson. RAN 1 needs to discuss procedures that yields a deterministic multiplexing outcome whenever it is possible. Such procedures are being discussed under Proposal 2. However, if we agree to Proposal 1, it will render Proposal 2 ineffectual. |
| Samsung | Fine with the proposal. |
| Intel | Fine with the proposal. |
| Spreadtrum | We support the proposal. |

**For Proposal 2,** some companies (Ericsson, vivo, QC, CATT, OPPO, DCM, Spreadtrum) agree it in principle; some companies (Nokia, NSB, Samsung, HW/HiSi) think the proposal is not clear, further clarification is necessary; Some companies (ZTE, Intel) think the Proposal 2 is related to the **Question 3.2-3**: solutions on how to handle the PUCCH that overlaps with a PUSCH of the same L1 priority but the PUSCH is not delivered by MAC, hence no need to agree the proposal 2. Based on the comments, FL also agree with ZTE and Intel it is understood that the proposal 2 should be the principle of the solutions to reduce the blind detection efforts for PUSCH-UCI multiplexing. It is more efficient to discuss the solutions. But anyway, the Proposal 2 is further updated to make the intention clearer, let’s check whether it can be agreed or not.

**Updated Proposal 2:**

* **For a given PHY priority level, the PUSCH#0 (DG or CG) expected to have UCI multiplexing is determined. The UCI is either multiplexed with PUSCH#0 or transmitted via PUCCH, but not to be multiplexed with another PUSCH.**
* **Note:** 
  + **Above “PUSCH#0” is defined as the PUSCH transmission occasion/resource that is expected to multiplex the UCI based on the PUSCH selection rule for UCI multiplexing as defined in Clause 9 of TS 38.213 if the PUCCH containing the UCI overlaps with at least one PUSCH.**
  + **Above “another PUSCH” is defined as the PUSCH other than the PUSCH#0 and “another PUSCH” also overlaps with the PUCCH containing the UCI in the same or different carrier as PUSCH#0.**

**FL Q2-3: Do you agree above Updated proposal 2 as one design principle for solutions to reduce the BD complexity of PUSCH-UCI multiplexing?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Ericsson | Support the intention of updated proposal 2, with the changes to PUSCH#0 definition as explained below.  After further checking the chicken-egg problem between MAC and PHY by Apple, we acknowledge that it is necessary to take assumptions in Stage 1 described in Apple contribution [6]. That is, for PHY to have the test-run of UCI multiplexing to determine PUSCH#0-HP (if exist) and PUSCH#0-LP (if exist), assumptions need to be taken for SR and CG-PUSCH. That is, for PHY preliminary UCI multiplexing to determine PUSCH#0-HP (if exist) and PUSCH#0-LP (if exist),   * For CG-PUSCH (both HP and LP): the procedure follows the agreements made under 7.1 for case 1-1 to 1-6 assuming uplink channels of the other priority does not exist; * For SR (both HP and LP): assume negative SR.   The PHY outcome of PUSCH#0-HP and PUSCH#0-LP are indicated to MAC. MAC assigns PUSCH#0-HP (if exist) and PUSCH#0-LP (if exist) highest LCH priority. Then MAC procedure can proceed as is to generate SR and MAC PDU, including data-vs-data LCH prioritization and SR-vs-data LCH prioritization. After receiving SR and PDU from MAC, then PHY finalizes PUCCH, PUSCH multiplexing/prioritization for transmission.  With the above, the uncertainty still exists for SR and PUSCH grant without UCI multiplexing. But no uncertainty for PUSCH with UCI multiplexing.  In the above, the tricky part is how to determine PUSCH#0-LP. Two alternatives exist:  Alt1: PUSCH#0-LP is selected without considering potential deprioritization by high priority PUCCH or PUSCH;   * Pro: simpler to determine PUSCH#0-LP; * Con: if PUSCH#0-LP is deprioritized by a HP channel in the end, the UCI is dropped together with PUSCH#0-LP;   Alt2: PUSCH#0-LP is selected after excluding LP PUSCH that may be deprioritized by high priority PUCCH or PUSCH;   * Pro: LP UCI is not dropped since PUSCH#0-LP is selected such that it’s not dropped due to HP PUCCH or PUSCH. * Con: very difficult to come up with a rule to exclude LP PUSCH that may be deprioritized by high priority channels, considering that HP PUCCH resource depends on MAC decision on SR, and potential PUCCH-PUSCH multiplexing;   Considering the above, Alt 1 is preferred.  In summary, we propose the following for PUSCH#0 bullet:  Above “PUSCH#0” is defined as the PUSCH transmission occasion/resource that is expected to multiplex the UCI based on the PUSCH selection rule when *enhancedSkipUplinkTxDynamic=True* and *enhancedSkipUplinkTxConfigured=True*. The PUSCH selection rule is applied among all UCI and PUSCH of the given PHY priority in the (sub-)slot assuming **SR (if any) is negative** and ignoring UCI and PUSCH of the other PHY priority. |
| CATT | We agree with updated FL proposal2. |
| Vivo | Support the proposal in principle. For SR, given the conclusion made in RAN#95 as mentioned by HW below (note that in Rel-15, different SR configurations can correspond to different logical channel(s)), the uncertainty (SR multiplexing with other UCIs (e.g. HARQ-ACK/CSI), the final PUCCH may or may not overlap with the PUSCH depending on SR status) seems already exist in Rel-15. Not sure how it is different from Rel-16 and whether we need to address the uncertainty. Welcome more views.  **RAN1#95 Conclusion**:   * For HARQ-ACK/CSI overlapping with PUCCH resources corresponding to more than one positive SR, it is up to UE to select one PUCCH with positive SR and drop the other PUCCH(s) with positive SR before doing the multiplexing of positive SR and HARQ-ACK/CSI. * When there are multiple non-overlapping PUCCH resources with positive SR corresponding to different SR configurations within one slot, it is up to UE to select at most two PUCCHs with positive SR, and one of the selected PUCCH should be short PUCCH if two PUCCHs are selected. * No changes in specification is needed for the above |
| OPPO | We agree with updated FL proposal2. |
| ZTE | Just one quick question, how to interpret the UCI is not multiplexed with another PUSCH? Is it the UE behavior or the network scheduling restriction or others? |
| LG | We support the intention of the proposal. One thing we concern is that this may not aligned with previous conclusions.  For UL multiplexing and two PHY priority, we think priority should be considered after the multiplexing, however, for transmitting UCI via PUCCH in above case, priority needs to be considered indirectly.  For UL multiplexing and PDU generation, there is the intention which is to perform UL multiplexing without considering a result of PDU generation. However, for transmitting UCI via PUCCH in above case, UE should consider a result of PDU generation during UL multiplexing procedure.  Thus, we slightly prefer to drop the PUCCH for aligned UE behavior, if UCI cannot multiplexed into PUSCH due to LCH prioritization. |
| Nokia, NSB | Do not support or at least some clarifications would be needed  Explanation: We think this is still related to the CA operation – note: we are more worried about the CA operation here than the single carrier case. As LTE pointed out, the PDU generation needs to be taken into account. If the proposal would be agreed – does this mean that if the PUSCH#0 is not available (cannot be multiplexed), as the UCI is transmitted on PUSCH there actually should not be ‘another’ PUSCH with a PDU delivered by higher layers? As otherwise, the procedure described above would require simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH transmissions within a cell group, which is clearly not supported in Rel-16. |
| HW/HiSi | We prefer to discuss Proposal 3 directly, since the design principle here may not be clear. Based on the FL feedback for the CA case, if the PUCCH does not need to be multiplexed with another PUSCH, then it may be cancelled. This is not clear from the updated Proposal 2. |
| DOCOMO | We agree with the proposal |
| Qualcomm | Support the proposal in principle.  To partly solve LG/Nokia’s concern, we suggested the following update on the main bullet.   * **For a given PHY priority level, the PUSCH#0 (DG or CG) expected to have UCI multiplexing is determined. The UCI is either multiplexed with PUSCH#0 or transmitted via PUCCH or dropped, but not to be multiplexed with another PUSCH.**   Whether UCI is to be multiplexed on the PUSCH0 or dropped or transmitted via PUCCH (based on the PDU generation status) can be discussed separately. In our understanding, the proposal here only concerns the first step that is required by the UE to solve the multiplexing issue. There will be another step at PHY after MAC delivers the PDU to PHY for UCI multiplexing. |
| Samsung | Still have concern on the proposal with the same reason as Nokia. Furthermore, for the suggestion from QC, dropping UCI is not preferable way to us. |
| Spreadtrum | For CA case, we think PUCCH dropping can solve the concerns. Thus we support the revision from Qualcomm. |

About the PUCCH handling, the solutions discussed in **Question 3.2-3,** some **FL reply** to companies e.g. Ericsson, DCM, QC, OPPO can be found in the First round part. It would be good to clarify that the 1st goal of the solution is to confirm RAN2’s WA; 2nd goal is to reduce the BD efforts, not to avoid. Companies views are summarized as below:

* Option 1: Drop the PUCCH#0.
  + Supported by vivo
* Option 2: When timeline condition is met,
  + If there is no other remaining PUSCH(s) on any serving cell(s) overlapping with the PUCCH#0 of the same L1 priority, the UCI is transmitted on the PUCCH.
  + Otherwise, the PUCCH#0 should be dropped.

Note: above timeline condition is ensured by gNB, i.e. the ending symbol of UL grant for the PUSCH#1 should be at least symbols before the first symbol of the earliest PUCCH#0 or PUSCH#0.

* + Supported by Nokia, NSB, vivo, ZTE, Intel, CATT
* Option 3: Transmit PUCCH#0 and the UE does not expect that there is other remaining PUSCH(s) on any serving cell(s) overlapping with the PUCCH#0 of the same L1 priority.
  + Supported by vivo

In addition, HW/HiSi proposed considering that the intra-UE prioritization/multiplexing will be enhanced in Rel-17, for Rel-16, maybe we can leave it to implementation, since anyhow it is possible for the gNB to avoid the overlap.

**Samsung raised one question** on whether the solution can be common regardless of which a PUSCH is higher priority than other PUSCH. For example, **if PUSCH#1 is higher priority than PUSCH#0, PUCCH would be dropped based on intra-UE prioritization/multiplexing rule since LP channels are assumed to be multiplexed without considering HP channel.** If PUSCH#1 is lower priority than PUSCH#0, PUCCH can be transmitted since PUSCH#0 has no data to be multiplexed.

Based on above comments, the proposal and options are updated as below:

**Proposal 3: in case LCH based prioritization is configured and LCH based prioritization has higher priority than UL skipping operation, for the case that a PUSCH i.e., PUSCH#0 overlap with a PUCCH#0 with the same L1 priority on a same or different serving cell, a PUSCH i.e., PUSCH#1 overlaps with the PUSCH#0 on a serving cell with the same or different L1 priorities and the PUSCH#1 does not overlap with the PUCCH#0, if the PUSCH#0 is NOT delivered by MAC, following options can be considered to handle the PUCCH#0.**

* **Option 1: Drop the PUCCH#0.**
* **Option 2: When timeline condition is met,** 
  + **If there is no other remaining PUSCH(s) on any serving cell(s) overlapping with the PUCCH#0 of the same L1 priority, the UCI is transmitted on the PUCCH.**
  + **Otherwise, the PUCCH#0 should be dropped.**

**Note: above timeline condition is ensured by gNB, i.e. the ending symbol of UL grant for the PUSCH#1 should be at least**  **symbols before the first symbol of the earliest PUCCH#0 or PUSCH#0.**

* **Option 3: Transmit PUCCH#0 and the UE does not expect that there is other remaining PUSCH(s) on any serving cell(s) overlapping with the PUCCH#0 of the same L1 priority.**
* **Option 4: error case, i.e., when there is collision scenario between CG and DG with same/different L1 priority index, the UE does not expect to have a collision between PUCCH and the CG with the same L1 priority and/or have a collision between PUCCH and the DG with the same L1 priority.**
* **Option 5:** 
  + **If the PUSCH#0 has Lower L1 priority than PUSCH#1, Option 1 is used;**
  + **Otherwise, Option 2.**

**FL Q2-4:**

* **Do you agree proposal 3 in principle?**
* **Which option is preferred?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Ericsson | Do not support Proposal 3.  When LCH based prioritization has higher priority than UL skipping, we do not see how PUSCH#0 can be determined without dependency on MAC LCH prioritization decision. |
| CATT | We are fine with FL proposal. |
| vivo | Support Proposal 3. As mentioned, the “PUSCH#0” is defined as the PUSCH transmission **occasion/resource** (rather than the real data delivered by MAC) that is expected to multiplex the UCI based on the PUSCH selection rule for UCI multiplexing as defined in Clause 9 of TS 38.213 if the PUCCH containing the UCI overlaps with at least one PUSCH.  We are open for all options. slightly prefer option 1. |
| OPPO | Support Proposal 3 with slight preference to option 1 for simplicity. |
| ZTE | We agree this proposal and prefer option 2 as discussed above. |
| LG | We support the proposal and we prefer option 1. Since it make UL multiplexing procedure irreverent to LCH prioritization, which is aligned other conclusions. |
| Nokia, NSB | Support the proposal 3 and prefer option 2.  As stated earlier, if the proposal 2 is agreed (which we are not fine with), this would to our reading result actually automatically in Option 3 of proposal 3. So we are a bit wondering, how companies can be fine with proposal 2 and then suggest an option different than Option 3 in Proposal 3!?? |
| HW/HiSi | Proposal 3 seems fine, since it includes all possible options, ut the problem will be the down-selection ☺  In our view, Option 4 is not captured correctly here. Option 4 is based on the Rel-16 multiplexing/Prioritization procedure.  That is:   * If there is no remaining PUSCH(s) on any serving cell overlapping with PUCCH#0 of the same priority, the UCI is transmitted on the PUCCH. * Otherwise, the UCI is multiplexed in the PUSCH according to the existing rules. * No spec change is needed.   The gNB has full control about the hypothesis testing of PUSCH-UCI and can perform it to the level it wants. For example, the gNB can avoid that PUCCH will overlap with other PUSCH(s) on any serving cell, i.e. like Option 3. Alternatively, the gNB could also do some limited hypothesis testing.  Further improvements could then be specified in Rel-17, e.g. through simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH transmission which already is agreed.  If the proposal shall be agreed, we think the description of Option 4 should be updated according to our comments on Option 4 above, |
| DOCOMO | We agree with the proposal and prefer Option 2 |
| Qualcomm | Do not support the proposal. As indicated earlier, we do not support the RAN2 WA “**LCH based prioritization has higher priority than UL skipping operation**”. As such, it is unclear to us how/when PUSCH#0 is determined in case LCH based prioritization is configured and LCH based prioritization has higher priority than UL skipping. |
| Samsung | We are fine with the proposal. Prefer to option 3 or 4. We have understood that option 3 is defined in the case where both LCH prioritization and PHY prioritization are not enabled. That is, if we assume PUSCH#0 as CnotG PUSCH and PUSCH#1 as DG PUSCH, it is agreed that a UE transmit PUCCH. (No dropping). Having said that, we share similar view with Huawei. This should be up to gNB implementation. That is, it is quite reasonable that a gNB can schedule overlapping PUSCHs as much as gNB can handle blind detection to some extent. |
| Intel | Same view as Nokia; support Proposal 3 and option 2. |
| Spreadtrum | We support the proposal, and open to further down selection. |

## Third Round

### Status summary for proposal 1

**Proposal 1: RAN1 confirms RAN2’s working assumption that LCH based prio has higher priority than UL skipping.**

* Supported by CATT, vivo, OPPO, ZTE, LG, Nokia, NSB, DOCOMO, Samsung, Intel, Spreadtrum
* Not supported by Ericsson, QC

**FL suggestion is maybe we can postpone proposal 1 after we decide the solution on how to handle the PUCCH for which the overlapped PUSCH of the same L1 priority is NOT delivered by MAC.**

**Q 3-1: Any different views, please fill in the following table.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| CATT | We are fine to postpone proposal 1. |
| ZTE | We can accept this. We also think we can still confirm RAN2’s WA even if we haven’t decided the solution on the PUCCH finally. |
| DOCOMO | OK to postpone |
| Nokia, NSB | We would have preferred to confirm this in RAN1, as otherwise we just delay the related work in RAN2. |
| HW/HiSi | We are fine with Proposal 1, but if no agreement can be achieved it is also acceptable to postpone as suggested by the FL. |
| Ericsson | We still have serious problem with Proposal 1.  Even if companies ignore the problem of gNB blind decoding PUSCHs, RAN1 should discuss the implication of the RAN2 WA before making decision. RAN2 WA asks that UL skipping related procedure occurs after LCH based prioritization has performed, i.e., after MAC has decided on SR, CG-PUSCH, and DG-PUSCH, both HP and LP. Thus the following steps are performed between MAC and PHY according to RAN2 WA:  Step 1: MAC takes as input PUSCH resources, SR resources, and info on if the resources overlap;  **Step 2 (LCH based prioritization)**: MAC decisions on SR, CG, DG, both HP and LP. The CG and DG may be allowed a PDU (prioritized grants), or not (deprioritized grants).  Step 3: PHY runs UL skipping related procedure in 38.213 based on actually delivered SR (positive or negative), and prioritized grants. Exclude deprioritized empty grants in this step. The procedure selects the PUSCH(s), among the prioritized grants, that are expected to have UCI multiplexing.  **Step 4 (UL skipping related)**: For prioritized grants that are expected to have UCI multiplexing, MAC generates a PDU even if there is no data in the buffer.   * For prioritized grants that are not expected to have UCI multiplexing, MAC may or may not generate a PDU depending on buffer status.   Step 5. PHY performs intra-UE multiplexing/prioritization procedure in 38.213, based on actually delivered SR, PDU for CG, PDU for DG, from MAC.  As shown above, these are iterative steps between MAC and PHY. PHY cannot run step 3 based on scheduled PUCCH, PUSCH resources. PHY has to wait for MAC decision of LCH based prioritization for data-vs-data and SR-vs-data. This requires spec change to 38.213 for UCI-PUSCH multiplexing, for example, one set of procedure for step 3, and another set of procedure for Step 5. Also this may open a discussion about processing timeline.  Also: the UL skipping related procedure totally fails the purpose of minimizing gNB blind decoding, due to the dependency to the outcome of LCH based prioritization. Thus, we don’t see any point of performing the UL skipping related procedure.  In summary, we think there are serious issues with RAN2 WA and no benefit. RAN1 should consider the two options below, and not confirm RAN2 WA:  Option A. Fulfil the purpose of UL skipping related procedure. UL skipping related procedure has higher priority than LCH based prioritization.  Option B. Abandon the purpose of UL skipping related procedure. No need to perform UL skipping related procedure if LCH based prioritization is configured.  Option A make it deterministic which PUSCH is expected have UCI multiplexing when LCH based prioritization is configured, which reduces implementation complexity at UE and gNB. Details of Option A can be discussed further.  Option B does not give implementation benefits at UE and gNB, but Step 3-4 are removed to avoid iterations between MAC and PHY.  **FL reply 3: thank you for the explanation. please see Intel’s reply. In addition, with Option B, we still need to discuss on how to handle the PUCCH with which the overlapped PUSCH of the same L1 priority is not delivered by MAC (same as when UL skipping is configured).** |
| Intel | Same view as Nokia, but OK to postpone.  @Ericsson: Yes, there would be some additional PHY-MAC interactions including some level of iteration necessary compared to Rel-15. These are internal to the UE and details of which depends on UE implementation. We do not think additional discussions on processing timelines would be necessary.  On the other hand, unless we mandate that UL skipping is always prioritized over LCH prioritization (in which case the value of configuring LCH prioritization gets washed out), there would still be some coupling between PHY and MAC, so, UE implementation aspect would remain the same as today (following RAN2’s WA). |

### Status summary for the updated proposal 2

**Many companies from the 1st, 2nd round discussion think proposal 2 is not needed since this principle is for proposal 3, and suggest focusing directly on proposal 3; Some companies think proposal 2 needs more clarification; Some companies would like to make modifications (including assumption for SR status etc.). FL think it is better to postpone this discussion, because 1) give people more time to check Apple’s contribution** [R1-2105083](file:///C:\Users\wanshic\OneDrive%20-%20Qualcomm\Documents\Standards\3GPP%20Standards\Meeting%20Documents\TSGR1_105\Docs\R1-2105083.zip) **on SR and 2) it is not so essential from many companies perspective, given we will discuss proposal 3. So, if proponents of proposal 2 think it is necessary or essential, please share your views and address companies’ questions in 1st and 2nd Round discussion following table.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| ZTE | We are fine to postpone this discussion. |
| DOCOMO | OK to postpone |
| Nokia, NSB | OK to postpone |
| HW/HiSi | Ok to postpone. |
| Intel | Agree; can be picked up later if justified. |
| Apple | We suggest continuing the discussion if LCH based prioritization can be configured for a UE; otherwise the UE behavior is unspecified. Ericsson has a proposal below that LCH based prioritization is not supported together with UL skipping, it seems it would be a pity we end with such a conclusion given the effort has been spent on this topic. |
| CATT | Ok to postpone. |

### Status summary for the updated proposal 3

* **Agree with proposal 3 in principle: CATT, vivo OPPO, ZTE, LG, Nokia, NSB, HW/HiSi, DOCOMO, Samsung, Intel, Spreadtrum**
  + **Option 1: supported by vivo, OPPO, LG**
  + **Option 2: supported by vivo, ZTE, Nokia, NSB, DCM, Intel, CATT**
  + **Option 3: vivo, CATT**
  + **Option 4 (with update from HW/HiSi): HW/HiSi, Samsung**
  + **Option 5: no one**
* **Disagree with proposal 3: Ericsson, Qualcomm**

**The main reason of disagreeing proposal 3 is they have concern on confirming RAN2 WA, since it is unclear how PUSCH#0 can be determined without dependency on MAC LCH prioritization decision. As explained, the PUSCH#0 can be defined as the PUSCH transmission occasion/resource which is hypothetical PUSCH (rather than the real data delivered by MAC) that is expected to multiplex the UCI based on the PUSCH selection rule for UCI multiplexing as defined in Clause 9 of TS 38.213 if the PUCCH containing the UCI overlaps with at least one PUSCH.**

**Based on the comments, proposal 3 is further updated below, in addition, further questions are made below proposal 3 for companies who do not confirm RAN2’s WA, what should we discuss if RAN2’s WA is not confirmed or provide some concrete proposals, so that companies can check and share the views.**

**Updated proposal 3:**

**In case LCH based prioritization is configured, if RAN1 confirms RAN2’s WA that LCH based prioritization has higher priority than UL skipping operation, for the case that a PUSCH i.e., PUSCH#0 overlap with a PUCCH#0 with the same L1 priority on a same or different serving cell, a PUSCH i.e., PUSCH#1 overlaps with the PUSCH#0 on a serving cell with the same or different L1 priorities and the PUSCH#1 does not overlap with the PUCCH#0, if the PUSCH#0 is NOT delivered by MAC, following options can be considered to handle the PUCCH#0.**

* **Option 1: Drop the PUCCH#0.**
* **Option 2: When timeline condition is met,** 
  + **If there is no other remaining PUSCH(s) on any serving cell(s) overlapping with the PUCCH#0 of the same L1 priority, the UCI is transmitted on the PUCCH.**
  + **Otherwise, the PUCCH#0 should be dropped.**

**Note: above timeline condition is ensured by gNB, i.e. the ending symbol of UL grant for the PUSCH#1 should be at least**  **symbols before the first symbol of the earliest PUCCH#0 or PUSCH#0.**

* **~~Option 3: Transmit PUCCH#0 and the UE does not expect that there is other remaining PUSCH(s) on any serving cell(s) overlapping with the PUCCH#0 of the same L1 priority.~~**
* **Option 4:**
  + **If there is no remaining PUSCH(s) on any serving cell overlapping with PUCCH#0 of the same priority, the UCI is transmitted on the PUCCH.**
  + **Otherwise, the UCI is multiplexed in the PUSCH according to the existing rules.**
  + **No spec change is needed.**
* **~~Option 5:~~** 
  + **~~If the PUSCH#0 has Lower L1 priority than PUSCH#1, Option 1 is used;~~**
  + **~~Otherwise, Option 2.~~**

**Q 3-2: Any concern on the updated proposals with deleting some options with less/no support.?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| CATT | We would like to keep Option 3 and downselect them in the next meeting. We add our preference to option 2 and option 3. |
| ZTE | We are fine with the proposal. |
| DOCOMO | We are fine with the proposal |
| Nokia, NSB | Fine with the intention of the proposal, but a bit missing the overall picture (it seems we are going actually back here & not move forward). We have now a proposal with options in case we confirm the WA, but in case the WA is not configured we don’t have anything (as potential outcome of this meeting)?  Would be appreciated if Ericsson & QC, could come up with the proposal on the behavior in case the RAN2 WA is not confirmed by RAN1.  As commented earlier our preference is Option 2. |
| HW/HiSi | Our preference is Option 4.  We think the carrier aggregation case should be left to gNB implementation in Rel-16. In Rel-17 it is easily resolved by the already agreed simultaneous transmission of PUCCH and PUSCH.  For single carrier we think PUCCH should be transmitted, which would happen according to Options 2 and 4. |
| Ericsson | Although FL kindly explained the terms of proposal 3, several things are still unclear to us.  In this context, what is a PUCCH#0? Is it a hypothetical PUCCH without knowing MAC decision, or an actual PUCCH after MAC has made decisions? The most important MAC decision here is SR. With LCH based prioritization, MAC may or may not trigger SR when SR overlaps a PUSCH.   * If PUCCH#0 is hypothetical, then PUCCH#0 is the outcome of multiplexing overlapping UCIs with certain assumption of all SR (e.g., SR-HP = SR-LP =negative). What assumptions to take should be discussed. If hypothetical, then actions cannot be performed on PUCCH#0, i.e., it does not make sense to talk about transmitting or dropping it. * If PUCCH#0 is actual, then PHY has received MAC decisions in order to figure out PUCCH#0. Then, why is PUSCH#0 hypothetical?   **FL reply 3: the PUCCH you intend is specifically for SR, right? for other PUCCH (HARQ-ACK, CSI), they are all actual PUCCH. the proposal will be updated to leave out SR, note that the UL skipping agreement does not include SR.**  **PUSCH#0 hypothetical is meaningful for other UCI (HARQ-ACK, CSI).** |
| Intel | Share the sentiments expressed by Nokia.  @Ericsson: To PHY, “hypothetical” applies to the PUSCH/PUCCH until corresponding MAC PDU or SR is available for the corresponding PUSCH/PUCCH resource from MAC layer. |
| Apple | For actual PUSCHs, “**PUSCH#0 overlap with a PUCCH#0 with the same L1 priority on a same serving cell”** won’t happen.There can be a number of reasons, PUSCH #0 which was required by PHY does not materialize,we don’t need to enumerate all the cases (but we are open to enumerate all the cases also),essentially when PUSCH #0 is not available, then the PHY behavior should be specified. With that understanding, Option 2 or Option 1 would be fine for us. |

**Q 3-3: If RAN1 does not confirm RAN2’s WA that LCH based prioritization has higher priority than UL skipping operation, what is your views/issues RAN1 should discuss and any concrete proposals/WFs for this direction?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Ericsson | As discussed under Q3-1, RAN1 should discuss:  Option A (preferred). Fulfil the purpose of UL skipping related procedure. UL skipping related procedure has higher priority than LCH based prioritization.  Option B. Abandon the purpose of UL skipping related procedure. No need to perform UL skipping related procedure if LCH based prioritization is configured.  **FL reply 3: thank you. I feel it would be difficult to discuss the steps you mentioned in Q3-1 to achieve common understanding how complex of the iterative steps between MAC and PHY and whether/how to reduce the iterative steps between MAC and PHY since these are internal to the UE and details of which depends on UE implementation.** |

## 3.3 Collision between SR and Data

## First Round

**Background**

Given RAN2 has not made the decision and postponed the reply LS on collision between the SR and data, it may be better for us to first discuss some RAN1 specific issues.

Following Table 1 gives the summary for Rel-15 NR SR multiplexing with other UCI(s), i.e., HARQ-ACK and CSI. Note that in Rel-15 and 16 without configuring LCH based prioritization, for the same L1 priority between the SR and PUSCH, there is no such case that the SR is still triggered and positive when it overlaps with the PUSCH. As observed in Table 1, in Rel-15, when both SR and HARQ-ACK is configured with PUCCH format 1 (PF1) and their resources are overlapping, gNB needs to do blind detection on the PUCCH resource (SR PUCCH resource or HARQ-ACK PUCCH resource), since gNB is not aware of the SR status (positive or negative). Similar BD is required at the gNB side for positive SR and the PUSCH with A-CSI or SP-CSI only transmission.

Table 1: Summary of Rel-15 SR multiplexing with other UCIs

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | **SR** | |
| PUCCH format (PF) PF0 | PF1 |
| **HARQ-ACK** | PF0 | Transmit HARQ-ACK/SR on PF0 for HARQ-ACK | |
| PF1 | * Transmit HARQ-ACK on PF1 for HARQ-ACK * Drop SR | * Transmit HARQ-ACK on * PF1 for HARQ-ACK, for negative SR; * PF1 for SR, for positive SR |
| PF2 | Transmit HARQ-ACK/SR on HARQ-ACK PUCCH resource (\*) | |
| PF3 |
| PF4 |
| **SR** | PF0 | * Transmit one positive SR * Which SR is transmitted is up to UE | |
| PF1 |
| **CSI** | PF2 | Transmit CSI/SR on CSI PUCCH resource (\*) | |
| PF3 |
| PF4 |
| **PUSCH** | UL-SCH | Transmit PUSCH and drop positive SR | |
| A/SP-CSI | Transmit positive SR and drop PUSCH | |
| UL-SCH + A-CSI | Transmit PUSCH and drop positive SR | |
| (\*) When K SR occasions are collided, bits are transmitted, which means that only one positive SR is allowed | | | |

For Rel-16 in case LCH-based prioritization is configured, as provided in one example in Figure 2 [6] that HARQ-ACK PUCCH resource, SR PUCCH resource i.e., SR1 for SR configuration#1 and SR PUCCH resource for SR configuration#2 i.e., SR2 are configured with PUCCH format 1, [6] pointed out that depending on SR status for the two SR configurations, 4 cases can arise:

1. Both SR1 and SR2 are negative, HARQ-ACK is sent on PUCCH-0
2. SR1 is positive and SR2 is negative, HARQ-ACK is sent on PUCCH-1
3. SR2 is positive and SR1 is negative, HARQ-ACK is sent on PUCCH-2
4. Both SR1 and SR2 are positive, HARQ-ACK is sent on PUCCH-1, and SR2 is sent over PUCCH-2.

Timeline

Description automatically generated

Figure 4 Resource selection for PUCCH format 1 from [6]

[6] observed that above uncertainty does not incur complexity on the UE side, as the UE PHY performs all the processing with information on SR status from MAC, the PHY is never tasked to track all the alternative outcomes. However, it may cause much complexity at the gNB side, since gNB cannot control the SR status at a UE, blind detection on the gNB side for different outcomes is inevitable. The complexity may increase drastically in case the SR&HARQ further overleaps with the PUSCH for case 2, 3 and 4 as discussed in R1-2102244. Therefore, [6] proposed following:

**Proposal 4: To mitigate the uncertainty in UCI multiplexing, the occurrence of HARQ-ACK PUCCH resource at PUCCH format 1 and SR PUCCH resource at PUCCH format 1 should be avoided. One of the following alternatives is selected:**

* **Alt. 1: HARQ-ACK PUCCH resource and SR PUCCH resource cannot be both configured with PUCCH format 1**
* **Alt. 2: If HARQ-ACK PUCCH resource and SR PUCCH resource overlap, then they won’t be both at PUCCH format 1.**
* **Alt. 3: SR is assumed to be negative for UCI multiplexing.**
* **Alt. 4: SR is assumed to be positive for UCI multiplexing.**

**Question 3.3-1: What is your views on above proposal 4 for**

* **Rel-15/Rel-16 without LCH-based prioritization?**
* **Rel-16 with LCH-based prioritization (especially considering the cases listed in the Rely LS R1-2102244)?**
* **What is your preferred Alternative if the UCI multiplexing uncertainty is an issue for Rel-15 or Rel-16 with/without LCH-based prioritization?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Nokia, NSB | We are a bit wondering if the **restriction** would only need to apply, if **more than one no-overlapping SR PF1 resource is overlapping with the HARQ-ACK PF1 resource** (as shown in the Figure 4), as just the overlap of only a single SR and HARQ-ACK PF1 resource is supported in Rel-15 already.  Moreover, it is unclear us for Alt. 3 & Alt. 4 which SR (as 2 overlapping SRs are to be considered) is assumed to be negative or positive.  So maybe Proposal 4 may need some related update to really try to capture the essence of Figure 4 and clarifying better Alt. 3 & 4 before being able to provide our preference. |
| Ericsson | **Rel-15:**  The issue raised by Proposal 4 does not seem to apply to Rel-15. In Rel-15, MAC triggers SR only if it does not overlap with any PUSCH grant. See 38.321 section 5.4.4: “if the PUCCH resource for the SR transmission occasion overlaps with neither a UL-SCH resource nor an SL-SCH resource;”  **Rel-16:**  The issue of multiple UCI multiplexing possibilities, as raised by Proposal 4, exists for Rel-16 with LCH-based prioritization. On the other hand, with LCH-based prioritization, there is always uncertainty if the PUSCH receives a MAC PDU or not due to SR-vs-PUSCH LCH prioritization, irrespective of PF1 or not for HARQ-ACK and SR. Hence it is not avoidable that gNB has to handle the uncertainty. Thus a gNB configures LCH-based prioritization only if it is capable of handling the multiple hypothesis. Proposal 4 does not seem necessary. |
| ZTE | In case of the overlapping between SR and HARQ-ACK with PF1, the blind detection at the gNB side cannot be avoided. For Alt. 1 and Alt. 2, the restriction is too large. For Alt. 3 and Alt. 4, the purpose of the SR is lost. To mitigate the uncertainty of UCI multiplexing in Figure 4, we think a simple way is the overlapping between two SR resource and a HARQ-ACK resource with PF 1 is not allowed or the UE can only generate at most one positive SR in this case. |
| Vivo | Maybe @Apple can clarify better. 😊 Below is just my understanding from Apple’s contribution.  To Nokia:  My understanding of Alt.3 and 4, is both SR1 and SR2 are assumed as negative for Alt.3 or positive for Alt.4.  Regarding to “We are a bit wondering if the **restriction** would only need to apply, if **more than one no-overlapping SR PF1 resource is overlapping with the HARQ-ACK PF1 resource** (as shown in the Figure 4), as just the overlap of only a single SR and HARQ-ACK PF1 resource is supported in Rel-15 already.” My understanding is it seems Rel-15 allows the Figure 4 **considering the SR1 and SR2 are from different SR configurations** (the triggering for SR is independent for different SR configurations corresponding to different logical channels).  To Ericsson,  Here the issue does not involve SR overlapping with PUSCH. It is about the SR using PUCCH format 1(PF1) overlaps with the HARQ-ACK using PF1. The SR1 and SR2 in Figure 4 are from different SR configurations. I think the issue exist for Rel-15 also as explained to Nokia. But I kind of share with your views that, for both Rel-15 and Rel-16, it depends on gNB’s capability, no restriction is needed. |
| Qualcomm | We don’t see why the restrictions in Proposal 4 are needed. gNB can always avoid such cases by configuration if it chooses too. And UE implementation for the colliding between SR and HARQ-ACK is deterministic, hence no increase of UE implementation complexity either. |
| Intel | Similar views as Qualcomm, Ericsson (2nd part of the comment), and vivo. Do not see a need to impose restrictions by spec. This can be up to gNB implementation. |
| CATT | In our understanding, this behavior of the occurrence of HARQ-ACK PUCCH resource at PUCCH format 1 and SR PUCCH resource at PUCCH format 1already exists in Rel-15 and it is not necessary to make any enhancement during Rel-16 maintenance. The UE behavior of maintaining Rel-15 will still work. In the case of combining with LCH, too much blind detection can be avoided by gNB scheduling and it belongs to gNB implementation. It should be noticed, no matter what gNB configuration or implementation is used, it already supported at the UE side in current specification.  Regarding the behavior for the overlapping of SR PUCCH and HARQ-ACK PUCCH, to our understanding, if there is no P-SR at the latest preparation time of A/N, UE will prepare for the A/N transmission according to N-SR, which then gives a guideline for MAC to decide the deadline to deliver P-SR to PHY. |
| OPPO | Similar view with other companies and does not see a need to impose these restrictions. |
| Samsung | Without having specification impact, we prefer to put this as gNB choice since this blind decoding burden and configuration are up to gNB implementation. That is, we think that gNB can configure those kinds of resource as long as gNB can. |
| Apple | Note the channel selection issue is an gNB issue in Rel-15 (we analyzed it in Section 2.1 of R1-2105083).  In Rel-16, if UL skipping is supported, it is no longer just an gNB issue (we analyzed it in Section 3.1 of R1-2105083).  The issue is that the status of SR is needed for UE PHY to perform UCI multiplexing over PUCCH, then eventually PUCCH resource Z may overlap with a PUSCH, however generation of SR and/or PUSCH is by LCH based prioritization, which should be conducted by UE MAC AFTER receiving indication from UE PHY, yet UE PHY needs the status of SR to move forward on UCI multiplexing over PUCCH. Hence there a cyclic dependence between UE PHY and UE MAC. Proposal 4 is to break the cyclic dependence. We provide two solutions in our contribution:  In Section 3/Section 4 of R1-205083, we have Solution 1 with assumed SR status, essentially Proposal 4 is needed for Solution 1;  In Section 5 of R1-205083, for Solution 2, essentially we need to split the LCH based prioritization into two: **To avoid the necessity for PHY to assume SR status for UCI multiplexing, RAN2 should split the LCH based prioritization between data and data from LCH based prioritization between data and SR so separate UE capabilities and RRC configurations from gNB are supported for SR/data LCH based prioritization and data/data LCH based prioritization when UL skipping is configured.**  We don’t have any intention to complicate the Rel-16 design, but please check with your product team to ensure every step is doable. We provide the processing flow in Section 3 and Section 5 for two solutions. Please kindly check. |
| HW/HiSi | The situation described in figure 4 was already discussed in Rel-15 and it was concluded that it is up to UE implementation. The proposal 4 is about the overlap with PUCCH and the overlap with PUCCH should follow Rel-15. We are not sure why it should be discussed here to modify the PUCCH multiplexing rule.  **RAN1#95 Conclusion**:   * For HARQ-ACK/CSI overlapping with PUCCH resources corresponding to more than one positive SR, it is up to UE to select one PUCCH with positive SR and drop the other PUCCH(s) with positive SR before doing the multiplexing of positive SR and HARQ-ACK/CSI. * When there are multiple non-overlapping PUCCH resources with positive SR corresponding to different SR configurations within one slot, it is up to UE to select at most two PUCCHs with positive SR, and one of the selected PUCCH should be short PUCCH if two PUCCHs are selected. * No changes in specification is needed for the above |
| Apple-2 | To HW/HiSi:  In Rel-15, UE PHY takes the outcome of UE MAC as inputs and performs UCI multiplexing, etc, (maybe we can use analog: MAC is PHY’s boss in Rel-15);  In Rel-16, due to the support of UL skipping, UE PHY can influence the outcome of UE MAC (e.g. through the indication sent to MAC), the Rel-15 solution does not work anymore (SR’s generation is by MAC considering PHY’s input). It is no longer clear who is the boss, and PHY and MAC seem to be each other’s boss! |

For the case that only SR overlaps with PUSCH of equal L1 priority, the timeline issue was discussed in the RAN1#104-e meeting, but no conclusion could be reached. [9] proposed to relax the UCI multiplexing timeline for the overlap between SR and PUSCH when LCH based prioritization is configured. The reasons are following:

* In Rel-15, when PHY receives an UL DCI scheduling UL-SCH and finds out that the scheduled UL-SCH is overlapping with SR, then PHY can start immediately with the PUSCH preparation that will contain the UL-SCH, since a positive SR will be dropped anyway when it overlaps with UL-SCH.
* But in Rel-16, if LCH based prioritization is configured, MAC can decide based on L2 prioritization, to deliver either SR or the MAC PDU. Therefore, whether PHY needs to transmit the SR or the PUSCH (containing UL-SCH) is depending on the MAC decision. It means that when PHY receives a DCI scheduling UL-SCH, it cannot immediately start to prepare the PUSCH transmission (containing UL-SCH), since it has to wait until it receives a MAC decision. An alternative handling would be that the UE anyhow starts an immediate preparation of the PUSCH, but then has to cancel it again in case that no PDU is delivered from MAC. This stopping operation requires also time and could also delay the processing.

However, [7] noted that similar case is already in Rel-15/16 in case where there are overlapping configured grant PUSCH and SR, although there is no use case where a UE transmitting SR instead of PUSCH in Rel-15. It is also noted that [R1-2104470] submitted in AI 7.1 discussed the similar issue in section 2.2 on whether/how timeline needs to be defined to give sufficient time for UE to cancel the PUSCH without UL-SCH when it overlaps with the positive SR. Although R1-2104470 did not get the email discussion, it would be good to take the issue that seems already existed in Rel-15 into account when we make the decision here.

**Question 3.3-2: What is your views on relaxing the UCI multiplexing timeline for the overlap between SR and PUSCH when LCH based prioritization is configured?**

* **For example, why it is necessary or not necessary? If it is necessary, any detailed proposals on how to define the timeline?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Nokia, NSB | Relaxation not necessary  We don’t see this any different than UL skipping (with no UCI multiplexing) and also there the timeline is not changed. Moreover, before having a MAC PDU delivered the potential preparation of the transmission is very much limited in the first place anyhow (i.e. DM-RS only). |
| Ericsson | Relaxation not necessary.  As explained by FL and Nokia, there are existing cases already where PHY needs to wait for a MAC decision. For example,   * It is mandatory since Rel-15 that CG-PUSCH may or may not receive a MAC PDU. * In Rel-16, it has also been clarified that DG-PUSCH is not transmitted if MAC does not generate a PDU for it. See 38.214 v16.5.0, section 6.1, “A UE shall upon detection of a PDCCH with a configured DCI format 0\_0, 0\_1 or 0\_2 transmit the corresponding PUSCH as indicated by that DCI unless the UE does not generate a transport block as described in [10, TS38.321].” |
| ZTE | We don’t think it is necessary.  The time relaxing is needed only when the UE would stop one ongoing transmission and transmit another transmission. For the overlapping with SR and PUSCH, the MAC may make the decision only before the SR or MAC PDU are not delivered to the PHY according to the LS from RAN2. So there is no ongoing transmission cancellation in this case. Anyway, the MAC shall deliver the MAC PDU to the PHY such that PHY has enough time for processing. When to deliver the MAC PDU is UE implementation. |
| Vivo | We share the views with above companies. Seems Rel-15 already exist the case as exampled above. |
| Intel | Relaxation is not necessary for the reasons mentioned by FL and others above. With LCH prioritization, certainly some of the UE implementation and interaction between MAC and PHY layers may need to be updated to support the feature, but we do not see a fundamental processing time issue in this case, esp. considering precedence from Rel-15. |
| CATT | Relaxing the UCI multiplexing timeline isn’t necessary because it isn’t clear why PHY needs to execute the preparation of the transmission before MAC delivers PDU to PHY.  The definition of the PUSCH preparation timeline is to give MAC some guidance for the last time to deliver PDU to PHY.  The proponents need clarify why the preparation of the transmission before MAC delivers PDU to PHY is needed and what the preparation of the transmission includes. |
| OPPO | Relaxation is not necessary for the reasons mentioned by FL and others above. |
| Samsung | Similar views with Nokia and Ericsson. |
| HW/HiSi | It is necessary for overlapping between SR and data, and we also think the timeline needs to be relaxed for the overlap between DG and CG.  Let’s take DG vs CG as an example to explain the reasons behind, since we think this is the more serious case: .  In Rel-15, the timeline for DG vs CG is N2 symbols, e.g. N2=5 for capability#2 with SCS = 15kHz (as illustrated in the figure below). In Rel-15 the DG always overrides CG. So, when the UE receives the DCI, PHY knows that the DG will be transmitted and that CG will not be transmitted, thus it can immediately start with the preparation of the DG PUSCH transmission.    But in Rel-16 if LCH based prioritization is configured, when the UE receives the DCI, PHY does not directly know which PUSCH will be transmitted. If PHY waits, then the available processing time will be reduced. If, on the other hand, PHY will not wait and assumes one PUSCH will be transmitted, then it may happen that MAC delivers the other PUSCH. Thus, PHY will have to re-start the processing for this PUSCH again, it will also impact the processing time.  Therefore, for the DG vs CG case, our proposal is to add delta symbols (FFS values) on the top of legacy timeline below as shown below. But we are also open for other solutions to solve this problem.    For SR vs data case, the motivation to relax its timeline is the same. However as we said before, SR vs data is maybe less serious, since it is PUCCH vs PUSCH, and the timeline requirement for PUCCH vs PUSCH is more relaxed than N2. |

**Other issues that you would like to discuss, please fill in the following table.**

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

## Second Round

For proposal 4, that is proposed to mitigate the uncertainty in UCI multiplexing in case the HARQ-ACK PUCCH resource at PUCCH format 1 overlaps with the SR PUCCH resource at PUCCH format 1, companies’ views are summarized as below.

* Proposal 4 is not needed: Ericsson, vivo, QC, Intel, CATT, OPPO, Samsung, HW/HiSi
  + Reasons:
    - The BD already existed in Rel-15.
    - It can be handled by gNB implementation to avoid such overlapping if the BD is the concern.
    - It was already discussed in Rel-15 and following is concluded:

|  |
| --- |
| **RAN1#95 Conclusion**:   * For HARQ-ACK/CSI overlapping with PUCCH resources corresponding to more than one positive SR, it is up to UE to select one PUCCH with positive SR and drop the other PUCCH(s) with positive SR before doing the multiplexing of positive SR and HARQ-ACK/CSI. * When there are multiple non-overlapping PUCCH resources with positive SR corresponding to different SR configurations within one slot, it is up to UE to select at most two PUCCHs with positive SR, and one of the selected PUCCH should be short PUCCH if two PUCCHs are selected. * No changes in specification is needed for the above |

* Proposal 4 is needed: Apple
  + Reasons: in Rel-15, only gNB has the BD issue; but for Rel-16 with UL skipping, when SR using PF1 overlaps with HARQ-ACK using PF1, depending on SR status, the final PUCCH may or may not overlap with the PUSCH which also have impacts on the PUSCH generation.

Given the majority view, the conclusion made in RAN1#95, and the limited case, which happens when both SR and HARQ-ACK use PUCCH format 1 and their PUCCH resources are overlapped, following is proposed:

**Conclusion 1:**

* In case the HARQ-ACK PUCCH resource using PUCCH format 1 overlaps with the SR PUCCH resource using PUCCH format 1, the uncertainty in UCI multiplexing can be managed/controlled by gNB’s configuration/scheduling, the additional solutions and restrictions are not necessary.

**FL Q2-3: Do you agree with above conclusion 1?**

* **If you do not agree, please provide your reasons and way forward.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Ericsson | **For Rel-15, fine with Conclusion 1.**  To clarify: we acknowledge that there is hypothesis testing of PUCCH outcome. On the other hand, no PUSCH is involved. In general, we are less concerned with PUCCH hypothesis testing, which is easier to perform than PUSCH hypothesis testing (LDPC decoding of potentially very large TB with puncturing/rate-matching of UCI). Thus we are don’t see an issue with Rel-15 scenario.  **For Rel-16, separately discuss the two UCI multiplexing steps:**   * **Do not support Conclusion 1 for the preliminary UCI multiplexing step for selecting PUSCH#0-LP and PUSCH#0-HP. Propose: SR=negative is assumed in the preliminary UCI multiplexing step for selecting PUSCH#0-LP and PUSCH#0-HP.** * **Fine with Conclusion 1 for the final UCI multiplexing step, which is performed after PHY receives the decisions from MAC for SR and PUSCH grant.**   After further checking the chicken-egg problem between MAC and PHY by Apple, we acknowledge that it is necessary to take assumptions in Stage 1 described in Apple contribution [6]. That is, for PHY to have the test-run of UCI multiplexing to determine PUSCH#0-HP (if exist) and PUSCH#0-LP (if exist), assumptions need to be taken for SR and CG-PUSCH.  As an example, the SR-vs-data scenario is extended to Figure 1 below, assuming all UCI and PUSCH are of the same PHY priority. There are five 5 possible outcome if LCH based prioritization is configured, see Figure 2. MAC decision to send positive SR(=1) or negative SR(=0) affects the outcome significantly. For (D) SR1=SR2=1: MAC prioritized SR1 and SR2 over the two PUSCHs. At physical layer, (D-1) and (D-2) are both possible, depending on UE implementation.  Figure 1:    Figure 2:    Thus preliminary UCI multiplexing step for selecting PUSCH#0-LP and PUSCH#0-HP is suggested to assume SR=0 (negative), see E/// input to Updated Proposal 2.  This would lead to the following for the example above:  DG-PUSCH2 is selected as PUSCH#0 with UCI multiplexing => MAC give DG-PUSCH2 highest LCH priority => SR2 is deprioritized, DG-PUSCH2 is prioritized => SR=0, DG-PUSCH2 receives a PDU => depending on SR1 is prioritized over DG-PUSCH1 or not, the final outcome is either (A) or (C). => gNB blind decoding of PUSCH can be controlled by checking if PUCCH1 for SR1 is transmitted. If PUCCH1 does not exist, it’s (A); otherwise it’s (C). |
| CATT | We are fine with FL proposal. |
| Vivo | Support conclusion 1 at least for Rel-15.  We are also fine with this conclusion for Rel-16. Reasons are following:  For Rel-16, given the conclusion made in RAN#95 below, it is noted the uncertainty (SR multiplexing with other UCIs (e.g. HARQ-ACK/CSI), the final PUCCH may or may not overlap with the PUSCH depending on SR status) seems already exist in Rel-15. Not sure how it is different from Rel-16 and whether we need to address the uncertainty. Welcome more views.  **RAN1#95 Conclusion**:   * For HARQ-ACK/CSI overlapping with PUCCH resources corresponding to more than one positive SR, it is up to UE to select one PUCCH with positive SR and drop the other PUCCH(s) with positive SR before doing the multiplexing of positive SR and HARQ-ACK/CSI. * When there are multiple non-overlapping PUCCH resources with positive SR corresponding to different SR configurations within one slot, it is up to UE to select at most two PUCCHs with positive SR, and one of the selected PUCCH should be short PUCCH if two PUCCHs are selected. * No changes in specification is needed for the above |
| ZTE | We agree conclusion 1. |
| LG | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Nokia, NSB | We are fine with the proposals (for Rel-15 & Rel-16, note this is a Rel-16 maintenance email thread…) |
| DOCOMO | We are fine with the proposed conclusion |
| Samsung | Fine with the proposal. |
| Intel | Fine with the propose Conclusion 1. |

For the issue whether and how to relax the UCI multiplexing timeline for the overlap between SR and PUSCH when LCH based prioritization is configured, companies’ views are summarized as below.

* Relaxing the UCI multiplexing timeline is NOT necessary: Nokia, Ericsson, ZTE, vivo, Intel, CATT, OPPO, Samsung
  + Reasons:
    - There are existing cases already where PHY needs to wait for a MAC decision e.g. CG vs SR
    - Before having a MAC PDU delivered the potential preparation of the transmission is very much limited in the first place anyhow (i.e. DM-RS only)
    - The time relaxing is needed only when the UE would stop one ongoing transmission and transmit another transmission, for SR vs. data case, there is no ongoing transmission to be cancelled.
    - With LCH prioritization, certainly some of the UE implementation and interaction between MAC and PHY layers may need to be updated to support the feature, but no fundamental processing time issue
* Relaxing the UCI multiplexing timeline is necessary: HW/HiSi
  + Reasons:
    - For DG vs. CG, when LCH-based prioritization is configured, the available processing time will be reduced since PHY needs to wait for MAC’s decision or re-start the processing if MAC delivers the PDU which is not the one prepared by PHY in advance
    - For SR vs. data, timeline maybe less serious

Given the reasons explained by the majority companies and the proponent for relaxing the UCI processing timeline also think it may be less serious, so, following conclusion is proposed:

**Conclusion 2:**

* **When LCH based prioritization is configured, for the case that only SR overlaps with PUSCH of equal L1 priority i.e., case 1 in Reply LS R1-2102244, RAN1 conclude that there is no impact on the PHY processing timeline to support the intended UE behavior as described in the LS R2-2011124 (i.e., if SR is prioritized in MAC, MAC shall not deliver the MAC PDU for the PUSCH and shall instruct PHY for SR transmission).**

**FL Q2-4: Do you agree with above conclusion 2?**

* **If you have strong concern, please provide your reasons and way forward.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Ericsson | Support Conclusion 2 |
| CATT | We are fine with conclusion 2. |
| Vivo | Support Conclusion 2. |
| ZTE | We agree this conclusion. |
| LG | Support Conclusion 2. |
| Nokia, NSB | Support conclusion 2 |
| DOCOMO | We are fine with the proposed conclusion |
| Samsung | Fine with the conclusion |
| Intel | Fine with proposed Conclusion 2. |

About HW/HiSi proposed to relax the overriding timeline between the DG and CG, as already discussed in previous meetings RAN1#101-e and 102-e meetings that the timeline e.g. N2 defined in TS 38.214 should be used as reference for MAC layer to deliver the one MAC PDU so that PHY can have sufficient time to process. Therefore, FL propose no need to discuss further and no more conclusion is needed.

**FL Q2-5: Do you agree that the timeline (i.e., N2) defined in TS 38.214 section 6.1 is used as processing timeline for handling the collision between DG and CG so that MAC will only deliver one MAC PDU to PHY. There is no need to discuss further about relaxing the processing timeline for DG vs. CG collision case?**

* **If you have strong concern on above, please provide your reasons and way forward.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Ericsson | Agree that timeline is not to be relaxed.  For the DG-vs-CG case pointed out by Huawei, RAN1 has made the conclusion below in RAN1#101. That is, Rel-15 timeline is reused without relaxation. Thus, no need to repeat the discussion again.  ***Conclusion (RAN1#101)***  *For the collision between DG PUSCH and CG PUSCH with same PHY priority, the DG PUSCH can be scheduled overlapping in time with CG PUSCH occasion if Rel-15 timeline satisfies.*  *Note: it is related to other discussion how UE prioritized and transmit one of grants.* |
| CATT | We agree that timeline needn’t be relaxed |
| vivo | Agree no need further discussion on relaxing the timeline for CG vs. DG.. |
| ZTE | We agree this proposal that no need to further discuss it. |
| LG | Agree that there is no need to discuss further about relaxing the processing timeline between DG and CG. |
| Nokia, NSB | Agree with other companies above, that no relaxation is needed. |
| HW/HiSi | For the SR case we can leave it as it is.  For the CG vs DG case, we prefer not and suggest to relax the time-line.  Generally, the PHY and MAC processing are independent from each other from the UE perspective. And when a dependency now is introduced, then the required UE processing time would have to be extended in our view. The conclusion that E/// copied above has a note that this is related to other discussion on prioritization and transmission. We don’t think that has been discussed thoroughly before, especially under consideration of the UE implementation aspects. Therefore, we would like to hear the views from other companies why they think the time-line is not an issue for this situation.  @ Proponents of this proposal to not relax the processing time. Could you please clarify why the situation described by us is not an issue for the processing time-line: as opposed to Rel-15, if LCH based prioritization is configured and the UE receives the DCI, PHY does not know directly which PUSCH will be transmitted. If PHY waits for the PDU, then the available processing time will be reduced. If, on the other hand, PHY will not wait and assumes one PUSCH will be transmitted, then it may happen that MAC delivers the other PUSCH. Thus, PHY will have to re-start the processing for this PUSCH again, it will also impact the processing time. |
| DOCOMO | We agree with the statement that no relaxation is needed |
| Qualcomm | We would like to clarify the question a bit: is the proposed conclusion only about CG/DG overlapping, or does it also include the case of UCI overlapping with the CG/DGs (i.e., the scenario being discussed in Section 3.2)? If the conclusion is to include the latter scenario, we think we can postpone the timeline discussion after a solution for the UCI multiplexing problem has been agreed. |
| Samsung | Agree |
| Intel | Agree that no relaxation is necessary. |

## Third Round

### Status summary for conclusion 1

Conclusion 1: In case the HARQ-ACK PUCCH resource using PUCCH format 1 overlaps with the SR PUCCH resource using PUCCH format 1, the uncertainty in UCI multiplexing can be managed/controlled by gNB’s configuration/scheduling, the additional solutions and restrictions are not necessary.

* Supported by: Ericsson (for Rel-15, not for Rel-16), CATT, vivo, ZTE, LG, Nokia, NSB, DCM, Samsung, Intel
* Not supported by:

FL suggestion for Conclusion 1 is to give companies more time to check the issue based on Apple’s contribution [R1-2105083](file:///C:\Users\wanshic\OneDrive%20-%20Qualcomm\Documents\Standards\3GPP%20Standards\Meeting%20Documents\TSGR1_105\Docs\R1-2105083.zip), and taking into account the conclusion made in RAN1#95, and the Rel-16 maintenance stage we are now. Maybe better not to rush to make the conclusion 1 at this meeting.

Q 3-4: Any comments?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Qualcomm | We are fine to postpone the discussion to check further the issues raised in Apple’s contribution. |
| CATT | It isn’t necessary to postpone the conclusion because majority companies think the additional solutions and restrictions are not necessary. |
| OPPO | We are fine to postpone the discussion for more time to check the issue of SR status. |
| ZTE | We are fine with the proposal to postpone the discussion. |
| DOCOMO | OK to postpone |
| Nokia, NSB | OK to postpone |
| Intel | Same view as CATT, but fine to come back to this later as well. |
| Samsung | Fine with the proposal. |
| Apple | We don’t agree with the proposed conclusion as it is NOT only a gNB configuration issue, the UE should not be expected to handle the huge number of hypotheses the gNB can throw at it. |

### Status summary for conclusion 2

Conclusion 2: When LCH based prioritization is configured, for the case that only SR overlaps with PUSCH of equal L1 priority i.e., case 1 in Reply LS R1-2102244, RAN1 conclude that there is no impact on the PHY processing timeline to support the intended UE behavior as described in the LS R2-2011124 (i.e., if SR is prioritized in MAC, MAC shall not deliver the MAC PDU for the PUSCH and shall instruct PHY for SR transmission).

* **Supported by Ericsson, CATT, vivo, ZTE, LG, Nokia, NSB, DCM, Samsung, Intel**
* **Note that HW/HiSi can “leave it as it is”**

**Therefore, FL suggestion is to agree on Conclusion 2.**

Q 3-5: Any comments?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| CATT | We are fine with FL proposal. |
| ZTE | We support conclusion 2. |
| DOCOMO | We support the conclusion |
| Nokia, NSB | Support conclusion 2. |
| Ericsson | Support conclusion 2 |
| Intel | Support conclusion 2. |
| Samsung | Agree |

### Status summary for conclusion 3

**Conclusion 3: the timeline (i.e., N2) defined in TS 38.214 section 6.1 is used as processing timeline for handling the collision between DG and CG so that MAC will only deliver one MAC PDU to PHY. There is no need to discuss further about relaxing the processing timeline for DG vs. CG collision case.**

* **Supported by Ericsson, CATT, vivo, ZTE, LG, Nokia, NSB, DCM, Samsung, Intel**
* **Not supported by HW/HiSi**
* **QC has one question on whether the proposed conclusion only about CG/DG overlapping, or does it also include the case of UCI overlapping with the CG/DGs (i.e., the scenario being discussed in Section 3.2.**

**FL’s understanding is conclusion 3 is only about the CG/DG overlapping. Therefore, the conclusion 3 is updated as below:**

**Updated Conclusion 3: the timeline (i.e., N2) defined in TS 38.214 section 6.1 is used as processing timeline for handling the collision between DG and CG without considering the UCI overlapping with the CG/DG of the same L1 priority so that MAC will only deliver one MAC PDU to PHY. There is no need to discuss further about relaxing the processing timeline for DG vs. CG collision case.**

Q3-6: Any comments?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| CATT | We are fine with FL proposal. |
| ZTE | Support conclusion 3. |
| DOCOMO | We support the conclusion |
| Nokia, NSB | We support the conclusion. |
| HW/HiSi | Do not support the conclusion 3.  We understand that there is a majority view that no relaxation of the time-line is needed, but can it be explained why the problem we described earlier is not an issue for the UE implementation, especially since the implementation related details have not been discussed at that time.  When a tighter dependency between MAC and PHY is introduced in Rel-16, the PHY processing is impacted. When the DCI with the UL grant is received PHY cannot start directly to prepare the transmission because it does not know which PDU will be received. Why do proponents of this proposal think that this does not impact the Rel-15 time-line? |
| Ericsson | Support conclusion 3 |
| Intel | Support updated conclusion 3 in principle. Perhaps a qualifier like “When LCH based prioritization is configured,” may need to be added to the proposed updated Conclusion 3 for the right context.  @Huawei: Certainly, PHY-MAC interaction may need to be updated compared to Rel-15 in consideration of LCH prioritization, but that is internal to the UE, which is supporting a new R16 feature. In other words, the delay corresponding to “delta” in earlier figure from Huawei depends entirely on UE implementation and not something that specifications need to address. |
| Samsung | Agree |

# 4 Email discussion Summary

**Based on companies’ input, Conclusion 2 seems stable, everyone supports or can accept it, so FL suggestion is to agree on the conclusion 2.**

**Conclusion 2: When LCH based prioritization is configured, for the case that only SR overlaps with PUSCH of equal L1 priority i.e., case 1 in Reply LS R1-2102244, RAN1 conclude that there is no impact on the PHY processing timeline to support the intended UE behavior as described in the LS R2-2011124 (i.e., if SR is prioritized in MAC, MAC shall not deliver the MAC PDU for the PUSCH and shall instruct PHY for SR transmission).**

**Following proposals and conclusion are supported by majority companies with one or two companies’ disagreement**

**Proposal 3.1-1: When *lch-BasedPrioritization* is not configured and PHY is configured with two L1 priorities, RAN1 confirms RAN2’s working assumption that DG always overrides CG.**

* **Supported by Ericsson, CATT, vivo, OPPO, ZTE, LG, Nokia, NSB, DCM, Samsung, Intel, HW, HiSi, Spreadtrum**
* **Not supported by QC**
  + **Supporting companies have different views with QC’s concerns**

**Conclusion 3: When LCH based prioritization is configured, the timeline (i.e., N2) defined in TS 38.214 section 6.1 is used as processing timeline for handling the collision between DG and CG without considering the UCI overlapping with the CG/DG of the same L1 priority so that MAC will only deliver one MAC PDU to PHY. There is no need to discuss further about relaxing the processing timeline for DG vs. CG collision case.**

* **Supported by Ericsson, CATT, vivo, ZTE, LG, Nokia, NSB, DCM, Samsung, Intel**
* **Not supported by HW/HiSi**
  + **Companies understanding is that it was already discussed in previous RAN1 meetings (#101 and #102-e meeting) that**

|  |
| --- |
| ***Conclusion (RAN1#101)***   * *For the collision between DG PUSCH and CG PUSCH with same PHY priority, the DG PUSCH can be scheduled overlapping in time with CG PUSCH occasion if Rel-15 timeline satisfies.* * *Note: it is related to other discussion how UE prioritized and transmit one of grants.* |

**Proposal 1：RAN1 confirms RAN2’s working assumption that LCH based prio has higher priority than UL skipping.**

* **Supported by CATT, vivo, OPPO, ZTE, LG, Nokia, NSB, DOCOMO, Samsung, Intel, Spreadtrum**
* **Not supported by Ericsson, QC**
  + **Supporting and non-supporting companies have different views on the complexity and benefits on confirming and not confirming the WA**

**Updated Proposal 3:**

**In case LCH based prioritization is configured, if RAN1 confirms RAN2’s WA that LCH based prioritization has higher priority than UL skipping operation, for the case that a PUSCH i.e., PUSCH#0 overlap with a PUCCH#0 including only HARQ-ACK and/or CSI with the same L1 priority on a same or different serving cell, a PUSCH i.e., PUSCH#1 overlaps with the PUSCH#0 on a serving cell with the same or different L1 priorities and the PUSCH#1 does not overlap with the PUCCH#0, if the PUSCH#0 is NOT delivered by MAC, following options can be considered to handle the PUCCH#0.**

* **Option 1: Drop the PUCCH#0.**
* **Option 2: When timeline condition is met,** 
  + **If there is no other remaining PUSCH(s) on any serving cell(s) overlapping with the PUCCH#0 of the same L1 priority, the UCI is transmitted on the PUCCH.**
  + **Otherwise, the PUCCH#0 should be dropped.**

**Note: above timeline condition is ensured by gNB, i.e. the ending symbol of UL grant for the PUSCH#1 should be at least**  **symbols before the first symbol of the earliest PUCCH#0 or PUSCH#0.**

* **Option 3: Transmit PUCCH#0 and the UE does not expect that there is other remaining PUSCH(s) on any serving cell(s) overlapping with the PUCCH#0 of the same L1 priority.**
* **Option 4:**
  + **If there is no remaining PUSCH(s) on any serving cell overlapping with PUCCH#0 of the same priority, the UCI is transmitted on the PUCCH.**
  + **Otherwise, the UCI is multiplexed in the PUSCH according to the existing rules.**
  + **No spec change is needed.**

**About proposal 2 and conclusion 1, FL suggestion is to give companies more time to check the issue based on Apple’s contribution** [**R1-2105083**](file:///C:\Users\wanshic\OneDrive%20-%20Qualcomm\Documents\Standards\3GPP%20Standards\Meeting%20Documents\TSGR1_105\Docs\R1-2105083.zip)**, and taking into account the conclusion made in RAN1#95, and the Rel-16 maintenance stage we are now. Maybe better not to rush to make decision at this meeting.**
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# Contribution Proposals

* [R1-2104214]

|  |
| --- |
| Observation 1: If LCH based prioritization has higher priority than UL skipping, multiple possible multiplexing/prioritization outcomes exist in each slot. This significantly increases the processing burden for both UE and gNB.    Figure 1(A). If LCH based prioritization has higher priority than UL skipping, and MAC generates a PDU for DG PUSCH1, and does not generate a PDU for CG PUSCH 1.    Figure 1(B). If LCH based prioritization has higher priority than UL skipping, and MAC does not generate a PDU for DG PUSCH1, and but generate a PDU for CG PUSCH 1.  Observation 2: If UL skipping has higher priority than LCH based prioritization, multiplexing/prioritization outcome is deterministic in each slot. This is necessary to control processing burden for both UE and gNB.    Figure 2. If UL skipping has higher priority than LCH based prioritization, the behavior is deterministic.   1. If UL skipping and intra-UE prioritization need to be supported simultaneously in Rel-16, RAN1 notify RAN2 that it is necessary to specify: UL skipping has higher priority than LCH based prioritization. 2. RAN1 notify RAN2 that it is acceptable: Rel-16 does not support a simultaneous configuration of the Rel-16 UL skipping and intra-UE prioritization. 3. For a given PHY priority level, the PUSCH#0 (DG or CG) expected to have UCI multiplexing is determined. The UCI is either multiplexed with PUSCH#0 or transmitted via PUCCH, but not to be multiplexed with another PUSCH. 4. For any UL grant (i.e., DG-PUSCH or CG-PUSCH), if MAC does not generate a TB for a grant, then the PUSCH is discarded and does not participate in subsequent physical layer procedure. |

* [R1-2104313]

|  |
| --- |
| **Proposal 1: RAN1 to indicate to RAN2 in an LS that RAN1 supports the confirmed RAN2 working assumption *“LCH based prio has higher priority than UL skipping”.***  **Proposal 2: RAN1 to indicate to RAN2 in an LS,**   * **that RAN1 supports the RAN2 working assumption “*When lch-BasedPrioritization is not configured and Rel-16 CG/DG PUSCH skipping is enabled, DG always overrides CG*”,** * **but when *lch-BasedPrioritization* is configured, the LCH based prioritization has higher priority than DG overriding CG PUSCH, i.e. MAC should select the overlapping DG or CG PUSCH grant of higher LCH priority having data available in the buffer.**   **Proposal 3: RAN1 to indicate to RAN2 in an LS that RAN1 supports the RAN2 working assumption *“The MAC entity does not generate a MAC PDU for a deprioritized uplink grant even when its associated PUSCH is overlapping with PUCCH”* and further clarify that this working assumption should be generically applicable including operation with and without LCH based prioritization as well as one & two UL PHY priorities.**  **Proposal 4: If the UE is configured with *lch-basedPrioritization* and/or two UL PHY priorities, the UE transmits a PUCCH which overlaps with a PUSCH on the same or different serving cell in case MAC did not deliver a PDU for the PUSCH.** |

* [R1-2104322]

|  |
| --- |
| ***Observation 1:*** *The agreement of PUSCH skipping cannot be applied to the collision scenario between CG PUSCH and DG PUSCH with different priorities where one of the PUSCH overlaps with a PUCCH with the same priority.*  ***Proposal 1:*** *If CG PUSCH and DG PUSCH overlap in the time domain with same/different priorities, and one of the collided PUSCH overlaps with a PUCCH, a UE expects a MAC PDU is generated only for the PUSCH with higher priority if there is available data.*  ***Proposal 2:*** *If the MAC entity does not generate MAC PDU for a PUSCH, the PUSCH should not participate in the subsequent UCI multiplexing.*  ***Proposal 3:*** *For the LP PUCCH overlapping with a LP PUSCH which is canceled by a HP PUSCH,*   * *If the time interval between LP PUCCH and the PDCCH scheduling HP PUSCH is not less than Tmuxproc,2, the LP PUCCH should be transmitted.* * *Otherwise, the LP PUCCH should be dropped.*   ***Proposal 4:*** *If the MAC entity does not generate MAC PDU for a HP PUSCH, the HP PUSCH should not cancel the overlapped LP PUSCH or LP PUCCH.*  ***Proposal 5:*** *When there is no available data for PUSCH transmission, the PUSCH can be skipped if the PUSCH overlaps with PUCCH and they are configured with different priorities.* |

* [R1-2104479]

|  |
| --- |
| **Proposal 1**: In case LCH prioritization is configured and there is resource overlapping between PUCCH and PUSCH(s) with a single PHY priority, MAC layer shall decide which MAC PDU should be delivered based on LCH prioritization and the UCI multiplexing requirements for a single PHY priority.  **Proposal 2:** In case LCH prioritization is configured and there is a single PHY priority for UL transmissions, when DG PUSCH, CG PUSCH and PUCCH overlap with each other, MAC generates PDU for the PUSCH selected to carry UCI and the UCI is multiplexed on the selected PUSCH.  **Proposal 3:** In case LCH prioritization is configured and there is a single PHY priority for overlapped UL transmissions, when DG PUSCH overlaps with CG PUSCH on the same serving cell and the DG PUSCH overlaps with PUCCH and the CG PUCCH does not overlaps with the PUCCH:   * If the PUCCH is earlier than the CG PUSCH, MAC always delivers PDU to the DG PUSCH and UCI is multiplexed on the DG PUSCH; * Otherwise, it is MAC behavior to deliver PDU for either the CG PUSCH or the DG PUSCH based on the Rel-16 LCH prioritization, and UCI is transmitted on the DG PUSCH when there is PDU for the DG PUSCH or transmitted on the PUCCH when there is no PDU for the DG PUSCH.     Case 2 of signle PHY priority for proposal 3  **Proposal 4:** In case LCH prioritization is configured and there is a single PHY priority for overlapped UL transmissions, when DG PUSCH overlaps with CG PUSCH on the same serving cell and the CG PUSCH overlaps with PUCCH and the DG PUSCH does not overlap with the PUCCH:   * If the PUCCH is earlier than the DG PUSCH, the same solution as for no Rel-16 LCH based prioritization could be reused; * Otherwise, it is MAC behavior to deliver PDU for either the CG PUSCH or the DG PUSCH based on Rel-16 LCH based prioritization, and UCI is transmitted on the CG PUSCH when there is PDU for the CG PUSCH or transmitted on the PUCCH when there is no PDU for the CG PUSCH.     Case 3 of signle PHY priority for proposal 4    Case 3 of signle PHY priority for proposal 4  **Proposal 5:** In case LCH prioritization is configured and there are two PHY priorities for UL transmissions, the MAC PDU generation and delivery can be handled by gNB scheduling or MAC layer.  **Proposal 6:** In case LCH prioritization is configured and there are two PHY priorities for overlapped UL transmissions which refer to LP DG PUSCH and HP CG PUSCH and the same priority between DG PUSCH and PUCCH, when LP DG PUSCH would overlap with HP CG PUSCH on the same serving cell and the LP DG PUSCH would overlap with LP PUCCH and the HP CG PUCCH does not overlaps with the LP PUCCH:   * If the LP PUCCH is earlier than the HP CG PUSCH, gNB should avoid scheduling such LP DG PUSCH overlapping with both the LP PUCCH and the HP CG PUSCH; * Otherwise, it is MAC behavior to deliver PDU for either the HP CG PUSCH or the LP DG PUSCH based on the Rel-16 LCH prioritization, and UCI is transmitted on the LP DG PUSCH when there is PDU for the LP DG PUSCH or transmitted on the LP PUCCH when there is no PDU for the LP DG PUSCH.     Case 1 of two PHY priorities for proposal 6    Case 2 of two PHY priorities for proposal 6  **Proposal 7:** In case LCH prioritization is configured and there are two PHY priorities for overlapped UL transmissions which refer to HP DG PUSCH overlaps with LP CG PUSCH on the same serving cell and the HP DG PUSCH overlaps with HP PUCCH and the LP CG PUCCH does not overlaps with the HP PUCCH:   * If the HP PUCCH is earlier than the LP CG PUSCH, MAC always delivers PDU to the HP DG PUSCH and UCI is multiplexed on the HP DG PUSCH; * Otherwise, it is MAC behavior to deliver PDU for either the LP CG PUSCH or the HP DG PUSCH based on the Rel-16 LCH prioritization, and UCI is transmitted on the HP DG PUSCH when there is PDU for the HP DG PUSCH or transmitted on the PUCCH when there is no PDU for the DG PUSCH.     Case 3 of two PHY priorities for proposal 7  **Proposal 8:** For overlapping between DG PUSCH and CG PUSCH with different priorities, the first symbol of LP PUSCH should be no earlier than the first symbol of HP PUSCH. |

* [R1-2104650]

|  |
| --- |
| **Proposal:** To handle CGDG collisions with PUCCH overlap, a UE follows the following steps:   * Step #1: Assume no uplink skipping. For each priority, a UE determines whether UCI will be multiplexed on a PUSCH or not. * Step#2: A UE selects one PUSCH that cannot be skipped by comparing the L1 priorities of the PUSCHs in case a 2-level priority is configured for a UE. * Step#3: The MAC layer can skip other PUSCHs except the one indicated by the PHY layer. * Step #4: The PHY layer performs prioritization/multiplexing as needed.   + In case the PHY has indicated one PUSCH as non-droppable, and if there is another PUSCH overlapping with it on the same carrier, that PUSCH, including UCI that is expected to be multiplexed on it as part of step #1, are dropped. |

* [R1-2105083]

|  |
| --- |
| **Observation 2-1: Channel selection with PUCCH Format 1 brings much complication to UCI multiplexing.**  **Observation 2-2: In Rel-15, PUSCH selection procedure clarified by Step 2 in the RAN1 #97 clarification applies to actual PUSCH transmissions.**  **Observation 2-3: DG PUSCHs, CG PUSCHs, and PUSCHs configured by semiPersistentOnPUSCH are candidates for UCI multiplexing. And a PUSCH without MAC PDU can be selected for UCI multiplexing.**  **Observation 2-4: Using a few examples with overlapping channels in discussion is helpful to understand the complex nature of the underlying design issue, but the complex nature of UCI multiplexing cannot be adequately covered by them.**  **Observation 2-5: There is an unremovable uncertainty in PUSCH selection for UCI multiplexing once CG configuration is activated.**  **Observation 3-1: when discussing the interaction between PHY and MAC, the demarcation between hypothetical PUSCH transmissions and actual PUSCH transmissions is key.**  **Proposal 2-1: in Rel-17, when HARQ-ACK PUCCH resource and SR PUCCH resource both configured with PUCCH format 1 collide, then a PUCCH resource for HARQ-ACK with payload more than 2 bits is used, zero padding can be considered to minimize specification change & implementation change:**  **In this case the payload is given by [HARQ bit(s)] + SR bit + zero or more padding bit.**   * **If there are 2 HARQ-ACK bits, then the 1 SR bit is included in the payload, so there are 3 bits in the payload (2 HARQ-ACK bits + 1 SR bit).** * **If there are 1 HARQ-ACK bit, then 1 SR bit and 1 padding bit are included, so there are 3 bits in the payload (1 HARQ-ACK bit + 1 SR bit + 1 padding bit).**   **Proposal 3-1: To mitigate the uncertainty in UCI multiplexing, the occurrence of HARQ-ACK PUCCH resource at PUCCH format 1 and SR PUCCH resource at PUCCH format 1 should be avoided. One of the following alternatives is selected:**   * **Alt. 1: HARQ-ACK PUCCH resource and SR PUCCH resource cannot be both configured with PUCCH format 1** * **Alt. 2: If HARQ-ACK PUCCH resource and SR PUCCH resource overlap, then they won’t be both at PUCCH format 1.** * **Alt. 3: SR is assumed to be negative in Stage 1.** * **Alt. 4: SR is assumed to be positive in Stage 1.**   **Proposal 3-2: For PUSCH selection with hypothetical PUSCH transmissions, the following priority order is used:**   * + **First priority: PUSCH with A-CSI as long as it overlaps with Z**   + **Second priority: earliest PUSCH slot(s) based on the start of the slot(s)**   + **If there are still multiple PUSCHs overlap with Z in the earliest PUSCH slot(s), follow the following priorities (sequentially from high to low)**     - **Third priority: Dynamic grant PUSCHs > PUSCHs configured by respective ConfiguredGrantConfig > semiPersistentOnPUSCH**     - **Fourth priority: PUSCHs on serving cell with smaller serving cell index > PUSCHs on serving cell with larger serving cell index**     - **Fifth priority: Earlier PUSCH transmission > later PUSCH transmission**   **Proposal 3-3: UE PHY provides the following to UE MAC:**   * **the PUSCH selected for UCI multiplexing** * **PUCCH resource Z**   + **For a PUCCH resource Z, the following are indicated to MAC:**     - **the starting symbol and duration (the number of OFDM symbols in the PUCCH)**     - **the UCI payload: information about SR (e.g. SR resource IDs) conveyed in resource Z, and optionally whether HARQ-ACK and/or CSI is included.**   **Proposal 3-4: if some form of the RAN1 102-e agreement is to be extended to the cases with configured physical layer priority and/or *lch-basedPrioritization,* there can be 3 outcomes:**   * + **Outcome 1:**      - **1> if  the PUSCH selected for UCI multiplexing is with UL-SCH,  and MAC generates MAC PDU for the PUSCH selected for UCI multiplexing  or**     - **1> if the PUSCH selected for UCI multiplexing is without UL-SCH, and MAC does not generate MAC PDU for another PUSCH to overlap with the PUSCH selected for UCI multiplexing**     - **2> PHY transmits the PUSCH selected for UCI multiplexing (dropping SR if SR is present in resource Z)**     - **Outcome 2-1:**   **1> if  the PUSCH selected for UCI multiplexing is with UL-SCH,  and MAC does not generate MAC PDU for the PUSCH selected for UCI multiplexing  or**  **1> if  the PUSCH selected for UCI multiplexing is without UL-SCH, and MAC generates ~~SR or~~MAC PDU for another PUSCH to overlap with the PUSCH selected for UCI multiplexing**   * + - 1. **2> PHY checks there is no PUSCH overlapping with resource Z on the PUCCH CC or another CC**       2. **3> PHY transmits resource Z including SR**     - **Outcome 2-2:**   **If neither the PUSCH selected for UCI multiplexing nor resource Z can be used by PHY (e.g. MAC does not generate MAC PDU for the PUSCH selected for UCI multiplexing, but MAC generates MAC PDU for a PUSCH overlapping with resource Z), then PHY drops UCI.**  **Proposal 5-1: To avoid the necessity for PHY to assume SR status for UCI multiplexing, RAN2 should split the LCH based prioritization between data and data from LCH based prioritization between data and SR so separate UE capabilities and RRC configurations from gNB are supported for SR/data LCH based prioritization and data/data LCH based prioritization when UL skipping is configured.** |

* [R1- 2105285] made some observations for the SR vs. data cases:

|  |
| --- |
| * Observation 1: Case 2-1(b) has the same PHY behavior regardless of understanding, while case 2-1(a) has different PHY behaviors according to understanding. * Observation 2: It is not clear whether a UE would multiplex AN/CSI on PUSCH or not due to negative SR on case 2-2(b) although MAC generates MAC PDU assuming PUSCH overlapping with final PUCCH resources. * Observation 3: It is not clear whether AN/CSI would be multiplexed with PUSCH or not due to negative SR although MAC generate MAC PDU assuming PUSCH overlapping with final PUCCH resources. |

* [R1- 2105467]:

|  |
| --- |
| **For collision between data and data**  **Proposal 1: When lch-BasedPrioritization is not configured and PHY is configured with two L1 prioritizes, RAN1 confirms RAN2’s working assumption** **that is DG always overrides CG.**  **Proposal 2: When the MAC entity is configured with *lch-basedPrioritization*, for the collision scenarios between CG and DG, CG and CG with different L1 priorities and when there is collision between L1 LP PUCCH and L1 LP PUSCH and there is no collision between L1 HP PUCCH and L1 HP PUSCH, confirm RAN2’s working assumption that LCH based prio has higher priority than UL skipping.**   * **If LP PUSCH is delivered, the LP PUCCH is multiplexed on the LP PUSCH;** * **Otherwise, the handling of LP PUCCH is down-selected from following options:**   + **Opt.1: LP PUCCH is dropped together with the LP PUSCH.**   + **Opt.2: define condition X, if X is satisfied, LP UCI is transmitted on LP PUCCH; otherwise, the LP PUCCH is dropped together with the LP PUSCH.**     - **FFS X**   **Proposal 3: When the MAC entity is configured with lch-basedPrioritization, for the collision scenarios between CG and DG, CG and CG with different L1 priorities and when there is collision between L1 HP PUCCH and L1 HP PUSCH and there is no collision between L1 LP PUCCH and L1 LP PUSCH, it is preferred from RAN1 perspective that MAC shall deliver the HP PUSCH when there is HP PUCCH overlapping with the HP PUSCH regardless whether there is available data for HP PUSCH.**  **Proposal 4: When the MAC entity is configured with lch-basedPrioritization, for the collision scenarios between CG and DG, CG and CG with different L1 priorities and when there is collision between L1 HP PUCCH and L1 HP PUSCH and there is also collision between L1 LP PUCCH and L1 LP PUSCH, it is preferred from RAN1 perspective that MAC shall deliver the HP PUSCH when there is HP PUCCH overlapping with the HP PUSCH regardless whether there is available data for HP PUSCH.**   * **PHY drops the LP PUSCH and transmits the LP UCI on LP PUCCH.**   **For collision between data and SR are of equal L1 priority**  **Observation 1: No RAN1 impacts is identified for case 2-1 regardless which understanding is the current MAC layer behaviour.**  **Observation 2: for case 2-2, regardless of which understanding is correct MAC behavior, if MAC delivers SR, there are potential RAN1 impacts in terms of processing timeline at the UE side and blind detection at the gNB side.**  **Observation 3: for case 3, regardless of which understanding is correct MAC behavior, if SR is delivered by MAC, the handling of the AN/CSI that overlaps with the PUSCH can adopt the similar way as for the collision between data and data.**  **Observation 4: for case 4, if understanding 1 is correct MAC behaviour, there is no RAN1 impacts; if understanding 2 is correct MAC behaviour and SR is delivered by MAC, there are potential RAN1 impacts in terms of processing timeline at the UE side and blind detection at the gNB side.**  **Proposal 5: if RAN1 can have common understanding on above observations, discuss from RAN1 perspective, which understanding of MAC layer behavior is preferred and send LS to RAN2 about RAN1’s preference.** |

* [R1- 2105532]:

|  |
| --- |
| ***Observation 1: For understanding 2, PHY needs to inform MAC about the final PUCCH resources assuming a positive SR, then MAC decides to deliver SR or PDU. If it delivers the PDU, the UE may need to perform UCI multiplexing again based on a negative SR which would complicate the UE implementation in the physical layer.***  ***Proposal 1: When LCH based prioritization is configured, the timeline in the following cases needs to be relaxed e.g. by adding delta symbols to the existing values***   * ***Case 1: UCI multiplexing timeline for the overlap between SR and PUSCH*** * ***Case 2: the timeline for the overlap between DG PUSCH and CG PUSCH***   ***Observation 2: In CA case, if logical channel prioritization is enabled, it is up the UE’s MAC to decide if a PDU for a PUSCH is delivered to PHY or not. The gNB might not know which PUSCH contains the UCI and has to perform blind decoding to find out.*** |