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# 1 Introduction

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

|  |
| --- |
|  [104-e-LTE-eMTC5-02] Multi-TB issues – Johan (Ericsson)* Issue #1: Clarification of DCI definition for SPS validation ([R1-2100561](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_104-e/Docs/R1-2100561.zip))
* Issue #2: Clarification of multicast scheduling gap definition ([R1-2100761](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_104-e/Docs/R1-2100761.zip), [R1-2101279](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_104-e/Docs/R1-2101279.zip))
* Discussion and decision by 1/29, TPs by 2/5
 |

# Issue #1: Clarification of DCI definition for SPS validation

Contribution [1] discusses the need for clarification of the DCI definition for SPS validation for the case when the Rel-16 LTE-MTC multi-TB scheduling feature is configured and presents a TP for 36.213.

**Question 1.1: Companies are invited to comment below on the 36.213 TP in [1] for clarification of the DCI definition for SPS validation when multi-TB scheduling is configured.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | We think the only necessary change is to change the 4-bit HPN field to 3 bits for TDD, the other changes are not needed. For example, this change:- if *ce-PDSCH-MultiTB-Config* is configured, the ‘New data indicator’ in ‘Scheduling TBs for Unicast’ field in DCI format 6-1A is set to ‘0’;otherwise, the new data indicator field in DCI format 6-1A is set to '0'. - if *ce-PUSCH-MultiTB-Config* is configured, the ‘New data indicator’ in ‘Scheduling TBs for Unicast’ field in DCI format 6-0A is set to ‘0’;otherwise, the new data indicator field in DCI format 6-0A is set to '0'. Is not needed, since indeed DCI format 6-1A has an NDI field when a single TB is scheduled: - If one TB is scheduled- 5 bits set to zero- HARQ process number – 3 bits- New data indicator – 1 bitSo, the only change would be :

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **DCI format 6-0A** | **DCI format 6-1A** |
| **HARQ process number** | set to '000' | FDD: set to '000'TDD: set to '0000’ if *ce-PDSCH-MultiTB-Config* is not configured, ‘000’ otherwise. |

 |
| Lenovo&MotoM | We share the similar view as Qualcomm. Since the same filed name for SPS validation is listed below the Scheduling TBs for Unicast field. |
| ZTE,sanechips | When multi-TB is configured, the SPS validation fields such as New data indicator, HARQ process number and Redundancy version do not exist since they are jointly coded in the ‘Scheduling TBs for Unicast’ field. More specifically, in subclause 7.1.7.1 of 36.213, regarding Modulation order and redundancy version determination, we have the following spec description:

|  |
| --- |
| - if $N\_{TB}=1$, for the TB is determined by the 'Redundancy version' in the 'Scheduling TBs for Unicast' field in DCI format 6-1A- else if $N\_{TB}=2$ and the HARQ process IDs for each of the scheduled TBs are h1 and h2 (h1<h2),  of the scheduled TB with HARQ process ID h1 is determined by the 'Redundancy version for TB 1' in the 'Scheduling TBs for Unicast' field in DCI format 6-1A, and  of the scheduled TB with HARQ process ID h2 is determined as follows:- If the UE is configured with higher layer parameter *ce-PDSCH-64QAM-Config* and the repetition number field in the DCI indicates no PDSCH repetition, it is given by the 'Redundancy version for TB 1' in the 'Scheduling TBs for Unicast' field in DCI format 6-1A- else if the UE is configured with higher layer parameter *mpdcch-pdsch-HoppingConfig* set to 'on' and the repetition number field in the DCI indicates PDSCH repetition, it is given by the 'Redundancy version for TB 1' in the 'Scheduling TBs for Unicast' field in DCI format 6-1A- else it is given by the 'Redundancy version for TB 2' in the 'Scheduling TBs for Unicast' field in DCI format 6-1A- else if $N\_{TB}$ = 4 or 6 is indicated by the corresponding DCI,  for all scheduled TBs |

It is seen that the Redundancy version should be in the 'Scheduling TBs for Unicast' field. Similarly, SPS validation fields including New data indicator, HARQ process number and Redundancy version need the adjustments also.Additionally, for the TDD case, a correction for the 4-bit HPN field to 3 bits is necessary. |
| LG | We agree with Qualcomm and Lenovo&MotoM, and okay with the corrections provided by Qualcomm. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Share similar view with Qualcomm, there’s only one field named HARQ process number, even it’s jointly encoded in Scheduling TBs for Unicast. For the correction proposed by Qualcomm, it’s better to be as following to remove any ambiguity:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **DCI format 6-0A** | **DCI format 6-1A** |
| **HARQ process number** | set to '000' | if *ce-PDSCH-MultiTB-Config* is configured,‘000’elseFDD: set to '000'TDD: set to '0000’ |

in fact, more concisely, we can use the wording for other fields such as “Resource block assignment” as below:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **DCI format 6-0A** | **DCI format 6-1A** |
| **HARQ process number** | set to '000' | Set to all '0's |

 |
| Nokia, NSB | We share similar view as Qualcomm. We are fine with either Qualcomm’s proposal or Huawei’s first proposal. In our view Huawei’s second proposal doesn’t explicitly mention *ce-PDSCH-MultiTB-Config* so it is not as clear. |
| Ericsson | If there are no issues with Qualcomm’s or Huawei’s TPs above, we prefer one of those due to their simplicity compared to the TPs in [1]. |
| Moderator (Ericsson) | Most responses argue that it will be enough to clarify that the content of the ‘HARQ process number’ should be set to zero in case of SPS validation, although there are some different preferences regarding how to express this in the specification. |

**Question 1.2: Will it be enough to clarify that the content of the ‘HARQ process number’ should be set to zero in case of SPS validation (according to one of the TPs from Qualcomm and Huawei above), or will some other clarification be needed?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | It is enough to clarify the ‘HARQ process number’. Either Huawei or our TP would be OK. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# Issue #2: Clarification of multicast scheduling gap definition

Contributions [2] and [3] discuss clarification of the definition of scheduling gaps for Rel-16 LTE-MTC multi-TB scheduling for multicast SC-PTM transmission and present three alternative TPs for 36.213. Two of the TPs assume that the scheduling gap should be in terms of absolute subframes, whereas the third TP assumes that the scheduling gap should be in terms of BL/CE DL subframes. The TPs also address the indentation issue discussed in the previous RAN1 meeting [4].

**Question 2.1: Should the scheduling gap for multi-TB multicast transmission be in terms of BL/CE DL subframes or absolute subframes?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | Although we have no strong view, we think the current spec already captures the gap being in absolute subframes. About the large corrections in [2], we think the current spec (with indentation issue resolved) may be enough to describe the behavior. |
| Lenovo,MotoM | If we need to select one, counting by absolute subframe is our preference since the scheduling gap is counted by absolute subframe in NBIoT. e.g., uplink scheduling gap, and downlink gap in NBIoT. although we don’t have strong view.I don’t think the current TS36.213 correctly captures the agreement. The TB(s) have already mapped to continuous BL/CE DL subframe(s) based on spec, and then the spec gives a debug to insert a gap among TB(s) if configured. The behavior of UE is not clear due to the spec contradiction. |
| ZTE,sanechips | We are OK with the absolute subframes if the majority have the consensus.  |
| LG | We have similar view with Qualcomm. We believe that scheduling gap should be counted in terms of absolute subframe, and we think it is already captured in the current spec. |
| Nokia, NSB | Our preference is to use absolute subframe as already captured in the specification. We also agree with the TP to fix the indentation. |
| Ericsson | We are also fine with absolute subframes. |
| Moderator (Ericsson) | There seems to be consensus that the scheduling gap for multi-TB multicast transmission should be in terms of absolute subframes (rather than BL/CE DL subframes). |

**Proposal 2.2: RAN1 confirms that the scheduling gap for multi-TB multicast transmission is in terms of absolute subframes.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | Yes |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Question 2.3: What (if any) specification updates are needed assuming that the scheduling gap for multi-TB multicast transmission should be in terms of absolute subframes?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
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