3GPP TSG-RAN WG1 Meeting #104-e R1-210xxxx

e-Meeting, 25th January – 5th February, 2021

Agenda Item: 8.2.3

Source: Moderator (Ericsson)

Title: FL Summary 2 for Enhancements for PUCCH formats 0/1/4

Document for: Discussion, Decision

# 1 Introduction

This document summarizes the contributions made under the “Enhancements for PUCCH Formats 0/1/4” agenda item of the Rel-17 work item "Supporting NR from 52.6GHz to 71 GHz."

The updated WID [1] contains the following objective related to this agenda item:

- Support enhancement for PUCCH format 0/1/4 to increase the number of RBs under PSD limitation in shared spectrum operation.

The following is an outline of the summary. An asterisk (\*) indicates that a proposal/discussion is to be treated with higher priority.

2 Link level evaluation assumptions for design of PUCCH Format 0/1/4 enhancements AGREEMENT

3 Frequency Domain Resource Mapping

3.1 Contiguous vs. Interlaced Mapping Agreement

3.2 Number of RBs \*Proposal 3e

4 PUCCH Format 0/1 Sequence Type \*Proposal 4D

5 PUCCH Format 4

5.1 Sequence Type for DMRS \*Proposal 5d

5.2 DFT Precoding and OCC Mapping \*Proposal 6d

6 PUCCH Resource Sets Prior to RRC Configuration CONCLUDE to Defer discussion

The following email thread is assigned for discussion of this topic:

[104-e-NR-52-71GHz-03] Email discussion/approval on PUCCH format 0/1/4 enhancements with checkpoints for agreements on Jan-28, Feb-02, Feb-05 – Steve (Ericsson)

# 2 Link level evaluation assumptions for design of PUCCH Format 0/1/4 enhancements

As many companies have discussed in their contributions, one of the main issues is to determine the number of RBs to specify for enhanced PUCCH formats 0/1/4 in order to enable increased coverage under various power limitations. In order to make decisions on the number of supported RBs, link budget calculations are required taking into account regional regulatory and practical UE limitations on conducted power, beamforming gain, and PSD. In turn this depends on the PUCCH detection performance evaluated by link level simulation. To align evaluation results between companies, it will be very useful to agree on a common set of link level evaluation asumptions. The same exercise was done in Rel-16 in the NR-U work item for design of interlaced PUCCH [3]. Tables 1, 2, and 3 below provide a proposal for discussion.

* Table 1 provides a set of link level simulation settings to be used for determining the required SNR to achieve a PUCCH detection error reqirement. This table is a simplified version of the link level evaluation assumptions from TR 38.808 [2] that were agreed during the study item, adapted for PUCCH evaluation. The required SNR from link level simulations is one of the inputs to the link budget calculation shown in Table 2.
* Table 2 is substantially similar to the table agreed in [3] for the Rel-16 PUCCH evaluations, with small adaptations to align with the scope of the WID for the 52.6 – 71 GHz WI. This table lists metrics to be reported by companies in future contributions during this WI, and includes expressions to derive the link budget in terms of maximum isotropic loss (MIL)
* Table 3 provides expressions for computing the maximum conducted power according to regional regulatory limitations. The maximum conducted power is another one of the inputs to the link budget calculation shown in Table 2.

**Proposal 1 Agree to the following**

Agree on a common set of assumptions contained in Tables 1, 2, and 3 for link level simulations and link budget calculations for evaluating enhancements to PUCCH formats 0/1/4.

Table 1: Simplified Evaluation Assumptions

| Assumptions | Value |
| --- | --- |
| Carrier Frequency [GHz] | 60 GHz |
| Subcarrier Spacing [kHz] | 120, 480, 960 kHz |
| Number of usable RBs per carrier | 256 for 120 kHz SCS (corresponds to ~400 MHz carrier)  256 for 480 kHz SCS (corresponds to ~1600 MHz carrier)  160 for 960 kHz SCS (corresponds to ~2000 MHz carrier)    Note: If other values used, companies to report values |
| PUCCH Frequency Hopping | On |
| PUCCH Frequency Domain Resource Mapping | N\_RB contiguous RBs per hop (with all REs allocated per PRB)  Note: If alternative RE allocation per PRB is used, companies to report details |
| Waveform | CP-OFDM for PF0/1  DFT-s-OFDM for PF4 |
| CP Type | Normal CP |
| Channel Model | TDL-A model as defined in of TR38.901 Section 7.7.2:  - Delay spread (DS) = {5ns, 10ns, 20ns}  - Optional: DS = 40ns |
| BS Antenna Configuration (Mg,Ng,M,N,P) | {1,1,1,1,2} |
| UE Antenna Configuration (Mg,Ng,M,N,P) | {1,1,1,1,1} |
| Mobility | 3 km/hr |
| PA Model | None |
| gNB TRP PN Model | Zero phase noise |
| UE PN Model | Zero phase noise |
| Pre-loaded Tx EVM | 0% |
| Additive Rx EVM | 0% |
| I-Q Imbalance | None |
| Frequency Offset | 0 ppm |
| Channel Estimation | Realistic channel estimation |

Table 2: Reporting metrics

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Parameter** | **Value** | **Notes** |
| PUCCH Format |  | PF0, PF1, PF4 |
| Subcarrier spacing, SCS [kHz] |  | SCS = {120, 480, 960} kHz |
| Frequency hopping details |  | Frequency offset between hops, |
| Number of RBs used per hop (N\_RB) |  | N\_RB contiguous RBs per hop |
| PUCCH bandwidth per hop, BW [MHz] |  | BW = N\_RB \* 12 \* SCS / 1e6 |
| Number of OFDM symbols used for PUCCH resource |  | 1 or 2 for PF0  {4 .. 14} for PF1/4 |
| Sequence construction details |  | Sequence type for PF0/1  Sequence type for DMRS of PF4 |
| OCC configuration details |  | Applicable for PF1, PF4 |
| Cyclic shift configuration details |  | For PF0/1  For DMRS of PF4 |
| Number of multiplexed users, e.g., by code division, if applicable |  | 1 user  Note: Companies to report if other cases if evaluated |
| PUCCH payload encoder type |  | Reed Muller or Polar for PF4 |
| PUCCH payload size(s) (bits) |  | If multiple payload sizes evaluated, then maximum isotropic loss (see calculation below) to be reported for each PUCCH payload size |
| PUCCH encoding rate(s) |  | Applicable for PF4  If multiple payload sizes evaluated, encoding rates to be reported for each payload size |
| Required SNR (dB) |  | Required SNR needed to fulfil detection criterion, from link level simulations based on Table 1 (see Notes (1) and (2) at bottom of table for definition of detection criteria for PF 0/1/4). |
| Cubic Metric, CM (dB) |  | Reported value is the 95th percentile, i.e., the CM for which 95% of all sequences of the design fall below |
| UE Tx Beamforming gain (dBi) |  | TxBF = 6 dBi  Notes:   1. TxBF includes antenna element gain 2. If other TxBF value(s) used, companies to report value(s) |
| BS Rx Beamforming gain (dBi) |  | RxBF = 20 dBi  Notes:   1. RxBF includes antenna element gain 2. If other RxBF value(s) used, companies to report value(s) |
| UE Power Limitations |  | Maximum EIRP:  UE\_EIRP = 25 dBm  Maximum conduced power (prior to consideration of backoff):  UE\_P = 21 dBm    Optional:  - UE\_EIRP = 40dBm  - UE\_P = 21 dBm  Note: Companies to report if other cases evaluated |
| Pmax (dBm) |  | Maximum allowed conducted power considering combined limit per region (from Table 3).  Note:Companies should report if Pmax is considered per region or a combined limit is considered across multiple regions |
| Backoff (dB) |  | Power backoff is equal to the cubic metric, CM  Note: If cubic metric is not used, information on the backoff metric used should be provided. |
| Transmit power, P\_TX (dBm) |  | Maximum allowed transmit power including UE power limitation and backoff  P\_TX = min(Pmax, UE\_EIRP – TxBF, UE\_P – Backoff) |
| Noise power, P\_N (dBm) |  | BS Noise Figure, NF = 7 dB  Noise PSD = -174 dBm/Hz  P\_N = Noise PSD + 10\*log10(BW \* 1e6) + NF  Note: BW is the PUCCH bandwidth per hop in MHz |
| Maximum Isotropic Loss, MIL (dB) |  | MIL = P\_TX – P\_N – Required SNR + TxBF + RxBF |
| Definition of detection criteria for PF0/1/4:  (1) For PF0/1 (payload of 1 or 2 bits) the detection criterion assumes that the PUCCH payload consists of randomly drawn HARQ ACK/NACK bits and the criterion is defined as the SNR for which P(ACK to Error) ≤ 1% AND P(NACK to ACK) ≤ 0.1%. Error is defined as NACK or DTX where the decision region for DTX is determined to ensure that the maximum P(DTX to ACK) ≤ 1% for the case when the input to the receiver is noise only.  (2) For PF4 (payload greater than 2 bits): the detection criterion is the UCI block error probability BLER ≤ 1% (as in TS38.104 Section 8.3.6) | | |

Table 3: Regulatory Power Limits by Region

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Region** | **Maximum Conducted Power, Pmax (dBm)** |
| US | Conducted power limit due to EIRP limit:  Pmax\_EIRP = 40 dBm - TxBF  Conducted power limit as a function of PUCCH BW per hop:  Pmax\_P = 27 dBm – max(0, 10\*log10(100 / BW))  Combined limit:  Pmax = min(Pmax\_P, Pmax\_EIRP) |
| Europe | Conducted power limit due to EIRP limit:  Pmax\_EIRP = 40 dBm – TxBF  Conducted power limit due to PSD limit (assumes N\_RB contiguous RBs with all REs allocated per PRB):  Pmax\_PSD = 23 dBm/MHz + max(0, 10\*log10(BW)) - TxBF  Combined limit:  Pmax = min(Pmax\_PSD, Pmax\_EIRP) |
| South Korea | Conducted power limit due to EIRP limit:  Pmax\_EIRP = 43 dBm – TxBF when an equipment is >=300m from an astronomical antenna  Pmax\_EIRP = 43 dBm – TxBF when an equipment is <300m from an astronomical antenna  Conducted power limit due to PSD limit (assumes N\_RB contiguous RBs with all REs allocated per PRB):  Pmax\_PSD = 13 dBm/MHz + max(0, 10\*log10(BW)) - TxBF  Combined limit:  Pmax = min(Pmax\_PSD, Pmax\_EIRP) |
| Other regions | … |
| Note: BW is the PUCCH bandwidth per hop in MHz | |

## 2.1 <1st Round Comments>

Please provide your company view on the above proposal on assumptions for for link level simulations and and link budget computation.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View/Position** |
| Qualcomm | Agree with the proposal |
| Intel | We are generally OK with the simulation assumptions. However, we recommend to capture in Table 3 also the current regulatory requirements of South Korea, which has a PSD restriction of 13 dBm/MHz and allow a maximum EIRP of 43 dBm if 300m or further from an astronomical antenna, or 27 dBm otherwise. Please note, that we have added the above restriction in Red in Table 3. |
| Apple | We agree with the proposal. We would like to add the following:   * Baseline frequency hopping should be intra-slot FH if simulated * Would be good to have 1 payload size value for PF4 e.g. 11 bits (RM) and 1 payload size for polar (e.g. 22 bits) |
| vivo | Table 1, frequency hopping is on. Need details on how the hopping is performed. E.g., what’s the assumption on the number of RB offset between two hops.  Table 2, only evaluate 1 or 2 OFDM symbols for PUCCH format 1? |
| Futurewei | We agree with the proposal |
| InterDigital | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Samsung | We’re fine with the propsal. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support the proposal. |
| CATT | We agree with the proposal |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We agree with the proposal. |
| Sony | We support the FL’s proposal. |
| Spreadtrum | We support the proposal. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Agree with the suggested simulation parameters. Also agree with the addition from Intel for the regions with more restricted PSD limitation 13dBm/MHz |
| Nokia/NSB | The proposed assumptions are ok for us. |
| LG Electronics | We are generally Ok with the proposal. As vivo pointed out, the number of OFDM symbols for PUCCH format 1 in Table 2 may need to modified. |
| Huawei | We are fine with the proposal. |

## 2.2 <1st Round Summary >

The following was agreed in the GTW session on 1/28:

Agreement:

Tables 1, 2, and 3 in R1-2101794 are agreed as a common set of assumptions for link level simulations and link budget calculations for evaluating enhancements to PUCCH formats 0/1/4 with the following modifications:

* For PUCCH payload values for PF4, add following values to the table as values that should be considered.
  + Low: 4 bits
  + Moderate: 11 bits
  + High: 22 bits

Note: Other parameters can be additionally considered in the evaluations

For completeness the agreed tables are copied here with the addition of the PF4 payload values in the above agreement:

Table 1: Simplified Evaluation Assumptions

| Assumptions | Value |
| --- | --- |
| Carrier Frequency [GHz] | 60 GHz |
| Subcarrier Spacing [kHz] | 120, 480, 960 kHz |
| Number of usable RBs per carrier | 256 for 120 kHz SCS (corresponds to ~400 MHz carrier)  256 for 480 kHz SCS (corresponds to ~1600 MHz carrier)  160 for 960 kHz SCS (corresponds to ~2000 MHz carrier)    Note: If other values used, companies to report values |
| PUCCH Frequency Hopping | On |
| PUCCH Frequency Domain Resource Mapping | N\_RB contiguous RBs per hop (with all REs allocated per PRB)  Note: If alternative RE allocation per PRB is used, companies to report details |
| Waveform | CP-OFDM for PF0/1  DFT-s-OFDM for PF4 |
| CP Type | Normal CP |
| Channel Model | TDL-A model as defined in of TR38.901 Section 7.7.2:  - Delay spread (DS) = {5ns, 10ns, 20ns}  - Optional: DS = 40ns |
| BS Antenna Configuration (Mg,Ng,M,N,P) | {1,1,1,1,2} |
| UE Antenna Configuration (Mg,Ng,M,N,P) | {1,1,1,1,1} |
| Mobility | 3 km/hr |
| PA Model | None |
| gNB TRP PN Model | Zero phase noise |
| UE PN Model | Zero phase noise |
| Pre-loaded Tx EVM | 0% |
| Additive Rx EVM | 0% |
| I-Q Imbalance | None |
| Frequency Offset | 0 ppm |
| Channel Estimation | Realistic channel estimation |

Table 2: Reporting metrics

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Parameter** | **Value** | **Notes** |
| PUCCH Format |  | PF0, PF1, PF4 |
| Subcarrier spacing, SCS [kHz] |  | SCS = {120, 480, 960} kHz |
| Frequency hopping details |  | Frequency offset between hops, |
| Number of RBs used per hop (N\_RB) |  | N\_RB contiguous RBs per hop |
| PUCCH bandwidth per hop, BW [MHz] |  | BW = N\_RB \* 12 \* SCS / 1e6 |
| Number of OFDM symbols used for PUCCH resource |  | 1 or 2 for PF0  {4 .. 14} for PF1/4 |
| Sequence construction details |  | Sequence type for PF0/1  Sequence type for DMRS of PF4 |
| OCC configuration details |  | Applicable for PF1, PF4 |
| Cyclic shift configuration details |  | For PF0/1  For DMRS of PF4 |
| Number of multiplexed users, e.g., by code division, if applicable |  | 1 user  Note: Companies to report if other cases if evaluated |
| PUCCH payload encoder type |  | Reed Muller or Polar for PF4 |
| PUCCH payload size(s) (bits) |  | For PF4, at least the following values should be considered:   * Low: 4 bits * Moderate: 11 bits * High: 22 bits   Maximum isotropic loss (see calculation below) to be reported for each PUCCH payload size |
| PUCCH encoding rate(s) |  | Applicable for PF4  If multiple payload sizes evaluated, encoding rates to be reported for each payload size |
| Required SNR (dB) |  | Required SNR needed to fulfil detection criterion, from link level simulations based on Table 1 (see Notes (1) and (2) at bottom of table for definition of detection criteria for PF 0/1/4). |
| Cubic Metric, CM (dB) |  | Reported value is the 95th percentile, i.e., the CM for which 95% of all sequences of the design fall below |
| UE Tx Beamforming gain (dBi) |  | TxBF = 6 dBi  Notes:   1. TxBF includes antenna element gain 2. If other TxBF value(s) used, companies to report value(s) |
| BS Rx Beamforming gain (dBi) |  | RxBF = 20 dBi  Notes:   1. RxBF includes antenna element gain 2. If other RxBF value(s) used, companies to report value(s) |
| UE Power Limitations |  | Maximum EIRP:  UE\_EIRP = 25 dBm  Maximum conduced power (prior to consideration of backoff):  UE\_P = 21 dBm    Optional:  - UE\_EIRP = 40dBm  - UE\_P = 21 dBm  Note: Companies to report if other cases evaluated |
| Pmax (dBm) |  | Maximum allowed conducted power considering combined limit per region (from Table 3).  Note:Companies should report if Pmax is considered per region or a combined limit is considered across multiple regions |
| Backoff (dB) |  | Power backoff is equal to the cubic metric, CM  Note: If cubic metric is not used, information on the backoff metric used should be provided. |
| Transmit power, P\_TX (dBm) |  | Maximum allowed transmit power including UE power limitation and backoff  P\_TX = min(Pmax, UE\_EIRP – TxBF, UE\_P – Backoff) |
| Noise power, P\_N (dBm) |  | BS Noise Figure, NF = 7 dB  Noise PSD = -174 dBm/Hz  P\_N = Noise PSD + 10\*log10(BW \* 1e6) + NF  Note: BW is the PUCCH bandwidth per hop in MHz |
| Maximum Isotropic Loss, MIL (dB) |  | MIL = P\_TX – P\_N – Required SNR + TxBF + RxBF |
| Definition of detection criteria for PF0/1/4:  (1) For PF0/1 (payload of 1 or 2 bits) the detection criterion assumes that the PUCCH payload consists of randomly drawn HARQ ACK/NACK bits and the criterion is defined as the SNR for which P(ACK to Error) ≤ 1% AND P(NACK to ACK) ≤ 0.1%. Error is defined as NACK or DTX where the decision region for DTX is determined to ensure that the maximum P(DTX to ACK) ≤ 1% for the case when the input to the receiver is noise only.  (2) For PF4 (payload greater than 2 bits): the detection criterion is the UCI block error probability BLER ≤ 1% (as in TS38.104 Section 8.3.6) | | |

Table 3: Regulatory Power Limits by Region

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Region** | **Maximum Conducted Power, Pmax (dBm)** |
| US | Conducted power limit due to EIRP limit:  Pmax\_EIRP = 40 dBm - TxBF  Conducted power limit as a function of PUCCH BW per hop:  Pmax\_P = 27 dBm – max(0, 10\*log10(100 / BW))  Combined limit:  Pmax = min(Pmax\_P, Pmax\_EIRP) |
| Europe | Conducted power limit due to EIRP limit:  Pmax\_EIRP = 40 dBm – TxBF  Conducted power limit due to PSD limit (assumes N\_RB contiguous RBs with all REs allocated per PRB):  Pmax\_PSD = 23 dBm/MHz + max(0, 10\*log10(BW)) - TxBF  Combined limit:  Pmax = min(Pmax\_PSD, Pmax\_EIRP) |
| South Korea | Conducted power limit due to EIRP limit:  Pmax\_EIRP = 43 dBm – TxBF when an equipment is >=300m from an astronomical antenna  Pmax\_EIRP = 43 dBm – TxBF when an equipment is <300m from an astronomical antenna  Conducted power limit due to PSD limit (assumes N\_RB contiguous RBs with all REs allocated per PRB):  Pmax\_PSD = 13 dBm/MHz + max(0, 10\*log10(BW)) - TxBF  Combined limit:  Pmax = min(Pmax\_PSD, Pmax\_EIRP) |
| Other regions | … |
| Note: BW is the PUCCH bandwidth per hop in MHz | |

# 3 Frequency Domain Resource Mapping

## 3.1 Contiguous vs. Interlaced Mapping

The following table provides a summary of company proposals on this topic.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Company Proposals** |
| vivo | Proposal 2: Support multi-sub-PRB based PUCCH format 0/1 for power boosting and coverage enhancement for NR operation from 52.6-71GHz.  Proposal 3: The RE and sequence mapping pattern of multi-sub-PRB based PUCCH needs further study.  **Proposal 4: For PUCCH format 4, multi-PRB or multi-sub-PRB based PUCCH need further evaluation as well as the RE and sequence mapping pattern.** |
| Qualcomm | **Proposal 1: NR should support configuring contiguous RB assignment for PUCCH format 0/1 in 60GHz unlicensed band.** |
| Nokia | ***Proposal 1:*** *Support contiguous multi-RB allocation for PUCCH formats 0, 1 and 4.* |
| Samsung | **Proposal 1: Enhanced PUCCH format 0/1/4 should be based on contiguous multi-PRB allocation.** |
| WILUS | * *Proposal 1: The interlaced design for PUCCH format 0/1/4 seems not necessary to apply to 60GHz unlicensed spectrum from the perspective of power boosting.* |
| NTT DOCOMO | ***Proposal 1****: At least the following aspects should be discussed to increase the number of RBs for PUCCH format 0/1/4.*   * *The number of allocated RBs* * *Resource allocation methods* * *Mapping to physical resources operation* |
| MediaTek | **Proposal 1: PRB and sub-PRB interlace are not supported for PUCCH format 0/1/4 in 60 GHz band.** |
| Spreadtrum | ***Proposal 1: Support contiguous multi-PRB allocation of PUCCH format 0 and format 1 to achieve higher transmit power when PSD limits apply.*** |
| OPPO | **Proposal 1: adopt interlace structure for PUCCH format 0, 1 and 4 with 120kHz subcarrier spacing.**  **Proposal 2: adopt sub-PRB allocation for PUCCH format 0, 1, 4 for 120kHz.** |

At least for 480/960 kHz SCS, many companies observe that a single PRB spans more than the 1 MHz measurement bandwidth defined in PSD regulations such that there is no possibility for power boosting by using PRB-based interlaced mapping. Seveeral companies also observe that for 480/960 kHz, sub-PRB interlacing is not beneficial either, since a sub-PRB unit (e.g., 2 REs) is equal to or exceeds the 1 MHz measurement bandwidth.

For 120 kHz SCS, some companies observe that sub-PRB interlacing can provide a power boosting gain; however, some other companies are concerned with the specification impact. For companies proposing sub-PRB interlacing, it is assumed that a subset of REs within each RB are allocated for PUCCH; however, the PRBs in which PUCCH is mapped are still contiguous.

Based on company contributions, it seems at least the following is agreeable.

**Proposal 2 Agree to the following**

For enhanced (multi-RB) PUCCH Formats 0/1/4 for 120/480/960 kHz SCS, support allocation of N\_RB contiguous RBs per hop

* FFS: Values of N\_RB for each SCS
* For 480/960 kHz SCS, all REs within each RB are mapped
  + Note: PRB and sub-PRB interlaced mapping is not considered further
* For 120 kHz SCS, further discuss the following two alternatives:
  + Alt-1: All REs within each RB are mapped
    - Note: PRB and sub-PRB interlaced mapping is not considered further
  + Alt-2: Subset of REs within each RB are mapped (sub-PRB interlaced mapping)

### 3.1.1 <1st Round Comments>

Please provide your company view on the above proposal

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View/Position** |
| Moderator | **Question**:  In Alt-2, sub-PRB allocation for PF0/1 will mean that cyclic shifts are no loner orthogonal within each PRB (as in Rel-15/16). What impact does this have on performance in a dispersive channel? |
| Qualcomm | Support the proposal. A unified design is preferred across different SCSs. Thus, we believe that contiguous RB and FULL RE be mapped can be adopted for 120/480/960KHz SCS, i.e., support Alt-1. Sub-PRB in Alt-2 complicates the design and the additional power boosting possible can be achieved by allocating more RBs for Alt-1. |
| OPPO | proposal 2 looks fine to us.. |
| Intel | We are Ok with proposal 2. As for 120 KHz SCS, our preference is Alt-1, and we share same concerns as the moderator regarding the penalties that Alt.2 would incur especially in a frequency dispersive channel. As for the FFS, we feel this is redundant with proposal 3, and it is not needed. |
| Apple | For 120 kHz, we support Alt-1 so that we have a general design across all SCSs and to reduce the specification load if Alt-2 is specified. |
| vivo | We suggest to remove “per hop” in the main bulle to avoid misinterpretation that continuous allocation of RBs only when frequency hopping is on.  Given proposal 1 in section 2 is to agree LLS assumptions for evaluations, we feel it’s premature to conclude only Alt-1 is supported for 120 kHz SCS for now.  Respond to Moderator’s question, the perforamnce impact of sub-PRB allocation for PF0/1 will be evaluated once we have the agreed LLS assumptions. |
| Futurewei | For 120 kHz we prefer Alt-1. We are OK with the first two bullets. |
| MediaTek | Support this proposal with Alt-1. |
| InterDigital | We think that Alt-2 complicates the design without clear benefits. So, we suggest to remove Alt-2 and focus only Alt-1. |
| Samsung | Agree with proposal 2, and we support Alt-1 for 120KHz SCS.  For 120KHz SC Alt-2, similar discussion for sub-PRB interlaced mapping happend in Rel-16 NR-U without support, and we fail to see the new motivation to discuss it again here. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support the 1st and 2nd bullet of proposal 2. For the 3rd bullet, we support Alt-1 since sub-PRB interlaced mapping is not considered for 480/960 kHz SCS. We agree with Qualcomm that a unified design is preferred across different SCSs. |
| CATT | We agree with the proposal with the support of Alt-1 for 120 kHz SCS |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We support the Moderator’s proposal. For 120kHz, we prefer alt1. |
| Sony | We support this proposal. |
| Spreadtrum | We support the first two bullets. For 120kHz, we prefer Alt 1. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support Alt-1. For Alt-2 , further study of the impact on orthogonality is needed. |
| Nokia/NSB | We support the proposal with Alt-1. We don’t see a need to consider sub-PRB interlacing further. |
| LG Electronics | We are fine with the Proposal 2 with Alt-1 for 120 kHz SCS. A unified design across the multiple subcarrier spacings is preferred. |
| Huawei | The proposal is fine to us but we are uncertain on the need for Alt. 2. |

### 3.1.2 <1st Round Summary>

The following was agreed in the GTW session on 1/28:

Agreement:

For enhanced (multi-RB) PUCCH Formats 0/1/4 for 120/480/960 kHz SCS, support allocation of N\_RB contiguous RBs

* FFS: Values of N\_RB for each SCS
* For 480/960 kHz SCS, all REs within each RB are mapped
  + Note: PRB and sub-PRB interlaced mapping is not considered further
* For 120 kHz SCS, further discuss the following two alternatives:
  + Alt-1: All REs within each RB are mapped
    - Note: PRB and sub-PRB interlaced mapping is not considered further
  + Alt-2: Subset of REs within each RB are mapped (sub-PRB interlaced mapping)

## 3.2 Number of RBs

The following table provides a summary of company proposals on this topic.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Company Proposals** |
| Intel | **Proposal 1: The transmission of PUCCH format 0 and 1 spans across a number of contiguous PRBs, which is configured by higher layer signaling.**  **Proposal 3: The transmission of PUCCH format 4 spans across a number of contiguous PRBs, which is configured by higher layer signaling** |
| Ericsson | **Proposal 1** RAN1 should discuss and decide the number of RBs to support for Rel-17 PUCCH enhancements for each of the supported subcarrier spacings separately. The number of RBs should depend on regulatory power limits, practical UE power limitations, and practical Tx beamforming gains. |
| Futurewei | [**Proposal 1** **To** **increase the spectrum utilization, especially**](#_Toc53775918) **for high-power equipment, multiple RBs should be used for PF0/1/4. Longer sequence or repetition in frequency-domain should be considered.**  [Proposal 2 Evaluate](#_Toc53775918) the coverage gain for PF0 by allowing multiple RBs and calculate to determine if the intended coverage range can be maintained. |
| Lenovo, MoM | ***Proposal 1: For NR operation between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz, increased RB allocation for PUCCH formats 0/1/4 should be supported*** |
| Qualcomm | **Proposal 3: NR should support PUCCH format 0/1 with different bandwidth for different UEs simultaneously.** |
| Huawei | ***Proposal 1: For operation in shared spectrum from 52.6GHz to 71GHz, Rel-15 PUCCH formats 0/1/4 can be used for 120 kHz and can be extended to 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS.***  ***Proposal 2: For enhanced PUCCH formats 0/1/4 in the shared spectrum from 52.6GHz to 71GHz，the maximum transmission bandwidth is 50 MHz.*** |
| LGE | **Proposal #1: The minimum required number of RBs to increase transmit power for PUCCH format 0/1/4 can be predefined (based on the regulatory requirements) or configured/indicated by gNB for each subcarrier spacing.** |
| Nokia | ***Proposal 1:*** *Support contiguous multi-RB allocation for PUCCH formats 0, 1 and 4.*  The number of RBs that are needed for the enhanced PUCCH depend on a number of factors:   * PSD limit applied on the region. * Subcarrier spacing. When PSD limit constrains the transmitted EIRP, there can be up to 9 dB EIRP difference between 120 kHz and 960 kHz SCSs. * Targeted EIRP. This depends e.g. on expected pathloss, UCI payload size (with PUCCH format 4), and UE power class (in case of dedicated resources). |
| Samsung | **Proposal 4: Support multi-PRB PUCCH format 4 by reusing PUCCH format 3 with minor modification:**   * **Pre-DFT OCC across contiguous multiple PRBs for UCI** * **FFS using single long sequence over multiple PRBs or single-PRB sequence repetition over multiple PRBs for DMRS, depending on whether support multiplexing between UEs with non-aligned PRBs.** * **Do not support PRB scaling according to UCI payload and configured coding rate.** |
| CATT | **Proposal 1** The PSD limit and the supported EIPR value should be discussed in details before deciding the number of required RBs for different SCS for PUCCH format0/1. |
| Apple | ***Proposal 1:*** *At least for PUCCH FM0, FM1 and FM4, N consecutive RBs are allocated for PUCCH.*   * *N should be based on the SCS, waveform restrictions for each format and the UE power class.* * *N can be configured by the gNB* |
| NTT DOCOMO | ***Proposal 2****: Enhancements for PUCCH format 4 may not be necessary and enhancements for PUCCH format 0/1 can be prioritized depending on the enhancement workload.* |

Many companies have observed that regional regulatory limitations and practical UE limitations on conduced power, PSD, and EIRP shall be considered when determining the number of PRBs supported for PUCCH Formats 0/1/4. The number of supported PRBs depends on the subcarrier spacing due to the fact that some regulatory limitations depend on the the PUCCH bandwidth. It also depends on the assumed UE Tx beamforming gain, since the conducted power plus Tx beamforming gain determine now many RBs are needed to reach the various EIRP limits.

The open issue to discuss is the minimum and maximum number of RBs supported for each SCS (120, 480, 960 kHz) and the degreed of configurability within the [min,max] range considering the regulatory and practical UE limitations as well as the detection performance for a given PUCCH design. The detection error performance is one of the inputs to link budget calculations, and in Section 2 of this summary, a common set of evaluation assumptions for link simulation and link budget computations is proposed.

Another open issue do discuss is raised in [17], and that is with respect to PUCCH Format 4. For PF4, the issue is whether or not the # of PRBs used for a PF4 PUCCH transmission should depend on the actual PUCCH payload (like for PF3 in Rel-15) in which case the number of PRBs could be less than the RRC configured value. The alternative would be that the number of PRBs for a PF4 transmission is fixed (like for interlaced PF3 in Rel-16 where it is fixed to 10 PRBs).

**Proposal 3 The following is proposed for discussion**

Further discuss at least the following aspects regarding the number of PRBs for enhanced (multi-RB) PF 0/1/4:

* Minimum and maximum [min/max] configured number of PRBs for each PUCCH format for each SCS 120, 480, and 960 kHz
  + For PF4, it is assumed that the number of RBs fulfils where is a set of non-negative integers
* Granularity of configuration, i.e., supported number of values within [min/max] range
* Whether or not actual number of PRBs for a PF4 transmission depends on the PUCCH payload, or if it is fixed at the RRC configured value

Note: The discussion should take into account link budgets for various practical UE and regional regulatory power limitations including detection performance for considered PUCCH design candidates and UE Tx beamforming gain.

### 3.2.1 <1st Round Comments>

Please provide your company view on the above discussion points. Realistically, it will not be possible to nail down precise values in this meeting, since further evauation using a common set of assumptions (as proposed in Section 2) is required.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View/Position** |
| Qualcomm | For PF0/1, gNB configure the number of RB based on EIRP and channel condition. The minimum RB should be 1 (legacy). To simplify design, possible to define a few values for gNB to choose from, such as 1, 2, 4, 8, 12, …  For PF4, can borrow PF3 design with a variable # of RBs, with a minimum value configured |
| OPPO | Since the enhancement is motivated by PSD limitation, we think the PUCCH bandwidth achieving max EIRP should be the baseline, e.g. 32 PRB for 120kHz, 8 PRB for 480kHz, and 4 PRB for 960kHz. |
| Intel | We are generally OK with the proposal. However the text could be further improved as follows:  Further discuss at least the following aspects regarding the number of PRBs for enhanced (multi-RB) PF 0/1/4:   * Minimum and maximum [min/max] configured number of PRBs for each PUCCH format and for each supported SCS ~~[20, 480, and 960] kHz~~   + ~~F~~or PF4, it is assumed that the number of RBs fulfils where is a set of non-negative integers * Granularity of configuration, i.e., supported number of values within [min/max] range * Whether or not actual number of PRBs for a PF4 transmission depends on the PUCCH payload, or if it is fixed at the RRC configured value   Note: The discussion should take into account link budgets for various practical UE and regional regulatory power limitations including detection performance for considered PUCCH design candidates and UE Tx beamforming gain.  The changes made above are motifated by the fact that it is not needed to list all SCS, but it could be sufficient to indicate that we would need to identify the maximum ad minimum number of PRBs for each of the supported SCS, since the downselection is still ongoing in other agenda items. |
| Apple | * This may be a typo: it is assumed that the number of RBs fulfils where is a set of non-negative integers. Assume that we need this restriction due to the DFT-S-OFDM restrictions. * As observed, N will depend on multiple outside factors/parameters. RAN1 should agree on some values for the parameters/factors to be able to dimension the range of N needed and the associated granularity. The minimum will depend not only on the regulatory limits but on the UE power class and as such, could be 1 if the right conditions arise. * The actual number of PRBs for a PF4 transmission is fixed at the RRC configured value. If we go with a UE autonomous value, this may increase the specification effort to make sure that both gNB and UE have a common understanding and to make sure that the maximum transmit power is used. |
| vivo | In principle, we are okay with this proposal.  However, like to understand the intention of the sub-bullet of the 1st bullet, “For PF4, it is assumed that the number of RBs fulfils N\_RB=2^(α\_2 )∙2^(α\_3 )∙2^(α\_5 ) where α\_2,α\_3,α\_5 is a set of non-negative integers“. |
| Futurewei | We would prefer that the PUCCH bandwidth that achieves maximum allowed power (EIRP) to be the baseline. The minimum may be the 1. The granularity can be further discussed. |
| InterDigital | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Samsung | We are generally OK with the proposal. We also agree with Apple the typo should be corrected. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We are OK for the moderator’s proposal. However, we think that the enhancements for PUCCH format 4 can be deprioritized while the differences between PUCCH format 3 and format 4 are the number of available RB(s) and CDM capacity, so the increased number of RBs for PUCCH format 4 would be the multi-user version of PUCCH format 3. |
| CATT | We are OK with the proposal. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We agree with the proposal. |
| Sony | Support the FL’s proposal that above points need further study. |
| Spreadtrum | We support the proposal. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Fine with the proposal. For the required max/min number of RBs, the configured SCS and the PSD for a certain region should be taken into the account for all formats 0/1/4. |
| Nokia/NSB | Regarding the range of the supported number of PRBs, we see that the minimum should be 1 PRB for all SCSs and PUCCH formats. In Europe, 24.6 dBm EIRP is reached already with 1 PRB and 120 kHz SCS, which is a reasonable value in several scenarios.  On the maximum number of PRBs, we see that up to 16 PRBs may need to be supported for 120 kHz SCS. This allows for 20.6 dBm conducted Tx power in US and up to 36.6 dBm EIRP in Europe. This can be considered sufficient even for fixed wireless access UEs capable of high EIRP.  There is no need to support such large number of PRBs for higher SCS values. The maximum number of PRBs supported with 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS can be scaled down numbers of 120 kHz SCS, that is, 4 PRBs and 2 PRBs for 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS, respectively.  The granularity of configuration values can be based on 3 dB increments in the allowed EIRP / conducted power, that is, {1, 2, 4, 8, 16} PRBs for 120 kHz SCS. Scaled down configuration values can be used with 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS (with minimum of 1 PRB).  We see that the actual number of PRBs for PUCCH Format 4 can be fixed at the RRC configured value. |
| LG Electronics | We are generally fine with the proposal except for where is a set of non-negative integers. We think that the minimum required number of RBs to increase transmit power for PUCCH format 0/1/4 can be predefined (based on the regulatory requirements) or configured/indicated by gNB for each subcarrier spacing. |
| Huawei | We are fine with the proposal. The note may not be needed though. |

### 3.2.2 <Summary of 1st Round Comments>

Proposal 3 generally acceptable. Several companies commented that the minimum number of RBs should be 1 and that the maximum should take into a account regional regulatory and UE power limitations. These limitations have now been agreed as part of the the link level evaluation assumptions, and it is expected that decisions on the number of RBs will be based on those agreed evaluation assumptions. Several companies pointed out an error in the formula used for the number of RBs for PF4. This is now fixed, and reflects values that ease DFT implementations (PF3 uses the same restrictions in Rel-15/16). One company suggested to deprioritize PF4; however, it is hard to do that at this stage given that PF4 enhancement is included in the WID objective. An update to Proposal 3 is as follows:

**Proposal 3b Agree to the following update of Propsal 3**

* The configured number of RBs for enhanced PF 0/1/4 is denoted NRB
  + The minimum value of NRB is 1 for PF 0/1/4 for all subcarrier spacings
  + The maximum value of NRB depends on subcarrier spacing
    - FFS: maximum value for each SCS and each of PF0/1/4
  + FFS: Allowed values of NRB within the [min/max] range
  + For PF4:
    - The actual number of RBs used for a PUCCH transmission is equal to NRB, i.e., the actual number of RBs does not vary dynamically based on PUCCH payload
    - NRB fulfils the following: where is a set of non-negative integers
* Note: if frequency hopping is enabled, NRB is the number of RBs per hop
* Note: decisions on the maximum value of NRB for each SCS and PUCCH format shall take into account link budgets based at least on the agreed evaluation assumptions

### 3.2.3 <2nd Round Comments>

Please provide your company view on Proposal 3b.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View/Position** |
| CATT | We are OK in principle. Since PF 0/1/4 has the minimum value of NRB equaling 1, the enhancement of PF0/1/4 should have the minimum value of NRB greater than 1. We prefer to have the enhancement of PF0/1/4 with different name, e.g., PF0a/1a/4a |
| LG Electronics | Support the Proposal 3b. Moreover, the minimum and/or maximum value of NRB for PUCCH format 0/1/4 can be configured by the gNB (e.g., via cell-common and/or UE-dedicated RRC signaling) or can be controlled by the dedicated configuration for each PUCCH format/resource. |
| Samsung | We’re generally ok with the proposal.  For the maximum value of NRB, we understand the proper number would be different for different SCS, but the configuration/signalling may not need to be SCS-specific. |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Apple | We are fine with the proposal |
| Nokia, NSB | We support the proposal. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine with FL’s proposal. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are fine with the proposal. |
| OPPO | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Huawei | We are fine with the proposal. |
| vivo | We agree with the proposal. |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal. However, for PF4 we prefer to keep the first bullet as FFS, and discuss in a second instance on whether the number of RBs should be varied more dynamically based on the PUCCH payload or not:   * + For PF4:     - FFS: whether ~~Tt~~he actual number of RBs used for a PUCCH transmission is equal to NRB, i.e., the actual number of RBs does not vary dynamically based on PUCCH payload     - NRB fulfils the following: where is a set of non-negative integers |
| NTT DOCOMO | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Sony | We are okay with the proposal. |
| WILUS | We are fine with the proposal. |

### 3.2.3 <Summary of 2nd Round Comments>

Proposal 3b seems generally acceptable, but several companies have suggested minor adjustments. Please see updated Proposal 3c addressing these comments as well as the moderator feedback in the below table.

**Proposal 3c Update of Propsal 3b**

* The configured number of RBs for enhanced PF 0/1/4 is denoted NRB
  + The minimum value of NRB is 1 for PF 0/1/4 for all subcarrier spacings
  + The maximum value of NRB depends on subcarrier spacing
    - FFS: maximum value for each SCS and each of PF0/1/4
  + FFS: Allowed values of NRB within the [min/max] range
  + FFS: Details of indication of NRB by cell-specific and dedicated signaling
  + For PF4:
    - [FFS: whether or not] The actual number of RBs used for a PUCCH transmission is equal to NRB, i.e., the actual number of RBs does not vary dynamically based on PUCCH payload
    - NRB fulfils the following: where is a set of non-negative integers
* Note: if frequency hopping is enabled, NRB is the number of RBs per hop
* Note: decisions on the maximum value of NRB for each SCS and PUCCH format shall take into account link budgets based at least on the agreed evaluation assumptions

**Proposal 3d Update of Propsal 3c**

* The configured number of RBs for enhanced PF 0/1/4 is denoted NRB
  + The minimum value of NRB is 1 for PF 0/1/4 for all subcarrier spacings
  + The maximum value of NRB depends on subcarrier spacing
    - FFS: maximum value for each SCS and each of PF0/1/4
  + FFS: Allowed values of NRB within the [min/max] range
  + FFS: Details of indication of NRB by cell-specific and dedicated signaling
  + FFS: Whether or not multiplexing of users with misaligned RB allocations is supported, where "misaligned" also includes users with different # of RBs.
  + For PF4:
    - [FFS: whether or not] The actual number of RBs used for a PUCCH transmission is equal to NRB, i.e., the actual number of RBs does not vary dynamically based on PUCCH payload
    - NRB fulfils the following: where is a set of non-negative integers
* Note: if frequency hopping is enabled, NRB is the number of RBs per hop
* Note: decisions on the maximum value of NRB for each SCS and PUCCH format shall take into account link budgets based at least on the agreed evaluation assumptions

**Proposal 3e Agree to the following cleaned-up version of Propsal 3d after resolving highlighted text**

* The configured number of RBs for enhanced PF 0/1/4 is denoted NRB
  + The minimum value of NRB is 1 for PF 0/1/4 for all subcarrier spacings
  + The maximum value of NRB depends on subcarrier spacing
    - FFS: maximum value for each SCS and each of PF0/1/4
  + FFS: Allowed values of NRB within the [min/max] range
  + FFS: Details of indication of NRB by cell-specific and dedicated signaling
  + FFS: Whether or not multiplexing of users with misaligned RB allocations is supported, where "misaligned" also includes users with different # of RBs.
  + For PF4:
    - [FFS: whether or not] The actual number of RBs used for a PUCCH transmission is equal to NRB, i.e., the actual number of RBs does not vary dynamically based on PUCCH payload
    - NRB fulfils the following: where is a set of non-negative integers
* Note: if frequency hopping is enabled, NRB is the number of RBs per hop
* Note: decisions on the maximum value of NRB for each SCS and PUCCH format shall take into account link budgets based at least on the agreed evaluation assumptions

### 3.2.4 <3rd Round Comments>

Please provide your company view on Proposal 3c.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View/Position** |
| Moderator | @CATT  Regarding the minimum number of RBs, CATT points out that PF0/1/4 already supports 1 RB, and suggests defining new PUCCH formats PF0/1/4 for N\_RB > 1. In the moderator's view, from a specification perspective, it would be highly undesirable to define 3 new PUCCH formats when the main difference between Rel-15/16 PF0/1/4 and enhanced PF0/1/4 for Rel-17 is the number of RBs. It would be preferable, from a specifications perspective, is that if there are any other differences between legacy and enhanced PF0/1/4 that the legacy spec can be used, but there can be a differentiation for the two cases: (1) N\_RB = 1, and (2) N\_RB > 1. With this in mind, I hope it is acceptable to leave the proposal on the minimum number of RBs as is.  @LG  Agreed, the inidication of N\_RB can be by cell-specific or by dedicated signalling. Regarding the former, we will revisit PUCCH resource set prior to RRC configuration once further progress is made on design of PF0/1 (see proposed conclusion in Section 6). For now, we can add an FFS on signalling details.  @Samsung  Agreed, even if there is a different defined maximum value for each SCS, the signalling of N\_RB can be common. Hopefully your concern is addressed by the addition of the FFS on signalling details.  @Intel  I have added square brackets around the FFS, since it seems the majority of companies providing comments on the issue, suggest that the actual number of PRBs should not vary based on the PUCCH payload. We can see what feedback there is from other companies. |
| Futurewei | We are OK with the proposal, and we prefer to remove the square brackets text. |
| Qualcomm | We are OK with the proposal |
| vivo | We are fine with this proposal. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine with Proposal #3c. |
| Samsung | Yes, our concern can be addressed by the FFS on signalling details.  We are ok with the proposal. |
| Intel | Thanks for addressing our concern. We would prefer to keep the text in square brackets, given that we fail to understand the technical reason why the actual number of PRBs should not need to be adjusted based on UCI payload size. We would like to remind that in NR-U, the mechanism defined in Rel.15 for PF2/3 was reused for the case when multiple interleaces are configured. |
| Moderator | @All  Please see Proposal 3d above, and continue to provide comments based on this updated proposal which includes an additional FFS. The rationale for adding this FFS is that the text   * + [Consideration of RB alignment/misalignment of PUCCH resources between multiplexed users]   is removed from Proposals 4c, 5c, and 6c (see discussion and moderator comment in Section 4.5).  Additionally, please indicate your preference for either removing the text " FFS: whether or not " or keeping the text (without square brackets). From the moderator's perspective, all but one company that has expressed a view so far would prefer a fixed (not dynamic) number of RBs for enhanced PF4, and if that is the prevailing view, the moderator suggests that we should remove the text. If dynamic # of RBs is needed, then PF3 can always be used, albeit without user multiplexing. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | For additional FFS, we don’t support multiplexing of users with misaligned RB allocations, but we are fine to reserve the FFS for the sake of progress.  Besides, we prefer to remove the text " FFS: whether or not ". We don’t see the necessity to vary the number of PRBs based on PUCCH payload for PF4.  As for the other bullets, we are fine with the proposal. |
| LG Electronics | We prefer to remove the text “FFS: whether or not” and the additional FFS. |
| Nokia, NSB | We are fine with the updated proposal 3d. We prefer that PF4 uses the configured number of RBs for the transmission and, hence, would prefer to remove the text “FFS: whether or not” from the proposal 3d. |
| Apple | * + FFS: Details of indication of NRB by cell-specific and dedicated signaling   Does this mean we are agreeing to both or is it “and/or” ? from the moderator’s comment to @ LG, the word “or” is used. |
| Sony | We are okay with the proposal. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are Ok with Proposal #3d. We are also fine with removing the text [FFS: whether or not] |
| Moderator | It seems like Proposal 3d is almost agreeable. The only open issues are (1) the text "[FFS: whether or not]" and (2) the "and" in the FFS on signalling details. We can discuss these remaining issues in the GTW.  Please see Proposal 3e which is a cleaned up version of 3d. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# 4 PUCCH Format 0/1 Sequence Type

The following table provides a summary of company proposals on this topic.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Company Proposals** |
| Intel | **Proposal 2: For PUCCH format 0 and 1, the sequence is generated by using a computer-generated sequence or Zadoff-Chu sequence of length equal to the number of subcarriers over which the PUCCH spans across.** |
| Ericsson | **Proposal 2** Reuse the Rel-15 rules to select base sequences for Rel-17 enhanced PUCCH format 0, 1 and 4 with multiple RBs, i.e., based on Low-PAPR sequence Type-1 defined in 38.211 Section 5.2.2. |
| vivo | **Proposal 3: The RE and sequence mapping pattern of multi-sub-PRB based PUCCH needs further study.** |
| Futurewei | [**Proposal 1** **To** **increase the spectrum utilization, especially**](#_Toc53775918) **for high-power equipment, multiple RBs should be used for PF0/1/4. Longer sequence or repetition in frequency-domain should be considered.**  [Proposal 3 For the PAPR concern, the](#_Toc53775918) length-12NRB sequence offers sufficiently low PAPR and is preferred over sequence repetition over a length-NRB sequence, given RB extension is allowed for PF 0 for NR-U 52.6 to 71GHz.  [Proposal 4 Consider](#_Toc53775918) evaluating the applicability of the new sequences designed under R17 coverage enhancement for NR-U 52.6 to 71GHz and further redesigns, given that the RB extension for PF0/1/4 is supported. |
| Lenovo, MoM | ***Proposal 2: For NR operation between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz, frequency domain repetition should be supported for mapping to multiple RBs for PUCCH format 0/1/4***  ***Proposal 3: For NR operation between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz, PUCCH format 0 with longer base sequence (more than length 12) should be supported for mapping to multiple RBs***  ***Proposal 4: For NR operation between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz, PUCCH format 0 transmitted with multiple number of (same) base sequences should be supported for mapping to multiple RBs***  ***Proposal 6: For NR operation between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz, PUCCH format 1 with longer orthogonal code (longer than the configured OFDM symbols for PUCCH) should be supported for mapping to multiple RBs***  ***Proposal 6: For NR operation between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz, PUCCH format 1 with longer orthogonal code (longer than the configured OFDM symbols for PUCCH) should be supported for mapping to multiple RBs*** |
| Qualcomm | **Proposal 2: NR should re-use the same base sequence generation procedure as in EPUCCH in NR-U FR1 for a PUCCH Format 0/1 in 60GHz unlicensed band if a PUCCH format 0/1 resource is configured with more than one RB.** |
| ZTE | **Proposal 1: Reuse the sequence based PUCCH format 0/1, further study on the sequence type and length based on CM/PAPR, detection performance and coverage analysis to select between CGS extended sequence and ZC sequence is needed.** |
| Huawei | ***Proposal 3: The Alternatives 1a/1b/2 identified for enhanced PUCCH format 0/1 in NR-U Rel-16 should be the starting point and be re-evaluated for the new SCS and different number of PRBs in the frequency band from 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz.*** |
| LGE | **Proposal #3: For multi-PRB based PUCCH format 0/1, consider the single long PUCCH sequence with contiguous mapping or PUCCH sequence by frequency domain repetition with an appropriate PAPR mitigation technique.** |
| Nokia | ***Proposal 3:*** *Contiguous multi-RB allocation is supported for PUCCH format 0 and format 1 by using type 1 low-PAPR sequences either of length or of length repeated for each RB with a RB dependent cyclic shift component.* |
| Samsung | **Proposal 2: Support contiguous multi-PRB PUCCH format 0/1 by reusing the design of NR-U PUCCH format 0/1, i.e. single-PRB sequence repetition and Cyclic Shift hopping among multiple PRBs.** |
| CATT | **Proposal 2** The method to reduce the PAPR can be discussed if repetitive sequences are supported. |
| Apple | ***Proposal 3:*** *RAN1 to specify sequences of length N* x *12 for PUCCH formats 0/1/4 with N PRBs and decide how the increased resources used for PUCCH transmission should be used.* |
| Interdigital | ***Proposal 2:*** *For new sequence design and frequency domain repetition, scenarios, potential approaches (e.g., reusing Rel-15/16 CGS/ZC/Gold/m-sequences generation with desired sequence lengths), performance metrics for evaluations and PAPR reduction techniques studied in NR coverage enhancement SI can be a starting point, if needed.*  ***Proposal 3:*** *Further study on possible solutions for enhancement of PUCCH formats 0/1/4 other than time domain repetition.* |
| WILUS | * *Proposal 2: For the case of sequence based PUCCH format 0/1, time/freq. domain repetition considering coherent bandwidth for the new numerologies 480kHz and 960kHz should be further investigated to compensate for PSD limitation per MHz in 60GHz unlicensed spectrum.* |
| MediaTek | **Proposal 2: Potential enhancements for PUCCH format 0/1/4 transmissions to achieve higher transmit power by repetition in frequency domain with PAPR mitigation schemes and longer sequence than length 12 for PUCCH format 0/1 can be considered.** |
| Speadtrum | ***Proposal 2: Rel-16 NR-U enhanced PUCCH format 0 and 1 could be the start point for the enhancement of multi-PRB allocation PUCCH format 0 and 1.*** |
| OPPO | **Proposal 3: adopt NRU-like phase cycling concept for PRB-based PUCCH allocation. FFS for sub-PRB based PUCCH allocation** |

Based on company contributions, two main alternatives are identified for enhanced (multi-RB) PF0/1. The first is based on extending the length of a Type-1 low-PAPR sequence to match the number of Res in multi-RB PF0/1. Type-1 low-PAPR sequence generation is described in 38.211 Section 5.2.2, which is used for PUCCH formats 0 and 1 in Rel-16. The other approach is to repeat a length-M Type-1 low-PAPR sequence in each of the PRBs (where M <= 12), and using an appropriate PAPR/CM mitigation approach as was specified for interlaced PF0/1 in Rel-16.

The following is proposed, which could be agreed independently from the proposal in Section 3.1 on frequency domain resource mapping.

**Proposal 4 Agree to the following**

For enhanced (multi-RB) PUCCH Formats 0/1 for 120/480/960 kHz SCS, support Type-1 low PAPR sequences. Further discuss the following alternatives for sequence construction:

* Alt-1: A single sequence of length equal to the total number of mapped Res of of the PUCCH resource is used. Cyclic shifts are defined in the same was as Rel-16 for the case that *useInterlacePUCCH-PUSCH* is not configured.
* Alt-2: A single sequence of length equal to the number of mapped Res per PRB of the PUCCH resource is used, and the sequence is repeated in each PRB. At least the following scheme is considered for PAPR/CM reduction:
  + Cycling of cyclic shifts across RBs in a similar way as for Rel-16 for PF0/1 for the case that *useInterlacePUCCH-PUSCH* is configured

## 4.1 <1st Round Comments>

Please provide your company view on the above proposal

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View/Position** |
| Qualcomm | Alt2 is preferred for for the reason of simplicity |
| OPPO | Alt-2 is preferred. |
| Intel | We are supportive of the current proposal, and our preference is for Alt-1 given that based on our evaluations this provides clear advantages in terms of PAPR and CM for all SCS. |
| Apple | We prefer Alt-1 |
| vivo | Support proposal 4 to FFS on Alt-1 and Alt-2. |
| Futurewei | Agree with vivo that further study is necessary to evaluate the PAPR and CM of solutions. |
| InterDigital | Agree with vivo and Futurewei that further study is needed. |
| Samsung | Agree with proposal 4. When comparing these 2 alternatives, both performance and potential standard effort should be considered.  Besides, similar to PUCCH format 4, whether or not the PRBs of enhanced (multi-RB) PF0/1 are aligned for users that are multiplexed also affects the sequence design selection in order to ensure orthogonality between multiplexed users. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Agree with vivo, Futurewei and InterDigital. |
| CATT | We are OK either Alt-1 or Alt-2 with the down selection criteria of BLER performance, coverage, and multiplexing capability |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Agree with Moderator’s proposal. Among the 2 options, we prefer alt2.  We are also fine to further evaluate the 2 options before downselection. |
| Sony | For minimum spec impact and UE complexity, at least Alt-2 should be supported. |
| Spreadtrum | We prefer Alt-2 to minimize standardization effort. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support both Alt-1 and Alt-2. PAPR mitigation techniques for Alt-2 can be studied further. |
| Nokia/NSB | We propose that both alternatives are considered further, as the preferred sequence construction depends also on the range of RBs that are supported for PUCCH Formats 0/1. |
| LG | Alt-2 is preferred. |
| Huawei | Agree that further study is needed. |
| WILUS | Agree with the proposal 4. It needs further study to down-select between Alt-1 and Alt-2. |

## 4.2 <Summary of 1st Round Comments>

Proposal 4 seems generally acceptable. While some companies have rdert o a preference for which alternative should be supported, other companies recommend that further study is required. Several companies have listed criteria that should be used to make a selection between the two alternatives including the the following aspects

* PAPR/CM as a function of N\_RB
* Required SNR to fulfil detection criterion
* Coverage (maximum isotropic loss (MIL))
* Consideration of RB alignment/misalignment of PUCCH resources between users
* Spec impact

Proposal 4 is updated to include a list of aspects to study, and that after study, down-selection to one of the alternatives should be done.

**Proposal 4b Agree to the following update to Proposal 4**

* For enhanced PF0/1, support Type-1 low PAPR sequences. Further study and then down-select to one to the following alternatives:
  + Alt-1: A single sequence of length equal to the total number of mapped REs of of the PUCCH resource is used. Cyclic shifts for PF0/1 are defined in the same way as Rel-16 for the case that *useInterlacePUCCH-PUSCH* is not configured.
  + Alt-2: A single sequence of length equal to the number of mapped REs per RB of the PUCCH resource is used, and the sequence is repeated in each RB. At least the following scheme is considered for PAPR/CM reduction:
    - Cycling of cyclic shifts across RBs in a similar way as for Rel-16 for PF0/1 for the case that *useInterlacePUCCH-PUSCH* is configured
* At least the following aspects should be considered in the study
  + Coverage (maximum isotropic loss (MIL)), including
    - Required SNR to fulfil PUCCH detection criterion
    - PAPR/CM as a function of N\_RB
  + Consideration of RB alignment/misalignment of PUCCH resources between multiplexed users
  + Specification impact

## 4.3 <2nd Round Comments>

Please provide your company view on Proposal 4b.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View/Position** |
| CATT | We are OK with the proposal to down select from two alternatives. |
| LG Electronics | We are fine with Proposal 4b and Alt-2 is preferred. However, it may need to clarify whether the reason for the expression “in a similar way” is because the number of repetitions can be different or not. |
| Samsung | We are ok with the proposal. |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with the proposal. Regarding the two alternatives, mechanisms similar to Alt-2 have been extensively and deeply studied in R16 NR-U, therefore, we prefer alt-2 in order to reduce specification effort. |
| Apple | We are fine with the proposal |
| Nokia, NSB | We are fine with the proposal |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are Ok with the Proposal. We prefer Alt.1 and fine with Alt.2 if supported by the majority. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are fine with the proposal. Among the 2 alternatives, alt2 is preferred due to the less spec effort. |
| OPPO | We are fine with the proposal and Alt-2 is preferred. |
| Huawei | We are fine with the proposal. Sequences according to Alt. 1 are already defined while we yet need to understand what is meant by “similar way” for Alt. 2. |
| vivo | We are OK to FFS Alt-1 and Alt-2 as commented in the 1st round.  However, we have concern on the wording “down-select to one” in the 1st bullet. With various aspects listed in the sub-bullets of the 2nd bullet, both Alt-1 and Alt-2 may have pros/cons for difference scenario/aspects. By agreeing “down-select to one” right now, it excludes the possibility of supporing both.  One more clarification question to “Consideration of RB alignment/misalignment of PUCCH resources between multiplexed users”. Is this referring to different number of RB allocation for PF0 and PF1 among UEs? Or what? |
| Intel | We are generally fine with the proposal, and prefer Alt.1, which based on our evaluations provides clear advantages in terms of PAPR and CM especially as N\_RBs becomes larger. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Sony | We are OK with the proposal for downselection and with the aspects introduced for consideration. We preferred Alt-2 due to minimum spec impact and UE complexity. |
| WILUS | We are ok with the proposal 4b and prefer Alt-2. |

## 4.4 <Summary of 2nd Round Comments>

Proposal 4b seems generally acceptable; however, two companies have comments on clarifications and one company has proposed that it should be considered to support both Alt-1 and Alt-2, i.e., not down-select. Please see updated Proposal 4c addressing these comments as well as the moderator feedback in the below table

.

**Proposal 4c Update to Proposal 4b**

* For enhanced PF0/1, support Type-1 low PAPR sequences. Further study [and then down-select to one of] the following alternatives:
  + Alt-1: A single sequence of length equal to the total number of mapped REs of of the PUCCH resource is used. Cyclic shifts for PF0/1 are defined in the same way as Rel-16 for the case that *useInterlacePUCCH-PUSCH* is not configured.
  + Alt-2: A single sequence of length equal to the number of mapped REs per RB of the PUCCH resource is used, and the sequence is repeated in each RB. At least the following scheme is considered for PAPR/CM reduction:
    - Cycling of cyclic shifts across RBs in a similar way as for Rel-16 for PF0/1 for the case that *useInterlacePUCCH-PUSCH* is configured
* At least the following aspects should be considered in the study
  + Coverage (maximum isotropic loss (MIL)), including
    - Required SNR to fulfil PUCCH detection criterion
    - PAPR/CM as a function of N\_RB
  + ~~[Consideration of RB alignment/misalignment of PUCCH resources between multiplexed users]~~
  + Specification impact

**Proposal 4d Agree to the following update to Proposal 4c after resolving the square brackets**

* For enhanced PF0/1, support Type-1 low PAPR sequences. Further study [and then down-select to one of] the following alternatives:
  + Alt-1: A single sequence of length equal to the total number of mapped REs of of the PUCCH resource is used. Cyclic shifts for PF0/1 are defined in the same way as Rel-16 for the case that *useInterlacePUCCH-PUSCH* is not configured.
  + Alt-2: A single sequence of length equal to the number of mapped REs per RB of the PUCCH resource is used, and the sequence is repeated in each RB. At least the following scheme is considered for PAPR/CM reduction:
    - Cycling of cyclic shifts across RBs in a similar way as for Rel-16 for PF0/1 for the case that *useInterlacePUCCH-PUSCH* is configured
* At least the following aspects should be considered in the study
  + Coverage (maximum isotropic loss (MIL)), including
    - Required SNR to fulfil PUCCH detection criterion
    - PAPR/CM as a function of N\_RB
  + Specification impact

## 4.5 <3rd Round Comments>

Please provide your company view on Proposal 4c, especially on the issue of whether or not RAN1 should down-select (see square brackets in red). Note: the moderator is not proposing that down-selection occurs in this meeting. Further study should occur first.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View/Position** |
| Moderator | @LG  For the sub-bullet of Alt-2, the reason I said "in a similar way" is because we have agreed not to support PRB-interlaced PUCCH. Also, sub-PRB interlacing is still on the table according to the agreement in Section 3.1.2. With that understanding, is it okay to leave it as is?  @vivo  It seems most companies would prefer to down-select. For now, I have added square brackets around the "down-select," and I invite further feedback from companies on whether or not supporting both alternatives should be considered. From the moderator's perspective, it seems undesirable from a specifications perspective to have two options, especially since it seems that both address the same kind of deployment. Such additional complexity should be be avoided in the network.  Regarding the clarification on RB alignment/misalignment. This issue was raised by Samsung in the 1st round comments. My understanding is that it is meant to cover the case of UEs configured with different number of RBs. For now I have added this in square brackets. We can further discuss if this needs to be considered. |
| Futurewei | We are OK with the proposal, and the first text in the square brackets (down-select). We are OK to discuss further the second square bracket. |
| Qualcomm | We are OK with the proposal and support to down-select one of the alts. |
| vivo | To clarify, we are not saying to support both Alt-1 and Alt-2. Rather, we think this down selection should be done after this FFS. The wording of “down-select to one” actually limit the possible outcome of down selection.  On [Consideration of RB alignment/misalignment of PUCCH resources between multiplexed users], given that we are relying on LLS to evaluate the performance, it’s not clear to us how this consideration can be reflected in LLS evaluation. Unless prove feasible, we suggest to remove it. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are ok with the proposal and agree with vivo on the part of down selection after the study. |
| Samsung | To respond to vivo: Our intention is to investigate whether the network supports multi-UE multiplexing with different number of PRBs. For example, there can be UE1 with 10 PRBs, and UE2 with 6 PRBs, and UE3 with 4 PRBs. If the multiplexing between these 3 UEs can be supported, then, 10 PRBs is sufficient. If not, then, it would require totally 20 PRBs. It have impact on scheduling flexibility/resource efficiency.  If companies agree that it would be beneficial to support such multiplexing, then, for LLS, we can evaluate detection performance for 2 cases, e.g. (a) 2 UEs with same number of PRBs. (b) 2 UEs with different number of PRBs.  Though we have not provided simulation results in this meeting, it is expected the performance of long sequence would be worse than short-sequence with repetition for this case, because the orthogognality is not maintained by long sequence with different sequence length. |
| vivo2 | Thanks for Samsung’s clarification. However, we still have concern on this sub-bullet of [Consideration of RB alignment/misalignment of PUCCH resources between multiplexed users].  In the agreed Table 2 for LLS evaluation, the number of multiplexed users is 1. If the intention is to evaluate multiple multiplexed UEs, we need more details/assumptions of the scenario. For example, do we assume the same maximum Tx power of those two UEs? We’re not sure if LLS evaluation is the way to study on this aspect of multiplexing.  To be consistent with the baseline assumption in the agreed Table 2, we suggest to remove [Consideration of RB alignment/misalignment of PUCCH resources between multiplexed users] and leave the invesitigation of multiplexing to any interested company. |
| Samsung2 | @FL, @vivo, maybe it would be better to firstly discuss whether we need to support the UE multiplexing with different PRBs before we discuss how/whether to evalue it by simulation.  As commented above, the benefit of supporting UE multiplexing with different PRBs is better resource efficiency/scheduling flexibility.  If companies agree to support it, next question is, do we need LLS evaluation, or just mathematical analysis to compare alt-1 and 2 performance in case of UE multiplexing with different PRBs? From our point of view, it is quite clear that the orthogonality can not maintained by long sequence with different sequence length, while short sequence can. Maybe no need of LLS evaluation to prove it. But if companies think the performance degradation by long sequence can be neglectable, it would be good to provide simualiton results. In that case, we need to discuss the simulation assumption. If time is not allowed in this meeting, details/assumptions for the simulation can be discussed in next meeting. |
| Intel | We are Ok with the proposal, and to keep the text within the first set of square brackets. As for the text within the second set of square brackets, we agree with Vivo’s argument, and to leave up to interested companies to provide further LLS evaluations to further study aspects related to multiplexing. |
| Moderator | The moderator agrees with the above comment from Samsung2, that the core issue is whether or not it is supported to multiplex users with different number of RBs, and this can be further discussed. I suggest that rather than force companies to simulate this given that we have already agreed on a baseline set of evaluation assumptions, we should remove the following text from Proposals 4c, 5c, and 6c   * + [Consideration of RB alignment/misalignment of PUCCH resources between multiplexed users]   So as to allow further discussion, I suggest to add the following FFS to Proposal 3c instead:  FFS: Whether or not multiplexing of users with misaligned RB allocations is supported, where "misaligned" also includes users with different # of RBs.  Please continue to comment on Proposal 4c above with the square bracketed text removed. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are generally fine with the proposal. As for the downselect issue, we understand the intention of vivo that the downselection should be based on the evaluation, although we prefer to select only of the alternatives, we are also OK to make the decision after futher evaluation and study. |
| LG Electronics | Support the multiplexing users with different numbers of RBs can be discussed further, but we prefer to remove the square bracketed text and the evaluation can only be carried out by the companies of interest. |
| Nokia, NSB | We are fine with the Proposal 4c with the second square bracketed text removed and addressed in Proposal 3c. We support down-selection to one of alternatives. |
| Apple | We are fine with the proposal and would prefer that we down-select to one of the alternatives. On the user multiplexing issue, given that we have not agreed to a way of evaluating this, an FFS would be appropriate as suggested in by the moderator. This does not stop interested companies from bringing results to show their preference or not. |
| Sony | We are fine with the proposal, and with the moving of the text in the second square bracket to Proposal 3d. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine with the suggested FFS by the moderator for UE multiplexing with misaligned RB allocation. |
| Moderator | It seems like Proposal 4c is almost agreeable. The only open issue is the square brackets. We can discuss further in the GTW.  Please see Proposal 4d which is a cleaned up version of 4c. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# 5 PUCCH Format 4

## 5.1 Sequence Type for DMRS

The following table provides a summary of company proposals on this topic.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Company Proposals** |
| Ericsson | **Proposal 2** Reuse the Rel-15 rules to select base sequences for Rel-17 enhanced PUCCH format 0, 1 and 4 with multiple RBs, i.e., based on Low-PAPR sequence Type-1 defined in 38.211 Section 5.2.2. |
| Futurewei | [**Proposal 1** **To** **increase the spectrum utilization, especially**](#_Toc53775918) **for high-power equipment, multiple RBs should be used for PF0/1/4. Longer sequence or repetition in frequency-domain should be considered.** |
| Lenovo, MoM | ***Proposal 2: For NR operation between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz, frequency domain repetition should be supported for mapping to multiple RBs for PUCCH format 0/1/4*** |
| Samsung | **Proposal 4: Support multi-PRB PUCCH format 4 by reusing PUCCH format 3 with minor modification:**   * **Pre-DFT OCC across contiguous multiple PRBs for UCI** * **FFS using single long sequence over multiple PRBs or single-PRB sequence repetition over multiple PRBs for DMRS, depending on whether support multiplexing between UEs with non-aligned PRBs.**   **Do not support PRB scaling according to UCI payload and configured coding rate.** |
| CATT | **Proposal 3** For format 4, the sequence in NR can be simply reused via removing the restriction on sequence length. |
| Apple | ***Proposal 3:*** *RAN1 to specify sequences of length N* x *12 for PUCCH formats 0/1/4 with N PRBs and decide how the increased resources used for PUCCH transmission should be used.* |
| Interdigital | ***Proposal 2:*** *For new sequence design and frequency domain repetition, scenarios, potential approaches (e.g., reusing Rel-15/16 CGS/ZC/Gold/m-sequences generation with desired sequence lengths), performance metrics for evaluations and PAPR reduction techniques studied in NR coverage enhancement SI can be a starting point, if needed.*  ***Proposal 3:*** *Further study on possible solutions for enhancement of PUCCH formats 0/1/4 other than time domain repetition.* |

Based on company contributions, two main alternatives are identified for enhanced (multi-RB) PF4. The first is based on extending the length of a Type-1 low-PAPR sequence for DMRS to match the number of Res in multi-RB PF4. Type-1 low-PAPR sequence generation is described in 38.211 Section 5.2.2. The other approach is to repeat a length-M Type-1 low-PAPR sequence in each of the PRBs (where M<=12) for DMRS, and using an appropriate PAPR/CM mitigation approach as was specified for interlaced PF0/1 in Rel-16.

An additional issue for discussion is raised in [17] regarding whether or not the PRBs of enhanced (multi-RB) PF4 are aligned for users that are multiplexed. This may affect the sequence design selection in order to ensure orthogonality between multiplexed users.

The following is proposed, which could be agreed independently from the proposal in Section 3.1 on frequency domain resource mapping.

**Proposal 5 Agree to the following**

For DMRS of enhanced (multi-RB) PUCCH Format 4 for 120/480/960 kHz SCS, support Type-1 low PAPR sequences. Further discuss the following alternatives for sequence construction:

* Alt-1: A single sequence of length equal to the total number of mapped Res of of the PUCCH resource is used. Cyclic shifts are defined in the same was as Rel-15/16 for PF4.
* Alt-2: A single sequence of length equal to the number of mapped Res per PRB of the PUCCH resource is used, and the sequence is repeated in each PRB. At least the following scheme is considered for PAPR/CM reduction:
  + Cycling of cyclic shifts across RBs in a similar way as for Rel-16 for PF0/1 for the case that *useInterlacePUCCH-PUSCH* is configured

Further discuss whether multiplexed Ues shall have aligned PRB allocations or are allowed to have non-aligned (partially overlapping) PRB allocations considering the above alternatives.

### 5.1.1 <1st Round Comments>

Please provide your company view on the above proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View/Position** |
| qualcomm | Alt-1 which is similar to DMRS sequence for other channels |
| OPPO | Alt-2 is preferred. |
| Intel | We are supportive of the current proposal. |
| Apple | We prefer Alt-1 |
| vivo | Support proposal 5. |
| Futurewei | We are supportive of the current proposal , including FFS for down-selection. |
| InterDigital | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Samsung | We support proposal 5. |
| CATT | Alt-1 |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Sony | For minimum spec impact and UE complexity, at least Alt-2 should be supported. |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are open for both options |
| Nokia/NSB | We support Alt-1, as it provides better commonality with PUCCH Format 3 than Alt-2. We don’t see particular need to support partially overlapping PRB allocations for PUCCH Format 4 as we see that FDM has a diminished importance at 52.6 GHz – 71 GHz range due to beamforming and shorter slots. |
| LG | We support Alt-2 |
| Huawei | We are fine with the proposal. |

### 5.1.2 <Summary of 1st Round Comments>

Proposal 5 seems generally agreeable. This proposal is updated to include a list of aspects to considered in the study, similar to the list in Proposal 4b. The proposal is also updated to say that after study, down-selection to one of the alternatives should be done.

**Proposal 5b Agree to the following update to Proposal 5**

* For DMRS of enhanced PF4, support Type-1 low PAPR sequences. Further study and then down-select to one of the following alternatives for sequence construction:
  + Alt-1: A single sequence of length equal to the total number of mapped Res of of the PUCCH resource is used. Cyclic shifts are defined in the same was as Rel-15/16 for PF4.
  + Alt-2: A single sequence of length equal to the number of mapped Res per PRB of the PUCCH resource is used, and the sequence is repeated in each PRB. At least the following scheme is considered for PAPR/CM reduction:
    - Cycling of cyclic shifts across RBs in a similar way as for Rel-16 for PF0/1 for the case that *useInterlacePUCCH-PUSCH* is configured
* At least the following aspects should be considered in the study
  + Coverage (maximum isotropic loss (MIL)), including
    - Required SNR to fulfil PUCCH detection criterion
    - PAPR/CM as a function of N\_RB
  + Consideration of RB alignment/misalignment of PUCCH resources between multiplexed users
  + Specification impact

### 5.1.3 <2nd Round Comments>

Please provide your company view on Proposal 5b.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View/Position** |
| CATT | We are OK with the proposal with the support of Alt-1 |
| LG Electronics | We are fine with Proposal 5b and Alt-1 is preferred. |
| Samsung | We are ok with the proposal. |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with the proposal and Alt-1 is preferred. |
| Apple | We are fine with the proposal |
| Nokia, NSB | We can accept the proposal |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine with the proposal. We prefer Alt.1 |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are fine with the proposal. Alt.1 is preferred. |
| OPPO | We are fine with the proposal and Alt-2 is preferred. |
| Huawei | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Vivo | As we commented towaed proposal 4b, we have concern on the wording “down-select to one” in the 1st bullet. With various aspects listed in the sub-bullets of the 2nd bullet, both Alt-1 and Alt-2 may have pros/cons for difference scenario/aspects. By agreeing “down-select to one” right now, it excludes the possibility of supporing both.  Same clarification question to “Consideration of RB alignment/misalignment of PUCCH resources between multiplexed users”. Is this referring to different number of RB allocation for PF4 among Ues? Or something else? |
| Intel | We are fine with the current proposal. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Sony | We are okay with the proposal and prefer Alt-2. |
| WILUS | We are fine with the proposal 5b. |

### 5.1.3 <Summary of 2nd Round Comments>

Proposal 5b seems generally acceptable; however, one company has proposed that it should be considered to support both Alt-1 and Alt-2, i.e., not down-select. Please see updated Proposal 5c addressing these comments as well as the moderator feedback in the below table.

**Proposal 5c Update to Proposal 5b**

* For DMRS of enhanced PF4, support Type-1 low PAPR sequences. Further study [and then down-select to one of] the following alternatives for sequence construction:
  + Alt-1: A single sequence of length equal to the total number of mapped Res of of the PUCCH resource is used. Cyclic shifts are defined in the same was as Rel-15/16 for PF4.
  + Alt-2: A single sequence of length equal to the number of mapped Res per PRB of the PUCCH resource is used, and the sequence is repeated in each PRB. At least the following scheme is considered for PAPR/CM reduction:
    - Cycling of cyclic shifts across RBs in a similar way as for Rel-16 for PF0/1 for the case that *useInterlacePUCCH-PUSCH* is configured
* At least the following aspects should be considered in the study
  + Coverage (maximum isotropic loss (MIL)), including
    - Required SNR to fulfil PUCCH detection criterion
    - PAPR/CM as a function of N\_RB
  + ~~[Consideration of RB alignment/misalignment of PUCCH resources between multiplexed users]~~
  + Specification impact

**Proposal 5d Agree to the following update to Proposal 5c after resolving the square brackets**

* For DMRS of enhanced PF4, support Type-1 low PAPR sequences. Further study [and then down-select to one of] the following alternatives for sequence construction:
  + Alt-1: A single sequence of length equal to the total number of mapped Res of of the PUCCH resource is used. Cyclic shifts are defined in the same was as Rel-15/16 for PF4.
  + Alt-2: A single sequence of length equal to the number of mapped Res per PRB of the PUCCH resource is used, and the sequence is repeated in each PRB. At least the following scheme is considered for PAPR/CM reduction:
    - Cycling of cyclic shifts across RBs in a similar way as for Rel-16 for PF0/1 for the case that *useInterlacePUCCH-PUSCH* is configured
* At least the following aspects should be considered in the study
  + Coverage (maximum isotropic loss (MIL)), including
    - Required SNR to fulfil PUCCH detection criterion
    - PAPR/CM as a function of N\_RB
  + Specification impact

### 5.1.4 <3rd Round Comments>

Please provide your company view on Proposal 5c, especially on the issue of whether or not RAN1 should down-select (see square brackets in red). Note: the moderator is not proposing that down-selection occurs in this meeting. Further study should occur first.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View/Position** |
| Moderator | @vivo  It seems most companies would prefer to down-select. For now, I have added square brackets around the “down-select,” and I invite further feedback from companies on whether or not supporting both alternatives should be considered. From the moderator’s perspective, it seems undesirable from a specifications perspective to have two options, especially since it seems that both address the same kind of deployment. Such additional complexity should be be avoided in the network.  Regarding the clarification on RB alignment/misalignment. This issue was raised by Samsung in the 1st round comments. My understanding is that it is meant to cover the case of Ues configured with different number of RBs. For now I have added this in square brackets. We can further discuss if this needs to be considered. |
| Futurewei | We are OK with the proposal and the text in the first brackets. OK to discuss the need to the second bracket. |
| Qualcomm | We support the proposal with down-select one of the Alts. We Prefer Alt1 |
| vivo | To clarify, we are not saying to support both Alt-1 and Alt-2. Rather, we think this down selection should be done after this FFS. The wording of “down-select to one” actually limit the possible outcome of down selection.  On [Consideration of RB alignment/misalignment of PUCCH resources between multiplexed users], given that we are relying on LLS to evaluate the performance, it’s not clear to us how this consideration can be reflected in LLS evaluation. Unless prove feasible, we suggest to remove it. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are ok with the proposal |
| Samsung | Regarding RB misalignment, please see the comment in section 4.5. |
| vivo2 | See our further comments in section 4.5 on the RB misalignment. |
| Intel | We are Ok with the proposal, and to keep the text within the first set of square brackets. As for the text within the second set of square bracket, we share same view as Vivo. |
| Moderator | Please continue to comment on Proposal 5c above with the following text removed:   * + [Consideration of RB alignment/misalignment of PUCCH resources between multiplexed users]   + The rationale for removing this text is described in Section 4.5. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are generally fine with the proposal. As for the downselect issue, we understand the intention of vivo that the downselection should be based on the evaluation, although we prefer to select only of the alternatives, we are also OK to make the decision after futher evaluation and study. |
| LG Electronics | Support the multiplexing users with different numbers of RBs can be discussed further, but we prefer to remove the square bracketed text and the evaluation can only be carried out by the companies of interest. |
| Nokia, NSB | We are fine with the Proposal 5 and we support down-selection to one of the alternatives. |
| Apple | Same position as 4c i.e. down-select and have the multiplexing issue as FFS. |
| Sony | We are fine with the proposal, and with the moving of the text in the second square bracket to Proposal 3d. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine with the proposal |
| Moderator | It seems like Proposal 5c is almost agreeable. The only open issue is the square brackets. We can discuss further in the GTW.  Please see Proposal 5d which is a cleaned up version of 5c. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## 5.2 DFT Precoding and OCC Mapping

The following table provides a summary of company proposals on this topic.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Company Proposals** |
| Intel | **Proposal 4: Enhance UE multiplexing for PUCCH format 4 by applying the pre-DFT block-wise OCC spread across the entire transmission bandwidth on UCI symbols.** |
| vivo | Proposal 5: The parameter related to block-wise spreading for PUCCH format 4 is dependent on the number of RBs and the number of REs in each RB. |
| Huawei | ***Proposal 4: The following two alternatives to enhance PUCCH format 4 can be considered in the frequency band from 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz***  ***Alt. 1: One DFT-precoder per PRB***  ***The following PAPR/CM reduction methods are considered:***   * ***PRB-specific modulation symbol interleaving*** * ***PRB-specific multiplication with a complex value*** * ***PRB-specific phase rotation*** * ***PRB-specific scrambling***   ***Alt. 2: One DFT-precoder for all PRBs***  ***No further PAPR/CM reduction is considered.*** |
| LGE | **Proposal #4: For multi-PRB based PUCCH format 4, it should discussed how the pre-DFT OCC with increased length (compared to Rel-15 PUCCH format 4) can be applied on multiple PRBs.** |
| Nokia | ***Proposal 4:*** *PUCCH format 4 applies the same intra-symbol block-wise spreading also when allocated with multiple contiguous RBs.* |
| Samsung | **Proposal 4: Support multi-PRB PUCCH format 4 by reusing PUCCH format 3 with minor modification:**   * **Pre-DFT OCC across contiguous multiple PRBs for UCI** * **FFS using single long sequence over multiple PRBs or single-PRB sequence repetition over multiple PRBs for DMRS, depending on whether support multiplexing between UEs with non-aligned PRBs.**   **Do not support PRB scaling according to UCI payload and configured coding rate.** |

PUCCH format 4 in Rel-15/16 uses pre-DFT blockwise spreading using OCCs to support user multiplexing. Several companies have discussed how this can be extended to enhanced (multi-RB) PF4. Some companies observe that the same approach as used for PF3 can be reused, whereas others suggest that changes are needed for the case of multiple RBs. One company also lists two alternatives for pre-DFT blockwise spreading, one based based on blockwise spreading over the entire PUCCH transmission bandwidth, and another based on per-PRB that requires a PAPR/CM reduction approach.

**Proposal 6 Agree to the following**

For UCI of enhanced (multi-RB) PUCCH Format 4 for 120/480/960 kHz SCS, support pre-DFT blockwise spreading based on OCCs. Further discuss the details, including the following:

* Supported OCC lengths, e.g., 2 and 4 as in Rel-15/16 PF4
* Whether or not the same approach as for Rel-16 interlaced PF3 is reused for multi-RB PF4
  + Note: blockwise spreading is performed across entire PUCCH transmission bandwidth
* If the same approach is not reused, what adaptations are needed

### 5.2.1 <1st Round Comments>

Please provide your company view on the above proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View/Position** |
| Moderator | It is the moderator's understanding that if N\_RB contiguous RBs are supported with all REs within each PRB mapped to PUCCH, then exactly the same pre-DFT approach as supported for Rel-16 interlaced PF3 can be reused for multi-RB PF4. The only adaptation that is needed is that the number of RBs N\_RB is configurable, and should fulfil where is a set of non-negative integers. |
| Qualcomm | Support. Reuse EPF3 design other than interlace |
| OPPO | We think the same approach as for Rel-16 interlaced PF3 should be reused for multi-RB PF4. |
| Intel | We are generally Ok with the proposal. However, we think that another factor that RAN1 should also take into account when enhancing the PUCCH format 4 is its multiplexing capacity, and whether any additional spreading factors compared to those currently supported (i.e., 2, and 4) are needed. Therefore, we propose to add an additional FFS (in red) as follows:   * Supported OCC lengths, e.g., 2 and 4 as in Rel-15/16 PF4   FFS on other OCC lengths |
| Apple | Supported OCC lengths, e.g., 2 and 4 as in Rel-15/16 PF4 |
| vivo | Support proposal 6. |
| Futurewei | Support the proposal. |
| MediaTek | Support reusing Rel-16 PF3 design. |
| InterDigital | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Samsung | We supprort the proposal. |
| CATT | Reuse PUCCH format 3 design |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We support moderator’s proposal, and resue PUCCH format 3 design except interlace structure. |
| Spreadtrum | We support the proposal. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Agree with Modulator’s proposal |
| Nokia/NSB | We share moderator’s understanding and propose that the same pre-DFT block-wise spreading as with Rel-16 interlaced PUCCH Format 3 is supported. We propose also to support the same OCC lengths as with the Rel-16 interlaced PUCCH Format 3 (2 and 4). |
| LG Electronics | Support moderator’s Proposal 6. |
| Huawei | We do not understand the last bullet, what is “same approach”?  The ”Note: blockwise spreading is performed across entire PUCCH transmission bandwidth“ should be removed. We would like to have this for further discussion. Using one DFT precoder per PRB allows reuse of much of the transmitter/receiver implementations for existing PF4. |

### 5.2.2 <Summary of 1st Round Comments>

For user multiplexing of UCI, most companies prefer to reuse the pre-DFT blockwise spreading approach used for Rel-16 for interlaced PF3, but without the interlace mapping. In other words, the block-wise spreading spans all allocated RBs. One company would still like to leave open the opportunity to study blockwise spreading *per PRB* followed by DFT *per PRB*. This approach requires adopting a PAPR/CM mitigation scheme, and several alternatives are listed in the company proposal. Since this is the first meeting of the WI, two alternatives can be left open for now; however, it would be preferable to down-select in the next meeting. One company proposes to study OCC lengths greater than 4. Based on the above, Proposal 6 is updated as follows:

**Proposal 6b Agree to the following update of Proposal 6**

* For UCI of enhanced PF4, support pre-DFT blockwise spreading using OCCs of length 2 and 4 as defined for Rel-16 PF4
* Further study the following and decide in RAN1#104-b:
  + Whether or not additional OCC lengths are supported
  + Down-select to one of the following alternatives for blockwise spreading
    - Alt-1: Blockwise spreading is performed across all allocated RBs
    - Alt-2: Blockwise spreading and DFT is performed per-RB followed by per-RB PAPR/CM reduction mechanism.
* At least the following aspects should be considered in the study
  + Coverage (maximum isotropic loss (MIL)), including
    - Required SNR to fulfil PUCCH detection criterion
    - PAPR/CM as a function of N\_RB
  + Consideration of RB alignment/misalignment of PUCCH resources between multiplexed users
  + Specification impact

### 5.2.3 <2nd Round Comments>

Please provide your company view on Proposal 6b.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View/Position** |
| CATT | We are OK with the proposal |
| LG Electronics | We are fine with Proposal 6b and Alt-1 is preferred. |
| Samsung | We are generally ok with the proposal.  Regarding extending OCC length, considering the number of REs within the coherence bandwidth of the channel is significantly decreased with large SCS, we’re wondering whether OCC length >4 can achieve required channel estimation performance. |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Apple | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Nokia, NSB | We are ok with the proposal |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are ok with the proposal, both alternatives are fine with us. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are fine with the proposal. |
| OPPO | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Huawei | We are fine with the proposal. |
| vivo | We are okay with proposal in general. However, we have the same clarification question to the sub-bullet “ Consideration of RB alignment/misalignment of PUCCH resources between multiplexed users”. It’s not clear to us what exactly need to be considered. If the intention is for evaluation assumption, prefer to spell out the details. |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We are fine with the proposal. |
| WILUS | We are fine with the proposal. |

### 5.2.4 <Summary of 2nd Round Comments>

Proposal 6b seems generally acceptable; however, one company has requested clarification on the bullet about RB alignment/misalignment. Please see updated Proposal 6c as well as the moderator feedback in the below table.

**Proposal 6c Update of Proposal 6b**

* For UCI of enhanced PF4, support pre-DFT blockwise spreading using OCCs of length 2 and 4 as defined for Rel-16 PF4
* Further study the following and decide in RAN1#104-b:
  + Whether or not additional OCC lengths are supported
  + Down-select to one of the following alternatives for blockwise spreading
    - Alt-1: Blockwise spreading is performed across all allocated RBs
    - Alt-2: Blockwise spreading and DFT is performed per-RB followed by per-RB PAPR/CM reduction mechanism.
* At least the following aspects should be considered in the study
  + Coverage (maximum isotropic loss (MIL)), including
    - Required SNR to fulfil PUCCH detection criterion
    - PAPR/CM as a function of N\_RB
  + ~~[Consideration of RB alignment/misalignment of PUCCH resources between multiplexed users]~~
  + Specification impact

**Proposal 6d Agree to the following update of Proposal 6c**

* For UCI of enhanced PF4, support pre-DFT blockwise spreading using OCCs of length 2 and 4 as defined for Rel-16 PF4
* Further study the following and decide in RAN1#104-b:
  + Whether or not additional OCC lengths are supported
  + Down-select to one of the following alternatives for blockwise spreading
    - Alt-1: Blockwise spreading is performed across all allocated RBs
    - Alt-2: Blockwise spreading and DFT is performed per-RB followed by per-RB PAPR/CM reduction mechanism.
* At least the following aspects should be considered in the study
  + Coverage (maximum isotropic loss (MIL)), including
    - Required SNR to fulfil PUCCH detection criterion
    - PAPR/CM as a function of N\_RB
  + Specification impact

### 5.2.5 <3rd Round Comments>

Please provide your company view on Proposal 6c.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View/Position** |
| Moderator | @vivo  Regarding the clarification on RB alignment/misalignment. This issue was raised by Samsung in the 1st round comments. My understanding is that it is meant to cover the case of UEs configured with different number of RBs. For now I have added this in square brackets. We can further discuss if this needs to be considered. |
| Futurewei | We are OK with the proposal and open to discuss the square bracket text. |
| Qualcomm | We are OK with the proposal |
| vivo | On [Consideration of RB alignment/misalignment of PUCCH resources between multiplexed users], given that we are relying on LLS to evaluate the performance, it’s not clear to us how this consideration can be reflected in LLS evaluation. Unless prove feasible, we suggest to remove this whole sub-bullet. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are ok with the proposal |
| Samsung | Regarding RB misalignment, Please see the comment in section 4.5. |
| vivo2 | See our further comments in section 4.5 on the RB misalignment. |
| Intel | We are OK with the proposal. As for the text in square bracket, given that all alternatives are based on comb structures, we are Ok to keep it. |
| Moderator | Please continue to comment on Proposal 6c above with the following text removed:   * + [Consideration of RB alignment/misalignment of PUCCH resources between multiplexed users]   The rationale for removing this text is described in Section 4.5. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are fine with the proposal. |
| LG Electronics | Support the multiplexing users with different numbers of RBs can be discussed further, but we prefer to remove the square bracketed text and the evaluation can only be carried out by the companies of interest. |
| Nokia, NSB | We are fine with the proposal |
| Apple | We are okay with the proposal but think we can use the FFS described in 4c. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are ok with the proposal |
| Moderator | It seems like Proposal 6c is agreeable  Please see Proposal 6d which is a cleaned up version of 6c. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# 6 PUCCH Resource Sets Prior to RRC Configuration

The following table provides a summary of company proposals on this topic.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Company Proposals** |
| Intel | **Proposal 5: Enhance PUCCH resource sets before dedicated PUCCH resource configuration to support sufficient resource partitioning via either additional starting symbols or orthogonal cover codes.** |
| Qualcomm | **Proposal 4: For initial access, gNB should support multiple bandwidths of PUCCH format 0/1, and UE indicates selecting of PUCCH bandwidth by using different PRACH resources provided by gNB.** |
| LGE | **Proposal #2: To address the potential shortage of PUCCH resources for the initial PUCCH resource set resulting from using multi-PRB to transmit PUCCH formats 0 and 1, consider the following alternatives:**   * **Alt. 1: Use only valid resources in the frequency domain** * **Alt. 2: Support additional starting symbol and OCC index** |
| Nokia | ***Proposal 2:*** *PUCCH resource sets provided by the pucch-ResourceCommon are enchanced to support several allocation options for the number of RBs.* |
| Samsung | **Proposal 3: Support contiguous multi-PRB PUCCH format 0/1 before RRC connection setup**   * **support different number of multiple PRBs for different scenarios.** * **support different number of multiple PRBs for different UEs.** |

Several companies have discussed enhancements to the PUCCH resource set used prior to RRC configuration, e.g., for HARQ-ACK of Msg 2/4. In Rel-15/16, the PUCCH resource set includes 16 PUCCH resources that are multiplexed in the frequency domain and code domain (through cyclic shifts). Some companies have observed that depending on the number of RBs allowed for PF0/1 for PUCCH used prior to RRC configuration, as well as the supported SCS(s) and sizes of the initial UL BWP, it may not be possible to support a sufficient number of disjoint allocations in the frequency domain to make up a set of 16 PUCCH resources.

Due to the dependencies on the number of RBs supported for PF0/1 and the supported SCS(s) and sizes of an initial UL BWP, it is hard to make progress in this area for now. Hence, it is recommended that this topic should be revisited at a later time once progress has been made on the number of RBs.

**Proposal 7 The following is recommended**

Revisit the design of the PUCCH resource set used prior to RRC configuration once more progress is made on the design of enhanced (multi-RB) PF0/1, e.g., # of supported RBs, as well as the supported SCS(s) and size(s) of an UL initial BWP.

## 6.1 <1st Round Comments>

While it is unlikely that progress will be made on this topic during this meeting, companies are still free to provide their view in the following if so desired. This can always help for future discussions.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View/Position** |
| Qualcomm | Support to revisit to take advantage of the higher power PUCCH for initial access |
| OPPO | Agree to revisit the design of the PUCCH resource set for UE in initial access procedure. |
| Intel | We are OK to postpone the discussion to the following meeting. However, we would like to point out that when PUCCH format 0 and 1 are enhanced so that they span across a number of PRBs larger than 1, for some numerologies (i.e., subcarrier spacing and bandwidth), and some of the NR PUCCH resources sets, the total number of PRBs used for the transmission of a PUCCH is so large that the PUCCH resource partitioning in frequency domain is no longer possible.  As an example, let’s consider the case when 960 kHz subcarrier spacing is used with a bandwidth of 400 MHz. In this case the total number of available PRBs would be approximately 32 PRBs. If a PUCCH format 1 is configured to be able to operate in Europe with the maximum transmit power, then the PUCCH should span over at least 5 PRBs. If frequency hopping is used, then 10 PRBs will be occupied by each resource set. For each of the resource set groups composed by more than 2 orthogonal resource sets the number of PRBs required would be greater than the one available: for instance, for the groups composed by {index4, index5, index6} and {index8, index9, index10} then a minimum of 36 PRBs would be needed, while for the group composed by {index12, index13, index14, index 15}, a minimum of 48 PRBs would be needed.  Therefore we think that RAN1 should indeed discuss how to enhance the PUCCH common resource sets (e.g., via either additional starting symbols or orthogonal cover codes) so that for each resource group at least the same number of orthogonal resources are supported. |
| Apple | We agree that the design should be revisited. |
| vivo | We prefer to study this only after evaluations to justify the need of such revistit of the design of the PUCCH resource set used prior to RRC configuration. |
| Futurewei | We are OK with the proposal to revisit at a later time. |
| InterDigital | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Samsung | We support revisit the design of the PUCCH resource set prior to RRC configuration. Besides, we’d like to also invite companies to show the views that whether and how to support different number of PRBs for different UEs in the same serving cell. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We are open to discuss the design of the PUCCH resource set for initial access later. |
| CATT | Multi-RB PUCCH format 0/1 will be new PUCCH format (e.g., PUCCH format 0A/1A) with new resource set configuration |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We agree with Moderator’s proposal. |
| Spreadtrum | We support to revisit the design of the PUCCH resource set used prior to RRC configuration. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine with the proposal of revisiting the design. |
| Nokia/NSB | We share the moderator’s view that more progress is needed on the number of supported RBs as well as on the UL initial BWP size(s) and SCS(s) before we can progress on the design of PUCCH resource sets prior to RRC configuration. |
| LG Electronics | We agree with Proposal 7 and the potential shortage of PUCCH resources for the initial PUCCH resource set resulting from using multi-PRB to transmit PUCCH formats 0 and 1 should be addressed. |
| Huawei | We are fine with the proposal. |

## 6.1 <Summary of 1st Round Comments>

There is general agreement that the issue of defining PUCCH resource sets prior to RRC configuration should be revisited later after more progress is made with the design of enhanced PF0/1.

**Proposal 7b Conclude on the following**

Revisit the design of the PUCCH resource set used prior to RRC configuration once more progress is made on the design of enhanced (multi-RB) PF0/1, e.g., # of supported RBs, as well as the supported SCS(s) and size(s) of an UL initial BWP.
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