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# 1 Introduction

TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH was included as one of the enhancements, for both FR1 and FR2 as well as TDD and FDD, to be specified in the NR coverage enhancement work item approved in RAN1#90-e [1]:

* *Specification of PUSCH enhancements [RAN1, RAN4]*
	+ *Specify mechanism(s) to support TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH [RAN1]*
		- *TBS determined based on multiple slots and transmitted over multiple slots.*

Section 2 summarizes the key aspects of TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH based on companies’ contributions submitted under AI 8.8.1.2 to RAN1#104-e [3]-[28].

All related proposals from different contributions, organized per aspect, are listed in Appendix A for reference.

# 2 Summary of Contributions on TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH

Contributions submitted under AI 8.8.1.2 discussed several aspects of TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH (referred to as TBoMS in this document, for simplicity). From FL’s perspective, laying down the bases for a constructive discussion is of utmost priority at this stage to ensure good progress is achieved. For this reason, a systematic categorization will be used in this document to summarize the content of all contributions. This is done according to both FL’s understanding and number of submitted proposals on the different aspects. The rationale of the categorization is given by the natural relationship of consequentiality which exists between different aspects. In the remainder of the document, aspects are thus categorized as follows:

* **Resource allocation aspects of TBoMS**
	+ TDRA
	+ FDRA
	+ TBS determination
* **Basic design aspects of TBoMS**
	+ Relationship between TBoMS and PUSCH repetitions
	+ DM-RS
	+ CB segmentation, Redundancy version, rate-matching and interleaving
	+ Link adaptation
* **Advanced design aspects of TBoMS**
	+ Frequency hopping
	+ Transmission power determination
	+ Rank of TBoMS transmission
	+ Channel estimation
	+ Retransmissions
* **Signaling and interaction with other signals/channels**
	+ Multi-slot/single-slot activation/switch
	+ UCI multiplexing, SRS/DL collisions/cancellations
	+ Service-like prioritization of TBoMS

The categorization above will be used to identify a priority order for the discussions to be held for AI 8.8.1.2. In this context, sections 2.1 to 2.3 will focus on aspects related to resource allocation for TBoMS. Priority will be given to these, during RAN1 #104-e. Summary of all other aspects will be provided in Section 2.4. Should discussions for 2.1 to 2.3 progress fast, new sections for specific aspects, currently in 2.4, will be added.

Before proceeding, it is also worth observing that simulation assumptions have also been discussed in one contribution [23]. Its content is summarized separately from all the above in Section 2.5. It is also treated with lower priority, given the existence of baseline evaluation assumptions agreed during Rel-17 SI [2].

## 2.1 TDRA

Five major sub-aspects of TDRA have been discussed by companies in the submitted contributions:

1. Time domain resource indication
2. Indication of number of slots
3. Constraints on how slots can be used for TBoMS
4. How to handle S slots
5. Definition of transmission occasion

Summary, discussion and proposals on these sub-aspects are provided in the following different sub-sections, whose numbers are given in the list above.

### 2.1.1 [CLOSED] Time domain resource indication

Most contributions acknowledged the fundamental nature of this aspect and discussed it in detail. Several options are considered in all contributions. A high-level summary of all options, including companies’ preferences based on the contributions, is as follows:

* **Option 1**. Repetition type A like or repetition type B like TDRA for TBoMS [11 companies]:
	+ Type A like:
		- Intel [8], CATT [6], Samsung [18], China Telecom [12], Ericsson (first preference) [23], Apple [20], OPPO [4], vivo [7], ZTE [3];
	+ Type B like:
		- Huawei [5], Nokia [28], CATT [6], Samsung [18], Ericsson (second preference) [23], vivo [7].
* **Option 2**. Indication via SLIV of a number of symbols L larger than 14 [4 companies]:
	+ - Panasonic [15], CMCC [16], Samsung (symbols can be grouped) [18], vivo [7].
* **Option 3**. Multiple SLIV for slot-by-slot resource allocation [3 companies]:
	+ - Panasonic [15], Fujitsu [11], vivo [7].
* **Option 4**. Different rules [3 companies]:
	+ Multiple number of slots for multi-slot PUSCH and length L (value ranging from 1-13 symbols) for the last slot [1 company]:
		- Lenovo [14];
	+ Multi-slot encoding with gaps [1 company]:
		- Sierra Wireless [19];
	+ Time-domain window configuration wherein all valid PUSCH symbols are used for TBoMS [1 company]:
		- Nokia/NSB [28];
	+ New PUSCH mapping type with L and S+L > 14; L valid symbols starting from the symbol with index S in the slot indicated by K2 are used for multi-slot TB transmission [1 company]:
		- Nokia/NSB [28].

A large majority of companies expressed preference for Option1, i.e., Repetition type A like or repetition type B like TDRA for multi-slot TB. The rationale of this option is its potential to reuse most if not all the existing signalling and indication framework. In this context, time domain resource indication would be supported by reinterpreting or adding possibly small modifications to Rel-16 PUSCH repetitions signalling structures.

Support for other approaches is non-negligible for Option 2 and Option 3, whose rationales are somehow aligned with the what is expressed for Option 1. Option 3, in particular, is described as an alternative which offers a larger flexibility which could be exploited by gNB to better adapt UL resource allocation to external factors/needs.

Option 4 includes all the approaches proposed by only 1 company. Different modifications to current specification would be needed to support them, however extents and degrees of such modifications may not be larger. From FL’s perspective, it may be premature to exclude them from the discussion at this stage.

#### 2.1.1.1 First round of discussions

Given the very early stage of the WI, FL’s recommendation is to have a first round of discussion among companies about the four options. The goal is to identify the preferred directions RAN1 should pursue for defining and specifying time domain resource indication for TBoMS. The number of considered options should be reduced. First FL’s proposals will be made at the end of the first round.

Companies are invited to express views on the Options provided above for defining and specifying time domain resource indication for TBoMS.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Intel | We prefer Option 1. Given the limited TU and specification impact, existing mechanism on PUSCH repetition type A or B should be considered as a starting point. We slightly prefer time domain resource allocation mechanism based on PUSCH repetition type A, but we can defer this to the next discussion.  |
| Sharp | We support Option 1. In our understanding, the motivations for this enhancement are exploiting more coding gain, reducing overhead (CRC or higher layer overhead) and PSD reduction. Therefore, TBS scaling for multi-slot PUSCH with reusing existing Rel-16 repetition type A or B should be supported. |
| Apple | We prefer Option 1, and mechanism of PUSCH repetition type A TDRA is applied.  |
| China Telecom | Support option 1. Other options need more standardization efforts. |
| Qualcomm | Prefer Option 1 with no changes to TDRA.We prefer to reuse the TDRA framework that is already in place for Type A repetitions. With TBS scaling handled by an independent scale factor parameter separate from number of repetitions, we see no need for any changes to TDRA. When coupled with RV cycling across repetitions, the gains of multi-slot TB processing are rather naturally realized.This is a lightweight approach that is equally applicable across contiguous or non-contiguous slot repetitions. Note that any scheme that we adopt must be applicable to TDD slots patterns that do not have two back-to-back U slots.Considerations of SLIV with L > 14 don’t seem well motivated and unnecessary from our point of view. The spec impact of this change could be rather large, and it may not be prudent to pursue this path given that better alternatives exist. This approach also clearly doesn’t help when we have TDD slot patterns that do not have two or more back-to-back U slots. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Our 1st preference is Option 2 and 2nd preference is Option 1.Option 1 is a reasonable choice, because the signalling mechanism can be reused as repetition, and the option seems to be for TBoMS with non-consecutive slots However, as the number of nominal repetitions in type A is smaller than that of actual repetitions, it is better to apply the enhancement of PUSCH repetition type As discussed in 8.8.1.1 even in TBoMS. Also, Option 1 should not include only repetition type A but repetition type B, because symbol-level repetition is flexible, e.g. considering special slot for TBoMSOption 2 is a good choice too, and the option seems to be for TBoMS with consecutive slots. This option makes it possible to assign TBoMS with large flexibility. We should consider whether or not to support more than one TDRA.  |
| ZTE | Support Option 1 with repetition type A like TDRA for TBoMS.For TBoMS, the issues listed in Section 2.1 and several issues in Section 2.3/2.4 could all use the corresponding mechanisms of PUSCH repetition type A as a starting point. For instance, we need to discuss the collision handling between TBoMS transmission and DL/flexible symbols/SFI, it would be a rather complicate topic and reusing the legacy mechanism is much preferred for moving forward. |
| WILUS | Support Option 1. Type-A PUSCH repetition and type-B PUSCH repetition can be reused to determine time domain resource allocations. If a new time domain indication rule (option 2/3/4) is necessary, clear motivations and gains should be justified.  |
| CATT | We support Option 1 for simplicity. We do not see large advantage from other options when compared to Option1. |
| IITH, IITM, CEWIT, Reliance Jio, Tejas Networks | Support Option-1 |
| NEC | Support option 1. |
| vivo | Option 1/2/3 can be further considered.Type-A like resource allocation is restricted by same starting symbols(S) and number of symbols(L) in a slot, which may limit the flexibility for resource allocation. Type-B like repetition is more efficient in resource utilization. For TDRA with L>14, it can be applied for TDD frame structure with slot format “…SU…”. Since type-B PUSCH repetition is an optional UE capability, UEs may not able to perform all behaviours for type-B like TDRA, such as segmentation within a slot, L>14 contiguous symbols seem easier to be implemented compared with resource allocation mechanism for type B repetition.For Multi-SLIV, it has been supported in Rel-16 NRU, and it is also applicable for license band. While the PUSCH occasions indicated by multiple SLIVs is restricted to be contiguous transmission in current specification. For TBoMS, this restricted can be removed to support non-contiguous transmissions. |
| Panasonic | For time domain resource allocation itself (i.e., the number of PUSCH transmissions and length of PUSCH transmissions), we agree that Option 1 could be straightforward way. Whether the indicated number of multiple slots is also applied to TBS determination should be further discussed as in Section 2.3. |
| OPPO | Option 1. PUSCH repetition type A TDRA should be the basis. We wonder how can Type B repetition would be the included as we did not agree that the Type B repetition itself will be enhanced.General comments on this issue is: the Type B repetition is a URLLC enhancement of UE feature group 11-5. We should to enhance type B at all for all the topic of CE which is looking as eMBB scenarios. |
| Sierra Wireless | Support Option-1.  |
| InterDigital | We support Option 1. We can use the existing mechanism as the starting point. |
| Ericsson | We lean toward option 1, but are open to further discussion at this stage. We favour option 1 since there seems to be strong commonality between multi-slot TBS and PUSCH repetition; PUSCH repetition is after all a way to transmit a TB in multiple slots. We can further downselect between Type A and Type B within option 1 in later discussions if/when option 1 is agreeable. |
| Nokia/NSB | We are fine with the majority view to support Option 1 given that this option may require less specification efforts than the other options. However, we would like to point out that the WID does not limit the enhancement for TBoMS as “enhancements for PUSCH repetition type A/type B”, otherwise this enhancement would have been deferred to AI 8.8.1.1. In addition, on the slots where the TBoMS is transmitted, we should allow the number of symbols in each slot to be different across slots. This helps to exploit the UL resource for the PUSCH and improves the coverage. In this regard, we prefer to reuse the time domain resource allocation for PUSCH repetition type B in Option 1. |
| CMCC | Option 1 and 2 are both fine to us.Type A like indication provide the slot number and symbols allocated per slot. And type B like indication provide similar information but without consideration specific slot allocation. The option 2 provides starting symbols and the symbol length in total, which is very similar with the Type B like indication.  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Our option is similar to type-A or type-B like indication where a repetition factor is indicated. However, to provide the flexibility to have the duration of last slot, we suggest indicating additional value of L. For PUSCH type A, it will allow supporting partial allocation in last slot as shown in Figure (from our contribution) |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | The definition of PUSCH repetition type B (or A) like TDRA should be clarified at first, such as whether it indicates to reuse the DMRS configuration and the RV determination mechanism of repetition type B (or A) or not. If repetition type B (or A) like TDRA has no meaning of DMRS and RV determination, we slight prefer Option2 where a continuous resources are allocated for one TB, which not only can better ensure the phase continuity in UE implementation for joint channel estimation, but also could avoid the possible empty symbols not used in repetition type A to make a full utilization of precious uplink resources (e.g. S slot can be used). |
| LG Electronics | We prefer repetition type A like TDRA in Option 1. In other word, the same symbol allocation is applied for multiple slots for a TB mapping. |

FL’s comments

A large majority of companies expressed preference for Option 1. Few companies expressed preference for Option 2 and only one company for Option 3. One company prefers Option 4.

It has been noted that Option 2 may offer a more straightforward way to exploit the “…SU…” slot allocation for TBoMS as compared to Type B PUSCH repetitions, given that support to the latter is an optional UE capability.

From FL’s perspective, the “…SU…” slot allocation for TBoMS may not be a corner-case, however it may not be the most likely situation in practice (given the presence of several other UL transmissions usually scheduled in the S slot);

For these reasons, FL would suggest focusing on Option 1 only. In this context, the fact that support to Type B PUSCH repetitions is an optional feature does not seem a big problem, given that Option 1 simply states that both type A and type B PUSCH repetitions will be considered in the subsequent discussion. It may also be worth observing that the goal of RAN1 in this AI should be the design on a new feature, hence it seems only normal to consider all available tools at an early stage of the design. Further down selection, refinement and restrictions may still occur if this the majority’s will.

Now, given the importance of this aspect for any other discussion we are having in the AI (as noted by many companies throughout this document), FL proposes the following:

***FL proposal 1. PUSCH repetition type A like and/or PUSCH repetition type B like TDRA are used as starting points to design time domain resource indication of TBoMS.***

Companies are invited to express views on ***FL proposal 1***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Intel | It is not clear to us whether we need to support both type A and type B like TDRA for TBoMS. Our view is to only use Type A for TDRA of TBoMS, which can simplify the design and TBS determination. PUSCH repetition type B like TDRA may not work well in case when TBoMS is transmitted in non-consecutive slots, especially for TDD system. To move forward, it seems that we can agree to reuse the existing type A or type B like TDRA for TBoMS for this meeting, and we can down-select one of the two options or even agree both in the next meeting. Based on the above, we suggest to update the proposal as follow:Consider one or two of the following options as starting points to design time domain resource indication of TBoMS* PUSCH repetition type A like TDRA
* PUSCH repetition type B like TDRA
 |
| Sharp | We are OK with either FL proposal or Intel’s proposal. We slightly prefer FL proposal since we think supporting type B is beneficial in some TDD deployments. With repetition type B, special slot resources can be utilized as well as resources in uplink slots. |
| Samsung | Both Option 1 and option 2 can be considered. |
| Ericsson | Option 1 is OK, but we should further discuss if repetition type B TDRA is also needed. |
| Qualcomm | We share similar views as Intel. Our preference is to focus on Type A TDRA, but we can discuss to down select in next meeting. |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | We are fine with the proposal. In the current standards, both type A and type B can be indicated to the UE for resource allocation. Both can be considered as the resource allocation method for the TB over multiple slots |
| WILUS | We are fine with Type A TDRA as starting points. However, although Type B TDRA is applicable to SU slots, its gain is not evaluated yet. We will decide whether to support Type B TDRA in next meeting. Also, it is not clear that “PUSCH repetition type A” in the proposal is intended to Rel-16 PUSCH repetition type A or Rel-17 enhanced PUSCH repetition A(i.e., counting available UL slots). At this stage, we have no clear Rel-17 enhanced type A, so it would be better to focus on Rel-16 type A first and then discuss whether to allow Rel-17 enhanced type A for TBoMS later.  |
| CATT | We support FL’s proposal. We also suggest adding FFS such as ‘Possible down-selection between repetition type A-like and type B-like TDRA’, or adopt Intel’s version. It is unclear whether more than one TDRA method is needed in this feature. |
| Panasonic | Current wording is not clear that “time domain resource indication” means for the determination of actual PUSCH allocation or for the determination of TBS calculation, although the wording seems to imply the actual PUSCH resource allocation. Our understanding is it is not yet concluded whether the time domain resource size for actual PUSCH allocation and TBS determination are same. In case the resource size used for TBS determination is smaller than the resource size for actual PUSCH transmission, the repetition would be used (It is related to FL recommendation 1). For actual PUSCH allocation perspective, we agree that FL Proposal 1 is reasonable. In order to clarify the above aspect, we would like to propose following update:* PUSCH repetition type A like and/or PUSCH repetition type B like TDRA are used as starting points to design time domain resource allocation indication of TBoMS.
	+ FFS whether the time domain resource used for TBS determination is same as the time domain resource allocation indication
 |
| Apple | It could be better to make the proposal clear that the down selection is performed in next meeting. |
| Fujitsu | We are fine with FL’s proposal. Repetition type B like TDRA is more flexible to utilize as many UL symbols as possible for coverage enhancement. |
| IITH, IITM, CEWIT, Reliance Jio, Tejas Networks | Fine with FL proposal with an FFS to see if down selection is needed or not.  |
| LG Electronics | In general, we are with option 1 for PUSCH repetition type A like TDRA. But, we should discuss whether repetition type B like TDRA is needed. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Proposal says that use type A and/or type B as starting point. Does that mean that some enhancements based on type A or type B for TDRA can be further considered? If yes, then we are fine to support the proposal.  |

#### 2.1.1.2 Second round of discussions

**FL’s comments after Jan 28’s GTW**

According to FL’s understanding, during today’s GTW companies expressed two major concerns which could not be addressed online (FL’s observations on the concern are added):

1. Confusion may exist between the expressions “PUSCH repetition type A like TDRA” and “PUSCH mapping type A”, and between the expressions “PUSCH repetition type B like TDRA” and “PUSCH mapping type B”.
* FL’s observation: All proposals so far clearly refer to PUSCH repetition type A like TDRA and PUSCH repetition type B like TDRA, and not PUSCH mapping types. In this context, FL’s understanding is that it is assumed that time resources to be used by UE to transmit TBoMS are indicated using similar (or maybe exactly the same) tools as the ones used for PUSCH repetitions framework, i.e., TDRA tables whose rows can be dynamically indexed via DCI. As a consequence, it is very hard to understand where the source of confusion may lie. Companies with concerns are warmly invited to further clarify.
1. Some companies are not in favour of considering PUSCH repetition type B like TDRA as a possible candidate for indicating time resource to be used for transmitting TBoMS, since this implies that UE should support PUSCH repetition type B, which is an optional feature.
	* + FL’s observation: Two aspects should be considered here. First, several companies would like to keep considering PUSCH repetition type B like TDRA for the time being. Given that down selection is not proposed yet, it is hard to understand why this should be a problem. It is a matter of fairness and completeness, which should always be important parameters in general, but even more at the beginning of the WI. Second, from FL’s understanding, PUSCH repetition type A/B TDRA tables provide an indication of which symbols over which slots are to be used by UE. How such indication is used by UE is currently tied to repetition framework, but there does not seem any straightforward reason for which reusing the indicator for other purposes should not be considered by companies.

Having said all this, I realize that discussion about these non-trivial aspects may easily cause misunderstandings. For this reason, I would like to propose a second alternative for FL’s proposal 1 in which the content is rephrased such that no reference to Type A/B is made, for the sake of simplicity. Therein, the focus is put what actually differs between the two options listed in the previous version of FL’s proposal 1, i.e., if the number of allocated symbols per slot in the multiple slots used for TBoMS is the same or different.

**FL’s proposal 1**

For time domain resource indication, select one of the following alternatives:

**Alt1**. Consider one or two of the following options as starting points to design time domain resource indication of TBoMS

• PUSCH repetition type A like TDRA.

• PUSCH repetition type B like TDRA.

A further down selection between the two options may still be considered.

**Alt2**. Consider one or two of the following options for time domain resource allocation in the set of multiple slots for UL transmission used for TBoMS:

* The number of allocated symbols is the same in each slot in the set.
* The number of allocated symbols in each slot in the set can be different.

A further down selection between the two options may still be considered.

Companies are invited to continue the discussion on ***FL proposal 1*** in the table below, indicating their preference:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Intel | Alt.1. Our view is that Alt. 1 is clear enough for time domain resource allocation of TBoMS. Alt. 2 may introduce additional spec impact. For instance, new TDRA scheme may be introduced if it is based on “The number of allocated symbols in each slot in the set can be different”. We think it is more appropriate to reuse the existing scheme for reduce spec effort.  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine to support either of Alt.1 or Alt. 2. For PUSCH repetition Type A like TDRA, we think that some enhancement would be useful to allow at least different number of symbols for the last slot to give better flexibility. |
| Ericsson | Somewhat prefer Alt 1, with the same reasoning as Intel.  |
| ZTE | Alt 1. Though we don’t think we need to support both two kinds of time domain resource indication (one based on repetition type A and one based on repetition type B), we are fine with Alt 1. The down-selection could be further discussed.  |
| Sharp | We support Alt.1. To further clarify, we may propose the following by combining both Alt.*Consider one or two of the following options as starting points to design time domain resource indication of TBoMS** *PUSCH repetition type A like TDRA*
	+ *The number of allocated symbols is the same in each slot in the set.*
* *PUSCH repetition type B like TDRA*
	+ *The number of allocated symbols in each slot in the set can be different.*

*A further down selection between the two options may still be considered.* |
| MediaTek | Slightly prefer Alt 1 but more words for explanation on the exact meaning can be added. It could be like Sharp’s comments. Besides, we don’t see the need to support both of them.  |
| Apple | It seems that the Alt.1 and Alt.2 are discussing different thing. Alt.1 focus on resource **indication**, just like the Time domain resource assignment filed in DCI. Alt. 2 focus on resource **allocation**.The confusing part of Alt.1 is the term of TDRA. According to the spec, the TDRA just indicates the allocated resource for the first slot whatever the repetition is type A or type B. So two bullets in the Alt.1 are the same for time domain resource **indication** if we try to re-use existing spec, I don’t see the difference. If consideration is from the time domain resource determination perspective, the TDRA indicate the resource in fist slot, the available resources in the following slots for type A and type B are derived independently, the proposal could be like:**Alt1**. Consider one or two of the following options as starting points to design time domain resource **determination** of TBoMS• PUSCH repetition type A like TDRA, and the number of allocated symbols is the same in each slot in the set.• PUSCH repetition type B like TDRA, and the number of allocated symbols in each slot in the set can be different. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We are generally fine with Alt.1 and Alt.2. For Alt.1, we think TDRA of TBoMS should support two TDRA of Type A and Type B to give better flexibility. Also, it is worth considering the number of Type B repetition in TBoMS on the basis of available slots. (In my understanding, as long as changing TDRA only in TBoMS, it is not an enhancement of Type B repetition.) |
| Qualcomm | Alt 1 seems fine to us. We need some framework to build upon. Alt 2 is literally starting from scratch and it will take us a long time to converge. |
| WILUS | We prefer Alt 1 to focus on the existing TDRA signaling mechanism for time domain resource determination before identifying any critical issues. The confusion parts in Alt 1 may be addressed by Apple.  |
| OPPO | After FL’s clarification, it seems try to define repetition type A like as semi-statically indicated number of repetitions, and the repetition type B like as dynamically indicated number of repetitions. However, seems both typeA/B like scheme need TDRA provided dynamically.Also seems this understanding is not same for different companies. Please see others comment like Sharp. I hope to it can be further clarified in the Alt1. In that sense we would like to be go with Alt 2 as it is more straightforward.It is also fair discussion in Alt 2, as different options are there. I was think about all slot assumed same number of symbols of repeated slots. Even it may be varying, it should not go far. And the motivation of TBoMS is for allocating flexible/reasonable number of PRB in repetitions for one TB. Counting the RE very accurately does not help. But for discussion, we are fine with the 2 options under Alt2. |
| CMCC | We are generally fine with both alternative. But the alternative 1 provide a more precise description. And the 2nd bullet in alternative 2 may extend the scope compared with Type B TDRA. We kind of share a similar view that the emphasis here is the time domain resource indication not the allocation, which is also reflected in the section title. The allocation may induce thinking about UE how to execute the indication and how many resources are available, and how to deal with the collision issue. Thus we propose some minor revision for the alternative 1**Alt1**. Consider one or two of the following options as starting points to design time domain resource indication of TBoMS• PUSCH repetition type A like ~~TDRA~~ time domain resource indication.• PUSCH repetition type B like ~~TDRA~~ time domain resource indication.A further down selection between the two options may still be considered.Another issue is mentioned during the GTW, how to deal with the situation that different symbols are allocated within each slot or each symbols sets. More ideas or clarifications are encouraged. Between the 2 bullets within the alternative 1, though we do not have strong views, the repetition type B like time domain resource indication is more friendly to the TDD special slot. But it is a bit more complicated compared with type A link TDRI. |
| Panasonic | We share the similar view with Apple. In order to clarify the focus on the proposal, we would like to propose to use the wording as Apple’s update (“time domain resource determination”) or “time domain resource allocation”. |
| Vivo | Alt. 1Same mechanism as Type-A/B PUSCH repetition, to derive time domain recourse allocation for TBoMS, should be maintained as much as possible. |
| Samsung  | We are fine with alt.1We understand the intention is to say the time domain resource determination when using TBoMS is based on that when using type A repetition or type B repetition. So Apple’s change is also fine for us.  |
| CATT | Prefer Alt.1. Also fine for CMCC’s modification.We think Alt. 2 is introducing something more than repetition type B like TDRA in the 2nd sub-bullet. |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | We are fine to use alt1 or 2 for the resource allocation discussion. Anyway they are not exactly type A or type B, the details can be discussed further. |
|  |  |

FL’s comments on Feb 01

After the discussion company had in the reflector, the following version of proposal 1 is considered stable, and copied in Section 3:

**Proposal 1**

Consider one or two of the following options as starting points to design time domain resource determination of TBoMS

* PUSCH repetition type A like TDRA, i.e., the number of allocated symbols is the same in each slot.
* PUSCH repetition type B like TDRA, i.e., the number of allocated symbols in each slot can be different

### 2.1.2 [CLOSED] Indication of number of slots

Observations on how numbers of slots for transmitting TBoMS should be indicated by gNB are provided in different forms in several contributions. Explicit proposals are made in 5 contributions. Several options are considered. A high-level summary of such options, including companies’ preferences based on the contributions, follows:

* **Option 1**. Indication of number of slots via RRC [2 companies]:
	+ - ~~CMCC [16]~~, China Telecom [12];
* **Option 2**. Dynamically indicated via DCI [3 companies]
	+ No preference on the max number:
		- China telecom [12], ZTE [3], CMCC [16];
	+ Up to maximum 8 slots:
		- Apple [20];
* **Option 3**. Indication should occur, details FFS [1 company]:
	+ - Samsung [18].

Option 2 is slightly more popular, with [20] stating that a maximum number of slots for TB transmission could be 8, if the TB overhead for the re-transmission is considered. On the other hand, number of contributors is not large hence further observations on the situation may not be so relevant at this stage. The general understanding is that semi-static or dynamic indication solutions used in Rel-16 for other parameters can be used for this indicator as well. Further discussion is needed.

#### 2.1.2.1 First round of discussions

Given the very early stage of the WI, FL’s recommendation is to have a first round of discussion among companies about the three options. The goal is to identify the preferred directions RAN1 should pursue for defining and specifying indication of number of slots for TBoMS. The number of considered options should be reduced. First FL’s proposals will be made at the end of the first round.

Companies are invited to express views on the Options provided above for defining and specifying indication of number of slots for TBoMS.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Intel | The number of slots can be configured as part of TDRA entries. Further, the existing time domain resource assignment field in the DCI can be used to indicate which row is used for TDRA. This can also enable dynamic switching from single slot and multiple slot based transmission for TB processing.  |
| Sharp | If we go with Option 1 in 2.1.1, indication mechanism for Rel-16 repetition type A or B can be reused. |
| Apple | We prefer dynamic indication via DCI, if DCI size is the concern, it can be indicated via MAC CE.  |
| China Telecom | Both semi-static configuration and dynamic indication can be supported. |
| Qualcomm | There is no need to indicate number of slots. We propose to reuse the existing TDRA framework in conjunction with a scale factor. The scale factor can be either indicated via DCI or provided as part of RRC configuration. |
| NTT DOCOMO | The difference between the indication of number of slot and repetition type A is not clear. Firstly it is better to clarify the difference |
| ZTE | Option 2. The TBS to be scheduled and the channel condition could be dynamically changed. Using semi-static indication cannot accommodate the change of TBS and link adaption, and will make TBoMS not useful. Similar to dynamic repetition indication of PUSCH repetition type A, Option 2 with adding one column for the number of slots in the TDRA table can be considered.  |
| WILUS | Agree with Sharp. If type-A or type-B PUSCH repetition is reused to determine the time domain allocation for TBoMS, then the number of slots can be indicated in TDRA table.  |
| CATT | OK with Option 1 (like *pusch-AggregationFactor* for repetition) and Option 2 (like *numberOfRepetitions* in RRC configururation and dynamically indicated by DCI TDRA).Not prefer Option 2 with dedicated DCI fields indicating the slot number. |
| IITH, IITM, CEWIT, Reliance Jio, Tejas Networks | We believe this is also linked to the issue in 2.3.1 If the K factor in 2.3.1 is signalled, then this slot indication parameter is not required.  |
| vivo | In our opinion, the number of slots for TBoMS can be derived, if the solution for TDRA for TBoMS is clear. For option 1/2/3 in section 2.1.1, the number of slots can be determined together with the TDRA indication. For CG-TBoMS, the TDRA(number of slots) is indicated via RRC, for DG-TBoMS, the TDRA(number of slots) is indicated in DCI. |
| Panasonic | For Option 1 in 2.2.1, Rel.16 TDRA mechanism can be reused for the indication of number of slots. For Option 2 in 2.2.1, the indication of the number of slots can be replaced by the indication of number of symbols larger than 14. For Option 3, the indication of the number of slots can be replaced by the indication of the number of PUSCH resource. |
| OPPO | Option1 would be natural. The most relevant case of TBoMS is the VoIP service, which you are looking for 1 PRB allocation for configured grant. In that case semi-static configuration is enough.  |
| Sierra Wireless | Support option 2: Indication by DCI is preferred as coverage condition may change rapidly before RRC re-configuration can occur. Based on our LLS – a maximum 2 slot of TBoMS is all that is needed thus number of DCI bits to signal this should be very small. |
| InterDigital | We support both Option 1 and 2. We agree with Intel that number can be included in TDRA. A DCI can be used to indicate to the UE that which row TDRA is used. |
| Ericsson | Semi-static indication of the number of slots or update of Rel-16 TDRA table can be starting points. Dynamically varying the number of slots could save resource, similar to dynamic repetition indication. The tradeoffs of complexity vs. resource efficiency can be studied further. |
| Nokia/NSB | The indication of number of slots may or may not be needed depending on the TDRA discussion in Section 2.1.1. Assuming that Option 1 in Section 2.1.1 is adopted, then there is no need for the indication of the number of slots since, for PUSCH repetition type A, the number of slots is the same as the number of “actual” repetitions; and for PUSCH repetition type B, the number of slots is not needed since the most important factor in this case is the number of nominal repetitions. Therefore, we propose to discuss this aspect after the discussion in Section 2.1.1. |
| CMCC | Updated our position into option 2. Sorry for the confusion caused by our proposal in the contribution. Our intention is that the slot number could be configured through RRC configuration like numberOfRepetitions-r16 but could be indicated through TDRA.The discussion in this part should be based on the section 2.1.1. If the slot level indication (type A like in the last section) is accepted, the option 2 within this section is also accepted. If the symbol level (type B and the option 2 in the last section) indication is accepted, more discussions are needed on whether we need an indication of the slot. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine to support both option 1 and option 2. Further discussion could be if the repetition factor could be used (to imply) number of slots. |
| Samsung | Both option 1 and option 2 can be considered. I think first step we can agree this number of slots for TBS determination should be indicated, rather than implicitly derived. Then we can further down select the detailed options like DCI (reuse or new field) or RRC. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option 2 is preferred. In the current specification the number of slots can be dynamically indicated by multiple RRC configuration and DCI indication. The slot number dynamic indication in R16 can be a starting point. No need to the limit the indication using RRC only. |
| LG Electronics | At this stage, we think Option 1 and Option 2 are considerable. To determine the maximum number of slots, the maximum number of PRBs and the maximum TB size for TBoMS should be discussed together. |

FL’s comments

Different opinions and views have been expressed. Majority of companies seem to prefer to defer the discussion on the indication of number of slots until an agreement on aspect 2.1.1 is found. This seems a reasonable course of action, hence FL suggest pausing the discussion for the time being and resume it after the aforementioned agreement is found. In this context, companies are invited to carefully consider FL’s proposal in Section 2.1.1 to ensure progress can be achieved in other sections as well, whenever possible.

FL’s comments on Feb 01

Indication of number of slots will be discussed after the finalization of the time domain resource determination/indication discussion. This implies that no further discussion may be held during this meeting on this aspect. Further discussions are deferred to RAN1 #104-bis-e, if applicable.

### 2.1.3 Constraints on how slots can be used for TBoMS

Observations on how numbers of slots can be used for transmitting TBoMS are provided in different forms in several contributions. Explicit proposals are made in 3 contributions. Two options are considered up to now. A high-level summary of such options, including companies’ preferences based on the contributions, follows:

* **Option 1**. Both consecutive and non-consecutive UL slots can be used to transmit TBoMS [2 companies]:
	+ - China Telecom [12], vivo [7];
* **Option 2**. Consecutive slot in paired, any available slot in unpaired spectrum (LGE) [1 company]
	+ - LGE [9].

For the sake of completeness, it is worth mentioning that the rationale of the position expressed in [9], lies on the difference between paired and unpaired spectrum cases, where finding several U slots in the latter may not be so straightforward. It is argued that not allowing transmission on non-consecutive slot in this case may hinder the transmission of TBoMS.

#### 2.1.3.1 First round of discussions

Given the very early stage of the WI, FL’s recommendation is to have a first round of discussion among companies about the two options. Other options can be proposed, as well. The goal is to identify the preferred directions RAN1 should pursue for defining and specifying constraints, if any, on how slots can be used for TBoMS. First FL’s proposals will be made at the end of the first round.

Companies are invited to express views on the Options provided above for defining and specifying constraints, if any, on how slots can be used for TBoMS.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Intel | Both consecutive and non-consecutive slots should be supported for TBoMS. In particular, for TDD system with semi-static UL/DL configuration, it is more desirable to consider the PUSCH to be transmitted based on the available UL slots, which is similar to enhancement on PUSCH repetition type A.  |
| Sharp | Agree that “not allowing transmission on non-consecutive slot in this case may hinder the transmission of TBoMS”. |
| Apple | Option 1 is preferred, the validation of slot can be similar as the PUSCH repetition type A enhancement. |
| China Telecom | In our understanding, it does not restrict the operation to consecutive slots only. UEs operated in TDD spectrum can also benefit from TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH.  |
| Qualcomm | Given the wide deployments of 5G NR in TDD bands, any solution we adopt must be applicable to non-contiguous slots as well. When transmitting across non-contiguous slots, RV cycling must be used to determine the exact transmission in each slot. |
| NTT DOCOMO |  For non-consecutive slots, repetition may cover the performance, so that TBoMS with consecutive slots might be sufficient.  |
| ZTE | Agree the intention of Option 2. As commented above, the time domain resource determination could follow that defined for PUSCH repetition type A.  |
| CATT | Option 1 is preferred. We think Option 2 may be the final TDRA result due to the difference between TDD and FDD band, but not the restriction principle. |
| IITH, IITM, CEWIT, Reliance Jio, Tejas Networks | Non-contiguous slots should be used. Otherwise, most TDD slot formats may not be covered. Option1 is supported.  |
| NEC | We prefer consecutive slots. Non-consecutive UL slots transmission may have higher latency of this TB. Benefits of one TB over multiple slots are not clear. We may use legacy one TB one slot instead. |
| vivo | Option 1 preferred. For paired spectrum, it can be up to NW implementation/scheduler to indicated contiguous or non-contiguous slots. |
| Panasonic | Both consecutive and non-consecutive slots should be considered. For time domain resource allocation, it is desirable to consider unified mechanism for enhancement of PUSCH repetition Type A. |
| OPPO | Both consecutive and non-consecutive slots should be supported for TBoMS. This may depend on decision in configuring the enhanced Repetition Type A with TBoMS. |
| Sierra Wireless | Prefer Option 1 as this supports TDD configuration DDDSU. |
| InterDigital | We support Option 1. Benefits of TBoMS (e.g., time diversity) can be obtained in either contiguous or non-contiguous slots. |
| Ericsson | If only consecutive slots are used for TDD, the multi-slot TB feature will be of much less benefit for TDD coverage enhancement. Moreover, we have observed gains from repetition when cross slot channel estimation is not used, so we expect that there also gains from non-consecutive multi-slot TBS transmission. So our preference is to support non-consecutive UL slots (in addition to consecutive slots in both TDD and FDD). |
| Nokia/NSB | We support Option 1. |
| CMCC | From the operation of TB processing itself, it is not relevant to consecutive slots or non-consecutive slots. Only the multiple slots are summed up to decode one TB. But from the operation in TDD system, there is no need to limit the TB processing only over the consecutive slots. So, the option 1 is preferred. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We don’t see a strong reason to limit to only consecutive slots. Therefore, we support option 1 |
| Samsung  | Option 1 is preferred. Due to the flexible UL/DL configuration, it will be quite challenging to find many cases that we have consecutive slots for TBS, and these consecutive slots are further “consecutive” for repetitions. Non-consecutive slots should be allowed, and we need to tackle the issues (if any) when facing non-consecutive, rather than simply rule it out. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We prefer Option 1. |
| LG Electronics | We propose that transmission of TBoMS is based on available slots. In paired spectrum, all slots are available. That is, all of available slots are consecutive. In this sense, we said that consecutive slots can be used to transmit TBoMS. On the other hand, since there exist not available slots in unpaired spectrum, consecutive and non-consecutive slots can be used to transmit TBoMS depending on TDD configuration and condition.  |

FL’s comments

Most companies seem to believe that TBoMS should be possible both for consecutive and non-consecutive slots, i.e., Option 1. Only 3 companies expressed preference for Option 2.

Indeed, concerns seem to exist for deployments making use of paired spectrum, i.e., FDD. Cocerning this aspect, one company addressed this concern stating that for paired spectrum, it can be up to NW implementation/scheduler to indicated contiguous or non-contiguous slots.

From FL’s perspective:

* It is rather evident that limiting the application TboMS only to contiguous slots almost defeats the purpose of this feature in TDD deployments, where slots structures are often DL-heavy. In these cases, consecutive U slots may not be easy to find/configure.
* In FDD deployments scheduling could ensure that suitable slots are indicated for TboMS.

Having sating this, it is acknowledged that understanding of companies in favour of Option 2 may differ from the above. In the interest of achieving progress, while considering all preferences in a faire manner, FL proposes the following:

progress can be achieved in other sections as well, whenever possible.

***FL proposal 2. Both consecutive and non-consecutive slots can be used for TboMS for unpaired spectrum.***

* ***FFS for paired spectrum.***

Companies are invited to express views on ***FL proposal 2***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposals. For FDD, only consecutive slots can be used for TboMS.  |
| Sharp | We are OK with the proposal. |
| Samsung | We are OK with the proposal. |
| Ericsson | Ok with the proposal in principle. Can we clarify with ‘FFS if non-consecutive slots are supported for paired spectrum’?  |
| Qualcomm | A little clarity on “can be used for TboMS” is required. Is the current proposal stating that the first transmission of a TboMS can span on-contiguous slots? If this is referring to the first transmission, then we would like to restrict this to contiguous slots (as indicated earlier we prefer to contain this to a single slot). Existing repetition framework can be reused when transmitting across non-consecutive slots.  |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | We are OK with the proposal. |
| WILUS | We are OK with the proposal. Regarding FFS point, it may be related to type-B TDRA. If type-B TDRA is supported, our understanding is invalid symbols can be configured even in FDD carrier in order to reserve some symbols for PUCCH/SRS transmission. And all symbols in a slot are configured as invalid, then the type-B TDRA may indicate non-consecutive slots. For type-A TDRA, it is enough to support consecutive slots for paired spectrum.  |
| CATT | We support FL’s proposal. Ericsson’s modification on FFS part seems more accurate, and is also fine for us. |
| Panasonic | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Apple | We are OK with the proposal. |
| Fujitsu | We are fine with the proposal. |
| IITH, IITM, CEWIT, Reliance Jio, Tejas Networks | Fine with the proposal |
| LG Electronics | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine with the proposal and also agree with Ericsson’s’ suggestion |
| InterDigital | We support the FL’s proposal |

#### 2.1.3.2 Second round of discussions

**FL’s comments after Jan 28’s GTW**

Companies expressed concerns on the FL proposal online, possibly because the paired and unpaired spectrum case were combined in one single proposal with no structural modification to the proposals. An interesting discussion occurred, and parts of the initial proposal were reworked. FL further reworked the last version of the proposal as per Chairman’s Notes, aiming at improving its readability. New version follows:

**FL’s Proposal 2**

* Both consecutive and non-consecutive slots for UL transmission can be used for TBoMS for unpaired spectrum.
	+ FFS: if a maximum distance between two non-consecutive slots used for TBoMS for unpaired spectrum should be defined
	+ FFS whether or not to preclude interleaved TB transmission ibn the non-consecutive slot case
* Consecutive slots for UL transmission can be used for TBoMS for paired spectrum
	+ FFS if non-consecutive slots for UL transmission are also supported for paired spectrum, e.g., in the SUL case.

FL invites companies to continue the discussion in the table below, considering FL’s proposal 2.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Intel | We are generally fine with the proposal, but it is not clear to us what “if a maximum distance between two non-consecutive slots used for TBoMS for unpaired spectrum should be defined” implies here. Is this for UE capability, e.g., in some cases that UE cannot transmit TBoMS? It would be good to clarify this, otherwise we suggest to remove this. Minor editorial comment: “FFS whether or not to preclude interleaved TB transmission i~~b~~n the non-consecutive slot case” |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support the proposal |
| Ericsson | Support the proposal. |
| ZTE | We think the confusion raised by companies in GTW may come from the definition of ‘slots’. In current spec, when we say ‘consecutive slots’ for PUSCH repetition transmission, it includes both DL slots and UL slots. With this assumption, we support to use both consecutive and non-consecutive slots for TBoMS for unpaired spectrum. Otherwise (if the slot is only the UL slots), we should keep the same rule for both unpaired spectrum and paired at least for now, i.e., leave non-consecutive slots as FFS for both unpaired spectrum and paired spectrum. Though this may restrict the use of TBoMS for some TDD configurations, it’s better to make sure whether and how it works first and these details could be further discussed. *TS 38.214: For PUSCH repetition Type A, in case K>1, the same symbol allocation is applied across the K consecutive slots and the PUSCH is limited to a single transmission layer. The UE shall repeat the TB across the K consecutive slots applying the same symbol allocation in each slot.* |
| Sharp | We support FL proposal. |
| MediaTek | We share the same view as ZTE. The confusion in GTW is whether “non-consecutive” is only applied for the physical slots for uplink transmission in the unpaired spectrum or applied for the logical slots for uplink transmission. If it is the logical slots for uplink transmission, we prefer only “consecutive” slots considering the spec impact and complexity. Moreover, we may need to clarify, e.g., whether special slots or dynamic indicted UL symbols in the slot or UL symbols in the mixed slot can be counted as “slots for UL transmission”. This is still open according to Chairman’s comments in GTW. So we can add one more FFSFFS: slots for UL transmission, e.g., whether the special slot, dynamic indicted UL slot, dynamically indicated symbols in the slot, or UL symbols in the mixed slot can be counted as “slots for UL transmission”. |
| Apple | The issue here is how to interpret the non-consecutive slot, if the non-consecutive transmission is due to the UL slot is not available, such as, DL slot in the middle, this should be fine. But if the gNB intentionally configures the gaps in UL transmission via the RRC signalling, we don’t think this is reasonable. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Is it counted as consecutive slots even if some of repetitions are dropped by interruption such as SFI and CI in Type A repetition? In any case, we are fine with supporting non-consecutive slots.  |
| Qualcomm | Like others have mentioned, it will be good to to clarify if we are referring to physical slots or some filtered list of slots (for e.g. only uplink slots of TDD system). I believe we originally intended to use physical slots. Further, we continue to have no clarity on whether this is intended for first transmission or includes a set of repetitions. To draw attention to this aspect and to have this option on the table, we request another FFS to clarify this point.Here is a revised proposal:**FL’s Proposal 2*** Both consecutive and non-consecutive physical slots for UL transmission can be used for TBoMS for unpaired spectrum.
	+ FFS: if a maximum distance between two non-consecutive physical slots used for TBoMS for unpaired spectrum should be defined
	+ FFS whether or not to preclude interleaved TB transmission in the non-consecutive physical slot case
	+ FFS: Whether support of TBoMS across physical slots is via repetitions.
* Consecutive slots for UL transmission can be used for TBoMS for paired spectrum
	+ FFS if non-consecutive slots for UL transmission are also supported for paired spectrum, e.g., in the SUL case.
	+ FFS: Whether support of TBoMS across physical slots is via repetitions.
 |
| WILUS | We support this proposal with the clarification that ‘consecutive slots’ include both UL slots and DL slots.  |
| OPPO | Understand the proposal better. The FFS point for TDD is OK for us. The FFS for FDD make it clear it is for SUL, looks fine.One more clarification during the online discussion is: “consecutive and non-consecutive slots for UL transmission” Is the consecutive means for the slots are “physically consecutive”? I think yes. Would be add note as a sub-bullet to clarify it.  |
| CMCC | We are fine with current version.For the 1st FFS under the first bullet, theoretically, longer distance between two non-consecutive slots for TBoMS will induce longer delay for the TB detection. Defining a maximum distance could bring benefits to UE and regulate the behaviour of gNB. But considering the TDD system, a number of DL slots are inserted between uplink slots. There is no need to define some restrictions which may conflicts with the TDD UL-DL configurations. So there is no need to defined a maximum distance between two non-consecutive slots.For the 2nd FFS under the first bullet, there is no need or motivation to introduce the interleaved TB transmission in non-consecutive slot case |
| Panasonic | We share the same view as Apple. If the non-consecutive transmission is due to the UL slot is not available, such as, DL slot in the middle, we are fine with the proposal. |
| Vivo | Support this proposal. The TDRA determination can be unified solution for both paired and unpaired spectrum, which supports both consecutive and non-consecutive slots for TBoMS. Whether non-consecutive slots are supported can be discussed in later stage, e.g. in UE feature phase. One potential confusion aross in GTW session was the word “consecutive slots”, maybe a note can be added to clarify.Note: consecutive slots for UL transmission are back to back UL slots |
| Samsung  | Our understanding of the consecutive originally is all the slots are UL and “consecutive”; and non-consecutive means some interruption between the UL slots. But it seems now some company’s understanding is that consecutive slots now also include the interruptions like DL etc, then what does non-consecutive mean?  |
| CATT | We support this proposal. In our view, this is a high layer proposal which defines what UL resource that can be considered for TBoMS, not intended to preclude/agree TDRA method. ‘Consecutive’ and ‘Non-consecutive’ slots mean physical slots in our view.  |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | We support the proposal. From our understanding, none consecutive slots means that the slots are interrupted by some downlink slots or some other signals due to collision, so from our point of view the slot is the physical slot. And the consecutive slots means the slot number of the slots are consecutive.  |

FL’s comments on Feb 01

After the discussion company had in the reflector, Proposal 2 is still under discussion and refinement.

FL’s comments on Feb 02

No consensus has been achieved via email discussion yet. We currently have two proposals. One proposed by FL, on which most companies expressed favourable opinion. One proposed by Apple and supported by Qualcomm and Apple, for which not many companies provided comments yet.

It may be worth re-organizing the discussion in this document to explicitly capture the two alternatives and ask companies to express support to either of the two (or both, if applicable), with the possibility to add further comments below to explain each company’s position. Proposal 2 follows, with its two alternative versions:

***FL proposal 2***

***ALT1:***

* Both consecutive and non-consecutive physical slots for UL transmission can be used for TBoMS for unpaired spectrum.
* Consecutive physical slots for UL transmission can be used for TBoMS for paired spectrum
	+ FFS if non-consecutive slots for UL transmission are also supported for paired spectrum, e.g., in the SUL case.

Note: consecutive physical slots for UL transmission are back-to-back physical slots over which a UL transmission can be scheduled

Note: non-consecutive physical slots for UL transmission are non-back-to-back physical slots for UL transmission.

Note: No specific assumption is made on how TBoMS transmission is performed over the considered physical slots.

***ALT 2:***

* Consecutive physical slots for UL transmission can be used for TBoMS.
	+ FFS whether/how non-consecutive slots for UL transmission are also supported

Note: consecutive physical slots for UL transmission are back-to-back physical slots over which a UL transmission can be scheduled

Note: non-consecutive physical slots for UL transmission are non-back-to-back physical slots for UL transmission.

Note: Only the relationship between physical slots is assumed. No specific assumption is made on how TBoMS transmission is performed over the considered physical slots.

Companies can input their preference in the box below. In view of the online GTW, it is important to have a precise count, thus please do not forget to add your name. Two preferences can be expressed (if this is the case, please also add reference to 1st and 2nd preference).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Preference | Company name |
| **ALT 1** | Intel, IITH, IITM, CEWIT, Reliance Jio, Tejas Networks, DCM 2nd, CATT, LG, WILUS(1st preference), Sharp, China Telecom, InterDigital, ZTE, Nokia, NSB, Panasonic, Huawei, Hisilicon, Samsung, CMCC, Ericsson, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility |
| **ALT 2** | Qualcomm, Apple, DCM 1st, WILUS(2nd preference) |

Additional comments, if any, can be added below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Qualcomm | We prefer to make additional progress on other design details before determining whether/how to support nonconsecutive slots.  |
| Intel | If non-consecutive slots are not used for TBoMS, it is not clear to us how to support TBoMS in TDD system, especially when considering the configuration with limited UL slots, e.g., DDDSU.  |
| Apple | During the SI phase, the evaluation is based consecutive slots. For TB processing over non-consecutive slot, the implementation impacts need to be checked, thus we propose to discuss the non-consecutive transmission in next meeting. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support Alt2. We think there is no practical use case to configure the gap between UL transmission occasions because it increases delay without enhancing coverage performance. Also, this requires additional TDRA mechanism on top of repetition like TDRA, which most of company agree on proposal 1. If any gain by non-consecutive slot transmission is provided, we are open to Alt1 and Alt2. |
| IITH, IITM, CEWIT, Reliance Jio, Tejas Networks | Agree to Intel views.  |
| CATT | During SI, components of TBoMS have clarify that coding gain can still be achieved without joint channel estimation. No need to put restriction that only consecutive slots can be used for TBoMS. Otherwise, TBoMS may not be applied to TDD system with typical TDD configuration. |
| LG | We prefer Alt. 1 and believe that TBoMS using non-consecutive slots is beneficial in unpaired spectrum.  |
| WILUS | We share the same view with Intel that TBoMS is also used for non-consecutive slots in TDD system. Without the support of non-consecutive slots in TDD system, use case of TBoMS is quite limited. Also, for the sake of progress, we can agree with alt 2 in this meeting and FFS points can be further discussed in the next meeting.  |
| Sharp | Share similar view with Intel. Non-consecutive physical slots should be supported. Otherwise, benefit cannot be obtained in TDD system. |
| China Telecom | TBoMS should be supported for non-consecutive physical slots for TDD. During the study item, we provide the simulation results based on non-consecutive physical slots. Please refer to our contribution R1-2008874. |
| OPPO | We believe the Alt1 make somehow further and seems no risk for interpret it for the TB determination and RV mapping sequences. For TDD, non-consecutive slots in time is quite common cases when the repetition factor is configured. Considering the special slot may be even jumped over, based on the agreement made in 8.8.1.1 so far, it is quite important for TDD using non-consecutive slots. |
| CMCC | As most company has mentioned, if the TBoMS could only be supported in the consecutive slots, it could be too limited to use in TDD system. And from the definition of TB processing over multiple slot itself, the TB processing do not have any requirement for the consecutive or non-consecutive slots. The performance gains do not depend on channel estimation, then it is not critical whether the slots are consecutive or not.Alt 1 is preferred. |
| InterDigital | We prefer Alt. 1. TBoMS is flexible enough to be mapped to either consecutive or non-consecutive slots to obtain transmission diversity. |
| ZTE | Support Alt 1. Using non-consecutive physical slots for TDD is important.  |
| Nokia, NSB | We share the same view with Intel. As mentioned earlier in our email, if we allow TBoMS to be transmitted only on consecutive slots, we have a big issue to apply it for TDD deployments, especially in FR2 where we agreed that DDDSU and DDSU slot structure may be the most relevant use cases during the SI, unless we go with options which allow us to use some available symbols in S slot, e.g., PUSCH repetition type B like TDRA. |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | We haven’t see the limitations of how a TB cannot be mapped on non-consecutive slots. And we think that the for a TDD carrier, the UL slots are likely not consecutive. The TDD case should benefit from the TBoMS.  |
| Samsung | There is no definition of physical slot in current spec. I did not see the difference with or without this “physical”. |
| vivo | Prefer Alt.1. If non-consecutive transmission is not supported, it will be quite restrictive to be used in TDD deployments. |
| Qualcomm | Just to clarify our stand, we prefer to revisit this after TDRA discussions have advanced further. Companies seem to assume that Alt 2 rules out non-consecutive slots, but this is not the case, the FFS makes it clear that it is under consideration.When we have sufficient clarity on what constitutes one transmission occasion of TBoMS we can then revisit this. Alternately, this can be resolved as part of a discussion on what constitutes one transmission occasion of TBoMS. |

**FL’s comments on Feb 4th**

A rather long discussion occurred during the GTW. The outcome of such discussion, following Mr. Chairman’s suggestion is the following proposal, where a “a question mark” has been left on the SUL case for which ZTE should provide answers w.r.t. a suggestion made by Huawei.

**FL’s Proposal 2:**

* Both consecutive and (as a working assumption) non-consecutive physical slots for UL transmission can be used for TBoMS for unpaired spectrum
	+ FFS the details particularly related to how to handle non-consecutive physical slots, aiming for minimal/low additional specification impact/complexity w.r.t. the consecutive case
* Consecutive physical slots for UL transmission can be used for TBoMS for paired spectrum
	+ FFS if non-consecutive physical slots for UL transmission are also supported for paired spectrum
	+ FFS the case of SUL~~, e.g., in the SUL case~~.

FL acknowledges that this is probably a good middle ground which could provide sufficient guarantees to companies supporting previous ALT 2, while reassuring companies supporting previous ALT 1 that a working assumption on non-consecutive slots exists.

Companies are invited to express explicitly their position in the first table below, and to explain their concern in the second table if they do not support the proposal. If this happens, other companies are invited to respond and address the concern, if applicable. Please refrain from proposing minor cosmetic modifications, if possible.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Preference** | **Company name** |
| **Support Proposal 2** | Ericsson |
| **Not support Proposal 2** |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Concern** |
|  |  |
|  |  |

### 2.1.4 [CLOSED] How to handle S slots

Observations on how S slots should be handles in the context of TBoMS are provided in different forms in several contributions. The same explicit proposal is made in 2 contributions and worth reporting, given the relevance of this aspect in the context of TDRA for transmitting TBoMS. In particular, the following is proposed:

* **Option 1**. Available UL symbols in special slot can be used for TBoMS [2 companies]:
	+ - China Telecom [12], NTT Docomo [25].
* **Option 2**. UL symbols in special slot cannot be used for TBoMS [-]:
	+ - Added for completeness.

It is worth mentioning that the rationale of the position expressed in [12] is that PUSCH repetition Type A can be configured to use S slot, hence similar behavior could apply to TBoMS transmission (assuming a repetitions Type A like TDRA configuration and indication for TBoMS). The rationale of the position expressed in [25] is related to the larger performance claimed to be achievable if both S and U slots can be used for transmitting TBoMS. From FL’s perspective, this important aspect of TDRA for TBoMS deserves more discussion before commenting further. Option 2 has been added for completeness, to simplify the discussion.

#### 2.1.4.1 First round of discussions

Given the very early stage of the WI, FL’s recommendation is to have a first round of discussion among companies about the two options. Other options can be proposed, as well. The goal is to identify the preferred directions RAN1 should pursue for defining and specifying how to handle the S slots in the context of TBoMS. First FL’s proposals will be made at the end of the first round.

Companies are invited to express views on the Options provided above for defining and specifying constraints, if any, on how to handle S slots in the context of TBoMS.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Intel | This depends on the discussion in 2.1.1, i.e., whether PUSCH repetition type A or B is considered as TDRA for TBoMS. We suggest to defer the discussion after we have better understanding on the TDRA for TBoMS.  |
| Sharp | Repetition type B can be used if resource in S slots should be exploited. |
| Apple | We share the similar view as Intel. The discussion can be deferred. |
| China Telecom | Support option 1 no matter which option is supported in section 2.1.1. In our view, for coverage enhancement, one of the principles is to maximize the amount of time a UE can transmit continuously at maximum power. In this sense, it is necessary to include any UL resource in time domain for PUSCH transmission, especially for TDD. |
| Qualcomm | To the best of our understanding, TBoMS was not intend to couple S and U slots under s a single PUSCH transmission. It was intended to prevent unnecessary segmentation of the payload and to reduce MAC/PDCP/RLC header overhead. With this in mind, S slot handling shall be govered by whatever is currently permitted using TDRA for Type A PUSCH repetitions. In particular, if we don’t allow S+L > 14, this question does not arise. |
| NTT DOCOMO | As TDD is one of the target scenario for coverage enhancements, it is beneficial to utilize some UL symbols (2-4 symbols) in special slots together with UL slots which has large number of symbols (e.g. 14 symbols). Therefore, unless any problem is found in TBoMS with S slot, TBoMS should cover UL symbols in special slots. |
| ZTE | Option 1 at least when the available UL symbols in special slot can accommodate the indicated symbols for transmission in a slot, similar as PUSCH repetition type A.  |
| WILUS | Flexible/UL symbols in S slots can be used for type-B PUSCH repetition. So, if option 1 in section 2.1.1 is supported, then flexible/UL symbols in S slots can be also used for TBoMS.  |
| CATT | We support Option 1. We share similar views with China Telecom that utilization of ‘S’ slot is not limited to the outcome of 2.1.1. |
| IITH, IITM, CEWIT, Reliance Jio, Tejas Networks | Option1, S slots should be considered for the TBoMS.  |
| NEC | It depends on the previous question that whether type A and/or type B like repetition is used. |
| vivo | Option 1, special slots can be used for TBoMS to take full usage of the available symbols. |
| Panasonic | We share the same view with Intel. |
| OPPO | Available UL symbols in special slot can be used for TBoMS. This may depend on decision in configuring the enhanced Repetition Type A with TBoMS. |
| InterDigital | We support Option 1. As long as there are enough resources available in a special slot, benefit of TBoMS is not lost by mapping one of PUSCHs to a special slot. For companies who mention about the relationship between Option 1 and S+L>14, we may be mixing up issues. From our understanding, Option 1 here also considers a case where there are enough resources in a special slot such that one PUSCH can be contained within a special slot. Our understanding is that Option 1 considers 2 types of PUSCH : whose length is less than equal to 14 or greater than 14. |
| Ericsson | While we understand that special slots can be used to provide extra PUSCH resource, doing so will be more complex, and so the gains and extra complexity from the use of special slots should be considered together. Whether such gains require further DMRS optimization and the use of other features like cross-slot channel estimation should be taken into account as well. So we prefer that this is studied further at this stage. Furthermore, whether Type A or B is used strongly affects how special slot support can be specified. Therefore, this discussion depends on which option in section 2.1.1 is agreed. |
| Nokia/NSB | We support Option 1. As discussed in Section 2.1.1, the available UL symbols should be exploited in case of coverage shortage. Therefore, we share the same view with CT, Docomo, WILUS, CATT that the available UL symbols in the S slot can be used, whenever needed, for this purpose. |
| CMCC | Support the option 1. The special slot should be fully used for the enhancement of uplink data rate and coverage. The basic unit of TB processing is RE, the uplink symbols within the special slot could also be considered within the procedure of TB size determination. The only issue is how to indicate those resources, which could be solved by the options in section 2.1.1. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Agree with Intel’s view that first we need to agree whether PUSCH repetition type A or B like TDRA is used. |
| Samsung  | Option 1. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option 1 is preferred. S slot can be used to improve the coverage of the PUSCH since as many as possible UL symbols can be used for the uplink transmission. |
| LG Electronics | We want to apply the same SLIV for all slots to transmit TBoMS. Thus, if symbols indicated by SLIV are all available for uplink in a special slot, the special slot can be used to transmit TBoMS. Otherwise, it becomes not available slot to transmit TBoMS. |

FL’s comments

Different opinions and views have been expressed. Majority of companies seem to prefer to defer the discussion on how to handle S slots until an agreement on aspect 2.1.1 is found. This seems a reasonable course of action, hence FL suggest pausing the discussion for the time being and resume it after the aforementioned agreement is found. In this context, companies are invited to carefully consider FL’s proposal in Section 2.1.1 to ensure progress can be achieved in other sections as well, whenever possible.

FL’s comments on Feb 01

Indication of number of slots will be discussed after the finalization of the time domain resource determination/indication discussion. This implies that no further discussion may be held during this meeting on this aspect. Further discussions are deferred to RAN1 #104-bis-e, if applicable.

### 2.1.5 [CLOSED] Definition of transmission occasion

The concept of “transmission occasion” in the context of TBoMS appears implicitly or explicitly in slots different forms in several contributions. On the other hand, an explicit proposal in this sense is made in only 1 contribution, as follows:

* **Option 1**. A TB transmission occasion for TBoMS can be composed by multiple slots [1 company]:
	+ - LGE [9].
* **Option 2**. A TB transmission occasion for TBoMS can be composed by one slot [-]:
	+ - Added for completeness.

From FL’s perspective, this important aspect of TDRA for TBoMS deserves more discussion before commenting further. Its relevance for subsequent discussions on repetition of TBoMS over multiple transmission occasions and/or re-transmission (if applicable), justifies its presence in this section. Option 2 has been added for completeness, to simplify the discussion.

#### 2.1.5.1 First round of discussions

Given the very early stage of the WI, FL’s recommendation is to have a first round of discussion among companies about the two options. Other options can be proposed, as well. The goal is to identify the preferred directions RAN1 should pursue for defining a transmission occasion for TBoMS. First FL’s proposals will be made at the end of the first round.

Companies are invited to express views on the Options provided above for defining a transmission occasion for TBoMS.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Intel | It is good to clarify the purpose of defining transmission occasions for TBoMS. Is this related to the cancellation/dropping for TBoMS? |
| Sharp | What is TB transmission occasion? If it means that RE mapping or DMRS mapping is done within the TB transmission occasion, those two should be separately discussed. In our view, change to RE mapping is not justified from coverage enhancement perspective. Instead of enhancing RE mapping, controlling RV for each TB transmission occasion will have less specification impacts. For DMRS mapping, we are fine to discuss. On the other hand, DMRS mapping optimization would be discussed in AI8.8.1.3. |
| Apple | Transmission occasion may not need if TBoMS joint operation with repetition is not supported. Maybe we need to determine first whether support TBoMS repetition. |
| China Telecom | We have the same question: what is the definition of TB transmission occasion? Is it related to whether the transmission in each slot can be self-decodable? |
| Qualcomm | Option 2. There is no compelling need to extend an occasion to more than 1 slot. |
| ZTE | Similar as above companies, the motivation to define a transmission occasion needs to be clarified.  |
| WILUS | Not clear on intention of defining “transmission occasion”. |
| CATT | Similar confusion as above companies. |
| NEC | We should discuss this after we have clear procedure of TBoMS. |
| vivo | In our opinion, the multiple slots for TBoMS and transmission occasion for TBoMS have different meanings.The multiple slots for TBoMS is composed of multiple transmission occasions derived by either Type-A/B repetition like TDRA indication or multi-SLIV TDRA indication, as discussed in section 2.1.1, which means the transmission occasion has finer granularity compared to the multiple slots for TBoMS. Collision handling, UCI multiplexing, can be performed per transmission occasion rather than per multiple slots. Otherwise, it may hinder the TBoMS transmission. |
| Panasonic | The clarification of the definition of TB transmission occasion for TBoMS is necessary. If it means the unit for calculating TBS determination, it can be composed by multiple slots and it is not required to be the same as the number of slots for PUSCH transmissions. |
| OPPO | Need clarification of the term of transmission occasion and the reason to discuss it. |
| Sierra Wireless | Not sure that we need to prioritize or need this definition |
| InterDigital | If the intention is to discuss collision or repetition, use of a term “occasion” seems to be appropriate here. For example, Option 1 can be used to describe retransmission of an entire TB in case of collision. Option 2 can be used to describe retransmission of occasion(s) in case of collision. |
| Ericsson | We are fine to further discuss the definition of transmission occasion. More specifically, we are open to consider if there are benefits to supporting repetition of a multi-slot TB. However, it seems straightforward to assume that HARQ retransmission is supported for a multi-slot TB. |
| Nokia/NSB | Option 1. Our understanding is that a transmission occasion of PUSCH is defined as the set of slots used by the UE to transmit PUSCH, i.e., this set is composed of only 1 slot in single-slot PUSCH transmission. This concept seems relevant in the context of repetitions, if any. For example, from our perspective TBoMS implies that a TBS is determined based on the PUSCH resource that spans across multiple slots (according to a rule which will have to be defined), and then the TB is transmitted (but **not repeated** on each slot) on the transmission occasion compose of multiple slots. Whether the TBoMS is then repeated or not can be further discussed. In this sense, we agree with Apple. |
| CMCC | Before the discussion of transmission occasion, we think we may need more discussion whether repetitions could applied to the transmission carrying the TB processed over multiple slots. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We don’t think that definition of transmission occasion is needed here.  |
| Samsung  | It seems not necessary for creating “TB transmission occasion”.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option 2 is preferred, but it needs further clarification of the intention of the occasion. |
| LG Electronics | In case of PUSCH repetition type A, it is our understanding that *K* repetitions of PUSCH TB is transmitted across *K* consecutive slots where each transmission occasion of TB repetitions is composed by *L* symbols within a slot. To extend PUSCH TB repetitions for TBoMS, we think a transmission occasion can be composed by multiple slots and a TB is mapped in the TB transmission occasion. Then, if a PUSCH TB is repeated *K* times, the repetition is performed using *K* TB transmission occasions. |

FL’s comments

FL would like to clarify that this aspect was included in the summary to ensure a fair inclusion of all proposals expressed in contributions submitted to AI 8.8.1.2. Most companies question the need for a definition of transmission occasion and FL agrees with the assessments that have been made. It is thus recommended to pause the discussion for the time being and reopen it, should the need for a definition of transmission occasion occur in the coming days/meetings, e.g., when aspects related to repetitions of TBoMS will be discussed.

***FL recommendation 1. Pause the discussion for the time being and reopen it, should the need for a definition of transmission occasion occur in the coming days/meetings.***

Companies are invited to express views on ***FL recommendation 1****.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Intel | We are fine with the suggestion. |
| Sharp | We agree with FL. |
| Samsung  | Fine. |
| Ericsson | Support the recommendation. |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | We are fine with the FL |
| WILUS | Agree. |
| CATT | Thank for clarification. We are fine with the suggestion.  |
| Panasonic | We are fine with the recommendation. |
| Apple  | OK with FL suggestion. |
| Fujitsu | Agree. |
| LG Electronics | We are fine with the suggestion. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Agree |
| OPPO | Agree |

## 2.2 FDRA

Two major sub-aspects of FDRA have been discussed by companies in the submitted contributions:

1. Maximum number of PRBs allocated for TBoMS transmission per symbol
2. Number of PRBs across the slots used for TBoMS

Summary, discussion and proposals on these sub-aspects are provided in the following different sub-sections, whose numbers are given in the list above.

### 2.2.1 Maximum number of PRBs allocated for TBoMS transmission per symbol

Several contributions acknowledged the fundamental nature of this aspect and discussed it in detail. Discussions on the major reason behind the performance increase observed in case of multi-slot TB transmissions as compared to their single-slot counterpart are carried out therein.

It is argued that TBoMS is beneficial in terms of PSD boosting, since it concentrates transmission power in a narrow frequency resource and frequency domain resource multiplexing. Moreover, there seems to be no need to occupy more frequency domain resource to achieve a lower code rate, given that the TB can be transmitted over multiple slots. It is finally observed that restricting the number of PRBs for the FDRA of TBoMS transmission may also reduce DCI size, which could positively impact the coverage of PDCCH as a by-product.

Several proposals are made in this regard. A high-level summary of all options, including companies’ preferences based on the contributions, follows:

* **Option 1**. FDRA for TBoMS is limited to a small number of PRBs [3 company]:
	+ - Samsung [18], LGE [9], InterDigital [10];
* **Option 2**. Any number of PRBs can be allocated for TBoMS transmission [-]:
	+ - Added for completeness.

Partially different technical understandings on why TBoMS is expected to bring gains as compared to single-slot counterpart have been provided in other contributions submitted to this AI, even if no proposal was added therein. From FL’s perspective, this important aspect of FDRA for TBoMS deserves more discussion before commenting further. Its relevance for subsequent discussions on TBS determination, link adaptation and (possibly) frequency hopping justifies its presence in this section. Option 2 has been added for completeness, to simplify the discussion.

#### 2.2.1.1 First round of discussions

Given the very early stage of the WI, FL’s recommendation is to have a first round of discussion among companies about the two options. Other options can be proposed, as well. The goal is to identify the preferred directions RAN1 should pursue for defining and specifying constraints, if any, on the maximum number of PRBs allocated for TBoMS. First FL’s proposals will be made at the end of the first round.

Companies are invited to express views on the Options provided above for constraints, if any, on the maximum number of PRBs allocated for TBoMS.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Intel | Although we agree the principle, it is not clear to us whether we need to define the limit for number of PRBs in the specification. BTW, for FDRA, our view is that we need to understand how to support frequency hopping and detailed frequency hopping pattern, e.g., intra-slot, inter-slot or inter-slot frequency hopping with inter-slot bundling.  |
| Sharp | Restricting use cases for specific feature should be carefully discussed. If UE implementation complexity doesn’t change for TBoMS for large PRBs, then we see no need to specify such a restriction. |
| Apple | The restriction on the PRB number is not really necessary, gNB scheduler could handle this to guarantee the TBoMS gain. |
| Qualcomm | Option 1. We don’t think there are any performance gains once we have a reasonable number of PRBs ( greater than 32 PRBs, for example). Coding gains diminish and become negligible once TB size exceeds 1000 bits or so. |
| ZTE | Firstly, we think the maximum TBS for one HARQ process should be limited. Otherwise, it would be increased since it is based on more resources in multiple slots, and then it would exceed legacy gNB/UE HARQ buffer. As for the options, we have no strong view, and would like to keep both options open for now. If we go with Option 1, we need carefully define the maximum number of RBs can be allocated. For Option 2, we may need other ways to limit the TBS.  |
| WILUS | Since TBoMS is intended to coverage enhancements, the number of PRBs may be limited. But, this is up to gNB configuration. |
| CATT | We understand the motivation. However, we think the gNB can handle this well without explicit restriction on FDRA, just by implementation. |
| IITH, IITM, CEWIT, Reliance Jio, Tejas Networks | Narrow banding operation is crucial to improve the link budgets and coverage. We agree with the motivation of Option-1.  |
| NEC | Option 1. |
| Vivo | It can be up to NW scheduler to limit the number of PRBs. |
| Panasonic | We see the need of total TB size limitation in order not to have very large TB size. It could be realized by limiting the number of PRBs allocated for TBoMS or to introduce limitation to TBS calculation itself. |
| OPPO | It is true the scheme only useful for small number of PRB. However, we can restrict it only if UE complexity issue is identified. Currently, UE is already defined with UE capability of TB size. |
| Sierra Wireless | There is no need to optimize FDRA for TBoMS so legacy FDRA can be used.  |
| InterDigital | We share the same view as Qualcomm. We support Option 1. The advantage of TBoMS transmission is time diversity gain achieved by mapping a TB across multiple slots. Thus, there should be some restrictions in the number of PRBs that can be used by this enhancement. Evaluation results from the study item demonstrate that one PRB for TBoMS yields coverage gain, thanks to time diversity and power boosting. |
| Ericsson | We agree the use case for multi-slot TB is for low data rates, so there is no motivation to define a larger maximum TB size. We are open to considering PRB size restrictions if they can be justified by simplified implementations and/or reduced spec impact.  |
| Nokia/NSB | Technically speaking, the matter of where the gains from TBoMS come from is non-trivial and we are not sure such gains occur only for limited number of allocated PRBs. Indeed, it depends on a multiple factor, e.g., MCS, FDRA, time diversity and so on. For this reason, we disagree with any assessment which states that the origin of the gain is unique, since it depends on how PUSCH is configured by gNB and on the considered system/network.Therefore, we share the same view as Intel, Sharp, Apple, WILUS and CATT that the gNB can fully control any aspect of PUSCH, depending on the use case. Hence, we do not see the need to specify such restriction in the specification. Later on, UE capabilities related to UE implementation complexity to handle any FDRA for TBoMS may or may not be discussed, depending if this issue is actually ever brought forward (which is not the case at present, and would be very premature at this stage). |
| CMCC | We do not see any need for the restriction of the allocated PRB number. It could be handled well by gNB scheduler. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | It can be up to implementation and no restriction in terms of number of PRBs need to be specified  |
| Samsung  | gNB can indeed schedule less PRBs by it’s implementation, but this doesn’t mean we cannot do anything about it. If the commonly useful cases of TBoMS is spreading TB over time domain, and reduce it in F domain (to get better PSD gain), we can, for example, reduce the FDRA indication size. These saved DCI bits could either be reused for other purpose, or improve DCI performance. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We prefer Option 2 where the number of PRB should not be limited to a small value, because it will cause a small TB which limits the coding gain etc, and a short DMRS sequence which reduces the performance of channel estimation. On the other head, we think this proposal can be deprioritized because the number of PRB is closely relevant to the number of slot, and therefore, this discussion can also be deferred. |
| LG Electronics | As we provided in our contribution, we think the benefits from TBoMS is meaningful with limited PUSCH PRB size and TB size. In our understanding, coding gain from increasing CB size and overhead reduction from reducing TB segmentation can be achieved with restricted TB size. Also, PSD boosting gain is obtained for small number of PRBs. Therefore, we support Option 1. |

FL’s comments

Different opinions and views have been expressed. 10 companies expressed a preference for absence of restrictions on the number PRBs allocated for TBoMS. 8 companies expressed a preference for presence of restrictions.

From FL’s perspective, the concept of “absence of restrictions” is clear, as much as its implication related to the fact that “NW implementation/scheduler” should be able to allocate resources for TBoMS properly. Conversely, the concept of “presence of restrictions” is not very clear and may require further elaborations from companies which prefer this option. More precisely, additional information on how limitations could be envisioned, and why would this problem be different from any link adaptation problem solve by NW depending on implementation would be very beneficial for the continuation of the discussion. The following questions could be used as a trace, or set of inputs, to continue the discussion and improve understanding between companies:

* Are envisioned limitations to be enforced by specification?
* Are envisioned limitations to be reflected by UE capability constraints?
* Are envisioned limitations to be enforced depending on the type of traffic, e.g., eMBB vs. VoIP?
* Why would this problem be different from any other link adaptation problem, e.g., coding gain vs. power gain and so on, which is typically solved by NW depending on the implementation?

FL invites companies to continue the discussion in the table below, if possible, focusing at least (but not limited to, of course) on the three bullets above.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Intel | As commented above, although we understand TBoMS is mainly targeted for low data rate, we do not think it is necessary to define such a limit in the specification and it should be handled properly by gNB implementation. We are open to discuss UE capability for such limitations.  |
| Sharp | Agree with FL and Intel. RAN1 specification doesn’t need to have restriction. UE capability can be discussed in UE feature list discussion. |
| Samsung  | As we commented above, spec change could be in FDRA indication in DCI. We think it might be not related to other UE capability (could be just in CE capability overall) and also not dependent on the eMBB or VoIP, this will up to gNB decide (even eMBB can have small data rate cases). |
| Qualcomm | We prefer to have clear limitations on TBoMS as it can have significant impact on circular buffer size. Limiting this to single CB transmissions is one option that may simplify potential spec impact. PRB limit is another option.  |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | It is not clear to us to limit the PRB number for the time being, and we are open to discuss the UE capability of the limitations and the what is the limitation factor for the number of PRBs used for TB over multiple-slots |
| WILUS | We prefer to discuss UE capability for such limitations. Spec change for FDRA indication is unclear to us because the scope of this WI is not intended to DCI size reduction for TBoMS. |
| CATT | Agree with FL, Intel and Sharp, link adaptation is a comprehensive problem and should be up to gNB implementation. Buffer size limit can be restricted during TBS determination procedure, by simply putting an upper bound on RE’# calculation.  |
| Apple | Maybe we can discuss this again after we have conclusion on TBS determination. |
| IITH, IITM, CEWIT, Reliance Jio, Tejas Networks | Support Qualcomm |
| LG Electronics | We prefer limited PUSCH PRB size and TB size.We think the benefits from TBoMS is meaningful with limited PUSCH PRB size and TB size. In our understanding, coding gain from increasing CB size and overhead reduction from reducing TB segmentation can be achieved with restricted TB size. Also, PSD boosting gain is obtained for small number of PRBs. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Agree with Huawei’s comment |
| OPPO | We are open to restrict the TB size or application case, if clear UE complexity issue shown. I guess we can further conclude this once we have exact key TBoMS scheme determined. |
| InterDigital | Our main motivation to support Option 1 is that performance gain can be maximized with the smaller number of PRBs. In addition, restriction of the number of PRBs may simplify the discussion. We are open to discussion and we can continue the discussion along with the discussion for resource indication and Ninfo calculation.  |
| ZTE | If the TBS for each HARQ process is determined by all the allocated resources in multiple slots, it definitely would increase the UE buffer for transmission or gNB buffer for reception. So, the maximum TBS should be restricted. One way is to limit the number of PRBs used for transmission, or by other ways, e.g., limiting the maximum data rate supported for a UE. Thus, it may have impacts on specification, UE complexity, gNB complexity, etc.  |

#### 2.2.1.2 Second round of discussions

After first round of discussions, preferences are still very different, and understandings are very heterogeneous across companies. On the other hand, from FL’s perspective it is not clear how restrictions could be specified, but for UE capabilities specifications.

In this context, the only purpose of discussing a “maximum number of PRBs allocated for TBoMS” seems to be to ensure companies adopt similar configurations when performing simulations, if any, to assess performance of different solutions/options. This problem is not new and occurred already during the SI, for which the following agreement was made during RAN1 #101-e.

**Agreements**

For link level simulation, adopt the following table for eMBB data or VoIP on PUSCH and for PUCCH for FR1.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Parameters** | **Values** |
| Number of receive antenna elements for BS | Urban: 192 antenna elements for 4GHz and 2.6GHz, (M,N,P,Mg,Ng) = (12,8,2,1,1)(optional) 128 antenna elements for 4GHz, (M,N,P,Mg,Ng) = (8,8,2,1,1)Rural: 64 antenna elements for 4GHz and 2.6GHz(M,N,P,Mg,Ng) = (8,4,2,1,1)32 antenna elements for 2GHz(M,N,P,Mg,Ng) = (8,2,2,1,1)16 antenna elements for 700MHz(M,N,P,Mg,Ng) = (4,2,2,1,1) |
| Number of receive TxRUs for BS | TBD |
| Delay spread | Urban: 300nsRural: 300nsRural with long distance: 30ns |
| PRBs/TBS/MCS for eMBB for PUSCH | Any value of PRBs, and corresponding MCS index, reported by companies will be considered in the discussion. Companies are encouraged to use 30 PRBs for 1Mbps, 4 PRBs for 100kbps, 1 PRB for 30kbps as a starting point.TBS can be calculated based on e.g. the number of PRBs, target data rate, frame structure and overhead. |
| PRBs/MCS for VoIP for PUSCH | [4 PRBs] for VoIP as starting point. Other values of PRBs can be reported by companies.QPSK, pi/2 BPSK (optional) |

FL’s recommendation is to refer to agreement above and not to agree on any other value for regulating the number of PRBs which, according to first round of discussions, may be a very controversial matter with arguably very low returns for the economy of the overall discussion.

The following proposal is then made.

FL’s proposal 4

Simulation assumptions agreed during the SI will be used to study performance of different solutions for TBoMS as a starting point, i.e.:

* 30 PRBs, 4 PRBs and 1 PRB for throughput targets of 1 Mbps, 100 kbps and 30kbps, respectively, for eMBB service;
* 4 PRBs for VoIP.

Other values can be reported by companies but will not be considered as baseline.

Companies are invited to express views on FL’s proposal 4

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Ericsson | The PRBs used for the study can be a starting point, but is it better to select data rates of interest as well as identify the # of PRBs for simulation as well as other pararmeters? I’d guess that there will not be much benefit for TBoMS for 100 kbps or 1 Mbps. Would say 30 kbps or VoIP be enough for TBoMS?What do you think of an alternative proposal like the following?VoIP or 30 kbps data rates are assumed for TBoMS evaluations.* Corresponding simulation assumptions from 38.830 are used as a starting point
 |
| Sharp | We are OK with FL proposal.  |
| Panasonic | We are fine with FL proposal. |
| Qualcomm | We are afraid this discussion is headed in a direction quite different from where we started. I feel there may be some misunderstanding of the motivation behind this discussion.We would like to bring the focus back to the earlier question on imposing a limit on the max number of RBs that can be allocated when using TBoMS. We think a constraint of this form is necessary. Else, UE will have to provision larger memory for encoding the TB since we can now exceed the largest TB size currently allowed and UE cost goes up. The feature being discussed doesn’t warrant such an increase and we should try to avoid such a scenario.This feature is intended only for small payloads and does not make sense to extend beyond a single CB. Capturing this explicitly is required.We suggest introducing the following proposals:Proposal: Support TBoMS only when RB allocation is less than X RBs* FFS: exact value of X.

Proposal: Support TBoMS only for single CB transmissions |
| ZTE | From our perspective, limiting the maximum number of PRBs is not for better performance. As we commented above, it is for restricting the maximum TBS to not be larger than legacy, otherwise it will incur UE/gNB complexity for transmitting or receiving a larger TBS. So, agreeing on simulation assumptions for performance comparison cannot solve the problem. As for proposal raised by Qualcomm, we prefer to make it more general, e.g., for TBoMS, the maximum supported TBS per HARQ process should not exceed legacy TBS in Rel-15/16. FFS details.  |
| OPPO | We see also the simulation assumption is for the performance comparison. The needed configuration would be higher than that. We even haven’t seen the exact needed restriction of number of PRB. It is also somehow earlier for the discussion. We are fine to discussion it later. The QC’s way of put a X here is also OK. |
| CATT | Similar to Qualcomm and ZTE, we feel the discussion in the 2nd round is a little far away from the 1st round. Before discussing ‘what is the suitable PRB# for TBoMS simulation’, should we first have a clear goal for setting up the simulation assumption? In other words, even with some evaluation results (if simulated), does it mean a restriction should be specified to the maximum PRB# for TBoMS?If a restriction is set up to limit the buffer size/memory, we think ZTE’s suggestion is more general and better. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine with the FL proposal |
| Nokia/NSB | Support the FL proposal. |
| InterDigital | We agree with Qualcomm that the discussion is not heading toward the right directdion. Our concern is that the results of the evaluation may not help for the discussion to converge. Indeed, the smaller number of PRBs will yield gains compared to scenarios with larger number of PRBs. However, due to different assumptions for micro parameters such as mobility speed, DMRS configurations, the results may not be conclusive enough to lead us to the decision. We recommend to discuss this issue along with TBS determination, and come back to the issue in the next meeting. |
| Fujitsu | We agree with the FL’s proposal. It makes sense to use baseline case(s) similar to the assumptions in the study item, with the possibility of adding other cases. |
| CMCC | We do not see there is a need to limit the maximum PRB number for TB processing. The limitation from the UE side, such as buffer size or UE capability, may put additional requirements to the TB processing over multiple slot.And sorry that we do not quite understand why should we begin to discuss simulation assumptions and further evaluation ? |
| IITH, IITM, CEWIT, Reliance Jio, Tejas Networks | We agree with Qualcomm’s motivation about restricting the number of PRBs. Without this, the link budget gains are not feasible for coverage enhancement and the whole feature goes for a toss. More details on this are given in our tdoc.  |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | From our perspective, it is too early to discuss the limitations of RBs or other limiting factors for the TB over multiple slots transmission. Technically, we think that the benefit is beyond the RB limitations in the proposal. The basic mechanism for the TB over multiple slots should be discussed first. And this limitation related aspects can be in a UE capability discussion, where it may be clearer on what is the limitation factors. |

FL’s comments

Thank you for the comments. However, there might be some misunderstanding. From FL’s perspective, there have not been any constructive proposals to show that constraining the maximum number of PRBs allocated for TBoMS in the specification is feasible, and compatible with common practice. This is regardless of any technical considerations about the relevance of allocating more or less PRBs for the TBoMS. Of course, discussions on UE capabilities could always yield mandatory and optional configurations for the UE, hence suitable discussion could always happen in this context. However, this AI is not such context. Here RAN1 is supposed to design a feature. Elsewhere (i.e., UE capability session) RAN1 will discuss constraints, mandatory configurations/support and limitations. I would invite all companies to respect this very clean separation of purposes, since this is what helps every AI to operate in a healthy way.

Furthermore, I would like to highlight that Proposal 5 does not impose any target throughput for any possible simulation companies may want to perform. It simply maps throughput values, i.e, scenarios, to possible values of numbers of PRBs for TBoMS, which seem very much aligned to what companies proposing to limit the max number of PRBs for TBoMS are suggesting. To be more specific, it is suggested to use 4 PRBs and 1 PRB for 100 kbps and 30 kbps, respectively. From FL’s perspective those are very low numbers which should provide sufficient guarantees to all companies who wish to discuss UE capabilities related to TBoMS later on.

Now, let me propose a mental exercise meant to show why Proposal 4 has been written that way and why it is important from FL’s perspective. Assume that the group does not agree that simulations to show superiority of one solution over the other should be performed according to the agreed baseline during the SI. What would realistically happen during next meetings? Very simply, companies would present results according to their own preferences and technical understanding. As a result, discussion would be impossible because conclusions would not be comparable between them. For instance, N companies would state that the only use case that makes sense to consider is “small number of PRBs”, whereas M other companies would state that this is not true. My goal as a FL in this context, is to find a way for this not to happen since it would greatly affect our capability of agreeing effectively on matters which are already complex by nature. This is the main reason for which I decided to take all proposals from companies and translate them in a proposal on simulation assumption confirmation. Please note that this is not an attempt to push companies to simulate other solutions, but an attempt to minimize inefficiencies in all our future discussions.

Please also note that it could be easily argued that the WID does not specify any constraint on the number of PRBs which should the used TBoMS, and neither does the TR. **Therefore, putting any upper bound on the number of PRBs can be easily labelled as “out of scope”. Indeed, that is my intention as FL if it comes to that**.

Moving to the suggestion on the maximum supported TBS, I am not sure I understand the rationale of this suggestion. No company proposed to increase the maximum supported TBS per HARQ process. My understanding as FL is that this is not considered by anyone and, even if it were, strong objections would be raised. In this context, I thought this could have been discussed with CB segmentation (in due time), if ever necessary. Having said this, two companies consider this a good agreement to have so I think we can give it a try.

For all the above reasons, I would like to re-propose Proposal 4 with a minor modification (hoping that companies can reconsider their position, given all my explanations above) and draft a new Proposal 7. Two tables will be added below:

* Table below Proposal 5 is for companies to add their names (for expressing support or not).
* Table below Proposal 7 is for companies to comment.

**FL’s proposal 4**

Companies willing to evaluate performance of different solutions for TBoMS are encouraged to use simulation assumptions as per TR 38.830 as a starting point, i.e.:

* 30 PRBs, 4 PRBs and 1 PRB for throughput targets of 1 Mbps, 100 kbps and 30kbps, respectively, for eMBB service;
* 4 PRBs for VoIP.

Other values can be reported by companies.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Position | Company name |
| **Support** | NTT DOCOMO, Sharp, Panasonic, Nokia, NSB, InterDigital, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility |
| **Not support** | Ericsson (but can support if clarified that example settings are for Rel-15/16 baseline schemes) |

**FL’s proposal 7**

For TBoMS, the maximum supported TBS per HARQ process should not exceed legacy TBS in Rel-15/16.

* FFS: Details.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Qualcomm | Support. We can further discuss if limitation to single CB is helpful as well.  |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Apple | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Ericsson | ‘per HARQ process’ is a bit confusing to me. Can we say ‘TBoMS uses Rel-15/16 maximum TBS’? |
| NTT DOCOMO | We are fine with the proposal |
| IITH, IITM, CEWIT, Reliance Jio, Tejas Networks | Support |
| CATT | Support. |
| LG | We are fine with the proposal. In addition, we want to discuss further on additional limitation of the maximum TBS. |
| WILUS | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Sharp | Support |
| Panasonic | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support the proposal |
| OPPO | General OK. We had similar questions as Ericsson, we should say the maximum supported TBS ~~per HARQ process~~ should not exceed legacy TBS in Rel-15/16. |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | General OK with the proposal. |
| Samsung  | Support. |

FL’s comments on Feb 3rd

All companies are fine with the principles described in the proposal. OPPO an Ericsson stated that the part “per HARQ process” is a bit confusing and suggested removing it. This seems acceptable, with no change to the principle expressed in the Proposal, i.e., the maximum supported TBS in Rel-17 should not exceed legacy maximum supported TBS in Rel-15/16. Minor modifications in this sense are lso added by FL further clarify.

The amended proposal follows.

**FL’s proposal 7**

For TBoMS, the maximum supported TBS ~~per HARQ process~~ should not exceed legacy maximum supported TBS in Rel-15/16.

* FFS: Details.

Please use the box below **only to express concerns** related to the amended proposal. Do not write anything if you are ok with it:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Concern** |
| vivo | Generally fine. Just one clarification that, is the same MIMO layer considered in comparison for the maximum supported TBS for TBoMS, and legacy maximum supported TBS in Rel-15/16? If TBoMS supports only one MIMO layer, we would like to clarify it does not mean the max TBS for TBoMS is the maximum supported TBS in Rel-15/16 assuming a higher MIMO layer. |
| **Qualcomm** | Under FFS, please state “additional constraints on the applicability of TBoMS.” |

**FL’s comments on Feb 4th**

The comments provided in the box above has been proposed during the GTW. From FL’s perspective, there is no harm in further clarifying the corresponding aspects, trying to address the concerns expressed in these comments.

Proposal 7 is then modified as follows:

**FL’s proposal 7**

For TBoMS, the maximum supported TBS should not exceed legacy maximum supported TBS in Rel-15/16, for the same number of layers in the two cases.

* FFS: Details and further constraints on the applicability of TBoMS.

Companies are invited to express explicitly their position in the first table below, and to explain their concern in the second table if they do not support the proposal. If this happens, other companies are invited to respond and address the concern, if applicable. Please refrain from proposing minor cosmetic modifications, if possible.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Preference** | **Company name** |
| **Support Proposal 7** | Ericsson |
| **Not support Proposal 7** |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Concern** |
| Ericsson | A comment, rather than a concern: we expect one layer should be sufficient for TBoMS, but this can be verified. |
|  |  |

### 2.2.2 [CLOSED] Number of PRBs across slots used for TBoMS

Implicit assumptions on how PRBs should be allocated across slots for TBoMS seem to be present in most contributions submitted to this AI. Indeed, only one company provided an explicit proposal in this sense which, from FL’s perspective, seems aligned with the aforementioned assumptions. Given its relevance in the context of FDRA for TBoMS, a more explicit discussion on this aspect seems to be in order, for the sake of completeness and to avoid any ambiguity.

A high-level summary of all options, including companies’ preferences based on the contributions, where Option 2 has been added for completeness, follows:

* **Option 1**. The same PRB allocation is used across slots for TBoMS [1 company]:
	+ - Ericsson [23];
* **Option 2**. Different PRB allocations can be used across slots for TBoMS [-]:
	+ - Added for completeness.

From FL’s perspective, this important aspect of FDRA for TBoMS deserves more discussion before commenting further. Its relevance for subsequent discussions on TBS determination, link adaptation and (possibly) frequency hopping justifies its presence in this section.

#### 2.2.2.1 First round of discussions

Given the very early stage of the WI, FL’s recommendation is to have a first round of discussion among companies about the two options. Other options can be proposed, as well. The goal is to identify the preferred directions RAN1 should pursue for defining and specifying how to allocate PRBs across slots for TBoMS. First FL’s proposals will be made at the end of the first round.

Companies are invited to express views on the Options provided above for defining and specifying how to allocate PRBs across slots for TBoMS.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Intel | In case of frequency hopping, different PRB allocation can be used across slots. Same PRB allocation is used without frequency hopping.  |
| Sharp | Motivation is not clear for Option 2 in a case of without frequency hopping. |
| Apple | FDRA is applied to all the slots used for TBoMS if frequency hopping is not enabled. At least we don’t indicate the FDRA per slot. |
| China Telecom | Agree with Intel. |
| Qualcomm | Same comment as Intel. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support Option 1, though we are open to both options. |
| ZTE | Agree with Intel.  |
| WILUS | The same PRB allocation is used across slots without frequency hopping. In case of frequency hopping, the starting PRB can be different but the number of PRBs are not changed. |
| CATT | Agree with Intel.  |
| IITH, IITM, CEWIT, Reliance Jio, Tejas Networks | The same PRB allocation is used across slots. Frequency hopping need not be coupled with TBoMS.  |
| NEC | Agree with Intel’s comments. |
| vivo | Agree with Intel. Same PRB allocation is used when frequency hopping is not enabled. |
| Panasonic | We agree with Intel. |
| OPPO | Agree with Intel. |
| Sierra Wireless | Support option 1 – there is no need to complicate the FDRA. FH enhancements can be considered. |
| InterDigital | We agree with Intel as well. If frequency hopping is supported, different frequency allocation should be supported for TBoMS. |
| Ericsson | Using the same PRB allocation seems a reasonable starting point. A variable allocation may lead to more complex and/or less spectrally efficient scheduling. On the other hand, using the same PRBs+ can facilitate cross-slot channel estimation. To clarify our view as captured in option 1: we mean the same number of PRBs is used across the multiple slots carrying the TB. We think that inter-slot frequency hopping can be supported, and so it is not necessarily the same PRB allocation. |
| Nokia/NSB | Agree with Intel, if inter-slot FH is considered. |
| CMCC | At least in the case of without frequency hopping, the same allocation of PRB should be maintained over multiple slots from the perspective of reducing the complexity. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Agree with Intel’s views |
| Samsung  | We think the intention of the discussion point is whether use the same PRBs without considering the FH case. It’s natural to use the same PRBs. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Prefer Option 2 considering the frequency hopping |
| LG Electronics | We think the same PRB allocation is applied across slots for TBoMS. It should be clarified that it does not mean frequency hopping is not applied within transmission of TBoMS.  |

FL’s comments

FL acknowledges that the formulation of the two options was ambiguous. As correctly clarified by Ericsson, original proponent, and as described by the title, the matter at hand is not “which PRBs” will be allocated slot by slot in the context of TBoMS but “how many”. In other words, is constant or variable across slots? Options should then be rephrased as follows:

* **Option 1**. The same number of PRBs is allocated across slots for TBoMS [1 company]:
	+ - Ericsson [23];
* **Option 2**. Different number of PRBs are allocated across slots for TBoMS [-]:

Therefore, no evident implication for FH exists in this question, which, at least according FL’s understanding, affects TBS determination via the parameter .

FL invites companies to continue the discussion in the table below, considering FL’s clarification.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Intel | Option 1. Same number of PRBs should be used for TBoMS.  |
| Sharp | Option 1. Repetition type A and/or B should be the starting point. |
| Samsung  | Option 1. |
| Ericsson | Option 1. (And thanks for the further discussion/clarification) |
| Qualcomm  | Option 1. |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | Option 1.  |
| WILUS | Option 1. |
| CATT | Option 1. Change on # of PRBs may lead to complicated issue like power fluctuation. |
| Apple | Option 1. |
| Fujitsu | Option 1. |
| IITH, IITM, CEWIT, Reliance Jio, Tejas Networks | Option 1 |
| LG Electronics | Option 1 |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Option 1 |

#### 2.2.2.2 Second round of discussions

**FL’s comments after Jan 28’s GTW**

According to FL’s understanding, the situation is very stable after the clarification, thus the following FL proposal is made:

**FL’s proposal 3**

The same number of PRBs per symbol is allocated across slots for TBoMS transmission.

FL invites companies to continue the discussion in the table below, considering FL’s proposal 3.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal.  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support the proposal |
| Ericsson | Support the proposal. |
| ZTE | Support the proposal.  |
| Sharp | Support the proposal. |
| MediaTek | Ok for the proposal. Or we can say “all slots for TBoMS transmission are allocated with the same number of PRBs”. Because “per symbol” may be confusing here. |
| Apple | Support the proposal. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support the proposal. |
| Qualcomm | Support |
| WILUS | Support the proposal. |
| OPPO | Support. I wonder if we assume one of the PUSCH repetitions, existing one or enhanced one, always used with TBoMS, then it is the case. Should we discuss PUSCH repetition configured with TBoMs first. |
| CMCC | Support the proposal |
| Panasonic | We are fine with the proposal. |
| vivo | Support the proposal. |
| Samsung | Fine. |
| CATT | We support the proposal. |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | Support the proposal.  |

FL’s comments on Feb 01

After the discussion company had in the reflector, the following version of proposal 1 is considered stable, and copied in Section 3:

**Proposal 3**

* The same number of PRBs per symbol is allocated across slots for TBoMS transmission.

## 2.3 TBS determination

TBS determination was discussed by many companies. Indeed, it is an aspect which will have to be discussed and properly defined, regardless of how other aspects of TBoMS are dealt with. Two major sub-aspects of TBS determination have been discussed by companies in the submitted contributions:

1. calculation
2. calculation

Summary, discussion and proposals on these sub-aspects are provided in the following different sub-sections, whose numbers are given in the list above.

### 2.3.1 calculation

Most contributions acknowledged the fundamental nature of this aspect and discussed it in detail. Several options are considered in all contributions. A high-level summary of all options, including companies’ preferences based on the contributions, is as follows:

* **Option 1**. Based on all REs in a set of slots allocated for PUSCH [8 companies]:
	+ The set of slots is equal to the total number of slots allocated for PUSCH:
		- Samsung [18], Fujitsu [11], CMCC [16], Huawei [5], China Telecom [12], Nokia/NSB [28], CATT (Upper bound of TBS should be adjusted other than 156\*) [6];
	+ The set of slots may or may not be equal to the total number of slots allocated for PUSCH:
		- Panasonic [15],
* **Option 2**. Based on the number of RE in one slot scaled by [8 companies]:
	+ is equal to the total number of slots allocated for TBoMS transmission:
		- NEC [13], Fujitsu [11], LGE [9], Intel [8], WILUS [27], Huawei [5], IITH [21];
	+ may or may not be equal to the total number of slots allocated for TBoMS transmission:
		- OPPO [4], Qualcomm (TBoMS implemented as a special case of PUSCH repetitions, i.e., scale a TB with repetitions and transmit the TB on each repetition with RV cycling) [22] , Sharp [24];
* **Option 3**. Based on average number of RE per slot scaled by the total number of slots allocated for TBoMS transmission [1 company]:
	+ - CMCC [16];
* **Option 4**. Based on number of REs calculated slot-by-slot [1 company]:
	+ - CMCC [16];

#### 2.3.1.1 First round of discussions

Given the very early stage of the WI, FL’s recommendation is to have a first round of discussion among companies about the four options. The goal is to identify the preferred directions RAN1 should pursue for defining and specifying how is calculated for TBoMS. The number of considered options should be reduced. First FL’s proposals will be made at the end of the first round.

Companies are invited to express views on the Options provided above for defining and specifying how is calculated for TBoMS.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Intel | We prefer Option 2. Note that this highly depends on the discussion 2.1.1. For PUSCH repetition type A based TDRA, option 2 is a straightforward solution for TBS determination.  |
| Sharp | In our contribution [24], it is proposed that the value K may not be equal to the total number of slots. If TB scaling is based on the total number of slots for TBoMS, there may be a gNB/UE ambiguity issue when the UE is configured with dynamic SFI. When the UE miss-detects dynamic SFI indication, resulting in different number of slots from the one assumed by the gNB, the gNB cannot decode the TB or needs multiple blind decoding. |
| Apple | We are ok with Option 1 and Option2. It’s not clear the difference between Option 1 and Option 4. Option 1 could use all the REs more efficiently with the cost of TDRA indication per slot. |
| China Telecom | Support option 1. |
| Qualcomm | Option 2. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We prefer Option 1. However, this TBS calculation depends on TDRA and FDRA, because some TDRA does not fit Option2.  |
| ZTE | If repetition type A like TBoMS is adopted, it seems not much difference between these Options. Otherwise, Option 1 would be more accurate. Thus, Option 1 is slightly preferred.  |
| WILUS | Option 2. For type A PUSCH based time domain resource allocation, K should be the number of slots. For type B PUSCH based time domain resource allocation, K should be the number of nominal repetitions.  |
| CATT | We think the calculation highly related to TDRA method in Section 2.1.1. Option 1 seems more like a high-level description, where other options are some detailed calculations under different TDRA assumption. We support Option 1 in principle. But we think this can be discussed later, after clear TDRA preference is shown in Section 2.1.1. |
| IITH, IITM, CEWIT, Reliance Jio, Tejas Networks | Option 2 |
| NEC | It depends on type A or Type B repetition like TBoMS. For type A like TBoMS, option 1 and 2 are the same. |
| vivo | Since it is not clear which TDRA method would be adopted. It is hard to say which option is better.If Type-A like TDRA is adopted, option 2 with K equals to the total number of slots for TBoMS, seems a simple solution. While if TDRA other than type-A like method is considered, and the number of REs is not the same across the multiple slots, option 1 is more accurate for TBS calculation, and it is also applicable for type-A like TDRA for TBoMS. |
| Panasonic | In Option 2, the determination of the number of REs is based on the reference slot (e.g., the first slot for multi-slot PUSCH) even if the number of REs are different among the slots for multi-slot PUSCH. On the other hand, Option 1 can determine the number of REs considering multiple slots. Option 1 is beneficial if the number of DMRS symbols is not equal among multiple slots. On Sharp’s comment, we think TBS determination should not depend on SFI. Similar to the discussion on “counted repetitions for a PUSCH repetition” and “actual repetitions for a PUSCH repetition” in PUSCH repetition Type A enhancement, TBS determination should be based on similar to “counted repetitions for a PUSCH repetition” or TB transmission occasion in Section 2.1.5. |
| OPPO | Justified by the application scenarios, the TBoMS is in the scale of multiple slots. And it is also to reach some reasonable number of RB. Thus, slot level scaling is sufficient.If we count RE in each slot, seems many parameters should be added.  |
| Sierra Wireless | Prefer option 2 as it is simplest but based it on the slot with the maximum number of REs. Although option 1 is more precise for the current slots over which TBoMS is applied, but when repetition is used in combination, then it may not provide enough code bits.  |
| Ericsson | While this is a key problem to solve, it is dependent on the decisions above on how resources are allocated and can be used, like Type A vs. Type B, whether special slots are used, etc. So we would suggest to not focus too much on this at this stage, presuming that the decision can be made more easily after these prerequisite decisions are made. |
| Nokia/NSB | We would like to point out that decisions we could take for 2.3.1 should take into account what is decided for Section 2.1.1 and if inter-slot FH is supported with different dumber of PRBs per slot. In this context, Option 1 for 2.3.1 should work regardless of how FH is supported and would be applicable to both repetition type A and repetition type B TDRA as per discussion in Section 2.1.1. Conversely, Option 2 may only work properly for the case that repetition type A is used and number of PRBs per slot does not change in the context of intra-slot FH. For all these reasons, we support Option 1. |
| CMCC | The option 3 and option 4 could be seen as the sub steps of the option 1. Both option 3 and 4 also consider the situation that the RE allocated are not even for each slot, which may be induced by the limitation of PUSCH resource allocation or some collisions with other transmissions.In general, the option 1 could cover all the other 3 options. Then the option 1 is preferred. The option 2 put a further restriction that the RE allocated per slot should be same, which cannot be guaranteed if collisions happens in some of the slots. From another point, if the RE number allocated per slot are kept the same, that means the allocated RE number the minimum value among multiple slots. And that is why we propose the option 3. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support option 1 as it is more accurate and provides better flexibility in comparison to option 2 where only multiples of symbols in 1 slot can be used to determine TBS |
| Samsung  | Option 1 is prefered. Option 2 looks like more suitable only for Type A repetition, in which the SLIV in each slots are the same, so RE number in each slot is the same as well, thus can be easily using scaling factor. But for type B repetition or other indication method for TBoMS, if the symbol number in each slot or each repletion is not the same, the final total RE number for TBS determination by option 2 is determined based on one slot multiplying the K, which could be in consistent with the actual total RE number, then additional handling is needed to fit in the actual RE number. In general, we understand the fundamental intention of TBoMS is to consider the multiple slots for this single TB as one whole part, while option 1 seems a more natural direction. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Both Option 1 and 2 can be considered. |
| LG Electronics | We think the same symbol allocation is applied across slots to transmit TBoMS. Therefore, we prefer Option 2 to increase TBS. Regard to the scaling factor *K*, we are open to indicate *K* independently with the number of slots allocated for TBoMS. |

FL’s comments

Different opinions and views have been expressed. Majority of companies seem to prefer to defer the discussion on how to determine TBS until an agreement on aspect 2.1.1 is found. This seems a reasonable course of action, hence FL suggest pausing the discussion for the time being and resume it after the aforementioned agreement is found. In this context, companies are invited to carefully consider FL’s proposal in Section 2.1.1 to ensure progress can be achieved in other sections as well, whenever possible.

#### 2.3.1.2 Second round of discussions

From FL’s perspective, identifying one method to calculate is not possible unless specific assumptions are made on how the TBoMS transmission is performed over the allocated time domain resources. On the other hand, the outcome of discussion in 2.1.1 can be used to identify two possible directions which will then have to be down-selected during next meeting, as a natural consequence of agreements made on how the TBoMS transmission is performed over the allocated time domain resources. More precisely, according to the discussion in 2.1.1, the following proposal can be made:

FL’s proposal 5

One or two of the following options will be considered to calculate for TBoMS:

* **Option 1**: Based on all REs determined across the slots over which the TBoMS transmission is performed.
* **Option 2**: Based on the number of RE determined in one slot over which the TBoMS transmission is performed, scaled by .

Companies are invited to express views on FL’s proposal 5.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Ericsson | Support the proposal. This seems like the right amount of progress for this meeting; we can further narrow down the options after more study. |
| Sharp | We are not fully sure on what is the K in Option 2. Is it OK to add FFS for clarification under Option 2 as follows? Further, “or the total number of nominal repetitions” should be inserted for repetition type B.One or two of the following options will be considered to calculate for TBoMS:* **Option 1**: Based on all REs determined across the slots over which the TBoMS transmission is performed.
* **Option 2**: Based on the number of RE determined in one slot over which the TBoMS transmission is performed, scaled by .
	+ FFS: K may or may not be equal to the total number of slots or the total number of nominal repetitions allocated for TBoMS transmission.
 |
| WILUS | Support intention of the proposal. Since we are still discussing on TDRA aspects, it would be better to use neutral terminology here rather than using ‘slot’ for option 2. For example, if type-B like TDRA is used, then the number of REs may be determined in one nominal repetition and scaled for option 2. Thus, we suggest to change “one slot” with “one slot/nominal repetition.” |
| Panasonic | On Option 1, although we understand that the aspects related to repetition of TBoMS will be discussed later, we would like to clarify that “the slots over which the TBoMS transmission is performed” does not include the repetition, i.e., “the slots over which the TBoMS transmission is performed” is related to first transmission of TBoMS. Is it common understanding?On the main bullet, we think it is not required to support both options. Our view is either one should be selected. |
| Qualcomm | Support the proposal. We can downselect in the next meeting. |
| ZTE | We slightly prefer Option 1, while ok for further discussion.  |
| OPPO | Principle is ok.For Alt2, it seems should be “in one of the slots over which the TBoMS”. Otherwise, it looks like 1 slot do the whole transmission. |
| CATT | We support this proposal in principle. Though, Option 1 reads like a general calculation principle, while Option 2 is more like a detailed calculation form of Option 1, when type-A repetition like TDRA is applied. But we can live with this for the sake of progress.Also fine with the modification from Sharp, WILUS and Panasonic. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine with the proposal and agree with Panasonic |
| Nokia/NSB | Support the FL’s proposal. |
| InterDigital | We share similar view with Sharp and WILUS. Whether the FL’s proposal can be applicable to already agreed “PUSCH repetition type B like TDRA” requires more time to discuss since, especially for Option 2, the unit over which number of REs is determined may not be a slot. It could be based on a nominal repetition-like unit. On the other hand, for already agreed “PUSCH repetition type A like TDRA”, the FL’s proposal is applicable. Therefore, we propose the following modification to the FL’s proposal.For PUSCH repetition type A like TDRA, one or two of the following options will be considered to calculate for TBoMS:* **Option 1**: Based on all REs determined across the slots over which the TBoMS transmission is performed.
* **Option 2**: Based on the number of RE determined in one slot over which the TBoMS transmission is performed, scaled by .

Our proposal is come back to the next meeting to discuss how to calculate Ninfo for type B like TDRA. |
| Fujitsu | We are OK with the FL’s proposalWe have a preference for Option 1, but it is fine to continue discussion and preferably down-select to one option. We see no strong reason to differentiate between TDRA based on repetition Type A and TDRA based on repetition Type B or end up with different options for these two cases.  |
| CMCC | Option 1 seems to be a more general principle. And the option 2 is a detailed calculation under PUSCH repetition type A like TDRA. As there is no conclusion for time domain resource indication, we may not preclude the solution corresponding to PUSCH repetition type B like TDRA. And option 2 could not cover the case that the RE allocation per slot are not same. We are open to further views. |

FL’s comments

There seems to be a bit of confusion or, at least, different understanding between FL and some companies. It may be good to clarify. I invite all companies to read all the “per-company” responses below. Therein you will find all the information you need to understand why I took certain decisions while modifying Proposal 6. Of course, new comments are welcome and possible in the Table below. My “per-company” responses follow:

@Sharp: Good catch. We need to ensure K covers several cases. On the other hand, since we have not discussed repetitions yet and we do not know how, if any, those will be modelled and supported in TBoMS, then my suggestion would be to streamline your suggested FFS as “FFS: the definition of K” (please see below for more clarity). I hope this can address your concern.

@Wilus: You make a very good point. In my mind, Option 1 was applicable for time domain resource determination based on both PUSCH repetition type A like TDRA and PUSCH repetition type B like TDRA. Conversely, Option 2 was applicable to time domain resource determination based on both PUSCH repetition type A like TDRA. You are now suggesting modifying Option 2 to make it applicable (at least in principle) to time domain resource determination based on both PUSCH repetition type B like TDRA. Interdigital seems to share the same concern/preference. I welcome this observation. However, as I explained to Sharp above, I do not think we should use the concept of “repetition” in these fundamental agreements, given that we have not defined the role that “repetitions” may or may not have in TBoMS. At the same time, we can already know that there will be a SLIV, for both time domain resource indication options. In particular, this SLIV will indicate the number of symbols L found in the first slot for the determination based on PUSCH repetition type A like TDRA or found in the first “nominal repetition” for the determination based on PUSCH repetition type B TDRA. For all these reasons, I suggest replacing “slot” with “symbols” and add a note to specify things properly. Please check proposal below.

@Panasonic: Good catch. Situation is a bit tricky because we have no agreement on repetitions, as I explained above. Thus, the notion of “first transmission” may sound ambiguous in this context. However, I think it is not in practice, since “first” may imply both “first and only” and also “first of several”. For this reason, I modified the proposal to further clarify, as you requested.

@OPPO: “one of the slots” may be vague in practice, given that if time domain resource indication is done as PUSCH repetition type B like TDRA, then different slots may have different number of REs. This observation stems from the comments Wilus and Interdigital made, which I accepted. On the other hand, I think that the modification I made to the proposal to address their concerns may address your as well, since now ambiguity seems to be removed. Please check the new proposal carefully and let me know.

@Interdigital: Please see my answer to Wilus. I hope what I did to address concerns expressed by Wilus can also address your concerns. To be honest, I would not be favourable to discuss further basic definitions of N\_info during the next meeting. I think we should strive to complete this step during this meeting, if possible. Down selection will not occur, of course. However, we should aim at having clean definitions during #104-e for us to be able to discuss down selection directly in #104-bis-e. I hope this can be acceptable for you.

@CMCC: You made good observations, which I also found in @CATT’s comments. I hope the modifications I am suggesting to address other companies’ concerns can contribute to improve the clarity of the proposal and be acceptable to you as well.

**FL’s proposal 5**

One or two of the following options will be considered to calculate for TBoMS:

* **Option 1:** Based on all REs determined across the symbols over which the first TBoMS transmission is performed.
* **Option 2:** Based on the number of RE determined in the first L symbols over which the TBoMS transmission is performed, scaled by **.**

FFS: the definition of K

Note: L is the number of symbols determined using the SLIV of PUSCH repetition type A/B like TDRA

Companies are invited to comment in the Table below on FL’s proposal 6. FL would appreciate if concerns and objections, if any, could be paired with constructive suggestions to improve the proposal. Please, refrain from suggesting minor modifications if they are only cosmetic and not structural.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Qualcomm | Assuming is a typo. With the rewording of Option 1, we don’t seem to be including an option to determine also based on number of repetitions included or specified as part of first TBoMS transmission (I use ‘first’ as we would use it in the HARQ context). (I see comments addressed to other companies on this aspect, but think a little more clarity can help.) Can we edit the first option as follows:* **Option 1:** Based on all REs determined across the symbols over which the first TBoMS transmission is performed. The first TBoMS transmission may include one or more repetitions.
 |
| Intel | First, we share similar view as QC that this should N\_info. Another question is whether we need to support both options. Our understanding is that we only consider one alternative out of these two. If this is the intention, it may be good to update the main bullet as “down-select one option to determine …”  |
| Apple | “First TBoMS transmission is performance” it gives the impression that repetition is supported. But whether support repetition over MBoTB is not discussed yet. We propose to remove the “first”. And add a note to say repetition is not considered in TBS determination. |
| Ericsson | Also assume N\_info is meant rather than N\_oh^PRB.For Option 1, a ‘first’ TBoMS transmission might be a slot or it might be all slots over which a TBoMS transmission (one repetition or a HARQ transmission) is performed. Suggest: “across the symbols carrying an instance of the transport block.”, which also hopefully avoids ambiguity with respect to repetition. |
| NTT DOCOMO | When it comes to Option1, I prefer the previous proposal. Current Option 1 is not clear because of the phrase “the first TBoMS transmission”. In my understanding, the original intention of Option 1 is to count all REs over all available slots where TBoMS PUSCH is allocated. However, this proposal misleads to calculating *Ninfo* only from the first repetition of repetition like TDRA.Therefore, we propose adding note to describe the definition of first TBoMS transmission or make the proposal of Option1 back to the original |
| IITH, IITM, CEWIT, Reliance Jio, Tejas Networks | We support Option-2Similar observation about typo. Does option 1 refer to all symbols that are needed to fill the entire TB that is sent using the TBoMS feature?Like Docomo, we also prefer older version of the proposal. |
| CATT | Understand the motivation for the update. But we have similar feeling with Apple that it is now assuming that repetition will be applied on top of TBoMS. For Option 1, we prefer the original version; fine with Option 2. And also, we think a note like “Repetitions for TBoMS is not considered here” may help clarifying the calculation. |
| LG | We are generally fine with the proposal.For Option 1, to deal with other companies concern on TBoMS repetitions, we can remove ‘first’ and add a sub-bullet “If repetition of TBoMS is supported, Ninfo determination is based on the first TBoMS transmission.” |
| WILUS | We appreciate FL’s response and modifications and the current version of option 2 is acceptable to us. |
| Sharp | Agree with Docomo. “first TBoMS transmission” is not clear to us. We are fine with the original Option 1 or Qualcomm’s proposal.Regarding, Option 2, we support the current wording. |
| Panasonic | For Option 1, our understanding of “first TBoMS transmission” is all slots over which a TBoMS transmission is performed without repetition. When repetition is applied on top of TBoMS transmission, “first TBoMS transmission” is first repetition of TBoMS of the repetition. In order to clarify the definition of “first TBoMS transmission”, we are fine to LG’s suggestion (with slight modification) to remove “first” and to add sub-bullet that “if repetition of TBoMS is supported, Ninfo determination is based on the first TBoMS transmission of the repetition”. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine with the proposal and support option 1 with similar understanding as Panasonic. |
| OPPO | Assuming the main bullet is for Ninfo, then we see the option1 will require more definition, e.g., what will be the first TBoMS transmission. We see the option 2 gives clearer direction.Thanks for the carful explanation. The number of L is fine for us. Open for discussion on repetition scheme. However, the option 2 bullet would be clearer to say “in L symbols” in main bullet and “SLIV of PUSCH indicated/derived by TDRA”. Mybe we don’t need to discuss the exact type here. |
| CMCC | General fine for the proposal. Option 1 covers all the cases. And option 2 is related with PUSCH repetition type B like TDRA indication. A down-selection is necessary for now, since the conclusion of TDRA indication is not clear. We understand the intention of “ **first** TBoMS transmission”. But it should be clarified with a note explicitly saying that the first means a single first transmission without repetitions or HARQ retransmissions. Or there could be more discussion about it during the online. Or when we comeback in the next meeting, more companies do not understand what it means.  |

FL’s comments on Feb 3rd

Most companies found the notion of first TBoMS transmission ambiguous. Several suggestions were made. Almost all comments targeted Option 1. According to some company, previous version of Option 1 was clearer. One company suggested a modification to the Note in Option 2. Following rationale has been followed to take all comments into account:

* + Previous version of Option 1 is now presented as a V1 (together with the new variant, labeled as V2). A box is added below the proposal for companies to express their preference here via email (please write either V1 or V2), for simplicity. More structural comments can still be made in the FL summary if companies prefer to do so. Having said this, I’d like to address companies who stated that they preferred the previous version, i.e., V1. Please consider that many companies would be ok with V2 if some modifications are performed. In this sense, if your preference is just about the “style” and you do not have a real issue with the content, then I would appreciate if you could carefully check all modifications performed on V2 and consider supporting it.
	+ From FL’s perspective the easiest way to address the concerns expressed by companies on the “first TBoMS transmission” is to accept Ericsson’s suggestion. Additionally, while I am personally against the idea of including reference to repetitions in this proposal, I am also including a note as suggested by at least LG and Panasonic to further clarify the situation, with no ambiguity. In this context, suggestion by Qualcomm could also be a possible option, however it seems to imply more than what is currently being accepted by most companies, thus it seems less suitable to solve the issue at hand.
	+ The note to Option 2 is modified as suggested by OPPO.
	+ @Intel: the sentence “one or two of the following options [..]” does not preclude the down selection, while it gives companies the possibility of working on this problem with an open mind and RAN1 the possibility of having more options to consider for next meeting. From FL’s perspective this seems acceptable with very limited risks. You were the only one raising this point. I hope this is fine with you.

Amended proposal follows. Please note that the goal here is not to down select one of the two options, but to finalize their form. Discussion on down selection will take place in #104-bis-e:

**FL’s proposal 5**

One or two of the following options will be considered to calculate   for TBoMS:

* **Option 1:**
	+ **V1:** Based on all REs determined across the slots over which the TBoMS transmission is performed.
	+ **V2:** Based on all REs determined across the symbols carrying one instance of the transport block.

**Note:** If repetition of TBoMS is supported, calculation is based on the first instance of the transport block.

* **Option 2:** Based on the number of RE determined in the first L symbols over which the TBoMS transmission is performed, scaled by **.**

FFS: the definition of K

Note: L is the number of symbols determined using the SLIV of PUSCH indicated via TDRA

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Preference** | **Company name** |
| **V1 of Option 1** |  |
| **V2 of Option 1** | CATT, ZTE, Nokia, NSB, Panasonic, Huawei, Hisilicon, CMCC, Ericsson, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility |

Additional comments can be added in the table below. Please do not add comments to confirm your support or explain why you picked V1 or V2. Use the table to comment **only if you have strong concerns**.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Samsung  | Maybe just me, I fail to understand what is the “instance” meaning in “**V2:** Based on all REs determined across the symbols carrying one instance of the transport block.”; Or company simply wants to say it is “based on all Res determined across the symbols carrying a single TB”? |
| vivo | Although we have never discussed TBoMS with repetition, we understand the intention for option 1-v2. While current wording seems to have already provide some detailed solutions for TBS determination if repetition for TBoMS is supported. For example, considering we may also support **type-B** like TDRA for TBoMS, “the symbols **carrying** one instance of the transport block”, does it mean the symbols corresponds to the actual number of symbols, rather than the nominal number of symbols for the TBS processing, which we may need further discussion, even if the repetition is supported. Also, assuming a type-B like TDRA for TBoMS is supported, another example is, “**first instance** of the transport block” in note of option 1, it may imply that even if the second instance for the TB may have different number of symbols (e.g. nominal length) for actual transmission compared with the first instance, the TBS is still determined based on the first instance?All these details, implied from current wording for v2, seem step too far in current stage, further discussion maybe needed? Hence, could we just focus on option 1-v1 for the cases if repetition is **not** supported. And the details for supporting repetition can be left for FFS? |
| Qualcomm | It is really hard to provide input unless we make more progress on the TDRA aspects. We need clarity on what constitutes one transmission occasion (this term is used extensively in the spec) of a TBoMS. A potential alternative for Option 1:Based on the number of REs determined across one or more transmission occasions of TBoMS |

**FL’s comments on Feb 4th**

This proposal was not treated online due to lack of time. At the same time some suggestions were made by some companies, and request for clarification were also issued.

A modification to Option 1 is then proposed in the following new version of Proposal 5 where:

* V2 of Option 1 has been modified to remove ambiguity some companies associated to the word “instance”
* V3 has been added, just in case, to provide an alternative whose wording is as close as possible to Option 2, with the necessary conceptual difference
* An FFS has been added to replace the Note, to clarify that further impacts if repetitions of TBoMS are supported are FFS

**FL’s Proposal 5**

One or two of the following options will be considered to calculate for TBoMS:

* **Option 1**:
	+ V1: Based on all REs determined across the slots over which the TBoMS transmission is performed.
	+ V2: Based on all REs determined across the symbols carrying a single TB.
	+ V3: Based on all REs determined across the symbols over which the TBoMS transmission is performed.

FFS: further impacts if repetitions of TBoMS is supported.

* **Option 2**: Based on the number of RE determined in the first L symbols over which the TBoMS transmission is performed, scaled by K≥1.
	+ FFS: the definition of K

Note: L is the number of symbols determined using the SLIV of PUSCH indicated via TDRA

Companies are invited to express explicitly their position in the first table below, and to explain their concern in the second table if they do not support the proposal. If this happens, other companies are invited to respond and address the concern, if applicable. Please refrain from proposing minor cosmetic modifications, if possible.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Preference** | **Company name** |
| **Support Proposal 5** | Ericsson |
| **Not support Proposal 5** |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Concern** |
| Ericsson | Minor comment: It may not be clear that we select only one of V1, V2, and V3. Perhaps something like ‘Option 1: Select one of V1, V2, and V3’ or some such. |
|  |  |

### 2.3.2 calculation

Most contributions discussed this aspect, which has a precise impact TBS determination and, as such, needs to be discussed carefully. Several options are considered in all contributions. A high-level summary of all options, including companies’ preferences based on the contributions, is as follows:

* **Option 1**. Same value of is assumed for all slots [1 company]:
	+ - InterDigital [10];
* **Option 2**. is calculated depending on both *xOverhead* and the resources allocated for multi-slot TB transmission, expressed in number of actual PUSCH symbols/slots [1 company]:
	+ - Nokia/NSB [28];
* **Option 3**. is calculated slot-by-slot [1 company]:
	+ - CMCC [16];
* **Option 4**. FFS [1 company]:
	+ - Samsung [18];

From FL’s perspective, this important aspect of TBS determination for TBoMS deserves more discussion before commenting further.

#### 2.3.2.1 First round of discussions

Given the very early stage of the WI, FL’s recommendation is to have a first round of discussion among companies about the four options. The goal is to identify the preferred directions RAN1 should pursue for defining and specifying how is calculated for TBoMS. The number of considered options should be reduced. First FL’s proposals will be made at the end of the first round.

Companies are invited to express views on the Options provided above for defining and specifying how is calculated for TBoMS.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Intel | We slightly prefer Option 1.  |
| Sharp | Basically, is designed for optimizing TBS taking RB/RE level rate matching including CORESET or CSI-RS into account. For UL, given that no RB/RE level rate-matching specified, we don’t think necessity of optimizing in Rel-17 CE WI. |
| Apple | Option 1 is straightforward; we open for other options. |
| Qualcomm | Option 1 |
| ZTE | Option 1 is sufficient if repetition type A like TBoMS is adopted.  |
| WILUS | We are open to discuss how to configure/apply *xOverhead*. Since *xOverhead* is configured in *PUSCH-ServingCellConfig,* we further discuss separate configuration of *xOvehead* for TBoMS is necessary and if configured it is per slot (i.e., is scaled by the number of slots) or per PUSCH transmission (i.e., is not scaled) |
| CATT | Similar to our answer in 2.3.1.1, we can discuss this later after TDRA method is concluded. |
| IITH, IITM, CEWIT, Reliance Jio, Tejas Networks | Option 1 |
| NEC | Option 1 |
| Panasonic | In the current specification, is {0, 6, 12 or 18} and these values are for a single slot allocation. Therefore, to scale the value of for multi-slot PUSCH or to introduce new values for multi-slot PUSCH is necessary. |
| OPPO | Option1. |
| InterDigital | Option 1 |
| Ericsson | Similar to Ninfo, this question may be dependent on other decisions above. So it may be better to not focus too much on this at this stage, presuming that the decision can be made more easily after the prerequisite decisions are made. |
| Nokia/NSB | We share the same view as CATT that this aspect can be discussed after we have a clear TDRA framework.  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Option1 is preferred  |
| Samsung  | Since *xOverhead* is a gNB configured parameter by RRC, it seems no harm to use the same for slots in TBS determination. Thus option 1 is slightly preferred, but we are open to discuss. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option 1 is preferred, we open for other options. |
| LG Electronics | Support Option 1. If Option 2 in 2.3.1 is applied, we think the same value of *NohPRB* should be assumed for all slots (Option 1). |

FL’s comments

Different opinions and views have been expressed. Majority of companies seem to prefer to defer the discussion on how to calculate until an agreement on aspect 2.1.1 is found. This seems a reasonable course of action, hence FL suggest pausing the discussion for the time being and resume it after the aforementioned agreement is found. In this context, companies are invited to carefully consider FL’s proposal in Section 2.1.1 to ensure progress can be achieved in other sections as well, whenever possible.

#### 2.3.2.2 Second round of discussions

From FL’s perspective, identifying one method to calculate is not possible unless specific assumptions are made on how the TBoMS transmission is performed over the allocated time domain resources. On the other hand, the outcome of discussion in 2.1.1 can be used to identify two possible directions which will then have to be down-selected during next meeting, as a natural consequence of agreements made on how the TBoMS transmission is performed over the allocated time domain resources. More precisely, according to the discussion in 2.1.1, the following proposal can be made:

FL’s proposal 6

One or two of the following options will be considered to calculate for TBoMS:

* **Option 1**: Same value of is assumed for all the slots over which the TBoMS transmission is performed.
* **Option 2**: is calculated depending on both *xOverhead* and the number of symbols/slots over which the TBoMS transmission is performed.
	+ FFS: if either the number of symbols or the number of slots is used.

Companies are invited to express views on FL’s proposal 6.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Ericsson | Support. |
| Sharp | We are OK with FL proposal. |
| WILUS | We are fine with the proposal with the clarification that in option 1 is configured by *xOverhead* as in Rel-15/16 and independent to the number of symbols/slots of TBoMS transmission. |
| Panasonic | We are fine with FL proposal. |
| Qualcomm | Support. |
| ZTE | We prefer Option 1, while ok for further discussion.  |
| OPPO | We are OK for the .The should be also discussed, there are ongoing discussion that DMRS overhead may be optimized for different slots. We are OK to say: Further study the DMRS overhead per slot. |
| CATT | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine with proposal and support option 1 |
| Nokia/NSB | Support the FL’s proposal. |
| InterDigital | We support the FL’s proposal |
| Fujitsu | We support the FL’s proposal |
| IITH, IITM, CEWIT, Reliance Jio, Tejas Networks | Support |

FL’s comments

Majority of companies seem to support the proposal as is. Some suggestions are made to further clarify some aspects. No company objected the proposal. From FL’s perspective, there is no harm to add clarifications which do not alter the substance of the proposal. In this regard, suggestion by Wilus is retained and integrated to Option 1. Suggestion by OPPO is also reasonable in principle, on the other hand a discussion on DM-RS is planned to occur as a separate item, as per Section 2.4.2. Of course, this topic will not be treated during this meeting, but it is definitely going to be treated as long as companies propose to do so. No agreement so far forbids this. For this reason, FL prefers to keep the proposal without FFS and hope this is acceptable by OPPO.

**FL’s proposal 6**

One or two of the following options will be considered to calculate for TBoMS:

* **Option 1**: is assumed to be the same for all the slots over which the TBoMS transmission is performed and is configured by *xOverhead* as in Rel-15/16.
* **Option 2**: is calculated depending on both *xOverhead* and the number of symbols/slots over which the TBoMS transmission is performed.
	+ FFS: if either the number of symbols or the number of slots is used.

This proposal will be copied in the email thread as it seems stable already. Companies with **strong concerns** can comment in the Table below for simplicity.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Qualcomm | Support. Prefer Option 1. |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal in principle. For option 2, is this correct understanding that xOverhead is separately configured from the one in Rel-15/16? If this is correct understanding, it may be good to add one bullet to mention this. Similar to the above comment, our understanding is that we only support one option. If this is correct understanding, it would be good to update the main bullet as “down-select one option to determine” |
| Apple | We are ok with this proposal. |
| Ericsson | Small comment to option 1: xOverhead is an optional parameter. Suggest ‘can be configured’ |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support proposal |
| IITH, IITM, CEWIT, Reliance Jio, Tejas Networks | Support |
| CATT | OK with this proposal. |
| LG | We are fine with the proposal and support Option 1. |
| WILUS | We are fine with this proposal.  |
| Sharp | We are fine with the proposal though we don’t see urgency of this proposal. We can discuss overhead assumption when more detailed structure is agreed. Anyway, the proposal says “will consider”, which means any other solutions are not precluded at this stage. Therefore, we are fine. |
| Panasonic | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine with the proposal and support Option 1 |
| OPPO | OK with the proposal, option1 preferred. |
| CMCC | We are fine with the proposal. Option 2 could fit into the situations that the allocated symbols are different in different slots. |

**FL’s comments on Feb 3rd**

All companies are fine with the principles described in the proposal. Some observations were made, with corresponding suggestions:

* + Ericsson noted that *xOverhead* is an optional parameter in Rel-15/16, hence it may be more appropriate to replace “is configured” with “can be configured” in the first bullet. Comment seems fair and modification is included.
	+ Intel asked if the correct understanding is that *xOverhead* is separately configured from the one in Rel-15/16. FL’s understanding is that no specific assumption is made for this. There may be no actual reason to support a separate configuration. On the other hand, the question is legit and an FFS could be added. It does not seem to alter the substance of the proposal.

The amended proposal follows. Please use the box below **only to express concerns** related to the amended proposal. Do not write anything if you are ok with it:

**FL’s proposal 6**

One or two of the following options will be considered to calculate for TBoMS:

* **Option 1**: is assumed to be the same for all the slots over which the TBoMS transmission is performed and can be configured by *xOverhead* as in Rel-15/16.
* **Option 2**: is calculated depending on both *xOverhead* and the number of symbols/slots over which the TBoMS transmission is performed.
	+ FFS: if either the number of symbols or the number of slots is used.
	+ FFS: if *xOverhead is separately configured from the one in Rel-15/16.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Concern** |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**FL’s comments on Feb 4th**

Two comments were raised during last GTW:

1. It was asked to modify the first sentence “One or two of the following options will be considered to calculate for TBoMS as follows: “One ~~or two~~ of the following options will be considered to calculate for TBoMS”. Proposal was supported by only one company. From FL’s perspective, it should be fine to keep “one or two” given that this does not preclude any down selection, while keeping more options open in compliance with the agreement the group had on time domain resource indication.
2. It was commented that no definition of “transmission occasion” has been agreed in this AI so far, hence it may be premature to restrict options for calculating for TBoMS. From FL’s perspective, it is not clear how progress can be obtained if we do not proceed step by step. In this context, the two options provide a very wide coverage of possible options for calculating . No further options have been proposed since Feb, 1st. No objection was raised for more than 24h.

Proposal 6 is then re-proposed as is, as follows:

**FL’s proposal 6**

One or two of the following options will be considered to calculate for TBoMS:

* **Option 1**: is assumed to be the same for all the slots over which the TBoMS transmission is performed and can be configured by *xOverhead* as in Rel-15/16.
* **Option 2**: is calculated depending on both *xOverhead* and the number of symbols/slots over which the TBoMS transmission is performed.
	+ FFS: if either the number of symbols or the number of slots is used.
	+ FFS: if *xOverhead is separately configured from the one in Rel-15/16.*

Companies are invited to express explicitly their position in the first table below, and to explain their concern in the second table if they do not support the proposal. If this happens, other companies are invited to respond and address the concern, if applicable. Please refrain from proposing minor cosmetic modifications, if possible.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Preference** | **Company name** |
| **Support Proposal 6** | Ericsson |
| **Not support Proposal 6** |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Concern** |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## 2.4 Others

As discussed at the beginning of Section 2, aspects and topics related to several aspects of TBoMS have been prioritized in order to ensure that constructive discussions and effective progress can be achieved during RAN1 #104-e. In this context, priority has been given to the aspects and topics discussed in sections 2.1 to 2.4, which mostly focus on resource allocation for TBoMS and related matters. All other aspects are listed in this section, i.e, 2.4, where proposals made by companies in their contributions are reported and described in detail. No specific FL’s proposal or recommendation is formulated at this stage, since such aspects may not be handled during RAN1 #104-e. Should discussions for 2.1 to 2.4 progress fast, new sections for specific aspects, currently in 2.4, will be open for discussions and corresponding FL’s proposals and recommendations would be made.

### Relationship between TBoMS and PUSCH repetitions

The relationship between TBoMS and PUSCH repetitions was discussed in several contributions, which can be summarized as follows:

* Two companies (Samsung[18], Intel [8]) proposed that repetition is supported for TBoMS.
* One company (vivo [7]) proposed that repetition is not supported for TBoMS.
* One company (ZTE [3]) proposed to further discuss this aspect.

### DM-RS

DM-RS allocation was discussed in several contributions, which can be classified into the following sub-topics:

 **DM-RS allocation for TBoMS in general**

* Two companies (Fujitsu [11], Ericsson [23]) proposed that the existing DM-RS specifications should be reused.
* One company (Huawei [5]) proposed that DM-RS positions can be determined per slot or the DM-RS determination mechanism of PUSCH repetition type B can be reused.
* One company (DOCOMO [25]) proposed that DM-RS configuration should be extended (e.g. 3 additional DM-RS positions) so that one PUSCH can have more than 14 OFDM symbols with uniform DM-RS symbol distribution.

**DM-RS allocation for TBoMS in case joint channel estimation is enabled**

* One company (Huawei [5]) proposed that DM-RS positions can be determined per L symbols where L is configurable.
* One company (Samsung [18]) proposed to further study time domain allocation of DM-RS considering joint channel estimation over multi-slot and transmissions (e.g. DM-RS allocation is determined per PUSCH transmission, or per slot).

### CB segmentation, redundancy version, rate-matching and interleaving

Concerning TB processing for mapping the TB on the resource that spans across multiple slots, the following sub-topics were discussed in several contributions:

 **Codebook (CB) segmentation**

* One company (Ericsson [23]) proposed that CB segmentation is deprioritized for TBoMS and that RAN1 should decide a maximum TBS of TBoMS to avoid CB segmentation.
* One company (Apple [20]) proposed that both TB segmentation and CBG-based TB processing can be considered.
* Two companies (Samsung [18], ZTE [3]) proposed that the supported maximum TBS remains unchanged.

 **Redundancy version (RV) if repetition of TBoMS is supported**

* One company (LGE [9]) proposed that the value of rvid applied to nth transmission occasion of the TB is determined based on the value “n mod 4”.
* One company (OPPO [4]) proposed that a single RV scheme can be used across all the repetition slots in case of TB size over multi-slot and PUSCH repetition is configured.
* One company (Intel [8]) proposed that the existing RV cycling pattern for PUSCH with repetition is reused for TBoMS with repetitions.

 **Rate-matching and interleaving**

* One company (Samsung [18]) proposed to further study the operation of interleaving and rate-matching output for TBoMS.

### Link adaptation

One company (Ericsson [23]) proposed that the same MCS index can be used for multiple slots of multi-slot PUSCH.

### Frequency hopping

Frequency hopping (FH) aspects were discussed, and corresponding proposals were made, depending on whether joint channel estimation and repetition are supported for TBoMS:

* One company (Lenovo [14]) proposed that multi-slot frequency hopping and multi-slot DM-RS bundling for joint channel estimation for entire hop can be supported and the association between frequency hop duration and DM-RS bundle duration should be considered.
* One company (Intel [8]) proposed that inter-slot FH with inter-slot bundling is supported for TBoMS without repetition and that inter-slot FH and inter-repetition FH are supported for TBoMS with repetition.

### Transmission power determination

One company (ZTE [3]) proposed that the transmission power determination should be based on the multiple slots for TBoMS.

### Rank of TBoMS transmission

The rank of a TBoMS transmission (number of layers) was discussed in several contributions and can be summarized as follows:

* One company (Ericsson [23]) proposed that the same number of layers can be used for multiple slots of multi-slot PUSCH.
* One company (vivo [7]) proposed that TBoMS should be limited to single-layer transmission.

### Channel estimation

Discussions on whether joint channel estimation can be applied for TBoMS were carried out in several contributions. The following proposals were made:

* One company (InterDigital [10]) proposed to support joint channel estimation for the TBoMS.
* One company (vivo [7]) proposed that it is up to UE capability to ensure phase continuity for TBoMS.
* One company (Lenovo [14]) implicitly assumed joint channel estimation for TBoMS by proposing that multi-slot frequency hopping and multi-slot DM-RS bundling for joint channel estimation for entire hop can be supported.

### Retransmissions

Details of retransmission of a TBoMS were discussed in several contributions as follows.

* One company (CMCC [16]) proposed that per-slot retransmission should be considered for the retransmission of TBoMS.
* One company (InterDigital [10]) proposed to support enhanced retransmission mechanisms to avoid the retransmission of the entire multi-slot PUSCH.

### Collision handling

Details of collision handling between TBoMS PUSCH and PUCCH/SRS/DL symbols were discussed in several contributions. Corresponding proposals can be classified into the following sub-topics:

 **UCI multiplexing on TBoMS PUSCH**

* One company (NEC [13]) proposed that UCI can be multiplexed on TBoMS PUSCH when PUCCH transmission overlaps with TBoMS PUSCH in at least one slot.
* One company (Intel [8]) proposed that when PUCCH and TBoMS are overlapped in time, if the timeline requirement is satisfied, the whole TBoMS PUSCH is cancelled and the PUCCH is transmitted in the overlapped slots.
* One company (vivo [7]) proposed that the number of symbols for UCI multiplexing is determined by the number of overlapping symbols in a slot or a configured PUSCH length that is not greater than 14 symbols.
* One company (vivo [7]) proposed that UCI multiplexing should be performed per PUSCH transmission occasion within a slot, and UCIs can be multiplexed more than once to different PUSCH occasions.
* One company (vivo [7]) proposed a limitation on the resource allocated for UCI multiplexing on later PUSCH occasions if there are UCI multiplexing on previous PUSCH occasions of TBoMS.
* One company (vivo [7]) proposed that HARQ-Ack multiplexing on TBoMS PUSCH can be allowed if HARQ-Ack for the scheduling DCI comes after the UL grant for the TBoMS PUSCH.
* One company (ZTE [3]) proposed to reuse the legacy collision handling mechanisms f or PUSCH repetition type A for TBoMS PUSCH by replacing a repetition by a PUSCH in one slot of a TBoMS.
* One company (Huawei [5]) proposed to further improve the current mechanisms of collision handling for PUSCH before applying them for TBoMS PUSCH.
* Three companies (CMCC [16], WILUS [27], ZTE [3]) proposed to further study the collision handling of PUCCH vs. TBoMS PUSCH, e.g. how to determine the number of REs for UCI multiplexing.

 **SRS/DL symbols collision handling**

* One company (Intel [8]) proposed that TBoMS PUSCH is transmitted on the basis of available UL slots.
* Two companies (CMCC [16], Panasonic [15]) proposed to further study the collision handling of SRS vs. TBoMS PUSCH.

### TBoMS vs. single slot PUSCH transmission indication

The indication of TBoMS feature, i.e. indication on whether a PUSCH transmission should follow TBoMS or legacy PUSCH transmission, was discussed in several contributions. Corresponding proposals can be summarized as follows.

* Two companies (NEC [13], InterDigital [10]) proposed to support dynamic switching between TBoMS and single-slot PUSCH.
* One company (NEC [13]) proposed implicit indication based on RB/MCS allocation/indication.
* One company (Nokia [28]) proposed to further study details of indication method, including introducing a new field or reusing the available field in the scheduling DCI (or RRC parameter in case of configured grant configuration), e.g., some rows in the TDRA table are used to configure for multi-slot TB transmission.

### Service-like prioritization of TBoMS

One company (Intel [8]) proposed that TBoMS is treated as low priority uplink transmission.

## Simulation assumptions

One company (Ericsson [23]) discussed the relevance of specific simulation assumptions for performance evaluation of TBoMS transmission. Proposals were made as follows:

* Low data rate services should be considered for evaluations, such as VoIP or 30 kbps data for simulations.
* To keep comparable PDCCH overhead, Rel-15/16 PUSCH repetition (including RV cycling) can be used as baseline for performance evaluation.

From FL’s perspective, a set of baseline evaluation assumptions already exists for the WI, i.e., the ones agreed during Rel-17 SI and detailed in [2]. No explicit item in the WID seems to indicate that a revision to baseline evaluation assumptions is to be agreed during the WI. On the other hand, any company is welcome to propose and discuss results of evaluations carried out using assumptions like the ones above.

# 3 Proposals for GTW

**Proposal 1**

Consider one or two of the following options as starting points to design time domain resource determination of TBoMS

* PUSCH repetition type A like TDRA, i.e., the number of allocated symbols is the same in each slot.

PUSCH repetition type B like TDRA, i.e., the number of allocated symbols in each slot can be different

**Proposal 3**

* The same number of PRBs per symbol is allocated across slots for TBoMS transmission.

# 4 [CLOSED] Agreements
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# Appendix A: Proposals from contributions aggregated by topic

## A.1 TDRA

|  |
| --- |
| **R1-2101222**  **TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH,**  **Samsung**Proposal 1: Further study the time domain resource allocation methods for TB over multi-slot, at least including:* Option 1: Indicating number of slot or repetition for one TB based on Type A and/or Type B PUSCH
	+ Number of occupied repetition/slots can be configured.
* Option 2: Directly indicating a number of symbol L that can be larger than 14.
	+ A symbols group can be considered

**R1-2100743**  **Views on TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH,**  **Fujitsu**Proposal 1: Further discuss which of the following mapping pattern to be supported,1. Continuous mapping over multi-slot
2. Common TDRA for at least UL-only slots
3. Flexible mapping

**R1-2101002**  **Enhancements for TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH, Lenovo/Motorola**Proposal 1: For one TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH in NR coverage enhancements in Rel-17, support time-domain resource allocation enhancement to indicate multiple number of slots for multi-slot PUSCH and length L (value ranging from 1-13 symbols) for the last slot to allow partial slot occupation at the end and avoid scheduling restriction to only multiples of 14 symbols**R1-2101056**  **Discussion on TB Processing Over Multi-Slot PUSCH, CMCC**Proposal 3: Both extending the allocated symbol length and indication of the slot number through RRC configuration similar as PUSCH repetition should be considered.**R1-2100398**  **Discussion on TB Processing Over Multi-Slot PUSCH, CATT**Proposal 3: For TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH, new time domain resource allocation method should be studied.Proposal 4: For TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH, take repetition type A and type B as the starting point for time domain resource allocation.**R1-2100713**  **Discussions on Tb processing over multi-slot PUSCH, LGE**Proposal 1: For TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH, a TB transmission occasion can be composed by multiple slots.Proposal 2: When a PUSCH TB is transmitted over multiple slots,* A PUSCH TB is transmitted over multiple consecutive slots in paired spectrum.
* A PUSCH TB is transmitted over multiple available slots in unpaired spectrum.

Proposal 4: To discuss the number of slots for a PUSCH TB mapping, the desired range of TB size should be considered.**R1-2100666**  **Discussion on TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH, Intel Corporation**Proposal 1:* Same time domain resource allocation is applied to each slot for mPUSCH transmission.
* SLIV for each slot, number of slots for an mPUSCH repetition, and number of repetitions can be configured as part of TDRA for mPUSCH transmission.

**R1-2101680**  **Discussion on TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH, WILUS**Proposal 2: It should be clarified whether to include PUSCH repetition Type B in the WI scope or not for TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH.**R1-2101018**  **Discussion on TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH, Panasonic**Proposal 2: For the time-domain resource, following options should be considered.* Option 1: Time-domain resource more than 14 OFDM symbols
* Option 2: Multi-SLIV based

**R1-2100232**  **Discussion on TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH, Huawei, HiSilicon**Proposal 2: The repetition type B like TDRA for TB over multi-slot PUSCH should be supported where a number of consecutive symbols after the start symbol S is allocated.**R1-2100916**  **Discussion on TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH, China Telecom**Proposal 2: Both consecutive slots and non-consecutive slots can be aggregated for TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH.Proposal 3: The number of aggregated slots for TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH can be semi-statically configured by RRC or dynamically indicated by DCI.Proposal 4: For both consecutive slot aggregation and non-consecutive slot aggregation for TB processing, network indicates the symbol allocation 1st slot, and the same symbol allocation is applied over multiple slots except for the special slots. For the special slots, the available UL symbols can be used for PUSCH transmission.**R1-2101521**  **TB Processing over Multi-Slot PUSCH, Ericsson**Proposals:* Reuse resource determination and signaling of Rel-15/16 PUSCH repetition as much as possible to avoid specifying duplicate functionality.
* Type A multi-slot TB can be prioritized, which occupies the same symbols in all the multiple slots of a TB. Type A with different number of symbols in different slots and Type B multi-slot TB can be further studied.
* RAN1 to decide if non-contiguous slots can be used for a TB.

R1-2101328 Design Considerations for TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH, Sierra WirelessProposal 1: Specify support for multi-slot encoding with gaps. FFS: sizes of gapsProposal 2: Multi-slot encoding should be specified with a maximum of 2 slots of encoding.R1-2101711 Transport block processing for PUSCH coverage enhancements, Nokia/NSBProposal 1: For multi-slot TB transmission, RAN1 to down-select the following time-domain resource indication/determination options:* Option 1: Define a time-domain window wherein all valid PUSCH symbols are used for multi-slot TB transmission.
	+ FFS details of window indication.
* Option 2: Define a new PUSCH mapping type that allows L and S+L > 14; L valid symbols starting from the symbol with index S in the slot indicated by K2 are used for multi-slot TB transmission.
* Option 3: Reuse the time-domain allocation from PUSCH repetition type B.

R1-2101642 TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH, NTT DOCOMOProposal 1: S+U slots in TDD configuration should be considered for TB processing over multi-slot PUSCHR1-2101396 Discussion on TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH, AppleProposal 1: Considering the maximum number of slots for TB transmission is 8. Proposal 2: The number of slots for TB processing is dynamic indicated via DCI. Proposal 3: The same PUSCH mapping type and SLIV are applied to slots for TB transmission.R1-2100173 Supporting TB over multi-slot PUSCH, OPPOProposal 2: A TB size over multi-slot should be configurable in case of enhanced PUSCH repetition Type A is configuredR1-2100458 Discussion on PUSCH TB processing over multiple slots, vivoProposal 2: For PUSCH with TB processing over multiples slots, the multiple slots does not need to be consecutive slots.Proposal 3: Following options can be considered to indicate transmission occasions for PUSCH with TB processing over multiple slots- Option 1: PUSCH repetition Type-A/B like time domain resource allocation;- Option 2: Multi-PUSCH scheduling like resource allocation;- Option 3: Support time domain length L>14 for resource allocation.R1-2100096 Discussion on TB Processing Over Multi-Slot PUSCH, ZTEProposal 1: For time domain resource determination of TB processing over multiple slots, legacy rules specified for PUSCH repetition type A could be a starting point. Proposal 2: For TB processing over multiple slots, the number of slots is jointly coded with the TDRA table***.***  |

## A.2 FDRA

|  |
| --- |
| **R1-2101222** **TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH, Samsung**Proposal 4: The maximal number of PRB allocated in time domain is reduced for TB over multi-slot.**R1-2100713**  **Discussions on TB Processing Over Multi-Slot PUSCH, LGE**Proposal 3: It is considerable to apply TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH when a PUSCH has a small number of PRBs**R1-2100732**  **TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH, InterDigital**Proposal 2: Support multi-slot TB transmission if the number of PRBs is under a limit.Proposal 3: At least 1 PRB is supported for the possible number of resource blocks for multi-slot TB transmission**R1-2101521**  **TB Processing over Multi-Slot PUSCH, Ericsson**Proposal:* The same DMRS configuration, MCS index, number of layers, and PRB allocation can be used for multiple slots of multi-slot PUSCH.
 |

## A.3 TBS determination

|  |
| --- |
| **R1-2101222**  **TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH, Samsung**Proposal 5: TBS determination is based on all REs in all slots for the TB. Further study on how to count the higher layer configured overhead.**R1-2100743**  **Views on TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH, Fujitsu**Proposal 2: Unquantized intermediate variable (Ninfo) is obtained by the following:**R1-2100943**  **DISCUSSION ON TB PROCESSING OVER MULTI-SLOT PUSCH, NEC**Proposal 1: TBS is determined based on number of RE over multiple slots or number of RE in one slot scaling by number of slots of multiple slots transmission.**R1-2101056**  **DISCUSSION ON TB PROCESSING OVER MULTI-SLOT PUSCH, CMCC**Proposal 1: The procedure of transport block size determinations should be updated considering the multiple slot PUSCH transmission. 3 alternatives have been proposed for the updates of the 1st step of determining the number of REs.* Alternative 1: counting the RE number within a slot on an average value then multiplied by the slot number.
* Alternative 2: counting the RE number slot by slot
* Alternative 3: counting the RE number in total

**R1-2100398**  **DISCUSSION ON TB PROCESSING OVER MULTI-SLOT PUSCH, CATT**Proposal 1: For TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH, the TBS should be determined by the allocated REs in the multi-slots.Proposal 2: For TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH, the upper bound of TBS should be adjusted other than 156\* nPRB.**R1-2100713**  **DISCUSSIONS ON TB PROCESSING OVER MULTI-SLOT PUSCH, LGE**Proposal 6: To determine TBS based on multiple slots, scaling of NRE or Ninfo can be considered.**R1-2100732**  **TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH, InterDigital**Proposal 4: For multi-slot TB transmission, assume same value of for all slots.**R1-2100666**  **Discussion on TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH, Intel Corporation**Proposal 3:* Number of slots is included for TBS determination of mPUSCH spanning multiple slots.

**R1-2101680**  **Discussion on TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH, WILUS**Proposal 1: RE calculation can be extended to multiple slots by redesigning total number of REs calculation, .**R1-2101018**  **Discussion on TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH, Panasonic**Proposal 1: The multiple slots for TBS determination are not required to be the same value as multiple slots for PUSCH transmissions.Proposal 3: For the TBS determination for TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH, there could be the following steps:* TBS is determined based on the number of REs over multiple slots.
	+ UE first determines the number of REs within a PRB over multiple slots for TB processing,
	+ Then, UE determines the TBS based on the equation in the current specification in TS38.214.

**R1-2100232**  **Discussion on TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH, Huawei, HiSilicon**Proposal 1: The TBS calculation of multi-slot PUSCH is based on the resources of multiple slots with following options: Option1: Count all REs over the multiple slots which carry UL-SCH data in TBS calculation.Option2: Multiply the number of available REs of the first slot with the number of slots for multi-slot TB.**R1-2100916**  **Discussion on TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH, China Telecom**Proposal 1: For TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH, TBS is determined based on multiple slots and different segment is transmitted in each slot.Proposal 5: For TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH, the computation of TBS is defined based on the total number of REs allocated for PUSCH.**R1-2101406**  **ON TB PROCESSING OVER MULTIPLE SLOTS FOR PUSCH, IITH, CeWiT, IITM, Reliance Jio, Tejas Networks**Proposal: The gNB signals a TBS\_scaleK factor to the UE which indicates the number of slots over which the UE must calculate the effective transport block size using the frequency domain resources indicated via the DCI. The frequency domain allocation is assumed to be the same across TBS\_scaleK slots. The number of slots to aggregate can vary between 1,2,4, and 8. If not indicated, the UE only assumes 1 slot processing. **R1-2101546**  **TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH, Sharp**Proposal 1: A TBS scaling factor is indicated through a DCI format for scheduling the PUSCH or RRC signaling.Proposal 2: The TBS scaling factor is applied to calculate Ninfo.**R1-2101711**  **Transport block processing for PUSCH coverage enhancements, Nokia/NSB**Proposal 2: For multi-slot TBS determination, the UE determines the overhead for N\_RE^' calculation depending on both xOverhead and the resources allocated for multi-slot TB transmission, expressed in number of actual PUSCH symbols/slots.* FFS: if the overhead is calculated by scaling the single slot xOverhead w.r.t. the resources allocated for multi-slot TB transmission or by configuring different values of xOverhead for different number of actual PUSCH symbols/slots.

Proposal 3: For multi-slot TBS determination, the UE determines the reference number for N\_RE calculation depending on both xOverhead and the resources allocated for multi-slot TB transmission, expressed in number of actual PUSCH symbols/slots.* FFS: how different multi-slot parameters and configurations are used to determine the reference number for N\_RE calculation in case of multi-slot TB transmission.

**R1-2100173**  **Supporting TB over multi-slot PUSCH, OPPO**Proposal 1: For coverage enhancement, TB size of PUSCH can be derived by a larger than 1 factor in case when PUSCH repetition is configured.* Ninfo can be multiplied by factor of 2, 4, 8 for determining TBS.

Proposal 3: A multi-slot TB size factor is introduced for TB size determination in case when PUSCH repetition is configured.* The multi-slot TB size factor is not larger than configured aggregation factor.

**R1-2101478**  **TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH, Qualcomm**Proposal 1: Support multi-slot TB transmission using TB scaling with repetitions and RV cycling. Introduce a new scale factor that can be used to increase the TB size when determining TB size for PUSCH transmission.* FFS: permitted values for the scale factor.
* FFS: Signaling aspects of the scale factor.

Proposal 2: Identify constraints or conditions under which TBS scaling can be used. Constraints may include limits on RB allocation, MCS, number of layers, TB size, number of code blocks, etc. |

## A.4 Relationship between TBoMS and PUSCH repetitions

|  |
| --- |
| **R1-2101222**  **TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH, Samsung**Proposal 2: Repetition is supported for TB over multi-slot. **R1-2100096**  **DISCUSSION ON TB PROCESSING OVER MULTI-SLOT PUSCH, ZTE**Proposal 4: Discuss whether to support PUSCH repetition together with TB processing over multiple slots. **R1-2100458**  **Discussion on PUSCH TB processing over multiple slots, vivo**Proposal 8: For PUSCH with TB processing over multiple slots, PUSCH repetition is not supported. |

## A.5 DM-RS

|  |
| --- |
| **R1-2101222**  **TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH, Samsung**Proposal 3: Further study the following method for time domain location of DMRS considering the joint channel estimation over multi-slot and transmissions:* DMRS time domain location is determined per PUSCH transmission
* DMRS time domain location is determined per slot

**R1-2100743**  **Views on TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH, Fujitsu**Proposal 3: Existing DM-RS specifications should be reused**R1-2100232**  **Discussion on TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH, Huawei, HiSilicon**Proposal 4: For TB over multi-slot PUSCH, DMRS position can be determined per slot or the DMRS determination mechanism of PUSCH repetition type B can be reused.Proposal 5: If joint channel estimation is enabled for TB over multi-slot PUSCH, DMRS positions can be determined per L symbols where L is configurable.**R1-2101521**  **TB Processing over Multi-Slot PUSCH, Ericsson**Proposal:* The same DMRS configuration, MCS index, number of layers, and PRB allocation can be used for multiple slots of multi-slot PUSCH.

**R1-2101642**  **TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH, NTT DOCOMO**Proposal 2: DM-RS configuration should be extended so that one PUSCH can have more than 14 OFDM symbols with uniform DM-RS symbol distribution. Proposal 3: It is better to support more than 3 additional DM-RS positions in case that one PUSCH has more than 14 OFDM symbols.  |

## A.6 CB segmentation, redundancy version, rate-matching and interleaving

***CB segmentation***

|  |
| --- |
| **R1-2101521**  **TB Processing over Multi-Slot PUSCH, Ericsson**Proposals:* CB segmentation is deprioritized for TB over multiple slots.
* RAN1 to decide a maximum TBS of TB over multiple slots to avoid CB segmentation.

**R1-2101396**  **Discussion on TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH, Apple**Proposal 4: Both TB segmentation and CBG based TB processing can be considered.**R1-2101222**  **TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH, Samsung**Proposal 6: The supported Max TBS remains unchanged.**R1-2100096 DISCUSSION ON TB PROCESSING OVER MULTI-SLOT PUSCH, ZTE**Proposal 5: For TB processing over multiple slots, the maximum supporting TBS per HARQ process should not exceed legacy TBS in Rel-15/16. * FFS detailed method for TBS determination.
 |

***Redundancy version***

|  |
| --- |
| **R1-2100713**  **DISCUSSIONS ON TB PROCESSING OVER MULTI-SLOT PUSCH, LGE**Proposal 5: The value of rvid applied to n-th transmission occasion of the TB is determined based on the value ‘n mod 4’.**R1-2100173**  **Supporting TB over multi-slot PUSCH, OPPO**Proposal 4: Single RV scheme can be used across all the repetition slots in case of TB size over multi-slot and PUSCH repetition is configured.**R1-2100666**  **Discussion on TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH, Intel Corporation**Proposal 4: Existing RV cycling pattern for PUSCH with repetition is reused for mPUSCH with repetition. |

***Rate-matching and Interleaving***

|  |
| --- |
| **R1-2101222**  **TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH, Samsung**Proposal 7: Further study the operation of interleaving and rate-matching output for TB over multi-slot. |

## A.7 Link adaptation

***MCS index***

|  |
| --- |
| **R1-2101521 TB Processing over Multi-Slot PUSCH, Ericsson**Proposal: * The same DMRS configuration, MCS index, number of layers, and PRB allocation can be used for multiple slots of multi-slot PUSCH.
 |

## A.8 Frequency hopping

|  |
| --- |
| **R1-2101002**  **Enhancements for TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH, Lenovo/Motorola**Proposal 2: For one TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH in NR coverage enhancements in Rel-17, support multi-slot frequency hopping and multi-slot DM-RS bundling for joint channel estimation for entire hop• Association between frequency hop duration and DM-RS bundle duration should be considered**R1-2100666**  **Discussion on TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH, Intel Corporation**Proposal 2:* For mPUSCH without repetition, inter-slot frequency hopping with inter-slot bundling is supported.
* For mPUSCH with repetition, inter-slot and inter-repetition frequency hopping are supported.
 |

## A.9 Transmission power determination

|  |
| --- |
| **R1-2100096**  **DISCUSSION ON TB PROCESSING OVER MULTI-SLOT PUSCH, ZTE**Proposal 7: For TB processing over multiple slots, the transmission power determination should be based on the multiple slots for TB processing |

## A.10 Rank of TBoMS transmission

|  |
| --- |
| **R1-2101521**  **TB Processing over Multi-Slot PUSCH, Ericsson**Proposal: The same DMRS configuration, MCS index, number of layers, and PRB allocation can be used for multiple slots of multi-slot PUSCH.**R1-2100458**  **Discussion on PUSCH TB processing over multiple slots, vivo**Proposal 9: PUSCH with TB processing over multiple slots should be limited to single transmission layer. |

## A.11 Channel estimation

|  |
| --- |
| **R1-2100732**  **TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH, InterDigital**Proposal 5: Support joint channel estimation for the multi-slot PUSCH transmission**R1-2100458**  **Discussion on PUSCH TB processing over multiple slots, vivo**Proposal 1: It is up to UE capability to ensure phase continuity for PUSCH with TB processing over multiple slots. |

## A.12 Retransmissions

|  |
| --- |
| **R1-2101056**  **DISCUSSION ON TB PROCESSING OVER MULTI-SLOT PUSCH, CMCC**Proposal 4: Per slot retransmission should be considered for the retransmission of multiple slot PUSCH transmission.**R1-2100732**  **TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH, InterDigital**Proposal 6: Support enhanced retransmission mechanisms to avoid the retransmission of the entire multi-slot PUSCH. |

## A.14 Multi-slot/Single-slot switch/indication

|  |
| --- |
| **R1-2100943**  **DISCUSSION ON TB PROCESSING OVER MULTI-SLOT PUSCH, NEC**Proposal 2: Dynamic switching between TB processing over multi-slot and single-slot is adopted. Switching is based on implicit indication by conditions of RB/MCS.**R1-2100732**  **TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH, InterDigital**Proposal 1: Dynamic enabling/disabling of multi-slot PUSCH transmission is supported.**R1-2101711**  **Transport block processing for PUSCH coverage enhancements, Nokia/NSB**Proposal 4: RAN1 to specify an indication method for enabling multi-slot TB transmission per PUSCH scheduling/configuration.* FFS: Details of the indication method, including introducing a new field or reusing the available field in the scheduling DCI (or RRC parameter in case of configured grant configuration), e.g. some rows in the TDRA table are used to configure for multi-slot TB transmission.
 |

## A.13 UCI multiplexing, SRS/DL collusions/cancellations

|  |
| --- |
| **R1-2100943**  **DISCUSSION ON TB PROCESSING OVER MULTI-SLOT PUSCH, NEC**Proposal 3: UCI could multiplex with PUSCH when PUCCH transmission overlapping with PUSCH transmission of TB processing over multi-slot in one or more slots.**R1-2101056**  **DISCUSSION ON TB PROCESSING OVER MULTI-SLOT PUSCH, CMCC**Proposal 2: The solution or the behavior on how to deal with the collision issue between multiple slot PUSCH and PUCCH/SRS should be discussed. **R1-2100666**  **Discussion on TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH, Intel Corporation**Proposal 1: mPUSCH is transmitted on the basis of available UL slots.Proposal 5: When mPUSCH overlaps with PUCCH in time, if the timeline requirement is satisfied, the whole mPUSCH transmission is cancelled and the PUCCH is transmitted in the overlapped slots**R1-2101680**  **Discussion on TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH, WILUS**Proposal 3: It should be further discussed how to determine the number REs for UCI multiplexing in case of TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH.**R1-2101018**  **Discussion on TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH, Panasonic**Proposal 4: To specify how to handle the interactions of TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH with DL / UL direction and cancellation.**R1-2100232**  **Discussion on TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH, Huawei, HiSilicon**Proposal 3: The resolution mechanism of collisions between signals (e.g. PUCCH) with PUSCH in current specification should be further improved before it’s applied to TB over multi-slot PUSCH. **R1-2100096**  **DISCUSSION ON TB PROCESSING OVER MULTI-SLOT PUSCH, ZTE**Proposal 3: For collision handling of TB processing over multiple slots, legacy collision handling rules for PUSCH repetition type A could be reused by replacing a repetition to a slot of the multiple slots for TB processing. Proposal 6: Discuss the UCI multiplexing rules in case PUCCH overlaps with PUSCH in one or more slots of the multiple slots for TB processing.**R1-2100458**  **Discussion on PUSCH TB processing over multiple slots, vivo**Proposal 4: For UCI multiplexing on PUSCH with TB processing over multiple slots, the number of modulated symbols in the PUSCH for UCI multiplexing is determined based on- the number of symbols for PUSCH in a slot, which is overlapping with the PUCCH, or- a configured PUSCH length, which is less than or equal to 14 symbols.Proposal 5: For PUSCH with TB processing over multiple slots, UCI multiplexing behavior should be performed per PUSCH transmission occasion within a slot, and UCIs can be multiplexed more than once to different PUSCH occasions.Proposal 6: The amount of resources for UCI multiplexing can be optimized to limit the resource allocated for UCI multiplexed in a later PUSCH occasion, if there are already UCI(s) multiplexed on previous PUSCH occasions Proposal 7: HARQ-Ack multiplexing on PUSCH with TB processing over multiple slots can be allowed if HARQ-Ack for the scheduling DCI comes after the UL grant for the PUSCH* The HARQ-Ack can be mapped to the PUSCH resource by puncturing some symbols in the PUSCH occasion.
 |

## A.15 Service-like prioritization of TBoMS

|  |
| --- |
| **R1-2100666**  **Discussion on TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH, Intel Corporation** Proposal 6:* mPUSCH is treated as low priority uplink transmission.
 |

## A.16 Simulation assumptions

|  |
| --- |
| **R1-2101521**  **TB Processing over Multi-Slot PUSCH, Ericsson**Proposals:* Evaluate low data rate services, such as VoIP or 30 kbps data for simulations.
* To keep comparable PDCCH overhead, Rel-15/16 PUSCH repetition (including RV cycling) can be used as baseline for performance evaluation.
 |

# Appendix B: Previous agreements on TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH [placeholder during RAN1 #104-e]