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# Introduction

This is the summary document for 8.2.5 on PDSCH/PUSCH enhancements (especially for scheduling and HARQ) for NR above 52.6 GHz, based on the contributions listed in reference section.

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

[105-e-NR-52-71GHz-03] Email discussion/approval on scheduling particularly w.r.t. multi-PDSCH/PUSCH with a single DCI, HARQ, with checkpoints for agreements on May 24, May 27 – Seonwook (LGE)

# Multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling

## Aspects common to PDSCH and PUSCH

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Views |
| [1] Futurewei | Proposal 2. Reuse the legacy Rel-17 maximum schedulable PDSCHs with a single DCI, i.e., 8, as the upper bound of number of slots in a multi-PDSCH/PUSCH for both the SCS 480kHz and SCS 960kHz. No further restriction is needed for SCS 480kHz.  Proposal 3. Extend the RRC TDRA configuration table to include multiple SLIVs, mapping types, and slot offsets for each scheduled PUSCH/PDSCH in a multi-PUSCH/PDSCH.  Observation 1: The number of rows of an enhanced TDRA configuration table might need to surpass 16 as configured for the legacy Rel-15/16, and thus increased DCI bit-width is expected.  Observation 2. User-multiplexing is of lower priority due to narrow-beam in 52.6GHz to 71GHz band, thus UE may occupy larger number of PRBs, which allows increased RBG size.  Proposal 5: CBGTI/CBGFI is not applicable in a DCI format that schedules multi-PDSCH for SCSs including 480kHz/960kHz; but can be applied to cases under the SCS 120kHz.  Proposal 10: Only DCI format 1\_1 is extended for scheduling multi-PDSCH. |
| [2] Huawei | Proposal 1: The maximum number of PDSCHs/PUSCHs scheduled by a single DCI is 4 for 480 kHz SCS.  Proposal 3: Support at least DCI format 1-1/0-1 for multi-slot PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling with a single DCI. No support of DCI format 0-0 and 1-0 for multi-slot PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling.  Observation 1: Further enhancements of FDRA are not essential for both multi-slot PDSCH scheduling and multi-slot PUSCH scheduling.  Observation 2: Configure rate matching pattern to support non-continuous resource mapping in time domain needs no additional specification effort. Non-continuous PDSCHs (resp. PUSCHs) allocation can be signaled by a k0 (resp. k2) value for each SLIV in each row of the RRC-configured TDRA table.  Proposal 5: CBG (re)transmission is not supported for multi-slot PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling. |
| [3] vivo | Proposal 1: For a DCI that can schedule multiple PDSCHs/PUSCHs, it should be studied how to configure K0/K2, and the following options could be considered:  - Option 1: Each PDSCH/PUSCH has a separate K0/K2.  - Option 2: Each row has a single K0/K2.  Proposal 2: Legacy frequency domain scheduling in NR Rel-15/16 is reused for multi-PUSCH/PDSCH scheduling.  Proposal 3: It can be clarified that the URLLC related fields in the DCI scheduling multiple PUSCHs are applied equally to each scheduled PUSCH, including priority indicator and open-loop power control parameter set indication.  Proposal 4: For CBG based scheduling, the same solution adopted in Rel-16 NR-U multi-PUSCH scheduling can be reused for multi-PUSCH scheduling, i.e., CBG based scheduling is supported only when a DCI schedules a single PUSCH.  Proposal 5: For scheduling DCI format, the same solution adopted in Rel-16 NR-U can be reused, i.e., the same DCI format is used for both single PUSCH scheduling and multi-PUSCH scheduling. |
| [4] Spreadtrum | Proposal 2: CBG (re)transmission should not be supported when more than one PDSCHs/PUSCHs are scheduled.  Proposal 3: Apply same method rule compared to Rel-16 NR-U for FDRA. |
| [5] Nokia | Proposal 1: The multi-PUSCH scheduling defined in Rel-16 NR-U is used as the baseline for designing multi-PxSCH scheduling. Maximize the similarity between multi-PDSCH and multi-PUSCH  · Do not introduce new DCI format for multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling.  · Use DCI format 0\_1 to schedule multiple PUSCHs with a single DCI  · Use DCI format 1\_1 to schedule multiple PDSCHs with a single DCI.  Proposal 2: The maximum number of PxSCH that can scheduled with a single DCI in Rel-17 is 8 also for 480 kHz SCS. All UEs need to support at maximum 8 PxSCH for both 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCSs.  Proposal 5: For TDRA, PUSCHTimeDomainAllocationListForMultiPxSCH indicates only contiguous slots.  • Invalid slots are determined based on RateMatchPattern(s)  • Non-contiguous transmission covers contiguous HARQ processes.  Proposal 7: For other multi-PxSCH enhancements:  • FDRA enhancements and frequency hopping enhancements are considered as secondary topics for multi-PxSCH transmission and they are considered only if time allows.  • CBGTI is not applicable to multi-PDSCH scheduling  • For URLLC related fields, one value of each field is applied for all scheduled PUSCHs |
| [6] Ericsson | Proposal 2: No further restriction or UE capability for 120 and 480 kHz SCS on the maximum number of PDSCHs that can be scheduled with a single DCI.  Proposal 3: No further restriction or UE capability for 120 and 480 kHz SCS on the maximum number of PUSCHs that can be scheduled with a single DCI.  Proposal 5: For TDRA table that supports multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling, each row contains up to 8 multiple PDSCHs/PUSCHs that can be non-contiguous on slot level.  Proposal 6: For TDRA table that supports multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling, each row contains up to 8 PDSCH/PUSCH, with separate SLIV, mapping type, and scheduling offset K0/K2 for each scheduled PDSCH/PUSCH.  Proposal 7: Introduce new RBG configuration for PDSCH/PUSCH frequency resource allocation Type 0 to reduce FDRA granularity and DCI size.  Proposal 8: Support configurable Resource Allocation Granularity (P) up to 32 for DCI Format 0\_1 and 1\_1 with PUSCH/PDSCH frequency resource allocation Type 1 to reduce FDRA granularity and DCI size.  Proposal 13: When multi-PDSCH is configured, the CBGTI/CBGFI fields in DCI Format 1\_1 should not be included. The saved bits can be re-used for indicating RV/NDI for multiple PDSCHs.  Observation 11: There are no real technical advantages for supporting multi-PDSCH/PUSCH and CBG transmission simultaneously.  Proposal 15: When DCI Format 0\_1 is used for scheduling multiple PUSCHs, priority indicator and open-loop power control parameter set indication fields in the DCI should apply to all PUSCHs being scheduled.  Proposal 17: Do not support scheduling of multiple PDSCHs with a single DCI where the TB(s) corresponding to one or more of the PDSCHs is(are) mapped over multiple slots by legacy TB repetition (semi-statically configured by pdsch-AggregationFactor or dynamically indicated by repetitionNumber in TDRA table).  Proposal 18: As in Rel-16, do not support scheduling of multiple PUSCHs with a single DCI where one or more of the PUSCHs is(are) mapped over multiple slots by legacy TB repetition (Type A or B repetition).  Proposal 19: Support multi-PDSCH scheduling with a single DCI for multi-TRP transmission in Rel-17 except for the case where the TB(s) corresponding to one or more of the scheduled PDSCHs is(are) mapped over multiple slots by legacy TB repetition.  Proposal 25: Do not support CBG transmission for multi-PUSCH in Rel-17 when multi-PUSCH is configured and when DCI Format 1\_0 is used to schedule multiple PUSCHs (same as multi-PUSCH in Rel-16).  Proposal 26: Do not support simultaneous configuration of multi-PDSCH scheduling and CBG transmission in Rel-17. |
| [7] CATT | Proposal 4: For multiple PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling, no more than one PUSCH/PDSCH shall be transmitted in one slot.  Proposal 5: Non-continuous time-domain allocation is indicated by invalid SLIV value in the configuration.  Proposal 6: When the scheduled PDSCH/PUSCH overlaps with unavailable slots/symbols, the corresponding SLIV value can be regarded as invalid.  Proposal 7: Whether the HARQ process ID is still consecutive when one or more SLIVs value is invalid can be further discussed.  Proposal 8: For SCS of 480 KHz, it is not needed to restrict the maximum number of PDSCHs to 4. |
| [8] Qualcomm | Proposal 2: A UE capability to be defined per SCS, to indicate the maximum number of supported PDSCHs/PUSCHs per single DCI for SCS 120kHz and 480kHz.  Proposal 9: For multi-PDSCH/PUSCH DCI fields enhancements:   * CBGTI: Not to be supported for more than one PDSCH/PUSCH * FDRA optimization can be deprioritized   Proposal 10: For TDRA filed of multi-PDSCH/PUSCH grants with single DCI, each row contains a single value of k0/k1 and multiple SLIVs, and new rules are needed to be defined  • For overlapping SLIVs: the second SLIV to be allocated in the next slot.  • Allow SLIV ‘0’ to indicate slot level gaps between the adjacent allocations.  Proposal 11: Introduce new default TDRA PDSCH and PUSCH tables depending on the used SCS, e.g., 960kHz and 480kHz SCS, to be able to schedule all the resources between any two adjacent PDCCH monitoring occasions. The slot offsets in these tables should cover up to the PDCCH monitoring periodicity. For the slots without PDCCH monitoring, L=14 can be considered. |
| [9] OPPO | Proposal 4: The maximum number of PDSCHs/PUSCHs that can be scheduled with a single DCI should be 8 for all the supported SCSs. |
| [10] ZTE | Proposal 1: The CBG (re)transmission should be supported when more than one PUSCHs are scheduled and the CBGTI field should be per re-transmitted PUSCH in the multiple PUSCHs scheduling DCI. |
| [11] Intel | Proposal 1: For multi-PUSCH scheduling,   * Support CBG based scheduling when 2 PUSCHs are scheduled. * Do not support enhancement on FDRA.   Proposal 2: For multi-PDSCH scheduling, supported CBG based scheduling.   * Maximum number of PDSCHs for CBG based scheduling is 2. |
| [12] Fujitsu | Proposal 1: For 120, 480 and 960 kHz SCS, the maximum number of PDSCHs or PUSCHs that can be scheduled with a single DCI in Rel-17 is 8. |
| [13] Apple | Proposal 1: For Rel-17 multi-PUSCH transmission  • The maximum number of PUSCHs that can be scheduled for 120 kHz and 480 kHz SCS can be further restricted based on UE capabilities.  • A clear use case should be made for CBG support for multi-PUSCH transmission.  • The FDRA size should be optimized to reduce the FDRA overhead.  • a single URLLC priority should be assigned to a single DCI  Proposal 2: For multi-PUSCH scheduling with a single DCI the following fields are signaled:  • Per DCI: FDRA, MCS, HARQ\_process\_number  • Per PUSCH: TDRA-K2, TDRA-(S,L), TDRA-Mapping\_type, NDI, RV  • FFS: Uplink TDAI  Proposal 4: For Rel-17 multi-PDSCH transmission  • The maximum number of PDSCHs that can be scheduled for 120 kHz and 480 kHz SCS can be further restricted based on UE capabilities.  • A clear use case should be made for CBG support for multi-PDSCH transmission.  • The FDRA size should be optimized to reduce the FDRA overhead.  • a single URLLC priority should be assigned to a single DCI  Proposal 5: For multi-PDSCH scheduling with a single DCI the following fields are signaled:  • Per DCI: FDRA, 1st MCS, 2nd MCS, HARQ\_process\_number, and PRB bundling size  • Per PDSCH: TDRA-K0, TDRA-(S,L), TDRA-Mapping\_type, 1st NDI, 1st RV, 2nd NDI, 2nd RV, rate matching indicator, and ZP CSI-RS trigger  • FFS: c-DAI, Downlink T-DAI, CGBTI/CBGFI, K1, and PRI. |
| [14] Sony | Proposal 1: CBG-based transmission should not be supported for multi-PUSCH scheduling.  Proposal 3: URLLC related fields should be supported for multi-PUSCH scheduling  • Further study whether single or multiple fields related to URLLC are applied to multiple PUSCH scheduled by single DCI.  Proposal 10: No new DCI format is needed for multi-PUSCH/PDSCH scheduling.  • The same DCI format is used for both single PUSCH/PDSCH scheduling and multi-PUSCH/PDSCH scheduling.  Proposal 11: At least DCI format 0\_1 should be supported for multi-PUSCH scheduling.  Proposal 12: At least DCI format 1\_1 should be supported for multi-PDSCH scheduling.  Observation 2: DCI enhancement may need to be additionally considered in the case that a lot of DCI overhead for multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling is required. |
| [15] NEC | Proposal 1: CBG based (re)transmission is not supported for multi-PDSCH scheduling with a single DCI |
| [16] Samsung | Proposal 1: The maximum number of PDSCHs/PUSCHs scheduled by a single DCI can be 4 or 8 for 120KHz and 480KHz, which is based on UE capability.  Proposal 2: Rel-16 NR-U multi-PUSCH scheduling DCI can be reused for multi-PUSCH in 52.6~71GHz with at least the following enhancement:  - PUSCH TDRA: separate k0, SLIV and mapping type to support non-continuous PUSCH transmissions.  - PUSCH FDRA: larger RRC configured range for RBG.  - URLLC related field: same priority for all PUSCHs scheduled by a single DCI  Proposal 3: For multi-PDSCH scheduling, the bit field common for DL and UL grant use the same design as multi-PUSCH scheduling, and at least following DL-specific bit field should be specified,  - CBG-based transmission is not applicable to multi-PDSCH scheduling, including CBGTI/CBGFI  Proposal 4: Support single DCI for single or multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling as Rel-16 NR-U. |
| [17] MediaTek | Proposal 8: To improve gNB scheduling flexibility, reinterpret CGBTI field to indicate which scheduled PDSCHs corresponding to a DCI are transmitted/retransmitted. |
| [18] Panasonic | Proposal 1: The specification supports 8 as the maximum number of PDSCHs and PUSCH respectively in any SCS in licensed/unlicensed band usage. The UE capability should be discussed later.  Proposal 3: No support CBG-based (re)transmission for multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling by a DCI.  Proposal 5: No need to have the optimization of FDRA size. |
| [19] LG Electronics | Proposal #1: Do not restrict the maximum number of PDSCHs or PUSCHs that can be scheduled with a single DCI to less than 8 for 120 and/or 480 kHz SCS.  Proposal #3: Do not introduce a new DCI format for multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling.  Proposal #4: Do not use DCI format 0\_0/1\_0 for multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling.  Proposal #5: Use DCI format 0\_1 to schedule multiple PUSCHs with a single DCI.  Proposal #6: Use DCI format 1\_1 to schedule multiple PDSCHs with a single DCI.  Proposal #7: For the multi-PUSCH scheduling in Rel-17,   * TDRA: Support slot-level gap between PUSCHs.   + Signalling details: A row index of TDRA table is signalled with {K2, SLIV, mapping type} for the first PUSCH and {D, SLIV, mapping type} for each of next PUSCH(s) where D corresponds to slot level gap between adjacent PUSCHs. * URLLC related fields such as priority indicator and/or open loop power control parameter set indication   + Alt 1: Apply to all of scheduled PUSCHs.   + Alt 2: Present if only a single PUSCH is scheduled, but absent otherwise. * CBGTI: The same rule with Rel-16 is supported, i.e., CBG (re)transmission is not supported if more than one PUSCHs are scheduled but supported otherwise.   Proposal #8: For multi-PDSCH scheduling with a single DCI,   * TDRA: Support slot-level gap between PDSCHs.   + Signalling details: A row index of TDRA table is signalled with {K0, SLIV, mapping type} for the first PDSCH and {D, SLIV, mapping type} for each of next PDSCH(s) where D corresponds to slot level gap between adjacent PDSCHs. * CBGTI/CBGFI: CBGTI/CBGFI field is not present when more than one PDSCHs are scheduled, but present when a single PDSCH is scheduled. |
| [20] Lenovo | Proposal 2: For NR operation between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz with 480 kHz, support scheduling up to 4 PDSCHs by single DCI.  Proposal 3: For NR operation between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz with 120 kHz and 480 kHz, support scheduling up to 8 PUSCHs by single DCI, similar to 960 kHz SCS. |
| [21] Xiaomi | Proposal 6: Support dynamic indication by DCI to determine the number of scheduled TTIs.  Observation 1: The current DCI 0-2/1-2 can be reused to allow frequency domain resource by multi-PRB granularity. |
| [22] InterDigital | Observation 1: To support cases where only small amount of data to be transmitted, enabling single-slot scheduling with slot-based monitoring for all the SCS configurations can be useful.  Proposal 1: Single-slot scheduling with slot-based monitoring is supported for all the SCS values, i.e. 120 kHz, 480 kHz, and 960 kHz.  Observation 2: As the symbol duration scales with the SCS, naturally the number of PDSCHs/PUSCHs that can be supported should also be scaled.  Observation 3: Defining the different maximum number of PDSCH/PUSCHs for 480 kHz based on UE capability introduces additional gNB implementation complexity to handle fragmented UE implementations without clear performance benefits.  Proposal 2: The maximum number of PDSCHs or PUSCHs schedules by a single DCI depends on the SCS.  Proposal 3: The maximum number of PDSCHs or PUSCHs schedules by a single DCI for 480 kHz SCS is 4.  Proposal 4: UE capability on the maximum number of PDSCHs or PUSCHs scheduled by a single DCI for 480 kHz is not supported.  Proposal 5: The benefits of increasing the size of TDRA tables for PDSCH and PUSCH to support multiple PDSCHs/PUSCHs scheduling by single DCI should be carefully evaluated.  Observation 4: It is observed that required payloads of DCI for frequency domain resource allocation do not increase as maximum number of RBs does not increase.  Observation 5: Larger RB size reduces frequency domain resource allocation flexibility, and this may be a crucial disadvantage as higher SCSs occupies larger bandwidths than lower SCSs within the same RBG size.  Proposal 7: The benefits from frequency domain resource allocation enhancements should be carefully evaluated. |
| [24] NTT DOCOMO | Proposal 1: For multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling,  - No need to restrict the maximum number of scheduled PDSCHs/PUSCHs to be smaller than 8 for 480 kHz and/or 120 kHz SCS.  Proposal 2:   * For multi-PUSCH scheduled by single DCI,   + Discuss whether/how a DCI format supporting multi-PUSCH scheduling can support scheduling single PUSCH with repetition.   + CBG based scheduling is not supported when multiple PUSCHs are scheduled by one DCI.   + Support FDRA enhancement to reduce DCI overhead.   + For URLLC related fields, one value of each related field is applied for all scheduled PUSCHs. * For multi-PDSCH scheduled by single DCI,   + Similar consideration on CBG based transmission, FDRA and URLLC fields as multi-PUSCH scheduling can be applied to multi-PDSCH scheduling. |
| [25] Charter | Proposal 1: No further SCS-dependent restrictions are necessary on the maximum number of PDSCHs or PUSCHs that can be scheduled with a single DCI.  Proposal 3: CBGFI/CBGTI is not supported for multi-PDSCH scheduling. |

### Summary (on the maximum number of scheduled PDSCHs/PUSCHs):

Company views on the maximum number (=N\_max) of PDSCHs or PUSCHs that can be scheduled by a single DCI:

* N\_max =8 for all SCSs
  + Supported by Futurewei, Nokia, Ericsson, CATT, OPPO, Fujitsu, Panasonic, LG Electronics, Lenovo (for PUSCH), NTT DOCOMO, Charter
* Additional restriction for 120 kHz SCS or 480 kHz SCS
  + Supported by Huawei (4 for 480 kHz SCS), Lenovo (4 PDSCHs for 480 kHz SCS), InterDigital (4 for 480 kHz SCS)
* UE capability
  + Supported by Qualcomm, Apple, Samsung

[Moderator’s note] 10 companies suggest not to further restrict N\_max to less than 8 for 120 and/or 480 kHz SCS. 3 companies suggest to restrict N\_max to 4 for 480 kHz SCS. 3 companies suggest to define UE capability on how many N\_max can be supported by a UE. Therefore, it is proposed to deprioritize this issue in this meeting.

Please feel free to express views on Moderator’s note, if any.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Views |
| DOCOMO | Fine with the proposal. |
| Qualcomm | We are okay with deprioritizing this discussion for this meeting. |
| MediaTek | Agree with the Moderator’s proposal |
| Samsung | OK to deprioritize the discussion. |
| Fujitsu | OK to deprioritize this issue in this meeting. |
| OPPO | Fine to deprioritize the discussion. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are fine to deprioritize this issue. |
| Nokia/NSB | Agree with Moderator’s proposal |
| Intel | We are fine to deprioritize this issue in this meeting |
| Futurewei | We are ok that this issue be deprioritized, and we believe the coherence time is a factor to consider for the SCS 120kHz case. |
| Apple | We are fine with the moderator’s proposal |
| CATT1 | Fine with the proposal. |
| Convida Wireless | We are fine with moderator’s proposal. |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with deprioritizing this issue. |
| Sony | We are fine with deprioritizing this issue. |

**Summary (on DCI format for multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling):**

Company views on DCI format for multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling:

* Do not use fallback DCI
  + Supported by Huawei, Nokia, LG Electronics
* Use DCI format 0\_1 or 1\_1
  + Supported by Futurewei, Huawei, vivo?, Nokia, Sony, Samsung, LG Electronics

[Moderator’s note] 7 companies suggest to use DCI format 0\_1 for multi-PUSCH scheduling and 1\_1 for multi-PDSCH scheduling. 3 companies suggest not to use fallback DCI for multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling. We can discuss this issue in this meeting.

**Proposal #1 (DCI format):**

* Do not use fallback DCI (i.e., DCI formats 0\_0 and 1\_0) for multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling.
* Use DCI format 0\_1 to schedule multiple PUSCHs with a single DCI.
* Use DCI format 1\_1 to schedule multiple PDSCHs with a single DCI.

Companies are encouraged to provide views on Proposal #1.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Views |
| DOCOMO | Agree with the Proposal.  We think DCI format 0\_1/1\_1 is enough for scheduling multiple PUSCHs/PDSCHs. |
| Qualcomm | We agree with the Moderator’s proposal |
| MediaTek | Agree with the Moderator’s proposal |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support proposal #1 |
| Samsung | We support the Proposal. |
| Panasonic | We support the proposal 1. In addition, our view is DCI format 0\_2/1\_2 should support it as DCI format 0\_2/1\_2 is super set function of DCI format 0\_1/1\_1. |
| Fujitsu | Support the proposal. |
| Xiaomi | Support the proposal |
| OPPO | Agree with the proposal. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We support the proposal. |
| vivo | Support proposal #1. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine with the proposal |
| Nokia/NSB | Support proposal #1. |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Futurewei | We agree that DCI 0\_1/1\_1 are sufficient for the multi-PUSCH/PDSCH be scheduled. |
| Apple | We are fine with the proposal. DCI format 0\_2/1\_2 can also be considered especially since it is configurable and may be used to compensate for the possible increase in DCI format size with the new fields. |
| Ericsson | Support Proposal #1  This is also consistent with multi-PUSCH scheduling introduced in Rel-16. |
| CATT1 | Fine with the proposal. |
| InterDigital | We support this proposal. |
| Convida Wireless | We are fine with moderator’s proposal or open to a (new) DCI format. |
| NEC | We are fine with the proposal |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with the moderator’s proposal |
| Sony | We are fine with the moderator’s proposal |
| Moderator | Proposal #1 seems agreeable to all companies. Regarding DCI format 0\_2/1\_2, I don’t think using DCI format 0\_2/1\_2 for multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling DCI is majority view, so we can discuss it separately later. |

On 5/21 GTW session, the following agreement was made:

### Agreement:

* Do not use fallback DCI (i.e., DCI formats 0\_0 and 1\_0) for multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling.
* Use DCI format 0\_1 to schedule multiple PUSCHs with a single DCI.
* Use DCI format 1\_1 to schedule multiple PDSCHs with a single DCI.

### Summary (on TDRA enhancement):

Company views on TDRA enhancement to support discontinuous allocation for multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling:

* Option 1: {SLIV, mapping type, scheduling offset K0/K2} for each PDSCH/PUSCH in a row of TDRA table
  + Supported by Furutrewei, Huawei, vivo, Apple, Samsung, NTT DOCOMO, Fujitsu, Xiaomi, ZTE, Convida
* Option 1a: {SLIV, mapping type, distance between PXSCHs} for each PDSCH/PUSCH in a row of TDRA table
  + Supported by LG Electronics, Xiaomi, Futurewei, Apple
* Option 2: Based on rate-matching pattern indicator (for PDSCH) or invalid symbol pattern indicator (for PUSCH)
  + Supported by Huawei, Nokia, CATT, MediaTek
* Option 3: When n-th SLIV is overlapped with (n+1)-th SLIV, (n+1)-th SLIV is allocated in the next slot from the slot corresponding to n-th SLIV.
  + Supported by vivo, Qualcomm
* Option 4: Based on invalid SLIV
  + Supported by CATT, Qualcomm (using SLIV=0)

[Moderator’s note] Several options are identified to support discontinuous allocation for multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling. We can discuss (and possibly down-select) this issue in this meeting.

### Proposal #2 (TDRA):

* In order to support non-continuous resource allocation in time-domain, the following options can be considered for TDRA enhancements:
  + Option 1: {SLIV, mapping type, scheduling offset K0/K2} for each PDSCH/PUSCH in a row of TDRA table
  + Option 1a: {SLIV, mapping type, distance between PXSCHs} for each PDSCH/PUSCH in a row of TDRA table
  + Option 2: Based on rate-matching pattern indicator (for PDSCH) or invalid symbol pattern indicator (for PUSCH)
  + Option 3: When n-th SLIV is overlapped with (n+1)-th SLIV, (n+1)-th SLIV is allocated in the next slot from the slot corresponding to n-th SLIV.
  + Option 4: Based on invalid SLIV (e.g., SLIV=0)

Companies are encouraged to provide views on Proposal #2. According to companies’ preference, hopefully we can choose one (or some) of those options in this meeting.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Views |
| DOCOMO | We support option 1 which is the most flexible. |
| Qualcomm | It will be helpful, if we agreed on general points at the beginning before diving in the signaling details. For instance, companies should share their views on allowing slot level gaps and the longest allowed gap between to allocations. In addition, whether we will allow multiple SLIVs to occupy the same slot. This will make sure that companies reach similar understandings about the non-continuous resource allocation.  After, this discussion, we may be able to reorganize the options as some of the options can work together while some of them may be only needed based on the choice of number of offsets in each row of the TDRA table.  For example, we can decide on the number of offsets in each row   * + Option 1: k0/k2 per SLIV   + Option 1a: a single value of k0/k2 per row and distance between PXSCHs   + Option 2: A single value of k0/k2 per row   Then, the remaining options will be only needed to define the gaps under Option 2. |
| MediaTek | We have similar comment with Qualcomm.  First of all, it should be clarified whether the definition of non-continuous resource allow slot level discontinuity, i.e., does it allow the scheduled PDSCHs to be allocated in a set of slots which are not consecutive in time? If not, then option1, option1a, and option2 might not be needed. If it allows, then the range of gap should be discussed.  Second, if achieving slot level gap is the intention of this proposal, then all the options can work. However, we are not sure we should optimize such slot level gap over the continuous resource allocation deployment. Therefore, we prefer not to support option 1, option 1a, option3, and option4. Regarding option 2, in our view, it follows Rel-15/16 rate-matching pattern rule specified in TS 38.214 (clause 5.1.4) and it should be supported naturally. Also, the TDD configuration can also be used as a tool to achieve non-continuous resource, which is related to the discussion in the Q2 in section 3.1. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We would suggest decoupling the questions because the list of options includes solutions that provide a number of symbols less than one slot as gap between two PDSCHs in consecutive slots (option 3), and solutions that provide a gap of one slot between two PDSCHs. We think that the second question should be addressed first (how to provide a gap of one or more slots between two PDSCHs). In this case we should first discuss between option 1, option 1a, option 2 and option 4.  Another question is whether to allow more than one PDSCH in a slot, which may be the intention of option 3. In our view this flexibility is not necessary given the already very short duration of slots with 480 or 960 kHz SCS. Such decision is also needed before progressing on HARQ feedback aspects. |
| Samsung | We also think that some general discussion would be helpful, including slot level gaps (minimum, maximum value), maximum number of indicated SLIVs (e.g. 8 or larger, the actual scheduled number of PDSCH/PUSCHs may be smaller than the number of SLIVs depending on option 2/3/4), etc.  Regarding options listed in proposal #2, we support option 1 for flexibility. The intention of non-continuous resource allocation is not only to provide the gap for semi-static DL/UL resource within consecutive slots, but also to provide the gap for dynamic scheduling, e.g. for other UEs, to reduce latency.  For option 2,3 and 4, more clarification would be helpful.  For option 2, for example, what is the relation between this rate matching pattern and Rel-15/16 rate matching pattern for PDSCH? Is it only RRC configured, or RRC configured + DCI indication. If only RRC configured, how to achieve flexibility for gaps for other dynamic DL or UL transmissions? If it needs DCI indication, what would be the overhead in DCI?  For option 3, does it only support maximum 1 slot gap?  For option 4, how UE knows the slot for PDSCHs other than 1st PDSCH ? |
| Panasonic | Before selecting an option, similar to Qualcomm, we also think to have some discussion on the longest slot gap length and the number of gaps scheduled by a DCI. Depending on these factors, which option to be selected is different in order to have minimum RRC overhead. Our view is the amount of gap is at most 1 or 2 slots, and only 1 or 2 gaps would be sufficient indicated by a DCI as all TBs needs to be confined within coherent times. |
| Fujitsu | We share the view with Huawei that the decision on TDRA is needed before progressing on HARQ feedback aspects, eps. For Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook.  Regarding TDRA, firstly, maybe it should be clarified what kind of ‘non-contiguous resource allocation’ we are talking about. For example, whether it means that the configured SLIVs of a row are non-contiguous or the actual scheduled SLIVs (e.g. considering collision with TDD UL/DL configuration) of a row are non-contiguous.  If it is the former case, we think the baseline should be the method as for multi-PUSCH scheduling in NR-U while symbol-level gap is allowed for neighboring SLIVs. That is, for a row of TDRA table, there is a single k0/k2, N (N>=1) pairs of SLIV and mapping type which are one-to-one corresponding to N consecutive slots.  On top of that, slot-level gap could be supported if there is well-justified motivation. And if it is the majority view is to support slot-level gap, we could be fine with it and prefer Option 1. |
| Xiaomi | We also think that it is necessary to define the longest slot gap length and the number of gaps scheduled by a DCI first.  In addition, some Options listed her cannot work standalone.  For TDRA enhancement, we prefer Option 1 and Option 1a. |
| OPPO | Before we discuss the details of SLIV configuration, we think some clarifications should be made:   1. Is it common understanding that slot-level discontinuity for time domain resource allocation should be supported? Should we have an agreement on this first? 2. In our contribution we have concerns on supporting reception of more than one PDSCHs in one slot at least for 480kHz and 960kHz. This is related to SLIV configuration and we think it should also be discussed together. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | For this proposal, we prefer Option 1 for flexibility.  Besides, we don’t think it is beneficial to configure more than one PDSCH in one slot due to the short slot duration in high frequency. The maximum SLIV number in a row should be limited to 8 and clearly separate k0/k2 values can provide the best flexibility with limited spec impact. |
| Vivo | Similar to the comments provided by QC and other companies, some general issues can be discussed first, such as whether slot-level gap or symbol-level gap is expected, the maximum number of gaps or the longest gap, etc. The answers to these issues will impact the organization and selection of candidate solution(s) significantly.  With respect to the listed options, Option 1 is preferred due to its simplicity and flexibility. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We also agree that general discussion can first be done on whether non-consecutive TDRA only applies across slots or could also be applied within slot.  In our view, considering, multiple SLIVs can be indicated by TDRA, we don’t see any reason to limit the TDRA for non-consecutive PUSCH/PDSCH only across slots. It should be applied to multiple non-consecutive PUSCH/PDSCH within slots.  Then for further signaling aspects, at least each PUSCH/PDSCH should be associated with SLIV.  Further discussion can continue later on mapping type and scheduling offset |
| Nokia/NSB | We are also fine to discuss general issues first.  Among the listed options, we support option 2 which can handle time domain pattern and rate matching pattern together. |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Futurewei | We prefer Option 1 and Option 1a. In our contribution, we discussed about the allowable slot gap for non-continuous multi-PDSCH and suggested a maximal of 2 slots for the gap. We support continue discussion of the minimal/maximal gap selection, and prefer a small gap to be allowable for multi-PDSCH. |
| Apple | We support the emerging consensus that clarifications need to be made on the on the symbol-level vs slot-level gap, the allowance of single or multiple SLIVs within a slot etc as this will impact the TDRA structure. We also agree with Huawei that the TDRA structure will have a direct bearing on the HARQ feedback discussion.  Our initial preferences are for Options 1 and 1a. Also, we do not see a need for more than 1 PDSCH to be transmitted per slot. |
| Ericsson | We support Option 1 due to flexibility and simplicity.  We are also okay to have a general discussion first. One fundamental question that needs to be answered is whether or not a PDSCH in a DCI scheduling multiple PDSCHs is allowed to collide with a set of symbols configured as 'U' by the semi-static TDD DL/UL pattern.  Our assumption is that slot level gaps would be supported, since it is beneficial to "schedule around" UL slots indicated in the TDD pattern (i.e., avoiding collisions with 'U' symbols/slots). As Samsung points out, support of slot level gaps is also beneficial when multiple UEs are scheduled. To support this in a flexible way, we think Option 1 is most suitable. One problem with some of the other options (e.g., Option 2) where a slot is invalidated by rate matching indicator is that it introduces complications on the HARQ-ACK process numbering for the multiple-PDSCHs as well as HARQ-ACK codebook generation. Hence, it would make sense to discuss these issues jointly. |
| CATT1 | We also prefer to have some general discussion first before making the decision . For example, we it’s better to not allow multiple SLIV to occupy the same slot. We also need some further clarification about the options. Right now it looks like option 4 is fine . |
| Convida Wireless | We prefer Option 1. |
| Spreadtrum | We share the same view as majority company that whether to support slot level gap or only symbol level gap should be determined first.  Regarding the listed options, we prefer option 1 for flexibility and simplicity. |
| Moderator | Based on comments, preferences are updated in the summary.  As most companies pointed out, it would be the better approach to make a high level proposal on whether to support slot-level gap and how large gap is necessary if supported. It would be beneficial to allow slot-level gap so that gNB can schedule DL/UL in between scheduled PDSCHs/PUSCHs. Additionally, as to the maximum number of PDSCHs/PUSCHs in a slot, several companies suggest to restrict to one in the same slot but this limitation seems to be desirable for higher SCS such as 480/960 kHz. In this sense, the following Proposal #2a can be made: |

### Proposal #2a (TDRA):

* For enhancement of TDRA in a DCI that can schedule multiple PDSCHs or PUSCHs,
  + Support a gap larger than 1 slot between consecutive PDSCHs or PUSCHs.
    - FFS: The maximum value of the gap
    - FFS: Details to inform the slot gap, e.g.,
      * K0/K2 per SLIV
      * A single value of K0/K2 per row and distance between PXSCHs per SLIV
      * A single value of k0/k2 per row and other methods
  + At least for 480/960 kHz SCSs, at most one PDSCH can be scheduled in a slot by the DCI.
  + At least for 480/960 kHz SCSs, at most one PUSCH can be scheduled in a slot by the DCI.

Companies are encouraged to provide views on Proposal #2a.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Views |
| Moderator | Thanks a lot for sharing your views during GTW session. Regarding Qualcomm’s formulation, this proposal also includes the case where SLIVs always indicate consecutive slots but other information such as rate matching indicator or semi-static UL symbols can disable some of PXSCHs, which makes non-consecutive slot allocation in the end. So, I prefer the current formulation, but I can be flexible based on further comments. ☺ |
| Qualcomm | We are okay with allowing slot level gaps by rate matching or TDD pattern based skipping. However, we do not think that this is captured in the current proposal as the current language of the proposal is only mentioning the TDRA design. Therefore, our understanding is to create long gap, one slot or longer, with TDRA only.  We propose modifying the first bullet to be   * + Support full slot(s) gaps between consecutive PDSCHs or PUSCHs.   To avoid the confusion, as we can have two allocations in slot n and n+1 with gap of 14 symbols, i.e., a slot, while we think that the common understanding is to have two allocations in slots n and n+2, while slot n+1 can be seen as a gap. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Based on the discussion in the GTW, it seems that allowing a gap smaller than 1 slot is not precluded. In this case, we suggest addingM a note stating that. |
| Apple | Alternatively, we could add the word “maximum” indictating that gaps less than a slot are allowed.  “Support a maximum gap larger than 1 slot between consecutive PDSCHs or PUSCHs” |
| Ericsson | We agree with the spirit of the proposal  But we're a bit confused by the confusion raised by Qualcomm :-) What case is Qualcomm trying to cover? In our view, both of the following should be supported:   * Allocations in slot n and n+1 where the gap between the end of the first allocation in slot n and the beginning of the 2nd allocation in slot n+1 can be 14 symbols or more (i.e., 1 slot or greater) * Allocations in slot n and n+X where X > 1, where clearly the gap between the end of the 1st allocation and the beginning of the next is clearly greater than 1 slot   If this is common understanding, then it seems like the Moderator's suggested "gap larger than 1 slot between consecutive PDSCHs" wording covers both. |
| DOCOMO | For the first bullet, we agree with Qualcomm that gap between PDSCHs/PUSCHs in consecutive slots can also be larger than 1 slot. In our understanding, the intention is to allow PDSCHs/PUSCHs in non-consecutive slots. So we suggest to modify the first bullet as   * + Support scheduled PDSCHs or PUSCHs in consecutive or non-consecutive slots.   For the three sub-bullets under the “FFS: Details to inform the slot gap”, we think the second sub-bullet and the third sub-bullet can be combined as “A single value of K0/K2 per row”.  For the last two bullets on restricting up to one PDSCH/PUSCH scheduled in one slot, we are not sure how strong the motivation is, considering there is no such limitation for multi-PUSCH scheduling in 120kHz SCS. We are open to discuss the limitation. |
| Intel | Our view is that both TDRA with consecutive slot and non-consecutive slots can be supported for multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling, i.e., there is no slot gap or the slot level gap > 1.  Instead of only mentioning the > 1 slot gap, it would be good to also support consecutive slot allocation for multiple PDSCHs/PUSCHs for TDRA. |
| Panasonic | For the first bullet, there are two understandings mentioned by Qualcomm and Ericsson. We share the same understanding with Ericsson about the gap between two adjacent/consecutive PDSCHs (or PUSCHs). Although it is covered by the first sub-bullet in FL proposal#2a, we suggest modifying it to avoid any confusion of the two understanding as follows     * + Support a gap equal to or more than 14 symbols between two consecutive PDSCHs or PUSCHs.   Regarding the last two sub-bullets (i.e., at least for 480/960 kHz SCSs, at most one PDSCH can be scheduled in a slot by the DCI; at least for 480/960 kHz SCSs, at most one PUSCH can be scheduled in a slot by the DCI), they preclude to support multi-TRP operation, where 2 PDSCHs can be scheduled in a slot. We think it is beneficial to support multi-TB scheduling in multi-TRP operation for overcoming blockage effect in this frequency range. Therefore, for the sake of progress, we suggest restricting the proposal only for non-multi-TRP operation by adding the following note   * + Note: The last two sub-bullets are not applicable to multi-TRP operation. |
| Xiaomi | For the first sub-bullet, we share same suggestion as DOCOMO that to modify as “support scheduled PDSCHs or PUSCHs in consecutive or non-consecutive slots”. Since if the 1st PDSCH is scheduled in symbol#3~4 in slot n, and the 2nd PDSCH is scheduled in symbol#8~9 in slot n+1, it is still the case of consecutive slots but with gap larger than one slot. |
| Samsung | For 1st sub-bullet, we share the same understanding with Docomo that, the intention is to allow adjacent PDSCH/PUSCHs in non-consecutive slots, rather than whether the number of symbols of the gap can be larger than 14 symbols (1 slot). Therefore, the suggested modification by Docomo is more accurate.   * + Support scheduled PDSCHs or PUSCHs in consecutive or non-consecutive slots.   For 2nd and 3rd sub-bullet, is it only applied to multi-PDSCH scheduling DCI, or is it also applicable to a DCI capable of scheduling only single PDSCH/PUSCH? If the rationale behind 2nd and 3rd sub-bullet is, at most one PDSCH/PUSCH in a slot is sufficient considering slot duration is very short for 480 and 960KHz SCS, it seems these 2 sub-bullets can be applicable to any DCI, regardless the DCI is capable of scheduling single or multiple PDSCH/PUSCHs. |
| vivo | For the first bullet, the wording change suggested by DCM seems to be reasonable.  For the last two bullets, whether at most one PDSCH/PUSCH can be scheduled in a slot or not can be discussed separately. We do not see the strong motivation but are open to discuss it. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | For the 1st sub-bullet, we agree with DOCOMO’s modification.  For the 3 options under the “FFS: Details to inform the slot gap”, the second option is the original Option 1a because it has the same signaling overhead and similar procedure with Option 1. But in the 2nd round summary FL categorizes the options in case of single or separate K0/K2, so the second option can be incorporated into the last option with the current wording. Anyway, the 2nd option is better not to be paralleled with the other 2 options. |
| Fujitsu | For the 1st sub-bullet, we share the understanding with some companies that the intention is to allow to configure consecutive PDSCHs/PUSCHs in non-contiguous slots. We are generally fine with it, but we prefer to make that point clearer. |
| Qualcomm (2) | It will be good to add a FFS on the maximum slot span for the allocations granted by the same DCI. Determining only the maximum gap between two allocations may result in allowing very long allocation, e.g., for a maximum gap of 2 slots and 8 PDSCHs can be scheduled in theory we are allowing scheduling allocations over 22 slots with single DCI |
| Futurewei | We support this propose and Docomo’s suggestion for the correction of the first bullet. For the last two bullets, we think they are applicable for both DCI scheduling single or multiple PDSCHs. Also, we are not so sure about the necessity to allow additional TB in a slot for multi-TRP operation, and this may be an FFS. |
| OPPO | In our view, whether the PDSCHs are consecutive in symbol level or not can be realized by setting flexible SLIV. Moreover we still fail to see the motivation to have non-consecutive slots. We can reuse pre-defined rules to avoid the DL/UL collision by cancelling or skipping the allocated PDSCH. For multi-UE scheduling, the gNB can perfectly configure large number of PDSCH scheduling for the low-load case and configure short number of PDSCH scheduling for high-load case. With this analysis, we don’t support proposal 2a. |
| CATT | We support the proposal with Docomo’s suggested change. |
| MediaTek | We are still not sure we should optimize such slot level gap over the continuous resource allocation deployment. In our view, if Rel-15/16 rate-matching pattern rule specified in TS 38.214 (clause 5.1.4) or other existing confliction rule should be supported naturally. If that is the case, then we probably don’t need some extra configuration flexibility on multi-PDSCHs scheduling.  Regarding the number of PDSCHs per slot under 480/960 kHz, we support only one per slot. |
| Moderator | The wording change suggested from NTT DOCOMO are being supported from several companies, but OPPO and MediaTek have a concern for PXSCH scheduling in non-consecutive slots. So, I tried to incorporate the following cases at once.   1. PXSCHs are scheduled in consecutive slots but other mechanism such as rate-matching indicator can be applied to allow transmissions in non-contiguous slots. 2. PXSCHs can be scheduled in non-consecutive slots.   Even for the first case, legacy tool such as rate-matching indicator may not be directly applied to multi-PDSCH scheduling case which is newly introduced in Rel-17.  With this regard, I revised Proposal #2a from scheduling perspective to transmission perspective.  On top of that, the followings are added to address comments received so far.   1. The second and third examples to inform the gap is merged into one, based on comments from NTT DOCOMO and ZTE 2. One more FFS to define the maximum slot span of PXSCH allocation, based on comment from Qualcomm 3. Allocating at most one PXSCH in a slot can be discussed separately |

### Proposal #2b-1 (TDRA 1):

* For TDRA in a DCI that can schedule multiple PDSCHs (or PUSCHs),
  + A row of the TDRA table can indicate PDSCHs (or PUSCHs) that are in consecutive or non-consecutive slots.
    - FFS: The maximum value of the gap between two consecutively scheduled PDSCHs or between two consecutively scheduled PUSCHs
    - FFS: The maximum value of the gap between the first scheduled PDSCH and the last scheduled PDSCH or between the first scheduled PUSCH and the last scheduled PUSCH
    - FFS: Details to introduce the gap between PDSCHs or between PUSCHs, e.g.,

Companies are encouraged to provide views on Proposal #2b-1.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Views |
| Huawei2, HiSilicon2 | We agree that gaps smaller than one slot should also be supported, as well as gaps larger than 1 slot in consecutive and non-consecutive slots. But the new formulation may be a little confusing (by definition adjacent means no gap…).  Perhaps a formulation avoiding “scheduled” could work better, to allow for the case where consecutive PDSCHs (resp. PUSCHs) may be signaled but some may be skipped (not actually scheduled) depending on collisions with UL or DL slots in TDD configuration (cf proposal 7):   * For TDRA in a DCI that can schedule multiple PDSCHs or PUSCHs,   + A row of the TDRA table can indicate PDSCHs (resp. PUSCHs) that are in consecutive or non-consecutive slots.   We don’t really understand the concerns from Mediatek. Relying only on rate-matching indication may not offer sufficient flexibility and may increase overhead in DCI (if a different rate-matching indication is required per PDSCH), compared to the RRC overhead of the TDRA table.  For the sub-bullets, the “maximum value of the gap” is what can be signalled in the TDRA, but the actual gap may be larger if there is a collision with a UL or DL slot. Perhaps this should be clarified. |
| MediaTek | Thanks Moderator for reflecting our comments in the previous round and we apologize that our comments are not clear. Let us clarify our position. We don’t have a concern on this proposal in general and we just don’t see the need to include non-contiguous slots pattern in TDRA table, which is captured as the FFS bullet   * + - FFS: Details to inform the gap between PDSCHs or between PUSCHs, e.g.,       * K0/K2 per SLIV   A single value of K0/K2 per row.  We already have rate-matching pattern signalling and slot format signalling which can be used for dynamically managing PDSCH reception. On the other hand, we agree with moderator that those existing tools need some discussion to apply on multi-PDSCH scheduling. We also agree with Huawei that those tools are not perfect in terms of scheduling flexibility. However, we are not sure how flexible it can be or we want to achieve if we only have a pre-configured TDRA table with separated K0/K2 for each PDSCH. Therefore, we support to discuss the first two FFS points on the values of gaps and we suggest to remove those examples and change the wording of the third FFS point to  FFS: Details to ~~inform~~ introduce the gap between PDSCHs or between PUSCHs |
| Moderator | Thanks for the quick response. I reflected Huawei’s suggestion to the main bullet and the first sub-bullet. Regarding the question on the “maximum value of the gap”, my understanding was the gap is determined based on scheduling, not based on actual transmission. That’s why I put “scheduled” for PDSCH or PUSCH. If it is not the common understanding, I will modify it to be aligned with the common understanding.  Also MediaTek’s comments for the last FFS are reflected. |
| LG | Fine with the latest updated proposal by FL.  And we share the same view with Huawei that use of rate-matching indication to insert gap would cause inflexibility to gNB’s scheduling, and consequently, it might not be possible to schedule maximum number of PDSCHs in non-consecutive slots. |
| Xiaomi | We are fine with the latest version of the proposal#2b-1 |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine with this proposal#2b-1. |
| Panasonic | We support the proposal#2b-1. |
| DOCOMO | We supported the modified proposal #2b-1.  We also share the same view as Huawei that the “maximum value of the gap” is the gap between PDSCHs/PUSCHs in the TDRA table, without considering UL/DL collision.  Regarding rate matching pattern application for non-contiguous scheduling, it would be inflexible to rely on rate-matching pattern to achieve non-contiguous slot scheduling. In our understanding, the main motivation of rate-matching pattern is to reserve certain resource. But allowing non-contiguous PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling can be motivated by other consideration(s), e.g. multi-UE scheduling as commented by other companies. |
| Convida Wireless | We are fine with the proposal #2b-1. |
| Qualcomm | We are okay with the proposal |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal #2b-1. We also share similar concern as other companies that only relying on rate-matching indication would pose certain restriction on scheduling flexibility.  For the FFS part, we would assume the gap is defined in term of slot to align the main bullet, so we suggest the following update:   * + - FFS: The maximum value of the slot gap between two consecutively scheduled PDSCHs or between two consecutively scheduled PUSCHs     - FFS: The maximum value of the slot gap between the first scheduled PDSCH and the last scheduled PDSCH or between the first scheduled PUSCH and the last scheduled PUSCH   FFS: Details to introduce the slot gap between PDSCHs or between PUSCHs |
| Apple | We are fine with proposal #2b-1.  1. We can remove the “e.g” on the last bullet if there are no examples or add examples to the bullet.  2. We are of the inclination that using the rate-matching pattern to reserve resources may be limiting and using K0/K2 signaling may be cleaner although this is in the FFS. |
| Futurewei | We are fine with proposal #2b-1. Agree with Docomo that it is less flexible to rely on rate-matching pattern to achieve non-contiguous slot scheduling.  An earlier concern on the maximum allowed gap to be determined. If allowing 1 slot maximum, the largest multi-slot length is 15, and 2 slots maximum gives length of 22. In order to argue that 15 is too large or 22 is too large, we still need a basis to talk about how ‘large’ is defined here for B52. I reiterate our prior opinion that the channel coherence time needs to be treated as (at least one of) the key technics for this and few other discussions to have a better basis.  If the channel varies too much during a length 22 slot, maybe many beam-switching inside the slot is needed, which is against the spirit of enabling multi-PDSCH to reduce switching/complexity. |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with the latest updated proposal. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are fine with Proposal 2b-1. |
| Samsung | We’re fine with the upated proposal.  We share similar view with other companies that rely on rate-matching pattern to achieve non-contiguous slot scheduling puts much scheduling restriction. |
| Ericsson | Proposal #2b-1 seems mostly okay.  One question though:  I agree with the modification in the main bullet that uses the word "indicate." But then it seems the FFSs may not be aligned with this. For the FFSs, I assume the intention is to introduce some limit on the gaps and duration can be configured within the TDRA table? Or is the intention to consider gaps after application of a rate matching pattern (e.g., TDD UL/DL pattern). If it is the former, shouldn't the wording be changed in the FFS to align with "indicate" in the main bullet, i.e., so it is more about configuration of gaps and duration in the TDRA table?   * + A row of the TDRA table can indicate PDSCHs (or PUSCHs) that are in consecutive or non-consecutive slots.   …   * + - FFS: The maximum value of the gap between two consecutively scheduled PDSCHs or between two consecutively scheduled PUSCHs     - FFS: The maximum value of the gap between the first scheduled PDSCH and the last scheduled PDSCH or between the first scheduled PUSCH and the last scheduled PUSCH |
| Fujitsu | We are fine with the updated proposal. |
| OPPO | We don’t support the proposal.  We still have concerns on this proposal. As we commented before, the PDSCHs are consecutive in symbol level or not can be realized by setting flexible SLIV. And we still fail to see the motivation to have non-consecutive slots. We can reuse pre-defined rules to avoid the DL/UL collision by cancelling or skipping the allocated PDSCH. For multi-UE scheduling, the gNB can perfectly configure large number of PDSCH scheduling for the low-load case and configure short number of PDSCH scheduling for high-load case. |
| vivo | Fine with the updated proposal |
| OPPO (comment from email reflector) | For proposal#2b-1 (TDRA 1), for the sake of progress, we changed our position and accept this proposal. |
| Moderator | Based on comments, Proposal #2b-1 seems quite stable while OPPO is against it.   * To Intel, “slot” is added for the first two FFS parts. But for the last FFS, it would be better to leave as is since the gap in the last FFS could imply symbol level gap. * To Apple, comments to remove “e.g.” is reflected * To Ericsson, the intention here was to introduce some limit on the gaps and duration can be configured within the TDRA table, which is the former case in your statement. But I intentionally used “scheduled” for FFS and “indicate” for the first sub-bullet. “Indicate” for the first bullet implies even though PDSCHs are scheduled in consecutive slots, those PDSCHs can be transmitted in non-consecutive slots after application of e.g., rate matching indicator. On the other hand, for FFS part, the slot gap limitation is decided before application of rate matching indicator, i.e., based on TDRA configuration. Hope this clarifies my intention. But let me know if you have better suggestion ☺ * To OPPO, thank you for accepting this proposal! |

### Proposal #2c-1 (TDRA 1):

* For TDRA in a DCI that can schedule multiple PDSCHs (or PUSCHs),
  + A row of the TDRA table can indicate PDSCHs (or PUSCHs) that are in consecutive or non-consecutive slots.
    - FFS: The maximum value of the slot gap between two consecutively scheduled PDSCHs or between two consecutively scheduled PUSCHs
    - FFS: The maximum value of the slot gap between the first scheduled PDSCH and the last scheduled PDSCH or between the first scheduled PUSCH and the last scheduled PUSCH
    - FFS: Details to introduce the gap between PDSCHs or between PUSCHs

### Proposal #2d-1 (TDRA 1):

* For TDRA in a DCI that can schedule multiple PDSCHs (or PUSCHs),
  + A row of the TDRA table can indicate PDSCHs (or PUSCHs) that are in consecutive or non-consecutive slots.
    - FFS: The maximum value of the ~~slot~~ gap between two consecutively scheduled PDSCHs or between two consecutively scheduled PUSCHs
    - FFS: The maximum value of the ~~slot~~ gap between the first scheduled PDSCH and the last scheduled PDSCH or between the first scheduled PUSCH and the last scheduled PUSCH
    - FFS: Details to introduce the gap between PDSCHs or between PUSCHs

Companies are encouraged to provide views on Proposal #2c-1.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Views |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support |
| OPPO | We support the original version without the added word ‘slot’ |
| Qualcomm | We are okay with the proposal  We do not think that it is necessary to add slot in the second sentence |
| Apple | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Ericsson | @Moderator: thank-you for the clarification.  We support the proposal without the added word "slot." Gaps are not always integer number of slots. |
| CATT | We support this proposal |
| Moderator | “slot” in FFS bullets are now removed. **Please provide views on Proposal #2d-1.** |
| Nokia/NSB | We are fine with the proposal. We prefer original proposal #2c-1. |

### Proposal #2b-2 (TDRA 2):

* In Rel-17 for NR 52.6-71 GHz, UE does not expect to be scheduled with more than one PDSCHs in a slot [, by a DCI that is configured with TDRA table containing at least one row with multiple SLIVs].
* In Rel-17 for NR 52.6-71 GHz, UE does not expect to be scheduled with more than one PUSCHs in a slot [, by a DCI that is configured with TDRA table containing at least one row with multiple SLIVs].

Companies are encouraged to provide views on Proposal #2b-2. It is moderator’s understanding that if we cannot reach a consensus on Proposal #2b-2, then we will allow more than one PDSCHs (PUSCHs) in a slot, as in Rel-15/16.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Views |
| Huawei2, HiSilicon2 | We agree with the proposal, but we don’t agree with the default agreement.  Slots are so short that scheduling more than one PDSCH or PUSCH within a slot seems of little use, and not having this complexity would greatly simplify the design (and thus the complexity) especially for HARQ.  In the case of DCI not configured to schedule multiple PDSCHs, it is unclear why gNB would schedule two PDSCHs in the same slot when the two DCIs indicate different values of k0, because that would mean the traffic is known sufficient well in advance, so the gNB could as well schedule the two PDSCHs in different slots. In case the two PDSCHs are scheduled within the same slot by two DCIs received in the same slot (with the same k0), then this means the UE has to monitor almost back-to-back PDCCHs within a short slot of 120/480/960 kHz, which is probably not a realistic assumption. At least this doesn’t follow from the logic to specify multi-slot PDCCH monitoring capability for the purpose of reducing the UE complexity.  So even for the case of single PDSCH scheduling, we may not need to support scheduling 2 PDSCHs in the same slot. The same logic would apply for PUSCH. |
| LG | Not supportive to this proposal.  Currently, TDMed PDSCH reception is not a mandatory feature for all the UEs but an optional feature as UE capability. We don’t see the reason to erase the existing UE capability at this early stage even though we can’t say yet there would be no potential use case/scenario (such as multi-beam operation, MTRP transmission, and so on).  On the other hand, it is OK to limit to schedule at most one PDSCH per slot by a multi-PDSCH scheduling DCI. |
| Xiaomi | We are fine with Proposal#2b-2 with or without the yellow parts and we slightly prefer it without the yellow parts because of the same reason noted by HW. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We do not support the proposal to introduce such restriction. |
| Panasonic | In our view, multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling by a DCI can be applicable for not only single TRP operation, but also for multi-TRP operation. Multi-TRP operation is beneficial to overcome blockage effect in high frequency range and provides high reliability. If a joint HARQ feedback for multiple PDSCHs is supported and sent to multiple TRPs, it can improve robust of HARQ feedback as well. In addition, in Rel. 15/16, more than one PDSCHs (PUSCHs) can be allocated in a slot. Hence, we want to restrict the proposal#2b-2 to single TRP operation for a sake of progress by adding the following bullet   * Only apply for single TRP operation |
| DOCOMO | We are open to discuss the limitation but we hope more clarification that there may be any difficulty from UE capability or implementation perspective for multiple PDSCHs/PUSCHs in the same slot.  Moreover, if such limitation is supported, as multiple PUSCHs in one slot in not precluded in Rel-16, do we need to add such limitation also for 120kHz SCS?  From another perspective of view, multiple PDSCHs/PUSCHs in one slot may be helpful considering possible PDSCHs/PUSCHs dropped due to LBT failure. |
| Convida Wireless | We are fine with the proposal #2b-2 for multi-PDSCH only. |
| Qualcomm | We are okay with the proposal in general.  For allowing more than one SLIV of PDSCH in the same slot, this can be problematic for UE processing and HARQ procedure and bookkeeping. For PUSCH case, it may be okay, but we do not see strong motivation to allow it. |
| Intel | We don’t support the proposal.  Multiple PDSCHs that are TDM’ed in a slot is support for SCS 120kHz in NR. There is no reason why the same functionality cannot be supported for SCS 120kHz in this WI. Further, same design principle is preferred for SCS 120/480/960kHz. Finally, it means multiple PDSCHs that are TDM’ed in a slot should be a capability of UE for SCS 120/480/960kHz |
| Apple | We are fine with the proposal with or without the text in the square brackets especially for the 480 kHz and 960 kHz scenarios. |
| Futurewei | We are supportive of the proposal and think that allowing more than one PDSCH inside one slot is not necessary for these larger SCSs.  This offers the benefit of the larger SCSs for simplifying the allocation. |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with the proposal. From our point of view, allowing multiple PDSCHs to be scheduled in one slot will result in more stringent processing timing which is not expected for the UE. In addition, for larger SCSs such as 480kHz/960kHz, the slot-level scheduling method has already met the latency requirement of latency-sensitive traffic. There is no obvious benefits to introducing the method of scheduling multiple PDSCHs in one slot.  Regarding PUSCHs, it may be OK, but we think it is better to maintain the same design principles of PUSCH and PDSCH. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are fine with the Proposal 2b-2 without the text in bracket. Even for single PDSCH scheduling, we don’t see benefit to support multiple PDSCH in a slot at least for 480kHz/960kHz. For PUSCH scheduling, we prefer the same design as for PDSCH. |
| Samsung | We can support the proposal for 480/960KHz SCS. But, we’d like to better understand for 120KHz SCS. In our understanding, it is already supported by UE feature.  Regarding the text in the square brackets, we think it can be deleted. As we previously commented, it does not depend on whether DCI can scheduling single or multiple PDSCH/PUSCHs. |
| Ericsson | We share a similar view as Panasonic in that we do not want to rule out multi-TRP operation, e.g., {tdmSchemeA,fdmSchemeA,fdmSchemeB}.  For single TRP In Rel-17 for NR 52.6-71 GHz, UE does not expect to be scheduled with more than one PDSCHs in a slot |
| Huawei3, HiSilicon3 | We are ok with Panasonic’s proposal to clarify that we are discussing the sTRP case only. For the sake of progress, we are ok to limit the proposal to 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS (our preference is without the text highlighted in yellow, as explained in our second response). |
| Fujitsu | We are fine with the proposal with the yellow part. However, we share the same view with LG that we should not totally erase the existing UE capability at this early stage. |
| OPPO | We support the proposal. |
| Vivo | At least we do not see strong motivation to introduce such restrictions, instead they may be subject to UE capabilities as some company mentioned. |
| Moderator | Company views are summarized as follows:   * Support: Huawei (for all SCSs, also OK for 480/960 kHz), LG Electronics (only for multi-PXSCH scheduling case), Xiaomi, Panasonic (only for single TRP), Convida (only for multi-PXSCH scheduling case), Qualcomm (UE processing complexity), Apple (480/960 kHz), Futurewei, Spreadtrum, ZTE (w/o restriction), Samsung (w/o restriction), Ericsson (only for single TRP), Fujitsu (only for multi-PXSCH scheduling case), OPPO * NOT support: Lenovo, NTT DOCOMO (benefit for LBT failure), Intel, Samsung (for 120 kHz), vivo   Considering the diverged views from companies, **it is recommended to further discuss this issue in the next meeting, at least considering the following aspects**:   * SCS-dependent restriction (e.g., same as R16 for 120 kHz, but one PXSCH in a slot for 480/960 kHz) * DCI-dependent restriction (e.g., same as R16 for single PXSCH scheduling DCI, but one PXSCH in a slot for multi-PXSCH scheduling DCI) * Repetition based transmission (e.g., R16 m-TRP PDSCH transmission) |

### Summary (on FDRA enhancement):

Company views on FDRA enhancement:

* Same as in Rel-16 (i.e., no enhancement): Huawei, vivo, Spreadtrum, Qualcomm, Intel, Panasonic
* FDRA field enhancement to reduce DCI overhead
  + Supported by Futurewei, Ericsson, Apple, Samsung, NTT DOCOMO

[Moderator’s note] 5 companies suggest to enhance FDRA field to reduce DCI overhead while 6 companies are against FDRA enhancement. Therefore, it is proposed to deprioritize this issue in this meeting.

Please feel free to express views on Moderator’s note, if any.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Views |
| DOCOMO | Fine with the proposal. |
| Qualcomm | We think that this discussion can be deprioritized |
| MediaTek | Agree with the Moderator’s proposal |
| Samsung | OK to deprioritize this issue. |
| Panasonic | Fine to deprioritize this issue. |
| Fujitsu | OK to deprioritize this issue in this meeting. |
| Xiaomi | Fine to deprioritize this issue |
| OPPO | We think FDRA enhancement is not necessary. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are fine to deprioritize this issue. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We agree to deprioritize this issue |
| Nokia/NSB | Agree with Moderator |
| Futurewei | We are ok to deprioritize this issue. |
| Apple | We are fine with the proposal. |
| CATT1 | Fine with the proposal |
| InterDigital | We think FDRA enhancement is not necessary and thus FDRA follows Rel-16 procedure. Based on the understanding, we are fine to deprioritize this issue. |
| Convida Wireless | We prefer FDRA bit field in DCI format can be further enhanced at least for higher SCS such 480, 960 KHz. |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with deprioritizing this issue. |
| Sony | We are fine to deprioritize this issue. |
| Vivo | We think FDRA enhancement is not necessary. |
| OPPO | agree |

### Summary (on CBG-based (re)transmission support of multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling DCI):

Company views on CBG-based (re)transmission support of multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling DCI:

* CBG (re)transmission is NOT supported for multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling DCI
  + Supported by Futurewei (for 480/960 kHz SCS), Huawei, Nokia, Ericsson (for PDSCH), Sony, NEC, ~~Samsung~~, Panasonic, Charter, Apple (for 480/960 kHz SCS)
* CBG-related field (e.g., CBGTI or CBGFI) is not present when more than one PDSCHs or PUSCHs are scheduled, i.e., similar to Rel-16
  + Supported by vivo, Spreadtrum, Ericsson (for PUSCH), Qualcomm, MediaTek, LG Electronics, NTT DOCOMO, Samsung, Apple (for 120 kHz)
* CBG-related field (e.g., CBGTI or CBGFI) is present when TWO PDSCHs or PUSCHs are scheduled
  + Supported by Intel
* CBG-related field (e.g., CBGTI or CBGFI) is always present
  + Supported by ZTE

[Moderator’s note] Most companies expressed their views on this issue, so we can discuss this issue in this meeting.

### Proposal #3 (CBG):

* For a DCI that can schedule multiple PDSCHs,
  + CBG-based (re)transmission is not supported for the DCI.
  + Note: Multi-PDSCH scheduling for the case of 120 kHz SCS is still FFS as per prior agreement. This case can be addressed after this FFS has been decided.
* For a DCI that can schedule multiple PUSCHs,
  + For a serving cell configured with 480 or 960 kHz SCS, CBG-based (re)transmission is not supported for the DCI.
  + For a serving cell configured with SCS other than 480 and 960 kHz SCSs, CBG-based (re)transmission is supported as in Rel-16, i.e., CBG (re)transmission is not supported if more than one PUSCHs are scheduled but supported otherwise.

Companies are encouraged to provide views on Proposal #3.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Views |
| DOCOMO | We are fine with the principle of the proposal.  For the FFS under the first bullet on DCI for scheduling multiple PDSCHs, we think the principle should also be applied to 120kHz SCS if the 120kHz SCS is supported. |
| Qualcomm | We found the proposal confusing in the sense that it is not clear whether we will not support CBG-based re(transmission) in the case of more than a single PDSCH/PUSCH is scheduled by the same DCI or the DCI format itself that can schedule multi-PDSCH/PUSCH grant will not have CBG related fields |
| MediaTek | We support the proposal in principle.  We have same confusion as Qualcomm. Is the proposal to not support CBG-based transmission for 120/480/960 kHz multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling but to support CBG-based transmission for 120 kHz single PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling? If so, we can support. However, then the case of 480/960 kHz single PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling should be FFS. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Question for the first bullet point: a DCI that can schedule multiple PDSCHs means that the TDRA table contains at least one row with multiple SLIVs. If this is the correct understanding, this means that CBG-based re(transmission) is not supported even if this DCI is used to schedule a single PDSCH. With this understanding, we support the proposal. |
| Samsung | We don’t support the proposal. We think no need to forbid CBG-based transmission when the DCI schedules a single PDSCH/PUSCH, no matter this DCI can schedule single or multiple PDSCH/PUSCHs. I move Samsung from ‘CBG (re)transmission is NOT supported for multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling DCI’ to ‘CBG-related field (e.g., CBGTI or CBGFI) is not present when more than one PDSCHs or PUSCHs are scheduled, i.e., similar to Rel-16’.  We don’t understand why we need separate handling for PUSCH and PDSCH. Further clarification would be appreciated. |
| Panasonic | Our view is not to support CBG-based (re)transmission. Separately, we support multi-PDSCH scheduling for the case of 120 kHz SCS. |
| Fujitsu | With the same understanding as Huawei, we support the proposal in principle. And it may be helpful to further clarify that the CBG-related field is not present in the DCI. |
| Xiaomi | We think it is not necessary to restrict the DCI not to support CBG-based (re)transmission. Only in the case of Multi-PDSCHs/PUSCHs are scheduled, CBG-based (re)transmission is not supported. |
| OPPO | We think for a DCI capable of scheduling multiple PDSCHs but schedules a single PDSCH, CBG-based (re)transmission could be supported, which is similar as NR-U multi-PUSCH scheduling. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Consider that most companies don’t support CBG-based (re)transmission when more than one PUSCHs or PDSCHs are scheduled, we can compromise but at least when single PUSCH or PDSCH is scheduled, CBG-based (re)transmission should be supported, similar as Rel-16 NRU. |
| Vivo | We share the same views as Samsung, and don’t support the proposal. In our opinion, the same mechanism defined for multi-PUSCH scheduling in NR-U Rel-16 can be reused for multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling in Rel-17. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support the proposal and our understanding is that both CBG-based transmission and retransmission are not supported with DCI scheduling multiple PDSCHs/PUSCHs |
| Nokia/NSB | Support Proposal #3. |
| Futurewei | Our view is that CBG-based (re)transmission is not supported when multiple PDSCHs/PUSCHs  are scheduled. The current version of proposal may only need little clarification for whether the DCI field still present. |
| Apple | To clarify, for 480 kHz and 960 kHz, CBG-based (re)transmission is not supported for both PDSCH and PUSCH. For 120 kHz transmission, Rel-16 behavior is used i.e. no CBG based (re)transmission if more than one PUSCH is selected with FFS for PDSCH.  We are fine with the proposal and I have added Apple’s positions to the company list. |
| Ericsson | In general, we agree with the direction of the proposal (at least the first bullet) in that we think that the combination of multi-PxSCH scheduling and CBG-based (re)transmission is not beneficial. The current wording of the 2nd bullet seems to allow CBG-based (re)transmission for multi-PUSCH scheduling for 120 kHz, and we don’t agree with that. For example, what if the TDRA table includes at least one row with a single SLIV and other row(s) with multiple SLIVs? CBG-based (re)transmission is not beneficial for large SCS (even 120 kHz), due to lack of time variation within a slot. Either all PUSCHs will fail, or all will succeed, hence there is no gain in retransmission efficiency with CBGs. Potential benefit of CBGs is limited to FR1 and small SCS, e.g., 15 kHz.  Similar to some other companies, we think that some clarifications are needed:   * It is our understanding is that multi-PxSCH scheduling means that “the corresponding TDRA table is configured with at least one row that can schedule multiple PxSCHS”, hence this should be clarified for both PDSH and PUSCH * It should be clarified that the DCI scheduling multi-PxSCHs will not be configured with the CBG related fields. * If Proposal #1 is agreed, then “For a DCI” can be replaced with the actual DCI format (1\_0 for multi-PUSCH; 1\_1 for multi-PDSCH).   Based on this we propose the following update:   * For a DCI that can schedule multiple PDSCHs (i.e., the corresponding TDRA table includes one or more rows with multiple SLIVs),   + CBG-based (re)transmission is not supported for the DCI.   + The CBG-related fields (CBGTI and CBGFI) are not configured in the DCI   + Note: Multi-PDSCH scheduling for the case of 120 kHz SCS is still FFS as per prior agreement. This case can be addressed after this FFS has been decided. * For a DCI that can schedule multiple PUSCHs (i.e., the corresponding TDRA table includes one or more rows with multiple SLIVs),   + For a serving cell configured with 120, 480 or 960 kHz SCS, CBG-based (re)transmission is not supported for the DCI.   + The CBG-related field (CBGTI) is not configured in the DCI   ~~For a serving cell configured with SCS other than 480 and 960 kHz SCSs, CBG-based (re)transmission is supported as in Rel-16, i.e., CBG (re)transmission is not supported if more than one PUSCHs are scheduled but supported otherwise~~. |
| CATT1 | We support the proposal |
| InterDigital | We share the similar view with Samsung that we don’t need different handling for PUSCH and PDSCH. Therefore, if one PDSCH is scheduled, CBG based (re)transmission is supported as of Rel-16. Otherwise, CBG based (re)transmission is not supported. |
| Convida Wireless | We are fine with the moderator’s proposal but supporting multi-PDSCH for SCS 120 KHz needs to be further studied. |
| NEC | We support the proposal in principle, and we have the similar confusion as Qualcomm, it would be helpful to further clarify the confusion. |
| Spreadtrum | From our perspective, we believe that when DCI schedules only a single PXSCH, there is no need to prohibit CBG retransmission. Therefore, we think that the terminology “DCI” in the first and second bullet is not clear yet. So far we don’t have an agreement that different DCI formats should be used for single PXSCH scheduling or multiple PXSCHs scheduling. Just like Rel-16 NR-U, A single DCI format can be used to schedule single PXSCH or multiple PXSCHs by applying different TDRA tables. |
| Sony | We are fine with the moderator’s proposal. |
| Moderator | My apology for making a confusion. What I intended was not to configure CBG-related field(s) in a DCI that is configured with the TDRA table containing at least one row with multiple SLIVs, which is in-line with Huawei’s understanding. However, looking at all of comments, companies’ views are somehow split, as follows.   * As in R16 for all SCSs (8): Samsung, Xiaomi, OPPO, ZTE, vivo, Futurewei, InterDigital, Spreadtrum * As in R16 for 120 kHz SCS, but not allowing CBG + multi-PxSCH for 480/960 kHz (9): NTT DOCOMO, MediaTek, Huawei, Fujitsu, Nokia, Apple, Convida, NEC, Sony * Not allowing CBG + multi-PxSCH for 480/960 kHz (4): Panasonic, Lenovo, Ericsson   It is observed that at least for 120 kHz, majority companies support Rel-16 behavior (i.e., CBGTI is present when a single PUSCH is scheduled but not present when more than one PUSCHs are scheduled). But we need further discussion for 480/960 kHz SCS, So the following proposal #3a can be made: |

### Proposal #3a (CBG):

* At least for 120 kHz SCS, for a DCI that can schedule multiple PUSCHs and is configured with the TDRA table containing at least one row with multiple SLIVs,
  + If CBG-based (re)transmission is configured, CBGTI field is not present when more than one PUSCHs are scheduled, but present when a single PUSCH is scheduled, as in Rel-16.
* FFS:
  + For 480/960 kHz SCS, whether to apply the same behavior with 120 kHz SCS or not to support CBGTI field configuration in the DCI
  + For a DCI that can schedule multiple PDSCHs and is configured with the TDRA table containing at least one row with multiple SLIVs, whether/how to configure CBGTI/CBGFI fields

Companies are encouraged to provide views on Proposal #3a.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Views |
| Qualcomm | We are okay with the updated proposal |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine with the proposal |
| Apple | Minor typo  If CBG-based (re)transmission is configured, CBGTI field is not present when more than one PUSCHs are scheduled, but is present when a single PUSCH is scheduled, as in Rel-16.  We are fine with the proposal. |
| Ericsson | We do not agree to the first bullet for the following reasons:   * We disagree that this Rel-16 behavior should be automatically inherited for the 52.6 – 71 GHz band. For Rel-16 NR-U, the context was multi-PUSCH scheduling for 15/30 kHz where the slots are comparatively long. * CBG-based (re)transmission is not useful for 120 kHz, since the slot is very short, and thus there is little time variation of the channel across the slot, so either (1) all code blocks fail or (2) all pass. Consequently, there is nothing to be gained in selective re-transmission efficiency by configuring CBG. |
| DOCOMO | We support the proposal in principle but we are a little confused what new things are agreed by the proposal#3a compared to previous situations. For the first main bullet, it was already specified in R16. We are not sure why we need an agreement here again. And the FFS issues are already in our study scope.  For the first FFS sub-bullet, we prefer to apply the same behavior for 120kHz SCS to all 480/960 SCSs.  For the second FFS bullet, we think same principle of multi-PUSCH scheduling can be applied to multi-PDSCH scheduling, i.e. CBGTI/CBGFI fields are not present if multiple PDSCHs are scheduled, but present if only one PDSCH is scheduled |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Panasonic | For the sake of progress, we are fine with the proposal (with fixed typo by Apple) in general. |
| Xiaomi | We are fine with the Proposal#3a |
| Samsung | We’re general fine with the proposal.  Some clarification questions for FFS points.  For FFS points, is 1st sub-bullet only for multi-PUSCH case? For 2nd sub-bullet, we share same view with Docomo that the same mechanism should be applied for multi-PDSCH and PUSCH case.  Besides, the wording in FFS point seems only for DCI capable of scheduling multiple PDSCH/PUSCHs. But we think whether CBG is beneficial for 480 or 960KHz SCS does not depend on single or multiple PDSCH scheduling DCI. In other words, if gNB configures 480/960KHz SCS while configures a DCI only capable of scheduling for a single PDSCH, whether CBG can be supported in such DCI? |
| Vivo | Fine with the Proposal #3a. For the two FFS sub-bullets, we share the same views as DCM that the same behaviour can be applied. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are generally fine with the proposal.  For the 2nd FFS, we share similar view with DOCOMO that the same mechanism should be applied for both multi-PUSCH and multi-PDSCH, we don’t see fundamental different between that. |
| Fujitsu | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Futurewei | Support the proposal #3a in principle. Regarding whether it is always the case that all CBs either pass or fail for SCS 120kHz, and whether there is non-trivial channel variation in a slot depends on the maximum Doppler shift. Technical discussions on the channel variation for SCS 120kHz would be helpful for better deciding the CBG related issues and whether to support multi-PDSCHs as well. |
| OPPO | support |
| CATT | We support the spirit of the proposal but the wording is confusing. Note the proposal seems a natural extension of the following proposal:  CBG-based (re)transmission is supported as in Rel-16, i.e., CBG (re)transmission is not supported if more than one PUSCHs are scheduled. We suggest first agree the above proposal. |
| Moderator | Thanks Panasonic and Lenovo for being positive for Proposal #3a even though they showed objection in the first round discussion.  Among 15 companies who provided comments, 14 companies are generally fine with Proposal #3a while 1 company is against. So, I would like to ask if Ericsson can accept Proposal #3.  I acknowledge that the main bullet is the same as in Rel-16. However, there is FFS points considering new SCSs and multi-PDSCH scheduling, which makes the proposal #3 different from Rel-16, even though the difference is a bit marginal.  I also added the last sub-bullet to emphasize common design principle between multi-PDSCH and multi-PUSCH scheduling.  To Samsung,  The first sub-bullet under FFS is for multi-PUSCH scheduling. I thought it can be seen as multi-PUSCH scheduling due to “the” DCI. But in case it is unclear, I can add more phrase to indicate that it is for multi-PUSCH scheduling case. |

### Proposal #3b (CBG):

* At least for 120 kHz SCS, for a DCI that can schedule multiple PUSCHs and is configured with the TDRA table containing at least one row with multiple SLIVs,
  + If CBG-based (re)transmission is configured, CBGTI field is not present when more than one PUSCHs are scheduled, but is present when a single PUSCH is scheduled, as in Rel-16.
* FFS:
  + For 480/960 kHz SCS, whether to apply the same behavior with 120 kHz SCS or not to support CBGTI field configuration in the DCI that can schedule multiple PUSCHs
  + For a DCI that can schedule multiple PDSCHs and is configured with the TDRA table containing at least one row with multiple SLIVs, whether/how to configure CBGTI/CBGFI fields
  + Aim the same behavior between multi-PUSCH scheduling and multi-PDSCH scheduling cases

Companies are encouraged to provide views on Proposal #3b.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Views |
| Huawei2, HiSilicon2 | We agree with the views from Ericsson on proposal #3a. In addition, for 480/960 kHz SCS, we assume that most of the time scheduling will be based on multi-slot PDCCH monitoring where multiple PDSCHs/PUSCHs will be scheduled by a single DCI, making the use of a single PDSCH/PUSCH with CBG a corner case, therefore offering really limited benefits. Scheduling a single PDSCH scheduling may be mostly used for common search space and fallback DCI.  Note that compared to Rel-16, we have already agreed to modify the TDRA for multi-PUSCH scheduling to allow for scheduling PUSCHs in non-continuous slots, so the Rel-16 design does not automatically translate to above 52.6 GHz in this case.  Finally, since the specification impact is largely different in case of PDSCH and PUSCH, especially for HARQ feedback, we don’t agree with the last bullet added to proposal #3b. |
| LG | Fine with the proposal in principle. |
| Xiaomi | We are fine with the proposal#3b |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support the proposal |
| DOCOMO | We support the proposal.  Regarding Huawei’s comment, we are confused what impact introduced by non-contiguous allocation may make the principle/motivation of Rel-16 CBG design not applicable here. |
| Qualcomm | We support the proposal |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Apple | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Futurewei | We are okay with the proposal. |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with the proposal. |
| NEC | We are fine with the proposal. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Samsung | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Ericsson | We still have concerns about the usefulness of CBG based (re)transmission for SCS >= 120 kHz even for single PDSCH transmission, and we have not heard the technical benefits. As we have stated before, CBG based (re)transmission is not beneficial unless the slot is long (e.g., 15 kHz) and significant time variation occurs such that some codeblocks fail and some pass. Just because CBG + multi-PUSCH is supported in Rel-16 (for 15/30 kHz), it does not mean that it is useful for 120, 480, and 960 kHz SCS when the slot is very short such that little time variation is expected.  We could be okay with supporting CBG based (re)transmission for 120 kHz (but not 480/960) if all rows of the TDRA table contain only single SLIV (i.e., single PUSCH/PDSCH scheduling) if companies really feel a need to support CGG (re)transmission for single PUSCH/PDSCH.  But if any DCI is configured for multi-PDSCH scheduling on/for any serving cell in the same PUCCH cell group, then our preference is that CBG would be disabled. This would lead to a uniform design across 120/480/960 kHz SCS. Furthermore, it would simplify the HARQ-ACK codebook design. |
| Huawei3, HiSilicon3 | To clarify our comment to Docomo, we are not saying that non-contiguous allocation has impact on the discussion on CBG support. Our comment was just to clarify that RAN1 has already agreed to modify the TDRA for multi-PUSCH scheduling compared to Rel-16 due to the introduction of non-continuous allocation, so keeping the same design as Rel-16 for CBG-based transmission is not a consideration in our view. We can discuss whether to support CBG-based transmission for PUSCH or not.  That being said, we are ok with the proposal except for the third FFS sub-bullet. |
| Fujitsu | We are fine with the proposal. |
| OPPO | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Vivo | Fine with the Proposal #3b. |
| Moderator | Company views are summarized as follows:   * Support: LG Electronics, Xiaomi, Lenovo, NTT DOCOMO, Qualcomm, Intel, Apple, Futurewei, Spreadtrum, NEC, ZTE, Samsung, Huawei (can be OK w/o third FFS), Fujitsu, OPPO, vivo * NOT support: Ericsson   Thanks Huawei for being flexible. Now, based on Huawei’s comment, the very last bullet is removed. Could Ericsson make a compromise given this situation? |

### Proposal #3c (CBG):

* At least for 120 kHz SCS, for a DCI that can schedule multiple PUSCHs and is configured with the TDRA table containing at least one row with multiple SLIVs,
  + If CBG-based (re)transmission is configured, CBGTI field is not present when more than one PUSCHs are scheduled, but is present when a single PUSCH is scheduled, as in Rel-16.
* FFS:
  + For 480/960 kHz SCS, whether to apply the same behavior with 120 kHz SCS or not to support CBGTI field configuration in the DCI that can schedule multiple PUSCHs
  + For a DCI that can schedule multiple PDSCHs and is configured with the TDRA table containing at least one row with multiple SLIVs, whether/how to configure CBGTI/CBGFI fields

Companies are encouraged to provide views on Proposal #3c.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Views |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support |
| Qualcomm | We are okay with the proposal |
| Apple | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Ericsson | We still have not heard a technical motivation for support of CBG for large SCS (>= 120 kHz), especially on the question of gains in re-transmission efficiency for short slots where there is very little time variation within a slot rendering CBG (re)transmission ineffective. However, since it seems we are alone on this we can agree to extend the same mechanism as Rel-16 for PUSCH for 120 kHz.  Hence, we can compromise to support Proposal #3c (assuming the last sub-bullet stays removed).  However, for 480/960 kHz PUSCH and for 120/480/960 PDSCH, there is no performance motivation to support configuration of the CBGTI/CBGFI fields. For the case of PDSCH it only complicates HARQ codebook discussions without a benefit in performance. |
| Nokia/NSB | We are fine with the proposal. |
| CATT | It seems to us the intention of this proposal is for supporting CBG transmission with SCS 120kHz when single PUSCH is scheduled. We would like to defer the discussion of this issue as it is not essential for muti-PUSCH scheduling. Aslo , as stated in the FFS bullet, for the case that the TDRA table for multiple PUSCHs is used but only one PUSCH is valid, it is complicated. |

### Summary (on URLLC related field enhancement):

Company views on enhancement for URLLC related field such as priority indicator and open-loop power control parameter set indication:

* Apply commonly to all PDSCHs or PUSCHs
  + Supported by vivo, Nokia, Ericsson, Samsung, LG Electronics, NTT DOCOMO, Apple
* Present if only a single PDSCH or PUSCH is scheduled, but absent otherwise
  + Supported by LG Electronics

[Moderator’s note] 6 companies commonly suggest to apply URLLC related fields to all scheduled PDSCHs or PUSCHs, but this issue can be deprioritized in this meeting given a small number of inputs.

Please feel free to express views on Moderator’s note, if any.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Views |
| DOCOMO | We think to apply the field commonly to each PDSCH/PUSCH is the simplest solution. If absent for others, default values may need to be defined, which is very limited (e.g. the priority of PDSCHs/PUSCHs except the first PDSCH is default as low priority). |
| Qualcomm | The URLLC fields should be applied to all allocations. In case of multi-PDSCH grant, not applying the URLLC field to allocations, will strictly imply that multiple PUCCHs should be triggered by the same DCI and it is opposed by several companies.  Also, we are okay with deprioritizing this discussion for this meeting |
| MediaTek | Agree with the Moderator’s proposal |
| Samsung | OK to deprioritize this issue. |
| Panasonic | We also think the field should be applied commonly to all TBs scheduled by a DCI. We are fine to deprioritize this issue in this meeting. |
| Fujitsu | OK to deprioritize this issue in this meeting. |
| Xiaomi | Ok to deprioritize this issue |
| OPPO | Fine to deprioritize this discussion. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are fine to deprioritize this issue. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We agree to deprioritize this issue |
| Nokia/NSB | Agree with Moderator |
| Intel | We are fine to deprioritize this issue in this meeting |
| Futurewei | We are ok to deprioritize this discussion.  We think applying the field commonly to each PDSCH/PUSCH is the solution as there is no obvious motivation for not doing so. |
| Apple | We are fine with the proposal. We support signaling per DCI and have added our name to the company list. |
| CATT1 | OK to deprioritize this issue. |
| InterDigital | We are fine with deprioritizing this issue in this meeting. |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with deprioritizing this issue. |
| Sony | We are fine with the moderator’s proposal. |
| vivo | We think URLLC related fields should be applied to all PDSCH/PUSCH. Fine to deprioritize this discussion. |

## PUSCH-specific issues

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Views |
| [2] Huawei | Observation 7: Further enhancements of frequency hopping for multi-slot PUSCH scheduling are not essential.  Proposal 8: Same multiplexing rule for aperiodic CSI report in multi PUSCH scheduling in Rel-16 should be applied at least in shared spectrum operation. |
| [3] vivo | Proposal 7: For A-CSI reporting, the same solution adopted in Rel-16 NR-U multi-PUSCH scheduling can be reused, i.e. A-CSI is multiplexed in the M-th or (M-1)-th scheduled PUSCH based on the value of M. |
| [4] Spreadtrum | Proposal 1: Frequency hopping should be supported for scheduled PUSCH.  Proposal 3: Apply same rule compared to Rel-16 NR-U for CSI request. |
| [5] Nokia | Proposal 7: For other multi-PxSCH enhancements:  • FDRA enhancements and frequency hopping enhancements are considered as secondary topics for multi-PxSCH transmission and they are considered only if time allows.  • The PUSCH that carries the AP-CSI feedback, the same solution adopted in Rel-16 NR-U multi-PUSCH scheduling is reused. |
| [6] Ericsson | Proposal 9: Support intra- and inter-slot frequency hopping for multi-PUSCH scheduling with a single DCI. For inter-slot hopping, consider modifying the hopping counter such that it increments across the scheduled PUSCHs rather than being tied to the slot number within the radio frame.  Proposal 14: When a DCI schedules M PUSCHs and an aperiodic CSI report with a valid CSI request field, the PUSCH that carries the aperiodic CSI feedback is M-th scheduled PUSCH for M <= 2, or (M-1)-th scheduled PUSCH for M > 2. |
| [8] Qualcomm | Proposal 9: For multi-PDSCH/PUSCH DCI fields enhancements:   * Frequency hopping for multi-PUSCH: supported for single PUSCH grant, and FFS: support intra-slot hopping for two or more PUSCHs |
| [10] ZTE | Proposal 2: For CSI request, the same design as in Rel-16 NRU can be considered for above 52.6GHz at least for unlicensed band.   * When a DCI schedules M PUSCHs, the PUSCH that carries the aperiodic CSI feedback is M-th scheduled PUSCH for M <= 2, or (M-1)-th scheduled PUSCH for M > 2. |
| [11] Intel | Proposal 1: For multi-PUSCH scheduling,   * Support intra-slot frequency hopping for scheduled PUSCHs. * Do not support enhancement on CSI request. |
| [13] Apple | Proposal 1: For Rel-17 multi-PUSCH transmission  • Re-use the CSI-request mechanism in Rel-16 NR-U  • Support inter-slot frequency hopping and NOT intra-slot frequency hopping for 480 kHz and 960 kHz  Proposal 2: For multi-PUSCH scheduling with a single DCI the following fields are signaled:  • Per DCI: FDRA, MCS, HARQ\_process\_number  • Per PUSCH: TDRA-K2, TDRA-(S,L), TDRA-Mapping\_type, NDI, RV  • FFS: Uplink TDAI |
| [14] Sony | Proposal 2: For AP-CSI feedback, the same rule as Rel-16 multi-PUSCH should be applied to Rel-17 multi-PUSCH scheduling. |
| [16] Samsung | Proposal 2: Rel-16 NR-U multi-PUSCH scheduling DCI can be reused for multi-PUSCH in 52.6~71GHz with at least the following enhancement:  - A-CSI feedback: A-CSI in first PUSCH for licensed band (as Rel-15/16 licensed band), and A-CSI in last or penult PUSCH for unlicensed band (as Rel-16 NR-U).  - Frequency hopping: intra-PUSCH hopping.  - HARQ process number: whether HARQ process number increments only for valid PUSCHs (no collision with semi-static DL symbol) |
| [18] Panasonic | Proposal 4: Support to reuse the existing rule for CSI-request specified in Rel. 16 for multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling by a DCI. |
| [19] LG Electronics | Proposal #7: For the multi-PUSCH scheduling in Rel-17,   * CSI-request: The same rule with Rel-16 is applied to both of licensed and unlicensed bands, i.e., when a DCI schedules M PUSCHs, the PUSCH that carries the aperiodic CSI feedback is M-th scheduled PUSCH for M <= 2, or (M-1)-th scheduled PUSCH for M > 2. |
| [21] Xiaomi | Proposal 7: Support to study intra-TTI frequency hopping and its enabling mechanism for multi-TTI scheduling.  Proposal 8: Support to indicate more than one channel access types in a single DCI. |
| [24] NTT DOCOMO | Proposal 2:   * For multi-PUSCH scheduled by single DCI,   + A-CSI reporting on PUSCH rule in Rel-16 should be reused.   + Support frequency hopping for multi-PUSCH scheduling. Newly introduced frequency hopping scheme for multi-PUSCH scheduling can be considered. |

### Summary (on frequency hopping enhancement):

Company views on frequency hopping enhancement:

* Intra-PUSCH hopping: Samsung, Xiaomi, NTT DOCOMO, Spreadtrum
* Inter-PUSCH hopping: NTT DOCOMO
* Intra-slot hopping: Ericsson, Intel
  + Objected by Apple
* Inter-slot hopping: Ericsson, Apple
* NO further enhancement: Huawei

[Moderator’s note] Company views are diverged, so it is proposed to deprioritize this issue in this meeting.

Please feel free to express views on Moderator’s note, if any.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Views |
| DOCOMO | Firstly, we think PUSCH frequency hopping can be supported for multi-PUSCH scheduling since interlaced allocation is not applied in 60GHz. It can be further discussed whether existing frequency hopping schemes are reused, or new frequency hopping scheme may be introduced. |
| Qualcomm | We are okay with deprioritizing this discussion for this meeting |
| MediaTek | Agree with the Moderator’s proposal |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Question for clarification: The field frequencyHopping applies to DCI format 0\_0 and 0\_1 for 'pusch-RepTypeA'. It is not clear which intra-slot frequency hopping is referred to for PUSCH when PUSCH is scheduled without repetition, which is the case for a DCI configured for multi-slot PUSCH scheduling as in Rel-16. So why is Intra-slot hopping listed here?  Question for clarification on inter-slot frequency hopping: It is our understanding that when multi-slot PUSCH is configured, then such DCI schedules different TBs in different slots without repetitions. In this case, there is no benefit of inter-slot hopping. In the case where PUSCH is scheduled with repetition, inter-slot hopping can be used. But multi-slot/multi-TB and multi-slots with repetitions cannot be used at the same time. |
| Samsung | OK to deprioritize this issue. |
| Panasonic | We are fine to deprioritize this issue in this meeting. |
| Fujitsu | OK to deprioritize this issue in this meeting. |
| Xiaomi | We think both intra-PUSCH and inter-PUSCH hopping should be considered |
| OPPO | Fine to deprioritize this discussion. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are fine to deprioritize this issue. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We agree to deprioritize this issue |
| Nokia/NSB | Agree with Moderator |
| Futurewei | We are ok to deprioritize the discussion. Clearer input is needed for the benefit of frequency hopping for multi-PUSCH. |
| Apple | We are fine with deprioritizing this discussion for this meeting |
| Ericsson | We think that Huawei raises one point that would be good to clarify and could help move the discussion on frequency hopping forward. We agree with Huawei that that multi-PDSCH scheduling in combination with repetition of one or more of the PDSCHs should not be supported. It is fine to configure them separately, but simultaneously could lead to many complications from a specification perspective. We think the highlighted text below from the RAN1#104 agreement leaves some ambiguity: Can we make a conclusion on this?  For example, the conclusion could be:   * Do not support scheduling of multiple PDSCHs/PUSCHs with a single DCI where one or more of the PDSCHs/PUSCHs is (are) mapped over multiple slots by repetition.   Clearly, this would still allow scheduling single PDSCH with legacy repetition/slot aggregation approaches as stated in the note.  Agreement:   * For a UE and for a serving cell, scheduling multiple PDSCHs by single DL DCI and scheduling multiple PUSCHs by single UL DCI are supported.   + Each PDSCH or PUSCH has individual/separate TB(s) and each PDSCH/PUSCH is confined within a slot.   + FFS: The maximum number of PDSCHs or PUSCHs that can be scheduled with a single DCI   + FFS: Whether multiple PDSCH scheduling applies to 120 kHz in addition to 480 and 960 kHz   + At least for 120 kHz SCS, single-slot scheduling with slot-based monitoring will still be supported as specified in Rel-15/Rel-16 * The followings will not be considered in this WI.   + Single DCI to schedule both PDSCH(s) and PUSCH(s)   + Single DCI to schedule one or multiple TBs where any single TB can be mapped over multiple slots, where mapping is not by repetition   + Single DCI to schedule N TBs (N>1) where a TB can be repeated over multiple slots (or mini-slots)   Note: This does not imply that existing slot aggregation and/or repetition for PDSCH and PUSCH by single DCI is precluded for the serving cell |
| InterDigital | We are fine with deprioritizing this issue in this meeting. |
| Spreadtrum | Our position is to support intra-PUSCH hopping. We are fine with deprioritizing this issue. |
| Sony | We are fine with deprioritizing this issue. |
| vivo | Actually, we are a little confused by the terminology here. Currently for PUSCH frequency hopping, intra-slot frequency hopping and inter-slot frequency hopping are defined for PUSCH repetition type A with the following application scenario:  - Intra-slot frequency hopping, applicable to single slot and multi-slot PUSCH transmission.  - Inter-slot frequency hopping, applicable to multi-slot PUSCH transmission.  Since multi-PUSCH scheduling doesn’t allow any PUSCH repetition, multi-PUSCH scheduling here refers to single slot in our understanding. Naturally according to current spec, intra-slot frequency hopping is supported which is indeed intra-PUSCH frequency hopping.  So, one question is to clarify the details and difference of listed choices here, e.g. what’s the difference of intra-PUSCH hopping and intra-slot hopping.  We are also fine with deprioritizing this issue in this meeting but the discussion in future is still needed to make it clear. |
| Moderator | Even though this issue can be deprioritized, I’d like to respond to some of arguments.  To Ericsson,  Highlighted part in previous agreement already precludes the combination of multi-PXSCH scheduling and TB repetition, so I don’t think we need additional conclusion. I think Huawei’s statement intended to explain that inter-slot frequency hopping is not beneficial for the case where TB is not repeated.  To Huawei,  Honestly, I have the similar question here. From my understanding, intra-slot hopping is defined for type-A PUSCH repetition but not explicitly defined for NR-U multi-PUSCH scheduling if interlaced PUSCH mapping is not configured. It would be highly appreciated if someone could explain how frequency hopping is operated for NR-U multi-PUSCH scheduling if interlaced mapping is not configured. ☺ |
| Ericsson | To the moderator:  Are you sure that it is precluded? When I read the following, especially the highlighted part, it gives the impression that mulit-PxSCH + repetition supported (the highlighted part says "where mapping is not by repetition") and the main bullet has a "not" as well. I don't believe that was the intention of this agreement, and perhaps it is a "double negative problem." So we wanted to double check on common understanding. Perhaps we can make a conclusion to clarify?   * The followings will not be considered in this WI.   + Single DCI to schedule one or multiple TBs where any single TB can be mapped over multiple slots, where mapping is not by repetition   Regarding frequency hopping, our understanding of the Rel-16 spec is the following:  Frequency hopping is supported in Rel-15/16 for PUSCH with uplink resource allocation Type 1 (i.e., contiguous frequency domain resource allocation) to achieve frequency diversity. Frequency hopping is semi-statically configured in RRC and dynamically enabled/disabled by the scheduling DCI. Two frequency hopping modes are supported: intra- and inter-slot hopping. Intra-slot hopping is supported for the following three schemes and inter-slot hopping for the latter two:   * single-slot PUSCH * multi-slot PUSCH (Type A and B repetition) * multi-PUSCH scheduling with a single DCI |
| DOCOMO | (1) For repetition vs. multi-PXSCH scheduling discussed by Ericsson, we want to share our understanding on previous agreement.  For the second bullet of precluded cases, we understand the intention is to preclude “a TB mapping to multiple slot” (the TBoMS scheme under Rel-17 CovEnh WI) for TB#=1 or TB#>1.  For the third bullet of precluded cases, we understand the intention is to preclude scheduling multiple PUSCHs/PDSCHs with repetition for each PUSCH/PDSCH. However, it only covers the case of TB#>1 in the agreement. We think it should be further clarified if there is only one TB scheduled by the multi-PUSCH scheduling DCI, whether repetition is supported for the single PUSCH.  Agreement:   * For a UE and for a serving cell, scheduling multiple PDSCHs by single DL DCI and scheduling multiple PUSCHs by single UL DCI are supported.   + Each PDSCH or PUSCH has individual/separate TB(s) and each PDSCH/PUSCH is confined within a slot.   + FFS: The maximum number of PDSCHs or PUSCHs that can be scheduled with a single DCI   + FFS: Whether multiple PDSCH scheduling applies to 120 kHz in addition to 480 and 960 kHz   + At least for 120 kHz SCS, single-slot scheduling with slot-based monitoring will still be supported as specified in Rel-15/Rel-16 * The followings will not be considered in this WI.   + Single DCI to schedule both PDSCH(s) and PUSCH(s)   + Single DCI to schedule one or multiple TBs where any single TB can be mapped over multiple slots, where mapping is not by repetition   + Single DCI to schedule N TBs (N>1) where a TB can be repeated over multiple slots (or mini-slots)   (2) Regarding PUSCH frequency hopping, in our understanding, whether frequency hopping is applicable is independent from whether PUSCH repetition is applied. It is only dependent on which frequency domain resource allocation type used. Note that PUSCH repetition type A/B was introduced in Rel-16 but PUSCH frequency hopping was supported before that. Moreover, there is no “PUSCH repetition type” configured DCI 0\_0 in Rel-16, but it is possible to schedule a PUSCH with the “Frequency hopping flag” field enabled by DCI 0\_0.  According to TS38.214, PUSCH repetition type A will be applied if no “PUSCH repetition type” configured:  “for PUSCH scheduled by DCI format 0\_1, if *pusch-RepTypeIndicatorDCI-0-1* is set to 'pusch-RepTypeB', the UE applies PUSCH repetition Type B procedure when determining the time domain resource allocation. For PUSCH scheduled by DCI format 0\_2, if *pusch-RepTypeIndicatorDCI-0-2* is set to 'pusch-RepTypeB', the UE applies PUSCH repetition Type B procedure when determining the time domain resource allocation. Otherwise, the UE applies PUSCH repetition Type A procedure when determining the time domain resource allocation for PUSCH scheduled by PDCCH.” (section 6.1.2.1 in TS38.214)  Therefore, in this case, PUSCH frequency hopping for PUSCH repetition type A will be applied. The frequency hopping scheme can be determined by *frequencyHopping* provided in *pusch-Config.*  “For PUSCH repetition Type A (as determined according to procedures defined in Clause 6.1.2.1 for scheduled PUSCH, or Clause 6.1.2.3 for configured PUSCH), a UE is configured for frequency hopping by the higher layer parameter *frequencyHoppingDCI-0-2* in *pusch-Config* for PUSCH transmission scheduled by DCI format 0\_2, and by *frequencyHopping* provided in *pusch-Config* for PUSCH transmission scheduled by a DCI format other than 0\_2*,* and by *frequencyHopping* provided in *configuredGrantConfig* for configured PUSCH transmission.” (section 6.3.1 in TS38.214) |
| Moderator | Thanks a lot for sharing your views.  For (1) repetition vs. multi-PXSCH scheduling, actually I have the same understanding with NTT DOCOMO. My earlier comments was incorrect in some sense. We may need further discuss whether multi-PDSCH scheduling DCI can schedule a single TB with repetition or not.  For (2) frequency hopping, it seems clear that intra/inter-slot hopping for type-A repetition is applied for multi-PUSCH scheduling. Now, companies are recommended to provide which enhancements are necessary for frequency hopping procedure, compared to Rel-16. |
| Ericsson | We agree with the intention explained by DOCOMO.  Regarding the case of N = 1, to keep things from getting too complicated, our preference would be to conclude that a DCI that can schedule multiples PxSCHs cannot schedule a single TB with repetition. This is the same principle as for multi-PUSCH in Rel-16.  We still think that the purple highlighted part can be interpreted in a way that is not aligned with the intention written by DOCOMO. However, if all companies common understanding on the intention, then we don't need to beat this to death. |
| vivo | Regarding the statement “intra/inter-slot hopping for type-A repetition is applied for multi-PUSCH scheduling” made by the moderator above, we have some different opinions. In fact, we have provided our view and related question about frequency hopping for multi-PUSCH scheduling before, which can also be found in this table.  In Rel-15, inter-slot frequency hopping is only applicable to multi-slot PUSCH transmission, which can also be mentioned as PUSCH repetition Type A. During RAN1#104-e meeting, it was agreed for NR-U Rel-16 that “If a UE is configured with higher layer parameter *pusch-TimeDomainAllocationListForMultiPUSCH*, the UE does not expect to be configured with *pusch-AggregationFactor*.”. In our opinion, multi-PUSCH scheduling can be regarded as single slot PUSCH transmission, since no multi-slot PUSCH transmission is allowed when multi-PUSCH scheduling is enabled. So only intra-slot frequency hopping can be allowed for multi-PUSCH scheduling, where for each scheduled PUSCH, the intra-slot frequency hopping operation is applied, which can indeed be equal to intra-PUSCH hopping. |

**Summary (on CSI-request enhancement):**

Company views on CSI-request enhancement:

* Same as in Rel-16 NR-U
  + Supported by Huawei (at least in shared spectrum operation), vivo, Spreadtrum, Nokia, ZTE, Intel, Apple, Sony, Samsung (for unlicensed band), Panasonic, LG Electronics, NTT DOCOMO
* In the first PUSCH for licensed band
  + Supported by Samsung (as in Rel-15/16 licensed band)

[Moderator’s note] At least 10 companies suggest to keep the same rule for licensed and unlicensed bands as in Rel-16 NR-U while 1 company suggests to apply different rules for licensed and unlicensed bands. However, according to the excerpt from TS 38.214 Clause 5.2.3 as below, aperiodic CSI reporting rule is applied regardless of licensed band or unlicensed band.

|  |
| --- |
| 5.2.3 CSI reporting using PUSCH  A UE shall perform aperiodic CSI reporting using PUSCH on serving cell c upon successful decoding of a DCI format 0\_1 or DCI format 0\_2 which triggers an aperiodic CSI trigger state.  When a DCI format 0\_1 schedules two PUSCH allocations, the aperiodic CSI report is carried on the second scheduled PUSCH. When a DCI format 0\_1 schedules more than two PUSCH allocations, the aperiodic CSI report is carried on the penultimate scheduled PUSCH. |

Therefore, we can make a conclusion as follows:

**Proposed conclusion #1 (CSI-request):**

* For a DCI that can schedule multiple PUSCHs,
  + CSI-request: When the DCI schedules M PUSCHs, the PUSCH that carries the aperiodic CSI feedback is M-th scheduled PUSCH for M <= 2, or (M-1)-th scheduled PUSCH for M > 2.

Companies are encouraged to provide views on proposed conclusion #1.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Views |
| DOCOMO | Support the proposal.  One correction for the main bullet:   * For a DCI that can schedule multiple ~~PDSCHs~~ PUSCHs |
| Qualcomm | Support the proposal and DOCOMO’s correction |
| MediaTek | Agree with the Moderator’s proposal with DOCOMO’s correction. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support conclusion #1 with the correction from Docomo |
| Samsung | Do not support the proposal.  There is no clear answer why we can handle separately for licensed and unlicensed band for Rel-15 and Rel-16, but not ok for Rel-17. It seems the reason to only support NR-U behavior for Rel-17 is to avoid impact on LBT. The benefit does not exist for 52.6GHz licensed band, right?  BTW, there are also some other discussion points with similar ‘majority’ vs ‘minority’ situation, but it seems different suggestion for these discussion points. |
| Panasonic | We support the proposal with DOCOMO’s correction. |
| Fujitsu | Support the proposal and DOCOMO’s correction. |
| Xiaomi | Support the proposed conclusion with DOCOMO’s correction. |
| OPPO | Support the proposal with DOCOMO’s correction. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Support the proposal with DOCOMO’s correction. |
| vivo | We support the proposal with DOCOMO’s correction. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine to support the proposal with DOCOMO’s correction |
| Nokia/NSB | Support the proposed conclusion with DOCOMO’s correction |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Futurewei | Support the proposed conclusion and DOCOMO’s correction. |
| Apple | Fine with the proposed conclusion and DOCOMO’s correction. |
| Ericsson | Support the proposed conclusion with DOCOMO's correction  Regarding Samsung's question, it is not clear to how/why the behavior should be any different for licensed/unlicensed. The fact remains that a rule is needed when the DCI schedules multiple-PUSCHs regardless of licensed/unlicensed. The rationale for the Rel-16 rule was that the CSI report should come in a PUSCH as late as possible so that the CSI is as "fresh" as possible. Why would this be different for licensed/unlicensed? What would be the counter proposal to this conclusion? |
| CATT1 | Support the modified proposal |
| InterDigital | We support the proposal with DOCOMO’s correction. |
| Convida Wireless | We are fine with moderator’s proposal. |
| Spreadtrum | We support the proposed conclusion with DOCOMO’s correction |
| Samsung | To Ericsson: in our understanding, during the discussion for A-CSI report in licensed band, the earlier UE can report A-CSI report, the better. In Rel-16 type-B repetition, it was discussed whether to multiplex A-CSI in 1st or last PUSCH, RAN1 agreed to support 1st. Similarly, in Rel-15, RAN1 agreed to support A-CSI in PUSCH in 1st slot for type-A repetition (same as 1st PUSCH). The relevant agreement/conclusion is listed as below:  RAN1 discussed how to handle A-CSI feedback in case of PUSCH repetition in Rel-15 and made the conclusion as below in RAN1 101e meeting.  Conclusion  **Conclusion in RAN1#96 with respect to A-CSI multiplexing in PUSCH with slot aggregation is interpreted as the following:**   * **When PUSCH slot aggregation is enabled, if A-CSI triggered by a DCI that schedules a PUSCH in a slot, the A-CSI is multiplexed only in the PUSCH in the first** **slot.**   + **~~A valid~~****~~A-CSI is multiplexed only if the~~****~~CSI computation~~****~~corresponding~~****~~timeline is met~~.**     - **~~The CSI computation timeline is referenced to the first slot of the slots with PUSCH repetition.~~** * **No changes to the specifications are needed.**   **RAN1 discussed how to handle A-CSI feedback in case of Type-B PUSCH repetition in Rel-16 and made** the conclusion as below in RAN1 101e meeting.  Agreement  For CSI report(s) triggered by DCI on PUSCH repetition Type B without UL-SCH,   * CSI report(s) is carried on the **first nominal repetition.**   + For A-CSI and the first PUSCH carrying SP-CSI after activation, the first nominal repetition is expected to be the same as the first actual repetition.   + For PUSCH carrying SP-CSI other than the first one after activation,     - If the first nominal repetition is not the same as the first actual repetition, the first nominal repetition is not transmitted;     - Otherwise, whether/how the first nominal repetition is dropped follows Rel-15 behavior for PUSCH repetition Type A with SP-CSI multiplexing. * All the other nominal repetitions are discarded, and these repetitions are not considered (i.e., treated as non-existing) when determining UCI multiplexing on PUSCH.   We want to emphasise that we do not intend to introduce new behaviour, actually, what we proposed is to reuse existing mechanism. Hope companies can further check and reconsider this issue. |
| Sony | We support the proposal with DOCOMO’s correction. |
| Moderator | First of all, sorry for a critical typo in the main bullet, now I fixed it ☺  Secondly, the situation is that only one company is opposed to Proposed conclusion #1.  To Samsung,  I do not insist on any different behavior in R15/16 and R17, rather, I think Proposed conclusion #1 is more aligned with R16. I understand that AP-CSI reporting rule pointed out by Samsung is for TB repetition case. However, what I cited in [Moderator’s note] above is for individual TB transmission case, which is developed for NR-U multi-PUSCH scheduling but also applied to licensed band in Rel-16. I cited it again as below.   |  | | --- | | 5.2.3 CSI reporting using PUSCH  A UE shall perform aperiodic CSI reporting using PUSCH on serving cell c upon successful decoding of a DCI format 0\_1 or DCI format 0\_2 which triggers an aperiodic CSI trigger state.  When a DCI format 0\_1 schedules two PUSCH allocations, the aperiodic CSI report is carried on the second scheduled PUSCH. When a DCI format 0\_1 schedules more than two PUSCH allocations, the aperiodic CSI report is carried on the penultimate scheduled PUSCH. |   Since multi-PUSCH scheduling in Rel-17 does not allow TB repetition for any scheduled TB, it should be straight forward to follow Rel-16 multi-PUSCH scheduling rule (not to follow Rel-15/16 PUSCH repetition rule) |
| Samsung | Thanks FL for providing the existing standard description.  For A-CSI report in case of multi-PUSCH scheduling, I believe we all agree that the motivation to transmit A-CSI in last PUSCH is to reduce dropping probability caused by LBT, thus reduce the latency. Successful transmission with some latency (from 1st to last or penultimate PUSCH) is more desirable than delayed transmission in 1st PUSCH in next UL COT.  In UE feature, NR-U features are applied to licensed band. But in fact, in licensed band at that time, there is no clear motivation for gNB to configure multi-PUSCH scheduling for a UE. So, we didn't discuss whether A-CSI in last PUSCH in licensed band is good for latency. But at least from the discussion in PUSCH repetition in licensed band, we care about the latency, that’s why we agreed to support A-CSI in 1st PUSCH in licensed band. Actually, for both PUSCH repetition and multi-PUSCH with different TB in licensed band, the benefit of shorter latency of transmitting A-CSI in 1st PUSCH always holds.  Rel-17 would be a good opportunity to make some reasonable alignment. But considering limited schedule and, majority companies want to simply reuse NR-U mechanism, we can live with the proposal for the sake of progress. Thanks. |

During email discussion, the following conclusion was made:

### Conclusion:

For a DCI that can schedule multiple PUSCHs,

* CSI-request: When the DCI schedules M PUSCHs, the PUSCH that carries the aperiodic CSI feedback is M-th scheduled PUSCH for M <= 2, or (M-1)-th scheduled PUSCH for M > 2.

## PDSCH-specific issues

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Views |
| [1] Futurewei | Proposal 1. Only single-PDSCH is supported for SCS 120kHz for reason that the duration of a multi-slot can be larger the channel coherence time consideration for cases of moderate speed.  Proposal 4: Decide the maximum number of layers that should be supported for 52.6GHz to 71GHz band before deciding whether the MCS/RV/NDI fields for the 2nd TB is needed or not. The legacy rule that the MCS/RV/NDI fields for the 2nd TB is only relevant for >4 layers transmissions still apply here. |
| [2] Huawei | Proposal 2: Multi-PDSCH scheduling by a single DCI is not supported for 120 kHz SCS.  Proposal 4: Support scheduling 2nd TB for multi-slot PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling, and MCS for the 2nd TB is applied commonly to all the scheduled PDSCHs/PUSCHs, while NDI and RV are indicated individually for each scheduled PDSCH/PUSCH.  Observation 3: The interleaved VRB-to-PRB mapping for 120 kHz SCS can be reused for 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS.  Observation 4: PRB bundling mechanism defined in Rel-15 can be reused as a baseline for multi-PDSCH scheduling in this new frequency range.  Observation 5: The existing configuration and indication related to RateMatchPattern can be reused.  Observation 6: Triggering scheme defined in Rel-15/16 can be reused directly for aperiodic ZP CSI-RS.  Proposal 6: Support periodic/semi-persistent ZP CSI-RS for 480 and 960 kHz SCS with periodicity up to 80 ms.  Proposal 7: Support gNB to mute PDSCH transmissions belonging to the indicated row of TDRA table if symbols of the corresponding PDSCH(s) are overlapped with the UL symbols configured by TDD DL/UL configuration when multi-slot PDSCH(s) is scheduled by single DCI. |
| [3] vivo | Proposal 8: Two codewords should be supported for multi-PDSCH scheduling.  Proposal 9: Each of resource allocation related fields in the DCI scheduling multiple PDSCHs is applied equally to each scheduled PDSCH, including VRB-to-PRB mapping, PRB bundling size indicator, rate matching indicator, and ZP CSI-RS trigger. |
| [4] Spreadtrum | Proposal 4: Support to indicate the MCS/NDI/RV for the 2nd TB for multi-PDSCH scheduling. |
| [5] Nokia | Proposal 3: Consider dynamic indication of the number of repetitions also for PDSCH.  Proposal 4: Support multi-PDSCH also for 120 kHz SCS   * Consider multi-PDSCH also for FR2.   Proposal 6: Support only one TB with multi-slot PxSCH |
| [6] Ericsson | Proposal 1: Support multiple PDSCH scheduling for 120 kHz SCS.  Observation 1: When multiple PDSCHs are scheduled by a single DCI with DCI Format 1\_1, it is not necessary to explicitly prohibit the MCS/NDI/RV fields for the second transport blocks in the specification. These fields can be disabled via existing RRC configuration.  Proposal 10: When multiple PDSCHs are scheduled by a single DCI with DCI Format 1\_1, the triggered ZP CSI-RS field applies to all the PDSCHs scheduled by the DCI.  Proposal 11: When multiple PDSCHs are scheduled by a single DCI with DCI Format 1\_1, the VRB-to-PRB mapping and PRB bundling size indicator fields apply to all the PDSCHs scheduled by the DCI.  Proposal 12: When multiple PDSCHs are scheduled by a single DCI with DCI Format 1\_1, the Rate Matching Indicator field applies to all the PDSCHs scheduled by the DCI. |
| [8] Qualcomm | Proposal 1: Multi-PDSCH or multi-PUSCH scheduling with the same DCI should be applicable to 120kHz as well as 480 and 960kHz, though we don’t need to introduce multi-slot monitoring capability for 120KHz.  Proposal 9: For multi-PDSCH/PUSCH DCI fields enhancements:   * Second TB can be supported for each PDSCH   + MCS for the 2nd TB: This appears only once in the DCI and applies commonly to the second TB of each PDSCH   + NDI for the 2nd TB: This is signaled per PDSCH and applies to the second TB of each PDSCH   + RV for the 2nd TB: This is signaled per PDSCH, with 2 bits if only a single PDSCH is scheduled or 1 bit for each PDSCH otherwise and applies to the second TB of each PDSCH * VRB-to-PRB mapping and PRB bundling size indicator: to be applied for all granted data allocations by the same DCI * ZP CSI trigger: to be applied to all the slots granted by the same DCI. |
| [9] OPPO | Proposal 5: UE is not expected to be scheduled with more than one PDSCHs in one slot for both 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS. |
| [11] Intel | Proposal 3: For multi-PDSCH scheduling   * Scheduling of 2nd TB is supported. * For 2nd TB, separate MCS, NDI and RV are signaled from 1st TB. * For 2nd TB, similar mechanisms for signaling of MCS, NDI and RV for 1st TB are reused. * Carrier indicator, BWP indicator, frequency domain resource allocation, DMRS configuration including antenna port, DMRS sequence initialization, etc., can be commonly applied for scheduled PDSCHs. |
| [13] Apple | Proposal 4: For Rel-17 multi-PDSCH transmission  • Multiple PDSCH scheduling applies to 120 kHz SCS in addition to 480 and 960 kHz SCS  • Support inter-slot frequency hopping and NOT intra-slot frequency hopping for 480 kHz and 960 kHz  • New signaling may be needed for the PRI, K1, priority, DAI, CBGTI and CBGFI fields to support HARQ compared with multi-PUSCH transmission.  Proposal 5: For multi-PDSCH scheduling with a single DCI the following fields are signaled:  • Per DCI: FDRA, 1st MCS, 2nd MCS, HARQ\_process\_number, and PRB bundling size  • Per PDSCH: TDRA-K0, TDRA-(S,L), TDRA-Mapping\_type, 1st NDI, 1st RV, 2nd NDI, 2nd RV, rate matching indicator, and ZP CSI-RS trigger  • FFS: c-DAI, Downlink T-DAI, CGBTI/CBGFI, K1, and PRI. |
| [16] Samsung | Proposal 3: For multi-PDSCH scheduling, the bit field common for DL and UL grant use the same design as multi-PUSCH scheduling, and at least following DL-specific bit field should be specified,  - MCS/RV/NDI for 2nd TB is not applicable to multi-PDSCH scheduling (only support single TB case)  - HARQ-ACK relevant bit field is applicable to all PDSCHs and single PUCCH |
| [18] Panasonic | Proposal 2: No support MCS/NDI/RV for the 2nd TB for each PDSCH in multi-PDSCH scheduling by a DCI. |
| [19] LG Electronics | Proposal #2: Apply scheduling multiple PDSCHs by single DL DCI to all SCSs including 480 and 960 kHz.  Proposal #8: For multi-PDSCH scheduling with a single DCI,   * MCS for the 2nd TB: This appears only once in the DCI and applies commonly to the second TB of each PDSCH. * NDI: For 2-TB case, this can be signalled per each TB. Alternatively, NDI per TB for up to N-scheduled PDSCHs and TB-common NDI for more than N-scheduled PDSCHs (e.g., N=1) can be considered. * RV: For 2-TB case, this can be signalled with 2 bits per TB if a single PDSCH is scheduled, TB-common 1 bit (i.e., 1 bit per PDSCH) if more than one PDSCHs are scheduled. * Rate matching indicator and ZP-CSI-RS trigger: This can be applied to all or part of scheduled PDSCHs (e.g., the first PDSCH). |
| [20] Lenovo | Proposal 1: For NR operation between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz with 120 kHz, multi-PDSCH scheduling enhancements are not considered in NR Rel-17, i.e. only single PDSCH can be scheduled by single DCI for 120 kHz SCS |
| [22] InterDigital | Observation 7: Supporting a second TB per each PDSCH when multiple PDSCHs are scheduled by a single DCI can have a significant specification impact and increase the signalling overhead, UE processing time and complexity.  Proposal 12: scheduling of the 2nd TB for each PDSCH when multiple PDSCHs are scheduled by a single DCI is not supported. |
| [24] NTT DOCOMO | Proposal 1: For multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling,  - Multi-PDSCH scheduling can apply to 120 kHz in addition to 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS.  Proposal 2:   * For multi-PDSCH scheduled by single DCI,   + Not support two TBs in one PDSCH when multiple PDSCHs are scheduled by one DCI.   + VRB-to-PRB mapping, PRB bundling size indicator, rate matching indicator, and ZP CSI-RS trigger are applied to all slots of scheduled PDSCHs. |
| [25] Charter | Proposal 2: Reuse the 1st TB framework as much as possible for the 2nd TB, as well as apply same settings commonly to all multiple PDSCHs. |

### Summary (on the applicability of multi-PDSCH scheduling to SCSs other than 480/960 kHz SCS):

Company views on the applicability of multi-PDSCH scheduling to SCSs other than 480/960 kHz SCS:

* Support to apply it to SCSs other than 480/960 kHz SCS
  + Nokia, Ericsson, Apple, LG Electronics, NTT DOCOMO
* Object to apply it to SCSs other than 480/960 kHz SCS
  + Futurewei, Huawei, Lenovo

[Moderator’s note] 5 companies suggest to apply multi-PDSCH scheduling also to SCSs other than 480/960 kHz SCS while 3 companies are against applying it to SCSs other than 480/960 kHz SCS. Therefore, it is proposed to deprioritize this issue in this meeting.

Please feel free to express views on Moderator’s note, if any.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Views |
| DOCOMO | We are fine to deprioritize the issue in this meeting. But we prefer to support multi-PDSCH scheduling in 120kHz SCS. Considering multi-PUSCH scheduling supported in 120kHz SCS, and no additional specification impact is needed compared to agreed 490/960kHz SCS, we think it is straightforward to also support multi-PDSCH scheduling for 120kHz SCS. |
| Qualcomm | We support multi-PDSCH grant for SCS 120kHz based on UE capability, i.e., a UE may only support single PDSCH grant for SCS 120kHz and we are okay with deprioritizing this discussion for this meeting |
| MediaTek | We don’t support applying multi-PDSCH scheduling for SCS 120kHz case but we agree with the Moderator’s proposal. |
| Samsung | We support multi-PDSCH grant for SCS 120kHz. But we’re OK to deprioritize this issue. |
| Panasonic | We support 8 as the maximum number of PDSCHs for all SCSs (120 kHz, 480 kHz, and 960 kHz) in licensed/unlicensed band usage. The UE capability should be discussed later. |
| Fujitsu | OK to deprioritize this issue in this meeting. |
| Xiaomi | We are fine to deprioritize this issue. |
| OPPO | We support to apply multi-PDSCH scheduling to SCSs other than 480/960kHz SCS. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We support to apply multi- PDSCH scheduling to 120kHz as well and the maximum number could 8 for all SCSs. We are also fine to deprioritize this issue. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We agree to deprioritize this issue in this meeting  We don’t support multi-PDSCH scheduling for SCS 120kHz (this would be also aligned with multi-slot PDCCH monitoring agreement that no enhancements done for 120 kHz) |
| Nokia/NSB | We support to apply multi-PDSCH scheduling to SCS other than 480/960 kHz SCS. But, this has been discussed long time, the issue has quite some implications for the system design (e.g. PDCCH monitoring) – the main issue from the specs point of view is that do we need to define special handling for PDSCH with 480/960 kHz SCS (compared to PDSCH with 120 kHz SCS).  It is better to gather more input from companies before conclusion. |
| Intel | We support to apply multi-PDSCH scheduling to SCSs other than 480/960 kHz SCS. We are fine to deprioritize this issue in this meeting |
| Futurewei | We are ok to deprioritize the issue. The channel coherence time is a key reference value to be calculated for deciding whether multi-PDSCH SCS 120kHz is supported. |
| Apple | We are with de-prioritizing this issue. |
| Ericsson | Similar to DOCOMO, we prefer to support multi-PDSCH scheduling in 120kHz SCS. Considering multi-PUSCH scheduling supported in 120kHz SCS, and no additional specification impact is needed compared to agreed 490/960kHz SCS, we think it is straightforward to also support multi-PDSCH scheduling for 120kHz SCS.  We still have not heard a technical motivation for precluding 120 kHz. How would multi-PDSCH scheduling for 480/960 kHz be specified any differently than 120 kHz? Given that we agreed on multi-PUSCH for 120/480/960, what is the motivation to have asymmetry in the specs when it comes to multi-PDSCH? Regarding differences in PDCCH monitoring, it seems to us that that is a separate issue. Regardless of the PDCCH monitoring configuration, if a DCI scheduling multiple PDSCHs is detected, how would the UE behave differently for 120 kHz SCS vs. 480/960 kHz SCS? |
| CATT1 | We support the proposal. |
| InterDigital | We are fine with deprioritizing this issue. |
| Spreadtrum | We support to apply multi-PDSCH scheduling to SCSs other than 480/960 kHz SCS. We are fine to deprioritize this issue in this meeting |
| Sony | We support to apply multi-PDSCH scheduling to SCSs other than 480/960 kHz SCS, but we are fine with deprioritizing this issue. |
| vivo | We are fine to deprioritize the issue in this meeting. We also prefer to support multi-PDSCH scheduling in 120kHz SCS due to its usefulness and no additional spec effort. |

### Summary (on MCS/NDI/RV for the 2nd TB):

Company views on MCS/NDI/RV for the 2nd TB:

* 2-TB scheduling
  + Supported by Huawei, vivo, Spreadtrum, Ericsson, Qualcomm, Intel, Apple, LG Electronics, Charter
  + Objected by Nokia, Samsung, Panasonic, InterDigital, NTT DOCOMO
* MCS for the 2nd TB
  + This appears only once in the DCI and applies commonly to the second TB of each PDSCH
    - Supported by Huawei, Qualcomm, Intel, LG Electronics
* NDI for the 2nd TB
  + This is signaled per PDSCH and applies to the second TB of each PDSCH
    - Supported by Huawei, Qualcomm, Intel, LG Electronics
  + NDI per TB for up to N-scheduled PDSCHs and TB-common NDI for more than N-scheduled PDSCHs (e.g., N=1)
    - Supported by LG Electronics
* RV for the 2nd TB
  + This is signaled per PDSCH and applies to the second TB of each PDSCH
    - Supported by Huawei, Qualcomm (with 2 bits if only a single PDSCH is scheduled or 1 bit for each PDSCH otherwise), Intel, LG Electronics (with 2 bits per TB if a single PDSCH is scheduled, TB-common 1 bit (i.e., 1 bit per PDSCH) if more than one PDSCHs are scheduled)

[Moderator’s note] 9 companies suggest to support 2-TB scheduling by a DCI that can schedule multiple PDSCHs while 5 companies are against 2-TB scheduling by the DCI. Nevertheless, it seems quite restrictive to disallow 2-TB scheduling for multi-PDSCH scheduling DCI. Furthermore, proponents of 2-TB scheduling seem to be mostly aligned on how to signal MCS/NDI/RV for the second TB, so we can minimize relevant specification impact by following approaches similar to the first TB which was agreed in the last meeting.

### Proposal #4 (2-TB scheduling):

* For a DCI that can schedule multiple PDSCHs,
  + MCS for the 2nd TB: This appears only once in the DCI and applies commonly to the second TB of each PDSCH
  + NDI for the 2nd TB: This is signaled per PDSCH and applies to the second TB of each PDSCH
  + RV for the 2nd TB: This is signaled per PDSCH, with 2 bits if only a single PDSCH is scheduled or 1 bit for each PDSCH otherwise, and applies to the second TB of each PDSCH

Companies are encouraged to provide views on Proposal #4.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Views |
| DOCOMO | We can accept the proposal even though we think the probability of scheduling two TBs (i.e. rank>4) is not typical in 60GHz. |
| Qualcomm | We support the proposal |
| MediaTek | We don’t support the proposal. As pointed out by many companies, it is unlikely to apply more than 4 layer for transmission in this frequency range and we don’t see the need on the enhancement of enabling the 2nd TB in multi-PDSCH scheduling. If the 2nd TB is needed, then single PDSCH scheduling can work. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support proposal #4. It is not clear why high rank statistics would be different depending on single PDSCH or multiple PDSCH scheduling by a single DCI. Can Mediatek or others explain? |
| Samsung | We do not agree with the proposal.  2-TB is a very corner case in 60GHz, thus no clear benefit to support it for both single or multi-PDSCH case. But, for the sake of progress, it is OK for us to support 2 TBs when the DCI (capable of multi-PDSCH) scheduling schedules single PDSCH to address such corner case, but it is not acceptable to introduce large DCI overhead to support such corner case for multiple PDSCH scheduling. |
| Panasonic | We think the probability of scheduling the 2nd TB of each PDSCH (i.e., rank ≥ 5) is low in the frequency range 52.6~71GHz. Therefore, we do not see a need to support the 2nd TB for SU-MIMO for multi-PDSCH scheduling with potentially large DCI payload. |
| Fujitsu | Although we also think scheduling 2 TBs is not a typical case for the frequency range, we could accept the proposal if it is the majority view to have it. |
| OPPO | We are fine with the proposal. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We don’t support 2nd TB for multi-PDSCH scheduling. It’s a corner case as mentioned by many companies but it requires quite large DCI overhead. It’s OK to support 2nd TB if only single PDSCH is scheduled. |
| vivo | We support the proposal. Whether to enable two codewords or not actually can up to RRC configuration. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support the proposal |
| Nokia/NSB | Support the proposal. If two TB support is not practical, NW may not configure this, and there is no issue. Applying the same principle with the first TB looks reasonable. |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Futurewei | We do not support the 2nd TB.  It might be restrictive if the 2nd TB is not supported, but such restriction is in line with the 52.6~71GHz band, since it is not necessary to pursue the same flexibility relating the number of layers (>4) here as with the FeMIMO. The 52.6~71GHz band has its own advantage of higher BW and better directivity and the number of layers/UE multiplexing are the natural tradeoffs. |
| Apple | We are fine with the proposal |
| Ericsson | Support the proposal.  We think that MU-MIMO possibilities should not be restricted, and such operation is suited to the 52.6 – 71 GHz band where narrow beams are expected. |
| CATT1 | Support the proposal. |
| InterDigital | We also think that scheduling 2nd TBs is not a typical case for this frequency range and share similar views with Samsung and Panasonic on DCI overhead. |
| Convida Wireless | We are fine with the moderator’s proposal. |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with the moderator’s proposal. |
| Sony | We are fine with the moderator’s proposal. |
| Moderator | Here is the summary of all comments:   * 2-TB is supported for multi-PDSCH scheduling DCI (15): NTT DOCOMO, Qualcomm, Huawei, Fujitsu, OPPO, vivo, Lenovo, Nokia, Intel, Apple, Ericsson, CATT, Convida, Spreadtrum, Sony * 2-TB-related fields are present only if a single PDSCH is scheduled (2): Samsung, ZTE * 2-TB is not supported for multi-PDSCH scheduling DCI (4): MediaTek, Panasonic, Futurewei, InterDigital   Majority companies support Proposal #4 while still several companies don’t support 2-TB transmission for multi-PDSCH scheduling DCI. |

### One question to opponents of Proposal #4: Do you also suggest not to support 2-TB transmission for a DCI that can schedule only a single PDSCH, for NR 52.6-71 GHz?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Views |
| DOCOMO | We think the probability of 2-TB for either single PDSCH or multiple PDSCHs would be low in 60GHz. From the perspective of specification impact and DCI payload, we think it may be not so important to restrict number of TBs for single PDSCH case as the restriction for multiple PDSCHs case.  Our first preference is not to support 2-TB for multiple PDSCHs case. But if majority companies think it necessary, we can accept for compromise. |
| Samsung | We think 2-TB is the corner case for 52.6GHz, no matter the PDSCH is scheduled by a DCI capable of scheduling a single or multiple PDSCHs. For multiple PDSCHs, the probability to schedule 2-TBs is even further limited, because it does not make sense for gNB to schedule 2-TBs for multiple PDSCHs when the failed TB is different for different PDSCHs (e.g. single TB fails for some PDSCHs while both TBs fails for other PDSCHs scheduling by a single DCI, or 1st TB fails for some PDSCHs while 2nd TB fails for other PDSCHs). Therefore, we don't think the optimization for such corner case is worth the effort.  If majority companies want to support this corner case in 52.6GHz, we can live with it, only if the DCI overhead is reasonable. At least for a DCI scheduling multiple PDSCHs, we think the overhead is unacceptable, e.g. 14 bit increase for 8 PDSCH case. And as we analyzed above, most of the time, these 14 bits are unused. Therefore, we do not support 2-TB for multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling. |
| Futurewei | We think probability for 2-TB is low in B52. While the key concern here is whether it eventually is needed to discuss about the number of layers that is typically for the 52.6 to 71GHz band, such that relevant discussion including but not limited to the current one has a better basis.  For DCI that schedules only a single PDSCH, we are fine if majority of companies support it, while it is relatively a smaller decision than figuring out if views may change if digging into technics better revealing the typical number of layers. |
| MediaTek | As pointed out by many companies, the use cases for the 2nd TB is not clear to us. However, if majority view is to support, we prefer to introduce a UE capability for it. |
| Moderator | Given that the opponents for 2-TB transmission seem to make a compromise if 2-TB transmission is allowed only when single PDSCH is scheduled. With this regard, Proposal #4b can be made.  To MediaTek,  As far as I know, the supported number of layers was already based on UE capability in Rel-15. I am not sure that kind of discussion is need at this stage. However, I added the relevant statement with square bracket. Let’s hear other companies’ views. |

### Proposal #4a (2-TB scheduling):

* For a DCI that can schedule multiple PDSCHs,
  + MCS for the 2nd TB: This field is present when only a single PDSCH is scheduled, but is absent when more than one PDSCHs are scheduled
  + NDI for the 2nd TB: This field is present when only a single PDSCH is scheduled, but is absent when more than one PDSCHs are scheduled
  + RV for the 2nd TB: This field is present with 2 bits when only a single PDSCH is scheduled, but is absent when more than one PDSCHs are scheduled
  + [The number of layers more than 4 is subject to UE capability.]

Companies are encouraged to provide views on Proposal #4a.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Views |
| LG | Fine with the proposal. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine with the proposal |
| Panasonic | We are fine with the proposal #4a |
| DOCOMO | Support the proposal. |
| Qualcomm | We are fine with the proposal |
| Intel | We do not support this proposal.  It is not clear to us why we need to restrict the support of 2 TBs only for the single PDSCH case. There is no fundamental difference between single PDSCH and multiple PDSCHs for 2 TBs by a DCI. We share similar view as other companies that we need to consider the possibilities for MU-MIMO for this. |
| Apple | We are fine with this proposal for PDSCH. We have the same question as Intel for PUSCH. |
| Futurewei | We support this proposal. |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with the proposal. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Samsung | We support this proposal.  Regarding MU-MIMO, we don’t understand why number of TBs for a UE can be larger for MU-MIMO than SU-MIMO, In our understanding, typically, the number of TBs and number of layers per UE is smaller for MU-MIMO compared with SU-MIMO.  Regarding mTRP, could companies explain which existing mTRP case supports 2-TB scheduling by a single DCI? In our understanding, Rel-16/17 mTRP case only supports 1 TB. There are two cases,   * Multi-DCI case, i.e. two PDSCHs are independently scheduled by each DCI and each DCI can schedule a PDSCH with one TB. Each PDSCH is transmitted by each TRP. * Single DCI case, i.e. one TB can be split into two parts, each part is transmitted by one TRP. The split is by layer. For example, 1 TB with 2 layers, each TRP transmits 1 layer.   If my understanding is wrong, please correct me.  Furthermore, we want to point out, support of 2-TB for multi-PDSCH does not only degrade PDCCH performance (DCI overhead increase of tens of bits), but also degrade PUCCH performance. Because 2 bits are always generated for each PDSCH, if at least one serving cell with multi-PDSCH scheduling support 2-TB scheduling, but the probability of scheduling 2-TBs for all these cells are very small. Do companies think it really worth to sacrifice both PDCCH and PUCCH performance for a very corner case? |
| Ericsson | We share the same view as Intel  We consider that MU-MIMO is a valid use case that motivates support for 2 TBs (5 – 8 layers). We don't see a need to make a hard retraction in the spec. |
| Huawei3, HiSilicon3 | As commented earlier and also by Intel, we don’t understand the technical reason why 2 TBs may be supported when a single PDSCH is scheduled and not when multiple PDSCHs are scheduled. While we understand the different impact in terms of DCI overhead, being able to schedule more or less MIMO layers only depends on the channel conditions, not on the number of scheduled PDSCHs. DCI overhead can be controlled by network configuration. Support of 1 or 2 TB depends on UE MIMO capability, so the last bullet in square brackets should anyway be the common understanding. But overall, the decision to support or not support 2 TBs should be consistent whether one or multiple PDSCHs are scheduled. |
| Fujitsu | We are fine with the proposal if it is the majority view. |
| OPPO | We share the same view as Intel and Ericsson and Huawei, we don’t support this proposal. |
| vivo | We share the same view as Intel, Ericsson and Huawei. Whether to support 2 TBs or not for multi-PDSCH scheduling can be up to UE capability and/or RRC configuration. |
| Moderator | Company views are summarized as follows:   * Support (10): LG Electronics, Lenovo, Panasonic, NTT DOCOMO, Qualcomm, Apple, Futurewei, Spreadtrum, ZTE, Samsung * NOT support (4): Intel, Ericsson, Huawei, OPPO, vivo   Similar situation with Proposal #4 can be observed. Main argument points:   * Use case of 2-TB transmission: Some companies think 2-TB transmission could be beneficial at least for MU-MIMO while others think probability of 2-TB could be low. * DCI overhead (and potentially UCI overhead): 2-TB transmission is scheduled for multi-PDSCH scheduling case, DCI overhead could be increased to indicate MCS/NDI/RV for the 2nd TB.   I’m not sure if we can simply assess the usefulness of 2-TB transmission. On the other hand, 2-TB transmission can be controlled by gNB’s configuration in addition to UE capability signaling. In that sense, I would like to suggest introducing 2-TB transmission for all DCI formats, but subject to UE capability. |

### Proposal #4b (2-TB scheduling):

* For a DCI that can schedule multiple PDSCHs,
  + MCS for the 2nd TB: This appears only once in the DCI and applies commonly to the second TB of each PDSCH
  + NDI for the 2nd TB: This is signaled per PDSCH and applies to the second TB of each PDSCH
  + RV for the 2nd TB: This is signaled per PDSCH, with 2 bits if only a single PDSCH is scheduled or 1 bit for each PDSCH otherwise, and applies to the second TB of each PDSCH
* In NR 52.6-71 GHz, support of the number of layers more than 4 is subject to UE capability.

Companies are encouraged to provide views on Proposal #4b.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Views |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support |
| Samsung | No, we can not accept this proposal !  The basis for determining the number of layer is (a) number of panels at gNB and UE, which is usually is small (e.g. up to 4 at gNB and usually only 1 at UE are considered for FR2), and each panel is usually has 2 ports, so the rank is limited to #UE panels. So, we usually have rank 1 or 2 transmission; (b) the channel is likely to be low rank due to fewer #strong clusters.  That is the technical reason we think 2-TB case is very corner case for 52.6GHz.  Actually, the typical layer for 52.6GHz is not firstly discussed in this meeting. Back to SI, companies discussed typical assumption, and agreed to use rank 1 or 2 to evaluate the performance, which is captured in TR 38.808.  We’d like to invite companies supporting 5~8 layers further elaborate what kind of typical scenario in their mind is good for 2-TB case. Up to now, companies mention mTRP, MU-MIMO. But as we explained, only single TB by a DCI is supported for mTRP now. And we don’t understand why MU-MIMO can. We need technical explanation.  Furthermore, we want to point out, arbitrarily ignore DCI overhead and UCI overhead is not a right way in RAN1. Supporting 2-TB for multiple PDSCHs lead to up to additional 14 bits in DCI, and can be up to N\*8 bits wasted bit in HARQ-ACK codebook, where N is the number of multi-PDSCH DCIs actually scheduling single TB. We can not agree that 2-TB case worth such tens of bits waste for both PDCCH and PUCCH. |
| OPPO | After analyzing Samsung’s explanation. We tend to agree that >4 layers is not a typical use case in 52.6-71 GHz. If my memory is functioning, during the SI phase, we had extensive discussions on the simulation assumption and the agreed RANK number is 1 or 2. Thus, it is not worthy spending more time to look at enhancement for this > 4 layers case. We think RAN1 should deprioritize this in this WI.  For the above reasons, we suggest that 52.6-71 GHz only supports 1 TB. |
| Qualcomm | We are okay with the proposal. We do not see a need to restrict the specs from supporting 2 TBs |
| Apple | We are fine with the proposal especially if the use of multiple TBs is subject to a UE capability. To answer Samsung’s question, if we look at IEEE 802.11ay, which operates in the same spectrum, IEEE 802.11ay supports concurrent transmission and reception of up to eight spatial streams at the same time and over the same frequency. We should not handicap NR operation in the same frequency just in case there are scenarios/use cases that will need to support this. |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal. |
| MediaTek | We originally shared the same view with Oppo and Samsung that 2TB configuration is not practical. However, given the fact that many companies see the value of it and supporting this feature is a UE capability, we can make the compromise. One clarification question: based on the last bullet, I assume that the 2nd TB can be scheduled to the UE which supports >4 layers? Can we somehow capture the relation between the 2nd TB feature and >4 layers as well? Otherwise, the last bullet seems to be irrelevant to the main bullet. |
| Ericsson | While we are okay with the proposal – we don't see a need to introduce restrictions in the spec – we are open to finding a compromise. We could live with Proposal #4a. |
| Moderator | To MediaTek,  From my understanding, 2nd TB is transmitted for more than 4 layers according to current specification.  <38.214>   |  | | --- | | 5.1.3.2 Transport block size determination In case the higher layer parameter *maxNrofCodeWordsScheduledByDCI* indicates that two codeword transmission is enabled, then one of the two transport blocks is disabled by DCI format 1\_1 if *IMCS* = 26 and if *rvid* = 1 for the corresponding transport block. If both transport blocks are enabled, transport block 1 and 2 are mapped to codeword 0 and 1 respectively. If only one transport block is enabled, then the enabled transport block is always mapped to the first codeword. |   <38.211>  **Table 7.3.1.3-1: Codeword-to-layer mapping for spatial multiplexing.**   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Number of layers** | **Number of codewords** | **Codeword-to-layer mapping** | | | 1 | 1 |  |  | | 2 | 1 |  |  | | 3 | 1 |  |  | | 4 | 1 |  |  | | 5 | 2 |  |  | |  | | 6 | 2 |  |  | |  | | 7 | 2 |  |  | |  | | 8 | 2 |  |  | |  |   To Samsung and OPPO,  As Apple pointed out, we don’t need to restrict ourselves considering that the competitor in the industry is already allowing 8 layer transmission. Whether to use this 2-TB feature is up to UE’s capability and gNB’s configuration. Why do we have to limit the peak throughput which can be useful at least for UE close to gNB? |
| Nokia/NSB | We are fine with the proposal.  The last bullet can be “Note” which is already specifies for all UE.   * Note: In NR ~~52.6-71 GHz~~, support of the number of layers more than 4 is subject to UE capability. |
| CATT | OK |

### Summary (on resource allocation related fields such as VRB-to-PRB mapping, PRB bundling size indicator, rate matching indicator, and ZP CSI-RS trigger):

Company views on resource allocation related fields such as VRB-to-PRB mapping, PRB bundling size indicator, rate matching indicator, and ZP CSI-RS trigger:

* VRB-to-PRB mapping
  + Applies to all the PDSCHs scheduled by the DCI: vivo, Ericsson, Qualcomm, NTT DOCOMO
* PRB bundling size indicator
  + Applies to all the PDSCHs scheduled by the DCI: vivo, Ericsson, Qualcomm, Apple, NTT DOCOMO
* Rate matching indicator
  + Applies to all the PDSCHs scheduled by the DCI: vivo, Ericsson, LG Electronics, NTT DOCOMO
  + Per PDSCH: Apple
  + Applies to part of scheduled PDSCHs (e.g., the first PDSCH): LG Electronics
* ZP CSI-RS trigger
  + Applies to all the PDSCHs scheduled by the DCI: vivo, Ericsson, Qualcomm, LG Electronics, NTT DOCOMO
  + Per PDSCH: Apple
  + Applies to part of scheduled PDSCHs (e.g., the first PDSCH): LG Electronics

[Moderator’s note] Given a small number of inputs, this issue can be deprioritized in this meeting.

Please feel free to express views on Moderator’s note, if any.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Views |
| DOCOMO | We are fine to deprioritize the issue in this meeting.  We think the simplest method is to apply the fields to all the PDSCH(s), which is the same handling as PDSCH repetition case in Rel-16. |
| Qualcomm | We support applying these fields for all PDSCHs and we are okay with deprioritizing this discussion for this meeting |
| MediaTek | Agree with the Moderator’s proposal |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | It may be possible to conclude on the VRB-to-PRB mapping, and PRB bundling size indicator. |
| Samsung | OK to deprioritize the issue. |
| Panasonic | We are fine to deprioritize the issue in this meeting |
| Fujitsu | OK to deprioritize this issue in this meeting. |
| Xiaomi | We are fine to deprioritize this issue |
| OPPO | Fine to deprioritize this discussion. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are fine to deprioritize this issue. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We agree to deprioritize this issue in this meeting |
| Nokia/NSB | Agree with Moderator |
| Intel | We are fine to deprioritize this issue in this meeting |
| Futurewei | We are ok that this issue be deprioritized. |
| Apple | We are fine with de-prioritizing the issue. |
| InterDigital | We are fine with deprioritizing this issue in this meeting. |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with deprioritizing this issue. |
| Sony | We are fine with deprioritizing this issue. |
| vivo | We are OK to deprioritize the issue in this meeting but think the simplest method is to apply the fields to all scheduled PDSCH(s). |
| CATT | We are fine with deprioritizing this issue. |

# HARQ

## Type-1 (semi-static) HARQ-ACK codebook

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Views |
| [1] Futurewei | Proposal 6: Option 1 is preferred over Option 1a for determine the candidate PDSCH occasion for type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook to be established. All slot offsets are included in the TDRA table for multi-PDSCH such that the extended K1 set is obtainable for contiguous and non-contiguous multi-PDSCH configurations.  Observation 3: Option 2 may not have the equal flexibility to handle non-contiguous multi-PDSCH as with Option 1 and can suffer from DL/UL collision.  Proposal 7: For the non-continuous multi-PDSCH, restrict the maximum allowable gaps to maximally 2 slots between individual PDSCHs to limit the size of the extended K1 set. |
| [2] Huawei | Observation 8: Extension of K1 set is redundant when slot offset between each PDSCH(s) for each row of TDRA can be calculated by each K0(s) values in TDRA table.  Observation 9: Option 2 has more impact on the specification when different PDSCH(s) occasions within one slot are from different rows of TDRA table  Proposal 9: Support option 1a to determine the candidate PDSCH reception occasions for multi-PDSCH scheduling by single DCI. |
| [3] vivo | Proposal 12: For semi-static codebook enhancement Option 1, the K1 set is extended to accommodate all the DL slots determined not only by K1 but also by DL slots occupied by a row in the TDRA table.  Proposal 13: For semi-static codebook enhancement Option 1, the set of SLIVs associated with a candidate DL slot involved in the extended K1 set contains every SLIV ending in the candidate DL slot when scheduling the TDRA row containing the SLIV and applying a certain K1 in the K1 set.  Proposal 14: For semi-static codebook enhancement Option 2, HARQ-ACK information of multiple PDSCHs scheduled by one DCI will be mapped to a same PDSCH candidate occasion, which is determined by the last scheduled PDSCH among the multiple PDSCHs originally.  Proposal 15: For semi-static codebook enhancement Option 2, the number of HARQ-ACK bits for a PDSCH candidate occasion in the semi-static codebook can be determined by the maximum number of SLIVs of those rows mapped to the PDSCH candidate occasion.  Proposal 16: For semi-static codebook enhancement, support Option 1, i.e. extending K1 set.  Proposal 17: Study semi-static HARQ-ACK codebook in conjunction with time domain bunding for multi-PDSCH scheduling. |
| [5] Nokia | Proposal 12: For Type-1 codebook, option 1: the set of candidate PDSCH reception occasions is determined according to each SLIV of each row in the TDRA table and based on extension of K1 set, is supported. |
| [6] Ericsson | Observation 9: There are a number of open issues around Option 2 for semi-static HARQ-ACK codebook enhancement to support multi-PDSCH scheduling that need to be clarified. Furthermore, it is not clear what potential advantage Option 2 offers compared to Option 1.  Observation 10: For Option 1a for semi-static HARQ-ACK codebook enhancement to support multi-PDSCH scheduling, it is unclear how a set of Candidate PDSCH reception occasions can be determined according to each SLIV of each row in the TDRA table without taking the configured K1 values into account. If the configured K1 values are taken into account, it is not clear how this is different from Option 1.  Proposal 21: Support Option 1 for semi-static HARQ-ACK codebook enhancement for multi-PDSCH scheduling.  Proposal 22: For each configured K1 value, the sets of candidate PDSCH reception occasions corresponding to different rows in the TDRA table should be pruned to generate a set of unique PDSCH candidate occasions for the K1 value.  Proposal 23: The sets of candidate PDSCH reception occasions corresponding to different configured K1 values should be pruned to generate a set of unique PDSCH candidate for semi-static HARQ-ACK codebook generation.  Proposal 24: If any occasion(s) in a set of candidate PDSCH reception occasions, derived from a row in the TDRA table and a configured K1 value, collide with any UL symbols indicated by tdd-UL-DL-ConfigurationCommon or tdd-UL-DL-ConfigurationDedicated, the entire set of candidate PDSCH reception occasions should be dropped in the generation of the semi-static HARQ codebook. |
| [7] CATT | Proposal 6: When the scheduled PDSCH/PUSCH overlaps with unavailable slots/symbols, the corresponding SLIV value can be regarded as invalid.  Proposal 10: The enhancement mechanism for discarding candidate PDSCH reception occasions and HARQ-ACK feedback information shall be studied before determination on the options for Type-1 HARQ-ACK can be made. |
| [8] Qualcomm | Proposal 5: Support Option 1, i.e., the set of the candidate PDSCH reception occasions can be determined based on each SLIV of each row in the TDRA table, extension of K1 can be discussed separately to avoid confusion.  Proposal 7: When some PDSCHs/PUSCHs are skipped due to conflict between multi-PDSCH/PUSCH grant and UL/DL TDD configurations, the HARQ increment process will be applied over all PDSCHs/PUSCHs carried by the same DCI, then the corresponding HARQ IDs corresponding to the skipped PDCSHs/PUSCHs should be cancelled and ignored when constructing the type-1 codebook. |
| [9] OPPO | Proposal 1: Support option 1 or option 2 for Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook construction.   * For option 1, the candidate DL slots are determined by the union of DL slot sets, where each DL slot set is determined by each row in the TDRA table and based on extension of one K1 value in K1 set. * For option 2, the number of HARQ-ACK bits corresponding to one candidate PDSCH reception occasion is determined by the maximum number of PDSCHs which can be scheduled with a single DCI according to the configured TDRA table. |
| [10] ZTE | Proposal 3: For enhancements of generating type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook, we support option 1:   * The set of candidate PDSCH reception occasions is determined according to each SLIV of each row in the TDRA table and based on extension of K1 set. |
| [11] Intel | Proposal 4   * For Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook generation, to allocate the occasion(s) for the candidate PDSCH transmissions corresponding to the multiple rows in TDRA table, the overlap of any SLIV of a row should be considered.   Proposal 5   * For Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook generation, the DL slots for PDSCH transmissions that are determined by the set of K1 values. For each determined DL slot, a set of (K1, row) are derived, then the overlap of any SLIV of different (K1, row) should be considered. |
| [12] Fujitsu | Observation 1: For Option 1 of determining set of candidate PDSCH reception occasions, besides extension of set of , it would require additional effort at least to determine the associated SLIVs for each in the set of (based on extension of set of ), which may need a significant change to the current structure of pseudo-code.  Observation 2: For Option 1a or Option 2 for determining the set of candidate PDSCH reception occasions, besides change on pruning based on TDD DL/UL configuration, it requires to specify the number of HARQ-ACK information bits for a candidate PDSCH reception occasion.   * Compared with Option 1a, Option 2 would bring extra restriction on scheduling.   Proposal 2: For Option 1a or Option 2 for determining the set of candidate PDSCH reception occasions, regarding the number of HARQ-ACK information bits for a candidate PDSCH reception occasion, the following 2 alternatives can be considered.   * Alt.1. The number of HARQ-ACK information bits for a candidate PDSCH reception occasion can be determined according to corresponding valid SLIVs. * Alt.2: Support bundling of HARQ-ACK information bits for multiple PDSCHs. Then the the number of HARQ-ACK information bits for a candidate PDSCH reception occasion is determined based on the number of bundled PDSCHs.   Observation 3: For determining the set of candidate PDSCH reception occasions, compared with Option 1 and Option 2, Option 1a provides a good trade-off between the complexity of generating the codebook and scheduling flexibility.  Proposal 3: Support Option 1a for determining the set of candidate PDSCH reception occasions. |
| [13] Apple | Observation 2: The use of Option 1 to construct the semi-static HARQ-ACK codebook results in a smaller codebook size than Option 2.  Proposal 8: For enhancement of the semi-static HARQ-ACK codebook for multi-PDSCH transmission, the set of candidate PDSCH reception occasions is determined according to each SLIV of each row in the TDRA table and based on extension of K1 set. |
| [14] Sony | Proposal 7: Support Option 1 (The set of candidate PDSCH reception occasions is determined according to each SLIV of each row in the TDRA table and based on extension of K1 set) |
| [15] NEC | Proposal 3: For type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook determination, we prefer option1. |
| [16] Samsung | Proposal 6: For Type-1 codebook, the set of candidate PDSCH reception occasions is determined according to each SLIV of each row in the TDRA table and based on extension of K1 set (Option 1).  - K1 set is extended based on K1 and slot offset between last PDSCH and other PDSCHs in a row in the TDRA table.  - Collison between candidate PDSCH reception occasion and TDD UL/DL configuration is handled per single PDSCH SLIV.  - Further study how to reduce redundant HARQ-ACK bit with joint consideration of multiple PDSCHs in multiple slots.  - Further study how to reduce redundant HARQ-ACK bit with the consideration of validity of PDCCH MO. |
| [17] MediaTek | Proposal 1: For Type-1 codebook construction, support Option1 or Option1a together with the Rel-16 per-slot pruning operation which is based on TDD configuration and UE capability on number of PDSCH reception per slot. |
| [18] Panasonic | Proposal 8: For type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook corresponding to DCI that can schedule multiple PDSCHs,  • The set of candidate PDSCH reception occasions is determined according to each SLIV of each row in the TDRA table and based on extension of K1 set. |
| [19] LG Electronics | Proposal #9: Three options agreed in RAN1#104bis-e can be rephrased as follows and Option 1 is preferred considering HARQ-ACK codebook size and specification impact.   * Option 1: The set of candidate PDSCH reception occasions is determined according to each SLIV of each row in the TDRA table and based on extension of K1 set   + K1\_set (=set of K1 values) is extended to K1\_ext based on K1 and slot offset between last PDSCH and other PDSCHs in a row in the TDRA table.   + R (=set of row indexes) is extended to R\_ext such that each of the multiple SLIVs in a row index of R is separated by a row in R\_ext and each of row indexes in R\_ext has a single SLIV.   + To determine the set of candidate PDSCH reception occasions, all of row indexes in R\_ext is used when the corresponding K1 value is included in K1\_set and also included in K1\_ext, but the row indexes in R\_ext associated only with multiple SLIVs in R are used when the corresponding K1 value is not included in K1\_set but included in K1\_ext. * Option 1a: The set of candidate PDSCH reception occasions is determined according to each SLIV of each row in the TDRA table   + Alt 1: For a K1 value (in K1\_set) and DL slot n corresponding to the K1 value, pruning procedure is performed for each slot from DL slot n-M+1 to DL slot n, where M is defined as the configured maximum number of DL slots that can be scheduled by a single DCI.   + Alt 2: For a K1 value (in K1\_set) and DL slot n corresponding to the K1 value, after pruning procedure is performed for DL slot n, P-1 PDSCH reception occasions are added where P is defined as the configured maximum number of PDSCHs that can be scheduled by a single DCI. * Option 2: The set of candidate PDSCH reception occasions is determined according to the last SLIV of each row in the TDRA table   + Pseudo code to determine the set of PDSCH reception occasions can be reused by performing pruning procedure with the last SLIV of each row in the TDRA table.   + In pseudo code to assign HARQ-ACK bit(s) for each PDSCH reception occasion, Q HARQ-ACK bits are assigned for each PDSCH reception occasion, where Q depends on the configured maximum number (=P) of PDSCHs that can be scheduled by a single DCI (e.g., Q=P for 1 TB case and Q=2P for 2 TB case).   Proposal #10: Further discuss whether or not to allow the case where some of PDSCHs scheduled by a multi-PDSCH scheduling DCI overlap with semi-static UL symbol(s). |
| [20] Lenovo | Proposal 5: For NR operation between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz, in order to generate type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook corresponding to DCI that can schedule multiple PDSCHs, the set of candidate PDSCH reception occasions is determined according to each SLIV of each row in the TDRA table and based on extension of K1 set. |
| [21] Xiaomi | Proposal 2: Prefer Option 1 for Type 1 HARQ-ACK codebook. |
| [22] InterDigital | Proposal 10: Support Option 1 for candidate PDSCH reception occasions determining, i.e., the set of candidate PDSCH reception occasions is determined according to each SLIV of each row in the TDRA table and based on extension of K1 set. |
| [23] Convida | Proposal 1. For type-1 codebook HARQ-ACK generation, Option 1 can be supported for single DCI scheduling multi-PDSCH for reducing specification impact and how to determine (expansion) K1 set can be further studied. |
| [24] NTT DOCOMO | Proposal 3:  Support option 2 with following procedure for type 1 HARQ-ACK CB construction for multi-PDSCH scheduling.   * Step 1: Determine PDSCH slot window for the HARQ-ACK based on configured K1 set. * Step 2: Determine candidate PDSCH reception occasions for each slot in the PDSCH slot window, based on TDD DL/UL configuration and last SLIV of each TDRA row. * Step 3: Generate HARQ-ACK information for each candidate PDSCH reception occasion in the set. The number of HARQ-ACK bits for one candidate PDSCH reception occasion needs to consider possible multiple PDSCHs.   Discuss further on the number of HARQ-ACK bits for each candidate PDSCH reception occasion   * Alt 1: Determined according to the maximum number of PDSCHs can be scheduled by one DCI on the serving cell. * Alt 2: Determined according to the number of SLIVs in TDRA row(s) whose last SLIV corresponds to the current candidate PDSCH reception occasion. |
| [26] WILUS | Proposal 2: For Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook construction for multi-PDSCH scheduling by a single DCI, we support option 1.   * Option 1: The set of candidate PDSCH reception occasions is determined according to each SLIV of each row in the TDRA table and based on extension of K1 set. |

### Summary (on Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook generation):

Company views on Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook generation:

* Option 1: The set of candidate PDSCH reception occasions is determined according to each SLIV of each row in the TDRA table and based on extension of K1 set
  + Supported by Futurewei, vivo, Nokia, Ericsson, Qualcomm, OPPO, ZTE, Intel, Apple, Sony, NEC, Samsung, MediaTek, Panasonic, LG Electronics, Lenovo, Xiaomi, InterDigital, Convida, WILUS
* Option 1a: The set of candidate PDSCH reception occasions is determined according to each SLIV of each row in the TDRA table
  + Supported by Huawei, Intel, Fujitsu, MediaTek
* Option 2: The set of candidate PDSCH reception occasions is determined according to the last SLIV of each row in the TDRA table
  + Supported by OPPO, NTT DOCOMO

[Moderator’s note#1] 20 companies prefer Option 1, 4 companies prefer Option 1a, and 2 companies prefer Option 2. Given that most companies prefer Option 1, we may narrow it down to Option 1. Even if we go with Option 1, still there seem to be further issues to finalize type-1 codebook design.

### Q1: Would it be acceptable to go with Option 1? If not, please provide the reason.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Views |
| DOCOMO | We can accept the proposal for progress.  But we hope more clarifications of option 1 before we go into an agreement. For example, for each PDSCH slot determined based on the extended K1 set, is the candidate PDSCH occasion in the slot determined considering all possible SLIVs in each row of the TDRA table, or only SLIVs that are possible to be located in the slot? For the former option, large redundancy is possible. For the latter option, UE complexity will be increased if there are many rows and many different SLIVs. |
| Qualcomm | We support Option 1 |
| MediaTek | We share the similar view with DOCOMO that all the options are lack of details and they are all the same at the level of finding the initial candidate PDSCH occasions. However, how to prune those candidate PDSCHs should be discussed together in order to down select those options. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We also think that alternatives for K1 set extensions should be better understood and listed before diving into agreeing to support Option 1. Perhaps the proponents can each describe their detailed method for K1 set extension for further discussion. |
| Samsung | For option 1a, according to the tdocs, it seems proponent companies for option 1a have different understanding for option 1a. For example, some companies propose the procedure same as option 2, only difference is whether to keep valid PDSCH candidate location if last SLIV is valid or at least one SLIV is valid. Some other companies propose a different procedure, which is not clear to us how to work. Therefore, we suggest to focus on option 1 and option 2.  We slightly prefer option 1 over option 2 for smaller HARQ-ACK overhead for most cases. |
| Panasonic | We support Option 1. |
| Fujitsu | We also think more details of options should be clarified before narrowing down. Although companies show their preference of the options, it seems there are different interpretations on the options.  As one of the proponents of Option 1a, we would like to share our interpretation on Option 1a as below. The difference with Option 2 is mainly that, the pruning of candidate PDSCH reception occasion is based on all SLIVs of each row in the TDRA table.  Regarding Option 2, in our view, since the pruning according to TDD UL/DL configuration is a sub-step for determining the set of candidate PDSCH reception occasions, it means that the pruning is performed only according to the last SLIV of each row in the TDRA table. That is why we do not think the method we mentioned for Option 1a belongs to Option 2.  And regarding Option 1, besides the K1 set extension, we are also wondering how to handle the collision with TDD configuration, and whether and how to support time domain bundling of multiple PDSCHs (although in our understanding, it cannot support such bundling). Hopefully, the proponents can share the details for further discussion.   * Option 1a:   + *Determination of candidate PDSCH reception occasion*   For a K1 (without extension) and DL slot n corresponding to the K1, pruning of candidate PDSCH reception occasion is based on all SLIVs of each row in the TDRA table. As an example, for K1=1 and the corresponding DL slot N-1 in the figure below, if at least one red-colored SLIV in slot N-4~N-1 is valid, it has a candidate PDSCH reception occasion.   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | (TDRA table) | | | Index = 0 | {SLIV R0\_0} | | Index = 1 | {SLIV R1\_0, SLIV R1\_1} | | Index = 2 | {SLIV R2\_0, SLIV R2\_1, SLIV R2\_2, SLIV R2\_3} | |  |  * + *Number of HARQ-ACK information bits for a candidate PDSCH reception occasion*      - Alt.1. The number of HARQ-ACK information bits for a candidate PDSCH reception occasion can be determined according to corresponding valid SLIVs.     - Alt.2: Support bundling of HARQ-ACK information bits for multiple PDSCHs. Then the number of HARQ-ACK information bits for a candidate PDSCH reception occasion is determined based on the number of bundled PDSCHs. |
| Xiaomi | We support Option 1. |
| OPPO | We support Option 1 or Option 2. |
| WILUS | We support Option 1. We are open to discuss details including extension of K1 set and determination of possible SLIVs. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We support Option 1. |
| vivo | We support Option 1. Regarding Option 1a, obviously different views can be found in the contributions, and we think the discussions on Option 1a can be deprioritized. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support option 1, but are okay to keep option2 as well for now and have further discussion to have better understanding of the details |
| Nokia, NSB | We support Option 1,  And, it would benefit from further clarification, e.g. from listing alternatives for determination of candidate PDSCH occasion(s) in the slot. |
| Intel | We don’t support Option 1a.  We are supportive to the principle of Option 1. However, we are not sure if all companies have exact same understanding on Option 1. From our side, we want to clarify   * To be precise, it is not to based on extended K1 set. To design for different numerology between PUCCH cell and PDSCH cell from the beginning, it should be the set of DL slots for potential PDSCH transmissions with HARQ-ACK in the same PUCCH slot * Not sure the exact meaning of ‘according to each SLIV of each row’. In our understanding, it emphasizes that an occasion can be identified in the Type1 codebook for each SLIV of each row. On the other hand, the rule to reduce Type1 codebook size, i.e. compression on the number of occasions in the codebook is FFS   Therefore, we suggest following revision to Option 1:  Modified Option 1: The set of candidate PDSCH reception occasions is determined ~~according to~~ for each SLIV of each row in the TDRA table and based on ~~extension of K1 set~~ the set of DL slots for potential PDSCH transmissions with HARQ-ACK in the same PUCCH slot   * FFS the exact way to compress the number of occasions in the Type1 codebook |
| Futurewei | We support Option 1 and think that further details to finalize the codebook design are for FFS. |
| Apple | We support Option 1. |
| Ericsson | We support Option 1  We can then discuss some more of the next level details. Some to things to nail down are:   * Pruning to generate a set of unique PDSCH candidate reception occasions for HARQ-ACK codebook generation * Handling of collisions with UL symbols indicated in the semi-statically configured TDD UL/DL pattern (see comments related to Q2)   In our view, if any occasion(s) derived from a row in the TDRA table and a configured K1 value collide with any UL symbols indicated by the TDD UL/DL pattern, then all candidate PDSCH reception occasions for that row + K1 value should be dropped in the generation of the semi-static HARQ codebook. This is because in our view (see comments on Q2 below) the gNB should not indicate that row and K1 value due to the conflict. |
| CATT1 | We support Option 1. |
| InterDigital | We support Option 1 |
| Convida Wireless | We prefer Option 1 and are open for Option 1a. |
| NEC | We support Option 1. |
| Spreadtrum | We support Option 1. |
| Sony | We support Option 1. |
| Moderator | It seems several companies suggest to clarify each option first and then down-select. Let’s start discussion from the figure provided by Fujitsu (Thanks! ☺) |

### Q1-1: Please describe the detailed procedure based on the preference between options, based on the figure below. For the simplicity, we can assume that any of PDSCHs is not collided with semi-static UL symbol(s) and time domain bundling is not configured.

[Moderator’s note for Q1-1] Furthermore, it is assumes that K1 set = {1, 2} and each SLIV corresponds to S=0 and L=14 for each PDSCH. However, if there could be more consideration points or potential enhancements, please describe your opinions with other examples of K1 set and/or SLIV values.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | (TDRA table) | | | Index = 0 | {SLIV R0\_0} | | Index = 1 | {SLIV R1\_0, SLIV R1\_1} | | Index = 2 | {SLIV R2\_0, SLIV R2\_1, SLIV R2\_2, SLIV R2\_3} | |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Preference | Codebook generation procedure |
| Example | Option X | 1. Extended K1 set (if Option 1 is preferred): {5,4,3,2,1} 2. How to determine a set of PDSCH reception occasions **for each K1 value** (i.e., pruning procedure)    1. K1=5    2. K1=4    3. K1=3    4. K1=2    5. K1=1 3. HARQ-ACK bit generation based on determined PDSCH reception occasions |
| Qualcomm | Option 1 | Our understanding of extending K1 is based on the fact that N1 will be relatively large for new SCS, such that most of current values of K1 will be invalid, so it the range of K1 values need to extended   1. K1 set: {5,4,3,2,1} 2. Consider each row    1. For row with index 0: set of candidate slots N-1, N-2, …,N-6    2. For row with index 1: set of candidate slots N-1, N-2, …,N-7    3. For row with index 2: set of candidate slots N-1,N-2,…,N-8 3. Generate 8 A/N bits corresponding to slots N-1,…, N-8 |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Option 1 | 1. Yes, we agree to extend the K1 set to {5,4,3,2,1} 2. Apple pruning to determine the unique PDSCH reception occasions 3. Based on the unique PDSCH reception occasions, ACK/NACK bits can be generated to construct the codebook |
| Moderator |  | It would highly appreciated if companies could provide pruning procedure in detail as much as possible (e.g., which SLIV values are used for each K1 value).  To Qualcomm,  I don’t understand how candidate slot for a row can be extended to slot N-8. Could you elaborate?  In addition, a loop in current pseudo code is based on K1 value, not based on row index of TDRA entry. Do you consider to change the structure of current pseudo code? |
| Apple | Option 1 | 1. extend the K1 set to {5, 4, 3 ,2 1}.    1. For each K1, create a set from the union of candidate PDSCH reception occasions over all rows of the TDRA table 2. Merge all sets corresponding to the different K1 values together, keeping only unique candidate PDSCH reception occasions.    1. N-1: SLIV R0\_0    2. N-2: SLIV R1\_0    3. N-3: SLIV R2\_1    4. N-4: SLIV R2\_0    5. N-5: SLIV R2\_0 3. Generate HARQ ACK bits for the set of unique (pruned) candidate PDSCH reception occasions generated in Step 2.    1. 5 bit ACK-NACK   NOTE: The size of the codebook could increase in the case (a) multiple PDSCHs are transmitted within a slot (under discussion) and (b) there are non-overlapping PDSCH start times within the slot e.g. SLIV = {0,7}, {7,7} |
| Ericsson | Option 1 | 1. Extended K1 set: {5,4,3,2,1} 2. Pruning procedure:  * For the 1st row of the TDRA table   + "Effective" K1 values are {1} and {2} * For the 2nd row of the TDRA table   + "Effective" K1 values are {1,2} and {2,3} * For the 3rd row of the TDRA table   + "Effective" K1 values are {1,2,3,4} and {2,3,4,5} * Merging all "effective" K1 values together into 1 set and keeping only the unique ones gives the extended K1 set {5,4,3,2,1}  1. The candidate PDSCH reception occasions are {N-5, N-4, N-3, N-2, N-1}   As a general comment, I believe we should not try to specify the exact procedure in too much detail, but rather try to find a way to describe the procedure at a relatively high level, with only as much detail as required such that the spec editor can capture the procedure properly.  It will probably be necessary to conclude on how many PSDCHs can occur in a slot for multi-PDSCH. In our view, it would be sufficient to support only single PDSCH per slot, since for 480/960 kHz and also 120 kHz, the slots are quite short. Multiple "mini-slots", i.e., multiple Type-B PDSCH mappings per slot do not seem to be motivated, even for URLLC traffic. |
| DOCOMO | Option 2 (1st preference),  Option 1 (2nd preference) | Option 1:   1. Extended K1 set: If the same SCS for PUCCH CC and PDSCH CC, the extended K1 set = {5,4,3,2,1}.   But for more general case considering different SCS of PUCCH CC and PDSCH CC, the K1 set extension method can be: If the set represents set of “slot offset values of each PDSCH slot to the last PDSCH slot in the same row” for each row, the extended K1 set can be obtained by {}, for each in the original configured K1 set and for each .   1. How to determine a set of PDSCH reception occasions **for each K1 value** (i.e., pruning procedure): based on all unique SLIVs among {SLIV R0\_0, SLIV R1\_0, SLIV R1\_1,…., SLIV R2\_3 }.   And we think the example is a special case that the {SLIV R0\_0, SLIV R1\_0, SLIV R1\_1,…., SLIV R2\_3 } have the same S and L. In this sepecial case, one PDSCH occasion each slot will result in 5\* 1= 5 bits (assuming 1 bit for one PDSCH). But if considering more general case with different S and/or L for SLIVs in each row, there can be multiple candidate occasions in one slot, e.g. 2 PDSCH candidate occasion. In this case, there will be 5\*2=10 bits (assuming 1 bit for one PDSCH)..   1. HARQ-ACK bit generation based on determined PDSCH reception occasions: One PDSCH reception occasion corresponds to HARQ-ACK bit(s) of one PDSCH.   Option 2:   1. No K1 set extension. 2. How to determine a set of PDSCH reception occasions **for each K1 value** (i.e., pruning procedure): based on the last SLIV of each row, i.e. {SLIV R0\_0, SLIV R1\_1, SLIV R2\_3 }.For the special case that {SLIV R0\_0, SLIV R1\_1, SLIV R2\_3 } have the same S and L, one PDSCH occasion is generated for each K. 3. HARQ-ACK bit generation based on determined PDSCH reception occasions. Number of bits for one PDSCH reception occasion is determined according to the number of SLIVs in TDRA row(s) whose last SLIV corresponds to the current candidate PDSCH reception occasion. For example, for the only one PDSCH reception occasion in the example, 4 bits will be generated. |
| WILUS | Option 1 | 1. Extended K1 set: {5,4,3,2,1} 2. How to determine a set of PDSCH reception occasions **for each K1 value** (i.e., pruning procedure):  First find SLIV candidates for the slot N-K1, where K1 is an extended K1 value in the extended K1 set. For example,    1. For K1=5, R\_5={R2\_0}    2. For K1=4, R\_4={R2\_0, R2\_1}    3. For K1=3, R\_3={R2\_1, R1\_0, R2\_2}    4. For K1=2, R\_2={R1\_0, R2\_2, R0\_0, R1\_1, R2\_3}    5. For K1=1, R\_1={R0\_0, R1\_1, R2\_3}   Second, exclude a SLIV candidate if the SLIV candidate overlaps with semi-static UL symbol. (same as in Rel-15/16)  Third, for a given R\_k (k=5,4,3,2,1), find unique HARQ-ACK occasions based on starting symbol and length of the SLIV candidates in R\_k. (same as in Rel-15/16) For example, all SLIVs occupy all symbols in a slot (i.e., S=0, L=14), then for a given R\_k(k=5,4,3,2,1), one HARQ-ACK occasion is determined and the number of all HARQ-ACK occasion is 5.   1. HARQ-ACK bit generation based on determined PDSCH reception occasions: one bit for HARQ-ACK occasion (assuming 1 TB per PDSCH and no CBG-based PDSCH reception). For example, we have 5 HARQ-ACK bits |
| Intel | Option 1 | 1. Yes, extend the K1 set to {5,4,3,2,1} 2. For each value K1,k in {5,4,3,2,1}, one or more occasions are allocated for the SLIVs that are mapped in slot n-K1,k by checking overlap among whole rows contains the SLIVs.    1. For slot n-5, there is only one SLIV, i.e. SLIV R2\_0 with K1=2, one occasion is allocated    2. For slot n-4, there are two SLIVs, i.e. SLIV R2\_1 with K1=2 and SLIV R2\_0 with K1=1. The number of occasions is determined by checking the overlap between row 2 with K1=2 and row 2 with K1=1. That is, if SLIV R2\_0 overlaps with SLIV R2\_1, or SLIV R2\_1 overlaps with SLIV R2\_2, or SLIV R2\_2 overlaps with SLIV R2\_3, one occasion is allocated for slot n-4, otherwise, 2 occasions are allocated    3. For slot n-3, there are 3 SLIVs, the occasion is allocated by checking the overlap between row 2 with K1=2, row1 with K1=2 and row 2 with K1=1.    4. For slot n-4, there are 5 SLIVs, the occasion is allocated by checking the overlap among row 2 with K1=2, row1 with K1=2, row0 with K1=2, row2 with K1=1 and row1 with K1=1.    5. For slot n-5, there are 3 SLIVs, the occasion is allocated by checking the overlap among row2 with K1=1, row1 with K1=1 and row0 with K1=1.   *NOTE: since it is assumed that each SLIV corresponds to S=0 and L=14, one occasion is determined for each of bullet a/b/c/d/e*   1. The occasions allocated for the 5 K1 values are concatenated. Assuming each SLIV corresponds to S=0 and L=14, the number of occasions is 5 in the Type1 codebook |
| OPPO | Option 1 (1st preference)  Option 2 (2nd preference) | Option 1   1. Extended K1 set: {5,4,3,2,1} 2. For K1=1, the K1 set is extended to {4,3,2,1};   For K1=2, the K1 set is extended to {5,4,3,2};  The K1 set is the union of {4,3,2,1} and {5,4,3,2}, i.e., the K1 set is extended to {5,4,3,2,1}.   1. The candidate PDSCH reception occasions are {N-5, N-4, N-3, N-2, N-1}, each candidate PDSCH reception occasion corresponds to TB number ACK/NACK bits.   The above option 1 is our first preference, but this option may cause redundant HARQ-ACK bits if both multi-PDSCH scheduling and CBG transmission are configured and each candidate PDSCH reception may correspond to CBG number ACK/NACK bits. So we are also open to Option 2.  Option 2   1. K1 set: {2,1} based on the last SLIV 2. The candidate PDSCH reception occasions are {N-2, N-1} as legacy, each candidate PDSCH reception occasion corresponds to N ACK/NACK bits, N is the maximum number of the configured SLIV in a row. |
| Samsung | Option 1 | First of all, we want to echo Ericsson’s comment that we should focus on high-level procedures rather than try to provide a very detailed description to be captured in the spec, which is editor’s work ☺  In the following, we provide our understanding for option 1 and 2 respectively. For simplicity, we consider same SCS, single TB case, and no CBG.  Option 1:   1. Extended K1 set: {5,4,3,2,1}    1. Extended K set is provided by the union of extended K1 derived by the slot offset between each SLIV and last SLIV of each row of the TDRA table for each configured K1. 2. How to determine a set of PDSCH reception occasions for each K1 value (i.e., pruning procedure)    1. K1=5   Find the candidate slot, i.e. slot n-5.  Find all SLIVs within this slot, i.e. SLIV 2\_0.  Determine 1 PDSCH reception occasion for SLIV 2\_0.   * 1. K1=4   Find the candidate slot, i.e. slot n-4.  Find all SLIVs within this slot, i.e. SLIV 2\_0 & SLIV 2\_1.  Because these 2 SLIVs are overlapped, determine 1 PDSCH reception occasion associated with both SLIVs.   * 1. K1=3   Find the candidate slot, i.e. slot n-3.  Find all SLIVs within this slot, i.e. SLIV 2\_1 & SLIV 1\_0& SLIV 2\_2.  Because these 3 SLIVs are overlapped, determine 1 PDSCH reception occasion associated with 3 SLIVs.   * 1. K1=2   Find the candidate slot, i.e. slot n-2.  Find all SLIVs within this slot, i.e. SLIV 1\_0 & SLIV 2\_2& SLIV 0\_0& SLIV 1\_1& SLIV 2\_3.  Because these 5 SLIVs are overlapped, determine 1 PDSCH reception occasion associated with 5 SLIVs.   * 1. K1=1   Find the candidate slot, i.e. slot n-1.  Find all SLIVs within this slot, i.e. SLIV 0\_0 & SLIV 1\_1& SLIV 2\_3.  Because these 3 SLIVs are overlapped, determine 1 PDSCH reception occasion associated with 3 SLIVs.  Therefore, after loop of all K1, there’re totally 5 PDSCH reception occasions for K1=5, 4, 3, 2, 1.   1. HARQ-ACK bit generation based on determined PDSCH reception occasions   => 1 bit for each PDSCH reception occasion. So, totally 5 bits.  For option 2,   1. K1 set {2,1} 2. How to determine a set of PDSCH reception occasions for each K1 value (i.e., pruning procedure)    1. K1=2   Find the candidate slot, i.e. slot n-2.  Find all last SLIVs of a row ending within this slot, i.e. SLIV 0\_0 & SLIV 2\_3&SLIV 1\_1. Because these ~~2~~ 3 SLIVs are overlapped, determine 1 PDSCH reception occasion associated with both SLIVs.   * 1. K1=1   Find the candidate slot, i.e. slot n-1.  Find all last SLIVs of a row ending within this slot, i.e. SLIV 0\_0 & SLIV 2\_3&SLIV 1\_1. Because these ~~2~~ 3 SLIVs are overlapped, determine 1 PDSCH reception occasion associated with both SLIVs.  Therefore, after loop of all K1, there’re totally 2 PDSCH reception occasions for K1=2, 1.  3）HARQ-ACK bit generation based on determined PDSCH reception occasions  => 4 bits for each PDSCH reception occasion (determined by the maximum number of scheduled PDSCHs associated with this occasion). So, totally 8 bits. |
| vivo | Option 1 | 1. The K1 set can be extended to {5,4,3,2,1}, and the set of associated DL slots is {N-5, N-4, N-3, N-2, N-1} (Note the same SCSs for DL and UL are assumed) 2. For each K1 in the extended K1 set, the corresponding set of associated SLIVs is as following:   K1=5: SLIV R2\_0  K1=4: SLIV R2\_0, SLIV R2\_1  K1=3: SLIV R2\_1, SLIV R1\_0, SLIV R2\_2  K1=2: SLIV R1\_0, SLIV R2\_2, SLIV R0\_0, SLIV R1\_1, SLIV R2\_3  K1=1: SLIV R0\_0, SLIV R1\_1, SLIV R2\_3  Based on the pruning procedure in Rel-15, each K1 has a corresponding PDSCH reception occasion, since all SLIVs in the corresponding set of associated SLIVs overlap each other (i.e. correspond to the same SLIV value that S = 0 and L = 14)  By concatenating the corresponding PDSCH reception occasion for each K1 in the extended K1 set in a specific order, a set of PDSCH reception occasions that has 5 occasions in total can be determined for Type-1 codebook, based on which the sequence of HARQ-ACK bits can be generated. Assuming 1 TB per PDSCH and no CBG-based PDSCH reception configured, there will be 5 HARQ-ACK bits in the generated Type-1 codebook, with 1 bit for each PDSCH reception occasion. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Option 1 | 1. The extended K1 set {5, 4 , 3, 2, 1}. 2. How to determine a set of PDSCH reception occasions for each K1 value (i.e., pruning procedure) 3. K1=5, R\_5={R2\_0} 4. K1=4, R\_4={R2\_0, R2\_1} 5. K1=3, R\_3={R2\_1, R1\_0, R2\_2} 6. K1=2, R\_2={R1\_0, R2\_2, R0\_0, R1\_1, R2\_3} 7. K1=1, R\_1={R0\_0, R1\_1, R2\_3}   Totally 5 bits for extended K1 set.   1. HARQ-ACK bit generation based on determined PDSCH reception occasions   1 bit for each PDSCH reception occasion. So totally we have 5 HARQ-ACK bits. |
| Fujitsu | Option 1a | 1. No extension of K1 set 2. How to determine a set of PDSCH reception occasions **for each K1 value** (i.e., pruning procedure)    1. K1=2,   According to all SLIVs for each row of the TDRA table across slot N-4~N-1. Following the assumption that any of PDSCHs is not collided with semi-static UL symbol(s), it has a candidate PDSCH reception occasion.   * 1. K1=1   According to all SLIVs for each row of the TDRA table across slot N-5~N-2. Following the assumption that any of PDSCHs is not collided with semi-static UL symbol(s), it has a candidate PDSCH reception occasion.   1. HARQ-ACK bit generation based on determined PDSCH reception occasions   The number of HARQ-ACK bit for a candidate PDSCH reception occasion can be determined according to corresponding valid SLIVs. Following the assumption that any of PDSCHs is not collided with semi-static UL symbol(s) and time domain bundling is not configured, there would be 4 bits per candidate PDSCH reception occasion (8 bits in total).  It may need to be noted that the example for elaborating the options is a special case. For example, the configured K1 values are consecutive. If we would analyze the pros and cons of the options, we should also consider the other cases. |
| Qualcomm (2) |  | Sorry for the confusion from our previous comment, we assumed K1={1,2,..,5} not its extension  1) K1 set {2,1}  2) Find the candidate slots   * K1=2, SLIV R1\_0, SLIV R2\_2, SLIV R0\_0, SLIV R1\_1, SLIV R2\_3   Given K1 is counted from the slots of the Last PDSCH, Slots N-5, N-4, can be occupied by the other SLIVs from R 2 and Slot N-3 can be occupied by other SLIVs from R2 or R1   * K1=1, SLIV R0\_0, SLIV R1\_1, SLIV R2\_3   Slots N-4, N-3, can be occupied by the other SLIVs from R 2 and Slot N-2 can be occupied by other SLIVs from R2 or R1  3)HARQ-ACK bit generation based on determined PDSCH reception occasions  => 1 bit for each PDSCH reception occasion. So, totally 5 bits.  We are okay with the majority of companies understanding of the extension of K1 set as we see the results are similar from the two algorithms  We think also the extension of K1 values needs to be discussed for the new SCSs |
| Futurewei | Option 1 | 1. Extended K1 set {5, 4 , 3, 2, 1};  2. The pruning procedure: For each k value in the K1 set, a. find all the SLIVs Rx\_y that appear in the slot n-k, and include into the set R\_k; b. Check under each slot n-k for the SLIV overlaps, while since it is assumed by moderator that each SLIV corresponds to S=0 and L=14, there is only one occasion for each slot;  3. Determine the number of HARQ-ACK bits to be 5, unless multi-TB or CBG is allowed within a slot. |
| Huawei2, HiSilicon2 | Option 1a  (option 1 would also work) | 1. No K1 set extension: K1 set = {1,2} 2. How to determine a set of PDSCH reception occasions for each K1 value (i.e., pruning procedure):    * + - 1. For each K1, and each row of TDRA, a set of candidate PDSCH reception occasions are determined by the SLIV(s) and offset between each SLIV(s), e.g. separate k0 value. 3. For K1=1, row\_1, set of candidate slots: {N-1} 4. For K1=1, row\_2, set of candidate slots: {N-2, N-1} 5. For K1=1, row\_3, set of candidate slots: {N-4, N-3,N-2, N-1} 6. For K1=2, row\_1, set of candidate slots: {N-2} 7. For K1=2, row\_2, set of candidate slots: {N-3, N-2} 8. For K1=2, row\_3, set of candidate slots: {N-5, N-4, N-3,N-2}    * + - 1. exclude a candidate slot if the SLIV candidate overlaps with semi-static UL symbol   The candidate PDSCH reception occasions are derived by union of none overlapped candidate slots: {N-5, N-4, N-3, N-2, N-1}  There are many similarities in the above descriptions from other companies for option 1 so this seems rather clear except if CBG is also considered (but that depends on another decision). Perhaps one thing is not really clear for cases where 2 SLIVs correspond to the same slot but result in non-overlapping PDSCHs. Many companies say that we should count two occasions, but this is not obvious as sometimes these occasions may correspond to overlapping PDCCHs (e.g. with same k0), which the UE cannot receive. In this case a single occasion should be counted. Even if these occasions correspond to different k0 values, it is unlikely that a UE could be scheduled with partially overlapping sets of multi-slot allocations. In summary it is not obvious that we should be assuming that multiple rows of the TDRA table could have been scheduled in overlapping slots with HARQ-ACK feedback in the same PUCCH.  We don’t really understand how option 2 works based on the feedback from companies above. |
| Moderator |  | Based on explanation provided each company, most companies are obviously aligned, but the only difference seems whether to explicitly create extended K1 set or not. Given that, I tried to make a proposal to describe codebook construction procedure in principle (i.e., not differentiating Option 1 and 1a). As commented by other companies, how to implement this procedure into specification could be up to discretion of spec editor. |

### Proposal #8 (Type-1 HARQ-ACK book):

* For enhancements of generating type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook corresponding to DCI that can schedule multiple PDSCHs, the set of candidate PDSCH reception occasions corresponding to a UL slot with HARQ-ACK transmission is determined based on a set of DL slots and a set of SLIVs corresponding to each DL slot belonging to the set of DL slots.
  + The set of DL slots includes all the DL slots that can be scheduled by any row index r of TDRA table in DCI indicating the UL slot as HARQ-ACK feedback timing.
  + The set of SLIVs corresponding to a DL slot (belonging to the set of DL slots) includes all the SLIVs that can be scheduled within the DL slot by any row index r of TDRA table in DCI indicating the UL slot as HARQ-ACK feedback timing.

Companies are encouraged to provide views on Proposal #8.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Views |
| LG | Fine with the proposal. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support the proposal |
| DOCOMO | We can accept the principle of the proposal, i.e. option 1 or option 1a.  But we have concern on the second sub-bullet. We think there are two possible ways to determine the set of SLIVs for a DL slot:   * Alt a) all the SLIVs that can be scheduled within the DL slot by any row index r of TDRA table * Alt b) all unique SLIVs in the TDRA table.   The method in the second sub-bullet represents Alt a). Of course Alt a) can lead to less redundancy than Alt b), but UE complexity is also higher, especially when there are many TDRA rows across many slots. We are open to further discuss which method to be applied. |
| Convida Wireless | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Qualcomm | We are fine with the proposal |
| Intel | The Proposal #8 seems to determine the occasions by checking non-overlap SLIVs within the set of SLIVs corresponding to a DL slot. This is sufficient if only one PDSCH can be scheduled in a slot. However, if more than one PDSCH can be scheduled in a slot, it is beneficial to check overlap between the rows that contains the set of SLIVs corresponding to a DL slot. For example, assuming only K2=2 is configured and there are 2 rows in TDRA table, taking slot n-2 as example,   * The set of SLIVs are {1-3, 2-2}, it requires two occasions since the two SLIVs {1-3, 2-2} are not overlapped * However, if we check the two rows, SLIV 1-2 and 2-1 are overlapped, that means the two rows can not be scheduled simultaneously, therefore, one occasion is sufficient for slot n-2.     We prefer to revise Proposal #8 to allow overlapping checking by rows Modified Proposal #8 (Type-1 HARQ-ACK book):  * For enhancements of generating type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook corresponding to DCI that can schedule multiple PDSCHs, the set of candidate PDSCH reception occasions corresponding to a UL slot with HARQ-ACK transmission is determined based on a set of DL slots and a set of rows that contain SLIVs corresponding to each DL slot belonging to the set of DL slots.   + The set of DL slots includes all the DL slots that can be scheduled by any row index r of TDRA table in DCI indicating the UL slot as HARQ-ACK feedback timing.   The set of SLIVs corresponding to a DL slot (belonging to the set of DL slots) includes all the SLIVs that can be scheduled within the DL slot by any row index r of TDRA table in DCI indicating the UL slot as HARQ-ACK feedback timing. |
| Apple | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Futurewei | We support the proposal. In addition to Intel’s modification, adding an FFS can be a way for the procedure to be better studied if more than one PDSCH can be scheduled in a slot, since it correlates with a prior discussion on whether more than one PDSCH is allowed. |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with the proposal. |
| NEC | We are fine with the proposal. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Samsung | We are fine with the proposal.  We are open to further discuss how to handle two rows with PDSCHs overlapped at least in one slot, e.g. as Intel mentioned. But we’re not sure whether the suggested wording by Intel can clearly capture this intention. Is it better to add one separate sub-bullet?   * For enhancements of generating type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook corresponding to DCI that can schedule multiple PDSCHs, the set of candidate PDSCH reception occasions corresponding to a UL slot with HARQ-ACK transmission is determined based on a set of DL slots and a set of SLIVs corresponding to each DL slot belonging to the set of DL slots.   + The set of DL slots includes all the DL slots that can be scheduled by any row index r of TDRA table in DCI indicating the UL slot as HARQ-ACK feedback timing.   + The set of SLIVs corresponding to a DL slot (belonging to the set of DL slots) includes all the SLIVs that can be scheduled within the DL slot by any row index r of TDRA table in DCI indicating the UL slot as HARQ-ACK feedback timing.   + FFS how to handle overlapped SLIVs from different rows in the same and different DL slot. |
| Ericsson | The proposal seems okay. However, I think the word "unique" is needed to capture the pruning:   * + The set of DL slots includes all the unique DL slots that can be scheduled by any row index r of TDRA table in DCI indicating the UL slot as HARQ-ACK feedback timing. |
| Huawei3, HiSilicon3 | In Intel’s example, if 1-2 and 2-1 cannot be scheduled simultaneously, then this means that 1-3 and 2-2 also cannot be scheduled simultaneously, since 1-2 and 1-3 are scheduled by the same TDRA row and 2-1 and 2-2 are scheduled by the same TDRA row.  We agree with Futurewei to add an FFS on impact if receiving more than one PDSCH in a slot is allowed.  The modification below may be able to address Docomo’s and Intel’s comments, also including Ericsson’s suggestion   * For enhancements of generating type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook corresponding to DCI that can schedule multiple PDSCHs, the set of candidate PDSCH reception occasions corresponding to a UL slot with HARQ-ACK transmission is determined based on a set of DL slots and a set of SLIVs corresponding to each DL slot belonging to the set of DL slots.   + The set of DL slots includes all the unique DL slots that can be scheduled by any row index r of TDRA table in DCI indicating the UL slot as HARQ-ACK feedback timing.   + The set of SLIVs corresponding to a DL slot (belonging to the set of DL slots) is based on all the SLIVs that can be scheduled within the DL slot by any row index r of TDRA table in DCI indicating the UL slot as HARQ-ACK feedback timing.     - FFS: details of further pruning of the set of SLIVs     - FFS: impact if receiving more than one PDSCH in a slot is allowed   Perhaps the proposal should also include a bullet point for time-domain bundling, such as “FFS impact of time domain bundling, if supported”. |
| Fujitsu | We are fine with the proposal. |
| OPPO | We are generally fine with the proposal. |
| vivo | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Moderator | In general, it seems that all companies can accept this proposal. Several points commented by Ericsson, NTT DOCOMO, and Intel are all addressed by Huawei’s version (Thanks David ☺). So, let’s see we can converge based on Huawei’s suggestion. In addition, as to the additional FFS for time-domain bundling proposed by Huawei, please provide your views. If there is no objection, we can add it as well. |

### Proposal #8a (Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook):

* For enhancements of generating type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook corresponding to DCI that can schedule multiple PDSCHs, the set of candidate PDSCH reception occasions corresponding to a UL slot with HARQ-ACK transmission is determined based on a set of DL slots and a set of SLIVs corresponding to each DL slot belonging to the set of DL slots.
  + The set of DL slots includes all the unique DL slots that can be scheduled by any row index r of TDRA table in DCI indicating the UL slot as HARQ-ACK feedback timing.
  + The set of SLIVs corresponding to a DL slot (belonging to the set of DL slots) is based on all the SLIVs that can be scheduled within the DL slot by any row index r of TDRA table in DCI indicating the UL slot as HARQ-ACK feedback timing.
    - FFS: details of further pruning of the set of SLIVs
    - FFS: impact if receiving more than one PDSCH in a slot is allowed
    - [FFS impact of time domain bundling, if supported]

Companies are encouraged to provide views on Proposal #8a and **on the additional FFS point proposed by Huawei (i.e., FFS impact of time domain bundling, if supported)**.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Views |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support |
| Qualcomm | We are okay with the proposal |
| Apple | We are fine with the proposal |
| Ericsson | We support the proposal, and we agree to include the FFS on time domain bundling. |
| Intel | Thanks for the revision suggestions provided by Samsung and Huawei. Not sure the FFS provided by David can allow our proposal. Our preference is to make it clear in the main bullet, e.g. ‘… based on a set of DL slots and a set of SLIVs/rows corresponding to each DL slot belonging to the set of DL slots.’ Alternatively, it is fine to revise the note   * + - FFS: details of further pruning ~~of the set of SLIVs~~ by considering the set of SLIVs only or the set rows that respectively contain the set of SLIVs |
| Moderator | To Intel,  I thought Intel’s comment was captured in the second FFS since the issue raised by Intel would not occur if only one PDSCH is allowed in a slot, isn’t it? However, if Intel prefer to capture that issue more clearly, what about the following (I used Samsung’s proposal ☺)?  FFS: impact if receiving more than one PDSCH in a slot is allowed, e.g., handling of overlapped SLIVs from different rows in the same and different DL slot |
| Nokia/NSB | We are fine with the proposal. |
| CATT | OK. But some correction in the wording is necessary. For example, the following change is suggested:  For enhancements of generating type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook corresponding to DCI that can schedule multiple PDSCHs, the set of candidate PDSCH reception occasions corresponding to a UL slot with HARQ-ACK transmission is determined based on a set of DL slots and a set of SLIVs each corresponding to the DL slot belonging to the set of DL slots. |

[Moderator’s note#2] In addition, companies have different views on whether or not to allow the case where some of PDSCHs scheduled by a multi-PDSCH scheduling DCI overlap with semi-static UL symbol(s). This issue should be resolved since it will affect type-1 codebook generation process.

**Q2: Is it allowed to schedule multiple PDSCHs where any of scheduled PDSCHs is collided with uplink symbol(s) indicated by tdd-UL-DL-ConfigurationCommon or tdd-UL-DL-ConfigurationDedicated? If YES, is it also allowed to schedule multiple PUSCHs where any of scheduled PUSCHs is collided with downlink symbol(s) indicated by tdd-UL-DL-ConfigurationCommon or tdd-UL-DL-ConfigurationDedicated?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Views |
| DOCOMO | From perspective of flexibility, we think it is possible to schedule a PDSCH overlapping with uplink symbol. However, it is not expected that each PDSCH overlapping with UL symbol, i.e. it is expected that at least one PDSCH doesn’t overlap with UL symbol. |
| Qualcomm | Following the legacy behaviour of slot aggregation, the overlapped PDSCHs with semi-static UL TDD symbols should be skipped (Not all the granted allocations)  The HARQ increment process will be applied over all PDSCHs/PUSCHs carried by the same DCI, then the corresponding HARQ IDs corresponding to the skipped PDCSHs/PUSCHs should be cancelled and ignored when constructing the type-1 codebook.  We don’t see a necessity for cancelling all PDSCHs in case of conflict as this will limit the scheduling options especially when have 8 PDSCHs that can be scheduled by the same DCI |
| MediaTek | We support to allow any scheduled PDSCHs from a single DCI to collide with UL patterns indicated by TDD configuration. Also, we support to treat each scheduled PDSCHs individually and apply the legacy behavior on each scheduled PDSCH separately. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We don’t see the need to complicate the configuration of TDRA table by requiring to configure many rows in order to avoid any collision with UL slots when the starting slot can have any offset with the UL/DL configuration. It is simpler to define a rule such that if a PDSCH is ignalled in TDRA and collides with an UL symbol in tdd-UL-DL-ConfigurationCommon or tdd-UL-DL-ConfigurationDedicated, then the PDSCH is considered not scheduled by the UE and by the gNB. This way the size of the TDRA table doesn’t need to be very large. |
| Samsung | We think we can reuse Rel-15 PDSCH/PUSCH repetition handling, i.e. gNB can schedule multiple PDSCHs with only some of PDSCHs collide with UL. Otherwise, the scheduling resection would be too large.  The description for existing PDSCH/PUSCH repetition (section 11.1 in TS 38.213) is copied as below:  If a UE is scheduled by a DCI format to receive PDSCH over multiple slots, and if *tdd-UL-DL-ConfigurationCommon*, or *tdd-UL-DL-ConfigurationDedicated*, indicate that, for a slot from the multiple slots, at least one symbol from a set of symbols where the UE is scheduled PDSCH reception in the slot is an uplink symbol, the UE does not receive the PDSCH in the slot.  If a UE is scheduled by a DCI format to transmit PUSCH over multiple slots, and if *tdd-UL-DL-ConfigurationCommon*, or *tdd-UL-DL-ConfigurationDedicated*, indicates that, for a slot from the multiple slots, at least one symbol from a set of symbols where the UE is scheduled PUSCH transmission in the slot is a downlink symbol, the UE does not transmit the PUSCH in the slot. |
| Fujitsu | Yes for both questions. In our view, a row of TDRA table for PUSCH/PDSCH scheduling is schedulable if it has at least one SLIV not colliding with semi-static configured DL/UL symbol. |
| OPPO | We support to schedule multiple PDSCHs where any of scheduled PDSCHs is collided with the configured uplink symbols. A SLIV which is collided with the configured uplink symbols should be taken as invalid SLIV. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We think it can be allowed to schedule multiple PDSCHs where any of scheduled PDSCHs is collided with uplink symbol(s). The PDSCHs that collide with UL symbols can be regarded as invalid. |
| Vivo | We share similar views as other companies that it is allowed to schedule multiple PDSCHs/PUSCHs where one or more of them (not all of them) may collide with semi-static UL/DL symbol(s). Otherwise, the scheduling may be too restrictive. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | When multiple PDSCHs are scheduled and if some of the PDSCHs overlap with uplink symbol, then only corresponding PDSCHs should be cancelled. We don’t see it is reasonable to cancel entire PDSCHs even if only some PDSCHs overlap. This will have serious implications on scheduling flexibility.  Similarly, for multiple PUSCHs scheduling, cancellation of PUSCH only that overlap with downlink symbols. No need to cancel entire PUSCHs |
| Nokia, NSB | We see that allowing this would improve the flexibility of TDRA allocation for a TDRA table of limited size. |
| Intel | We prefer to allow the flexibility.  It helps to support the scheduling in various slot pattern using a limited number of rows in TDRA table. For example, assuming a TDD period consisting DL slots followed by UL slots. A single row with 8 SLIVs is enough to indicate a PDSCH allocation in the last 1,2,…8 DL slots. On the other hand, if per PDSCH/PUSCH cancellation is not allowed, 8 separate rows have to be included in the TDRA table.  In fact, for PDSCH/PUSCH with repetitions in NR, it is allowed that some of the configured number of repetitions cannot be transmitted due to TDD UL-DL configuration. It doesn’t introduce additional complexity to allow such per PDSCH/PUSCH cancellation in multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling. |
| Futurewei | We think multi-PDSCH with certain scheduled PDSCH colliding with semi-static UL symbols can be allowed, so yes for the questions. But it may subject to FFS on how this affects the TDRA table, and if too complicated alternative solutions might be worth pursuing. |
| Apple | Yes to both. As has been mentioned, a PxSCH that collides with a configured UL/DL symbol should not be considered scheduled by the gNB and UE. |
| Ericsson | In our view, we think that it should be avoided to schedule PDSCH/PUSCH that would conflict with a U/D slot in the TDD DL/UL pattern.  Qualcomm mentions that the legacy behavior for multi-slot PDSCH is that a conflict is allowed; however, we are not so sure. According to 38.213 Section 9.1.2.1, there is the following pseudo-code which says that if a row+K1 combination conflicts with the TDD DL/UL pattern, that row is excluded in the HARQ-ACK codebook generation.  While  if the UE is provided *tdd-UL-DL-ConfigurationCommon*, or *tdd-UL-DL-ConfigurationDedicated* and, for each slot from slot to slot , at least one symbol of the PDSCH time resource derived by row  is configured as ULwhere  is the *k*-th slot timing value in set ,  ;  else  ;  end if  We think that it is also needed to discuss the related issue of HARQ processing numbering at the same time. If a PDSCH collides with UL symbols/slot, how is the HARQ processing number that was supposed to be allocated to that PDSCH handled? |
| CATT1 | We are fine to schedule multiple PDSCH/PUSCHs where any of scheduled PDSCH/PUSCHs is collided with the configured uplink symbols. A SLIV which is collided with the configured uplink symbols should be taken as invalid SLIV. |
| InterDigital | A SLIV which is collided with the configured uplink symbols can be considered as an invalid SLIV. |
| NEC | We support to allow any of scheduled PDSCHs of a single DCI to conflict with uplink symbol(s) indicated by TDD configuration, the PDSCH that collides with a configured UL symbol can be treated as invalid. |
| Spreadtrum | From the scheduling flexibility perspective, we believe that multi-PXSCH with certain scheduled PXSCH colliding with configured UL/DL symbols can be allowed. |
| Samsung | To Ericsson, we have different understanding for the paragagrah you cited.  It means, the row is deleted, only if each PDSCH repetition (that means, all PDSCH repetition) collides with UL.  Regarding HARQ processing numbering, there is no issue for PDSCH repetition. But, yes, it may have impact for multi-PDSCH with different TB. Actually, we discussed this issue in our tdoc. There can be two ways, (1) count HARQ process number for each SLIV, no matter it collides with UL or not. (2) count HARQ process number for valid SLIV, which does not collide with UL. |
| Sony | We support to allow schedule multiple PDSCHs where any of scheduled PDSCHs is collided with UL symbol and allow schedule multiple PUSCHs where any of scheduled PUSCHs is collided with DL symbol. If these are not allowed, scheduling will be too restricted. Collided PxSCH can be considered as invalid. |
| Moderator | It is observed that 18 companies support to schedule multiple PDSCHs (or PUSCHs) where any of scheduled PDSCHs (or PUSCHs) is collided with the configured uplink (or downlink) symbols, while 1 company seems to be against it.  To Ericsson,  Also I had a similar question on current description in TS 38.213 for type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook construction. From my understanding, below highlighted “each” implies that, the row index r will be excluded only if PDSCH occasions in every slot are collided with semi-static UL symbol, which is aligned with Samsung’s interpretation.  While  if the UE is provided *tdd-UL-DL-ConfigurationCommon*, or *tdd-UL-DL-ConfigurationDedicated* and, for each slot from slot to slot , at least one symbol of the PDSCH time resource derived by row  is configured as ULwhere  is the *k*-th slot timing value in set ,  ;  else  ;  end if  Having said that, it could be agreeable to allow scheduling multiple PDSCHs (or PUSCHs) where any of scheduled PDSCHs (or PUSCHs) is collided with the configured uplink (or downlink) symbols, so the following Proposal #7 can be made: |

**Proposal #7 (Collision handling):**

* If a PDSCH among PDSCHs that are scheduled by a single DCI is collided with uplink symbol(s) indicated by *tdd-UL-DL-ConfigurationCommon* or *tdd-UL-DL-ConfigurationDedicated*, the UE does not receive the PDSCH.
  + FFS on how to handle HARQ-related issue for the PDSCH (e.g., HARQ process numbering)
* The UE does not expect to be scheduled with multiple PDSCHs by a single DCI, where every PDSCH is collided with uplink symbol(s) indicated by *tdd-UL-DL-ConfigurationCommon* or *tdd-UL-DL-ConfigurationDedicated*.
* If a PUSCH among PUSCHs that are scheduled by a single DCI is collided with downlink symbol(s) indicated by *tdd-UL-DL-ConfigurationCommon* or *tdd-UL-DL-ConfigurationDedicated*, the UE does not transmit the PUSCH.
  + FFS on how to handle HARQ-related issue for the PUSCH (e.g., HARQ process numbering)
* The UE does not expect to be scheduled with multiple PUSCHs by a single DCI, where every PUSCH is collided with downlink symbol(s) indicated by *tdd-UL-DL-ConfigurationCommon* or *tdd-UL-DL-ConfigurationDedicated*.

Companies are encouraged to provide views on Proposal #7.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Views |
| Qualcomm | We are okay with the proposal |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine with the proposal |
| Ericsson | We see that we are in the minority. Hence, for the sake of progress, we can agree to Proposal #7, once the following is clarified:   * Our assumption is that Proposal #7 is general, i.e., not tied to semi-static HARQ codebook. Is this the common understanding? * The following wording is probably better (same correction for PUSCH):   "If a PDSCH among multiple PDSCHs that …" |
| DOCOMO | Support the proposal. |
| WILUS | We support the porposal |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal |
| OPPO | Support the proposal. |
| Samsung | We support the proposal.  This proposal is applicable to any HARQ-ACK codebook type. |
| vivo | We are fine with the proposal. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We support the proposal. |
| Fujitsu | We support the proposal. |
| CATT | We support the proposal. |
| Huawei2, HiSilicon2 | We support the proposal and agree with the clarification proposed by Ericsson. |
| Apple | We are fine with the proposal |

During email discussion, the following agreement was made:

### Agreement:

* If a PDSCH among multiple PDSCHs that are scheduled by a single DCI is collided with uplink symbol(s) indicated by *tdd-UL-DL-ConfigurationCommon* or *tdd-UL-DL-ConfigurationDedicated*, the UE does not receive the PDSCH.
  + FFS on how to handle HARQ-related issue for the PDSCH (e.g., HARQ process numbering)
* The UE does not expect to be scheduled with multiple PDSCHs by a single DCI, where every PDSCH is collided with uplink symbol(s) indicated by *tdd-UL-DL-ConfigurationCommon* or *tdd-UL-DL-ConfigurationDedicated*.
* If a PUSCH among multiple PUSCHs that are scheduled by a single DCI is collided with downlink symbol(s) indicated by *tdd-UL-DL-ConfigurationCommon* or *tdd-UL-DL-ConfigurationDedicated*, the UE does not transmit the PUSCH.
  + FFS on how to handle HARQ-related issue for the PUSCH (e.g., HARQ process numbering)
* The UE does not expect to be scheduled with multiple PUSCHs by a single DCI, where every PUSCH is collided with downlink symbol(s) indicated by *tdd-UL-DL-ConfigurationCommon* or *tdd-UL-DL-ConfigurationDedicated*.

## Type-2 (dynamic) HARQ-ACK codebook

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Views |
| [1] Futurewei | Proposal 9: Two sub-codebooks can be adopted with Alt 1 to reduce HARQ-ACK codebook size. While multi-PDSCH and CBG should not be jointly configured for HARQ-ACK codebook generation for multi-PDSCH.  Observation 5: The time-domain bundling size can be , for Alt 1 and a fixed value 2 for Alt 2a. Time-domain Bundling is appliable by all alternatives.  Proposal 11: Reuse the legacy carrier-first time-second ordering of DAI counting for multi-PDSCH.  Observation 6: Whether using two sub-codebooks for Alt 3 when 1 < M < N could serve to reduce notably the number of HARQ-ACK bits depends on the actual scheduled value M.  Proposal 12: Use two sub-codebooks for Alt 3 for cases when for 1 < M ≤ N if two sub-codebooks is agreed under Alt 1. |
| [2] Huawei | Proposal 10: Support Alt 2a (C-DAI/T-DAI is counted per PDSCH with a single codebook) for type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook with extension of DAI field in non-fallback DCI.  Proposal 11: For type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook generation, ordering of the PDSCHs for DAI counting is counted per PDSCH in time domain first and then frequency domain.  Observation 10: Alt 3 is problematic when the number of scheduled PDSCHs is smaller than configured M value.  Proposal 12: When time domain bundling of HARQ-ACK feedback per DCI is configured with Alt2a, C-DAI/T-DAI could be configured to be counted per DCI. |
| [3] vivo | Proposal 18: For dynamic HARQ-ACK codebook for multi-PDSCH scheduling, support Alt 2, i.e. C-DAI/T-DAI is counted per PDSCH.  Proposal 19: For DAI counting Alt 2, it should be discussed and determined to what extent the DAI counting can help to detect missed PDSCH(s), before determining whether/how to increase the number of DAI bits.  Proposal 20: For the ordering of DAI counting for Alt 2, PDSCH(s) scheduled by a single DCI is counted firstly, serving cell(s) in the same PUCCH cell group is counted secondly, and PDCCH monitoring occasion(s) is counted thirdly.  Proposal 21: Study dynamic HARQ-ACK codebook in conjunction with time domain bunding for multi-PDSCH scheduling. |
| [4] Spreadtrum | Proposal 5: Regarding the generation of type 2 codebook, C-DAI/T-DAI should be counted per PDSCH. |
| [5] Nokia | Proposal 9: Alt.3 is supported, that is, C-DAI/T-DAI is counted per M scheduled PDSCH(s), where M is configurable.  Proposal 10: Number of DAI bits is determined based on the configured M value and the maximum number of schedulable PDSCHs.  Proposal 11: Configurable time domain bundling of HARQ-ACK feedback over M consecutive PDSCHs scheduled by the same DCI can be supported. |
| [6] Ericsson | Observation 5: Fundamental redefinition of DAI can have a large impact on the current NR specs, and also affects DAI counting related to DCIs not used for multi-PDSCH scheduling. This can cause conceptual chaos among different 3GPP releases, hence should definitely be avoided.  Observation 6: To maintain the same robustness against DCI misdetection as in Rel-15/16 NR, Alt-2 and Alt-3 require increasing the bit-width of DAI values. Due to the use of a single- codebook for single/multi-PDSCH scheduling, this increment of DAI bit-widths applies to all relevant DL and UL DCI formats (DCI Format 1\_0, 1\_1, 1\_2, 0\_1 and 0\_2) and, in the case of carrier aggregation, to all component carriers.  Observation 7: Alt-1 reuses the same DAI counting mechanism as in Rel-15/16 NR. It requires neither re-definition of DAI counting mechanism nor extension of the bit-width of DAI values. Hence, Alt-1 has the minimum impact on the current NR specs and implementations among the three identified alternatives for dynamic HARQ-ACK codebook enhancement.  Observation 8: Applying time domain HARQ-ACK bundling on top of Alt-1 can reduce the HARQ-ACK codebook size, thus achieving a configurable balance with retransmission efficiency depending on the deployment scenario.  Proposal 20: Support DAI counting Alt-1 in combination with separate HARQ-ACK codebook for single/multi-PDSCH scheduling and configurable time domain HARQ-ACK bundling for dynamic HARQ codebook enhancement for multi-PDSCH scheduling. |
| [7] CATT | Proposal 11: Considering the motivation of introducing multiple PDSCHs scheduling is that PDCCH monitoring period is based on multiple slots, Alt-1 for Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook generation is preferred. |
| [8] Qualcomm | Proposal 8:  • Regarding the DAI counting, we support Alt 2, i.e., C-DAI/T-DAI is counted per PDSCH  • Support increasing the field size of the DAI based on RRC configuration to increase the reliability against the missed DCIs. However, the field size increase should be subject to gNB configuration.  • Allow adjusting the resolution of the DAI counter based on the greatest common divisor of the number of the SLIVs, among the rows of the TDRA, i.e., each increment of the DAI indicates that a number of PDSCHs equal to the greatest common divisor has been sent.  • Introduce new rule on how to place the virtual DCIs:   * Option 1: According to a defined symbol level offset for each additional PDSCH * Option 2: At the start symbol of each PDSCH allocation   • DAI counting follows the legacy approach after introducing the virtual DCIs. |
| [9] OPPO | Proposal 2: Support alt 1 or alt 2a for Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook construction.   * For alt 1, two sub-codebooks should be considered. * For alt 2a, a single codebook should be considered. |
| [10] ZTE | Proposal 4: Considering the effect on the HARQ-ACK codebook generation process, Alt 2: C-DAI/T-DAI is counted per PDSCH can be selected. |
| [11] Intel | Proposal 6: For Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook generation, only Alt. 1 is supported.  Proposal 7  For Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook generation,   * If CBG based transmission is configured, HARQ-ACK feedback for multi-PDSCH scheduling is included in the second sub-codebook. * If CBG based transmission is not configured, HARQ-ACK feedback for multi-PDSCH scheduling is included in   + the first sub-codebook if up to two PDSCHs are scheduled;   + otherwise, the second sub-codebook.   Proposal 8: Time domain bundling among some/all of the PDSCH transmissions that are scheduled by the same DCI is supported to reduce the HARQ-ACK codebook size. |
| [12] Fujitsu | Proposal 4: To generate the type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook for DCI scheduling multiple PDSCHs, Alt. 1 should be supported where C-DAI/T-DAI is counted per DCI. For Alt. 1, it should be supported that the Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook includes two sub-codebooks.  - The 1st sub-codebook includes HARQ-ACK bits for PDSCHs scheduled in a single-PDSCH and TB-based manner among all the CCs.  - The 2nd sub-codebook includes HARQ-ACK bits for PDSCHs scheduled in a single-PDSCH and CBG-based manner, and PDSCHs scheduled in a multi-PDSCH manner. |
| [13] Apple | Proposal 9: Reusing the existing C-DAI and T-DAI definition in Rel-15/6, i.e., counting per DCI.  Proposal 10: Introduce signaling mechanism to enable generating a HARQ-ACK bit per ‘M’ scheduled PDSCHs in a multi-PDSCH scheduling by performing HARQ-ACK bundling to compress the HARQ-ACK bits overhead. |
| [14] Sony | Proposal 8: C-DAI/T-DAI for multi-PDSCH scheduling should be counted per PDSCH. |
| [15] NEC | Proposal 4: For type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook determination, support both Alt 1 and Alt 2a. |
| [16] Samsung | Proposal 7: For Type-2/enhanced type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook, Alt -1 (DAI is counted per DCI, and single and multi-PDSCHs scheduled by a DCI are associated with different sub-codebook) should be supported.  Proposal 8: If HARQ-ACK bundling is supported, bundling is performed within PDSCHs scheduled by a single DCI. Down-select one of the following alternatives:   * Alt a: gNB configures a number of HARQ-ACK bundling groups (Nb) per DCI * Alt b: gNB configures a number of PDSCHs per HARQ-ACK bundling groups (Npb) * Alt c: gNB configures time duration of one HARQ-ACK bundling group (Tb). |
| [17] MediaTek | Proposal 2: For Type-2 codebook construction based on the principle of DAI per DCI, support the following PDSCH grouping and HARQ-ACK bit reporting to manage the codebook size.   * When a UE is configured for multi-PDSCH scheduling in a cell c, the scheduled PDSCHs from one DCI are grouped into PDSCH groups   + , where N is the maximum number of PDSCH groups per DCI configured by network and C is the number of scheduled PDSCHs in the DCI.   + Let   + Each PDSCH group in the first PDSCH groups contains scheduled PDSCHs and each PDSCH group in the remaining PDSCH groups contains scheduled PDSCHs.   + UE reports one HARQ-ACK bit for each PDSCH group     - If all PDSCHs within a PDSCH group are decoded correctly, UE reports “ACK”     - Else, UE reports “NACK”   + If , UE will append “NACK” bits after the M HARQ-ACK bits from the TB groups to construct the codebook   Proposal 3: For Type-2 codebook construction based on the principle of DAI per PDSCH, consider the scheduling restriction such that at most PDSCHs can be scheduled by any 3 consecutive DCIs.   * + The corresponding bit filed length of DAI will be .   Proposal 4: For Type-2 codebook construction, consider the principle of DAI per HARQ-ACK bit and consider the restriction on the number of HARQ-ACK bits such that at most HARQ-ACKs are corresponding to a DCI   * + When the number of PDSCHs scheduled by a DCI is less than , UE only needs to report HARQ-ACK bits instead of HARQ-ACK bits.   + When the number of PDSCHs scheduled by a DCI is greater or equal to , UE only needs to report HARQ-ACK bits instead of HARQ-ACK bits     - The HARQ-ACK bits can be generated based on Rel-16 CBG-like grouping among the scheduled PDSCH.   + DAI bit field length is   + can be configured by gNB   Proposal 6: CBG transmission is not supported with multi-PDSCH scheduling feature. |
| [18] Panasonic | Proposal 9: For generating type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook corresponding to DCI that can schedule multiple PDSCHs, C-DAI/T-DAI is counted per PDSCH, i.e., Alt. 2a.  Propose 10: For C-DAI/T-DAI is counted per PDSCH in Alt. 2a, when multi-PDSCH scheduling is configured,   * If only C-DAI is necessary, the DAI field size is , * If both T-DAI and C-DAI are necessary, the DAI field size is ), * If both T-DAI and C-DAI are necessary and non-scheduled PDSCH group is configured, the DAI field size is ), |
| [19] LG Electronics | Proposal #11: For (enhanced) type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook,   * If Alt 1 (C-DAI/T-DAI is counted per DCI) is adopted, two sub-codebooks where one is for single PDSCH scheduling case and the other is for multi-PDSCH scheduling case are introduced.   + If CBG is additionally configured, the number of sub-codebooks is kept as two and HARQ-ACK corresponding to CBG-based PDSCH scheduling and multi-PDSCH scheduling cases is merged into the same sub-codebook. * If Alt 2 (C-DAI/T-DAI is counted per PDSCH) is adopted, two sub-codebooks where one is for single PDSCH scheduling case and the other is for multi-PDSCH scheduling case are introduced to prevent from increasing C-DAI size in DCI format 1\_0.   + If CBG is additionally configured, the number of sub-codebooks is increased to three where first sub-codebook is for TB-based single-PDSCH scheduling case, second sub-codebook is for CBG-based PDSCH scheduling case, and third sub-codebook is for multi-PDSCH scheduling case. |
| [20] Lenovo | Proposal 6: For NR operation between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz, for dynamic (type-2) HARQ-ACK codebook, support C-DAI/T-DAI counting per DCI.  Proposal 7: For NR operation between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz, for dynamic (type-2) HARQ-ACK codebook, if C-DAI/T-DAI counting per DCI is agreed, the one of the following two options should be agreed for HARQ-ACK codebook construction:  - Option 1: Different sub HARQ-ACK codebook is generated for numerology corresponding to which different number of maximum PDSCHs can be scheduled. For example, if up to 1 PDSCH is scheduled for 120 kHz, then first sub HARQ-ACK codebook is constructed for 120 kHz, if up to 4 PDSCHs are scheduled for 480 kHz, then second sub HARQ-ACK codebook is constructed for 480 kHz, and if up to 8 PDSCHs are scheduled for 960 kHz, then third sub HARQ-ACK codebook is constructed for 960 kHz  - Option 2: Same HARQ-ACK codebook is applied for multi-PDSCH scheduling DCI, even if the maximum allowed PDSCH scheduling is different and codebook size alignment can be done by time-domain bundling. For example if up to PDSCHs can be scheduled with 480 kHz and up to 8 PDSCHs can be scheduled with 960 kHz, then 4 HARQ-ACK bits are expected to be generated per DCI for both cases, where time-domain bundling for every 2 PDSCHs is applied for 960 kHz in order to limit the size to 4, similar to 480 kHz |
| [21] Xiaomi | Proposal 1: Support Alt.1 for Type 2 HARQ-ACK codebook corresponding to DCI that can schedule multiple PDSCHs. |
| [22] InterDigiatl | Proposal 9: For counting C-DAI/T-DAI for generating type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook, Alt 3: C-DAI/T-DAI is counted per M scheduled PDSCH(s), where M is configurable (e.g., 1, 2, 4, …). |
| [23] Convida | Proposal 2. For type-2 codebook HARQ-ACK generation, Alt-3 seems a flexible option for consideration and the details of Alt-3 can be further studied. |
| [24] NTT DOCOMO | Proposal 4: For HARQ-ACK feedback for multiple PDSCHs scheduled by one DCI if HARQ-ACK bundling among different PDSCHs is not applied,   * Support Alt. 2 (C-DAI/T-DAI is counted per PDSCH) for type 2 HARQ-ACK CB construction.   Proposal 5: For HARQ-ACK feedback for multiple PDSCHs scheduled by one DCI,   * Support HARQ-ACK bundling among PDSCHs scheduled by single DCI. * Support Alt. 1 or Alt. 3 if HARQ-ACK bundling is applied. |

### Summary (on Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook generation):

Company views on Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook (CB) generation:

* Alt 1 (C-DAI/T-DAI is counted per DCI)
  + Supported by Futurewei (2 sub-CBs), Ericsson (2 sub-CBs + time domain bundling), CATT, OPPO (2 sub-CBs), Intel (2 sub-CBs), Fujitsu (2 sub-CBs), Apple, NEC, Samsung (2 sub-CBs), MediaTek, LG Electronics (2 sub-CBs), Lenovo, Xiaomi (2 sub-CBs), NTT DOCOMO (if time domain bundling is applied)
* Alt 2 (C-DAI/T-DAI is counted per PDSCH)
  + Supported by Huawei (extension of DAI field in non-fallback DCI), vivo, Spreadtrum, Qualcomm, OPPO, ZTE, Sony, NEC, MediaTek, Panasonic, LG Electronics (2 sub-CBs), NTT DOCOMO
* Alt 3 (C-DAI/T-DAI is counted per M scheduled PDSCH(s), where M is configurable)
  + Supported by Furturewei (for 1< M≤N, 2 sub-CBs), Nokia, InterDigital, Convida, NTT DOCOMO (if time domain bundling is applied)

[Moderator’s note#1] 14 companies prefer Alt 1, 12 companies prefer Alt 2, and 5 companies prefer Alt 3. Given the preference and considering Alt 3 includes Alts 1 and 2, it seems reasonable to focus on Alts 1 and 2. Instead of narrowing it down to a specific alternative, we may first try to agree on more details of each alternative.

### Proposal #5 (Type-2 HARQ-ACK CB Alt 1):

* If Alt 1 (C-DAI/T-DAI is counted per DCI) is adopted for generating type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook corresponding to a DCI that can schedule multiple PDSCHs,
  + Two sub-codebooks are generated, where the HARQ-ACK bits in the first sub-codebook correspond to PDSCH(s) scheduled by a DCI that schedules a single PDSCH and the HARQ-ACK bits in the second sub-codebook correspond to PDSCHs scheduled by a DCI that schedules more than one PDSCHs.
  + If CBG is configured, the HARQ-ACK bits corresponding to CBG-based PDSCH receptions are included in the second sub-codebook.

Companies are encouraged to provide views on Proposal #5.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Views |
| DOCOMO | We are fine with the proposal. But we don’t prefer Alt 1 considering large PUCCH redundancy. |
| Qualcomm | We do not believe that this option should be restricted to the two sub-codebook case. In addition, it should be clarified that this feature will always assume either A/N bundling or padding to ensure the alignment of the codebook sizes, this will be needed even if we agreed on supporting this feature with multiple sub-codebooks. |
| MediaTek | Agree with Qualcomm. We are not sure including multi-PDSCH HARQ-ACK information with CBG codebook is feasible without aligning the number of HARQ-ACK bits corresponding to one DCI with CBG transmission. In our understanding, there is a notion of max CBG group size which determines the number of HARQ-ACK bits corresponding to one DCI with CBG transmission and that size might not be the same as the number of HARQ-ACK bits corresponding to one DCI scheduling multiple PDSCHs. Is this scenarios is allowed, then how to merge CBG and multi-PDSCH HARQ information in one codebook is not clear to us.  We do agree that there should be separate codebooks for single PDSCH scheduling and multi-PDSCHs scheduling. One clarification question is, if a DCI only schedules one PDSCH under the multi-PDSCH feature, e.g., one row of TDRA table only has one SLIV, which codebook should this HARQ-ACK bit belong to? |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Proposal #3 (on whether to allow CBG (re)transmissions for PDSCH in a DCI that can schedule multiple PDSCHs) should be addressed first before discussing proposal #5.  We would like to understand the relation between Alt1 and time-domain bundling. If it is assumed that time-domain bundling is applied within the PDSCHs scheduled by one DCI, then it is not clear why two sub-codebooks are needed. |
| Samsung | We support the proposal.  To be fair, we think that the determination of Type-2 codebook alternatives should be decoupled from the HARQ-ACK bundling, though the HARQ-ACK redundancy can be reduced by HARQ-ACK bundling for Alt-1, e.g. no redundancy at all if bundled HARQ-ACK is always 1 bits per DCI. There is no discussion for HARQ-ACK bundling yet (though we prefer to start the discussion in this meeting), we can’t delay codebook discussion until HARQ-ACK bundling discussion in later meetings. We should choose a proper Type-2 codebook alternative without the consideration of HARQ-ACK bundling first, and then, discuss how to incorporate the bundling into the agreed Type-2 codebook alternative. For example, if HARQ-ACK bundling is to always bundle all PDSCHs by a single DCI into 1 bits, then, no need of 2 sub-codebooks. But, if the number of bundled bits can be more than 1 bit, then, 2 sub-codebooks may still be needed. Anyway, it depends on how to perform HARQ-ACK bundling. It seems no common view for that issue yet.  Without HARQ-ACK bundling, Alt-1 has some PUCCH redundancy compared with Alt-2. But such redundancy highly depends on TDRA configuration, and gNB scheduling for PDSCHs with HARQ-ACK in one PUCCH. It does not always cause PUCCH redundancy for each PUCCH transmission. But, DAI overhead in Alt-2 is always there, for each non-fallback DCI in any serving cell within a PUCCH group. Therefore, we think Alt-1 should be supported.  Furthermore, we think that potential standard effort is also one important factor to be considered to select a proper alternative. We suggest to add one sub-bullet for potential standard effort for both Alt 1 and Alt 2. The suggested update for Alt1 is, Proposal #5 (Type-2 HARQ-ACK CB Alt 1):  * If Alt 1 (C-DAI/T-DAI is counted per DCI) is adopted for generating type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook corresponding to a DCI that can schedule multiple PDSCHs,   + Two sub-codebooks are generated, where the HARQ-ACK bits in the first sub-codebook correspond to PDSCH(s) scheduled by a DCI that schedules a single PDSCH and the HARQ-ACK bits in the second sub-codebook correspond to PDSCHs scheduled by a DCI that schedules more than one PDSCHs.   + If CBG is configured, the HARQ-ACK bits corresponding to CBG-based PDSCH receptions are included in the second sub-codebook.   + Potential Standard effort:     - Reusing existing DAI definition     - Reusing existing two-sub-codebooks for CBG and TB-based transmission. |
| Panasonic | We do not support the proposal 5. |
| Fujitsu | “DCI that schedules a single PDSCH” may have different interpretations. As one interpretation, it refers to the conventional single-PDSCH DCI. As another interpretation, it refers to a multi-PDSCH DCI which schedules only one PDSCH, e.g., indicating the row with a single SLIV within the TDRA table. It should be further clarified. Adding an FFS on that part is also OK. |
| Xiaomi | We support the proposal in principle.  More clarification is needed, first the sub-codebook size for Multi-PDSCHs should be aligned. Second if the DCI for multiple PDSCHs scheduling only one PDSCH, whose HARQ-ACK bit belong to sub-codebook of Multi-PDSCHs. |
| OPPO | We agree with the proposal in principle. |
| WILUS | We support the proposal only when time domain bundling is not configured. If the time domain bundling is configured and there is 1 bundled HARQ-ACK bit for a DCI scheduling multiple PDSCHs, we don’t need to generate 2 sub-codebooks. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are fine with Proposal 5. |
| vivo | We share the same concerns with MTK in terms of the feasibility for merging HARQ-ACK bits for CBG-based transmission(s) and multi-PDSCH scheduling into a same sub-codebook, and which sub-codebook to use when a multi-DCI schedules only a single PDSCH. Besides, Samsung’s proposal on decoupling the selection from Type-2 codebook alternatives and discussion on HARQ-ACK bundling can also be considered. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Generally, we support Alt 1, but regarding the number of sub-codebooks, we would like to have following clarification.  If a restriction is agreed for 120 kHz and/or 480 kHz in terms of maximum PDSCH to 4, while for 960 kHz it is 8, then still a single sub-codebook is sufficient for all of 120 kHz, 480 kHz and 960 kHz? In this case, there will be misalignment of the sub-codebook size, unless bundling is applied.  Based on above, we suggest adding additional FFS under first sub-bullet   * If Alt 1 (C-DAI/T-DAI is counted per DCI) is adopted for generating type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook corresponding to a DCI that can schedule multiple PDSCHs,   + Two sub-codebooks are generated, where the HARQ-ACK bits in the first sub-codebook correspond to PDSCH(s) scheduled by a DCI that schedules a single PDSCH and the HARQ-ACK bits in the second sub-codebook correspond to PDSCHs scheduled by a DCI that schedules more than one PDSCHs.     - **FFS additional number of sub-codebooks for multiple PDSCHs scheduling DCI if the maximum number of PDSCHs can be different corresponding to different SCS value**     - **FFS sub-codebook size alignment, if only single sub-codebook is applied corresponding to DCI scheduling multiple PDSCHs with different number of maximum PDSCHs corresponding different SCS**   + If CBG is configured, the HARQ-ACK bits corresponding to CBG-based PDSCH receptions are included in the second sub-codebook. |
| Nokia, NSB | We share the view with Huawei that the relation between proposal #5 and time-domain bundling is not clear. Perhaps time-domain bundling could be discussed separately, as the detailed operation of time-domain bundling has not yet been discussed.  We are not convinced that including HARQ-ACK bits for CBG-based PDSCH receptions and for multi-PDSCH scheduling into the same sub-codebook is necessary given the related specification efforts.  We see also that terms “DCI that schedules a single PDSCH” and “DCI that schedules more than one PDSCHs” should be clarified further to avoid confusion when multi-PDSCH DCI schedules only a single PDSCH. |
| Intel | We support Alt 1.  We prefer to clarify the exact meaning of ‘a DCI that schedules a single PDSCH’. It should include the following cases (the 3 cases are not mutual exclusive)   * Any DCI on a cell that is not configured with CBG-based scheduling or multi-PDSCH scheduling * Any fallback DCI * A DCI for multi-PDSCH scheduling, if single PDSCH is scheduled by the DCI   Further, we may consider another case for multi-PDSCH scheduling. That is, if two PDSCHs are scheduled by a DCI and if one HARQ-ACK bit is generated per PDSCH, HARQ-ACK bits for the DCI may still be included in the first sub-codebook too. We’d like to hear companies’ view on such design.  Above all, the current wording on Alt 1 doesn’t consider time bundling for the PDSCH(s) scheduld by a DCI. It is better to explicitly capture it in a note. |
| Futurewei | We are fine with the proposal. In principle, we are fine with Alt-1 and Alt-2, some additional discussion may be necessary to further clarify the impact of each alternative.  It can be beneficial to have a separate discussion on details of time-domain bundling for each of the alternative, such that it is easier to down-select in later phases. |
| Apple | We support the proposal in principle. We support separate codebooks for single PDSCH scheduling and multi-PDSCHs scheduling. However, the discussion on merging the CBG and multi-PDSCH codebooks can be done once proposal #3 on CBG (re)transmissions is decided. |
| Ericsson | We support the main bullet and first sub-bullet of Proposal #5, but we do not support the 2nd sub-bullet:   * The 2nd sub-bullet contradicts Moderator's Proposal #3 * As we commented on Proposal #3, the combination of CBG-based scheduling and multi-PDSCH which is used for large SCSs (480/960 and FFS: 120) is not beneficial. * As commented by other companies even if multi-PDSCH and CBG were supported, it does not seem straightforward how to merge HARQ-ACK feedback for CBG-based scheduling and multi-PDSCH scheduling into one sub codebook   To address some companies concerns, the definition of "A DCI that can schedule multiple PDSCHs" should be clarified as a DCI for which the corresponding TDRA table includes one or more rows with multiple SLIVs. We made the same comment with respect to Proposal #3. With clarification, it is clear that PDSCH(s) scheduled by that DCI would correspond to the 2nd sub codebook.  Regarding time domain bundling, we note that HARQ-ACK bundling is not a new concept – spatial bundling is already specified. To answer Huawei's question on why two sub-codebooks are beneficial, is that the number of bundles can be configurable, such that the codebook size depends on the number of configured bundles. Only in the extreme case of 1 bundle (logical AND HARQ-ACKs for all scheduled PDSCHs) would a single sub codebook make sense.  We agree with Samsung's comments that Alt-1 can offer PUCCH redundancy and related improvements in UCI decoding performance with smart gNB implementations. This is certainly true without HARQ-ACK bundling, but can be true even with HARQ-ACK bundling depending on the number of configured bundles vs. the number of actually scheduled PDSCHs.  We agree with Samsung's addition of the following (excluding the sub-bullet on CBG):   * + Potential Standard effort:   Reusing existing DAI definition |
| CATT1 | We support the main bullet (Alt1).But the sub-bullet need further discussion. We suggest to first try to decision on top level before going into the details. |
| InterDigital | We are fine with this proposal. |
| Convida Wireless | We prefer Alt 3 or Alt 2. Regarding Alt 1, it may need further study if multi-PDSCH is support for lower SCS (e.g., 120 KHz). |
| NEC | We are fine with this proposal 5. |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with the proposal in principle. |
| Samsung | We also think clarification for "A DCI that can schedule multiple PDSCHs" is helpful, as suggested by other companies.  For the sub-bullet for CBG, we think, it does not conflict with Moderator's Proposal #3. If we consider CA, it is possible that some CCs in low band, some CCs in high band. gNB has the flexibility to configure CBG for CCs suitable for CBG transmission, e.g. at least in low band, no matter CBG transmission is supported for 52.6GHz or not. Then, there would be 2nd sub-codebook in such configuration. |
| Sony | We are fine with the proposal in principle. For the 2nd sub-bullet, it should be discussed after proposal#3 is decided. |
| Moderator | Several points that I should explain:   1. How to map a HARQ-ACK bit if multi-PDSCH scheduling DCI schedules only a single PDSCH: The HARQ-ACK bit is contained into the first sub-codebook, which is aligned with Intel’s understanding. 2. CBG configuration: As Samsung pointed out, Proposal #3 and Proposal # 5 do not have a conflict since a serving cell below 52.6 GHz can be configured with CBG, another serving cell above 52.6 GHz can be configured with multi-PDSCH scheduling, and those two serving cells are within the same PUCCH cell group. Furthermore, if HARQ-ACK bits for CBG-based PDSCH are merged into the second sub-codebook, it is straightforward that HARQ-ACK payload size can be aligned with max (the maximum configured number of CBGs, the maximum configured number of schedulable PDSCHs). 3. Time bundling: As I commented through reflector as a response to Samsung’s question, this proposal should be decoupled with time bundled HARQ-ACK operation.   To Lenovo,  The similar situation is already occurred even if the maximum PDSCH is not further restricted to 4. For example, serving cell #1 can be configured with TDRA table where the maximum SLIVs in all of rows is equal to 5 while serving cell #2 can be configured with TDRA table where the maximum SLIVs in all of rows is equal to 7. In this case, my understanding is the number of HARQ-ACK bits corresponding to a DAI is max(5,7).  To Intel,  Could you elaborate on how HARQ-ACK bits for the DCI can be still included in the first sub-codebook if two PDSCHs are scheduled by a DCI and if one HARQ-ACK bit is generated per PDSCH? In that case, two HARQ-ACK bits are generated for the DAI. How can two bits be included in the first sub-codebook? |

### Proposal #5a (Type-2 HARQ-ACK CB Alt 1):

* If Alt 1 (C-DAI/T-DAI is counted per DCI) is adopted for generating type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook corresponding to a DCI that can schedule multiple PDSCHs,
  + Two sub-codebooks are generated for a PUCCH cell group where
    - The first sub-codebook is for the following cases:
      * Any DCI for a cell in the PUCCH cell group that is not configured with CBG-based scheduling or is not configured with multi-PDSCH scheduling
      * Any DCI that is configured with TDRA table containing each row with a single SLIV
      * Any DCI that is configured with TDRA table containing at least one row with multiple SLIVs but schedules only a single PDSCH
    - The second sub-codebook is for the following case:
      * Any DCI that is configured with TDRA table containing at least one row with multiple SLIVs but schedules multiple PDSCHs
  + If CBG is configured with a serving cell in the same PUCCH cell group, the HARQ-ACK bits corresponding to CBG-based PDSCH receptions are included in the second sub-codebook, where the number of HARQ-ACK bits for a DAI is determined by the maximum of “the maximum configured number of CBGs” and “the maximum configured number of multi-PDSCH scheduling DCI”.
  + Note: Time domain bundling of HARQ-ACK feedback is still FFS as per prior agreement. Above issues can be addressed after this FFS has been decided.

Companies are encouraged to provide views on Proposal #5a.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Views |
| Qualcomm | While we agree that the time bundling is applicable as enhancement for all alternative, but with Alt 1, the number of A/N bit per DCI (DAI increment) will need to be fixed, this can be achieved either by bundling or assuming N A/N bits per DCI, and pad NACKs if number of SLIVs is less than N. Otherwise, the codebook sizes will not be aligned.  Therefore, these two options are needed to be captured in the agreement.  In addition, we support adding the two sub-codebook case as FFS as the design can work without it. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We think that time domain bundling of HARQ-ACK should be discussed along with this issue to clarify the details on codebook size alignment when the maximum number of PDSCHs scheduled by single DCI can be different such as for different SCS |
| Apple | A question for the moderator: For the 1st bullet:   * Any DCI that is configured with TDRA table containing at least one row with multiple SLIVs but schedules only a single PDSCH   vs:   * Any DCI that is configured with TDRA table containing at least one row with multiple SLIVs but schedules multiple PDSCHs   And using the TDRA table example in Q1-1, i.e.   |  |  | | --- | --- | | (TDRA table) | | | Index = 0 | {SLIV R0\_0} | | Index = 1 | {SLIV R1\_0, SLIV R1\_1} | | Index = 2 | {SLIV R2\_0, SLIV R2\_1, SLIV R2\_2, SLIV R2\_3} |  1. Does scheduling a single PDSCH mean scheduling using Index 0 and that scheduling with Index 0 would belong to codebook 1 while scheduling with index 1 and 2 would belong to codebook 2 ? |
| Ericsson | While we understand now that Proposal #3 does not conflict with Proposal #5a, we still do not agree on merging HARQ-ACK feedback for CBG-based (re)transmissions and HARQ-ACK feedback for multi-PDSCH transmissions into a single codebook. We believe it is a much simpler and cleaner solution to maintain separate codebooks for multi-PDSCH and CBG, especially since our expectation is that CBG based feedback is rarely configured, especially for CA in FR2 and above. We don't think optimizing for this corner case is worth the effort.  We also agree with Nokia's comment:  *We are not convinced that including HARQ-ACK bits for CBG-based PDSCH receptions and for multi-PDSCH scheduling into the same sub-codebook is necessary given the related specification efforts*. |
| DOCOMO | Fine with the principle of the Proposal#5a but suggest one modification:   * + - The second sub-codebook is for the following case:       * Any DCI that is configured with TDRA table containing at least one row with multiple SLIVs ~~but~~ and schedules multiple PDSCHs   For HARQ-ACK bundling, we agree with the moderator’s view that it should be an optional instead of mandatory function for UE. It should be able to be enabled/disabled by network. each alternative should be able to work regardless of with or without HARQ-ACK bundling. Therefore, we think HARQ-ACK bundling can be discussed separately. |
| WILUS | We are generally fine with the proposal.  Regarding “Any DCI that is configured with TDRA table containing each row with a single SLIV”, the intention seems be to reduce type-2 CB size and avoid unnecessary filler bits by including the DCI format in the first sub-codebook, not the second sub-codebook. If it is correct understanding, it is possible to include a DCI scheduling up to two SLIVs in the first sub-codebook in case of that 2 TBs per PDSCH is configured where each cDAI/tDAI increments generate 2 HARQ-ACK bits. |
| Intel | We are also supportive to discuss time domain bundling together. For example, the Note can be replaced by a simple bullet,   * Time domain bundling of HARQ-ACK feedback can be applied to the multiple PDSCHs that are scheduled by a same DCI. Details FFS   To reply one early moderator question to Intel: In the first sub-codebook in NR, each PDSCH can have one or two HARQ-ACK bits depending on the RRC configuration (2 HARQ-ACK bits if more than 4 layers are scheduled, otherwise 1 bit). Therefore, we can put the 2 HARQ-ACK bits for the two PDSCHs scheduled by a DCI for multi-PDSCH scheduling to the first sub-codebook. Such a design helps to reduce the final codebook size with almost no complexity. Such benefit can be obtained only in case one HARQ-ACK bit for each PDSCH that are scheduled by the DCI for multi-PDSCH scheduling |
| Xiaomi | We have same question as apple, If the answer is “yes”, we are wondering that if the DCI is not decoded correctly, UE doesn’t how many PDSCHs are scheduled by this DCI, thus which sub-codebook belong to? |
| Samsung | Generally fine with the proposal. For 1st sub-codebook, maybe one sub-bullet instead of 3 sub-bullets is sufficient, i.e. Any DCI schedules a single PDSCH with TB transmission.  For whether separate or single sub-codebook for multi-PDSCH and single PDSCH with CBG transmission, we think, the standard effort is larger for separate sub-codebook. Because we need to discuss whether indicates UL DAI for 3 sub-codebooks (we only have 2 UL DAI for Rel-15), and study the potential robustness lost, if UL DAI bit field <3, and we’ll define which one is 2nd sub-codebook and which one is 3rd sub-codebook. On the contrary, if we support single sub-codebook for multi-PDSCH and single PDSCH with CBG, the minor standard impact is to add one sub-bullet of multi-PDSCH scheduling to existing 2nd sub-codebook in the standard. Considering we anyway need to add one sub-bullet of multi-PDSCH scheduling for a sub-codebook, no matter it is in the same sub-codebook with CBG or not. Thus, the effort is marginal.  Regarding bundling, as we previous commented, and shared the same view with FL and Docomo, each alternative should be able to work regardless of with or without HARQ-ACK bundling. Therefore, it should be separately discussed.  Regarding Intel’s suggestion of adding “Time domain bundling of HARQ-ACK feedback can be applied to the multiple PDSCHs that are scheduled by a same DCI.” We’re fine with the sentence itself, but we think it should be a separate discussion from HARQ-ACK codebook alternatives as explained above.  Regarding whether to put 2-PDSCH into 1st sub-codebook, we want to understand, if companies support (Samsung does not support) 2-TB also for multiple PDSCHs, it seems 4 bits for 2 PDSCH case while 2 bits for 1 PDSCH case, how to combine them into one sub-codebook? |
| vivo | Support it in principle. When a DCI format is configured with TDRA table containing at least one row with multiple SLIVs but schedules only a single PDSCH, which sub-codebook to use for corresponding HARQ-ACK feedback may require further discussion. |
| Fujitsu | We are fine with the proposal in principle. However, it seems that the cases listed for the 1st sub-codebooks are overlapping and thus a little bit confusing. Considering that, we tend to agree with the suggestion from Samsung with minor update as below:  Any DCI schedules a single PDSCH with TB-based transmission.  As for the bundling, we agree with FL and some other companies’ view that it could be separately discussed. |
| Futurewei | We are okay with the proposal #5a and we support the first bullet on details of cases first/second sub-codebooks is generated. We suggest to not include CBG related bullet 2 in this proposal, instead merge into proposal 3, maybe as another FFS. For the bullet 3, we suggest to further discuss time domain bundling in this meeting for progress. |
| CATT | We are fine in principle with the proposal but have the same clarification question as apple & xiaomi. |
| MediaTek | We have concerns on the bullet highlighted below   * + - The first sub-codebook is for the following cases:       * Any DCI for a cell in the PUCCH cell group that is not configured with CBG-based scheduling or is not configured with multi-PDSCH scheduling       * Any DCI that is configured with TDRA table containing each row with a single SLIV       * Any DCI that is configured with TDRA table containing at least one row with multiple SLIVs but schedules only a single PDSCH   Our concern comes from the case of missing a DCI that is configured with TDRA table containing at least one row with multiple SLIVs and schedules only one PDSCH. In this case, UE doesn’t know how many PDSCHs are scheduled by the DCI and UE doesn’t know which codebook needs to be used to report the NACK on those missing PDSCH.  In general, we don’t see the need to specify how many sub-codebooks and which sub-codebook is used under which scenario in Alt-1 at this stage since this might not be the decision factor. In our view, more discussion is needed for this aspect in both Alt-1 and Alt-2. |
| Moderator | 1. Time bundling issue: I don’t think this is the critical factor to decide between Alt 1 and Alt 2. If time domain bundling is supported, it could be applied both to type-1 and type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook design. Furthermore, any HARQ-ACK codebook design should work without time domain bundling configured. In addition, if we start to discuss the details of bundling, we may need to clarify first how time domain window to bundle HARQ-ACK bits can be defined as commented by several companies earlier, which makes things messed up. As captured in the NOTE, we can discuss further how type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook with Alt 1 can be dealt with time domain bundling. 2. Sub-codebook issue: From moderator’s point of view, the most critical factors to decide between Alt 1 and Alt 2 are, HARQ-ACK payload size for Alt 1 and DCI overhead for Alt 2. In that sense, we should have a common sense for HARQ-ACK payload size for Alt 1, which is tightly related to how to construct sub-codebooks. Similarly, for Alt 2, main issue should be how many bits need to be increased in each DCI format. That’s why I focus on Q1 and Q2 under Proposal #6a.   To Qualcomm,  It seems that your concern is coming from the fact that only a single codebook can be constructed when time domain bundling is configured. On the other hand, it’s clear that all proponents of Alt 1 support 2 sub-codebooks to alleviate total HARQ-ACK payload size. So, this is added in the NOTE and hope it can address your concern.  To Apple, Xiaomi, vivo, CATT, and MediaTek,  Does scheduling a single PDSCH mean scheduling using Index 0 and that scheduling with Index 0 would belong to codebook 1 while scheduling with index 1 and 2 would belong to codebook 2 ?  From my understanding, the answer is YES. I do not understand why this is a problem. How can UE determine the DCI format in case the DCI is not successfully decoded? In some cases, DCI format 0\_1 and 1\_1 may have the same DCI size. Even though we can assume that UE can recognize the format of unsuccessfully detected DCI, the problem of UE unware of how many PDSCHs are scheduled is common to Alt 1 and Alt 2. Moreover, I don’t think typically UE generates HARQ-ACK codebook whenever UE receives DCI. Rather, when UE receives the last DCI corresponding to a PUCCH occasion, UE will make a HARQ-ACK codebook and miss-detected DCI can be recovered by C-DAI/T-DAI from another successfully received DCI(s).  To Ericsson and Futurewei,  I made FFS for CBG-related bullet. We should keep discussing to figure it out.  To WILUS and Intel,  To address your proposals, I put FFS under the second codebook. However, I request to answer the question from Samsung to clarify your proposals.  To Samsung and Fujitsu,  Regarding simplified wording, considering several companies have different understanding for the case that multi-PDSCH scheduling DCI schedules a single DCI, it seems better to keep as it is. |

### Proposal #5b (Type-2 HARQ-ACK CB Alt 1):

* If Alt 1 (C-DAI/T-DAI is counted per DCI) is adopted for generating type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook corresponding to a DCI that can schedule multiple PDSCHs,
  + Two sub-codebooks are generated for a PUCCH cell group where
    - The first sub-codebook is for the following cases:
      * Any DCI that is not configured with CBG-based scheduling or is not configured with multi-PDSCH scheduling
      * Any DCI that is configured with TDRA table containing at least one row with multiple SLIVs and schedules only a single PDSCH
    - The second sub-codebook is for the following case:
      * Any DCI that is configured with TDRA table containing at least one row with multiple SLIVs but schedules multiple PDSCHs
        + FFS: Whether HARQ-ACK bits for 2 PDSCHs scheduled by this DCI can be included in the first sub-codebook in some cases
  + FFS: 2 or 3 sub-codebooks if CBG is configured with a serving cell in the same PUCCH cell group
  + Note: Time domain bundling of HARQ-ACK feedback is still FFS as per prior agreement. Above issues can be addressed after this FFS has been decided, including the possibility of single codebook if time domain bundling is configured.

Companies are encouraged to provide views on Proposal #5b.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Views |
| Huawei2, HiSilicon2 | What is the difference between these two cases?   * A DCI not configured with multi-PDSCH scheduling * A DCI that is configured with TDRA table containing each row with a single SLIV   Sorting of DCIs to sub-codebooks is still proposed to depend on the dynamic indication of the actual number of scheduled PDSCHs in the case where the TDRA table has at least one row with multiple SLIVs, which may result in codebook size mismatch in case of DCI misdetection.  We generally agree with the comments from Ericsson and Nokia regarding CBG-based transmissions. |
| WILUS | We are generally fine with the proposal.  Regarding “FFS: Whether HARQ-ACK bits for 2 PDSCHs scheduled by this DCI can be included in the first sub-codebook in some cases”, we do not see any difference between two DCI formats,   * 1) DCI format scheduling 2 TB per PDSCH (no spatial bundling) and * 2) DCI format scheduling 2 PDSCHs (1 TB per PDSCH).   Both two DCI formats generate 2-bit HARQ-ACK. Hence, if the 2-bit HARQ-ACK in response of DCI format scheduling 2 TB per PDSCH is included in the first sub-codebook, why the 2-bit HARQ-ACK in response of DCI format scheduling 2 PDSCHs is included in the second sub-codebook?  Regarding Samsung’s questions on  “Regarding whether to put 2-PDSCH into 1st sub-codebook, we want to understand, if companies support (Samsung does not support) 2-TB also for multiple PDSCHs, it seems 4 bits for 2 PDSCH case while 2 bits for 1 PDSCH case, how to combine them into one sub-codebook?”,  our understanding is that if 2 TBs per PDSCH for multiple PDSCH is configured without spatial bundling, then 4-bit HARQ-ACK is generated in response of DCI format scheduling 2 PDSCHs. In this case, the DCI format scheduling 2 PDSCHs is associated with the second sub-codebook.  In summary, if the number of HARQ-ACK bits in response of a DCI format is less than or equal to the number of HARQ-ACK bits in response of DCI format scheduling TB-based PDSCH reception, then the DCI format is associated with the first sub-codebook. Otherwise, the DCI format is associated with the second sub-codebook. |
| Moderator | Huawei’s comment is reflected to avoid overlap between DCIs.  However, I couldn’t understand why DCI misdetection results in codebook size mismatch. DAI counting is separately performed for each sub-codebook and UE can easily recover any DCI missing by using DAI value from other DCIs. It would be helpful if Huawei can elaborate on this issue. |
| LG | Supportive to this proposal. |
| Xiaomi | Thanks moderator for the answer to our questions. I agree that UE will make a HARQ-ACK codebook when UE receives the last DCI corresponding to a PUCCH occasion. But I think UE can’t recover the number of scheduled PDSCH by C-DAI/T-DAI from another successfully received DCI(s) for Alt 1 since the C-DAI/T-DAI is counted per DCI not per PDSCH, which is different from Alt 2. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | In our view, we still suggest discussing the HARQ-ACK time bundling as it is essential to Alt 1 to align the maximum HARQ-ACK bits corresponding to multi-PDSCH scheduling DCI that can have different number of maximum PDSCHs.  For Alt 2, since C-DAI/T-DAI are per PDSCH, therefore HARQ-ACK time bundling is not so crucial there. However, in our view, it is essential for Alt 1. If you assume, always the maximum number is 8/DCI, although a DCI can schedule maximum 4 PDSCHs (for example with 480 kHz, if agreed). Then for the DCI scheduling for 480 kHz, still you would assume 8 bits, which is unnecessary. Rather, time bundling could be applied for the DCI that can schedule maximum 8 PDSCHs and reduce the size of HARQ-ACK to 4/DCI. |
| DOCOMO | We are fine with the proposal but one suggestion for modification:   * + - The second sub-codebook is for the following case:       * Any DCI that is configured with TDRA table containing at least one row with multiple SLIVs and ~~but~~ schedules multiple PDSCHs   For number of sub-codebooks considering CBG, we think it may be better to use separate sub-codebook since the maximum number of PDSCHs and the maximum number of CBs may be different. If put in one sub-codebook, further larger redundancy is expected, making the redundancy issue for Alt 1 more severe. |
| Qualcomm | We share the same views with Lenovo, we need to include in the proposal an FFS to choose between time domain bundling or fixing the number of feedback bits to maximum number of PDSCHs in a single row.  Again, we do not think that counting the DAI per DCI requires having multiple codebooks, and the multi-codebook design can be decoupled from Alt 1. |
| Apple | We are fine with the proposal |
| Futurewei | We are fine with this proposal  The FFS added addresses our prior concern.  It would be even better that the details of time domain bundling is figured out for Alt-1 by this meeting, such that a clearer comparison between Alt-2 is expected. |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with the proposal. |
| NEC | We are fine with the proposal |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Samsung | We are fine with the proposal.  For the time domain bundling, though we still think no need to go to details for bundling for Alt-1, we’re ok to add some description in the Note for time domain bundling to provide a clearer comparison between Alt-2. For example, the number of HARQ-ACK bits per DCI for 2nd sub-codebook is the maximum number of PDSCH bundles per DCI, if time domain bundling is configured.  To WILUS: Thanks for the explanation for 2 PDSCHs case. I understand now. The optimization is based on certain condition. It’s fine to add it as FFS for further discussion. |
| Ericsson | We are generally fine with this proposal but have a couple comments/questions:   * Agree with the editorial comment from DOCOMO as well as the comment on number of codebooks. * Regarding the following FFS, it is not clear what is the benefit of doing this, and it seems like rules for handling this are unnecessarily complicated and there becomes an overlap between single/multiple PDSCH depending on if 1/2 TBs and whether spatial bundling is used or not. Isn't it much more straight forward to keep the two codebooks separate for single/multiple-PDSCH   + - * + FFS: Whether HARQ-ACK bits for 2 PDSCHs scheduled by this DCI can be included in the first sub-codebook in some cases * We are confused a little bit by the wording of the Note:   + - Note: Time domain bundling of HARQ-ACK feedback is still FFS as per prior agreement. Above issues can be addressed after this FFS has been decided, including the possibility of single codebook if time domain bundling is configured.   + What does "above issues" refer to?   + Which FFS does "this FFS" refer to?   + "Single codebook" is not accurate     - Time domain bundling does not necessarily imply that all HARQ-ACKs scheduled by a single DCI are bundled   As we have discussed before, a middle ground is to configure N bundles, e.g., N = 2 or 4 when the max number of PDSCHs per DCI is 8. Hence, 2 codebooks would still be maintained, and the multi-PDSCH related codebook would contain HARQ-ACK bits for N bundles. |
| Huawei3, HiSilicon3 | After further reading, we would suggest the following modifications:   * Any DCI that is not configured with CBG-based scheduling (if supported for a DCI that can schedule multiple PDSCHs) or is not configured with multi-PDSCH scheduling   We agree with the suggestion from Docomo.  Regarding time-domain bundling, perhaps a simpler FFS point may be sufficient, such as “FFS impact of time domain bundling, if supported”.  Regarding the moderator’s question (copied from email):  *Thanks a lot for follow-up discussion on Proposal #5b. Let me take an example to see where our misalignments are coming from. In case of 2 sub-codebooks, DAI counting will be performed separately.*   * *Received C-DAIs for the first sub-codebook (1 bit per DAI): 1/2/3/5* * *Received C-DAIs for the second sub-codebook (N bit per DAI): 1/3/4*   *Based on successfully received DCI, UE can generate 5 bits for the first sub-codebook and 4\*N for the second sub-codebook, then will concatenate two sub-codebooks (with size of 5+4\*N). I don’t see why UE has to know how many PDSCHs are scheduled in a missed multi-PDSCH scheduling DCI.*  We agree with the explanation from the moderator that there would be no ambiguity if the UE missed a DCI that can schedule one or more PDSCHs, if the UE subsequently receives another DCI providing the DAI for the same sub-codebook. |
| Fujitsu | We are fine with the spirit of the proposal. But we think the following issues may need to be fixed.  1. For the 1st sub-codebook:  Regarding the first case, it seems that if a DCI is configured with CBG-based scheduling but is not configured with multi-PDSCH scheduling, the DCI is also counted in the 1st sub-codebook. But we understand the intention of the first case is to refer to the DCI that is configured with neither CBG-based nor multi-PDSCH scheduling. If that is the correct understanding, we suggest changing the ‘or’ to ‘and’.  Regarding the second case, considering the discussion of Proposal #3b (CBG), it is possible to support a DCI configured with multi-PDSCH scheduling to schedule a single PDSCH in a CBG-based manner. However, according to the current wording, it seems such DCI would also be counted in the 1st sub-codebook. We understand that it is not the intention, and we suggest adding ‘not configured with CBG-based scheduling’ to the second case.  2. We understand that “DCI that is configured with TDRA table containing at least one row with multiple SLIVs” is equivalent to “DCI configured with multi-PDSCH scheduling”. For better understanding, we prefer to use same description and either one is fine to us.  To sum up, we suggest the following modification for consideration.   * + - The first sub-codebook is for the following cases:       * Any DCI that is not configured with CBG-based scheduling and is not configured with multi-PDSCH scheduling       * Any DCI that is not configured with CBG-based scheduling and is configured with multi-PDSCH scheduling and schedules only a single PDSCH     - The second sub-codebook is for the following case:   Any DCI that is configured with multi-PDSCH scheduling but schedules multiple PDSCHs |
| OPPO | We are generally fine with the proposal. |
| vivo | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Moderator | Most companies seems to be agreeable, but still several points need to be updated.  To Lenovo,  I totally agree with you that HARQ-ACK codebook size is an essential factor for Alt 1. However, in your example, the issue may come from the fact that the maximum schedulable number of PDSCHs can be restricted to 4. But we can discuss further after we agree such restriction. On the other hand, I added time domain bundling as FFS, as suggested by Huawei. Hope it could address some part of your concern.  To NTT DOCOMO,  Suggested modification is reflected. CBG is captured as FFS so it would be fine at this stage.  To Qualcomm,  I cannot see any company (proponent of Alt 1) is suggesting single codebook. This is because as you know two sub-codebook design obviously reduces HARQ-ACK codebook size. I don’t disagree single codebook won’t work. At the same time, we cannot say two sub-codebooks won’t work. It has been proven that two sub-codebook works from Rel-15 NR. Furthermore, we should first design HARQ-ACK codebook considering the case where time domain bundling (if supported) is not configured. I assume time domain bundling is not always configured. Do you agree? Anyway, to address your concern, I added time domain bundling as FFS, as suggested by Huawei.  To Ericsson,  Regarding the FFS for 2 PDSCH scheduling case, I agree with you that it could make specification unnecessarily complicated. However, from the moderator’s view, at least two companies proposed it and one company accepted it. Could we just live with it?  Regarding time domain bundling, I added time domain bundling as FFS, as suggested by Huawei. Hope it can avoid confusion to some extent.  To Huawei,  I couldn’t catch the first modification. It would be highly appreciated if you could give me more explanation on that. Perhaps, can updated Proposal #5c resolve that issue?  To Fujitsu,  I think your suggestions are all reflected ☺ |

### Proposal #5c (Type-2 HARQ-ACK CB Alt 1):

* If Alt 1 (C-DAI/T-DAI is counted per DCI) is adopted for generating type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook corresponding to a DCI that can schedule multiple PDSCHs,
  + At least two sub-codebooks are generated for a PUCCH cell group where
    - The first sub-codebook is for the following cases:
      * Any DCI that is not configured with CBG-based scheduling and is configured with TDRA table containing each row with a single SLIV
      * Any DCI that is not configured with CBG-based scheduling and is configured with TDRA table containing at least one row with multiple SLIVs and schedules only a single PDSCH
    - The second sub-codebook is for the following case:
      * Any DCI that is configured with TDRA table containing at least one row with multiple SLIVs and schedules multiple PDSCHs
        + FFS: Whether HARQ-ACK bits for 2 PDSCHs scheduled by this DCI can be included in the first sub-codebook in some cases
  + FFS: 2 or 3 sub-codebooks if CBG is configured for~~with~~ a serving cell in the ~~same~~ PUCCH cell group
  + FFS: impact of time domain bundling, if supported
  + [FFS: the methods (for example, time domain bundling) to align the size of HARQ-ACK feedback corresponding to DCIs that may support scheduling different number of maximum PDSCHs]

Companies are encouraged to provide views on Proposal #5c.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Views |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Adding the FFS doesn’t really add much as it is simply reiterating the Note.  We suggest adding following FFS to highlight the concern:  FFS: the methods (for example, time domain bundling) to align the size of HARQ-ACK feedback corresponding to DCIs that may support scheduling different number of maximum PDSCHs |
| Moderator | Now the Note in the last bullet is removed (I forgot to remove in earlier version). Please companies make a comment if Lenovo’s FFS is agreeable or not. |
| Qualcomm | We do not think that only the proponents of Alt 1 are allowed to suggest modifying it 😊  We agree time domain bundling is one option and may not be configured.  We still believe that the multiple codebooks can be decoupled from Alt 1, i.e., counting DAI per DCI |
| Apple | We are fine with the FFS from Lenovo |
| Ericsson | We agree with the direction of the proposal, but we think that one of the points raised by Fujitsu and Huawei is not yet captured. Given Proposal #3b, is not agreed yet that CBG-based scheduling is supported for a DCI that can schedule multiple PDSCHs. Further the 2/3 codebook issue is still FFS. So then for the case (if supported) that CBG is configured + TDRA table includes at least one row with multiple SLIVs + only single PDSCH scheduled, it is still FFS which codebook is used (1st or 3rd). Hence we recommend capturing these comments as follows (including some editorial corrections on the FFS).   * + At least Two sub-codebooks are generated for a PUCCH cell group where     - The first sub-codebook is for the following cases:       * Any DCI that is not configured with CBG-based scheduling and is configured with TDRA table containing each row with a single SLIV       * Any DCI that is not configured with CBG-based scheduling and is configured with TDRA table containing at least one row with multiple SLIVs and schedules only a single PDSCH     - The second sub-codebook is for the following case:       * Any DCI that is configured with TDRA table containing at least one row with multiple SLIVs and schedules multiple PDSCHs         + FFS: Whether HARQ-ACK bits for 2 PDSCHs scheduled by this DCI can be included in the first sub-codebook in some cases   + FFS: 2 or 3 sub-codebooks if CBG is configured ~~with~~ for a serving cell in the ~~same~~ PUCCH cell group, and which codebook is used for the following case (if supported):     - Any DCI that is configured with CBG-based scheduling and is configured with TDRA table containing at least one row with multiple SLIVs and schedules only a single PDSCH |
| Intel | We are supportive to the FL proposal |
| Moderator | To Ericsson,  I reflected your comments except for FFS part. Anyway CBG configuration is still FFS, to it seems OK without saying more details. |
| Nokia/NSB | We are fine with the proposal. |
| CATT | Similar view that it is not agreed yet that CBG-based scheduling is supported for a DCI that can schedule multiple PDSCHs.  Another minor issue is for the following bullet the following change may be better to indicate the real meaning   * Any DCI that is not configured with CBG-based scheduling and is configured with TDRA table containing rows each with a single SLIV |

### Proposal #6 (Type-2 HARQ-ACK CB Alt 2):

* If Alt 2 (C-DAI/T-DAI is counted per PDSCH) is adopted for generating type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook corresponding to a DCI that can schedule multiple PDSCHs,
  + PDSCH(s) scheduled by a single DCI is counted firstly, serving cell(s) in the same PUCCH cell group is counted secondly, and PDCCH monitoring occasion(s) is counted thirdly.
  + DAI field in fallback DCI (i.e., DCI formats 0\_0 and 1\_0) is not extended.
  + The number of bits for each of counter DAI and total DAI in non-fallback DCI is extended by
    - Alt A: 2 + ceiling{log2(N\_max)} where N\_max is determined by the maximum configured number of PDSCHs for multi-PDSCH scheduling DCI across serving cells belonging to the same PUCCH cell group
    - Alt B: 2 + N\_conf where N\_conf is configured by new RRC parameter

Companies are encouraged to provide views on Proposal #6.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Views |
| DOCOMO | We are fine with the proposal and we prefer Alt 2 to Alt 1. |
| Qualcomm | We want to add adjusting the resolution of the DAI increment based on the greatest common divisor of the number of the SLIVs among the different rows in the TDRA table, as this can significantly reduce the number of DAI bits in many cases.  For example, consider a TDRA table that only contains rows with 4 or 8 SLIVs, then every four PDSCHs can increment the DAI counter by 1, i.e., a grant of 4 PDSCHs will increment the DAI once, and a grant of 8 PDSCHs will increment the DAI twice. By doing this, there is no need to increase the number of DAI bits in the DCI based on the maximum number of the SLIVs in the TDRA table, which can save some DCI overhead while maintaining the same level of reliability of the missed grants. |
| MediaTek | Few clarification questions below:  For the second sub-bullet   * + DAI field in fallback DCI (i.e., DCI formats 0\_0 and 1\_0) is not extended.   is this bullet necessary if we can agree on the Proposal #1?  Regarding the number of bits for each C-DAI/T-DAI, if Alt B is adopted, then does the C-DAI/T-DAI still counted per PDSCH or per group of PDSCH? If so, then we suggest to somehow capture the relation between N\_conf and the group of PDSCH and FFS on the grouping rule associated with Alt B. If not, can Moderator clarify the meaning of N\_conf? is it related to some scheduling restriction like the maximum number of scheduled PDSCHs in any three consecutive DCIs? |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Proposal #3 (on whether to allow CBG (re)transmissions for PDSCH in a DCI that can schedule multiple PDSCHs) should be addressed first before discussing proposal #5.  We are ok with proposal #6 to clarify Alt2. The option to have 2 sub-codebooks for Alt2 can be kept if companies have concerns with not extending the DCI field in fallback DCI. |
| Samsung | It Alt-2 is only for single sub-codebook (Alt-2a in last meeting) case, we’d like to add explicit description. Because we don’t want to reopen the discussion for two sub-codebooks case (Alt-2b in last meeting. It is deprioritized because majority companies fail to see the benefit) in this meeting.  Alt B seems unclear to us. If N\_conf is samller than ceiling{log2(N\_max)}, how it works ? For example, how to determine DAI, and how to determine HARQ-ACK bits per DAI value ? Is it same as Alt-3?  Besides, we like to clarify the case for CBG-based transmission. Whether CBG-based transmission in 2nd sub-codebook, while non CBG-based transmission for single and multiple PDSCHs in 1st sub-codebook ? Or any other way?  Furthermore, we’d like to add the analysis for potential standard impact, e.g. fundamental change of DAI definition, additional mechanism to handle different DAI size. At least to us, these changes requires huge standard effort.  Therefore, we suggest some update for proposal #6 as below: Proposal #6 (Type-2 HARQ-ACK CB Alt 2):  * If Alt 2 (C-DAI/T-DAI is counted per PDSCH) is adopted for generating type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook corresponding to a DCI that can schedule multiple PDSCHs,   + Single sub-codebook is generated.   + PDSCH(s) scheduled by a single DCI is counted firstly, serving cell(s) in the same PUCCH cell group is counted secondly, and PDCCH monitoring occasion(s) is counted thirdly.   + DAI field in fallback DCI (i.e., DCI formats 0\_0 and 1\_0) is not extended.   + The number of bits for each of counter DAI and total DAI in non-fallback DCI is extended by     - Alt A: 2 + ceiling{log2(N\_max)} where N\_max is determined by the maximum configured number of PDSCHs for multi-PDSCH scheduling DCI across serving cells belonging to the same PUCCH cell group     - Alt B: 2 + N\_conf where N\_conf is configured by new RRC parameter   + If CBG is configured, two sub-codebooks are generated. The HARQ-ACK bits corresponding to non-CBG-based PDSCH receptions for single and multiple PDSCHs are included in first sub-codebook, HARQ-ACK bits corresponding to CBG-based PDSCH receptions are included in the second sub-codebook.   + Potential Standard effort:     - New DAI definition     - New mechanism to align different number of DAI bits |
| Panasonic | We support the proposal 6 in general. |
| Xiaomi | We are fine with the detail of Alt 2. But we prefer Alt 1. |
| OPPO | We agree with the proposal in principle. And we’d like to modify the following bullet to make it clear:   * + PDSCH(s) scheduled by a single DCI is counted firstly, serving cell(s) in the same PUCCH cell group and same PDCCH monitoring occasion is counted secondly, and PDCCH monitoring occasion(s) is counted thirdly. |
| WILUS | We are fine with the proposal 6 |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are fine with Proposal 6. |
| vivo | Support the proposal #6 in principle. The Alt B seems to be unclear, as pointed out by some companies, which may need more clarification. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Although our preference is Alt 1, but we are fine with the FL proposal on details related to Alt 2 |
| Nokia, NSB | The relation between the number of sub-codebooks and not extending DAI field for fallback DCI should be clarified. In the case of single sub-codebook, UE missing a single non-fallback DCI preceding (in the order of DAI counting) a fallback DCI can be enough to cause an error in the codebook determination.  In Alt\_B, N\_conf should be clarified, especially its relation to the maximum configured number of PDSCHs for multi-PDSCH scheduling DCI as C-DAI/T-DAI is proposed to be counted per PDSCH. |
| Intel | We prefer to explicitly clarify that it is based on single HARQ-ACK codebook or two sub-codebooks. If it is single HARQ-ACK codebook, we prefer to the following update in the last main bullet  The number of bits for each of counter DAI and total DAI in non-fallback DCI for all configured serving cells is extended by |
| Futurewei | We are fine with both Alt 1 and Alt 2. In principle, we are fine with Alt-1 and Alt-2, some additional discussion may be necessary to further clarify the impact of each alternative. We think the prominent standard impact of Alt 2 is on the new DAI definition.  Also, the N\_conf needs a definition. |
| Apple | We are fine with proposal 6. However, with the sub-bullet “Alt B: 2 + N\_conf where N\_conf is configured by new RRC parameter”, the N\_conf should be configured subject to the agreement in RAN1 #104b-e “C-DAI/T-DAI in DL DCI and T-DAI in UL DCI shall be designed such that at most 3 consecutive DCI missing can be resolved, same as in Rel-15/16 NR” |
| Ericsson | We are not okay with the following sub-bullet:   * + DAI field in fallback DCI (i.e., DCI formats 0\_0 and 1\_0) is not extended.   This contradicts the sub-bullet from the agreement from last meeting:   * + C-DAI/T-DAI in DL DCI and T-DAI in UL DCI shall be designed such that at most 3 consecutive DCI missing can be resolved, same as in Rel-15/16 NR.   As pointed out by Nokia, if the last DCI prior to PUCCH is DCI 1\_0 scheduling a single PDSCH and the UE misdetected the previous DCI which is DCI 1\_1 scheduling multiple-PDSCHs, then there will be ambiguity between the gNB and UE on HARQ codebook size.  We also think that the single sub-codebook approach that is inherent to Alt-2 bleeds into DCIs that are unrelated to multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling (DAI field size increase), e.g., DCI 1\_2 and 0\_2 in order to maintain robustness against 3 consecutive missed PDCCH detections.  We agree with Samsung's addition of the following since we have strong concerns about the fundamental redefinition of the DAI counting mechanism compared to Rel-15/16 (and LTE). This can lead to very long discussions when it comes down to specifying the details. This should not be undertaken lightly.  Potential Standard effort:   * + - New DAI definition     - New mechanism to align different number of DAI bits   Regarding Alt-B, we have similar concerns as other companies on how this works. Alt-2 is supposed to count per-PDSCH. Is this alternative supposed to be counting per N PDSCHs, e.g., configurable DAI increment? This puts restrictions on how many PDSCHs a DCI can schedule which violates the current agreement on scheduling 1 .. 8 PDSCHs. More importantly, if N\_conf is small and the # of scheduled PDSCHs is large, then the UE will not be able to correctly generate the HARQ-ACK codebook potentially with even a single DCI mis-detection. We have strong concerns about the loss in robustness. |
| CATT1 | We prefer alt1 and think alt2 . Also some sub-alternative (for example altb needs for clarification) |
| Convida Wireless | We are fine with the moderator’s proposal. |
| NEC | We are fine with this proposal 6. |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with the moderator’s proposal. |
| Sony | We are fine with the moderator’s proposal. |

### Proposal #6a (Type-2 HARQ-ACK CB Alt 2):

* If Alt 2 (C-DAI/T-DAI is counted per PDSCH) is adopted for generating type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook corresponding to a DCI that can schedule multiple PDSCHs,
  + PDSCH(s) scheduled by a single DCI is counted firstly, serving cell(s) in the same PUCCH cell group and same PDCCH monitoring occasion is counted secondly, and PDCCH monitoring occasion(s) is counted thirdly.
  + DAI field in fallback DCI (i.e., DCI formats 0\_0 and 1\_0) is not extended.
  + The number of bits for each of counter DAI and total DAI in non-fallback DCI for all configured serving cells in the same PUCCH cell group is extended by
    - Alt A: 2 + ceiling{log2(N\_max)} where N\_max is determined by the maximum configured number of PDSCHs for multi-PDSCH scheduling DCI across serving cells belonging to the same PUCCH cell group
    - Alt B: 2 + N\_conf where N\_conf is configured by new RRC parameter

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Moderator | The modification suggestions from OPPO and Intel are reflected as above, but comment from Samsung is put on hold since the number of codebooks is unclear for the time being.  It seems that companies still have different understandings, so instead of suggesting a single proposal, it would be better to have a Q&A style discussion to get a better understanding. So, please respond to Q1 and Q2, rather than providing a comment to Proposal #6a.  To Qualcomm,  From my understanding, Qualcomm’s suggestion to adjust the resolution of the DAI increment does not fall into Alt 2, since Alt 2 clearly states DAI counting is performed per PDSCH. Rather, Qualcomm’s suggestion can be categorized into Alt 3, the difference from Alt 3 is that M is not separately configured but can be implicitly derived from the number of SLIVs in the configured TDRA table. Is this the correct understanding?  It would be appreciated if Qualcomm could reply to my question above. |
| Qualcomm | It is related to Alt 2 in the sense that it does not require bundling or padding to ensure the alignment of the codebooks size unlike Alt 3, where padding or bundling will be needed whenever number of SLIVs/M is not an integer. In other words, there will be no uncertainty of the number of PDSCHs for non-fallback DCIs |
| Moderator | Thanks a lot for the clarification. However, still Qualcomm’s proposal doesn’t seem to fall into Alt 2. Anyway, I’d like to further check my understanding. Let’s say all rows have 4 or 8 SLIVs in the TDRA table of DCI 1\_1 for serving cell #1. Then, Qualcomm’s proposal is that DAI value increment by one corresponds to 4 PDSCHs, is that correct? Even in that case, I think DAI bit width needs to be increased by one since a DCI can make DAI counter be increased by two.  In addition, what if serving cell #2 is aggregated with serving cell #1 but multi-PDSCH scheduling is not configured for serving cell #2? I guess in that case, regardless of TDRA configuration of serving cell #1, DAI value is increased by one every PDSCH. Hope Qualcomm can clarify whether my understandings are correct or not. |
| Qualcomm | We do not oppose the DAI field increase, but we want to make it up gNB decision. For example, we may have a TDRA table with all 8 PDSCHs so in this case we can consider each increment as 8 PDSCHs.  In the example of two serving cells, we can make DAI increment per PDSCH as mentioned above, or keep the rule DAI increment corresponding to 4 PDSCH, and we can increment the DAI once per DCI from cell #2, and the UE can append NACKs (3 in the example above) to ensure proper codebook size alignment |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine with the FL proposal |
| Moderator | I understood Qualcomm’s suggestion better. However, let’s hear other companies views if Qualcomm’s proposal that DAI increment can be adjusted by configured number of SLIVs in each row, is under Alt 2 or not. |
| Intel | We share moderator’s view that DAI increment by configured number of SLIVs in each row looks like Alt 3. It provides a way to determine value M in Alt 3. i.e. value M can be explicitly configured by RRC or can be implicitly derived by the TDRA table configured on the multiple serving cells.  As commented in Proposal #5a, we may need to consider a room for time bundling. However, we don’t know how to combine timing bundling and DAI counter per PDSCH. |
| Samsung | We don’t think Qualcomm’s proposal that DAI increment can be adjusted by configured number of SLIVs in each row, is under Alt 2.  If I understanding correctly, the example provided by QC that always 8 PDSCHs configured for all rows intends to say, the number of HARQ-ACK bits per DCI can be fixed, and DAI is incremented by 1 for each DCI. In that case, it is actually the same as Alt-1, i.e. DAI is counted per DCI. The UCI feedback in the example of two serving cells provided by QC is exactly the same as Alt-1 with single codebook, and UCI overhead is larger than Alt-1 with two-sub codebook.  Furthermore, we think it is not reasonable to choose very special case (e.g. all rows with 8 PDSCHs) good for one alternative while put much restriction on scheduling flexibility, or even infeasible.  To Moderator: If the proposal does not mention the number of sub-codebooks, it seems the following description in the updated proposal is not accurate. Because if 2 sub-codebooks is assumed, the increase of DAI bits is only for cells associated with 2nd sub-codebook, not all configured serving cells, e.g. only cells with configuration of multi-PDSCH scheduling is in 2nd sub-codebook. Or, do you imply that 1st sub-codebook only for fallback DCI, while 2nd sub-codebook for all non-fallback DCI? In that case, single and multiple PDSCHs scheduled by a non-fallback DCI for all configured cells are in 2nd sub-codebook, then, the following description in the updated proposal is OK. However, there was very limited input for 2 sub-codebook for Alt-2, and even within this limited input, it seems different companies have different understanding how to construct 2 sub-codebooks for Alt-2. Therefore, we feel it would be difficult to accurately evaluate the potential DAI increase without clear picture of the number of sub-codebooks and details of how to construct multiple sub-codebooks for Alt-2.   * + The number of bits for each of counter DAI and total DAI in non-fallback DCI for all configured serving cells in the same PUCCH cell group is extended by |
| Futurewei | We suggest to deprioritize the discussion on DAI resolution for the proposal #6a, but continue discussion on time bundling details for both Alt-1 and Alt-2 in this meeting. We still slightly prefer Alt-1, as the standard effort for the new way DAI is counted seems high compare with its potential codebook size reduction gain over Alt-1. |
| Huawei2, HiSilicon2 | In our view, if two sub-codebooks are considered for Alt-2, then they are associated respectively with DCI Format 1\_0 and DCI Format 1\_1, to address the concerns that DAI field is not increased in DCI Format 1\_0. Contrary to Alt-1, the two sub-codebooks are not addressing the HARQ-ACK codebook size, but addressing the mismatch in the DAI signalling capability of the two DCI Formats when DAI is counted per PDSCH (which is not an issue with Alt-1). |
| LG | Consider the case where UE is configured with CBG for a serving cell, this proposal is to be only for the case not configure with CBG.  For this reason, we suggest following modification.   * + In case where CBG retransmission is not configured for any serving cell in a same PUCCH cell group, ~~T~~the number of bits for each of counter DAI and total DAI in non-fallback DCI for all configured serving cells in the same PUCCH cell group is extended by     - Alt A: 2 + ceiling{log2(N\_max)} where N\_max is determined by the maximum configured number of PDSCHs for multi-PDSCH scheduling DCI across serving cells belonging to the same PUCCH cell group     - Alt B: 2 + N\_conf where N\_conf is configured by new RRC parameter   + FFS the case with configuration of CBG retransmission |
|  |  |

### Q1: For Alt 2, do you agree that DAI field in fallback DCI (i.e., DCI formats 0\_0 and 1\_0) shall not be extended? If YES, how can we maintain the robustness against 3 consecutive missed PDCCH detections (as per the conclusion that was made in the last meeting)?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Views |
| Qualcomm | We agree not to increase the DAI field size in fallback DCIs to avoid changing these formats  The fallback DCIs are for fall back purpose and we do not see a need for maintaining robustness property (3 missed DCIs) when fallback is used. Our understanding is that conclusion made in the previous meeting was for non-fallback DCIs.  In addition, gNB can maintain this robustness by proper scheduling decisions when using fallback DCIs |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Similar view as Qualcomm that increase of DAI field in fallback DCI is not needed |
| Apple | We would like that the DAI field size in the fallback DCIs not be changed to avoid changing these formats. However, given that the fallback DCI can be used when the coverage deteriorates, robustness against multiple missed detections becomes a very important design metric. If Alt 2 is down-selected, this issue has to be solved. |
| Ericsson | DAI field in fallback DCI 1\_0 must be extended. The agreed principle of maintaining robustness against 3 consecutive PDCCH missed detections is fundamental, and has been a principle that has existed since Rel-15 (and also in LTE). We do not agree to sacrifice this.  As pointed out by Nokia, if the last DCI prior to PUCCH is DCI 1\_0 scheduling a single PDSCH and the UE misdetected the previous DCI which is DCI 1\_1 scheduling multiple-PDSCHs, then there will be ambiguity between the gNB and UE on HARQ codebook size.  We have the same understanding for other DCIs that can schedule single PDSCH, e.g., DCI 1\_2. |
| DOCOMO | If no extension for DCI 0\_0, separate sub-codebook for DCI 0\_0 and DCI 0\_1 may be needed. If extension for DCI 0\_0, single sub-codebook is enough. |
| Intel | DAI size in fallback DCI should not be increased.  We are not sure how to handle PDSCH ordering when fallback DCI and non-fallback DCI are both used in the PDSCH scheduling. It is up to the proponents to provide some details to solve the issue. |
| OPPO | We agree not to increase the DAI field size in fallback DCIs. |
| Samsung | We think, from DCI overhead point of view, it is undesirable to increase DAI bits for fallback DCI. And we also think that conclusion made in the previous meeting was for non-fallback DCIs. So, our answer is no.  If no increase in fallback DCI, then, the robustness is restricted by the fallback DCI, i.e. it doesn’t work even if one PDCCH is missed. It is unacceptable for UCI reception performance. |
| vivo | We share similar views with QC, and think DAI field size in fallback DCI is not extended. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We think the DAI field size in fallback DCI should not be increased. |
| Futurewei | We think no DAI field size increment is necessary for the fallback DCI. |
| CATT | We think the DAI field size in fallback DCI should not be increased. |
| Moderator | First of all, in the highlighted part below, how can we interpret that this is only for non-fallback DCI?   |  | | --- | | Conclusion: (RAN1#104bis-e)  The following is observed for alternative 2 from prior agreement.   * For Alt 2a (C-DAI/T-DAI is counted per PDSCH with a single codebook) of generating type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook corresponding to DCI that can schedule multiple PDSCHs,   + C-DAI/T-DAI in DL DCI: Bit-width can be increased (FFS: by how much), in DL DCI not only for multi-PDSCH DCI but also for single-PDSCH DCI for all serving cells including a serving cell not configured with multi-PDSCH DCI   + T-DAI in UL DCI: Bit-width can be increased (FFS: by how much), in UL DCI for all serving cells including a serving cell not configured with multi-PDSCH DCI   + C-DAI/T-DAI in DL DCI and T-DAI in UL DCI shall be designed such that at most 3 consecutive DCI missing can be resolved, same as in Rel-15/16 NR.     - FFS: details on increment of DAI field size     - FFS: whether/how to handle the case where different DCI formats (e.g., DCI format 1\_0 and DCI format 1\_1) have different field sizes for C-DAI/T-DAI   + HARQ-ACK codebook generation:     - The number of HARQ-ACK bits depends on the number of scheduled PDSCHs.     - FFS: ordering of the PDSCHs for DAI counting     - FFS: time domain bundling of HARQ-ACK feedback, as per agreement in RAN1#104-e   + Note that multi-PDSCH DCI refers to a DL DCI where at least one entry of the TDRA table allows scheduling more than one PDSCH |   Even though majority companies suggest not to increase DAI field size in fallback DCI, it is not quite clear how PDSCH scheduled by fallback DCI and other PDSCH(s) scheduled by non-fallback DCI can be combined into a single HARQ-ACK codebook. **Please proponents of Alt 2 provide your views on how PDSCH scheduled by fallback DCI and other PDSCH(s) scheduled by non-fallback DCI can be combined into a single HARQ-ACK codebook.** |
| Huawei2, HiSilicon2 | We agree with the principle that DAI field size should not be increased in fallback DCI. If this is deemed as a strong concern for the operation with Alt2, then 2 sub-codebooks can be considered for Alt-2, associated respectively with DCI Format 1\_0 and DCI Format 1\_1. Practically, the network can ensure that the last DCI or the last two DCIs (for even more robustness) is/are non-fallback DCI(s). The last DCI can correct the DAI in case of a missed earlier fallback DCI. |
| Panasonic | We agree not to increase the DAI field size in fallback DCIs (i.e., DCI 0\_0/1\_0) |
| DOCOMO2 | As we commented previously, if no extension for DCI 0\_0, separate sub-codebook for DCI 0\_0 and DCI 0\_1 can be applied. |
| Convida Wirless | There is no need to extend DAI field for fallback DCI. |
| Futurewei | We are also fine if it has to take two sub-codebooks for Alt-2 to embrace a fallback DCI that does not associate with an increased DAI size. |
| Spreadtrum | We think there is no need to increase DAI size for fallback DCI. |
| NEC | Similar view as majority companies that increase of DAI field size in fallback DCI is not needed |
| Samsung | As we previously commented, fallback DCI should not increase DAI bit field.  If two sub-codebooks for Alt-2 is used (one sub-codebook for fallback DCI, one sub-codebook for non-fallback DCI), we want to understand how to handle CBG transmission? Is CBG-based single PDSCH transmission scheduled by non-fallback DCI in the same sub-codebook for multi-PDSCH scheduled by non-fallback DCI? In our understanding, it does not work in this case. Because 1 bit HARQ-ACK per DAI value for multi-PDSCH case, but Ncbg bits HARQ-ACK per DAI value for single PDSCH with CBG case. |
| vivo | We share the same view as Huawei that two sub-codebooks may be introduced for fallback DCI and non-fallback DCI separately. |
| Moderator | All companies except for one company agree not to increase DAI bit field in fallback DCI. From my understanding, the concern of Ericsson comes from the worry that fallback DCI’s robustness may not be maintained in case DAI field size in fallback DCI is not increased. Given this situation, the following conclusion can be made. |

### Proposed conclusion #2 (DAI field):

* In Rel-17, the bit width of counter DAI field in fallback DCI (i.e., DCI formats 0\_0 and 1\_0) remains the same as in Rel-15 NR.
  + Note: Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook in Rel-17 shall be designed such that at most 3 consecutive DCI missing can be resolved, same as in Rel-15/16 NR (as per previous conclusion).

Companies are encouraged to provide views on proposed conclusion #2.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Views |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support |
| Qualcomm | We are okay with the conclusion |
| Apple | We are fine with the conclusion |
| Ericsson | We can be okay with this conclusion since it seems now 2 sub-codebooks are back on the table. However, we have a concern about this as a standalone conclusion. We think it is better to include in into Proposal 6b for Alt-2 since there is a dependence on the number of sub-codebooks in the Alt-2 design. If single sub-codebook is decided, then we have a concern that the only way to achieve robustness is to introduce gNB restrictions on a specific ordering of fallback/non-fallback DCI transmission to achieve the robustness requirement.  If a standalone conclusion is preferrable to companies, then we could accept it, but with the following addition to the Note:  Note: Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook in Rel-17 shall be designed such that at most 3 consecutive missed DCIs ~~missing~~ can be resolved, same as in Rel-15/16 NR (as per previous conclusion). Achieving robustness against missed DCIs shall not require the gNB to use a specific ordering of fallback/non-fallback DCI transmissions. |
| Intel | We are fine with the conclusion |
| Moderator | To Ericsson,  Just to understand better, could you please what kind of specific ordering from gNB side is considered? I thought single/two sub-codeoobk or whatever can be further discussion after this conclusion is agreed. |
| Nokia/NSB | We are fine with the proposal. |

### Q2: For Alt 2, do you agree that the number of bits for each of counter DAI and total DAI in non-fallback DCI can be RRC-configurable? If YES, how can we maintain the robustness against 3 consecutive missed PDCCH detections (as per the conclusion that was made in the last meeting)?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Views |
| Qualcomm | We support making the DAI field size for non-fallback DCIs RRC configurable. As we mentioned before, the way gNB configure the TDRA table as well as the resolution of DAI increments can help in reducing number of DAI bits needed to maintain the same level of robustness. |
| Ericsson | No. The number of bits should not be RRC configurable.  As we commented in Q1, the principle of maintaining robustness against 3 consecutive PDCCH missed detections is fundamental and should not be changed. |
| DOCOMO | We are open to discuss whether the number of bits of T-DAI/C-DAI can be configured by gNB. If supported, the configuration should take the maximum number of consecutive missed PDCCH detections and maximum number of scheduled PDSCHs into account. |
| OPPO | No. The number of bits should not be RRC configurable. |
| vivo | We prefer to determine the DAI field size based on the TDRA table configured for multi-PDSCH scheduling, i.e. Alt A. When the DAI field size is RRC-configurable, the corresponding RRC configuration should guarantee the required robustness, which is also mentioned by DCM. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are open to this issue and share similar view with DCOCOMO. |
| Futurewei | We prefer Alt-A. FFS the issue of maintaining robustness against 3 consecutive PDCCH missed detections. |
| Moderator | It seems there is no supporting company except for Qualcomm. **At least Qualcomm, please provide your view on how the robustness can be maintained with DAI field size configurable.** If not, that option would be hard to be captured in this meeting. |
| Huawei2, HiSilicon2 | At least the number of bits of DAI in non-fallback DCI can depend on N\_max, which is related to an RRC configuration, and the total number of bits that depends on N\_max can still ensure robustness against 3 consecutive PDCCH missed detections. |
| WILUS | We are supportive of Alt-B because it can provide flexible DAI size configuration and reduce DCI payload size (note that DCI format 1\_2 allows to configure 1-bit cDAI and in this case a UE can detect 1 missing PDCCH only).  However, we are fine with Alt-A to detect at least 3 consecutive PDCCH missing events. |
| Panasonic | We share the same view with DOCOMO. |
| Convida Wireless | We support DAI field size for non-fallback DCIs is RRC configurable as legacy NR specification. |
| Qualcomm | As we mentioned before, number DAI bits needed to ensure robustness is highly dependent on the configuration of the TDRA table, and how many PDSCHs are assumed to increment the DAI. Determining the DAI field size based on N\_max makes it as well RRC dependent based on the configuration, so why limiting the size to this choice while neglecting the option of saving some DCI overhead if the DAI is incremented based on the greatest common divisor of the number of the SLIVs among the rows of the TDRA tables. |
| Spreadtrum | We are open to discuss this issue and share the same view as DOCOMO |
| Samsung | No. The number of bits should not be RRC configurable. |
| Moderator | No consensus on the necessity of RRC configurable DAI size. However, the common factor would be that DAI size increment depends on the number of SLIVs associated with row index in the TDRA table. |

### Proposal #6b (Type-2 HARQ-ACK CB Alt 2):

* If Alt 2 (C-DAI/T-DAI is counted per PDSCH) is adopted for generating type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook corresponding to a DCI that can schedule multiple PDSCHs,
  + PDSCH(s) scheduled by a single DCI is counted firstly, serving cell(s) in the same PUCCH cell group and same PDCCH monitoring occasion is counted secondly, and PDCCH monitoring occasion(s) is counted thirdly.
  + In case where CBG retransmission is not configured for any serving cell in a same PUCCH cell group, the number of bits for each of counter DAI and total DAI in non-fallback DCI is extended (if needed) at least based on
    - The number of SLIVs associated with a row index in TDRA table
      * FFS: details
  + FFS: the case with configuration of CBG retransmission
  + FFS: the number of sub-codebooks

Companies are encouraged to provide views on Proposal #6b.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Views |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support |
| Qualcomm | We can be okay with the proposal |
| Apple | On the statement   * + - The number of SLIVs associated with a row index in TDRA table   Is this any generic row, all the rows, some of them ? I would appreciate it how this statement maps to Alt A (maximum # across all serving cells) and Alt B (a configured # that satisfies the in the original proposal. |
| MediaTek | We apologize for the last minute comment. We just found that the following case is not covered by the ordering of C-DAI specified in the first sub bullet, i.e., cross-carrier scheduling where two DCIs have the same MO positions and schedule multi-PDSCHs in the same cell. Can we add an FFS to address this issue?  FFS: The C-DAI ordering of PDSCH(s) in the same serving cell(s) in the same PUCCH cell group scheduled by separate DCIs in the same PDCCH monitoring occasion. |
| Ericsson | We can be okay with this proposal (also MediaTek's FFS) with the following addition. The reason the following Note should be included is that Alt-2 is new since the number of sub-codebooks is now an open issue. Previously there was a conclusion on Alt-2a which was for single sub-codebook only.  Note: The DAI bit width and number of sub-codebooks shall ensure that:   * At most 3 consecutive missed DCIs can be resolved, same as in Rel-15/16 NR * Achieving robustness against missed DCIs shall not require gNB to use a specific ordering of fallback/non-fallback DCI transmissions |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal |
| Moderator | To MediaTek,  Do you think it is allowed that two CCs are scheduling a single CC? Are you assuming Rel-17 DSS enhancement? Anyway, I don’t see an issue even for that case, since DAI counting is based on PDCCH monitoring occasion, not based on PDSCH reception occasion. If I’m wrong, please educate me^^  To Ericsson,  Same question for Proposed conclusion #2. If the second bullet can be clarified, we can discuss whether to add the proposed note or not. |
| Nokia/NSB | We are fine with the proposal. |

## HARQ timing

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Views |
| [1] Futurewei | Observation 4: It can be beneficial to study coverage loss if a larger size type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook is carried by UCI of certain PUCCH format.  Proposal 8: Study if there is benefit of adopting multi-PUCCH for multi-PDSCH for either mitigation of coverage loss or reduce idle slot if HARQ starvation is a significant issue for the higher SCSs. |
| [3] vivo | Proposal 10: For multi-PDSCH scheduling, support reporting HARQ-ACK information corresponding to different PDSCHs scheduled by a DCI on different PUCCH(s).  Proposal 11: For reporting HARQ-ACK feedback on different PUCCHs, further study how to divide the PDSCHs scheduled by a single DL DCI, as well as indicate or determine more than one PUCCH carrying HARQ-ACK feedback. |
| [5] Nokia | Proposal 8: If up to 32 DL HARQ processes are supported for 960 kHz SCSs, it is enough to support single transmission of HARQ feedback per multi-PDSCH DCI.  If only 16 DL HARQ processes are supported for 960 kHz SCS, HARQ information for multi-PDSCH DCI can be carried by up to two PUCCHs to reduce HARQ process starvation   * When DCI schedules more than N PDSCHs, where N is configurable, the HARQ-ACK feedback for the scheduled PDSCHs is transmitted over two slots. |
| [6] Ericsson | Proposal 27: Do not support HARQ-ACK information corresponding to different PDSCHs scheduled by the DCI to be carried by different PUCCH occasions. |
| [8] Qualcomm | Proposal 4: All HARQ-ACK information corresponding to different PDSCHs scheduled by the same DCI to be carried by the same PUCCH. |
| [9] OPPO | Proposal 3: Separate the scheduled PDSCHs into two groups, consider two PUCCH resources allocated for the two PDSCH groups, an earlier PUCCH is used to report HARQ-ACK information of the earlier PDSCH group. |
| [10] ZTE | Observation 1: HARQ-ACK information corresponding to different PDSCHs scheduled by the DCI can be carried by different PUCCH(s) considering HARQ-ACK feedback delay. |
| [11] Apple | Observation 1: HARQ-ACK information corresponding to different PDSCHs scheduled by a single DCI carried by different PUCCHs affects the UE complexity, signaling overhead and transmission latency but may be affected by channel access within or across COTs.  Proposal 6: RAN1 should decide whether a multi-PxSCH transmission can occur across multiple COTs and the specify the UE HARQ-ACK feedback behavior in the case that one or more of the PDSCH transmissions occurs outside a valid COT.  Proposal 7: RAN1 should support a single HARQ-ACK feedback for Multi-PDSCH transmissions within a single COT only. |
| [14] Sony | Proposal 6: If PDSCH processing time is long, at least one of the following solutions should be considered  1. Multiple HARQ feedback timing indication by one DCI  2. Multiple DCI in a slot  3. Increasing the number of HARQ process |
| [15] NEC | Proposal 2: HARQ-ACK information corresponding to the PDSCHs scheduled by a single DCI can be carried in an uplink slot or at most 2 uplink slots. |
| [16] Samsung | Proposal 5: HARQ-ACK information corresponding to different PDSCHs scheduled by the DCI carried by different PUCCH(s) is not supported in Rel-17. |
| [17] MediaTek | Proposal 5: The HARQ-ACK information corresponding to different PDSCHs scheduled by a DCI should only be carried by single PUCCH to simplify Type-2 codebook design. |
| [18] Panasonic | Proposal 7: Support HARQ-ACK information corresponding to different PDSCHs scheduled by the DCI can be carried by different PUCCH(s). |
| [19] LG Electronics | Proposal #12: Further discuss whether or not HARQ-ACK information corresponding to different PDSCHs scheduled by a single DCI can be carried by two different PUCCHs, at least considering the follows:   * How to separately allocate resource for two PUCCHs (e.g., K1, PRI, etc) * How to signal individual DAI values corresponding to two PUCCHs * Under which condition(s) two PUCCHs are indicated by the DCI (e.g., in case more than N PDSCHs are scheduled) |
| [20] Lenovo | Proposal 4: For NR operation between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz, for HARQ-ACK information corresponding to PDSCHs scheduled by the DCI, different PUCCH(s) can be used where the PUCCH carrying the HARQ-ACK can be transmitted in the middle of non-contiguous PDSCHs transmissions to allow earlier/faster transmission of HARQ-ACK associated with earlier PDSCHs |
| [21] Xiaomi | Proposal 3: For latency sensitive service, separate HARQ-ACK PUCCH resources for multiple PDSCHs scheduled by single DCI can be considered. |
| [22] InterDigital | Observation 6: Configuring one PUCCH transmission with HARQ-ACK for all the PDSCHs scheduled by one DCI can introduce excessive HARQ-ACK round trip delay and negatively impact on the expected performance gains.  Proposal 8: When multiple PDSCH are scheduled using single DCI, support multiple sub-codebooks each carrying HARQ-ACK information of a sub-set of scheduled PDSCHs.  Proposal 11: To support multiple PUCCHs each carrying HARQ-ACK information of a group of PDSCHs scheduled by a single DCI, extend TDRA table such that each row indicates multiple slot offsets (K0 values) corresponding to multiple HARQ-ACK sub codebooks. |
| [24] NTT DOCOMO | Proposal 6: Support transmitting HARQ-ACKs for multiple PDSCHs scheduled by one DCI on different PUCCHs. |

### Summary (on whether or not HARQ-ACK information corresponding to different PDSCHs scheduled by the DCI can be carried by different PUCCH(s)):

Company views on whether or not HARQ-ACK information corresponding to different PDSCHs scheduled by the DCI can be carried by different PUCCH(s):

* Supported by vivo, OPPO, ZTE, Sony, NEC, Panasonic, Lenovo, Xiaomi, InterDigital, NTT DOCOMO, Nokia/NSB
* Objected by Ericsson, Qualcomm, Apple, Samsung, MediaTek, LG Electronics

[Moderator’s note] 10 companies suggest to support that HARQ-ACK information corresponding to different PDSCHs scheduled by a DCI is carried by different PUCCHs while 6 companies are against it. Therefore, it is proposed to deprioritize this issue in this meeting.

Please feel free to express views on Moderator’s note, if any.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Views |
| DOCOMO | Fine to deprioritize the issue in this meeting. |
| Qualcomm | We don’t see significant benefit from carrying the feedback of PDSCHs scheduled by the same DCI over two PUCCHs in terms of latency. This is because the expected timeline of PDSCH decoding will be relatively large.  For example, with 960kHz, N1 will be around 11 slots, using SCS 120kHz absolute timeline as a baseline. With 8 PDSCHs at maximum scheduled by the same DCI, the offset between any PDSCH reception and its feedback has to be larger than N1, i.e., 11 slots, i.e., counting this offset from a slot of PDCSH at the middle of the allocation or the slot of the last PDSCH will not lead to a significant reduction in the latency of the feedback. For example, if we allow the first 4 PDSCHs to be feedback separately before the last 4 PDSCHs, the first feedback will be transmitted at most 4 slots before the second feedback, this will count for ~56us latency enhancement for SCS 960kHz which is not significant. |
| MediaTek | We also don’t see the need for introducing more PUCCHs for the multi-PDSCH scheduling and we agree to deprioritize the discussion. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are open to discuss if time allows. This could allow getting HARQ feedback earlier for the first group of PDSCHs, i.e. immediately after the last PDSCH, while the second group of PDSCHs require more processing time. If there are available UL slots in between the multiple DL slots scheduled by a single DCI, then this could be allowed by the network. |
| Samsung | OK to deprioritize the issue, though we don’t support using multiple PUCCHs. |
| Panasonic | We are fine to deprioritize the issue in this meeting |
| Fujitsu | OK to deprioritize this issue in this meeting. |
| Xiaomi | We support HARQ-ACK information corresponding to non-contiguous PDSCHs by a DCI is carried by different PUCCHs for latency reduction. |
| OPPO | We are fine to deprioritize this discussion. But in our view, this feature should be supported. In case of multi-PDSCH scheduling, if all the PDSCHs are supposed to be transmitted in one PUCCH, the first scheduled PDSCH will suffer a much longer delay than the last scheduled PDSCH. Allowing earlier feedback for the earlier scheduled PDSCHs will help quick release HARQ processes, hence to improve the scheduling efficiency. Also, in unlicensed carrier, there may be the case that some of the scheduled PDSCHs are satisfied with the PDSCH processing time while others of the scheduled PDSCHs are not when the multi-PDSCH are scheduled at the end of a COT. In this case, it is more reasonable to report the HARQ-ACK for those PDSCHs which fulfill the processing time instead of not report HARQ-ACK at all. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are fine to deprioritize this issue. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support using multiple PUCCHs, but we are okay to postpone this discussion to the next meeting |
| Nokia, NSB | We are fine to deprioritize the issue in this meeting, as we see that the maximum number of HARQ processes should be agreed first. |
| Intel | We are fine to deprioritize this issue in this meeting |
| Futurewei | We think the discussion on multi-PUCCH can be deferred until the timeline aspect of multi-PDSCH/PUSCH is better studied, for instance whether HARQ starvation is severe for multi-PDSCH and the latency issue are better presented. |
| Apple | We are fine with deprioritizing the issue. |
| Ericsson | We are okay to deprioritize.  Furthermore, we don't see the benefit of supporting feedback on multiple PUCCHs:   * We think the latency savings are minimal as pointed out by Qualcomm. The important factor is to consider the absolute latency (in seconds).   We think this will be quite complicated to specify and will lead to long discussions without a clear benefit |
| CATT1 | We are fine with deprioritizing the issue. |
| InterDigital | We prefer to discuss this topic if time permits. In our view, this feature should be supported. In case of multi-PDSCH scheduling, if HARQ-ACK of all the PDSCHs are to be transmitted in one PUCCH, the initial PDSCHs will suffer a much longer delay than the last scheduled PDSCH. Allowing earlier feedback for the earlier scheduled PDSCHs will help quick release HARQ processes, therefore improve the scheduling efficiency and avoid the requirement to increase the number of HARQ processes. |
| Convida Wireless | We are fine with moderator’s proposal. |
| NEC | We are fine to deprioritize this issue. |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with deprioritizing this issue. |
| vivo | We share similar views with Huawei, but we are also OK to deprioritize the issue in this meeting if the majority want to. |

## HARQ process

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Views |
| [3] vivo | Proposal 6: There is no need to increase the maximum number of HARQ processes due to multi-PDSCH/PUSCH scheduling. |
| [5] Nokia | Proposal 8: If up to 32 DL HARQ processes are supported for 960 kHz SCSs, it is enough to support single transmission of HARQ feedback per multi-PDSCH DCI. |
| [6] Ericsson | Proposal 4: Increase maximum number of DL and UL HARQ processes in Rel-17 from 16 to 32. |
| [8] Qualcomm | Proposal 3: In the case of increasing the HARQ processes to 32 for SCSs 480kHz and 960kHz, a UE capability should be defined such that X HARQ processes can be supported, and Y of them can do soft combining where X and Y ≥ 16. |
| [21] Xiaomi | Proposal 4: Tx/Rx HARQ buffer capacity will need to be enhanced if HARQ process number increases for SCS 480/960 kHz.  Proposal 5: Not support CBG (re)transmission when more than one PUSCHs are scheduled especially when the total HARQ processes is extended to 64/128. |

### Summary (on the number of HARQ processes):

Company views on increasing the number of HARQ processes:

* Supported by Ericsson, Qualcomm (subject to UE capability)
* Objected by vivo

[Moderator’s note] Given a small number of inputs, this issue can be deprioritized in this meeting.

Please feel free to express views on Moderator’s note, if any.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Views |
| sSS | Fine to deprioritize the issue in this meeting. |
| Qualcomm | We are okay with increasing the HARQ processes based on UE capability |
| MediaTek | Agree to deprioritize the discussion. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Proposals were already provided at the last meeting so it is unclear if more companies will contribute in later meetings. We think that a decision could be made in this meeting. Given that NTN already agreed to increase to 32 HARQ processes, at least the same could be agreed in this WI. |
| Samsung | OK to deprioritize the issue. We don’t think NTN mechanism can be directly extended to 52.6GHz UEs. |
| Panasonic | We support to increase number of HARQ processes up to 32 in order to maintain the same scheduling framework while having the similar RTT. This is because when the slot length is reduced but having the similar RTT means that the required number of HARQ processes needs to be increased to allow full scheduling. |
| Fujitsu | OK to deprioritize this issue in this meeting. |
| OPPO | Agree to deprioritize the discussion. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are fine to deprioritize this issue. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We agree to deprioritize this issue in this meeting |
| Intel | We are fine to deprioritize this issue in this meeting |
| Futurewei | We are ok to deprioritize this issue. |
| Apple | We are fine with deprioritizing the issue. Note that NTN has increased the number of HARQ processes to 32 with the caveat that the feedback enable/disable can be configured per HARQ process. As such, some HARQ processes will not need additional memory if they are disabled (e.g. based on a UE capability) |
| CATT1 | We are ok to deprioritize this issue. |
| InterDigital | We are fine with de-prioritizing this proposal. We don’t see the need to increase the number of HARQ processes. |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with deprioritizing this issue. |
| vivo | OK to deprioritize the issue in this meeting. |

## Others

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Views |
| [10] ZTE | Proposal 5: Further enhancement on enhanced dynamic HARQ-ACK codebook construction should be considered. |
| [14] Sony | Proposal 9: NR-U HARQ enhancement features (Non-numerical K1, enhanced Type-2 HARQ CB, and Type-3 HARQ CB) for multi-PDSCH scheduling should be supported.  • Further study how to indicate/determine PDSCH group if multiple PUCCH for multi-PDSCH scheduling is supported. |
| [17] MediaTek | Proposal 7: The UCI information bits including HARQ-ACK information bits should reuse the existing PUCCH payload size limit 1706. |
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# Appendix: Previous agreements

Agreement: (RAN1#104-e)

* For a UE and for a serving cell, scheduling multiple PDSCHs by single DL DCI and scheduling multiple PUSCHs by single UL DCI are supported.
  + Each PDSCH or PUSCH has individual/separate TB(s) and each PDSCH/PUSCH is confined within a slot.
  + FFS: The maximum number of PDSCHs or PUSCHs that can be scheduled with a single DCI
  + FFS: Whether multiple PDSCH scheduling applies to 120 kHz in addition to 480 and 960 kHz
  + At least for 120 kHz SCS, single-slot scheduling with slot-based monitoring will still be supported as specified in Rel-15/Rel-16
* The followings will not be considered in this WI.
  + Single DCI to schedule both PDSCH(s) and PUSCH(s)
  + Single DCI to schedule one or multiple TBs where any single TB can be mapped over multiple slots, where mapping is not by repetition
  + Single DCI to schedule N TBs (N>1) where a TB can be repeated over multiple slots (or mini-slots)
* Note: This does not imply that existing slot aggregation and/or repetition for PDSCH and PUSCH by single DCI is precluded for the serving cell.

Agreement: (RAN1#104-e)

* For a DCI scheduling multiple PDSCHs, HARQ-ACK information corresponding to PDSCHs scheduled by the DCI is multiplexed with a single PUCCH in a slot that is determined based on K1,
  + where K1 (indicated by the PDSCH-to-HARQ\_feedback timing indicator field in the DCI or provided by *dl-DataToUL-ACK* if the PDSCH-to-HARQ\_feedback timing indicator field is not present in the DCI) indicates the slot offset between the slot of the last PDSCH scheduled by the DCI and the slot carrying the HARQ-ACK information corresponding to the scheduled PDSCHs.
    - It is noted that granularity of K1 can be separately discussed.
* FFS: If needed, further discuss whether or not HARQ-ACK information corresponding to different PDSCHs scheduled by the DCI can be carried by different PUCCH(s)

Agreement: (RAN1#104-e)

For generating type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook corresponding to DCI that can schedule multiple PDSCHs, the following alternatives can be considered to DAI counting and will be down-selected in RAN1#104bis-e.

* Alt 1: C-DAI/T-DAI is counted per DCI.
* Alt 2: C-DAI/T-DAI is counted per PDSCH.
* Alt 3: C-DAI/T-DAI is counted per M scheduled PDSCH(s), where M is configurable (e.g., 1, 2, 4, …).
* FFS: Codebook generation details
* FFS: How to signal DAI values (e.g., increase of DAI bits for Alt 2 and Alt 3)
* FFS: Whether to apply time domain bundling of HARQ-ACK feedback

Agreement: (RAN1#104-e)

The multi-PUSCH scheduling defined in Rel-16 NR-U is the baseline for multi-PUSCH scheduling in Rel-17.

* FFS: Applicability to multi-PDSCH scheduling.

Agreement: (RAN1#104-e)

* For the multi-PUSCH scheduling in Rel-17, study the enhancement of the following in addition to Rel-16 multi-PUSCH scheduling.
  + CBGTI: Whether or not CBG (re)transmission is supported when more than one PUSCHs are scheduled (Already supported when only one PUSCH is scheduled).
  + CSI-request: Whether to apply same or different rule compared to Rel-16 (e.g., the PUSCH that carries the AP-CSI feedback is the first PUSCH that satisfies the multiplexing timeline).
  + TDRA: Down-select among
    - Alt 1: TDRA table is extended such that each row indicates up to [X, FFS for X] multiple PUSCHs (continuous in time-domain). Each PUSCH has a separate SLIV and mapping type. The number of scheduled PUSCHs is signalled by the number of indicated valid SLIVs in the row of the TDRA table signalled in DCI.
    - Alt 2: TDRA table is extended such that each row indicates up to [X, FFS for X] multiple PUSCHs (that can be non-continuous in time-domain). Each PUSCH has a separate SLIV and mapping type. The number of scheduled PUSCHs is signalled by the number of indicated valid SLIVs in the row of the TDRA table signalled in DCI.
    - Alt 3: TDRA table is extended such that each row indicates up to 8 multiple PUSCH groups (that can be non-continuous between PUSCH groups). Each PUSCH group has a separate SLIV, mapping type and number of slots/PUSCHs N. Within each PUSCH group, N PUSCHs occupy the same OFDM symbols indicated by the SLIV and mapping type. The number of scheduled PUSCHs is the sum of number of PUSCHs in all PUSCH groups in the row of the TDRA table signalled in DCI.
  + FDRA: Whether/how to enhance FDRA e.g., by increasing RBG size or changing allocation granularity
  + Frequency hopping: Whether/how to support frequency hopping for scheduled PUSCHs, e.g., inter-PUSCH/intra-PUSCH hopping
  + URLLC related fields such as priority indicator and open-loop power control parameter set indication: Whether/how to apply URLLC related fields for scheduled PUSCHs
  + Applicability to multi-PDSCH scheduling in Rel-17.
  + Note: Other enhancements are not precluded.

Agreement: (RAN1#104bis-e)

* The maximum number of PDSCHs that can be scheduled with a single DCI in Rel-17 is 8 for SCS of 480 and 960 kHz.
  + FFS: Further restrictions for 480 kHz to 4
  + FFS: A UE capability to select between 4 and 8 for 480 kHz SCS
  + Note: Multi-PDSCH scheduling for the case of 120 kHz SCS is still FFS as per prior agreement. This case can be addressed after this FFS has been decided.
* The maximum number of PUSCHs that can be scheduled with a single DCI in Rel-17 is 8.
  + FFS: Further restrictions for 120 kHz and 480 kHz SCS
  + FFS: A UE capability to select between different values for 120 kHz and 480 kHz SCS

Agreement: (RAN1#104bis-e)

For a DCI that can schedule multiple PDSCHs,

* MCS for the 1st TB: This appears only once in the DCI and applies commonly to the first TB of each PDSCH
* NDI for the 1st TB: This is signaled per PDSCH and applies to the first TB of each PDSCH
* RV for the 1st TB: This is signaled per PDSCH, with 2 bits if only a single PDSCH is scheduled or 1 bit for each PDSCH otherwise and applies to the first TB of each PDSCH
* HARQ process number: This applies to the first scheduled PDSCH and is incremented by 1 for subsequent PDSCHs (with modulo operation, if needed)
* FFS:
  + MCS/NDI/RV for the 2nd TB for each PDSCH, including whether scheduling of the 2nd TB for each PDSCH can be supported or not
  + Details of resource allocation related fields such as VRB-to-PRB mapping, PRB bundling size indicator, rate matching indicator, and ZP CSI-RS trigger
  + Whether/how to signal CBGFI/CBGTI if CBGFI/CBGTI is supported for multi-PDSCH scheduling
  + Details of fields that are common with multi-PUSCH scheduling, e.g., TDRA, FDRA, priority indicator, including potential enhancements

Agreement: (RAN1#104bis-e)

* For a DCI that can schedule multiple PUSCHs,
  + TDRA: Alt 2 (TDRA table is extended such that each row indicates up to 8 multiple PUSCHs (that can be non-continuous in time-domain). Each PUSCH has a separate SLIV and mapping type. The number of scheduled PUSCHs is implicitly indicated by the number of indicated valid SLIVs in the row of the TDRA table signalled in DCI.), as per agreement made in RAN1#104-e
    - FFS: signaling details
  + Note: Alt 2 does not preclude continuous resource allocation in time-domain.
* For a DCI that can schedule multiple PDSCHs,
  + TDRA: TDRA table is extended such that each row indicates up to 8 multiple PDSCHs (that can be non-continuous in time-domain). Each PDSCH has a separate SLIV and mapping type. The number of scheduled PDSCHs is implicitly indicated by the number of indicated valid SLIVs in the row of the TDRA table signalled in DCI.
    - FFS: signaling details
  + Note: This does not preclude continuous resource allocation in time-domain.
  + Note: Multi-PDSCH scheduling for the case of 120 kHz SCS is still FFS as per prior agreement. This case can be addressed after this FFS has been decided.

Agreement: (RAN1#104bis-e)

For enhancements of generating type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook corresponding to DCI that can schedule multiple PDSCHs, the following options can be considered,

* Option 1: The set of candidate PDSCH reception occasions is determined according to each SLIV of each row in the TDRA table and based on extension of K1 set
* Option 1a: The set of candidate PDSCH reception occasions is determined according to each SLIV of each row in the TDRA table
* Option 2: The set of candidate PDSCH reception occasions is determined according to the last SLIV of each row in the TDRA table
* FFS: Codebook generation details, including how to handle the collision with TDD DL/UL configuration and whether/how to extend K1 set based on K1 and slot offset between last PDSCH and other PDSCHs in a row in the TDRA table

Conclusion: (RAN1#104bis-e)

The following is observed for alternative 1 from prior agreement.

* For Alt 1 (C-DAI/T-DAI is counted per DCI) of generating type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook corresponding to DCI that can schedule multiple PDSCHs,
  + C-DAI/T-DAI in DL DCI: Same DAI overhead with Rel-16 single-PDSCH DCI
  + T-DAI in UL DCI:
    - In case of single codebook handling feedback for both single and multi-PDSCH scheduling, same DAI overhead with Rel-16 UL DCI
    - In case of separate sub-codebooks, need additional DAI field (with same bit-width of DAI with Rel-16 UL DCI), in UL DCI for all serving cells including a serving cell not configured with multi-PDSCH DCI
      * Note that DAI field increment for this case is similar for the case in Rel-15 where CBG is configured
  + HARQ-ACK codebook generation:
    - A separate sub-codebook can be generated when multi-PDSCH DCI is configured for a serving cell, similar to the way as 2nd sub-codebook is defined to handle CBG-based scheduling
      * FFS: whether single codebook or separate sub-codebooks is(are) generated when multi-PDSCH DCI is configured for a serving cell
      * FFS: how many sub-codebooks are generated when multi-PDSCH DCI is configured for a serving cell and CBG is configured for the serving cell and/or the other serving cell(s)
    - HARQ-ACK payload size is increased compared to single PDSCH scheduling only, since the number of HARQ-ACK bits corresponding to each DAI of the (sub-)codebook for multi-PDSCH DCI in case of separate sub-codebooks (or for all DL DCIs in case of single codebook) depends on the maximum configured number of PDSCHs for multi-PDSCH DCI across serving cells belonging to the same PUCCH cell group.
    - The number of HARQ-ACK bits for multi-PDSCH DCI in case of separate sub-codebooks, or for all DL DCIs in case of single codebook, does not depend on the number of actually scheduled PDSCHs, rather, it is fixed as the maximum configured number of PDSCHs.
    - FFS: time domain bundling of HARQ-ACK feedback, as per agreement in RAN1#104-e
  + Note that multi-PDSCH DCI refers to a DL DCI where at least one entry of the TDRA table allows scheduling more than one PDSCH

Conclusion: (RAN1#104bis-e)

The following is observed for alternative 2 from prior agreement.

* For Alt 2a (C-DAI/T-DAI is counted per PDSCH with a single codebook) of generating type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook corresponding to DCI that can schedule multiple PDSCHs,
  + C-DAI/T-DAI in DL DCI: Bit-width can be increased (FFS: by how much), in DL DCI not only for multi-PDSCH DCI but also for single-PDSCH DCI for all serving cells including a serving cell not configured with multi-PDSCH DCI
  + T-DAI in UL DCI: Bit-width can be increased (FFS: by how much), in UL DCI for all serving cells including a serving cell not configured with multi-PDSCH DCI
  + C-DAI/T-DAI in DL DCI and T-DAI in UL DCI shall be designed such that at most 3 consecutive DCI missing can be resolved, same as in Rel-15/16 NR.
    - FFS: details on increment of DAI field size
    - FFS: whether/how to handle the case where different DCI formats (e.g., DCI format 1\_0 and DCI format 1\_1) have different field sizes for C-DAI/T-DAI
  + HARQ-ACK codebook generation:
    - The number of HARQ-ACK bits depends on the number of scheduled PDSCHs.
    - FFS: ordering of the PDSCHs for DAI counting
    - FFS: time domain bundling of HARQ-ACK feedback, as per agreement in RAN1#104-e
  + Note that multi-PDSCH DCI refers to a DL DCI where at least one entry of the TDRA table allows scheduling more than one PDSCH

Conclusion: (RAN1#104bis-e)

The following is observed for alternative 3 from prior agreement.

* For Alt 3 (C-DAI/T-DAI is counted per M scheduled PDSCH(s), where M is configurable) of generating type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook corresponding to DCI that can schedule multiple PDSCHs,
  + If M equals to the maximum configured number of PDSCHs, Alt 3 is the same with Alt 1, if the same number of codebooks is assumed.
  + Else if M equals to 1, Alt 3 is the same with Alt 2.
  + Otherwise (i.e., 1<M<the maximum configured number of PDSCHs), Alt 3 is similar to Alt 2, except that
    - The number of HARQ-ACK bits corresponding to each DAI increases by M times.
    - NACK bits may be padded if the number of scheduled PDSCHs is not an integer multiple of M.
    - FFS: details on DAI field size
    - FFS: whether single codebook or separate sub-codebooks is(are) generated when multi-PDSCH DCI is configured for a serving cell
  + In addition, new RRC parameter to configure M needs to be introduced.
  + Note that multi-PDSCH DCI refers to a DL DCI where at least one entry of the TDRA table allows scheduling more than one PDSCH