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# Introduction

This email thread discusses the demodulation part of the Rel-17 NR coverage enhancement WI: in agenda 10.18.3.

List of candidate target of email discussion for 1st round and 2nd round:

* 1st round: Invite companies to provide comments in section 1.3 and 2.3.
* 2nd round: TBA

# Topic #1: PUSCH Enhancements of Rel-17 NR Coverage Enhancement

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| R4-2203552 | Samsung | Observation 1: Compared with Rel-15/16, the range of slot repetition can be up to 32 from 16  Observation 2: PUSCH slot repetition requirements have been verified in RAN4 for both FR1 and FR2. No PUSCH requirement with 16 repetition.  Propose 1: No BS demodulation requirements for PUSCH repetition type A with 32 repetitions.  Propose 2: RAN4 applies 4 available slots in FDD and 2 available slots in TDD for PUSCH requirements with TBoMS  Propose 3: RAN4 do not apply repetition for PUSCH requirements with TBoMS  Propose 4: RAN4 applies narrow PUSCH allocation for PUSCH requirements with TBoMS.  Propose 5: RAN4 applies the following TDD UL-DL pattern for PUSCH requirement with TBoMS for 30KHz SCS.  - For 30KHz SCS  - 7D1S2U, S=6D:4G:4U as starting point  - Reuse the existing applicability rule for test requirement for different TDD UL-DL patterns  No PUCCH requirement with TBoMS for TDD UL-DL pattern as 3D1SU in 15 KHz SCS. If needed, the PUSCH requirement with TBoMS for TDD with 2 available slots can be applied for FDD with 2 available slots  Propose 6: RAN4 applies CP-OFDM waveform for PUSCH requirements with TBoMS  Propose 7: RAN4 not to test PUSCH demodulation with UCI multiplexing for TBoMS transmission  Propose 8: RAN4 applies the following parameters for PUSCH with TBoMS transmission  - Cover both FR1 and FR2, with test applicability rule  - For MCS: QPSK 1/3 MCS4  - For RV sequence for HARQ transmission: [0 2 3 1]  - For PUSCH mapping type: Cover PUSCH mapping type A and type B, with test applicability rule.  Propose 9: RAN4 applies the test metric of SNR@ 70% of Throughput for PUSCH requirements with TBoMS  Propose 10: RAN4 applied 2 slots in TDD and FDD for PUSCH requirement with Joint channel estimation  Propose 11: RAN4 applied configured TDW lengths as 2 for requirement with JCE  Propose 12: RAN4 applied repetition type A for requirement with JCE  Propose 13: RAN4 applies full applicable test bandwidth for PUSCH requirement with JCE  Propose 14: RAN4 applies inter-slot frequency hopping disable for PUSCH requirement with JCE.  Propose 15: RAN4 applies the following TDD UL-DL pattern for PUSCH requirement with JCE for 30KHz SCS.  - For 30KHz SCS  - 7D1S2U, S=6D:4G:4U as starting point  - Reuse the existing applicability rule for test requirement for different TDD UL-DL patterns  No PUCCH requirement with JCE for TDD UL-DL pattern as 3D1SU in 15 KHz SCS. If needed, the PUSCH requirement with JCE for TDD with 2 continuous slots can be applied for FDD with 2 available slots  Propose 16: RAN4 applies only CP-OFDM waveform only for PUSCH requirement with JCE  Propose 17: RAN4 applies the configuration of existing Rel-16 PUSCH requirement with repetition Type A as the starting point.  Propose 18: RAN4 applies the test metric as SNR @70%TP for PUSCH requirement with JCE |
| R4-2204033 | Ericsson | Proposal 1: For PUSCH repetition type A with 32 repetitions, regardless counting repetitions based on physical slot or available slot, no demodulation requirement is defined.  Observation 1: Frequency hopping impact depends on channel condition but not the implementation of BS.  Proposal 2: For type A repetitions for Msg.3, no demodulation requirement is defined.  Proposal 3-1: For PUSCH TBoMS requirement, only CP-OFDM is considered.  Proposal 3-2: For PUSCH TBoMS requirement, frequency hopping is disabled.  Proposal 3-3: For PUSCH TBoMS requirement, repetition is not considered.  Proposal 3-4: For PUSCH TBoMS requirement, following parameters are considered  • MCS#2 (193/1024) in 64QAM MCS table  • RV sequence of {0,2,3,1}  • PUSCH mapping type  o FR1: A and B  o FR2: B  Proposal 3-5: For PUSCH TBoMS requirement, UCI multiplexing is not considered.  Proposal 3-6: For PUSCH TBoMS requirement, following TDD patterns are used:  • 15kHz/120kHz SCS: 3D1S1U, S=10D:2G:2U  • 30kHz SCS: 7D1S2U, S=6D:4G:4U  • 60kHz SCS: DDSU, S=11D:3G:0U  Proposal 3-7: For PUSCH TBoMS requirement, following RB and slot assignments are used:  • 15kHz SCS: 25 RBs and 2 available slots for all channel bandwidths  • 30kHz SCS: 24 RBs and 2 available slots for all channel bandwidths  • 60kHz and 120kHz SCS: 32 RBs and 2 available slots for all channel bandwidths  Proposal 3-8: For PUSCH TBoMS requirement, 1 Tx antenna and 2 Rx antennas are considered.  Proposal 3-9: Take parameters in Table 2-3 and 2-4 for TBoMS requirement.  Proposal 4-1: For PUSCH JCE demodulation requirement, only CP-OFDM is considered.  Proposal 4-2: For PUSCH JCE demodulation requirement, frequency hopping is disabled.  Proposal 4-3: For PUSCH JCE demodulation requirement, only PUSCH repetition type A is considered.  Proposal 4-4: Define new TDD pattern with multiple contiguous UL slots for SCS 15kHz/60kHz/120kHz for PUSCH JCE test.  Proposal 4-5: Define PUSCH JCE requirement for TDD and FDD separately. Test the maximum aTDW length for FDD.  Proposal 4-6: cTDW = aTDW = 2 slots for TDD and cTDW = aTDW = [8] slots for FDD as the start point.  Proposal 4-7: For PUSCH JCE requirement, full bandwidth is used.  Proposal 4-8: For PUSCH JCE requirement, 1 Tx antenna and 2 Rx antennas are considered.  Proposal 4-9: Take parameters in Table 2-5 at least for the requirement PUSCH JCE with 30kHz SCS in FR1  Proposal 5-1: Do not define new demodulation requirement for Redcap UE. |
| R4-2205500 | China Telecom | Proposal 1: Define BS demodulation requirements for PUSCH repetition type A with 32 repetitions, using the following parameters:   Counting based on physical slots and available slots (i.e., UL slots) for FDD and TDD respectively   QPSK 1/3 (MCS 4), 4PRB PUSCH allocation   Inter-slot frequency hopping enabled   DFT-S-OFDM and CP-OFDM   FR1 and FR2  Proposal 2: For the test metric for PUSCH repetition type A with 32 repetitions, use the required SNR at 2% BLER, which is also used in RAN1 phase I verification in TR38.830.  Proposal 3: Use 4 physical/available slots for a TBoMS for FDD/TDD with repetition number of 4 with Inter-slot frequency hopping enabled for TBoMS PUSCH demodulation tests.  Proposal 4: Use narrow PUSCH allocation with either single or non-single PRB allocation.  Proposal 5: Cover 15kHz SCS for TBoMS tests for FR1, and the existing TDD UL-DL pattern, i.e., 3D1S1U, S=10D:2G:2U, can be used as a start point.  Proposal 6: Cover 60kHz and 120kHz SCS for TBoMS tests for FR2, and use TDD UL-DL pattern with more UL slots in the test, e.g., DSUUU.  Proposal 7: Cover both DFT-S-OFDM and CP-OFDM for BS requirements for PUSCH TboMS.  Proposal 8: Use the following parameters for PUSCH TboMS test:  – QPSK 1/3 MCS 4  – Use [0 2 3 1] as the effective RV sequence and further adjust the test parameter based on the repetition number  – Cover both PUSCH mapping type A and type B  Proposal 9: Include SNR point at 2% BLER as a candidate test metric and further decide based on simulation results.  Proposal 10: Use the following parameters for BS PUSCH demod requirements for JCE:   JCE over 2 slots for TDD with available slot based counting, and JCE over 16 slots for FDD   QPSK 1/3 (MCS 4), 4PRB PUSCH allocation   Inter-slot frequency hopping with DMRS bundling disabled for TDD, and enabled for FDD (16\*2=32 repetition for FDD)   Use PUSCH repetition type A   DFT-S-OFDM and CP-OFDM   Cover both FR1 and FR2  Proposal 11: Further decide whether to use 1+0 or 1+1 DMRS symbol based on companies’ simulation results, and select one that achieves larger PUSCH performance gain with JCE compared with PUSCH performance without JCE.  Proposal 12: Include SNR point at 2% BLER as a candidate test metric and further decide based on simulation results.  Proposal 13: Phase error needs also to be modeled in the BS demod test for JCE. Smaller number of phase offset compared to the UE RF requirements should be model in the BS demodulation requirements, and the exact number can be further discussed in the next meeting pending on the inputs from TE side.  Proposal 14: Do not model the power error when defining BS demod requirement. |
| R4-2205489 | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Test metric for PUSCH  Proposal 1:Use as evaluation metric the SNR at which the PUSCH achieves 70% of throughput to test PUSCH TBoMS and PUSCH JCE performances.  TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH  Observation 1:The increase from n16 to n32 impacts the BS demodulation performance in a very predictable way that is independent of implementation. New repetition factors can be included in the JCE feature.  Proposal 2:RAN4 to not specify new BS demodulation requirements only for the increased number of Type A repetitions.  TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH  Observation 2:For both single-slot transmission and TBoMS, the number of slots of retransmission could be different from the initial transmission. However, this would not strongly impact the TPUT KPIs. Hence, we should not test this slot number change.  Observation 3:The same RV is used for all slots in the TBoMS scheme and is up counted for repetitions. New RV values can be chosen for HARQ re-transmissions, RAN1 does not give guidance concerning which RV cycling should be used.  Observation 4:In the common use cases for TBoMS, the 1st slot will contain the most systematic bits and the following slots will contain a large portion of the parity bits.  Observation 5:For re-transmissions it is advantageous to always use RV0, to be sure that systematic bits are contained.  Proposal 3:RAN4 to use HARQ re-transmission RV cycling with the pattern [0 0 0 0] and optionally [0 3 0 3].  Proposal 4:TBoMS demod requirements to be specified using 4PRB.  Proposal 5:RAN4 to include both FR1 and FR2 in demod requirements of TBoMS  Proposal 6:RAN4 to specify TBoMS requirements over 8 available slots in FDD and TDD (using the default 7D1S2U, S=6D:4G:4U pattern).  Proposal 7:RAN4 to test TBoMS performance without enabling repetitions.  Proposal 8:RAN4 to consider CP-OFDM only to test TBoMS performance  Observation 6:The UCI on PUSCH multiplexing feature on top of the TBoMS PUSCH feature has some non-trivial performance interactions between the two features. It can be discussed, but priority is lower with respect to other requirements.  Joint channel estimation for PUSCH  Observation 7:To test JCE PUSCH performance, the inter-slot frequency hopping interval and configured cTDW should be defined jointly to ensure an actual aTDW > 1.  Observation 8:In Rel-17 coverage enhancement it was agreed to have a new configuration to set a frequency hopping interval, i.e., it is no longer needed to hop at each slot, which enable aTDW>1 with FH enabled.  Proposal 9:To test PUSCH JCE, the aTDW/slot number should at least be equal to 2  Proposal 10:Use TDD UL/DL pattern 7DSUU.  Proposal 11:Use configured time domain window (cTDW) to be 32 slots.  Proposal 12:Use configured number of repetitions = 8.  Proposal 13:Activate inter-slot frequency hopping, with hopping interval length equal to 2 slots.  Observation 9:In FDD the phase continuity is not repeatedly broken by DL slots and similar JCE gains to TDD can be achieved with smaller cTDW/aTDW lengths.  Proposal 14:Use configured time domain window (cTDW) to be 8  Proposal 15:Use configured number of repetitions = 8.  Proposal 16:Activate inter-slot frequency hopping, with hopping interval 4.  Proposal 17:RAN4 to specify BS demod requirements for JCE PUSCH feature by using large TDRA, e.g., 14 slot PUSCH TDRA with full applicable test bandwidth.  Type A PUSCH repetition for msg3  Observation 10: The implementation of PUSCH Msg3 repetition could simply reuse Rel-16 demodulation implementation of PUSCH up to 16 repetitions cycled over RV sequence.  Proposal 18: RAN4 not to specify new BS demodulation requirements for the introduced PUSCH Msg3 repetitions. |
| R4-2205772 | Huawei, HiSilicon | Proposal 1: Do not define performance requirements enhancements on PUSCH repetition type A.  Proposal 2: For TDD, select 2 consecutive slots for BS requirements for PUSCH TBoMS.  Proposal 3: For FDD, select 4 or 8 consecutive slots for BS requirements for PUSCH TBoMS.  Proposal 4: Do not to consider repetition for TBoMS..  Proposal 5: Select 5 PRB for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE.  Proposal 6: Do not consider inter-slot frequency hopping for PUSCH TBoMS.  Proposal 7: Do not consider 15kHz SCS for BS requirements for PUSCH TBoMS.  Proposal 8: Select CP-OFDM only as transform precoding configuration for BS requirements for PUSCH TBoMS.  Proposal 9: Do not to test PUSCH demodulation with UCI multiplexing for TBoMS transmission.  Proposal 10: Select MCS2 for BS requirements for PUSCH TBoMS.  Proposal 11: Select the test SNR at which the PUSCH achieves 70% of throughput as the test metric for BS demodulation requirements for PUSCH TBoMS.  Proposal 12: For TDD, select 2 consecutive slots for BS PUSCH demod with JCE.  Proposal 13: For FDD, select 4 or 8 consecutive slots for BS PUSCH demod with JCE.  Proposal 14: Select configured TDW length same as actual TDW length for BS PUSCH demod with JCE.  Proposal 15: Only consider one typical configuration for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE.  Proposal 16: Select 4 PRB for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE.  Proposal 17: Do not consider inter-slot frequency hopping for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE.  Proposal 18: For 30kHz SCS, select 7D1S2U, S=6D:4G:4U for PUSCH demod requirements with JCE.  Proposal 19: For 15kHz SCS, do not consider BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE for 15kHz SCS.  Proposal 20: Select CP-OFDM only as transform precoding configuration for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE.  Proposal 21: Use configuration of existing Rel-16 PUSCH requirements with repetition Type A as the starting point.  Proposal 22: Select the test SNR at which the PUSCH achieves 70% of throughput as the test metric for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE. |
| R4-2205817 | Intel Corporation | Proposal 1: Don’t define the requirements for PUSCH repetition type A with 32 repetitions.  Proposal 2: Consider the following PUSCH test design for verification of TB over Multi Slots:  • 2 physical slots  • No repetitions  • 5 PRBs PUSCH allocation  • Inter-slot frequency hopping is ON  • CP-OFDM only  • Without UCI multiplexing on PUSCH  • FRC: QPSK 1/3, MCS 4  • RV sequence: [0 2 3 1]  • PUSCH mapping type A and type B  • Other parameters are same as for Rel-15 PUSCH tests (Table: 8.2.1.1-1 in 38.104)  • Test metric: Test SNR at which the PUSCH achieves 70% of throughput  Proposal 3: Consider the following PUSCH test design for verification of Joint Channel Estimation:  • Number of slots for JCE: 2 and 4 slots as starting point with further down selection based on results  • PUSCH repetition type A  • 4 PRBs PUSCH allocation  • Inter-slot frequency hopping is OFF  • CP-OFDM only  • MCS 2 and 4 as starting point and make final decision based on simulation results  • PUSCH mapping type A and type B  • Other parameters (DMRS and time domain resource allocation) are same as for Rel-15 PUSCH tests (Table: 8.2.1.1-1 in 38.104)  • Test metric: SNR for 70% of maximum throughput and SNR for 1% BLER as starting point with further down selection based on results  Proposal 4: In case big misalignment will be observed for JCE simulations, consider the following reference receiver for definition of minimum requirements: DMRS symbols from previous (if available) and current slots are used for channel estimation on Data REs at current slot. |
| R4-2206132 | MediaTek Inc. | 1) Why are only up to 8 slots being considered for the BS demod testing, when some companies (including at least 1 BS vendor) have been pushing quite hard to specify up to 32 slots for the UE?  2) Why is a cTDW size not at least as large as the maximum consecutive slot size?  3) Why is non-back to back PUSCH not being considered, when a few companies (including 1 BS vendor) have been pushing very hard to define complex requirements on the UE for such a case?  4) Changing the UE RB allocations has been ruled out since RAN#98-e. So, what does “enabling” inter-slot frequency hopping for PUSCH mean in this context?  5) TDD patterns: Why is a maximum of 2ms of UL consecutive transmissions being considered when companies are asking the UE to support up to 32ms?  6) Given that the whole aim of this feature is to enhance “coverage”. Why is it being questioned as to whether demod requirements should be defined for DFT-s-OFDM?  Proposal 1: We would appreciate answers to the above questions raised on the status, as one would naturally expect the Base Station requirements to follow the UE potential capabilities that are being requested.  Proposal 2: Consider how to take into account the presence of frequency error in the UL signal for BS demodulation |

## Open issues summary

### Sub-topic 1-1: PUSCH repetition type A with 32 repetitions

**Issue 1-1-1: Whether to define BS demodulation requirements for PUSCH repetition type A with 32 repetitions**

* *Status in the last meeting WF (R4-2203030):*
  + *Whether to define BS demodulation requirements for PUSCH repetition type A with 32 repetitions*
    - *Option 1: Yes*
    - *Option 2: No*
* Proposals:
  + Option 1: Yes (China Telecom)
    - CTC: PUSCH repetition type A with 32 repetitions achieves about 10dB lower SNR point than that of 2 repetitions which is the only repetition test we have in RAN4.
  + Option 2: No (Samsung, E///, Nokia, HW, Intel)
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

**Issue 1-1-2: Parameters for BS requirements for PUSCH repetition type A with 32 repetitions (if introduced)**

* *Status in the last meeting WF (R4-2203030):*
  + *Whether to define BS demodulation requirements for PUSCH repetition type A with 32 repetitions*
    - *Option 1: Yes*
    - *Option 2: No*
  + *Parameters for BS requirements for PUSCH repetition type A with 32 repetitions (if introduced)*
    - *Option 1:*

*Counting based on physical slots and available slots (i.e., UL slots) for FDD and TDD respectively*

*QPSK 1/3 (MCS 4), 4PRB PUSCH allocation*

*Inter-slot frequency hopping enabled*

*DFT-S-OFDM and CP-OFDM*

*FR1 and FR2*

* + - *Other options are not precluded*
* Proposals:
  + Option 1: (China Telecom)
    - Counting based on physical slots and available slots (i.e., UL slots) for FDD and TDD respectively
    - QPSK 1/3 (MCS 4), 4PRB PUSCH allocation
    - Inter-slot frequency hopping enabled
    - DFT-S-OFDM and CP-OFDM
    - FR1 and FR2
* Recommended WF
  + Encourage comments

**Issue 1-1-3: Test metric for BS demodulation requirements for PUSCH repetition type A with 32 repetitions (if introduced)**

* *Status in the last meeting WF (R4-2203030):*
  + *Option 1: Test SNR at which the PUSCH achieves 70% of throughput*
  + *Other options are not precluded*
* Proposals:
  + Option 1: The required SNR at 2% BLER (China Telecom)
    - CTC: also used in RAN1 evaluation in TR 38.830, and it is also similar with the existing test metric for PUSCH repetition type A with 2 repetitions
* Recommended WF
  + Encourage comments

### Sub-topic 1-2: PUSCH TB over Multi Slots (TBoMS)

**Issue 1-2-1: Physical/available slots for BS requirements for PUSCH TBoMS**

* *Status in the last meeting WF (R4-2203030):*
  + *For FDD:*
    - *Option 1: 4 physical/available slots*
    - *Option 2: 8 available slots*
    - *Option 3: 2 available slots*
  + *For TDD:*
    - *Option 1: 4 available slots*
    - *Option 2: 2 available slots*
* Proposals:
  + For FDD:
    - Option 1: 4 available slots (Samsung, CTC, HW)
    - Option 2: 8 available slots (HW, Nokia)
    - Option 3: 2 available slots (E///, Intel)
  + For TDD:
    - Option 1: 4 available slots (CTC)
    - Option 2: 2 available slots (Samsung, E///, HW, Intel)

Samsung: the PUSCH requirement with TBoMS for TDD with 2 available slots can be applied for FDD with 2 available slots.

* + - Option 3: 8 available slots (Nokia)
* Recommended WF
  + To have unified test setup for FDD and TDD, can we agree to use 2 available slots for FDD and TDD.

**Issue 1-2-2: Repetition number for BS requirements for PUSCH TBoMS**

* *Status in the last meeting WF (R4-2203030):*
  + *Option 1: 4*
  + *Option 2: Not to consider repetition for TBoMS*
  + *Option 3: FFS after available slot number is agreed*
* Proposals:
  + Option 1: 4 (CTC)
  + Option 2: Not to consider repetition for TBoMS (Samsung, Nokia, HW, Intel)
* Recommended WF
  + Agree option 2?

**Issue 1-2-3: PRB number for BS requirements for PUSCH TBoMS**

* *Status in the last meeting WF (R4-2203030):*
  + *Option 1: Narrow PUSCH allocation*
    - *Option 1A: Single PRB PUSCH allocation*
    - *Option 1B: Non-single PRB allocation, i.e., 5 or 10 PRBs*
  + *Option 2: Full applicable test bandwidth*
  + *Option 3: FFS pending whether frequency hopping should be enabled*
* Proposals:
  + Option 1: Narrow PUSCH allocation (Samsung, Nokia, CTC, HW, Intel)
    - Option 1A: Single PRB PUSCH allocation (CTC)

CTC: Small PRB with high PSD is main use case for TBoMS

Samsung: With single PRB, if multiple slots is configured, the effective coding rate will be very low, which can be comparable with NB-IoT

* + - Option 1B: 4 PRBs (Nokia, CTC)
    - Option 1C: 5 PRBs (HW, CTC, Intel)
  + Option 2: (E///)
    - 15kHz SCS: 25 RBs for all channel bandwidths
    - 30kHz SCS: 24 RBs for all channel bandwidths
    - 60kHz and 120kHz SCS: 32 RBs for all channel bandwidths
* Recommended WF
  + Can we agree using 5 PRBs for BS requirements for PUSCH TBoMS?

**Issue 1-2-4: Inter-slot frequency hopping for BS requirements for PUSCH TBoMS**

* *Status in the last meeting WF (R4-2203030):*
  + *Option 1: Enabled*
  + *Option 2: Disabled*
  + *Option 3: FFS*
* Proposals:
  + Option 1: Enabled (CTC, Intel)
  + Option 2: Disabled (E///, HW)
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

**Issue 1-2-5: TDD UL-DL pattern and test applicability for BS requirements for PUSCH TBoMS**

* *Status in the last meeting WF (R4-2203030):*
  + *For 30kHz SCS:*
    - *7D1S2U, S=6D:4G:4U as starting point*
    - *As baseline, reuse the existing applicability for test requirement for different TDD UL-DL patterns.*
    - *The above sub-bullets can be further updated if technical issues are found*
  + *For 15kHz SCS:*
    - *FFS whether 15kHz SCS will be included*
* Proposals:
  + For FR1 15kHz SCS:
    - Option 1: 3D1S1U, S=10D:2G:2U (E///, CTC)
    - Option 2: No PUSCH requirement with TBoMS for TDD UL-DL pattern as 3D1SU in 15 kHz SCS. (Samsung, HW)
  + For FR1 30kHz SCS:
    - Option 1: 7D1S2U, S=6D:4G:4U (Samsung, E///, Nokia)
  + For FR2 60kHz SCS:
    - Option 1: DDSU, S=11D:3G:0U (E///)
    - Option 2: Use TDD UL-DL pattern with more UL slots in the test, e.g., DSUUU (CTC)
  + For FR2 120kHz SCS:
    - Option 1: 3D1S1U, S=10D:2G:2U (E///)
    - Option 2: Use TDD UL-DL pattern with more UL slots in the test, e.g., DSUUU (CTC)
    - Option3: Use the default 7D1S2U, S=6D:4G:4U pattern (Nokia)
* Recommended WF
  + For FR1 30 kHz SCS, agree on option 1.
  + For other SCSs, encourage more discussion.

**Issue 1-2-6: Transform precoding for BS requirements for PUSCH TBoMS**

* *Status in the last meeting WF (R4-2203030):*
  + *Option 1: Cover both DFT-S-OFDM and CP-OFDM*
  + *Option 2: CP-OFDM only*
  + *Option 3: Prioritize CP-OFDM*
* Proposals:
  + Option 1: Cover both DFT-S-OFDM and CP-OFDM (CTC)
  + Option 2: CP-OFDM only (Samsung, E///, Nokia, HW, Intel)
* Recommended WF
  + Cover CP-OFDM, FFS DFT-S-OFDM

**Issue 1-2-7: Whether to consider UCI multiplexing on PUSCH for TBoMS transmission**

* *Status in the last meeting WF (R4-2203030):*
  + *Option 1: Test PUSCH demodulation with UCI multiplexing for TBoMS transmission*
  + *Option 2: Not to test PUSCH demodulation with UCI multiplexing for TBoMS transmission*
  + *Option 3: FFS*
* Proposals:
  + Option 1: Not to test PUSCH demodulation with UCI multiplexing for TBoMS transmission (Samsung, E///, HW, Intel)
    - Nokia: The UCI on PUSCH multiplexing feature on top of the TBoMS PUSCH feature has some non-trivial performance interactions between the two features. It can be discussed, but priority is lower with respect to other requirements.
* Recommended WF
  + Agree not to test PUSCH demodulation with UCI multiplexing for TBoMS transmission

**Issue 1-2-8: Test requirement for FR1 and FR2 on PUSCH for TBoMS transmission**

* *Agreement in the last meeting WF (R4-2203030):*
  + *Cover both FR1 and FR2*
* Proposals:
  + Option 1: Cover both FR1 and FR2, with applying the existing test applicability rule (Samsung, Nokia)
* Recommended WF
  + Keep the previous agreement on covering both FR1 and FR2, and proponent of option 1 is encourage to further clarify what existing test applicability rule is proposed.

**Issue 1-2-9: MCS for TBoMS PUSCH demod test**

* *Status in the last meeting WF (R4-2203030):*
  + *Option 1: QPSK 1/3 MCS4*
  + *Option 2: MCS2*
* Proposals:
  + Option 1: MCS4 (QPSK 1/3) in 64QAM MCS table (Table 1) (Samsung, CTC, Intel)
    - Samsung: With TB processing over multi-slot, then effective coding rate is very low.
  + Option 2: MCS2 (QPSK 193/1024) in 64QAM MCS table (Table 1) (E///, HW)
* Recommended WF
  + Agree Option 1 with majority support?

**Issue 1-2-10: RV sequence for TBoMS PUSCH demod test**

* *Status in the last meeting WF (R4-2203030):*
  + *Option 1: [0 2 3 1]*
  + *Option 2: [0 3 0 3] in case two repetitions will be considered*
  + *Other options are not precluded pending on repetition number*
* Proposals:
  + Option 1: [0 2 3 1] in case no repetition is used (Samsung, E///, CTC, Intel)
    - CTC: RV sequence to be further adjust to ensure the effective sequence is also [0 2 3 1] in case repetition is enabled
  + Option 2: [0 0 0 0] and optionally [0 3 0 3] when no repetition is used (Nokia)
    - Nokia: New RV values can be chosen for HARQ re-transmissions, for re-transmissions it is advantageous to always use RV0, to be sure that systematic bits are contained
* Recommended WF
  + Agree option 1 with majority’s support?

**Issue 1-2-11: PUSCH mapping type for TBoMS PUSCH demod test**

* *Status in the last meeting WF (R4-2203030):*
  + *Option 1: Cover PUSCH mapping type A and type B*
  + *Option 2: Other options are not precluded*
* Proposals:
  + For FR1:
    - Option 1: Cover PUSCH mapping type A and type B (Samsung, E///, CTC, Intel)

Option 1A: Cover PUSCH mapping type A and type B with test applicability rule (Samsung)

* + For FR2:
    - Option 1: Cover PUSCH mapping type A and type B (CTC, Intel)
    - Option 2: Only cover PUSCH mapping type B (E///)
* Recommended WF
  + Check if we can we have the following agreements:
    - Cover PUSCH mapping type A and type B for both FR1 and FR2
    - Reuse the existing applicability rule for different configurations defined in 8.1.2.1.3 in TS 38.141-1 and TS 38.141-2 for FR1 and FR2, respectively.

**Issue 1-2-12: Antenna configuration for TBoMS PUSCH demod test**

* Proposals:
  + Option 1: 1T2R (E///)
* Recommended WF
  + Encourage feedback.

**Issue 1-2-13: Propagation condition for TBoMS PUSCH demod test**

* Proposals:
  + Option 1: TDLB100-400 Low for FR1 and TDLA30-300 Low for FR2 (E///)
* Recommended WF
  + Encourage feedback.

**Issue 1-2-14: Test metric for TBoMS PUSCH demod test**

* *Status in the last meeting WF (R4-2203030):*
  + *Option 1: Test SNR at which the PUSCH achieves 70% of throughput*
  + *Other options are not precluded*
* Proposals:
  + Option 1: Test SNR at which the PUSCH achieves 70% of throughput (Samsung, E///, Nokia, HW, Intel)
    - Samsung: For TBoMS feature, the design purpose is not to achieve high reliable probability.
  + Option 2: Include SNR point at 2% BLER as a candidate test metric and further decide based on simulation results (CTC)
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

**Issue 1-2-15: Other parameters for BS requirements for PUSCH TBoMS**

* *Status in the last meeting WF (R4-2203030):*
  + *Cover both FR1 and FR2*
  + *For other parameters, use the parameters in the following table as starting point*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| *Parameter* | | *Value* |
| *HARQ* | *Maximum number of HARQ transmissions* | *4* |
| *DM-RS* | *DM-RS configuration type* | *1* |
| *DM-RS duration* | *single-symbol DM-RS* |
| *Additional DM-RS position* | *pos1* |
| *Number of DM-RS CDM group(s) without data* | *2* |
| *Ratio of PUSCH EPRE to DM-RS EPRE* | *-3 dB* |
| *DM-RS port* | *0* |
| *DM-RS sequence generation* | *NID0=0, nSCID =0* |
| *Time domain resource assignment* |  |  |
| *Start symbol* | *0* |
| *Allocation length* | *14* |
| *Code block group based PUSCH transmission* | | *Disabled* |

* Proposals:
  + Proposal 1: (E///)
    - Test parameters for TBoMS in FR1: Same with the agreed start point parameters listed above
    - Test parameters for TBoMS in FR2:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Parameter | | Value |
| HARQ | Maximum number of HARQ transmissions | 4 |
| DM-RS | DM-RS configuration type | 1 |
|  | DM-RS duration | single-symbol DM-RS |
|  | Additional DM-RS symbols | pos0, pos1 |
|  | Number of DM-RS CDM group(s) without data | 2 |
|  | Ratio of PUSCH EPRE to DM-RS EPRE | -3 dB |
|  | DM-RS port(s) | {0} |
|  | DM-RS sequence generation | NID=0, nSCID =0 |
| Time domain | PUSCH mapping type | B |
| resource | Start symbol index | 0 |
| Allocation length | 10 |
| PT-RS | Frequency density (*KPT-RS*) | 2, Disabled |
| configuration | Time density (*LPT-RS*) | 1, Disabled |

* + Proposal 2 (Intel): Other parameters are same as for Rel-15 PUSCH tests (Table: 8.2.1.1-1 in 38.104)
* Recommended WF
  + Encourage feedback on the test parameter proposal for FR2.

### Sub-topic 1-3: PUSCH demodulation with Joint Channel Estimation (JCE)

**Issue 1-3-1: Actual TDW length for JCE in BS PUSCH demod requirements**

* *Status in the last meeting WF (R4-2203030):*
  + *For TDD* 
    - *Option 1: 2 consecutive slots*
    - *Other options are not precluded*
  + *For FDD*
    - *Option 1: 2 consecutive slots*
    - *Option 2: more than 2 consecutive slots*
    - *Option 3: 4 consecutive slots*
    - *Option 4: 8 consecutive slots*
    - *Other options are not precluded*
  + *Note: Slot number refers to the actual TDW number*
* Proposals:
  + For TDD
    - Option 1: 2 consecutive slots (Samsung, E///, Nokia, CTC, HW)

Samsung: the PUSCH requirement with JCE for TDD with 2 available slots can be applied for FDD with 2 available slots

* + - Option 2: 2 and 4 slots as starting point with further down selection based on results (Intel)
  + For FDD
    - Option 1: 2 consecutive slots (Samsung)
    - Option 2: 4 consecutive slots (Samsung, Nokia, HW)
    - Option 3: Test the maximum aTDW length, i.e., 8 slots (E///, HW)
    - Option 4: 16 consecutive slots (CTC, [MTK])

MTK: Some companies (including at least 1 BS vendor) have been pushing quite hard to specify up to 32 slots for the UE?

* + - Option 5: 2 and 4 slots as starting point with further down selection based on results (Intel)
* Recommended WF
  + Can we agree using aTDW length of 2 slots for TDD?
  + Further discussion is needed for FDD case.

**Issue 1-3-2: Configured TDW number for JCE in BS PUSCH demod requirements**

* *Status in the last meeting WF (R4-2203030):*
  + *For TDD* 
    - *Option 1: 4 slots*
    - *Other options are not precluded*
  + *For FDD*
    - *Option 1: 4 slots*
    - *Other options are not precluded*
* Proposals:
  + For TDD
    - Option 1: cTDW length is configured same as the aTDW length (Samsung, E///, HW)

Moderator’s note: based on available slot counting?

* + - Option 2: Use configured time domain window (cTDW) to be 32 slots (Nokia)

MTK: Why is a cTDW size not at least as large as the maximum consecutive slot size

* + For FDD
    - Option 1: cTDW length is configured same as the aTDW length (Samsung, E///, HW)
    - Option 2: Use configured time domain window (cTDW) to be 8 slots (Nokia)
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

**Issue 1-3-3: PUSCH repetition type for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**

* *Status in the last meeting WF (R4-2203030):*
  + *Agree to use Back-to-back PUSCH transmissions*
  + *Repetition Type will be further discussed*
* Proposals:
  + Option 1: RAN4 apply repetition type A for requirement with JCE (Samsung, E///, CTC, Intel, [HW])
    - HW: Only consider one typical repetition type
    - MTK: Why is non-back to back PUSCH not being considered, when a few companies (including 1 BS vendor) have been pushing very hard to define complex requirements on the UE for such a case?
* Recommended WF
  + Can we agree RAN4 only apply repetition type A for requirement with JCE?

**Issue 1-3-4: PUSCH repetition number for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**

* Proposals:
  + Option 1: the same as aTDW length for JCE (CTC, E///)
  + Option 2: 8 for TDD and 8 for FDD (Nokia)
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

**Issue 1-3-5: PRB number for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**

* *Status in the last meeting WF (R4-2203030):*
  + *Option 1: 4 PRB*
  + *Option 2: Full applicable test bandwidth*
* Proposals:
  + Option 1: 4 PRB (CTC, HW, Intel)
  + Option 2: Full applicable test bandwidth (Samsung, E///, Nokia)
    - Samsung: With large number of PRB, the channel estimation performance can be improved
    - E///: Align with the existing PUSCH related tests.
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

**Issue 1-3-6: Inter-slot frequency hopping for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**

* *Status in the last meeting WF (R4-2203030):*
  + *Option 1: Enabled*
  + *Option 2: Disabled*
* Proposals:
  + Option 1: Enabled with hopping with interval length equal to 2 slots for TDD and 4 for FDD (Nokia)
    - Nokia: RAN1 agreed to have a new configuration to set a frequency hopping interval, i.e., it is no longer needed to hop at each slot, which enable aTDW>1 with FH enabled
  + Option 2: Disabled for TDD and FDD (Samsung, E///, HW, Intel)
    - E///: Frequency hopping is an event of violating power consistency and phase continuity
  + Option 3: Disabled for TDD, and enabled for FDD (CTC)
* Recommended WF
  + Can we agree option 2 with majority’s support?

**Issue 1-3-7: TDD UL-DL pattern for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**

* *Status in the last meeting WF (R4-2203030):*
  + *For 30KHz SCS*
    - *Option 1: 7D1S2U, S=6D:4G:4U*
    - *Option 2: Depend on the slot number for JCE*
  + *For 15KHz SCS*
    - *Option 1: Reuse the pattern in the spec, i.e., 3D1S1U, S=10D:2G:2U*
    - *Option 2: Consider other TDD patterns*
* Proposals:
  + For FR1 15KHz SCS
    - Option 1: Define new TDD pattern with multiple contiguous UL slots (E///)
    - Option 2: No PUCCH requirement with JCE for TDD UL-DL pattern as 3D1SU in 15 KHz SCS. (Samsung, HW)

Samsung: For TDD pattern 3D1S1U in 15 KHz SCS, DMRS bundling is not feasible.

* + For FR1 30kHz SCS:
    - Option 1: 7D1S2U, S=6D:4G:4U (Samsung, E///, Nokia, HW)
  + MTK: Why is a maximum of 2ms of UL consecutive transmissions being considered when companies are asking the UE to support up to 32ms?For FR2 60/120 kHz SCS:
    - Option 1: Define new TDD pattern with multiple contiguous UL slots (E///)
* Recommended WF
  + For FR1 15 kHz SCS: further discuss
  + For FR1 30 kHz SCS: agree option 1?
  + For FR2 60/120 kHz SCS: agree option 1, and inputs on the candidate new TDD patterns are encouraged.

**Issue 1-3-8: Transform precoding for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**

* *Status in the last meeting WF (R4-2203030):*
  + *Option 1: Cover both DFT-s-OFDM and CP-OFDM*
  + *Option 2: CP-OFDM only*
  + *Option 3: Prioritize CP-OFDM*
  + *Option 4: FFS whether DFT-s-OFDM should be included*
* Proposals:
  + Option 1: Cover both DFT-S-OFDM and CP-OFDM (CTC, [MTK])
  + Option 2: CP-OFDM only (Samsung, E///, Nokia, HW, Intel)
* Recommended WF
  + Include CP-OFDM, FFS on DFT-S-OFDM

**Issue 1-3-9: MCS for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**

* *Status in the last meeting WF (R4-2203030):*
  + *Option 1: QPSK 1/3 MCS 4*
  + *Option 2: MCS2*
  + *Option 3: Use configuration of existing Rel-16 PUSCH requirements with repetition Type A as the starting point*
* Proposals:
  + Option 1: QPSK 1/3 MCS 4 (CTC, Intel)
  + Option 2: MCS2 (Intel)
  + Option 3: Use configuration of existing Rel-16 PUSCH requirements with repetition Type A as the starting point, i.e., QPSK 99/1024 MCS 5 in MCS Table 3 (Samsung, HW)
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

**Issue 1-3-10: Propagation condition for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**

* Proposals:
  + Option 1: TDLB100-400 Low for FR1 (E///)
* Recommended WF
  + Encourage feedback

**Issue 1-3-11: Antenna configuration for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**

* Proposals:
  + Option 1: 1T2R for FR1 (E///)
* Recommended WF
  + Encourage feedback

**Issue 1-3-12: Frequency range coverage for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**

* Proposals:
  + Option 1: Cover both FR1 and FR2 (CTC)
* Recommended WF
  + Encourage feedback

**Issue 1-3-13: PUSCH mapping type for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**

* Proposals:
  + Option 1: Cover PUSCH mapping type A and type B for FR1 (Intel, E///, Samsung, HW)
* Recommended WF
  + Cover PUSCH mapping type A and type B for FR1
  + Further discuss for FR2

**Issue 1-3-14: Additional DM-RS position for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**

* Proposals:
  + Option 1: DMRS 1+1 (E///)
  + Option 2: Decide whether to use 1+0 or 1+1 DMRS symbol based on companies’ simulation results, and select one that achieves larger PUSCH performance gain with JCE compared with PUSCH performance without JCE. (CTC)
* Recommended WF
  + Can we agree option 2 for initial simulation purpose?

**Issue 1-3-15: Phase and power offset modelling for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**

* Proposals:
  + Phase offset model:
    - Proposal 1: Model smaller number of phase offset compared to the UE RF requirements in the BS demodulation requirements, and the exact number can be further discussed in the next meeting pending on the inputs from TE side (CTC)
    - Proposal 2: Consider how to take into account the presence of frequency error in the UL signal for BS demodulation, as part of the channel estimation (MTK)
  + Power offset model
    - Option 1: Do not model the power error when defining BS demod requirement. (CTC)

CTC: Power offset has marginal impact on the link simulation results

* Recommended WF
  + Encourage feedback

**Issue 1-3-16: Receiver implementation for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**

* Proposals:
  + Option 1: In case big misalignment will be observed for JCE simulations, consider the following reference receiver for definition of minimum requirements: DMRS symbols from previous (if available) and current slots are used for channel estimation on Data REs at current slot. (Intel)
* Recommended WF
  + Encourage feedback

**Issue 1-3-17: Test metric for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**

* *Status in the last meeting WF (R4-2203030):*
  + *Option 1: Test SNR at which the PUSCH achieves 70% of throughput*
  + *Other options are not precluded*
* Proposals:
  + Option 1: Test SNR at which the PUSCH achieves 70% of throughput (Samsung, E///, Nokia, HW)
  + Option 2: Include SNR point at a certain BLER as a candidate test metric and further decide based on simulation results (CTC, Intel)
    - Option 2A: SNR point at 2% BLER (CTC)
    - Option 2B: SNR point at 1% BLER (Intel)
* Recommended WF
  + Can we agree to use both option 1 and 2B for initial simulation purpose, and make decision on the test metric in the next meeting?

**Issue 1-3-18: Other parameters for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**

* Proposals:
  + Proposal 1: Use configuration of existing Rel-16 PUSCH requirements with repetition Type A as the starting point (Samsung, HW)
  + Proposal 2: Other parameters (DMRS and time domain resource allocation) are same as for Rel-15 PUSCH tests (Intel)
  + Proposal 3: (E///)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Parameter | | Value |
| HARQ | Maximum number of HARQ transmissions | 4 |
| RV sequence | 0, 3, 0, 3 for TDD  0, 0, 0, 0 for FDD |
| DM-RS | DM-RS configuration type | 1 |
| DM-RS duration | single-symbol DM-RS |
| Number of DM-RS CDM group(s) without data | 2 |
| Ratio of PUSCH EPRE to DM-RS EPRE | -3 dB |
| DM-RS port | {0} |
| DM-RS sequence generation | NID0=0, nSCID =0 |
| Time domain | Start symbol | 0 |
| Resource allocation | Allocation length | 14 |
| Code block group based PUSCH transmission | | Disabled |

* + Proposal 4: Use large TDRA, e.g., 14 slot PUSCH TDRA (Nokia)
* Recommended WF
  + Check whether parameters in Proposal 2 can be agreed as a start point.

### Sub-topic 1-4: PUSCH Enhancements for Type A PUSCH repetitions for Msg3

**Issue 1-4-1: Whether to define PUSCH demodulation requirements for Msg3 repetition**

* *Status in the last meeting discussion summary (R4-2203117):*
  + Option 1: Consider type A PUSCH repetition for Msg 3 with inter-slot frequency hopping requirement, FFS on requirement with intra-slot frequency hopping
  + Option 2: No
* Proposals:
  + Option 1: Not to consider type A PUSCH repetition for Msg 3 with inter-slot frequency hopping requirement, FFS on requirement with intra-slot frequency hopping (E///, Nokia)
* Recommended WF
  + Not to consider type A PUSCH repetition for Msg 3 with inter-slot frequency hopping requirement
  + Discuss further to consider requirement with intra-slot frequency hopping

### Sub-topic 1-5: Redcap BS demodulation for NR coverage enhancement demodulation

**Issue 1-5-1: Whether to new BS demodulation requirement for Redcap UE**

* Proposals:
  + Option 1: Do not define new BS demodulation requirement for Redcap UE (E///)
* Recommended WF
  + Encourage feedback.

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Company A | Sub-topic 1-1: PUSCH repetition type A with 32 repetitions  **Issue 1-1-1: Whether to define BS demodulation requirements for PUSCH repetition type A with 32 repetitions**  **Issue 1-1-2: Parameters for BS requirements for PUSCH repetition type A with 32 repetitions (if introduced)**  **Issue 1-1-3: Test metric for BS demodulation requirements for PUSCH repetition type A with 32 repetitions (if introduced)**  Sub-topic 1-2: PUSCH TB over Multi Slots (TBoMS)  **Issue 1-2-1: Physical/available slots for BS requirements for PUSCH TboMS**  **Issue 1-2-2: Repetition number for BS requirements for PUSCH TBoMS**  **Issue 1-2-3: PRB number for BS requirements for PUSCH TBoMS**  **Issue 1-2-4: Inter-slot frequency hopping for BS requirements for PUSCH TBoMS**  **Issue 1-2-5: TDD UL-DL pattern and test applicability for BS requirements for PUSCH TBoMS**  **Issue 1-2-6: Transform precoding for BS requirements for PUSCH TBoMS**  **Issue 1-2-7: Whether to consider UCI multiplexing on PUSCH for TBoMS transmission**  **Issue 1-2-8: Test requirement for FR1 and FR2 on PUSCH for TBoMS transmission**  **Issue 1-2-9: MCS for TBoMS PUSCH demod test**  **Issue 1-2-10: RV sequence for TBoMS PUSCH demod test**  **Issue 1-2-11: PUSCH mapping type for TBoMS PUSCH demod test**  **Issue 1-2-12: Antenna configuration for TBoMS PUSCH demod test**  **Issue 1-2-13: Propagation condition for TBoMS PUSCH demod test**  **Issue 1-2-14: Test metric for TBoMS PUSCH demod test**  **Issue 1-2-15: Other parameters for BS requirements for PUSCH TBoMS** Sub-topic 1-3: PUSCH demodulation with Joint Channel Estimation (JCE) **Issue 1-3-1: Actual TDW length for JCE in BS PUSCH demod requirements**  **Issue 1-3-2: Configured TDW number for JCE in BS PUSCH demod requirements**  **Issue 1-3-3: PUSCH repetition type for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**  **Issue 1-3-4: PUSCH repetition number for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**  **Issue 1-3-5: PRB number for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**  **Issue 1-3-6: Inter-slot frequency hopping for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**  **Issue 1-3-7: TDD UL-DL pattern for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**  **Issue 1-3-8: Transform precoding for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**  **Issue 1-3-9: MCS for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**  **Issue 1-3-10: Propagation condition for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**  **Issue 1-3-11: Antenna configuration for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**  **Issue 1-3-12: Frequency range coverage for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**  **Issue 1-3-13: PUSCH mapping type for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**  **Issue 1-3-14: Additional DM-RS position for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**  **Issue 1-3-15: Phase and power offset modelling for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**  **Issue 1-3-16: Receiver implementation for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**  **Issue 1-3-17: Test metric for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**  **Issue 1-3-18: Other parameters for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**  Sub-topic 1-4: PUSCH Enhancements for Type A PUSCH repetitions for Msg3  **Issue 1-4-1: Whether to define PUSCH demodulation requirements for Msg3 repetition**  Sub-topic 1-5: Redcap BS demodulation for NR coverage enhancement demodulation  **Issue 1-5-1: Whether to new BS demodulation requirement for Redcap UE** |
| Intel | Sub-topic 1-1: PUSCH repetition type A with 32 repetitions  **Issue 1-1-1: Whether to define BS demodulation requirements for PUSCH repetition type A with 32 repetitions**  Support Option 2. In comparison to Rel-16 URLLC requirements, the main change is number of repetitions. However, the processing itself is same and already verified  Sub-topic 1-2: PUSCH TB over Multi Slots (TBoMS)  **Issue 1-2-1: Physical/available slots for BS requirements for PUSCH TboMS**  Agree with the recommended WF.  **Issue 1-2-2: Repetition number for BS requirements for PUSCH TBoMS**  Agree with the recommended WF.  **Issue 1-2-3: PRB number for BS requirements for PUSCH TBoMS**  Agree with the recommended WF.  **Issue 1-2-4: Inter-slot frequency hopping for BS requirements for PUSCH TBoMS**  Both options are fine for us. Slightly prefer Option 1. The main purpose is to verify the TBoMS functionality which can be covered by any configuration of Inter-slot frequency hopping.  **Issue 1-2-5: TDD UL-DL pattern and test applicability for BS requirements for PUSCH TBoMS**  We think that we can check the performance in case the typical TDD patterns are used:   * FR1 15 kHz: 3D1S1U, S=10D:2G:2U * FR1 30 kHz: 7D1S2U, S=6D:4G:4U * FR2 60 and 120 kHz: 3D1S1U, S=10D:2G:2U   **Issue 1-2-6: Transform precoding for BS requirements for PUSCH TBoMS**  Support Option 2 and fine with recommended WF. TBoMS feature is agnostic to waveform. Therefore, definition of requirements for CP-OFDM should be sufficient.  **Issue 1-2-7: Whether to consider UCI multiplexing on PUSCH for TBoMS transmission**  Support the recommended WF.  **Issue 1-2-9: MCS for TBoMS PUSCH demod test**  Prefer Option 1. However, we don’t have any technical concern for Option 2. Based on comments from 1st round we can check which option is more supported.  **Issue 1-2-10: RV sequence for TBoMS PUSCH demod test**  Support the Option 1 as typical configuration. Also, taking into account that MCSs with CR 1/3 or lower are consider, the difference between different RV indexes is order of systematic and parity bits in transmission, because original coding rate at the output of LDPC decoder is 1/3 (before rate matching).  **Issue 1-2-11: PUSCH mapping type for TBoMS PUSCH demod test**  Support the recommended WF  **Issue 1-2-12: Antenna configuration for TBoMS PUSCH demod test**  We are fine with Option 1. Also, we suggest to consider existing applicability rule for antenna connection.  **Issue 1-2-13: Propagation condition for TBoMS PUSCH demod test**  Channel models with low speed conditions can considered as one of candidates: TDLA30-10 for FR1 and TDLA30-75 for FR2  **Issue 1-2-14: Test metric for TBoMS PUSCH demod test**  We think that throughput test metric is sufficient to verify correct processing.  **Issue 1-2-15: Other parameters for BS requirements for PUSCH TBoMS**  For FR2, probably we can focus on requirements with one DMRS and one PT-RS configuration, for example DMRS 1+1 and without PT-RS. But we are open to further discuss. Sub-topic 1-3: PUSCH demodulation with Joint Channel Estimation (JCE) **Issue 1-3-1: Actual TDW length for JCE in BS PUSCH demod requirements**  Probably we can consider 2 as starting point and check whether JCE provide the testable performance benefits (>= 1dB) over the basic per slot CE. If not, we can consider another value.  **Issue 1-3-2: Configured TDW number for JCE in BS PUSCH demod requirements**  Support Option 1 to simplify the test design.  **Issue 1-3-3: PUSCH repetition type for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**  Support Option 1.  **Issue 1-3-4: PUSCH repetition number for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**  Support Option 1 to simplify test design.  **Issue 1-3-5: PRB number for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**  At current stage, we support Option 1 because this feature is related to coverage limited UEs and narrow allocation is more practical.  **Issue 1-3-6: Inter-slot frequency hopping for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**  Our original proposal is Option 2, but we are also fine to double check the Option 1 (whether it is supported for DMRS bundling feature).  **Issue 1-3-7: TDD UL-DL pattern for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**  Support Recommended WF. As for FR1 15 kHz, we can double check the typical TDD patterns (except DDDSU). For example, in LTE, we have DDSUU pattern  **Issue 1-3-8: Transform precoding for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**  Support the recommended WF. Same comment as for TBoMS discussion.  **Issue 1-3-9: MCS for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**  We are fine to check the JCE for different options and decide later based on simulation results.  **Issue 1-3-10: Propagation condition for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**  Probably low speed conditions can be considered as another option: TDLA30-10 for FR1 and TDLA30-75 for FR2  **Issue 1-3-11: Antenna configuration for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**  Support Option 1  **Issue 1-3-12: Frequency range coverage for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**  Support Option 1  **Issue 1-3-13: PUSCH mapping type for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**  Agree with recommended WF. For FR2, probably we can consider Type B only, i.e. similar to Rel-15 requirements  **Issue 1-3-14: Additional DM-RS position for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**  We are fine with Option 2  **Issue 1-3-15: Phase and power offset modelling for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**  As for phase offset, we need more time to check. As for power offset, we agree with option 1.  **Issue 1-3-16: Receiver implementation for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**  In case the big misalignment will be observed for results submitted by companies we think that it will be beneficial to have more discussion on receiver assumptions for minimum requirements definition.  **Issue 1-3-17: Test metric for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**  We are fine with the recommended WF.  **Issue 1-3-18: Other parameters for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**  Just comment for FR2 assumptions, we just realized that non-full slot allocation is considered (i.e. 10 symbols). Therefore, we suggest to consider full slot allocation for JCE test to avoid the phase continuity issue. Also, it is probably better to focus on one DMRS and PTRS configuration (for example, 1+1 and no PTRS).  Sub-topic 1-4: PUSCH Enhancements for Type A PUSCH repetitions for Msg3  **Issue 1-4-1: Whether to define PUSCH demodulation requirements for Msg3 repetition**  Support the recommended WF.  Sub-topic 1-5: Redcap BS demodulation for NR coverage enhancement demodulation  **Issue 1-5-1: Whether to new BS demodulation requirement for Redcap UE**  Support Option 1. |
| Samsung | Issue 1-1-1:  We support option2. From the baseband processing perspective, existing Rel-16 test case can fulfill the verification of multi-slot combination functionality. Increasing the number of repetition, there is no impact on the BS implementation with different repetition configuration.  Although the number of repetition can be up to 16. There is no PUSCH requirement with 16 repetition in Rel-16.  Issue 1-1-2  Pending on issue 1-1-1  Issue 1-1-3  Pending on issue 1-1-1  Issue 1-2-1  Since the available UL slots in FDD is more than TDD, we can apply 4 for FDD, middle of 2 and 8.  Issue 1-2-2  We are ok with recommended WF  Issue 1-2-3  We support option 1. Since the motivation of TBoMS feature is to improve the cell edge UE performance with reducing the coding rate, it should be more typical to apply narrow PUSCH allocation for PUSCH with TBoMS. We can go with option 1C as recommended WF  Issue 1-2-4  We support option 2, disable the inter-slot frequency hopping, similar as existing BS PUSCH requirement test setup  We do not need to define requirement with combining two different features together  Issue 1-2-5  OK with option 1 for 30KHz SCS  For 15KHz, based on existing TDD pattern as DDDSU, the processing delay will be increasing if configured large number of slot. Based on existing TDD pattern, with preferred 2 available slots, the processing delay will be up to 5 slots. Therefore, we prefer to not define PUSCH with TBoMS transmission with TDD pattern as DDDSU in 15 KHz. If 15KHz TDD requirement, other TDD pattern with more UL slots can be selected.  For 60KHz and 120KHz SCS, we prefer using 7D1S2U, since 2 continuous slots are available  Issue 1-2-6  Support with option 2. There is no difference processing foresee for CP-OFDM and DFT-s-OFDM in terms of TBoMS feature. Therefore, from TBoMS functionality verification perspective, we think selecting one of waveform for requirement can fulfill the test purpose. Similar as Rel-16 WIs, CP-OFDM waveform can be considered for PUSCH requirement with TBoMS transmission  Issue 1-2-7  OK with option 1  Issue 1-2-8  OK with option 1. The same test applicanilty rule as  “Unless otherwise stated, PUSCH requirement tests shall apply only for each subcarrier spacing declared to be supported (see D.7 in table 4.6-1).  ”  Where D.7 is BS supported SCS and channel bandwidth per supported SCS, Declared for each beam (D.3) and each *operating band* (D.4).  Issue 1-2-9  We are ok with recommended WF  Issue 1-2-10  We support option 1. We prefer to only define PUSCH requirement with TBoMS transmission without repetition, the legacy RV sequence with [0 2 3 1] can be reused as starting point.  Issue 1-2-11  Ok with FR1. For FR2, we suggest to define requirement with typical scenario as mapping type B, There is no requirement for mapping type A, reusing the existing configuration in FR2.  Issue 1-2-12  Ok with option 1  Issue 1-2-13  We can apply option 1 as start point  Issue 1-2-14  We support option 1, either option 1 or option 2 can fulfil the TBoMS functionality verification. Since the design purpose of TBoMS feature is not to achieve high reliable probability, we apply the exiting test metric as 70% of TP  Issue 1-2-15  Ok with the test parameters for TBoMS in FR1  Regarding test parameters in FR2, since low MCS with QPSK is considered for requirement, the PTRS can be disable, where the phase noise impact is minor for QPSK  Issue 1-3-1  For TDD with 30KHz SCS, existing TDD pattern is 7D1S2U, only 2 consecutive slots is available. Therefore, we prefer to apply 2 slots in TDD  For FDD, with large number of slots, power consistency and phase continuity should be maintained for UE side, which is determined by UE. If the power consistency and phase continuity is violated, the gain coming from JCE is limited. Therefore, with considering trade-off of performance and implementation complexity, we prefer to apply small number slot for JCE. Repetition number of 2 is considered for Rel-16 URLLC, we prefer to apply the same value as 2. We are also fine with FDD with 4  Issue 1-3-2  We support option 1 for both FDD and TDD. Regarding the configured TDW length, it is determined by gNB. Since across non-consecutive slots is not supported for PUSCH with JCE in Rel-17, we prefer to apply the cTDW length is configured same as the actual TDW length. As preferred, since only 2 consecutive slots is available, we can use 2  The cTDW length is based on available slot counting  Issue 1-3-3  We support option 1 and recommended WF. Regarding PUSCH repetition type, both PUSCH repetition type A and Type B can be supported for JCE. Since there is no requirement for PUSCH repetition B in Rel-16 URLLC, we prefer to define PUSCH requirement with JCE only based on repetition type A.  Issue 1-3-4  We support option 1  Issue 1-3-5  Regarding the number of PRB, there is no limitation for JCE. With large number of bandwidth, the channel estimation performance can be improved. Since small number is preferred for requirement with TBoMS as preferred, to differentiate with PUSCH requirement with TBoMS, we can configure full applicable test bandwidth for PUSCH requirement with JCE  Issue 1-3-6  We support option 2 and recommended WF. With inter-slot frequency hopping, the power consistency and phase continuously will be impacted. It is not feasible to apply DMRS bundling for joint channel estimation with small number of slots. Therefore, we prefer to disable inter-slot frequency hopping for PUSCH with JCE.  Issue 1-3-7  For FR1 15KHz TDD with other TDD pattern where more than 2 continuous UL is available, from baseband processing with JCE, there is no different with FDD. So, if RAN4 agree to introduce TDD with 15KHz SCS requirement, we can add a note PUSCH requirement with FDD under aTDW as 2 can apply for the requirement with TDD, no additional simulation effort is needed,  Issue 1-3-8  We support option 2, there is no difference processing foresee for CP-OFDM and DFT-s-OFDM in terms of DMRS bundling feature. Therefore, from DMRS bundling with JCE functionality verification perspective, we think selecting one of waveform for requirement can fulfil the test purpose. Similar as Rel-16 WIs, CP-OFDM waveform can be considered for PUSCH requirement with JCE  Issue 1-3-9  Since repetition transmission is available for JCE, we can apply the configuration of existing Rel-16 PUSCH requirements with repetition Type A to compare performance improvement with JCE.  We are also ok with Option 1 to apply large MCS with high coding rate.  Issue 1-3-10  We are fine with option 1, for FR2, TDLA30-300 can be considered  Issue 1-3-11  Ok with option 1  Issue 1-3-12  We are fine with option 1. Regarding BS conformance test, we prefer to define test applicability rule to reduce the test effort pending on BS declaration.  Issue 1-3-13  We are ok with option 1  Regarding FR2, we prefer to use the same configuration as Rel-15, since type B is more typical scenario for FR2. So, only considering mapping type B for FR2  Issue 1-3-14  We are fine with option 2 as starting point for initial simulation purpose  Issue 1-3-15  In our understanding, during test, the phase offset model will be covered by TE side, The test uncertainty can cover the phase offset impact. For BS demodulation requirement definition, we just use the ideal phase offset to derive requirement. Similar with TTI bundling in LTE, or NB-IoT with repetition, there is no assumption for phase noise model.  For Power offset model, we are fine with option 1 no model power offset model.  Issue 1-3-16  In our understanding, the receiver is up to BS implementation. We can check simulation results firstly.  Issue 1-3-17  We support option 1, Since the targeting of JCE is not for high reliability, the existing test metric with SNR@70%TP can be reused  Issue 1-3-18  Excepting for MCS, RV and number of HARQ, option 1 and option 2 is same. We can futher discussion pending the conclusion above values.  Issue 1-4-1  From the BS baseband processing perspective, there is no difference foresee between Msg3 PUSCH and PUSCH scheduled with UE in RRC\_CONNECTED, only different is the payload and scheduled MCS. So, We are ok with not to consider type A PUSCH repletion for Msg3 with inter-slot frequency hopping requirement  Regarding the requirement with intra-slot frequency hopping, Considering there is no basic requirement for PUSCH without repetition transmission for intra-slot frequency hopping, we think it is not necessary to define requirement with intra-slot frequency hopping  In summary, we prefer no PUSCH demodulation requirements for Msg3 repetition  Issue 1-5-1  We are fine with option 1, since Rel-15 has already defined the minimum number of CBWs for each SCS and 1 Tx requirement, which can cover the BS demodulation requirement for RedCap |
| China Telecom | Sub-topic 1-1: PUSCH repetition type A with 32 repetitions  **Issue 1-1-1: Whether to define BS demodulation requirements for PUSCH repetition type A with 32 repetitions**  We proposed to define PUSCH repetition type A test with 32 repetitions is mainly because it has large performance gain compared with the existing PUSCH repetition test with only 2 repetitions.  However, considering the majorities’ view, we are ok to give our compromise not to define PUSCH repetition type A test with 32 repetitions.  Sub-topic 1-2: PUSCH TB over Multi Slots (TBoMS)  **Issue 1-2-1: Physical/available slots for BS requirements for PUSCH TboMS**  We can compromise to the recommended WF.  **Issue 1-2-2: Repetition number for BS requirements for PUSCH TBoMS**  We can compromise to the recommended WF.  **Issue 1-2-3: PRB number for BS requirements for PUSCH TBoMS**  We support narrow PUSCH allocation. We agree with the recommended WF.  **Issue 1-2-4: Inter-slot frequency hopping for BS requirements for PUSCH TBoMS**  We support to enable Inter-slot frequency hopping for TBoMS test. Unlike JCE test, frequency hopping does not bring any issue and it will purely achieve better performance.  **Issue 1-2-5: TDD UL-DL pattern and test applicability for BS requirements for PUSCH TBoMS**  For FR1 30 kHz SCS, fine with option 1.  We support to include TBoMS test for FR1 15kHz SCS and we support option 1 as a start point. TBoMS can be enabled regardless of TDD pattern or SCS. Whether BS will use TBoMS under 15kHz SCS with higher latency is depending on the real channel condition.  We are open to discuss the TDD pattern for FR2 60/120kHz SCS, the reason we proposed option 2 is because DSUUU is also a practical configuration for UL major situations and it can bring lower latency comparing with the TDD pattern we used for the existing Rel-15 tests, i.e., DDDSU.  **Issue 1-2-6: Transform precoding for BS requirements for PUSCH TBoMS**  We can compromise to the recommended WF.  **Issue 1-2-7: Whether to consider UCI multiplexing on PUSCH for TBoMS transmission**  Fine with the recommended WF.  **Issue 1-2-8: Test requirement for FR1 and FR2 on PUSCH for TBoMS transmission**  Based on the clarification from Samsung, we are fine with option 1 with reusing the existing test applicability rule for different subcarrier spacings defined in 8.1.2.1.1 in 38.141-1 for FR1 and 38.141-2 for FR2.  **Issue 1-2-9: MCS for TBoMS PUSCH demod test**  We agree with the recommended WF. Our main concern is that the features we are testing will have better performance result in lower SNR working points. If we reuse the MCS from Rel-15 test cases, the SNR points may be very low.  **Issue 1-2-10: RV sequence for TBoMS PUSCH demod test**  Fine with the recommended WF.  **Issue 1-2-11: PUSCH mapping type for TBoMS PUSCH demod test**  Generally fine with the recommended WF.  For PUSCH mapping type for FR2 tests, more specifically, we propose to cover mapping type A and type B for BS type 1-O and only cover mapping B for BS type 2-O, which is aligned with the existing Rel-15 test cases.  **Issue 1-2-12: Antenna configuration for TBoMS PUSCH demod test**  Considering the SNR working point will be too low for more than 2 Rx ports, we are fine to only consider 1T2R antenna configuration.  **Issue 1-2-13: Propagation condition for TBoMS PUSCH demod test**  We agree with Intel to cover both high and low speed channel model for simulation, and we can further make down-selection to only use one based on which model provides more performance gain.  **Issue 1-2-14: Test metric for TBoMS PUSCH demod test**  Support option 2 at this stage and we can make further down-selection based on simulation results. Sub-topic 1-3: PUSCH demodulation with Joint Channel Estimation (JCE) **Issue 1-3-1: Actual TDW length for JCE in BS PUSCH demod requirements**  For TDD, fine with option 1 as a start point.  For FDD, based on the latest agreements in RAN4 Core part, UE can support as large as 16 slot for DMRS bundling:   |  | | --- | | **Issue 2-1: Length of maximum duration**  Agreement: For UE capability, the set of values of duration lengths are   * For TDD, {5, 8}   + FFS: 16 * For FDD, {5, 8, 16, [32]} |   As a result, we support to test 16 consecutive slots for PUSCH JCE test for FDD to have the best performance gain.  **Issue 1-3-2: Configured TDW number for JCE in BS PUSCH demod requirements**  To simplify, we are fine with option 1 for TDD and FDD.  **Issue 1-3-3: PUSCH repetition type for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**  Fine with the recommended WF.  **Issue 1-3-4: PUSCH repetition number for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**  We are fine with option 1.  **Issue 1-3-5: PRB number for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**  We proposed 4 PRBs which is more aligned with practical usage of PUSCH JCE.  However, based on companies’ views that channel estimation can have better performance and also considering the test coverage of different PUSCH resource allocation, we are also fine with using full PRB allocation for PUSCH JCE test.  **Issue 1-3-6: Inter-slot frequency hopping for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**  We can compromise to the recommended WF.  **Issue 1-3-7: TDD UL-DL pattern for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**  For FR1 15 kHz SCS: We support option 1, and TDD pattern of DSUUU is proposed.  For FR1 30 kHz SCS: Agree option 1.  For FR2 60/120 kHz SCS: We support option 1, and TDD pattern of DSUUU is proposed.  **Issue 1-3-8: Transform precoding for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**  We can compromise to the recommended WF.  **Issue 1-3-9: MCS for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**  Similar concern as expressed in Issue 1-2-9. We can decide using MCS 4 or MCS 2 based on simulation results.  **Issue 1-3-10: Propagation condition for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**  Same comment as in Issue 1-2-13.  **Issue 1-3-11: Antenna configuration for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**  Same comment as in Issue 1-2-12.  **Issue 1-3-12: Frequency range coverage for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**  Support option 1.  **Issue 1-3-13: PUSCH mapping type for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**  We support option 1 for FR1.  For PUSCH mapping type for FR2 tests, more specifically, we propose to cover mapping type A and type B for BS type 1-O and only cover mapping B for BS type 2-O, which is aligned with the existing Rel-15 test cases.  **Issue 1-3-14: Additional DM-RS position for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**  Support the recommended WF.  **Issue 1-3-15: Phase and power offset modelling for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**  We think phase offset model should be considered in the test requirement, and we are open to discuss whether this should be modelled for simulation or can be simply specified in the test uncertainty.  We propose no need to consider Power offset.  **Issue 1-3-16: Receiver implementation for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**  We suggest to come back to this issue if large mis-aliment of companies’ simulation result is observed.  **Issue 1-3-17: Test metric for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**  Support the recommended WF.  **Issue 1-3-18: Other parameters for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**  Sub-topic 1-4: PUSCH Enhancements for Type A PUSCH repetitions for Msg3  **Issue 1-4-1: Whether to define PUSCH demodulation requirements for Msg3 repetition**  We are fine not to consider type A PUSCH repetition for Msg 3 test. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Sub-topic 1-1: PUSCH repetition type A with 32 repetitions  **Issue 1-1-1: Whether to define BS demodulation requirements for PUSCH repetition type A with 32 repetitions**  Support option 2: The increase of number of repetitions does not impact BS implementation.  **Issue 1-1-2: Parameters for BS requirements for PUSCH repetition type A with 32 repetitions (if introduced)**  **Issue 1-1-3: Test metric for BS demodulation requirements for PUSCH repetition type A with 32 repetitions (if introduced)**  Sub-topic 1-2: PUSCH TB over Multi Slots (TBoMS)  **Issue 1-2-1: Physical/available slots for BS requirements for PUSCH TboMS**  The most common use case for TBoMS would be VoIP; small periodic and delay tolerant packets. The voice packet is generated every 20 ms. Assuming the default tdd ul-dl pattern (7DSUU), we have 8 available UL slots for FR1 (SCS 30 kHz) and 32 available slots for FR2 (SCS 120kHz) before a new packet is generated.  This means that TBoMS could be applied over 8 slots in both FR1 and FR2 before a new voice packet is generated.  Hence our choice is:  FDD: support option 2  TDD: support option 3  **Issue 1-2-2: Repetition number for BS requirements for PUSCH TBoMS**  RAN1 has shown [R1-2200656] that TBoMS is better suited for cases with high number of slots (N) and small M (number of repetitions).  Support option 2  **Issue 1-2-3: PRB number for BS requirements for PUSCH TBoMS**  We are fine with option 1. We can compromise to the proposed WF of option 1C.  **Issue 1-2-4: Inter-slot frequency hopping for BS requirements for PUSCH TBoMS**  We have a slight preference for option 1, as it reflects common configuration in the field, but we are open for compromises.  **Issue 1-2-5: TDD UL-DL pattern and test applicability for BS requirements for PUSCH TBoMS**  FR1 15 kHz SCS: Option1 (to be aligned with Rel-15, BSs should test all declared SCS)  FR1 30 kHz SCS: Option 1 (as per recommended WF)  FR2 60 kHz: Option 2 (to be aligned with Rel-15, BSs should test all declared SCS)  FR2 120 kHz: Option 2 or3 (to be aligned with Rel-15, BSs should test all declared SCS)  In general, SCSs with slot patterns that privilege successive UL slots are preferred.  We propose to split the issue into: a) which SCS to include b) which TDD pattern to include for each SCS.  For a) we want to be aligned with Rel-15, i.e., BSs should test all declared SCS, and we have requirements for all SCS.  For b) this can be further discussed.  **Issue 1-2-6: Transform precoding for BS requirements for PUSCH TBoMS**  Option2, we support the recommended WF.  The implementation of TBoMS is independent of transform precoding, so we would prefer to continue with CP-OFDM only.  **Issue 1-2-7: Whether to consider UCI multiplexing on PUSCH for TBoMS transmission**  Can compromise to the WF.  **Issue 1-2-8: Test requirement for FR1 and FR2 on PUSCH for TBoMS transmission**  The current applicability rules captured in 38.141-2 8.1.2.1.1 and 8.1.2.1.2, though we did not refer to them in our initial proposal.  **Issue 1-2-9: MCS for TBoMS PUSCH demod test**  We are also happy to reduce the MCS below MCS4 in case the test SNR remains above -10 dB. If it is not the case, we should fallback to MCS4.  **Issue 1-2-10: RV sequence for TBoMS PUSCH demod test**  Option 2 is still preferred, as we expect (slightly) better performance. The most fragile slot in the initial transmission is the first one that contains most systematic bits. So most often a failure to demodulate is due to losing the first slot. Please see our contribution for more detailed analysis [**[R4-2205489](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_102-e/Docs/R4-2205489.zip)**].  So, for now we would request for other contributors to give it a bit more thought. But if we remain to be the only company in the second round in favour of option 2, then we can compromise, as the expected performance gains are minor.  **Issue 1-2-11: PUSCH mapping type for TBoMS PUSCH demod test**  Cover PUSCH mapping type A and type B. Support WF.  **Issue 1-2-12: Antenna configuration for TBoMS PUSCH demod test**  We would prefer to also have more Rx antennas, at least in FR1, to cover long range deployments.  **Issue 1-2-13: Propagation condition for TBoMS PUSCH demod test**  Why were the “TDLA30-10Low” excluded? It seems to require the higher SNR and it could be used to model range limited scenarios.  **Issue 1-2-14: Test metric for TBoMS PUSCH demod test**  Option 1. We don’t see the reason for a 2%BLER (presumably pre-HARQ BLER) in long range scenarios with low MCS.  **Issue 1-2-15: Other parameters for BS requirements for PUSCH TBoMS**  Use Proposal 2 as starting but come back in the next meeting and leave the revision of the values open.  --------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------- Sub-topic 1-3: PUSCH demodulation with Joint Channel Estimation (JCE) **Issue 1-3-1: Actual TDW length for JCE in BS PUSCH demod requirements**  TDD: Option 1. We cannot have more than the 2 UL consecutive slots using TDD pattern.  FDD: Option 3.  @Moderator: Sorry if it was not clear in our contribution. Nokia’s proposal is as follows:   * 8 in case of FH disabled * 4 in case of FH enabled with FH interval=4   Please remove Nokia from Option2 or adapt correspondingly.  Please also note that the aTDW is a consequence of the cTDW and the hopping configuration, so it cannot be chosen independently.  We want to clear up this potential misunderstanding with UE chipset vendor(s). A cTDW of 32 is not equal to an aTDW of 32. In FDD, most commonly, the FH configuration will break up the cTDW into smaller aTDWs. The actual DM-RS bundling takes place in the aTDW only.  As such our cTDW proposal is 8 in FDD with FH interval=4, which leads to aTDW of 4.  **Issue 1-3-2: Configured TDW number for JCE in BS PUSCH demod requirements**  TDD: max(n32, n16, n20) depending on RF discussion outcome.  FDD: Option 2, please see technical explanation in issue 1-3-1.  **Issue 1-3-3: PUSCH repetition type for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**  Support WF.  **Issue 1-3-4: PUSCH repetition number for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**  Postpone decision until aTDW clear.  **Issue 1-3-5: PRB number for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**  Support option 2.  We see JCE to be suited mostly for high TPUT scenarios, as such a narrow FDRA does not seem to be a common configuration.  **Issue 1-3-6: Inter-slot frequency hopping for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**  Support option 1  Operators often configure FH for its diversity gain, and having a violating event in the test will assure better test coverage of the implementation.  **Issue 1-3-7: TDD UL-DL pattern for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**  FR1 15 kHz SCS: Option1 (otherwise JCE does not differ from legacy requirements)  FR1 30 kHz SCS: Option 1  FR2 60 kHz/ 120 kHz: Option 1 (otherwise JCE does not differ from legacy requirements)  **Issue 1-3-8: Transform precoding for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**  Option 2 is preferred. Can keep dft-s FFS if minority continues to ask for it.  **Issue 1-3-9: MCS for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**  Options 1 and 3 seem reasonable to us. Addition of higher MCS should not precluded in these early stages of the work.  We are surprised that no 16QAM MCSs have been proposed, which are more adapted to higher TPUT scenarios.  **Issue 1-3-10: Propagation condition for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**  Why were the “TDLA30-10Low” excluded? It seems to require the higher SNR and it could be used to model range limited scenarios.  **Issue 1-3-11: Antenna configuration for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**  Similar comments to before. Come back in the next meeting and leave the revision of the values open  **Issue 1-3-12: Frequency range coverage for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**  Option 1.  **Issue 1-3-13: PUSCH mapping type for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**  Agree with WF  **Issue 1-3-14: Additional DM-RS position for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**  Option 2 for simulation alignment.  **Issue 1-3-15: Phase and power offset modelling for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**  We propose to capture in WF that companies are encouraged to study the phase offset model until the next meeting.  Concerning the power offset model we can agree to option 1.  **Issue 1-3-16: Receiver implementation for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**  Come back to this issue, in case big misalignment is observed.  **Issue 1-3-17: Test metric for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**  It is unclear to us, why the legacy KPIs should not be sufficient in JCE, could the proponents of option 2 please elaborate? Also is this pre- or post-HARQ BLER?  Cannot agree with WF for now.  **Issue 1-3-18: Other parameters for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**  Come back in the next meeting. Until then we can think of proposal 2 as starting point.  Sub-topic 1-4: PUSCH Enhancements for Type A PUSCH repetitions for Msg3  **Issue 1-4-1: Whether to define PUSCH demodulation requirements for Msg3 repetition**  We don’t see a need with neither FH scheme enabled. Msg3 receiver implementation is not much different from standard PUSCH.  Sub-topic 1-5: Redcap BS demodulation for NR coverage enhancement demodulation  **Issue 1-5-1: Whether to new BS demodulation requirement for Redcap UE**  We do not need to explicitly define redcap requirements, however we should take care to define minimum CBWs that are compatible with the redcap constraint. |
| Ericsson | Sub-topic 1-1: PUSCH repetition type A with 32 repetitions  **Issue 1-1-1: Whether to define BS demodulation requirements for PUSCH repetition type A with 32 repetitions**  We support Option 2. No algorithm changes when repetition time is adjusted to 32. If the simulation results are aligned at 2 repetitions, then it could be expected align at 32 repetitions.  **Issue 1-1-2: Parameters for BS requirements for PUSCH repetition type A with 32 repetitions (if introduced)**  Pending the discussion until the agreement of Issue 1-1-1 is concluded.  **Issue 1-1-3: Test metric for BS demodulation requirements for PUSCH repetition type A with 32 repetitions (if introduced)**  Pending the discussion until the agreement of Issue 1-1-1 is concluded.  Sub-topic 1-2: PUSCH TB over Multi Slots (TBoMS)  **Issue 1-2-1: Physical/available slots for BS requirements for PUSCH TboMS**  We support recommended WF to define 2 available slots for both FDD and TDD. We don’t think there will be algorithm difference between 2 or more available slots. Only one requirement could be defined to cover TDD and FDD.    **Issue 1-2-2: Repetition number for BS requirements for PUSCH TBoMS**  Support Option 2 that no repetition considered for this feature. Repetition only increases the resources but has no additional impact on the BS implement comparing with single TBoMS  **Issue 1-2-3: PRB number for BS requirements for PUSCH TBoMS**  We think it could be better to define the requirement for the minimum BW with 2 available slots. In that case, we don’t need to add new applicability rule for several PRB requirement. From our understanding, it is no difference for BS receiver algorithm between small PRB and minimum BW allocation.  **Issue 1-2-4: Inter-slot frequency hopping for BS requirements for PUSCH TBoMS**  Support Option 2 that no frequency hopping considered for the TBoMS requirement. The impact of frequency hopping on the performance depends on the channel condition but not the implementation of BS. This function has been implemented from Rel-15, we don’t think it needs to be checked here.  **Issue 1-2-5: TDD UL-DL pattern and test applicability for BS requirements for PUSCH TBoMS**  For FR1 30kHz SCS, we support Option 1. For FR1 15kHz SCS and FR2 60kHz/120kHz, we think new TDD pattern is needed. Further checking on Option 2 could be needed because 3 UL slots is not fit for the 2, 4, 8 slot allocation for TBoMS.  **Issue 1-2-6: Transform precoding for BS requirements for PUSCH TBoMS**  We still support Option 2 since there should be no clear performance difference between CP-OFDM and DFT-s-OFDM when PRB allocation and MSC are the same based on Rel-15 simulation experience.  **Issue 1-2-7: Whether to consider UCI multiplexing on PUSCH for TBoMS transmission**  Support recommanded WF.  **Issue 1-2-8: Test requirement for FR1 and FR2 on PUSCH for TBoMS transmission**  Support recommended WF.  **Issue 1-2-9: MCS for TBoMS PUSCH demod test**  Still prefer Option 2 to use the same MCS as Rel-15 to see the performance improvement by TBoMS.  **Issue 1-2-10: RV sequence for TBoMS PUSCH demod test**  Prefer Option 1 because no clear problem is seen for now. Open for discussion.  **Issue 1-2-11: PUSCH mapping type for TBoMS PUSCH demod test**  We support recommended WF.  **Issue 1-2-12: Antenna configuration for TBoMS PUSCH demod test**  Support Option 1. To reduce the specification effort, 1Tx2Rx antennas could be considered for both FR1 and FR2.  **Issue 1-2-13: Propagation condition for TBoMS PUSCH demod test**  Support Option 1.  **Issue 1-2-14: Test metric for TBoMS PUSCH demod test**  Support Option 1 to use the same metric as Rel-15 to see the improvement.  **Issue 1-2-15: Other parameters for BS requirements for PUSCH TBoMS**  Prefer Option 1 and encourage companies to check. Sub-topic 1-3: PUSCH demodulation with Joint Channel Estimation (JCE) **Issue 1-3-1: Actual TDW length for JCE in BS PUSCH demod requirements**  For FDD, we support Option 3 to test the maximum aTDW if possible.  For TDD, currently there are only 2 available UL slots in available TDD pattern. We suggest companies to check if 2 slots aTDW can get enough gain compared to non-JCE algorithm. The motivation is to make sure that BS use better receiver algorithm when it pass this requirement.  **Issue 1-3-2: Configured TDW number for JCE in BS PUSCH demod requirements**  Support Option 1 for both TDD and FDD that use same duration length for aTDW and cTDW. The intention is to avoid confusion and JCE is actually based on aTDW.  **Issue 1-3-3: PUSCH repetition type for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**  Support Option 1. To check BS receiver algorithm, one typical repetition type could be enough.  **Issue 1-3-4: PUSCH repetition number for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**  Support Option 1.  **Issue 1-3-5: PRB number for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**  Support Option 2 to use full bandwidth allocation. Current applicability rule could be reused in that case.  **Issue 1-3-6: Inter-slot frequency hopping for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**  Prefer Option 2 that no frequency hopping considered for JCE requirement.  **Issue 1-3-7: TDD UL-DL pattern for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**  For FR1 15kHz and FR2 60k/120kHz SCS, we prefer Option 1 to use new TDD pattern,  For 30kHz SCS, Option 1 is preferred.  **Issue 1-3-8: Transform precoding for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**  Prefer Option 2.  **Issue 1-3-9: MCS for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**  Prefer Option 2 to align with Rel-15 configuration to see the improvement.  **Issue 1-3-10: Propagation condition for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**  Support Option 1.  **Issue 1-3-11: Antenna configuration for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**  Support Option 1.  **Issue 1-3-12: Frequency range coverage for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**  If new FR2 TDD pattern with more consecutive UL slots is agreed, we support Option 1.  **Issue 1-3-13: PUSCH mapping type for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**  Support recommended WF.  **Issue 1-3-14: Additional DM-RS position for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**  We prefer Option 1 to only consider DMRS 1+1 which is aligned with Rel-15.  **Issue 1-3-15: Phase and power offset modelling for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**  For phase offset model, we prefer Proposal 1 to consider a model based on RF discussion. For power offset model, we support Option 1 that don’t consider it in requirement.  **Issue 1-3-16: Receiver implementation for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**  We agree with Option 1 to align simulation.  **Issue 1-3-17: Test metric for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**  We prefer Option 1 to use same metric as Rel-15.  **Issue 1-3-18: Other parameters for BS PUSCH demod requirements with JCE**  Consider both Option 2 and 3. We agree to consider other parameters based on Rel-15 assumptions and we also propose some modification according to the available slots number and repetition number.  Sub-topic 1-4: PUSCH Enhancements for Type A PUSCH repetitions for Msg3  **Issue 1-4-1: Whether to define PUSCH demodulation requirements for Msg3 repetition**  We think it is no need to define requirement for Msg3 repetition. Intra-slot or inter-slot frequency hopping is not the target feature here.  Sub-topic 1-5: Redcap BS demodulation for NR coverage enhancement demodulation  **Issue 1-5-1: Whether to new BS demodulation requirement for Redcap UE**  We suggest not to define requirement for Redcap UE scenario because BS could well support Redcap UE if BS pass requirements for normal UE. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## Summary for 1st round

### Open issues

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Status summary** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## Discussion on 2nd round

# Topic #2: PUCCH Enhancements of Rel-17 NR Coverage Enhancement

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| R4-2203553 | Samsung | Propose 1: RAN4 apply the existing test metric for PUCCH requirement with joint channel estimation, if agreed to introduce.  Propose 2: Further discuss the necessity of requirement of PUCCH with JCE  Propose 3: if RAN4 agreed to introduce PUCCH requirement with joint channel estimation, format 1 or format 3 can be considered  Propose 4: if RAN4 agreed to introduce PUCCH requirement with joint channel estimation, 2 consecutive slots for TDD and FDD can be considered.  Propose 5: if RAN4 agreed to introduce PUCCH requirement with joint channel estimation, apply existing test parameters specified in Rel-15 for PUCCH requirement with JCE as starting point. The details can be further discussed pending on the agreed PUCCH format. Disable inter-slot and intra-slot hopping with DMRS bundling. |
| R4-2204034 | Ericsson | Proposal 1: The demodulation requirement for multi-slot PUCCH with JCE should be defined.  Observation 1: FR2 PUCCH is performance bottleneck only in O2I scenario according to TR38.830.  Observation 2: There is no available FR2 TDD pattern for PUCCH JCE.  Proposal 2: Only define FR1 PUCCH JCE demodulation requirement.  Proposal 3: For PUCCH JCE demodulation requirement, frequency hopping is disabled.  Proposal 4: For defining the demodulation requirement for PUCCH JCE, PUCCH format 1 and 3 can be considered.  Proposal 5: For PUCCH JCE demodulation requirement, use the same cTDW and aTDW configuration as PUSCH JCE requirement.  Proposal 6: Take following parameters for PUCCH JCE requirement. |
| R4-2205490 | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | PUCCH formats  Proposal 1:RAN4 to specify BS demod requirements for PUCCH DMRS bundling for formats 1 and 3.  Test metric  Proposal 2:Use as evaluation metric for PUCCH format 3 requirements UCI block error probability. Format 1 shall use NACK to ACK detection probability and ACK missed detection probability  Test parameters for TDD  Observation 1:For PUCCH DMRS bundling, FH is commonly configured, and cTDW needs to be chosen rather larger than the repetition factor due to the different slot counting methods.  Proposal 3:Use TDD UL/DL pattern 7DSUU.  Proposal 4:Use configured time domain window (cTDW) to be 32 slots.  Proposal 5:Use configured number of repetitions = 8.  Proposal 6:Activate inter-slot frequency hopping, with hopping interval length equal to 2 slots.  Test parameters for FDD  Observation 2:In FDD the phase continuity is not repeatedly broken by DL slots and similar JCE gains to TDD can be achieved with smaller cTDW/aTDW lengths.  Proposal 7: Use configured time domain window (cTDW) to be 8  Proposal 8:Use configured number of repetitions = 8.  Proposal 9:Activate inter-slot frequency hopping, with hopping interval 4.  Other test parameters  Proposal 10:For PUCCH format 3, use 1 PRB allocation, 14 OFDM symbols, and [16] bits payload. Intra-slot FH shall be disabled. Requirements shall be applicable to both FR1 and FR2.  Proposal 12:For PUCCH format 1, use 14 OFDM symbols, and 2 bits payload. Intra-slot FH shall be disabled. Requirements shall be applicable to both FR1 and FR2. |
| R4-2205501 | China Telecom | Proposal 1: Define BS PUCCH demodulation requirements with JCE.  Proposal 2: Use the following parameters for PUCCH demodulation requirements for JCE:   JCE over 2 slots for TDD, and JCE over 8 slots for FDD   11 or 22 bits for PUCCH format 3, 2 bits for PUCCH format 1   1 PRB allocation and 14 OFDM symbols for PUCCH format 1 and format 3   Inter-slot frequency hopping with DMRS bundling disabled for TDD and FDD   FR1 and FR2  Proposal 3: Use the same phase and power offset model as defined in PUSCH demodulation test with JCE. |
| R4-2205773 | Huawei, HiSilicon | Proposal 1: Do not define BS PUCCH demodulation requirements with JCE. |
| R4-2205818 | Intel Corporation | Proposal 1: Define BS PUCCH demodulation requirements with Joint Channel Estimation.  Proposal 2: Consider the following PUCCH test design for verification of Joint Channel Estimation:  • Format 1 and 3  • Number of slots for JCE: 2 and 4 slots as starting point with further down selection based on results  • Test parameters  o Format 1: Payload 2 bits, 14 symbols  o Format 3: Payload 16 bits, 14 symbols, 1 PRB, With additional DMRS  • Test metric  o Format 1: NACK to ACK and ACK missed detection  o Format 3: UCI block error probability |

## Open issues summary

### Sub-topic 2-1: General

**Issue 2-1-1: Test metric for BS PUCCH demodulation test cases**

* *Status in the last meeting WF (R4-2203031):*
  + *Option 1*
    - *Test UCI block error probability for PUCCH format 2/3/4*
    - *Test NACK to ACK detection probability for PUCCH format 1*
  + *Option 2: Reusing the existing test metric for different PUCCH formats can be reused as a baseline*
  + *Option 3: FFS*
* Proposals:
  + For PUCCH format 3:
    - Option 1: Reuse the existing test metric for different PUCCH formats as a baseline, i.e., Test UCI block error probability (Samsung, Intel, Nokia)
  + For PUCCH format 1:
    - Option 1: Reuse the existing test metric for different PUCCH formats as a baseline, i.e., Test NACK to ACK detection probability (Samsung, Intel)
    - Option 2: Test NACK to ACK detection probability **and ACK missed detection probability** (Nokia)
* Recommended WF
  + Check if we can use option 1 for PUCCH format 3?
  + Encourage feedback for PUCCH format 1.

### Sub-topic 2-2: PUCCH demodulation with Joint Channel Estimation (JCE)

**Issue 2-2-1: Whether to define BS PUCCH demodulation requirements with JCE**

* *Status in the last meeting WF (R4-2203031):*
  + *Option 1: Yes*
  + *Option 2: No*
  + *Option 3: FFS after the finalization of core requirements in RAN1 and RAN4*
* Proposals:
  + Option 1: Yes (E///, Nokia, CTC, Intel)
  + Option 2: No (HW)
  + Option 3: FFS the necessity of requirement of PUCCH with JCE (Samsung)
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

**Issue 2-2-2: PUCCH format for BS PUCCH demodulation requirements with JCE (if introduced)**

* *Status in the last meeting WF (R4-2203031):*
  + *Option 1: Format 3*
  + *Option 2: Format 1, 2,3,4*
  + *Option 3: Format 1*
  + *Option 4: Format 1 and Format 2 or 3 or 4*
  + *Option 5: Format 1 and 3*
* Proposals:
  + Option 1: Format 1 or format 3 (Samsung)
    - Samsung, Intel: As per RAN1 agreement, PUCCH DMRS bundling is not supported for PUCCH format 0/2.
  + Option 2: Format 1 and format 3 (E///, Nokia, CTC, Intel)
* Recommended WF
  + In case BS PUCCH demodulation requirements with JCE is introduced, can we cover both format 1 and format 3 based on majorities’ view?

**Issue 2-2-3: Actual TDW length for JCE in BS PUCCH demod requirements (if introduced)**

* *Status in the last meeting WF (R4-2203031):*
  + *For TDD*
    - *Option 1: 2 consecutive slots*
    - *Option 2: 4 slots within the configured TDW*
    - *Option 3: Depending on the Slot number for JCE in BS PUSCH*
  + *For FDD*
    - *Option 1: 2 consecutive slots*
    - *Option 2: more than 2 consecutive slots*
    - *Option 3: 4*
    - *Option 4: 8*
    - *Option 5: Depending on the Slot number for JCE in BS PUSCH*
  + *Note: slot number refers to the actual TDW length*
* Proposals:
  + For TDD
    - Option 1: 2 consecutive slots (Samsung, Nokia, CTC, [E///])
    - Option 2: Follow the Slot number for JCE in BS PUSCH (E///)
    - Option 3: 2 and 4 slots as starting point with further down selection based on results (Intel)
  + For FDD
    - Option 1: 2 consecutive slots (Samsung)
    - Option 2: Follow the Slot number for JCE in BS PUSCH (E///)
    - Option 3: 4 consecutive slots (Nokia, Intel)
    - Option 4: 8 slots (CTC)

MTK: some companies (including at least 1 BS vendor) have been pushing quite hard to specify up to 32 slots for the UE

* + - Option 5: 2 and 4 slots as starting point with further down selection based on results (Intel)
* Recommended WF
  + In case BS PUCCH demodulation requirements with JCE is introduced
    - Can we agree using aTDW length of 2 for TDD?
    - Further discussion is needed for FDD case.

**Issue 2-2-4: Configured TDW length for JCE in BS PUCCH demod requirements (if introduced)**

* Proposals:
  + For TDD
    - Option 1: 32 slots (Nokia)
  + For FDD
    - Option 1: 8 slots (Nokia)
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

**Issue 2-2-5: Number of repetitions for BS PUCCH demodulation requirements with JCE (if introduced)**

* Proposals:
  + Option 1: 8 for FDD and TDD (Nokia)
  + Option 2: 2 (E///)
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

**Issue 2-2-6: Frequency hopping for BS PUCCH demodulation requirements with JCE (if introduced)**

* Proposals:
  + Intra-slot frequency hopping:
    - Option 1: Disabled (Samsung. E///, Nokia)
  + Inter-slot frequency hopping:
    - Option 1: Disabled (Samsung. E///, CTC)
    - Option 2: Activate inter-slot frequency hopping, with inter-slot hopping interval length 2 for TDD and 4 for FDD (Nokia)
* Recommended WF
  + Intra-slot frequency hopping: Disabled
  + Inter-slot frequency hopping: Disabled?

**Issue 2-2-7: TDD UL-DL pattern for BS PUCCH demodulation requirements with JCE (if introduced)**

* Proposals:
  + Option 1: Use 7DSUU (Nokia)
* Recommended WF
  + Same as PUSCH JCE demod requirements?

**Issue 2-2-8: Frequency range coverage for BS PUCCH demodulation requirements with JCE (if introduced)**

* Proposals:
  + Option 1: Only cover FR1 (E///)
    - E///: 1) FR2 PUCCH is performance bottleneck only in O2I scenario according to TR38.830. 2) here is no available FR2 TDD pattern for PUCCH JCE.
  + Option 2: Cover both FR1 and FR2 (Nokia, CTC)
* Recommended WF
  + Encourage feedback

**Issue 2-2-9: Phase and power offset modelling for BS PUCCH demod requirements with JCE (if introduced)**

* Proposals:
  + Phase offset model:
    - Proposal 1: Aligned with the JCE test modelling for PUSCH (CTC)
  + Power offset model
    - Proposal 1: Aligned with the JCE test modelling for PUSCH (CTC)
* Recommended WF
  + Encourage feedback

**Issue 2-2-10: Bit payload for BS PUCCH demodulation requirements with JCE (if introduced)**

* Proposals:
  + PUCCH format 1:
    - Option 1: 2 bits (CTC, E///, Nokia, Intel, Samsung)
  + PUCCH format 3:
    - Option 1: 11 or 22 bits (CTC)
    - Option 2: 22 bits (E///, CTC)
    - Option 3: 16 bits (Nokia, Intel, Samsung)
* Recommended WF
  + In case BS PUCCH demodulation requirements with JCE is introduced:
    - Can we agree with using 2 bits for PUCCH format 1?
    - For PUCCH format 3, can we agree to use option 3 of 16 bits, which is in the middle of option 1 and 2, and supported by majority companies

**Issue 2-2-11: Resource allocation for BS PUCCH demodulation requirements with JCE (if introduced)**

* Proposals:
  + PUCCH format 1:
    - Option 1: 14 symbols, 1 PRB (Intel, Nokia, E///, CTC, Samsung)
  + PUCCH format 3:
    - Option 1: 14 symbols, 1 PRB (Intel, E///, Nokia, CTC)
* Recommended WF
  + In case BS PUCCH demodulation requirements with JCE is introduced:
    - Can we agree with using 14 symbols, 1 PRB for both PUCCH format 1 and format 3?

**Issue 2-2-12: Other parameters for BS PUCCH demodulation requirements with JCE (if introduced)**

* *Status in the last meeting WF (R4-2203031):*
  + *Option 1:* 
    - *11 or 22 bits for PUCCH format 3*
    - *1 PRB allocation and 14 OFDM symbols*
    - *Inter-slot frequency hopping with DMRS bundling*
    - *FR1 and FR2*
  + *Option 2: Use legacy configuration as starting point but disable intra-slot frequency hopping to allow for DM-RS bundling.*
  + *Option 3: Consider test configuration of existing multi-slot PUCCH requirements as the starting point*
* Proposals:
  + Proposal 1: Apply existing test parameters specified in Rel-15 for PUCCH requirement with JCE as starting point (Samsung)
  + Proposal 2: (E///)

Table 2-1: Test Parameters for PUCCH JCE format 1

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Parameter | Test |
| First PRB prior to frequency hopping | 0 |
| Group and sequence hopping | neither |
| Hopping ID | 0 |
| Initial cyclic shift | 0 |
| First symbol | 0 |
| Index of orthogonal cover code (*timeDomainOCC*) | 0 |

Table 2-2: Test Parameters for FR1 PUCCH JCE format 3

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Parameter | Test |
| Modulation order | QPSK |
| First PRB prior to frequency hopping | 0 |
| Group and sequence hopping | neither |
| Hopping ID | 0 |
| First symbol | 0 |

* + Proposal 3: (Nokia)
    - Use Rel-15 PUCCH format 3 SCS, CBW, tx/rx antenna numbers, number of DM-RS per slot, and channel model, as starting point for further discussion.
    - Use Rel-15 PUCCH format 1 SCS, CBW, tx/rx antenna numbers, and channel model, as starting point for further discussion.
* Recommended WF
  + Encourage feedback.

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Company A | Sub-topic 2-1: General  **Issue 2-1-1: Test metric for BS PUCCH demodulation test cases**  Sub-topic 2-2: PUCCH demodulation with Joint Channel Estimation (JCE)  **Issue 2-2-1: Whether to define BS PUCCH demodulation requirements with JCE**  **Issue 2-2-2: PUCCH format for BS PUCCH demodulation requirements with JCE (if introduced)**  **Issue 2-2-3: Actual TDW length for JCE in BS PUCCH demod requirements (if introduced)**  **Issue 2-2-4: Configured TDW length for JCE in BS PUCCH demod requirements (if introduced)**  **Issue 2-2-5: Number of repetitions for BS PUCCH demodulation requirements with JCE (if introduced)**  **Issue 2-2-6: Frequency hopping for BS PUCCH demodulation requirements with JCE (if introduced)**  **Issue 2-2-7: TDD UL-DL pattern for BS PUCCH demodulation requirements with JCE (if introduced)**  **Issue 2-2-8: Frequency range coverage for BS PUCCH demodulation requirements with JCE (if introduced)**  **Issue 2-2-9: Phase and power offset modelling for BS PUCCH demod requirements with JCE (if introduced)**  **Issue 2-2-10: Bit payload for BS PUCCH demodulation requirements with JCE (if introduced)**  **Issue 2-2-11: Resource allocation for BS PUCCH demodulation requirements with JCE (if introduced)**  **Issue 2-2-12: Other parameters for BS PUCCH demodulation requirements with JCE (if introduced)** |
| Intel | Sub-topic 2-1: General  **Issue 2-1-1: Test metric for BS PUCCH demodulation test cases**  Support Option 1 for Format 3 and Option 2 for Format 1, because it is the existing test metrics.  Sub-topic 2-2: PUCCH demodulation with Joint Channel Estimation (JCE)  **Issue 2-2-1: Whether to define BS PUCCH demodulation requirements with JCE**  We support the introduction of this requirements because it is one of the mains features introduced for Coverage Enhancement WI with impact on baseband processing.  **Issue 2-2-2: PUCCH format for BS PUCCH demodulation requirements with JCE (if introduced)**  **Support the recommended WF to cover both Format 1 and 3.**  **Issue 2-2-3: Actual TDW length for JCE in BS PUCCH demod requirements (if introduced)**  Similar comment as for PUSCH. We can consider 2 slots as starting point and check the JCE performance.  **Issue 2-2-4: Configured TDW length for JCE in BS PUCCH demod requirements (if introduced)**  Similar suggestion as for PUSCH, actual TDW length and configured TDW length can be equal.  **Issue 2-2-5: Number of repetitions for BS PUCCH demodulation requirements with JCE (if introduced)**  We suggest to use the same value as for TDW length.  **Issue 2-2-6: Frequency hopping for BS PUCCH demodulation requirements with JCE (if introduced)**  Support that intra-slot hopping is disabled. As for inter-slot hopping, we can check the proposal from Nokia  **Issue 2-2-7: TDD UL-DL pattern for BS PUCCH demodulation requirements with JCE (if introduced)**  Probably we can align assumptions for PUSCH and PUCCH tests on this issue.  **Issue 2-2-8: Frequency range coverage for BS PUCCH demodulation requirements with JCE (if introduced)**  We think that both FR1 and FR2 can be covered.  **Issue 2-2-9: Phase and power offset modelling for BS PUCCH demod requirements with JCE (if introduced)**  Support Proposal 1 for both issues.  **Issue 2-2-10: Bit payload for BS PUCCH demodulation requirements with JCE (if introduced)**  We are also find to check the JCE performance for different options for Format 3 and decide later based on simulation results.  **Issue 2-2-12: Other parameters for BS PUCCH demodulation requirements with JCE (if introduced)**  We think that Rel-15 assumptions can be reused. Same time, probably we can consider not all antenna configuration and focus on 1x2 only. Also, for Format 3, probably we can consider only with or without additional DMRS. |
| Samsung | Issue 2-1-1  For format 3, support recommended WF.  For format 1, we are ok with both ACK missed and NACK-to ACK, reusing the existing test metric for format1  Issue 2-2-1  With format 0 and format 2, they are used for short latency and small payload or when uplink coverage is good.  With format 1, format 3 and format 3, they are used for less latency critical and larger payload or when larger uplink coverage is required. Meanwhile, to further improve the UL coverage, PUCCH repetitions over multi-slots are supported. The related performance was specified in Rel-15. In general, we think PUCCH is not bottleneck of Uplink  From DMRS bundling functionality verification aspect, our understanding there is no different compared with PUSCH and PUCCH, except for the DMRS location in PUSCH and PUCCH. Since RAN4 have agreed to introduce PUSCH with JCE requirement, the test purpose can be fulfilled. Therefore, we think PUCCH requirement with JCE can be deprioritized. We are open to further discuss the necessity of requirement  Issue 2-2-2  We are fine with recommended WF.  Issue 2-2-3  Similar as PUSCH with joint channel estimation, we prefer 2 consecutive slots for TDD and FDD for PUCCH requirement.  Issue 2-2-4  We prefer the same value for aTDW and cTDW as 2 slots  Issue 2-2-5  We support option 2, which can be comparable with multi-slot transmission requirement without JCT  Issue 2-2-6  With frequency hopping, the power consistency and phase continuously will be impacted. It is not feasible to apply DMRS bundling for joint channel estimation with small number of slots. Therefore, we prefer to disable frequency hopping for PUCCH with JCE, similar as PUSCH  Issue 2-2-7  We are fine with option 1  Issue 2-2-8  We support option 1 if JCE introduced  Issue 2-2-9  We prefer no phase offset model and power offset model, aligned with JCE test modelling for PUSCH  Issue 2-2-10  We are ok with recommended WF, same as Rel-15 PUCCH test setup  Issue 2-2-11  We are ok with recommended WF, same as Rel-15 PUCCH test setup  Issue 2-2-12  In general, we prefer to apply the existing test parameters specified in Rel-15 PUCCH requirement for PUCCH requirement with joint channel estimation as starting point. The details can be further discussed pending on the agreed PUCCH format. |
| China Telecom | Sub-topic 2-1: General  **Issue 2-1-1: Test metric for BS PUCCH demodulation test cases**  We support option 1 for PUCCH format 3 and option 2 for format 1, which is aligned with the existing PUCCH tests.  Sub-topic 2-2: PUCCH demodulation with Joint Channel Estimation (JCE)  **Issue 2-2-1: Whether to define BS PUCCH demodulation requirements with JCE**  We support option 1. PUCCH JCE has clear impact to the BS implementation. We do not think JCE performance can be verified if BS only pass the PUSCH JCE test due to the different resource allocation, coding, test metric, etc.  **Issue 2-2-2: PUCCH format for BS PUCCH demodulation requirements with JCE (if introduced)**  Support the recommended WF.  **Issue 2-2-3: Actual TDW length for JCE in BS PUCCH demod requirements (if introduced)**  Fine with 2 slots for TDD.  Support option 2 or option 4 for FDD case.  **Issue 2-2-4: Configured TDW length for JCE in BS PUCCH demod requirements (if introduced)**  Similar with PUSCH case, we suggest to use same aTDW and cTDW length for simplify purpose.  **Issue 2-2-5: Number of repetitions for BS PUCCH demodulation requirements with JCE (if introduced)**  We are fine with configure repetition number the same aTDW length for simplify purpose.  **Issue 2-2-6: Frequency hopping for BS PUCCH demodulation requirements with JCE (if introduced)**  Fine with the recommended WF.  **Issue 2-2-7: TDD UL-DL pattern for BS PUCCH demodulation requirements with JCE (if introduced)**  We support to use the same with PUSCH case.  **Issue 2-2-8: Frequency range coverage for BS PUCCH demodulation requirements with JCE (if introduced)**  Support option 2.  **Issue 2-2-9: Phase and power offset modelling for BS PUCCH demod requirements with JCE (if introduced)**  Should be aligned with the outcome for PUSCH test.  **Issue 2-2-10: Bit payload for BS PUCCH demodulation requirements with JCE (if introduced)**  We are fine with the recommended WF.  **Issue 2-2-11: Resource allocation for BS PUCCH demodulation requirements with JCE (if introduced)**  We are fine with the recommended WF. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Sub-topic 2-1: General  **Issue 2-1-1: Test metric for BS PUCCH demodulation test cases**  PUCCH format 3: Option 1 (we are ok with proposed WF)  PUCCH format 1: Option 2 (it is our understanding that Rel-15 PUCCH F1 has requirements for both NACK to ACK and ACK MD, is this common understanding?)  Sub-topic 2-2: PUCCH demodulation with Joint Channel Estimation (JCE)  **Issue 2-2-1: Whether to define BS PUCCH demodulation requirements with JCE**  Support Option 1  PUCCH JCE is impacting the BS demod performance and implementation.  **Issue 2-2-2: PUCCH format for BS PUCCH demodulation requirements with JCE (if introduced)**  Support option 2, agree with WF  **Issue 2-2-3: Actual TDW length for JCE in BS PUCCH demod requirements (if introduced)**  TDD: Option 1. We cannot have more than the 2 UL consecutive slots using TDD pattern.  FDD: Option 3.  @Moderator: Sorry if it was not clear in our contribution. Nokia’s proposal is as follows:  • 8 in case of FH disabled  • 4 in case of FH enabled with FH interval=4  Please remove Nokia from Option2 or adapt correspondingly.  We agree on the recommended WF.  **Issue 2-2-4: Configured TDW length for JCE in BS PUCCH demod requirements (if introduced)**  TDD: max(n32, n16, n20) depending on RF discussion outcome.  FDD: Option 2, please see technical explanation in issue 2-2-3.  **Issue 2-2-5: Number of repetitions for BS PUCCH demodulation requirements with JCE (if introduced)**  Option 1: 8 repetitions for FDD and TDD (maximum when counting based on physical slots under the cTDW=32 assumption; might change depending on outcome of RF session.)  **Issue 2-2-6: Frequency hopping for BS PUCCH demodulation requirements with JCE (if introduced)**  Agree to intra-slot FH proposed WF.  Prefer to keep inter-slot open in the first round.  **Issue 2-2-7: TDD UL-DL pattern for BS PUCCH demodulation requirements with JCE (if introduced)**  Agree with WF.  **Issue 2-2-8: Frequency range coverage for BS PUCCH demodulation requirements with JCE (if introduced)**  Option 2. Cover FR2 with new TDD pattern, which is also under discussion in PUSCH.  **Issue 2-2-9: Phase and power offset modelling for BS PUCCH demod requirements with JCE (if introduced)**  Agree to align with PUSCH model.  **Issue 2-2-10: Bit payload for BS PUCCH demodulation requirements with JCE (if introduced)**  Agree with WF  **Issue 2-2-11: Resource allocation for BS PUCCH demodulation requirements with JCE (if introduced)**  Agree with WF  **Issue 2-2-12: Other parameters for BS PUCCH demodulation requirements with JCE (if introduced)**  At least proposal 1 and proposal 3 seem to be the same, and potentially also proposal 2.  We can thus compromise to at least proposal 3 and 1. |
| Ericsson | Sub-topic 2-1: General  **Issue 2-1-1: Test metric for BS PUCCH demodulation test cases**  We prefer to use existing test metric for format 1 and 3 as start point.  Sub-topic 2-2: PUCCH demodulation with Joint Channel Estimation (JCE)  **Issue 2-2-1: Whether to define BS PUCCH demodulation requirements with JCE**  Support Option 1 to define requirement for PUCCH JCE.  **Issue 2-2-2: PUCCH format for BS PUCCH demodulation requirements with JCE (if introduced)**  Support Option 2 to cover important formats.  **Issue 2-2-3: Actual TDW length for JCE in BS PUCCH demod requirements (if introduced)**  Support recommended WF. Furthermore, we prefer using same configuration as PUSCH JCE.  **Issue 2-2-4: Configured TDW length for JCE in BS PUCCH demod requirements (if introduced)**  We prefer use same configuration as PUSCH JCE.  **Issue 2-2-5: Number of repetitions for BS PUCCH demodulation requirements with JCE (if introduced)**  We prefer Option 2 but open for discussion.  **Issue 2-2-6: Frequency hopping for BS PUCCH demodulation requirements with JCE (if introduced)**  We prefer not to consider frequency hopping for JCE requirement.  **Issue 2-2-7: TDD UL-DL pattern for BS PUCCH demodulation requirements with JCE (if introduced)**  We prefer use same TDD pattern as PUSCH JCE requirement.  **Issue 2-2-8: Frequency range coverage for BS PUCCH demodulation requirements with JCE (if introduced)**  Prefer to only consider FR1 because the motivation of introducing feature for FR2 is not typical for FR2 deployment. But we open for further discussion.  **Issue 2-2-9: Phase and power offset modelling for BS PUCCH demod requirements with JCE (if introduced)**  We agree to align with PUSCH JCE.  **Issue 2-2-10: Bit payload for BS PUCCH demodulation requirements with JCE (if introduced)**  For format 1, we support Option 1. For format 3, we support Option 2 to test largest bits but can compromise to 16bits.  **Issue 2-2-11: Resource allocation for BS PUCCH demodulation requirements with JCE (if introduced)**  Support recommended WF.  **Issue 2-2-12: Other parameters for BS PUCCH demodulation requirements with JCE (if introduced)**  We prefer Option 2, but open for further discussion. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## Summary for 1st round

### Open issues

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Status summary** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## Discussion on 2nd round

# Recommendations for Tdocs

## 1st round

**New tdocs**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Title** | **Source** | **Comments** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Existing tdocs**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Tdoc number** | **Title** | **Source** | **Recommendation** | **Comments** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Notes:

1. Please include the summary of recommendations for all tdocs across all sub-topics incl. existing and new tdocs.
2. For the Recommendation column please include one of the following:
   1. CRs/TPs: Agreeable, Revised, Merged, Postponed, Not Pursued
   2. Other documents: Agreeable, Revised, Noted
3. For new LS documents, please include information on To/Cc WGs in the comments column
4. Do not include hyper-links in the documents

## 2nd round

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Tdoc number | Title | Source | Recommendation | Comments |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Notes:

1. Please include the summary of recommendations for all tdocs across all sub-topics.
2. For the Recommendation column please include one of the following:
   1. CRs/TPs: Agreeable, Revised, Merged, Postponed, Not Pursued
   2. Other documents: Agreeable, Revised, Noted
3. Do not include hyper-links in the documents

# Annex

Contact information

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Name** | **Email address** |
| Samsung | Yunchuan Yang | yc0301.yang@samsung.com |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Note:

1. Please add your contact information in above table once you make comments on this email thread.
2. If multiple delegates from the same company make comments on single email thread, please add you name as suffix after company name when make comments i.e. Company A (XX, XX)