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# Introduction

The Rel-17 work item for enhancements on MIMO for NR includes an objective to extend specification support for enhancements on multi-TRP/panel transmission. In RAN #86, the objectives were agreed to read as follows:

*Enhancement on the support for multi-TRP deployment, targeting both FR1 and FR2:*

* 1. *Identify and specify features to improve reliability and robustness for channels other than PDSCH (that is, PDCCH, PUSCH, and PUCCH) using multi-TRP and/or multi-panel, with Rel.16 reliability features as the baseline*
  2. *Identify and specify QCL/TCI-related enhancements to enable inter-cell multi-TRP operations, assuming multi-DCI based multi-PDSCH reception*
  3. *Evaluate and, if needed, specify beam-management-related enhancements for simultaneous multi-TRP transmission with multi-panel reception*
  4. *Enhancement to support HST-SFN deployment scenario:*
     1. *Identify and specify solution(s) on QCL assumption for DMRS, e.g. multiple QCL assumptions for the same DMRS port(s), targeting DL-only transmission*
     2. *Evaluate and, if the benefit over Rel.16 HST enhancement baseline is demonstrated, specify QCL/QCL-like relation (including applicable type(s) and the associated requirement) between DL and UL signal by reusing the unified TCI framework*

Based on the Chairman guidance, the following discussions is needed,

[102-e-NR-feMIMO-03] Email discussion on enhancements on multi-TRP for PUSCH, PUCCH by 8/28– Keeth (Nokia)

* Prioritize topics to be resolved in RAN1#102-e by 8/19 (EVM should be highest priority)

To start the discussion, the proposals on the reliability and robustness improvements for PUCCH and PUSCH are summarized in this document and several draft FL proposals are listed.

# Proposals for online/offline discussion on PUCCH

The sub-sections below summarize company proposals on multi-TRP based PUCCH related enhancements based on the submitted contributions. Further details can be found in Section 4 where exact company proposal are mentioned.

## 2.1 Repetition scheme for PUCCH

In the company contributions that discuss the details of PUCCH transmission schemes for multi-TRP, a majority of companies consider PUCCH repetition schemes based on TDM (VIVO, ZTE, InterDigital, QC, Lenovo, Oppo, CMCC, Apple, Xiaomi, LG, Covinda, MediaTek, CATT, AsusTek, DOCOMO, Nokia). There is not much support on FDM/SDM like schemes for PUCCH, thus, such schemes are clearly not the priority in Rel-17 PUCCH reliability enhancements.

Within the proponents of TDMed PUCCH repetition, several companies provide the preference on supporting multi-TRP operation considering both inter-slot and intra-slot PUCCH repetition (VIVO, Intel, Spreadtrum, Ericsson, QC, Nokia), and two companies supporting only inter-slot PUCCH repetition (MediaTek, Lenovo). As the number of inputs are limited on inter-slot and intra-slot repetitions, it makes sense to check further views from companies prior to making any conclusion.

**[Draft for offline] Proposal 1:** Support TDMed PUCCH repetition scheme(s) to improve reliability and robustness for PUCCH using multi-TRP and/or multi-panel. Consider TDMed PUCCH repetition scheme(s) based on,

Alt.1: both inter-slot repetition and intra-slot repetition.

Alt.2: only inter-slot repetition

Please comment preferred changes below. Also indicate the preference on Alt.1 or Alt.2. Please do not edit the draft proposal above and suggest your modification (if any) in the comments.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Apple | We think Rel-17 should support TDM only. But it is too early to decide Alt1 and Alt2. |
| NEC | We are OK with TDM repetition for PUCCH. For Alt1 and Alt2, similar view as Apple, it seems too early to decide. We think both inter-slot and intra-slot repetition should be studied, and if we have to choose, we prefer Alt 1. |
| Lenovo/ Motorola Mobility | Support Alt 2. |
| LG | We are fine with prioritizing inter-slot but would like to keep intra-slot open for further study at this meeting. |
| ZTE | We share the same view with Apple. The first important issue is to **support TDMed beam diversity**. We can further study inter-slot or intra-slot repetition. |
| Spreadtrum | Support the proposal. But we think more discussion is needed before making the choice between Alt.1 and Alt.2. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support TDM PUCCH repetition. We support Alt.1, i.e., both inter-slot and intra-slot can be further considered. |
| CMCC | Support TDMed PUCCH repetition scheme.  Support Alt.1. Both reliability and latency are critical for URLLC, so intra-slot repetition should be also considered. |
| OPPO | Support the proposal. Down-selection of the alternative can be suspended until sufficient studies are done |
| Sony | Before discussing this, how to use different antenna panel/beams should be discussed at first. |
| Ericsson | Support Alt. 1. As reducing latency is important for URLLC schemes, support of intra-slot repetition in addition to inter-slot repetition is critical. |
| QC | Support the proposal (assuming no down-selection in this meeting between the two options). |
| Sharp | We are OK to support TDMed PUCCH repetition scheme(s) In our view, both reduced latency and high reliability are critical, so we support Alt. 1. |
| MediaTek | We support to focus on TDMed repetition schemes for PUCCH. We actually also support intra-slot repetition, i.e, Alt. 1. To have further progress in this meeting, at least inter-slot repetition alone can be agreed and we may leave intra-slot repetition FFS. |
| Samsung | First, we need to consider latency aspect as well as reliability, since we are in URLLC enhancement. It is clear that intra-slot repetition is beneficial compared to inter-slot repetition in latency perspective.  Next, intra-slot PUCCH repetition (sub-slot repetition) is already supported from Rel-16. There is no clear reason to preclude existing scheme from the scope of Rel-17 enhancement. |
| InterDigital | Support Alt. 1. |
| Convida Wireless | Support the proposal.  Prefer Alt.2. |
| Futurewei | We support TDM and FFS Alt. 1 and 2. |
| Intel | Support the proposal |
| CATT | TDM-based enhancement is supported.  Both inter-slot repetition and intra-slot repetition should be studied before making the choice. |
| Xiaomi | Support the proposal. More discussion on both inter-slot repetition and intra-slot repetition is needed before making the choice between Alt.1 and Alt.2. |
| Fujitsu | Support TDM and Alt.1 |
| China Telecom | Support TDM. We prefer Alt.1 |
| Nokia/NSB | Support the proposal.  Although we prefer Alt.1, we are OK to down select between Alt.1 and Alt.2 after further discussions. |
| APT | Alt. 1. We think both inter-slot and intra-slot repetition should be considered for TDM schemes. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support Alt.1, as latency and robustness for UCI feedback are both important. |

#### Proposal 1: FL comments/update:

Based on comments received so far, the company support is listed as below.

* **Alt.1**: both inter-slot repetition and intra-slot repetition.

Support: NTT DOCOMO, CMCC, Ericsson, Sharp, MediaTek, Samsung, InterDigital, Fujitsu, China Telecom, APT

* **Alt.2:** only inter-slot repetition

Support: Lenovo, Covinda Wireless

* **Study both:** down select later after further study.

Support: Apple, NEC, LG, ZTE, Spreadtrum, OPPO, Sony, QC, Futurewei, Intel, CATT, Xiaomi, Nokia

It is clear that we can not make a decision now. Therefore both options shall be further studied until the next meeting.

**Proposed offline Agreement 1:** Support TDMed PUCCH repetition scheme(s) to improve reliability and robustness for PUCCH using multi-TRP and/or multi-panel. ~~Consider~~ Study the following alternatives, ~~TDMed PUCCH repetition scheme(s) based on,~~

* Alt.1: supporting both inter-slot repetition and intra-slot repetition.
* Alt.2: supporting only inter-slot repetition

Comment if you have any changes.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| QC | Since aspects related to repetition or no repetition is discussed in a different proposal, we prefer to keep the description general at least for intra-slot. For example, if beam hopping is used within one PUCH resources, and assuming that we use similar procedures as frequency hopping, it is not technically a repetition. The following is suggested:  **Proposed offline Agreement 1:** Support TDMed PUCCH scheme(s) to improve reliability and robustness for PUCCH using multi-TRP and/or multi-panel. ~~Consider~~ Study the following alternatives, ~~TDMed PUCCH repetition scheme(s) based on,~~   * Alt.1: supporting both inter-slot repetition and intra-slot repetition / intra-slot beam hopping. * Alt.2: supporting only inter-slot repetition |
| ZTE | Since the proposal is for study anyway, we should not preclude intra-slot beam hopping at this state. So we support QC’s update. |
| LG | Support QC’s revision. |
| Lenovo & Motorola mobility | Support QC’s revision. |
| Fujitsu | Support QC’s revision. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are fine with the update from QC. |
| Samsung | It seems that the wording inter-/intra-slot repetition is restricted for a single PUCCH resource case. However, we think that using multiple PUCCH resources with the same UCI can be also treated as repetition. Hence, if each repeated PUCCH contains same UCI regardless of a single or multiple PUCCH resources, it can be seen as PUCCH repetition. Hence, the revised proposal from QC’s is suggested as:  **Proposed offline Agreement 1:** Support TDMed PUCCH scheme(s) to improve reliability and robustness for PUCCH using multi-TRP and/or multi-panel. ~~Consider~~ Study the following alternatives, ~~TDMed PUCCH repetition scheme(s) based on,~~   * Alt.1: supporting both inter-slot UCI repetition and intra-slot UCI repetition / intra-slot beam hopping * Alt.2: supporting only inter-slot repetition |
| DOCOMO | We support QC’s update. |
| Erisson | We support QC’s revision. |

## 2.2 Supported PUCCH formats

TDMed PUCCH repetition is supported in Rel-15 for PUCCH formats 1, 3, and 4 by “*nrofSlots*” provided in “*PUCCH-FormatConfig*”. As highlighted by few companies, it makes sense to extend this PUCCH repetition of PUCCH formats 1, 3, and 4 by also considering multi-TRP operation. Also, few companies (QC, ZTE, VIVO) propose additionally consider PUCCH format 0 and 2 in the multi-TRP PUCCH reliability enhancement. As there are only few companies proposed this, the following alternatives are listed for further considerations.

**[Draft for offline] Proposal 2:** To improve reliability and robustness for PUCCH using multi-TRP and/or multi-panel, consider following PUCCH formats.

Alt.1: All PUCCH formats

Alt.2: Support only PUCCH format 1, 3, and 4.

Please comment preferred changes below. Also indicate the preference on Alt.1 or Alt.2. Please do not edit the draft proposal above and suggest your modification (if any) in the comments.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Apple | Support Alt1. We think the objective should be to improve reliability and robustness for PUCCH, not for particular PUCCH format(s). |
| NEC | Alt 1. |
| Lenovo/ Motorola Mobility | Alt 1. Same view with Apple. |
| LG | In our understanding, Alt 1 does not mean “support” all formats but “consider” all formats. In this sense, we are fine with Alt 1 with a note that down selection may or may not be needed in further meeting. |
| ZTE | Alt 1 |
| Spreadtrum | Support Alt.1 |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support Alt.1 to improve reliability and robustness for all PUCCH formats. |
| CMCC | Support Alt.1. From our understanding, for single-TRP transmission, all the parameters are totally same for different repetitions, then PUCCH format 1, 3, and 4 can be used instead of introducing the repetition of PUCCH format 0 and 2 to improve the reliability. However, for multi-TRP transmission, the spatial for different repetitions maybe not same, then the repetition of PUCCH format 0 and 2 cannot be replaced by PUCCH format 1, 3, and 4, and should be also considered for M-TRP. |
| OPPO | Support the proposal and prefer Alt.1 |
| Ericsson | Support Alt 1. |
| QC | Support Alt1. |
| Sharp | Alt. 1 |
| MediaTek | This issue can be discussed after resolving Issues 2.1 and 2.3. In case that a UCI can be transmitted on two PUCCH resources within a slot, then there is no need to improve PUCCH formats 0 and 2. Furthermore, we do not see the need to apply inter-slot repetition on PUCCH formats 0 and 2. |
| Samsung | Support Alt1. In Rel-15/16, PUCCH repetition schemes are not applied for short PUCCH format since a performance of short PUCCH repetition degrades rather than that of a single long PUCCH transmission with a same length of short PUCCH repetition, under the transmission toward single-TRP. However, when blockage occurs, this situation can be changed, and multi-TRP repetition for short PUCCH repetition can obtain performance gain rather than a single long PUCCH transmission with a same length of short PUCCH repetition. Hence, in this stage, one of short or long PUCCH format would not be precluded. |
| InterDigital | Support Alt. 1. |
| Convida Wireless | Support the proposal and prefer Alt. 1. |
| Futurewei | Alt. 1. |
| Intel | Alt 1 |
| CATT | Alt. 1 |
| Xiaomi | Support Alt. 1 |
| Fujitsu | Support Alt 1. |
| China Telecom | Support Alt.1. |
| Nokia/NSB | Support Alt. 1 |
| APT | Alt. 1. We should not exclude possibility of enhancing reliability of some PUCCH formats. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Alt.1. We’re open to discuss all PUCCH formats at this stage. From our understanding, format 0 would be important for quick HARQ-ACK feedback. |

#### Proposal 2: FL comments/update:

Based on comments received so far, it is only MediaTek raised concerns on considering Alt.1.

@MediaTek: All other companies seem supporting Alt.1. In that sense, I think it is reasonable to go with the majority view. Also, the proposal has the wording “consider”, and the intension for that is to allow companies can propose enhancements considering all PUCCH formats.

**Proposed offline Agreement 2:** To improve reliability and robustness for PUCCH using multi-TRP and/or multi-panel, consider ~~following~~ all PUCCH formats.

~~Alt.1: All PUCCH formats~~

~~Alt.2: Support only PUCCH format 1, 3, and 4.~~

Comment if you have any changes.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| QC | Support |
| ZTE | Support |
| Lenovo & Motorola mobility | Support |
| Fujitsu | Support |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support |
| Samsung | Support |
| DOCOMO | Support |
| Erisson | Support |

## 2.3 PUCCH Spatial Relation Info

The existing NR PUCCH repetition scheme uses a single spatial relation associated with the single PUCCH resource is used across all the PUCCH repetitions. Based on a majority of company inputs (ZTE, Lenovo, Ericsson, Apple, LG, QC, CATT, Interdigital, Vivo), this shall be enhanced for multi-TRP based PUCCH transmission, where multiple spatial relations shall be used for PUCCH repetitions towards multiple TRPs. Proponents also suggest investigating further on how the configuration/activation of multiple spatial relation info can be done for enhanced PUCCH repetitions towards multiple TRPs.

As highlighted by few companies (VIVO, Lenovo, DOCOMO, Samsung, QC, Apple, Nokia, ZTE), configuring/activating multiple Spatial Relation Info may also be related to the use of single PUCCH resource or multiple PUCCH resources towards different TRPs. In one alternative, the same PUCCH resource is used for repetitions with multiple spatial relations for a PUCCH resource. In another alternative, different PUCCH resources can be indicated for repetitions. However, many companies are still in the initial phase of evaluations and it makes sense to consider both options for now.

Moreover, few companies discuss details on the mapping patterns between Spatial Relation Info of PUCCH and PUCCH repetitions by considering cyclical mapping and sequential mapping patterns (Lenovo, Spreadtrum, QC). It may be bit early to decide the best mapping patterns, and that could be studied further as proposed below.

**[Draft for offline] Proposal 3:** To enable PUCCH repetition with different beams, support configuring/activating of multiple PUCCH Spatial Relation Info. RAN1 shall further study the following,

* Method of configuration/activation of multiple spatial relation info
* Use of the same PUCCH resource or different PUCCH resource for PUCCH repetitions
* Mapping between PUCCH resource and spatial relation info within a PUCCH repetition bundle

Please comment preferred changes below. Please do not edit the draft proposal above and suggest your modification (if any) in the comments.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Apple | In general, there are two options:   * Option 1: configure up to 2 spatial relation for a PUCCH resource * Option 2: configure up to 2 PUCCH resources for a UCI   We think option 2 should be better, which could be more flexible and with less spec impact. |
| NEC | Support the proposal. |
| Lenovo/ Motorola Mobility | We support the proposal in general. We think both two options where one option is configuring up to 2 spatial relation information for a PUCCH resource with repetition and the other option is configuring multiple PUCCH resources for a UCI should be studied. And the two options should be discussed separately. |
| LG | Support. |
| ZTE | Two options can be categorized as Apple/Lenovo suggested. |
| Spreadtrum | Could any company clarify the definition of a PUCCH bundle in the third bullet? In our memory, RAN1 seems not to have such definition. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support the proposal. |
| CMCC | On one hand, the payload of different repetitions is same, on the other hand, based on the EVM assumption, the maximum RSRP differences between TRPs is 6dB, which means that the channel quality of different TRPs are similar, then there is no need to use different PUCCH resources for different repetitions.  For same PUCCH resources with repetition, MAC CE should be enhanced to activate 2 TCI states for each PUCCH resource.  Similar as M-TRP PDSCH repetition specified in Rel-16, both cyclical mapping and sequential mapping patterns can be considered for the mapping between spatial relation info of PUCCH and PUCCH repetitions. |
| OPPO | Support the proposal. We also have the same question as for “a PUCCH repetition bundle”. |
| Sony | Does this proposal mean simultaneous transmission available with different beams? Maybe repetition itself is TDM. I don’t know where one PUSCH can be transmitted with different beams. |
| Ericsson | We are ok to further study the details. Regarding whether to using a single PUCCH resource or multiple PUCCH resources,  we think using a single PUCCH resource with multiple spatial relations has the least spec impact.  For the option with multiple PUCCH resources, the benefit is unclear. But we are ok to study it further.  We also have similar question as some of the other companies on the meaning of PUCCH bundle. May be there is no need to define this term in RAN1. Also, using PUCCH repetition instead of PUCCH resource is more appropriate at this stage since we haven’t down-selected between using single PUCCH resource vs multiple PUCCH resources yet. Suggest the following wording change:   * Mapping between PUCCH repetition ~~resource~~ and spatial relation info ~~within a PUCCH repetition bundle~~ among multiple PUCCH repetitions |
| QC | Regarding “Use of the same PUCCH resource or different PUCCH resource”, we think it is better if the two options are considered in the context of inter-slot vs intra-slot. For inter-slot, using the same PUCCH resource (in different slots) is the Rel. 15 approach, and we do not see any reason for using different PUCCH resources in different slots. For intra-slot, the two options can be valid and should be further studied. |
| Sharp | We support the proposal. |
| MediaTek | Agree with Apple, Lenovo, ZTE that the two options should be listed and further studied. |
| Samsung | We prefer PUCCH repetition based on multiple PUCCH resources. In multi-TRP scenario, since distances between a UE and TRPs are usually different, flexible resource allocation to adapt different PL for each TRP can be beneficial for PUCCH repetition. |
| InterDigital | Support this proposal, however we need to clarify the definition of PUCCH repetition bundle or reword the proposal per Ericsson’s suggestion. |
| Convida Wireless | Support the proposal. |
| Futurewei | Support the proposal and support to explicitly list the two options (as done by Apple) for further study. |
| Intel | Support the proposal, although we think its better to not introduce “bundle” – the wording from E/// seems better. |
| CATT | Support the proposal with the change of wording suggested by Ericsson. |
| Xiaomi | Support the proposal |
| Fujitsu | Support the proposal. |
| China Telecom | Support the proposal. |
| Nokia/NSB | Support the proposal.  A ‘PUCCH repetition bundle’ is basically the group of repeated PUCCHs of a same PUCCH repetition operation (i.e. for a same UCI) |
| APT | We support this proposal in general. We think Apple’s two options are reasonable. Whether/how to discuss the third bullet in the proposal may be related to which option we adopt. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We think more study for PUCCH repetition and defining two PUCCH resources with different spatial info is needed as it seems a rush and limited decision at this stage. Using one PUCCH resource may be a starting point. Moreover, considering spatial info at this stage seems limiting PUCCH enhancement to FR2 only. |

#### Proposal 3: FL comments/update:

Based on comments received so far, all the companies support the direction of the proposal, but there are some concerns raised on the wording and additional aspects that should be mentioned in the proposal.

Several companies suggested changing the wording “bundle”. It seems that Ericsson suggestion can be adopted there.

Sony asked about simultaneous transmission with different beams, and we can also clarify that in the agreement as this is mainly to TDMed PUCCH repetition.

Apple/Lenovo/ZTE/MediaTek/QC suggested the discussion should be focused on, “option 1: configure up to 2 spatial relation for a PUCCH resource” and “option 2: configure up to 2 PUCCH resources”. QC also has a view that this may also related to inter slot and intra slot repetition scenarios. From the FL perspective, all these options are feasible within the wording used in the proposal. For example, the main bullet refers to “To enable PUCCH repetition with different beams, support configuring/activating of multiple PUCCH Spatial Relation Info.”, and the Ran1 shall further study method of configuration or activation depending on the use of same of different PUCCH resources. For now, it is ok to be a bit generic as companies have not provided detailed proposals. Anyways, some changes are suggested below to make things clearer.

**Updated proposal 3:** To enable TDMed PUCCH repetition with different beams, support configuring/activating of multiple PUCCH Spatial Relation Info. RAN1 shall further study the exact schemes considering the following aspects,

* Method of configuration/activation of multiple spatial relation info
* Use of the same PUCCH resource or different PUCCH resource for PUCCH repetitions
* Mapping between PUCCH repetition ~~resource~~ and spatial relation info ~~within a PUCCH repetition bundle~~ among multiple PUCCH repetitions.

Comment if you have any changes.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| QC | Similar comment as in proposal 1 since the proposal is general to both inter-slot as well as intra-slot. We suggest the following  **Updated proposal 3:** To enable TDMed PUCCH transmission with different beams, support configuring/activating of multiple PUCCH Spatial Relation Info. RAN1 shall further study the exact schemes considering the following aspects,   * Method of configuration/activation of multiple spatial relation info * Use of the same PUCCH resource or different PUCCH resource for PUCCH transmission * Mapping between PUCCH repetition / symbol ~~resource~~ and spatial relation info ~~within a PUCCH repetition bundle~~ among multiple PUCCH repetitions / multiple PUCCH symbols. |
| ZTE | The same view as QC |
| LG | The same view as QC |
| Lenovo & Motorola mobility | The same view as QC |
| Fujitsu | The same view as QC |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are fine with the update from QC, as the enhancement should not be limited to repetition only at this stage considering the latency as well. |
| Samsung | The same view as QC |
| DOCOMO | We support QC’s update. |
| Ericsson | Fine with QC’s update. |

## 2.4 Other proposals

In addition to the main directions mentioned in sections 2.1-2.3, there are other proposals from companies.

On the indication of PUCCH repetitions, several companies think that PUCCH repetitions should be dynamically indicated or investigate further for enhancements (VIVO, Ericsson, ZTE, Lenovo, Intel, Samsung). Ran1 could consider such enhancement compared to Rel-15 like method where the number of repetitions is higher layer configured.

**[Draft for offline] Proposal 4:** For configuration/indication of the number of PUCCH repetitions, RAN1 shall further study the following,

Alt.1: Use Rel-15 like framework

Alt.2: Dynamic indication of the number of PUCCH repetitions

Please comment preferred changes below. Please do not edit the draft proposal above and suggest your modification (if any) in the comments.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Apple | This is connected with issue 2.3. We can discuss it based on the outcome of 2.3. |
| NEC | Support the proposal. |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | Support Alt 2. Since different PUCCH resources with same format may have different length, the repetition number of different PUCCH resources should be able to be configured or indicated to be different to obtain the same level of reliability. Besides, different types of UCI have different requirement of reliability, therefore, dynamic indication of the number of PUCCH repetitions is needed. |
| LG | Support the proposal. Down selection between the two alts will be done in future meeting. |
| ZTE | Support this proposal |
| Spreadtrum | Support the proposal. Down selection could be done in future meeting. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support the proposal. And we agree with Apple that this issue is related to 2.3. |
| CMCC | Support the proposal. |
| OPPO | Support the proposal. Down-selection of the alternative can be suspended until sufficient studies are done |
| Ericsson | We prefer Alternative 2. Similar to Rel-16 PDSCH repetition, dynamic indication/selection of the number of repetitions is desirable for PUCCH repetition over multiple TRPs to meet different reliability requirements and to adapt to potential changes in channel conditions. For a UE supporting mixed eMBB and URLLC traffic, different PUCCH reliabilities are also needed, Rel-15 semi-static configuration of number of repetitions are no longer suitable. |
| QC | Support the proposal. |
| Sharp | We support the proposal. |
| MediaTek | Support the proposal |
| Samsung | Support Alt2. Since UCI payload of PUCCH is dynamic by e.g., PUCCH overlapping/multiplexing, to achieve the target reliability requirement efficiently, it is needed to make # of PDCCH repetitions dynamically. |
| InterDigital | Support FL proposal. |
| Convida Wireless | Support the proposal. |
| Futurewei | Support the proposal |
| Intel | We prefer some level of dynamic signaling (keeping in mind that gNB could do early termination transparently). we would like to keep both DCI and MAC-CE options open at this stage. |
| CATT | Support this proposal |
| Xiaomi | Support the proposal |
| Fujitsu | Support Alt.1. The spec impact may be significant if Alt.2 is adopted. |
| China Telecom | Support the proposal. |
| Nokia/NSB | Support the proposal |
| APT | Support to FFS Alt. 1 and Alt. 2. And we think Alt. 2 makes sense, which is similar to what we enhanced for PDSCH slot aggregation in Rel-16. |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | Although we prefer Alt2 in concept wise, it seems too early to decide on this issue. |

#### Proposal 4: FL comments/proposal:

Based on comments received so far, all the companies support the direction of the proposal. We can make a quick agreement on the following (no changes to the earlier version).

**Offline Agreement 4:** For configuration/indication of the number of PUCCH repetitions, RAN1 shall further study the following,

* Alt.1: Use Rel-15 like framework
* Alt.2: Dynamic indication of the number of PUCCH repetitions

Comment if you have any objections.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| QC | Support. |
| ZTE | Support |
| LG | Support |
| Lenovo & Motorola mobility | Support |
| Fujitsu | Support |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support for further study |
| Samsung | Although our preference is dynamic way, we can support FL proposal for further study. |
| DOCOMO | Support |
| Ericsson | Support |

Related to power control mechanisms considering multi-TRP framework, several companies wish to study further on existing power control mechanism vs independent power control mechanisms. At least there is some support (Lenovo, CMCC, Ericsson, DOCOMO, NEC, VIVO, LG, CATT) to discuss power control aspects related to PUCCH repetition towards multiple TRP.

**[Draft for offline] Proposal 5:** For multi-TRP PUCCH transmission, further investigate required power control enhancement.

Please comment preferred changes below. Please do not edit the draft proposal above and suggest your modification (if any) in the comments.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Apple | This is connected with issue 2.3. We can discuss it based on the outcome of 2.3. |
| NEC | Support the proposal. |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | Supported. |
| LG | It is worth studying separate TA configuration for 2 TRPs considering different TRP distance. So we support with the following revision.  **Revised proposal 5:** For multi-TRP PUCCH transmission, further investigate required power control and TA enhancement. |
| ZTE | TA enhancement is outside the scope from our view.  For power control, we see the potential issue would be on close loop power control. Then, we suggest a bit change as  **Proposal 5:** For multi-TRP PUCCH transmission, further investigate required power control enhancement, especially for close loop power control |
| Spreadtrum | Fine with the proposal. But the priority should be low. In R16, we also discuss this issue but with no progress, i.e., current mechanism of power control could be applied for multiple PUCCHs towards different TRPs. We have not seen the essential difference between R16 and R17 on multiple PUCCH transmission towards multiple TRPs, from the perspective of power control. |
| CMCC | For open loop power control, since the power control related parameters are associated with PUCCH-SpatialRelationInfo, if the PUCCH-SpatialRelationInfo of different repetitions are different, the power control related parameters are also different.  For close loop power control, considering single-DCI based M-TRP, TPC command in DCI could be also enhanced to support independent indication for different repetitions of PUCCH. |
| OPPO | Support the proposal. |
| Ericsson | Support FL proposal. For UL transmission towards different TRPs, different power control loops are likely needed, thus further enhancements can be studied. |
| QC | We prefer to add more details to the proposal to help the decision in future meetings. As CMCC mentioned, PUCCH-SpatialRelationInfo already contains the power control parameters for PUCCH, which can be considered as part of 2.3 (proposal 4). For TPC command, additional enhancements may be needed. |
| Sharp | We support the proposal. |
| MediaTek | Support LG’s update |
| Samsung | Support FL proposal. It seems natural to enhance for power control based on multi-TRP situation. Existing power control framework is designed based on single-TRP case, e.g., default pathloss reference RS. |
| InterDigital | Support FL proposal. |
| Convida Wireless | This discussion can be postponed. |
| Futurewei | Support LG’s update.  Both TA and PC are critical to UL transmissions and both should be considered. When separate PC is needed, separate TA is also needed. Therefore, both should be studied. |
| Intel | support |
| CATT | Support this proposal |
| Xiaomi | Support the proposal |
| Fujitsu | Support the proposal. |
| Nokia/NSB | Support the proposal |
| APT | Support |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | As mentioned by CMCC and QC, if multiple spatial relation Info are supported, then the open loop PC parameter is separately configured for each spatial relation Info. It seems the separate open loop power control can be implemented already. There may be some problem with the TPC command, which needs further study. |

#### Proposal 5: FL comments/proposal:

Based on comments received so far, a majority of companies are fine with the proposal. But there are some comments which are addressed below.

Apple mentioned that this could be discussed later. As this is high-level proposal supported by many companies, there is no harm of agreeing to study.

LG, Mediatek, Futurewei wanted to discuss also TA aspects, but not supported by others, so it would be ok to consider that later.

QC, CMCC suggested to include more details to the proposal. Given the limited time we might get in RAN1 #102e, we may not able an agreement on details. So, having a generic proposal should be fine.

**Proposed offline Agreement 5:** For multi-TRP PUCCH transmission, further investigate required power control enhancement.

Comment if you have any changes.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| QC | We are fine with the proposal, but as mentioned earlier this would be a trivial agreement without more specifics. |
| ZTE | Support |
| LG | The proposal is not to support something but to study something, and 3 companies see the need of study and there is no objection. We need to capture TA as well and it does not depend on type of UL channel so it should be captured in both Proposal 5 and 8. |
| Lenovo & Motorola mobility | Support |
| Fujitsu | Support |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are fine with the proposal for further study. |
| Samsung | Support |
| DOCOMO | Support |
| Ericsson | Support |

## 2.5 Additional high priority proposals

In this FL summary, we have not included any FL proposals based on certain other directions suggested by one or two companies. Such proposals can be discussed in a later stage once the basic framework is agreed. Please see the full list of company contribution proposals in Section 4. If companies wish to bring any additional aspects related to PUCCH during RAN1 #102-e, please comment below.

Please indicate any other high priority items that companies wish to discuss in RAN1#102-e. Please note that detailed technical proposals may not be possible to agree, thus, keep your proposal in high-level.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Apple | Are we going to endorse the EVM we have discussed? |
| LG | We think non-repetition PUCCH transmission scheme from MTRP is a potential candidate scheme. For example, 10 symbol PUCCH is scheduled and 1st to 5th symbols are transmitted to TRP 1 and the remains are to TRP 2.   * Proposal: Consider TDM based single PUCCH scheme without repetition as a potential candidate MTRP scheme. |
| ZTE | Similar view with LG. Beam per hop should be prioritized. |
| Ericsson | Given that UE may be served with different types of traffic, it may be beneficial to support dynamic switching between single TRP based PUCCH transmission and multiple TRP based PUCCH transmission. So, we would like to highlight this issue in the following proposal:  Proposal: Support dynamic switching between single TRP based PUCCH transmission and multiple TRP based PUCCH transmission in Rel-17. |
| QC | Same view as LG. The aspect about repetition / non-repetition, can be added as part of proposal 3. Also, this aspect is relevant only for intra-slot (for inter-slot, non-repetition may not be very meaningful). |
| Intel | Similar view as Ericsson, we also hope to discuss the issue of dynamically switching between 1 TRP and 2 TRP repetitions. |
| Fujitsu | Similar view with LG. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Similar view as LG and QC that enhancement within a PUCCH transmission should also be considered, so as to reduce latency for URLLC traffic. |

#### New proposals: FL comments/proposal:

Apple raised a good point on EVM, and EVM assumptions that were agreed during the offline discussion are now added to the FL summary (section 2.6) for endorsing during Ran1#102-e.

LG, ZTE, QC, Fujitsu suggesting considering TDM based single PUCCH scheme without repetition as a potential candidate MTRP scheme. We can check the other company views by having a proposal on that. Proposal 10 is now to discuss that.

**[Draft for offline] Proposal 10:** Consider TDM based PUCCH transmission without repetition as a potential candidate M-TRP PUCCH scheme.

Please comment preferred changes below. Please do not edit the draft proposal above and suggest your modification (if any) in the comments.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| QC | Support. We think this is only applicable to the intra-slot case. |
| ZTE | Support. But this can be removed if the updated proposal 3 is agreed as QC suggested |
| LG | Support |
| Lenovo & Motorola mobility | Not support. Since there is no gap between two hops of a PUCCH resource, while it may need time to switch beams between two hops. In order to support this, a gap may should be designed for a PUCCH resource with frequency hopping. The specification impact is too much. |
| Fujitsu | Support |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support. |
| Samsung | Same view with Lenovo. According to RAN4 specification, a transient period is defined for power change between UL transmissions. If we adopt Proposal 10, symbol gap for the transient period might be needed in some cases. |
| DOCOMO | Fine. Agree with ZTE that if the updated Proposal3 by QC is agreed, this Proposal10 is not needed. |
| Ericsson | Since we have ‘study’ in proposal 3, it would be better to study this further. Suggest replacing ‘Consider’ with ‘Study’ for now.  Alternatively, as suggested by ZTE and Docomo, we are also fine to remove this if updated proposal 3 from QC is agreeable. |

Ericsson and Intel proposal on “dynamic switching between single TRP based PUCCH transmission and multiple TRP based PUCCH transmission in Rel-17”. However, this can still be done at a later stage just like RAN1 did for Rel-16 discussion.

## 2.6 EVM for PUCCH/PUSCH LLS

Evaluation methodology/assumptions for multi-TRP PUCCH have been discussed offline (“Phase 2 - FeMIMO EVM Item 2a”), and the common evaluation scenarios and EVM assumptions are discussed in the FL summary for PDCCH. Therefore, the following proposal is only to agree on the detailed assumptions for PUCCH and PUSCH. This can already be referred to as the proposed offline agreement as there was enough discussion on EVM before.

**Proposed offline Agreement 11:** For multi-TRP PUCCH/PUSCH evaluations, the following tables are used,

* Detailed assumptions for PUCCH:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Parameters | Potential values |
| Baseline scheme | Rel-15 PUCCH repetition |
| PUCCH format | Format 1 and 3.  Other PUCCH Formats can be optionally considered. |
| # of RBs/symbols | PUCCH Format 1: 4 symbols, 1 RB  PUCCH Format 3: 4 and 8 symbols, 1 RB  Other combinations are not precluded. |
| UCI payload | 2 bits for PUCCH Format 1 (and Format 0, if considered).  Companies to report assumptions on other PUCCH Formats |
| Frequency hopping | Reported by companies |
| Number of repetitions (when applicable) | 2, 4, 8 |
| Schemes | TDM  Details to be reported by companies |
| Receiver assumption | Reported by companies |

* Detailed assumptions for PUSCH:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Parameters | Potential values |
| Baseline scheme | Rel-15/-16 PUSCH repetition |
| # of RBs/symbols | Companies to Report. |
| DMRS pattern | DM-RS configuration type 1  DM-RS Configuration type 2 (optional) |
| # of layers | 1, 2 (optional) |
| Code rates | Low (<0.2) and moderate (<0.4) |
| Frequency hopping | Reported by companies |
| UL transmission scheme | Codebook based UL transmission is baseline. Non-codebook based can be optional. |
| Redundancy Version | Reported by companies |
| Number of repetitions (when applicable) | 2, 4, 8  Other numbers are not precluded |
| Schemes | TDM  Details to be reported by companies |
| Receiver assumption | Reported by companies |

Comment if you have any changes.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| QC | Support. |
| ZTE | Support |
| LG | Support |
| Lenovo & Motorola mobility | Support |
| Fujitsu | Support |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | As discussed in section 2.2, it’s the common understanding to study all formats. So it would make more sense that companies to report the PUCCH formats used in their evaluations. |
| Samsung | Support |
| DOCOMO | Support |
| Ericsson | Support |

# Proposals for online/offline discussion on PUSCH

## Single DCI vs multi-DCI PUSCH

Companies provided various inputs on their preferences for supporting DG PUSCH reliability enhancements based on single DCI and multi-DCI based PUSCH repetitions. Support of single DCI based PUSCH repetitions in Rel-17 seems to have more support by the companies (VIVO, Futurewei, ZTE, CATT, Apple, LG, DOCOMO, QC, Nokia, Samsung) compared to the multi-DCI based PUSCH repetitions (VIVO, Futurewei, ZTE, Samsung CMCC, LG (2nd preference), QC (2nd preference), DOCOMO). Even though companies wish to study/support multi-DCI based PUSCH enhancements, the majority wishes to discuss the design based single DCI based approach. Therefore, RAN1 could start agreeing to the PUSCH reliability enhancements shall be based on single DCI approach and also keep the multi-DCI approach open due to the interest of companies.

**[Draft for offline] Proposal 6:** For M-TRP PUSCH reliability enhancement, support single DCI based PUSCH transmission/repetition scheme(s).

* Further study multi-DCI based PUSCH transmission/repetition scheme(s) to identify potential gains and required enhancements.

Please comment preferred changes below. Please do not edit the draft proposal above and suggest your modification (if any) in the comments.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Apple | We think one scheme should be enough. As single-DCI is used for PDSCH, we think it should be good to support single-DCI only. |
| NEC | Support the proposal. |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | We think both of single DCI based PUSCH transmission and multiple DCI based PUSCH transmission should be studied while the single DCI based PUSCH transmission has a higher priority. |
| LG | We don’t prefer prioritization as it is written. Considering many scheduling parameters such as TPMI/TPC/SRI needs to be configured separately M-DCI also provides a good starting point.  **Revised proposal 6:** For M-TRP PUSCH reliability enhancement, consider single/multiple DCI based PUSCH transmission/repetition scheme(s) |
| ZTE | Fine with the proposal in principle. But we also support MDCI based enhancement. |
| Spreadtrum | Support the proposal |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support to further study both single DCI and multiple DCI based PUSCH repetition |
| CMCC | For PUSCH scheduling, TPMI, RI, SRI, DMRS port, and TPC command are all indicated by DCI. If single-DCI based UL scheduling is used, it is hard to extend these fields to support different indication for multi-TRP transmission. If same TPMI, RI, SRI, DMRS port, and TPC command are assumed for different repetitions of PUSCH, the performance of PUSCH will be reduced. Therefore, considering the different DCI format for PDSCH and PUSCH scheduling, it seems that multi-DCI based PUSCH scheduling is more suitable. |
| OPPO | We support the proposal with higher priority for single-DCI based PUSCH repetition |
| Ericsson | We support the FL’s proposal. Multi-DCI based PUSCH transmission may have some benefits as well. So, it is good to further study multi-DCI based PUSCH transmission/repetition scheme(s). |
| QC | Support the proposal. |
| Sharp | We support the proposal. |
| MediaTek | Further analysis of impact on DCI payload is required to decide whether to support single-DCI based PUSCH. We propose to leave it open in this meeting and to first study which DCI fields should be different for each TRP. |
| Samsung | In multi-TRP scenario, since distances between a UE and TRPs are usually different, flexible resource allocation to adapt different PL for each TRP can be beneficial for PUSCH repetition. To allocate resource flexibly, multi-DCI framework has an advantage rather than single-DCI. Hence, we support not only single-DCI based PUSCH repetition but also multi-DCI based solution. |
| Fraunhofer | Support the proposal |
| InterDigital | Support FL proposal |
| Convida Wireless | Support the proposal. |
| Futurewei | Support LG’s revision. M-DCI for PDSCH was supported in Rel-16 and has its clear advantages in some scenarios. Likewise, M-DCI for PUSCH should be considered. |
| Intel | Support the proposal |
| CATT | Support this proposal |
| Xiaomi | Support the proposal |
| Fujitsu | Support the proposal. |
| China Telecom | Support the proposal. |
| Nokia/NSB | Support the proposal.  Single-DCI based PUCSH repetition should have higher priority than M-DCI based PUSCH repetition |
| APT | Support the proposal. We think both of single DCI based PUSCH transmission and multi-DCI based PUSCH transmission can be supported for M-TRP PUSCH reliability enhancement. However, single DCI based approach should be prioritized. |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | Support the proposal. We think that S-DCI based solution should be of higher priority. For URLLC enhancement, ideal-backhaul would be the main targetted scenario. S-DCI scheduling would be enough for coordinated scheduling as in R16 DL design. Only small enahcenement for some fields, e.g. TPMI indication, SRI indication, etc, is needed. |

#### Proposal 6: FL comments/proposal:

Based on comments received so far, a majority of companies are fine with the proposal. However, there are some comments which are addressed below.

Apple wishes to support only single-DCI based scheme, but the other one mentioned as further study. There is no clear reason to exclude other variants at this stage.

Lenovo/LG/FutureWei thinks that both shall be supported with equal priority, which is not the majority view and having multi-DCI for further study is still a good outcome.

CMCC thinks multi-DCI is more suitable, but it is hard to rely on only multiple DCIs when enhancing URLLC performance.

MediaTek wants to keep both options open, but we shall make some progress, and many companies think that single DCI should be the main focus.

From FL perspective, it is hard to see any reason to change the proposal and hope the concerns can still be addressed by studying m-DCI PUSCH further.

**Proposed offline Agreement 6:** For M-TRP PUSCH reliability enhancement, support single DCI based PUSCH transmission/repetition scheme(s).

* Further study multi-DCI based PUSCH transmission/repetition scheme(s) to identify potential gains and required enhancements.

Comment if you have any changes.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| QC | Support. |
| ZTE | Fine with this proposal |
| LG | It is not my first preference but we are fine for progress. |
| Lenovo & Motorola mobility | Support. |
| Fujitsu | Support the proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support |
| Samsung | As we already mentioned in our 1st round comment, different pathloss based on different distances between a UE and TRPs are usual in multi-TRP scenario. Hence supporting multi-DCI based multi-TRP scheme with a same priority for a single DCI case should be needed. |
| DOCOMO | Support |
| Ericsson | Support |

## 3.2 Repetition scheme for PUSCH

In the company contributions that discuss the details of PUSCH transmission schemes for multi-TRP, a majority of companies consider PUSCH repetition schemes based on TDM (FutureWei, Vivo, ZTE, Fujitsu, Mtek, Fraunhofer, Lenovo, Oppo, Spreadtrum, Ericsson, Apple, Sharp, LG, Covinda, Asia pacific Telecom, Docomo, QC, Nokia, Xiaomi, AsusTek). Similar to the PUCCH scenario, there is not much support on FDM/SDM like schemes for PUSCH.

Within the proponents of TDMed PUSCH repetition, several companies (Vivo, MediaTek, Intel, Oppo, Spreadtrum, Ericsson, Sharp, LG, QC, Nokia) provide the preference on supporting multi-TRP operation considering both PUSCH repetition Type A and Type B that defined in Rel-16 eURLLC. There are some other views, e.g. supporting only PUSCH repetition Type B (Fujitsu), but not in line with the majority view.

Based on this, it makes sense to agree on the following such that scope is clear for PUSCH reliability enhancements with multi-TRP.

**[Draft for offline] Proposal 7:** For single DCI based M-TRP PUSCH reliability enhancement, support TDMed PUSCH repetition scheme(s) based on Rel-16 PUSCH repetition Type A and Type B.

Please comment preferred changes below. Please do not edit the draft proposal above and suggest your modification (if any) in the comments.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Apple | We suggest changing “TDMed” into “only TDMed”. Other multiplexing schemes should be out of Rel-17 scope. |
| NEC | Support the proposal. |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | Agree with Apple. |
| LG | Firstly, Proposal 6 and 7 should be decoupled so that transmission scheme can be discussed regardless of number of DCI.  Secondly, if we add “only” as Apple suggested, it may cause misunderstanding such that other TDM based MTRP PUSCH schemes are excluded such as MTRP PUSCH scheme without repetition in which, for example, 10 symbol PUSCH is scheduled and 1st to 5th symbols are transmitted through beam/panel toward TRP 1 and the remains are through beam/panel toward TRP 2.  So, our revised proposal as follows:  **Revised proposal 7:** For ~~single DCI based~~ M-TRP PUSCH reliability enhancement,   * support ~~TDMed~~ PUSCH repetition scheme(s) based on Rel-16 PUSCH repetition Type A and Type B * support TDM based scheme only * consider PUSCH scheme without repetition |
| ZTE | Support the proposal. |
| Spreadtrum | Support the proposal |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support the proposal. |
| OPPO | Support the proposal. Also fine with Apple’s proposal |
| Ericsson | Support FL’s proposal. |
| QC | Support the proposal. |
| Sharp | We support the proposal. |
| MediaTek | We prefer to revise the proposal as  For M-TRP PUSCH reliability enhancement, support only TDMed PUSCH repetition scheme(s) in R17.   * Single DCI based enhancement is based on Rel-16 PUSCH repetition Type A and Type B.   The revision also covers the multi-DCI based schemes. |
| Samsung | Prefer to considering TDM scheme only. |
| Fraunhofer | Support the proposal |
| InterDigital | Support FL proposal |
| Convida Wireless | Support the proposal. |
| Futurewei | Support the proposal |
| Intel | Support the proposal |
| CATT | Support this proposal |
| Xiaomi | Support the proposal |
| Fujitsu | We are open to support PUSCH repetition type A. But the potential benefit of type A in comparison with type B should be carefully justified. |
| China Telecom | Support the proposal |
| Nokia/NSB | Support the proposal |
| APT | Support. Both types of PUSCH should be supported, which is similar to PDSCH reliability enhancement. |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | Share the same view as LGE, the case that PUSCH hopping (TDMed) is enable should also be considered. We can be fine with LGE’s modification. |

#### Proposal 7: FL comments/proposal:

Based on comments received so far, a majority of companies are fine with the proposal. However, there are some comments from LG, Apple (Oppo, Lenovo share similar view), MediaTek are addressed below.

Mediatek/Apple wishes to mention “only TDM,” and LG opposes that. As we do not have any proposal for FDM/SDM, this discussion of “only TDM” seems not essential to the proposal. To support those SDM/FDM schemes, RAN1 needs more discussions, and we do not have any such FL proposals in that direction.

MediaTek and LG wish to include generalized text that covers both single and multi-DCI approach. As mentioned in the earlier proposal, multi-DCI aspects should be further studied. We can keep the original proposal as the majority supports it. Please note that the M-DCI TDM approach is not precluded yet with this proposal, as the plan is to restrict the focus of single DCI mainly considering TDM approach as that seems to be the majority view. Without this proposal, the scope for single DCI is wider, and progress becomes difficult with that.

**Proposed offline Agreement 7:** For single DCI based M-TRP PUSCH reliability enhancement, support TDMed PUSCH repetition scheme(s) based on Rel-16 PUSCH repetition Type A and Type B.

Comment if you have any changes.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| QC | Support |
| ZTE | Support |
| LG | Like PUCCH beam hopping, PUSCH beam hopping also can be considered. We suggest the following revision.  For single DCI based M-TRP PUSCH reliability enhancement, support TDMed PUSCH repetition scheme(s) based on Rel-16 PUSCH repetition Type A and Type B.   * Consider TDM based PUSCH transmission without repetition as a potential candidate M-TRP PUSCH scheme |
| Lenovo & Motorola mobility | Support |
| Fujitsu | Support the proposal. Also fine with the update from LG. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We think enhancement on PUSCH transmission without repetition is also very import in terms of latency, and diversity. But at this stage it should not be limited to TDM, as it is also beneficial using FDM/multi-TPMI. So the following update is proposed:  For single DCI based M-TRP PUSCH reliability enhancement, support TDMed PUSCH repetition scheme(s) based on Rel-16 PUSCH repetition Type A and Type B.   * Consider PUSCH transmission without repetition as a potential candidate M-TRP PUSCH scheme |
| Samsung | Support the FL’s proposal. |
| DOCOMO | We support FL’s proposal |
| Ericsson | Support FL’s proposal |

## PUSCH Spatial Relation Info

As highlighted by few companies (Lenovo, Ericsson, Apple, LG, QC, CATT, Interdigital, VIVO, Apple), in order to support PUSCH transmission with repetition towards multiple TRPs, multiple UL beams shall be indicated in the DCI. When introducing such enhancement, few proponents (Ericsson, Apple, QC) mentioned the interest of considering both codebook and non-codebook based PUSCH transmission. Moreover, for single DCI based M-TRP PUSCH repetition schemes, several companies (ZTE, QC, Fraunhofer IIS/HHI, Lenovo, Ericsson, Apple, DOCOMO) suggest other enhancements on TPMI/power control parameters. There are also some discussions on the mapping patterns for spatial relation info and PUSCH repetitions (Intel, Fraunhofer, Lenovo, Spreadtrum), and exact details require further investigation.

**[Draft for offline] Proposal 8**: To support single DCI based M-TRP PUSCH repetition scheme(s), at least two spatial relation information is supported. RAN1 shall further study the details considering,

* Codebook based and non-codebook based PUSCH
* Enhancements on TPMI/power control parameters/any other
* Mapping between PUSCH repetitions and spatial relation info

Please comment the necessity and preferred changes below. Please do not edit the draft proposal above and suggest your modification (if any) in the comments.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Apple | There is no spatial relation info for PUSCH, but we use SRI. From discussion purpose, we think we can use the term “beam”. Further, we think it should be “up to two” instead of “at least two”. Therefore, we suggest the following changes:  “To support single DCI based M-TRP PUSCH repetition scheme(s), up to two beams is supported. RAN1 shall further study the details considering,   * Codebook based and non-codebook based PUSCH * Enhancements on SRI/TPMI/power control parameters/any other * Mapping between PUSCH repetitions and SRI(s)” |
| NEC | We are OK with the updated proposal from Apple. |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | Supported. |
| LG | Proposal 6 and 8 should be decoupled and different TA configuration also needs to be studied.  **Revised proposal 8:**  “To support ~~single DCI based~~ M-TRP PUSCH repetition scheme(s), up to two beams is supported. RAN1 shall further study the details considering,   * Codebook based and non-codebook based PUSCH * Enhancements on TA/SRI/TPMI/power control parameters/any other * Mapping between PUSCH repetitions and SRI(s)” |
| ZTE | Support in principle. |
| Spreadtrum | Support the proposal in principle |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support the proposal in general. And we suggest adding enhancement on SRI.  Enhancements on SRI/TPMI/power control parameters/any other |
| OPPO | Support. Apple’s version is better |
| Ericsson | Support the proposal with the modification suggested by NTT Docomo. |
| QC | Apple’s version is preferred. |
| Sharp | We support the proposal in principle. |
| MediaTek | Support Apple’s and LG’s update |
| Samsung | For a single-DCI based framework, we also consider the enhancement of SRI field since codebook/non-codebook based transmission is based on SRI in DCI. However, for multi-DCI based framework, the enhancements on proposal 8 is clearly resolved. The baseline of the number of different TRPs is two as in Rel-16 and other values can be further studied. |
| Fraunhofer | Support Apple’s revision of the proposal |
| InterDigital | Support revised version by Apple’s, but for now we prefer to remove the restriction on the number of beams  **Revised Proposal**  “To support ~~single DCI based~~ M-TRP PUSCH repetition scheme(s), at least two beams is supported. RAN1 shall further study the details considering,   * Codebook based and non-codebook based PUSCH * Enhancements on TA/SRI/TPMI/power control parameters/any other   Mapping between PUSCH repetitions and SRI(s)” |
| Convida Wireless | Support, with Apple’s and DOCOMO’s revisions. |
| Futurewei | Support LG’s and InterDigital’s update |
| Intel | Generally we are fine but prefer more general approach – prefer Apple’s approach |
| CATT | Support Apple’s revision. |
| Xiaomi | Support in principle. |
| Fujitsu | Support the proposal. |
| Nokia/NSB | Support the proposal |
| APT | We support this proposal. Apple’s modification also makes sense to us. |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | We are fine with Apple’s modification. But some update is needed, as the mapping is not only related to SRI but also be possible to be related to TPMI as well, and the term beam is more general at this stage for discussion  “To support single DCI based M-TRP PUSCH repetition scheme(s), up to two beams is supported. RAN1 shall further study the details considering,   * Codebook based and non-codebook based PUSCH * Enhancements on SRI/TPMI/power control parameters/any other   Mapping between PUSCH repetitions and beams” |

#### Proposal 8: FL comments/proposal:

Many companies support the direction of the proposal, but several companies have specific updates to the proposal. However, it seems that several companies prefer Apple’s edits. Therefore the proposal is updated based on the suggestions made by Apple.

LG and Interdigital have a similar edit to generalize the proposal to both single DCI and multi-DCI, but there seems no fundamental issue with the proposal as stated (m-DCI PUSCH may require other attentions as well, not enough details to agree on anything on those). Suggestion to include TA related aspects are mentioned in the updated proposal.

**Proposed offline agreement 8**: To support single DCI based M-TRP PUSCH repetition scheme(s), ~~at least~~ up to two ~~spatial relation information~~ beams are ~~is~~ supported. RAN1 shall further study the details considering,

* Codebook based and non-codebook based PUSCH
* Enhancements on SRI/TPMI/power control parameters/TA/any other
* Mapping between PUSCH repetitions and ~~spatial relation info~~SRI(s)

Comment if you have any changes.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| QC | TA enhancements is being brought-up in at least two other AI’s in 8.1.1 and 8.1.2.2. We think if enhancements are needed, the most appropriate place for it is 8.1.1. Otherwise, it becomes very hard to coordinate on this issue among these three AI’s. |
| ZTE | The same view as QC |
| LG | Support the proposal. Proposal 8 is about what scheduling parameters we need to study for UL MTRP transmission and TA is one of them. In each AI, there are different aspects and reasons to support/not support different TA and we can discuss it parallelly targeting each AI’s objective. |
| Lenovo & Motorola mobility | The same view as QC. |
| Fujitsu | Support the proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are fine with the proposal in general, But we think some update is needed, as the mapping is not only related to SRI but also be possible to be related to TPMI as well, and the term beam is more general at this stage for discussion:  To support single DCI based M-TRP PUSCH repetition scheme(s), ~~at least~~ up to two ~~spatial relation information~~ beams are ~~is~~ supported. RAN1 shall further study the details considering,   * Codebook based and non-codebook based PUSCH * Enhancements on SRI/TPMI/power control parameters/TA/any other * Mapping between PUSCH repetitions and ~~spatial relation info~~beams |
| Samsung | Support the proposal for single-DCI based PUSCH repetition. Also, as we already mentioned, multi-DCI based scheme should also be considered. Regarding TA, it’s important factor to consider in UL transmissions toward different TRPs. |
| DOCOMO | We support FL’s proposal |
| Ericsson | Similar view as QC. |

## Other proposals

In addition to the main directions mentioned in sections 3.1-3.3, there are other proposals from companies.

On the support for configured grant PUSCH, several companies (Apple, QC, Nokia, TCL) also thinks that it is important to support both DG PUSCH and CG PUSCH with multi-TRP operation. From the FL perspective, investigating further on CG PUSCH may be challenging due to the workload of the WI, and could be considered if majority of companies support this.

**[Draft for offline] Proposal 9:** Further study M-TRP CG PUSCH reliability enhancements in Rel-17.

Please comment preferred changes below. Please do not edit the draft proposal above and suggest your modification (if any) in the comments.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Apple | We are fine with the proposal. We do not see a reason to deprioritize CG-PUSCH. |
| NEC | Support the proposal. |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | Supported. |
| LG | Support |
| ZTE | Support |
| Spreadtrum | Support |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support the proposal. |
| OPPO | Support |
| Ericsson | We think configured grant based PUSCH is important for URLLC scenarios. So we are positive to further studying M-TRP CG PUSCH reliability enhancements in Rel-17. |
| QC | We think DG and CG should have the same priority. |
| Sharp | We support the proposal. |
| MediaTek | Support |
| Samsung | We support the proposal that both DG-PUSCH and CG-PUSCH are considered without any priority. Also, in Rel-16 multi-TRP enhancement, SPS PDSCH is deprioritized and do not have any specific framework yet. This leftover functionality should be supported. |
| Fraunhofer | Support the proposal |
| InterDigital | Support FL proposal |
| Convida Wireless | Support. |
| Futurewei | Support |
| Intel | Support |
| CATT | Support this proposal |
| Fujitsu | Support the proposal. |
| Nokia/NSB | Support the proposal |
| APT | Support. From URLLC’s perspective, CG-PUSCH would be important for handling latency issue. So, further reliability enhancement on CG-PUSCH is needed. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support |

#### Proposal 9: FL comments/proposal:

All companies support the proposal.

**Offline agreement 9:** Further study M-TRP CG PUSCH reliability enhancements in Rel-17.

Comment if you have any objections prior online session.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| QC | Support |
| ZTE | Support |
| LG | Support |
| Lenovo & Motorola mobility | Support |
| Fujitsu | Support |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support |
| Samsung | Support |
| DOCOMO | Support |
| Ericsson | Support |

## 3.5 Additional high priority proposals

Other proposals are not yet included as the main intention of this discussion is agree on the basic framework for further discussion. Please see the full list of company contribution proposals in Section 4. If companies wish to bring any additional aspects related to PUSCH during RAN1 #102-e, please comment below.

Please indicate any other high priority items that companies wish to discuss in RAN1#102-e. Please note that detailed technical proposals may not be possible to agree, thus, keep your suggestion in high-level.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Apple | Are we going to endorse the EVM we have discussed? |
| Ericsson | Given that UE may be served with different types of traffic, it may be beneficial to support dynamic switching between single TRP based PUSCH transmission and multiple TRP based PUSCH transmission. So, we would like to highlight this issue in the following proposal:  Proposal: Support dynamic switching between single TRP based PUSCH transmission and multiple TRP based PUSCH transmission in Rel-17. |
| InterDigital | We also need to discuss panel selection for PUSCH/PUCCH transmission. |
| Intel | Similar view as Ericsson to support dynamic switching between single TRP based PUSCH transmission and multiple TRP based PUSCH transmission. Also we would like to discuss TRP specific DMRS for the repetitions. |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | Regarding the panel selection proposed by InterDigital, we think cross feature designs would have low priority at this stage as the multi-panel topic is still under discussion. |
|  |  |

#### New proposals: FL comments/proposal:

Ericsson and Intel proposal on “dynamic switching between single TRP based PUSCH transmission and multiple TRP based PUSCH transmission in Rel-17”. However, this can still be done at a later stage just like RAN1 did for Rel-16 discussion.

Apple’s comment is already addressed in section 2.6.

Panel selection discussion proposed by Interdigital is not within the scope of M-TRP URLLC discussion.

# Summary of Technical proposals

## 4.1 Common for PUCCH and PUSCH

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Proposals |
| FutureWei | Proposal 1: For multi-TRP non-PDSCH enhancement, clarify the scenario and key assumptions on time/frequency synchronization, backhaul, and M-TRP signal delay spread.  Proposal 5: For multi-TRP UL enhancement, support to acquire and maintain multiple TA values for multiple TRPs on the same carrier via PRACH enhancement and TA configuration enhancement. |
| InterDigital | Proposal 3: Rel-17 UL enhancements enable spatial filter selection for repetitions per TRP.  Proposal 4: Introduce solutions to enable efficient panel activation and selection for UL transmission.  Proposal 5: Rel-17 enhancements should be flexible enough to support use cases with simultaneous and non-simultaneous transmissions by multi-panel UEs. |
| Sony | Proposal 3: Specify the UE capability whether the UE can transmit simultaneously two PUSCHs/PUCCHs from different antenna panels.  Proposal 4: Specify the UE capability for following.   Total number of antenna panels   Number antenna panel which can transmit simultaneously   Antenna panel direction information |
| MediaTek | Proposal 5: In R17, only TDM-based multi-TRP is specified for PUSCH/PUCCH. |
| China Telecom | Proposal 2: Panel selection and/or joint UL transmission across different panels can be considered for PUSCH & PUCCH enhancement using multi-TRP and/or multi-panel. |
| NEC | Proposal 3: For PUCCH/PUSCH repetition based on multi-TRP, configurations such as beam related parameters, power control parameters should be enhanced. |
| CATT | Proposal 7: At least TDM based approaches can be considered for UL channel enhancement with M-TRP.  Proposal 8: For TDM schemes of PUSCH/PUCCH with M-TRP, the extension of SRS/spatialrelationinfo indication/configuration and resource allocation need further discussion.  Proposal 9: For the UE supporting simultaneous transmission of multiple beams, SDM based repetition scheme can also be considered to improve the robustness and reliability against the blockage with lower latency. |
| Samsung | Proposal 6. Support multi-TRP based PUCCH/PUSCH repetition by using single-DCI based framework as a starting point. |
| Xiaomi | Proposal 3: TDM schemes for PUCCH/PUSCH repetition is much more preferred. |
| Asia pacific Telecom | Proposal 3: Study whether to introduce indication of multiple sets of transmit parameters for repetitive UL transmission in multi-TRP scenario.  Proposal 4: RAN1 to study procedural impact for inter-panel beam switch. |
| AsusTek | Proposal: TDM repetition scheme is suggested as a starting point for M-TRP enhancement for PDCCH, PUSCH, PUCCH. |

## 4.2 PUCCH

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Proposals |
| FutureWei | Proposal 2: For PUCCH enhancement, the following may be considered:  - Extend Rel-16 enhancement of PUCCH with ACK/NACK to PUCCH with CSI  - Study repeated ACK/NACK transmissions to one or both TRPs  - Study the feasibility of soft combining / joint reception |
| Vivo | Proposal 8: Support PUCCH repetitions for all PUCCH formats and both inter/intra-slot PUCCH repetition.  Proposal 9: Determination of PUCCH resources for repetitions, signaling of number of PUCCH repetitions should be studied.  Proposal 10: Specify the configuration, activation of spatial relations of PUCCH resources for PUCCH repetitions.  Proposal 11: For PUCCH transmission in MTRP, support independent power controls for a single PUCCH transmission and PUCCH repetitions to different TRPs. |
| ZTE | Proposal 3: Support repetition with beam diversity for all PUCCH formats.  Proposal 4: Support dynamical indication of the number of PUCCH repetitions.  Proposal 5: Multiple beams can be configured to one PUCCH resource, and beam switching can be supported among PUCCH repetitions or PUCCH hops. |
| Fujitsu | Proposal 1: In terms of PUCCH multi-TRP enhancement, the following PUCCH format are preferred for further study   PUCCH format 0   PUCCH format 1   PUCCH format 3 |
| MediaTek | Proposal 7: Inter-slot PUCCH repetition can be reused, where each slot/repetition can target a specific TRP.  Proposal 8: The different modes of frequency hopping can be a starting point for TDM-based multi-TRP.  Proposal 9: Take UCI multiplexing into account when designing multi-TRP operation for PUCCH. |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | Proposal 8: PUCCH repetition with multiple beams should support TDM scheme only.  Proposal 9: The spatial relation of PUCCH should be enhanced to include multiple TX beams activated with MAC-CE.  Proposal 10: Flexible number of repetition of PUCCH resource should be supported.  Proposal 11: Cyclical mapping pattern and sequential mapping pattern should be supported in R17 PUCCH repetition.  Proposal 12: Power control mechanism should support PUCCH repetition with multiple spatial relations.  Proposal 13: The inter-slot frequency hopping for PUCCH repetition should be used to obtain the frequency diversity between UE and all TRPs in R17.  Proposal 14: Support a UCI transmitted in multiple PUCCH resources to increase the reliability and robustness of UCI transmission. How to indicate the multiple PUCCH resources can be further studied. |
| Intel | Proposal-14: Consider both slot-level and sub-slot level multi-TCI PUCCH repetitions  Proposal-15: Consider some level of dynamic control of PUCCH repetition factor and switching between 1-TRP and 2-TRP repetitions  Proposal-16: Consider PUCCH DMRS sequence to be cycled in consecutive repetitions in a TRP specific manner |
| Oppo | Proposal 3: Support repetition of PUCCH via multiple TRPs in TDM manner in Rel-17.  Proposal 4: Specify the mapping pattern between spatial relations of PUCCH and PUCCH repetitions. |
| Samsung | Proposal 7. Support the use of multiple PUCCH resources for multi-TRP based PUCCH repetition. |
| CMCC | Proposal 3: TDM scheme could be considered for PUCCH repetition with SpatialRelationInfo and power control related enhancements. |
| Spreadtrum | Proposal 6: Support both intra-slot and inter-slot PUCCH repetition for multi-TRP operation  Proposal 7: For PUCCH beam diversity enhancement of multi-TRP operation,  - Support at least one of the following options for PUCCH repetition with two different spatial relations.   option1: one PUCCH resource can be associated with two spatial relations   oprion2: the UE can be indicated with two PUCCH resources simultaneously, each with a different spatial relation.  - Support both cyclical mapping order and sequential mapping order. |
| Ericsson | Proposal 10: Dynamic switching between single-TRP based PUCCH and multi-TRP based PUCCH should be considered as part of PUCCH multi-TRP enhancements depending.  Proposal 11: For PUCCH multi-TRP enhancements, how to activate/associate multiple spatial relations for a PUCCH resource needs to be considered in NR Rel-17 feMIMO WI.  Proposal 12: For PUCCH multi-TRP enhancements, how to configure/indicate the number of repetitions for PUCCH needs to be further discussed/considered in NR Rel-17 feMIMO WI.  Proposal 13: For PUCCH multi-TRP enhancements, consider power control enhancements related to different close loops and associated TPC commands targeting different TRPs.  Proposal 14: For PUCCH multi-TRP enhancements, consider intra-slot PUCCH repetitions for formats 1, 3 and 4 in NR Rel-17 feMIMO WI. |
| Apple | Proposal 3-1: For PUCCH reliability enhancement, only TDMed based PUCCH repetition multiplexing could be considered.  Proposal 3-2: Support to transmit UCI over PUCCH by indicating up to 2 spatial relation.  Proposal 3-3: Compared to indicate 2 spatial relation for a PUCCH resource, it is slightly preferred to indicate 2 PUCCH resources in non-orthogonal symbols for a UCI transmission. |
| Xiaomi | Proposal 4: Consider to reuse the agreement on TDM PUCCH resources for PUCCH repetition in Rel-16. |
| LG | Proposal 9: For MTRP PUCCH transmission, at least TA, power control parameters and spatial relation RS should be configured separately for different transmission occasion.  Proposal 10: Extend Rel-15 TDM based PUCCH repetition scheme for MTRP PUCCH enhancement.  Proposal 11: TDM based single PUCCH scheme can be considered for both low latency and high reliability, additionally. |
| Covinda Wireless | Proposal 3: PUCCH transmission to two TRPs is supported.  Proposal 6: Only TDM is supported for PUCCH multi-TRP repetition. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Proposal 3:   For PUCCH repetition over multiple TRPs, following options can be considered:   * Option 1: the same PUCCH resource is used for repetitions with multiple spatial relations for a PUCCH resource. * Option 2: different PUCCH resources can be indicated for repetitions.    For PUCCH repetition over multiple TRPs, enhancement on TPC command for PUCCH can be considered. |
| Qualcomm | Proposal 4: Support extending Rel. 15 inter-slot PUCCH repetition mechanisms to  • Two PUCCH-SpatialRelationInfoId’s  • PUCCH formats 0 and 2 in addition to PUCCH formats 1, 3, and 4.  Proposal 5: RAN1 should study pros and cons of the following two alternatives before deciding how to enable intra-slot multi-beam PUCCH transmission:  • Alternative 1: Reusing intra-slot frequency hopping mechanisms to enable beam-hopping within one PUCCH resource.  • Alternative 2: Allowing PUCCH repetition in two different non-overlapping PUCCH resources in a given slot, where the two PUCCH resources are configured / activated with different beams. |
| Nokia | Proposal 8: PUCCH reliability enhancements can be identified considering the following aspects:  • PUCCH repetition operation across multiple TRPs/beams with a focus on TDM schemes.  • FFS: whether intra-slot repetitions should be considered.  Proposal 9: Study solutions to enable tuning PUCCH resources differently for repeated PUCCH transmissions depending on the associated TRP/beam for each transmission.  Proposal 10: Study enhancements for the robustness of periodic PUCCH resource configurations by exploiting multiple TRPs/beams. |

## 4.3 PUSCH

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Proposals |
| FutureWei | Proposal 3: For M-TRP PUSCH enhancement, support:  - TDM of PUSCH, with single or multiple DCIs to schedule the PUSCH  - Multiple scrambling IDs for M-TRP PUSCH transmissions and link to the higher layer indexes  - URLLC related enhancements via PUSCH |
| Vivo | Proposal 4: Rel-16 URLLC Type A and Type B PUSCH transmission can be starting point for PUSCH reliability enhancement in Rel-17.  Proposal 5: TDM repetition is considered as the major optimization target in Rel-17 MTRP PUSCH repetition enhancement.  Proposal 6: Support M-DCI based PUSCH repetition across M-TRP in Rel-17.  Proposal 7: For S-DCI based PUSCH repetition across M-TRP, further study PUSCH transmission schemes without significantly increasing DCI overhead. |
| ZTE | Proposal 6: TDMed PUSCH repetition with beam diversity should be prioritized.  Proposal 7: Considering both single-DCI and multi-DCI based PUSCH repetition with beam diversity.   * For single-DCI based, SRI and TPMI enhancement need to be studied. * For Muti-DCI based, gNB should let UE know which two DCIs schedule the same TB. |
| Fujitsu | Proposal 2: In terms of PUSCH multi-TRP enhancement, PUSCH repetition type B is preferred for further study |
| MediaTek | Proposal 6: PUSCH repetition types A and B can be reused, where each slot/repetition can target a specific TRP. |
| CATT | Proposal 10: RV sequence should be specified for PUSCH enhancements with M-TRP.  Proposal 11: At least S-DCI based PUSCHs repetitions under MTRP scenario can be considered to improve PUSCH robustness and reliability.  Proposal 12: For UL enhancement with M-TRP, separate power control for each link can be considered. |
| Fraunhofer IIS/HHI | Proposal 3: Specify time domain repetition of PUSCH with two different spatial relation and power control settings to transmit to two TRPs.  Proposal 4: Reuse the cyclic and sequential mapping of TCI-states in Rel. 16 PDSCH for the mapping of spatial relation and pathloss reference RS for PUSCH reliability enhancement with repetition.  Proposal 5: Obtain the pathloss reference RS and the spatial relation information with respect to the TRPs from SRI-PUSCH-PowerControl IDs or PUSCH-PathlossReferenceRS IDs and down-selected PDSCH TCI-states, respectively. |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | Proposal 15: PUSCH repetition with multiple beams should only support TDM scheme.  Proposal 16: To support PUSCH repetition with multiple beams, multiple spatial relation information should be supported.  Proposal 17: TDRA field should indicate the number of PUSCH repetition in R17.  Proposal 18: Cyclical mapping pattern and sequential mapping pattern should be supported in R17 PUSCH repetition.  Proposal 19: How to apply the beam mapping pattern for PUSCH repetition Type B should be further studied in R17.  Proposal 20: The power control of a PUSCH repetition with multiple spatial relations should include multiple sets of power control parameters.  Proposal 21: The inter-slot frequency hopping and the inter-repetition frequency hopping for R17 PUSCH repetition should be able to obtain the frequency diversity between UE and all TRPs. |
| Intel | Proposal-9: Multi-TRP PUSCH repetition should apply to both Type A and Type B mapping up to rank-2 transmissions  Proposal-10: For Type B mapping, consider whether TCI state to PUSCH mapping should be performed before or after PUSCH segmentation  Proposal-11: Allow dynamic switching between 1-TRP repetition and 2-TRP repetitions for PUSCH  Proposal-12: Consider DMRS sequence to be cycled in consecutive repetitions in a TRP specific manner |
| Oppo | Proposal 5: Support PUSCH repetition via multiple TRPs in TDM manner with Rel-16 PUSCH for eURLLC as starting point. |
| Samsung | Proposal 8. Support multi-DCI based multi-TRP PUSCH repetition scheme for flexible resource allocation across repetitions. |
| CMCC | Proposal 4: Multi-DCI based PUSCH scheduling could be considered for multi-TRP URLLC PDSCH transmission. |
| Spreadtrum | Proposal 2: For multi-TRP operation, PUSCH repetition in time domain should be prioritized.  Proposal 3: The extension of R16 PUSCH repetition schemes to multi-TRP scenario should be as the starting point.  Proposal 5: For PUSCH beam diversity enhancement of multi-TRP operation,  - Support at least one of the following options of the association between spatial relations and transmission occasion for PUSCH repetition type B:   option1: each spatial relation applied to each actual PUSCH transmission   option2: each spatial relation applied to each nominal PUSCH transmission  - Support both cyclical mapping order and sequential mapping order. |
| Ericsson | Proposal 6 : Consider PUSCH multi-TRP enhancements for PUSCH repetition types A and B; PUSCH multi-TRP enhancements relying on simultaneous transmission are deprioritized in Rel-17 feMIMO.  Proposal 7 : Dynamic switching between single-TRP based PUSCH and multi-TRP based PUSCH should be considered as part of PUSCH multi-TRP enhancements.  Proposal 8 : Consider PUSCH Multi-TRP enhancements for both codebook based and non-codebook based PUSCH in NR Rel-17.  Proposal 9: For PUSCH multi-TRP enhancements, different power control close loops for different TRPs are to be considered in NR Rel-17. |
| Huawei | Proposal 2: For UL non-codebook based PUSCH transmission, the CSI-RS configuration should be enhanced to enable multi-TRP based reception. |
| Apple | Proposal 4-1: For PUSCH reliability enhancement, only TDMed based multiplexing should be considered.  Proposal 4-2: PUSCH reliability enhancement should support the enhancement of DG-PUSCH, CG-PUSCH and Msg3/MsgA PUSCH.  Proposal 4-3: PUSCH reliability enhancement should support enhancement for both codebook based transmission scheme and non-codebook based transmission scheme.  Proposal 4-4: The starting point should consider up to 2 beams/precoders indicated for PUSCH repetitions.  Proposal 4-5: To improve the PUSCH reliability, support gNB to indicate 2 SRIs/TPMIs based on single-DCI operation. |
| Sharp | Proposal 2: PUSCH repetition mechanism specified in Rel-16 URLLC should be reused.  Proposal 3: For multi-TRP PUSCH transmission, TDM scheme is the baseline. |
| LG | Proposal 5: For MTRP PUSCH transmission, at least TA, power control parameters, PMI and spatial relation RS should be configured separately for different transmission occasion.  Proposal 6: Extend Rel-15/16 TDM based PUSCH repetition scheme for MTRP PUSCH enhancement.  Proposal 7: TDM based single PUSCH scheme can be considered, additionally.  Proposal 8: Support S-DCI based MTRP PUSCH transmission and M-DCI based MTRP PUSCH transmission can be additionally considered. |
| Covinda Wireless | Proposal 4: Transmission of a TB on PUSCH to two TRPs is supported.  Proposal 7: Only TDM is supported for PUSCH multi-TRP repetition. |
| Asia Pacific Telecom | Proposal 2: Study how to apply TDM schemes (e.g., introduce a new configuration or apply single transmission layer based PUSCH repetitions in NR Rel-15 and NR Rel-16 as baseline) for multi-TRP/panel based PUSCH repetitions. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Proposal 2:   To support PUSCH repetition over MTRPs, both single-DCI based and multi-DCI based MTRP transmission can be studied.   For single-DCI based MTRP PUSCH transmission, enhancements on SRI and TPC command indications can be considered. |
| Qualcomm | Proposal 6: Support extending PUSCH repetition Type A and Type B to repetitions with different sets of UL beams / different sets of transmission parameters for codebook based UL transmission and non-codebook based UL transmission including  • Indication of two sets of power control parameters (by enhancing SRI signalling in the DCI)  • Indication of two spatial relation Info’s (by enhancing SRI signalling in the DCI)  • Indication of two TPMIs for codebook based UL transmission (by enhancing “Precoding information and number of layers” signaling in the DCI)  Proposal 7: Enhancements for reliability and robustness of PUSCH should be extended to the case of configured grant for both cases of Type 1 and Type 2 configured grant.  Proposal 8: RAN1 should study if and how multi-DCI based multi-PUSCH transmission can be optimized to enhance the flexibility and performance of PUSCH.  • Compared to single-DCI based approach, multi-DCI based approach has lower priority. |
| Nokia | Proposal 11: PUSCH reliability enhancements can be identified considering the following aspects:  • PUSCH repetition operations across multiple TRPs/beams with a focus on TDM schemes  • PUSCH repetition Type A and Type B can be considered.  • For DG PUSCH, focus on a single-DCI design.  Proposal 12: Study low overhead mechanisms for the TX beam selection for multi-TRP CG PUSCH. |
| TCL | Proposal 1: Configured grant PUSCH should be supported and identified as an essential feature in multi-DCI based multi-TRP in Rel-17.  Proposal 2: Association between configured grant PUSCH and TRP should be studied in Rel-17.  Proposal 3: Out-of-order scheduling for multiple PUSCHs that include configured grant PUSCH should be studied in Rel-17.  Proposal 4: When multiple PUSCHs including configured grant PUSCH collide in multi-DCI based multi-TRP scenario, how to solve the collision problem should be further studied. |
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