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# Introduction

In this document, a summary of companies’ proposals for PUCCH coverage enhancement is provided.

# Dynamic PUCCH repetition factor indication

## Scope of dynamic PUCCH repetition factor indication

Regarding whether dynamic PUCCH repetition factor indication should be applied to semi-static PUCCH, the following agreement is made in RAN1 106e.

**Agreement**

**Dynamic PUCCH repetition factor indication for SR or P/SP-CSI on PUCCH is not supported in Rel-17.**

With the above agreement, in R1-2109889, a potential ambiguity is observed. The ambiguity is that whether SR or P/SP-CSI on PUCCH can utilize a PUCCH resource configured with repetition factor “nrofSlots-r17”. The following proposal is made, which basically allow UE to use the PUCCH resource configured with repetition factor “nrofSlots-r17”. But UE ignore the RRC parameter “nrofSlots-r17” and use the legacy RRC parameter nrofSlots to determine the repetition factor for this particular PUCCH resource.

In R1-2109889, Proposal 1: in the case a PUCCH resource is not associated with a scheduling DCI (e.g. PUCCH resource associated with CSI report) and the PUCCH resource is characterized by a dynamic repetition factor, the parameter nrofSlots is used for determining the repetition factor of the specific PUCCH resource.

Companies are welcome to provide comments to the above proposal in the following table.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Comment** |
| Nokia/NSB | Current agreement defines a principle: dynamic PUCCH repetition factor indication does not apply to SR or P/SP-CSI. However, this principle can be realized in at least two ways in practice:   1. SR and P/SP-CSI can only be mapped to PUCCH resources for which a number of repetitions is not configured, i.e., the per format config is used. 2. SR and P/SP-CSI can be mapped to any PUCCH resource, regardless of whether a per-resource number of repetitions is configured. When no per-resource rep. factor is configured then per format config is used. Conversely, when per-resource rep. factor is considered, then per format config is used instead.   Proposal 1 in R1-2109889 proposes to go for the understanding described in Approach 2.  As a matter of fact, both ways have pros and cons. However, Approach 2 seems the best approach for the following reasons.  According to Approach 1, NW would always need to configure at least a few PUCCH resources with no per-resource rep. factor configured, to accommodate for SR and P/SP-CSI. This creates a needless redundancy of configurations, which in turn would cause a reduction of the possible resource allocation options at NW when scheduling that resources of several UEs, which need to be properly fit in the time-frequency grid of the uplink or flexible slots (in this sense, the larger flexibility NW’s scheduler has, the better it is).  Conversely Approach 2 offers the possibility, if needed, to have a per-resource rep. factor configuration for each configured PUCCH resource. Thus, all PUCCH resources could have a per-resource configured rep-factor, but whenever such resources are used for SR of P/SP-CSI, the per format rep. factor applies instead (to ensure the most suitable SNR-depending rep. factor can be used). This would maximize flexibility of NW’s scheduler, both for the single and for the multi-UE case, since no “choice” would need to be made on “which PUCCH resource should be configured for SR and P/SP-CSI”. In fact, all PUCCH resources could be used for any PUCCH transmission now, and only UE’s behavior would be different (depending on what is actually transmitted on the PUCCH) but not more complex. |
| Intel | It seems the proposal is fine.  For PUCCH resource which is not associated with a scheduling DCI, if gNB configures the PUCCH resource with repetition factor, repetition factor configured within the PUCCH resource would override the repetition factor which is configured for the PUCCH format. |
| Apple | Without this proposal, gNB shall not map PUCCH without associated DCI to per resource repetition factor (which is our view). To save signaling overhead, we are ok to assume “otherwise” is ignored by UE, i.e. if (for example) SR is mapped to a PUCCH with dynamic repetition factor, UE just ignores the parameter and takes per format repetition factor, if configured. |
| Sharp | In our view, a Rel-15/16 repetition factor configured per PUCCH format isn’t needed to use if the new repetition factor is configured on a PUCCH resource associated with CSI report. We think it has no special handling. |
| Panasonic | The proposal looks fine. |
| Vivo | Fine with the proposal. |
| CATT | PUCCH resources associated with SR or P/SP-CSI are separately configured by RRC which will not be used for HARQ-ACK feedback for dynamic PDSCH.  Subsequently, gNB shall NOT configure the repetition factor “nrofSlots-r17” in these PUCCH resources. We do not see there is ambiguity. |
| ZTE | Fine with the proposal. |
| OPPO | The proposal is fine for not saying if this is dynamic PUCCH repetition. And it avoid the ambiguity that the selecting PUCCH resource with repetition number is not allowed.’ |
| Qualcomm | We don’t see any benefit in excluding repetition per PUCCH resource for other PUCCH. If the motivation is to ensure the agreement that excludes dynamic repetition for SR and P/SP-CSI, there is no need to exclude configured repetition per PUCCH resource, because in absence of dynamic indication of PUCCH resource, configured repetition per PUCCH resource is not dynamic indication. Adding extra restrictions (for configured repetition per PUCCH resource) just complicates the standard spec. without any benefit. |
| Ericsson | Support the proposal |
| Nokia/NSB | @Qualcomm: We do not agree with your understanding. We realized the dynamic repetition configuration via per PUCCH resource configuration. This new framework creates an ambiguity, which the Proposal is trying to solve, while guaranteeing that **a repetition factor can be configured in each PUCCH resource**. We believe this ensure that the most flexible configuration of PUCCH resources can be realized. This is beneficial for both NW and UE, with no complexity increase at either side. |

Based on the received comments so far, most of the companies are fine with the proposal 1 In R1-2109889. Based on FL’s understanding, the proposal indeed clarifies an ambiguity that whether P/SP CSI and SR can use PUCCH resource with “nrofSlots-r17” configured. Therefore, the follow FL proposal is made.

FL proposal 1-1: **For a PUCCH resource to transmit a PUCCH without an associated scheduling DCI (e.g. P/SP-CSI or SR), if the PUCCH resource is configured with RRC parameter “nrofSlots-r17”, “nrofSlots-r17” is ignored and the RRC parameter “nrofSlots” is used for determining the repetition factor of the specific PUCCH resource.**

Companies are welcome to provide further comments to the above FL proposal

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Comment** |
|  |  |

For the scope of dynamic PUCCH repetition factor indication, the remaining open issue is whether to support dynamic PUCCH repetition factor indication to HARQ-ACK for SPS PDSCH?

Regarding the above open issue, companies have the following proposals.

In R1-2108848: Proposal 1: Dynamic PUCCH repetition indication is supported for HARQ-ACK for the first SPS PDSCH with associated with the activation DCI, while not supported for HARQ-ACK for the remainging SPS PDSCHs other than the first SPS PDSCH

In R1-2109243: Proposal 2: It is not necessary to apply dynamic repetition factor indication on the HARQ-ACK feedback for SPS PDSCH.

In R1-2109457: Proposal 4: Dynamic PUCCH repetition factor indication for HARQ-ACK for SPS PDSCH can be considered. If supported, dynamic PUCCH repetition factor indication should be based on PRI in activation DCI.

In R1-2109627: Proposal 1: Dynamic PUCCH repetition factor indication for HARQ-ACK of SPS PDSCH is not supported.

In R1-2110215: Proposal 1: Defer consideration of support for dynamically indicated PUCCH repetition factor for HARQ-ACK of SPS PDSCH to when it can be addressed together with dynamically indicated PUCCH repetition factor for periodic and semi-persistent CSI

In R1-2110204 Proposal 2: Support applying dynamically indicated PUCCH repetition factor to PUCCH carrying Ack/Nack for SPS

* FFS details, e.g. it can be implicitly indicated based on configuration of PUCCH resource for each PUCCH, or by switching of associated PUCCH resources, implicitly based on the dynamic indication via PDCCH
* FFS the required configuration changes
* FFS the expiry of the repetition factor for other PUCCH (or whether it should be applied in a semi-persistent manner).

The following are the input collected during RAN1 106e in email discussion, which is provided here for information purpose.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Comments** |
| China Telecom | We think dynamic PUCCH repetition factor indication to P/SP CSI or SR is not support. |
| CMCC | Not support the dynamic PUCCH repetition factor to P/SP CSI or SR.  For the Periodic and semi-persistent CSI and SR, the repetition should be based on the RRC configurations. Once the UE needs enhancements for the periodic feedbacks, there is no need to update the repetition factor from time to time. |
| Vivo | No need to discuss. The semi-static PUCCH or P/SP PUCCH is out of scope. |
| Intel | We do not support dynamic PUCCH repetition factor indication for P/SP CSI or SR and HARQ-ACK for SPS PDSCH.  This is semi-static PUCCH resource configuration, where semi-static repettition factor should be used for PUCCH. It is not clear the motivation. |
| Nokia/NSB | In our view, use of dynamic PUCCH repetition factor should be limited to dynamic HARQ-ACK. P/SP reporting, or HARQ-ACK for SPS PDSCH are designed not to require further dynamic adjustments. The whole point of configuring them as P/SP would seem void if this were not the case. Concerning P/SP CSI, indeed its payload size is static, hence gNB can set static repetition factor accordingly. Concerning SPS PDSCH, it should be noted its main use is in the context of URLLC, for which dynamic signaling does not seem suitable. |
| Samsung | Do not support dynamic indication of repetitions for semi-static configuration of resources. That can actually be detrimental as, by definition, P/SP UCI is not associated with a DCI format and whatever was indicated for transmission at time A by a DCI format may not be suitable for transmission at time B, C, D, … when there is no DCI format. Relying on existence of regular DCI formats to update repetitions of P/SP UCI is not reasonable. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We do not support dynamic indication of repetitions for P/SP CSI or SR |
| Apple | Do not support dynamic indication for P/SP-PUCCH (wasn’t this same topic discussed in FL’s summary in 105-e?!) |
| Ericsson | We agree that P/SP CSI can get greater coverage by configuring repetition. However, dynamic repetition (regardless of whether it is HARQ-ACK or CSI) is about improving spectral efficiency while maintaining coverage: the gNB selects repetition factor according to current channel conditions. There is no mechanism for repeating aperiodically triggered CSI today, regardless of if it is on PUSCH or PUCCH, and so the next best thing we can do is to dynamically change the repetition factor of P/SP CSI. **Since in our understanding HARQ-ACK is less of a bottleneck than CSI, we don’t see how the intent of the WI is met unless we somehow support dynamic repetition for CSI.** |
| LG | Since the P/SP CSI does not have a corresponding DCI, in order to dynamically indicate it, introducing a new DCI for indication for this purpose or an implicit indication method can be considered. Introducing corresponding DCI is not feasible since it leads too large spec impact. On the other hand, indicating in an implicit way has too large a spec impact either, and the simplest way to dynamically indicate it is using AP CSI, which is feasible. Therefore, it is not supported. |
| Sharp | We don’t support dynamic PUCCH repetition factor indication to P/SP-CSI.  For example, both semi-static PUCCH with 8 repetitions and dynamic PUCCH without repetition can be realized to maximize coverage for the semi-static PUCCH without disturbing utilization efficiency of the dynamic PUCCH.  We support dynamic PUCCH repetition factor indication to HARQ-ACK for SPS PDSCH if the same PUCCH repetition factor indication mechanism can be reused. |
| Panasonic | We think periodic is purely semi-static configuration, and therefore, to support dynamic indication is difficult. The repetition factor for periodic CSI would be set considering the maximum payload size of CSI reporting. For semi-static CSI or HARQ-ACK for SPS PDSCH, to introduce PRI like indication to activation DCI is one of possibility if the motivation to introduce dynamic indication is clarified. |
| NEC | We don’t support dynamic PUCCH for P/SP-CSI. It may increase indication complexity and the gain seems to be not large compared with legacy static PUCCH repetition.  We think dynamic PUCCH repetition factor for SPS PDSCH can be supported without any extra effort. |
| CATT | Do not support dynamic PUCCH repetition factor indication to HARQ-ACK for SPS PDSCH. The flexibility is still limited even if the PUCCH repetition number for SPS-PDSCH could be dynamically indicated by the active DCI, since the repetition number remains unchanged until a new active DCI is received. |
| ZTE | We don’t support dynamic PUCCH repetition for P/SP-CSI and SR. There is no associated PRI for dynamic indication.  Support dynamic PUCCH repetition factor for SPS PDSCH HARQ-ACK, otherwise additional spec effort is needed. Because PRI in activation DCI would anyway indicate a PUCCH resource for SPS PDSCH HARQ-ACK, and the indicated PUCCH resource could be associated with one repetition factor. Without any additional clarification, dynamic repetition would be automatically supported for SPS PDSCH HARQ-ACK. |
| Spreadtrum | Dynamic signalling is not needed. Instead, we may study implicit ways to enable PUCCH repetition factor indication to P/SP CSI /SR/HARQ-ACK/SPS PDSCH. |
| Xiaomi | Do not support dynamic PUCCH repetition factor indication for P/SP-CSI or HARQ-ACK for SPS PDSCH. |
| Qualcomm | We support dynamic PUCCH repetition indication for HARQ-ACK of SPS PDSCH, We think in terms of coverage, the motivation is the same as scheduled PDSCH. |

Given this issue has been discussed for a few meetings, it would be good to conclude this issue as soon as possible. But before settling down this issue, FL would like to collect companies’ view on the following aspects related to SPS PDSCH.

**FL question 1: Whether the** **HARQ-ACK for the first SPS PDSCH associated with the activation DCI is considered as SPS HARQ-ACK or dynamic HARQ-ACK? In other words, whether dynamic PUCCH repetition indication is supported for HARQ-ACK for the first SPS PDSCH associated with the activation DCI?**

**FL question 2: Whether the HARQ-ACK corresponding to the** **SPS Release DCI is considered as SPS HARQ-ACK or dynamic HARQ-ACK? In other words, whether dynamic PUCCH repetition indication is supported for HARQ-ACK corresponding to the SPS Release DCI?**

Companies are welcome to provide answers to the above questions in the following table.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Answer** |
| Nokia/NSB | In our view, current specification should be kept. The HARQ-ACK corresponding to the SPS PDSCH associated with the activation DCI is considered dynamic HARQ-ACK. The HARQ-ACK corresponding to the SPS Release DCI is considered dynamic HARQ-ACK. Possible, arguably unnecessary, optimizations made available by this situation should be up to NW and no further optimization to HARQ-ACK for SPS PDSCH should be performed in this AI. |
| Intel | Our understanding is that HARQ-ACK for the first SPS PDSCH associated with the activation DCI and HARQ-ACK corresponding to the SPS Release DCI are considered as dynamic HARQ-ACK feedback, given that it is determined based on PRI and/or CCE index.  We think it may not be necessary to consider dynamic repetition factor indication for these HARQ-ACK, also including HARQ-ACK for SPS PDSCH. |
| Samsung | If a PUCCH transmission with HARQ-ACK is associated with a DCI format that indicates a PUCCH resource, it does not matter if the HARQ-ACK in response to TB reception, SPS PDSCH activation/deactivation, SCell dormancy, or possible other cases introduced in Rel-17. If the PUCCH transmission with HARQ-ACK is not associated with a DCI format that indicates a PUCCH resource, such as a PUCCH with HARQ-ACK only for SPS PDSCH receptions, Rel-16 applies. Basically, current agreements and specifications are sufficient to describe the UE behaviour. |
| Apple | HARQ-ACK for activation/release SPS “are” associated with DCI, and by default are excluded from this discussion, in our view. Now to extend dynamic indication of repetition factor to other than the 1st SPS PDSCH, for which in current spec the PUCCH resource is RRC indicated, is not needed. |
| Sharp | In our view, PUCCH repetition indication using new repetition parameter configured on a PUCCH resource can be supported for HARQ-ACK corresponding to the SPS activation/release. In both cases, PRI-based indication can be reused. |
| LG | It is unnecessary to specify new mechanism to support it considering current DCI structure, furthermore it is not desirable to enhance something good to have since only couple of meetings left. |
| Panasonic | In our view, both HARQ-ACK for the first SPS PDSCH associated with the activation DCI and HARQ-ACK corresponding to the SPS release DCI are considered as dynamic HARQ-ACK as current specification. Then, dynamic PUCCH repetition indication based on PRI should be reused. |
| Vivo | When SPS PDSCH is activated or released by DCI, this HARQ-ACK is indicated by PRI/CCE index and it is a dynamic HARQ-ACK. After SPS PDSCH is activated, semi-static configured HARQ-ACK resources are used for the feedback of SPS PDSCH. |
| CATT | The important principle is whether PRI in DCI will be used to indicate the PUCCH resource. So in our understanding:  Q1: No. In the current specification, the PRI field in the activation DCI is reserved. HARQ-ACK for the first SPS PDSCH associated with the activation DCI is transmitted with HARQ-ACK for the subseqeunt SPS PDSCH(s) in the same PUCCH selected from one of the PUCCH resources configured by RRC in *sps-PUCCH-AN-List* according to the total UCI bits. In other words, only one candidate PUCCH resource (not indicated by PRI) is available for a specific UCI bit size.  Q2: Yes. The HARQ-ACK according to the SPS release DCI is considered as dynamic HARQ-ACK and transmitted in the PUCCH resource indicated according to the PRI field in the release DCI. Hence, dynamic PUCCH repetition indication can be supported for HARQ-ACK corresponding to the SPS Release DCI. |
| ZTE | We agree that both HARQ-ACK for the first SPS PDSCH associated with the activation DCI and HARQ-ACK corresponding to the SPS release DCI are considered as dynamic HARQ-ACK. So, we support dynamic repetition indication for PUCCH carrying these HARQ-ACK. |
| OPPO | It is unclear if those PUCCHs can be possibly “dynamic” as they are triggering indication and would not be send frequently. If it is configured with insufficient resource, just reconfigure it. Seems reusing current specification is good enough. |
| CMCC | The HARQ-ACK of SPS PDSCH activation or release could be considered as dynamic indicated HARQ-ACK. They should be considered for the PUCCH repetitions. |
| Qualcomm | For both questions, we think they can be considered as dynamic HARQ-ACK. |
| Spreadtrum | Q1: No. The PRI field in the activation DCI is reserved.  Q2: Yes. The PRI field in the activation DCI is valid. Also there are other type of HARQ-ACK for un-scheduling DCI, such as dormancy BWP only switching DCI, Type 3 HARQ-ACK CB DCI. These can be treated as dynamic too. In general, we think the valid PRI in the DCI can be regarded as dynamic. |

Based on the majority view, both HARQ-ACK for the first SPS PDSCH associated with the activation DCI and HARQ-ACK corresponding to the SPS Release DCI should be considered as dynamic HARQ-ACK and they can support dynamic PUCCH repetition factor indication. CATT and Spreadtrum stated that “The PRI field in the activation DCI for SPS PDSCH is reserved”. Can CATT and Spreadtrum please point to FL the spec text that support this statement, in the following table.

Based on input collected in above table, the following FL proposal is made.

**FL proposed conclusion 0: For HARQ-ACK for SPS PDSCH, in NR Rel-17**

* **The dynamic PUCCH repetition factor indication mechanism agreed in RAN1 106e applies to the following two cases:**
  + **HARQ-ACK for the first SPS PDSCH associated with the activation DCI.**
  + **HARQ-ACK corresponding to the SPS Release DCI**
* **The dynamic PUCCH repetition factor indication mechanism agreed in RAN1 106e does not apply to other SPS PDSCH beyond the above two cases.**

Companies are welcome to provide comments to the above conclusion.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Comment** |
| Vivo | Support |
| LG | We would like to know the motivation of supporting dynamic PUCCH repetition factor indication for HARQ-ACK for SPS PDSCH. Furthermore if there is no RRC impact, discussion can be postponed. |
| CATT | In the current 213 spec, Section 9.2.1:   |  | | --- | | If the UE is provided *SPS-PUCCH-AN-List* and transmits UCI information bits that include only HARQ-ACK information bits in response to one or more SPS PDSCH receptions and SR, if any, the UE determines a PUCCH resource to be  - a PUCCH resource provided by *sps-PUCCH-AN-ResourceID* obtained from the first entry in *sps-PUCCH-AN-List* if including 1 or 2 HARQ-ACK information bits and a positive or negative SR on one SR transmission occasion if transmission of HARQ-ACK information and SR occurs simultaneously, or  … |   So:   * The spec does not state that the 1st SPS PDSCH is not a SPS PDSCH. * In case if only one SPS PDSCH is received, this SPS PDSCH is apparently the 1st SPS PDSCH. And the yellow part is suggesting that the PUCCH of the first entry in *sps-PUCCH-AN-List* should be used (not indicated by PRI field in DCI).   To clarify, our intention is not to extend the usage of PRI field beyond Rel-16 mechanism.  What is your view? |
| Samsung | The specifications are clear and CATT’s understanding is correct. We object to including the first sub-bullet. |
| Intel | We tend to think this is not needed. The motivation is not clear. |
| Apple | Agree with FL’s proposal in principal (maybe a conclusion on the first bullet and an agreement on the second bullet is a better arrangement). |
| Spreadtrum | We agree with CATT.  Actually, there is no explicit statement awards the first SPS PDSCH. So we think the first SPS PDSCH after the activation DCI is still a normal SPS PDSCH. The HARQ-ACK feedback on PUCCH resource in Rel-15 is configured as n1PUCCH-AN, in Rel-16 is *SPS-PUCCH-AN-List.* |
| Nokia/NSB | Disagree with CATT and Spreadtrum.  The first PDSCH following SPS activation is just a dynamically scheduled PDSCH with CS-RNTI. It falls in the category “DCI format scheduling a PDSCH reception or a SPS PDSCH release”, as we can read in many places in TS 38.213. Therefore, the HARQ for SPS activation simply follows what is described for normal dynamic PDSCH, i.e., when “UE detects a DCI format scheduling a PDSCH reception”.  We agree that if we take the excerpt that CATT shared, some doubts may arise. However, that excerpt can be better understood, i.e., with no ambiguity, by looking at 9.2.3, where we can read the following:    Here it is crystal clear that PUCCH resources provided by SPS-PUCCH-AN-List (if any) are used only for SPS **without DCI/PDCCH** (i.e., not for the SPS activation). Fallback solution when SPS-PUCCH-AN-is the legacy R15 SPS PUCCH resource, provided by n1PUCCH-AN.  Similarly, the SPS deactivation provided via DCI does not fall in the category “PDSCH reception without a corresponding PDCCH” but rather in the category “DCI format scheduling a PDSCH reception or a SPS PDSCH release”.  We support FL proposal, which is technically correct. |
| ZTE | Support the proposal. Agree with the analysis from Nokia. |
| FL | @CATT, Samsung, and Spreadtrum, can you please check the spec Nokia provided and let us know if you agree with Nokia’s understanding, which by the way is FL’s personal understanding of the spec as well.  By the way, for the spec CATT provided “If the UE is provided *SPS-PUCCH-AN-List* and transmits UCI information bits that include only HARQ-ACK information bits in response to one or more SPS PDSCH receptions and SR”, FL’s personal reading is that the “SPS PDSCH reception” is referring to the SPS PDSCH without associated activation DCI.  @Intel: the motivation/intention of this conclusion is very simple. It is to close this open issue on whether dynamic repetition factor indication can be applied to A/N for SPS PDSCH or not. |
| Spreadtrum | After further checked with our product colleagues, we would like update our views to support this conclusion.  However, we also notice that at least three companies have different understanding towards the first SPS PDSCH. So a clearer statement or conclusion for the first SPS PDSCH would be better for R15/16, which can be similar as Nokia mentioned:  **HARQ-ACK for the first SPS PDSCH associated with the activation DCI,** *regarded as a PDSCH reception scheduled by DCI format.* |
| CATT | @FL, Nokia,  Thanks for the effort. We noticed the 213 part quoted by Nokia. It gives guidance on how a UE shall determine the PUCCH resource for a SPS reception without a corresponding PDCCH, when *SPS-PUCCH-AN-List* is not provided. However, we do not think it clearly supports ‘A UE does not use the PUCCH resource for the 1st SPS PDSCH, indicated in *SPS-PUCCH-AN-List,* when provided*’*.  Specifically, if the 1st SPS PDSCH does not use the PUCCH resource provided by *sps-PUCCH-AN-ResourceID*, shouldn’t the spec spell out, e.g. in the following part (using [])?   |  | | --- | | If the UE is provided *SPS-PUCCH-AN-List* and transmits UCI information bits that include only HARQ-ACK information bits in response to one or more SPS PDSCH receptions and SR [without a corresponding PDCCH], if any, the UE determines a PUCCH resource to be  - a PUCCH resource provided by *sps-PUCCH-AN-ResourceID* obtained from the first entry in *sps-PUCCH-AN-List* if including 1 or 2 HARQ-ACK information bits and a positive or negative SR on one SR transmission occasion if transmission of HARQ-ACK information and SR occurs simultaneously, or  … |   It is unfortunate that the spec description is ambiguous in this part and causing confusion not only to one company. We would appreciate if it can be clearly clarified by this opportunity, e.g. by a note like:  **Note: It is confirmed that a UE transmits HARQ-ACK feedback for the first SPS PDSCH in a PUCCH resource indicated by the PRI field of the activation DCI, which is the same with Rel-16***.* |
| Samsung | Thanks for the further discussion above.  In our understanding:  ***SPS-PUCCH-AN-List*** is for Rel-16 where there can be more than 1 SPS PDSCHs for a UE.  ***n1PUCCH-AN*** is for single SPS-Config from Rel-15. The SPS-Config includes ***n1PUCCH-AN*** which is an ID to a PUCCH resource included in PUCCH-Config. It is a single PUCCH resource. There cannot be dynamic indication of the PUCCH resource for SPS PDSCH – it is unique. |
| Intel | Technically speaking, we do not think the conclusion is needed.  Our understanding is that based on the agreement from the last meeting (copied below), it is clear that if a PUCCH is associated with a scheduling DCI, dynamic PUCCH repetition factor indication is supported. This covers the cases for 1) dynamic HARQ-ACK feedback 2) HARQ-ACK feedback for HARQ-ACK for the first SPS PDSCH associated with the activation DCI, 3) HARQ-ACK corresponding to the SPS Release DCI.  Further, we also need to cover other cases, e.g., when PUCCH carrying dynamic HARQ-ACK overlaps with PUCCH resource carrying other UCI types like P-CSI, SR, etc.. In this case, dynamic repetition factor indication is applied for the determined PUCCH resource which is associated with a DCI based on the agreement.  Based on the above, our view is that the existing agreement is sufficient to cover the conclusions. We do not need additional conclusions. Otherwise, we need to list all the cases, which seems not necessary.  **Confirm the following working assumption**  **Working assumption:**  In Rel-17, for a PUCCH with associated scheduling DCI, support the following for dynamic PUCCH repetition factor indication.   * Enhance RRC signaling to allow configuration of PUCCH repetition factor per PUCCH resource. Reuse Rel-16 PUCCH resource indication mechanism based on “PUCCH resource indicator” (PRI) field and starting CCE index (when applicable based on Rel-16 spec) of DCI to indicate a PUCCH resource and its associated repetition factor.   + FFS: RRC signaling enhancement details |
| Apple | @CATT, on the red part that you’ve added, at least I asked to be added in Rel-16 CR phase, but that portion of spec was so clear to everybody “it is only applicable to SPS PDSCH receptions without a corresponding DCI” that the editor at the time didn’t take it (and I believe he was right). I suggest companies who have different understanding on activation/release SPS (for which the PUCCH is considered as dynamic PUCCH), please check with their R16 URLLC delegates.  Going back to FL’s proposal, we are fine with FL’s proposal although we share similar view as Intel (previously we suggested to take a conclusion, and we think conclusion is helpful to clear all ambiguities, but given the current spec and prior agreements in R17, everything should be already clear). |

Based on the discussion in the above table, it should be clear that HARQ-ACK for the first SPS PDSCH associated with the activation DCI and HARQ-ACK corresponding to the SPS Release DCI should be categorized as PUCCH with associated scheduling DCI and they are covered by previous agreement. The only case need to be concluded is the HARQ-ACK for other SPS PDSCHs. For that case, FL still prefer to have an affirmative conclusion to formally document this discussion. Therefore, the following updated conclusion is proposed.

**Updated FL proposed conclusion 0: In NR Rel-17, the dynamic PUCCH repetition factor indication mechanism agreed in RAN1 106e does not apply to HARQ-ACK for SPS PDSCH except for the following two cases**

* + **HARQ-ACK for the first SPS PDSCH associated with the activation DCI.**
  + **HARQ-ACK corresponding to the SPS release DCI**

**Note: HARQ-ACK for the first SPS PDSCH associated with the activation DCI and HARQ-ACK corresponding to the SPS release DCI are categorized as PUCCH with associated scheduling DCI**

Companies are welcome to provide comments to the above conclusion.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Comment** |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## Applicability of dynamic PUCCH repetition factor indication

Based on the agreements/conclusion made in RAN1 #105e and RAN1 #106e under IIoT/URLLC WI, dynamic PUCCH repetition is applied to short PUCCH format 0 and 2.

Agreement:

* Support sub-slot-based PUCCH repetition for HARQ-ACK based on the Rel.16 PUCCH procedure for slot-based PUCCH applied to sub-slot-based PUCCH.
  + Note: The intention is to take the Rel.16 slot-based PUCCH by replacing with “sub-slot” appropriately, without further optimization unless necessary.
  + FFS whether or not there is any restriction for the applicability of sub-slot-based PUCCH repetition for HARQ-ACK
  + Dynamic repetition indication is supported also for sub-slot-based PUCCH in Rel.17.
    - FFS: If the method to be specified in CovEnh WI for slot-based PUCCH repetition can be directly applied to sub-slot PUCCH or if changes are needed.

Agreement:

* + Support PUCCH repetition for PUCCH formats 0 and 2 at least for sub-slot-based PUCCH repetition.
    - FFS: Support for slot-based PUCCH repetition

**Conclusion**

The dynamic repetition indication solution for slot-based PUCCH repetition from the RAN1#105-e working assumption from Cov. Enh. WI can be directly applied for dynamic repetition indication for sub-slot based PUCCH repetition.

**Agreement**

Support slot-based PUCCH repetition for PUCCH Format 0 and Format 2 also for single TRP operation.

The support is subject to independent UE capability indication

Apparently, dynamic repetition factor indication should also be applied to long PUCCH format 1,3,4, as this is the intention anyway for this WI. Furthermore, based on companies’ input in the contributions, majority companies support dynamic repetition factor indication for long PUCCH format 1,3,4.

With the above, FL has the following conclusion to clarify the applicability of dynamic PUCCH repetition.

**FL proposed conclusion 1: Support dynamic PUCCH repetition factor indication for all PUCCH formats including format 0, 1, 2, 3, 4.**

Companies are welcome to provide comments to the above conclusion in the following table.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Comment** |
| Nokia/NSB | Agree. |
| InterDigital | Support. |
| Intel | We are fine with the conclusion. |
| Samsung | OK |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support the FL’s proposed conclusion |
| Sharp | OK |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support |
| LG | It needs to be clarified that since we agreed to support dynamic PUCCH repetition with RRC enhancement, does the repetition of short PUCCH is indicated by same mechanism?  @LG: Thanks for the comment. It is reflected in the updated FL conclusion. |
| Panasonic | We support the FL proposed conclusion. |
| vivo | Support |
| CATT | Agree. |
| ZTE | Support |
| China Telecom | Support |
| OPPO | The scheme should be specified in URLLC session. It is difficult to specify sub-slot level repetition in the same way of slot level.  If we mixed that specification in CE session. I afraid they actually have UE capabilities mixed. Is that a right approach?  I guess the motivation is to reusing the PRI indication, this is reasonable. But we can just ask URLLC session to reused CE agreements on that PRI indication.  @ OPPO: Since the dynamic repetition factor indication mechanism is agreed in this session. It is better to clarify in this session that it applies to all PUCCH format, rather than ask URLLC session to reuse CE agreements. By the way, there is no official way to ask URLLC session to do that as we cannot send LS within RAN1 😊 |
| Spreadtrum | Support |
| Ericsson | Support |
| OPPO2 | To FL: It seems the proposal here is very ambiguous by mixing the functionality of URLLC and Coverage Enhancement. It is agreed that format 0 and 2 is in sub-slot level. Slot level will be FFS. But if we support all the format in the same frame work. The long format will only have slot level. Then, does that means the sub-slot or slot level should be format dependent?  It also unclear for the URLLC capability sub-slot level will be specific for URLLC UE. If we put them with coverage enhancement, should that means CE UE have to support sub-slot level processing? |

Consider the comments received, the conclusion is slightly updated as below.

**Updated FL conclusion 1: Support dynamic PUCCH repetition factor indication for all PUCCH formats including format 0, 1, 2, 3, 4 with a unified mechanism as agreed in RAN1 106e under agenda 8.8.2.**

## Other proposals

There are a few other proposals mentioned in submitted contributions to this agenda. FL’s initial assessment is that the discussion of those proposals can be deprioritized, comparing to proposals in Section 2.1 and 2.2.

In R1-2110049, Proposal 6: Support the existing mechanism in 38.213 Sec. 9.2.3 when number of resources per PUCCH resource set is up to 32.

* Combine existing mechanisms based on PRI, NCCE and nCCE,0 to indicate the PUCCH resource with repetition factor within a PUCCH resource set up to 64 PUCCH resources

In R1-2110204, Proposal 1: Also using other properties of PDCCH (e.g. PDCCH aggregation level), in addition to PRI and starting CCE index, to indicate the PUCCH resource.

In R1-2110204, Proposal 3: Support enhancing RRC signaling to allow dynamic indication of frequency hopping for PUCCH repetition via indication of PUCCH resource.

In R1-2110204, Proposal 4: Support implicit indication of PUCCH repetition factor based on beam selection.

In R1-2110099, Proposal 1: The following methods to configure PUCCH repetition for the UE without dedicated PUCCH resource configuration should be studied.

* PUCCH repetition is indicated by using repetition number of PUSCH.
* PUCCH repetition is indicated by PRI and/or system information.
* Introduce a PUCCH resource set with repetition number.

In R1-2110240, Proposal 1: For supporting dynamic indication of the repetition factor for PUCCH repetitions in NR Rel-17 coverage enhancements, PRI table can be enhanced to map each PUCCH resource with a repetition factor.

In R1-2110240, Proposal 2: For supporting dynamic indication of the repetition factor for PUCCH repetitions in NR Rel-17 coverage enhancements, consider increasing maximum the number of PRI bits from 3 to 4 to allow more flexibility in terms of multiple repetition factors associated with each of the PUCCH resource.

Companies are welcome to provide comments to the above proposals in the following table.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Comment** |
| Samsung | RAN1 had extensive discussion in RAN1#106-e and it was agreed to confirm the WA. That should not have happened if the WA was not sufficient or had any problem. Companies bringing new proposals at this meeting supported confirming the WA and therefore agreed that it provides all necessary functionality without any problem. We do not support any enhancements/changes to the agreement in this WI. |
| Apple | In our view, RAN1 shall discuss the exact formulation on PRI/CCE to map a PUCCH resource, at least when number of resources within a set is more than 32. Alternatively, there has to be an agreement that number of resources per set (with/without per resource repetition factor) is never more than 32. |
| LG | Increasing the number of the PUCCH resource or PUCCH resource set that can be indicated by expansion of indication method by considering PDCCH aggregation level, CCE index can be considered. However the necessary of it should be forementioned. |
| CATT | Although some of above proposals may be ‘nice to have’, we think none of them is essential to support dynamic PUCCH repetition. |

# DMRS bundling across PUCCH repetitions

The second objective of this agenda item is to “specify mechanism to support DMRS bundling across PUCCH repetitions.” Under this objective, a few topics are addressed in companies’ contributions. The topics are summarized as below.

## DMRS bundling scheme and signalling

### Time domain window design details

In RAN1 #106e, after a heated discussion, the following working assumption was agreed for time domain window design for DMRS bundling across PUSCH repetitions.

**Working assumption:**

For joint channel estimation for PUSCH repetition type A of PUSCH repetitions of the same TB, all the repetitions are covered by one or multiple consecutive/non-consecutive configured TDWs.

   Each configured TDW consists of one or multiple consecutive physical slots.

   The window length *L* of the configured TDW(s) can be explicitly configured with a single value~~and~~*~~L~~*~~is no longer than the maximum duration~~.

‐   FFS: The maximum value of *L* ~~is the duration of all repetitions~~

‐   FFS: Solutions to error propagation issue if ~~for~~ *L* is longer than the maximum duration is to be discussed further.

‐   FFS: The window length *L* is configured per UL BWP

   The start of the first configured TDW is the first PUSCH transmission

‐   FFS: The first available slot/symbol, or the first physical slot/symbol for the first PUSCH transmission.

   The start of other configured TDWs can be implicitly determined prior to first repetition.

‐   FFS: The configured TDWs are consecutive for paired spectrum/SUL band

‐   FFS: The start of the configured TDWs for unpaired spectrum is implicitly determined based on semi-static DL/UL configuration.

   The end of the last configured TDW is the end of the last PUSCH transmission.

‐   FFS: The end of the configured TDW is the last available slot/symbol, or the last physical slot/symbol for the last PUSCH transmission.

   Within one configured TDW, one or multiple actual TDWs can be implicitly determined:

‐   The start of the first actual TDW is the first PUSCH transmission within the configured TDW.

* FFS: The first available slot/symbol, or the first physical slot/symbol for the first PUSCH transmission.

‐   After one actual TDW starts, UE is expected to maintain the power consistency and phase continuity until one of the following conditions is met, then the actual TDW is ended.

* The actual TDW reaches the end of the last PUSCH transmission within the configured TDW.

  FFS: The end of the actual TDW is the last available slot/symbol, or the last physical slot/symbol for the last PUSCH transmission.

* An event occurs that violates power consistency and phase continuity

  FFS: The events may include e.g., a DL slot based on DL/UL configuration for unpaired spectrum, the actual TDW reaches the maximum duration, DL reception/monitoring occasion for unpaired spectrum, high priority transmission, frequency hopping, precoder cycling.

  FFS: The end of the actual TDW is the last available slot/symbol of the PUSCH transmission right before an event such that the power consistency and phase continuity are violated.

‐   If the power consistency and phase continuity are violated due to an event, whether a new actual TDW is created is subject to UE capability of supporting restarting DMRS bundling.

* If UE is capable of restarting DM-RS bundling, one new actual TDW is created after the event,

  FFS: The start of the new actual TDW is the first available slot/symbol for PUSCH transmission after the event.

* If UE is not capable of restarting DM-RS bundling, no new actual TDW is created until the end of the configured TDW.
* FFS: UE capability of restarting DMRS bundling is applied only to dynamic event or not

Note 1: A ‘configured TDW’ refers to a time domain window whose length can be configured to ‘L’ and whose start and end is determined as described above.

Note 2: An ‘actual TDW’ refers to a time domain window during whose entire duration the DM-RS bundling is actually applied. An ‘actual TDW’ duration is always less than or equal to the ‘configure TDW’ duration.

Note 3: Whether the terms ‘configured TDW’ and ‘actual TDW’ are revised to other terms and if such terminology is used in specifications is to be further discussed.

Since almost all companies prefer to have a common TDW(time domain window) design between PUCCH and PUSCH DMRS bundling. The following is proposed by FL

**FL proposal 1: the working assumption agreed in RAN1 106e on TDM (time domain window) in agenda 8.8.1.3 is reused for DMRS bundling for PUCCH repetitions, by replacing “PUSCH repetition/transmission” with “PUCCH repetition/transmission”.**

Companies are welcome to provide comments to the above FL proposal in the following table.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Comments** |
| Nokia/NSB | Agree |
| InterDigital | Support |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Samsung | We think the agreement for DM-RS bundling for PUCCH should be based on an agreement for PUSCH. After the WA is confirmed (with or without any changes), we would agree to apply to PUCCH. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Although our preference would be to wait for the confirmation of working assumption and some further details related to FFS points under PUSCH agenda, but if we want to same WA here (not yet agreement), we are okay to have it |
| QC | We are okay to extend the WA to PUCCH as well. |
| Sharp | Support |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support |
| LG | We support the idea of the proposal that the time domain window of PUCCH should be based on the common design with PUSCH. However the detail of it is being discussed in other agenda, we can revisit it after the time domain window of PUSCH is settled. |
| Panasonic | We are fine with the FL proposal. |
| vivo | Support |
| CATT | Agree. |
| ZTE | Support in principle. Shouldn’t it be sufficient to use ‘PUCCH repetition’? |
| China Telecom | Support |
| OPPO | We do not see the benefit of Appling the same window of PUSCH, especially the window sizes not to be same. We would prefer to decide if it workable until PUSCH solution done. |
| CMCC | The TDW of PUSCH could be the starting point of PUCCH. Whether replacement of “PUCCH” is sufficient needs more discussion. |
| Spreadtrum | Support |
| WILUS | Support |
| Ericsson | Agree in principle, but as other companies have commented, replacing ‘PUSCH’ with ‘PUCCH’ may not be all that is needed. We already have the agreement to ‘Strive for common design of the time domain window for PUSCH/PUCCH with DMRS bundling as much as possible,’ so this seems enough for the moment. |
| Apple | We share similar view as OPPO and Ericsson |

### Signalling for DMRS bundling cross PUCCH repetitions

The following issue was identified in RAN1 106e. We continue to discuss this issue in RAN1 106bis-e.

Question: whether additional dynamic signaling is needed to enable/disable PUCCH/PUSCH repetitions with DMRS bundling?

For this open issue, based on input from companies in the submitted contributions, majority companies support not introducing additional dynamic signalling. Therefore, the following FL proposal is made.

**FL proposal 2: Dynamic signaling to enable/disable DMRS bundling for PUCCH or PUSCH repetitions is not supported in Rel-17.**

Companies are welcome to provide comments to the above proposal in the following table.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Comments** |
| Nokia/NSB | Agree. |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Samsung | OK |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support the FL proposal |
| QC | Support. |
| Sharp | Support |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support |
| LG | Support the FL proposal 2. |
| Panasonic | We are fine with the FL proposal. |
| CATT | Agree. |
| ZTE | Support |
| China Telecom | Support |
| OPPO | Agree |
| Spreadtrum | Support |
| WILUS | Support |
| Ericsson | Support |

## Inter slot freq hopping enhancement with DMRS bundling

In RAN1 104e, the following agreements were made under AI 8.8.2.

Agreements: Subject to the prerequisite of DMRS bundling for PUCCH repetitions, enhance inter-slot frequency hopping pattern for PUCCH repetitions with DMRS bundling.

* FFS: details in inter-slot frequency hopping pattern enhancement, e.g., additional frequency hopping patterns than Rel-16.
* Strive for common design for PUSCH/PUCCH with DMRS bundling as much as possible

In RAN1 104bis-e, the following agreements were made under AI 8.8.1.3. Since RAN1 should trive for common design between PUCCH and PUSCH repetition. The following agreement should be taken into account for the design of PUCCH repetition.

Agreements (RAN1#104-bis-e):

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

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

FFS: relation between the bundle size (time domain hopping interval) and the time domain window size

There are three key questions RAN1 need to answer to complete the design for this topic.

Question 1: how to determine the bundle size (time domain hopping interval) for PUCCH/PUSCH

Question 2: whether the bundle size (time domain hopping interval) equals to the size of time domain window

Question 3: What is the interaction between the determination of time domain hopping interval determination and the determination of time domain window for DMRS bundling? In other words, when the two features, DMRS bundling and frequency hopping, are enabled simultaneously, a UE should determine the hopping intervals first or determine the window(s) for DMRS bundling first?

The first two questions are related to the design of hopping interval. Again, it is desired to have a unified design between PUCCH and PUSCH. Therefore, we will wait for progress in 8.8.1.3 and reuse the design in 8.8.1.3 for 8.8.2.

Based on the partition of work load between 8.8.13 FL and 8.8.2 FL, the discussion of question 3 will be conducted in 8.8.2 and the outcome of this discussion will be applied to both PUCCH and PUSCH repetitions.

The following are the discussion on this topic in RAN1 106e.

FL Question 4 (raised in RAN1 106e): What is the interaction between the determination of time domain hopping interval determination and the determination of time domain window for DMRS bundling? In other words, when the two features, DMRS bundling and frequency hopping, are enabled simultaneously, a UE should determine the hopping intervals first or determine the window(s) for DMRS bundling first?

The answers to the above FL question in RAN1 106e are collected below for information purpose.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Answer/Comment** |
| China Telecom | We think the situation for paired and unpaired spectrum is different, and can be discussed separately. For paired spectrum, the TDM for bundling can be determined first then, the hopping interval is equal to the TDM. For unpaired spectrum, the hopping interval is related to DL/UL configuration. |
| CMCC | As the bundling size/ time domain window has a strong impact to the hopping pattern, the window of bundling should be determined first. |
| Vivo | Similar issue has been discussed in PUSCH repetitions with frequency hopping, we prefer a common design for both PUCCH and PUSCH. |
| Intel | We think there is some connection between time domain window size and frequency hopping bundle size. In our view, when inter-slot frequency hopping with inter-slot bundling is applied, the time domain window size can be determined by the bundle size. |
| Nokia/NSB | We think that it is not possible to provide and answer to Question 3 before agreeing on an answer to Question 2. We first need to agree on whether the time hopping interval can be different from the time-domain window duration. If the two durations coincide, then discussing on which one is determined first does not seem relevant. The converse is true if we agree that the two durations are, or can be, different. Indeed, as of today, there is no answer to the following question: is the hopping occurring within the time domain window or between two time-domain windows (e.g., inter-window hopping). In turn, this question cannot be answered unless the following is answered first: is there only one or multiple time-domain windows? |
| Samsung | For paired spectrum, the time domain hopping interval is same as the TDW for DMRS bundling. There is no reason for differentiation and a smaller TDW will result to worse coverage. The same can apply for unpaired spectrum subject to conditions for maintaining phase continuity. In general, the TDW should be equal to the number of repetitions for which conditions for the UE to maintain phase continuity are satisfied. There is no need for additional rules and they will only result to worse coverage. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | In our view, the time domain window size and the bundle size for inter-slot frequency hopping should be related and only one of them need to be configured/indicated. |
| Ericsson | We think the UEs should determine the frequency hopping intervals first. One reason is that not all Ues in a cell may be configured for, or even support, DMRS bundling. In order to have spectrally efficient use of PUCCH, Ues not configured for bundling but that share the same PRBs should be able to hop with Ues using DMRS bundling and hopping. |
| LG | Since the same discussion is ongoing in joint channel estimation, it is better not to discuss it here in order to avoid duplication, and it is appropriate that it is commonly applied to PUSCH and PUCCH. |
| Sharp | In our view, a UE should determine the hopping intervals first. This is because the hopping pattern should be configured/indicated independently from DMRS bundling to multiplex among Ues. |
| Panasonic | A length of time domain window and a length of inter-slot FH are the same or not depending on the pattern of inter-slot FH. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We prefer to have a unified design with PUSCH. |
| Qualcomm | Same views as Ericsson/Sharp. |
| CATT | We also prefer a common design for both PUCCH and PUSCH. Our preliminary consideration is that, the hopping point should be considered when determining the time domain window, since the frequency hopping would damage phase continuity. The PUCCHs in the hopping intervals are the actual transmissions for DMRS bundling. Hence, a UE should determine the hopping intervals first. |
| ZTE | It depends on how to design the time domain window. In addition, we also prefer a unified design with PUSCH. |
| Spreadtrum | We think the length of time window highly depends on the hopping interval, meaning hopping interval should be determined first. |
| Xiaomi | Same view with CATT. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | The RAN1 mechanism should be band agnostic. Additionally, a common design for both PUCCH and PUSCH is needed. |
| InterDigital | We prefer to align the design principle with DMRS bundling for frequency hopping for PUSCH. This discussion related to how a time window is configured. |
| WILUS | We prefer common design for PUSCH/PUCCH. |

Based on the comments received in RAN1 106e, and considering the concept of both configured TDW and actual TDW are introduced, the discussion on interaction between frequency hopping and DMRS bundling for PUCCH/PUSCH can be formulated as following.

**FL proposal 3: For the interaction between inter-slot frequency hopping and DMRS bundling for PUCCH/PUSCH repetitions, a UE perform the “hopping intervals determination”, “configured TDW determination”, and** **“actual TDW determination” in a sequential ordering. The following options of the ordering are the starting point for further study.**

* **Option 1: “hopping intervals determination” -> “configured TDW determination” -> “actual TDW determination”**
  + **Supported by: Intel, QC, Sharp, CT, Spreadtrum, WILUS, Ericsson**
* **Option 2: “configured TDW determination” -> “hopping intervals determination” -> “actual TDW determination”**
  + **Supported by: Interdigital, Lenovo/Moto (2nd preference), Sharp, DCM, Panasonic, VIVO, CT, WILUS**
* **Option 3: “configured TDW determination” -> “actual TDW determination” -> “hopping intervals determination”**
  + **Support by: ZTE**
* **Option 4: “configured TDW determination” -> “actual TDW determination” and “hopping intervals determination”**
  + **Supported by: Nokia/NSB, Samsung (?), Lenovo/Moto (1st preference), ZTE, CMCC, Spreadtrum**

**Note: option 1, 2, and 3 assume a hopping internal can be different than an actual TDW. Option 4 assumes a hopping internal is the same as an actual TDW.**

**Note 2: other options are not precluded.**

**Note 3: combinations of above option 1 such as adopting one option for FDD and adopting another option for TDD are not precluded.**

Companies are welcome to provide comments and suggestions to the above FL proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Answer/Comment** |
| Nokia/NSB | The goal of DMRS bundling is to increase channel estimation accuracy. This technique was studied during the SI with this understanding in mind, which is not only intuitive but also practically relevant. Out of the 4 proposed options, Option 4 is the one which guarantees that the largest number of DMRS can be bundled on average.  Option 1 and Option 2 will always result in poorer channel estimation accuracy, which in general brings more gain that frequency diversity.  Option 3 may provide the same results as Option 4 if hopping intervals coincide (and they could, depending on the configuration), however lower performance would be observed in other cases. For this reason, it is safe to say it would provide less stable results, and never better than Option 4.    For all these reasons, Option 4 should be preferred as more aligned with the ultimate target of this PUSCH/PUCCH enhancement. |
| InterDigital | Option 2 seems to be aligned with the TDW design. A TDW is configured, and based on hopping intervals, actual TDW is determined implicitly. Determination of actual TDWs should follow the configurations given to the UE (thus it should be the last step). |
| Intel | Our view is that inter-slot bundling size may be separately configured from TDW duration, which can provide good flexibility/balance for frequency diversity gain and channel estimation gain. So we prefer Option 1.  We have concerns on Option 3 if hopping interval duration is determined based on actual TDW determination. Given that it may be some mis-alignment between gNB and UE on the determination of actual TDW, if hopping interval duration is determined based on the actual TDW, this would introduce undesirable impact on the frequency hopping and lead to decoding failure at receiver side. |
| Samsung | The TDW length is the time duration of the frequency hop when frequency hopping is configured. In case the TDW length is also provided (and can’t be larger than the duration of the frequency hop), UE would use it. Then other constraints apply if an event occurs, as discussed in AI 8.8.1.3 for PUSCH. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine with either option 2 or option 4. Basically, both options ensure that the actual TDW duration will always be less than or equal to the hopping interval duration. Based on simplicity that actual TDW and hopping interval are determined simultaneously in option 4, we can slightly prefer option 4.  Minor type in the note:  **Note 1: option 1, 2, and 3 assume a hopping inter~~n~~val can be different than an actual TDW. Option 4 assumes a hopping inter~~n~~val is the same as an actual TDW.** |
| QC | Option 1 is the only way to make sure the gNB is able to allocate resources in an efficient manner across users when frequency hopping is enabled. Ill-fitting hop patterns across users will lead to resource wastage.  Even in the current spec, hopping is tied to physical slot indices (odd/even), and not impacted by when a UE is scheduled to transmit PUSCH. This same principle should continue to be observed. Cell-level resource efficiency should be an important consideration. |
| Sharp | We support option 1 and option 2. Furthermore, the window length L can be used as a hopping interval.  In our view, the hopping interval should be determined before the actual TDW determination to consider UE multiplexing and DCI mis-detection. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support that the configured TDW length is used for the determination of hop duration in frequency hopping. Therefore we support that “configured TDW determination” =“hopping intervals determination” -> “actual TDW determination”. Also this topic and how to configure the hop duration will be discussed in PUSCH, so we prefer to have the unified mechanism. |
| LG | The above options can be differently interpreted according to the size of configured TDW which is being discussed in other agenda. Specifically, according to the maximum size of configured TDW, the candidate of it is maximum duration or the whole repetition, the UE behavior of single option can be different. Therefore we should revisit it after the size of configured TDW is settled. |
| Panasonic | In our view, inter-slot frequency hopping pattern for joint channel estimation is per configured TDW which is determined based on configured/indicated TDW length and semi-static TDD configuration. Then, we support Option 2. |
| vivo | Option 2 is preferred.  According to the WA, the actual window could be determined by events due to dynamic signalling, if the frequency hopping pattern is determined subject to the actual window, once UE misses the dynamic signalling, the misalignment on frequency hopping pattern between gNB and UE would occur. Furthermore, actual windows could be created with irregular intervals, which could lead to un-symetric FH pattern, and leading to worse resource fragment. Hence, FH intervals should not base on actual TDW, and op3 and op4 are not preferred.  Based on opt-2, a preferred configured TDW length can be configured to achieve the desired FH interval, and it can results in the same FH pattern with Opt-1. Hence, opt-1 is also not necessary. |
| CATT | We agree with the proposal in general. A typo correction for “**a hopping interval**” in the Note 1. Additionally, it should clarify that the hopping interval can be different from a configured TDW in all of the four options. |
| ZTE | We prefer Option 3 and Option 4. For Option 3, the frequency hopping interval could be the same or smaller than the actual time domain window depending on the duration of the window size. |
| China Telecom | We prefer Option 1 or Option 2, but we want to make some more clarification as follows:  The time domain hopping interval is configured or implicitly derived based on the number of repetitions and can be different with the size of configured/actual window.  In our understanding, gNB can has the flexibility to configure the time domain hopping intervals taking into account both gain of frequency hopping and gain of joint channel estimation. Inter-slot frequency hopping with inter-slot bundling can be deemed as one kind of events that violates the power consistency and phase continuity. The time domain hopping intervals can be configured smaller than the window length of the configured TDWs. But whether it can be configured larger than the window length of the configured TDWs needs further study. |
| CMCC | Option 4 is slightly preferred. As the frequency hopping pattern should be determined based on the TDW length to maximum the performance of JCE. And the frequency hopping may violate the conditions for JCE. Then the actual TDW and hopping intervals should be determined together. |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with Option 1 and Option 4.  In Option 1, gNB can configure separate FH interval duration based on inter-UE’s multiplexing. Especially considering the frequency resource allocation.  In Option 4, the FH length is same as configured window length. No need to configure FH interval duration. Considering inter-UE multiplexing in frequency, same configured window length should be configured for different UEs. |
| WILUS | We prefer Option 1 or Option 2. A hopping interval can be configured separately with TDW. Also, since both configured TDW and hopping interval are semi-statically configured, the order between them seems not a critical issue. However, a hopping interval should be configured at least before actual TDW. |
| Ericsson | We agree with Qualcomm that frequency hopping should be at the cell level; this is needed to maintain resource allocation efficiency. Not all UEs in cell may have configurations suitable for, or support, DMRS bundling. There are diversity vs. channel estimation tradeoffs as well, as can be seen in the results in R1-2110124, where we show a case where JCE gains are less than the gains from frequency hopping. **Therefore a frequency hopping pattern should be independently configured from JCE, so that UEs using JCE+FH can still be in a cell with UEs that aren’t using JCE.**  The different options seem to point to different considerations on if frequency hopping is dynamically or not, and if the hopping pattern follows the PUSCH allocation and/or available slots, and whether hopping can be considered an ‘event’.  Option 1) seems to presume that the hopping pattern is slot based and common across the cell, since it is applied prior to the configured TDW. Since the configured TDW is determined after the hopping pattern, hopping may be considered a semi-static event in the TDW framework.  Option 2) seems to assume that the hopping pattern follows the available slots and/or the PUSCH transmission, since it must start and end with the PUSCH (whose length  matches the configured TDWs), and then the hopping pattern is used to set the actual windows. So here the hopping seems to be a dynamic event in the TDW framework, and the presence of hopping itself could be dynamic.  Option 3) determines the hopping pattern after the actual TDWs, and so the hopping patterns are dynamically determined according to the actual TDWs. Here, frequency hopping is not really an event, but determined instead by the window design. How such TDW-matched hopping patterns will work for TDD patterns like DDDSUDDSUU is not so clear to us.  Option 4) jointly sets the hopping pattern and TDWs, and the same PRBs are occupied throughout an actual TDW. In this case, if an event other than hopping creates an actual TDW, the hopping should adjust to the actual TDW. This would seem to make cell specific hopping difficult. Like option 3), frequency hopping does not seem to be an event, and support for TDD patterns with varying numbers of UL slots is not so obvious.  Overall, Option 1) seems most aligned with Rel-15/16 principles for hopping, as it compatible with slot based hop determination (rather than available or scheduled PUSCH slots), and can be cell common. It can also be independent of JCE since it is not derived from the configured or actual TDWs. Hopping patterns can be straightforwardly configured to match TDD patterns, as discussed in R1-2110124.  **So we prefer something like Option 1), where:**   * The hopping offsets are determined by the slot index * Frequency hopping is an event that sets the TDW size * UEs can be configured with the hopping pattern |

Based on the comments received so far, option 3 has only a single company to support it. And the company supporting option 3 also supports option 4 as well. Therefore, to make a step forward, FL suggest to remove option 3 in the updated proposal as below.

**Update FL proposal 3: For the interaction between inter-slot frequency hopping and DMRS bundling for PUCCH/PUSCH repetitions, a UE perform the “hopping intervals determination”, “configured TDW determination”, and “actual TDW determination” in a sequential ordering. The following options of the ordering are the starting point for further study.**

* **Option 1: “hopping intervals determination” -> “configured TDW determination” -> “actual TDW determination”**
  + **Supported by: Intel, QC, Sharp, CT, Spreadtrum, WILUS, Ericsson**
* **Option 2: “configured TDW determination” -> “hopping intervals determination” -> “actual TDW determination”**
  + **Supported by: Interdigital, Lenovo/Moto (2nd preference), Sharp, DCM, Panasonic, VIVO, CT, WILUS**
* **~~Option 3: “configured TDW determination” -> “actual TDW determination” -> “hopping intervals determination”~~**
  + **~~Support by: ZTE~~**
* **Option 4: “configured TDW determination” -> “actual TDW determination” and “hopping intervals determination”**
  + **Supported by: Nokia/NSB, Samsung (?), Lenovo/Moto (1st preference), ZTE, CMCC, Spreadtrum**

**Note: option 1~~,~~ and 2~~, and 3~~ assume a hopping internal can be different than an actual TDW. Option 4 assumes a hopping internal is the same as an actual TDW.**

**Note 2: other options are not precluded.**

**Note 3: combinations of above option 1 such as adopting one option for FDD and adopting another option for TDD are not precluded.**

Companies are welcome to provide comments to the above proposal in the following table.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Comment** |
| Vivo | Fine with the proposal, and prefer Opt-2.  If frequency hopping interval is determined by actual TDW, and whether UE can start new actual TDW is subject to UE capability. It is not clear how frequency hopping is performed during the duration no actual TDW is started, if UE do not have this capability. Hence, we do not support FH interval based on actual TDW. |
| LG | Support option 1. Considering the Rel-16 inter-slot frequency hopping decision, the hopping index is decided by slot index. It seems option 1 is more aligned for the legacy behavior, and moreover it enables gNB for efficient resource management. |
| Nokia/NSB | Fine with the removal of Option 3. Concerning the remaining Options, we would like to observe that the discussion in this AI is about DMRS bundling. Our preference is for Option 4, where UE would hop following the pattern identified by actual TDW. but such preference Our preference is justified by the fact that we would like to ensure the DMRS bundle can be as large as possible, to ensure good performance of JCE (which is the ultimate goal we have in this AI and in 8.8.1.3).  In this context, Option 1 is the worst possible option, since it gives priority to FH. This does not seem aligned with the objective of the enhancement we have been discussing so far.  If this can help finding a middle ground between companies, we are open to try checking if a solution according to “Note 3” above can be found. It is not our preferred way forward, but we can discuss, if this is the will or the majority. In this case, Option 4 (TDD) and Option 2 (FDD) could be an acceptable outcome. |
| CATT | Fine with the proposal. We prefer Option 1 and Option 2. It is also note that, in LTE, ‘cell-level’ inter-bundling hopping is supported for eMTC UEs (although not explicitly using JCE).  And if we are trying to narrow down the options, Note 2 is not need. |
| Samsung | We support Option 1. (please remove Samsung in option 4) |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal in principle and also think Note 2 is not needed. We do not think a combination of the above options is needed, which would only complicate the design. We strongly prefer a single solution to cover both TDD and FDD case. So Note 3 is not needed in our view.  For Option 4, we still have mis-alignment issue between gNB and UE in case of dynamically triggered event. Frequency hopping boundary alignment issue is more severe that joint channel estimation. In case of mis-alignment, gNB may not be able to decode the PUSCH repetition.  We prefer Option 1 and share similar view as LG that Option 1 can resolve backward compatible issue and allow efficient resource allocation for frequency hopping. |
| InterDigital | We support the proposal from the FL. We prefer Option 2. |
| Apple | Support the intention and prefer Option 1 |
| Spreadtrum | Support |
| QC | Support and prefer Option 1.  Cell-level resource utilization and sharing resources between UEs with or without bundling is a key criterion. Option 1 addresses this directly. Note that if we select hop durations carefully, we should be able to get close to a configuration that looks like Option 2/4.  At any given instance its unlikely that fraction of cell-edge UEs outnumber cell-center UEs. So allowing a mixed pairing (with and without bundling) is useful as well.  R15 choice of odd/even slots for hopping sets a clear precedent. We should build on this. |
| Sharp | Support and prefer either Option 1 or Option 2. |
| China Telecom | Support. We prefer option 1 or Option 2. |
| Ericsson | Support the proposal and prefer option 1. We agree with Intel that a single solution should work well for both TDD and FDD, so at present we see no need for multiple options. However, the design tradeoffs should be decided using simulations, so we would welcome further discussions of results and configurations of interest. |
|  |  |

## Other proposals

R1-2110125 studied the sensitivity of DMRS bundling to imperfect phase continuity and provided simulation results. Companies are encouraged to check the simulation results provided and consider the need to study the techniques of gNB phase error compensation.

Regarding the issue of PUCCH with repetition/DMRS bundling overlap with other PUCCH without repetition/DMRS bundling, R1-2110049 proposed the following proposals.

* Specify conditions under which a PUCCH with dynamic indication of repetition number may overlap with another PUCCH repetitions without dynamic indication of repetitions.

Companies are welcome to provide comments to the above proposal in the following table.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Comment** |
| Samsung | Rel-16 specifications are sufficient. The only change in Rel-17 is that the number of repetitions for a PUCCH with HARQ-ACK can be part of the PUCCH resource instead of being same for all PUCCH resources. That is not a reason for changing the Rel-16 UE behavior for overlapped PUCCHs. |
| Apple | To Samsung: we are puzzled with “Rel-16 specifications are sufficient”: we do NOT have DMRS bundling in R15/16. The issue here is that at least one PUCCH with DMRS bundling is dropped. Open questions are on UE behavior/expectation, for example: should DMRS bundling being terminated, or resume for the rest of repetitions… These open aspects at least need to be discussed and concluded. |
| CATT | High priority transmission has been agreed as one of the ‘events’ that violate power consistency and phase continuity condition in the WA of PUSCH on TDM. If the WA of PUSCH JCE is reused for PUCCH repetitions, R15/16 prioritization rules can be applied in Rel-17 overlapping case. Specifically, DMRS bundling may be interrupted, and a new actual TDW may resume (up to UE capability, under discussion). |

# Power control and TA with PUCCH repetitions

Based on companies input in contributions, we could strive for a common design of power control and TA handling for PUCCH and PUSCH repetitions. Therefore, we could hold on the discussion on this topic until progress made in agenda 8.8.1.3.
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