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# Introduction

TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH was included as one of the enhancements, for both FR1 and FR2 as well as TDD and FDD, to be specified in the NR coverage enhancement work item approved in RAN1#90-e [1]:

* *Specification of PUSCH enhancements [RAN1, RAN4]*
  + *Specify mechanism(s) to support TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH [RAN1]*
    - *TBS determined based on multiple slots and transmitted over multiple slots.*

Section 2 summarizes the remaining aspects of TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH based on companies’ contributions submitted under AI 8.8.1.2 to RAN1 #107-e [3]-[21].

All related proposals from different contributions, organized per aspect, are listed in Appendix A, for reference.

Previous Rel-17 agreements are listed in Appendix B, for reference.

# Summary of contributions on TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH

Contributions submitted under AI 8.8.1.2 discussed several aspects of TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH (referred to as TBoMS in this document, for simplicity). A systematic categorization will be used to summarize the content of all contributions. This is done according to both the number of submitted proposals on the different aspects and on the relevance the latter have for designing the feature, from FL’s perspective. Concerning the second criterion, its rationale is given by the natural relationship of consequentiality which exists between different aspects. In the remainder of the document, aspects are thus categorized as follows:

* **High priority aspects**
  + Time domain resource determination
    - Time domain resource determination for TBoMS for CG-PUSCH
    - Time domain resource determination for TBoMS for CG-PUSCH Type 1
  + Rate matching
    - Starting bit in each slot for the single TBoMS according to Option C
  + UCI multiplexing
    - Timeline requirements
    - Dropping rules
    - HARQ-ACK multiplexing in case of missed DCI
    - The case of UL CA
* **Mid priority aspects**
  + Time domain resource determination
    - Candidate values for N
    - Candidate values for M
  + Data rate calculation and UE behavior related to TBS determination
    - How to handle configuration of TBS larger than the size of one CB
  + Transmission power determination
  + Support of TBoMS by HD-FDD UE
* **Other aspects**
  + Time domain resource determination
    - Support of TBoMS in case of counting based on physical slots
    - Early termination of TBoMS
    - Out of order handling for TBoMS
  + TBS determination
    - TBS capping
  + FDRA
  + TBoMS repetitions
    - Slot mapping for TBoMS repetitions
  + Frequency hopping
  + TBoMS retransmission
  + Interlaced TBoMS transmissions
  + DCI format for scheduling of TBoMS

The categorization above will determine the initial priority order for the discussions to be held for AI 8.8.1.2. In this context, sections 2.1 and 2.2 will focus on discussions which will (2.1 and some parts of 2.2) and may (remaining parts of 2.2) be discussed during RAN1 #107-e. Section 2.3 will collect all other aspects.

Tags [OPEN], [CLOSED] and [PAUSED] will be used to identify the status of the discussion at any moment of the meeting. New sections for specific aspects will be open during the meeting, should discussions for the higher priority aspects progress fast.

## High priority aspects

Seven high priority aspects are identified at the beginning of the meeting:

1. Time domain resource determination
   1. Time domain resource determination for TBoMS for CG-PUSCH
   2. Time domain resource determination for TBoMS for CG-PUSCH Type 1
2. Rate matching
   * + 1. Starting bit in each slot for the single TBoMS according to Option C
3. UCI Multiplexing
   1. Timeline requirements
   2. Dropping rules
   3. HARQ-ACK multiplexing in case of missed DCI
   4. The case of UL CA

Several companies have discussed at large about such aspects in the submitted contributions. Summary, discussion, and proposals on these aspects are provided in the following different sub-sections. Sub-section numbers follow the list above, for simplicity.

### [CLOSED] Time domain resource determination

Most contributions acknowledged the fundamental nature of this aspect and discussed it in detail. Three high-level sub-aspects can be isolated as illustrated above. The summary of companies’ preferences and opinions based on the contributions is organized accordingly.

#### [CLOSED] **Time domain resource determination for TBoMS for CG-PUSCH**

Companies’ preferences concerning the time domain resource determination for TBoMS for CG-PUSCH are as follows:

* The UE is not expected to be configured with the time duration for the transmission of a single TBoMS or TBoMS repetitions larger than the time duration derived by the periodicity P **[2]**:
  + - Interdigital [11], Ericsson [18]

Furthermore, one company (Nokia/NSB [17]) brought forward a TP which proposes to capture the fact that the UE is not expected to be configured with the time duration for N\*K transmissions larger than the time duration derived by the periodicity P, where N is the number of allocated slots for TBoMS and K is the number of TBoMS repetitions.

This coincides with the preference expressed by the two companies mentioned above.

Finally, it is worth considering that a discussion on this aspect was already carried out during RAN1 #107-e, with no company objecting what is proposed by the 3 companies above. Eventually the proposal was never discussed online, nor via email, and a corresponding agreement was not made.

FL’s opinion is that if no strong objection exists, a quick agreement should be made on this aspect to switch the focus on other issues for the rest of the meeting.

The following proposal is formulated.

**FL’s proposal 1**

* **For PUSCH transmissions of TBoMS, the UE is not expected to be configured with the time duration for the N\*M transmissions larger than the time duration derived by the periodicity P.**
* **The above “time duration for the N\*M transmission” means the time duration between the start of the 1st slot of the N\*M available slots for TBoMS and the end of the last slot of the N\*M available slots for TBoMS, for any instance of a CG Type 2 period.**

##### **First round of discussion**

Companies are invited to express their views on **FL’s proposal 1** below. Please comment **only if you have strong concerns**. If you do so, please also ensure you provide an alternative formulation of the proposal which captures the current spirit. Once again, it is very important for everyone to be **pragmatic and constructive**. Thank you.

**FL’s proposal 1**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Company name |
| **Support FL’s Proposal 1** | CATT, DCM, QC, InterDigital (We accept the majority view from the last meeting), Panasonic, Intel, SS, LG, Apple, Ericsson, OPPO, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, vivo1, Nokia, NSB, ZTE, Sharp |
| **Do not support FL’s Proposal 1** |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Additional comments related to FL’s Proposal 1, if any. |
| QC | We are at this point just mirroring each clause associated with PUSCH Rep Type A. This was something we were striving to avoid. Unless otherwise stated, can we agree that TBOMS follows the same behavior as PUSCH Rep Type A, and only focus on the cases where there is a deviation? |
| Samsung | Usually, the “time duration” is called “span”. |
| Ericsson | @QC: we already list TBoMS as a configuration in the specs. Don’t we need this proposal for consistency then? |

FL’s comments on January, 18

Thank you all for your comments.

@Samsung: both terms can be found in TS 38.214, I guess we can leave the choice of which word to use to the Editor.

@QC: I have similar understanding as Ericsson. Furthermore, this issue has been discussed already in 3 occasions lately and it does not hurt to set something on stone for consistency and clarity.

I plan to keep the proposal as is and discuss it during the GTW, if time allows it, or ask for email approval.

This discussion is closed.

FL’s comments on January, 18 (after GTW)

As I was explaining during the GTW, and as I explained in Section 2.1.1.2, if the situation was that a super majority exists in favour of the introduction of support of type-1 CG for TBoMS, I would simply sketch up a couple of proposals and ask for a quick discussion online about this.

However, this is not the case. I count 6 companies in favour of introducing support of type-1 CG for TBoMS and 6 companies against. There is no consensus on whether this would revert an existing agreement. Furthermore, it is very much clear that some companies are strongly against the introduction of the support of type-1 CG for TBoMS, with some other companies potentially open to discuss it during maintenance phase but not now.

Please also note that this situation is also not very compatible with our needs to close RRC parameter discussion soon.

For all the above reasons, I think that the simplest way to address Huawei’s concern, as per today’s GTW’s comments, while not reopening discussions that will not go anywhere, is the following reformulation of FL’s proposal 1.

**FL’s proposal 1-v1**

* **For CG-PUSCH transmissions of TBoMS, the UE is not expected to be configured with the time duration for the N\*M transmissions larger than the time duration derived by the periodicity P.**

Companies are invited to express views on FL’s proposal 1-v1, **only if they have strong concerns**. If this is the case, please comment and avoid expressing objections during next GTW if you haven’t done so in the FL’s summary. Please also refrain from suggestion micro-optimization. Thank you.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Concerns on FL’s Proposal 1-v1, if any. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

FL’s comments on January, 19

The proposal seems acceptable to everyone in its current form. This discussion is now closed.

#### [CLOSED] **Time domain resource determination for TBoMS for CG-PUSCH Type 1**

Several companies commented on this aspect. The following proposals have been made:

* Type-1 CG-PUSCH is supported for TBoMS and the number of allocated slots for TBoMS is indicated using a new RRC parameter in ConfiguredGrantConfig **[4]**:
  + - Huawei/HiSi [3], Intel [12], Apple [13], Sharp [19]
* Type-1 CG for TBoMS is not supported **[2]**:
  + - Vivo [6], Nokia/NSB [17]

Additionally, one company (CMCC [9]) proposes that if Type-1 CG-PUSCH is supported for TBOMS, no impact to legacy UEs should be ensured.

From FL’s perspective, a decision on whether support for Type-1 CG-PUSCH for TBoMS should be added cannot be made unless the group decide to revert a couple of existing agreements on how the number of slots allocated to TBoMS is indicated to UE.

Indeed, the following two agreements exist:

|  |
| --- |
| **Agreement**   * The number *N* of allocated slots for TBoMS is indicated via a new column added to the TDRA table configured via *PUSCH-TimeDomainAllocationList*. The column for configuring the number of repetitions in the TDRA for Rel-17 PUSCH repetition Type A, i.e., *numberOfRepetitions,*is used for indicating the number of repetitions *M* of a single TBoMS, when TBoMS transmission is enabled. * FFS: supported values of *N* and *M.* * FFS: how to enable the TBoMS transmission * FFS: details of retransmission of TBoMS   **Agreement**  For TBoMS transmission in Rel-17:   * TBoMS feature is enabled (or disabled) by configuring (or not) the number of allocated slots for a single TBoMS (N) in a row of the TDRA table.   + TBoMS transmission is enabled when N>1, where N is the number of allocated slots for a single TBoMS.   + Single-slot PUSCH transmission is enabled when N=1.   + Supported combinations of N and M that can be configured in the TDRA table, these combinations are constrained by retransmission are to be further discussed |

From the above we can see that RAN1 already agreed that:

* The number *N* of allocated slots for TBoMS is indicated via a new column added to the TDRA table configured via *PUSCH-TimeDomainAllocationList*.
* TBoMS feature is enabled (or disabled) by configuring (or not) the number of allocated slots for a single TBoMS (N) in a row of the TDRA table.
* No FFS was agreed related to possible other ways to indicate the number *N* of allocated slots for TBoMS or enabling/disabling the TBoMS feature.

Therefore, if Type-1 CG-PUSCH was to be supported for TBoMS we would have that:

* The number *N* of allocated slots for TBoMS **would not be** indicated via a new column added to the TDRA table configured via *PUSCH-TimeDomainAllocationList*.
* TBoMS feature **would not be** enabled (or disabled) by configuring (or not) the number of allocated slots for a single TBoMS (N) in a row of the TDRA table.

As a result, **the two existing agreements would not be respected in this case**.

For completeness, it should also be noted that one argument used by the proponents of the support of Type-1 CG-PUSCH for TBoMS is that the following agreement also exists:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement  TBoMS is supported for both configured grant and dynamic grant. |

From FL’s perspective, this last agreement is fully respected by current specification, where means to configure and schedule TBoMS exist for both DG and CG-PUSCH (Type 2). Indeed, the agreement does not state that all types of CG-PUSCH should allow the configuration and scheduling of TBoMS transmission.

Given the above observations, I would start the discussion with a question.

***2.1.1.2-Q1*** *Should existing agreements on how the number N of allocated slots for TBoMS is indicated and how the TBoMS feature is enabled/disabled be reverted?*

##### **First round of discussion**

FL’s recommendation is to have a first round of discussion among companies about **2.1.1.2-Q1**. Corresponding tables are added below to this end. Companies are invited to be constructive, given the very limited available time and the relevance of this matter. Thank you.

**2.1.1.2-Q1**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Company’s name for the answer to 2.1.1.2-Q1 |
| **Yes** |  |
| **No** | CATT, DCM, QC, Panasonic, LG, Ericsson, OPPO, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, vivo1, Nokia, NSB, ZTE, Sharp |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Additional comments related to 2.1.1.2-Q1, if any. |
| CATT | As we are approaching the end of Rel-17, we prefer to keep the situation simple. The gNB and UE can still apply TBoMS in CG-PUSCH, if they like, by using Type 2 CG-PUSCH, which is actually more controllable than Type 1 CG-PUSCH. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We do not think the following agreement is meant to alienate TBoMS for CG type1.  Agreement  TBoMS is supported for both configured grant and dynamic grant.  In order to complete the above agreement, it is not necessary to revert how to indicate allocated slots for DG and CG type2 TBoMS. Just adding another indication mechanism only for CG type1 TBoMS is sufficient to support TBoMS for all types of configured grant. |
| QC | The time for this has passed. Lets focus on maintenance issues. |
| Intel | Our view is that support of Type 1 CG-PUSCH for TBoMS does not mean the existing agreement is reverted. This means that we need to introduce additional parameter for number of allocated slots for TBoMS in ConfiguredGrantConfig.  Note that we already agreed TBoMS is supported for both CG-PUSCH and DG-PUSCH. If we do not support Type 1 CG-PUSCH, this means that the following agreement is reverted.  **Agreement**  TBoMS is supported for both configured grant and dynamic grant. |
| Apple | First, from our understanding the configured grant includes both configured grant type 1 and type 2. Second, we don’t think support CG type 1 would revert the previous meeting’s agreements, it just introduces additional resource indication method for CG type1. |
| Ericsson | Similar view as CATT |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | From the agreements as follows, it is very clear that the TBoMS must be supported for both CG type 1 and CG type 2. It is a waste of time to discuss whether to support TBoMS with CG type 1. We should focus on how to support TBoMS with CG type 1. **It is quite clear that the spec impact is very small**, i.e. following the same outcome of discussions for enlarged repetition number of PUSCH repetition Type A and adding a simple RRC parameter to indicate it.   |  | | --- | | Agreement  TBoMS is supported for both configured grant and dynamic grant. |   **We don’t feel that such small spec impact is reverting the two agreements cited by FL.** **Because those two agreements are never intended to preclude CG Type 1 PUSCH** but only to elaborate how to support TBoMS in a way of TDRA table when some companies still believed the way of TDRA table was suitable to CG Type 1 PUSCH. However, according to the discussion in the email thread of PUSCH repetition Type A **last meeting**, companies preferred not to change the TDRA table of DCI 0\_0 resulting in an agreement instead which added a new RRC parameter to indicate the number of slot. **Therefore, we believe the discussion point now is simply whether to reuse the same solution (i.e. RRC parameter) as PUSCH repetition Type A or still change the TDRA table of DCI 0\_0 for CG Type 1.**  Additionally, we also don’t feel current spec that was introduced last meeting is an argument not to support TBoMS over CG Type 1 PUSCH. It is quite clear that companies did not intent to preclude CG Type 1 but only capture the agreements with sufficient details into the spec.  In short, the discussion point here is exactly the same as the discussion on enlarging repetition number of PUSCH repetition Type A for CG Type 1 last meeting. **We hope the discussion would not be repeated.** **The spec impact on how to support TBoMS over CG Type 1 PUSCH is very small**. We prefer to reuse the same solution as the outcome of PUSCH repetition Type A rather than changing the TDRA table of DCI 0\_0. We propose,  ***Proposal:*** *For TBoMS transmission with type 1 configured grant, a new field should be introduced in IE ConfiguredGrantConfig to indicate the number of allocated slots for a single TBoMS transmission.* |
| OPPO | We don’t think the agreement based on TDRA table to support TBoMS will prevent supporting of TBoMS in Type 1 CG.  The addition of TBoMS in Type 1 CG can be realized by an independent RRC parameter. |
| vivo1 | Agree with FL’s analysis that it will revert the existing agreements if CG Type-1 TBoMS is supported. Hence, prefer to not support CG Type-1 for TBoMS. |
| Nokia/NSB | We have spent a lot of time to discuss this issue and agreed that N and M are indicated via TDRA table. Optimization to enable CG type 1 does not justify the need to disregard all efforts from the group so far. Indeed, CG type 1 is used for URLLC applications which should not be the focus in coverage shortage scenario. Even if it is, CG type 2 can be used. |
| ZTE | Type 2 CG has already support TBoMS. Considering that its use is more wider than Type 1 CG, there is no need to discuss TBoMS for Type 1 CG at this stage. |
| Sharp | We don’t think supporting TBoMS for type-1 CG reverts the two agreements above. On top of what we have agreed, as a special case, RRC configuration can be provided for indicating the number of slots for TBoMS for type-1 CG. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon 2 | The TPs for 38.212 and 38.214 are given as follows to support TBoMS with type 1configured grant.  TP for 38.214:   |  | | --- | | 6.1.2.3 Resource allocation for uplink transmission with configured grant When PUSCH resource allocation is semi-statically configured by higher layer parameter *configuredGrantConfig* in *BWP-UplinkDedicated* information element, and the PUSCH transmission corresponding to a configured grant, the following higher layer parameters are applied in the transmission:  - For Type 1 PUSCH transmissions with a configured grant, the following parameters are given in *configuredGrantConfig* unless mentioned otherwise:  - For the determination of the PUSCH repetition type, if the higher layer parameter *pusch-RepTypeIndicator* in *rrc-ConfiguredUplinkGrant* is configured and set to 'pusch-RepTypeB', PUSCH repetition type B is applied; otherwise, PUSCH repetition type A is applied;  - For the determination of TB processing over multiple slots, if *numberOfSlotsTBoMS* is present in *ConfiguredGrantConfig* and larger than 1, the TB processing over multiple slots procedure is applied, and number of slots used for TBS determination *N* is provided by *numberOfSlotsTBoMS*; otherwise, the TB processing over multiple slots procedure is disabled.  - For PUSCH repetition type A and TB processing over multiple slots, the selection of the time domain resource allocation table follows the rules for DCI format 0\_0 on UE specific search space, as defined in Clause 6.1.2.1.1.  - For PUSCH repetition type B, the selection of the time domain resource allocation table is as follows:  - If *pusch-RepTypeIndicatorDCI-0-1* in *pusch-Config* is configured and set to *'*pusch-RepTypeB*'*, *pusch-TimeDomainResourceAllocationListDCI-0-1* in *pusch-Config* is used;  - Otherwise, *pusch-TimeDomainResourceAllocationListDCI-0-2* in *pusch-Config* is used.  - It is not expected that *pusch-RepTypeIndicator* in *rrc-ConfiguredUplinkGrant* is configured with *'*pusch-RepTypeB*'* when none of *pusch-RepTypeIndicatorDCI-0-1* and *pusch-RepTypeIndicatorDCI-0-2* in *pusch-Config* is set to *'*pusch-RepTypeB*'*.  - The higher layer parameter *timeDomainAllocation* value *m* provides a row index *m*+1 pointing to the determined time domain resource allocation table, where the start symbol and length are determined following the procedure defined in Clause 6.1.2.1;  - Frequency domain resource allocation is determined by the *N* LSB bits in the higher layer parameter *frequencyDomainAllocation*, forming a bit sequence , where is the LSB, according to the procedure in Clause 6.1.2.2 and *N* is determined as the size of frequency domain resource assignment field in DCI format 0\_1 for a given resource allocation type indicated by *resourceAllocation,* except if *useInterlacePUCCH-PUSCH* in *BWP-UplinkDedicated* is configured, in which case uplink type 2 resource allocation is used wherein the UE interprets the LSB bits in the higher layer parameter *frequencyDomainAllocation* as for the frequency domain resource assignment field of DCI 0\_1 according to the procedure in Clause 6.1.2.2.3*;*  - The *IMCS* is provided by higher layer parameter *mcsAndTBS;*  - Number of DM-RS CDM groups, DM-RS ports, SRS resource indication and DM-RS sequence initialization are determined as in Clause 7.3.1.1.2 of [5, TS 38.212], and the antenna port value, the bit value for DM-RS sequence initialization, precoding information and number of layers, SRS resource indicator are provided by *antennaPort, dmrs-SeqInitialization, precodingAndNumberOfLayers*, and *srs-ResourceIndicator* respectively;  - When frequency hopping is enabled, the frequency offset between two frequency hops can be configured by higher layer parameter *frequencyHoppingOffset.*  - For Type 2 PUSCH transmissions with a configured grant: the resource allocation follows the higher layer configuration according to [10, TS 38.321], and UL grant received on the DCI.  - The PUSCH repetition type, TB processing over multiple slots, and the time domain resource allocation table are determined by the PUSCH repetition type and the time domain resource allocation table associated with the UL grant received on the DCI, respectively, as defined in Clause 6.1.2.1.  <omitted text>  6.1.2.3.3 Transport Block repetition for uplink transmissions of TB processing over multiple slots with a configured grant  The procedures described in this clause apply to PUSCH transmissions of TB processing over multiple slots with a Type 1 or Type 2 configured grant.  <omitted text> |   TP for 38.212:   |  | | --- | | 6.3.2 Uplink control information on PUSCH < Unchanged parts are omitted > 6.3.2.4 Rate matching6.3.2.4.1 UCI encoded by Polar code 6.3.2.4.1.1 HARQ-ACK  For HARQ-ACK transmission on PUSCH not using repetition type B with UL-SCH, and if *numberOfSlotsTBoMS* is not present in the resource allocation table or if *numberOfSlotsTBoMS* is present in the resource allocation table and the value of *numberOfSlotsTBoMS* in the row indicated by the Time domain resource assignment field in DCI is equal to 1 for that the PUSCH is scheduled by DCI format 0\_1 and DCI format 0\_2, and if *numberOfSlotsTBoMS* is not present in *ConfiguredGrantConfig* or if *numberOfSlotsTBoMS* is present in *ConfiguredGrantConfig* and equal to 1 for that the PUSCH is scheduled by RRC, the number of coded modulation symbols per layer for HARQ-ACK transmission, denoted as , is determined as follows:    where  -  is the number of HARQ-ACK bits;  - if , ; otherwise  is the number of CRC bits for HARQ-ACK determined according to Clause 6.3.1.2.1;  - ;  -  is the number of code blocks for UL-SCH of the PUSCH transmission;  - if the DCI format scheduling the PUSCH transmission includes a CBGTI field indicating that the UE shall not transmit the -th code block, =0; otherwise,  is the -th code block size for UL-SCH of the PUSCH transmission;  -  is the scheduled bandwidth of the PUSCH transmission, expressed as a number of subcarriers;  -  is the number of subcarriers in OFDM symbol  that carries PTRS, in the PUSCH transmission;  -  is the number of resource elements that can be used for transmission of UCI in OFDM symbol , for , in the PUSCH transmission and  is the total number of OFDM symbols of the PUSCH, including all OFDM symbols used for DMRS;  - for any OFDM symbol that carries DMRS of the PUSCH, ;  - for any OFDM symbol that does not carry DMRS of the PUSCH, ;  -  is configured by higher layer parameter *scaling*;  -  is the symbol index of the first OFDM symbol that does not carry DMRS of the PUSCH, after the first DMRS symbol(s), in the PUSCH transmission.  For HARQ-ACK transmission on PUSCH not using repetition type B with UL-SCH, and if *numberOfSlotsTBoMS* is present in the resource allocation table and the value of *numberOfSlotsTBoMS* in the row indicated by the Time domain resource assignment field in DCI is larger than 1 for that the PUSCH is scheduled by DCI format 0\_1 and DCI format 0\_2, and if *numberOfSlotsTBoMS* is present in *ConfiguredGrantConfig* and larger than 1 for that the PUSCH is scheduled by RRC, the number of coded modulation symbols per layer for HARQ-ACK transmission, denoted as , is determined as follows:  where  - is the value of *numberOfSlotsTBoMS* in the row indicated by the Time domain resource assignment field in DCI if the PUSCH is scheduled by DCI format 0\_1 and DCI format 0\_2, or is the value of *numberOfSlotsTBoMS* in *ConfiguredGrantConfig* if the PUSCH is scheduled by RRC;  - is the number of subcarriers in OFDM symbol that carries PTRS, in the PUSCH transmission of TB processing over multiple slots in the slot with the HARQ-ACK transmission;  - is the number of resource elements that can be used for transmission of UCI in OFDM symbol , for , in the PUSCH transmission of TB processing over multiple slots in the slot with the HARQ-ACK transmission and is the total number of OFDM symbols of the PUSCH in the slot, including all OFDM symbols used for DMRS;  - is the symbol index of the first OFDM symbol that does not carry DMRS of the PUSCH, after the first DMRS symbol(s), in the PUSCH transmission of TB processing over multiple slots in the slot with the HARQ-ACK transmission;  - and all the other notations in the formula are defined the same as for PUSCH not using repetition type B and if *numberOfSlotsTBoMS* is not present in the resource allocation table for that the PUSCH is scheduled by DCI format 0\_1 and DCI format 0\_2, and if *numberOfSlotsTBoMS* is not present in *ConfiguredGrantConfig* for that the PUSCH is scheduled by RRC.  For HARQ-ACK transmission on an actual repetition of a PUSCH with repetition Type B with UL-SCH, the number of coded modulation symbols per layer for HARQ-ACK transmission, denoted as , is determined as follows:  where  - is the number of resource elements that can be used for transmission of UCI in OFDM symbol , for , in the PUSCH transmission assuming a nominal repetition without segmentation, and is the total number of OFDM symbols in a nominal repetition of the PUSCH, including all OFDM symbols used for DMRS;  - for any OFDM symbol that carries DMRS of the PUSCH assuming a nominal repetition without segmentation, ;  - for any OFDM symbol that does not carry DMRS of the PUSCH assuming a nominal repetition without segmentation, where is the number of subcarriers in OFDM symbol that carries PTRS, in the PUSCH transmission assuming a nominal repetition without segmentation;  - is the number of resource elements that can be used for transmission of UCI in OFDM symbol , for , in the actual repetition of the PUSCH transmission, and is the total number of OFDM symbols in the actual repetition of the PUSCH transmission, including all OFDM symbols used for DMRS;  - for any OFDM symbol that carries DMRS of the actual repetition of the PUSCH transmission, ;  - for any OFDM symbol that does not carry DMRS of the actual repetition of the PUSCH transmission, where is the number of subcarriers in OFDM symbol that carries PTRS, in the actual repetition of the PUSCH transmission;  - and all the other notations in the formula are defined the same as for PUSCH not using repetition type B, and if *numberOfSlotsTBoMS* is not present in the resource allocation table for that the PUSCH is scheduled by DCI format 0\_1 and DCI format 0\_2, and if *numberOfSlotsTBoMS* is not present in *ConfiguredGrantConfig* for that the PUSCH is scheduled by RRC.  < Unchanged parts are omitted > |   Base on the TPs given above, it is obvious that there is only a little spec impact to support TBoMS with type 1 configured grant. |

FL’s comments on January, 18

Thank you all for your comments. I think that the focus should not be on the agreement related to CG and DG, given that it cannot be claimed that TBoMS cannot be scheduled via CG (it can). Hence the agreement is fully respected. Conversely, if we do not use a solution based on the TDRA table to enable TBoMS, then adding support of type-1 CG would not only require discussions on the parameter used to configure the number of allocated slots for TBoMS but also a discussion on how to enable TBoMS in this case. That discussion could easily get out of control due to its impact on existing agreements on TBoMS activation and impact on RRC parameter discussion.

Now, if the situation was that a super majority exists in favour of the introduction of support of type-1 CG for TBoMS, I would simply sketch up a couple of proposals and ask for a quick discussion online. However, this is not the case. I count 6 companies in favour of introducing support of type-1 CG for TBoMS and 6 companies against. There is no consensus on whether or not this would revert an existing agreement. Furthermore, it is very much clear that some companies are strongly against the introduction of the support of type-1 CG for TBoMS, with some other companies potentially open to discuss it during maintenance phase but not now.

For all the above reasons, I think all the elements point towards putting an end to this discussion for the time being.

### [OPEN] Rate Matching

This aspect has been discussed in detail in several contributions, with specific focus on the index of the starting coded bits in each slot for TBoMS, following the agreement on Option C made during RAN #90-e.

Several contributions discussed how to capture this agreement in the specification. Proposals were made either in the form of explicit proposals (on the concepts) or in the form of text proposals. Concerning, the former type, from FL’s perspective the details of Option C are already very much clear on aspects such as the impact of dropping a slot on the bit selection, and the impact of the UCI multiplexing. Indeed, this has been the subject of numerous discussions, and yielded a very clear agreement during RAN1 #106-b-e (the part related to Option B is grayed out for simplicity):

|  |
| --- |
| **Agreement**  For the bit selection for each transmitted slot for TBoMS, one of the following is to be down selected in RAN1 #107-e for determining the index of the starting coded bit in the circular buffer:   * Option B: the index of the starting coded bit in the circular buffer is the index continuous from the position of the last bit selected in the previous allocated slot. * Option C: the index of the starting coded bit in the circular buffer is the index continuous from the position of the last bit selected in the previous allocated slot, regardless of whether UCI multiplexing occurred in the previous allocated slot or not.   FFS: whether the index of the starting coded bit for each transmitted slot is expressed as a multiple integer of the lifting size Zc  Note: Dropping/cancellation rules are not considered for the starting bit position determination in both Option B and Option C. |

In summary, these aspects of the bit selection are already agreed:

* For each transmitted slot, the index of the starting coded bit in the circular buffer is the index continuous from the position of the last bit selected in the previous allocated slot, regardless of whether UCI multiplexing occurred in the previous allocated slot or not
* Dropping/cancellation rules are not considered for the starting bit position determination in the bit-selection procedure.

Therefore, no rate-matching operation can occur in TBoMS and only bit puncturing is supported, dropped/cancelled slots do not impact the index of the starting coded bit for each transmitted slot.

In this context, one company (Huawei/Hisi [3]) proposed to express the index of the starting coded bit in the circular buffer as function of the lifting size . This issue has been debated repeatedly during the past meetings. No consensus could be achieved in the group on the benefits and the need of such constraint, and no agreement could be made. From FL’s perspective, there is no reason to reopen this discussion a simple conclusion can be sufficient to close the matter (please see below).

Now, moving to the text proposal discussion, from FL’s perspective there are two core decisions to be taken before deciding how to capture the agreed bit selection mechanism in the specification:

1. The same number of bits is selected for each allocated slot for TBoMS. Therefore, the offset between the starting coded bits of any two allocated slots for TBoMS is always an integer multiple of the number of bits selected in one slot. In this context, does the index of starting coded bit for each allocated slot need to be expressed as a function of the index of the starting coded bit for the previous allocated slot or rather as a function of the index of the starting coded bit for the first allocated slot for TBoMS?
2. If we focus on TS 38.212, we observe that rate matching procedures for PUSCH are described in two Clauses, i.e., 5.4.2 and 6.2.5. More precisely, 5.4.2 describes general procedures for Rate matching for LDPC code, valid for both PDSCH and PUSCH, whereas 6.2.5 describes Rate matching procedures for PUSCH only. In this context, two possible options exist to capture the description of the bit selection for TBoMS:
   1. Bit selection for TBoMS is described in Clause 5.4.2.1 only, where conditions on RRC parameters valid only for PUSCH are described, i.e., making it the description less general and arguably less aligned with the spirit of the Clause.
   2. Bit selection of TBoMS is described in Clause 6.2.5, to preserve the generality of Clause 5.4.2.1, where a simple exception for TBoMS is added in Clause 5.4.2.1, i.e., the latter will simply state that the procedure described therein is valid for all cases but TBoMS.

Given the above I would start the discussion with a proposal for a Conclusion and two questions.

**FL’s proposal 2**

**The following Conclusion is made:**

|  |
| --- |
| **There is no consensus in RAN1 on whether the index of the starting coded bit in the circular buffer should be expressed as function of the lifting size .** |

***2.1.2-Q1*** *Given that the same number of bits is selected for each allocated slot for TBoMS, irrespective of slot dropping, collisions or UCI multiplexing, should the index of the starting coded bit for each allocated slot need to be expressed as a function of the index of the starting coded bit for the previous allocated slot or rather as a function of the index of the starting coded bit for the first allocated slot for TBoMS?*

***2.1.2-Q2*** *Should the bit selection for TBoMS be described in Clause 5.4.2.1 of TS 38.212 (where general procedures for PDSCH and PUSCH are described), or rather in 6.2.5 of TS 38.212 (where PUSCH-specific procedures are described)?*

##### **First round of discussion**

FL’s recommendation is to have a first round of discussion among companies about **FL’s proposal 2**.

**FL’s proposal 2**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Company name |
| **Support FL’s Proposal 2** | CATT, DCM, QC, Panasonic, Intel,SS, LG, Apple, Ericsson, OPPO, vivo1, Nokia, NSB, ZTE, Sharp |
| **Do not support FL’s Proposal 2** |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Additional comments related to FL’s Proposal 2, if any. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

Additionally, companies are invited to provide an answer to ***2.1.2-Q1*** and ***2.1.2-Q2*** in the tables below. If you add any additional comment, it is very much appreciated if discussion is kept at technical level, for the sake of an efficient use of the limited time RAN1 has. Constructive attitude is warmly recommended.

**2.1.2-Q1**

***The index of the starting coded bit for each allocated slot is expressed as a function of the index of***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Company name |
| ***The starting coded bit for the previous allocated slot for TBoMS*** | CATT, DCM (2nd preference), Panasonic (2nd preference), Intel, SS(no to function), LG, OPPO, vivo1, ZTE |
| ***The starting coded bit for the first***  ***allocated slot for TBoMS*** | CATT, DCM (1st preference), Panasonic (1st preference), LG, Nokia, NSB |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Additional comments related to 2.1.2-Q1, if any. |
| CATT | Considering the TDRA pattern of TBoMS, we think the two alternatives are almost equivalent. Either is fine. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We think either approach results in the same starting point at each slot. For the simplicity, we would rather express the index of the starting coded bit for each allocated slot as a function of the index. |
| QC | Not too sure what is the point of this question. Either option would work fine for Option C. We just need to converge on the offset value to use. |
| Panasonic | We are fine with either direction. We slightly prefer to use first allocated slot for TBoMS since it may simplify the specification text. |
| Intel | Share similar view as other companies, but slightly prefer “the starting coded bit for the previous allocated slot for TBoMS”, but it can be up to editor how to capture this. |
| Samsung | 1. when FL proposes it is expressed as “a function of…”, we are wondering, why there has to be function on it, a simple description sentence is enough.  2. to answer the question, our preference is stick to the agreement, so our preference is to “previous” in general. |
| LG | Either option is fine. |
| Ericsson | Similar view as Qualcomm: should we focus on determining the offset value? |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | In fact, both of these two options can clearly determine the index of starting coded bit. And the first option (the index of the starting coded bit is expressed as a function of the index of starting coded bit for the previous allocated slot for TBoMS) is a bit preferred, considering that:   * + - * The first option can provide more flexibility to adapt that the space between two indexes of starting coded in each two adjacent slots is not always the same because the filler bits will not be selected from the circular buffer.       * The first option is more clear and concise by avoiding introducing the slot index.   More details for both options are suggested, e.g. the interleaving depth in each slot. In T-doc review, we find there are different understandings about interleaving depth:   1. The first one: the interleaving depth is G’, where G’ is the total number of coded bits available for transmission of the transport block in the current slot, assuming no UCI multiplexing occurred in the current slot.   For example: TBoMS occupies two slots, UCI is multiplexed on the first slot with 5 bits, G’ = 10 bit for each slot, and filler bits occupy a3 and a4, where a denotes UL-SCH bits, b denotes UCI bits.   * + - * + Bit selection: * 1st slot: {a0,a1,a2,a5,a6,a7,a8,a9,a10,a11} * 2nd slot: {a12,a13,a14,a15,a16,a17,a18,a19,a20,a21}   + - * + Bit interleaving: * 1st slot: {a0,a7,a1,a8,a2,a9,a5,a10,a6,a11} * 2nd slot: {a12,a17,a13,a18,a14,a19,a15,a20,a16,a21}   + - * + UCI multiplexing: * 1st slot: {b0,b1,b2,b3,b4,a0,a7,a1,a8,a2} * 2nd slot: {a12,a17,a13,a18,a14,a19,a15,a20,a16,a21} * So UL-SCH bits {a9,a5,a10,a6,a11} are punctured.  1. The second one: the interleaving depth is G, where G is the legacy definition, i.e., G is the total number of coded bits available for transmission of the transport block in the current slot. In other words, G will be shorten if UCI multiplexing is occurred.   For example: TBoMS occupies two slots, UCI is multiplexed on the first slot with 5 bits, G = 5 bit for the first slot, G = 10 bit for the second slot, G’ = 10 bit for each slot, and filler bits occupy a3 and a4, where a denotes UL-SCH bits, b denotes UCI bits.   1. Bit selection:  * 1st slot: {a0,a1,a2,a5,a6} * 2nd slot: {a12,a13,a14,a15,a16,a17,a18,a19,a20,a21}  1. Bit interleaving:  * 1st slot: {a0,a5,a1,a6,a2} * 2nd slot: {a12,a17,a13,a18,a14,a19,a15,a20,a16,a21}  1. UCI multiplexing:  * 1st slot: {b0,b1,b2,b3,b4,a0,a5,a1,a6,a2} * 2nd slot: {a12,a17,a13,a18,a14,a19,a15,a20,a16,a21} * So UL-SCH bits {a7,a8,a9,a10,a11} are punctured.   As discussed above, the second understanding is preferred, because the determination of bit selection length and bit interleaving depth are the legacy behaviour; only the determination of the index of starting coded bit is a new behaviour. It benefits from UE and gNB implementation. |
| OPPO | We prefer to be based on the previous slot, seems this one can directly implement agreements. |
| vivo1 | Either one of the 2 options can work.  We slightly prefer “the starting coded bit for the previous allocated slot for TBoMS”, though it can be up to editor to capture this. |
| Nokia/NSB | The index of starting coded bit for each allocated slot can be expressed as a function of the index of the starting coded bit for the first allocated slot (i.e., k0, which is associated with RVid) for TBoMS and the number of bits selected in one slot. This approach is simple since it is specified in TS 38.214 that all slots allocated for a TBoMS having the same RVid. |
| ZTE | We prefer the former since it reflects the spirit of the agreement that the index of the starting coded bit is the index continuous from the position of the last bit in the previous allocated slot. We are also agree with Samsung that it does not have to be a function of a parameter. |
| Sharp | We are fine with either. |

**2.1.2-Q2**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Company name |
| **5.4.2.1** | DCM, ZTE |
| **6.2.5** | CATT, Panasonic, Intel, OPPO, Nokia, NSB |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Additional comments related to 2.1.2-Q2, if any. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Since the detail bit selection procedure including starting point determination is defined in 5.4.2.1, we prefer describing 5.4.2.1. Even though 5.4.2.1 includes PDSCH procedure, TBoMS cannot be enabled for PDSCH based on the agreements. Adding the procedure only for PUSCH with TBoMS enabled does not affect PDSCH transmission. |
| QC | Leave it to the editor. We are okay if the editor chooses to start a new section or add it elsewhere. We need to provide the editor with the logic/equation to compute the starting bit for each slot. |
| Intel | As mentioned in FL summary, it is more desirable to capture the rate-matching for TBoMS in 6.2.5, which is only for PUSCH. |
| Samsung | the target of this aspect is to have a TP for the adopted C, we would like to directly compare with the proposed TP for this question. |
| LG | It is up to editor. |
| Ericsson | Agree with Qualcomm |
| OPPO | We can make decision here, since the general rate matching does not help for PDSCH. |
| vivo1 | Whether to capture this in the general sections (5.4.2) or in the section of 6.2.5 can be up to editor. |
| Nokia/NSB | Where to capture the bit selection for TBoMS would impact the way TP is formulated. Unless the group does not prefer to come up with a TP in this meeting, otherwise answer for Q2 is needed. |
| ZTE | Similar view as DOCOMO, we slightly prefer to capture in section 5.4.2.1. We are also ok to leave it to editor. |
| Sharp | It is up to editor. We are fine with either. |

FL’s comments on January, 18

Thank you all for your comments. The conclusion will be brought online during today’s GTW, if time allows, or email approval will be asked for it.

Moving to the questions I asked, I will first provide some general answers since many companies asked similar questions in their comments:

* The purpose of Q1 is indeed to understand which offset to use. From where I stand the offset can only have two values:
  + An offset calculated as a function of the starting bit of the previous allocated slots
  + An offset calculated as a function of the starting bit of the first allocated slot

Note that when I say “function of” I simply mean that it is calculated taken this or that bit as a reference and expressed accordingly. My initial idea was to first converge on this to then come up with a TP which could already be agreeable to everyone.

* Concerning Q2: I am not sure we can leave the choice up to the editor unless the group agrees that we will not provide a TP to the Editor but only the description of the algorithm

Finally, a comment to Huawei/HiSi. In my view, your second scenario is technically incorrect. According to Clause 5.4.2.1, is defined the total number of coded bits available for transmission of the transport block in case UCI multiplexing does not occur, and its definition does not change if UCI multiplexing occurs. This is confirmed in Clause 6.2.7, where the sequence is denoted as the multiplexed data and control coded bit sequence. Therefore, the only meaningful scenario in our case is what you describe as scenario 1, in which UL-SCH bits are punctured to create “space” for the UCI.

It should also be noted that if this were not the case, and scenario 2 was technically valid, then it would imply that UL-SCH bits are not punctured but rate-matched around the UCI bits, which is also against the common understanding the group had concerning Option C. Having said this, it would be good to have a confirmation from all companies.

The following question is asked.

**2.1.2-Q3** *Do you agree that, according to descriptions in Clause 5.4.2.1 and 6.2.7 o TS 38.212, is the total number of coded bits available for transmission of the transport block in case UCI multiplexing does not occur, and its definition does not change if UCI multiplexing occurs?*

Now, given the current situation, I will then dig a bit a more into the matter and discuss both offset and algorithm for the TP in detail. I hope companies understand that available time is scarce, hence we cannot afford being too finicky on the words and we should focus on details and technical correctness.

Concerning the offset, and according to what companies proposed in the Tdocs, I see three possible directions (I will use reference Tdocs as an example, note that the final TP may not be identical to what can be found in the Tdocs):

* The index of the starting coded bit in the circular buffer for the -th slot is obtained by summing the index of the starting coded but in the circular buffer of the first slot allocated for TBoMS, i.e., to an offset obtained by multiplying the total number of coded bits available for transmission of the TB in a slot allocated for TBoMS without UCI multiplexing, i.e., , by . (R1-2200321, R1-2200161)
* The index of the starting coded bit in the circular buffer for the -th slot is obtained by summing the index of the starting coded bit in the circular buffer for the -th slot, i.e., , to an offset obtained by multiplying the modulation order by the the number of REs available in the th slot for transmission. (R1-2200302, R1-2200501)
* A simple sentence is used in Clause 5.4.2.1 to explain that the procedure described therein is valid for all slots except for the slot(s) other than the first slot in a repetition if applicable when *numberOfSlotsTBoMS* is present in the resource allocation table and larger than 1, for which is continuous from the last rate matching output bit of last previous slot. (R1-2200206)

The following question is then asked.

**2.1.2-Q4** *Which of these three alternative approaches should be retained for describing in the specification how the index of the starting coded bit in the circular buffer for the -th slot in a single TBoMS is calculated? Please consider the following alternatives* ***as examples****. The exact wording can and will be refined once we converge on the approach.*

1. *The index of the starting coded bit in the circular buffer for the -th slot in a single TBoMS is calculated as*

*,*

*where is the total number of coded bits available for transmission of the TB without UCI multiplexing in a slot allocated for TBoMS.*

1. *The index of the starting coded bit in the circular buffer for the n-th slot in a single TBoMS s\_n is calculated as*

*where*

* *,*
* *is the modulation order,*
* *is the number of REs available in the th slot for transmission and is given by ,*
* *is the scheduled bandwidth of the TBOMS transmission, expressed as a number of subcarriers,*
* *is the number of symbols allocated per slot of TBOMS as per the indicated/configured row of TDRA table, excluding the symbols with DMRS tones.*
* *is set to be the starting bit index of the RV associated with the single TBOMS.*

1. *A sentence is used in Clause 5.4.2.1 to explain that the procedure described therein is valid for all slots except for the slot(s) other than the first slot in a repetition if applicable when numberOfSlotsTBoMS is present in the resource allocation table and larger than 1, for which is continuous from the last rate matching output bit of last previous slot.*

Further discussions on which Clause(s) of TS 38.212 should be modified will occur after we converge on the index of the starting bit.

Companies are invited to provide their views on **2.1.2-Q3** and **2.1.2-Q4**. In this context, please note that the goal of 2.1.2-Q4 is to down-select an approach to used as a “draft” to agree on a final TP. In this context, and as explained above, 2.1.2-Q4 provides **examples**. The exact wording can and will be refined once we converge on the approach.

**2.1.2-Q3**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Company name |
| **Yes** | DCM, Panasonic,SS, Ericsson, Intel, CATT, ZTE, Nokia, NSB, vivo2, Sharp, LG |
| **No** | Huawei, HiSilicon |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Additional comments related to 2.1.2-Q3, if any. |
| Sharp | After checking the specification, we understood that G is the number of available bits assuming no UCI. |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | From the current specification, the variable in Clause 5.4.2.1 and 6.2.7 are with definition. The in 5.4.2.1 is defined as the number of bits for the transport block assuming the number of UCI bits is excluded. While the in section 6.2.7 is defined as the number bits including the UCI bits. Then they are with different values when more than 2 bits UCI multiplexing occurs.  The in Clause 5.4.2.1 is equal to the variableinClause 6.2.7  Otherwise, the coded bits of the transport block are punctured by the UCI ibts, not rate matched!  From this understanding, for each slots, the number of coded bits for rate matching (including bit selection and interleaving) is the number of data bits excluding the UCI bits  Then the last bit of the rate matching output bits will be different with different number of UCI bits.  So we cannot agree with FL’s comments on the explanation of the variable and this is related to the alternatives to calculate the starting bits index for each slot.  So we need to align the understanding of the variables presented in different clauses of TS38.212 before talking about the alternatives of starting bit index calculation. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**2.1.2-Q4**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Company name |
| **Alt. 1** | Panasonic, Ericsson, Intel, CATT, Nokia, NSB, vivo2, LG |
| **Alt. 2** | Panasonic |
| **Alt. 3** | DCM, SS, ZTE |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Additional comments related to 2.1.2-Q4, if any. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We think it can be up to the editor’s choice because all alternatives results in the same starting point determination. If it is better not to leave it to the editor as FL insists, we prefer Alt3 for simplicity. |
| Samsung | Alt.3 is supported.  The situation is clear: all three alternatives serve the same purpose. But Alt.1 and alt.2 are the **particular** implementation on the adopted option C; while Alt.3 is just describing the rules for the implementation, with simple wording and alignment with agreement. With alt.3 is supported, either alt.1 or alt.2 could be implemented by UE, there is no limitation. |
| Ericsson | Alt 1 seems to be quite close to the existing specification, and straightforward to implement. We also think that Alt 1 is more clear than a pure text description, i.e. Alt 3. A small change could be to ensure that it is crystal clear that G is the same for each of the n slots:  *UCI multiplexing in each of the n slots ~~a slot~~ allocated for TBoMS.* |
| Intel | We share similar view as DCM that it is better to leave editor to capture the agreement for starting position determination of the coded bits.  Among the alternatives, we prefer Alt. 1 as this is simple extension of the agreement. |
| CATT | Either of them should work. Our first choice is Alt.1 as a proper trade-off between simplicity and accuracy. |
| ZTE | Alt 3 is our first preference. We don’t seem a need to limit the detailed implementation as Samsung pointed out. |
| Nokia/NSB | As commented to 2.1.2-Q3, our understanding is that G is fixed regardless of whether UCI multiplexing exists or not. In addition, it is specified in TS 38.214 that RVid (and hence k0) for all PUSCH transmissions of a TBoMS are the same. Therefore, with the same k0 and G or each PUSCH transmission (in each slot), Alt. 1 is very clear and concise. It also does not require any definition of starting bit in the previous slot. |
| vivo2 | Alt1 is preferred and the detailed spec. text to capture this can be up to the editor.  One more comment is that the formula in Alt.1 may need to be updated as following: |
| Sharp | We are fine with either. |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | Currently the example alternatives have some problems to exactly align with the agreement. For example, the index should be rounded by the size of the circular buffer in both of the al1 and alt2. And for alt3, the understanding of the variable G should be aligned. |
| LG | We prefer Alt. 1, but the choice can be up to editor. |

##### **Second round of discussions**

FL’s comments on January, 19

Thank you all for your comments. I think the situation is close to convergence for both aspects of this discussion. Some differences still exist among companies, especially for the TP. I think we should try working on this a bit more, being pragmatic about it. To ensure we can converge before the end of the meeting.

I will start by considering the answers received to **2.1.2-Q3**. Only one company Huawei/HiSi thinks that in Clause 5.4.2.1 and in Clause 6.2.7 of TS 38.212 refer to different quantities if we consider the case of TBoMS, and the agreed Option C. All other companies think that is the total number of coded bits available for transmission of the transport block in case UCI multiplexing does not occur, both in Clause 5.4.2.1 and in Clause 6.2.7 of TS 38.212. The situation puzzles me significantly, for several reasons.

1. Huawei/HiSi state that the in Clause 5.4.2.1 is equal to the variableinClause 6.2.7. However, this can be the case only of UL-SCH is rate matched around the UCI, which is not the case for TBoMS, for which **puncturing** occurs regardless of UCI type, as per underlying common understanding of Option C. In this case, in Clause 5.4.2.1 and in Clause 6.2.7 must be the same.
2. Indeed, when is firstly defined, there is not notion of UCI multiplexing introduced yet. Hence, this parameter can only refer to a max number of coded bits that UE can transmit using the allocated resource. It cannot be smaller than that, why would it? Then, if UCI multiplexing occurs on a slot for TBoMS, for which **puncturing and not rate-matching occurs**, this total number cannot change. What would change is the use UE makes of this number, i.e., some of this ***G*** bits will be used for the UL-SCH, i.e., , whereas some others will used for UCI, i.e.,

I urge Huawei/HiSi to reconsider the position they expressed so far, since it is not aligned with the common understanding the group has always been having of Option C, which can only result in a scenario as the one described in the “example 1” in the first comment made by Huawei/HiSi about this aspect.

Moving now to **2.1.2-Q4**, I think we can safely say that we can eliminate Alt. 2 from the candidate lists, since only one company expressed a preference in this sense.

Concerning Alt. 3, I have a different understanding as compared to (at least) Samsung and ZTE. While I understand the spirit of the comments these companies made, I am not sure that explaining with an equation the logic of the bit selection operation mandates any UE behaviour in this sense. The equation is meant to avoid any ambiguity in the understanding, and certainly not to mandate a behaviour, which in any case cannot be tested/verified as such. Please consider the discussion with Huawei/HiSi above. If we rely on simple sentences, it is easy to create mismatch between different interpretations. I believe this is also the reason why many companies would be fine with any technically correct alternative, given that the goal is to describe the logic of the bit-selection but not to describe what a UE should do to implement the logic. Please remember that this was also one of the reasons why RAN1 could not take a decision during RAN1 #107-e on this aspect, i.e., lack of a precise equation describing the logic of the bit-selection. The approach I am suggesting here is consistent with the spirit of that discussion. I hope this can clarify the intention and address your concerns. With this, I would also hope we could remove Alt. 3 from the list, given that it received only 3 preferences.

Finally moving the comments suggesting to “leave it to the Editor”, I am afraid this may turn out to be a complicated situation in which different companies may then disagree with the Editor’s understanding of the “most straightforward way to capture the agreement”, similar to what has happened in AI 8.8.1.3 for the discussion on the TPC accumulation. In this context, I think it would be good to agree on a simple equation to represent the logic, and let the Editor decide where and how to integrate it in the specification.

I hope the above can be acceptable to everyone.

@vivo: thank you for the correction, which looks good to me.

@Huawei/HiSi: thank you for the suggestion, which looks good to me.

The following proposal is then formulated.

**FL’s proposal 10**

The index of the starting coded bit in the circular buffer for the -th slot in a single TBoMS is calculated as

,

where is the total number of coded bits available for transmission of the TB without UCI multiplexing in a slot allocated for TBoMS, and N is the number of slots allocated for TBoMS.

Note: this equation describes the logic of the bit-selection for TBoMS; decision on where and how to capture this in TS 38.212 is up to the Editor.

I understand this may not be ideal for companies who originally supported Alt. 3; however, I hope that my explanations above, and the addition of the Note, can make you reconsider your position. **Please remember that available time to converge on this matter is very limited**. I think we can all agree that providing the Editor with a clear description of the logic minimizes future discussions on the actual CR.

Companies are invited to express their views on FL’s proposal 10 in the tables below. Please be constructive and comment only if you have **strong concerns which have not addressed yet.** If this is the case, make sure you also propose viable alternatives to help progressing on this issue. Thank you.

**FL’s proposal 10**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Company name |
| **Support FL’s Proposal 10** | QC, vivo3 |
| **Do not support FL’s Proposal 10** |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Additional comments related to FL’s Proposal 10, if any. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

### [OPEN] UCI multiplexing

Most contributions acknowledged the fundamental nature of this aspect and discussed it in detail. The summary of companies’ preferences and opinions based on the contributions is organized accordingly.

#### [CLOSED] **Timeline requirements**

Several contributions discussed about this aspect. All companies who commented also proposed to reuse the legacy timeline requirement used for multiplexing UCI on PUSCH in case of Type A PUSCH repetition, and apply it for the actual overlapped slot in the TBoMS (Nokia/NSB [17], Xiaomi [10], OPPO [8], Samsung [16], CATT [16], InterDigital [11])

One company (NEC [20]), proposed that CG-UCI multiplexes on the first slot of TBoMS transmission if CG-UCI multiplexing with TBoMS is supported, otherwise support of CG-UCI multiplexing with TBoMS should be removed from TS 38.212.

One company (TCL [4]) proposed that if UCI multiplexing in TBoMS is supported, then UCI repetition should be considered. However, this proposal violates an existing agreement on UCI multiplexed only on the overlapped slot and thus will not be discussed further in this document.

From FL’s perspective, it seems straightforward to reuse existing timeline requirements as proposed by all companies who commented on such aspect. At the same time, before formulating a proposal in this sense, I would like to ask companies to express their views on what has been proposed about CG-UCI.

**2.1.3.1-Q1** *Should the case of CG-UCI multiplexed on PUSCH be handled differently in case of TBoMS transmission? If yes, how?*

##### **First round of discussions**

Companies are invited to provide an answer to ***2.1.3.1-Q1*** in the tables below. If you add any additional comment, it is very much appreciated if discussion is kept at technical level, for the sake of an efficient use of the limited time RAN1 has. Constructive attitude is warmly recommended.

**2.1.3.1-Q1**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Company name |
| ***Yes*** | NEC (need some clarification based on current TS) |
| ***No*** | CATT, DCM, QC, InterDigital, Panasonic, Intel,SS, LG, Apple, Ericsson, Huawei, Hisilicon, OPPO, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, vivo1, Nokia, NSB, ZTE, Sharp |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Additional comments/proposals related to 2.1.3.1-Q1, if any. |
| QC | The contents of CG-UCI itself may need to be redefined as it carries RV information on a per slot basis. These aspects would be beyond the scope of Cov Enh WI. A change to whether CG-UCI is carried in every slot of TBOMS, or just the first slot and the consequences of these decisions need careful consideration of folks working on NR for unlicensed spectrum.  TBOMS for unlicensed bands is to be treated as a separate feature.  Having said the above, we don’t think it is necessary for us to get into any of these details. The current framework for TBOMS provides all the necessary hooks. Starting bit determination is now nicely decoupled from UCI multiplexing.  We think we can repurpose the existing timelines for UCI multiplexing and leave it at that. |
| Panasonic | Since TBoMS for CG-PUSCH does not start in the middle of the single TBoMS, we think no special handling is needed. |
| Intel | Our view is that CG-UCI should not be considered for TBoMS. CG-UCI is targeted for NR-U, which does not have coverage issue. |
| Samsung | CG-UCI is specific to unlicensed band operation. We are not sure the TBoMS is supported for unlicensed band or not. It seems this is out of our scope. |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | TBoMS can be treated similar with the repetition type A. no new mechanisms is needed. |
| NEC | RAN1 have agreement on ratio of CG-UCI resources to PUSCH resources and have specified them in TS38.212 already. We think it implies that CG-UCI and TBoMS multiplexing is supported.  RAN1 also have agreement on which slots UCI should be multiplexing with TBoMS PUSCH. However, this agreement is not suitable for CG-CUI since CG-UCI doesn’t have PUCCH that overlapping criterion is unavailable.  RAN1 TS should resolve ambiguous of whether to support CG-UCI and TBoMS multiplexing. If not supported, removing current specification in TS38.212, else give a clear specification on which slots multiplexing may occur.  We don’t need any optimization of CG-UCI and TBoMS multiplexing but need a clear specification. If companies think current TS is clear enough, we hope they can provide us some information on which slots CG-UCI will multiplex with TBoMS. |
| vivo1 | CG-UCI is only used for unlicensed spectrum, if CG-UCI is only transmitted in the first slot, and UE failed to transmit in the first slot due to LBT failure, NW may not able to decode the transmissions in later slots. Hence, we prefer CG-UCI is transmitted in each slot of TBoMS, i.e., reusing existing mechanism. |
| Nokia/NSB | We share similar view as Samsung. |
| ZTE | We don’t see the need to handle CG-UCI multiplexing in TBoMS PUSCH in a different way. |

FL’s comments on January, 18

Thank you for all the comments. @NEC: I understand you may still have concerns, but as you can see no other companies share them and this discussion is not leading the group anywhere. In the interest of an efficient use of time I will close it and defer any further discussion on the interactions between TBoMS and the unlicensed spectrum case to a more appropriate setting/AI.

I would then ask a final question before closing this discussion.

**2.1.3.1-Q2** *Do you think any further UCI multiplexing timeline aspect should be discussed, or does current specification already provide a basic framework for TBoMS to work properly?*

*Note: if you think further aspects should be discussed, please elaborate on them in the second table below.*

Companies are invited to provide an answer to ***2.1.3.1-Q2*** in the tables below. If you add any additional comment, it is very much appreciated if discussion is kept at technical level, for the sake of an efficient use of the limited time RAN1 has. Constructive attitude is warmly recommended.

**2.1.3.1-Q2**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Company name |
| **Further UCI multiplexing timeline aspect should be discussed.** |  |
| **Current specification already provides a basic framework for TBoMS to work properly** | DCM, InterDigital, Panasonic, SS, Ericsson, Intel, CATT, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, ZTE, Nokia, NSB, Apple, vivo2, Sharp, Huawei, HiSilicon, LG |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Additional comments/proposals related to 2.1.3.1-Q2, if any. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

FL’s comments on January, 19

Thank you all for adding your preference. All companies are aligned on the same position, i.e., current specification already provides a basic framework for TBoMS to work properly, for what concerns UCI multiplexing timeline. This discussion is now closed.

#### [OPEN] **Dropping/collisions**

Three companies commented on this aspect. Corresponding proposals we made.

One company proposed to consider TBoMS a low priority uplink transmission (Intel [12]).

One company proposed that PUCCH repetition can override the transmission of a single TBoMS or repetitions of TBoMS in the overlapping slot(s) (Ericsson [19]).

One company proposed that only dropping the overlapped slot(s) should be considered for TBoMS transmission when collisions happen (TCL [4]).According to FL’s understanding, this is already covered by existing agreements and thus will not be handled in this meeting.

The following two questions are asked to start the discussion.

**2.1.3.2-Q1** *Should TBoMS be considered a low priority transmission?*

**2.1.3.2-Q2** Building on the previous question, *should PUCCH repetition be allowed to override the transmission of a single TBoMS or repetitions of TBoMS in the overlapping slot(s)?*

##### **First round of discussions**

Companies are invited to provide an answer to ***2.1.3.2-Q1*** and ***2.1.3.2-Q2*** in the tables below. If you add any additional comment, it is very much appreciated if discussion is kept at technical level, for the sake of an efficient use of the limited time RAN1 has. Constructive attitude is warmly recommended.

**2.1.3.2-Q1**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Company name |
| ***Yes*** | Intel |
| ***No*** | CATT, QC, Panasonic, SS, LG, Ericsson, Huawei, Hisilicon, OPPO, vivo1, Nokia, NSB, ZTE, Sharp |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Additional comments/proposals related to 2.1.3.2-Q1, if any. |
| CATT | This can be up to gNB to configure. |
| QC | Treat TBOMS to be no different from PUSCH Rep Type A. Allow low/high priority labels to be attached to a TBOMS transmission just as they would with legacy PUSCH transmissions. |
| Panasonic | We think same handling of normal (or PUSCH repetition Type A) is sufficient. |
| Intel | TBoMS is targeted for coverage enhancement, instead of low latency application. In this case, TBoMS should be treated as low priority uplink transmission. |
| Samsung | Whether a PUSCH is low or high priority is not dependent on it is TBoMS or not. The gNB will do the configuration to tell UE. So we don't this is the question to be answered. |
| Apple | It’s not fully clear the meaning of low priority transmission. Does TBoMS have lower priority than PUCCH, UCI, SRS or other signal/channels? Is the overlapping slot in TBoMS dropped or punctured if TBoMS is colliding with UCI, PUCCH repetition, SRS? |
| Ericsson | TBoMS should be treated in the same way as PUSCH repetition, and its priority is up to gNB configuration. |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | TBoMS can be treated similar with the repetition type A. no more new priority is needed. |
| OPPO | There is not such use cases for the kind of collision control. |
| vivo1 | In our understanding, the motivation of configuration of priority is not only for low latency, but also for high reliability. NW should have the flexibility to configure TBoMS as higher priority. |
| Nokia/NSB | The discussion on priority of a PUSCH transmission seems to be out of the scope of coverage enhancement WI. In addition, the gNB can configure such priority label as mentioned by some companies above. Therefore, a specific restriction for TBoMS does not seem to be needed. |
| ZTE | If the two L1 priorities are not configured, there is no need to set default priority. If two L1 priorities are configured, the priority is configured by RRC or DCI. The network can indicate a low priority for TBoMS transmission, if needed. We don’t see the need to set a default priority. |

**2.1.3.2-Q2**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Company name |
| ***Yes*** | CATT, Panasonic (for same priority), Intel (Same priority),SS, Apple, Ericsson, Huawei, Hisilicon, OPPO, vivo1, Nokia, NSB, ZTE, Sharp |
| ***No*** |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Additional comments/proposals related to 2.1.3.2-Q2, if any. |
| CATT | This aligns with current spec that the overlapped slot of PUSCH repetition type A will be dropped when collide with PUCCH with . |
| QC | Depends on high/low priority label attached to a TBOMS transmission. |
| Panasonic | We think same handling of normal (or PUSCH repetition Type A) is sufficient. |
| Intel | If this is based on existing collision handling rule as in Rel-15: when multi-slot PUCCH overlaps with multi-slot PUSCH, PUSCH in the overlapped slot is dropped, we are fine with the proposal |
| Samsung | This is again not the question needs special handling for TBoMS, the PUCCH itself will be low or high priority. The other agenda has already decided how to handle the overlapping and related dropping rule. We can directly use that. |
| LG | We’d like to keep the aligned behavior with PUSCH repetition type A. |
| Apple | In our view, this is the same handling as the PUCCH repetition overlapping with repetition. |
| Ericsson | We also think that Rel-15 rules for PUSCH repetition type A can be reused. |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | TBoMS can be treated similar with the repetition type A. |
| OPPO | We prefer to have same processing as for type A repetition. |
| vivo1 | This is similar to the handling of collision between PUCCH repetition and PUSCH repetition in legacy. |
| Nokia/NSB | Legacy collision handling rules can be reused. |
| ZTE | Following the legacy UE behavior is preferred. |

FL’s comments on January, 18

Thank you all for your comments. It is rather evident that an overwhelming majority of company think that no specific labelling/handling should be introduced for TBoMS concerning priorities or collision handling rules.

The following conclusion is then proposed.

**FL’s proposal 6**

**The following Conclusion is made:**

|  |
| --- |
| **Defining priority of TBoMS transmission is up to gNB. No new TBoMS-specific collision handling and dropping rules in introduced as compared to legacy collision handling and dropping rule for PUSCH repetitions.** |

Companies are invited to express views on **FL’s proposal 6 only if strong concerns exist**. Please note that the intention here is to have a neat closure of the discussion. If the group cannot agree on FL’s proposal 6, the discussion will be closed in any case. Thanks.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Concerns on FL’s Proposal 6, if any. |
| Samsung | We share the intention of the proposal. Some wording change:  **~~Defining~~ Priority configuration of TBoMS transmission is up to gNB. No new TBoMS-specific collision handling and dropping rules in introduced ~~as compared to legacy collision handling and dropping rule for PUSCH repetitions~~.**  1. the priority of a PUSCH is configured by gNB, prefer to use configuration;  2. the delete of last part is that, the urllc agenda is still discussing the handling of pucch repetition and pusch, for CR pahse. There might be some rules added. So we may not need to say legacy rule, we just need to say, no new TBoMS-specific rules. |
| Ericsson | Support the proposal. However, the existing specification does not reflect this.  38.213 has the following at present, which is missing the reference to TBoMS added in red. This should be added so that 38.213 is then in agreement with FL proposal 6.  If a UE would transmit a PUCCH over a first number of slots and the UE would transmit a PUSCH with repetition Type A or a TB processing over multiple slots over a second number of slots, and the PUCCH transmission would overlap with the PUSCH transmission in one or more slots, and the conditions in clause 9.2.5 for multiplexing the UCI in the PUSCH are satisfied in the overlapping slots, the UE transmits the PUCCH and does not transmit the PUSCH in the overlapping slots. |
| Intel | Although it is not clear to us the motivation to indicate the TBoMS as HP uplink transmission as it is mainly for coverage enhancement, we are fine to reuse the same mechanism as defined for URLLC given the majority view.  Some wording changes:  **~~Defining~~ Configuration and/or indication of priority of TBoMS transmission is up to gNB. No new TBoMS-specific collision handling and dropping rules ~~in~~ are introduced as compared to legacy collision handling and dropping rule for PUSCH repetition~~s~~ type A.** |
| vivo2 | Fine with the conclusion in general and we also agree that some spec. changes may be needed to consider the collision handling between TBoMS and PUCCH as indicated by TBoMS as indicated by Ericsson.  And the updates of the conclusion proposed by Intel are also fine to us. |

##### **Second round of discussions**

FL’s comments on January, 19

Thank you all for your comments during the first round. As far as I can see most of what Samsung proposes seems compatible with the modifications suggested by Intel, and vice-versa. Furthermore, I retain the suggestion made by Ericsson and I will formulate another proposal to capture the TP meant to capture the content of the conclusion.

**FL’s proposal 6-v1**

**The following Conclusion is made:**

|  |
| --- |
| **Configuration and/or indication of priority of TBoMS transmission is up to gNB. No new TBoMS-specific collision handling and dropping rules are introduced ~~as compared to legacy collision handling and dropping rule for PUSCH repetitions~~.** |

**FL’s proposal 9**

**The following text proposal for TS 38.213, Clause 9.2.6, should be adopted.**

|  |
| --- |
| 9.2.6 PUCCH repetition procedure  **<omitted text>**  If a UE would transmit a PUCCH over a first number of slots and the UE would transmit a PUSCH with repetition Type A or a TB processing over multiple slots over a second number of slots, and the PUCCH transmission would overlap with the PUSCH transmission in one or more slots, and the conditions in clause 9.2.5 for multiplexing the UCI in the PUSCH are satisfied in the overlapping slots, the UE transmits the PUCCH and does not transmit the PUSCH in the overlapping slots.  **<omitted text>** |

Companies are invited to express views on **FL’s proposal 6-v1** and **FL’s proposal 9 only if strong concerns exist**. In this context:

* Please refrain from asking further modifications of FL’s proposal 6-v1, if you are ok with the content of the conclusion. If the group cannot agree on FL’s proposal 6-v1, the discussion will be closed in any case. Thanks.
* If you do not agree to FL’s proposal 9, please propose alternative formulations of the TP.

Thanks.

**FL’s proposal 6-v1**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Concerns on FL’s Proposal 6-v1, if any. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**FL’s proposal 9**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Concerns on FL’s Proposal 9, if any. |
| vivo3 | We’re generally fine with the proposal.  However, some minor updates may be needed considering “multiple slots” is already included in TBoMS, and “…multiple slots over a second number of slots” is not necessary for TBoMS. The updated TP could be:  **<omitted text>**  If a UE would transmit a PUCCH over a first number of slots and the UE would transmit a PUSCH with repetition Type A over a second number of slots or a TB processing over multiple slots, and the PUCCH transmission would overlap with the PUSCH transmission in one or more slots, and the conditions in clause 9.2.5 for multiplexing the UCI in the PUSCH are satisfied in the overlapping slots, the UE transmits the PUCCH and does not transmit the PUSCH in the overlapping slots.  **<omitted text>** |
|  |  |
|  |  |

#### [CLOSED] **HARQ-ACK multiplexing in case of missed DCI**

One company commented on this aspect (ZTE [5]). The following proposals were made:

* + *For single TBoMS transmission and no overlapping PUCCH with HARQ-ACK within a span of one PUCCH slot, if T-DAI in UL grant is not equal to 4 for Type 2 codebook or is equal to 1 for Type 1 codebook, the UE should multiplex HARQ-ACK in the PUSCH following the T-DAI in UL grant.*
  + *One of the slots for TBoMS transmission should be specified for HARQ-ACK multiplexing if the UE does not know the PUCCH slot due to missing detection of the DL DCI and the T-DAI in the UL grant is not equal to 4 for Type 2 codebook or is equal to 1 for Type 1 codebook.*

From FL’s perspective, the problem highlighted in [3] deserves some attention and is worth discussing. In this context, it is important to understand other companies’ views before taking any further step in this direction.

Companies are thus invited to express their views on Missed DCI – Proposal 1 and Proposal 2.

##### **First round of discussions**

Companies are invited to input their views in the corresponding tables below. Constructive attitude in this regard is greatly appreciated.

**Missed DCI – Proposal 1**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Views on Missed DCI – Proposal 1, if any. |
| CATT | See our comments in Missed DCI – Proposal 2. |
| QC | A solution for legacy PUSCH repetitions needs to be identified first. If the issue is not resolved for legacy PUSCH repetitions, no need to rush to a solution for TBOMS. |
| Intel | Share similar views as other companies and can be deprioritized. |
| Samsung | This is out of our discussion scope. TBoMS is similar to PUSCH repetition type A in terms of UCI multiplexing. |
| LG | We share the view with QC. |
| Ericsson | Similar views as CATT and QC |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | TBoMS can be treated similar with the repetition type A. |
| OPPO | Same view as QC. |
| vivo1 | This issue seems not solved in Rel-15/16. If we are trying to solve this issue in R17, we prefer to have a solution for more general cases, e.g. for type-A PUSCH repetition, than reuse the same mechanism for TBoMS. |
| Nokia/NSB | The same handling as legacy PUSCH repetition type A can be applied for TBoMS. Therefore, we prefer to deprioritize this issue for now until solution for legacy PUSCH repetition type A is identified. |
| ZTE | Thanks FL for highlighting this issue. In our view, it is for the very basic case (i.e., if T-DAI in UL grant is not equal to 4 for Type 2 codebook or is equal to 1 for Type 1 codebook) and it’s important to clarify the UE behavior. Otherwise, the network cannot know how the UE perform UCI multiplexing exactly since it does not know whether the UE decodes the DL DCI successfully or not. |
| Sharp | Rel-16 behaviour agreed at the last meeting for PUSCH can be applied. There is no TBoMS specific discussion. |

**Missed DCI – Proposal 2**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Views on Missed DCI – Proposal 2, if any. |
| CATT | Thanks FL and ZTE for raising this interesting but complicated scenario. Missing the DL grant DCI will always have the risk of mis-alignment on the understanding of UCI location between gNB and UE, when PUSCH occupies more than one slot.  As far as we know, similar issue also happens in Rel-15 PUSCH repetition type A, and unfortunately it is still under discussion in Rel-15 CR and has not been concluded yet (correct me if I missed the latest progress). We think this issue can be deprioritized for now. Once the solution for PUSCH repetition type A is clear, it can be applied to TBoMS directly. |
| QC | See answer to Proposal 1. |
| Intel | Share similar views as other companies and can be deprioritized. |
| Samsung | This is out of our discussion scope. TBoMS is similar to PUSCH repetition type A in terms of UCI multiplexing. |
| Ericsson | Similar views as CATT and QC |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | TBoMS can be treated similar with the repetition type A. |
| vivo1 | See answer to Proposal 1. |
| Nokia/NSB | Same answer as for “Missed DCI-Proposal 1”. |
| ZTE | If majority of companies think the issue for PUSCH repetition type A should be discussed in Rel-15/16 CR first, we are also fine. But we think this issue should be solved anyway. Otherwise, it will limit the applicable scenario of TBoMS transmission. |
| Sharp | TBoMS reuses a concept of PUSCH repetition type-A. A PUSCH in a slot overlapping with a PUCCH is identified as PUSCH for UCI piggyback. |

FL’s comments on January, 18

Thank you all for your comments. It is rather evident that an overwhelming majority of company think that this discussion should be deprioritized and the problem at hand should be discussed and solved in other AIs. This section is closed.

#### [OPEN] **The case of UL CA**

Two companies commented on this aspect (CATT [7], OPPO [8]). Proposals were made to support UCI multiplexing on PUSCH, in case of TBoMS and UL CA scenario. More precisely, in [7] it was proposed to reuse existing mechanisms for PUSCH repetition Type A, whereas in [8] it was proposed to have minimal specification impact associated to the support of UCI multiplexing in case of TBoMS and UL CA scenario.

From FL’s perspective, what is discussed in [7] and [8] deserves some attention and is worth discussing. In this context, it is important to understand other companies’ views before taking any further step in this direction.

Companies are thus invited to express their views on the support UCI multiplexing on PUSCH in case of TBoMS and UL CA scenario.

The following question is formulated.

**2.1.3.4-Q1** *Should UCI multiplexing on PUSCH in case of TBoMS and UL CA scenario be supported? If yes, is any specification modification needed, or can existing rules and mechanisms for Type A PUSCH repetitions be reused for TBoMS?*

##### **First round of discussions**

FL’s recommendation is to have a first round of discussion about **2.1.3.4-Q1**. Companies are invited to input their views in the corresponding tables below. Constructive attitude in this regard is greatly appreciated.

**2.1.3.4-Q1**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Company name |
| **Yes** | CATT, QC, Intel, LG, Ericsson, OPPO, vivo1, ZTE, Sharp |
| **No** |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Additional comments/view related to 2.1.3.4-Q1, if any. |
| CATT | Considering the limited time, reusing the current rules of PUSCH repetition Type A is reasonable. |
| QC | Extend existing UCI mux. rules. Nothing new is needed. |
| Intel | Prefer to reuse existing mechanism. CA case should be deprioritized for TBoMS |
| Samsung | We think current rules, existing rules from rel15/16 could be reused, and no matter what new rules the URLLC people defined for HP/LP cases, we can reuse that as well. Because, to UCI multiplexing issue, there is no fundamental difference between TBoMS and PUSCH repetition type A. |
| Apple | We consider the UL CA is not the typical use case for coverage limited UE. |
| Ericsson | We also expect Type A repetition rules can be reused. |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | TBoMS can be treated similar with the repetition type A and reuse the same rules. |
| vivo1 | For UCI multiplexing on TBoMS in CA cases(if supported), the same mechanisms as that for type-A PUSCH repetitions can be reused, and UCI multiplexing is performed per slot. No specification change is needed. |
| Nokia/NSB | We share similar view as the majority that no new handling is needed. We also think that CA is not a typical scenario in coverage shortage. |
| ZTE | The mechanism for PUSCH repetition Type A can be reused. |

FL’s comments on January, 18

Thank you all for your comments. It is rather evident that an overwhelming majority of company think that no TBoMS-specific rule should introduced for UCI multiplexing on PUSCH in case of TBoMS and UL CA scenario, and existing Type A PUSCH repetitions rules can be reused.

The following conclusion is then proposed.

**FL’s proposal 7**

**The following Conclusion is made:**

|  |
| --- |
| **Existing Type A PUSCH repetitions rules can be reused for UCI multiplexing on PUSCH in case of TBoMS and UL CA scenario. No new No TBoMS-specific rule is introduced as compared to legacy rules for Type A PUSCH repetitions.** |

Companies are invited to express views on **FL’s proposal 7 only if strong concerns exist**. Please note that the intention here is to have a neat closure of the discussion. If the group cannot agree on FL’s proposal 7, the discussion will be closed in any case. Thanks.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Concerns on FL’s Proposal 7, if any. |
| Samsung | No objection. Similar comments as for above proposal in 2.1.3.2. |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal.  Some wording change:  **Existing Type A PUSCH repetitions rules can be reused for UCI multiplexing on PUSCH in case of TBoMS and UL CA scenario. No new ~~No~~ TBoMS-specific rule is introduced as compared to legacy rules for UCI multiplexing on Type A PUSCH repetitions.** |
| CATT | Just a typo to fix: ‘No new ~~No~~ TBoMS-specific rule is …’ |
| vivo2 | Fine with the proposal.  And one minor editorial suggestion on top of the proposal updated by Intel/CATT:  **Existing Type A PUSCH repetition~~s~~ rules can be reused for UCI multiplexing on PUSCH in case of TBoMS and UL CA scenario. No new ~~No~~ TBoMS-specific rule is introduced as compared to legacy rules for UCI multiplexing on Type A PUSCH repetitions.** |

##### **Second round of discussions**

FL’s comments on January, 19

Thank you for all your comments during the first round. No objection was expressed on the content of the proposal, and only wording changes where suggested. I find Samsung’s comment a bit obscure, but I suspect what is proposed is to remove the second sentence. At the same time, I don’t think the situation is the same here, given that we are not talking about dropping rules but multiplexing rules. As far as I know, this is not being discussed in the URLLC agenda, hence it is rather safe to keep it here, given that no other company proposed to remove. I hope this can be fine with Samsung.

The proposal is thus modified as follows.

**FL’s proposal 7-v1**

**The following Conclusion is made:**

|  |
| --- |
| **Existing Type A PUSCH repetition~~s~~ rules can be reused for UCI multiplexing on PUSCH in case of TBoMS and UL CA scenario. No new ~~No~~ TBoMS-specific rule is introduced as compared to legacy rules for UCI multiplexing on Type A PUSCH repetitions.** |

I will add a table for expressing strong concerns, if any, and leave the section open until the GTW scheduled on January, 20, just in case. However, I do hope no late strong concern is raised until then. Please refrain from suggesting minor modifications if you agree with the content. If the group cannot agree on FL’s proposal 7-v1, the discussion will be closed in any case. Thanks.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Concerns on FL’s Proposal 7-v1, if any. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## Mid priority aspects

Five mid priority aspects are identified at the beginning of the meeting:

1. Time domain resource determination
   * 1. Candidate values for N
     2. Candidate values for M
2. Data rate calculation and UE behavior related to TBS determination
   * 1. How to handle configuration of TBS larger than the size of one CB
3. Transmission power determination
4. Support of TBoMS by HD-FDD UEs

Although arguably less paramount at this stage of the discussion, these aspects have been included here since they seem to impact the TBoMS design at a more fundamental level than aspects in Section 2.3. Summary, discussion, and FL’s comments/proposals on these aspects are provided in the following different sub-sections, whose numbers are given in the list above.

### [OPEN] Time domain resource determination

#### [CLOSED] **Candidate values for N**

One company (Ericsson [18]) proposed that {3, 5, 6, 12, 16, 32} can be considered for the candidate numbers of slots for a single TBoMS.

From FL’s perspective, candidate values for N have been discussed extensively in the previous meeting. Other candidate values for N aside from the agreed ones may not be needed. Therefore, I would like to collect companies’ views on this aspect before making any proposal.

***2.2.1.1-Q1.*** *Do you agree adding the following values to the list of candidate values for N?*

* *3, 5, 6, 12, 16, 32.*

##### **First round of discussions**

Companies are invited to provide an answer to **2.2.1.1-Q1** in the tables below. If you add any additional comment, it is very much appreciated if discussion is kept at technical level, for the sake of an efficient use of the limited time RAN1 has. Constructive attitude is warmly recommended.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Candidate value | Support | Not support |
| **3** | Ericsson |  |
| **5** | Ericsson |  |
| **6** | Ericsson |  |
| **12** | Ericsson |  |
| **16** | Ericsson |  |
| **32** | Ericsson |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Additional comments related to 2.2.1.1-Q1, if any. |
| CATT | We do not see strong need to introduce additional candidate values. |
| QC | We would like to support TBOMS spanning 20 slots. This is primarily to cover VOIP where a packet is generated every 20 ms. N=5, 10, and 20 are of interest. |
| Panasonic | Whether to support 16 or 32 depends on the UE feature discussion on FG30-3 / FG30-3a. If these FGs are not merged, we agree the need of 16 or 32. For {3, 5, 6, 12}, we think it would be the optimization. |
| Intel | Given that repetition is already supported for TBoMS, large value of N is not necessary. Also for irregular values, this is not very desirable as this may lead to some un-even partitioning on the coded bits in different slots for TBoMS transmission. |
| Apple | According to the evaluation in the study phase, N should be no larger than 8. |
| Ericsson | We think {3, 5, 6, 12} are especially suitable for the TDD UL/DL configuration DDDSUDDSUU, to fit 5ms, 10ms, 15ms and 20ms boundaries. The values of 16 and 32 are beneficial, since they allow UEs to be more flexible with respect to UE capability; we don’t think a UE that implements TBoMS should have to support TBoMS repetitions to transmit with N\*M=32. |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | At this stage, we should focus on the maintenance. |
| OPPO | We do not see the motivation the add the number. The extreme large value would be useful if we support sub-PRB allocation. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We don’t see the need to introduce additional values and this should be kept our of maintenance phase |
| vivo1 | Up to 8 slots per TBoMS is enough in our view. |
| Nokia/NSB | These values have been discussed extensively in previous meetings without reaching any consensus. Therefore, we don’t see the need to reopen the discussion on this aspect. |
| ZTE | We think the current candidate value is sufficient. But we are also open to the additional values. |

FL’s comments on January, 18

Thank you all for your comments.

Outcome from the first round of discussion is as follows:

* 9 companies commented that other candidate values for N are not needed.
* One company agreed adding 3, 5, 6, 12, 16 and 32 to the list of candidate values for N.
* One company proposed adding 5, 10 and 20 to the list of candidate values for N.
* One company proposed adding 16 and 32 to the list of candidate values for N.

Given the above outcome and that this discussion has been carried out in several meetings, it is fair stating that there is no consensus on supporting other candidate values for N at this stage. Considering the impact this may have on RRC parameter discussion, it is reasonable to close the discussion on this topic for Rel-17.

#### [OPEN] **Candidate values for M**

One company (Ericsson [18]) proposed that if a UE supports TBoMS, it should support configuration with M\*N up to 32.

In RAN1#107-e meeting, the following was concluded:

|  |
| --- |
| Conclusion  There is no consensus in RAN1 to introduce any restriction on the combinations of N and M that can be configured in the TDRA table, other than the already agreed N\*M <= 32 restriction. |

From FL’s perspective, and following the above conclusion, the gNB can configure any combination of N and M such that N\*M <= 32.

Therefore, it is straightforward assuming that a UE that supports TBoMS should also support the combinations with N\*M = 32. Otherwise, another restriction is needed, and it contradicts with the above conclusion.

At the same time, if we consider the TP provided in [18], it is clear that the proposal concerning the support of configuration with M\*N up to 32 in [18] targets the removal of the condition on UE capabilities present in TS 38.214.

The following question is thus formulated to collect companies’ views on this aspect.

***2.2.1.2-Q1****. Do you agree that if a UE supports TBoMS, it should support configuration with M\*N up to 32 and no condition on UE capabilities related to this aspect should exist?*

##### **First round of discussions**

Companies are invited to provide an answer to **2.2.1.2-Q1** in the tables below. If you add any additional comment, it is very much appreciated if discussion is kept at technical level, for the sake of an efficient use of the limited time RAN1 has. Constructive attitude is warmly recommended.

**2.2.1.2-Q1**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Company name |
| **Yes** | CATT, DCM, Panasonic, Intel, LG, Apple, Ericsson, Huawei, Hisilicon, OPPO, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, vivo1, Nokia, NSB, ZTE |
| **No** | QC |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Additional comments related to 2.2.1.2-Q1, if any. |
| QC | M\*N should be limited to the largest number of repetitions supported by a UE. Allowing this to go to 32 irrespective of UE capability does not make sense. A separate UE capability is already being discussed for the increased number of repetitions. We should respect this capability and not violate it. In a previous agreement, we agreed to reuse the agreements made in 8.8.1.1. Features in 8.8.1.1 are gated by UE capabilities, and the current spec is merely reflecting this. |
| Ericsson | We would like to better understand why UEs should not support the number of repetitions allowed in the current release. In our understanding this was what was done for Rel-15/16: we did not define capability for a subset of repetitions, just support for the value range in Rel-15 or Rel-16. |
| vivo1 | Repetition of TBoMS should be an optional feature in our view. A UE supporting TBoMS doesn’t have to support repetition of TBoMS. |
| Nokia/NSB | If there is another restriction on the maximum value of M\*N, e.g., M\*N A 32 where A is up to UE capability, then the conclusion made in RAN1#107-e meeting above is violated. |

FL’s comments on January, 18

Thank you all for your inputs.

From the first round of discussion, 13 companies agreed that if a UE supports TBoMS, it should support configuration with M\*N up to 32 and no condition on UE capabilities related to this aspect should exist, while one company is not ok with it. The following proposal is then formulated to capture the majority view. The opponent is encouraged to address the comments from other companies in the first round of discussion or reconsider its position for the sake of a quick progress.

**FL’s proposal 8**

**If a UE supports TBoMS, it should support configurations with M\*N up to 32 and no condition on UE capabilities related to this aspect should exist.**

Companies are invited to input their views on **FL’s proposal 8** in the corresponding table below. Constructive attitude in this regard is greatly appreciated.

**FL’s proposal 8**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Company name |
| **Support FL’s Proposal 8** | DCM, Intel, CATT, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, ZTE, Nokia, NSB, Sharp, Huawei, HiSilicon |
| **Do not support FL’s Proposal 8** | Ericsson |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Additional comments related to FL’s Proposal 8, if any. |
| Panasonic | In UE feature discussion, following was agreed.  Agreement  • FG 30-3 and FG30-3a are not merged.  Since the repetition is separate FG, does proposal mean TBoMS of up to 32 without repetition is supported? |
| Ericsson | Given the closure of section 2.2.1.1 in this round, we have a different situation. With N having a max value of 8, this proposal forces UEs to support at least M=4. We don’t believe UEs supporting TBoMS should be mandated to support TBoMS repetition. We can instead say something like.  “A UE that supports TBoMS supports all values of N defined for TBoMS, and a UE that supports TBoMS repetition supports all values of M defined for TBoMS repetition.”  (And then values of M\*N>32 are still not allowed to be configured.) |
| CATT | In our understanding, FG 30-3 means supporting TBoMS (without repetition) with N={2,4,8} only. Supporting FG 30-3a means supporting TBoMS (with repetition) with N={2,4,8} and M={1,2,3,4,7,8,12,16} and a restriction of N\*M<=32. |
| Nokia/NSB | In our understanding, it’s rather straightforward that FL’s proposal 8 is applicable for UEs that support TBoMS with repetitions. For UE that support TBoMS without repetition, it’s equivalent to the case with repetition when M=1, hence the maximum N\*M is 8. Obviously, the constraint on supporting N\*M up to 32 is not applicable in this case. |
| Apple | The proposal could be updated according the progress of UE feature discussion.  If a UE supports TBoMS repetition, it should support configurations with M\*N up to 32. |
| vivo2 | It would be good to clarify whether this proposal would mean a UE supporting TBoMS shall support TBoMS repetition. If yes, then some updates are needed as the 2 features are separate features. |
| CMCC | Considering the agreements from the UE feature, further clarification or updates could be made for this proposal. |

##### **Second round of discussions**

FL’s comments on January, 19

Thank you all for your inputs.

From the previous round of discussion, 8 companies confirmed their support of FL’s proposal 8, while one company expressed their concern on it. Several companies commented that this topic is related to UE feature discussion. From FL’s perspective, given the agreement made in UE feature discussion that FG 30-3 and FG30-3a are not merged, as quoted above by Panasonic, FL’s proposal 8 can be modified to clarify that it is applied for UEs that support TBoMS repetition as suggested by Ericsson.

**FL’s proposal 8-v1**

**A UE that supports TBoMS supports all values of N defined for TBoMS, and a UE that supports TBoMS repetition supports all values of M defined for TBoMS repetition.**

Companies are invited to input their views on **FL’s proposal 8-v1** in the corresponding table below. Constructive attitude in this regard is greatly appreciated.

**FL’s proposal 8-v1**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Company name |
| **Support FL’s Proposal 8-v1** | QC, vivo3 |
| **Do not support FL’s Proposal 8-v1** |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Additional comments related to FL’s Proposal 8-v1, if any. |
| QC | We drop our initial concern in light of the UE feature discussion. |
|  |  |

### [CLOSED] Data rate calculation and UE behaviour related to TBS determination

#### [CLOSED] **How to handle configuration of TBS larger than the size of one CB**

One company (Huawei/HiSi [3]) proposed applying the following data rate constraint (changes in red) in Clause 6.1.4 of TS 38.214 for the transmission of TBoMS PUSCH,

* Within a cell group, a UE is not required to handle PUSCH(s) transmissions if the following condition is not satisfied at the point in time:

where still represents the scheduled bits for the m-th TB over multi-slot and is the slot number allocated for the PUSCH transmission of a single TBoMS in serving cell-j.

* For a j-th serving cell, the UE is not required to handle PUSCH transmissions if the following condition is not satisfied:

where represents the time duration of one symbol, and is the number of symbols assigned to the PUSCH within a slot.

One company (TCL [4]) proposed that the maximum TBS for TBoMS should be limited based on DataRateCC.

Furthermore, one company (ZTE [5]) brought forward a TP which proposes to capture that the data rate limitation for cell group should be updated to reflect TBoMS by scaling the TBS based on the number of slots for TB size determination.

In this context, the following FL proposal was formulated during RAN1#107-e. However, due to limited time for commenting before the end of the meeting, only one company expressed concern on the proposal. Therefore, from FL’s perspective, the discussion could resume during this meeting.

**FL’s proposal 3**

**Within a cell group, a UE is not required to handle a PUSCH transmission of a single TBoMS in slot sj in serving cell-j, and for j = 0,1,2.. J-1, slot sj overlapping with any given point in time, if the following condition is not satisfied at that point in time:**

**,**

**Where is the slot number allocated for the PUSCH transmission of a single TBoMS in serving cell-j.**

##### **First round of discussions**

FL’s recommendation is to have a first round of discussion about **FL’s proposal 3**. Companies are invited to input their views in the corresponding table below. Constructive attitude in this regard is greatly appreciated. In this sense, if you cannot support the proposal, please propose an alternative formulation which considers the current spirit of the proposal. If you do so, I’d like to invite you to be pragmatic and acknowledge that focus on the scope of the WID and on the prioritization of the completion of the feature over the micro-optimizations which cannot be immediately agreed by everyone.

**FL’s proposal 3**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Company name |
| **Support FL’s Proposal 3** | Panasonic, Ericsson, Huawei, HiSilicon, ZTE |
| **Do not support FL’s Proposal 3** | CATT(need justification), QC, Intel, OPPO, vivo1, Sharp |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Additional comments related to FL’s Proposal 3, if any. |
| CATT | We would like to hear more technical justification for this proposal. We already put a very strict restriction (only single CB and single layer is allowed) to TBoMS. It is unlikely to generate huge date rate any more. So, even without change on *DataRate* or *DataRateCC*, the system is unlikely to break? |
| QC | TBOMS is no different from PUSCH Rep Type A. If the current equation works for PUSCH Rep Type A, it should work for TBOMS as well without any changes. |
| Apple | Maybe we need to clarify first whether UL CA is supported for TBoMS. |
| Ericsson | While we share CATT’s doubts on if the change is needed, it is consistent with TBS determination for TBoMS. Therefore, while we do not have a strong view, we can support. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | By using current equation of DataRate, the data rate calculated for TBoMS is incorrectly larger than the real data rate, which unnecessarily restricts the data rate for other cells within the same cell group.  Moreover, for more precise, the proposal can be modified as follows:  **FL’s proposal 3**  **Within a cell group, a UE is not required to handle a PUSCH transmission of a single TBoMS in slot sj in serving cell-j, and for j = 0,1,2.. J-1, slot sj overlapping with any given point in time, if the following condition is not satisfied at that point in time:**  **,**  **Where is the slot number allocated for the PUSCH transmission of a single TBoMS in serving cell-j; otherwise, .** |
| OPPO | Those limitation are for quite extreme data rate which will be not applicable for TBoMS cases. |
| vivo1 | The maximum value of TBS of TBoMS is not larger than the maximum TBS of a single PUSCH as legacy meaning that this long TBoMS PUSCH can still be treated in the same way as a single-slot PUSCH with same TBS repeated in a same number of slots allocated to the TBoMS PUSCH, with respect to the datarate validation. So no spec. changes seem necessary in our understanding for TBoMS. |
| Nokia/NSB | The legacy formula for calculation data rate is done per slot. *M* is the number of TB(s) transmitted in a slot. If we change the time unit to multiple slots, then *M* should also be the number of TB(s) transmitted in multiple slots. In other words, time unit for calculating data rate across the serving cells should be aligned. |
| ZTE | We support the proposal and also the updates from Huawei.  In current specification, the data rate is calculated in the unit of slot as shown below. On the other hand, the TBS is determined based on multiple slots for TBoMS. So the date rate calculated will be increased unnecessarily due to unaligned time unit. Therefore, some corresponding update is needed.  *Within a cell group, a UE is not required to handle PUSCH(s) transmissions in slot sj in serving cell-j, and for j = 0,1,2.. J-1, slot sj overlapping with any given point in time, if the following condition is not satisfied at that point in time:*  *,*  *where*  *- J is the number of configured serving cells belong to a frequency range*  *- for the j-th serving cell,*  *- M is the number of TB(s) transmitted in slot-sj. For PUSCH repetition Type B, each actual repetition is counted separately.*  *- Tslotμ(j) =10-3/2μ(j), where μ(j) is the numerology for PUSCH(s) in slot sj of the j-th serving cell.*  *- for the m-th TB,*  *- A is the number of bits in the transport block as defined in Clause 6.2.1 [5, TS 38.212]*  *- C is the total number of code blocks for the transport block defined in Clause 5.2.2 [5, TS 38.212].*  *- is the number of scheduled code blocks for the transport block as defined in Clause 5.4.2.1 [5,38.212]*  *- [Mbps] is computed as the maximum data rate summed over all the carriers in the frequency range for any signaled band combination and feature set consistent with the configured servings cells, where the data rate value is given by the formula in Clause 4.1.2 in [13, TS 38.306], including the scaling factor f(i).* |

FL’s comments on January, 18

Thank you all for your comments.

From the first round of discussion, 4 companies supported FL’s proposal 3, while 6 companies do not support it. As commented by the proponents, the main motivation for the changes comes from the time unit for data rate calculation in case of TBoMS. However, as commented by vivo and some other companies, no specification change is needed since TBS of TBoMS is not larger than the maximum TBS of a single PUSCH. Hence, even if TBS of TBoMS is used for data rate calculation per slot there should not be any issue related to data-rate validation. In addition, as commented by Qualcomm and some other companies, if the current data-rate validation formula works for PUSCH repetition type A, it should also work for TBoMS. From FL’s perspective, we can take one step back and try to align companies’ views before making any modification, if applicable. Therefore, the following questions are formulated

***2.2.2.1-Q1.*** *Do you agree that, since TBS of TBoMS is not larger than the maximum TBS of a single PUSCH, even if TBS of TBoMS is used for data rate calculation per slot there should not be any issue related to data-rate validation? If not, then why?*

***2.2.2.1-Q2.*** *Do you agree that, since the current data-rate validation formula works for PUSCH repetition type A, it should also work for TBoMS? If not, then why?*

Companies are invited to provide answers to **2.2.2.1-Q1** and **2.2.2.1-Q2** in the tables below. If you add any additional comment, it is very much appreciated if discussion is kept at technical level, for the sake of an efficient use of the limited time RAN1 has. Constructive attitude is warmly recommended.

**2.2.2.1-Q1**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Company name |
| **Yes** | Panasonic, Intel, CATT, vivo2, Sharp |
| **No** | Huawei, HiSilicon |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Additional comments related to 2.2.2.1-Q1, if any. |
| Ericsson | The effective data rate calculation will be higher for TBoMS due to its TBS determination mechanism. However, whether this is a problem, especially with the single CB and layer restrictions, as well as the likely lower data rates for the coverage applications TBoMS is designed for, is not clear to us. As was requested earlier by CATT, it would be good to quantify the limits. |
| CATT | For the serving cell itself, TBoMS cannot create huge data rate anymore, so a UE should not worry about this. Digging further, the motivation to increase the room of data rate of other cells in UL CA in such coverage limited scenario is not strong to us. |
| ZTE | The issue is the calculated date rate would be increased for TBoMS compared to the actual date rate. We have to be accurate and make sure the spec is technically correct. Otherwise it may cause confusion and unexpected implementation issues. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | As shown in the, within a cell group, assuming three serving cells are configured, the SCSs of CC 0, CC 1 and CC 2 are 60 kHz, 30 kHz and 15kHz, respectively.    A TBoMS is transmitted via two slots in CC 0, two single-slot TBs are transmitted in CC 1 and CC 2, respectively. Directly applying the first data rate constraint condition as follows,  Considering the actual data rate for TBoMS, this data rate constraint condition is modified as follows,  Comparing above two formulas, the TBS of TB1 and TB2 using the second formula can be larger than that using the first formula. The dararate for CC0 and CC1 is restricted unnecessarily in the first formula. |

**2.2.2.1-Q2**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Company name |
| **Yes** | DCM, Panasonic, Intel, CATT, Nokia, NSB, vivo2, Sharp |
| **No** | Ericsson, ZTE, Huawei, HiSilicon |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Additional comments related to 2.2.2.1-Q2, if any. |
| Ericsson | The data rate of Rep Type A is calculated as the peak rate per slot, not the data delivered to higher layers. So it can be correct in that sense. However, for TBoMS, the TB is transmitted over multiple slots, and so the value is N times too high. But as commented above, whether this is a serious problem should be considered further. |
| ZTE | For PUSCH repetition type A, the TBS is calculated by one slot which is different from TBoMS. As commented by Ericsson, would be *N* times higher for TBoMS. |
| Nokia/NSB | From our understanding, what is important for the data rate validation condition is the TBS for a PUSCH transmission at a given slot, regardless of how the TBS is calculated. Now, the question should be that, for data rate validation in case of PUSCH repetition type A, whether the same TBS is applied for each slot of the PUSCH repetitions? If the answer is yes, then the situation is the same for TBoMS. If the answer is no, we are open to discuss it further. |
| vivo2 | For TBoMS, the situation is same as PUSCH repetition for which the number of repetitions is not considered in the data rate validation either in legacy. So we do not see the need to have any spec. changes for data rate validation of TBoMS. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | For PUSCH repetition Type A, different RVs are applied for each repetition. UE needs to deal with the different RVs for each repetition even though the TB is the same. So the datarate is for repetition type A. But for TBoMS, only one single RV is applies across repetitions. So the data rate should be for TBoMS, which is different from the case for PUSCH repetition Type A. |

##### **Second round of discussions**

FL’s comments on January, 19

Thank you all for your inputs. Summary of previous round of discussion is as follows.

* For 2.2.2.1-Q1, 5 companies agreed that, since TBS of TBoMS is not larger than the maximum TBS of a single PUSCH, even if TBS of TBoMS is used for data rate calculation per slot there should not be any issue related to data-rate validation, while one company did not agree with it.
* For 2.2.2.1-Q2, 7 companies agreed that since the current data-rate validation formula works for PUSCH repetition type A, it should also work for TBoMS, while 3 companies did not agree with it.

From FL’s perspective, regardless of whether the current data rate validation condition works for PUSCH repetition type A or not, if there is an issue with TBoMS it should be fixed under this agenda item. However, most companies seem to think that such issue does not exist. More precisely, 6 companies objected FL’s proposal 3 in the previous round, 5 companies stated that even if TBS of TBoMS is used for data rate calculation per slot there should not be any issue related to data-rate validation and, finally, 7 companies agreed that since the current data-rate validation formula works for PUSCH repetition type A, it should also work for TBoMS. Therefore, it’s fair concluding that there is no consensus to modify the condition on data rate validation in this meeting. If any issue were to be observed in the future, this topic can of course be debated again during maintenance phase, as per usual practice. This discussion is closed.

### [CLOSED] Transmission power determination

One company (Ericsson [18]) proposed reusing Rel-16 per-slot transmission occasion of power determination for TBoMS.

The following two agreements were made during RAN1#106-bis-e:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:   * For transmission power determination of TBoMS transmission in Rel-17, RAN1 to down-select one of the following two options:   + Option 1: The transmission power determination of TBoMS should be based on all the REs allocated in one available slot for the TBoMS transmission, excluding the overhead of reference signals   + Option 2: The transmission power determination of TBoMS should be based on all the REs allocated in the N available slots for the TBoMS transmission, excluding the overhead of reference signals. * FFS: details on BPRE   Agreement:  BPRE for TBOMS is calculated as  where N is the number of slots allocated for a single TBOMS and  is the number of allocated REs in one allocated slot of a single TBOMS.  Note: How this equation or its equivalent is captured in the specification is left to the editor |

From FL’s perspective, the calculation of BPRE for TBoMS is clear from the above agreement. However, although the intention of reusing Rel-16 per-slot transmission occasion of power determination for TBoMS was also clear, it has never been officially agreed in RAN1. Therefore, the following proposal is formulated.

**FL’s proposal 4**

**The Rel-16 per-slot transmission occasion definition is re-used for transmission power determination for TBoMS.**

##### **First round of discussions**

FL’s recommendation is to have a first round of discussion about **FL’s proposal 4**. Companies are invited to input their views in the corresponding tables below. Constructive attitude in this regard is greatly appreciated. In this sense, if you cannot support the proposal, please propose an alternative formulation which considers the current spirit of the proposal. If you do so, I’d like to invite you to be pragmatic and acknowledge that focus on the scope of the WID and on the prioritization of the completion of the feature over the micro-optimizations which cannot be immediately agreed by everyone.

**FL’s proposal 4**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Company name |
| **Support FL’s Proposal 4** | CATT, DCM, QC, Panasonic, Intel, LG, Ericsson, Huawei, HiSilicon, OPPO, vivo1, Nokia, NSB, ZTE, Sharp |
| **Do not support FL’s Proposal 4** |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Additional comments related to FL’s Proposal 4, if any. |
| Apple | In general, we are ok with this proposal. Just want to know any specification changes are expected with this proposal? |
| ZTE | We are fine with the proposal. In addition, we think the conclusion in 8.8.1.3 should be followed in case both TBoMS and DMRS bundling are enabled. |
|  |  |

FL’s comments on January, 18

Thank you all for your inputs.

From the first round of discussion, 13 companies supported FL’s proposal 4 and no company objected to it.

@Apple: From FL’s perspective, this should not have specification impact.

Given the outcome from the first round of discussion, FL’s proposal 4 will be discussed in today’s GTW, if time allows, or shared in the reflector for email approval. This discussion is closed.

### [CLOSED] Support of TBoMS by HD-FDD UE

One company (Apple [13]) proposed that TBoMS is supported by the HD-FDD UE with the agreed available slot determination for HD-FDD UE.

From FL’s perspective, it is worth clarifying this aspect during RAN1#107-bis-e. According to the following specification excerpt from TS 38.214, the use of TBoMS for HD-FDD UE with counting on available slot has not been captured, which makes this topic still open for discussion.

|  |
| --- |
| 6.1.2.1 Resource allocation in time domain <<omitted text>>  For TB processing over multiple slots:  - For unpaired spectrum, the same symbol allocation is applied across the slots determined for the PUSCH transmission and the PUSCH is limited to a single transmission layer. The UE shall transmit the TB across the slots determined for the PUSCH transmission, applying the same symbol allocation in each slot.  - For paired spectrum or supplementary uplink band, the same symbol allocation is applied across the consecutive slots and the PUSCH is limited to a single transmission layer. The UE shall transmit the TB across the consecutive slots applying the same symbol allocation in each slot.  <<omitted text>> |

Therefore, the following proposal is formulated.

**FL’s proposal 5**

**The use of TBoMS for HD-FDD UE with counting on available slot is supported.**

##### **First round of discussions**

FL’s recommendation is to have a first round of discussion about **FL’s proposal 5**. Companies are invited to input their views in the corresponding table below. Constructive attitude in this regard is greatly appreciated. In this sense, if you cannot support the proposal, please propose an alternative formulation which considers the current spirit of the proposal. If you do so, I’d like to invite you to be pragmatic and acknowledge that focus on the scope of the WID and on the prioritization of the completion of the feature over the micro-optimizations which cannot be immediately agreed by everyone.

**FL’s proposal 5**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Company name |
| **Support FL’s Proposal 5** | CATT, DCM, QC, Panasonic, Intel, LG, Apple, Ericsson (reuse the agreement on HD-FDD UEs for Rel-17 PUSCH repetition based on available slots) , Huawei, HiSilicon, OPPO, vivo1, Nokia, NSB, ZTE, Sharp |
| **Do not support FL’s Proposal 5** |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Additional comments related to FL’s Proposal 5, if any. |
| Ericsson | Better to clarify that HD-FDD UEs use the same rules of determining available slots for TBoMS and Rel-17 PUSCH repetition Type A. |
|  |  |
|  |  |

FL’s comments on January, 18

Thank you all for your inputs.

From the first round of discussion, 14 companies supported FL’s proposal 5 and no company objected to it. One company requested to clarify the available slot determination for HD-FDD UEs. From FL’s perspective, only one way of available slot determination for HD-FDD UEs has been agreed so far under AI 8.8.1.1. In addition, it was agreed in RAN1#106-e meeting that the determination of available slots for PUSCH repetition type A, as defined in AI 8.8.1.1, is reused for TBoMS. Therefore, the FL’s proposal 5 should be clear enough and will be discussed in today’s GTW, if time allows, or shared in the reflector for email approval. This discussion is closed.

FL’s comments on January, 18 (After GTW)

Given the overwhelming support shown for FL’s proposal 5 during the first round of comments, I do not think I can propose further modifications to the proposal, while capturing the will of the group.

@Qualcomm: I am opening Section 2.3.1.1 to discuss about the topic you wished to discuss. I hope that you will reconsider your position on FL’s proposal 5, which you did not object during the first round of comments. In this context, it is fair to say that you are asking to reopen a very basic discussion we closed long time ago concerning the counting method to be used to determine the slots to be used for TBoMS. This is something we should avoid, since we had sufficient time in the past to discuss about this as well, without complicating the “last mile” as it is instead happening now. As matter of fact, current specification support TBoMS for TDD, FDD and SUL band. If a strong technical need existed to reopen this discussion existed, many companies would have asked to discuss this. It is safe to say that this is not happening because such strong technical need is not acknowledged. Of course, I will invite all companies to comment in Section 2.3.1.1.

Given the above, FL’s proposal 5 is confirmed in its current form. If companies have further comments on it, these can be added in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Additional comments related to FL’s Proposal 5, if any. |
| Ericsson | We are supportive, but wonder if we can have the note from the GTW, since this is for a HD-FDD UE. The current spec says that an FDD UE considers all slots as available, and this rule also applies to HD-FDD UE, which is not correct. The other understanding is that the current spec only covers a FD-FDD UE, and HD-FDD UE behavior is missing.  **Possible Agreement**  The use of TBoMS for HD-FDD UE with counting on available slot is supported.  Note: same existing mechanism as in AI8.8.1.1 should be applied for this case. |
| CMCC | We also support FL’s proposal or the current possible agreement.  To further clarify Ericsson issue, in 107e we have the following agreement in AI 8.8.1.1  Agreement   * For HD-FDD RedCap Ues supporting the counting based on available slots. * For DG-PUSCH, *ssb-PositionsInBurst* is used in the first step of determining of available slots.   + A slot is not counted in the number of available slots if at least one of the symbols indicated by the indexed row of the used resource allocation table in the slot overlaps with a symbol of an SS/PBCH block with index provided by ssb-PositionInBurst. * Note: Neither tdd-UL-DL-ConfigurationCommon nor tdd-UL-DL-ConfigurationDedicated is configured for FDD. |
|  |  |

FL’s comments on January, 19

Thank you all for your comments.

@Ericsson: The agreement quoted by CMCC above was captured in Section 6.1.2.1 of TS 38.214 as follows.

“For the case of reduced capability half-duplex UE, and when *AvailableSlotCounting* is enabled, a slot is not counted in the number of 𝑁 ∙ 𝐾 slots for a PUSCH transmission of a PUSCH repetition Type A scheduled by DCI format 0\_1 or 0\_2, or for a PUSCH transmission of TB processing over multiple slots scheduled by DCI format 0\_1 or 0\_2, if at least one of the symbols indicated by the indexed row of the used resource allocation table in the slot overlaps with a symbol of an SS/PBCH block with index provided by *ssb-PositionsInBurst*.”

For this reason, I think that adding the note is redundant, however it does not hurt. I can put it back, with minor changes and bring it up online tomorrow. I hope you will agree to remove it if it becomes controversial for other companies. Thank you.

The proposal is updated as follows:

**FL’s proposal 5-v1**

**The use of TBoMS for HD-FDD UE with counting on available slot is supported.**

**Note: existing mechanism as in AI8.8.1.1 should be applied for this case**

This discussion is now closed.

## Others

As discussed at the beginning of Section 2, discussions on different aspects of TBoMS have been prioritized to ensure that constructive discussions and effective progress can be achieved during RAN1 #107-bis-e. Priority has been given to the aspects and topics discussed in sections 2.1 and 2.2. All other aspects are listed in this section, i.e., 2.3, where proposals made by companies in their contributions are reported and described in detail.

These aspects may not be handled during RAN1 #107-bis-e unless technical need arises during the discussion on other aspects. For this reason, no specific FL’s proposal or recommendation is formulated at this stage. Should discussions for 2.1 and 2.2 progress fast and converge to agreements, sections for specific aspects, currently in 2.3, may be open for discussions and corresponding FL’s proposals and recommendations may be formulated.

### [CLOSED] Time domain resource determination

#### [CLOSED] Support of TBoMS in case of counting based on physical slots

One company (Qualcomm [14]) proposed enabling the use of TBoMS even when PUSCH repetitions are counted based on physical slots.

FL’s comments on January, 18 (after GTW)

After today’s GTW, I would like to ask companies to comment on Qualcomm’s proposal to enable the use of TBoMS even when PUSCH repetitions are counted based on physical slots. From FL’s perspective, it is important that any modification we introduce at this stage is justified by strong technical needs acknowledged by all companies. Given that TBoMS can already be used for TDD, FDD and SUL band, such technical needs are not so evident to me. For this reason, I would like to ask companies supporting Qualcomms’s proposal, if any, to specifically focus on this in their comments.

Views and comments can be added in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Views and comments related to enabling the use of TBoMS even when PUSCH repetitions are counted based on physical slots. |
| QC | We don’t think TBOMS requires available slot-based counting as a prerequisite, especially in FDD/SUL bands. Its rather clear that available slot-based counting offers no advantages in paired spectrum for full-duplex UEs. For this reason, we don’t envision gNB and UE vendors to enable this feature in FDD/SUL bands --- it just adds unnecessary implementation and IODT overhead. TBOMS with physical slot counting is likely the most preferred mode of operation in such bands. Do note that FDD/SUL bands are typically in the lower frequencies and therefore play a critical role in extending coverage. TBOMS for FDD/SUL bands is an important use case.  Further, as things currently stand, TBOMS requires available slot counting as a prerequisite. Its not clear what the intended UE behavior should be when RRC parameter availableSlotCounting is disabled. Does this also disable TBOMS? If not, does it mean that TBOMS will follow available slot counting while legacy PUSCH repetitions follow physical slot counting? If so, doesn’t this add additional complexity to the scheduler to track two modes of counting for the same UE depending on the nature of the PUSCH transmission?  The proposed relaxation should benefit all gNB and UE vendors, while also helping IODT and commercialization efforts. We hope other companies can reconsider their views in light of the above. |
| NTT DOCOMO | In terms of coverage performance, there is no need to support physical slot counting for TBoMS. Also, we do not want to revert the agreement made in the past when it comes to a showdown. |
| Ericsson | This seems to us to be a significant change at this late stage, and so should be well justified. Since there should be no performance benefit, we would like to understand the UE complexity benefits before adding this feature to TBoMS. |
| Intel | In AI 8.8.1.1, it was agreed in the last meeting that counting based on available slots is applicable for TDD/FDD and SUL. Same design should be reused for TBoMS, which is based on available slots.  **Agreement**   * The counting based on available slots is applicable to unpaired spectrum, paired spectrum and SUL * For paired spectrum and SUL except HD-FDD, all slots are considered as available slots in the first step of determining the available slots. |
| CATT | Based on the feature group discussion so far, FG 30-3 does not take FG 30-2/30-2a as a prerequisite. Our understanding is that TBoMS does not mind *availableSlotCounting* is on or not. This means TBoMS (and TBoMS repetition) counts on available slots by natural.  In FDD/SUL, all slots are available slots for FD-FDD UE. There is no inner difference between physical slot counting or available slot counting in this case. |
| Nokia/NSB | Counting on available slots for TBoMS was agreed several meetings ago. Counting on physical slots was also discussed back then. This shows that the whole group had spent sufficient time and efforts for making such agreement. In addition, counting on available slot may open again the discussion on TBS determination for TBoMS since the number of allocated slots could be significantly higher than the number of available slots for transmission. This would bring us to a few meetings back and could lead to the situation that multiple behaviours exist for a single feature, which should be avoided in RAN1. |
| Apple | For FDD/SUL, there is no big difference between the counting on physical slot and available slot. But for TDD, the counting on available slot would provide more slots for UL transmission, this is the reason why TBoMS adopt the method of counting based on available slot. If we go backward to adopt counting based on physical slot for TBoMS, the performance would be worse than available slot based counting if the allocated slots for a single TBoMS is still limited to [2, 4, 8]. |
| vivo2 | TBoMS was agreed to be always based on available slot as defined in agenda 8.8.1.1 in RAN1 #106-e meeting:  ***Agreement***  *The number of slots allocated for TBoMS is counted based on the available slots for UL transmission.*   * *The determination of available slots for PUSCH repetition type A, as defined in AI 8.8.1.1, is reused.* * *Note: Available slots for FDD or SUL could be revisited according to discussion in AI 8.8.1.1*   And according to the agreements Intel copied above, the available slot determination for FDD/SUL defined in AI 8.8.1.1 is also clear.  According to above, TBoMS based on physical slot would revert earlier agreements in our understanding and is not pursued at this maintenance state. |
| Sharp | We see performance loss for TBoMS with physical slot counting since coded bit mapping is dis-continuous unless continuous slots are available. Therefore, in TDD, performance improvement over repetition type-A is not expected since, in most cases, slots are non-continuous. On the other hand, for FDD, physical slot counting is equivalent to available slot counting. Therefore, we don’t need to introduce TBoMS with physical slot counting. |
| LG | In our understanding, it was agreed that slot resource for TBoMS is determined based on available slots in RAN1#106-e meeting.  According to the agreement in AI 8.8.1.1 in the last meeting, the available slot based counting method is applicable in FDD/SUL band also, where all slots are considered as available slots for FDD/SUL except HD-FDD.  Thus, it is not necessary to discuss TBoMS based on physical slot based counting method. |
| CMCC | We share the similar idea that at this maintenance phase we do not revert the previous agreements. As commented by other companies, the available slot could work for all the TDD, FDD and SUL bands, no need for further discussion on this physical slot issue. |

FL’s comments on January, 19

Thank you all for your comments. It is evident that only one company wishes to rediscuss this aspect and all others object this discussion. At this late stage of the WI, it does not make a lot of sense to continue debating about it. I hope Qualcomm can reconsider the position expressed in Section 2.2.4. The discussion is closed. Thank you.

#### [CLOSED] Early termination of TBoMS

One company (Xiaomi [10]) proposed that early termination mechanism for TBoMS with configured grant is supported and the early termination mechanism for TBoMS with dynamic grant is FFS.

#### [CLOSED] Out of order handling for TBoMS

One company (Intel [12]) proposed clarifying the out of order scheduling scenarios in case of TBoMS.

### [CLOSED] TBS determination

#### [CLOSED] TBS capping

One company (Huawei/HiSi [3]) brought forward a TP which proposes to capture that the actual determined TBS is determined as following:

* If and the determined TBS larger than 3824, the UE takes 3824 as the actual TBS,
* else if determined TBS larger than 8424, the UE takes 8424 as the actual TBS,
* else the determined TBS is taken as the actual TBS.

One company (NEC [20]) brought forward two alternatives for TP which propose to capture that the same constraints on TBS of TBoMS should be applied for the re-transmission of an initial transmission with TBoMS of the same TB.

### [CLOSED] FDRA

Two companies (Xiaomi [10], TCL [4]) proposed that the maximum number of PRBs allocated for TBoMS is limited by gNB scheduling.

### [CLOSED] TBoMS repetitions

#### [CLOSED] Slot mapping for TBoMS repetitions

One company (InterDigital [11]) proposed supporting non-interleaved mapping for TBoMS repetitions when DMRS bundling is enabled and interleaved mapping for TBoMS repetitions when DMRS bundling is disabled.

### [CLOSED] Frequency hopping

Two companies (CATT [7], Intel [12]) proposed that inter-slot frequency hopping with inter-slot bundling is supported for TBoMS for the case when DMRS bundling is applied.

Two companies (Xiaomi [10], TCL [4]) proposed that inter-slot frequency hopping with inter-slot bundling is supported for TBoMS.

One company (Intel [12]) proposed that frequency hopping pattern for TBoMS in case of inter-slot frequency hopping with inter-slot bundling is determined based on physical slot index.

One company (Intel [12]) proposed that, for repetition of a single TBoMS transmission, inter-repetition frequency hopping is supported.

FL’s comments on January 17

Relevant discussions on this topic may be carried out under AI 8.8.2 and/or AI 8.8.1.3.

### [CLOSED] TBoMS retransmission

One company (Panasonic [15]) proposed the following conclusion for clarification.

* For TBoMS, a TB can be sent either *numebrOfSlots* = 1 or *numberOfSlots* > 1 for (re)transmissions.
  + No specification change is expected.

One company (TCL [4]) proposed that a slot or a set of slots retransmission for TBoMS should be supported.

FL’s comments on January 17

From FL’s perspective, concerns brought by the above proposals should already be addressed by the following agreement made in RAN1#107-e meeting.

|  |
| --- |
| **Agreement (RAN1#107-e)**  For the retransmission of a single TBoMS with or without repetition in Rel-17:   * The gNB schedules only complete retransmissions of TBs. * How the retransmission of the entire TB is done is up to gNB, e.g., could be single slot PUSCH retransmission or TBoMS retransmission, etc.   Note: this has no specification impact. |

### [CLOSED] Interlaced TBoMS transmissions

One company (Qualcomm [14]) proposed that interlaced TBoMS transmissions (carrying different TBs) are not permitted. A UE does not expect a TBoMS transmission in a component carrier to begin before the completion of an ongoing TBoMS transmission in the same component carrier.

### [CLOSED] DCI format for scheduling of TBoMS

One company (Xiaomi [10]) proposed that fallback DCI format is not supported for the scheduling of TBoMS PUSCH.

# 3 Proposals for GTW

**FL’s proposal 10**

The index of the starting coded bit in the circular buffer for the -th slot in a single TBoMS is calculated as

,

where is the total number of coded bits available for transmission of the TB without UCI multiplexing in a slot allocated for TBoMS, and N is the number of slots allocated for TBoMS.

Note: this equation describes the logic of the bit-selection for TBoMS; decision on where and how to capture this in TS 38.212 is up to the Editor.

**FL’s proposal 6-v1**

The following Conclusion is made:

|  |
| --- |
| Configuration and/or indication of priority of TBoMS transmission is up to gNB. No new TBoMS-specific collision handling and dropping rules are introduced ~~as compared to legacy collision handling and dropping rule for PUSCH repetitions~~. |

**FL’s proposal 9**

The following text proposal for TS 38.213, Clause 9.2.6, should be adopted.

|  |
| --- |
| 9.2.6 PUCCH repetition procedure  **<omitted text>**  If a UE would transmit a PUCCH over a first number of slots and the UE would transmit a PUSCH with repetition Type A or a TB processing over multiple slots over a second number of slots, and the PUCCH transmission would overlap with the PUSCH transmission in one or more slots, and the conditions in clause 9.2.5 for multiplexing the UCI in the PUSCH are satisfied in the overlapping slots, the UE transmits the PUCCH and does not transmit the PUSCH in the overlapping slots.  **<omitted text>** |

**FL’s proposal 7-v1**

The following Conclusion is made:

|  |
| --- |
| Existing Type A PUSCH repetition~~s~~ rules can be reused for UCI multiplexing on PUSCH in case of TBoMS and UL CA scenario. No new ~~No~~ TBoMS-specific rule is introduced as compared to legacy rules for UCI multiplexing on Type A PUSCH repetitions. |

**FL’s proposal 8-v1**

A UE that supports TBoMS supports all values of N defined for TBoMS, and a UE that supports TBoMS repetition supports all values of M defined for TBoMS repetition.

**FL’s proposal 5-v1**

The use of TBoMS for HD-FDD UE with counting on available slot is supported.

Note: existing mechanism as in AI8.8.1.1 should be applied for this case

# 4 Agreements during RAN1 #107-bis-e

**Conclusion**

There is no consensus in RAN1 on whether the index of the starting coded bit in the circular buffer should be expressed as function of the lifting size .



**Agreement**

The Rel-16 per-slot transmission occasion definition is re-used for transmission power determination for TBoMS.
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# Appendix A: Proposals from contributions aggregated by topic

## A.1 Time domain resource determination

**TDRA Table**

|  |
| --- |
| **R1-2200656 Ericsson**  **Proposal 6.** The UE is not expected to be configured with the time duration for the transmission of a single TBoMS or TBoMS repetitions larger than the time duration derived by the periodicity P. |

**Candidate values for N**

|  |
| --- |
| **R1-2200656 Ericsson**  **Proposal 2.** {3, 5, 6, 12, 16, 32} can be considered for the candidate numbers of slots for a single TBoMS.  **Proposal 3.** If a UE supports TBoMS, it should support configuration with M\*N up to 32. |

**Candidate values for M**

|  |
| --- |
| **R1-2200656 Ericsson**  **Proposal 3.** If a UE supports TBoMS, it should support configuration with M\*N up to 32. |

**Time domain resource determination for TBoMS for CG-PUSCH**

|  |
| --- |
| **R1-2200656 Ericsson**  **Proposal 6.** The UE is not expected to be configured with the time duration for the transmission of a single TBoMS or TBoMS repetitions larger than the time duration derived by the periodicity P.  **R1-2200519 InterDigital Inc.**  **Proposal 4:** For TBoMS, the UE is not expected to be configured with for N∙K transmissions larger than the time duration derived by the periodicity P. |

**Time domain resource determination for TBoMS for CG-PUSCH Type 1**

|  |
| --- |
| **R1-2200052 Huawei/HiSi**  ***Proposal 1:*** *For TBoMS transmission with type 1 configured grant, a new field should be introduced in IE ConfiguredGrantConfig to indicate the number of allocated slots for a single TBoMS transmission.*  **R1-2200519 Intel Corporation**  **Proposal 1**   * Type-1 CG-PUSCH is supported for TBoMS. * Number of slots for TBoMS transmission is configured in *ConfiguredGrantConfig*.   **R1-2200161 Nokia/NSB**  [*Proposal 6. TBoMS with Type 1 configured grant PUSCH is not supported in Rel-17.*](#_Toc92811192)  **R1-2200087 vivo**  Proposal 1: Type-1 CG for TBoMS is not supported.  **R1-2200421 Apple**  **Proposal 1:** For type 1 configured grant, introduce IE *numberOfSlotsTBoMS-r17* in *ConfiguredGrantConfig* to indicate the number of allocated slots for TBoMS   * + - Parameter *repK-r17* is to indicate the repetition number of TBoMS     - The total number of slots allocated for TBoMS, i.e., *numberOfSlotsTBoMS-r17\** *repK-r17,* is not larger than 32   **Proposal 2** The initial transmission of a transport block for TBoMS with configured grant type 1 is the same as the agreed restriction on configured grant type 2.  **R1-2200501 Sharp**  **Proposal 4:** A value N for indicating the number of slots for a single TBoMS is configured in *rrc-ConfiguredUplinkGrant* for type-1 configured grant.  **R1-2200589 CMCC**  **Proposal 1:** If the type 1 CG-PUSCH would be supported by TBOMS, it should ensure that legacy UEs should not be impact. |

**Early termination of TBoMS**

|  |
| --- |
| **R1-2200466 Xiaomi**  **Proposal 2:** Support the early termination mechanism for TBoMS with configured grant.   * FFS: Whether to support early termination of TBoMS with dynamic grant |

**Others**

|  |
| --- |
| **R1-2200656 Ericsson**  Proposal 1. Reuse resource determination and signaling of Rel-15/16 PUSCH repetition as much as possible to avoid specifying duplicate functionality.  **R1-2200380 Intel**  **Proposal 2**   * For out of order handling for TBoMS:   + Consider Case A), B) and C) in Figure 2 as out of order scheduling.     Figure . Out of order handling between TBoMS and single-slot PUSCH  **R1-2200302 Qualcomm**  **Proposal 1:** Enable the use of TBOMS even when PUSCH repetitions are counted based on physical slots. |

## A.2 Rate-matching

**How the index of the starting bit in each slot for the single TBoMS is chosen**

|  |
| --- |
| **R1-2200112 ZTE**  **Proposal 3:** The coded bits that originally map to a dropped slot for the TBoMS transmission should be skipped for the rate matching for TBoMS.  **R1-2200152 CATT**  **Proposal 1:** Confirm that Option C is supported for bit selection of TBoMS. Relevant RAN1 CRs shall be prepared based on Option C.  **R1-2200302 Qualcomm**  **Proposal 2:** The index of the starting coded bit for the kth slot of a TBOMS transmission is given by , where  where   * , * is the modulation order, * is the number of REs available in the th slot for transmission and is given by ,   + is the scheduled bandwidth of the TBOMS transmission, expressed as a number of subcarriers,   + is the number of symbols allocated per slot of TBOMS as per the indicated/configured row of TDRA table, excluding the symbols with DMRS tones. * is set to be the starting bit index of the RV associated with the single TBOMS.   **R1-2200335 OPPO**  **Proposal 1:** Slot dropping should puncture those slots after interleaving and bit selection.  **R1-2200501 Sharp**  **Proposal 1:** TS38.212 should refer to transmission occasion index n in TS38.214 for starting coded bit determination.  **Proposal 2:** New starting coded bit determination procedure by referring to the previous allocated slot is not applied to transmission occasion n with (n mod N) = 0. |

## A.3 Data Rate calculation and UE behavior related to TBS determination

**Data rate calculation**

|  |
| --- |
| **R1-2200052 Huawei/HiSi**  ***Proposal 2****: Apply the following data rate constraint (changes in red) in Clause 6.1.4 of TS 38.214 for the transmission of TBoMS PUSCH,*   * *Within a cell group, a UE is not required to handle PUSCH(s) transmissions if the following condition is not satisfied at the point in time:*   *where still represents the scheduled bits for the m-th TB over multi-slot and is the slot number allocated for the PUSCH transmission of a single TBoMS in serving cell-j.*   * *For a j-th serving cell, the UE is not required to handle PUSCH transmissions if the following condition is not satisfied:*   *where represents the time duration of one symbol, and is the number of symbols assigned to the PUSCH within a slot.*  **R1-2200112 ZTE**  ***Proposal 4:*** *The data rate limitation for cell group should be updated to reflect TBoMS by* *scaling the TBS based on the number of slots for TB size determination.*  **R1-2200604 TCL**  ***Proposal 3:*** *The maximum TBS for TBoMS should be limited based on DataRateCC.* |

## A.4 TBS determination

|  |
| --- |
| **R1-2200052 Huawei/HiSi**  ***Proposal 4****: The actual determined TBS is determined as following:*   * *If and the determined TBS larger than 3824, the UE takes 3824 as the actual TBS,* * *else if determined TBS larger than 8424, the UE takes 8424 as the actual TBS,* * *else the determined TBS is taken as the actual TBS.*   *The corresponding proposed text changes for TS 38.214 is given in Appendix B.* |

## A.5 FDRA

|  |
| --- |
| **R1-2200466 Xiaomi**  **Proposal 4:** Limit the number of RBs allocated for TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH by gNB scheduling.  **R1-2200604 TCL**  **Proposal 4:** The maximum number of PRBs can be limited when TBoMS is enabled. |

## A.6 TBoMS repetitions

**Slot mapping for TBoMS repetitions**

|  |
| --- |
| **R1-2200519 InterDigital Inc.**  **Proposal 3:** Support type 1(non-interleaved) when DMRS bundling is enabled and type 2 (interleaved) mapping for TBoMS repetitions when DMRS bundling is disabled shown in Figure 1    Figure 1 Examples of TBoMS repetition mapping: Type 1 (non-interleaved mapping) vs. Type 2 (interleaved mapping) for N=4 (slots), M=2 (repetitions) |

**Others**

|  |
| --- |
| **R1-2200335 OPPO**  **Proposal 4:** The TBoMS repetition should apply fixed RV sequence cycling among different actual repetitions of TBoMS.  The cycling unit is based on TBoMS instead of slot. |

## A.7 Transmission power determination

|  |
| --- |
| **R1-2200656 Ericsson**  **Proposal 5.** Reuse Rel-16 per-slot transmission occasion of power determination for TBoMS. |

## A.8 Frequency hopping

|  |
| --- |
| **R1-2200519 Intel Corporation**  **Proposal 3**   * In case of DMRS bundling, inter-slot frequency hopping with inter-slot bundling is supported for TBoMS.   + Frequency hopping pattern for TBoMS is determined based on physical slot index. * For repetition of a single TBoMS transmission, inter-repetition frequency hopping is supported.   **R1-2200152 CATT**  **Proposal 4:** Inter-slot frequency hopping with inter-slot bundling is supported for TBoMS at least for the case when DMRS bundling is applied.  **R1-2200466 Xiaomi**  **Proposal 3:** Support intra-TB frequency hopping for TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH.  **R1-2200604 TCL**  **Proposal 8:** The bundling of inter-slot frequency hopping should be supported for TBoMS. |

## A.9 Retransmissions

|  |
| --- |
| **R1-2200321 Panasonic**  **Proposal 2:** To make following conclusion for clarification.   * For TBoMS, a TB can be sent either *numebrOfSlots* = 1 or *numberOfSlots* > 1 for (re)transmissions.   + No specification change is expected.   **R1-2200604 TCL**  **Proposal 2.** A slot or a set of slots retransmission for TBoMS should be supported. |

## A.10 UCI multiplexing, dropping rules, uplink cancellation

**UCI multiplexing**

|  |
| --- |
| **R1-2200161 Nokia/NSB**  *Proposal 2. Specification change is not needed for UCI multiplexing for TBoMS.*  **R1-2200112 ZTE**  **Proposal 1:** For single TBoMS transmission and no overlapping PUCCH with HARQ-ACK within a span of one PUCCH slot, if T-DAI in UL grant is not equal to 4 for Type 2 codebook or is equal to 1 for Type 1 codebook, the UE should multiplex HARQ-ACK in the PUSCH following the T-DAI in UL grant.  **Proposal 2:** One of the slot for TBoMS transmission should be specified for HARQ-ACK multiplexing if the UE does not know the PUCCH slot due to missing detection of the DL DCI and the T-DAI in the UL grant is not equal to 4 for Type 2 codebook or is equal to 1 for Type 1 codebook.  **R1-2200152 CATT**  **Proposal 3:** For UL CA case, Rel-16 UCI multiplexing rules and mechanisms for PUSCH repetition Type A are applied to TBoMS.  **R1-2200335 OPPO**  **Proposal 3:** Supporting the UCI multiplexing TBoMS for UL CA with minimal specification impact.  **R1-2200509 NEC**  **Proposal 2:** CG-UCI multiplexes on the first slot of TBoMS transmission if CG-UCI multiplexing with TBoMS is supported, otherwise (if CG-UCI multiplexing with TBoMS is not supported) remove CG-UCI multiplexing with TBoMS in TS38.212.  **R1-2200604 TCL**  **Proposal 5:** UCI multiplexing is performed by puncturing or rate-matching depending on the determination time is before or latter the starting time of PUSCH preparation.  **Proposal 6:** If UCI multiplexing is performed by puncturing， may differ from rate-matching for UCI multiplexing.  **Proposal 7:** If UCI multiplexing in TBoMS is supported, UCI repetition should be considered. |

**Dropping rules, e.g., collision handling**

|  |
| --- |
| **R1-2200519 Intel Corporation**  **Proposal 4**   * TBoMS is considered as low priority uplink transmission.   **R1-2200656 Ericsson**  **Proposal 4.** PUCCH repetition can override the transmission of a single TBoMS or repetitions of TBoMS in the overlapping slot(s).  **R1-2200604 TCL**  **Proposal 1:** Only dropping the overlapped slot(s) should be considered for TBoMS transmission when collision happen. |

**Timeline requirements**

|  |
| --- |
| **R1-2200519 InterDigital Inc.**  **Proposal 1:** Rel-16 timeline constraint to multiplex UCI on PUSCH is used to determine whether to multiplex UCI on TBoMS or not.  ***R1-2200161 Nokia/NSB***  [*Proposal 3. For multiplexing UCI on the individual overlapping slot for TBoMS, the legacy Rel-15/16 timeline requirements are reused for each UCI type.*](#_Toc92811189)  **R1-2200152 CATT**  **Proposal 2:** Reuse Rel-16 timeline for UCI multiplexing on TBoMS.  **R1-2200206 Samsung**  ***Proposal 2:*** The legacy timeline requirement is reused and applied for the actual overlapped slot in the TBoMS***.***  **R1-2200335 OPPO**  **Proposal 2:** For timeline of UCI multiplexing TBoMS, we suggest to reuse all the timeline requirement of UCI multiplexing Type A PUSCH repetition in Rel-15.  **R1-2200466 Xiaomi**  **Proposal 5:** For TBoMS, reuse the timeline requirements for the UCI multiplexing on PUSCH repetition type A in Rel-16. |

**Uplink cancellation**

|  |
| --- |
| **R1-2200519 InterDigital Inc.**  **Proposal 2:** In case of uplink cancellation, the UE resumes the TBoMS transmission in the next allocated slot. |

## A.11 Interlaced TBoMS transmissions

|  |
| --- |
| **R1-2200302 Qualcomm**  **Proposal 3:** Interlaced TBoMS transmissions (carrying different TBs) are not permitted. A UE does not expect a TBoMS transmission in a component carrier to begin before the completion of an ongoing TBoMS transmission in the same component carrier. |

## A.12 Support of TBoMS by HD-FDD UE

|  |
| --- |
| **R1-2200421 Apple**  **Proposal 3:** TBoMS is supported by the HD-FDD UE with the agreed available slot determination for HD-FDD UE. |

## A.13 DCI format for scheduling TBoMS

|  |
| --- |
| **R1-2200466 Xiaomi**  **Proposal 1:** Don’t support fallback DCI format for the scheduling of TBoMS PUSCH. |

# Appendix B: Previous agreements on TB processing over multi-slot PUSCH

Working assumption: 🡪 Agreement:

For TBS determination of TBoMS:

* *NohPRB* is configured by xOverhead and represents the overhead per slot.
* *NohPRB* is assumed to be the same for all the slots over which the TBoMS transmission is allocated.

Note: xOverhead configuration is as per Rel-15/16.

Agreement:

The following 2 options for time domain resource determination for TBoMS are considered for down-selection during RAN1 #105-e:

* Option 1: Time domain resource determination for TBoMS can be performed only via PUSCH repetition Type A like TDRA.
* Option 2: Time domain resource determination for TBoMS can be performed via PUSCH repetition Type A like TDRA or via PUSCH repetition Type B like TDRA.
  1. The use of PUSCH repetition Type B like TDRA for time domain resource determination is according to an additional UE capability for a TBoMS capable UE.
  2. FFS DMRS pattern for PUSCH repetition Type B like TDRA

**Working assumption**

A transmission occasion for TBoMS (TOT) is constituted of at least one slot or multiple consecutive physical slots for UL transmission

* FFS: whether the concept of TOT will be used for designing aspects related to signal generation, e.g., rate-matching, power control, etc.
* FFS: whether such concept will be specified or not.

Agreement:

* The structure of TBoMS will be according to only one of these two options (to be down-selected in RAN1#106-e)
  + Option 3, if a design based on single RV is adopted.
  + Option 4, if a design based on different RVs is adopted.
* FFS: other details, e.g., rate-matching, TBS determination, collision handling, etc.
* The single RV is not constrained to have only the same coded bits in each slot or in each TOT
* The concept of TOT as per the corresponding Working assumption is used to define Option 3 and Option 4 and may or may not be used to design other details, e.g., rate-matching, TBS determination, collision handling and so on.

Agreement:

Time domain resource determination for TBoMS can be performed only via PUSCH repetition Type A like TDRA.

* FFS: details
* FFS: whether or not optimizations for time domain resource determination are necessary for allocating resource in the S slots (for the unpaired spectrum case)

**Working assumption**

Allocating resources for TBoMS in the special slot in TDD is possible according to the agreed time domain resource determination for TBoMS.

Agreement:

The following three options for rate-matching for TBoMS are considered for down-selection during RAN1 #106-e, where only one option will be selected:

* Option a: Rate-matching is performed per slot;
* Option b: Rate matching is performed continuously across all the allocated slot(s) per TOT;
* Option c: Rate matching is performed continuously across all the allocated slots/TOTs for TBoMS

Note: “rate-matching is performed per X” means that the time unit for the bit selection and bit interleaving is X.

Note2: the above 3 options imply that the UL resource in the time unit may or may not be consecutive (depending on the given option)

Agreement:

Number of slots allocated for TBoMS is determined by using a row index of a TDRA list, configured via RRC.

* FFS: details.

Agreement:

The following approach is used to calculate NInfo for TBoMS:

* Approach 2: Based on the number of REs determined in the first L symbols over which the TBoMS transmission is allocated, scaled by K≥1.
  + FFS: the definition of K.

L is the number of symbols determined using the SLIV of PUSCH indicated via TDRA

FFS: impacts and further details if repetitions of TBoMS is supported.

FFS: whether the symbols over which the TBoMS transmission is allocated are the same or can be different from the symbols over which the TBoMS transmission is performed, and details on how to handle such scenarios.

Agreement:

Non-consecutive physical slots for UL transmission can be used to transmit TBoMS at least for unpaired spectrum.

* How TBoMS is transmitted over non-consecutive physical slots for UL transmission for unpaired spectrum is to be discussed further.
* Whether and how non-consecutive physical slots for UL transmission can be used to transmit TBoMS for paired spectrum and SUL band as well, is to be discussed further.

Working Assumption

The concept of transmission occasion for TBoMS (TOT) is utilized for the purpose of discussion, where a TOT is constituted of time domain resources which may or may not span multiple slots

* FFS: details, whether multiple slots which constitute a TOT are consecutive or non-consecutive physical slots for UL transmissions
* FFS: other details.
* FFS: whether such concept will be specified or not.

Agreements**:**

For the definition of a single TBoMS, down select among the following options:

* **Option 1**: Only one TOT is determined for a TBoMS. The TB is transmitted on the TOT using a single RV.
  + FFS: whether and how the single RV is rate matched across the TOT, e.g., continuous rate-matching across the TOT, rate matched for each slot and so on.
* **Option 2**: Only one TOT is determined for a TBoMS. The TB is transmitted on the TOT using different RVs.
  + FFS: how RV index is refreshed within the TOT, e.g. after each slot boundary, at every jump between two non-contiguous resources, if any, and so on.
* **Option 3**: Multiple TOTs are determined for a TBoMS. The TB is transmitted on the multiple TOTs using a single RV.
  + FFS: how the single RV is rate matched across single or multiple TOTs, e.g., rate matched for each TOT, rate matched for all the TOTs, rate matched for each slot and so on.
* **Option 4**: Multiple TOTs are determined for a TBoMS. The TB is transmitted on the multiple TOTs using different RVs.
  + FFS: whether and how RV index is refreshed within one TOT, e.g. after each slot boundary, at every jump between two non-contiguous resources, if any, and so on.
* FFS: the exact TBS determination procedure.
* FFS: whether a single TBoMS can be repeated or not.
* FFS: other implications, e.g., power control, collision handling and so on.

Agreement:

* Consider one or two of the following options as starting points to design time domain resource determination of TBoMS
  + PUSCH repetition Type A like TDRA, i.e., the number of allocated symbols is the same in each slot.
  + PUSCH repetition type B like TDRA, i.e., the number of allocated symbols in each slot are different.

Agreement:

* Consecutive physical slots for UL transmission can be used for TBoMS for unpaired spectrum.
  + To resolve in RAN1#104b-e whether to support non-consecutive physical slots for UL transmission for TBoMS for unpaired spectrum.
* Consecutive physical slots for UL transmission can be used for TBoMS for paired spectrum and the SUL band.
  + FFS if non-consecutive physical slots for UL transmission are also supported for paired spectrum and the SUL band.

Agreement:

* The same number of PRBs per symbol is allocated across slots for TBoMS transmission.

Agreement:

For TBoMS, the maximum supported TBS should not exceed legacy maximum supported TBS in Rel-15/16, for the same number of layers.

* FFS: Details and further constraints on the applicability of TBoMS.

Agreement:

One or two of the following approaches will be considered as a starting point to decide how NInfo for TBoMS is calculated (aiming for down selection in RAN1 #104-bis-e):

* Approach 1: Based on all REs determined across the symbols or slots (FFS whether symbols or slots are used) over which the TBoMS transmission is allocated.
* Approach 2: Based on the number of REs determined in the first L symbols over which the TBoMS transmission is allocated, scaled by K≥1.
  + FFS: the definition of K.

Note: L is the number of symbols determined using the SLIV of PUSCH indicated via TDRA

FFS: impacts and further details if repetitions of TBoMS is supported.

FFS: whether the symbols over which the TBoMS transmission is allocated are the same or can be different from the symbols over which the TBoMS transmission is performed, and details on how to handle such scenarios.

Agreement:

One or two of the following options will be considered (aiming for down-selection in RAN1#104b-e) to calculate NohPRB for TBoMS:

* Option 1: NohPRB is assumed to be the same for all the slots over which the TBoMS transmission is allocated and can be configured by xOverhead as in Rel-15/16.
* Option 2: NohPRB is calculated depending on both xOverhead and the number of symbols or slots (FFS whether symbol or slot are used) over which the TBoMS transmission is allocated.
  + FFS: if either the number of symbols or the number of slots is used.
  + FFS: if xOverhead is separately configured from the one in Rel-15/16.

FFS: impacts and further details if repetitions of TBoMS is supported.

FFS: whether the symbols over which the TBoMS transmission is allocated are the same or can be different from the symbols over which the TBoMS transmission is performed.

Agreement

The number of slots allocated for TBoMS is counted based on the available slots for UL transmission.

* The determination of available slots for PUSCH repetition Type A, as defined in AI 8.8.1.1, is reused.
* Note: Available slots for FDD or SUL could be revisited according to discussion in AI 8.8.1.1

Agreement

Allocating resources for TBoMS in the special slot in TDD is possible according to the agreed time domain resource determination for TBoMS.

* No further optimization to allocate resources for TBoMS in the special slot is supported.

Agreement

TBoMS is supported for both configured grant and dynamic grant.

Working Assumption

Single TBoMS structure of Option 3 is selected

* **Option 3**: Multiple TOTs are determined for a TBoMS. The TB is transmitted on the multiple TOTs using a single RV.
  + FFS: how the single RV is rate matched across single or multiple TOTs, e.g., rate matched for each TOT, rate matched for all the TOTs, rate matched for each slot and so on.

**Agreement**

To calculate for TBS determination, at least the scaling factor value K=N is supported, where N is the number of allocated slots for a single TBoMS.

FFS: whether further values 1<K<N are supported.

FFS: details related to the indication of K.

Note: No supporting the case K=1 for a single TBoMS.

**Agreement**

Repetitions of a single TBoMS are supported, where:

* The number of repetitions is denoted by M, i.e., the total number of allocated slots for TBoMS repetition is M\*N.
  + Note: M\*N is no more than the max number of repetitions agreed for repetition Type A enhancement in agenda 8.8.1.1
* Available slot determination is according to existing agreements.
* The number and location of allocated symbols within an allocated slot for TBoMS transmission are the same among all repeated single TBoMS.
* FFS other aspects of TBoMS repetitions, e.g.:
  + Details of time domain resource indication.
  + Supported values for the number of TBoMS repetitions.
  + How to indicate the number of TBoMS repetitions.
  + Interactions with frequency hopping and precoder cycling across the M groups of N allocated slots for each single TBoMS repetition.
  + Whether RV indices should be cycled across the M groups of N allocated slots for each single TBoMS repetition.
  + Details of TBoMS retransmissions.
  + Potential MAC layer impact, but should be decided by RAN2

Note: No additional dropping rule optimization will be introduced other than dropping rules for single TBoMS transmission.

**Agreement**

The UE determines whether or not to drop a slot determined as available for TBoMS transmission according to Rel-15/16 PUSCH dropping rules, where the dropped slot is still counted in the N allocated slots for the single TBoMS transmission.

FFS: Rel-17 PUSCH dropping rules are also applied if introduced in other WI(s)

|  |
| --- |
| **Conclusion**  Bit interleaving performed per ToT is precluded, and ToT will not be used in further discussion. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Conclusion**  The N allocated slots for the single TBoMS are defined as the number of slots after available slot determination for a single TBoMS transmission, before dropping rules are applied.  Note: the number of final transmitted slots for the single TBoMS may be lower than N, depending on dropping rules for TBoMS transmission. |

**Agreement**

* For transmission power determination of TBoMS transmission in Rel-17, RAN1 to down-select one of the following two options:
* Option 1: The transmission power determination of TBoMS should be based on all the REs allocated in one available slot for the TBoMS transmission, excluding the overhead of reference signals
* Option 2: The transmission power determination of TBoMS should be based on all the REs allocated in the N available slots for the TBoMS transmission, excluding the overhead of reference signals.
* FFS: details on BPRE

**Agreement**

The number of MIMO layers (rank) for TBoMS transmission in Rel-17 is limited to 1.

**Agreement**

For a single TBoMS transmission and TBoMS repetitions in Rel-17, at least the legacy Rel-15/16 inter-slot frequency hopping framework used in PUSCH repetition Type A is supported.

* FFS: other frequency hopping schemes.

**Agreement**

* The number *N* of allocated slots for TBoMS is indicated via a new column added to the TDRA table configured via *PUSCH-TimeDomainAllocationList*. The ~~existing~~column for configuring the number of repetitions in the TDRA for Rel-17 PUSCH repetition Type A, i.e., *numberOfRepetitions,*is used for indicating the number of repetitions *M* of a single TBoMS, when TBoMS transmission is enabled.
* FFS: supported values of *N* and *M.*
* FFS: how to enable the TBoMS transmission
* FFS: details of retransmission of TBoMS

**Agreement**

For the repetition of a single TBoMS transmission, redundancy versions (RVs) are cycled across the TBoMS repetitions. The legacy Rel-15/16 RV sequences and RV index indication are reused.

|  |
| --- |
| **Conclusion**  Values 1<K<N for the scaling factor to calculate N\_info for TBS determination for TBoMS transmission in Rel-17 are not supported. |

**Agreement**

At least the following values are supported in Rel-17 for the number*N* of allocated slots for the single TBoMS:

* 

FFS: whether *N*=1 is also supported depends on how TBoMS transmission feature is enabled (or disabled)

FFS: other values, if any.

FFS: further constraints on N\*M

**FL’s proposal 13**

The following values are supported in Rel-17 for the number*M*of repetitions of the single TBoMS:

* 

FFS: further constraints on N\*M, e.g., N\*M is a valid value according to agreements in AI 8.8.1.1

**Agreement**

BPRE for TBOMS is calculated as  where N is the number of slots allocated for a single TBOMS and  is the number of allocated REs in one allocated slot of a single TBOMS.

Note: How this equation or its equivalent is captured in the specification is left to the editor

**Agreement**

For a single TBoMS transmission and TBoMS repetitions in Rel-17, the legacy Rel-15/16 intra-slot frequency hopping framework used in PUSCH repetition Type A is supported.

* FFS: other frequency hopping schemes.

**Working Assumption**

For TBoMS in Rel-17, the following is supported:

* Bit interleaving is performed per slot.

       The index of the starting coded bit for each transmitted slot is predetermined prior to the start of the TBoMS transmission.

* Transmission is limited to one CB only.
* FFS: whether UCI multiplexing bits or cancellation/dropping of coded bits, if any, have to be known prior to the determination of the index of the starting coded bit for each transmitted slot or not
* FFS: Performance with UCI multiplexing on single and multiple slots of a single TBoMS

Note: How UCI multiplexing and cancellation/dropping of coded bits influence the sequence of coded bits transmitted in each slot of a single TBOMS is to be further discussed. Some knowledge on UCI to be multiplexed or cancellation/dropping of coded bits in each slot of a single TBOMS may be known prior to the start of a single TBOMS transmission. How this is to be handled is to be discussed further.

**Agreement**

For the bit selection for each transmitted slot for TBoMS, one of the following is to be down selected in RAN1 #107-e for determining the index of the starting coded bit in the circular buffer:

* Option B: the index of the starting coded bit in the circular buffer is the index continuous from the position of the last bit selected in the previous allocated slot.
* Option C: the index of the starting coded bit in the circular buffer is the index continuous from the position of the last bit selected in the previous allocated slot, regardless of whether UCI multiplexing occurred in the previous allocated slot or not.

FFS: whether the index of the starting coded bit for each transmitted slot is expressed as a multiple integer of the lifting size Zc

Note: Dropping/cancellation rules are not considered for the starting bit position determination in both Option B and Option C.

**Agreement**

For TBoMS transmission in Rel-17:

* TBoMS ~~transmission~~feature is enabled (or disabled) by configuring (or not) the number of allocated slots for a single TBoMS (N) in a row of the TDRA table.
* ~~Dynamic switching between at least TboMS transmission and the legacy single-slot PUSCH transmission, by using a row in the TDRA table, is supported.~~
  + TBoMS transmission is enabled when N>1, where N is the number of allocated slots for a single TBoMS.
  + Single-slot PUSCH transmission is enabled when N=1.
  + Supported combinations of N and M that can be configured in the TDRA table, these combinations are constrained by retransmission are to be further discussed

**Agreement**

A single RV is used to transmit a single TBoMS.

Note: It is common assumption for option B and option C for “Starting bit in each slot for the single TBoMS”

Note: below working assumption does not need confirm.

Working Assumption

Single TBoMS structure of Option 3 is selected

* **Option 3**: Multiple TOTs are determined for a TBoMS. The TB is transmitted on the multiple TOTs using a single RV.

FFS: how the single RV is rate matched across single or multiple TOTs, e.g., rate matched for each TOT, rate matched for all the TOTs, rate matched for each slot and so on.

Agreement

The working assumption is confirmed.

**Working Assumption**

For TBoMS in Rel-17, the following is supported:

* Bit interleaving is performed per slot.

       The index of the starting coded bit for each transmitted slot is predetermined prior to the start of the TBoMS transmission.

* Transmission is limited to one CB only.
* FFS: whether UCI multiplexing bits or cancellation/dropping of coded bits, if any, have to be known prior to the determination of the index of the starting coded bit for each transmitted slot or not
* FFS: Performance with UCI multiplexing on single and multiple slots of a single TBoMS

Note: How UCI multiplexing and cancellation/dropping of coded bits influence the sequence of coded bits transmitted in each slot of a single TBOMS is to be further discussed. Some knowledge on UCI to be multiplexed or cancellation/dropping of coded bits in each slot of a single TBOMS may be known prior to the start of a single TBOMS transmission. How this is to be handled is to be discussed further.

|  |
| --- |
| **Conclusion**  There is no consensus in RAN1 to introduce any restriction on the combinations of N and M that can be configured in the TDRA table, other than the already agreed N\*M <= 32 restriction. |

**Agreement**

* For TBoMS, UCI is multiplexed on the individual overlapping slot for UL transmission in one carrier
* FFS: timeline requirements
* FFS: details on the calculation of the number of coded modulation symbols per layer for UCI multiplexing on a single TBoMS.
* Note: no new UCI multiplexing mechanism other than existing puncturing or rate-matching is introduced for TBoMS in Rel-17.

**Agreement**

For TBoMS repetitions, if the parameter numberOfRepetitions is not configured in the TDRA table, then the number of repetitions M of a single TBoMS is equal to 1.

**Agreement**

For a configured grant type 2, if M=1, or if M>1 and the configured grant is configured with startingFromRV0 set to 'off', the initial transmission of the transport block may only start at the first slot of the N\*M slots determined as available for PUSCH transmission of TBoMS. Otherwise, the initial transmission of the transport block may start at

-             The first slot of the N\*M slots determined as available for PUSCH transmission of TBoMS if the configured RV sequence is {0,2,3,1},

-             The first slot of any of the M groups of N slots determined as available for PUSCH transmission of TBoMS associated with RV=0, if the configured RV sequence is {0,3,0,3} or {0,0,0,0}.

Note: It is up to Editor to decide how to capture these rules.

**Agreement**

For UCI multiplexing on an available slot for TBoMS, the following are supported in Rel-17 for calculating C:\Users\cmcc\AppData\Roaming\Foxmail7\Temp-13284-20211119111418\Attach\image018(11-19-1(11-20-16-59-32).png, C:\Users\cmcc\AppData\Roaming\Foxmail7\Temp-13284-20211119111418\Attach\image019(11-19-1(11-20-16-59-32).png, C:\Users\cmcc\AppData\Roaming\Foxmail7\Temp-13284-20211119111418\Attach\image020(11-19-1(11-20-16-59-32).png,  and C:\Users\cmcc\AppData\Roaming\Foxmail7\Temp-13284-20211119111418\Attach\image021(11-19-1(11-20-16-59-32).png:

* C:\Users\cmcc\AppData\Roaming\Foxmail7\Temp-13284-20211119111418\Attach\image022(11-19-1(11-20-16-59-32).png  is the number of symbols in an available slot for TBoMS in which UCI is multiplexed.
* The CB size is scaled by C:\Users\cmcc\AppData\Roaming\Foxmail7\Temp-13284-20211119111418\Attach\image023(11-19-1(11-20-16-59-32).png, where N is the number of slots allocated for TBoMS, i.e., C:\Users\cmcc\AppData\Roaming\Foxmail7\Temp-13284-20211119111418\Attach\image024(11-19-1(11-20-16-59-32).png becomes C:\Users\cmcc\AppData\Roaming\Foxmail7\Temp-13284-20211119111418\Attach\image025(11-19-1(11-20-16-59-32).png.

Note: It is up to the Editor to decide how to capture the scaling in the specification.

**Agreement**

The UE does not expect NW to indicate a TBoMS configuration which results in a TBS which exceeds the maximum TBS for single CB transmission.

**Agreement**

For the retransmission of a single TBoMS with or without repetition in Rel-17:

* The gNB schedules only complete retransmissions of TBs.
* How the retransmission of the entire TB is done is up to gNB, e.g., could be single slot PUSCH retransmission or TBoMS retransmission, etc.

Note: this has no specification impact.