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1. Introduction

In RAN #90 e-meeting, a new Rel-17 work item on NR coverage enhancements was approved [1] and was revised in [2]. The objective of this work item is to specify enhancements for PUSCH, PUCCH and Msg3 PUSCH for both FR1 and FR2 as well as TDD and FDD.

The detailed objectives are as follows.

* *Specification of PUSCH enhancements [RAN1, RAN4]*
	+ *Specify the following mechanisms for enhancements on PUSCH repetition type A [RAN1]*
		- *Increasing the maximum number of repetitions up to a number to be determined during the course of the work.*
		- *The number of repetitions counted on the basis of available UL slots.*
	+ *Specify mechanism(s) to support TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH [RAN1]*
		- *TBS determined based on multiple slots and transmitted over multiple slots.*
	+ *Specify mechanism(s) to enable joint channel estimation [RAN1, RAN4]*
		- *Mechanism(s) to enable joint channel estimation over multiple PUSCH transmissions, based on the conditions to keep power consistency and phase continuity to be investigated and specified if necessary by RAN4 [RAN1, RAN4]*
			* *Potential optimization of DMRS location/granularity in time domain is not precluded*
		- *Inter-slot frequency hopping with inter-slot bundling to enable joint channel estimation [RAN1]*
* *Specification of PUCCH enhancements [RAN1, RAN4]*
	+ *Specify signaling mechanism to support dynamic PUCCH repetition factor indication [RAN1]*
	+ *Specify mechanism to support DMRS bundling across PUCCH repetitions [RAN1, RAN4]*
* *Specify mechanism(s) to support Type A PUSCH repetitions for Msg3 [RAN1]*

This contribution is a summary of the following email discussion:

[104b-e-NR-R17-CovEnh-02] Email discussion on joint channel estimation for PUSCH– Jianchi (China Telecom)

* 1st check point: 4/15
* 2nd check point: 4/19
* 3rd check point: 4/20
1. Summary of contributions

## 2.1 Conditions to keep power consistency and phase continuity

An LS [3] was sent to RAN4 asking the conditions for UE to keep power consistency and phase continuity among PUSCH transmissions. The reply LS was send by RAN4 [4]. Based on the reply LS, if the conditions for phase continuity among PUSCH transmissions are fulfilled, the same power level (with certain tolerance level) can also be achieved. The certain tolerance level is still under discussion in RAN4.

For back-to-back transmissions with zero gap in-between adjacent transmissions, in order to maintain phase continuity, the following conditions should be met:

* Modulation order does not change.
* RB allocation in terms of length and frequency position should not be changed, and intra-slot and inter-slot frequency hopping is not enabled within a repetition bundle.
* No change on transmission power level of its own CC, i.e., no change on the power control parameters specified in TS 38.213, and also when own CC is not impacted by other concurrent CC(s) that are configured for inter-band CA or DC for same UE with dynamic power sharing and no change in any configured CC s that are part of configured intra-band uplink CA or DC.
* No UL beam switching for FR2 UE occurs

For non-back-to-back transmission with non-zero gap in-between adjacent transmissions, RAN4 concluded that at least following additional condition also need to be met in addition to the above conditions:

* No downlink reception in-between the PUSCH or PUCCH repetition in the same band for TDD case

In scenario of no more than *X* un-scheduled OFDM symbols in-between the PUSCH or PUCCH repetition (e.g., *X* = 0, 1, 2, …, 14), and scenario of other physical signals/channels in-between PUCCH or PUSCH repetitions from the UE perspective, e.g., SRS or PUCCH transmission in-between the PUSCH repetition for the UE, RAN4 is still discussing if *X* can be non-zero value and UE can maintain phase continuity.

## 2.2 Use cases for joint channel estimation

RAN1 has identified the potential use cases for joint channel estimation for PUSCH.

* Use case 1: back-to-back PUSCH transmissions within one slot.
* Use case 2: non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions within one slot.
* Use case 3: back-to-back PUSCH transmissions across consecutive slots.
* Use case 4: non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions across consecutive slots.
* Use case 5: PUSCH transmissions across non-consecutive slots.

**Companies’ views are summarized in the following table.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Use cases** | **Companies view** |
| * Use case 1: back-to-back PUSCH transmissions within one slot.
 | **Support:** ZTE, Nokia, NSB, Lenovo, Motorola, Spreadtrum, CATT, CTC, Panasonic, CMCC, WILUS, HW, HiSilicon, NTT DOCOMO, Samsung* Repetition type B for the same TB
	+ ZTE, Spreadtrum, CTC, Panasonic, WILUS, NTT DOCOMO, Lenovo, Motorola, CATT
* PUSCH transmissions with different TBs

**Deprioritize:** Qualcomm**Not support:** Apple, Ericsson |
| * Use case 2: non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions within one slot.
 | **Support:** ZTE, Nokia, NSB, Panasonic, HW, HiSilicon, CTC, Samsung* Repetition type B for the same TB
* PUSCH transmissions with different TBs

**Deprioritize:** MediaTek, Qualcomm**Further discussed after RAN4’s conclusion:** WILUS, Lenovo, Motorola, CMCC, CATT**Not support:** Spreadtrum, Apple, Ericsson |
| * Use case 3: back-to-back PUSCH transmissions across consecutive slots.
 | **Support:** WILUS, Nokia, NSB, CMCC, Spreadtrum, Lenovo, Motorola, NTT DOCOMO**,** CATT, CTC, Panasonic, Samsung* Repetition type B for the same TB
	+ Panasonic, WILUS, Nokia, NSB, NTT DOCOMO, CTC, Samsung
* PUSCH transmissions with different TBs
	+ Support: Nokia, NSB, CMCC, HW, HiSilicon, CTC, CATT
	+ Not support: Qualcomm
 |
| * Use case 4: non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions across consecutive slots.
 | **Support:** LG, Sharp, ZTE, Panasonic, HW, HiSilicon, Nokia, NSB, CTC, Sony, Ericsson* Repetition type A for the same TB
	+ LG, Sharp
* Repetition type B for the same TB
* PUSCH transmissions with different TBs
* TBoMS

**Deprioritize:** MediaTek**Further discussed after RAN4’s conclusion:** WILUS, Lenovo, Motorola, CMCC, CATT, Qualcomm**Not support:** Spreadtrum, Apple |
| * Use case 5: PUSCH transmissions across non-consecutive slots.
 | **Support:** LG, Ericsson, Nokia, NSB* Repetition type A for the same TB
	+ LG

**Deprioritize:** ZTE, MediaTek**Further discussed after RAN4’s conclusion:** Qualcomm**Not support:** Apple, CATT, Spreadtrum |

**Additional views from companies:**

**MediaTek:**

* Considering CA and DC scenario, whether/how to support phase continuity and power consistency for UL repetition should be clarified with RAN4 feedback.

**Sony:**

* Method to enable N-BtB JCE include: DL-blanking (keeping the Tx active without transmitting), separate UL / DL antennas in FR1 (configure the UE to use different antenna ports) and separate UL/DL panels in FR2.

**Nokia/NSB:**

* gNB dynamically indicate whether and which DL reception occasion should be monitored/skipped by the UE to facilitate JCE.

Support to confirm the following working assumption: CMCC, Apple, CATT, Interdigital, Panasonic, Nokia, NSB, Spreadtrum, CATT

**Working assumption:**

* For back-to-back PUSCH transmissions across consecutive slots, support necessary design aspects (under the condition of power consistency and phase continuity) to enable joint channel estimation for the following case:
	+ Over back-to-back PUSCH transmissions for one TB processed over multiple slots
		- It’s subject to UE capability

Open issues:

* Use case 1: back-to-back PUSCH transmissions within one slot.
	+ Repetition type B for the same TB
	+ PUSCH transmissions with different TBs
* Use case 2: non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions within one slot.
	+ Repetition type B for the same TB
	+ PUSCH transmissions with different TBs
* Use case 3: back-to-back PUSCH transmissions across consecutive slots.
	+ Repetition type B for the same TB
	+ PUSCH transmissions with different TBs
* Use case 4: non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions across consecutive slots.
	+ Repetition type A for the same TB
	+ Repetition type B for the same TB
	+ PUSCH transmissions with different TBs
	+ TBoMS
* Use case 5: PUSCH transmissions across non-consecutive slots.
* CA or DC

## 2.3 Time-domain window for joint channel estimation

In RAN1 #104e, a time domain window is agreed to be introduced to facilitate further discussion, during which UE is expected to maintain power consistency and phase continuity among PUSCH transmissions subject to power consistency and phase continuity requirements.

* FFS: whether the window should be specified
* FFS: the length of the time domain window is defined by a set of repetitions/slots/symbols
* FFS: single or multiple time domain windows
* FFS: relation with UE capability
* FFS: the time domain window may or may not be configured.
* FFS: whether the term "time domain window" is used in the specification or replaced by other technical terms
* FFS: Whether the window is determined by the power consistency and phase continuity requirements and/or by other factors is to be decided.

**Pros and cons of whether or not to specify the time domain window are summarized below:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Specify a time domain window** | **Pros** | * Make sure that the condition for joint channel estimation is met during the time window.
* If DMRS transmissions for joint channel estimation over long time require the processing load, the time window specified per UE can reduce the UE complexity.
* Help the UE to know when and how long it should maintain power/phase continuity.
* Facilitate the optimization of DMRS for JCE. The DMRS location/granularity in different slots within one time domain window can be jointly designed.
* Facilitate the design of inter-slot frequency hopping with inter-slot bundling.
 |
| **Cons** | * More standardization efforts.
 |
| **NOT specify a time domain window** | **Pros** | * Less standardization efforts.
 |
| **Cons** | * Misunderstanding between gNB and UE may occur in some cases.
* It may be difficult to expect improvement in channel estimation performance even if the gNB performs joint channel estimation since there is no expected behaviour of UE which makes UE to operate arbitrarily.
* UE may try to keep power consistency and phase continuity as much as possible for all PUSCH transmissions, while gNB may try to jointly estimate channel based on all DMRS symbols over PUSCH transmissions.
* If the UE must maintain the phase continuity across scheduled PUSCH transmissions for a very long period, the UE may have to forgo events such as uplink tracking loop, UE calibration, antenna virtualization etc., leading to possible performance degradation.
* More UE power consumption.
 |

**Companies’ views are summarized as follows:**

**1. Whether to specify the window?**

**Support:** WILUS, Lenovo, Motorola, LG, Sharp, NTT DOCOMO, Nokia, NSB, InterDigital, Qualcomm, Xiaomi, CATT, CTC, vivo, HW, HiSilicon, Sierra Wireless, Samsung, Panasonic

**Not support:** CMCC (if only back-to-back PUSCH transmissions are supported), OPPO, Ericsson

**2. How to define the length of the time window?**

* Option1: The time window is defined in units of repetitions.

**Support:** WILUS, InterDigital, Samsung

* Option2: The time window is defined in units of slots.

**Support:** LG, CATT

**3. How to configure the parameters of this time window?**

* Option1: explicitly configured by RRC or DCI.

**Support:** Nokia, NSB, Panasonic, InterDigital, Xiaomi, Sierra Wireless, Lenovo, Motorola

* Option2: implicitly determined, e.g. by the repetition factor.

**Support:** Spreadtrum, Sharp

* Option3: UE report capability on the length of time domain window or signals a bundling indication.

**Support:** Nokia, NSB, vivo, Sierra Wireless, Qualcomm

**4. Single or multiple time windows?**

* Option1: Support single time window.

**Support:** Lenovo, Motorola, LG

* Option2: Support multiple time windows.

**Support:** InterDigital, Qualcomm, Xiaomi, CATT

**Other considerations:**

**NTT DOCOMO:** There are two options to specify the time window per UE.

* Opt1: A time domain window is determined based on the specification, according to the UE capability.
* Opt2: A time window is configured, according to the UE capability and channel quality.

Samsung: Support a same power, precoding, RV, and frequency position for a number of repetitions of a PUSCH transmission. And during a time window, the UE skips application of TPC commands and does not update the CLPC adjustment state

**CTC:** Send an LS to RAN4 asking whether the duration of maintaining power consistency and phase continuity among PUSCH transmissions will be defined based on UE capability and the length of duration if defined.

Sierra Wireless: UE signals a time window capability & gNB signals a required time window.

**Qualcomm:** proposed to allow UE to signal indication in the UCI multiplexing with PUSCH transmission. The indication can indicate whether the PUSCH transmission is coherent with respect to the previous PUSCH transmission or whether the PUSCH transmission is coherent with respect to the next PUSCH transmission as illustrated.

**Lenovo/Motorola:** the maximum duration for the time-domain window should be determined based on the minimum of following two durations:

* Maximum duration for which power consistency and phase continuity can be maintained
* Maximum duration of PUSCH transmissions (depend on maximum value of repetition factor)

Open issues:

* Whether to specify the window
* Length of the time window
* Single or multiple time domain windows
* Relation with UE capability
* Signalling design for the time window

## 2.4 Inter-slot frequency hopping with inter-slot bundling

**Companies’ views are summarized as follows:**

**Issue 1:** The relationship between the size of time window and the bundle size (time domain hopping interval).

* Option 1: Smaller than the size of time domain window
	+ CTC
* Option 2: Equal to the size of time domain window
	+ CTC, LG, NTT DOCOMO
* Option 3: Large than the size of time domain window
	+ LG

**Issue 2:** Explicit or implicit.

* Option 1: Explicit indicated by signaling, e.g. RRC or DCI
	+ ZTE, WILUS, NTT DOCOMO, Intel, Samsung
* Option 2: Implicitly determined by the number of repetitions.
	+ ZTE, NTT DOCOMO, Intel, Samsung

Issue 3: Cell-specific or UE-specific.

* Option 1: Cell-specific
	+ LG
* Option 2: UE-specific
	+ HW, HiSilicon

Issue 4: Frequency hopping pattern for TDD.

* Option 1: UE perform frequency hopping between non-consecutive UL slots and only bundling consecutive UL slots for JCE.
	+ vivo
* Option 2: UE perform frequency hopping for every K UL slots.
* Option 3: UE perform frequency hopping after a DL reception occasion, and applies a time-domain window starting from the hopping slot. After the time-domain window expires, UE perform frequency hopping again.
	+ Nokia, NSB

Open issues:

* The bundle size (time domain hopping interval)
* Signalling design
* Frequency hopping pattern for TDD

## 2.5 Optimization of DMRS location/granularity in time domain

Companies’ views are summarized as follows:

* Optimization of DMRS granularity in time domain w/ JCE.
	+ Support: CATT, ZTE, CMCC, OPPO
	+ Deprioritize: LG
	+ Not support: Qualcomm, Intel
* Optimization of DMRS location in time domain w/ JCE.
	+ Support: Lenovo, Motorola, Xiaomi, Interdigital, HW, HiSilicon, vivo, OPPO, CMCC, ZTE, Motorola
	+ Not support: Qualcomm

For optimization of DMRS granularity in time domain w/ JCE, two schemes are considered and simulated by companies:

* **Scheme a-1:** No DMRS for some PUSCH transmissions
	+ Support: CATT, ZTE, OPPO
	+ Not support: Intel

One company (ZTE) shows 2 DMRS symbols in every two repetitions w/ JCE can provide additional 2.52 dB, 2.43 dB, 0.15 dB, 0.81 dB and 0.87 dB gain over 1 DMRS symbol in each repetition w/o JCE, 2 DMRS symbols in each repetition w/o JEC, 1 DMRS symbol in each repetition w/ JCE, 2 DMRS symbols in each repetition w/ JEC, 1 DMRS symbol in every two repetitions w/ JCE respectively in 700MHz Rural scenario at 10% BLER.

One company (Intel) shows ~1.5dB degradation can be observed when DMRS symbols are not allocated in odd slots.

* **Scheme a-2:** Higher DMRS density
	+ Not support: Intel

One company (Intel) shows 4 DMRS symbols can achieve better link level performance than 6 DMRS symbols for PUSCH w/ 8 repetitions and inter-slot frequency hopping.

For optimization of DMRS location in time domain w/ JCE, four schemes are considered and simulated by companies:

* **Scheme b-1:** Equally spaced DMRS pattern.
	+ Support: Lenovo, Motorola, Xiaomi
	+ Not support: vivo, Intel

One company (vivo) shows no gain for equally spaced DMRS pattern.

One company (Intel) shows the performance difference is negligible between existing DMRS pattern as defined in Rel-15 and equally spaced DMRS pattern.

* **Scheme b-2:** DMRS located in special slots
	+ Support: Interdigital, HW, HiSilicon, vivo, LG, CMCC, Spreadtrum
	+ Not support: Intel

One company (HW) shows JCE w/ 2 DMRS located in special slot can improve the performance of PUSCH transmissions by 1.2dB at 10% BLER in typical TDD mode ‘DDDSUDDSUU’.

One company (Interdigital) shows JCE w/ 1 DMRS located in special slot can provide 0.5~0.8dB gain at 10% BLER in TDD mode ‘DDDSU’.

One company (vivo) shows JCE w/ 1 DMRS located in special slot can provide 0.7dB gain. Moreover, the performance gain is not sensitivity to the DMRS pattern.

One company (Intel) shows JCE w/ 1 DMRS located in special slot can provide ~0.1dB gain at 10% BLER in TDD mode ‘DDDSU’.

* **Scheme b-3:** Different DMRS locations
	+ Support: OPPO

One company (OPPO) shows 0.3dB gain can be found while DMRS placed on different symbol within the slot (1st and 11th symbol, respectively)

* **Scheme b-4:** Orphan symbol used for DMRS
	+ Support: vivo, LG

One company (vivo) shows 0.8 dB gain if orphan DMRS symbol in-between PUSCH repetitions is utilized for JCE.

Other consideration:

Sierra Wireless: This residual frequency error is NOT the UE’s carrier frequency offset. The residual frequency error is the remain error after the gNB has compensated for the UE’s carrier frequency offset. The RAN4 specification [4] of +/- 0.1 ppm defines the UE’s requirement for frequency error and does not include gNB frequency error compensation and is therefore is a poor choice for simulation assumptions, as the higher RFE would decrease the gain of joint channel estimation. For a 4GHz carrier frequency, the +/- 0.1 ppm results in a RFE of +/- 400 Hz which is too large. The amount of residual frequency error will depend on base station vendors’ proprietary methods of limiting the residual frequency error.

**Vivo:** if orphan symbol(s) used for DMRS or symbol in special slot used for DMRS is supported and located before the first symbol of this PUSCH transmission, the preparation time of this PUSCH need to be revised:

* Opt 1 : Redefine PUSCH preparation time $T\_{proc,2}$ considering the first symbol in the orphan symbol(s) or symbol(s) in special slot.
* Opt 2 : Additional time offset in $T\_{proc,2}$, which is related to the number of the orphan symbol(s) or symbol(s) in special slot.

Open issues:

* Whether to support optimization of DMRS granularity in time domain.
	+ Different DMRS density for different PUSCH transmissions
	+ No DMRS for some PUSCH transmissions
* Whether to support optimization of DMRS location in time domain
	+ DMRS equally spaced among PUSCH transmissions
	+ DMRS located in special slots
	+ Orphan symbol used for DMRS

## 2.6 Others

PTRS:

InterDigital: When DM-RS bundling is enabled, PTRS should be enabled as well, at least for FR2.

**Qualcomm:** Support different criteria for activation of PTRS or its density for the case of joint channel estimation.

Power control:

**Samsung:** A UE updates the CLPC adjustment state per number of repetitions corresponding to the DM-RS interpolation window.



**Illustration of power control method over multiple PUSCH repetitions for joint channel estimation**

Phase correction at gNB

**Ericsson:** proposed further study the benefit of gNB estimated inter-slot relative phase correction for PUSCH, addressing how frequency selective such phase corrections would need to be for UEs and/or conditions that do not sufficiently support maintaining inter-slot relative phase.

TA command

**LG:**It should be adopted that received TA command is not applied within time-domain window for joint channel estimation when TA command is indicated to the UE.

Grant-type dependent index

**InterDigital:** proposed a grant-type dependent index which indicates PUSCH(s) to bundle.

PUSCH transmission interrupted by other transmissions/procedures

**Vivo:** PUSCH transmissions within the time-domain window for joint channel estimation may be interrupted by other transmissions/procedures. PUSCH transmissions is cancelled by SFI, CI or higher priority transmissions.

1. Email discussion (1st round)

## 3.1 Use cases for joint channel estimation

**Companies are encouraged to answer whether joint channel estimation should be supported for the following use case and provide the reasons:**

* Use case 1: back-to-back PUSCH transmissions within one slot.
	+ Repetition type B for the same TB
	+ PUSCH transmissions with different TBs

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Yes/No** | **Reasons** |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | Yes | * + **repetition type B for the same TB:**

Joint channel estimation can improve the coverage, regardless of repetition type A or type B, where joint channel estimation for repetition type B should also be supported. It’s a very common case that several repetitions (including actual repetition and nominal repetition) are within one slot with various S and L combinations.* + **PUSCH transmission with different TBs:**

The key point for joint channel estimation is phase continuity between multiple PUSCH transmissions, regardless of the same TB or different TBs for PUSCH transmissions. For PUSCH transmissions with different TBs, conditions such as same modulation order, RB allocation, etc., can also be ensured.Moreover, during the SI phase, for 1Mbps throughput, the joint estimation evaluations of many companies are based on different TB across different slots. Thus this is a typical case for joint channel estimationOverall，we think joint channel estimation should be supported in above case 1 |
| vivo | Yes | According to the conditions of maintaining phase continuity for back-to-back transmissions with zero gap in-between adjacent transmissions, RAN1 should prioritize back-to-back transmissions. Repetition type B for the same TB could be considered as part of enhancement on joint channel estimation. Some extra conditions and restrictions may be required for PUSCH transmissions with different TBs, which requires further study. |
| CATT | Yes | Specifically, we support the sub-case of Repetition type B for the same TB. To clarify, we are supportive to ‘back-to-back PUSCH transmissions with different TBs’ across slots. Whether ‘different TB within one slot’ is a typical use case in coverage limited scenario still needs justification in our view. |
| Qualcomm | No | A back-to-back PUSCH transmission within a single slot is not relevant to a cell-edge UE. Its not clear why such a configuration would be adopted for a cell-edge UE. The first step to improving performance for such configurations would be to instead schedule a longer duration PUSCH.Type B repetitions are primarily relevant for low latency applications, which are not the focus of this WID. Need to also factor in additional effort to accommodate this case, with little to no practical benefit. |
| LG | Yes | Even for different TB, gNB can perform joint channel estimation in case the transmission of UE satisfies RAN4’s requirement for joint CE (i.e., same modulation order/PRB/precoding matrix, power/phase continuity). For PUSCH repetition type B, the discussion whether or not to support repetition type B in coverage enhancement should be preceded. |
| InterDigital | Yes | For coverage enhancement, there are benefits for supporting both repetition type B and different TB within one slot, if they are back-to-back transmission. If phase/power continuity conditions are satisfied, both use cases should be supported.  |
| CMCC | Yes | We support the use case 1, back-to-back PUSCH transmissions within one slot. And the repetition type B for the same TB and transmission with different TB seems natural under this use case. But we still hesitate on whether we should support a transmission shorter than one slot in the coverage enhancement. |
| Samsung | Yes/No | OK to consider Repetition type BThere is no need to consider different TBs. The scenario where a UE transmits back-to-back PUSCH with different TBs using repetitions is not something to focus on. The focus should remain on repetitions of a PUSCH transmission providing a same TB. |
| Xiaomi | Yes | The same view with vivo, considering phase continuity, back-to-back PUSCH transmission within one slot should have high priority.As for repetition type B for same TB, we think if the same TB transmission can meet the restrictions for joint channel estimation, it can be supported no matter to repetition type.Regarding PUSCH transmissions with different TBs, how to allocate and maintain the power consistency between different TBs should be further considered. |
| China Telecom | Yes for repetition type B | In our understanding, PUSCH repetition type B can make full use of UL resources, e.g., UL symbols in special slots for TDD, and can achieve better performance than PUSCH repetition type A in some cases in terms of coverage. Joint channel estimation over back-to-back PUSCH transmissions for repetition type B is an enhancement. So PUSCH repetition type B is relevant to coverage enhancement. Regarding the scope, we indeed studied enhancements on PUSCH repetition type B during the study item phase, including actual PUSCH transmission across the slot boundary/invalid symbols, the length of actual repetition larger than 14 symbols, RV enhancement, and enhanced frequency hopping for PUSCH repetition type B. These enhancements were not included in the WID. But it does not mean WID precludes joint channel estimation for PUSCH repetition type B. |
| Sony | Yes | We support all back-to-back use cases. We, however, agree with Qualcomm that the motivation of Type-B for the CE scenarios needs to be clarified. |
| Intel | Okay for repetition Type B  | We are fine to support joint channel estimation for repetition type B within and across slots. As mentioned by other companies, repetition type B can also be used for coverage enhancement, by allocating contiguous resource for PUSCH transmission. However, it is not clear to us the support of different TBs within a slot for joint channel estimation. In our view, this is not targeted for coverage enhancement.  |
| ZTE | Yes | As long as the conditions for phase continuity can be met, JCE can be applied to both repetition types and both one or multiple TBs. On the other hand, we should aim for defining the same JCE rules for different cases as much as possible. In other words, optimization specific for repetition type B or multiple TBs should be minimized.  |
| Sharp | No | We don’t support Use case 1. We don’t see the necessity of splitting a single slot resource into two PUSCHs for joint channel estimation. If we want channel estimation gain, gNB can schedule a single PUSCH.In our view, L that equals 14 is sufficient for repetition type B. |
| Panasonic | Partial Yes | * + Repetition type B for the same TB within one slot:

We support back-to-back PUSCH transmissions within a slot for repetition type B for the same TB. * + PUSCH transmissions with different TBs within one slot:

We don't support the proposal as the merit is unclear. In general, we propose to revise the proposal as follows* Use case 1: back-to-back PUSCH transmissions within one slot.
	+ Repetition type B for the same TB
	+ FFS: PUSCH transmissions with different TBs scheduled by a DCI
 |
| Apple | No | We share the similar view as Qualcomm, we agree performing the joint channel estimation for repetition B could enhance the UL performance, but it’s not directly relevant to the coverage enhancement, if the coverage is the concern, more resources from the time domain, i.e., symbols, can be scheduled directly. * + For PUSCH transmissions with different TBs, this is depending on whether the UL transmission is back-to-back without gap as mentioned in RAN4 LS. If there is gap between two PUSCHs, this is subject to RAN4 further study.
 |
| Nokia/NSB | Yes | If the power consistency and phase continuity constraint can be guaranteed for back-to-back PUSCH transmissions, further constraints on whether the PUSCH transmissions should or should not be within a slot or associated with different TBs are irrelevant, since no additional issue has been identified to support the cases. Therefore, any constraint on supporting back-to-back PUSCH transmission should be avoided, unless additional difficulties are identified. |
| WILUS | Yes/No | We support the Repetition Type B for the same TB.Regarding PUSCH transmissions with different TBs, it is unclear that such a case is practical since it would be better to schedule one larger TB not multiple small TBs in a slot in terms of coding gain. |
| OPPO | Partially Yes | We can accept repetition type B for the same TB, but we don’t agree with PUSCH transmissions with different TBs.For different TBs, if joint channel estimation is applied, the frequency domain resources, the precoder and the power shall be the same among PUSCH for these different TBs, which puts stringent restriction on the gNB’s scheduling.  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Yes | We support joint channel estimation for back-to-back PUSCHs within a slot (for both same and different TB). For PUSCH repetition type B, if back-to-back transmission is not possible, then whether joint channel estimation is applied or not should be discussed after input from RAN4 on phase continuity. |
| Ericsson | No | * + **Repetition type B for the same TB**

Can companies explain why having more than one repetition of a TB per slot improves coverage? If the repetition is for diversity purposes, the DMRS can’t be combined if the effective channel is different between repetitions. Also, frequency hopping can provide diversity. If diversity is not the motivation, then latency can be improved with multiple repetitions per slot, but that I think this is not in the scope of coverage enhancement, and is why we have e.g. dynamic sub-slot PUCCH repetition discussed and agreed in the URLLC track. * + **PUSCH transmissions with different TBs**

Different TBs has less motivation than repetitions of a TB in our understanding. It is not clear why there would be a performance gain from multiple TBs per slot, for the same reasons as TB repetition in a slot. Also, multiple TBs require more overhead (CRC and possibly higher layer overhead), so the coverage should be less than the repeated case. Different TBs may in general occupy different PRBs, have different MCS, be transmitted on different beams, use different precoders, and have different requirements, e.g. UCI only on PUSCH vs. eMBB PUSCH vs. URLLC PUSCH, etc, so the likelihood the gNB can exploit a commonality between TBs is reduced. |

**Companies are encouraged to answer whether joint channel estimation should be supported for the following use case and provide the reasons:**

* Use case 3: back-to-back PUSCH transmissions across consecutive slots
	+ Repetition type B for the same TB
	+ PUSCH transmissions with different TBs

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Yes/No** | **Reasons** |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | Yes | * + **repetition type B for the same TB:**

Joint channel estimation can improve the coverage, regardless of repetition type A or type B, where joint channel estimation for repetition type B should also be supported. It’s a very common case that several repetitions (including actual repetition and nominal repetition) are across consecutive slots with various S and L combinations.* + **PUSCH transmission with different TBs:**

The key point for joint channel estimation is phase continuity between multiple PUSCH transmissions, regardless of the same TB or different TBs for PUSCH transmissions. For PUSCH transmissions with different TBs, conditions such as same modulation order, RB allocation, etc., can also be ensured.Moreover, during the SI phase, for 1Mbps throughput, the joint estimation evaluations of many companies are based on different TB across different slots. Thus this is a typical case for joint channel estimation. Furthermore, it’s a very common case that two back-to-back PUSCH transmissions are across consecutive slots Overall，we think joint channel estimation should be supported in above case 3 |
| vivo | Yes | According to the conditions of maintaining phase continuity for back-to-back transmissions with zero gap in-between adjacent transmissions, RAN1 should prioritize back-to-back transmissions. Repetition type B for the same TB could be considered as part of enhancement on joint channel estimation. Some extra conditions and restrictions may be required for PUSCH transmissions with different TBs, which requires further study. |
| CATT | Yes | From view of joint channel estimation at gNB side, it does matter whether the same or different TBs are carried on the multiple PUSCHs. The key point for joint channel estimation is to meet the requirement from RAN4. |
| Qualcomm | No | Type B repetitions are primarily relevant for low latency applications, which are not the focus of this WID. Need to also factor in additional effort to accommodate this case, with little to no practical benefit.DMRS bundling across PUSCH transmissions with different TBs suggests that this UE is not coverage limited. It is therefore not clear why this use case needs to be considered. Enabling bundling across repetitions and across transmissions of different TBs could require two very different approaches. Given that this is not a typical case for a coverage-limited UE, we prefer to leave this case out. |
| LG | Yes | Same reason with use case one. |
| InterDigital | Yes | For coverage enhancement, there are benefits for supporting both repetition type B and different TB across slots, if they are back-to-back transmission. If phase/power continuity conditions are satisfied, both use cases should be supported.  |
| CMCC | Yes  | Use case 3 and PUSCH with different TBs are supported. In the case that a single UE is scheduled by gNB in consecutive uplink slots, the precoding, MCS and power could remain the same. Thus the joint channel estimation could work.We open to the discussion whether type B repetition or type A repetition or other mechanisms would be used. Though we know the type B repetition could make a full use of the symbols in the special slot, our concern is type B repetition may divide the time domain resource into pieces, which may not be easy to use. |
| Samsung | Yes | Support back-to-back PUSCH transmissions across consecutive slots.OK to consider Repetition type B for same TB. |
| Xiaomi | Yes | The same view with case1, considering phase continuity, back-to-back PUSCH transmission within one slot should have high priority.As for repetition type B for same TB, we think if the same TB transmission can meet the RAN4 restrictions for joint channel estimation, it can be supported no matter to repetition type.Regarding PUSCH transmissions with different TBs, how to allocate and maintain the power consistency between different TBs should be further considered. |
| China Telecom | Yes for repetition type B and different TBs | Repetition type B: same comments as above.Different TBs: PUSCH transmissions with different TBs for high data rate, e.g, 1Mbps, may also benefit from joint channel estimation. As long as power consistency and phase continuity can be maintained, it does not make sense to preclude joint channel estimation for PUSCH transmissions with different TBs. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Yes for repetition type B for the same TB  | Supporting repetition type B provides flexibility in time resource assignment. It is effective especially in TDD scenarios, as PUSCH can be allocated to different numbers of symbols over each slot. From RAN4 reply, phase continuity is not maintained, when downlink reception is between PUSCH. This implies that consecutive slots would be a main scenario of joint channel estimation. For this reason, joint channel estimation should be supported for back-to-back PUSCH transmissions repetition type B. |
| Sony | yes | We support all back-to-back use cases. We, however, agree with Qualcomm that the motivation of Type-B for the CE scenarios needs to be clarified. |
| Intel | Okay for repetition Type B  | We are fine to support joint channel estimation for repetition type B within and across slots. As mentioned by other companies, repetition type B can also be used for coverage enhancement, by allocating contiguous resource for PUSCH transmission. However, it is not clear to us the support of different TBs within a slot for joint channel estimation. In our view, this is not targeted for coverage enhancement.  |
| ZTE | Yes | Similar comments as above. We support the proposed use cases while optimization specific for repetition type B or multiple TBs should be minimized.  |
| Sharp | Yes | We support Use case 3. Repetition type B is beneficial for coverage enhancement due to increasing UL symbols. We can also support different TBs. |
| Panasonic | Partial Yes | * + Repetition type B for the same TB:

We support back-to-back PUSCH transmissions across consecutive slots for repetition type BE for the same TB. * + PUSCH transmissions with different TBs across consecutive slots:

The proposal is not clear whether PUSCH transmission with different TBs are scheduled by multiple DCIs or a single DCI. If scheduled by multiple DCIs, we do not see motivation for enabling joint CE because RB assignments and modulation orders in-between adjacent PUSCH transmissions/modulation of different TBs scheduled by multiple DCIs are usually different. If scheduled by a DCI, for NR-U usage specified in current specifications, we don't see the motivation for enabling joint channel estimation as the shared frequency resource is used when the channel is generally good because of LBT aspect. For multi-TB scheduling by a DCI in Rel. 17 NR 52.6-71 GHz, further conclusion is necessary before discussing on enabling joint CE. * Use case 1: back-to-back PUSCH transmissions across consecutive slots.
	+ Repetition type B for the same TB
	+ FFS: PUSCH transmissions with different TBs scheduled by a DCI
 |
| Apple | No | As commented above, the repetition type B enhancement is not objective of the coverage enhancement, it can be discussed in URLLC WI.* + For PUSCH transmission with different TBs, we try to understand this sub-bullet. To differentiate from last question on case1, the PUSCH transmission is scheduled in whole slot, whether there is gap between two PUSCHs back-to-back transmission could impact the feasibility of joint channel estimation.
 |
| Nokia/NSB | Yes | Similar comment as provided above for Use case 1. |
| WILUS | Yes/No | We support the Repetition Type B for the same TB.Regarding PUSCH transmissions with different TBs, it is unclear that such a case is practical scenario because back-to-back scheduling with different TBs are mainly target to high-rate data service, which is not an intended scenario for coverage enhancements. So, we suggest to focus on the scenario with the same TB. |
| OPPO | Partially Yes | We can accept repetition type B for the same TB, but we don’t agree with PUSCH transmissions with different TBs.For different TBs, if joint channel estimation is applied, the frequency domain resources, the precoder and the power shall be the same among PUSCH for these different TBs, which puts stringent restriction on the gNB’s scheduling.  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Yes | As long as the PUSCH transmissions (both for same TB and different TB) are back-to-back across slots, it is okay to support joint channel estimation. ). For PUSCH repetition type B, if back-to-back transmission is not possible across slots, then whether joint channel estimation is applied or not should be discussed after input from RAN4 on phase continuity. |
| Ericsson | No | * + **Repetition type B for the same TB**

The general use case for repetition type B across multiple slots is also not clear for back-to-back transmission of normal slots: why would it be desirable to have part of a slot occupied by a PUSCH if coverage is desired? * + **PUSCH transmissions with different TBs**

Similar to the case within a slot, different TBs for back to back transmission has less motivation than repetitions of a TB in our understanding. The same problems exist as in the within-slot case with respect to different resource allocation, diversity/precoding, and QoS requirements. Also, cases where repetition is not used are naturally at higher SINR operating points, where channel estimation may not be so crucial. Furthermore, the specification impact may be higher than for repetition, since each transmission will have a separate grant. So we would like more study of the performance benefit and the specification impacts before agreeing to support PUSCH transmission with different TBs.All that said, this part of the discussion is on use cases that motivate solutions. In principle, if solutions for Type A repetition can be directly applied for Type B, we see no problem with that. Our concern is that we should focus on use cases that are relevant to coverage, and to ensure we have enough time for solutions to make these work well.  |

**Proposal: Confirm the following working assumption**

**Working assumption:**

* For back-to-back PUSCH transmissions across consecutive slots, support necessary design aspects (under the condition of power consistency and phase continuity) to enable joint channel estimation for the following case:
	+ Over back-to-back PUSCH transmissions for one TB processed over multiple slots
		- It’s subject to UE capability

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | Agree. |
| vivo | Agree with the proposal. |
| CATT | Support. |
| Qualcomm | Wait for more details on either feature to emerge. We would like to make sure the designs/configurations for the two features are compatible and implementable. |
| LG | Agree to confirm the working assumption. |
| InterDigital | Support to confirm the working assumption. |
| CMCC | Agree |
| Samsung | Agree |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| China Telecom | Support. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support the proposal. |
| Sony | Support |
| Intel | Support |
| ZTE | Support |
| Sharp | Support |
| Panasonic | Support |
| Apple | Agree to confirm the working assumption. To be more accuracy, back-to-back PUSCH transmission without gap in-between could be better for now. |
| Nokia/NSB | Support the FL’s proposal. |
| WILUS | Support |
| OPPO | Agree. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support |
| Ericsson | Support  |

**Companies are encouraged to provide views whether the following cases are considered for joint channel estimation for non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions.**

* For non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions within one slot:
	+ Non-zero gap in-between adjacent PUSCH transmissions due to invalid symbol(s) for PUSCH repetition type B
	+ Non-zero gap in-between adjacent PUSCH transmissions for different TBs scheduled by network.
* For non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions across slots:
	+ Non-zero gap in-between adjacent PUSCH transmissions due to SRS or PUCCH transmission from other UE(s) in-between adjacent PUSCH transmissions
	+ Non-zero gap in-between adjacent PUSCH transmissions due to invalid symbol(s)/orphan symbol for PUSCH repetition type B
	+ Non-zero gap in-between adjacent PUSCH transmissions for different TBs scheduled by network.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | * + **non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions within one slot:**

The key point for joint channel estimation is keeping phase continuity between PUSCH transmissions, if conditions for phase continuity can still be ensured in non-zero gap non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions, joint channel estimation can still be supported. Furthermore, the non-zero gap in-between PUSCH transmissions is a very common case* + **For non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions across slots:**

Similar view as the above bullet that joint channel estimation should be supported for this bullet once conditions for phase continuity can be met. And for a coverage limited UE, the maximum power is reached, resulting in the same restricted MCS and number of PRB for two successive PUSCH transmissions across slots.. Thus it is very high probable that the phase continuity is much easier to bekept by the UE. Furthermore, these cases are very common cases in reality. And how to perform the joint channel estimation in the above use case can be for further study. |
| CATT | Regarding to these non-zero gap cases, we can wait for RAN4’s feedback on the exact symbol number of *X* (gap between PUSCHs). |
| Qualcomm | Non-back-to-back transmissions within one slot does not seem relevant or typical for a cell-edge UE. Prefer to drop this case.For the case of non-back-to-back transmission across slots, wait for final guidance from RAN4 before discussing these cases further. |
| LG | We are fine with the identified cases.But, for repetition type B, we need to clarify whether repetition type B is supported or not for coverage enhancement. |
| InterDigital | We support to consider non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions within one slot/across slots. Maintenance of phase/power continuity for non-back-to-back require further studies. |
| CMCC | For the non-zero gap cases, it should depend on RAN4’s conclusion. |
| Samsung | Ok to consider non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions within one slot and across slot. We would like to clarify what would be the implication of SRS or PUCCH transmission ‘from other UE(s)’. |
| Xiaomi | Regarding to non-back-to-back cases, maybe there should be some additional restrictions, such as the gap length X, or some power or phase fluctuations. Thus it can be depends on UE capability and RAN4 feedback. |
| China Telecom | Support to consider these cases for non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions while whether to support non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions depends on RAN4 feedback. From our perspective, in the practical network, several symbols may be reserved for SRS and PUCCH. If joint channel estimation is only restricted to back-to-back transmissions without any gap, joint channel estimation may not be applied eventually. In this sense, we think to support the non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions is meaningful and necessary. |
| Sony | We are ok with waiting for RAN4. Depending on the potential gain various companies has reported, the NW typical configurations on UL/DL ratios we think it is important to enable this. |
| Intel | We prefer to wait for RAN4 response on non-back to back PUSCH transmission first before we discussion this issue.  |
| ZTE | We are fine to support JCE for these cases, as long as the conditions for phase continuity can be ensured. But, as commented by other companies, it depends on further RAN4 feedback.  |
| Sharp | We support non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions within one slot for different TBs.We support non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions within one slot for repetition type B to ensure joint channel estimation between PUSCH repetitions separated by invalid symbols.We support non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions across slots for both different TBs and repetition type B. |
| Panasonic | For a scenario of no more than *X* un-scheduled OFDM symbols in-between the PUSCH repetition (e.g., *X* = 0, 1, …, 14), and a scenario of other physical signals/channels in-between PUSCH repetitions from the UE perspective, e.g., SRS or PUCCH transmission in-between the PUSCH repetition from the other UEs, RAN4 is still discussing if X can be non-zero value and UE can maintain phase continuity. For the coexistence with Rel.15/16 UEs, we think to allow SRS or PUCCH from the other UEs are essential. Therefore, for non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions with non-zero gap in-between adjacent transmissions, where there is no DL reception and X un-scheduled OFDM symbols in-between the PUSCH repetition, support necessary design aspects to enable joint channel estimation. X is decided by RAN4.  |
| Apple | We prefer to wait RAN4’s progress. It was mentioned in RAN4 LS response, they were studying the case of non-zero gap. |
| Nokia/NSB | Joint channel estimation for non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions should be supported, since it is critical for joint channel estimation feature to be used in TDD. Details on how to support and whether additional constraints should be applied or not can be further discussed after RAN4’s feedback is received. |
| WILUS | Regarding the scenarios including non-back-to-back PUSCH transmission, the discussion is deferred till RAN4’s decision. |
| OPPO | Prefer to wait RAN4’s progress. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Decision on whether to support joint channel estimation for not back-to-back transmissions should be made after RAN4 feedback on phase continuity  |
| Ericsson | For repetition type B and different TBs, our general thinking is given above. RAN4’s inputs on whether a gap can be supported are needed for us to ultimately decide what can be supported for any of the use cases we have in RAN1. However, from a RAN1 perspective, gaps due to transmission from other UE(s) e.g. for SRS or PUCCH seem to be a common use case, and would be beneficial to support. |

**Proposal:**

**RAN1 waits for RAN4’s additional information to decide whether joint channel estimation should be supported for the following use cases.**

* Use case 2: non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions within one slot.
* Use case 4: non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions across consecutive slots.
* Use case 5: PUSCH transmissions across non-consecutive slots.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | Whether a use case is beneficial should be discussed in RAN1 while whether it is feasible from implementation perspective should be discussed RAN4. Since the SI & WI are led by RAN1, it will be very helpful to reach RAN1 consensus on the benefits of those use cases. Therefore, we would like to suggest to keep RAN1 discussion on it from benefit perspective, in the end the results of RAN4 discussions from implementation perspective will be taken into account together.  |
| CATT | Support. |
| Qualcomm | Support.  |
| LG | We are fine to wait for RAN4’s additional information. But, according to LS from RAN4, we may need to reply regarding on the use cases which RAN1 is considering for RAN1 specification work and RAN4 study. |
| InterDigital | We are ok to accept RAN4 inputs on this issue. |
| Samsung | OK to wait.  |
| Xiaomi | support |
| China Telecom | Support |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support the proposal |
| Sony | We are ok with waiting for RAN4. Depending on the potential gain various companies has reported, the NW typical configurations on UL/DL ratios we think it is important to enable this. |
| Intel | We are fine with the conclusion.  |
| ZTE | RAN4 is asking RAN1 about the concerned use cases. So, when drafting the reply LS to RAN4, we could provide our RAN1 views on the supported use cases. This could also facilitate RAN4 discussion.  |
| Sharp | Support |
| Panasonic | For non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions with non-zero gap in-between adjacent transmissions, RAN4 is still discussing. Hence, we should wait for feedback from RAN4 to discuss necessary design aspects to enable joint channel estimation. |
| Apple | We are fine with is proposal. |
| Nokia/NSB | We are fine with the intention in general. However, this proposal may not be necessary, since RAN1 can still wait for RAN4 without agreeing to this proposal. |
| WILUS | Support |
| OPPO | Agree. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support |
| Ericsson | Our thinking is that we should ensure that at least the configurations we know will allow joint channel estimation should be well specified. However, we also know that non-back-to-back use cases are important, and it would be a shame if they are precluded. So, similar to Nokia’s view, it may not be necessary to agree to formally pause discussions on non-back-to-back, since we will anyway naturally spend most of our time on methods that we know are feasible from the available information from RAN4. |

**Companies are encouraged to provide views on joint channel estimation for PUSCH for intra-band CA/inter-band CA and DC.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Since RAN1 design is typically band agnostic, more inputs on such band-specific issue from RAN4 are necessary. However, the topic seems not relevant to coverage enhancement because UL power deficits for a cell-edge UE are exacerbated by any UL CA or DC and the strategy of de-configuring UL CA or DC to a cell-edge UE or the scheduling strategy of single uplink scheduling usually provides much more UL coverage gain than concurrent uplink transmissions. For DL CA, there is no specific new issue for joint channel estimation.Therefore, we would like to suggest to deprioritize this discussion in RAN1.  |
| vivo | For CA/DC, the UE may not be able to maintain phase continuity in the expected time duration, due to concurrent transmissions. The UE behaviour should be discussed for these cases. |
| CATT | In our view, single cell/carrier scenario should be prioritized. It is not usual for a UE to perform UL CA/DC in an UL coverage limited scenario. |
| Qualcomm | JCE is on a per CC or even per BWP basis. The only aspects of CA/DC that we need to worry about are on power control. CA/DC operation can be viewed as an interrupting event and separate rules for how to handle them can be defined. Please see our response under Section 3.5. |
| LG | A UE can perform downlink CA/DC when the downlink coverage is sufficient. In that case, it should be noted that the UL coverage enhancement is needed when the coverage mismatch between downlink and uplink occurs, i.e., downlink coverage is sufficient but the uplink coverage is not. In such case, the UE should perform UL coverage enhancement on a cell or both of them which can collide with the other cell. Therefore transmission power adjustment is needed due to the uplink transmission in other CC, it could be impossible for UE to maintain power consistency. It should be discussed. |
| Samsung | It is highly unlikely that a UE with poor coverage will be configured with CA/DC. No need to consider unrealistic cases. |
| Xiaomi | For CA/DC, it is more difficult for UE to maintain power consistency and phase continuity, thus it should be low priority. |
| China Telecom | According to RAN4 reply, for CA and DC, as long as the condition that no change on transmission power level of its own CC and not impacted by other concurrent CC(s) can be met, joint channel estimation can be applied. |
| Sony | If deemed relevant, we think that RAN1 shall ask RAN4 to take this into consideration. |
| Intel | We share similar view as other companies that a coverage limited UE would unlikely operate simultaneous transmission for CA/DC. It is hard for UE to maintain the power consistency. We suggest to consider this as low priority.  |
| ZTE | When CA/DC is configured, the UE may only transmit PUSCH in one CC at a given time, e.g., single Tx switching. In such case, it seems no need to preclude JCE. Even a UE would transmit PUSCH on multiple CCs, RAN4 has already defined the conditions. So, we are fine to consider JCE for CA/DC. |
| Sharp | In our view, intra-band CA/inter-band CA and DC degrade UL coverage performance due to splitting transmit power over multiple carriers and are not appropriate scenario for coverage enhancement. |
| Panasonic | We think these topics are not high priority, hence they should be deprioritized in the discussion of RAN1 due to limited timing unit. |
| Apple | First, we consider the CA/DC is not main use case to be considered by coverage enhancement. Second, the two FR links could impact each other, it’s hard to fulfill the conditions for joint channel estimation.  |
| Nokia/NSB | Agree with Huawei and Samsung. |
| WILUS | Our understanding is that JCE can be applicable for the single cell/carrier transmission case (i.e., PUSCH transmission is scheduled in a cell/carrier at a given time) even if CA/DC are configured. |
| OPPO | Before we solve other basic and important issues, we propose to deprioritize these topics. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Agree that this should be deprioritized topic |
| Ericsson | CA/DC with a low band carrier is a coverage solution itself. Taking into account CA behavior for joint channel estimation may take significant effort, and so we agree that it can be deprioritized at least in Rel-17. |

## 3.2 Time-domain window for joint channel estimation

**Based on the analysis of pros and cons for the time domain window and the majority views summarized in section 2.3, it is proposed to specify the time domain window.**

**Proposal:**

* For joint channel estimation, specify a time domain window during which UE is expected to maintain power consistency and phase continuity among PUSCH transmissions subject to power consistency and phase continuity requirements.

**If companies still have concerns, please answer the following questions:**

* What’s the technical problem of specifying a time domain window other than more standardization efforts?
* What’s the benefit of not specifying a time domain window other than less standardization efforts?
* How to handle the problems of not specifying a time domain window summarized in section 2.3?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | We agree with FL’s proposalThe time window is to facilitate the alignment of the UE and gNB regarding to the phase continuity |
| vivo | Agree with the proposal. |
| CATT | Support. |
| Qualcomm | Support. |
| LG | We are generally fine with the proposal to specify a time domain window. In addition to maintaining power consistency and phase continuity, UE should de expected to maintain timing advance during a time domain window. |
| InterDigital | Support the FL’s proposal. |
| CMCC | According to the current replies from RAN4, only consecutive slots could work. And under the current typical TDD configuration, only one or two uplink slots could use joint channel estimation. We do not see a necessity to define a time window in such cases but only an indication of activation of the joint channel estimation by gNB. And in the FDD case which could have long consecutive uplink slots, we are wondering that whether the phase drifting or other issues could impact the performance of joint channel estimation. If there is, we are open to discuss. |
| Samsung | Support |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| China Telecom | As summarized in section 2.3, there are a number of advantages to specify the time domain window. Thus we support the proposal. |
| Sony | Support |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal. Without defining the time window for joint channel estimation, it is not clear to us when/how UE would maintain the power consistency and phase continuity and when/how gNB would perform joint channel estimation. |
| ZTE | We are fine to specify a time domain window. Our understanding is the window could be implicitly determined, e.g., by the number of repetitions or TDD configuration. Thus, ‘specify’ it doesn’t mean we will use the term in the specification, which is up to further discussion.  |
| Sharp | We agree with the proposal. In our view, the time domain window should be specified to update the current phase shift requirement in TS38.211. (See below yellow highlight)6.2 Physical resources…If intra-slot frequency hopping is not enabled by higher layer parameter for a physical channel, the UE transmission shall be such that the channel over which a symbol on the antenna port used for uplink transmission is conveyed can be inferred from the channel over which another symbol on the same antenna port is conveyed if the two symbols correspond to the same slot. |
| Panasonic | We don't see so technical difference between " a time domain window is introduced to facilitate further discussion" and "specify it" from UE and gNB behaviour perspective. This can be carried out by the editor in the later phase. On the other hand, if there is a need to agree this for specific reason, we are fine to agree it. Our view is following part of wording discussion is more important.In addition, on the wording, current usage is "UE is expected to maintain ...". It means there can be the possibility that UE does not maintain power consistency and phase continuity. For gNB receiver perspective, more deterministic UE behaviour is required in order to allow joint channel estimation. Therefore, by removing "is expected to", we propose "UE maintain power consistency and phase continuity ..." |
| Apple | We support this proposal. |
| WILUS | We support the FL’s proposal. |
| OPPO | Based on RAN4’s LS, for consecutive back-to-back PUSCH transmission with zero-gap, the phase continuity can be maintained. For other cases, it is still under study in RAN4 whether UE can maintain phase continuity and how much the phase tolerance. In addition, based on our simulation results, with +/- 0.1 ppm residual frequency offset, there is no obvious performance gain loss of joint channel estimation. Please note that +/- 0.1 ppm residual frequency offset will bring in a phase drifting of about +/- 45 degree. Therefore, we propose to wait until RAN4’s progress on the phase continuity for other cases. In addition, we propose companies to further study the impact on the performance of different phase drifting cases.  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support |
| Ericsson | **Regarding technical problems beyond standardization effort:** If a time domain window is specified, and if the window applies to e.g. portions of a set of repetitions, then the channel estimation performance will vary if the subsets that can be combined varies. Furthermore, the gNB receiver may have to do parameter estimation differently across bundles than within them. We would like to better understand what time domain window sizes UE vendors have in mind, so the impact on gNB receiver complexity and performance can be understood.**On problems with not specifying a time domain window:** Having some constraint that the UE does not change phase among all transmissions (repetitions and/or slots of a TBoMS PUSCH) of the same information seems to be a good starting point to allow the UE time instants when it can update phase. So if the windows are not very long (however long that turns out to be), then this constraint together with the power/phase requirements could be enough. On the other hand, if it turns out that UEs can only maintain phase among a subset of transmissions, then some additional mechanism may be needed.Requiring a UE to maintain phase strictly on a time domain basis (e.g. every N slots) may have the appeal that it is easy to combine DMRS from any PUSCH, e.g. different TBs, etc. However, different TBs may in general have different MCS, be transmitted on different beams, use different precoders, and have different requirements, e.g. UCI only on PUSCH vs. eMBB PUSCH vs. URLLC PUSCH, etc. So the use cases where a purely time domain window has strong benefits from this perspective are not obvious.We would be fine with something like:* For joint channel estimation, specify a time domain window during which UE is expected to maintain power consistency and phase continuity among PUSCH transmissions subject to power consistency and phase continuity requirements.
	+ The time domain window during which the UE is expected to maintain power consistency and phase continuity among PUSCH transmissions is according to slots occupied by the same PUSCH content
		- FFS the fraction of the slots carrying the same content for which the UE maintains power consistency and phase continuity
 |

**Companies are encouraged to provide views on the following aspects of the time domain window if it is specified.**

* Whether the time domain window should be defined independently for each use case, e.g., by a set of repetitions/slots/symbols?
* Whether the time domain window depends on UE capability?
* Whether single or multiple time domain windows should be defined?
* Whether the time domain window is explicitly configured or implicitly determined?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | * + The time window may be different for different cases, e.g. repetition, TBoMS, resource allocation types (TDRA type A or TDRA type B), FDD and TDD etc.
	+ The length of time window could depend on the UE capability
	+ At least one window can be defined. Whether multiple window length should be defined may depends on the specific usage of the window.
	+ The time domain window determined implicitly is preferred, if applicable.
* The start time of time domain window can be relative to current PUSCH transmission.

FFS: the time domain window starts from the last/first symbol of the current PUSCH transmission |
| vivo | Answer to Q1: The time domain window should not be independently defined/configured for each use case.Answer to Q2: UE capability is needed. However, the window size depends on UE RF requirements, such as power change tolerance as defined in section 6.3.4.4 of TS 38.101, and phase continuity tolerance, as discussed in R4-2103363. The details of the UE capability can be up to RAN4 decision.Answer to Q3: Not clear of the motivation and detailed design of the multiple windows. Further clarification is needed.Answer to Q4: Explicit configuration of the time domain window is needed. While for implicit determination of the window, we should first clarify in which cases the implicit window is needed. In our understanding, implicit time domain window may be needed in addition to the configured one in the following use cases. For example, in TDD case, the window size may be determined implicitly considering the frame structure. Another example is the time window to maintain power consistency and phase continuity can be shorter than the configured one if the UE need to receive DL signals as indicated by NW, or the phase continuity and power consistency can not be guaranteed due to CA/DC. |
| CATT | * We think it is enough to define the time domain window by a set of slots (minimum 1 slot), for all use cases.
* The time domain window should be configured by gNB, while the gNB shall determine the window based on UE capability report.
* We prefer defining multiple time domain windows by specification. For a particular UE, the gNB may only configure/indicate one window for it at one time.
* It may be a little early to discuss this detail issue. May be we can come back after Question 3-2 is clear. In our view, as long as the time domain window length can be clearly determined, aligned between gNB and UE, either explicit or implicit methods are fine.
 |
| Qualcomm | 1. Duration of time domain window to be specified in slots/symbols
2. Duration of time domain window to be governed by UE capability, i.e. not to exceed maximum duration indicated by UE capability. Limits based on modulation order may also need to be considered.
3. Depending on number of repetitions of PUSCH, one or more number of time domain windows may be necessary to indicate DMRS bundling.
4. Start of each time domain window to be determined by start of a PUSCH transmission.

Time domain window configuration can be different between DG and CG PUSCH. If multiple CGs are available, then each can have its own configuration. |
| LG | * + On the purpose of the unified structure for the time-domain window, a set of slots more than or equal to 1 should be considered.
	+ The time-domain window can depend on UE capability, however it should be configured by gNB in order not to create ambiguity.
	+ The gain of multiple time-domain window for same grant is quite confused and it is redundant. At least single time-domain window for same grant is desirable.
	+ The both of explicit and implicit configuration can be considered. It can be further studied.
 |
| InterDigital | For Q1, yes, it should depend on the use case. Whether type A/B repetitions are considered for joint channel estimation may influence the definition. For example, defining the window by repetitions/slots may be suitable for type A repetition. While defining the window by symbols may be suitable for type B repetition. For Q3, multiple time windows may be defined as the UE may be configured with a mixture of grant types.For Q4, Our preference is explicit configuration of the window. |
| Samsung | - the time window can be defined by a number of repetitions or slots- FFS whether the time domain window needs to depend on UE capability- the motivation for multiple windows is not clear- both options should be further discussed |
| Xiaomi | * Time domain window should be defined independently for each use case with different granularity, e.g., repetitions/slots/symbols
* Time domain window depends on UE capability. If UE meets the RAN4 constrictions, UE can send a report to Gnb to help configuring the time window.
* We support to define multiple time domain windows for different use cases or service type, such as gNB can configure N time domain windows through RRC, and each UE can enable and support M time window simultaneously
* Both time domain window is explicitly configured or implicitly determined can be fine and need further considered.
 |
| China Telecom | Regarding whether the time domain window should be defined independently for each use case, it may depend on UE capability, whether the duration of maintaining power consistency and phase continuity is defined in RAN4. Therefore, we propose to send an LS to RAN4 asking whether the duration of maintaining power consistency and phase continuity among PUSCH transmissions will be defined based on UE capability and the length of duration if defined. |
| Sony | If the window duration is not a mandatory feature, a UE capability will be needed.For us the explicit window size indication shall be avoided if possible, due to the associated overhead. |
| Intel | In our view, • Time domain window is defined based on a set of slots. • Time domain window depends on UE capability.• Single time domain window seems sufficient. At this moment, it is not clear to us the need to define multiple time domain windows• Time domain window can be configured or implicitly determined. For the latter case, time domain window can be equal to the bundle size for inter-slot frequency hopping with inter-slot bundling. |
| ZTE | * If the time window depends on UE capability, the maximum size of the time window should be the same for all cases. But, the actual duration of the time window may be different for different cases, e.g., the actual duration of the time window is determined by the available UL slots in TDD.
* It’s fine to let UE to report the maximum window size, but whether/how to configure the actual time window is up to NW.
* A single time window seems sufficient.
* Both explicit and implicit way can be considered at this stage.
 |
| Sharp | * + The time domain window should be studied for each use case, e.g., repetition or different TBs.
	+ If a UE capability in terms of length is smaller than repetition factor, the window should depend on the UE capability.
	+ The multiple time domain windows corresponding to multiple use cases should be studied.
	+ Since the time domain window should include a set of continuous UL slots for joint channel estimation, TDD pattern should be considered for the window. Furthermore, the window can be implicitly determined by considering TDD pattern.
 |
| Panasonic | We agree the time domain window can be different depending on the set of repetition/slots/symbols.To support time domain window or not is UE capability. Whether the time domain window length depends on the UE capability needs to be determined after the maximum length of time domain window. If the maximum length is not so long, the length would not be UE capability.It should be further discussed how time domain window is obtained from UE before the decision of single or multiple time domain window.Our view is time domain window is signalled by a scheduled DCI for dynamic grant and by an activated DCI for CG type 2, or signalled by RRC configuration for CG type 1.  |
| Apple | 1. Time domain window is on the slot level. It needs to be specified/configured for FDD, and it can be configured or implicitly derived for TDD, which is subject to further study.
2. To understand the question better, is the time domain window bundled with joint channel estimation or not? And the capability is to report the size of time domain window?
3. Two time domain window could be needed if two different UL/DL configurations are configured.

For explicit or implicit derive the window, we are open for now. |
| Nokia/NSB | Comment on Q1: The time-domain window can be defined differently for different use cases. For example, for PUSCH repetitions, the time-domain window can be specified as the repetition period without RRC configuration. In contrast, RRC configuration of the window size in slots/symbols may be needed for other use cases. Comment on Q2: Time-domain window may depend on UE capability in the end, which could be used for implicit determination of the window.Comment on Q3: A single time-domain window should be defined.Comment on Q4: Whether the time domain window is explicitly configured or implicitly determined may depend on use cases, as commented for Q1. |
| WILUS | * At least for the repetition case, the time domain window can be defined by a set of repetitions. For other cases, the time domain window can be defined by a set of slots.
* Both single and multiple windows can be considered for different use cases.
* Both explicit and implicit configurations can be further studied in terms of flexibility and overhead.
 |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | * + Time domain window can be defined independently for each case i.e. based on repetitions or symbols or slots
	+ Maximum time window duration can be reported by UE for which the power consistency and phase continuity is expected to be maintained
	+ Multiple time domain windows can be defined
	+ Time domain window can be explicitly configured/indicated. For the case of frequency hopping, it can be based on hop duration
 |
| Ericsson | * Whether the time domain window should be defined independently for each use case, e.g., by a set of repetitions/slots/symbols?
	+ Turning joint channel estimation on/off for a PUSCH configuration can be a starting point.
* Whether the time domain window depends on UE capability?
	+ We would prefer to save this for later discussion, once the range of durations UEs can support are more clear.
* Whether single or multiple time domain windows should be defined?
	+ Prefer to further discuss once the definition of a time window is more clear. If the definition is in units of transmissions/repetitions rather than absolute time, the use of multiple windows are different.
* Whether the time domain window is explicitly configured or implicitly determined?
	+ Our first preference is implicit: slots of a PUSCH with the same content. If the UE can only combine a fraction of the slots, then it may need to be configured.
 |

## 3.3 Inter-slot frequency hopping with inter-slot bundling

**Companies are encouraged to provide views on the following aspects of inter-slot frequency hopping with inter-slot bundling.**

* Whether the bundle size (time domain hopping interval) can be independently configured from the time domain window?
* Whether the bundle size (time domain hopping interval) should be defined separated for FDD and TDD?
* Whether the bundle size (time domain hopping interval) is explicitly configured or implicitly determined, e.g., derived from the number of repetition?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | The discussion seems to rely on the detailed design of time window for joint-channel-estimation. For example, if a time window indicated by gNB has required a UE to maintain phase contiguity for joint-channel-estimation across multiple hops, then a bundle size has already been indicated and determined. Therefore, in our understanding, it can be implicitly determined. |
| vivo | * Whether the bundle size (time domain hopping interval) is explicitly configured or implicitly determined, e.g., derived from the number of repetition?

Answer: the bundle size can be determined implicitly based on TDD frame structure. For example, ‘DDDSUDDSUU’, the bundle size is 1 slot for 1st half of the period, and 2 for the 2nd half of the period. |
| CATT | * It seems unnecessary to have independent configuration for hopping interval and time domain window. For example, the benefit is unclear to configure the hopping interval as 4-slots if the time domain window is 2-slots.
* It may be a little early to discuss this detail issue. But to provide our initial view, if UE capability of maintaining power consistency and phase continuity are the same in FDD and TDD, we prefer the same hopping interval(s) for both TDD and FDD.
* It may be a little early to discuss this detail issue. May be we can come back after Question 3-2 is clear. In our view, as long as the length of time domain hopping interval can be clearly determined, aligned between gNB and UE, either explicit or implicit methods are fine.
 |
| Qualcomm | We should first discuss on how to specify the time domain window. If multiple time domain windows are specified to cover the transmissions, the frequency hop for a transmission can be determined based on the time domain window. For example, if it is agreed that UE has to maintain phase continuity across transmissions within a time domain window, all transmissions within the window should belong to the same hop. In addition, the hop for transmissions in one window can be different from the hop for transmissions in another window.  |
| LG | One thing to point out is that, the coherent transmission window (i.e., bundle size) for joint channel estimation and frequency hopping boundary for inter-slot frequency hopping with inter-slot bundling can be different. In our understanding, the coherent transmission window is desirable to be UE-specific since the bundle size can be different depending on UE. Therefore, it is natural for the frequency hopping boundary, i.e., grid to be cell-specific value for the alignment of frequency hopping boundary among UEs. |
| Samsung | There is currently no justification for independent configuration. There is also no agreement for configuration.Whether the bundle size needs to be defined separately for FDD and TDD will depend on RAN4 input. The bundle size can be as long as the UE can maintain properties required for DM-RS interpolation across slots and that general condition is independent of FDD or TDD.Need for signalling (explicit configuration) needs to be justified; otherwise, the determination is implicit. |
| Xiaomi | Bundle size can be independently configured depends on different cases. If there is no joint channel estimation or bundle size has not be determined, it can be independently configured. Otherwise, bundle size should be defined with some restrictions, such as, it should be greater than and be an integer multiple of time domain window.We think bundle size for TDD and FDD should be defined separated.Whether the bundle size (time domain hopping interval) is explicitly configured or implicitly determined, e.g., derived from the number of repetition?If the repetition number and time domain for channel estimation is determined, then the bundle size can be implicitly configured for saving indication overhead, such as 1/2 the number of repetitions or twice the time window. But we also think explicit or dynamic indication for bundle size should also be supported. |
| China Telecom | In our understanding, the bundle size or time domain hopping interval may not be tightly related to the length of the duration based on UE capability. Even if the bundle size is larger than the length of duration, as long as network and UE keep the alignment, network does joint channel estimation over multiple PUSCH transmissions across the slots which UE can maintain power consistency and phase continuity. If the time domain window is specified, the bundle size may not be tightly related to the size of the time domain window either. However, from performance perspective, it does not make much sense if the bundle size is larger than the length of duration based on UE capability or the size of the time domain window. Hence, we propose the bundle size can be independently configured, but cannot be larger than the length of duration based on UE capability or the size of the time domain window. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We would like a bundle size to be equal to the time domain window to achieve the largest gain of joint channel estimation.Based on the simulation results, a gain of frequency hopping is the same regardless of the bundle size. On the other hand, longer bundle size provides higher gain of joint channel estimation. Therefore, the bundle size should be equal to the time domain window size, which provides the largest joint channel estimation gain. |
| Intel | In our view,* Typically, bundle size is smaller than time domain window.
* It is not clear to us why bundle size should be defined separately for TDD and FDD. Our understanding is that single bundle size would be sufficient.
* Bundle size can be either explicitly configured or implicitly determined. For the latter case, it can be equal to half of the number of the repetitions.
 |
| ZTE | We can first discuss the bundle size for FH separately with the time window which is UE capability related. Whether they would be the same can be further discussed later once things get clear.The bundle size for TDD could be different with FDD. For TDD, it depends on the available UL slots in a TDD configuration.  |
| Sharp | - Hopping interval should be flexibly determined by considering both frequency diversity gain and joint channel estimation gain. The flexibility of hoping interval shouldn’t be restricted by the time domain window.- Basically, commonality between FDD and TDD should be exploited as much as possible. It should be applied to half-duplex FDD discussed in WID of RedCap. |
| Panasonic | The time domain hopping interval can be different between FDD and TDD depending on how time domain window is defined related to "DL" slot in the middle between "UL" slots.It is FFS whether the bundle size is explicitly or implicitly determined. |
| Apple | For TDD, the bundle size can be the same as the time domain window.For FDD, the bundle size can be the different as the time domain window. |
| Nokia/NSB | Comment on Q1: The time-domain window size and the bundle size for inter-bundle frequency hopping can be different and they are not necessarily to be configured. For example, if time-domain window is defined to be equal to the repetition duration of PUSCH repetitions, then in case inter-bundle frequency hopping is enabled, the bundle size is smaller than the time-domain window size.Comment on Q2: The difference in definition of bundle size is unclear in the two cases. Is it about whether the bundle should be counted on physical slots or available slots for FDD and TDD? Comment on Q3: We are open to further discuss both options, depending on how time-domain window is specified for PUSCH repetitions use cases. |
| WILUS | * The bundle size may or may not be configured independently with the time domain window. If JCE is desired, then the bundle size can be configured with the length of the time domain window. If frequency diversity is desired, the bundling size can be configured independently with the time domain window.
* Common design between FDD and TDD are strived to avoid unnecessary specification effort.
* The bundle size can be configured explicitly.
 |
| OPPO | The bundle size depends on how to balance the gain from frequency hopping and the gain from joint channel estimation and to maximize the total gain. It has nothing to do with the time domain window, which, as we commented above, may not be necessary.* The bundle size may be different for FDD and TDD. In TDD, it may be derived by the slot structure, e.g., consecutive UL slots.
 |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | * + Bundle size is equal or less than the time window duration
	+ Bundle size doesn’t need to be defined separately for TDD and FDD
	+ Bundle size should be explicitly configured/indicated
 |
| Ericsson | * **Whether the bundle size (time domain hopping interval) can be independently configured from the time domain window?**
	+ Independently configured can be a starting point. Having frequency hopping patterns strictly rely on bundling may be unnecessarily complicated and restrict gNB implementation.
* **Whether the bundle size (time domain hopping interval) should be defined separated for FDD and TDD?**
	+ Would like to further discuss this point. Our inclination would be to define one set of hopping patterns. If there is sufficient benefit to separately defining the frequency hopping pattern for TDD and for FDD, we can be open to that.
* **Whether the bundle size (time domain hopping interval) is explicitly configured or implicitly determined, e.g., derived from the number of repetition?**
	+ Explicitly configured can be a starting point. Having frequency hopping patterns strictly rely on e.g. the number of repetitions may be unnecessarily complicated and restrict gNB implementation.
 |

## 3.4 Optimization of DMRS location/granularity in time domain

**Based on the simulation results, following observations are proposed:**

**Observation:**

* For optimization of DMRS granularity in time domain with joint channel estimation
	+ One company (ZTE) shows 2 DMRS symbols in every two repetitions w/ JCE can provide additional 2.52 dB, 2.43 dB, 0.15 dB, 0.81 dB and 0.87 dB gain over 1 DMRS symbol in each repetition w/o JCE, 2 DMRS symbols in each repetition w/o JEC, 1 DMRS symbol in each repetition w/ JCE, 2 DMRS symbols in each repetition w/ JEC, 1 DMRS symbol in every two repetitions w/ JCE respectively in 700MHz Rural scenario at 10% BLER.
	+ One company (Intel) shows ~1.5dB degradation can be observed when DMRS symbols are not allocated in odd slots.

**Companies are encouraged to provide views on the above observation.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Thanks for the simulation results. Clarification with more detailed simulation assumptions for Intel’s observation are appreciated, such as the moving speed of UE. Ideally, in case of low moving speed or static fading channel, a performance improvement (at a target data rate, such as 1Mbps) due to DMRS overhead reduction can be expected.  |
| Qualcomm | While we appreciate the simulation results, we are not in favor of DMRS granularity optimizations as we prefer to retain the option to recover PUSCH based on per slot processing for all repetitions/transmissions. This is important from a UCI multiplexing perspective where it may not be prudent to wait until all repetitions/transmissions have arrived. Additionally, we want to also have some robustness to address scenarios where some repetitions may get cancelled due to ULCI or prioritization. We therefore prefer to have uniform DMRS granularity across all repetitions/transmissions. |
| LG | Considering multi-user multiplexing, enhancement in DMRS granularity in time-domain is quite burden and at the same time lots of specification effort is needed. It should be deprioritized. |
| Samsung | Conclusions should be drawn based on cases that are important for coverage, e.g. TDD and 3.5~4 GHz |
| Intel | For our simulation results, it was assumed that TBS = 288, 4 PRBs, 4 repetitions, moving speed of 3km/h and inter-slot frequency hopping with bundling size of 2 slots. joint channel estimation is employed with bundling size of 2 slots. Further, CFO is uniformly distributed within [-0.1, 0.1] ppm of 4GHz carrier frequency, and ML based CFO estimation algorithm is employed at receiver. Our understanding of the performance degradation is due to the CFO estimation accuracy. If DMRS is not transmitted in the even slots, it is expected that CFO estimation performance is largely degraded, which would lead to performance loss.  |
| Panasonic | We share a similar view of Huawei to clarify details simulation assumptions for Intel’s observations. |
| Nokia/NSB | We appreciate the simulation results and open for further discussions. Concerning the simulation results, we share similar question as Huawei on the potential gain of DMRS overhead reduction.One general question is that are we trying to (and why) make agreements on these observations? We would expect that these observations are used for discussion and more generic proposals may or may not be made based on these observations.  |
| OPPO | We share similar view with ZTE that optimization of DMRS granularity in time domain with joint channel estimation can achieved gains.  |
| Ericsson | Our thanks also for the results. From ZTE’s results, it would be good to better understand if gains tend to be closer to the 0.15 dB case vs. the 2.5 dB case. Also, results at more than 700 MHz can be of interest before drawing conclusions. For Intel’s results, given that CFO changes on a slot by slot basis, having some loss make sense to us. |

**Observation:**

* For DMRS equally spaced among PUSCH transmissions with joint channel estimation
	+ One company (vivo) shows no gain for equally spaced DMRS pattern.
	+ One company (Intel) shows the performance difference is negligible between existing DMRS pattern as defined in Rel-15 and equally spaced DMRS pattern.

**Companies are encouraged to provide views on the above observation.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | Above observation seems reasonable. |
| vivo | Agree with the observation. |
| LG | With same reason of enhancement of DMRS granularity in time-domain, it should be depriortized. |
| Samsung | Any “reasonable” DM-RS pattern within a slot should result in almost same BLER. That may also be shown analytically by considering phase shift due to CFO/Doppler for different patterns. |
| Intel | We agree with the observations. |
| Nokia/NSB | The observations seem reasonable since JCE is useful when the channel within the JCE period is not changed dramatically. Therefore, the position of DMRS symbols is less important than the number of DMRS symbols within the JCE period. |

**Observation:**

* For DMRS located in special slots with joint channel estimation
	+ One company (HW) shows JCE w/ 2 DMRS located in special slot can improve the performance of PUSCH transmissions by 1.2dB at 10% BLER in typical TDD mode ‘DDDSUDDSUU’.
	+ One company (Interdigital) shows JCE w/ 1 DMRS located in special slot can provide 0.5~0.8dB gain at 10% BLER in TDD mode ‘DDDSU’.
	+ One company (vivo) shows JCE w/ 1 DMRS located in special slot can provide 0.7dB gain. Moreover, the performance gain is not sensitivity to the DMRS pattern.
	+ One company (Intel) shows JCE w/ 1 DMRS located in special slot can provide ~0.1dB gain at 10% BLER in TDD mode ‘DDDSU’.

**Companies are encouraged to provide views on the above observation.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | From Intel’s simulation with minor gain from the utilization of S slot in joint channel estimation, 1 DMRS symbol is used in special slot while 2 DMRS in each UL slot is assumed, thus the gain by the utilization of S slot is smaller as compared to observations of others’. Typically, S slot has at least 2 UL symbols which can be allocated as DMRS.TDD is the most coverage limited scenario and the consecutive S slot should be fully utilized to assist the joint channel estimation with subsequent UL slot, where DMRS located at S slot will not occupy the resource of data in UL slot. |
| vivo | For intel’s simulation, I think the reason the performance gain seems marginal, is PUSCH repetition number 4 assumed, the performance gain is marginal due to the performance relies on number of repetitions. While in vivo’s assumption, DDSUU frame structure is assumed, and repetition number 2 is assumed, the performance gain can be more obvious if a smaller number of repetitions is assumed. |
| CATT | It is good to utilize the UL symbols in the special slot, since the coverage is challenging in TDD bands.  |
| Qualcomm | It is not surprising that additional DMRS symbols can be helpful in low SNR scenarios. These considerations however can be neither classified as granularity or location optimizations. The PUSCH transmission spans multiple slots with DMRS being located in a completely different slot. Timeline considerations will come into play and there could be significant spec impact with potentially some overlap with TBoMS. Not in favor of these new configurations at this point. |
| InterDigital | The simulation results demonstrate performance benefits in using DMRS in the special slot. The amount of performance gain may depend on the UE mobility assumed in the simulation. |
| CMCC | The use of DMRS in special slot could facilitate the joint channel estimation in TDD bands. |
| Intel | In our simulations, we assume 4 repetitions, 2 DMRS symbols in each UL slot and inter-slot frequency hopping with bundling size of 2 slots. In this simulation assumption, we observed some marginal performance gain.  |
| ZTE | We are fine to consider to transmit DMRS in special slots for better channel estimation.  |
| Nokia/NSB | Agree with Qualcomm. |
| Ericsson | We think further alignment of simulation results is needed. Can companies clarify how many DMRS symbols are in the baseline in the case where DMRS is in special slot, and how much of the gains come from the DMRS configuration?  |

**Observation:**

* For orphan symbol used for DMRS with joint channel estimation
	+ One company (vivo) shows 0.8 dB gain if orphan DMRS symbol in-between PUSCH repetitions is utilized for JCE.

**Companies are encouraged to provide views on the above observation.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| vivo | Agree with the observation. |
| Samsung | Any gain from using additional DM-RS would depend on the scenario, such as whether or not there is DM-RS interpolation, the DM-RS of the PUSCH, and the operating SINR. If those are insufficient, additional DM-RS will help. |
| Nokia/NSB | Using orphan symbol for DMRS seems to be a corner case, since in coverage shortage scenario the gNB can make sure that there is no orphan symbol to leverage resource for coverage. |

**Observation:**

* For different DMRS locations with joint channel estimation
	+ One company (OPPO) shows 0.3dB gain can be found while DMRS placed on different symbol within the slot (1st and 11th symbol, respectively)

**Companies are encouraged to provide views on the above observation.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Samsung | It is pointless to discuss DM-RS locations without specifying phase rotation values (which are gNB implementation dependent) and, to a lesser extent, the Doppler shift (which will be different at 700 MHz vs. at 4 GHz). |
| Nokia/NSB | Similar comment as for equally spaced DMRS symbols. |
| OPPO | Agree with the observation |

**Companies are encouraged to provide views on whether +/- 0.1 ppm is the appropriate value for the residual frequency error.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| vivo | +/- 0.1 ppm is the appropriate value for the residual frequency error. And based on our simulation, whether to consider the residual frequency error, will not bring about remarkable difference in relative performance gain achieved by joint channel estimation. |
| Samsung | +/- 0.1 ppm is appropriate for CFO assumption but a gNB receiver compensates it using received PUSCH/PUCCH. Without such compensation, we do not think DM-RS interpolation is feasible. It would be better for companies to suggest residual values after compensating/correcting the +/- 0.1 ppm CFO.  |
| Intel | We are fine with +/- 0.1 ppm for residual frequency offset error.  |
| ZTE | +/- 0.1 ppm is the maximum value for residual frequency error. And we don’t see the residual frequency error with Uniform distribution during [-0.1, +0.1] ppm would bring much performance impacts at least for 700MHz.  |
| Panasonic | In our simulation results, it has been observed that in the condition of +/- 0.1 ppm residual frequency offset/error, the performance loss due to residual frequency offset/error can be negligible at least when performing 4 and 8 repetition with joint channel estimation and inter-slot frequency hopping. |
| OPPO | We are fine with +/- 0.1 ppm for residual frequency offset error. And we have already provide simulation results, which shows that the performance loss due to residual frequency offset/error can be negligible. |
| Ericsson | As I think was pointed out, ‘residual frequency offset’ is not really correct terminology; what we intended when we raised this frequency offset issue is that carrier frequency offset should be modelled, and the offset of +/- 0.1 ppm can be used as a starting point for CFO. Then the residual after this e.g. 0.1 ppm error is dependent on the compensation used in the simulations. As can be seen in our contribution R1-2103446, if there is no compensation for CFO, there can significant losses in the presence of CFO (0.5 dB loss as compared to an overall gain of 1.3 dB in an example for 4 GHz). This value of 0.1 ppm is commonly used in RAN4 work, but we would very much appreciate UE vendor inputs on whether a UE capable of joint channel estimation can support tighter CFO requirements. |

## 3.5 Others

**Companies are encouraged to provide views on PT-RS.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | With proper PTRS like reference signal, the phase rotation may be estimated and compensated for joint channel estimation.  |
| Qualcomm | Several aspects of PTRS configuration and activation were made assuming a single slot channel estimation. These aspects may need to be revised in light of joint channel estimation across multiple slots. These revisions are particularly important for efficient FR2 operation. We can focus on these aspects once basic design framework for JCE is in place.Further, similar to Huawei, we think that with proper PTRS configuration, any residual phase offset across slots can be estimated and compensated for prior to joint channel estimation by gNB. |
| InterDigital | We support to include PT-RS in the DM-RS bundle, at least for FR2, to assist the gNB to perform any additional phase correction such as residual phase discontinuity or phase disruptions at the slot boundary. |
| Samsung | We prefer to not assume use of PT-RS in FR1 in order to correct phase rotation. Most gains due to DM-RS interpolation will be lost from the additional overhead. Also, PT-RS is typically not implemented in FR1. |
| Sony | Support inclusion of PT-RS for FR2 in the same framework. |
| ZTE | We’d like to note that the frequency error is the residual error after estimation, regardless there is PTRS or not.  |
| Ericsson | We think that joint channel estimation should operate properly without PT-RS, at least for FR1. However, it makes sense to support its use with joint channel estimation, at least for FR2. Agree with Qualcomm that it may be early to address details of PT-RS yet. |

**Companies are encouraged to provide views on power control.**

* Whether the mechanism of power control should be adjusted for joint channel estimation?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| vivo | YES. Compared with legacy power control mechanism, UE can not apply the new TPC command, does not apply the new pathloss measured, and does not change the pathloss RS, in the time domain window in which phased continuity and power consistency is required. |
| Qualcomm | Please see comment on “PUSCH transmission interrupted by other transmissions/procedures”. Allowing power changes only after a bundling window has ended is reasonable. |
| LG | It is important to maintain same transmission power during the time-domain window, if specified, according to the LS from RAN4. The enhancement on power control to keep power continuity is required. |
| Samsung | No need to change the mechanism of power control. But a UE needs to keep a constant transmission power during a DM-RS bundling window. |
| Intel | We share similar view as Samsung that existing power control mechanism can be reused. And UE needs to maintain the power during the time domain for joint channel estimation.  |
| ZTE  | Agree with Samsung and Intel.  |
| Apple  | Agree with Samsung, Intel and ZTE. |
| Nokia/NSB | Agree with Samsung. We can treat this aspect as low priority. |
| OPPO | Agree with vivo. |
| Ericsson | We are open to further discuss.  |

**Companies are encouraged to provide views on whether phase correction at gNB should be considered.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | With proper PTRS like reference signal, the phase rotation may be estimated and compensated for joint channel estimation.  |
| Qualcomm | Is the assumption here that all gNBs will be able to correct for phase errors? If only a subset of gNBs implement this, how will the UE know whether this feature is available at the gNB? |
| InterDigital | PT-RS in the DM-RS bundle should aid gNB to perform phase correction. |
| Samsung | Phase correction at the gNB is essential to enable DM-RS interpolation at GHz bands. There is no need, and would actually be counter-productive, to rely on PT-RS. |
| ZTE | As we commented above, the frequency error is the residual error after estimation. There is no need to consider phase correction at lease for simulation purpose.  |
| Nokia/NSB | Agree with Qualcomm. This aspect can be considered as gNB’s implementation which may add additional benefit for joint CE but does not need to be specified. In addition, given the short time allocation for the WI, RAN1 should focus on the main aspects identified so far, i.e. how UE can keep the power consistency and phase continuity. |
| OPPO | It depends on gNB’s implementation.Please note that whether joint channel estimation is also up to gNB’s implementation. |
| Ericsson | Agree that joint channel estimation is gNB implementation, and UEs should not need to know whether gNB support it. What we show in R1-2103446 is that if slots have a wideband phase shift, gNB can estimate it, and then use joint channel estimation on slots that would otherwise not be able to be combined. We are hoping that this can to some degree simplify UE implementations that support phase continuity, e.g. allowing non-back-to-back use cases for joint channel estimation.  |

**Companies are encouraged to provide views on TA command.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | Please see comment on “PUSCH transmission interrupted by other transmissions/procedures” |
| LG | The UE is expected to adjust transmission timing when TA command is received, which behaviour makes UE impossible to maintain the phase continuity. It should be supported for UE not to receive TA command during the joint channel estimation period. |
| Sony | Agree that the UE behaviour needs to be defined in the specification. This relates to any potential interruptions. |
| Ericsson | OK to discuss what may be needed in specifications for this. However, fine points like this may be better taken once the joint channel estimation framework is better defined. |

**Companies are encouraged to provide views on grant type dependent signalling: bundling group index.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| InterDigital | We support the proposal. The proposal is related to maintenance of multiple windows. The bundling group index can be associated with grant type for the UE to determine DM-RS bundling in transmissions. |
| Panasonic | We think that the length of time domain window is indicated by scheduled DCI for dynamic grant and by activated DCI for CG type 2. The length of time domain window is RRC configuration for CG type 1. |
|  |  |

Companies are encouraged to provide views on the case PUSCH transmission interrupted by other transmissions/procedures.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| vivo | The following cases should be considered: * PUSCH transmissions is cancelled by SFI, CI or higher priority transmissions
* UL transmission in another serving cell, when intra band CA is configured.

Power consistency and phase continuity can not be guaranteed, if above cases occurs in the time domain window. |
| Qualcomm | It might help for us to start forming a list of events/procedures that are impacted when DMRS bundling is enabled. Different companies are listing different aspects, but rather than taking a disjointed approach, we might need a common framework to handle interruptions to bundled PUSCH transmissions. We could start with the following (based on comments in tdocs from other companies):dSFI, ULCI, channel prioritization, TPC command, TA command, TA changes (transparent to gNB), freq offset correction (transparent to gNB), CA operation, DC operation.For each item we then determine if it is to be (a) postponed, (b) cancelled/ignored, (c) applied as per original timeline within bundling being terminated, or (d) declared an error event. |
| InterDigital | More generally, DM-RS bundling operation in a dynamic environment should be considered. UE behavior when PUSCH transmission which contains a DM-RS bundle needs to be discussed. For example, how a UE behaves when the time window contains flexible symbols and flexible symbols are converted to uplink symbols via SFI. |
| Samsung | It is unlikely for a coverage limited UE to operate with UL CA (if the UE supports UL CA) – no need for such consideration even if they may theoretically happen.  |
| Sony | UE behaviour needs to be specified for all relevant events |
| Nokia/NSB | Agree with Qualcomm approach on listing the potential interruption constraints and with Samsung that it’s unlikely UL CA is used for coverage shortage UE. |
| Ericsson | Also agree a list is a good way to organize the discussion. CA/DC can be deprioritized in our view, as discussed above. |

1. Email discussion (2nd round)

**FL’ comments:**

**For the 2nd round of discussion, FL would like to focus the discussion on issues with high priority, including use cases, whether to specify time domain window, observations on the simulations results on optimization of DMRS granularity/location in time domain and potential proposals, as well as the relation between inter-slot frequency hopping with inter-slot bundling and the time domain window. Other issues may more or less depend on the outcome of the discussion.**

## 4.1 Use cases for joint channel estimation

**FL’ comments:**

**For proposal 1 and proposal 2, the majority view on repetition type B is clear. The arguments are summarized in the following table. Companies are encouraged to be constructive and flexible.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Support** | **Not support** |
| PUSCH repetition type B | * As long as the power consistency and phase continuity can be maintained by UE, joint channel estimation can be applied.
* PUSCH repetition type B can make full use of UL resources, e.g., UL symbols in special slots for TDD, and can achieve better performance than PUSCH repetition type A in some cases in terms of coverage
* The WID does not preclude joint channel estimation for PUSCH repetition type B.
 | * A back-to-back PUSCH transmission within a single slot is not relevant to a cell-edge UE. PUSCH repetition type B cannot improve coverage.
* Type B repetitions are primarily relevant for low latency applications, which are not the focus of this WID.
 |

**Proposal 1:**

* For back-to-back PUSCH transmissions within one slot, support necessary design aspects (under the condition of power consistency and phase continuity) to enable joint channel estimation for the following cases:
	+ Over back-to-back PUSCH transmissions (of the same TB) for repetition type B scheduled by dynamic grant or configured grant

Support: Huawei, HiSilicon, vivo, CATT, InterDigital, CMCC, Samsung, Xiaomi, China Telecom, Sony, Intel, ZTE, Panasonic, Nokia, NSB, WILUS, OPPO, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, Spreadtrum, NTT DOCOMO (21)

Not support: Qualcomm, Sharp, Apple, Ericsson (4)

* + FFS: Over back-to-back PUSCH transmissions with different TB

Support: Huawei, HiSilicon, LG, InterDigital, CMCC, Sony, ZTE, Nokia, NSB, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility

Further study: vivo, CATT, Xiaomi

Not support: Qualcomm, Samsung, Sharp, Panasonic, Apple, WILUS, OPPO, Ericsson

**Proposal 2:**

* For back-to-back PUSCH transmissions across consecutive slots, support necessary design aspects (under the condition of power consistency and phase continuity) to enable joint channel estimation for the following cases:
	+ Over back-to-back PUSCH transmissions (of the same TB) for repetition type B scheduled by dynamic grant or configured grant

Support: Huawei, HiSilicon, vivo, CATT, InterDigital, Samsung, Xiaomi, China Telecom, NTT DOCOMO, Sony, Intel, ZTE, Sharp, Panasonic, Nokia, NSB, WILUS, OPPO, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, Spreadtrum (21)

Not support: Qualcomm, Apple, Ericsson (3)

* + FFS: Over back-to-back PUSCH transmissions with different TB

Support: Huawei, HiSilicon, CATT, LG, InterDigital, CMCC, China Telecom, Sony, ZTE, Sharp, Nokia, NSB, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility

Further study: vivo, Xiaomi

Not support: Qualcomm, Panasonic, Apple, WILUS, OPPO, Ericsson

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| CATT | OK with Proposal 1 and Proposal 2. |
| Sony | Ok with both proposals |
| LG | One thing we would like to point out is that we do not support PUSCH repetition type B for joint channel estimation. In our understanding, PUSCH repetition type B is not suitable for coverage enhancement scenarios because it allocates a lot of data to a small number of resources for the purpose of URLLC, resulting in high code rate. Therefore, PUSCH repetition type A is the primary to be considered in coverage enhancement scenario. About different TB, joint channel estimation can be performed if the requirements for joint channel estimation (phase and power continuity, same precoder, same PRB, etc.) are maintained. How and whether such requirements can be kept needs to be studied. |
| WILUS | Support both Proposal 1 and Proposal 2. |
| vivo | OK with Proposal 1 and Proposal 2. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support both Proposal 1 and Proposal 2 |
| InterDigital | We are ok with both Proposal 1 and Proposal 2. |
| Nokia/NSB | We are fine with both Proposal 1 and Proposal 2. |
| Ericsson | We are not OK with Proposal 1, as we don’t see how splitting a slot can improve coverage (as we discussed in more detail earlier).For proposal 2, the different TBs case is the most problematic. There will be multiple grants, which will likely have higher specification impact than repetition, while the gains could be lower due to the higher SINR operating point as compared to repetition. We would like further study of its performance and specification impact before agreeing to it.While repetition Type B may not be a use case for coverage enhancement, if it can be automatically supported from mechanisms defined for Type A, it does seem a bit unfair to not support it. Therefore, we would like to offer a compromise proposal:For back-to-back PUSCH transmissions across consecutive slots, joint channel estimation over PUSCH transmissions (of the same TB) for repetition type B scheduled by dynamic grant or configured grant can be supported if it reuses only those joint channel estimation mechanisms defined for repetition Type A. |
| Intel | We are fine to consider joint channel estimation for repetition type B. We do not support joint channel estimation for different TBs as this is not targeted for coverage enhancement. For the sake of the progress, we are fine with these two proposals.  |
| Sierra Wireless | We do not support proposal 1. As explained by Ericsson and LG, Repetition type B within a slot is for URLLC which is not a target for coverage enhancement. Proposal 2 maybe acceptable as this fit more into a coverage enhancement scenario. Sierra also supports JCE over different TBs as this will provide more gain since more DRMS can be aggregated so would like to keep that FFS. |
| Samsung | OK with the proposals. For Proposal 2, we also do not support the FFS. |
| OPPO | Ok with both proposals |
| Qualcomm | Do not support Proposal 1 and 2. Use case is not justified. Prefer to focus the limited time we have on use cases that have maximum impact on a coverage-limited UE. Furthermore, for short duration repetitions, as in the case of Type B, diversity is a more important consideration than DMRS bundling. Enabling DMRS bundling for Type B may disable the use of diversity techniques. |
| Sharp | We don’t agree with Proposal 1 by the same reason that Ericsson mentioned.We support Proposal 2. |
| Huawei， HiSilicon | For Proposal 1 that back-to-back PUSCH transmissions within one slot: * The case of back-to-back PUSCH transmissions (of the same TB) for repetition type B should be supported.

As a response to Sharp’s comment in 1st round discussion that L equals 14 is sufficient for repetition type B with S=0, where each repetition occupy a slot, considering the fact that SRS is frequently transmitted, L=14 and S=0 for repetition type B is not practical and can trigger an error case as shown in the figure below, where the indicated PUSCH overlaps with the SRS.(an error case: SRS overlap with the repetition of L=14 symbols)However, a type B repetition, S is 0 and L<14 can avoid such error case and maximize UL resource utilization, as illustrated in the following figure with two repetitions in the same slot.(rep#i and rep#i+1 in one slot, joint channel estimation can be performed)* Furthermore, the case of back-to-back PUSCH transmissions with different TB should be supported in joint channel estimation.

The key requirement for joint channel estimation is UE phase continuity across PUSCH transmissions, which is obviously independent of whether same TB (e.g. repetition) or different TBs.Such back-to-back PUSCH transmission with different TB has been supported by Rel-16, which does not require additional burden of phase continuity for joint channel estimation. For example, with type B repetition, the last repetition of the previous TB may coincide with the first repetition of the current TB in the same slot, as illustrated below: (The 2nd TB and last repetition of 1st TB are within the one slot and joint channel estimation can be performed for coverage enhancement)For Proposal 2 that back-to-back PUSCH transmissions across consecutive slots:* The case of back-to-back PUSCH transmissions (of the same TB) for repetition type B should be supported in joint channel estimation.

Because TDRA of repetition type B can across slot boundaries and it’s a common case that two type B repetitions are across consecutive slots. * The case of back-to-back PUSCH transmissions with different TB should be supported, because numerous simulation results in SI demonstrated significant gains (e.g. 1.3-2.1 dB in TR 38.830) by joint channel estimation among different TBs across consecutive slots at the target of 1Mbps uplink throughput
 |
| CMCC | General fine with the proposal. One question is that are we missing the discussion of repetition type A under the proposed cases ? |
| Apple | We don’t agree both Proposals. Type B is not target scheme to enhance the coverage. For the cross slot transmission, type B can’t keep the back-to-back transmission without gap in the slot boundary. |
| Xiaomi | We are fine with both proposals |

**FL’ comments:**

**For proposal 3, only one company wants to defer the confirmation. FL encourages Qualcomm to reconsider it.**

**Proposal 3: Confirm the following working assumption**

**Working assumption:**

* For back-to-back PUSCH transmissions across consecutive slots, support necessary design aspects (under the condition of power consistency and phase continuity) to enable joint channel estimation for the following case:
	+ Over back-to-back PUSCH transmissions for one TB processed over multiple slots
		- It’s subject to UE capability

Support: Huawei, HiSilicon, vivo, CATT, LG, InterDigital, CMCC, Samsung, Xiaomi, China Telecom, NTT DOCOMO, Sony, Intel, ZTE, Sharp, Panasonic, Apple, Nokia, NSB, WILUS, OPPO, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, Ericsson (24)

Defer: Qualcomm

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| CATT | OK with Proposal 3. |
| Sony | Ok |
| LG | We are fine with proposal. |
| WILUS | Support Proposal 3. |
| vivo | OK |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support Proposal 3 |
| InterDigital | We support Proposal 3 and confirm the working assumption. |
| Nokia/NSB | Support the FL’s proposal. |
| Ericsson | We support the proposal. However, we suggest to not debate this at length, since we will work according to the working assumption unless it is revoked. |
| Intel | We support the proposal.  |
| Sierra Wireless | OK to confirm the WA. Would like to add FFS:* + FFS: Over back-to-back PUSCH transmissions with different TB
 |
| Samsung | Fine with the proposal. |
| OPPO | OK |
| Qualcomm | We prefer to wait until additional details for TBoMS emerge. We can revisit once the TBoMS TDRA aspects are known. |
| Sharp | OK |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree to confirm the work assumption. It is good to have the FFS that Sierra suggested. |
| CMCC | Agree to confirm the WS. And also proposal to add the FFS brought by Sierra, which was also our comments in the last meeting. |
| Apple | OK |
| Xiaomi | OK |

## 4.2 Time-domain window for joint channel estimation

**FL’ comments:**

**For proposal 4, the majority support to specify the window. FL understands the raised concerns. Some sub-bullets are added to make the proposal clearer. For the sake of progress, companies are encouraged to be constructive and flexible.**

**@ Panasonic, regarding whether to remove "is expected to", actually we discussed the wording intensively in last meeting, it’s better to keep the same wording at this stage.**

**Proposal 4:**

* For joint channel estimation, specify a time domain window during which UE is expected to maintain power consistency and phase continuity among PUSCH transmissions subject to power consistency and phase continuity requirements.

Support: Huawei, HiSilicon, vivo, CATT, Qualcomm, LG, InterDigital, Samsung, Xiaomi, China Telecom, Sony, Intel, ZTE, Sharp, Panasonic, Apple, WILUS, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility (19)

Not support: CMCC, OPPO, Ericsson (3)

* + The time domain window may be specified using units of e.g. repetitions, slots, and/or symbols.
	+ The time domain window may be explicitly configured or implicitly determined.
	+ FFS: the time domain window may or may not be configured.
	+ FFS: single or multiple time domain windows
* FFS: relation with UE capability
* FFS: whether the term "time domain window" is used in the specification or replaced by other technical terms

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| CATT | We are generally fine with the proposal. But we think the 1st FFS (the time domain window may or may not be configured) is unnecessary. The possible application methods have already been well captured in sub-bullet ‘The time domain window may be explicitly configured or implicitly determined’ and another sub-bullet ‘FFS: whether the term "time domain window" is used in the specification or replaced by other technical terms’.  |
| Sony  | Ok with the proposal |
| LG | There are requirements for joint channel estimation that the UE should satisfy according to the LS from RAN4. A time domain window is required to mandate a UE for specific behaviour to satisfy these conditions over a certain period of time. Of course, joint channel estimation of the gNB is possible even if there is no time domain window, however in that case, the UE can perform arbitrary operations such as phase compensation or calibration, so the gain is likely to be marginal or not guaranteed. Therefore, the time domain window should be specified. |
| WILUS | We share the similar view with CATT. The 2nd sub-bullet may include the 3rd sub-bullet. |
| vivo | Generally agree with the Proposal 4. For 1st FFS, we share the same view with CATT.For 3rd FFS, UE capability could be considered as one of factors for the determination of the time domain window, i.e., the upper bound of the time domain window is restricted by UE capability. However, we are fine to leave it FFS. |
| Lenovo, Motorola mobility | We support the proposal and also agree with CATT that the first FFS bullet is not needed |
| InterDigital | We support to specify a time window for joint channel estimation.We have some suggestion for modifications for the FL’s proposal. We agree with CATT that FFS for “the time domain window may or may not be configured” is not necessary. Furthermore, can we take one more step and delete the “the time domain window may or may not be configured” since we are already discussing whether the window is implicitly determined or configured explicitly?In addition, are we agreeing to select both implicit determination and explicit configuration, or narrowing down to one choice? If so that should be clarified with FFS.Finally regarding the units for the time window, from our reading of the first round of discussion, the consensus seems to be use-case dependent choice for units of the time window (e.g., repetitions/slots/symbols). So we suggest the following changes to the proposal.* For joint channel estimation, specify a time domain window during which UE is expected to maintain power consistency and phase continuity among PUSCH transmissions subject to power consistency and phase continuity requirements.
	+ Units for the time domain window may be repetitions, slots, and/or symbols and choice of unit depends on the potential use case(s) agreed in RAN1#104e
	+ FFS : association between the potential use case(s) agreed in RAN1#104e and units of the time window
	+ FFS: Whether the time domain window is explicitly configured or implicitly determined.
	+ ~~FFS: the time domain window may or may not be configured.~~
	+ FFS: single or multiple time domain windows
* FFS: relation with UE capability
* FFS: whether the term "time domain window" is used in the specification or replaced by other technical terms
 |
| Nokia/NSB | Support the FL’s proposal. |
| Ericsson | OK with the proposal as written. Prefer to keep ‘FFS: the time domain window may or may not be configured.’, since if the window is implicitly determined, whether it applies or not may be still be configured. This detail can be decided after more discussion in our view.As we have commented before, we would really like to have a quantitative notion of what UE vendors think is an appropriate window duration. If it is only a few slots vs. a radio frame or more, the solutions and the impact on gNB receivers could be quite different. It will be hard to make good progress without such information. |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal in principle. We share similar views as other companies that the first FFS is redundant.  |
| Sierra Wireless | Support the FL’s proposal but wording could be improved slightly e.g. “among” could be change to “across its”* For joint channel estimation, specify a time domain window during which **a** UE is expected to maintain power consistency and phase continuity **across its** PUSCH transmissions subject to power consistency and phase continuity requirements.

We feel it is essential to keep this bullet:* + The time domain window may be explicitly configured or implicitly determined.

We feel this bullet should be an FFS or can be removed:* + **FFS:** The time domain window may be specified using units of e.g. repetitions, slots, and/or symbols.
 |
| Samsung | Support the proposal. |
| OPPO | As we commented earlier, the phase continuity issue is still under RAN4’s study, including under which cases there would be phase discontinuity, how much phase can change between two transmissions and how long gap in time between two repetitions is possible. Before we get their further reply, we are not sure whether it is the right procedure to have this proposal to be agreed. In addition, we don’t see the dependency between the time domain window and other issue, including the bundle size of frequency hopping.  |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support the proposal. In our understanding, the time domain window is for alleviating the duration of the phase continuity UE maintains. It is beneficial for UEs to update the transmitted power and carrier frequency offset frequently enough while joint channel estimation is applied. |
| Qualcomm | Agree in principle. Suggest dropping the first FFS. |
| Sharp | We support Proposal 4 but the 3rd sub-bullet is not needed. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We agree with FL’s proposalThe time window is to facilitate the alignment of the UE and gNB regarding to the phase continuity  |
| CMCC | We can live with current version of the proposal with 2nd ,3rd and 6th sub-bullet as the part of the proposal. As we mentioned in the last round, in some cases we may not need an explicit configuration or indication of the time window. And we need more information from RAN4 about this and then determine the definition or the details in the specification. |
| Apple  | We support this proposal. The time window is helpful from implementation and standard perspective, such as the joint channel estimation working with frequency hopping. |
| Xiaomi | Support |

## 4.3 Optimization of DMRS location/granularity in time domain

**FL comments:**

The intention of the observations on the simulations results is to facilitate the discussion on optimization of DMRS granularity/location in time domain with joint channel estimation. From FL perspective, making agreements on the observations is not a must but is preferred. Then, we can discuss whether optimization of DMRS granularity/location is necessary based on the observations.

**FL comments:**

Observation 1 is updated with detailed simulation assumptions.

**Observation 1:**

* For optimization of DMRS granularity in time domain with joint channel estimation
	+ One company (ZTE) shows 2 DMRS symbols in every two repetitions w/ JCE can provide additional 2.52 dB, 2.43 dB, 0.15 dB, 0.81 dB and 0.87 dB gain over 1 DMRS symbol in each repetition w/o JCE, 2 DMRS symbols in each repetition w/o JEC, 1 DMRS symbol in each repetition w/ JCE, 2 DMRS symbols in each repetition w/ JEC, 1 DMRS symbol in every two repetitions w/ JCE respectively. Other simulation assumptions are as include: 700MHz, 4PRBs, 8 repetitions, 3km/h, CFO ~ U[-0.1, 0.1] ppm.
	+ One company (Intel) shows ~1.5dB degradation can be observed when DMRS symbols are not allocated in odd slots. Other simulation assumptions are as include:: 4GHz, TBS = 288, 4 PRBs, 4 repetitions, 3km/h, bundling size of 2 slots with JCE, CFO ~ U[-0.1, 0.1] ppm.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| LG | The simulation results are contradictory which is controversial and the spec impact is expected to be large when considering multi-user multiplexing. So for now, it is desirable to be deprioritized. |
| Ericsson | If we understand correctly, the 0.15 dB gain is the ‘most fair’ and relevant result from ZTE. That there are losses due to CFO, and that they are larger at 4 GHz, as observed by Intel, is understandable in our view. Therefore, if we are to agree on some observations as a group, we should refine the observations to be the most relevant cases, otherwise it will be hard to use them to move forward. |
| Intel | It may be good to clarify the purpose of making such observations as this is not SI. Are we going to capture the observations in the chairman’s note?  |
| Samsung | In general, we don’t see the point of agreeing the proposed observations. The same applies for all observations 1~5. |
| Qualcomm | Thanks for the simulation results and we appreciate the extra effort. Our take on this is slightly different and we are not in favor of changing DMRS granularity/location across repetitions. Independent recovery of each repetition is important --- especially with UCI multiplexing in mind. We also need to account for instances where certain repetitions get cancelled/dropped. Its good to not over-optimize. This therefore may not be a good direction to go in. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | The observation is reasonable. Thanks for the clarification of detailed simulation assumptions. Given a very low speed of 3km/h, the performance degradation in Intel’s observation seems result from the inaccurate CFO estimation and compensation in odd slots without DMRS while the joint channel estimation among successive even slots with DMRS should be performed well. Additionally, if there is no frequency hopping, the impacts of CFO on performance are expected to be smaller. In our view, overhead reduction of DMRS in some slots can bring gains.  |
| Xiaomi | The observation is reasonable. |

**FL comments:**

It seems most companies think the simulation results in observation 2 are reasonable. Proposal 5 is proposed.

**Observation 2:**

* For DMRS equally spaced among PUSCH transmissions with joint channel estimation
	+ One company (vivo) shows no gain for equally spaced DMRS pattern.
	+ One company (Intel) shows the performance difference is negligible between existing DMRS pattern as defined in Rel-15 and equally spaced DMRS pattern.

**Proposal 5:**

* DMRS equally spaced among PUSCH transmissions is not considered for joint channel estimation in Rel-17.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| LG | We are fine with FL proposal 5. |
| vivo | Agree with FL Proposal 5. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Based on observations, we are fine to accept this proposal |
| Nokia/NSB | Support the FL’s proposal. |
| Ericsson | We are fine with this proposal in spirit. However, its relation to Rel-15 DMRS should be clarified to avoid confusion. Can we say instead:* A new DMRS pattern equally spaced among PUSCH transmissions is not considered for joint channel estimation in Rel-17.
 |
| Intel | We are fine with FL’s proposal. |
| Samsung | Support the proposal. |
| OPPO | We propose to move observation 5 into observation 2 since they are all on DMRS location optimization and reconsider proposal 5.* For different DMRS locations with joint channel estimation
	+ One company (OPPO) shows 0.3dB gain can be found while DMRS placed on different symbol within the slot (1st and 11th symbol, respectively)
 |
| Qualcomm | Support. |
| Sharp | We agree with the proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We agree with FL’s Proposal |
| Apple | We agree with the proposal. |

**FL comments:**

Observation 3 is updated with detailed simulation assumptions.

**Observation 3:**

* For DMRS located in special slots with joint channel estimation
	+ One company (HW) shows JCE w/ 2 DMRS located in special slot can improve the performance of PUSCH transmissions by 1.2dB at 10% BLER in TDD configuration ‘DDDSUDDSUU’ and 1 DMRS symbol per UL slot.
	+ One company (Interdigital) shows JCE w/ 1 DMRS located in special slot can provide 0.5 and 0.8dB gain at 10% BLER in TDD configuration ‘DDDSU’, 2 DMRS symbol and 1 DMRS symbol per UL slot, respectively.
	+ One company (vivo) shows JCE w/ 1 DMRS located in special slot can provide 0.7dB gain at 10% BLER with 2 repetitions, TDD configuration ‘DDSUU’ and 1 DMRS symbol per UL slot. Moreover, the performance gain is not sensitivity to the DMRS pattern.
	+ One company (Intel) shows JCE w/ 1 DMRS located in special slot can provide ~0.1dB gain at 10% BLER with 4 repetitions, TDD and 2 DMRS symbol per UL slot.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| vivo | Agree with the observation.From these simulation results, we can observe that with lower granularity of DMRS pattern, e.g. 1 DMRS per slot, the additional DMRS symbol(s) in special slot provide larger performance gain. Briefly, additional DMRS symbol(s) in special slot is beneficial for performance gain. |
| InterDigital | We would like to thank the FL for going through our contributions for details in the simulation assumption. We would like to make some modifications for observations for our simulation results. * + One company (Interdigital) shows JCE w/ 1 DMRS located in special slot can provide 0.5 and 0.8dB gain at 10% BLER in TDD configuration ‘DDDSU’, with 2 DMRS in the UL slot with the baseline and optimized DM-RS placement in the uplink slot, respectively, compare to the baseline DM-RS placement in the uplink slot in TDD configuration ‘DDDDU’.

We note that type B DM-RS placement is assumed for the simulation and CFO ~ U[-0.1, 0.1] ppm is also included in the simulation. |
| Ericsson | We think it is premature to make observations on performance, and would like further discussion.While it is intuitive that adding symbols from a special slot to normal UL slot(s) in a PUSCH transmission will improve link level performance, this improvement diminishes with the number of PUSCH symbols, as shown by Intel’s results. Therefore, significant coverage enhancement seems available only for a limited set of conditions. The net system benefit is not so clear yet. The special slot is often used for PUCCH or SRS. If we assume the common case where there is much more downlink than uplink traffic, then we can expect PUCCH is transmitted quite commonly by a UE. In this case, the special slot will often be unavailable for PUSCH, and any net coverage gain from the special slot may require the gNB to defer PDSCH transmissions to ensure the special slot is available for PUSCH. |
| Intel | Same comments as above. It may be good to clarify the purpose of making such observations as this is not SI. Are we going to capture the observations in the chairman’s note? |
| Samsung | No need to agree - the observations will need to be qualified and that will re-open the discussions. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | The observation seems reasonable. In our view, TDD is the most coverage limited scenario and the consecutive S slot should be fully utilized to assist the joint channel estimation with subsequent UL slot, and DMRS located at S slot will not occupy the resource of data in UL slot. Thus, DMRS located in special slot should be supported in joint channel estimation.  |
| CMCC | We appreciate the observations summarized by the FL. Based on current observation, we think the DMRS in special slot should be considered for further study of joint channel estimation. |
| Xiaomi | The observation seems reasonable |

**FL comments:**

Observation 4 is updated with detailed simulation assumptions.

**Observation 4:**

* For orphan symbol used for DMRS with joint channel estimation
	+ One company (vivo) shows JCE w/ 1 orphan DMRS symbol in-between PUSCH repetitions can provide 0.8 dB gain at 10% BLER with 2 repetitions, 4GHz TDD and 1 DMRS symbol per UL slot.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Is it the correct understanding that the ‘repetitions’ in the observation is referred to repetition type B only? |
| LG | Since PUSCH repetition type B is currently being discussed in the use case, it is preferable to revisit after the discussion. |
| vivo | To address the question raised by CATT and LG, the observation can be revised as**Observation 4:** * For orphan symbol used for DMRS with joint channel estimation
	+ One company (vivo) shows JCE w/ 1 orphan DMRS symbol in-between **type-B** PUSCH repetitions can provide 0.8 dB gain at 10% BLER with 2 repetitions, 4GHz TDD and 1 DMRS symbol per UL slot.
 |
| Ericsson | We also wonder why a portion of a slot is used if coverage is desired. Won’t the gains be less if there are more symbols used? |
| Samsung | No need to agree - the observations will need to be qualified and that will re-open the discussions. |

**FL comments:**

For observation 5, the proponent should clarify the detailed simulation assumptions as mentioned by other companies.

**Observation 5:**

* For different DMRS locations with joint channel estimation
	+ One company (OPPO) shows 0.3dB gain can be found while DMRS placed on different symbol within the slot (1st and 11th symbol, respectively)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Not sure whether this is against the latest Proposal 5. To understand better, is the repetition mechanism is applied here? |
| LG | In our understanding, if the location of the DMRS for the UE performing CE is changed, a problem may occur in the OCC of the legacy UE, which may lead huge spec impact. Therefore we think the performance gain compared to spec impact is marginal which leads us to deprioritize it. |
| Samsung | No need to agree - the observations will need to be qualified and that will re-open the discussions. |
| OPPO | @CATT, In our simulation, repetition is applied. We propose to move observation 5 into observation 2 since they are all on DMRS location optimization and reconsider proposal 5. |

## 4.4 Inter-slot frequency hopping with inter-slot bundling

**FL comments:**

It seems most companies think the bundle size (time domain hopping interval) can be independently configured from the time domain window.

**Proposal 6:**

* For inter-slot frequency hopping with inter-slot bundling, the bundle size (time domain hopping interval) can be independently configured from the time domain window.
	+ FFS: Whether the bundle size (time domain hopping interval) is explicitly configured or implicitly determined.
	+ FFS: Whether the bundle size (time domain hopping interval) is defined separately for FDD and TDD.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| CATT | According to our rough statistic, it is hard to say that MOST companies think the bundle size can be independently configured from the time domain window. It seems most companies agree that the bundling size is more or less related to the time domain window. We suggest to further discuss their relationship rather than hurry to an agreement. |
| LG | We agree to the FL proposal if the following sentence is included:“The bundle size is equal to or larger than the time domain window.” |
| WILUS | Regarding the 2nd FFS point, the bundle size may be determined based on consecutive UL slots in TDD, so that the bundle size can be smaller than the configured bundle size. In this sense, we suggest to add “How” in the 2nd FFS:* + FFS: Whether/How the bundle size (time domain hopping interval) is defined separately for FDD and TDD.
 |
| vivo | The current wording seems confusing. The main bullet says independently ‘configured’, while in 1st sub bullet it is FFS whether ‘explicit configured’ or ‘implicitly determined’.Does the following revision reflect FL’s intention?**Proposal 6:** * For inter-slot frequency hopping with inter-slot bundling, the bundle size (time domain hopping interval) can be independently ~~configured~~ determined from the time domain window.
	+ FFS: Whether the bundle size (time domain hopping interval) is explicitly configured or implicitly determined.
	+ FFS: Whether the bundle size (time domain hopping interval) is defined separately for FDD and TDD.
 |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We don’t agree with proposal. In our view, there is going to be some dependency between bundle size and time domain window size. We don’t think it is beneficial to have a bundle size greater than the time domain window size. In our view, the bundle size should be limited by time domain window size. For example, if the time domain window size is 2 slots, then we don’t see the benefit of having a bundle size greater than 4 slots.  |
| Nokia/NSB | We share similar view as Lenovo that there may be some dependency between bundle size and time-domain window size. In addition, we don’t see the use case to configure/determine bundle size to be greater than time-domain window size, which basically means that instead of exploiting frequency diversity we keep e.g. two windows in the same frequency hope (same bundle). On the wording of the proposal, we think that the bundle size can be different from the time-domain window size, but they do not necessary to be independently configured. Therefore, we prefer to agree on the former first, and leave the latter FFS. |
| Ericsson | OK with the proposal in principle; support vivo’s change. |
| Intel | We are not ready to agree the proposal. As commented by other companies, there is some connection between bundle size and time domain window size for joint channel estimation. In our view, bundle size should be smaller than or equal to time domain window size.  |
| Samsung | Unclear why the time domain window needs to be independently configured from the bundle size for frequency hopping. Either the UE can maintain phase/power throughout a frequency hop or it can maintain phase/power during N slots/repetitions. That is the time domain window, it may be a UE capability, and the independent configuration is unnecessary. The gNB can choose to do whatever it wants with the DM-RS during that time.Should wait for RAN4 input and conclude discussions on UE capability (if any) – this is not a critical aspect for progress. |
| OPPO | Fine with the proposal. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We do not support the proposal. Nothing about time domain window has been decided yet. It is too early to decide the bundling size is configured independently from the time domain window size. Based on our simulation results, different frequency hopping patterns provide the negligible gain difference of frequency hopping. On the other hand, longer duration per hop provides better joint channel estimation gain. Long duration per hop achieves the highest gain as long as frequency hops once in repetition transmissions. We are only concerned about the cases where the number of repetitions is less than the time domain window size. In that scenario, frequency doesn’t hop, which losses the gain of frequency diversity. To avoid it, we would like to decide the bundle size implicitly based on the number of repetitions and the time domain window size. In this approach, gNB can make sure to get the gain of frequency hopping with the highest joint channel estimation gain. |
| Qualcomm | Suggest deferring. Like others have said, “independently” is a strong word, and we would prefer to be more careful.Prefer to discuss this further after time domain window definition/specification is clear. If multiple time domain windows are specified to cover the transmissions, then it may offer a natural way to accommodate frequency hopping.  |
| Sharp | We are not ready to agree the proposal. Hopping instance should not be within the time domain window where phase continuity and power consistency are met. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | If there is no time domain window configured, the bundle size for inter-slot frequency hopping can be configured independently. If there is time domain window introduced, we don’t see the necessity to configure the bundle size as it can be determined implicitly. We should first discuss on how to specify the time domain window. |
| Apple | This proposal can be discussed later after the progress on time domain window. |
| Xiaomi | We are generally fine with it. We think if there is no time domain window or channel estimation configured, the bundle size for inter-slot frequency hopping can be configured independently. Otherwise, it should be configured with some restrictions related to time bundling size, such as not less than the time window and be an integer multiple of the window |

1. Email discussion (3rd round)

## 5.1 Use cases for joint channel estimation

**FL comments: Companies are encouraged to check whether the compromised proposal 2 by Ericsson can be acceptable.**

**Proposal 2:**

* For back-to-back PUSCH transmissions across consecutive slots, support necessary design aspects (under the condition of power consistency and phase continuity) to enable joint channel estimation for the following cases:
	+ Over back-to-back PUSCH transmissions (of the same TB) for repetition type B scheduled by dynamic grant or configured grant, if it reuses only those joint channel estimation mechanisms defined for repetition Type A.
	+ FFS: Over back-to-back PUSCH transmissions with different TB

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Panasonic  | We are fine with the proposal 2. |
| vivo | We would like to clarify that, whether a DMRS optimization, which only applies for type-B PUSCH repetition, has been precluded by the red color text. If the answer is ‘YES’, we would prefer to remove it. |
| InterDigital | We have a question for clarification. What are the “mechanisms” for joint channel estimation? |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We have similar clarification question as Interdigital. We would rather prefer to keep FFS on what joint channel estimation mechanisms are applied for  |
| Intel | Share similar view as other companies that the red part needs more clarification. We are not sure whether this is needed.  |
| Nokia/NSB | We are fine with the FL’s proposal in principle. The wording in the red part may need to be reformulated. We have the same question as InterDigital. It is our understanding that the intention here is that no additional design aspect is expected for supporting join CE for PUSCH repetition type B than the ones specified for PUSCH repetition type A, and this intention is fully aligned with our preference so far. In other words, we support this use case so far because we don’t see why with the same design and specification efforts, we should limit ourselves to repetition type A only but not type B. However, if the intention of supporting PUSCH repetition type B is to artificially add some optimizations on top, which unnecessarily requires additional specification efforts, then we cannot agree to that. |
| Sierra Wireless | We support the proposal. The red part could use some clarification but the intention is good in that NO repetition type B optimizations should be specified including DMRS optimization.  |
| Samsung | The added red text is an unnecessary restriction. But in the spirit of maximal commonality with Type A repetition, our suggestion would be:* + Over back-to-back PUSCH transmissions (of the same TB) for repetition type B scheduled by dynamic grant or configured grant by reusing joint channel estimation mechanisms defined for repetition Type A as much as possible.

And we don’t support FFS. |
| Sharp | We support the original Proposal 2 without the red text. We accept the red text by removing “only”. |
| WILUS | We generally fine with the proposal. As other companies commented, it is better to clarify the red part in the 1st sub-bullet. |
| Qualcomm | Given the differences between Type A and Type B TDRA, and additional considerations such as how to handle invalid symbol patterns, we think we would need to eventually pursue two different tracks for JCE. Time scales are different as well --- with Type B its best to think in terms of symbols, while with Type A its best to think in terms of slots. Further with Type B repetitions, diversity is an important consideration --- UE may likely perform beam sweeping or cycle through antennas to make sure at least one of the repetitions is received clearly, and we’ll be precluding these options by enabling bundling.Extending JCE to Type B is not going to come for “free” like companies seem to think. We either do it right, or not do it at all. The text in red only adds confusion.We prefer to focus on the use cases that are most likely to benefit a cell-edge UE. Also wish to remind companies that we didn’t even bother to include Type B repetitions in our SI --- a clear indication of how irrelevant we thought they were to a cell-edge UE.To sum up, we don’t support this proposal.  |
| ZTE | Similar question and position as vivo. This is also related to the proposal for DMRS optimization, e.g., DMRS optimization for orphan symbol or special slots.  |
| Apple | With repetition Type B, it could create the orphan symbol at the slot boundary. Whether joint channel estimation could be applied in this case is still unclear. So this proposal could be deferred until RAN4 further input. |
| InterDigital 2 | We understand the intention of the red texts. This was a compromise from the 2nd round. To keep the spirit, incorporating Samsung’s suggestion for the red texts, can we reword it as follows. The wording is similar to the one used in CovEnh WID (to encourage similar mechanisms between PUSCH and PUCCH repetitions).**Proposal 2:*** For back-to-back PUSCH transmissions across consecutive slots, support necessary design aspects (under the condition of power consistency and phase continuity) to enable joint channel estimation for the following cases:
	+ Over back-to-back PUSCH transmissions (of the same TB) for repetition type B scheduled by dynamic grant or configured grant
		- When applicable, based on similar mechanism(s) for enabling joint channel estimation for repetition Type A

FFS: Over back-to-back PUSCH transmissions with different TB |
| CATT | We think the direction is fine, but the red words are not clear enough. We are confused by the ‘reuse range’. For example, what is going to be reused by Type B repetition from Type A? Time domain window length? Potential DMRS optimization (principle)? Inter-slot bundling size for frequency hopping? RRC configuration signalling?The red words are better to be removed if they do not provide clear ranges. Anyway, if there are any particular restrictions/designs to this use case, they will be discussed. |
| Xiaomi | We are generally fine with the proposal, but red text part should be further clarified. |
| Ericsson | While it is not so clear given some of the feedback above that it will help, I’ll try to clarify our proposed addition / compromise. Our intention is that we design for PUSCH repetition Type A, and then if the resulting design works for Type B, support for Type B is essentially supported by default. The word ‘mechanisms’ seems to bring some confusion; perhaps ‘specification enhancements’ might be more clear. Regarding dropping the word ‘only’, this seems contrary to the notion that we reuse the design for Type B, so I think we should not remove ‘only’. The proposal doesn’t preclude DMRS optimization if it can be supported by Type A; that can be addressed as a separate discussion in my view. So my clarification to the proposal is: * + Over back-to-back PUSCH transmissions (of the same TB) for repetition type B scheduled by dynamic grant or configured grant, if it reuses only those joint channel estimation specification enhancements defined to support repetition Type A.

In case that this is not acceptable, another way could be to come back to Type B after the Type A design has progressed. Then if it appears that Type B can be supported directly based on what we have designed for Type A, perhaps companies at that time can agree to additionally support Type B. The key part of this proposal is to have enough time for some progress; debating this at the next meeting would probably just waste time as it seems unlikely we would have enough of the design completed to make a proper decision on whether Type B can reuse the Type A design. So we should wait at least until the August meeting to revisit Type B in my view. My fall back proposal is then:Conclusion:* + Based on progress for repetition Type A, revisit in RAN1#105bis whether to support joint channel estimation over back-to-back PUSCH transmissions (of the same TB) for repetition type B scheduled by dynamic grant or configured grant

Lastly, if either of these two proposals are not agreeable, in our view we should only support Type A. |
| CMCC | General fine with the proposal under the condition that the red words are updated in a proper way. From our understanding, the design related to DMRS within joint channel estimation for type A and type B could be different. We could try to reuse the mechanisms as much as possible, but for the DMRS designs, they may not need to be 100% same.For the proposal 3, as at least 3 companies had mentioned to add the FFS* + FFS: Over back-to-back PUSCH transmissions with different TB

We think it is fair to provide an opportunity to discuss in the GTW or by email. As it is an FFS, for even included in a candidate agreements, there is nothing to worry about. |
| LG | As we mentioned in previous round, the target of repetition type B is URLLC which implies the code rate is expected to be high. Therefore, it is not desirable for PUSCH repetition type B to be used for coverage enhancement scenario. In that sense, we cannot support proposal.We have similar view with Qualcomm, however one thing should be pointed out. In our understanding, coverage enhancement should be applied not only for cell-edge UEs but also UEs under coverage mismatch between uplink and downlink. |
| Huawei，HiSilicon | As replied in the previous round, PUSCH repetition type B has its coverage advantage over PUSCH repetition type A as shown in the following figure where an additional actual rep#i+1 near the slot boundary can provide coverage gain. Therefore, joint channel estimation (JCE) should be applicable to PUSCH repetition type B for coverage enhancement.“Type A repetition with L=14:(an error case: SRS overlap with the repetition of L=14 symbols)However, a type B repetition, S is 0 and L<14 can avoid such error case and maximize UL resource utilization, as illustrated in the following figure with two repetitions in the same slot.(rep#i and rep#i+1 in one slot, joint channel estimation can be performed)”Companies seem to agree at least the same mechanism of JCE as that for PUSCH repetition type A can enable PUSCH repetition type B with JCE, i.e. it is feasible to support PUSCH repetition type B with JCE, but concern that whether additional spec effort for any optimization is necessary. In this case, we can agree the common part of supporting it, and FFS the additional spec effort and its necessity. Therefore, we propose a change to the FL proposal as below**Proposal 2:*** For back-to-back PUSCH transmissions across consecutive slots, support necessary design aspects (under the condition of power consistency and phase continuity) to enable joint channel estimation for the following cases:
	+ Over back-to-back PUSCH transmissions (of the same TB) for repetition type B scheduled by dynamic grant or configured grant,
	+ FFS: if it reuses only those joint channel estimation mechanisms defined for repetition Type A.
	+ FFS: Over back-to-back PUSCH transmissions with different TB

As a response to Ericsson’s comment in the 2nd round discussion that ‘gains could be lower than that of repetition’ for joint channel estimation among different TBs, observations in R1-2007583 (captured by TR 38.830) still demonstrate a significant gain by joint channel estimation among different TBs, e.g. 1.3-2.1dB. |
| FL | @all, Regarding whether PUSCH repetition type is relevant to coverage or whether it is included in WID, we have discussed these quite many times. Different companies have different understandings. The arguments are summarized in section 4.1. I don’t think repeating these arguments would be helpful. From FL perspective, 21 companies support repetition type B while 4 companies have concerns. It is quite clear that the majority support repetition type B. What we need to do is to find a compromised way to make progress. Ericsson, Samsung, InterDigital and Huawei proposed good directions. It seems that companies acknowledged that mechanism for repetition A should be reused for repetition B as much as possible. Based on the comments, proposal 2 is revised as follows:**Proposal 2:*** For back-to-back PUSCH transmissions across consecutive slots, support necessary design aspects (under the condition of power consistency and phase continuity) to enable joint channel estimation for the following cases:
	+ Over back-to-back PUSCH transmissions (of the same TB) for repetition type B scheduled by dynamic grant or configured grant.
		- When applicable, based on similar mechanism(s) for enabling joint channel estimation for repetition Type A
		- FFS: if it reuses only those joint channel estimation specification enhancements defined to support repetition Type A.
	+ FFS: Over back-to-back PUSCH transmissions with different TB

Regarding whether to come back to Type B after the Type A design has progressed, I’m afraid maybe it’s not a good choice, as other issues may depend on the use case, e.g., the time domain window. In the opposite, from FL understanding, we should nail down the use cases as early as possible. In summary, I encourage companies to check the compromised proposal and provide constructive suggestions to make progress while not just object to the proposal. |
|  |  |

**FL comments: No further discussion on proposal 3 seems necessary. Let’s discuss it during next GTW session.**

**Proposal 3: Confirm the following working assumption**

**Working assumption:**

* For back-to-back PUSCH transmissions across consecutive slots, support necessary design aspects (under the condition of power consistency and phase continuity) to enable joint channel estimation for the following case:
	+ Over back-to-back PUSCH transmissions for one TB processed over multiple slots
		- It’s subject to UE capability

## 5.2 Time-domain window for joint channel estimation

**FL comments: Thank everyone for the constructive discussion during GTW. For the time domain window, there are many FFS to be addressed. FL would like to focus the discussion on the following two FFS during the left time of this meeting, and discuss the remaining issues in next meeting.**

* + FFS how the time domain window is determined (e.g., via explicit configuration and/or implicitly derived) and whether or not to have the possibility of enabling/disabling the time domain window
	+ FFS the units the time domain window (e.g. repetitions, slots, and/or symbols)
		- FFS : association between the potential use case(s) and units of the time window

**FL comments: Before we discuss the specific unit of the time domain window, e.g. repetitions, slots, and/or symbols, we may need to discuss the relation with use cases.**

**Proposal 7:**

* For the time domain window for joint channel estimation, down select on the following two options:
	+ Option 1: The unit of the time domain window is defined separately for each use case.
	+ Option 2: The unit of the time domain window is the same for all use cases.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Panasonic | In our understanding, proposal 7 is to define a length of time domain window. Hence, we suggest replacing wording “The unit of…” by “The length of…” in both Options 1 and 2. Consequently, we support Option 1. |
| Vivo | Support |
| InterDigital | We support Option 1 with the FL’s words. From our understanding, Proposal 7 is about how we express the length of the time window (e.g., the length of the window is X symbols/Y slots/Z repetitions), thus “unit” should be used in the proposal. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine with the proposal and support option 1 |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal.  |
| Nokia/NSB | Support the FL’s proposal and share similar view as InterDigital. |
| Sierra Wireless | The units of measurement seem like a minor decision we can take later after we have decided, as Panasonic suggests, the possible lengths of the JCE time domain window.  |
| Samsung | Option 1 is preferred. From our perspective, the unit of the time domain window can be defined separately according to each use cases such as repetition type A, repetition type B, TBoMS. We can determine the separate unit of time domain window to take into account resource allocation method of each use cases. |
| Sharp | We support Proposal 7. Regarding “unit”, we have the same view as InterDigital. |
| WILUS | We support the FL’s proposal. |
| Qualcomm | Similar to Panasonic, we suggest replacing unit with ‘duration’ or ‘length. What units we use to describe this duration or length is a secondary question. |
| ZTE | Fine with the proposal. |
| Apple | Similar view as Sierra Wireless, maybe this can be discussed later. As for now, we only have the agreed use case 3 with repetition Type A, other use cases are open. |
| CATT | No objection and no strong preference. However, currently we do not find technical difference that may have impact on the performance of joint channel estimation, due to the ‘unit’ definition is different or the same. This seems to be a very detailed design that should be discussed in a later phase, after we collect all application use cases (e.g. different TB is allowed or not) and RAN4’s feedback (e.g. how long can a UE maintain power and phase requirement).  |
| Xiaomi | Fine with the proposal |
| Ericsson | I don’t object to the proposal, but would like to understand it before agreeing. Regarding units, limiting to ‘length’ seems to neglect the question of how to quantify the start of the window. This has to be agreed at some point as e.g. the start of a PUSCH or a radio frame or…Can the FL clarify if the use cases are the 5 use cases we have agreed last meeting, the refined use cases we are discussing with RAN4, or whether use case are e.g. repetition or TBoMS? Should I understand this as a question if there should be more than one mode of PUSCH joint channel estimation to support different applications? If so, it is possible that more than one mode could be required, according to how PUSCH is transmitted. However, for me at least it’s hard to say at this stage of discussion. |
| CMCC | Agreed with the proposals from the companies that the wording could be updated.According to the current Agreements * *For joint channel estimation, specify a time domain window during which a UE is expected to maintain power consistency and phase continuity among PUSCH transmissions subject to power consistency and phase continuity requirements.*

The time window is more of a UE capability “is expected to maintain power consistency and phase continuity”. From this perspective, the UE should have one maximum capability no matter the use case is. But if the intention is for the indication to UE how long the UE should maintain the power consistency and phase continuity, the time unit depends on gNB’s scheduling which is exactly the use cases. And if the intention is this, as the scheduled or configured by gNB, only an additional indication that the UE should keep the power consistency and phase continuity within the duration is needed.If I may misunderstand something, could FL provide further clarification on the intentions or the scenarios here. |
| LG | We are fine with proposal and prefer option 2. It is not clear to us with benefits of configuring unit of time domain window separately for each use cases. Further clarification about the motivation of it will be appreciated. In our understanding, separate unit of time domain window implies for example, symbol as unit for cases and slot as unit for other cases. The gain due to it should be justified.Rather, same unit of time domain window for all use cases is desirable in unified structure perspective. In that sense, we prefer the unit to be one or multiple slots. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are fine with FL’s proposal and option 1 is preferred. |
| FL | @all, The intention of this proposal is to discuss the following FFS:* + FFS the units the time domain window (e.g. repetitions, slots, and/or symbols)
		- FFS : association between the potential use case(s) and units of the time window

From FL understanding, the units of the time domain window size should be determined before discussing the start or length of the window. Agree with Ericsson that the wording “use case” may be confusion. From FL understanding, different units can be adopted. for instance, the unit of time domain window for repetition type A/B can be “repetition”, while the unit of time domain window for TBoMS can be “slots”. Maybe proposed 7 can be revised as follows:**Proposal 7:** * For the time domain window for joint channel estimation, down select on the following two options:
	+ Option 1: The unit of the time domain window is defined separately for the following PUSCH transmissions:
		- PUSCH repetition type A
		- PUSCH repletion type B, if agreed
		- TBoMS, if agreed
		- Different TB, if agreed
	+ Option 2: The unit of the time domain window is the same for the following PUSCH transmission:
		- PUSCH repetition type A
		- PUSCH repletion type B, if agreed
		- TBoMS, if agreed
		- Different TB, if agreed
 |
| CMCC | fine with the FL’s updated proposal. And support the option 1 as it is dependent on different use cases. And we are open for other cases, since I am not sure we have exhausted all the cases. |

**Companies are encouraged to provide views on the following aspects of the time domain window:**

* + FFS how the time domain window is determined (e.g., via explicit configuration and/or implicitly derived) and whether or not to have the possibility of enabling/disabling the time domain window

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Panasonic | We support to use TDRA table to determine the length of time domain window* For dynamic grant or CG type 2, it is indicated by DCI
* For CG type 1, it is indicated by RRC

A triggering method for enabling or disabling joint channel estimation is signalled to the UE by jointly indicating the length of time domain window. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | At least for back-to-back PUSCH transmissions, the time domain window size can be implicitly determined by the total duration of back-to-back transmissions |
| Intel | Our view is that time domain window and enabling/disabling the time domain window are configured by RRC signalling. We are open to discuss to determine the time domain window based on the bundle size of inter-slot frequency hopping with inter-slot bundling.  |
| Nokia/NSB | We think that this aspect should be discussed per use case as the configuration/determination can be different for different use cases. For example, with PUSCH repetitions, the time-domain window may be determined based on the number of repetitions or the number of slots that the repetitions span on. But if the PUSCH transmissions are not only PUSCH repetitions then another configuration approach may be needed. |
| Sierra Wireless | This will depend on which use cases we support and if we support JCE across different TB. Likely a combination of RRC signalling, DCI and implicit indication will be needed. This can be agree after we agree on use casese. |
| Samsung | Support of both explicit configuration and implicitly derived is preferred. From our perspective, the time domain window can be enabled by RRC to perform the joint CE according to gNB and the UE capability. Both the explicit configuration and implicitly derived can be considered to determine the time domain window. |
| Sharp | In our view, how to define the time domain window should be discussed for each use case. |
| WILUS | Both explicit configuration and implicit derivation can be considered with regarding slot configuration and/or use cases. Enabling/disabling the time domain window can be indicated by gNB. |
| Qualcomm | Q1: how the time domain window is determined (e.g., via explicit configuration and/or implicitly derived) As other companies have pointed out, we need to separately consider CG and DG PUSCH for each use case we agree to study. If we decide to extend JCE across PUSCH transmissions carrying different TBs, this will then require separate considerations from JCE across PUSCH repetitions. How the window is determined will also depend on other considerations such as whether there are unscheduled symbols or intervening uplink transmissions --- the length of the window and the quality of phase coherence could be impacted. UE capability on the maximum time domain window for each case will also need to be discussed and factored in.Q2: whether or not to have the possibility of enabling/disabling the time domain windowIs this separate from enabling/disabling DMRS bundling? If so, are we envisioning cases where a UE is configured DMRS bundling without time domain windows? This is a scenario we prefer to avoid as the notion of a time domain window is rather important from a UE standpoint to handle a lot of internal loops and calibration updates. |
| ZTE | We share similar view as above companies that the determination of time window could be different per use case basis.  |
| Apple | The time domain window determination could be different for TDD and FDD, implicit derivation of the window is only feasible for TDD. We are not so clear the meaning of Enabling/disabling the time domain window, does it mean to enable/disable joint channel estimation feature, or meaning something else.  |
| InterDigital | We also share the similar view as other companies that determination of time window can depend on a use case. |
| CATT | Fine to FFS how the time domain window is determined. But we think ‘the possibility of enabling/disabling the time domain window’ is a bit ambiguous. Does it mean fast enabling/disabling, e.g. by DCI, to change DMRS patterns? If so, we share the same concern with Qualcomm. If no, we think the gNB always has the capability to control the configuration of joint channel estimation aspects. |
| Xiaomi | Both explicit configuration and implicit determination can be supported. Enabling/disabling the time domain window can be triggered by gNB indication or a UE report. Time domain window mechanism can be triggered simultaneously when gNB send a time domain window configuration for the first time. |
| Ericsson | Implicit time window definition should take us pretty far if we have a limited number of PUSCH transmission methods we support. Then some configurability can be added on top if it is truly needed by UE capability (still looking forward to insights from UE vendors on window lengths… 😊). As Nokia points out, if JCE over different TB is supported, more complicated solutions may be needed.  |
| CMCC | The indication of time window could be implicitly indicated via DCI in the case DG and CG type 2. And for the CG type 1, it should be configured or indicated to the UE via RRC. It mainly depends on the use cases that whether there is non-zero gap between the transmissions and how long the transmission with joint channel estimation is scheduled by gNB. Enabling or disabling the joint channel estimation should of course be configured.  |
| LG | Both of explicit and implicit configuration can be considered, one step further, considering the frequency hopping configured with joint channel estimation at the same time, it is important to be associated with frequency hopping boundary and time domain window. Since the same PRB should be maintained for joint channel estimation according to RAN4, frequency hopping boundary should be depend on time domain window (for example, larger than or equal to) or vice versa. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Similar view as Nokia, the determination of time domain window should be discussed per use case.  |

## 4.3 Optimization of DMRS location/granularity in time domain

**FL comments: The intention of the observations on the simulations results is to facilitate the discussion on optimization of DMRS granularity/location in time domain with joint channel estimation. Companies are encouraged to check whether the simulation results are reasonable. From FL perspective, making agreements on the observations is not a must. Then, we can make decision on whether optimization of DMRS granularity/location is necessary based on the observations.**

**FL comments: Proposal 5 seems stable. Simulation results in observation 5 can be discussed separately.**

**Proposal 5:**

* A new DMRS pattern equally spaced among PUSCH transmissions is not considered for joint channel estimation in Rel-17.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Panasonic | We are fine with the proposal. |
| vivo | Support. |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Nokia/NSB | Support the FL’s proposal. |
| Sierra Wireless | Support |
| Samsung | We are fine with FL’s proposal. |
| Qualcomm | Support |
| ZTE | Support |
| Apple | Support. |
| CATT | We are fine with FL’s proposal. |
| Ericsson | Support |
| LG | We support FL’s proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are fine with the proposal. |
| FL  | Proposal 5 is stable. Please refrain from any further comments. |

**FL comments: based on the discussion on observation 1. More simulation results seems needed.**

**Observation 1:**

* For optimization of DMRS granularity in time domain with joint channel estimation
	+ One company (ZTE) shows 2 DMRS symbols in every two repetitions w/ JCE can provide additional 2.52 dB, 2.43 dB, 0.15 dB, 0.81 dB and 0.87 dB gain over 1 DMRS symbol in each repetition w/o JCE, 2 DMRS symbols in each repetition w/o JEC, 1 DMRS symbol in each repetition w/ JCE, 2 DMRS symbols in each repetition w/ JEC, 1 DMRS symbol in every two repetitions w/ JCE respectively. Other simulation assumptions are as include: 700MHz, 4PRBs, 8 repetitions, 3km/h, CFO ~ U[-0.1, 0.1] ppm.
	+ One company (Intel) shows ~1.5dB degradation can be observed when DMRS symbols are not allocated in odd slots. Other simulation assumptions are as include:: 4GHz, TBS = 288, 4 PRBs, 4 repetitions, 3km/h, bundling size of 2 slots with JCE, CFO ~ U[-0.1, 0.1] ppm.

**Proposal 8:**

* For optimization of DMRS granularity in time domain with joint channel estimation, the proponents are encouraged to provide more simulation results in next meeting.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Panasonic | Support the proposal 8. |
| vivo | Fine with the proposal. |
| Intel | We are fine with the observations. Just want to clarify this is not intended for agreement.  |
| Nokia/NSB | We are fine with the FL’s proposal. |
| Sierra Wireless | This potential conclusion is not necessary. |
| ZTE | Support  |
| Apple | The proposal 8 seems not necessary. It likes a conclusion. |
| CATT | OK. Of cause, companies can provide further simulation results in their interested cases, with or without conclusion. |
| Xiaomi | Fine with it. |
| Ericsson | Same as Intel, prefer not to agree on observation 1, as it would in our view need some refinement (as commented earlier). While we think the proposal is not necessary (companies can and will likely bring more results), we don’t object to it.  |
| CMCC | Fine with the proposal. |
| LG | It seems performance gain can be obtained in specific cases. If further simulation results are needed, we can agree with proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Fine with the proposal. |
| FL | It seems companies are fine with proposal 8 as a conclusion.**Conclusion:*** For optimization of DMRS granularity in time domain with joint channel estimation, the proponents are encouraged to provide more simulation results in next meeting.
 |

**FL comments: It seems many companies think the simulation results in observation 3 are reasonable. Thus, proposal 9 is proposed.**

**Observation 3:**

* For DMRS located in special slots with joint channel estimation
	+ One company (HW) shows JCE w/ 2 DMRS located in special slot can improve the performance of PUSCH transmissions by 1.2dB at 10% BLER in TDD configuration ‘DDDSUDDSUU’ and 1 DMRS symbol per UL slot.
	+ One company (Interdigital) shows JCE w/ 1 DMRS located in special slot can provide 0.5 and 0.8dB gain at 10% BLER in TDD configuration ‘DDDSU’, with 2 DMRS in the UL slot with the baseline and optimized DM-RS placement in the uplink slot, respectively, compare to the baseline DM-RS placement in the uplink slot in TDD configuration ‘DDDDU’.
	+ One company (vivo) shows JCE w/ 1 DMRS located in special slot can provide 0.7dB gain at 10% BLER with 2 repetitions, TDD configuration ‘DDSUU’ and 1 DMRS symbol per UL slot. Moreover, the performance gain is not sensitivity to the DMRS pattern.
	+ One company (Intel) shows JCE w/ 1 DMRS located in special slot can provide ~0.1dB gain at 10% BLER with 4 repetitions, TDD and 2 DMRS symbol per UL slot.

**Proposal 9:**

* For joint channel estimation for PUSCH, DMRS located in special slots is supported.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Panasonic | Support the proposal 9. |
| Vivo | Support. |
| InterDigital | We support the FL’s proposal. |
| Intel | We are not sure whether we can agree on the support DMRS location in the special slots. The performance gain is marginal at least based on our simulation assumptions. We need more throughfall investigation on the spec impact and simulation results. It is good to agree upon some simulation assumptions for this to proceed.  |
| Nokia/NSB | It is unclear to us how DMRS located in S slots is defined. Whether there is PUSCH data allocated together like in PUSCH repetition type B or only DMRS symbols is allocated in the S slot? If the former applies, we don’t think any additional specification work is needed since this has been supported by PUSCH repetition type B. If the latter applies, we have the following two concerns:* + The performance should be compared with the case when the UL symbols in the S slots is also used for PUSCH. Otherwise, it’s not a fair comparison as it is rather obvious that the more DMRS symbols, the better channel estimation quality.
	+ We don’t see the reason why RAN1 should spend extra specification efforts to specify DMRS location without data whereas the legacy DMRS with data allocation can still be re-used. Let’s not forget that, as pointed out in the Proposal 5 which is arguably stable, that the number of DMRS symbols is more important than where they are placed. Therefore, if only 1 DMRS symbol was used per U slot, adding another DMRS symbol in the S slot or U slot should result in similar performance. We remark that the latter is already specified, hence we can simply use that and achieve the same result with no specification effort.

Having said this, we cannot agree to this proposal now without further evaluation/clarification and propose to postpone the discussion on this proposal. |
| Qualcomm | Is the S-slot DMRS introduced only for PUSCH without repetitions? Not convinced that this enhancement is absolutely necessary --- we see significant spec impact and the use case seems rather narrow. |
| ZTE | We are fine with the proposal.  |
| Apple | We share the similar view as Nokia. In addition, the UL symbols in special slot are very precious, SRS is configured there in most time, and SRS plays very important roles in TDD system. Thus, the use case for DMRS in special slot is rare. The DMRS in special slot only can help the channel estimation with the consecutive PUSCH transmission in the following slot without gap. Before conclusion is made, more evaluations and analysis are needed. We are not ready to agree this proposal for now. |
| InterDigital2 | We try to provide replies for the questions above.The proposal here is to use DMRS in the special slot for joint channel estimation. Any specification impact joint channel estimation needs can be applied to this case.The point of the evaluation was to verify whether a performance gain can be achieved in the situation such as DDDSU or DDDSUDDSUU which were agreed as baseline frame format during SI. We have complied with evaluation assumptions including CFO agreed in the last meeting. If companies are interested in the evaluation results which consider data in the special slot (and effect of DMRS in the special slot), for example please refer to the results presented in R1- 2009583 which was presented during the SI.There does not seem to be a technical justification for further postponing the discussion given the evaluation results based on agreed assumptions.We continue to support the FL’s proposal. |
| CATT | In principle, we are positive to utilize S slot to improve the UL channel estimation performance. But the concerns mentioned by Nokia, Apple and Qualcomm seem reasonable. Or, can we compromise to ‘For joint channel estimation for PUSCH, further study DMRS located in special slots’? |
| Xiaomi | Fine with the proposal |
| Ericsson | We also prefer more discussion on the benefit of DMRS in special slots. As we commented in the 2nd round, the net system benefit is not so clear yet, e.g. due to the use of the special slot for PUCCH or SRS.  |
| CMCC | Fine with the proposal. |
| LG | The performance gain according to simulation results is marginal, so we doubt whether specification effort is necessary or not. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We agree with FL’s proposal. |
| FL  | It seems some companies have concerns if repetition type B is adopted. From FL understanding, DMRS located in special slots is beneficial for repetition type A as UL symbols in special slots cannot be fully utilized. FL suggest to revise the proposal for repetition type A.**Proposal 9:*** For joint channel estimation for PUSCH, DMRS located in special slots for repetition type A is supported.
 |
| CMCC | Some of the evaluation results are not limited only on repetition type A. and if we want to extend the coverage or the data rate of cell edge UEs, using the special slot to transmit different TBs are un-avoidable. Thus we propose to use the DMRS located in the special slots also for different TBs. considering the different TB is still under discussion. We could add FFS in front of that. The updated proposal is as below, **Proposal 9:**For joint channel estimation for PUSCH, DMRS located in special slots ~~for repetition type A~~ is supported in the following cases,* Repetition type A
* FFS, Transmission of different TBs
 |

**FL comments: Companies are encouraged to check whether the simulation results in observation 4 and 5 are reasonable.**

**Observation 4:**

* For orphan symbol used for DMRS with joint channel estimation
	+ One company (vivo) shows JCE w/ 1 orphan DMRS symbol in-between **type-B** PUSCH repetitions can provide 0.8 dB gain at 10% BLER with 2 repetitions, 4GHz TDD and 1 DMRS symbol per UL slot.

**Observation 5:**

* For different DMRS locations with joint channel estimation
	+ One company (OPPO) shows 0.3dB gain can be found while DMRS placed on different symbol within the slot (1st and 11th symbol, respectively)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| vivo | YES | Support these observations. |
| Samsung | Yes/No | We are generally fine with the Observation 4 but not Observation 5. The observations will need to be further qualified according to each use cases for joint CE and that will re-open the discussions. |
| ZTE |  | It looks reasonable for us to use additional DMRS from orphan symbol for better channel estimation. In addition, it expects there is similar performance gain between using DMRS located in special slots or orphan DMRS symbol here.  |
| CATT |  | For observation 4, we think it is nature to have gains since additional DMRS is utilized. For observation 5, may be it can be regarded as the proponent of the new Proposal 5, if this simulation from OPPO is also to demonstrate that a new DMRS pattern equally spaced among PUSCH is unnecessary? |
| Ericsson  | No | We prefer further discussion before agreeing on observations 4 and 5.For observation 4: We still wonder why a portion of a slot is used if coverage is desired. Won’t the gains be less if there are more symbols used?For both observations 4 and 5, drawing conclusions leading to new DMRS patterns should take quite a bit of study, so we prefer not to draw them yet. |

## 5.4 Inter-slot frequency hopping with inter-slot bundling

**FL comments: From FL understanding, we need to discuss whether the bundle size is always equals to the window size or can be different from the time domain window size. Based on the comments, proposal 6 is rephrased as follows.**

**Proposal 6:**

For inter-slot frequency hopping with inter-slot bundling, down select on the following two options:

* Option 1: The bundle size (time domain hopping interval) equals to the time domain window size.
* Option 2: The bundle size (time domain hopping interval) can be different from the time domain window size.
	+ FFS: Whether the bundle size (time domain hopping interval) is explicitly configured or implicitly determined.
	+ FFS: Whether/How the bundle size (time domain hopping interval) is defined separately for FDD and TDD.
	+ FFS: relation between the bundle size (time domain hopping interval) and the time domain window size, e.g., smaller than or equals to time domain window size

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Panasonic | We support the proposal 6. |
| vivo | Support. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine with the proposal and support option 1. For option 1, if time domain window is enabled, then separate indication of the bundle size is not needed.  |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal.  |
| Nokia/NSB | Support the FL’s proposal. |
| Samsung | We support the Option 1.From our understanding, the gNB can adjust the bundle size to perform the joint CE by implementation, even if the bundle size equals to the time domain window. |
| Sharp | We agree with Proposal 6. |
| WILUS | We support the FL’s proposal. |
| Qualcomm | Support |
| ZTE | Fine with the proposal.  |
| Apple | We are fine with this proposal. |
| CATT | We are generally fine with the proposal. In addition, for the 2nd FFS in Option 2, not sure it should be only placed under Option 2. Does Option 1 have the same design difference (e.g. time domain window sizes are different for TDD and FDD)? If so, the 2nd FFS may be a common FFS for both Option 1 and Option 2. |
| Xiaomi | Fine with the proposal. And the same view with Lenovo, for option 1, there is no need to indicate the bundle size separately. |
| Ericsson | Support the proposal |
| CMCC | Fine with the proposal.If the window size is UE’s capability, the bundle size could differ from the bundle size and the bundle size should be smaller than the window size or duration. But the intention is to indicate to use the joint channel estimation within the bundling, the bundle size should be equal to the window. |
| LG | We are fine with FL proposal, and prefer option 2.Since the transmission channel is different for each UEs, the target of performance gain by joint channel estimation will be different depending on UEs. It means that the bundle size is likely to be different for each UE. If only option 1 is supported, the frequency hopping boundary will be different for each UE, and thus, it will be difficult for gNB in resource management of multi users. On the other hand, if the bundle size per UE is supported and a cell-specific frequency hopping boundary which is equal to or larger than bundle size of UEs is supported, gNB will get maximum flexibility in resource management, and at the same time, the requirement per UE can be satisfied. In that sense, modification in the last FFS is needed:* + FFS: relation between the bundle size (time domain hopping interval) and the time domain window size, e.g., ~~smaller~~ **larger** than or equals to time domain window size

Furthermore option 1 is included as a special case of option 2, it is desirable to support option 2. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are fine with the proposal. |
| FL | It seems the majority are fine with proposal 6. @CATT, for option 1, as the bundle size equals to the time domain window size, Whether/How the bundle size (time domain hopping interval) is defined separately for FDD and TDD can be determined based on the design of the time domain window size. Thus FFS is not needed.@LG, regarding whether the bundle size is smaller or larger than the time domain window, we can remove “e.g., ~~smaller~~ **larger** than or equals to time domain window size” at this stage and discuss it later.**Revised Proposal 6:** For inter-slot frequency hopping with inter-slot bundling, down select on the following two options:* Option 1: The bundle size (time domain hopping interval) equals to the time domain window size.
* Option 2: The bundle size (time domain hopping interval) can be different from the time domain window size.
	+ FFS: Whether the bundle size (time domain hopping interval) is explicitly configured or implicitly determined.
	+ FFS: Whether/How the bundle size (time domain hopping interval) is defined separately for FDD and TDD.
	+ FFS: relation between the bundle size (time domain hopping interval) and the time domain window size~~, e.g., smaller than or equals to time domain window size~~
 |

1. Agreements at RAN1#104b-e

Agreements:

* For joint channel estimation, specify a time domain window during which a UE is expected to maintain power consistency and phase continuity among PUSCH transmissions subject to power consistency and phase continuity requirements.
	+ FFS how the time domain window is determined (e.g., via explicit configuration and/or implicitly derived) and whether or not to have the possibility of enabling/disabling the time domain window
	+ FFS the units the time domain window (e.g. repetitions, slots, and/or symbols)
		- FFS : association between the potential use case(s) and units of the time window
	+ FFS: single or multiple time domain windows
* FFS: relation with UE capability
* FFS: whether the term "time domain window" is used in the specification or replaced by other technical terms
* FFS whether or not to further consider impacting of timing advance
1. Agreements at RAN1#104e

**Agreements**:

* Following potential use cases are considered for joint channel estimation for PUSCH:
	+ Use case 1: back-to-back PUSCH transmissions within one slot.
	+ Use case 2: non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions within one slot.
	+ Use case 3: back-to-back PUSCH transmissions across consecutive slots.
	+ Use case 4: non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions across consecutive slots.
	+ Use case 5: PUSCH transmissions across non-consecutive slots.

Note: RAN1 assumes “back-to-back PUSCH transmission” has zero gap in-between adjacent PUSCH transmissions.

Agreements:

* For back-to-back PUSCH transmissions across consecutive slots, support necessary design aspects (under the condition of power consistency and phase continuity) to enable joint channel estimation at least for the following case:
	+ Over back-to-back PUSCH transmissions (of the same TB) for repetition type A scheduled by dynamic grant or configured grant
	+ FFS details (including possible other cases)

Agreements:

* For joint channel estimation, ~~define~~ a time domain window is introduced to facilitate further discussion, during which UE is expected to maintain power consistency and phase continuity among PUSCH transmissions subject to power consistency and phase continuity requirements.
	+ FFS: whether the window should be specified
	+ FFS: the length of the time domain window is defined by a set of repetitions/slots/symbols
	+ FFS: single or multiple time domain windows
* FFS: relation with UE capability
* FFS: the time domain window may or may not be configured ~~or specified~~.
* FFS: whether the term "time domain window" is used in the specification or replaced by other technical terms
* FFS: Whether the window is determined by the power consistency and phase continuity requirements and/or by other factors is to be decided.

Agreements:

* Companies are encouraged to study optimization of DMRS granularity in time domain with joint channel estimation, including:
	+ Use cases
	+ Simulations results
	+ Enhanced schemes, e.g.,
		- Different DMRS density for different PUSCH transmissions
		- No DMRS for some PUSCH transmissions
	+ If applicable, impact of dynamic changes, e.g., cancellation of a repetition and companies report the evaluation method.
* Companies are encouraged to study optimization of DMRS location in time domain with joint channel estimation, including:
	+ Use cases
	+ Simulations results
	+ Enhanced schemes, e.g.,
		- DMRS equally spaced among PUSCH transmissions
		- DMRS located in special slots
		- Orphan symbol used for DMRS
	+ If applicable, impact of dynamic changes, e.g., cancellation of a repetition and companies report the evaluation method.
* Note: the simulation assumptions for DM-RS in TR 38.830 are used as baseline for performance evaluation on optimization of DMRS location/granularity in time domain.
	+ Take into account impairments such as frequency offset, and report corresponding parametrization together with the results. Further discuss impairment details.

**Working assumption:**

* For back-to-back PUSCH transmissions across consecutive slots, support necessary design aspects (under the condition of power consistency and phase continuity) to enable joint channel estimation for the following case:
	+ Over back-to-back PUSCH transmissions for ~~TB processing~~ one TB processed over multiple slots
		- It’s subject to UE capability

Agreements:

* For joint channel estimation.
	+ Take into account the residual frequency error, e.g., +/- 0.1 ppm as upper bound.
	+ Companies can report other values and frequency error model.
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|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company/Tdoc** | **Views** |
| Huawei/ R1-2102313 | ***Observation 1****: Phase continuity for joint channel estimation can be also achieved for non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions on the same conditions agreed in RAN4 LS for back-to-back PUSCH transmission and only one additional condition that UE PA state for the first PUSCH transmission is retained until the start of the next transmission at a potential cost of UE energy consumption.****Observation 2:*** *If SRS has same transmission power and antenna port with PUSCH transmissions, phase continuity can be ensured between two PUSCH transmissions with same RB allocation, even SRS is transmitted in-between two PUSCH transmissions.****Observation 3:*** *By joint channel estimation across consecutive PUSCH transmissions of different TBs, a large coverage gain can be achieved as compared to the baseline of PUSCH transmissions without joint channel estimation, i.e., 1.4 dB and 2.1 dB SNR gains are obtained at 10% BLER for 2 and 3 slots joint channel estimation, respectively.****Observation 4****: Joint channel estimation with DMRS located in special slot can improve the performance of PUSCH transmissions by 1.2dB at 10% BLER in typical TDD mode ‘DDDSUDDSUU’ with 2 symbols of DMRS in S slot and 1 symbol of DMRS in U slot.****Proposal 1****:**Joint channel estimation should be supported for non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions** *FFS: whether and how to minimize the UE energy consumption caused by retaining PA state for phase continuity between successive PUSCH transmissions*

***Proposal 2****:**Joint channel estimation should be supported for the very common scenario where SRS is transmitted in-between PUSCH transmissions** *FFS: Mechanism to support joint channel estimation for SRS transmitted in-between PUSCH transmissions.*

***Proposal 3****:**Joint channel estimation should be supported among different TBs.****Proposal 4****:**With a time window and an indication of joint channel estimation among different PUSCH transmissions, UE is expected to maintain phase continuity during this time window.** *e.g. UE retains PA state, no antenna switching, etc.*

***Proposal 5****: DMRS located in special slot should be supported for joint channel estimation*.***Proposal 6****:**For inter-slot frequency hopping with inter-slot DMRS bundling, frequency hopping is performed every K slots.****Proposal 7****: UE specific signaling is preferred in configuring the time domain interval K for DMRS bundling in inter-slot frequency hopping, while candidate values of K can be further discussed.* |
| OPPO/ R1-2102409 | ***Observation 1: Performance gain of joint channel estimation still keep increasing as the length of joint estimation window increases in case of residual frequency offset of +/- 0.1 ppm.******Observation 2: The Performance gain loss due to residual frequency offset is not sensitive to the length of joint estimation window.******Observation 3: Joint channel estimation may be impacted due to power reduction during PUSCH repetition.******Proposal 1: Same DMRS antenna ports, same transmission power, same codebook, same Tx spatial parameters and same frequency domain resource allocation shall be applied among multiple PUSCH slots to enable joint channel estimation.******Proposal 2: Study potential interoperation of joint channel estimation and pre-coder cycling.*** ***Proposal 3: PUSCH can be hopped across different slot bundles to enable joint channel estimation.******Proposal 4: It is not necessary to introduce an additional time domain window to restrict UE’s PUSCH transmission behaviors.******Proposal 5: DMRS-less, optimized DMRS pattern and non-uniform distributing DMRS can be considered for PUSCH repetition.*** |
| Spreadtrum/ R1-2102465 | ***Proposal 1. Only back-to-back PUSCH transmissions with the same TB is considered in Rel-17.******Proposal 2. For back-to-back PUSCH transmissions with the same TB, time domain window can be implicitly determined by the repetition factor.******Proposal 3. For DMRS unbalanced issues, we can replace the unbalanced DMRS pattern by balanced pattern.******Proposal 4. Within time domain window, DMRS is only located in special slots.*** |
| ZTE/ R1-2102499 | ***Proposal 1:*** *Support use case 1 (back-to-back PUSCH transmissions within one slot) for joint channel estimation for PUSCH.* * *Joint channel estimation for PUSCH repetition type B is supported while optimization specific for PUSCH repetition type B is not considered.*

***Proposal 2:*** *As long as the condition of power consistency and phase continuity defined by RAN4 can be met, support use case 2 (non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions within one slot) and use case 4 (non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions across consecutive slots) for joint channel estimation for PUSCH.* ***Proposal 3:*** *De-prioritize use case 5 for joint channel estimation for PUSCH.* ***Observation 1:*** *Inter-slot FH with inter-slot bundling to enable joint channel estimation can provide up to 2.66 dB gain for PUSCH with 8 repetitions in 700MHz rural scenario.* ***Proposal 4:*** *For the determination of inter-slot bundling size for inter-slot FH, RAN1 down-selects from the two options below.* * *Option 1: Inter-slot bundling size is implicitly determined by the number of repetitions K, e.g., floor (K/2) or cell(K/2).*
* *Option 2: Inter-slot bundling size is RRC configured or dynamically indicated to a UE.*

***Proposal 5:*** *FFS the inter-slot FH bundling pattern for TDD operation.* ***Observation 2:*** *The performance impact due to frequency offset error is negligible in 700MHz Rural scenario.* ***Observation 3:*** *Optimization of DMRS location/granularity in the time domain can provide 0.15~2.52 dB gain for PUSCH repetitions in 700MHz Rural* *scenario.* ***Proposal 6:*** *Support optimization of DMRS location/granularity in the time domain with minimized specification impacts by at last the following conditions.* * *DMRS optimization is only applied for PUSCH repetition type A.*
* *DMRS pattern in each repetition is not changed.*
* *Consider to reuse the repetition bundle defined for inter-slot FH for DMRS optimization.*
 |
| vivo/ R1-2102536 | ***Observation 1: For PUSCH transmissions with different TBs, some extra conditions and restrictions are required, following parameters should be unchanged across the multiple TBs.**** + ***TB size, TPMI, SRI and pathloss RS.***

***Observation 2: Joint channel estimation could provide improved performance for PUSCH transmissions with same TB or with different TBs.*** ***Observation 3: Equally spaced DMRS pattern provides no performance gain.*** ***Observation 4: If orphan DMRS symbol in special slot is introduced, further optimization on DMRS location in adjacent UL slot does not provide remarkable performance gain.******Observation 5: DMRS on orphan symbol combined with joint channel estimation could provide performance gain.*** ***Observation 6: Further optimization on DMRS pattern of adjacent PUSCH does not provide remarkable performance gain, if orphan symbol DMRS is introduced in-between the PUSCH repetitions.******Proposal 1:*** ***Time-domain window for joint channel estimation should be specified.**** + ***UE report capability on the length of time domain window, in which phase continuity and power consistency can meet the requirement for joint channel estimation.***
		- ***The details of capability can be discussed in RAN4.***
	+ ***The time domain window for joint channel estimation should be configurable.***

***Proposal 2: Inter-slot bundling for hopping pattern should take the TDD frame structure into consideration.******Proposal 3: No need to support equally spaced DMRS pattern.******Proposal 4: DMRS on orphan symbol in-between the PUSCH repetitions can be used for joint channel estimation for adjacent PUSCH transmissions.*** ***Proposal 5: If orphan symbol(s) used for DMRS or symbol in special slot used for DMRS is supported and located before the first symbol of this PUSCH transmission, the preparation time of this PUSCH need to be revised:**** + ***Opt 1 : Redefine PUSCH preparation time*** $T\_{proc,2}$ ***considering the first symbol in the orphan symbol(s) or symbol(s) in special slot.***
	+ ***Opt 2 : Additional time offset in*** $T\_{proc,2}$***, which is related to the number of the orphan symbol(s) or symbol(s) in special slot.***

***Proposal 6: PUSCH transmissions within the time-domain window for joint channel estimation may be interrupted by other transmissions/procedures, and whether and how to ensure phase continuity in these cases should be further studied. The interruptions can be caused in the following cases**** ***PUSCH transmissions is cancelled by SFI, CI or higher priority transmissions.***
* ***UL transmission in another serving cell, when intra band CA is configured.***
 |
| CATT/ R1-2102645 | ***Observation 1: The use case of non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions across consecutive slots need to be discussed after receiving the reply from RAN4.******Observation 2: The use case of PUSCH transmissions across non-consecutive slots should not be supported in joint channel estimation.******Proposal 1: Cross-slot channel estimation can be applied to the back-to-back PUSCH transmissions for one TB processed over multiple slots.******Proposal 2: Cross-slot channel estimation can be applied to the back-to-back PUSCH transmissions with different TBs.******Proposal 3: A time domain window should be introduced in which the enhanced FH pattern and the optimization of DMRS location/granularity in time domain can be further studied.******Proposal 4: The length of the time domain window should be defined by a set of slots.******Proposal 5: Multiple time domain windows can be defined to adapt to different channel conditions.**** ***One of the defined windows can be configured/indicated by gNB.***

***Proposal 6: New DMRS patterns on continuous slots with lower DMRS density should be further studied.******Proposal 7: Frequency hopping pattern with inter-slot bundling can be determined according to the bundling window size.*** |
| MediaTek/ R1-2102692 | ***Observation 1.*** *In order to maintain phase continuity during those unscheduled symbols between UL repetition, UE power consumption would get higher and the OFF power requirement cannot be met.****Proposal 1:*** *Deprioritize the non-back-2-back UL repetition scenario.**Observation 2: SRS typically has very different settings on antenna port, occupied PRBs and UL power to PUCCH and PUSCH. It is an extreme corner case to see all these settings are exactly the same between SRS and PUSCH/PUCCH.****Proposal 2:*** *No support of the scenario of other physical signals/channels in-between PUCCH or PUSCH repetitions for phase continuity and power consistency.**Observation 3: The use case to remain phase continuity and power consistency for UL repetition is not clear under CA scenario.* ***Proposal 3:*** *Whether/how to support phase continuity and power consistency for UL repetition under CA scenario should be clarified with RAN4 feedback.****Proposal 4:*** *Whether/how to support phase continuity and power consistency for UL repetition under DC scenario* |
| China Telecom/ R1-2102862 | **Proposal 1: Reply to RAN4:*** **Following potential use cases are considered for joint channel estimation for PUSCH for both paired spectrum and unpaired spectrum in RAN1:**
	+ **Use case 1: back-to-back PUSCH transmissions within one slot.**
	+ **Use case 2: non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions within one slot.**
	+ **Use case 3: back-to-back PUSCH transmissions across consecutive slots.**
	+ **Use case 4: non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions across consecutive slots.**
	+ **Use case 5: PUSCH transmissions across non-consecutive slots.**
* **Note: RAN1 assumes “back-to-back PUSCH transmission” has zero gap in-between adjacent PUSCH transmissions.**
* **For non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions within one slot, RAN1 is considering the following case:**
	+ **Non-zero gap in-between adjacent PUSCH transmissions due to invalid symbol(s) for PUSCH repetition type B**
	+ **Non-zero gap in-between adjacent PUSCH transmissions for different TBs scheduled by network.**
* **For non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions across slots, RAN1 is considering the following case:**
	+ **Non-zero gap in-between adjacent PUSCH transmissions due to SRS or PUCCH transmission from other UE(s) in-between adjacent PUSCH transmissions**
	+ **Non-zero gap in-between adjacent PUSCH transmissions due to invalid symbol(s)/orphan symbol for PUSCH repetition type B**
	+ **Non-zero gap in-between adjacent PUSCH transmissions for different TBs scheduled by network.**

**Proposal 2:*** **For back-to-back PUSCH transmissions within one slot, if power consistency and phase continuity can be maintained.**
	+ **Joint channel estimation over back-to-back PUSCH transmissions for repetition type B scheduled by dynamic grant or configured grant is supported.**
* **For back-to-back PUSCH transmissions across consecutive slots, if power consistency and phase continuity can be maintained.**
	+ **Joint channel estimation over back-to-back PUSCH transmissions for repetition type B scheduled by dynamic grant or configured grant is supported.**

**Proposal 3:** * **Specify a time domain window during which UE is expected to maintain power consistency and phase continuity among PUSCH transmissions subject to power consistency and phase continuity requirements.**

**Proposal 4:** * **Send an LS to RAN4 asking whether the duration of maintaining power consistency and phase continuity among PUSCH transmissions will be defined based on UE capability and the length of duration if defined.**

**Proposal 5:** * **For inter-slot frequency hopping with inter-slot bundling, the bundle size can be independently configured, but cannot be larger than the length of duration based on UE capability or the size of the time domain window.**
 |
| CMCC/ R1-2102895 | **Observations 1:*** **Currently only back-to-back with zero gap in-between adjacent transmissions could keep the power consistency and phase continuity.**
* **No frequency hopping is allowed if joint channel is implemented.**
* **No power change between the transmissions**
* **No downlink receptions between the adjacent transmissions are allowed if joint channel estimation is implemented.**
* **Non-back-to-back transmission with non-zero gap in-between adjacent transmissions, there is no conclusion**

**Observation 2:****Besides the power consistency and phase continuity, a same transmission precoding and channel coherence should be maintained during the multiple slot transmission under the joint channel estimation.** **Observation 3:****In the typical TDD UL-DL configurations, special slot bundled with one or two uplink slots could work under joint channel estimation. And the DMRS optimization could be further studied under this condition.** **Proposal 1:****Non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions should be suspended until RAN4 gets a conclusion. Back-to-back PUSCH transmission should be prioritized for further discussion.****Proposal 2:****The optimization of DMRS granularity and locations are encouraged to be studied under the typical configurations with consecutive slots of one special slot and one/two uplink slots.****Proposal 3:****The length or the slot numbers of the joint channel estimation should be limited to reduce the impact to the other physical signals and channels.****Proposal 4:****Confirm the working assumption that joint channel estimation could be enabled for the back-to-back transmission for one TB processed over multiple slots.****Proposal 5:** **The multiple TBs transmission in consecutive slots, e.g. last two uplink slots and last three slots (one special slot and two uplink slots), should be considered and supported in the joint channel estimation.****Proposal 6:****If no other conditions except power consistency and phase continuity should be maintained, only the consecutive slots/symbols intended for joint channel estimation should be indicated. The time domain window for joint channel estimation should not be defined.****Proposal 7:****The impact of phase drifting to the performance of joint channel estimation under a large number of consecutive slots should be studied.****Proposal 8:****If the impact of phase drifting is verified, the maximum consecutive slot number should be defined as the upper bound for the joint channel estimation.****Proposal 9:****According to the reply from RAN4, *X* consecutive slots could be configured for the joint channel estimation. And the inter-slot frequency hopping could be configured every *X* consecutive slots.** |
| Xiaomi/ R1-2102994 | ***Proposal 1: Proper granularity for DMRS bundling or a DMRS bundling time window need to be introduced and specified if joint channel estimation is supported.******Proposal 2: DMRS bundling mechanism can be triggered by gNB or UE.******Proposal 3: The length of the time window should be final configured and indicated by gNB.******Proposal 4 : Support to configure N multiple time windows through RRC, and at any given time, only M time window can be activated and supported for each UE simultaneously through DCI.******Proposal 5: Support maintain a DMRS configuration table containing more diverse DMRS patterns for dynamically indication and configuration******Proposal 6：The maximum number of DMRS symbols and DMRS interval in a DMRS bundling time window should be defined and configured for equally spacing DMRS among PUSCH transmissions.*** |
| InterDigital/ R1- 2103009 | **Observation 1: Maintenance of phase and power continuity across bundled PUSCH(s) is critical to enable DMRS bundling** **Observation 2: The UE may have a limitation of how long the UE can maintain power/phase continuity****Observation 3: The UE needs a specific interval to bundle DM-RS symbols in PUSCH****Observation 4: Expressing the length of the bundling window in terms of symbols or slots provide granularities for DM-RS bundling****Observation 5: Expressing the length of the bundling window in terms of the number of repetitions provide alignment with PUSCH transmission****Observation 6: Considering different grant types for PUSCH(s), an indication mechanism that is adjustable for grant type offers flexibility and robustness****Observation 7: In the presence of CFO, PT-RS insertion may assist the gNB for the phase continuity maintenance within an acceptable range so the DM-RS coherence is maintained.****Observation 8: DMRS in special slot brings performance benefits****Observation 9: DMRS placement in a slot according to the DMRS in the special slot brings additional benefits****Observation 10: Joint channel estimation for TBoMS will provide additional performance gain from the receiver side****Proposal 1: Define a time window during which the UE is expected to maintain power or phase continuity****Proposal 2: Support at least the number of repetitions to indicate the length of the DM-RS bundling window****Proposal 3: Support a higher layer signaling (RRC) to enable DMRS bundling****Proposal 4 : Time window configuration is associated to repetition configurations in configured grant** **Proposal 5: Support a grant-type dependent index which indicates PUSCH(s) to bundle****Proposal 6: Support multiple DM-RS bundling windows****Proposal 7: When DM-RS bundling is enabled, PTRS should be enabled as well, at least for FR2.****Proposal 8: Support DM-RS placement in a special slot in DM-RS bundling when a special slot and uplink slot are placed continuously****Proposal 9: Confirm the working assumption from RAN1#104b and support joint channel estimation for the TBoMS transmission for back-to-back PUSCH transmission****Proposal 10: Disable DM-RS bundling if flexible symbols or slots included in the time window turn to downlink symbols/slots due to SFI.****Proposal 11: RAN4 evaluation should include at least Use case 1 (BtB transmission for consecutive slots) and Use case 3 (BtB transmission for consecutive symbols within a slot)**  |
| Intel/ R1-2103044 | **Observation 1*** *For PUSCH with 8 repetitions and inter-slot frequency hopping, 4 DMRS symbols can achieve better link level performance than 6 DMRS symbols for PUSCH.*

**Observation 2*** *For PUSCH with 4 repetitions and inter-slot frequency hopping with bundling size of 2 slots, relatively large performance degradation, i.e., ~1.5dB can be observed for lower DMRS density, i.e., when DMRS symbols are not allocated in odd slots compared to the case when DMRS symbols are allocated in every slot.*

**Observation 3*** *For PUSCH with 4 repetitions and joint channel estimation with bundling size of 2 slots, ~0.1dB performance gain can be achieved when an additional DMRS symbol is inserted in the special slot for PUSCH repetition.*

**Observation 4*** *For PUSCH with 4 repetitions and joint channel estimation with bundling size of 2 slots, performance difference is negligible between existing DMRS pattern as defined in Rel-15 and equally spaced DMRS pattern.*

**Observation 5*** *For PUSCH with 4 repetitions, when employing joint channel estimation with bundling size of 2 slots, ~1.0dB performance gain can be achieved by inter-slot frequency hopping with inter-slot bundling of 4 slots, compared to the case without frequency hopping.*

**Proposal 1*** *UE needs to keep same Tx power, precoder and frequency resource within a window for joint channel estimation over multiple PUSCHs.*

**Proposal 2*** *Higher DMRS density in time domain is not supported for PUSCH enhancement.*

**Proposal 3*** *Lower DMRS density in time domain is not supported for PUSCH enhancement.*

**Proposal 4*** *Additional DMRS symbols located in the special slot may not be supported for PUSCH enhancement.*

**Proposal 5*** *Equally spaced DMRS pattern may not be supported for PUSCH enhancement.*

**Proposal 6*** *For inter-slot frequency hopping with inter-slot bundling, the bundle size may be configured by higher layers, or implicitly determined based on the number of repetitions for PUSCH.*
 |
| Apple/ R1-2103118 | **Proposal 1: Joint channel estimation for back-to-back PUSCH transmissions within one slot is not supported.****Proposal 2 : Confirm the following working assumption:*** **For back-to-back PUSCH transmissions across consecutive slots, support necessary design aspects (under the condition of power consistency and phase continuity) to enable joint channel estimation for the following case:**
	+ **Over back-to-back PUSCH transmissions for one TB processed over multiple slots**
		- **It’s subject to UE capability**

**Proposal 3: Specify the inter-slot frequency hopping pattern to enable the conjunction operation of repetition, frequency hopping and cross-slot channel estimation.** |
| Qualcomm/ R1-2103180 | **Proposal 1:** Deprioritize joint channel estimation for the following cases:* Use case 1: back-to-back PUSCH transmissions within one slot.
* Use case 2: non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions within one slot.

**Proposal 2:** RAN1 waits for further RAN4 input on feasibility of the following cases:* Use case 4: non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions across consecutive slots.
* Use case 5: PUSCH transmissions across non-consecutive slots.

**Proposal 3:** RAN1 specifies time domain window(s) during which UE may maintain phase continuity among PUSCH transmissions subject to phase continuity requirements.* The UE is not required to maintain phase continuity of the PUSCH transmissions scheduled outside of the window.
* FFS: how to indicate the window configuration.

**Proposal 4:** Support multiple non-overlapping time domain windows for joint channel estimation over PUSCH repetitions. * Windows are determined based on semi-static slot format configuration.
* FFS: determine start of a window.

**Proposal 5:** For each PUSCH transmission, the UE signals a bundling indication in the PUSCH transmission.**Proposal 6:** Only support non-interleaving case where the bundled PUSCHs in a hop are consecutively transmitted when inter-slot frequency hopping is configured. **Proposal 7:** Support different criteria for activation of PTRS or its density for the case of joint channel estimation.**Proposal 8:** Maintain the same DMRS granularity across all PUSCH transmissions that are configured for DMRS bundling.**Proposal 9:** No change in DMRS locations compared to R15/R16 for PUSCH transmissions that are configured with DMRS bundling. |
| Samsung/ R1-2103253 | ***Observation 1: The time domain window is defined as the duration in which the power consistency and phase continuity are preserved for joint channel estimation.*** ***Proposal 1: Support a same power, precoding, RV, and frequency position for a number of repetitions of a PUSCH transmission.*** ***Proposal 2: A UE updates the CLPC adjustment state per number of repetitions corresponding to the DM-RS interpolation window.******Proposal 3: The number of repetitions where a UE transmits using same power/precoding/RV/RBs is either the number of repetitions per frequency hop or is configured by higher layers.*** ***Observation 3: DM-RS interpolation in absence of CFO provides a gain of ~0.7 dB for PUSCH repetition type A and of ~1.3 dB for PUSCH repetition type B.******Proposal 4: Support DM-RS interpolation for both PUSCH repetition Type A and Type B.*** ***Proposal 5: A UE performs PUSCH frequency hopping per number of M>1 PUSCH repetitions. The number M can be predetermined, such as M=4 or M=N/2 where N is the number of repetitions, or be configured by RRC (a selection may also depend on the approach for the determination of the time window).*** ***Proposal 6: Support a same power, precoding and frequency position for a number of repetitions of a PUCCH transmission.***  |
| Sony/ R1-2103312 | Observation 1: For UL dominated traffic, a UE can be configured to ignore DL symbols to maintain UL phase continuity and amplitude consistency. Observation 2: For UEs with cross switch (1-Tx-z-Rx, where z≥2), or in general terms, UEs that have multiple Rx/Tx chains, it is possible to use different antennas for UL and DL traffic during the JCE window.Observation 3: For FR2 a UE needs to be able to request an alternative beam for DL.Proposal 1: Enable JCE by configuring DL blanking to UEs.Proposal 2: Companies are encouraged to investigate the additional power needed to keep the PA biased during the DL periods. Proposal 3: Companies are encouraged to investigate the required isolation between the antenna ports to avoid desensitization from PA noise leakage.Proposal 4: Companies are encouraged to investigate the probability of having too weak signal at the second antenna. Proposal 5: UE capability of supporting JCE and signaling that JCE is not applicable is needed.Proposal 6: Companies are encouraged to estimate the required tolerance of the phase and the amplitude consistency needed for JCE. |
| Nokia/ R1-2103382 | **Proposal 1. For back-to-back PUSCH transmissions with zero gap in-between adjacent transmissions, RAN1 to further support necessary design aspects to enable joint channel estimation at least for the following additional scenarios:*** **back-to-back PUSCH transmissions within one slot;**
* **back-to-back PUSCH transmissions across consecutive slots including:**
	+ - * **one TB processed over multiple slots, PUSCH transmissions of different TB, and PUSCH repetition type B.**

**Proposal 2. For non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions with non-zero gap in-between adjacent transmissions:** * **RAN1 to support necessary design aspects to enable joint channel estimation at least for the following scenarios:**
	+ - * **non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions across consecutive slots.**
			* **PUSCH transmissions across non-consecutive slots.**
* **gNB to dynamically indicate whether and which DL reception occasion should be monitored by the UE.**

**Proposal 3. RAN1 to specify a time-domain window at least for non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions with non-zero gap in-between adjacent transmissions. The window size may be reported as UE capability and/or configured via higher-layer signalling.****Proposal 4. For inter-slot frequency hopping with inter-slot bundling to enable joint channel estimation:*** **RAN1 to specify at least the following frequency hopping modes:**
	+ - * **UE switches frequency hop for the repetitions after a DL reception occasion that the UE is expected/configured to monitor/receive.**
			* **UE switches frequency hop for the repetitions after a DL reception occasion that the UE is expected/configured to monitor/receive; and applies a time-domain window starting from the switching slot. The UE also switches frequency hop for the repetitions after the time-domain window expires.**
 |
| Ericsson/ R1-2103446 | **Observations:**1. Multiple PUSCH transmissions within a slot will have at least some loss in coverage as compared to a single PUSCH transmission within a slot, especially if there is also one or more x-symbol gaps in the slot. Therefore, multiple PUSCH transmission does not seem to be a use case within the scope of the coverage enhancement work item.
2. Back to back transmission across slots is the most straightforward use case to support, and the case where there is a multi-symbol gap also appears promising.
3. Support for different numbers of symbols in a slot is more complicated, and likely to have less gain than the same number of symbols in a slot.
4. From a RAN1 perspective, we should strive to support non-consecutive transmission over slots.
	* This may be challenging from a RAN4 perspective, but heavy DL:UL TDD ratios are common in real networks.
5. Sub-slot repetition of PUCCH is to be specified in Rel-17
6. Sub-slot repetition of PUCCH can provide coverage enhancement for URLLC applications
7. The specification impact, net gains, and use cases of TBoMS support for special slot should be carefully studied prior to specifying it.
8. Configurations where the number of symbols is the same in all slots of a TBoMS transmission is a logical starting point for RAN4 studies
	* According to RAN1#104 agreements, at least these configurations will be specified.
	* RAN1 can update RAN4 on supported TBoMS configurations as RAN1 discussions progress.
9. In a number of scenarios, a receiver can correct for a wideband phase error between repetitions of an uplink channel in different slots, such that the performance is relatively close to where the ideal relative phase is known.
10. The use of wideband relative phase estimation to facilitate cross-slot channel estimation seems promising at least when the UE can’t adequately maintain relative phase between slots.
11. For a fair assessment of the gains from joint channel estimation, the carrier frequency offset (CFO) should be modeled in simulations.
	* The loss from an uncompensated CFO is found to be about 0.5 dB, which is significant in comparison to the overall gains of 1.3 dB observed for joint channel estimation.
12. If the UE can maintain phase coherence between slots, joint channel estimation can give gains of about 1.3 dB for FDD at 3 km/h.
	* Similar gains are seen also for TDD with non-back-to-back slots.
	* Further studies at higher speeds are needed.
13. Even with fully random wide-band transmitter phase offsets between slots, joint estimation was found to be able to yield similar gains as in the absence of phase offsets, as long as the receiver can estimate and compensate for the phase offsets.
	* The simulations were performed using 4 PRBs and assuming a single phase offset over that bandwidth; wider bandwidths are for further study.
14. Joint channel estimation brings gains, but further study is needed on how much needs to be specified vs. what can be done in gNB implementation (e.g. by estimating wideband phase corrections to combine slots).
15. Even without explicit phase offset compensation in the receiver, joint channel estimation can perform well if the phase offsets between slots are not too large (e.g. phase offsets up to in the order of 20° between consecutive slots in the simulated scenario).
16. Joint channel estimation brings gains also in the case of frequency hopping, both for inter-slot FH and intra-slot FH.
	* Inter-slot FH was generally found to perform better than intra-slot FH under the used simulation assumptions.
17. The benefit of defining a time domain window beyond the slots occupied by a PUSCH is not yet clear
	* A potential use case is where the window is smaller than the number of repetitions, but the performance and need for such a case requires further study.

**Proposals:**1. Respond to RAN4 on specific scenarios that RAN4 should focus in their study according to the proposed LS response in **Error! Reference source not found.**.
2. Further study the benefit of gNB estimated inter-slot relative phase correction for PUSCH, addressing how frequency selective such phase corrections would need to be for UEs and/or conditions that do not sufficiently support maintaining inter-slot relative phase.
3. Identify which mechanisms should be specified and which can be gNB implementation to support phase coherence across slots with multiple repetitions.
4. The time domain window during which the UE is expected to maintain power consistency and phase continuity among PUSCH transmissions is according to slots occupied by the same PUSCH content
	* When joint channel estimation is configured, power consistency and phase continuity is required over all repetitions of a PUSCH or over all slots of one TBoMS transmission that meet power consistency and phase continuity requirements
		+ Power consistency and phase continuity requirements are defined according to R1-2102298 as a starting point, and can be revised according to further updates from RAN4.
		+ Further study the need for a time domain window spanning a portion of the PUSCH repetitions or TBoMS transmission**.**
 |
| Panasonic/ R1-2103458 | **Proposals:****Proposal 1: For back-to-back PUSCH transmissions, support necessary design aspects to enable joint channel estimation for the following cases*** **Over back-to-back PUSCH transmissions (of the same TB) for repetition type B across consecutive slots and within a slot where scheduled by dynamic grant or configured grant**
* **Over back-to-back PUSCH transmissions of a single TB over multi-slots**

**Proposal 2: For non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions with non-zero gap in-between adjacent transmissions, where there is no DL reception and X un-scheduled OFDM symbols in-between the PUSCH or PUCCH repetition, support necessary design aspects to enable joint channel estimation. X is decided by RAN4.****Proposal 3: It is not necessary to enable joint channel estimation for multi-TB scheduling by multiple DCIs and by single DCI at least for NR-U. It is FFS for multi-TB scheduling by a single DCI.** **Proposal 4: The length of time domain window is indicated by scheduled DCI for dynamic grant and by activated DCI for CG type 2. The length of time domain window is RRC configuration for CG type 1.****Proposal 5: TDRA table is used to indicate the length of time domain window.****Proposal 6: Optimization of DMRS location/granularity should be specified only if the significant gain is identified*** **If specified, different number of DMRSs can be set for different PUSCH transmissions within a time domain window.**

**Proposal 7: One or more lengths of time domain windows are configured to be jointly used with inter-slot FH*** **Each of the one or more lengths of time domain windows is used for the same frequency allocation in inter-slot FH procedure.**

**Proposal 8: Each of the one or more lengths of time domain windows and a length of inter-slot FH can be the same or different.****Observations:** **Observation 1: Joint channel estimation with inter-slot frequency hopping provides an improvement of gain of 1.0 ~1.5 dB compared to joint channel estimation without inter-slot frequency hopping and doubling a length of time domain window.****Observation 2: The performance loss due to frequency offset/error of +/- 0.1 ppm can be negligible at least when performing 4 and 8 repetitions with joint channel estimation and inter-slot frequency hopping.** |
| Sierra Wireless/ R1-2103460 | **Proposal 1:** RAN1 should agree on a common residual frequency error for JCE LLS**Observation 1:** The RAN4 UE frequency error requirement of +/- 0.1ppm should NOT be used as a JCE LLS assumption since it does not consider gNB frequency offset compensation. The residual frequency error should be in the range of +/- 50Hz but more input is needed. **Observation 2:** JCE LLS simulation assumptions should focus on indoor low doppler scenarios (e.g. 2Hz)since it is most likely to experience coverage issues due toinbuilding penetration loss.**Observation 3:** For the FDD eMBB scenario, joint channel estimation can provide ~1.5 dB of coverage gain.**Observation 4:** For the FDD VoIP scenario, joint channel estimation can provide ~3.5 dB of coverage gain.**Observation 5:** For the FDD eMBB scenario, the coverage gain for joint channel estimation with frequency hopping and inter-slot bundling is ~1.25dB.**Observation 6:** For the FDD eMBB scenario, joint channel estimation with FH and inter-slot bundling limits frequency diversity.**Observation 7:** For TDD, joint channel estimation can only be used with UEs which can maintain phase continuity across TDD frames. **Proposal 2:** Study resource allocation and procedural changes which could increase the likelihood that a UE could maintain phase continuity across TDD frames.**Observation 8:** For the TDD DDDSU eMBB scenario, joint channel estimation across TDD frames can provide >1 dB coverage gain.**Observation 9:** For the TDD DDDSU VoIP scenario, joint channel estimation across frames can provide ~2 dB coverage gain.**Proposal 3:** The gNB may signal to the UE a required phase continuity time window which the UE shall maintain phase continuity over.* FFS whether signalling is semi-static (e.g. RRC) or dynamic (e.g. DCI)
* FFS whether the time window is a sliding window across the transmission or whether a transmission is segmented into several serial non-overlapping time windows

**Proposal 4:** The UE shall signal a maximum phase continuity time window capability to the gNB which is the maximum time the UE is capable to maintain phase continuity.**Proposal 5:** RAN1’s answer to RAN4’s LS should be for RAN4 to focus on the TDD frame structure DDDSU with multiple slots scenario. |
| Sharp/ R1-2103481 | ***Proposal 1: For non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions across consecutive slots with X symbol gap (X=1~14) where no other uplink transmission is performed on the X symbol gap, support necessary design aspects (under the condition of power consistency and phase continuity) to enable joint channel estimation at least for the following case:**** ***Over non-back-to-back transmissions of the same TB for repetition type A scheduled by dynamic grant or configured grant***

***Proposal 2: A time domain window is specified such that the phase continuity is ensured.**** ***The specification should ensure that the UE transmission for PUSCH repetitions shall be such that the channel over which a symbol on the antenna port used for uplink transmission is conveyed can be inferred from the channel over which another symbol on the same antenna port is conveyed only if the two symbols corresponds to the same time domain window.***

***Proposal 3: Time domain window configuration should support implicit determination which enables a time domain window to include a set of continuous UL slots.*** |
| NTT DOCOMO/ R1-2103589 | **Proposal 1: Ask RAN4 the amount of tolerable phase change between repetitions in back-to-back transmissions with zero gap in-between adjacent transmissions over multiple slots.** **Proposal 2: A time domain window should be specified per UE, if DMRS transmissions for joint channel estimation over long time require the processing load.****Proposal 3: Support inter-slot frequency hopping with inter-slot bundling when applying joint channel estimation.** **Proposal 4: The duration per hop should be a time domain window. If a time domain window is not specified, duration per hop should be decided based on the specification or indicated by signalling.****Proposal 5: Support joint channel estimation of PUSCH repetition type B as well for back-to-back PUSCH transmission across consecutive slots of the same TB.****Observation 1: Applying joint channel estimation over 2 slots and 4 slots brings a gain of 0.72 dB and 1.02 dB, respectively.**  |
| Lenovo/ R1-2103617 | ***Proposal 1: For specifying joint channel estimation with DM-RS bundling across multiple PUSCHs for coverage enhancements in NR Rel-17, use cases with back-to-back PUSCH transmission within one slot in addition to across multiple slots (****repetition type A)* ***are supported.**** ***Support of joint channel estimation for non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions is dependent up on RAN4’s input***

***Proposal 2: For supporting joint channel estimation with DM-RS bundling across multiple PUSCHs for coverage enhancements in NR Rel-17, additional DM-RS time-domain pattern should be enhanced with following consideration:**** ***to support equally spaced DM-RS symbols across multiple PUSCHs (new design for additional DMRS symbols)***
* ***to avoid extrapolation for large number of symbols for the last PUSCH (similar design aspect as supported in NR)***

***Proposal 3: For supporting joint channel estimation with DM-RS bundling across multiple PUSCHs for coverage enhancements in NR Rel-17, UE should be configured with an additional new configuration for additional DM-RS patterns (for up to 14 symbols) to apply to all PUSCH transmissions, but last**** ***For the last PUSCH transmission, the current additional DM-RS configuration should be applied***

***Proposal 4: For supporting joint channel estimation with DM-RS bundling across multiple PUSCHs for coverage enhancements in NR 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 supported***
* ***At least hop duration of 2 slots should be supported with DM-RS bundling***

***Proposal 5: For supporting joint channel estimation with DM-RS bundling across multiple PUSCHs for coverage enhancements in NR Rel-17, time domain window for the purpose of joint channel estimation DM-RS bundling should be specified with following details:**** ***Maximum duration for the time-domain window should be determined based on the minimum of following two durations:***
	+ ***Maximum duration for which power consistency and phase continuity can be maintained***
	+ ***Maximum duration of PUSCH transmissions (depend on maximum value of repetition factor)***
* ***Depending upon coverage requirements, the duration of the time-domain window can be configured/indicated (duration value could be smaller than the maximum duration)***
* ***For a burst of PUSCH transmissions with joint channel estimation, only a single duration of the time domain window should be configured/indicated***
* ***For the case of joint channel estimation with frequency hopping, explicit indication/configuration for time domain window can be avoided and implied by the duration of the hop***
* ***DM-RS bundling duration could be possible considered as a term to be included in specifications.***

***Proposal 6: For supporting joint channel estimation with DM-RS bundling across multiple PUSCHs for coverage enhancements in NR Rel-17, enabling or disabling of joint channel estimation can be jointly indicated by the presence of signalling for time domain window duration*****Dynamic signalling of time domain window duration should be supported** |
| LG/ R1-2103626 | ***Proposal 1: For non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions across consecutive slots, and PUSCH transmission across non-consecutive slots, support necessary design aspects (under the condition of power consistency and phase continuity) to enable joint channel estimation for repetition type A scheduled by dynamic grant or configured grant******Proposal 2: It should be adopted that received TA command is not applied within time-domain window for joint channel estimation when TA command is indicated to the UE.******Proposal 3: The time domain window for joint channel estimation is specified.******Proposal 4: Time-domain window for joint channel estimation is consecutive slots.******Proposal 5: Multiple time windows in the same transmission channel of the same grant should not be considered.******Proposal 6: The frequency hopping boundary length can be equal to or larger than the time-domain window for joint channel estimation.******Proposal 7: Inter-slot frequency hopping boundary with inter-slot bundling follows cell-specific time-domain resource grid.******Proposal 8: Deprioritize the optimization of DMRS granularity.******Proposal 9: If necessary, the additional DMRS in special slot or orphan symbol can only be considered for optimization of DMRS location in time domain.*** |
| WILUS/ R1-2103701 | ***Proposal 1: For back-to-back PUSCH transmissions, prioritize PUSCH repetition type A and PUSCH repetition type B for joint channel estimation.**** + ***For non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions, it can be further discussed after RAN4’s conclusion.***

***Proposal 2: For back-to-back PUSCH transmissions with repetition case, specify the time domain window. The length of the time domain window can be configured by a set of repetitions explicitly or implicitly.******Proposal 3: For inter-slot frequency hopping with inter-slot bundling, it should be further discussed to determine frequency hopping index by taking into account UE multiplexing, frequency hop balancing and availability of joint channel estimation.*** |