**3GPP TSG RAN WG1 #107-e R1-21xxxxx**

**e-Meeting, November 11th – 19th, 2021**

**Agenda Item: 8.8.1.3**

**Source: Moderator (China Telecom)**

**Title: [107-e-NR-R17-CovEnh-03] Email discussion regarding joint channel estimation for PUSCH**

**Document for: Discussion**

1. Introduction

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

The detailed objectives are as follows.

* *Specification of PUSCH enhancements [RAN1, RAN4]*
  + *Specify the following mechanisms for enhancements on PUSCH repetition type A [RAN1]*
    - *Increasing the maximum number of repetitions up to a number to be determined during the course of the work.*
    - *The number of repetitions counted on the basis of available UL slots.*
  + *Specify mechanism(s) to support TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH [RAN1]*
    - *TBS determined based on multiple slots and transmitted over multiple slots.*
  + *Specify mechanism(s) to enable joint channel estimation [RAN1, RAN4]*
    - *Mechanism(s) to enable joint channel estimation over multiple PUSCH transmissions, based on the conditions to keep power consistency and phase continuity to be investigated and specified if necessary by RAN4 [RAN1, RAN4]*
      * *Potential optimization of DMRS location/granularity in time domain is not precluded*
    - *Inter-slot frequency hopping with inter-slot bundling to enable joint channel estimation [RAN1]*
* *Specification of PUCCH enhancements [RAN1, RAN4]*
  + *Specify signaling mechanism to support dynamic PUCCH repetition factor indication [RAN1]*
  + *Specify mechanism to support DMRS bundling across PUCCH repetitions [RAN1, RAN4]*
    - *When applicable, based on similar mechanism(s) for enabling joint channel estimation for PUSCH*
* *Specify mechanism(s) to support Type A PUSCH repetitions for Msg3 [RAN1, RAN2]*

This contribution is a summary of the following email discussion.

[107-e-NR-R17-CovEnh-03] Email discussion regarding joint channel estimation for PUSCH – Jianchi (China Telecom)

* 1st check point: November 15
* Final check point: November 19

1. Summary of contributions

## 2.1 Conditions to keep power consistency and phase continuity

Based on the LSs between RAN1 and RAN4 [3]-[10], the conditions for UE to keep power consistency and phase continuity among PUSCH transmissions for different scenarios can be summarized as follows:

**Back-to-back transmissions with zero gap in-between adjacent transmissions**

In order to maintain phase continuity, the following conditions should be met:

* Modulation order does not change.
* RB allocation in terms of length and frequency position should not be changed, and intra-slot and inter-slot frequency hopping is not enabled within a repetition bundle.
* No change on transmission power level of its own CC, i.e., no change on the power control parameters specified in TS 38.213, and also when own CC is not impacted by other concurrent CC(s) that are configured for inter-band CA or DC for same UE with dynamic power sharing and no change in any configured CC s that are part of configured intra-band uplink CA or DC.
* No UL beam switching for FR2 UE occurs.
* Applying the same TPMI precoder across PUSCH transmissions.
* TA adjustment and UE uplink timing autonomous adjustments cause the phase to change. RAN4 is still investigating the full impacts of the detailed scenarios, and will provide a final view about this at the next RAN4 meeting.

**Non-back-to-back transmission with non-zero gap in-between adjacent transmissions**

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

* No downlink reception in-between the PUSCH or PUCCH repetition in the same band for TDD case.
  + The “downlink reception” means downlink symbols with actual DL transmission from gNB to UE and/or DL monitoring with the assumption that UE is receiving information.
  + Regarding whether “downlink reception” include downlink symbols without actual DL transmission from gNB to UE and without DL monitoring, it would be helpful if RAN1 could provide more information on the exact scenario.
  + Phase discontinuity tolerance LLS is ongoing in RAN4 study and conditions of whether the phase continuity can be maintained in TDD case that has downlink reception in-between the PUSCH or PUCCH repetition could be revisited in future meeting with consideration of phase discontinuity tolerance. RAN4 is also still checking whether there are any optional UE antenna configurations where a UE could overcome this problem and still gain from using the feature.
* In scenario of no more than X un-scheduled OFDM symbols in-between the PUSCH or PUCCH repetition (e.g., X = 0, 1, 2, …, 14), RAN4 confirms the feasibility of phase continuity and power consistency for non-zero un-scheduled gap case for a gap less than 14 symbols when UE is not required to meet the existing off power requirements. RAN4 has further agreed that the 13-symbol is the maximum length for the gap for all SCS, and that the 14-symbol or 1ms will not be discussed in RAN4 anymore for un-scheduled gap in Rel-17 [8].
* In scenario of other UL channels in-between PUCCH or PUSCH repetitions, e.g., SRS or other PUCCH, at least if the other scheduled signals/channels during the non-zero gap have the same settings in antenna port, allocated number and locations of PRBs transmitted, and PAPR and average power, e.g., PUSCH/PUCCH part of repetitions and SRS has same PAPR and average power, it is feasible to maintain the phase continuity and power consistency across the repetitions. RAN4 has agreed that it is not considered for UE to transmit other channels in the gap with different settings.
* RAN4 has not agreed detailed requirement for phase continuity and plans to revisit the above agreement in the scenario of other UL signals/channels in the gap once the requirement is defined. Therefore, RAN4 would like to ask RAN1 what are the consequences if phase continuity cannot be maintained in that scenario?

In [10], RAN1 provide the following information to RAN4 on the scenario when “downlink reception” from UE point of view includes downlink symbols without actual DL transmission from gNB to UE and UE is not assumed to do DL monitoring:

* In RAN1 understanding, regarding to the “downlink reception”, there are actually three scenarios:
  + Scenario 1: downlink or flexible symbols with actual DL transmission from gNB to UE, with/without DL monitoring occasion configured.
  + Scenario 2: downlink or flexible symbols without actual DL transmission from gNB to UE, but with DL monitoring occasion configured.
  + Scenario 3: downlink or flexible symbols without DL monitoring occasion configured.

RAN1 further respectfully asks RAN4 to provide answer to the following question.

* Question 1: In additional to scenario 1 and 2, does the “downlink reception” in RAN4 reply LS R4-2103393 (“No downlink reception in-between the PUSCH or PUCCH repetition in the same band for TDD case”) further include scenario 3?

In [11], RAN1 provides the answer to RAN4:

* If phase continuity cannot be maintained in the case of UL transmissions of other signals/channels in the repetition gap, then DM-RS symbols transmitted before and after the transmission of such other signals/channels cannot be part of the same bundle from UE perspective. A new DMRS bundle may or may not start after the other UL signals/channel transmission in the repetition gap. Details are still under discussion in RAN1.

**The maximum duration**

In the latest LS from RAN4 [9], RAN4 replied RAN1’s questions related to the maximum duration and provided further agreement for the gap between PUSCH/PUCCH transmissions, details are listed as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **RAN1’s questions** | **RAN 4’s answers** |
| For joint channel estimation, is there a maximum duration during which UE is able to maintain power consistency and phase continuity under certain tolerance level? If any, how long is it? | Yes, there is a maximum duration but RAN4 has not agreed how many slots it is. |
| What factors determine the maximum duration? | RAN4 has agreed that TA adjustment should be avoided across the PUSCH/PUCCH transmissions (i.e., from start of first transmission until the end of last transmission) for joint channel estimation. RAN4 is still investigating other factors impact in more detail. |
| Whether the maximum duration should be the same for different cases for both PUSCH and PUCCH? | Yes. |
| Whether the maximum duration is dependent on the modulation order of transmission, e.g., QPSK, 16QAM, 64QAM? | Considering the scenario of coverage extension, RAN4 recommends to only focus on modulation orders not higher than QPSK, i.e., focus on QPSK (PUCCH and PUSCH), Pi/2 BPSK (PUCCH and PUSCH), BPSK (PUCCH). RAN4 is still discussing whether maximum duration depends on modulation order for the above modulation schemes. |
| Whether the maximum duration is dependent on UL waveform (DFT-s-OFDM vs. OFDM)? | No. |
| Besides the factors listed above, whether or not the maximum duration is further dependent on UE capabilities (e.g., multiple possible values for a given set of factor(s)), and if so, whether the UE should report such a duration. | Still under discussion in RAN4. |

## 2.2 Use cases for joint channel estimation

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

* Use case 1: back-to-back PUSCH transmissions within one slot.
* Use case 2: non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions within one slot.
  + Use case 2a: no uplink transmission in the middle of two PUSCH transmissions
  + Use case 2b: other uplink transmissions in the middle of two PUSCH transmissions
* Use case 3: back-to-back PUSCH transmissions across consecutive slots.
* Use case 4: non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions across consecutive slots.
  + Use case 4a: no uplink transmission in the middle of two PUSCH transmissions
  + Use case 4b: other uplink transmissions in the middle of two PUSCH transmissions
* Use case 5: PUSCH transmissions across non-consecutive slots.
  + Use case 5a: no uplink transmission in the middle of two PUSCH transmissions
  + Use case 5b: other uplink transmissions in the middle of two PUSCH transmissions

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

Note: intervening “other uplink transmissions” can be either on the same component carrier or a different component carrier.

In the past RAN1 meetings, it was discussed whether joint channel estimation can be applied to the above uses cases. In addition, during online discussion of RAN1 #106-e meeting, according to the guidance from Chair there would be no further discussion for transmissions with different TBs. Based on the discussion and agreements so far, the situation is summarized in the following table.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Use cases | Repetition type A for the same TB | Repetition type B for the same TB | Transmissions with different TBs | TBoMS |
| 1: B2B PUSCH transmission within one slot | / | Support | Not support | / |
| 2: Non-B2B PUSCH transmission within one slot | / | Not support | Not support | / |
| 3: B2B PUSCH transmissions across consecutive slots | Support | Support | **No further discussion** | Support |
| 4: Non-B2B PUSCH transmissions across consecutive slots | Support  (4a) | Support  (4a) | **No further discussion** | Support  (4a) |
| TBD  (4b) | TBD  (4b) | TBD  (4b) |
| 5: PUSCH transmissions across non-consecutive slots | Not support | Not support | Not support | Not support |

Thus, only Use case 4b remains to be discussed.

### 2.2.2 Use case 4b

For Use case 4b (other uplink transmissions in the middle of two PUSCH/PUCCH transmissions), there exist two sub-cases and companies’ views on the sub-cases are summarized as follows:

* **Use case 4b-1**: other UL transmission in the middle of two PUSCH/PUCCH transmissions has the same setting with PUSCHs.

**Support**: Nokia, NSB, TCL, CTC, xiaomi

**Not support**: LG, HW, HiSilicon, ZTE, Qualcomm, Ericsson, Sharp, CATT, WILUS, Panasonic

* **Use case 4b-2**: other UL transmission in the middle of two PUSCH/PUCCH transmissions has different settings than PUSCHs.

**Not support**: Nokia, NSB, vivo, CTC, xiao mi, CMCC, Sharp, LG, HW, HiSilicon, ZTE, Intel, Qualcomm, Ericsson, Sharp, CATT, WILUS, Panasonic

In RAN1 #106b-e, four options were discussed to handle Use case 4b-2 as follows:

* Option 1: Adapt the settings of the other UL transmission to make it be the same as PUSCHs.
* Option 2: Multiplex the data of the other UL transmission on PUSCH, if any.
* Option 3: Drop the other UL transmission with different settings.
* Option 4: Transmit the other UL transmission with different settings and break the phase continuity.

Based on the discussion in RAN1 #106b-e and contributions in RAN1#107-e, two companies (vivo, Panasonic) support Option 3 while majority companies (vivo, Panasonic, HW, HiSilicon, xiaomi, CTC, CATT, CMCC, Samsung, TCL, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, Intel, Qualcomm, Panasonic, Sony) support Option 4.

### 2.2.4 Use case for UL CA

One company (ZTE) analyzes the benefit of using two carriers w/ Tx switching over single carrier under UL CA scenario. As shown in the following figure, there are two inter-band carriers with unaligned frame boundary. This is one main important deployment scenario and supported in Rel-16. It is also pointed out that the phase continuity can be kept for CA at least when PUSCH is only transmitted in one carrier at a given time.



Fig. Tx switching with unaligned frame boundary for CA

## 2.3 Time domain window for joint channel estimation

In RAN1 #104b-e meeting, a time domain window (TDW) was agreed to be specified, during which **UE is expected to** maintain power consistency and phase continuity among PUSCH transmissions subject to power consistency and phase continuity requirements. In RAN1 #105-e meeting, the maximum duration is defined to facilitate the discussion (whether it is specified is up to RAN4), during which **UE is able** to maintain power consistency and phase continuity subject to power consistency and phase continuity requirements. In RAN1 #106-e meeting, a working assumption for the framework of TDW was achieved.

### 2.3.1 Configured time domain window

#### Issue #1: The window length *L* of the configured TDW

#### Issue #1-1: The maximum value of L

During past RAN1 meetings, it has been extensively discussed whether the maximum value of the window length *L* of the configured TDW(s) can be longer than the maximum duration during which UE is able to maintain power consistency and phase continuity. In RAN1 #106b-e, it was further discussed whether default value of *L* should be defined and the following agreement was achieved:

|  |
| --- |
| **Agreement:**  Down-select one of the following options in this meeting:  **Option 1**:   * The maximum value of window length *L* of the configured TDW should not exceed the maximum duration, which is reported as UE capability as the duration where UE is able to maintain power consistency and phase continuity subject to power consistency and phase continuity requirements.   **Option 1’:**   * The maximum value of window length L of the configured TDW should not exceed the maximum duration, which is reported as UE capability as the duration where UE is able to maintain power consistency and phase continuity subject to power consistency and phase continuity requirements.   + - If L is not configured, default behavior should be defined, e.g., the configured TDW length is equal to all repetitions   **Option 3’**:   * Whether the window length *L* of the configured TDW can be longer than maximum duration is subject to UE capability.   + If UE is capable of *L* being longer than maximum duration,     - The maximum value of the window length *L* of the configured TDW is the duration of all repetitions.       * FFS: whether *L* cannot be other values other than the duration of all repetitions, if it is longer than the maximum duration.     - If *L* is longer than the maximum duration, UE does not expect dynamic events.       * FFS: details of dynamic events |

It was further discussed on above options via email and it seems companies tend to converge on option 1’:

|  |
| --- |
| **Option 1’-a:**   * The maximum value of window length L of the configured TDW should not exceed the maximum duration, which is reported as UE capability as the duration where UE is able to maintain power consistency and phase continuity subject to power consistency and phase continuity requirements.   + - If L is not configured, the default value ~~and default behavior are~~ is to be discussed, with default value not exceeding the maximum duration.   **Option 1’-b:**   * The maximum value of window length L of the configured TDW should not exceed the maximum duration, which is reported as UE capability as the duration where UE is able to maintain power consistency and phase continuity subject to power consistency and phase continuity requirements.   + - If L is not configured, the default value and default behavior are to be discussed, ~~with~~ where default value may or may not exceed~~ing~~ the maximum duration. |

Companies’ views on the above options are summarized as follows:

**Companies supporting Option 1**: Spreadtrum, NTT DOCOMO, LG, ZTE, CATT(1st), Intel, InterDigital, Qualcomm, MediaTek, vivo

**Companies supporting Option 1’**: CTC, CMCC, Sharp, LG, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, Nokia, NSB, OPPO, Apple, Panasonic, xiaomi, Samsung, Sierra Wireless, HW, HiSilicon, CATT(2nd) , Qualcomm, WILUS, Ericsson

**Companies supporting Option 1’-a**: Panasonic, xiaomi, Samsung, Sierra Wireless, HW, HiSilicon, CATT(2nd) , Qualcomm, WILUS, Ericsson, CMCC

**Companies supporting Option 1’-b**: CTC, Sharp, Nokia, NSB, OPPO, Apple

**Apple** proposes to update Option 1’ and Option 3’ as:

|  |
| --- |
| **Updated Option 1’:**   * The maximum value of window length L of the configured TDW should not exceed the maximum duration, which is reported as UE capability as the duration where UE is able to maintain power consistency and phase continuity subject to power consistency and phase continuity requirements.   + - If L is not configured, default behavior should be defined, ~~e.g., the configured TDW length is equal to all repetitions~~ i.e., TDW length and starting position of the TDW adapt to UL slots in UL/DL configuration.   **Updated Option 3’:**   * Whether the window length L of the configured TDW can be longer than maximum duration is subject to UE capability. * If UE is capable of *L* being longer than maximum duration, the maximum duration is consider as an event * The maximum value of the window length *L* of the configured TDW is the duration of all repetitions. * ~~FFS: whether~~ *~~L~~* ~~cannot be other values other than the duration of all repetitions, if it is longer than the maximum duration.~~ The TDW length and starting position of the TDW adapt to UL slots in UL/DL configuration. * ~~If~~ *~~L~~* ~~is longer than the maximum duration, UE does not expect dynamic events.~~ * ~~FFS: details of dynamic events~~ |

Nokia: The issue of error propagation, if any, could be handled by the gNB using at least one of the following options:

* If the gNB anticipates that there is a chance of missing DCI, it may configure a short configured TDW size L such that the impact of error propagation is minimized.
* The gNB may try to detect the dynamic event and know whether the actual TDWs are determined without or with the dynamic event by the UE and perform JCE accordingly.
* The gNB may apply a conservative approach by performing JCE only on the PUSCHs repetitions that are not impacted by the error propagation.


**Ericsson:** When L is not configured the value of L is set to the lesser of the maximum duration and the duration of the PUSCH repetition.

**Ericsson** analyzes the probability of length of actual TDWs and have the following observations.

* Whether L is larger than the maximum duration may not have a big impact on ATDW length
  + Allowing L > max duration can increase the probability of longer window lengths
  + Careful choice of L can also increase the probability of longer window lengths
  + The choice L does not affect smaller window sizes, at least when both L and the max duration is a significant fraction of the number of repetitions.

**Ericsson** discusses the issue of possible segment of UL slots for TDD and have the following observations.

* Requiring L ≤ max duration can in principle prevent JCE over some TDD back-to-back slots, if PUSCH repetition type A counting based on physical slots is used.
* It seems such issues can be avoided by instead using PUSCH repetition type A counting based on available slots and/or by supporting max duration ≥ 5 slots.
  + Hence, L > max duration is not needed to support specific TDD configurations, and its complications can be avoided.





**Qualcomm:**

Default UE behaviour when is not configured, or when exceeds the duration of PUSCH Type A repetitions is specified as follows. Let max duration indicated by the UE be and let the number of PUSCH/PUCCH repetitions be . To differentiate between the configured value of and the actual value of , denote the parameters as and . Assume all parameters are in units of slots.

Case (i) value of is not configured i.e., is not available:

1. In this case, set .

Case (ii) value of L is configured i.e., is available to the UE and :

1. If value of exceeds the total repetitions, i.e., ,
   1. in this case set .
2. Number of repetitions exceeds ,
   1. in this case, .

#### Issue #1-2: Configuration/Indication of L

In RAN1 #106b-e, following agreements were achieved for the configuration/indication of configured window length L:

|  |
| --- |
| **Agreement**   * For DG-PUSCH, Type1 CG-PUSCH and Type2 CG-PUSCH, the window length L of the configured TDW is at least configured by RRC. * FFS: For DG-PUSCH and Type2 CG-PUSCH, whether the window length *L* of the configured TDW can be indicated by DCI or indicated by TDRA table with one additional entry.   **Agreement**   * The window length L of the RRC configured TDW is configured separately for PUSCH and PUCCH.   + For PUSCH, *L* is configured per BWP. * FFS whether the window length L can be configured with each row in the TDRA table |

The remaining issue is whether the configured window length L can be configured/indicated dynamically by DCI or TDRA table. Companies’ views are summarized as follows:

**Companies supporting DCI indication:** Spreadtrum

**Companies supporting TDRA indication:** Panasonic, NTT DOCOMO

**Companies not supporting dynamic indication:** Nokia, NSB, Samsung, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, HW, HiSilicon

NTT DOCOMO analyses the benefit of dynamic indication of L: for semi-static window length indication, only single value can be configured regardless of the number of allocated slots for one TB. This restriction cannot provide the desired window length based on time domain resource allocation. One example is illustrated in the following figure showing that dynamic window length indication makes it possible to balance the length of multiple TDWs or adjust the window length so that one TDW can cover the whole duration of repetitions.




Fig. Comparison between semi-static window length indication and dynamic window length indication, when the number of allocated slots for PUSCH changes

#### Issue #1-3: Candidate values of L

Regarding the candidate value of L, LG proposes that the minimum value of L is 2. ZTE proposes the window length L of the configured TDW can be set to any integer value that is larger than 1 and no larger than the maximum duration.

#### Issue #1-4: Counting of L based on available slots

Nokia proposes one issue to clarify: For configured TDWs determination of PUSCH repetition type A counting based on available slots, RAN1 to further clarify that the configured time domain window length L is counted on available slots.

### 2.3.2 Actual time domain window

#### Issue #2: The determination of actual TDW

#### Issue #2-1: The start/end of the actual TDW

In RAN1 #106b-e, the following working assumption was achieved for the start/end of the actual window:

|  |
| --- |
| **Working assumption:**   * The start of the first actual TDW is the first ~~available~~ symbol (at least determined by TDRA table) ~~in available slot~~ for the first PUSCH transmission in an available slot within the configured TDW. * The end of the actual TDW is   + the last ~~available~~ symbol (at least determined by TDRA table) ~~in available slot~~ for the last PUSCH transmission in an available slot within the configured TDW if the actual TDW reaches the end of the last PUSCH transmission within the configured TDW.   + the last ~~available~~ symbol (at least determined by TDRA table) ~~in available slot~~ of the PUSCH transmission right before the event if an event occurs that violates power consistency and phase continuity, and the PUSCH transmission is in an available slot. * For UE capable of restarting DM-RS bundling, the start of the new actual TDW is the first ~~available~~ symbol (at least determined by TDRA table) ~~in available slot~~ for PUSCH transmission after the event violates power consistency and phase continuity, and the PUSCH transmission is in an available slot. |

**Spreadtrum** proposes to update the working assumption as:

|  |
| --- |
| **Working assumption:**   * The start of the first actual TDW is the first symbol ~~(at least determined by TDRA table)~~ for the first PUSCH transmission in an available slot within the configured TDW.   + Determined by TDRA table   + Starting symbol of a slot   + Starting symbol after an event * The end of the actual TDW is   + the last symbol ~~(at least determined by TDRA table)~~ for the last PUSCH transmission in an available slot within the configured TDW if the actual TDW reaches the end of the last PUSCH transmission within the configured TDW.     - Determined by TDRA table     - Ending symbol of a slot   + the last symbol (at least determined by TDRA table) of the PUSCH transmission right before the event if an event occurs that violates power consistency and phase continuity, and the PUSCH transmission is in an available slot.   + For UE capable of restarting DM-RS bundling, the start of the new actual TDW is the first symbol (at least determined by TDRA table) for PUSCH transmission after the event violates power consistency and phase continuity, and the PUSCH transmission is in an available slot. |

**WILUS**: If a collision occurs between DL reception/monitoring occasion and dynamically scheduled PUSCH in the set of symbols of the slot within the configured TDW, the DL reception/monitoring can be considered as not the event to determine the start of the actual TDW as illustrated in the following figure.




Fig. Actual TDW determination if a collision occurs between DL reception/monitoring occasion and PUSCH.

#### Issue #2-2: Events that violate power consistency and phase continuity

In RAN1 #106b-e, the following agreement was achieved for events that violate power consistency and phase continuity.

|  |
| --- |
| **Agreement**   * Support at least the following events that violate power consistency and phase continuity.   + Dropping/cancellation based on Rel-15/16 collision rules.   + FFS: Rel-17 collision rules.   + DL slot or DL reception/monitoring based on semi-static DL/UL configuration for unpaired spectrum.   + FFS: Other UL transmission in between PUSCH/PUCCH transmissions.   + Gap between two PUSCH/PUCCH transmissions exceeds 13 symbols.   + FFS: Transmission parameters need to be changed due to network-indicated operations, including: Tx power, UL beam/TPMI, and RB allocation.   + FFS: TPC command.   + FFS: TA adjustment.   + FFS: The actual TDW reaches the maximum duration.   + FFS: Frequency hopping.   + FFS: Precoder cycling.   + FFS: other events.   + FFS: whether events are semi-static events or dynamic events.   + FFS: the time duration of an event. |

Regarding the FFS parts, companies’ views are summarized as follows:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Potential events** | **Support as an event** | **Not support as an event** |
| Rel-17 collision rules | Ericsson |  |
| Other UL transmission in between two successive PUSCH/PUCCH transmissions has **different settings** than PUSCHs | Nokia, NSB, vivo, CTC, xiaomi, CMCC, Sharp, LG, HW, HiSilicon, ZTE, Intel, Qualcomm, Ericsson, Sharp, CATT, WILUS, Panasonic |  |
| Other UL transmission in between two successive PUSCH/PUCCH transmissions has the **same setting** with PUSCHs | LG, HW, HiSilicon, ZTE, Qualcomm, Ericsson, Sharp, CATT, WILUS, Panasonic | Nokia, NSB, TCL, CTC, xiaomi |
| Action of TPC commands | Spreadtrum, ZTE | vivo, OPPO, Panasonic, CTC, xiaomi, CMCC, Samsung, HW, HiSilicon, CATT, InterDigital, Nokia, NSB, Sharp, NTT DOCOMO, Intel, Ericsson, LG |
| Action of TA commands | Spreadtrum, HW, HiSilicon, ZTE，CATT(1st) | Samsung, vivo, Panasonic, CTC, xiaomi, CMCC, Apple, Sharp, CATT(2nd), InterDigital, NTT DOCOMO, Intel, Ericsson |
| The actual TDW reaches the maximum duration | It depends on whether L can be larger than maximum duration. | |
| Frequency hopping | Spreadtrum, xiaomi, Sharp, ZTE, InterDigital, Ericsson, Nokia, NSB, CTC, LG, Qualcomm | vivo, CMCC, Samsung, HW, HiSilicon, NTT DOCOMO |
| Precoder cycling | Nokia, NSB | Sharp, CMCC, CATT, Ericsson |

For changing of transmission parameters and precoder cycling, companies’ views are summarized as follows:

**Transmission parameters need to be changed due to network-indicated operations, including: Tx power, UL beam/TPMI, and RB allocation.**

**Support as an event:** vivo, Spreadtrum, xiaomi, Sharp, ZTE, Intel, Qualcomm

**Not support as an event:** CMCC, Ericsson

**Nokia**: This event type would need further discussion in RAN1. At least, it is unclear what is the network-indicated operation for Tx power and what is the difference with TPC command. In addition, the difference between UL beam/TPMI and precoder cycling is unclear. Moreover, for PUSCH repetition type A (and also PUSCH repetition type B and TBoMS), it is unclear why RB allocation is changed across PUSCH repetitions.

**LG**: Discuss prioritizations for transmission power reductions with joint channel estimation.

**Precoder cycling**

**Sharp:** For precoder cycling, the UE should not implicitly change precoder for PUSCH repetitions within at least the actual TDW because the gNB cannot identify that.

**Ericsson:** In our understanding, a UE can use precoder cycling according to implementation for PUSCHs/PUCCHs that are not bundled together. This can be when DMRS bundling is not configured or between different frequency hopping positions. The gNB will not be aware of such cycling. Therefore, precoder cycling should not be an event.

**CMCC:** The precoding cycling is transparent to gNB. And precoding cycling should not be considered as an event.

Apart from the above discussion, there are two additional issues to be discussed:

**Whether events are semi-static events or dynamic events?**

This issue is related to Issue #2-3. Companies (Nokia, NSB, vivo, OPPO, CTC, xiaomi, Sierra Wireless, Sharp, HW, HiSilicon, ZTE, CATT, LG) supporting Option 1 for Issue #2-3 support to differentiate semi-static events and dynamic events.

**Ericsson:** if L>max duration is not supported, it is already sufficient to define what conditions are events, without labeling them as semi-static or dynamic events.

**Apple:** Actual time domain window is determined in the order of event triggered by semi-static signaling, then event triggered by dynamic signaling.

**The time duration of an event**

**LG:** define either time duration of events or UE should report the start of actual time domain window after the event.

**Ericsson:** there is no need to further define the duration of an event beyond the working assumption on actual TDW determination.

**Other considerations:**

**Samsung**: Support the same RV within time domain window (at least for PUSCH repetitions Type A).

**Intel**: The events that violate power consistency and phase continuity may further include:

* If a PUSCH overlaps with PUCCH and UCI is multiplexed on the PUSCH repetition.
* If a UE needs to transmit another uplink channel/signal in a different carrier simultaneously.

**Sony** proposes to categorize the events into 4 subgroups, as:

1. **Events that can be handled by a UE**, relate to configurations that are not time critical and can be applied outside an active TDW or actual TDW. The specification impact relates to UE behavior.
2. **Scheduled events**, relate to events when both the UE and the gNB side is aware of the occurrence. Each time they happen a new TDW/actual TDW will be started. The specification impact is that scheduled events needs to be listed.
3. **UE capability conditioned events**, similar as for the scheduled events, both the UE and the gNB are aware of them and if the UE needs to restart a TDW/actual TDW is up to the UE capability. The specification impact is both the definition of the capability and, the conditioned behavior.
4. **Isolated events**, relates to events the UE need to perform instantaneously but where the gNB is not aware. If such events are present and how to be handled is not clear.

#### Issue #2-3: UE capability of restarting DMRS bundling

In RAN1 #106 b-e meeting the following agreement was achieved for UE capability of restarting DMRS bundling:

|  |
| --- |
| **Agreement**  Down-select one of the following options:   * **Option 1:** If DM-RS bundling is supported, UE is mandatory to support restarting DM-RS bundling due to semi-static events. UE capability of restarting DMRS bundling is applied only to dynamic events. * **Option 2:** UE capability of restarting DMRS bundling is applied to both semi-static events and dynamic events. |

Companies’ views are summarized as follows:

**Companies supporting Option 1**: Nokia, NSB, vivo, OPPO, CTC, xiaomi, Sierra Wireless, Sharp, HW, HiSilicon, ZTE, CATT, LG

**Companies supporting Option 2**: Spreadtrum, Panasonic, CMCC, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, MediaTek

**Sierra Wireless**: There have been no agreements made WRT which events are considered semi-static vs dynamic events. Thus, assuming semi-static event are events which are known before the start of the transmission and dynamic events are only known after the start of the transmission then we support Option 1.

**Nokia**: RAN1 to clarify whether the UE capability of restarting DM-RS bundling is applicable per configured TDW or across all configured TDW.

**LG**: If UE is mandatory to support restarting DM-RS bundling due to semi-static event, working assumptions in RAN1#106-e and RAN1#106b-e should be revisited to describe the start of the other actual time domain window.

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

In RAN1 #104b-e meeting, two options were agreed to be down selected about the bundle size of inter-slot frequency hopping with inter-slot bundling.

* 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.

In RAN1 #106b-e, the following agreement was made.

|  |
| --- |
| **Agreement:**  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. One option of the following options is to be selected.   * Option 1: “hopping intervals determination” -> “configured TDW determination” -> “actual TDW determination” * Option 2: “configured TDW determination” -> “hopping intervals determination” -> “actual TDW determination” * Option 4: “configured TDW determination” -> “actual TDW determination” and “hopping intervals determination”   Note: option 1 and 2 assume a hopping interval can be different than an actual TDW. Option 4 assumes a hopping interval is the same as an actual TDW. |

The above three options are illustrated below:



Fig.1 Illustration of the configured hopping interval smaller than the window length of the configured TDWs for option 1



Fig.2 Illustration of the configured hopping interval larger than the window length of the configured TDWs for option 1



Fig.3 Illustration of the hopping interval equal to the window length of the configured TDWs for option 2



Fig.4 Illustration of the hopping intervals equal to the window length of the actual TDWs for option 4

**FL comments:** This issue is discussed under AI 8.8.2.

## 2.5 TPC command

In RAN1#106bis-e meeting, the handling of TPC command was discussed extensively [12]. During the discussion, accumulated TPC commands and absolute TPC commands were discussed separately as follows.

|  |
| --- |
| **Accumulate TPC commands:**   * The action of TPC commands does not constitute an event that violates power consistency and phase continuity.   + If UE is configured to accumulate TPC commands, down select one of the following options.     - Option 1: If UE receives TPC commands that would take into effect during an actual TDW, UE accumulates TPC commands without taking effect during the current actual TDW. TPC commands take effect after the current actual TDW.     - Option 2: If UE receives TPC commands that would take into effect during a configured TDW, UE accumulates TPC commands without taking effect during the current configured TDW.   **Absolute TPC commands:**   * If UE is not configured to accumulate TPC commands, down select one of the following alternatives.   + Alt 1: the last TPC command that would take effect within a configured TDW supersedes all previous TPC commands that take effect within that configured TDW and only the last TPC command is applied by the UE.     - FFS: no more than 1 TPC command is expected to take effect during a configured TDW.   + ~~Alt 2: no more than 1 TPC command is expected to take effect during a configured TDW.~~   + Alt 3: the last TPC command that would take effect within an actual TDW supersedes all previous TPC commands that take effect within that actual TDW and only the last TPC command is applied by the UE.     - FFS: no more than 1 TPC command is expected to take effect during an actual TDW.   + ~~Alt 4: no more than 1 TPC command is expected to take effect during an actual TDW.~~   + Alt 5: The UE applies TPC commands after a configured TDW. It is left to UE implementation which TPC commands to apply from those that would take effect within the configured TDW.   + Alt 6: The UE applies TPC commands after an actual TDW. It is left to UE implementation which TPC commands to apply from those that would take effect within the actual TDW. |

For accumulate TPC commands, companies’ views are summarized as follows:

**Companies supporting Option 1**: vivo, OPPO, Panasonic, CTC, xiaomi, CMCC, Samsung, HW, HiSilicon, CATT, InterDigital, LG

**Companies supporting Option 2**: Nokia, NSB, Sharp, NTT DOCOMO, Intel, Ericsson

For absolute TPC commands, companies’ views are summarized as follows:

**Companies supporting Alt 1**: Sharp

**Companies supporting Alt 3**: vivo, OPPO, CMCC, Samsung, HW, HiSilicon

**Companies supporting Alt 4**: CATT

**Companies supporting Alt 5**: Ericsson

**Other considerations**

**Apple**: Clarify power control for PUSCH repetition first, then determine whether new power control mechanism is introduced for DMRS bundling.

**LG**: Select one of the following alternatives for TPC command without accumulation when joint channel estimation is enabled.

* Alt. 1: TPC without accumulation is semi-static event with 1 slot time duration.
* Alt. 2: Enabling joint channel estimation implies enabling of TPC accumulation.

**Qualcomm**: A UE is not expected to receive TPC commands that take effect during a configured time domain window.

**Nokia/NSB:** for paired spectrum, wherein the reception/monitoring of a DL transmission does not break power consistency and phase continuity (at least no agreement in both RAN1 and RAN4 exists that prevents such scenario for paired spectrum), then the PDCCH carrying the DCI that contains TPC command could be considered as an event. However, if TPC command is applied in the next configured TDW instead of the next actual TDW, then it is not necessary to consider TPC command as an event, even for paired spectrum.

## 2.6 TA adjustment

In RAN1#106bis-e meeting, the handling of TA adjustment was discussed extensively. The latest FL’s proposals on this topic are as follows [12].

|  |
| --- |
| * The action of TA commands does not constitute an event that violates power consistency and phase continuity, down select one of the following options.   + Option 1: UE performs TA adjustment after the actual TDW if it receives any TA command indicating TA adjustment during the actual TDW.     - FFS: UE receives no more than 1 TA command whose action time falls within an actual TDW.   + Option 2: UE performs TA adjustment after the configured TDW if it receives any TA command indicating TA adjustment during the configured TDW.     - FFS: UE receives no more than 1 TA command whose action time falls within a configured TDW. |

**Companies supporting Option 1**: vivo, Panasonic, CTC, xiaomi, CMCC, Apple, Sharp, CATT(2nd), InterDigital

**Companies supporting Option 2**: NTT DOCOMO, Intel, Ericsson

**LG**:

**gNB indicated TA adjustment：**

Select one of the following options for the gNB indicated TA adjustment when joint channel estimation is enabled.

* Opt. 1: gNB indicated TA adjustment is semi-static event without time duration.
* Opt. 2: gNB indicated TA adjustment that taking effect during the configured or actual time domain window is applied right after the end of the time domain window.

To support above Opt. 2, select one of the following options for the multiple gNB indicated TA adjustment during a time domain window.

* Alt. 1: UE expects only single TA adjustment is indicated during the time domain window.
* Alt. 2: UE applies multiple TA adjustments right after the end of time domain window in the indicated order.
* Alt. 3: UE applies only single TA adjustment during the time domain window even multiple indicated.

**UE autonomous TA adjustment：**

UE should report the end of the actual time domain window when it is terminated by the UE autonomous TA adjustment.

Discuss whether the reduced slot due to TA adjustment is included in the time domain window or not.

**CATT**: 1st preference is that the action of TA command constitutes a dynamic event.

**Qualcomm**: A UE is not expected to receive TA commands indicating TA adjustment during a configured time domain window.

**Nokia/NSB:** The action of TA commands does not constitute an event that violates power consistency and phase continuity, down select one of the following options.

* Option 1: UE performs TA adjustment after the actual TDW if it receives any TA command indicating TA adjustment during the actual TDW.
  + FFS: in which actual TDW after the current actual TDW the TA adjustment is applied.
* Option 2: UE performs TA adjustment after the configured TDW if it receives any TA command indicating TA adjustment during the configured TDW.

## 2.7 JCE for PUSCH repetition type B and TBoMS

Companies (Nokia, NSB, CTC, Samsung) propose that the time domain window determination procedure agreed for PUSCH repetition type A is also applicable for PUSCH repetition type B and TBoMS.

Nokia proposes that the configured TDWs determination procedure for PUSCH repetition type A counting based on physical slots is applied for PUSCH repetition type B and the configured TDWs determination procedure for PUSCH repetition type A counting based on available slots is applied for TBoMS.

Panasonic thinks PUSCH repetition Type B cannot be supported as it does not reuse only those joint channel estimation specification enhancements defined to support repetition Type A considering that the terminology of "available slot" is not used for PUSCH repetition Type B specified in current Rel. 15/16.

InterDigital proposes to support joint channel estimation for TBoMS repetition. The DMRS bundling restarting behavior for actual TDW needs to be modified correspondingly. For joint channel estimation for TBoMS repetitions, the earliest actual TDW occurs at the first symbol of the next ToT (TBoMS transmission occasion) as illustrated in the following figure.



Figure. Joint channel estimation for TBoMS repetitions (N=4, m=3), actual TDW is denoted by “A-TDW”

## 2.8 Others

**Coherent transmission indication**

**LG**: The coherent transmission indication using DMRS resource (e.g., DMRS port, DMRS phase) should be reported at least for the end of the actual time domain window due to the dynamic event.

**Qualcomm**: UE signals a bundling indication in the UCI multiplexing with PUSCH transmission to indicate whether a PUSCH transmission is coherent with respect to the other PUSCH transmission. The motivation of the coherent transmission indication is due to the fact that some events on the UE side may impact the phase continuity but such change may not be known to the gNB. These events may include: frequency error correction, timing correction, RF calibration, antenna virtualization and etc.

**Phase drifting**

**CMCC**: The impact of phase drifting to the performance of joint channel estimation under a large number of consecutive slots should be studied.

**PTRS:**

**InterDigital:** Support to include PTRS in a DMRS bundle. Parameters of PTRS in the DMRS bundle depend on duration of the time window, SCS, bandwidth for PUSCH, and MCS used with DMRS bundling.

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

1. Email discussion (1st round)

## 3.1 Use cases for joint channel estimation

**Use case 4b:**

**Proposal 1:**

* For non-back-to-back PUSCH/PUCCH transmissions across consecutive slots, the other uplink transmission in the middle of two PUSCH/PUCCH transmissions constitutes an event that violates power consistency and phase continuity.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support the proposal. |
| ZTE | Support |
| QC | Support. |
| Spreadtrum | Support |
| Nokia/NSB | We prefer to wait until receiving a new LS from RAN4. |
| Intel | Share similar view as Nokia. |
| CMCC | General fine. Since only other UL transmissions with the same bandwidth, precoding, antenna ports and ect, will not interrupt the power consistency and phase continuity, which is a very restrict limitations. We can accept to a bigger step that any other uplink transmission is forbidden or the power consistency and phase continuity will be broken. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support |
| Samsung | We are fine with FL’s proposal 1. |
| LG | Support |
| WILUS | We support the proposal. |
| Panasonic | We are fine with the proposal 1. |
| CATT | Support. |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| Sharp | Support |
| TCL | Support |
| Apple | Ok |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support. |
| Ericsson | Support |

## 3.2 Time domain window

**Proposal 2: Confirm the following working assumption**

|  |
| --- |
| **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. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support the proposal. |
| ZTE | Support |
| QC | Support in principle but prefer to wait for resolution on L <= max duration. |
| vivo | Support the proposal. |
| Spreadtrum | Support |
| Nokia/NSB | Support the FL’s proposal. |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal. |
| CMCC | We still think it is good enough as a working assumption, as part of the contents are still under discussion in section 3.3.1 and 3.3.2 and without a conclusion. As there are still lots of FFSs inside, then it is more proper as a working assumption. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support, but would prefer to also resolve on the value of L, whether it can be longer than max duration or not |
| Samsung | Support to confirm the above WA in principle. |
| LG | Agree with QC. We can revisit it after the maximum value of configured TDW is settled. |
| WILUS | We share the similar view with Qualcomm and CMCC. It can be confirmed according to further discussion and conclusion. |
| Panasonic | Support the proposal 2 |
| CATT | Support. |
| Xiaomi | Support to confirm the above WA. |
| Sharp | Support |
| TCL | Support |
| Apple | Support |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | OK to confirm it if the following subbullet is not FFS anymore, which is quite straightforward and has been checked for multiple meetings.   * + FFS: The configured TDWs are consecutive for paired spectrum/SUL band |
| Ericsson | Support |

### 3.2.1 Configured TDW

#### Issue #1: The window length *L* of the configured TDW

#### Issue #1-1: The maximum value of L

**FL comments:** Based on the discussion in RAN1 #106b-e, companies tend to converge on option 1’. In addition, based on the guideline in R1-2111193, default values are primarily important for cases where the NW has not yet provided a (UE-specific) configuration. In other cases, it can help clarify what the UE does when a parameter or feature is not configured. Thus, let’s focus on the discussion on option 1’. There are two sub-options for option 1’. To make each option clearer, they are modified as follows.

**Option 1’-a:**

* If L is configured, the maximum value of window length L of the configured TDW should not exceed the maximum duration, which is reported as UE capability as the duration where UE is able to maintain power consistency and phase continuity subject to power consistency and phase continuity requirements.
* If L is not configured, the default value of L = min (maximum duration, duration of all PUSCH repetitions)

**Option 1’-b:**

* If L is configured, the maximum value of window length L of the configured TDW should not exceed the maximum duration, which is reported as UE capability as the duration where UE is able to maintain power consistency and phase continuity subject to power consistency and phase continuity requirements.
* If L is not configured, the default value of L is the duration of all PUSCH repetitions.

Pros and cons for each options are summarized below.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Pros | Cons |
| **Option 1’-a** | Error propagation is restricted within one configured TDW. | May cause segment of UL slots for counting based on physical slots for TDD. |
| **Option 1’-b** | Can achieve best performance if no dynamic events | May have error propagation across configured TDWs in case of dynamic events. |

Companies are encouraged to provide further views on the above two options.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| NTT DOCOMO | We do not support either option. The default behaviour should not be supported for joint channel estimation. According to LS from RAN2 (R1-1905937), RAN2 requested RAN1 not to define default values for UEs in RRC connected mode.  @FL In what scenario do you assume UE applies DMRS-bundling without RRC configuration? We only assume DMRS-bundling is applied after UE acquires RRC configuration. Otherwise, it is not clear how UE determines whether to enable or disable DMRS-bundling. |
| ZTE | Suggest not to define a default value as commented by NTT DOCOMO. If defined, Option 1 a’ is preferred. |
| QC | Prefer additional clarity on what RAN2 guidance is.  If they are okay with us providing a default behavior, then we can go with Option 1’-a |
| vivo | In our understanding, there is no necessity to discuss the default value for configured window length. According to the following agreement,   |  | | --- | | **Agreement**     Introduce two RRC parameters to indicate enabling of DM-RS bundling and the window length of the configured TDW respectively. |   Based on this agreement, NW have to provide configured window length to enable DMRS bundling. And the window length should provide the window lengthbased on required performance and resource configuration e.g. DL-UL-configuration. The default value may not be the expected one, which bring in the better performance, why not to configure the expected one?  From RRC parameter perspective, it can be easily solved by add some description, such as, *PUSCH-TimeDomainWindowLength* should be configured if *PUSCH-DMRS-Bundling* is set to ‘enabled’, which can be left to RAN2 discussion. We think there is no necessity to discuss the default value. |
| Spreadtrum | Agree with NTT DOCOMO, default value is not preferred. |
| Nokia/NSB | We share the same view as NTT DOCOMO that a default value is not needed. If a default value is defined, we prefer Option 1’-b. |
| Intel | Share similar view as NTT DOCOMO and prefer the original Option 1.  If majority companies think that a default value is needed, we can make compromise to support Option 1’-a. |
| CMCC | We are open for the discussion about the default value issue raised by RAN2. And if it is allowed, the option 1’-a is preferred.  I am not sure if this is the exactly the case raised by RAN2, if we consider the repetition numbers is kind of implicit indication of the duration of L. With the consideration of TDD-UL-DL configuration and repetition numbers are already configured by RRC, they are more like a candidate value. We do not have strong views about this. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | In principle, we are fine with both options, but have higher preference for option 1a’ |
| Samsung | We prefer Option 1’-a. Option 1’-a seems to be the most appropriate way to determine the window length L of the configured TDW without potentially introducing an additional event. In addition, we don’t see Option 1’-b would outperform Option 1’-a. |
| InterDigital | We have the same view as NTT Docomo and we prefer Option 1. |
| FL | We have achieved the agreement on issue #1-1, no further discussion is needed. |

#### Issue #1-2: Configuration/Indication of L

**FL comments:** It seems the majority do not support dynamic indication of the window length L of the configured TDW.

**Proposal 3:**

* Dynamic indication of the window length *L* of the configured TDW by DCI or indicated by TDRA table with one additional entry is not supported.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| NTT DOCOMO | We do not support the proposal. The desired window length is dependant on TDRA. As LS from RAN2(R1-1905937), the default behaviour is not recommended by RAN2. Then, how can we adjust the configured time domain window according to TDRA? As dynamic window length indication apparently achieves better coverage performance than only single value, we cannot support this proposal. |
| ZTE | Support. The window length L can be separately configured with TDRA. |
| QC | We acknowledge the issue flagged by DCM. Setting same value of L for 4 repetitions vs. 32 repetitions may not be ideal. We are open to simpler solutions via RRC where L value is provided as a function of number of repetitions. |
| Vivo | Support the proposal. |
| Nokia/NSB | We support the FL’s proposal. We do not see the need of dynamically modifying the configured TDW length, given that it’s just nominal duration. In addition, adding more information to TDRA table would make the configuration of TDRA table being too restrictive. |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support the proposal |
| Samsung | OK with the proposal |
| LG | Support the proposal. The motivation of dynamic indication of window length is not clear. |
| WILUS | We support the proposal. |
| Panasonic | We share similar view with DOCOMO. In addition, we would like to highlight that the TDRA table approach possibly provides an alignment with the period of an inter-slot frequency hopping and/or inter-slot precoder cycling with joint channel estimation. Depending on the repetition number, which can be dynamic indication by DCI, the window length *L* can be adjusted. |
| CATT | Agree with the proposal. |
| Xiaomi | Fine with the proposal |
| Sharp | Support the proposal |
| Apple | Support this proposal |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support the proposal. |
| Ericsson | Support the proposal. The window already adapts to the PUSCH duration as well as to the TDD or FH patterns, etc. We expect this is sufficient for Rel-17. |
|  |  |

#### Issue #1-3: Candidate values of L

**FL comments:** The candidate values of L depend on the maximum duration. Based on RAN4 discussion, RAN4 is studying the impact of enabling up to 32 slots for maximum duration and other numbers beyond 32 slots are not analyzed in RAN4.

**Proposal 4:**

* The candidate values of the window length *L* of the configured TDW can be any integer value that is larger than 1 and no larger than the maximum duration.
* FFS: candidate values if *L* can be larger than the maximum duration.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| NTT DOCOMO | The candidate value should include 1 so that the window length can implicitly indicate either DMRS-bundling enabling or disabling. |
| ZTE | Fine with the proposal with removing the whole FFS bullets. We have agreed to use a separate RRC to enable or disable DMRS bundling. So, there is no need to set L to 1. |
| QC | Support |
| vivo | The FFS part should be removed. |
| Spreadtrum | Support. |
| Nokia/NSB | On the one hand, the candidate values for maximum duration is unclear, and we still need to wait until receiving further LS from RAN4. On the other hand, what is clear is that L can be equal to the repetition duration (otherwise, it’s contradicts again the intention of having a middle ground WA). Therefore, we prefer to either postponing this discussion until receiving further LS from RAN4 or we modify the proposal as follows:  **Proposal 4:**  The minimum candidate value for the window length L should be the minimum supported maximum time duration value as per RAN4 indication. Other ~~The~~ candidate values of the window length *L* of the configured TDW can be any integer value larger than the minimum value of L from the candidate values for number of repetitions defined for PUSCH repetition type A ~~that is larger than 1 and no larger than the maximum duration~~.  FFS: whether the maximum value of L is 16 or 32. |
| Intel | We are fine the proposal by removing the FFS part. |
| CMCC | Fine with the proposal. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support without the FFS |
| Samsung | We are fine with the 1st bullet of proposal 4, and with deleting the FFS bullet. |
| LG | Fine with the proposal. |
| FL | Since we have agreed L cannot be larger than the maximum duration. Proposal 4 is updated as follows.  **Proposal 4-v2:**   * The candidate values of the window length *L* of the configured TDW can be any integer value that is larger than 1 and no larger than the maximum duration. |
| WILUS | We support the FL’s updated proposal 4-v2. |
| Panasonic | We only support the proposal without FFS or the FL’s updated proposal 4-v2. |
| CATT | Fine with the FL’s updated proposal. |
| Xiaomi | Support the proposal after being updated. |
| Sharp | Support the updated proposal |
| TCL | Support |
| Apple | Support the updated proposal |
| Nokia/NSB | We are fine with FL’s proposal 4-v2, given the agreement made in the previous GTW. |
| Samsung | Support |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support the updated proposal. |
| Ericsson | Support the updated proposal. |

#### Issue #1-4: Counting of L based on available slots

**FL comments:** From FL understanding, based on the working assumption, each configured TDW consists of one or multiple consecutive physical slots, regardless of the counting based on physical slots or available slots.

Companies are encouraged to provide views whether it is necessary to the configured time domain window length L is counted on available slots as proposed in R1-2110865.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support the working assumption and share the same view with FL.  Each configured TDW consists of consecutive physical slots regardless of the counting way. It is just the starting and ending symbols of configured TDW are determined based on available slot when the available slot counting is applied. |
| ZTE | We share the same understanding with FL. If the configured TDW is based on available slot, it will end up with L larger than maximum duration even if L is configured. This is not aligned with our discussion in Issue#1-1. |
| QC | We share FL’s understanding. Configured TDWs are across consecutive physical slots. |
| vivo | Agree with FL. It is Not necessary to consider the configured window based on available slots.  In our understanding, the configured window is just a nominal window, while the actual window determines performance of JCE . Even though the configured window is determined based on available slots, the configured window may also be segmented into multiple actual window due to the unavailable slots within the duration of the configured window. |
| Spreadtrum | We think it is a good clarification for configured TDW length L. Because we only clearly defined the start of the first configured TDW, the end of the last configured TDW. The other TDWs are given based on the end of the previous TDW, which is not quite clear. Actually, we are more prefer configured time domain window length L is counted on available slots when PUSCH repetition is based on available slots.  Because we only support consecutive slots cases for JCE, do not support dis-consecutive slots. When there is unavailable slots within a configured window, anyhow UE should treated as an event, which means the actual TDW would be end before the event, and a new actual TDW would be start later depends on the UE capability. Therefore, total length of L larger than maximum duration does not break anything, UE never holds the actual TDW window larger than max duration. On the other hand, in order to maintain continuous slots as long as possible, these unavailable slots should not be counted in window length L. |
| Nokia/NSB | The ambiguity stems from the highlighted text from the agreement:  *Agreement*   * *For PUSCH repetition type A counting based on physical slots*   + *The configured TDWs are consecutive, where the start of other configured TDWs is the first physical slot right after the last physical slot of a previous configured TDW.* * *For PUSCH repetition type A counting based on available slots*   + *The configured TDWs are determined based on available slots, where start of a configured TDWs is the first available slot after the last available slot of a previous configured TDW.*   *Note: The determination of available slots for PUSCH repetition Type A is defined in AI 8.8.1.1*  It is indeed a bit unnatural to have that each TDW consists of consecutive slots and is determined based on available slots for PUSCH repetition type A counting based on available slots. Clarification is needed. |
| Intel | We suggest to keep the agreement. It is natural to consider the configured TDW based on available slots for PUSCH repetition type A counting based on available slots |
| CMCC | Counting based on the available slot is more efficient for the available slot based repetitions. Though for the duration in the unpaired spectrum, the duration of L could be larger that the maximum duration. But it could not break any joint channel estimation. And if in the paired spectrum, as the available slot would be consecutive, then L should not be larger than the maximum duration. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Similar understanding as FL, that configured TDW span across consecutive physical slots |
| Samsung | We share a similar view with FL. If available slot is configured, there will be multiple actual TDWs within a configured TDW separated by slots that are not available. |
| InterDigital | We have the same view as the FL. |
| LG | Our view is different from FL’s understanding. The unit for counting slot is the slots that constitutes TDW, i.e., each configured TDW consists of one or multiple consecutive for consecutive available slots if the counting based on available slots. It is our understanding that is the reason why we agreed on counting based on physical/available slots separately. |
| WILUS | In our understanding, it can be different w.r.t. the slot counting method. According to the agreement that Nokia/NSB attached, it was agreed to support determination of configured TDWs based on available slots when *AvailableSlotCounting* is enabled. The WA can be revised if this issue is clarified. |
| Panasonic | We share a similar view with FL. The configured TDW includes consecutive physical slots regardless of the counting way. The only difference between the counting based on physical slots or available slots is about the determination of the start/end of the configured TDW. |
| CATT | We have sympathy with Nokia that this is a bit ambiguity, since we agreed that ‘For PUSCH repetition type A counting based on available slots, the configured TDWs are determined based on available slots’.  Clarification on the relationship between ‘determined based on available slots’ and ‘consists consecutive physical slots’ is needed. |
| Xiaomi | We share a same view with FL’s understanding. Configured TDWs are across consecutive physical slots. |
| Sharp | The one configured TDW should consist of L consecutive physical slots. For example, the configured TDWs (expressed as square brackets) are determined when L = 4 and the number K of repetitions = 4 (whose positions are expressed as underline) in DDDSUDDSUU as the following:  DDDS[UDDS][UUDD]DS[U]DDSUU |
| Apple | We share the same understanding as FL. But some clarifications are needed as pointed out by Nokia. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We would like to echo Nokia’s comment. More discussions are encouraged because it is trying to clarify the end of a configured TDW which has not been clearly described yet.  For example, assuming DDDSUDDSUU, if a UE is configured with L=5 and is scheduled with a PUSCH repetition Type A in length of 3 available slots and 13 symbols each slot, then the scheduled slots are U + UU. Which one below is the common understanding on configured TDW now?  Alt 1: the first configured TDW is U (in DDDSU), and the second configured TDW is UU (in DDSUU), since it is based on available slot.  Alt 2: the first configured TDW is UDDSU and the second configured TDW is UDDDS. As a result, two actual TDWs are immediately split within the first configured TDW as two separate U, while in the second configured TDW, it is U.  From performance perspective, Alt 1 is better than Alt 2 because Alt 2 unnecessarily avoids JCE on the consecutive UU.  Therefore, we propose a clarification  ***Proposal***:  *For PUSCH repetition type A counting based on available slots, a configured TDWs with length L are determined based on available slots and comprises only no more than L consecutive available slots.* |
| Ericsson | Agree we may need some clarification.  The units of the maximum duration should match those of the configured value L. I expect that RAN4 will define the maximum duration in slots rather than available slots. On the other hand, the TDW is sized by the PUSCH repetitions, and so it does make sense to define the windows by available slots when these are used to transmit the PUSCH. I expect it is not too difficult to constrain the TDWs using units of (‘physical’) slots. |

### 3.2.2 Actual time domain window

#### Issue #2: The determination of actual TDW

#### Issue #2-1: The start/end of the actual TDW

**Proposal 5: Confirm the following working assumption**

|  |
| --- |
| **Working assumption:**   * The start of the first actual TDW is the first ~~available~~ symbol (at least determined by TDRA table) ~~in available slot~~ for the first PUSCH transmission in an available slot within the configured TDW. * The end of the actual TDW is   + the last ~~available~~ symbol (at least determined by TDRA table) ~~in available slot~~ for the last PUSCH transmission in an available slot within the configured TDW if the actual TDW reaches the end of the last PUSCH transmission within the configured TDW.   + the last ~~available~~ symbol (at least determined by TDRA table) ~~in available slot~~ of the PUSCH transmission right before the event if an event occurs that violates power consistency and phase continuity, and the PUSCH transmission is in an available slot. * For UE capable of restarting DM-RS bundling, the start of the new actual TDW is the first ~~available~~ symbol (at least determined by TDRA table) ~~in available slot~~ for PUSCH transmission after the event violates power consistency and phase continuity, and the PUSCH transmission is in an available slot. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support the proposal. |
| ZTE | Support |
| QC | Support |
| Spreadtrum | Considering this definition of actual TDW is not only for PUSCH repetition type A, but also for PUSCH repetition type B, we would like to check the “at least determined by TDRA table” part first before confirm it. In our paper, we gives some examples for the other cases beside first or last symbol is not determined by TDRA table for PUSCH repetition type B, but determined by slot boundary or events.  So two methods could be fine:  Method1: Clarify there are other cases for first/end symbol besides determined by TDRA table, which can be FFS.  Method2: Study further for all the cases for first/end symbol firstly, and then confirm the WA. |
| Nokia/NSB | Support the FL’s proposal. |
| Intel | We are fine with FL proposal. |
| CMCC | Support |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Fine to support |
| Samsung | Support to confirm the WA. |
| InterDigital | Support |
| LG | As we pointed out in our contribution, the reduced slot due to TA adjustment may not include the symbol indicated by TDRA table. Discussion regarding it should be taken. |
| WILUS | We support the proposal. |
| Panasonic | Support the proposal 5. |
| CATT | We support the proposal. |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| Sharp | Support |
| TCL | If the UE indicates the capability of [partialCancellation], only partial PUSCH transmission is cancelled. However another part of PUSCH transmission is not included in any actual TDW based on the current proposal. |
| Apple | Support |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support. |
| Ericsson | Support |

#### Issue #2-2: Events that violate power consistency and phase continuity

**FL comments:** Regarding the change of transmission parameters, some companies think it is not necessary to discuss this type of event, since some parameters will not change while other parameters are covered by other events.

* Transmission parameters need to be changed due to network-indicated operations, including: Tx power, UL beam/TPMI, and RB allocation.

Companies are encouraged to answer the following questions.

Q1: Whether it is necessary to consider the change of transmission parameters as an event?

Q2: If the answer to Q1 is yes, which parameters should be considered while not covered by other events?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| ZTE | Q1: Yes. As long as the transmission parameters could violate the phase continuity, it should be considered as event.  Q2: In our view, Tx power, UL beam/TPMI, RB allocation, and Tx/BWP switching should be considered. |
| QC | Yes, it should be included. It provides clarity on UE behavior. Examples include change in RB allocation due to frequency hopping or change in UL beam due to mTRP operation. |
| Vivo | Q1: Yes. Except that we do not understand ‘RB allocation’ change due to NW indicated operation?  Q2: Not sure whether we need to consider CA cases. When CA is enabled, events on other serving cell may also impact phase continuity.  One example is power sharing between multiple UL carriers. The Tx power may be not changed for one serving cell but total tx power is changed, the phase continuity may be changed. Besides, reception on other serving cell also leads to violation of phase continuity.  If JCE is enabled only for single carrier operation, a conclusion is needed. |
| Spreadtrum | Q1:Yes  Q2: RB allocation in case of frequency hopping. |
| Nokia/NSB | It is unclear to us what are the other transmission parameters. At least, the following questions need to be clarified:   * What is the network-indicated operation for Tx power and what is the difference with TPC command? * What is the use case of having different UL beam/TPMI (other than precoder cycling) across the PUSCH repetitions? * For PUSCH repetition type A (and also PUSCH repetition type B and TboMS), what is the use case of changing RB allocation across PUSCH repetitions? Please note that this would not be possible according to agreements for TboMS in AI 8.8.1.2. Is this about FH? |
| Intel | Q1: yes  Q2: We also suggest to include SRI in case of multi-TRP operation. |
| CMCC | Q1: yes  Q2: legacy frequency hopping should be considered as an event. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Q1: Yes, any transmission parameter that can affect the phase continuity and power consistency should be considered as an event  Q2: Frequency hopping, RB allocation, beam switch |
| LG | Q1: No.  According to agreement, since TPC command and frequency hopping separately listed, it is our understanding that all other parameters cannot be changed during repetition, they are only configured when scheduling. |
| Panasonic | Q1: Yes. It provides a clear behaviour to UE.  Q2: Tx power, UL beam/TPMI. Regarding RB allocation aspect, does FL intend to interact with FH pattern? If yes, we suggest considering this aspect with the discussion on the interaction with FH and joint channel estimation. |
| CATT | Q1: Y.  Q2: Possibly Tx power (TPC command activation) and RB (frequency hopping). But we do not see the need to consider UL beam/TPMI change. |
| Xiaomi | Q1:Yes  Q2: Frequency hopping also should be included besides Tx power, UL beam/TPMI, and RB allocation. |
| Sharp | Q1: Yes  Q2: UL beam |
| Apple | It’s not fully clear the question here. Are these parameter changes is triggered by other DCI? such as TPC, it is discussed in another section. What does it mean of RB allocation change? It is changed by scheduling DCI with frequency hopping? Or by other means. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Q1: No.  Similar view as LG. |
| Ericsson | Q1: In short, no.  If these transmission parameters could change, then they would naturally be events. However, if as LG points out they are set once for all repetitions, then they are not events. Regarding UL M-TRP, we would like to understand why it is sufficient to not configure DMRS bundling. Also, can companies clarify what is meant by ‘UL/beam TPMI’: is this a change in SRI or something else? |

**FL comments:** Based on companies’ views, whether precoder cycling is used is up to UE implementation and it is transparent to gNB. UE should not change precoder within the actual TDW because the gNB cannot identify that.

**Proposal 6:**

* Precoder cycling does not constitute an event that violates power consistency and phase continuity.
* UE should not perform procoder cycling within the actual TDW.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| ZTE | Fine with the proposal. |
| QC | Can we go with just the second statement. First statement by itself doesn’t seem accurate as precoder cycling does impact power consistency and phase continuity. |
| Vivo | Not sure the meaning of precoding cycling. Hope proponents can clarify.  Based on our understanding for PUCCH&PUSCH transmission in Rel-16, for codebook based PUSCH transmission, the precoder is indicated by TPMI, and precoder is not changed across PUSCH repetitions. For non-codebook based PUSCH transmission, the precoder follows the same antenna port of SRS. For PUCCH, the antenna port follows the indicated spatial relation info. Hence, we do not find any cases that precoder can be cycled across PUSCH/PUCCH repetitions. If our understanding is wrong, hope companies can correct us.  In Rel-17 MIMO, beam switching every repetition or every 2 repetitions are supported. If it is considered as ‘Precoder cycling’ in the FL proposal, we are fine to consider it as an event. Otherwise, we do not think precoder cycling is an event, based on our understanding on Rel-16. |
| Nokia/NSB | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Intel | We share similar view as Vivo. If this is for multi-TRP operation, precoder cycling should be considered as an event. |
| CMCC | Precoder cycling is transparent to spec. When the implementation is not clear, we cannot consider it as an event or not. But if the UE reports to support JCE, the precoding cycling should not impact |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Similar view as QC. Basically, if precoder cycling is done, it will be an event. Agree to keep second bullet for clarity |
| LG | Fine with proposal. |
| Panasonic | The fist bullet seems inaccurate because when precoder cycling is performed, it will be an event as mentioned by some companies. In this sense, we think a precoder cycling is performed within an actual TDW in order to maximize performance again. |
| CATT | Fine with proposal. |
| Sharp | Support the proposal |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Precoder cycling does not have to violate phase contiguity, a UE should be allowed to perform precoder cycling but not violate JCE requirements. Therefore, we propose to remove the second bullet, or revise the second bullet as   * UE is not expected to violate power consistency and phase continuity ~~should not perform procoder cycling~~ within the actual TDW due to any precoder cycling. |
| Ericsson | Given the interpretation of multi-TRP from vivo, we support the proposal. |

**FL comments:** Regarding whether events are semi-static events or dynamic events, it depends on whether UE capability of restarting DMRS bundling is applied only to dynamic events. Companies are encouraged to provide views on how to differentiate semi-static events or dynamic events if the differentiation is necessary.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| ZTE | In general, our thinking is as long as an event is associated with a DCI, it is a dynamic event. For instance, if the dropping/cancellation is due to dynamic SFI, it is considered as dynamic events. Otherwise if the dropping/cancellation is due to DL-UL RRC configuration, it is a semi-static event. |
| QC | Suggest avoiding this classification. Its going to be a rather difficult exercise. |
| Vivo | In our understanding, if the event is caused by semi-static configuration, then it is semi-static events. Otherwise, it belongs to dynamic events. |
| Nokia/NSB | We share similar view with ZTE that as long as an event is associated with a DCI, it is a dynamic event. |
| Intel | If this is associated with a DCI, then it is dynamic event.  Suggest to resolve the issue for restarting DMRS bundling first. |
| CMCC | Similar views as above companies. The event that is triggered through DCI, then it is a dynamic event. |
| Samsung | It is not clear that there is a need for such differentiation. |
| LG | Since down-selection between restarting DMRS bundle after semi-static event is mandated or not is already agreed, it is our understanding that we should differentiate dynamic/semi-static events.  If there is no possible misunderstanding regarding the time when event happens between gNB and UE, it can be defined as semi-static event. And if there is any possibility for misunderstanding regarding the time when event happens between gNB and UE, it can be defined as dynamic event. |
| CATT | We share similar view with ZTE. There will be difference, for example, error propagation may happen by dynamic events due to DCI missing. |
| Sharp | In our view, semi-static events are events identified by higher-layer configuration and the DCI which schedules the PUSCH repetition, and dynamic events are events identified by another DCI. |
| Apple | Share the similar view as ZTE and Sharp.  One clarification question, why restarting the DMRS bundling after dynamic event is a UE capability? Whatever the event is semi-static or dynamic, if UE can re-start the transmission, then there is timeline issue, no power adjustment issue otherwise UE will not re-start the transmission. Maybe I missed something here? |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We share the similar view with ZTE, Nokia. |
| Ericsson | We would prefer to first understand why there is a need to distinguish dynamic vs. semi-static events, especially given that we have agreed to Option 1’-a for the TDW definitions. |
| FL | This issue can be discussed together with issue#2-3. |

**FL comments:** Regarding the time duration of an event, Companies are encouraged to answer the following questions.

Q1: Is it necessary to define the time duration of an event?

Q2: If the answer to Q1 is yes, how to define the time duration of an event?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| ZTE | Q1: Seems not necessary. Defining the start of each actual TDW is sufficient. |
| QC | Don’t see need to define time duration of an event. |
| Vivo | Q1: unnecessary. |
| Nokia/NSB | Q1: Not necessary. |
| Intel | Q1: not necessary. |
| CMCC | Q1: it is not necessary. |
| Samsung | Q1: No |
| LG | Q1: Depending on UE indicating coherent transmission, it is necessary due to possible misunderstanding of the start of actual TDW after event.  Q2: Slot-level events can be introduced. |
| Panasonic | Q1: No, it is not necessary. |
| CATT | Q1: Not necessary. |
| Xiaomi | Q1: Not necessary |
| Sharp | Q1: Not necessary |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Q1: unnecessary. |
| Ericsson | Q1: We think current agreements are sufficient. |
| FL | It seems the majority think it’s not necessary to consider the time duration of an event. |

Any other comments about events?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| LG | UE autonomous TA should be an event and the timing of it is not known to gNB. We should define UE behaviour regarding UE autonomous TA when joint CE enabled. |
| WILUS | As we described in our contribution [39], the UE transmits dynamically scheduled PUSCH in the set of symbols of the slot which overlaps with DL reception/monitoring according to current specification.    However, since DL reception/monitoring is regarded as an event that violates power consistency and phase continuity, symbols of PUSCH rep#4 that overlaps with DL reception/monitoring cannot be determined as a same actual TDW with PUSCH rep#5 and #6 even if they are actually transmitted without cancellation.  Therefore, if a collision occurs between DL reception/monitoring occasion and dynamically scheduled PUSCH in the set of symbols of the slot within the configured TDW, the DL reception/monitoring can be considered as not the event to determine the start of the actual TDW. |
| Ericsson | We think autonomous TA is already covered (but agree UE should not change it during a CTDW).  **Agreement**   * UE should not perform TA adjustment during the time domain window.   ‐   FFS: UE does not expect to receive TA command to indicate TA adjustment during the TDW.  ‐   FFS: UE ignores any TA command which indicates TA adjustment during the TDW.  ‐   FFS: UE performs TA adjustment after the TDW if it receives any TA command indicating TA adjustment during the TDW.  We think the following should be events:   * Dropping/cancellation based on Rel-17 collision rules. * Other UL transmission in between PUSCH/PUCCH transmissions. * Frequency hopping. |

#### Issue #2-3: UE capability of restarting DMRS bundling

**FL comments:** Regarding UE capability of restarting DMRS bundling, two options are discussed to be down selected. From FL understanding, as we have agreed that DL slot or DL reception/monitoring based on semi-static DL/UL configuration for unpaired spectrum is regarded as an event. For option 2, for UE not capable of restarting DMRS bundling, DMRS bundling cannot be supported after DL slot within the configured TDW. This seems a drawback of option 2.

* **Option 1:** If DM-RS bundling is supported, UE is mandatory to support restarting DM-RS bundling due to semi-static events. UE capability of restarting DMRS bundling is applied only to dynamic events.

**Support:** Nokia, NSB, vivo, OPPO, CTC, xiaomi, Sierra Wireless, Sharp, HW, HiSilicon, ZTE, CATT, Panasonic

* **Option 2:** UE capability of restarting DMRS bundling is applied to both semi-static events and dynamic events.

**Support:** Spreadtrum, ~~Panasonic~~, CMCC, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, MediaTek, Intel

Companies are encouraged to provide pros and cons of the above two options.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Option 1** | **Option 2** |
| NTT DOCOMO | Pros: some UE can restart DMRS bundling only due to semi-static events, which could reduce the UE burden with achieving JCE gains because UE does not have to restart DMRS bundling according to the dynamic signaling. | Pros: Since there is no need to define semi-static and dynamic events, it is simple. |
| ZTE | Pros: For semi-static events, a UE could well know where it needs to restart DMRS bundling once it is scheduled with PUSCH/PUCCH transmissions. From implementation point of view, it is the same as restart DMRS bundling between different configured TDWs (which is also semi-statically configured). So, as long as the UE can support DMRS bundling, it should be able to support restart DMRS bundling due to semi-static events. |  |
| QC |  | Classification of events is not straightforward. Suggest going with a simple approach. |
| Vivo | Pros: better performance. NW does not need to switch to per slot channels estimation due to semi-static events. | Cons: Degraded performance due to semi-static events. And NW also have to switch JCE granularity due to semi-static events, leading to higher complexity. |
| Spreadtrum |  | Pros: UE can use unified solution for restarting DMRS bundling.  And what is the benefit to differ the semi-static or dynamic events? |
| Nokia/NSB | Pros:  If Option 1 is adopted, then the spirit of the three options listed for the inter-slot FH with inter-slot bundling in the agreement made under AI 8.8.2 holds (see the cons of Option 2 on the same issue in next column). | Cons:   * For a UE that reports the capability of supporting JCE but it does not support restarting DM-RS bundling due to semi-static events, then JCE can only be applied in the first bundle of PUSCH transmissions for FH and cannot be applied across any bundle of PUSCH transmissions after the first frequency hopping, within a configured TDW. Therefore, if Option 2 is adopted, then the inter-slot FH with inter-slot bundling specified under AI 8.8.2 is incomplete, which does not fulfil the requirement in the WID. * Assuming a (semi-static) event that happens right after the first PUSCH repetition, then it is meaningless for a UE to report the capability of supporting JCE if it doesn’t have capability of restarting after semi-static events (and so as for dynamic events), since JCE cannot be applied across any bundle of PUSCH transmission in this scenario. |
| Intel |  | It is not necessary to differentiate semi-static and dynamic event. Note that current list of events is already very comprehensive, it is not beneficial to further differentiate these two to complicate the spec. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility |  | Pros: Straightforward to not categorize events |
| InterDigital | Pro : If it’s not mandatory, the UE may not be able to restart the window at many occasions, preventing the DMRS bundling from occurring. |  |
| LG | According to the definition of semi-static event, which is no misalignment of event timing, possibly have the largest number of time domain window. The detailed list of semi-static events should be defined. | The detailed list of events whether it is semi-static or dynamic is not necessary. However the UE without capability always have single actual TDW within configured TDW, and the length of it is likely to be reduced due to the event. |
| CATT | Pros: Provide better performance since gNB can continue to apply JCE to the left PUSCH transmissions after the semi-static event in the current configured TDW. | Pros: No need to differentiate semi-static events or dynamic events. |
| Sharp | Pros: First, both options are the same if UE is capable to restart DMRS bundling. If UE is not capable to restart DMRS bundling, Option 1 achieves more DMRS bundling gain than options 2 because UE of option 1 can restart DMRS bundling after semi-static events (e.g., overlapping with P-CSI on PUCCH with repetition). |  |
| Ericsson | Pros: May simplify some UEs.  Cons: May complicate the definition of events. | Pros: Allows a unified definition of events, which is already very complex. |

Companies are encouraged to provide comments on whether UE should be mandatory to support restarting DM-RS bundling at least due to some of the events, e.g., DL slot or DL reception/monitoring based on semi-static DL/UL configuration for unpaired spectrum?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| QC | On FL’s comment on the drawback of Option 2, we don’t think this is an issue. A gNB is unlikely to ever configure a UE with an L such that it spans uplink slots separated by multiple DL slots (think of L=8 for TDD band with DDDUU slot pattern). Smaller values of L should should alleviate this concern. Setting L = 2 in the above example ensures issues don’t occur. |
| Nokia/NSB | Aside from the pros and cons above, the main concern and reason for introducing UE capability of restarting after an event is that the UE may not be able to quickly react to a dynamic event and hence may not be able to support the restarting of DM-RS bundling after a dynamic event, depending on its capability. In contrast, all semi-static events are known to the UE before the first transmissions. Please also note that the semi-static events are not subject to the missing DCI problem. Therefore, the motivation for introducing a separate capability of restarting DM-RS bundling after semi-static events, independently from the JCE capability, is unclear. |
| Samsung | We don’t see a technical reason for restarting DM-RS bundling based on the type of event. When DM-RS bundling restarts, it is a new DM-RS bundle, so even the duration of the event seems not to have an impact. |
| LG | It is our understanding that “whether UE should be mandatory to support restarting DM-RS bundling at least due to some of the events” is equal to option 1 when the “some of events” is “semi-static events”. In this regard, detailed list of semi-static events should be discussed. |
| Apple | As we commented in the previous question. We fail to see the necessity to define a UE capability. why restarting the DMRS bundling after dynamic event is a UE capability? Whatever the event is semi-static or dynamic, if UE can re-start the transmission, then there is timeline issue, no power adjustment issue otherwise UE will not re-start the transmission. Maybe I missed something here? |
| Ericsson | Similar to Apple’s question, not sure why we need to worry about the UE capability so much. Dynamic events naturally do imply tighter timing than semi-static ones, but the timing itself will be according to existing features. So at least from our perspective, there is not an obvious need to differentiate semi-static and dynamic events. |

## 3.3 TPC command

**FL comments:** In RAN 1#106b-e, we almost reached the consensus that the action of TPC commands does not constitute an event and down select one of the following options for accumulate TPC commands. Considering this is the last meeting before RAN1 freeze, let’s focus the discussion on the following two options.

* The action of TPC commands does not constitute an event that violates power consistency and phase continuity.
  + If UE is configured to accumulate TPC commands, down select one of the following options.
    - Option 1: If UE receives TPC commands that would take into effect during an actual TDW, UE accumulates TPC commands without taking effect during the current actual TDW. TPC commands take effect after the current actual TDW.
    - Option 2: If UE receives TPC commands that would take into effect during a configured TDW, UE accumulates TPC commands without taking effect during the current configured TDW.

Companies are encouraged to provide pros and cons of the above two options.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Option 1** | **Option 2** |
| ZTE | We are not sure why TPC cannot be regarded as an event. Some companies argued that gNB may send TPC very frequently and make the TDW too segmented. But, in our view, in coverage limited scenario, UE is also power limited and may already reach its maximum power. gNB would not send TPC very frequently.  Thus, we suggest to simply consider TPC as an event without introduce additional rules for TPC reception. | Same comments as for Option 1. |
|  |  | This is a general comment since we are not comfortable with with either option; placed here since no other options were available.  We have been open to TPC command deferral in the past hoping for a strong use case to emerge. We unfortunately do not see a clear justification offered by any of the companies.  We wonder why a gNB will ever send TPC commands to a UE configured with PUSCH repetitions. We think UE tx power will have been maxed out in such a scenario. In fact we think a UE reporting 0 dB power headroom would be the catalyst for a gNB to schedule PUSCH repetitions.  In such a scenario we wonder if there is any value at all to adding additional procedures in the spec whose practical use case is negligent.  Does the FL see a clear value to establishing this new procedure?  We request the FL to bring back the option where a UE is not expected to receive TPC commands. |
| vivo | Pros: Apply the TPC command as early as possible | Cons: possible large latency due to the configured window length |
| Nokia/NSB | Cons: Option 1 is not applicable for unpaired spectrum. The notion of current actual TDW would be unclear in this case, given that **the reception of a PDCCH does not occur during an actual TDW for unpaired spectrum.**  @ZTE: it does not make sense to consider TPC as an event because the event is the downlink reception of the DCI. | Pros: Option 2 can be used as a unified solution for both paired and unpaired spectrum. |
| Intel | Con: this may have mis-alignment issue between gNB and UE for actual TDW due to mis-detection of dynamic event. | Pro. More robust than aligning with actual TDW. |
| CMCC | Compared with configured TPC, the actual TDW |  |
| Samsung | Pros: better performance  There can be multiple actual TDWs within a configured TDW, and transmit powers for TDWs after the first TDW should be changed to improve performance. | Cons: lower performance  Requiring same transmit power for different DMRS bundles is not a requirement for a gNB to perform joint channel estimation within a DMRS bundle. |
| InterDigital | Pro : Application of TPC at the earliest opportunity |  |
| LG | It is our understanding since TPC command is group common DCI, joint channel estimation enabled UE can receive it.  The pros and cons depends on the length of configured TDW. If the length of configured TDW is large enough, option 1 would have advantage compared to option 2 since the delayed time of applying TPC command is reduced. On the other hand, option 2 has advantage that the length of configured TDW can be described directly. | Same comment as for option 1. |
| Xiaomi | Compared with configured TDW, actual TDW has less latency |  |
| Sharp | Pros: the accumulated TPC commands are applied as earlier as possible | Pros: More robust than aligning with actual TDW |
| Ericsson | Pros: Quicker power control. | Pros: Simpler designs.  Note: we do sympathize with Qualcomm’s comments. The network should not generally rely on power control, since it is precluded during ATDWs. If group common TPC is to be supported, then having it be an event would be fine in our view. Scheduling group common TPC commands may be more difficult than UE specific so we prefer somewhat to have TPC be an event rather than it not being expected, if that can still be considered. |

**FL comments:** Regarding absolute TPC commands. It seems no company supports Alt 6. Let’s focus the discussion on Alt 1, Alt 3 and Alt 5.

* If UE is not configured to accumulate TPC commands, down select one of the following alternatives.
  + Alt 1: the last TPC command that would take effect within a configured TDW supersedes all previous TPC commands that take effect within that configured TDW and only the last TPC command is applied by the UE.
    - FFS: no more than 1 TPC command is expected to take effect during a configured TDW.
  + ~~Alt 2: no more than 1 TPC command is expected to take effect during a configured TDW.~~
  + Alt 3: the last TPC command that would take effect within an actual TDW supersedes all previous TPC commands that take effect within that actual TDW and only the last TPC command is applied by the UE.
    - FFS: no more than 1 TPC command is expected to take effect during an actual TDW.
  + ~~Alt 4: no more than 1 TPC command is expected to take effect during an actual TDW.~~
  + Alt 5: The UE applies TPC commands after a configured TDW. It is left to UE implementation which TPC commands to apply from those that would take effect within the configured TDW.
  + ~~Alt 6: The UE applies TPC commands after an actual TDW. It is left to UE implementation which TPC commands to apply from those that would take effect within the actual TDW.~~

Companies are encouraged to provide pros and cons of the above options

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Alt 1** | **Alt 3** | **Alt 5** |
| QC | Please see comment to earlier proposal |  |  |
| vivo | Cons: possible large latency due to the configured window length | Pros: much less latency, and the occasion after an actual window can be available to apply the TPC commend.  Further comment: No need to add the FFS to restrict the NW behavior. | Cons: potential misalignment, which is not beneficial for the subsequent power control. |
| CMCC |  | Alt 3 has less latency. |  |
| Samsung | Cons: lower performance by using configured TDW | Pros: Can identify the UE behavior clearly and achieve better performance by using actual TDW.  FFS is not needed. Power cannot be changed within an actual TDW. | Cons: lower performance by using configured TDW |
| LG | As we pointed out in our contribution, the transmit power due to the TPC command without accumulation, i.e., absolute TPC command, is different from the previous and after that transmission.  In other words, if the transmit power is changed due to absolute TPC command, no other transmission can be included within a same actual TDW. That is, only the transmission constitutes and actual TDW. We should discuss it before how we supersedes TPC command. |  |  |
| Xiaomi |  | Alt a has less latency |  |
| Sharp | Pros: More robust than aligning with actual TDW. | Pros: a TPC command is applied as earlier as possible. |  |
| Ericsson | Pros:   * Simpler design than Alt 3   Cons:   * New power control behavior. (The FFS may simplify.) * Slower response than ATDW. | Pros:   * faster response than Alt 1   Cons:   * New power control behavior. The FFS may simplify. * More complicated power control, since events can affect when PC commands apply. | We’re not sure our intention is clear with this proposal. If the network sends only one command, there will be no ambiguity, and the UE will not have to select among the commands. If the UE does receive multiple commands, then of course the  Pros:   * Simplified UE implementation, and equivalent performance to Alts. 1& 3. * More flexible gNB implementation, since gNB can send its single command at any time that meets the timeline for the end of the window. |

#### Updated proposal after GTW Nov. 11th.

**FL comments:** Based on the discussion during GTW session, proposal 10 on TPC commands is revised as follows.

**Proposal 10:**

* The action of common TPC commands does not constitute an event that violates power consistency and phase continuity.
  + If UE is configured to accumulate TPC commands, down select one of the following options.
    - Option 1: If UE receives TPC commands that would take into effect during an actual TDW, UE accumulates TPC commands without taking effect during the current actual TDW. TPC commands take effect after the current actual TDW.
    - Option 2: If UE receives TPC commands that would take into effect during a configured TDW, UE accumulates TPC commands without taking effect during the current configured TDW.
  + If UE is not configured to accumulate TPC commands, down select one of the following alternatives.
    - Alt 1: the last TPC command that would take effect within a configured TDW supersedes all previous TPC commands that take effect within that configured TDW and only the last TPC command is applied by the UE.
      * FFS: no more than 1 TPC command is expected to take effect during a configured TDW.
    - Alt 3: the last TPC command that would take effect within an actual TDW supersedes all previous TPC commands that take effect within that actual TDW and only the last TPC command is applied by the UE.
      * FFS: no more than 1 TPC command is expected to take effect during an actual TDW.
    - Alt 5: The UE applies TPC commands after a configured TDW. It is left to UE implementation which TPC commands to apply from those that would take effect within the configured TDW.
* The action of UE specific TPC commands, if supported, constitutes an event that violates power consistency and phase continuity.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| CATT | We are somehow making the situation more and more complicated by differentiating the category of TPC commands. If possible, a unified solution is preferred.  The current logic on TPC and JCE is also a little unreasonable. If a TPC command is increasing the Tx power by, e.g. 3 dB, it seems comparable with the performance gain brought by JCE. On the other hand, if a TPC command is decreasing the Tx power, it means the channel condition is good enough, so it may not be important to keep DMRS bundling at this moment. So we do not see strong need to prioritize JCE than TPC command activation.  More importantly, if TPC command action does not constitute an event, it means newly introduced JCE procedure has higher order than legacy TPC control logic, so legacy procedure on power control (which is already very complicated) is changed. Eventually, allowing TPC command action constitutes an event is a simpler choice. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support the proposal. |
| Sharp | Support the proposal 10. |
| CMCC | For the 2nd one, the UE specific TPC command cannot be an event.  The UE specific TPC command is the DCI with a scheduling of PUSCH. It is the beginning of the PUSCH transmission when the TPC taking effect, which is also the beginning of a JCE or the actual TDW. Then it will not take effect during the TDW and break the joint channel estimation. |
| Nokia/NSB | We are fine with the proposal. |
| InterDigital | We are ok with the proposal. |
| Samsung | The TPC command not being an event is the most straightforward solution for capturing the benefits from having a TDW. As the TDW can be over several slots, the probability that the UE power needs to be tracked at the end of TDW is large and the periodicity of DCI format 2\_2 for tracking fading at low UE speeds (e.g. 10-20 msec) is such that it is likely to coincide with the TDW. That is not possible to avoid by the gNB and it is not even desirable to avoid. The spec impact from applying the TPC command at the end of the TDW and having an up-to-date CLPC state is trivial and smaller than the spec impact from having the TDW broken by TPC commands. There is no impact in practice from delaying application of a TPC command by a few slots. There is no actual change in the UL PC procedure other than delaying an update for the CLPC state.  In summary,   1. It is not possible (at least for DCI 2\_2), and it would be detrimental, for a NW to not be able to issue TPC commands during a TDW. 2. It is detrimental for a UE to have an invalid CLPC state by ignoring TPC commands, and it is also detrimental to have to break a TDW in order to immediately process a TPC command. 3. The specification impact is trivial – consider the TDW as the transmission occasion or apply the TPC command at the end of the TDW, there is no new procedure. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | For the action of common TPC commands,   * If UE is configured to accumulate TPC commands, we prefer Alt 1 with better performance. We think there is no reason to apply the TPC commands after the configured TDW, because it is a good timely opportunity to apply TPC commands after an actual TDW. * If UE is not configured to accumulate TPC commands, we prefer Alt 3 for better performance and a consistent mechanism with that UE is configured to accumulate TPC commands. Besides, before the end of a TDW, whether a TPC command is the last one is uncertain. Our understanding is that the last TPC command is applied after the current TDW. We suggest to add “after the current configured/actual TDW” to the end of Alt 1 and Alt 3 to make them clear.   + - Alt 1: the last TPC command that would take effect within a configured TDW supersedes all previous TPC commands that take effect within that configured TDW and only the last TPC command is applied by the UE after the current configured TDW.       * FFS: no more than 1 TPC command is expected to take effect during a configured TDW.     - Alt 3: the last TPC command that would take effect within an actual TDW supersedes all previous TPC commands that take effect within that actual TDW and only the last TPC command is applied by the UE after the current actual TDW.       * FFS: no more than 1 TPC command is expected to take effect during an actual TDW.   For the action of UE specific TPC commands,   * We prefer a common design for both PUSCH and PUCCH. The proposal seems incorrect for PUCCH. Firstly, only non-zero TPC command has potential impact. Secondly, in TDD, each PUCCH slot in PUCCH repetition can be associated with multiple DL DCIs in multiple DL slots. Because all of the DCIs are received before the first PUCCH slot, the multiple TPC commands in these DL DCIs should not trigger any event that violates power consistency and phase continuity. Thirdly, for PUSCH with UE-specific TPC, the proposal is unnecessary if such event never occurs. |
| QC | We think we are over complicating things here. We want to make some clarifying remarks.  A group-common DCI is addressed to a group of UEs (via TPC-PUSCH RNTI; this RNTI can be commonly assigned to a group of UEs). It carries multiple payloads, but each payload is meant for a unique UE. The portion of the payload that is relevant to a UE is indicated by the higher layer parameter *tpc-index*.  Thus, while the delivery mechanism (DCI signaling) is shared across many UEs, the message itself is unique to a UE.  In this sense, there are only UE-specific TPC commands. We are not saying that such DCIs cannot be sent. We are only saying that the payload meant for a UE engaging in bundling should not require a tx power change.  I don’t think Proposal 10 is helping matters here. We should either choose to treat TPC as an error case (i.e., UE does not expect TPC commands to take effect during a bundling TDW) or treat it as an event and start a new bundle. |
| Ericsson | Support the proposal  Regarding Alt 5: We’re not sure our intention is clear with this proposal. If the network sends only one command, there will be no ambiguity, and the UE will not have to select among the commands. If the UE does receive multiple commands, then of course the  We think the benefits could be:   * Simplified UE implementation, and equivalent performance to Alts. 1& 3. * More flexible gNB implementation, since gNB can send its single command at any time that meets the timeline for the end of the window.   On the other hand, we do sympathize with comments that it would be simpler to make group common power control commands events. |

## 3.4 TA adjustment

**FL comments:** In RAN 1#106b-e, the majority support that the action of TA commands does not constitute an event and down select one of the following options. Let’s focus on the discussion on the following two options.

* The action of TA commands does not constitute an event that violates power consistency and phase continuity, down select one of the following options.
  + Option 1: UE performs TA adjustment after the actual TDW if it receives any TA command indicating TA adjustment during the actual TDW.
    - FFS: UE receives no more than 1 TA command whose action time falls within an actual TDW.
  + Option 2: UE performs TA adjustment after the configured TDW if it receives any TA command indicating TA adjustment during the configured TDW.
    - FFS: UE receives no more than 1 TA command whose action time falls within a configured TDW.

Companies are encouraged to provide pros and cons of the above two options.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Option 1** | **Option 2** |
| ZTE | Similar as our comment to TPC. We suggest to simply consider TA as an event without introducing additional rules. This is because, TA is indicated by MAC CE, and would not happen frequently during PUSCH/PUCCH repetitions. | Same comments as for Option 1. |
| QC | This is a general remark.  Similar to our comment on TPC commands, the only meaningful justification we have received was from Huawei who said this needs to be treated as an event since the gNB is probably sending this due to issues with uplink multi-user operation. Barring this, we see no reason why a gNB should be sending TA commands. So here again we expect gNB to exercise some restraint. We should either treat this as an error case or as an event. |  |
| vivo | Pro: apply the TA adjustment as early as possible | Cons: possible large latency due to the configured window length |
| Nokia/NSB | Cons: Option 1 is not applicable for unpaired spectrum. The notion of current actual TDW would be unclear in this case, given that **the reception of a PDSCH carrying MAC CE does not occur during an actual TDW for unpaired spectrum.**  @ZTE: it does not make sense to consider TA command as an event because the event is the reception of the PDSCH carrying the MAC CE. | Pros: Option 2 can be used as a unified solution for both paired and unpaired spectrum. |
| Intel | Same comment for TPC command. |  |
| CMCC | Pro: the actual TDW has less latencies compared with the configured TDW |  |
| Samsung | Pros: better performance | Cons: lower performance |
| InterDigital | Pro : Application of TA at the earliest opportunity |  |
| LG | The time duration for gNB expects for UE not to adjust the TA command is shorter than option 2. | It could be simpler to be described since the the length of configured TDW is indicated by gNB. |
| Xiaomi | Pro: actual TDW has less latency compared with configured TDW |  |
| Sharp | Pros: It can perform TA adjustment faster than Option 2 |  |
| Ericsson | Pros: It could in theory allow TA to be faster, but this is only relevant when PUSCH has long repetitions.  Cons: The design needs to take into account events and ATDWs. | Pros: Better matched to the use case: TA changes very slowly.  Simpler than relying on events.  Timing may be more straightforward to define. |

#### Updated proposal after GTW Nov. 11th.

**FL comments:** Based on the discussion during GTW session, the proposed working assumption by Chair can be a starting point for discussion.

**Proposed Working assumption**

* Based on the assumption the timeline of TA in effect is deterministic, the action of TA commands constitutes an event that violates power consistency and phase continuity
* Note: if the timeline of TA in effect is not is deterministic, the working assumption will be revisited.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| CATT | OK to make it a working assumption.  We do not think DMRS bundling will be beneficial if the TA mis-alignment is un-tolerable from gNB’s point of view. The gNB may be unable to perform correct channel estimation regardless DMRS are bundled or not. UE reaction to TA command shall be as soon as possible.  Allowing TA constitutes an event makes TA procedure unchanged, so legacy behaviour is not affected by the newly introduced JCE feature. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Although we prefer not to treat the action of TA command as an event, but we are fine with the proposal for the sake of progress.  Just need to correct the typo as follow   * Note: if the timeline of TA in effect is not ~~is~~ deterministic, the working assumption will be revisited. |
| Nokia/NSB | Support the proposed working assumption with the minor typo correction from NTT DOCOMO. |
| Samsung | A TA should not be an event that interrupts the TDW. When the time to apply the TA (based on legacy TA timeline) happens to be within a TDW, the application of the TA can be postponed to after the TDW. The infrequent MAC CE based TA command should not be viewed in a same manner as the DCI-based relatively frequent TPC commands that, for DCI 2\_2, it is impossible for a NW to avoid and it is important for a UE to maintain a current CLPC state by updating at the end of the TDW. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support the proposal. Different from TPC adjustment, TA adjustment should be an event. If it is not considered as an event, the TA adjustment cannot respond immediately. It impacts not only the current PUSCH transmission, but also the uplink transmissions from other UEs due to ICI. Secondly, TA adjustment impacts on both PUCCH and PUSCH. If a gNB is required not to send TA within any configured TDW, then the gNB may never have a chance to send it because the configured TDWs of PUSCH and PUCCH may never be aligned especially in case that configured TDW were agreed per PUCCH resource. Thirdly, since the effective timing of TA command is fixed and in reference to PDSCH slot carrying the TA command, a gNB may not find any DL slot to send TA command that can be effective in a given UL slot because of TDD UL/DL configuration, e.g. DSUU where S has very few DL symbols for PDCCH only. |
| Ericsson | Since TA changes slowly, we think there is no need to make a more complicated design based on events and ATDWs.  However, we can accept the WA for progress. (After some checking we expect the timeline should not be an issue). |

## 3.5 JCE for PUSCH repetition type B and TBoMS

**FL comments:** Based on the agreements, joint channel estimation (DM-RS bundling) is supported for PUSCH repetition type B and TBoMS. One issue raised about the configured TDW determination for PUSCH repetition type B and TBoMS is the counting method. There are two counting methods for PUSCH repetition type A, i.e., counting based on physical slots and counting based on available slots.

**Proposal 7:**

* The TDW determination procedure agreed for PUSCH repetition type A is applicable for PUSCH repetition type B and TBoMS.
  + The configured TDWs determination procedure for PUSCH repetition type A counting based on physical slots is applied for PUSCH repetition type B.
  + The configured TDWs determination procedure for PUSCH repetition type A counting based on available slots is applied for TBoMS.
* No additional specification enhancements for PUSCH repetition type B and TBoMS.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support the proposal. |
| ZTE | Support |
| vivo | Support the proposal. |
| Spreadtrum | The main bullet can be limited to the configured TDW procedure, with the revision below:  The configured TDW determination procedure agreed for PUSCH repetition type A is applicable for PUSCH repetition type B and TBoMS |
| Nokia/NSB | Can we remove the “configured” from the above proposal? Similar to FL’s proposal 8, the whole TDW determination procedure for PUSCH repetition type A should be reused, not only the configured TDW determination procedure. Therefore, we propose to modify the proposal as follows.  **Proposal 7:**   * The TDW determination procedure agreed for PUSCH repetition type A is applicable for PUSCH repetition type B and TBoMS.   + The ~~configured~~ TDWs determination procedure for PUSCH repetition type A counting based on physical slots is applied for PUSCH repetition type B.   + The ~~configured~~ TDWs determination procedure for PUSCH repetition type A counting based on available slots is applied for TBoMS. * No additional specification enhancements for PUSCH repetition type B and TBoMS. |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Samsung | We are okay with Proposal 7. |
| InterDigital | Support |
| LG | It is our understanding that counting based on physical slot is supported for TBoMS. Moreover since it is already agreed to support PUSCH repetition type B and TBoMS if it reuses enhancements for PUSCH repetition type A. |
| WILUS | We support the proposal. |
| CATT | Support the proposal. |
| Xiaomi | Support the proposal |
| Sharp | We are OK with the proposal. |
| TCL | Support the proposal. |
| Apple | Ok with this Proposal. |
| Ericsson | Ok with the proposal |

**FL comments:** Another issue is whether DM-RS bundling and TDW determination can be applied to repetition of TBoMS.

**Proposal 8:**

* DM-RS bundling for repetition of TBoMS is supported.
* The TDW determination procedure agreed for PUSCH repetition type A is applicable for repetition of TBoMS.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support the proposal. |
| ZTE | Support the proposal, with the following suggested revisions.  The TDW determination procedure agreed for PUSCH repetition type A counting based on available slots is applicable for repetition of TBoMS. |
| vivo | Agree with revision from ZTE. |
| Spreadtrum | Support the revision from ZTE. |
| Nokia/NSB | Support the FL’s proposal. Modification from ZTE seems to be correct. |
| Intel | We are fine with the update from ZTE.  Suggest to add “No additional specification enhancement is needed” |
| Samsung | Fine with proposal 8. |
| InterDigital | @FL  We have a clarification question. We have the following restarting behaviour which was agreed.  “For UE capable of restarting DM-RS bundling, the start of the new actual TDW is the first ~~available~~ symbol (at least determined by TDRA table) ~~in available slot~~ for PUSCH transmission after the event violates power consistency and phase continuity, and the PUSCH transmission is in an available slot.”  Regarding the above restarting behavior, when it is applied to TBoMS repetitions, does “...the first ~~available~~ symbol (at least determined by TDRA table) ~~in available slot~~ for PUSCH transmission after the event” correspond to the first PUSCH transmission of the next TBoMS transmission occasion after the event? |
| LG | Similar comment as proposal 7. |
| Panasonic | We support with the proposal 8 with the modification from ZTE. |
| CATT | Support the proposal. |
| Xiaomi | Fine with the proposal. |
| Sharp | We are OK with the proposal. |
| Apple | Ok with this proposal |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | ZTE’s version seems better. |
| Ericsson | Also prefer ZTE’s version |

1. Email discussion (2nd round)

## 4.1 Use cases for joint channel estimation

**FL comments:** It seems the majority are fine with proposal 1.

@Nokia/NSB, Intel: Though from FL understanding, if other uplink transmission in the middle of two PUSCH/PUCCH transmissions has the same setting with PUSCH transmission, DMRS bundling can be supported as long as power consistency and phase continuity can be maintained. However, considering the clear majority support of proposal 1 and we are running out of time and the latest LS R4-2120002 from RAN4 does not cover this issue, it seems the best choice is to make it as an event.

**Proposal 1:**

* For non-back-to-back PUSCH/PUCCH transmissions across consecutive slots, the other uplink transmission in the middle of two PUSCH/PUCCH transmissions constitutes an event that violates power consistency and phase continuity.

**Support:** DOCOMO, ZTE, Qualcomm, Spreadtrum, CMCC, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, Samsung, LG, WILUS, Panasonic, CATT, Xiaomi, Sharp, TCL, Apple, Huawei, HiSilicon, Ericsson

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Apple | OK this proposal. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support the proposal. |
| Sharp | Support the proposal |
| WILUS | Support the proposal |
| CMCC | Support |
| Spreadtrum | Support |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| Nokia/NSB | It’s unfortunate that we have spent a lot of efforts from both RAN1 and RAN4 to discuss the case of other UL transmission with same settings in between two PUSCH/PUCCH repetitions and we exclude it at the end with unclear technical reason. However, given that the LS from RAN4 doesn’t mention about this info and we need to conclude this issue in this meeting, we are fine with the FL’s proposal for the sake for progress. |
| LG | Support |
| CATT | Support. |
| Intel | Although we still prefer to define this based on RAN4 input, we are fine to not to support “other uplink transmission in the middle of repetition” for the sake of progress. |
| Ericsson | Support |
| Samsung | Support |
| FL | Thank Nokia/NSB, Intel for the flexibility. It seems proposal 1 is stable, please refrain from any further comments. Proposal 1 is for email approval. |

## 4.2 Time domain window

### 4.2.1 Configured TDW

#### Issue #1: The window length *L* of the configured TDW

#### Issue #1-2: Configuration/Indication of L

**FL comments:** It seems the majority support proposal 3.

@DOCOMO, Panasonic: From FL understanding, it may be beneficial to support dynamic indication of the window length. However, considering the clear majority support of proposal 3 and lack of simulation results, it seems difficult to support dynamic indication.

**Proposal 3:**

* Dynamic indication of the window length *L* of the configured TDW by DCI or indicated by TDRA table with one additional entry is not supported.

**Support:** ZTE, vivo, Nokia/NSB, Intel, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, Samsung, LG, WILUS, CATT, Xiaomi, Sharp, Apple, Huawei, HiSilicon, Ericsson

**Not support:** DOCOMO, Panasonic

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Apple | Support this proposal. |
| ZTE | Support |
| NTT DOCOMO | We can accept the proposal, even though we still think the dynamic indication is beneficial for coverage enhancements. |
| Sharp | Support the proposal. |
| WILUS | Support the proposal. |
| vivo | Support |
| CMCC | Fine with the proposal |
| Spreadtrum | Support |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| Nokia/NSB | Support the FL’s proposal. |
| LG | Support. |
| CATT | Support. |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Ericsson | Support |
| Samsung | Support |
| FL | Thank DOCOMO for the flexibility. It seems proposal 3 is stable, please refrain from any further comments. Proposal 3 is for email approval. |

#### Issue #1-3: Candidate values of L

**FL comments:** It seem the majority support proposal 4-v2. Regarding whether L can be equal to 1, for PUSCH repetition type A and TBoMS, it depends on whether dynamic indication of L is supported. If dynamic indication is supported, supporting L=1 means dynamic switching between JCE and non-JCE is supported. Otherwise, it seems not necessary to support L=1. For PUSCH repetition type B, supporting L=1 means JCE within one slot is supported while JCE across slots is not supported.

**Proposal 4-v2:**

* The candidate values of the window length *L* of the configured TDW can be any integer value that is larger than 1 and no larger than the maximum duration.

**Support:** ZTE, Qualcomm, vivo, Spreadtrum, Intel, CMCC, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, Samsung, LG, WILUS, Panasonic, CATT, Xiaomi, Sharp, TCL, Apple, Nokia/NSB, Samsung, Huawei, HiSilicon, Ericsson

Considering L=1 is beneficial for PUSCH repetition type B, companies are encouraged to provide views whether L=1 can be supported.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Apple | Ok with this proposal. For L=1 for repetition type B, it is implicit supporting DMRS bundling already, don’t see any reason to change the transmission power and phase continuity. It’s not necessary to configure with L=1. |
| ZTE | Support |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support the proposal. |
| Sharp | L = 1 is not necessary. Even for PUSCH repetition type B, DMRS bundling within one slot or across multiple slots is achieved by configuring L > 1 and it depends on the actual TDW. |
| WILUS | Support the proposal |
| vivo | Support |
| CMCC | Fine with the proposal |
| Spreadtrum | Support |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| Nokia/NSB | Support the FL’s proposal. On the FL’s question, we see no harm to further support L=1 to complete the feature for PUSCH repetition type B as well, given that a configuration is needed for the gNB to be sure that JCE can be applied across the PUSCHs within the slot. It also compatible with the definition of a configured TDW in the working assumption, i.e., “Each configured TDW consists of one or multiple consecutive physical slots.” |
| LG | Support. |
| CATT | Support. |
| Intel | It is not clear to us whether we need to optimize the repetition type B as we already agreed to reuse the same mechanism from repetition type A. L = 1 or repetition in one slot is not a typical use case for coverage enhancement. We do not support to configure L = 1. |
| Ericsson | Prefer to further discuss this.  Can companies elaborate the use case for Type B with L=1? |
| InterDigital | Support the FL’s proposal and also support to include L=1. |
| Samsung | For PUSCH repetition type B, we think joint channel estimation over back-to-back PUSCH transmissions within one slot can be applied. |
| FL | Proposal 4-v2 is stable, since there seems no concern. Proposal 4-v2 is for email approval. Regarding L=1, companies have different views, further discussion is needed. |

#### Issue #1-4: Counting of L based on available slots

**FL comments:** From FL understanding, based on the working assumption, each configured TDW consists of one or multiple consecutive physical slots, regardless of the counting based on physical slots or available slots. While the start of the configured TDW depend on the counting method, i.e., physical slots or available slots. However, it seems it is necessary to clarify the agreement for PUSCH repetition type A counting based on available slots.

According to the agreed WF (R4-2120003) in RAN4, the number of slots for maximum duration means the consecutive slots. In case of non-scheduled gap and/or other channel transmission, the duration of the non-scheduled gap and/or other channel should be counted.

**Proposal 12:** The following agreement is clarified as follows.

* For PUSCH repetition type A counting based on available slots,
  + One configured TDW consists of one or multiple consecutive physical slots.
  + “The configured TDWs are determined based on available slots” in the agreement means “The start of the configured TDWs is determined based on available slots”

|  |
| --- |
| **Agreement**   * For PUSCH repetition type A counting based on physical slots   + The configured TDWs are consecutive, where the start of other configured TDWs is the first physical slot right after the last physical slot of a previous configured TDW. * For PUSCH repetition type A counting based on available slots   + The configured TDWs are determined based on available slots, where start of a configured TDWs is the first available slot after the last available slot of a previous configured TDW.   + Note: The determination of available slots for PUSCH repetition Type A is defined in AI 8.8.1.1. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Panasonic | Support the proposal 12. |
| Apple | OK with this clarification. |
| ZTE | Fine with the proposal, though we think previous agreement is clear that it only refers to the start of a configured TDW. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support the proposal. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support the proposal |
| Sharp | We would like to add “the configured time domain window length L is counted on physical slots” in the proposal to clarify that the common understanding is interpretation 1 below. Otherwise, people may have interpretations as the following:  Interpretation 1: DDDS[UDDS][UUDD]DS[U]  Interpretation 2: DDDS[U]DDS[UU]DDDS[U]  Interpretation 3: DDDS[UDDSUUDDDSU]  Underline expresses positions of PUSCH repetition and square brackets express the configured TDWs when K = 4 with available slot based counting and L = 4. |
| vivo | Support. |
| CMCC | Support |
| Spreadtrum | Support  We are also fine with Sharp’s comments that to make L more clear, that the configured time domain window is continuous L physical slots. |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| Nokia/NSB | Support the FL’s proposal. The additional text proposed by Sharp is correct but may not be necessary given that such definition is already included in the working assumption for the determination of configured TDWs, i.e., “Each configured TDW consists of one or multiple consecutive physical slots.”, as pointed out by the FL. |
| CATT | Support. |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal in principle.  For this, we suggest remove 1 physical slot  One configured TDW consists of ~~one or~~ multiple consecutive physical slots. |
| Ericsson | OK with the FL proposal as modified by Intel, but similar view as ZTE that the agreement is on the start of the configured TDWs. |
| Samsung | We are okay with FL’s proposal. |
| FL | It seems the majority are fine with proposal 12. Proposal 12 is for email approval.  Regarding Sharp’s comments, as explained by Nokia, the definition of CTDW in the WA is clear.  @Intel, in my understanding, “one or” cannot be removed, since there could be only one slot for the last CTDW. For instance, assuming 16 repetitions, L=5, then there are 4 CTDWs, 5 slots for the first 3 CTDW and 1 slot for the last CTDW. |

### 4.2.2 Actual time domain window

#### Issue #2: The determination of actual TDW

#### Issue #2-1: The start/end of the actual TDW

**FL comment:** It seems the majority are fine with proposal 5.

@ Spreadtrum, LG, TCL, From FL understanding, the raised issues can be discussed separately from the confirmation of the working assumption.

**Proposal 5: Confirm the following working assumption**

|  |
| --- |
| **Working assumption:**   * The start of the first actual TDW is the first ~~available~~ symbol (at least determined by TDRA table) ~~in available slot~~ for the first PUSCH transmission in an available slot within the configured TDW. * The end of the actual TDW is   + the last ~~available~~ symbol (at least determined by TDRA table) ~~in available slot~~ for the last PUSCH transmission in an available slot within the configured TDW if the actual TDW reaches the end of the last PUSCH transmission within the configured TDW.   + the last ~~available~~ symbol (at least determined by TDRA table) ~~in available slot~~ of the PUSCH transmission right before the event if an event occurs that violates power consistency and phase continuity, and the PUSCH transmission is in an available slot. * For UE capable of restarting DM-RS bundling, the start of the new actual TDW is the first ~~available~~ symbol (at least determined by TDRA table) ~~in available slot~~ for PUSCH transmission after the event violates power consistency and phase continuity, and the PUSCH transmission is in an available slot. |

**Support:** DOCOMO, ZTE, Qualcomm, Nokia/NSB, Intel, CMCC, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, Samsung, InterDigital, WILUS, Panasonic, CATT, Xiaomi, Sharp, Apple, Huawei, HiSilicon, Ericsson.

Companies are encourage to provide views on the following issues.

1. The first/last symbol determined other than TDRA table raised by Spreadtrum.
2. The reduced slot due to TA adjustment raised by LG.
3. Partial PUSCH cancellation raised by TCL.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Panasonic | For TA adjustment, we suggest discussing it in section of TA adjustment. We do not see the motivation to repeat the discussion herein.  For partial PUSCH cancellation, we do not see any issue for determining actual TDW. This is because we have an agreement of definition of configured TDW for “PUSCH repetition type A counting based on physical slots”, and partial PUSCH cancellation capability is based on physical slot. Hence, UE can still implicitly determine actual TDW within the configured TDW. |
| ZTE | Step by step, we agree FL to first confirm the WA.  For the three issues, we are not sure whether further discussion is needed. Because the first symbol would be known once the first PUSCH transmission is determined by the legacy ways. |
| WILUS | In addition to three issues, we propose to discuss about the collision between DL reception/monitoring occasion and dynamically scheduled PUSCH.  According to current specification, the UE transmits dynamically scheduled PUSCH in the set of symbols of the slot which overlaps with DL reception/monitoring.    However, since DL reception/monitoring is regarded as an event that violates power consistency and phase continuity, symbols of PUSCH rep#4 that overlaps with DL reception/monitoring cannot be determined as a same actual TDW with PUSCH rep#5 and #6 even if they are actually transmitted without cancellation.  Therefore, if a collision occurs between DL reception/monitoring occasion and dynamically scheduled PUSCH in the set of symbols of the slot within the configured TDW, the DL reception/monitoring can be considered as not the event to determine the start of the actual TDW. |
| Spreadtrum | Thank FL for addressing our comments. We are willing to support to confirm the WA first and then we are go further with the other cases for first/ending symbols besides indicted by TDRA.  To make our comments more clear, we think:   * For the start of the first actual TDW in an available slot within the configured TDW, besides the first symbol of the first PUSCH transmission determined by TDRA table, it can be the first symbol of an actual PUSCH repetition, which would be treated as the first symbol for PUSCH transmission after the event or slot boundary. As shown in the Figure 1 actual PUSCH #6, which belongs to the configured TDW#1. It is the start of actual TDW#2, which is after DL symbol#0 and invalid symbol#1. Thus, the start of the first actual TDW in an available slot within the configured TDW can be the first symbol of the PUSCH after the event. Furthermore, the starting symbol of the first PUSCH in the configured TDW can be slot boundary that causes PUSCH segmentation.     Figure 1: Example for actual time domain window   * When the last symbol for the last PUSCH transmission in an available slot within the configured TDW if the actual TDW reaches the end of the last PUSCH transmission within the configured TDW, the last symbol for the actual TDW can also the last symbol in the slot. For example, as shown in Figure 2, the end of actual TDW1 reaches the end of configured TDW0. However, its ending symbol is the ending symbol of slot 1, not indicated by TDRA table.     Figure 2: Example for actual time domain window |
| Nokia/NSB | Agree with the FL that we can do it step by step and confirm the WA first. We share similar view with ZTE that the first symbol is known when the first PUSCH transmission after the event is determined by the legacy ways. If there is any ambiguity caused by the wording in brackets, i.e., “(at least determined by TDRA table)”, we can remove it. The determination of a PUSCH transmission is clear. |
| LG | We support to confirm the WA. |
| CATT | Fine to confirm the WA first. |
| Intel | We are fine to confirm WA first. |
| Ericsson | Also fine to confirm the WA |
| Samsung | We are fine with confirming the WA. |
| FL | It seems companies are fine to confirm the WA first. Proposal 5 is for email approval.  Regarding the issues raised by Spreadtrum, LG, TCL, WILUS, it seems more discussion is needed. |

#### Issue #2-2: Events that violate power consistency and phase continuity

**FL comments:** Regarding the change of transmission parameters, it seems controversial whether it should be regard as an event. Note that whether action of TPC command or frequency hopping is an event is discussed separately. Regarding UL CA, as we discussed in previous meetings, most companies think UL CA is not the typical case for coverage enhancements. As commented by some companies, at least the following issues should be clarified.

1. For PUSCH repetition type A/B and TBoMS, why UL beam/TPMI, BWP, Tx, RB allocation would be changed?
2. The action of TPC commands is under discussion, what’s the difference between Tx power and TPC commands?
3. Is it necessary to consider UL beam switching for multi-TRP operation?

The proponents are encouraged to answer the first two questions and companies are encouraged to answer the last question.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Panasonic | For UL beam switching for multi-TRP operation in Q3, we think it is a part of UL beam/TPMI in Q1, hence it should be treated as an event. |
| ZTE | Regarding BWP switching, a UE will fall back to the default BWP if bwp-InactivityTimer expires. It will violate the phase continuity.  Regarding Tx switching, a UE can transmit PUSCH/PUCCH only in one carrier in case of CA/SUL. It is actually very useful for coverage limited scenario by choosing a carrier having better channel conditions for transmission. The phase continuity will be violated when switching across carriers.  Regarding Tx power, the existing power control is per repetition basis. The power could be changed not only by TPC but also many other factors, e.g., UCI multiplexing only on some of PUSCH/PUCCH repetitions. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We PUSCH multi-TRP repetition, UL beam/TPMI can be changed and it should be treated as an event. |
| Sharp | 1: At least UL beam would be changed due to mapping between UL beam and PUSCH repetition for multi-TRP.  3: It is necessary to enable to configure both multi-TRP and JCE at the same time because multi-TRP is also beneficial for coverage enhancement. |
| vivo | **A for 1:**  ForBWP switchingindicated by UL grant DCI received in source BWP, the PUSCH transmission is performed in the target BWP, PUSCH repetition will not be switched to another BWP before the transmission PUSCH repetitions are finished.  For BWP switching indicated by DL grant DCI before the transmission of PUSCH repetitions are finished in the source BWP, UE switched to the dedicated BWP, and the remaining PUSCH repetitions in the source BWP are dropped.  Hence, for single carrier operation, BWP change seems do not constitute an event violate phase continuity.  As for timer based BWP switching, it seems have no impact for DG-PUSCH for which case the timer is restarted due to the scheduling DCI. For CG-PUSCH, the CG transmission would be suspended or cleared according to 38.321 section 5.15. Hence, it will not be an event.  For CA cases, the BWP switching on a 2nd serving cell may cause interruption in the first serving cell. It may violate phase continuity on the 1st serving cell. However, the group seems prefer not to enable CA and JCE simultaneously. If it is the case, we may need a conclusion/agreement to avoid such cases.  RB allocation would be changed only due to frequency hopping, it belongs to separated discussion.  **A for 2:**  For CA cases, the total transmission power may be changed due to power sharing with simultaneous transmission. However, it seems majority prefer these two features not enabled simultaneously.  If CA cases are not considered, for single cell operation, we do not identify any NW indication other than TPC command may change the Tx power due to NW indication.  **A for 3:**  Fine to consider UL beam switching for multi-TRP operation. |
| CATT | 1. We do not think carrier/BWP switching should be an event, given the understanding that the UE shall perform switching only after finishing the current PUSCH.  If RB allocation means frequency hopping, it may be an event, but it is separately discussed.  2. Regarding to power issue, if UCI multiplexing in part of the PUSCH repetition, the transmitted power may change (different from TPC command).  3. It may be beneficial but complicated to consider mTRP scenario. Different beam switching patterns (e.g. 0101…, or 0011…) are introduced in Rel-17, and only part of them may be able to apply JCE. We do not have very strong views, but we doubt whether the group have enough time to check all aspects for combination of mTRP and JCE. |
| Intel | Q1: UL beam/TPMI is for multi-TRP operation. It is not clear to us BWP switching is needed for repetition. RB allocation is for frequency hopping.  Q2: Tx power change may be related to the case when UE needs to transmit another uplink channel/signal in another CC. this may not be related to TPC command  Q3: yes, UL beam switching/cycling is important to improve coverage in FR2. |
| Ericsson | Q1: ‘UL beam’ is not clear, and could be SRI or M-TRP. We don’t think SRI should change, since that is set when the PUSCH repetition/TBoMS is scheduled. This also applies to RB allocation (with the exception of FH, as pointed out by vivo).  Q2: Open loop power control can change Tx power without a TPC command, since pathloss can change. It should be clear in the specs that the UE does not adjust power according to OLPC within a TDW.  Q3: We’re OK to consider precoder switching for UL M-TRP. It may be a bit of an optimization though. |
| QC | Q1: Same understanding as Intel. mTRP scenarios could lead to UL beam/TPMI changes that are known to the network. Freq hopping is an example for change in RB allocation  Q2: TPC command is one mechanism due to which Tx power could change. If we list tx power change, then there is no need to list TPC, but not the other way around.  Q3: Yes, its critical for robust mTRP/FR2 scenarios. |
| FL | Again, as we discussed in previous meetings, most companies think UL CA is not the typical case for coverage enhancements. Let’s focus the discussion on single carrier first. In addition, TPC command and frequency hopping are discussed separately.  Based on the discussion so far, power change due to UCI multiplexing (proposal 14) and UL beam switching for multi-TRP operation (proposal 6) can be treated as events.  **Proposal 14:**   * Power change due to UCI multiplexing constitutes an event that violates power consistency and phase continuity. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support the proposal 14 from FL |
| vivo | We have different understandings on proposal 14.  In our understanding, UCI multiplexing will not lead to tx power change. Not sure how UCI MUX lead to Tx power change or violation of phase continuity. Hope proponents can clarify. |
| Nokia/NSB | We share the same concern as vivo. Clarification would be helpful. |
| ZTE | @vivo @FL, bwp-InactivityTimer can be configured as small as 2ms. In case the number of repetitions is large or for TDD case, it is clear that the bwp-InactivityTimer may expire in the middle of the repetitions. As we commented, a UE will fall back to the default BWP if bwp-InactivityTimer expires. It will violate the phase continuity. In addition, for TDD, UL BWP may also be changed due to the change of DL BWP to have an aligned frequency center of the DL/UL BWP. If our understanding is correct, BWP switching should be added as an event. Could FL add one proposal for this?  bwp-InactivityTimer ENUMERATED {ms2, ms3, ms4, ms5, ms6, ms8, ms10, ms20, ms30,  ms40,ms50, ms60, ms80,ms100, ms200,ms300, ms500,  ms750, ms1280, ms1920, ms2560, spare10, spare9, spare8,spare7, spare6, spare5, spare4, spare3, spare2, spare1 }  @vivo, Nokia, For power change due to UCI multiplexing, it could happen at least for PUCCH repetition. Firstly, one PUCCH could be overlapped with PUCCH repetition in one or multiple slots, i.e., UCI multiplexing may happen only in some of the PUCCH repetitions. Then, it would cause the change of the UCI payload, which then impacts the transmission power of PUCCH based on the following specs.  *- For a PUCCH transmission using PUCCH format 0 or PUCCH format 1,  where*  *....*  *-  for PUCCH format 0*  *-  for PUCCH format 1, where  is a number of UCI bits in PUCCH transmission occasion*  .....  *- For a PUCCH transmission using PUCCH format 2 or PUCCH format 3 or PUCCH format 4 and for a number of UCI bits smaller than or equal to 11, ,*  *....*  *- For a PUCCH transmission using PUCCH format 2 or PUCCH format 3 or PUCCH format 4 and for a number of UCI bits larger than 11, , where*  *......* |

**FL comments:** It seems companies have different understandings on precoder cycling. Based on companies’ views, there seems two kinds of precoder cycling, i.e., UE implementation based precoder cycling and UL beam switching for multi-TRP operation.

**Proposal 6-v2:**

* UE should not perform UE implementation based precoder cycling within the actual TDW.
* If DMRS bundling and UL beam switching for multi-TRP operation can be supported simultaneously, UL beam switching for multi-TRP operation constitutes an event that violates power consistency and phase continuity.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Panasonic | For a general proposal, we suggest modifying the first bullet as follows   * UE expects to perform the same precoding cycling within the actual TDW   With this modification, we support the proposal. |
| Sharp | Support the proposal. |
| vivo | Support. |
| CMCC | For the 1st bullet, if a UE report to support JCE, then even a precoding cycling is implemented, then it should use the mechanisms that could maintain the power consistency and phase continuity. As UEs with 2T4R could use precoding cycling for PUCCH transmission, we should be cautious for the 1st bullet in the proposal. Then Panasonic’s proposal seems a compromise.  We have no problem for the 2nd bullet, as RAN4 give a clear information that UL beam switching would break the power consistency and phase continuity. But the UL beam switching pattern ‘0011’ or ‘0101’ depends on the configuration. We see no problem for this issue. |
| Nokia/NSB | Support the FL’s proposal. |
| CATT | Fine with the 1st bullet.  For 2nd bullet, seems only one pattern (e.g. 0011 like) may be simultaneously used for JCE, while the other one (e.g. 0101 like) will violate the JCE in every slot. |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal with Panasonic’s update. |
| Ericsson | Support the proposal.  Regarding implementation based precoder cycling, we think that is often used for non-coherent UL MIMO UEs, and is also up to UE implementation, so we don’t think it should be constrained to be the same within an actual TDW. |
| Samsung | We are fine with the first bullet.  For multi-TRP, since this has not been fully investigated so far, it can be assumed that DM-RS bundling is not configured with multi-TRP operation. |
| FL | Based on the discussion above, most companies think UL beam switching for multi-TRP operation is important for FR2. Regarding UE implementation based precoder cycling, companies have different views. Further discussion seems needed.  **Proposal 6-v3:**   * If DMRS bundling and UL beam switching for multi-TRP operation ~~can be supported~~ are configured simultaneously, UL beam switching for multi-TRP operation constitutes an event that violates power consistency and phase continuity. * FFS: UE should not perform UE implementation based precoder cycling within the actual TDW. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support the FL proposal 6-v3 |
| vivo | Fine with Proposal 6-v3.  If UE perform precoder cycling within the actual TDW, it will be transparent to NW, and would lead to performance loss due to miss alignment between NW and UE. |
| Nokia/NSB | Support the FL’s proposal 6-v3. |
| ZTE | Fine with the proposal 6-v3. ` |
| Samsung | OK.  Probably we can also remove the bullet of the FFS. |
| Ericsson | We’re OK with proposal 6-v3. |

#### Issue #2-3: UE capability of restarting DMRS bundling

**FL comments:** As pointed out by Nokia, the main concern and reason for introducing UE capability of restarting after an event is that the UE may not be able to quickly react to a dynamic event and hence may not be able to support the restarting of DM-RS bundling after a dynamic event, depending on its capability. In contrast, all semi-static events are known to the UE before the first transmissions. The semi-static events are not subject to the missing DCI problem. Considering the motivation of introduced UE capability of restarting DMRS bundling, the analysis of pros and cons for each option, option 1 has better performance, as well as option 1 receives more support, I suggest to support option 1 with a note to clarify the definition of semi-static events and dynamic events.

* **Option 1:** If DM-RS bundling is supported, UE is mandatory to support restarting DM-RS bundling due to semi-static events. UE capability of restarting DMRS bundling is applied only to dynamic events.

**Support:** Nokia, NSB, vivo, OPPO, CTC, xiaomi, Sierra Wireless, Sharp, HW, HiSilicon, ZTE, CATT, Panasonic, InterDigital, LG(?)

* **Option 2:** UE capability of restarting DMRS bundling is applied to both semi-static events and dynamic events.

**Support:** Spreadtrum, CMCC, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, MediaTek, Intel, Qualcomm

The pros and cons for each option are summarized the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Option 1** | **Option 2** |
| **Pros:** Better performance than option 2  **Cons:** need to differentiate semi-static and dynamic events  Some companies think classification of events is straightforward while some companies don’t think so. | **Pros:** a unified definition of events, no need to differentiate semi-static and dynamic events  **Cons:**   * worse performance than option 1; * JCE can only be applied in the first bundle of PUSCH transmissions for FH and cannot be applied across any bundle of PUSCH transmissions after the first frequency hopping, within a configured TDW. |

**Proposal 13:**

* If DM-RS bundling is supported, UE is mandatory to support restarting DM-RS bundling due to semi-static events. UE capability of restarting DMRS bundling is applied only to dynamic events.
* Note: An event is regarded as a dynamic event if it is associated with a DCI, otherwise it is regarded as a semi-static event.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Panasonic | We support the proposal 13. |
| Apple | We fail to see to define a UE capability for re-starting the bundle window. As we commented in last round, if UE can re-strart the transmission after the event (whatever it’s semi-static or dynamic event), it means the UE hardware is ready to adjust the target transmission power, and there is no timeline issue. What is the technical reason to introduce this UE capability? As for dynamic event is missing, it’s not relevant to capability of the actual TDW re-starting. Indeed, if a UE capability is to be introduced, it seems there is no obvious difference to distinguish dynamic event and semi-static event from implementation perspective. |
| ZTE | Support the proposal |
| NTT DOCOMO | Given that limited time is left for the discussion, we prefer the unified definition of TDW. If the majority companies support the proposal, we are fine with the proposal. |
| Sharp | We would like to revise Note to “An event is regarded as dynamic event if it is associated with a DCI except for the one scheduling the PUSCH repetition, …”.  In our view, semi-static events are events identified by higher-layer configuration and the DCI which schedules the PUSCH repetition. For example, if a DCI scheduling the PUSCH repetition indicates frequency hopping on/off, events triggered by hopping boundary should not be included in the dynamic events. |
| vivo | For the note, we are not sure whether MAC-CE triggered events are considered as semi-static events. For example, MAC-CE may trigger SP-CSI report on PUCCH, which may be transmitted in between PUSCH repetitions. Are these also semi-static events?  Alternatively, maybe we can have the following revision?  Note: An event is regarded as a semi-static event if it is only associated with higher layer configurations, otherwise, it is regarded as a dynamic event. |
| CMCC | As the option 1 puts additional requirements for UE to resume the power consistency and phase continuity compared with option2, and if majority companies support it, we are glad to see it happen. |
| Spreadtrum | We do not support the proposal.  Re-starting a DMRS bundling in a configured TDW, UE has similar implementations towards dynamic events and semi-static events when the timeline is satisfied. We do not want to separate the events apart. |
| Xiaomi | Support the proposal |
| Nokia/NSB | Support the FL’s proposal in principle. However, Sharp has raised a good point that frequency hopping should be semi-static event. |
| LG | Fine with the proposal. |
| CATT | Fine with the proposal. |
| Intel | In our view, we do not see the need to consider a large value for configured TDW length. In this case, it does not make much difference in terms of performance whether to mandate UE to restart the DMRS bundling when dynamic or semi-static event is triggered.  We still do not think we need to differentiate the semi-static and dynamic event to restart the DMRS bundling.  Another point is that for dynamic event, we may also need to consider the case when it is triggered by MAC-CE, e.g., for TA command. In addition, DCI for triggering PUSCH/PUCCH repetition should not be included for the dynamic event, e.g., frequency hopping as we discussed in the GTW session. |
| Ericsson | Given the discussion in Monday’s GTW for PUCCH DMRS bundling, while we would prefer to have a single definition of events, we can also support proposal 13 in principle if it helps with the frequency hopping issue.  Regarding the Note:   * Note: An event is regarded as a dynamic event if it is associated with a DCI, otherwise it is regarded as a semi-static event.   We think this should be part of the agreement, rather than a note.  Also, we see vivo’s point regarding MAC CE. However, L1 configurations are provided by higher layers, so we think their proposal needs further refinement. For now, we would be fine with saying the following. Note that ‘actuated’ is used here since almost all control signaling is associated with RRC, but may not turned on/off by RRC directly.   * Note: An event is regarded as a dynamic event if it is ~~associated with a~~ actuated by DCI, ~~otherwise it is regarded as~~ and a semi-static event if it is actuated by RRC.   + FFS: MAC CE |
| InterDigital | We support the proposal. |
| Samsung | We fail to understand the reason for differentiating between dynamic event and semi-static event for the purpose of a UE capability to restart DMRS bundling. The capability of restarting DM-RS bundling, if specified, should apply independently of a dynamic or semi-static trigger interrupts the TDW. |
| QC | Many companies have raised good points on the current wording. We feel trying to draw a distinction will be quite difficult, but are okay to go with it if majority prefers it this way.  We are okay with FH being classified as semi-static, but MAC-CE based events are to be treated as dynamic along with events associated with a DCI.  In essence, if a UE knew of something before the start of the first bundle, we are okay to let it be classified as semi-static. We could go with the following distinction:  Events known to the UE prior to N2 timeline can be classified as semi-static. The rest are treated as dynamic. |
| FL | Good to see that most companies tend to acknowledge the benefit of option 1. Many companies have provided good comments on classification of the events. The main motivation of introducing this UE capability is the timeline issue. In this sense, can we take the suggestion by Qualcomm while avoid mentioning RRC, MAC-CE and DCI?  **Proposal 13-v2:**   * If DM-RS bundling is supported, UE is mandatory to support restarting DM-RS bundling due to semi-static events. UE capability of restarting DMRS bundling is applied only to dynamic events. * ~~Note: An event is regarded as a dynamic event if it is associated with a DCI, otherwise it is regarded as a semi-static event.~~ * Events known to the UE prior to N2 timeline can be classified as semi-static events. The rest are treated as dynamic events. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | For sake of progress, we are fine to accept Proposal 13-v2 |
| vivo | Fine with the first bullet.  While for the 2nd bullet. In our understanding, the critical issue is not whether N2 timeline is fulfilled. Even if DCI/MAC-CE triggered events happens N2 prior to PUSCH transmission, NW may still not ware of UE behaviour due to potential miss detection of DCI/MAC-CE.  Hence, we still prefer DCI and MAC-CE triggered events as dynamic events; otherwise, it is semi-static events. |
| Nokia/NSB | FL’s Proposal 13-v2 seems to be a good way forward. However, can we clarify a bit more that the N2 timeline is w.r.t. the first symbol of the first configured TDW? Therefore, can we take the following (modifications are highlighted in blue):  **Proposal 13-v2:**   * If DM-RS bundling is supported, UE is mandatory to support restarting DM-RS bundling due to semi-static events. UE capability of restarting DMRS bundling is applied only to dynamic events. * ~~Note: An event is regarded as a dynamic event if it is associated with a DCI, otherwise it is regarded as a semi-static event.~~ * Events known to the UE prior to N2 timeline before the start of the first configured TDW can be classified as semi-static events. The rest are treated as dynamic events.   @vivo: From our understanding, since we have agreed that L is not greater than maximum duration, the error propagation within a configured TDW due to missing DCI does not exist. Now, in the worst case if the DCI is missed, the UE keeps power consistency and phase continuity across the (missing) event, but the gNB doesn’t use it. Given that this case is rarely happen, we don’t think there is any issue. |
| ZTE | Support the first bullet of FL’s proposal v-2.  For the second bullet, we are confused why it is related to N2 timeline, which is the processing timeline for PUSCH processing (including decoding PDCCH and preparing PUSCH), instead of the time for preparation of power/phase change. Further clarification is needed. In our view, using DCI triggered events as dynamic could be better. We are ok to FFS MAC CE. |
| MediaTek | Timeline based classification may not be good because the same event may be treated as the semi-static or dynamic depending on the arrival time. Instead, SIB or UE-dedicated RRC configuration based events can be treated as the semi-static events. The others are treated as dynamic events. This may be simpler. |
| Samsung | We still fail to understand the reason for this proposal which introduces dynamic and semi-static events so that restarting DMRS can be mandatory based on the type of event. It seems overdesigning. |
| Ericsson | Proposal 13-v2 as clarified by Nokia looks pretty good, although the wording ‘known prior to N2 timeline’ might be improved somewhat. Would the following be more clear?   * Events known to the UE ~~prior to N2 timeline~~ that meet UE processing time requirements for a PUSCH transmission at ~~before~~ the start of the first configured TDW can be classified as semi-static events. The rest are treated as dynamic events. |
| Intel | We share similar view as other companies that it is also not clear to us the timeline is used to determine DMRS bundling restarts.  We still prefer the clear definition of semi-static (without associated DCI) and dynamic events (with associated DCI and MAC-CE), which is very simple can clean. If we cannot reach consensus on the differentiation, we suggest to go back to original Alternative 2, i.e., UE capability of restarting DMRS bundling is applied to both semi-static events and dynamic events. |

## 4.3 TPC command

**FL comments:** In last RAN1 meeting, almost all companies are fine with the following proposal. In this meeting, it is really surprising that there are a lot of concerns on this proposal.

|  |
| --- |
| * The action of TPC commands does not constitute an event that violates power consistency and phase continuity.   + If UE is configured to accumulate TPC commands, down select one of the following options.     - Option 1: If UE receives TPC commands that would take into effect during an actual TDW, UE accumulates TPC commands without taking effect during the current actual TDW. TPC commands take effect after the current actual TDW.     - Option 2: If UE receives TPC commands that would take into effect during a configured TDW, UE accumulates TPC commands without taking effect during the current configured TDW. |

**FL comment:** We have already spent great efforts on issues. From my understanding, it can work properly with either considering the action of common TPC commands as an event or not. The main difference is the UE behavior while different companies have different views. After last GTW, it seems a compromise to treat common TPC commands and UE specific non-zero TPC commands separately. Please note that this is the last RAN1 meeting before RAN1 freeze. We need to finalize this issue in this meeting. Proposal 10 is updated taking into account the comments from Huawei. **If you still have strong concerns, please do not just say you are not in favor of this proposal. Please provide constructive comments and persuade the other group to accept your proposal.**

**Proposal 10-v2:**

* The action of common TPC commands does not constitute an event that violates power consistency and phase continuity.
  + If UE is configured to accumulate TPC commands, down select one of the following options.
    - Option 1: If UE receives TPC commands that would take into effect during an actual TDW, UE accumulates TPC commands without taking effect during the current actual TDW. TPC commands take effect after the current actual TDW.
    - Option 2: If UE receives TPC commands that would take into effect during a configured TDW, UE accumulates TPC commands without taking effect during the current configured TDW.
  + If UE is not configured to accumulate TPC commands, down select one of the following alternatives.
    - Alt 1: the last TPC command that would take effect within a configured TDW supersedes all previous TPC commands that take effect within that configured TDW and only the last TPC command is applied by the UE after the current configured TDW.
      * FFS: no more than 1 TPC command is expected to take effect during a configured TDW.
    - Alt 3: the last TPC command that would take effect within an actual TDW supersedes all previous TPC commands that take effect within that actual TDW and only the last TPC command is applied by the UE after the current configured TDW.
      * FFS: no more than 1 TPC command is expected to take effect during an actual TDW.
    - Alt 5: The UE applies TPC commands after a configured TDW. It is left to UE implementation which TPC commands to apply from those that would take effect within the configured TDW.
* The action of UE specific TPC commands with non-zero values, if supported, constitutes an event that violates power consistency and phase continuity.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Panasonic | We support the proposal 10-v2. Our preference is Option 1 and Alt. 3. |
| ZTE | For group common TPC, we share with previous comment from QC that each information block in DCI 2\_2 could be set to be unique for each UE in practice. Then, there is no need to differentiate different kinds of TPC commands. For UE specific TPC, though it is true that the TPC for PUSCH would always take effect at the beginning of a PUSCH, it seems the current proposal (i.e., the last bullet) is also ok with considering the event is at the beginning of the configured TDW.  As also asked by Chair, it is about whether TPC or DMRS bundling should have high priority. Regarding this aspect, we have pretty much similar view as CATT commented before. If TPC command is to boost the power, the gain from power boosting would most possibly larger than the gain we can get from JCE. If the TPC is to reduce the power, there is no much need to care much about the JCE gain.  With above, and also the limited time left, we prefer to simply go with the following proposal to conclude the discussion here.   * The action of TPC commands with non-zero values constitutes an event that violates power consistency and phase continuity. |
| NTT DOCOMO | All in all, we are fine with the proposal.  However, we prefer to modify Alt3 as following.   * + - Alt 3: the last TPC command that would take effect within an actual TDW supersedes all previous TPC commands that take effect within that actual TDW and only the last TPC command is applied by the UE after the ~~current~~ actual configured TDW.   If TPC command that would take effect within an actual TPC commands are supplanted, the effect of TPC commands should be postponed until the actual TDW not configured TDW. |
| Sharp | We are fine with the proposal. |
| vivo | We prefer Option 1 If UE is configured to accumulate TPC commands.  For Alt 3, we wonder whether it should be ‘last TPC command is applied by the UE after the current ~~configured~~ actual TDW’. We are fine with this proposal if Alt-3 is revised. |
| CMCC | For the 1st bullet, if the group common TPC is not appropriate, we can use the TPC command in DCI format 2\_2 and the UE specific TPC with scheduling.  For the 2nd bullet, as commented in the last round and also by Huawei, for the scheduling related TPC command, there is no chance to send other TPC commands during the transmission. Then no matter it is zero or non-zero power adjustment, as it is the beginning of the transmission, it will not impact the power consistency or phase continuity. Only the TPC in DCI format 2\_2 could change the transmit power during the procedure.  Then then 2nd bullet should be removed.  If the gNB want to interrupt the JCE during the procedure, the DCI format 2\_2 TPC and TA command both could work. But TAC may take a few slots to taking effect. Then DCI format 2\_2 seems a more efficient choice. Still the DCI format 2\_2 could be UE specific but also for a group of UEs, gNB cannot prevent to send a TPC command without interrupting some other UEs’ JCE transmission. |
| Spreadtrum | Agree with ZTE. |
| Xiaomi | We support the proposal 10-v2. Our preference is Option 1 and Alt. 3. |
| Nokia/NSB | Support the FL’s proposal. |
| LG | The alternatives for TPC accumulation is supported. However, clarification is needed for when TPC is not accumulated.  As mentioned in the previous round, the non-accumulated TPC command is applied only to a single transmission occasion as an absolute value. That is, if TPC without accumulation is indicated while PUSCH is being repeated, the transmission power of the corresponding transmission occasion is different from the previous and after transmission occasions, except for a specific case (for example, when transmit power is maximum and TPC indicated to boost the transmit power). It is necessary to ensure that our understanding is aligned with those of other companies.  Considering this, if the TPC indicated in the configured TDW is delayed to the next configured TDW, one actual TDW is configured at the same time as the start of the configured TDW. If the UE is not capable of configuring a new actual TDW after the first actual TDW ends, there will be no more actual TDW within that configured TDW. Similarly, when the indicated TPC in the actual TDW is delayed outside the actual TDW, the same situation as above occurs if the actual TDW was the last actual TDW in the configured TDW. In our understanding, the options do not seem appropriate, and therefore it seems appropriate to treat them as events in the case of TPC without accumulation. |
| CATT | Agree with QC’s analysis in the precious round. Also, our technical concern seems not addressed by any proponent (If a TPC command is increasing the Tx power by, e.g. 3 dB, it seems comparable with the performance gain brought by JCE. On the other hand, if a TPC command is decreasing the Tx power, it means the channel condition is good enough, so it is not important to keep DMRS bundling at this moment).  So we do not see strong need to prioritize JCE than TPC command activation. Prefer ZTE’s conclusion. |
| Intel | We prefer Option 2 and Alt. 1.  We suggest to remove the last bullet, as UE specific TPC command cannot be considered as an event, which is included in the scheduling DCI for PUSCH repetition. |
| Ericsson | Sympathize with ZTE, LGE, CATT, and QC’s comments earlier with respect to group common TPC with format 2\_2. It is also attractive to leave TPC to gNB scheduling decisions during JCE operation, and it is possible that powering down during long repetitions could be beneficial to control interference. Furthermore, it is difficult to adjust timing of group common signaling.  On the other hand, if gains from JCE are to be expected, TPC should be infrequent. Therefore, the benefit of allowing TPC to be an event will also be infrequently obtained.  Overall, then, benefit of JCE should be balanced against the complexity of supporting events and of deferred TPC.  If TPC deferral is excessively complex for UEs, then we are fine to have TPC be an event.  Otherwise, we can support the FL proposal. We expect Option 2 should be sufficient, since long CDWs would seem to be really only useful for non-interference limited scenarios. Alt 5 in our view should be better from gNB flexibility and UE implementation viewpoint, but otherwise Alt 1 can be acceptable. |
| InterDigital | We support the FL’s proposal. |
| Samsung | We support the first main bullet - whether TPC commands are accumulated or not, the actual TDW should be considered because constant power/phase continuity requirement would apply to the actual TDW (Option 1 and Alt 3).  For the second main bullet – we have concerns as provided in previous rounds. In addition, whether DMRS bundling or CLPC achieves better performance depends on channel conditions, TDW length and frequency hopping. Overall DMRS bundling improves performance and that is why this objective is specified. Lastly, the specification impact of using TPC command as an event is not trivial as a new procedure needs to be introduced, a legacy signaling needs to be reinterpreted under certain conditions and such conditions need to be specified. |
| QC | As other companies have pointed out, we think it suffices to focus on TPC commands received via group-common DCI. We don’t see how TPC commands received via scheduling DCI can have an impact.  As mentioned many times already, treating it as an event would be the most straightforward way to go about this. We don’t anticipate such a UE receiving TPC commands too frequently.  Think about the following:  Once gNB detects link budget issues and notices that UE has maxed out its power, it starts to provide UE with PUSCH grants with repetitions. If the situation continues to degrade the number of repetitions could keep increasing: 1 rep 🡪 2 reps 🡪 4 reps 🡪 8 reps and so on. Through the process of increasing repetitions, TPC commands help in any way. Similarly, as the UE slowly gets out of poor channel conditions, the gNB slowly reduces the number of repetitions: 8 rep 🡪 4 reps 🡪 2 reps 🡪 1 rep. Its only when the UE is back to PUSCH transmissions without repetitions that TPC commands begin to play an important role. We think this entire process, could play out over 100s of ms or more. We therefore don’t think its necessary to define a new procedure to handle TPC commands. An occasional command breaking a bundle should not impact performance.  For downselection, please bring back the option to treat TPC as an event. We suggest the following:  **Proposal 10-v2:**   * ~~The action of common TPC commands does not constitute an event that violates power consistency and phase continuity.~~ Consider the following options for the action of TPC commands received via group-common DCI 2\_2:   + If UE is configured to accumulate TPC commands, down select one of the following options.     - Option 1: If UE receives TPC commands that would take into effect during an actual TDW, UE accumulates TPC commands without taking effect during the current actual TDW. TPC commands take effect after the current actual TDW.     - Option 2: If UE receives TPC commands that would take into effect during a configured TDW, UE accumulates TPC commands without taking effect during the current configured TDW.     - Option 3: If UE receives TPC commands that would take effect during a configured TDW, the UE applies the TPC command as per legacy timeline. The tx power change is treated as an event, the current actual TDW is terminated, and a new actual TDW is started.   + If UE is not configured to accumulate TPC commands, down select one of the following alternatives.     - Alt 1: the last TPC command that would take effect within a configured TDW supersedes all previous TPC commands that take effect within that configured TDW and only the last TPC command is applied by the UE after the current configured TDW.       * FFS: no more than 1 TPC command is expected to take effect during a configured TDW.     - Alt 3: the last TPC command that would take effect within an actual TDW supersedes all previous TPC commands that take effect within that actual TDW and only the last TPC command is applied by the UE after the current configured TDW.       * FFS: no more than 1 TPC command is expected to take effect during an actual TDW.     - Alt 5: The UE applies TPC commands after a configured TDW. It is left to UE implementation which TPC commands to apply from those that would take effect within the configured TDW.     - Alt 6: The UE applies the TPC commands in the order in which they are received as per as per legacy timeline. The tx power change is treated as an event, the current actual TDW is terminated, and a new actual TDW is started. * ~~The action of UE specific TPC commands with non-zero values, if supported, constitutes an event that violates power consistency and phase continuity.~~ |
| FL | It seems we are discussing different options back and forth. Again, this is the last RAN1 meeting before RAN1 freeze. We need to finalize this issue in this meeting! Now half time of this meeting has passed. We do not have time to discuss so many options. In my understanding, considering the current situation, to adopt option 2 for accumulate TPC commands and adopt Alt 1 for absolute TPC command can be a compromised way we can go. **If you still have strong concerns, please provide constructive comments and persuade the other group to accept your proposal.**  **Proposal 10-v3:**   * The action of group common TPC commands with format 2\_2 does not constitute an event that violates power consistency and phase continuity.   + If UE is configured to accumulate TPC commands, ~~down select one of the following options.~~     - ~~Option 1: If UE receives TPC commands that would take into effect during an actual TDW, UE accumulates TPC commands without taking effect during the current actual TDW. TPC commands take effect after the current actual TDW.~~     - Option 2: If UE receives TPC commands that would take into effect during a configured TDW, UE accumulates TPC commands without taking effect during the current configured TDW.   + If UE is not configured to accumulate TPC commands~~, down select one of the following alternatives.~~     - Alt 1: the last TPC command that would take effect within a configured TDW supersedes all previous TPC commands that take effect within that configured TDW and only the last TPC command is applied by the UE after the current configured TDW.       * FFS: no more than 1 TPC command is expected to take effect during a configured TDW.     - ~~Alt 3: the last TPC command that would take effect within an actual TDW supersedes all previous TPC commands that take effect within that actual TDW and only the last TPC command is applied by the UE after the current actual TDW.~~        * ~~FFS: no more than 1 TPC command is expected to take effect during an actual TDW.~~     - ~~Alt 5: The UE applies TPC commands after a configured TDW. It is left to UE implementation which TPC commands to apply from those that would take effect within the configured TDW.~~ * ~~The action of UE specific TPC commands with non-zero values, if supported, constitutes an event that violates power consistency and phase continuity.~~ |
| vivo | Fine with Proposal 10-v3. |
| Nokia/NSB | We support FL’s proposal 10-v3, which seems to be a good way-forward. |
| CMCC2 | Thanks for FL’s updates.  For the 1st main bullet, I am not sure the whole group have thoughts about whether the group common TPC with format 2\_2 is an event or not. If we want to interrupt the JCE through TPC command, then the TPC with format 2\_2 could be an event. Otherwise, it is not an event and we could discuss the following sub-bullets. Either way is generally fine to us. As if the TPC command are used to interrupt the JCE, it is more efficient compared with TA command which may take a few slots to take effect. But gNB should prevent the situation that some of the UEs in the group are carrying out the JCE meanwhile the other UEs in the group needs TPC updates. If the TPC with DCI format 2\_2 is not considered as an event, TA adjustment could be used to interrupt the JCE.  For the sub-bullet below, we do not think the majority are supporting the alternatives with configured TDW as in the proposal above. Sorry if I missed something. From our side, the actual TDW is more efficient and shorter than the configured TDW, which has less impact to the performance if the TPC is delayed. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Thanks for FL’s great effort for this issue.  For the UE-specific TPC commands in current power control mechanism,   * For PUSCH transmission, according to the current power control mechanism, there is no UE-specific TPC commands that will take effect in a TDW, because UE-specific TPC commands are only present in the scheduling DCI. Therefore, it makes no sense to take UE-specific TPC commands as an event. * For PUCCH transmission, although each PUCCH slot in PUCCH repetition can be associated with multiple scheduling DL DCIs, all of the DCIs associated to a PUCCH repetition are received before the first PUCCH slot. All of the UE-specific TPC commands will take effect at the beginning of the first PUCCH transmission. The UE-specific TPC commands should not trigger any event that violates power consistency and phase continuity   Thus, it is unreasonable to take UE-specific TPC commands as events for both PUSCH and PUCCH.  For the common TPC commands,   * As commented by Samsung, whether DMRS bundling or CLPC achieves better performance depends on channel conditions, TDW length and frequency hopping. As an enhancement that can achieve SNR gains without additional resource overheads, it is unreasonable to require DMRS bundling to be used only in extreme coverage scenarios. And requiring the gNB not to schedule TPC commands that take effect within a TDW will cause great scheduling restrictions, which is not desirable. * In practice, there is no obvious negative effects from delaying application of a TPC command by a few slots. However, taking the action of TPC commands as an event will result in frequent TDW terminations and a significant degradation in JCE performance, especially considering that some UEs may not have the ability to restart DMRS bundling after an event.   Therefore, taking the action of TPC commands has no obvious benefits and maybe lead to larger spec impact. Delaying application of TPC commands that will take effect within a TDW is a better choice.  Finally, we are OK with the current FL proposals. According to our observations, more companies seem to prefer actual TDW to determine the rules of TPC commands, rather than configured TDW. If this is the case, we are also OK with Option 1 (under the first sub-bullet) and Alt 3 (under the second subbullet). |
| Samsung | We are fine with the FL’s proposal.  It would be better to choose Option 1 and Alt 3 (actual TDW) because of better performance respect to Option 2 and Alt 1 (configured TDW), although the latter would work too. |
| Ericsson | We can be OK with FL’s proposal 10-v3, and can understand the frustration with the back-and-forth at this late stage.  It is also OK for us to make format 2\_2 an event. As CMCC mentions, the group may not have thought so much about group common TPC. |
| Intel | We are fine with Proposal 10-v3. |

## 4.4 TA adjustment

**FL comments:** After checking the timeline, it seems the majority are fine with the proposed working assumption. Similar with TPC commands, we need to finalize this issue in this meeting. **If you still have strong concerns, please do not just say you are not in favor of this proposal. Please provide constructive comments and persuade the other group to accept your proposal.**

**Proposed Working assumption**

* Based on the assumption the timeline of TA in effect is deterministic, the action of TA commands constitutes an event that violates power consistency and phase continuity
* Note: if the timeline of TA in effect is not deterministic, the working assumption will be revisited.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Panasonic | We understand the wording “deterministic” means that gNB purposely configures UE to adjust TA due to such as a misalignment of TA measured from signal/channel of UE by gNB. If this is a common understanding, we are fine with the working assumption. Otherwise, we prefer to formulate a proposal for TA in a similar way used for TPC as shown in Proposal 10-v2. |
| Apple | We support this WA. |
| ZTE | Support  TA adjustment should be prioritized over DMRS bundling because of the importance of TA adjustment to keep UEs aligned and mitigate the interference. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support the proposal. |
| Sharp | We are fine with the proposal |
| vivo | Support. |
| Spreadtrum | Support |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| Nokia/NSB | Support the FL’s proposal in principle.  @Panasonic, @FL: From our understanding, the WA was formulated and the wording “deterministic” was used to give time for companies to check on whether the time when the UE applies TA adjustment (i.e., timeline from when the UE receives TA command to when the UE applies the TA adjustment) is clearly defined in the specs or not. After further checking, we think that the definition of this timeline in TS 38.213 is clear enough. Therefore, we can even formulate this WA as a proposal for an agreement without the assumption. |
| LG | We still think that the action of TA command should not be an event, however for the sake of progress, we are fine with the proposal. However, it should be clarified that the action of TA command mentioned in this proposed working assumption is gNB indicated TA and UE autonomous TA is not performed during the actual TDW.  Thankfully, Ericsson clarified our concern regarding UE autonomous TA (which is well described in section 7.1.2.1 in TS 38.133) by capturing agreement below.  **Agreement**   * UE should not perform TA adjustment during the time domain window.   ‐   FFS: UE does not expect to receive TA command to indicate TA adjustment during the TDW.  ‐   FFS: UE ignores any TA command which indicates TA adjustment during the TDW.  ‐   FFS: UE performs TA adjustment after the TDW if it receives any TA command indicating TA adjustment during the TDW.  It says that TA adjustment is not performed within the TDW. It is ambiguous to us whether the TDW of the agreement is actual or configured. In this regard, it is necessary to check whether all group members have the same understanding and need further clarification. Since the gNB indicated TA adjustment is being discussed in other proposal, we suggest following:  **Proposal X**  UE should not perform UE autonomous TA adjustment during the actual time domain window. |
| CATT | Support.  Regarding to the early agreement in RAN1#106-e raised by LG, it is unclear the TDW is a ‘configured TDW’ or ‘actual TDW’. Actually, after further clarification in RAN1#106bis-e, it should refer to ‘actual TDW’. So, even if we allow TA violates the DMRS bundling, it just put an end to an actual TDW. So current FL proposal is not against the agreement. |
| Intel | We share similar view as Nokia that TA action timeline is clearly defined in 213 and is deterministic. In this case, we do not have to mention “Based on the assumption the timeline of TA in effect is deterministic”. |
| Ericsson | Support the FL proposal.  Slightly different view from LG regarding autonomous TA: we somewhat prefer CTDW for autonomous TA adjustment, since very long PUSCH transmissions may not be that common.  Ok to drop the ‘deterministic’ bullet as Intel suggests. |
| Samsung | A TA should not be an event that interrupts the TDW. It is an infrequent update and delaying the application when the TDW ends would not cause any major issue.  Regarding the RAN1#106-e agreement mentioned by LG, in our view it refers to an actual TDW, but we agree its formulation is open for interpretation. Note that when interpreted as configured TDW, TA adjustment will be postponed for a longer time, so the necessity of a TA command to be an event departs further from the intention of that agreement. |
| QC | Same views as Intel. |
| FL | It seems the majority support the action of TA commands constitutes an event after checking the timeline issue. The following proposal is proposed.  **Proposal 11:**   * The action of TA commands constitutes an event that violates power consistency and phase continuity. |
| Nokia/NSB | Support FL’s proposal 11. |
| ZTE | Support |
| LG2 | Regarding the TA command, an agreement was previously made that TA adjustments should not be performed within the TDW. However, we are currently trying to make a new proposal for TA adjustment. It needs to be clarified that the new proposal, proposal 11, is for gNB indicated TA. And, since there is a comment about autonomous TA in reply LS from RAN4 that autonomous TA should not be performed during the TDW, it is correct to discuss and to make an agreement regarding autonomous TA. In that perspective, the previous agreement is understood to be autonomous TA, so we should clarify that the previous agreement is about autonomous TA. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support.  @LG, regarding the agreement, in our understanding, the TDW is an actual TDW there. |
| Ericsson | Support proposal 11 |
| Intel | Support proposal 11. |

**FL comments:** Regarding autonomous TA adjustment, it seems companies have different views. More discussion is needed.

* Option 1: UE should not perform UE autonomous TA adjustment during the actual time domain window.
* Option 2: UE should not perform UE autonomous TA adjustment during the configured time domain window.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Vivo | Support proposal 11, and Slightly Prefer option-1. |
| Nokia/NSB | In general, we think that this can be up to UE’s implementation. The TDW determination procedure should be clear enough for specification. The specification impacts of these two options are unclear to us.  However, if we really need to down select, we slightly prefer Option 1. Any UE autonomous TA adjustment across actual TDWs would not impact the JCE. Therefore, this option can allow the UE autonomous TA adjustment to be performed as soon as possible. |
| CMCC | Option 1 is slightly preferred. If the autonomous TA adjustment will not happen during a period, then the period should be shorter from the perspective of performance. Thus the actual TDW is preferred. |
| LG | As we commented in previous proposal, clarification for TDW is required. In the case of autonomous TA, actual TDW is preferred between actual TDW and configured TDW. We prefer option 1. |
| MediaTek | Fine with Proprosal 11 for gNB initiated TA adjustment. For UE autonomous TA adjustment, option 1 is preferred slightly. |
| Samsung | Although unnecessary to interrupt the TDW for TA adjustment, for sake of progress we would accept Proposal 11.  Option 1. |
| Ericsson | Option 2 seems sufficient, and hopefully simpler. We can be with Option 1 as well. |
| Intel | We slightly prefer Option 2. But we can live with Option 1 if majority supports. |

## 4.5 JCE for PUSCH repetition type B and TBoMS

**FL comments:** It seems all companies are basically fine with proposal 7.

@Nokia, Agree that the whole TDW determination procedure for PUSCH repetition type A should be reused, which is the intention of the first main bullet. Regarding the sub-bullets, since only the determination of configured TDW depends on the counting method. To be complete, one sub-bullet for the determination of actual window can be added.

@LG, From FL understanding, TBoMS supports counting based on available slots for unpaired spectrum and supports counting based on physical slots for paired spectrum/SUL. To make it clearer, proposal 7 is updated.

**Proposal 7-2:**

* The TDW determination procedure agreed for PUSCH repetition type A is applicable for PUSCH repetition type B and TBoMS.
  + The configured TDWs determination procedure for PUSCH repetition type A counting based on physical slots is applied for PUSCH repetition type B.
  + The configured TDWs determination procedure for PUSCH repetition type A counting based on available slots is applied for TBoMS for unpaired spectrum.
  + The configured TDWs determination procedure for PUSCH repetition type A counting based on physical slots is applied for TBoMS for paired spectrum/SUL.
  + The actual TDWs determination procedure for PUSCH repetition type A is applied for PUSCH repetition type B and TBoMS.
* No additional specification enhancements for PUSCH repetition type B and TBoMS.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| ZTE | We are not sure whether it is a good idea to mix up with the spectrum here. Because it is still under discussion in AI 8.8.1.1 and AI 8.8.1.2 about whether to apply counting based on available slot for paired spectrum/SUL.  Based on the discussion, we feel the following proposal could be sufficient. It means the related procedure for counting based on available slot is not applicable for PUSCH repetition type B, and if counting based on physical slot is not supported in AI 8.8.1.2, then the procedure for counting based on physical slot is not applicable for TBoMS with or without repetition.  Updated proposal:  The whole TDW determination procedure agreed for PUSCH repetition type A is reused, when applicable, for PUSCH repetition type B and TBoMS with or without repetition. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support the proposal. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support the proposal |
| Sharp | We are fine with the proposal |
| vivo | Similar view as ZTE. |
| Spreadtrum | Support |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| Nokia/NSB | Support the FL’s proposal. |
| CATT | The latest clarification from AI 8.8.1.1 is that for FD-FDD UE, all slots are considered valid for SUL/paired spectrum (under approving). We are supportive with FL’s proposal.  Also fine to wait a bit time for more progress in AI 8.8.1.1/2 if necessary. |
| Intel | We share similar view as ZTE. |
| Ericsson | Support |
| Samsung | Fine with Proposal 7-2. |
| QC | ZTE makes a good point. We have kept out spcectrum aspects and focused only on counting methods. Prefer to keep it this way. ZTE proposal makes sense. |
| Panasonic | We support the proposal of ZTE. |

**FL comments:** Similar with proposal 7, only the determination of configured TDW depends on the counting method. And as pointed out by LG, TBoMS also supports counting based on physical slots for paired spectrum/SUL. Therefore, the suggested revision by ZTE seems not inclusive.

@InterDigital, It seems companies have different understandings on the transmission occasion of TBoMS, i.e., one slot or N slots of a single TBoMS. If the transmission occasion of TBoMS refers to one slot, then it corresponds to the first PUSCH transmission of the next TBoMS transmission occasion after the event. If the transmission occasion of TBoMS refers to N slots of a single TBoMS, it seems not reasonable to correspond to the first PUSCH transmission of the next TBoMS transmission occasion after the event.

**Proposal 8-v2:**

* DM-RS bundling for repetition of TBoMS is supported.
  + The TDW determination procedure agreed for PUSCH repetition type A is applicable for repetition of TBoMS.
  + No additional specification enhancement is needed.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Panasonic | We support the proposal 8-v2. |
| Apple | Ok with this proposal. |
| ZTE | It seems the comment *‘TBoMS also supports counting based on physical slots for paired spectrum/SUL.’* is not correct. Now, it is proposed in AI 8.8.1.1 that ‘The counting based on available slots is applicable to unpaired spectrum, paired spectrum and SUL’. TBoMS may reuse the clarification from AI 8.8.1.1.  As commented above, we can incorporate the repetition of TBoMS in Proposal 7. If separate discussion is preferred, we prefer the wording suggested as in Proposal 7, while can also live with the proposal 8-v2. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support the proposal. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support the proposal |
| Sharp | We are fine with the proposal |
| Spreadtrum | Support |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| Nokia/NSB | Support the FL’s proposal. |
| LG | Thanks for addressing our concern. We support the proposal. |
| CATT | Fine with the proposal. |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Ericsson | Support |
| InterDigital | @FL, thank you very much for explanations. The reason for our question is to clarify when the actual window starts for TBoMS repetitions. For N-slot TBoMS transmission with M repetitions, if an event breaks phase continuity and power consistency, it was not clear whether the actual window starts at the earliest slot which contains the part of TBoMS or at the earliest occasion of TBoMS repetitions. The restart behavior for the “earliest occasion of TBoMS repetitions” is shown in the figure below (N=4, M=3, as an example).    If the common understanding is slot-based restart, we propose to add the following note.  **Proposal 8-v2:**   * DM-RS bundling for repetition of TBoMS is supported.   + The TDW determination procedure agreed for PUSCH repetition type A is applicable for repetition of TBoMS.   + No additional specification enhancement is needed.   Note : for restarting DM-RS bundling, “for PUSCH transmission after the event violates power consistency and phase continuity” refers to the earliest slot, after the event, which contains the part of TBoMS |
| Samsung | Fine with Proposal 8-v2 |
| QC | Support |

**FL comments:** Thanks ZTE for the good comments. Proposal 7 and 8 are merged to avoid confusion.

@InterDigital, I think “the part of TBoMS” is not clear and should be clarified in AI8.8.1.2 first.

**Merge proposal 7/8:**

* The TDW determination procedure agreed for PUSCH repetition type A is reused, when applicable, for PUSCH repetition type B and TBoMS with or without repetition.
* No additional specification enhancements for PUSCH repetition type B and TBoMS.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support the merged proposal |
| vivo | Support |
| Nokia/NSB | Support the merged proposal 7/8. |
| ZTE | Support |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | OK. |
| Samsung | OK |
| Ericsson | Support |
| Intel | Support |

1. Email discussion (3rd round)

## 5.1 Use cases for joint channel estimation

**FL comments:** Proposal 1 is stable for a long while.

**Proposal 1:**

* For non-back-to-back PUSCH/PUCCH transmissions across consecutive slots, the other uplink transmission in the middle of two PUSCH/PUCCH transmissions constitutes an event that violates power consistency and phase continuity.

## 5.2 Time domain window

**FL comments:** We are approaching the end of this meeting and we need to reserve at least 24 hour for email approval. Can we confirm the following working assumption now?

**Proposal 2: Confirm the following working assumption**

|  |
| --- |
| **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. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support the proposal. |
| Sharp | Support the proposal |
| Spreadtrum | Support |
| Xiaomi | Support the proposal. |
| LG | Support |
| Apple | Support the proposal |
| Samsung | Okay |
| CATT | Support |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support |
| Intel | Support |
| Nokia/NSB | Support |
| Ericsson | Support |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support. |

### 5.2.1 Configured TDW

#### Issue #1: The window length *L* of the configured TDW

#### Issue #1-2: Configuration/Indication of L

**FL comments:** Proposal 3 is stable for a long while.

**Proposal 3:**

* Dynamic indication of the window length *L* of the configured TDW by DCI or indicated by TDRA table with one additional entry is not supported.

#### Issue #1-3: Candidate values of L

**FL comments:** After latest discussion via email reflector, it seems there is no concern on proposal 4-v2. Hope proposal 4-v2 is really stable this time.

@MediaTek: As I explained and also clarified by other companies, it’s clear that each configured TDW consists of one or multiple consecutive physical slots, regardless of the counting based on physical slots or available slots. No more clarification in this proposal is necessary.

**Proposal 4-v2:**

* The candidate values of the window length *L* of the configured TDW can be any integer value that is larger than 1 and no larger than the maximum duration.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Panasonic | Support the proposal 4-v2. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support the proposal.  As of L = 1, we prefer supporting it. It is beneficial for PUSCH repetition type B and there is no gain by restricting L = 1. However, if it is against the agreement, we are fine with not supporting L = 1. |
| Sharp | Support the proposal. |
| Spreadtrum | Support |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| LG | Support. |
| Apple | Support the proposal |
| Samsung | Fine with the proposal. |
| CATT | We share the same understanding with DOCOMO, but we can live with keeping L>1 even for PUSCH repetition type B if this is majority view. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support |
| CMCC | Support the proposal. |
| Intel | Support |
| Nokia/NSB | Support the FL’s proposal. |
| Ericsson | Support |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support |
| FL | It seems proposal 4-v2 is stable this time. |

#### Issue #1-4: Counting of L based on available slots

**FL comments:** After latest discussion via email reflector, it seems there is no concern on proposal 12-v2. Hope proposal 12-v2 is really stable this time.

**Proposal 12-v2:** The following agreement is clarified as follows.

* For PUSCH repetition type A counting based on available slots,
  + ~~One configured TDW consists of one or multiple consecutive physical slots.~~
  + “The configured TDWs are determined based on available slots” in the agreement means “The start of the configured TDWs is determined based on available slots”

|  |
| --- |
| **Agreement**   * For PUSCH repetition type A counting based on physical slots   + The configured TDWs are consecutive, where the start of other configured TDWs is the first physical slot right after the last physical slot of a previous configured TDW. * For PUSCH repetition type A counting based on available slots   + The configured TDWs are determined based on available slots, where start of a configured TDWs is the first available slot after the last available slot of a previous configured TDW.   + Note: The determination of available slots for PUSCH repetition Type A is defined in AI 8.8.1.1. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Panasonic | Support the proposal 12-v2. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Vivo | Support |
| Sharp | Support the proposal. |
| Spreadtrum | Support |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| LG | Fine with the clarification. |
| Apple | Ok with this proposal |
| Samsung | Fine with the proposal. |
| CATT | Fine with the handling. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support the proposal |
| CMCC | Fine with the proposal. |
| Intel | Support |
| Nokia/NSB | Support the FL’s proposal. |
| Ericsson | Support |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support |
| FL | It seems proposal 12-v2 is stable this time. |

### 5.2.2 Actual time domain window

#### Issue #2: The determination of actual TDW

#### Issue #2-1: The start/end of the actual TDW

**FL comment:** Proposal 5 is stable for a long while.

**Proposal 5: Confirm the following working assumption**

|  |
| --- |
| **Working assumption:**   * The start of the first actual TDW is the first ~~available~~ symbol (at least determined by TDRA table) ~~in available slot~~ for the first PUSCH transmission in an available slot within the configured TDW. * The end of the actual TDW is   + the last ~~available~~ symbol (at least determined by TDRA table) ~~in available slot~~ for the last PUSCH transmission in an available slot within the configured TDW if the actual TDW reaches the end of the last PUSCH transmission within the configured TDW.   + the last ~~available~~ symbol (at least determined by TDRA table) ~~in available slot~~ of the PUSCH transmission right before the event if an event occurs that violates power consistency and phase continuity, and the PUSCH transmission is in an available slot. * For UE capable of restarting DM-RS bundling, the start of the new actual TDW is the first ~~available~~ symbol (at least determined by TDRA table) ~~in available slot~~ for PUSCH transmission after the event violates power consistency and phase continuity, and the PUSCH transmission is in an available slot. |

#### Issue #2-2: Events that violate power consistency and phase continuity

**FL comments:** It seems companies have different understandings on UCI multiplexing and BWP switching. Companies are encouraged to continue the discussion on the following issues.

* Whether power change due to UCI multiplexing constitutes an event?
* Whether BWP switching constitutes an event if bwp-InactivityTimer expires?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| NTT DOCOMO | We hesitate to include BWP switching as an event.  We are not sure why gNB configures bwp-InactivityTimer shorter than the duration of PUSCH repetition configured in TDRA table. Also, UE will not transmit on UL-SCH on the BWP after BWP is deactivated. Actual TDW will end anyway, when PUSCH transmission ends. |
| vivo | **For UCI multiplexing** due to PUCCH overlapping with PUCCH repetition, as raised by ZTE in 2nd round. We don’t think UCI multiplexing will happen. According to section 9.2.6 of 38.213.   |  | | --- | | A UE does not multiplex different UCI types in a PUCCH transmission with repetitions over slots. If a UE would transmit a first PUCCH over more than one slot and at least a second PUCCH over one or more slots, and the transmissions of the first PUCCH and the second PUCCH would overlap in a number of slots then, for each slot of the number of slots and with UCI type priority of HARQ-ACK > SR > CSI with higher priority > CSI with lower priority  - the UE does not expect the first PUCCH and any of the second PUCCHs to start at a same slot and include a UCI type with same priority  - if the first PUCCH and any of the second PUCCHs include a UCI type with same priority, the UE transmits the PUCCH starting at an earlier slot and does not transmit the PUCCH starting at a later slot  - if the first PUCCH and any of the second PUCCHs do not include a UCI type with same priority, the UE transmits the PUCCH that includes the UCI type with higher priority and does not transmit the PUCCH that include the UCI type with lower priority |   As **for** **BWP switching**, according to 38.321 section 5.15, the transmission of PUCCH/PUSCH repetitions would be terminated. In our understanding, it will not be an event.   |  | | --- | | 1> if a BWP is deactivated:  2> not transmit on UL-SCH on the BWP;  2> not transmit on RACH on the BWP;  2> not monitor the PDCCH on the BWP;  2> not transmit PUCCH on the BWP;  2> not report CSI for the BWP;  2> not transmit SRS on the BWP;  2> not receive DL-SCH on the BWP;  2> clear any configured downlink assignment and configured uplink grant of configured grant Type 2 on the BWP;  2> suspend any configured uplink grant of configured grant Type 1 on the inactive BWP. | |
| Sharp | We think UCI multiplexing does not lead to tx power change and for PUCCH repetition, each PUCCH repetition cannot be multiplexed with other PUCCH/PUSCH. |
| Spreadtrum | For UCI multiplexing, we agree with ZTE, it may lead to power change of a PUCCH repetition due to a PUCCH overlapping with it. But it is not an event for PUSCH repetition. According to the specification quoted by vivo, it means two or more PUCCH with repetitions are overlapping, UCI dropping is done instead of multiplexing. Thus when a PUCCH without repetition overlapping with a PUCCH with repetitions, UCI contents can change.  For bwp-InactivityTimer expires, and all the other BWP switching, we agree with vivo that PUSCH could be terminated. So it is not an event, but a termination. |
| QC | On UCI mux: section 9.2.6 of 38.213 seems to counter what ZTE is claiming (as pointed out by other companies as well). |
| LG | According to the reply LS from RAN4 of the RAN1#106-e, in order for the other UL transmission in between PUSCH/PUCCH to satisfy phase continuity, the following condition should be satisfied.  - PAPR and average power, e.g., PUSCH/PUCCH part of repetitions and SRS has same PAPR and average power  - Allocated number and locations of PRBs transmitted  - Antenna port settings  We think same principle should be kept for the UCI multiplexing, which means PAPR and average power should be same to ensure phase continuity. In that perspective, we think UCI multiplexing is an event. |
| Samsung | For the 1st bullet, we don’t see the UCI multiplexing changes PUSCH/PUCCH repetition power based on the current spec. Hence, the UCI multiplexing should not constitute an event.  For the 2nd bullet, gNB can avoid this case, e.g., by proper configuration of bwp-InactivityTimer. |
| CATT | After check with our research team, we have the following views on UCI issue:  (1) From power control point of view, UCI multiplexing may not lead to power in-consistence.  (2) From waveform point of view, it is unclear whether there will be implicit impacts which violate JCE condition, e.g. change in power spectrum. We are open to hear more voice from others.  For BWP switching, we think it is a corner case and the gNB should be able to avoid. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | In our view, UCI multiplexing is not a violation event  Regarding BWP switching, as commented by other companies, we think that gNB can and should avoid this issue. Therefore, no need to consider it as violation event |
| Intel | We tend to agree with other companies that UCI multiplexing is not an event as Tx power does not change.  For BWP switching, gNB should avoid such BWP switching during PUSCH repetition and DMRS bundling. We do not think this should be treated as an event. |
| Nokia/NSB | We share the same views with Intel. |
| Ericsson | Regarding BWP switching, we agree with the logic from DOCOMO, vivo, and others that it should not be an event.  Regarding UCI, for PUSCH we also don’t see why UCI multiplexing should affect the power, especially given the RAN4 guidance to not focus on higher modulation orders than QPSK.  For PUCCH, referring to section 9.2.6 of 38.213 that Qualcomm pointed out, my understanding for PUCCH repetition is that while PUCCH-PUCCH collision might affect power, UCI payloads are not combined. So I don’t see a reason why UCI multiplexing should be an event for PUCCH. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Share the same view with vivo and QC. |
| FL | It seems the majority think UCI multiplexing and BWP switching are not events. |

**FL comments:** It seems the majority are fine with proposal 6-v3.

**Proposal 6-v3:**

* If DMRS bundling and UL beam switching for multi-TRP operation ~~can be supported~~ are configured simultaneously, UL beam switching for multi-TRP operation constitutes an event that violates power consistency and phase continuity.
* FFS: UE should not perform UE implementation based precoder cycling within the actual TDW.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Panasonic | Support the proposal 6-v3. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support the proposal. |
| Vivo | Support |
| Sharp | Support the proposal. |
| Spreadtrum | Support |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| LG | Support |
| Apple | We are the not so sure how much the benefits for joint operation of DMRS bundling and UL beam switching. Currently the UL switching patterns were defined, per slot switching doesn’t show the coverage gai. Another pattern is 2 slots switching, PUSCH transmits twice to one TRP, then switching to another TRP. Current pattens degrade the joint channel estimation gain. If no more repetitions per TRP are supported for UL beam switching, the joint operation of DMRS bundling and UL beam switching make less sense. We propose to add one FFS, i.e., increase the per TRP repetition number {4, 6, 8}. |
| Samsung | Fine with the first bullet.  Instead of the FFS, can we agree the following “**In case of DMRS bundling, the UE should have the same precoding for the transmission**”. |
| CATT | OK for the sake of progress, although we are still susceptive on the benefit.  In addition, regarding to the FFS, we afraid that there is no much time to further study. It is our understanding UE with DMRS bundling will not perform precoder cycling in an actual TDW. If ‘UE should not’ is too strong, maybe ‘UE is not expected to’ (as suggested by Panasonic and CMCC) can be consider. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Fine with the proposal, and also fine with Samsung’s suggestion |
| CMCC | Support the 1st bullet. For the FFS, we should not limit the UE implementation, as the precoding cycling are widely used for the 2T4R UEs for PUCCH transmission. If the UE report it support the JCE, it should keep the power consistency and phase continuity with whatever the precoding cycling mechanism is. Still, as it is a UE implementation and transparent to gNB, I do not think there is any spec impact. |
| Intel | We are fine with the first bullet.  For the second bullet, we are fine with the suggestion from Samsung with update:   * UE is expected to have the same precoding within the actual TDW |
| Nokia/NSB | We support the first bullet. The second bullet may not have specification impact. |
| Ericsson | Also OK with the first bullet. Should we further agree that it is a ‘semi-static’ event, similar to the power control agreement, since it should be known within the PUSCH/PUCCH processing timeline(s)?  The second bullet, should be UE implementation, since how the UE creates antenna ports is UE implementation. Therefore the second bullet should not have specification impact. We already have the following in 38.211, which seems to be enough:  If DM-RS bundling is applied to PUSCH and/or PUCCH repetitions as described in clause XXX of [6, 38.214], the UE transmission shall be such that the channel over which a symbol on the antenna port used for uplink transmission is conveyed can be inferred from the channel over which another symbol on the same antenna port is conveyed if the two symbols are transmitted within the same time window. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support |

#### Issue #2-3: UE capability of restarting DMRS bundling

**FL comments:** It seems the majority are basically fine with proposal 13. The main point is how to classify the events. Based on companies’ views, there are be two options. Companies are encouraged to provide further views.

**Proposal 13-v3:**

* If DM-RS bundling is supported, UE is mandatory to support restarting DM-RS bundling due to semi-static events. UE capability of restarting DMRS bundling is applied only to dynamic events.
* Option 1: An event is regarded as a dynamic event if it is triggered by a DCI or MAC-CE, otherwise it is regarded as a semi-static event.
* Option 2: Events known to the UE ~~prior to N2 timeline~~ that meet UE processing time requirements for a PUSCH transmission at ~~before~~ the start of the first configured TDW can be classified as semi-static events. The rest are treated as dynamic events.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Panasonic | We are fine with the proposal 13-v3, and our preference is Option 2. |
| vivo | Fine with the proposal, and Prefer option 1.  Timeline involved in dynamic events determination is not necessary, and we are not sure of the potential spec impacts if timeline is involved. |
| Sharp | We prefer Option 2.  For example, multiple configured TDWs are basically determined based on at least a scheduling DCI. Likewise, the UE can create multiple actual TDWs (i.e., first actual TDW and restarted actual TDWs) based on at least the scheduling DCI. Therefore, even if an event is associated with a DCI, it is not always one of the dynamic events. |
| Spreadtrum | We can live with the proposal for progress.  According to the definition of dynamic and semi-static event, we prefer Option 1, since it is consistent with previous usages, e.g. semi-static/dynamic HARQ-ACK codebook.  Second, several events may be mixed in one occasion, such as semi-static configured DL symbol and dynamic TPC action. In this case, it would be good to clarify if there are only semi-static events, UE is mandatory to restart DMRS bundling, otherwise if there is at least one dynamic event, it up to UE capability. |
| Xiaomi | Fine with the proposal and prefer option 1. |
| LG | Fine with the proposal and our preference is option 2.  Although we are not agreed for frequency hopping to be semi-static or dynamic event, even it is event or not, it seems for option 1, frequency hopping is only considered for the semi-static event. |
| Apple | We prefer the UE capability to restarting DMRS bundling due to both semi-static and dynamic events. But for the progress, we can live with this proposal. |
| CATT | Fine with the proposal and prefer Option 1, which is more aligned with current spec understanding. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Fine with the proposal and prefer option 1 |
| CMCC | Fine with the 1st bullet.  For the options, we prefer option 1 which is more precise and restrict. Though the option 2 have the knowledge of events before the process time, there are still some DCI based indication will fall into the category of ‘semi-static’ events, e.g. SFI?. We do not think further iterate discussion is good for the group. Then the more strict or the conservative one is preferred. |
| InterDigital | We support the proposal and prefer Option 1. |
| Ericsson | As discussed above: Following on from Wednesday’s agreement to use Option 1, but with FH being a ‘semi-static’ event, should we make UL M-TRP precoder switching a ‘semi-static’ event? |

#### Other issues

Companies are encourage to continue the discussion on the following issues.

1. The first/last symbol determined other than TDRA table raised by Spreadtrum.
2. The reduced slot due to TA adjustment raised by LG.
3. Partial PUSCH cancellation raised by TCL.
4. Collision between DL reception/monitoring occasion and dynamically scheduled PUSCH proposed by WILUS.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Sharp | 1: In our view, it is necessary to actually transmit PUSCH repetition not only on the first/last symbol, but also on all symbols included in the actual TDW. Therefore, “at least determined by TDRA table” is just supplementary information.  4: In our view, DL reception (i.e., downlink or flexible symbols without DL monitoring occasion configured) is one of the events regardless of whether PUSCH is dynamically transmitted according to RAN4 LS. |
| Spreadtrum | For first/last symbol determined other than TDRA table in 1, we are fine to list all cases of first/last symbol determination, such as below. Or just delete the part of (at least determined by TDRA table) in the bullet, because the first symbol of the first PUSCH transmission can be derived by current rules. Either is fine for us. So there are two alternatives for this issue:  Alt 1:   * ***The start of the first actual TDW is the first symbol ~~(at least determined by TDRA table)~~ for the first PUSCH transmission in an available slot within the configured TDW.***   + ***Determined by TDRA table***   + ***Starting symbol of a slot***   + ***Starting symbol after an event*** * ***The end of the actual TDW is***   + ***the last symbol ~~(at least determined by TDRA table)~~ for the last PUSCH transmission in an available slot within the configured TDW if the actual TDW reaches the end of the last PUSCH transmission within the configured TDW.***     - ***Determined by TDRA table***     - ***Ending symbol of a slot***   Alt2:   * ***The start of the first actual TDW is the first symbol ~~(at least determined by TDRA table)~~ for the first PUSCH transmission in an available slot within the configured TDW.*** * ***The end of the actual TDW is***   + ***the last symbol ~~(at least determined by TDRA table)~~ for the last PUSCH transmission in an available slot within the configured TDW if the actual TDW reaches the end of the last PUSCH transmission within the configured TDW.*** |
| LG | 2: According to section 4.2 from TS 38.213, the reduced slot due to TA adjustment is described as follows: “If two adjacent slots overlap due to a TA command, the latter slot is reduced in duration relative to the former slot.”  There are two problems with this.  First, it is not specified which symbols in the slot to be reduced, and secondly, whether the phase continuity can be guaranteed when the slot is reduced.  For the first problem, when the corresponding slot is the first or last of the TDW in back-to-back consecutive PUSCH transmission, the first symbol or the last symbol indicated in the at least determined TDRA table may not exist. Therefore, we think that it is necessary to rephrase the beginning and end of the actual TDW, and it is necessary to check whether the group's understanding of this is consistent.  For the second problem, regardless of whether this is an event or not, it is questionable whether such a reduced slot can be included in DMRS bundling. According to our understanding that phase continuity is guaranteed only by having the same PAPR, this cannot ensure phase continuity, and therefore the reduced slot should not be included in the TDW.  4: We share similar view with Sharp. |
| WILUS | @Sharp, LG: Agree that DL reception includes three scenarios (e.g., downlink or flexible symbols without DL monitoring occasion configured) according to RAN4’s feedback. However, this “DL reception” is about the symbol gap in-between the PUSCH or PUCCH repetition, while we want to point out is determination of the starting of a new actual TDW.    Refer to above figure, overlapped symbols (red parts) are for PUSCH transmission, not for DL reception/monitoring as long as a collision has occurred based on current specification. Also, flexible symbols prior to PUSCH rep#4 does not need to be considered because those symbols are not regarded for the start of actual TDW#2 anyhow. Therefore, it’s beneficial for a UE to determine Actual TDW#2, not Actual TDW#2, which does not violate phase continuity and power consistency. |
| Samsung | Regarding the partial PUSCH cancellation raised by TCL, we think the partial transmitted PUSCH can be included to the previous actual TDW right before the cancelled symbol of PUSCH to perform DM-RS bundling.  We don’t see the others are problematic issues for DM-RS bundling. |

## 5.3 TPC command

**FL comments:** In last RAN1 meeting, it’s clear that the majority support the action of TPC commands does not constitute an event. In that sense, I don’t think keeping all the options open is a good choice, as we are approaching the end of the last RAN1 meeting before RAN1 freeze. According to my observation, some companies supporting the action of TPC commands as an event, can accept option 2 for accumulate TPC commands and Alt 1 for absolute TPC command. That’s why I think this can be a compromised way we can go. **If you still insist on the other option, appreciate if you can propose an alternative way that can be accepted by everyone.**

**Proposal 10-v3:**

* The action of group common TPC commands with format 2\_2 does not constitute an event that violates power consistency and phase continuity.
  + If UE is configured to accumulate TPC commands, ~~down select one of the following options.~~
    - ~~Option 1: If UE receives TPC commands that would take into effect during an actual TDW, UE accumulates TPC commands without taking effect during the current actual TDW. TPC commands take effect after the current actual TDW.~~
    - Option 2: If UE receives TPC commands that would take into effect during a configured TDW, UE accumulates TPC commands without taking effect during the current configured TDW.
  + If UE is not configured to accumulate TPC commands~~, down select one of the following alternatives.~~
    - Alt 1: the last TPC command that would take effect within a configured TDW supersedes all previous TPC commands that take effect within that configured TDW and only the last TPC command is applied by the UE after the current configured TDW.
      * FFS: no more than 1 TPC command is expected to take effect during a configured TDW.
    - ~~Alt 3: the last TPC command that would take effect within an actual TDW supersedes all previous TPC commands that take effect within that actual TDW and only the last TPC command is applied by the UE after the current actual TDW.~~ 
      * ~~FFS: no more than 1 TPC command is expected to take effect during an actual TDW.~~
    - ~~Alt 5: The UE applies TPC commands after a configured TDW. It is left to UE implementation which TPC commands to apply from those that would take effect within the configured TDW.~~
* ~~The action of UE specific TPC commands with non-zero values, if supported, constitutes an event that violates power consistency and phase continuity.~~

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Panasonic | Although our position is to support Option 1 and Alt. 3, we are fine with the proposal 10-v3 for a sake of progress. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support the proposal. |
| vivo | Support |
| Sharp | Support |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with the proposal 10-v3 for a sake of progress, although our first preference is TPC action is an event. |
| QC | We understand the urgency here. We can live with this option even though it’s not our first preference. Can we take this as a working assumption to make sure this is not incompatible with any of the other procedures in the spec? |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| Apple | OK with this proposal |
| Samsung | In Option 2 it seems that the last part was dropped at a certain point. As in all other cases the part in red should be there.  Option 2: If UE receives TPC commands that would take into effect during a configured TDW, UE accumulates TPC commands without taking effect during the current configured TDW. TPC commands take effect after the current actual TDW. |
| CATT | Our 1st preference is the same handling as TA command, i.e. treat is as an event. It is not reasonable to assume a gNB to send TPC command frequently, especially when it knows this is a UE performing DMRS bundling. We are not sure this is really the best way we can go with. |
| CMCC | Fine with the main bullet. But our preference are still option 1 and Alt 3. And similar idea as QC, the wording needs improvement, such as ‘supersedes all previous TPC commands. |
| Samsung 2 | This was to correct a typo in our previous input. Since Option 2 is for configured TDW.  In Option 2 it seems that the last part was dropped at a certain point. As in all other cases the part in red should be there.  Option 2: If UE receives TPC commands that would take into effect during a configured TDW, UE accumulates TPC commands without taking effect during the current configured TDW. TPC commands take effect after the current configured TDW. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Thanks for FL’s great effort for this issue.  For the UE-specific TPC commands in current power control mechanism, all the UE-specific TPC commands will not take effect within a TDW, which should not trigger any event that violates power consistency and phase continuity. Thus, it is unreasonable to take UE-specific TPC commands as events for both PUSCH and PUCCH.  For the common TPC commands,   * As commented by Samsung, whether DMRS bundling or CLPC achieves better performance depends on channel conditions, TDW length and frequency hopping. As an enhancement that can achieve SNR gains without additional resource overheads, it is unreasonable to require DMRS bundling to be used only in extreme coverage scenarios. And requiring the gNB not to schedule TPC commands that take effect within a TDW will cause great scheduling restrictions, which is not desirable. * In practice, there is no obvious negative effects from delaying application of a TPC command by a few slots. However, taking the action of TPC commands as an event will result in frequent TDW terminations and a significant degradation in JCE performance, especially considering that some UEs may not have the ability to restart DMRS bundling after an event.   Therefore, taking the action of TPC commands as an event has no obvious benefits and maybe lead to larger spec impact. Delaying application of TPC commands that will take effect within a TDW is a better choice.  Finally, we are OK with the current FL proposals. |

## 5.4 TA adjustment

**FL comments:** It seems the majority are fine with proposal 11. To address the concern from LG, proposal 11 is updated as follows.

**Proposal 11-v2:**

* The action of gNB indicated TA commands constitutes an event that violates power consistency and phase continuity.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Panasonic | Support the proposal 11-v2. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support the proposal. |
| vivo | Support |
| Sharp | We are fine with the proposal. |
| QC | Support |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| LG | Support. |
| Samsung | Ok |
| CATT | Support. |
| CMCC | Fine with the proposal. |
| Nokia/NSB | Support. |
| Ericsson | Support |

**FL comments:** Regarding autonomous TA adjustment, it seems option 1 can be accepted by all companies.

**Proposal 11’:**

* UE should not perform UE autonomous TA adjustment during the actual time domain window.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Panasonic | Support the proposal 11’. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support the proposal. |
| vivo | Support |
| Sharp | We are fine with the proposal. |
| QC | Support |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| LG | Support. |
| Samsung | Ok |
| CATT | Support. |
| CMCC | Support |
| Apple | After checking, we are ok with the proposal. |
| Nokia/NSB | Although the spec impact of this proposal is unclear, we are fine to support it. |
| Ericsson | Support |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support |

## 5.5 JCE for PUSCH repetition type B and TBoMS

**FL comments:** It seems the majority are fine with the merged proposal 7/8. Hopefully it is stable.

**Merge proposal 7/8:**

* The TDW determination procedure agreed for PUSCH repetition type A is reused, when applicable, for PUSCH repetition type B and TBoMS with or without repetition.
* No additional specification enhancements for PUSCH repetition type B and TBoMS.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
| Panasonic | Support the merged proposal 7/8. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support the proposal. |
| vivo | Support |
| Sharp | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| LG | Support. |
| Apple | OK with this proposal |
| Samsung | Support |
| CATT | Support. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support |
| InterDigital | We support the FL’s proposal. @FL, thank you for the explanations. |
| Intel | Support |
| Nokia/NSB | Support. |
| Ericsson | Support |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support |

1. Email discussion (4th round)

## 6.1 Time domain window

#### Issue #2-2: Events that violate power consistency and phase continuity

**FL comments:** It seems the majority are fine with first main bullet, while the majority think there is no spec impact for the second bullet. Regarding the proposed FFS by Apple, I’m not sure whether this is within the scope of this WI. Regarding the suggestion from Samsung, CATT, CMCC, Intel for the second bullet, in my understanding, it seems not necessary as this is one of the conditions to maintain power consistency and phase continuity indicated by RAN4. Considering that companies acknowledge there is no spec impact for UE implementation based precoder cycling, suggest to remove the second bullet. Regarding the comments from Ericsson, companies are encouraged to provide view whether UL beam switching for multi-TRP operation is a semi-static event.

**Proposal 6-v4:**

* If DMRS bundling and UL beam switching for multi-TRP operation ~~can be supported~~ are configured simultaneously, UL beam switching for multi-TRP operation constitutes an event that violates power consistency and phase continuity.
  + FFS: UL beam switching for multi-TRP operation is regarded as a semi-static event.
* ~~FFS: UE should not perform UE implementation based precoder cycling within the actual TDW.~~

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

#### Other issues

**There are following issues to be discussed.**

1. The first/last symbol determined other than TDRA table raised by Spreadtrum.
2. The reduced slot due to TA adjustment raised by LG.
3. Partial PUSCH cancellation raised by TCL.
4. Collision between DL reception/monitoring occasion and dynamically scheduled PUSCH proposed by WILUS.

**FL comments:**

* For the first/last symbol determined other than TDRA table and reduced slot due to TA adjustment, after clarification by companies, it seems there is no critical problem based on the agreement. As explained by Sharp, “at least determined by TDRA table” is just supplementary information.
* For partial PUSCH cancellation, after clarification by companies, it seems the concern has been addressed.
* For collision between DL reception/monitoring occasion and dynamically scheduled PUSCH, according to the latest RAN4 LS (R4-2120002), for scenario 3 (downlink or flexible symbols without DL monitoring occasion configured), UE needs to prepare for the reception of DCI triggered DL for flexible symbols therefore it needs to retune the RF for reception and therefore loses phase continuity. Therefore scenario 3 is included in the “downlink reception”. It seems there is no ambiguity.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

#### Any other comments about TDW determination?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## 6.2 TPC command

The following working assumption has been achieved.

**Working assumption:**

* The action of group common TPC commands with format 2\_2 does not constitute an event that violates power consistency and phase continuity.
  + If UE is configured to accumulate TPC commands,
    - If UE receives TPC commands that would take into effect during a configured TDW, UE accumulates TPC commands without taking effect during the current configured TDW. TPC commands take effect after the current configured TDW.
  + If UE is not configured to accumulate TPC commands
    - the last TPC command that would take effect within a configured TDW supersedes all previous TPC commands that take effect within that configured TDW and only the last TPC command is applied by the UE after the current configured TDW.
      * FFS: no more than 1 TPC command is expected to take effect during a configured TDW.

Companies are encouraged to provide views on FFS bullet and whether this WA can be confirmed.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Companies** | **Comments** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

1. Agreements at RAN1#107-e

**Agreement:**

**Support Option 1’-a**

**Option 1’-a:**

* If L is configured, the maximum value of window length L of the configured TDW should not exceed the maximum duration, which is reported as UE capability as the duration where UE is able to maintain power consistency and phase continuity subject to power consistency and phase continuity requirements.
* If L is not configured, the default value of L = min (maximum duration, duration of all PUSCH repetitions)

**Agreement:**

* For non-back-to-back PUSCH/PUCCH transmissions across consecutive slots, the other uplink transmission in the middle of two PUSCH/PUCCH transmissions constitutes an event that violates power consistency and phase continuity.

**Conclusion:**

* Dynamic indication of the window length *L* of the configured TDW by DCI or indicated by TDRA table with one additional entry is not supported.

**Agreement:**

**This working Assumption is confirmed.**

|  |
| --- |
| **Working assumption:**   * The start of the first actual TDW is the first ~~available~~ symbol (at least determined by TDRA table) ~~in available slot~~ for the first PUSCH transmission in an available slot within the configured TDW. * The end of the actual TDW is   + the last ~~available~~ symbol (at least determined by TDRA table) ~~in available slot~~ for the last PUSCH transmission in an available slot within the configured TDW if the actual TDW reaches the end of the last PUSCH transmission within the configured TDW.   + the last ~~available~~ symbol (at least determined by TDRA table) ~~in available slot~~ of the PUSCH transmission right before the event if an event occurs that violates power consistency and phase continuity, and the PUSCH transmission is in an available slot. * For UE capable of restarting DM-RS bundling, the start of the new actual TDW is the first ~~available~~ symbol (at least determined by TDRA table) ~~in available slot~~ for PUSCH transmission after the event violates power consistency and phase continuity, and the PUSCH transmission is in an available slot. |

**Agreement:**

* The action of gNB indicated TA commands constitutes an event that violates power consistency and phase continuity.

**Agreement:**

* If DM-RS bundling is supported, UE is mandatory to support restarting DM-RS bundling due to semi-static events. UE capability of restarting DMRS bundling is applied only to dynamic events.
  + An event is regarded as a dynamic event if it is triggered by a DCI or MAC-CE, otherwise it is regarded as a semi-static event.
  + Note: At least frequency hopping event is considered as semi-static event.

**Working assumption:**

* The action of group common TPC commands with format 2\_2 does not constitute an event that violates power consistency and phase continuity.
  + If UE is configured to accumulate TPC commands,
    - If UE receives TPC commands that would take into effect during a configured TDW, UE accumulates TPC commands without taking effect during the current configured TDW. TPC commands take effect after the current configured TDW.
  + If UE is not configured to accumulate TPC commands
    - the last TPC command that would take effect within a configured TDW supersedes all previous TPC commands that take effect within that configured TDW and only the last TPC command is applied by the UE after the current configured TDW.
      * FFS: no more than 1 TPC command is expected to take effect during a configured TDW.

1. Agreements at RAN1#106b-e

**Agreement:**

* For PUSCH repetition type A counting based on physical slots
  + The start of the first configured TDW is the first physical slot for the first PUSCH transmission.
  + The end of the last configured TDW is the last physical slot for the last PUSCH transmission.
* For PUSCH repetition type A counting based on available slots
  + The start of the first configured TDW is the first available slot for the first PUSCH transmission.
  + The end of the last configured TDW is the last available slot for the last PUSCH transmission.
  + Note: The determination of available slots for PUSCH repetition Type A is defined in AI 8.8.1.1.

**Conclusion:**

* Joint channel estimation over PUSCH transmissions across non-consecutive slots is not supported in Rel-17.

**Agreement:**

Down-select one of the following options in this meeting:

**Option 1**:

* The maximum value of window length *L* of the configured TDW should not exceed the maximum duration, which is reported as UE capability as the duration where UE is able to maintain power consistency and phase continuity subject to power consistency and phase continuity requirements.

**Option 1’:**

* The maximum value of window length L of the configured TDW should not exceed the maximum duration, which is reported as UE capability as the duration where UE is able to maintain power consistency and phase continuity subject to power consistency and phase continuity requirements.
  + - ~~If L is not configured, the configured TDW length is equal to all repetitions~~
    - If L is not configured, default behavior should be defined, e.g., the configured TDW length is equal to all repetitions

**Option 3’**:

* Whether the window length *L* of the configured TDW can be longer than maximum duration is subject to UE capability.
  + If UE is capable of *L* being longer than maximum duration,
    - The maximum value of the window length *L* of the configured TDW is the duration of all repetitions.
      * FFS: whether *L* cannot be other values other than the duration of all repetitions, if it is longer than the maximum duration.
    - If *L* is longer than the maximum duration, UE does not expect dynamic events.
      * FFS: details of dynamic events

**Agreement**

* For DG-PUSCH, Type1 CG-PUSCH and Type2 CG-PUSCH, the window length L of the configured TDW is at least configured by RRC.
* FFS: For DG-PUSCH and Type2 CG-PUSCH, whether the window length *L* of the configured TDW can be indicated by DCI or indicated by TDRA table with one additional entry.

**Agreement**

* The window length L of the RRC configured TDW is configured separately for PUSCH and PUCCH.
  + For PUSCH, *L* is configured per BWP.
* FFS whether the window length L can be configured with each row in the TDRA table

**Agreement**

* For PUSCH repetition type A counting based on physical slots
  + The configured TDWs are consecutive, where the start of other configured TDWs is the first physical slot right after the last physical slot of a previous configured TDW.
* For PUSCH repetition type A counting based on available slots
  + The configured TDWs are determined based on available slots, where start of a configured TDWs is the ~~next~~ first available slot after the ~~conclusion~~ last available slot of a previous configured TDW.
  + Note: The determination of available slots for PUSCH repetition Type A is defined in AI 8.8.1.1.

**Working assumption:**

* The start of the first actual TDW is the first ~~available~~ symbol (at least determined by TDRA table) ~~in available slot~~ for the first PUSCH transmission in an available slot within the configured TDW.
* The end of the actual TDW is
  + the last ~~available~~ symbol (at least determined by TDRA table) ~~in available slot~~ for the last PUSCH transmission in an available slot within the configured TDW if the actual TDW reaches the end of the last PUSCH transmission within the configured TDW.
  + the last ~~available~~ symbol (at least determined by TDRA table) ~~in available slot~~ of the PUSCH transmission right before the event if an event occurs that violates power consistency and phase continuity, and the PUSCH transmission is in an available slot.
* For UE capable of restarting DM-RS bundling, the start of the new actual TDW is the first ~~available~~ symbol (at least determined by TDRA table) ~~in available slot~~ for PUSCH transmission after the event violates power consistency and phase continuity, and the PUSCH transmission is in an available slot.

**Agreement**

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

**Agreement**

* For non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions across consecutive slots (no uplink transmission in the middle of two PUSCH transmissions), support necessary design aspects (under the condition of power consistency and phase continuity) to enable joint channel estimation for the following case:
  + Over non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions for one TB processed over multiple slots
    - It’s subject to UE capability
    - if it reuses only those joint channel estimation specification enhancements defined to support repetition Type A

**Agreement**

Down-select one of the following options:

* **Option 1:** If DM-RS bundling is supported, UE is mandatory to support restarting DM-RS bundling due to semi-static events. UE capability of restarting DMRS bundling is applied only to dynamic events.
* **Option 2:** UE capability of restarting DMRS bundling is applied to both semi-static events and dynamic events.

**Agreement**

* Support at least the following events that violate power consistency and phase continuity.
  + Dropping/cancellation based on Rel-15/16 collision rules.
  + FFS: Rel-17 collision rules.
  + DL slot or DL reception/monitoring based on semi-static DL/UL configuration for unpaired spectrum.
  + FFS: Other UL transmission in between PUSCH/PUCCH transmissions.
  + Gap between two PUSCH/PUCCH transmissions exceeds 13 symbols.
  + FFS: Transmission parameters need to be changed due to network-indicated operations, including: Tx power, UL beam/TPMI, and RB allocation.
  + FFS: TPC command.
  + FFS: TA adjustment.
  + FFS: The actual TDW reaches the maximum duration.
  + FFS: Frequency hopping.
  + FFS: Precoder cycling.
  + FFS: other events.
  + FFS: whether events are semi-static events or dynamic events.
  + FFS: the time duration of an event.

**Agreement**

* Introduce two RRC parameters to indicate enabling of DM-RS bundling and the window length of the configured TDW respectively.

**Agreement**

* Introduce a new RRC parameter for when UE restarts a PUSCH bundling window

1. Agreements at RAN1#106-e

**Agreement: Confirm the following working assumption.**

**Working assumption:**

* For non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions (at least for the case of the same TB) across consecutive slots, support necessary design aspects (under the condition of power consistency and phase continuity) to enable joint channel estimation for the following cases:
  + Over non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions (of the same TB) for repetition type A scheduled by dynamic grant or configured grant.
  + Over non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions (of the same TB) for repetition type B scheduled by dynamic grant or configured grant, if it reuses only those joint channel estimation specification enhancements defined to support repetition Type A.
    - FFS: additional specification enhancements on top of that defined to support repetition Type A
    - Only for single layer transmissions
    - Subject to UE capability
  + FFS: Over non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions with different TBs
  + FFS: Over non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions for TBoMS
  + For the non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions, it is defined as at least when there is no UL transmission between the two successive PUSCH transmissions
  + Subject to UE capability with details FFS (e.g., separate vs. joint capability for type A & type B, w.r.t. OFF power requirements, etc.)
* FFS: Joint channel estimation over non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions with other uplink transmissions between the two successive PUSCH transmissions across consecutive slot.

**Conclusion**

* Optimization of DMRS location in time domain for PUSCH is not considered for joint channel estimation in Rel-17.

**Agreement**

* Joint channel estimation for PUSCH transmissions and the time domain window are jointly enabled or disabled via RRC configuration for a UE.
  + Note: Enabling/disabling of joint channel estimation for PUSCH transmissions means enabling/disabling of DMRS bundling for PUSCH transmissions under the condition of power consistency and phase continuity.

**Agreement**

**Make down-selection between the following two alternatives:**

* Alt 1: UE is not expected to receive TPC commands during the current time domain window.
* Alt 2: UE receives and accumulates TPC commands without taking effect during the current time domain window.

**Agreement**

* UE should not perform TA adjustment during the time domain window.
  + FFS: UE does not expect to receive TA command to indicate TA adjustment during the TDW.
  + FFS: UE ignores any TA command which indicates TA adjustment during the TDW.
  + FFS: UE performs TA adjustment after the TDW if it receives any TA command indicating TA adjustment during the TDW.

**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.

1. Agreements at RAN1#105-e

Agreement**:**

* Joint channel estimation over non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions within one slot is not supported.

Agreement:

* Definition of **the maximum duration**: a maximum time duration during which **UE is able to** maintain power consistency and phase continuity subject to power consistency and phase continuity requirements.
* FFS whether or not such a definition is necessary for RAN1 specifications.
  + Note: whether such a definition is to be specified in RAN4 specifications is up to RAN4.
* FFS the maximum duration may be reported by UE.
* Note: it is understood that for a UE, the maximum duration is no less than the time domain window duration

Agreement:Send LS to RAN4 asking the following questions

* For joint channel estimation, is there a maximum duration during which UE is able to maintain power consistency and phase continuity under certain tolerance level? If any, how long is it?
  + What factors determine the maximum duration?
  + Whether the maximum duration should be the same for different cases for both PUSCH and PUCCH?
  + Whether the maximum duration is dependent on the modulation order of transmission, e.g., QPSK, 16QAM, 64QAM?
  + Whether the maximum duration is dependent on UL waveform (DFT-s-OFDM vs. OFDM)?
  + Whether the maximum duration is band specific?
  + Besides the factors listed above, whether or not the maximum duration is further dependent on UE capabilities (e.g., multiple possible values for a given set of factor(s)), and if so, whether the UE should report such a duration

Agreement:

* Optimization of DMRS granularity in time domain for PUSCH is not considered for joint channel estimation in Rel-17.

Agreement:

* For back-to-back PUSCH transmissions within one slot, support necessary design aspects (under the condition of power consistency and phase continuity) to enable joint channel estimation for the following cases:
  + Over back-to-back PUSCH transmissions (of the same TB) for repetition type B scheduled by dynamic grant or configured grant, if it reuses only those joint channel estimation specification enhancements defined to support repetition Type A with consecutive slots
    - FFS: additional specification enhancements on top of that defined to support repetition Type A
    - Only for single layer transmissions
    - Subject to UE capability
* Joint channel estimation over back-to-back PUSCH transmissions with different TBs within one slot is not supported.

**Working assumption:**

* For non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions (at least for the case of the same TB) across consecutive slots, support necessary design aspects (under the condition of power consistency and phase continuity) to enable joint channel estimation for the following cases:
  + Over non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions (of the same TB) for repetition type A scheduled by dynamic grant or configured grant.
  + Over non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions (of the same TB) for repetition type B scheduled by dynamic grant or configured grant, if it reuses only those joint channel estimation specification enhancements defined to support repetition Type A.
    - FFS: additional specification enhancements on top of that defined to support repetition Type A
    - Only for single layer transmissions
    - Subject to UE capability
  + FFS: Over non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions with different TBs
  + FFS: Over non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions for TBoMS
  + For the non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions, it is defined as at least when there is no UL transmission between the two successive PUSCH transmissions
  + Subject to UE capability with details FFS (e.g., separate vs. joint capability for type A & type B, w.r.t. OFF power requirements, etc.)
* FFS: Joint channel estimation over non-back-to-back PUSCH transmissions with other uplink transmissions between the two successive PUSCH transmissions across consecutive slot.

Agreement:

* Joint channel estimation for PUSCH transmissions is enabled or disabled via RRC configuration for a UE
  + FFS: whether additional dynamic signaling is needed to enable/disable joint channel estimation for PUSCH transmissions
  + Note: the enabling of such a feature is subject to certain prerequisites
  + FFS RRC parameter details (including explicit vs. implicit configuration)
* FFS For joint channel estimation for PUSCH, the time domain window is not explicitly enabled or disabled separately from joint channel estimation.

Note: Enabling/disabling of joint channel estimation for PUSCH transmissions means enabling/disabling of DMRS bundling for PUSCH transmissions under the condition of power consistency and phase continuity.

Agreement:

For joint channel estimation for PUSCH repetition type A of PUSCH repetitions of the same TB, down select one of the following alternatives for the time domain window.

* Alt 1: All the repetitions are covered by one single time domain window
  + The start of the window is the first PUSCH transmission
  + FFS: how to handle non-consecutive physical slots for UL transmission, e.g., due to DL/UL configuration for unpaired spectrum
  + FFS: frequency hopping and precoder cycling
* Alt 2: All the repetitions are covered by one or multiple time domain windows
  + For the start of each window,
    - The start of the first window is the first PUSCH transmission.
    - FFS: how to determine the start of other windows, e.g., whether multiple windows are consecutive or non-consecutive, whether the start of the window depends on DL/UL configuration for unpaired spectrum
  + For the length of each window,
    - FFS Each window consists of at least two adjacent physical slots for UL transmission.
    - The length of each window is no longer than the maximum duration.
    - FFS: how to determine the length of each window
    - FFS: whether the length of each window depends on DL/UL configuration for unpaired spectrum
  + FFS: how to handle non-consecutive physical slots for UL transmission, e.g., due to DL/UL configuration for unpaired spectrum.
  + FFS: frequency hopping and precoder cycling
* Other alternatives are not precluded.

1. Agreements at RAN1#104b-e

Agreements:

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

**Agreements:**

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

**Agreements:**

* 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

**Conclusion:**

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

**Agreements:**

* For the time domain window for joint channel estimation, down select on the following two options:
  + Option 1: The unit of the time domain window is defined separately for the following PUSCH transmissions:
    - PUSCH repetition type A
    - PUSCH repetition type B, if agreed
    - TBoMS, if agreed
    - Different TB, if agreed
  + Option 2: The unit of the time domain window is the same for the following PUSCH transmission:
    - PUSCH repetition type A
    - PUSCH repetition type B, if agreed
    - TBoMS, if agreed
    - Different TB, if agreed

**Agreement:**

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

1. Agreements at RAN1#104e

**Agreements**:

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

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

Agreements:

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

Agreements:

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

Agreements:

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

**Working assumption:**

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

Agreements:

* For joint channel estimation.
  + Take into account the residual frequency error, e.g., +/- 0.1 ppm as upper bound.
  + Companies can report other values and frequency error model.

1. Reference
2. 3GPP RP-202928, “New WID on NR coverage enhancements”, China Telecom, RAN#90e, December 7th – 11th, 2020.
3. 3GPP RP-211566, “Revised WID on NR coverage enhancements”, China Telecom, RAN#92e, June 14th – 18th, 2021.
4. 3GPP R1-2009784, “LS on PUCCH and PUSCH repetition”, Qualcomm, RAN1#103-e, October 26th – November 13th, 2020.
5. 3GPP R4-2103393, “Reply on LS on PUCCH and PUSCH repetition”, Qualcomm, RAN4#98-e, January 25th – February 5th, 2021.
6. 3GPP R4-2105417, “Reply LS on PUCCH and PUSCH repetition”, Qualcomm, RAN4#98b-e, April 12th – 20th April, 2021.
7. 3GPP R1-2104119, “Reply LS on PUCCH and PUSCH repetition”, Qualcomm, RAN1#104bis-e, April 12th – April 20th, 2021.
8. 3GPP R1-2106212, “LS on joint channel estimation for PUSCH and PUCCH”, China Telecom, RAN1#105-e, May 10th – 27th, 2021.
9. 3GPP R4-2107880, “Reply LS on PUCCH and PUSCH repetition”, Qualcomm, RAN4#99-e, May 2021.
10. 3GPP R4-2114991, “LS on joint channel estimation for PUSCH and PUCCH (R1-2106212, R4-2111706)”, Qualcomm, RAN4#100-e, Aug. 2021.
11. 3GPP R1-2108458, “Reply LS on PUCCH and PUSCH repetition”, Qualcomm, RAN1#106-e, August 16th – 27th, 2021.
12. 3GPP R1-2110642, “Reply LS on PUCCH and PUSCH repetition”, Qualcomm, RAN1#106b-e, October 11th – 19th, 2021.
13. 3GPP R1-2110569, “Summary of email discussion on joint channel estimation for PUSCH”, China Telecom (moderator), RAN1#106b-e, October 11th – 19th, 2021.
14. R1-2110791 Discussion on joint channel estimation for PUSCH Huawei, HiSilicon
15. R1-2110865 Joint channel estimation for PUSCH coverage enhancements Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell
16. R1-2110920 Discussion on joint channel estimation for PUSCH ZTE
17. R1-2111029 Remaining issues on joint channel estimation for PUSCH vivo
18. R1-2111108 Discussion on joint channel estimation for PUSCH Spreadtrum Communications
19. R1-2111205 Discussion on joint channel estimation for PUSCH TCL Communication Ltd.
20. R1-2111273 Discussion on joint channel estimation for PUSCH CATT
21. R1-2111330 Consideration on Joint channel estimation for PUSCH OPPO
22. R1-2111425 Discussion on joint channel estimation for PUSCH Panasonic Corporation
23. R1-2111428 Remaining issues on joint channel estimation for PUSCH China Telecom
24. R1-2111429 FL Summary of joint channel estimation for PUSCH Moderator (China Telecom)
25. R1-2111509 Discussion on joint channel estimation for PUSCH Intel Corporation
26. R1-2111586 Discussion on joint channel estimation for PUSCH Xiaomi
27. R1-2111622 Discussion on joint channel estimation for PUSCH CMCC
28. R1-2111681 On events for Joint Channel Estimation for PUSCH Sony
29. R1-2111753 Joint channel estimation for PUSCH Samsung
30. R1-2111794 Joint channel estimation for PUSCH InterDigital, Inc.
31. R1-2111841 Design Considerations for Joint channel estimation for PUSCH Sierra Wireless. S.A.
32. R1-2111889 Discussion on joint channel estimation for PUSCH Apple
33. R1-2111950 Enhancements for joint channel estimation for multiple PUSCH Lenovo, Motorola Mobility
34. R1-2111980 Discussions on joint channel estimation for PUSCH LG Electronics
35. R1-2112021 Joint channel estimation for multiple PUSCH transmission Sharp
36. R1-2112037 Remaining Issues for Joint Channel Estimation for PUSCH Ericsson
37. R1-2112121 Joint channel estimation for PUSCH NTT DOCOMO, INC.
38. R1-2112232 Joint channel estimation for PUSCH Qualcomm Incorporated
39. R1-2112317 Discussion on Joint channel estimation over multi-slot MediaTek Inc.
40. R1-2112391 Discussion on joint channel estimation for PUSCH WILUS Inc.