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# **Introduction**

The Rel-17 WID for further enhancements on MIMO (FeMIMO) includes the following objective:

1. Enhancement on the support for multi-TRP deployment, targeting both FR1 and FR2:
   1. Identify and specify features to improve reliability and robustness for channels other than PDSCH (that is, PDCCH, PUSCH, and PUCCH) using multi-TRP and/or multi-panel, with Rel.16 reliability features as the baseline

This document focuses on PDCCH reliability part. The company proposals are summarized, and offline proposals drafted passed on company contributions.

# **Summary of Contributions and Offline Proposals**

## **Working Assumption on Alt3**

In the previous meeting, we had a working assumption to use Alt3 (two SS sets associated with corresponding CORESETs) for PDCCH repetition (Option 2 + Case 1). Based on the contributions in this meeting, a clear majority of companies support to confirm the working assumption. One company (FUTUREWEI) proposed to also increase the number of CORESETs. The technical benefits / drawbacks for each of the alternatives have been discussed extensively and are well-known among the group. Below are the views based on RAN1 #104-e contributions:

* Confirm WA (Alt3): FUTUREWEI, InterDigital, Huawei/HiSilicon, Lenovo/Motorola Mobility, ZTE, Fraunhofer, MediaTek, Intel, NEC, Nokia/NSB, CMCC, Qualcomm, DOCOMO, Ericsson
* Other Alts: CATT (Alt1-2), vivo (Alt1-2)
* In addition to Alt3: Huawei/HiSilicon (Alt1-3), CMCC (Alt1-3)

***FL Proposal 1: Confirm the working assumption: For PDCCH reliability enhancements with non-SFN schemes and Option 2 + Case 1, support Alt3 (two SS sets associated with corresponding CORESETs).***

Please comment if you object/disagree with confirming the WA:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| NTT Docomo | Support the proposal. |
| InterDigital | We support FL’s proposal. |
| Futurewei | Support. |
| CATT | We support FL’s proposal.  In addition to that, we think Alt 1-2 can be supported as a supplementary solution for at least the following reasons:   * For Alt 1-2, only one CORESET is needed, whereas, as pointed by FUTUREWEI, the number of CORESET might need to be increased with Alt 3. * Associated candidates for repetition or multi-chance transmission are restricted within only one SS set, and compared with Alt 3, the complexity of determining the linked candidates can be limited. For example, repetition over multiple MOs of the same SS set can be supported in Alt 1-2. |
| Convida Wireless | Support. |
| Lenovo&MotM | We support FL’s proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support FL’s proposal.  In addition, we propose to also support Alt 1-3. For the case that there is only one available CORESET for PDCCH repetition, we don’t need to mandate the UE to support more CORESET if Alt 1-3 can be used. In addition, with support of Alt 1-1 for SFN, activation of two TCI states for one CORESET has already been supported, then in such configuration, the spec impact of Alt 1-3 is just the linkage of two SS set, which is the same as Alt 3. |
| LG | Support the FL proposal. We also support Alt 1-2 or 1-3 when the number of CORESET is not enough. |
| ZTE | Support FL proposal.  We don’t think the number of CORESET is an issue since at least two CORESETs are supported. |
| Fraunhofer IIS/HHI | Support FL’s proposal |
| MediaTek | Support |
| OPPO | Support to confirm the working assumption |
| Samsung | Support FL proposal. |
| Spreadtrum | Support the proposal. |
| vivo | Support FL proposal.  Alt3 is supported mainly due to which does not change the relationship between CORESET and Search Space set. However, the disadvantage of Alt3 is also obvious.   1. In FR2, one CORESET-BFR is configured for BFR procedure and one CORESET( e.g. CORESET zero) can be configured with a wide transmission beam for group common DCI format 2-X which can serve many UEs located in same wide beam to reduce the overhead of DCI in real network deployment, there is only one available CORESET with narrow beam for normal PDSCH scheduling. Performance of such beam combination is degraded for PDCCH repetition comparing Alt1-2 or Alt1-3. 2. Furthermore, although Alt3 reuses the legacy framework between CORESET and search space, two search spaces are configured with many redundant parameters in RRC to support same payload of PDCCH transmission, where only the linkage of PDCCH candidates/monitoring occasions is indicated.   We also support **Alt1-2** with only one CORESET and one search space for PDCCH repetition. |
| Apple | We suggest to discuss this WA and issue 2.2 together. We cannot agree with directly confirming this WA without any further scope discussion. |
| Xiaomi | Support the FL proposal. We also support Alt 1-3 when the number of CORESET is not enough. |
| Fujitsu | Support FL’s proposal. |

## **Intra-slot versus Inter-Slot**

Multiple companies discussed the pros/cons of inter-slot PDCCH repetition versus intra-slot PDCCH repetition. At the same time, all companies support at least intra-slot PDCCH repetition. Based on the contributions, multiple reasons have been mentioned from both sides: On the one hand, inter-slot PDCCH repetition requires higher latency just for conveying the control information, higher UE complexity, and additional specification work such as BD limit, overbooking, linking monitoring occasions, etc. On the other hand, reducing PDCCH blocking in congested scenarios and more flexibility in scheduling have been mentioned as the benefit of inter-slot PDCCH repetitions. Views based on the contributions are summarized below:

* Intra-slot only or with higher priority: vivo, Fraunhofer (higher priority), Spreadtrum (higher priority), Apple, Qualcomm, DOCOMO (higher priority), Ericsson (higher priority)
* Both intra-slot and inter-slot: OPPO, ZTE, Lenovo/Motorola Mobility, MediaTek, Intel, Nokia/NSB, Xiaomi, Samsung

Given the amount of work, and the fact that all companies support at least intra-slot while there are some concerns on supporting both, the following proposal is suggested to make progress.

***FL Proposal 2: At least support intra-slot PDCCH repetition.***

* ***FFS: Whether inter-slot PDCCH repetition is supported additionally.***

Please comment if the above is not acceptable to you:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| NTT Docomo | Support the proposal. |
| InterDigital | We support FL’s proposal. |
| Futurewei | Support |
| CATT | We agree to support intra-slot PDCCH repetition. On the other hand, we also think inter-slot repetition is important to us, and both of them have their use cases. So, both intra-slot and inter-slot repetition should be supported. |
| Convida Wireless | Support |
| Lenovo&MotM | We have similar view as CATT. If inter-slot PDCCH repetition can be also supported, it will be desirable from view of scheduling flexibility and wide application scenario, e.g. eMBB scenario with only one PDCCH transmission occasion in a slot. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We understand the motivation of the proposal, however, it only holds when PDCCH span is not used/configured. But when PDCCH span is used, the UE will buffer and process PDCCH BD span by span. Therefore, we propose the following modification:  ***FL Proposal 2: At least support intra-slot PDCCH repetition.***   * ***FFS: Whether inter-slot PDCCH repetition is supported additionally.*** * ***FFS: when PDCCH span is configured.*** |
| LG | Support the FL proposal. |
| ZTE | We support both intra-slot and inter-slot PDCCH repetition.  From network perspective, support of inter-slot repetitions can increase flexibility and avoid PDCCH congestion. For the concern on PDCCH latency for inter-slot repetition, we don’t the concern is an issue since the main requirement of some URLLC traffics is high reliability rather than always low latency, that’s why Rel-15/16 introduce PDSCH/PUSCH inter-slot repetition schemes.  For the intra-sot PDCCH repetition, we think it should be supported no matter PDCCH span is configured or not. If PDCCH repetitions are always restricted within the same span, PDCCH congestion will be caused. |
| Fraunhofer IIS/HHI | Support FL’s proposal |
| Intel | We have shown that the direct drawback of PDCCH repetition is increase in blocking probability and inter-slot is one of the best tools to reduce blocking w/o increasing BD limits (see plots in R1-2100637). PDCCH repetition will not be a useful feature if blocking increases at the same time. More time is needed so folks can be on the same page that blocking is an issue here.  Also both span-based and slot-based should be considered. |
| MediaTek | Support. We think inter-slot repetition is also beneficial. |
| OPPO | Generally, we support FL’s proposal and also support inter-slot PDCCH repetition as it provides more flexibility. Moreover, we suggest to make it clear the repetition are not overlapped in any RE.  ***FL Proposal 2: At least support intra-slot PDCCH repetition.***   * ***The intra-slot PDCCH repetition (non-SFN scheme) are not overlapped in any RE*** * ***FFS: Whether inter-slot PDCCH repetition is supported additionally.*** |
| Samsung | We prefer both intra-slot and inter-slot PDCCH repetition. The argument of higher latency for inter-slot PDCCH repetition is unreasonable as Rel16 already supports inter-slot repetition for PDSCH/PUSCH. Also we believe inter-slot repetition provides better reliability and flexibility for PDCCH in URLLC, which should be considered as a priority compared to latency requirements. |
| Spreadtrum | Support the proposal. |
| vivo | For explicit linkage PDCCH repetition, we only support intra-slot PDCCH repetition rather than inter-slot.   1. inter-slot repetition increases spec impact, for instance, how to determine scheduling slot offset and there are different scheduling patterns to be considered with inter-slot repetition. For example, two inter-slot PDCCH repetition with linkage schedule two PDSCH repetition within respective slots, as shown below, which PDCCH candidate should be the reference?      1. Regarding the PDCCH congestion raised by few companies, we see no problem here.    1. Firstly, PDCCH repetition in TDM mode is explicitly linked with fixed configuration, there is little freedom to adjust the second PDCCH repetition occasion to avoid PDCCH congestion regardless of intra-slot or inter-slot repetition.    2. Secondly, TDM based PDCCH reliability enhancement is mainly used in FR2 when UE cannot support reception of two beams simultaneously. Few UEs are located on the same narrow beam in FR2, the collision probability of PDCCH CCE resources between a few of UEs is very low. 2. Furthermore, inter-slot repetition needs more PDCCH buffer capability for UE to combine soft bits and increase the complexity of UE.   In conclusion, we support intra-slot PDCCH repetition with explicit linkage. |
| Apple | We are fine with the version modified by HW. |
| Xiaomi | We support both intra-slot and inter-slot PDCCH repetition. It was agreed in RAN1-103e meeting as follows:  **Agreement**  For PDCCH reliability enhancements with non-SFN schemes, support at least Option 2 + Case 1.   * Maximum number of linked PDCCH candidates is two   In our understanding, it is agreed for both intra-slot and inter-slot. And it means that the maximum number of inter-slot repetition is 2. Thus we think the latency is not a problem. In addition, inter-slot PDCCH can provide more flexibility and reduce the intra-slot BD times at UE side. |
| Fujitsu | We are fine with FL’s proposal. Also, we support inter-slot PDCCH repetition from the perspective of scheduling flexibility. |

## **Linking between SS sets / MO / PDCCH candidates**

**2.3.1. SS set / MO linking and SS set configuration restrictions**

For PDCCH repetition with Alt3, the UE needs to be aware of the two SS sets that are linked / paired. How to indicate the linking to the UE was discussed by multiple companies and options such as using RRC signalling or MAC-CE were proposed. In additions, SS set configuration restrictions have been proposed by majority of companies, such as restricting the two SS sets to have the same periodicity, same DCI formats to monitor, etc. Once the SS sets are linked, how to link monitoring occasions is also an additional issue addressed by multiple contributions. Also, three companies mentioned that CORESET configuration restrictions are needed additionally. More discussions are required for CORESET configuration restrictions as some other companies (e.g. DOCOMO, Intel) do not see the need. A summary of the inputs is provided below:

* SS set restrictions and linking: OPPO (same periodicity and symbol duration), Lenovo/Motorola, CATT, Fraunhofer, MediaTek, LG, Intel, Qualcomm, DOCOMO, Xiaomi
  + Two SS sets linked by MAC-CE: Fraunhofer, MediaTek
  + Define SS set group (SSG) and SSs within a group are used for PDCCH repetition: Apple
* CORESET restrictions: Lenovo/Motorola, MediaTek, Apple
* MO linking: Huawei/HiSilicon, Lenovo/Motorola, LG, Intel (by configuration), Qualcomm
  + LG: linked MO pairs are mutual exclusive

The restrictions required may also depend on intra-slot versus inter-slot. For example, for intra-slot, we need to ensure that both SS sets exist in the same slots, and hence, both periodicity and offset (RRC param *monitoringSlotPeriodicityAndOffset*) should be the same. However, for inter-slot PDCCH repetition, the offset may not need to be the same. Given that at least intra-slot case is supported by all companies (See Section 2.2), we can first focus on intra-slot PDCCH repetition. For linking MO’s, some companies pointed out that linked SS sets / MO’s should be mutually exclusive. Also, different options such as linking MO’s by configuration or by SS set restrictions (RRC param *monitoringSymbolsWithinSlot*) and some rules were discussed.

The following proposal is suggested based on the above:

***FL Proposal 3: For PDCCH repetition, support linking two SS sets by RRC configuration:***

* ***FFS: Whether MAC-CE can be used additionally***
* ***FFS: Whether a given SS set can be linked with more than one other SS set***
* ***The two linked SS sets have the same SS set type (USS/CSS) and the same DCI formats to monitor***
* ***At least for intra-slot PDCCH repetition, the two SS sets have the same periodicity and offset (monitoringSlotPeriodicityAndOffset), and the same duration***
  + ***For linking monitoring occasions across the two SS sets that exist in the same slot:***
    - ***Alt1: Provide linking by configuration***
      * ***FFS: Whether a one-to-one mapping or mutual exclusive relationship between monitoring occasion pairs are required***
    - ***Alt2: The two SS sets have the same number of monitoring occasions within a slot and they are linked one-to-one***
  + ***FFS: Conditions for inter-slot PDCCH repetition if supported***

Please provide your input:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| NTT Docomo | We are fine with the proposal in general.  For the second FFS bullet, we suggest to clarify that for a given SS set linked with more than one other SS Sets, linkages with different SS sets are used for repetition of different PDCCHs, since the maximum number of linked PDCCH candidates for repetition is two. |
| Ericsson | Support FL Proposal 3 if we set the “same duration” as FFS and also add “same number of MO in a slot” as FFS |
| InterDigital | We support FL’s proposal. |
| Futurewei | Support |
| QC | Support. The second FFS can be additionally agreed (SS set pairs should be mutually exclusive, otherwise, the ambiguities cannot be resolved easily), and we agree with the comment from Docomo. |
| CATT | We suggest treating the restriction on time domain parameters in Proposal 3 as FFS.  Even if different periodicities are configured for different SS sets, intra-slot repetition is still possible if the linked SS sets can meet each other in some of slots.  Furthermore, for the case that more than two SS sets are linked, it’s not reasonable force all the linked SS sets to have the same time domain parameters.  In our view, more than two SS sets can be configured to be linked, while activation of SS set pairs can be achieved via MAC-CE.  For the two alternatives, we support Alt 1, i.e. linking is provided by configuration.  The recommended modification is shown as follows:  ***FL Proposal 3: For PDCCH repetition, support linking two SS sets by RRC configuration:***   * ***FFS: Whether MAC-CE can be used additionally*** * ***FFS: Whether a given SS set can be linked with more than one other SS set*** * ***The two linked SS sets have the same SS set type (USS/CSS) and the same DCI formats to monitor*** * ***At least for intra-slot PDCCH repetition***   + ***FFS: The two SS sets have the same periodicity and offset (monitoringSlotPeriodicityAndOffset), and the same duration***   + ***For linking monitoring occasions across the two SS sets that exist in the same slot:***     - ***Alt1: Provide linking by configuration***       * ***FFS: Whether a one-to-one mapping or mutual exclusive relationship between monitoring occasion pairs are required***     - ***Alt2: The two SS sets have the same number of monitoring occasions within a slot and they are linked one-to-one***   + ***FFS: Conditions for inter-slot PDCCH repetition if supported*** |
| Convida Wireless | Support the FL proposal.  It seems to complicate things to allow an SS set to be linked with more than one other SS set. |
| Lenovo&MotM | We agree with the FL’s proposals in general. If inter-slot PDCCH can be also supported, it is better to discuss a unified solution. For Alt.2, the one-to-one mapping can be determined based on the minimum time interval between candidates from two linked search space sets. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support the modification from CATT. For the fourth sub-bullet, we don’t think the further restrictions are necessary. Since for intra-slot case, PDCCH repetition can only be performed within a slot, even though different ***monitoringSlotPeriodicityAndOffset*** and ***duration*** are configured, the repetition can be assumed in the slots containing two MOs simultaneously. Therefore, there will be no ambiguity between gNB and UE.  For the second FFS, we don’t see any use case that one SS set needs to be linked with more than one other SS sets.  As we commented in FL’s proposal 2, we need to further consider whether to support the case that the two repetitions are within the same slot but within two different monitoring spans. |
| LG | On 4th bullet: we are not sure those scheduling restriction is needed. For example, if SS sets have different periodicity, then in some slot there is PDCCH MO only for SS set 1 then that PDCCH MO can be used for conventional STRP PDCCH transmission. So, we support the modification from CATT.  For the second FFS, UE may have an ambiguity on which SS set pair gNB transmits repeated PDCCH. For example, if SS set pair 1 is (SS set 1, SS set 2) and SS set pair 2 is (SS set 1, SS set 2) and if UE detects PDCCH in SS set 1, then UE does not know which SS set pair gNB transmits for repeated PDCCH.  On Alt 1: we would like to clarify difference between one-to-one mapping and mutual exclusive relationship, which looks the same.  On Alt 2: the restriction on the same number of monitoring occasions in a slot is not necessary. If number of monitoring occasion is different, then some monitoring occasion can be used for STRP PDCCH transmission. We propose the following revision on Alt 2:  ***Alt2: ~~The two SS sets have the same number of monitoring occasions within a slot and~~ they are linked one-to-one for MTRP PDCCH transmission or one to none for STRP PDCCH transmission*** |
| ZTE | We are generally fine with the proposal.  From network side, CATT’s revision is more preferred since it seems unnecessary to restrict the same periodicity. For example, one SS has 10 slots periodicity and the linked SS has 5 slots periodicity. So the repetition can happen in very 10 slots.  For the second FFS part, we have the similar view with HW and CATT, the use case should be clarified. |
| Fraunhofer IIS/HHI | Support the proposal |
| Intel | Still unclear what it means to say that 2 SS -sets are linked, does it mean that all candidates of SS-set-1 are linked to all candidates of SS-set-2 – that will increase BD requirements a lot plus may be not useful to have lower ALs linked plus SS sets may be configured with different number of candidates. Example wording can be “***For PDCCH repetition, support linking candidates from two SS sets by RRC configuration***”  Fundamentally we want to minimize configuration restrictions from the gNB, UE can apply linkage to the commonly configured portion of the SS-sets  We don’t see the use-case of linking more than 2 SS sets  We don’t see the need for having same DCI formats (the UE can apply linkage to the commonly configured format)  We don’t see the need for restrictions in time-domain, it can be simply indicated which MOs are linked |
| MediaTek | Support the proposal generally. For the first FFS, MAC CE can activate/deactivate the linkage dynamically. However, for the second FFS, we don’t think that a linkage with more than one other SS set is necessary. |
| OPPO | Support in general, but we suggest to remove the two FFS parts as the benefits are not clear and additional complexity and standardization efforts are needed. For example, if SS set A is linked to SS set B and C, then a question is that whether SS set B and C are linked with each other? Why cannot gNB configure different SS for the linkage? |
| Samsung | We are fine with the RRC based configuration for SS linking. Regarding second FFS, we do not see any use case for linking more than one SS to another at this point. For linking of MOs, we believe one-to-one mapping of monitoring occasions across linked SS has lesser specification impact without much loss of flexibility. |
| Spreadtrum | Generally support the proposal. |
| vivo | In Rel-15/16, up to 10 search spaces are supported in one active BWP/CC. Two search spaces can be selected for M-TRP PDCCH repetition and the other search spaces can be used for S-TRP PDCCH transmission. Basic framework to support M-TRP PDCCH repetition should be supported first. MAC-CE or one SS set linked with multiple other SS sets can be discussed if benefit is shown. In order to simplify the design followings are proposed:   1. at most 1 SS set pair is supported for UE-specific PDCCH repetition and the SS pair is only used for PDCCH transmission in M-TRP. 2. only support TDM based PDCCH repetition, FDM based repetition is not supported. 3. inter-slot is not supported 4. only monitoring occasions in intra-slot are linked and other parameters of different SS are same. 5. the number of repeated PDCCH in one slot should be restricted, e.g. up to 1.   We don't see the use case for MAC CE activating different SS set pairs hence, in our view is not needed |
| Apple | We think we should make sure the SSs are one to one mapped instead of one to N mapped. |
| Xiaomi | Support in general.  For the second FFS, we don’t see the scenario of linking more than 2 SS sets.  For the linking of two SS sets, we share same view with Intel, it is possible to link parts of (not all) PDCCH candidates in two SS sets.  For the linking MO, we support Alt 1. |
| Fujitsu | Support FL’s proposal in general. We are concerned on the FFS point that “whether a given SS set can be linked with more than one other SS set”. This is not preferable unless a strong need is justified. |

**2.3.2. PDCCH candidate linking**

With respect to how to link two PDCCH candidates, multiple options have been proposed by companies as can be seen below:

* Same AL and same candidate index: OPPO, Huawei/HiSilicon (for Alt3), CATT, Fraunhofer, MediaTek, LG, Intel, Spreadtrum, Convida Wireless, Qualcomm, DOCOMO, Xiaomi (For Alt 3)
* By configuration: FUTUREWEI, CATT, Intel (additionally), Nokia/NSB, Lenovo&MotM
* By wrap-around or truncation: Lenovo/Motorola

Given the majority support of linking candidates with same AL and the same candidate index, and the simplicity of it, the following proposal is suggested:

***FL Proposal 4: For PDCCH repetition, two PDCCH candidates in two SS sets are linked based on having the same AL and the same candidate index:***

* ***Two linked SS sets are configured with the same number of candidates for each AL.***

Please provide your input:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| NTT Docomo | We support the main bullet.  For the sub-bullet, we think whether two linked SS sets shall have same number of candidates can be further discussed. From our perspective, such restriction is not necessary. For a PDCCH candidate is not liked with another PDCCH candidate, it can be used for single transmission. |
| Ericsson | Support FL Proposal 4. We agree with DCM comment on non-linked candidates. i.e. FFS whether to support candidates that are not linked in order to support single TRP transmission, e.g. if CORESETs have different number of candidates |
| InterDigital | We support FL’s proposal. |
| Futurewei | We still think RRC configuration is the most versatile and most clear solution, but we can accept the proposal in principle. The proposed seems a bit restrictive, i.e., only one-to-one mapping is supported, and cannot support one-to-none mapping (i.e., the case described by DCM), one-to-multiple mapping, and so on. Maybe the same AL / same candidate index approach can be the baseline implicit approach, while the RRC configuration can be the explicit approach. |
| QC | Support. For non-paired candidates, network can always configure other SS sets. Furthermore, even without the condition in the sub-bullet, it is impossible that for a given AL, we can have non-paired candidates from both TRPs (only the one with larger number of candidates can have non-paired candidates). Removing the sub-bullet may not be the best way to achieve what DCM and Ericsson have in mind. |
| CATT | Agree with Futurewei that RRC configuration would be a simple and flexible solution.  To our understanding, in Proposal 3, if not all the MOs in linked SS sets are paired, the MOs without pairing can be used for non-repetition transmission. |
| Convida Wireless | Support the FL proposal |
| Lenovo&MotM | We have similar view as Futurewei to use RRC signalling to provide configuration flexibility for candidate number and mapping relation, especially when one search space set is monitored for single PDCCH transmission and multiple repeat PDCCH transmission.  If the same candidate number is assumed, it may be more natural with restriction of same CORESET size, e.g. parameters for PRB number, duration. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support the main bullet. For the sub-bullet, we don’t think the restriction is necessary. To address QC’s concern on the possibility of non-paired candidates for both TRPs, the number of linked candidates in an AL for a SS set can be configured, and the candidates beyond that configured number can be used for single TRP. |
| LG | We support the main bullet. For the sub-bullet, we don’t think the restriction is necessary with the same reason as Docomo mentioned. |
| ZTE | We generally support FL proposal. However, in our view, if UE does not support soft combining, the link at candidate level may not be needed. So our suggestion is  ***Proposal 4: For PDCCH repetition, two PDCCH candidates in two SS sets are linked based on having the same AL and the same candidate index:***   * ***Two linked SS sets are configured with the same number of candidates for each AL.***   ***This should be used at least when UE does soft combining of two PDCCH candidates*** |
| Fraunhofer IIS/HHI | Support the main bullet. The restriction in the sub-bullet is not necessary for the reasons mentioned by Docomo. |
| Intel | We do not support the sub-bullet as others have mentioned above already. Further we don’t see the need to link all ALs configured for a SS-set- for example AL1, AL2, AL4 may not need to be linked (used for 1-TRP Tx only) as it increases BD. At this stage we think its better to list both RRC method and this method as possible options for further discussions during the week. |
| MediaTek | Support the FL’s proposal. Agree with QC. We think sub-bullet should be kept to ease UE’s implementation. |
| OPPO | Support. Also share the same view as QC |
| Samsung | We also believe the sub-bullets is too restrictive at this point, since we need further discussion on dynamic switching between single and multiple TRP. |
| Spreadtrum | Support the FL’s proposal. |
| vivo | Support the FL proposal  Regarding concern from DCM, we are not sure why PDCCH transmission in S-TRP must share same SS for PDCCH transmission in M-TRP? A very simple solution is that gNB configures other search spaces for S-TRP PDCCH transmission. |
| Apple | Support the proposal |
| Xiaomi | We do not support the sub-bullet since it is too restrictive for these two SS sets. For a PDCCH candidate is not linked with another one, it can be used for single transmission. In addition, even the number of PDCCH candidates are same in two SS sets, it is also not necessary to pair all candidates. Non-paired PDCCH candidates can improve the network flexibility in the case of blockage in one TRP. |
| Fujitsu | Support FL’s proposal. |

## **Decoding Assumptions and Impact on BD / Overbooking**

**2.4.1. Number of BDs**

The following decoding Assumptions 1-4 have been identified in the previous meeting:

* Assumption 1: UE only decodes the combined candidate without decoding individual PDCCH candidates
* Assumption 2: UE decodes individual PDCCH candidates
* Assumption 3: UE decodes the first PDCCH candidate and the combined candidate
* Assumption 4: UE decodes each PDCCH candidate individually, and also decodes the combinedcandidate

Based on the contributions in RAN1 #104-e, the views are quite diverse in terms of which combination of decoding assumption should be assumed for further discussion:

* Assumption 3: InterDigital, OPPO,
* Assumptions 1, 2, 4: Huawei/HiSilicon
* Assumptions 1, 3, 4: NEC
* Assumption 1: ZTE, vivo, CMCC, Xiaomi (for intra-slot)
* Assumptions 1 and 2: CATT
* Assumptions 1, 2, 3: Fraunhofer
* Assumptions 2, 3, 4: Intel, LG (also fine with Assumption 1)
* Assumption 4: Fujitsu (also fine with any option that includes Assumption 4)
* Assumption 2: Spreadtrum
* Assumptions 2 and 3: DOCOMO, Ericsson
* Assumptions 1 and 4: Xiaomi (Assumption 1 for intra-slot, Assumption 4 for inter-slot)
* Assumptions 1 and 3: TCL communication
* Assumptions 1, 3, [4]: Futurewei (4 is needed only if dynamic network selection / overbooking occurs)

In terms of the performance, Huawei/HiSilicon and Qualcomm showed that Assumption 4 is more robust in certain scenarios while ZTE and Futurewei showed that difference is negligible.

In addition, multiple companies proposed that the number of BDs can be at least based on the UE capability reporting. Three types of capability have been proposed: 1) UE indicates the required number of BDs 2) UE indicates whether it supports soft-combining 3) UE directly indicates one or more decoding assumption out of decoding assumptions 1-4:

* Type-1: UE indicates required number of BDs: FUTUREWEI, OPPO, Fraunhofer, LG, Nokia/NSB, Samsung, Apple, Qualcomm
* Type-2: UE indicates whether it supports soft-combining: Fraunhofer, DOCOMO
* Type-3: UE indicates one or more of the decoding assumptions: Huawei/HiSilicon, Lenovo/Motorola

Considering the fact that for a UE supporting soft-combining, the number of BDs may also depend on UE implementation, Type-1 and Type-2 can be combined together. Furthermore, the network may benefit from additional flexibility if it knows whether UE performs soft-combining or not. Hence the following two options can be considered (note that since it is agreed that “the complexity associated with RE de-mapping / demodulation, 2 units are required”, for decoding assumption 1, the number of BDs should be larger than 1)

***FL Proposal 5: For number of BDs corresponding to two PDCCH candidates that are linked for PDCCH repetition, consider one of the following two options for UE capability***

* ***Option 1: UE reports whether it supports soft-combining or not***
  + ***If soft-combining is supported, UE further reports one or more numbers as required number of BDs for the two PDCCH candidates***
    - ***Candidate values: 2, 3.*** 
      * ***FFS: Whether a value between 1 and 2 should be added to the candidate values***
* ***Option 2: UE reports one or more decoding assumptions out of decoding assumptions 1-4***
  + ***Number of BDs for decoding assumptions 1:*** 
    - ***Alt1: 2BDs***
    - ***Alt2: A value between 1 and 2 BDs***
  + ***Number of BDs for decoding assumptions 2 or 3: 2***
  + ***Number of BDs for decoding assumption 4: 3***
* ***FFS: Network configuration based on the above UE capabilities***

Please provide your input:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| NTT Docomo | We would like to clarify that for option1, if 2 BDs are assumed for both assumption1 and 3, when UE reports 2 BDs, does it mean UE supports both assumption1 and assumption3, or UE’s supporting of assumption1 or 3 is transparent to NW.  In our view, whether UE supports assumption1 or assumption3 needs to be aware of by NW to make proper configuration.  It is related to the discussion of inter-slot repetition and PDCCH overbooking. If inter-slot repetition is supported, in case of inter-slot repetition, assumption1 will lead to higher latency. And considering PDCCH overbooking, if one of the PDCCH candidate may be dropped, UE may not be able to decode the PDCCH since UE only decodes the combined candidate with assumption1. |
| Ericsson | Don’t support the FL proposal. We don’t see the need for UE capability signaling for this feature. A basic PDCCH repetition functionality for all UEs that support such repetition is sufficient to support this feature, and there is no need to introduce and distinguish multiple levels of functionality within this feature by the introduction of UE capability signaling. Either the UE support PDCCH repetition or it does not.  We propose that two BD is used, and whether UE implements soft combining or not is up to UE implementation (it is unlikely that RAN4 will introduce an additional PDCCH repetition test for soft combining). |
| InterDigital | We support FL’s proposal. We think option 1 gives the flexibility to the NW to make the proper configuration to support either assumption while taking into account the UE’s capability. |
| Futurewei | * Added our tdoc position in the summary before the FL proposal. * We also think whether the UE performs soft combining or not can be transparent to the network. * There does not seem to be sufficient discussion on dynamic network selection, in which the gNB may dynamically transmit only one PDCCH candidate. This may be due to the signal blockage at one TRP or PDCCH overbooking at one TRP (unless both candidates are dropped in this case). When this can happen, only Assumption 4 of 3 BDs can work. Otherwise, Assumption 1 of 1 BD and Assumption 3 of 2 BDs (moderately better than Assumption 1 in some cases with smart choice of the one individual candidate) are sufficient. |
| QC | We prefer option 1.  In our Tdoc, we showed that decoding assumption 4 is more robust against certain scenarios. We considered 3 scenarios corresponding to 1) extreme blockage 2) extreme interference (by disturbing the LLR values) 3) gNB dynamically selects one of the candidates, and the other candidate can be used for sending another DCI (to the same UE or another UE):    It is clear that for assumption 4, 3 BDs are required, and we cannot always assume 2BDs as it depends on how the UE decodes. Furthermore, gNB’s knowledge of whether / how the UE combines is important as pointed out by most companies. |
| CATT | Our preference is to discuss the down-selection of decoding assumptions first, followed by the transparency issue.  If assumption 4 is not considered, we can further discuss whether soft combining at UE side can be transparent to network or not.  If assumption 4 is supported, we don’t see much difference between option 1 and 2, because the decoding assumption is actually implicitly reported in option 1 as well.  For option 1, we think a value between 1 and 2 is needed. |
| Lenovo&MotM | We slightly prefer option 2 since it is a little complex for two level signalling indication in option 1. For FFS part, we support the network configuration to align the assumption on BD number. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are fine with the current proposal, leaving two options open for further checking.  We slightly prefer option 1. It is beneficial for gNB scheduling, if more information can be provided, but this only occurs if the performance between assumptions is large enough for a different scheduling, such as AL. With shown by the simulation results in Figure 3 of R1-2100209, the difference between assumptions with soft-combining may not be so large. While the performance between assumptions with and without soft-combining can be large as shown in Figure 3 of R1-2006391. Therefore, the information whether soft-combining is supported or not by the UE may be enough. So from this perspective, option 1 is preferred. |
| LG | We are fine with the current proposal. In our view, assumption 4 (3 BD) should be supported to achieve both selection gain and combining gain, which is the reason why it outperforms other assumption in various scenario. Other assumptions can achieve either selection gain or combining gain. Also it is natural to support assumption 2 since it is legacy implementation and, if assumption 2 is supported, assumption 3 can be supported in spec transparently. Accordingly, we support assumption 2,3 and 4 and we are open with assumption 1. |
| ZTE | For option 1 for 2 BDs, as DOCOMO suggested, it is better to clarify whether assumption 3 or assumption 1 is supported by UE. For assumption 1, gNB should always transmit PDCCH repetitions since there is no individual detection. However, for assumption 3, gNB may not always transmit PDCCH repetitions.  In our view, assumption 3 will cost 2 BDs, but assumption 1 will cost 1~2 BDs.  For option 2, does it mean all four assumptions will be supported since the wording of the second sub-bullet ‘decoding assumptions 2 or 3’ is not clear for us.  Thus, our suggestion is  ***Proposal 5: For number of BDs corresponding to two PDCCH candidates that are linked for PDCCH repetition, consider one of the following two options for UE capability***   * ***Option 1: UE reports whether it supports soft-combining or not***   + ***If soft-combining is supported, UE further reports one or more numbers as required number of BDs for the two PDCCH candidates***     - ***Candidate values: 2, 3.***        * ***FFS: Whether a value between 1 and 2 should be added to the candidate values***       * ***FFS value 2 is used for assumption 1 or assumption 3 or both*** * ***Option 2: UE reports one or more decoding assumptions out of decoding assumptions 1-4***   + ***Number of BDs for decoding assumptions 1:***      - ***Alt1: 2BDs***     - ***Alt2: A value between 1 and 2 BDs***   + ***Number of BDs for decoding assumption 2: 2***   + ***Number of BDs for decoding assumption 3: 2***   + ***Number of BDs for decoding assumption 4: 3*** * ***FFS: Network configuration based on the above UE capabilities*** |
| Fraunhofer IIS/HHI | Reporting of the number of BDs and the reporting of soft-combining capability may not be performed using two separate reports. If the BD complexity to count for the assumptions supporting soft-combining is different from that of selection decoding, then the UE’s capability for soft-combining is implicitly conveyed to the gNB, i.e., in option 1, just the BD complexity value may be reported and the capability for soft-combining is not required. Therefore, we would like to revise option 1 as follows:  ***Option 1: UE capability for soft-combining is reported explicitly or implicitly***   * ***UE reports one or more numbers as required number of BDs for the two PDCCH candidates.***   1. ***Candidate values: 2, 3.*** * ***If any of the candidate values for soft-combining is the same as that of selection decoding, then a UE capability reporting for soft-combining is considered.*** * ***FFS: Whether a value between 1 and 2 should be added to the candidate values*** |
| Intel | We would prefer to discuss the decoding assumptions (from the last meeting) as CATT mentioned. Same clarification as DOCOMO suggested for assumption-1 vs assumption-3 would be helpful. Also, the motivation for supporting assumption-1 is not clear to us. |
| MediaTek | Support the FL’s proposal. Slightly prefer option 1. We don’t think a value between 1 and 2 should be added to the candidate values. |
| OPPO | We think that different decoding assumption should be reported by UE in case gNB is not aware if DCI can be decoded or not. If decoding assumption is indicated, gNB can choose proper Search Space to transmit PDCCH and the transmission of PDSCH can be ensured. Also we think that different BD number required at UE for each assumption and can be used to differentiate decoding assumption. Thus, we suggest to support UE to report the number of BD required for PDCCH repetition. |
| Samsung | Support Option 1. In addition to report whether to support soft combining or not, UE can further report the required number of BDs for the two PDCCH candidates, and NW can consider this reported value as UE’s maximum ability. Among the reported value, whether to perform soft combining or not is up to UE implementation. |
| Spreadtrum | Prefer to firstly discuss the #BD for each assumption and down-selection among assumptions, then discuss UE capability. |
| vivo | We share same view as Ericsson.  UE can adopt assumption1, assumption2, or assumption3 by itself, which is transparent to gNB and gNB always assume 2 BDs for PDCCH repetition with explicit linkage.  Regarding the simulation curves from Qualcomm and Huawei, it seems that the results showed Assumption4 can achieve better performance assuming PDCCH congestion (rather than blockage of channel as ZTE’s assumption) always appears per slot. We think the assumption of congestion in every slot is the worst case, it is not realistic in real deployment for gNB.  The issue on congestion raised by companies under proposal7 in section 2.5.2 should be considered together, if the two linked PDCCH candidates must be transmitted simultaneously, the PDCCH congestion can be avoided by gNB implementation, and there is no advantage of assumption4 in terms of performance compared to other assumptions (as in ZTE’s results) but with higher complexity. We agree with proposal from Ericsson. |
| Apple | We have concern to disclose UE receiving algorithm directly. UE can report the BD/CCE counting scheme/capability, instead of reporting how UE would decode PDCCH. |
| Xiaomi | We support Assumption 1 for intra-slot PDCCH repetition. In order to avoid the case of blockage, gNB should be able to indicate it to UE explicitly or implicitly. As for the explicitly way, one or two TCI states indication by DCI can be used. If it is blocked in one TRP, only one TCI state will be indicated. If two TCI states are indicated, Assumption 1 will be used. As for implicitly way, it is possible to differentiate PDCCH candidates for single TRP PDCCH transmission and for Multi-TRP PDCCH candidate transmission. It means that for paired PDCCH candidates, Assumption 1 should be used. In this case, gNB can dynamically switch between single TRP PDCCH transmission and Multi-TRP PDCCH candidate transmission by using different PDCCH candidates.  While for inter-slot, the number of BD times can be split into different slots, thus Assumption 4 can be used. |
| Fujitsu | Support FL’s proposal. For the down-selection, option 1 is preferred. We fail to see the need to report exact UE assumption as a UE capability. From our perspective, UE may report 3 BDs (Rel-17) otherwise 2 BDs by default (Rel-15/16). |

**2.4.2. Overbooking**

Regarding the overbooking, the company proposals are diverse as shown below:

* InterDigital: Prioritize monitoring of repeated PDCCH candidates
* ZTE: Drop one of them instead of dropping both
* Intel: SS set dropping due to linkage for Assumptions 3 and 4
* Samsung: Per candidate-level
* Apple: Per group of SS sets
* Qualcomm: When 3 BDs are counted, the third one is counted as part of one of the SS sets
* DOCOMO: PDCCH repetitions are allocated together

Given the diverse inputs, and the fact that the decision for overbooking is also a function of the outcome of FL Proposal 5 above, this issue can be discussed in more details later.

## **Resolving ambiguities**

**2.5.1. Implicit PUCCH resource determination**

Three alternatives were identified in the previous meeting for this issue:

* Alt 1: Ensure same start CCE index (based on linking options) and the same number of CCEs in the two CORESETs (based on CORESET configuration restriction)
* Alt 2: Starting CCE index and number of CCEs in the CORESET of one of the linked PDCCH candidates is applied
  + FFS:  Which one of the linked PDCCH candidates is used.
* Alt 3: It is up to the UE to determine the PUCCH resource based on the starting CCE index and number of CCEs in the CORESET of any of the two linked PDCCH candidates

Companies views are summarized below:

* Alt1: vivo, MediaTek, Apple
* Alt2: OPPO, Huawei/HiSilicon, Lenovo/Motorola, Fraunhofer, LG, Intel, Fujitsu, Spreadtrum, NEC, Nokia/NSB, CMCC, Xiaomi, Samsung, Convida Wireless, Qualcomm, DOCOMO, Ericsson
  + CORESET ID: Lenovo/Motorola, Fraunhofer, DOCOMO, Ericsson
  + SS set ID: Intel (if they end in the same symbol), Qualcomm, Ericsson
  + The one that ends later: Intel, Spreadtrum
* Alt3: CATT

There is majority view to support Alt2. It is pointed out by multiple companies that Alt1 requires unnecessary restrictions while Alt3 may require multiple PUCCH decoding at the gNB side. In terms of “FFS: Which one of the linked PDCCH candidates is used.”, companies have different views. It should be noted that SS set IDs are always different, but if we want to allow PDCCH repetition with single-TRP, CORESET IDs could be allowed to be the same (in other words, whether associated CORESETs shall be always different requires further discussions).

***FL Proposal 6: When DL DCI is transmitted via PDCCH repetition, for PUCCH resource determination for HARQ-Ack when the corresponding PUCCH resource set has a size larger than eight, starting CCE index and number of CCEs in the CORESET of one of the linked PDCCH candidates is applied***

* ***Option 1: The one with the lowest CORESET ID is applied***
* ***Option 2: The one with the lowest SS set ID is applied.***
* ***Option 3: The one that ends later is applied.***
  + ***If they end in the same symbol, choose either Option 1 or option 2.***

Please indicate your preference out of the three options above:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| NTT Docomo | We are fine with either option1 or option2. |
| Ericsson | Support Option 1 or 2. |
| InterDigital | We support either option 1 or 2. |
| Futurewei | Support.  Based on the FL summary, it seems Option 2 is the simplest solution. |
| QC | Support Option 2 since SS set IDs are always different and no additional rule is needed. |
| CATT | Agree with QC and support option 2. |
| Convida Wireless | Support |
| Lenovo&MotM | Support option 1 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support either Option 1 or Option 2. |
| LG | Support option 1 |
| ZTE | Support option 3 |
| Fraunhofer IIS/HHI | Support option 1 |
| Intel | option 2 is okay |
| MediaTek | Fine with option 1 or option 2. |
| OPPO | Support option 1 or 2. |
| Samsung | Support Option 1 since PUCCH resource determination is based on the starting CCE index and number of CCEs, it can be determined based on CORESET related information, not a SS set related information. Also, we need to clarify whether we consider single-TRP PDCCH repetition or not and not supporting is our understanding. |
| Spreadtrum | Fine with option 2 or option3, slightly prefer option 3. Option 3 is to keep alignment with proposal 8 where a reference PDCCH candidate is defined as the candidate that ends later in time among the two linked PDCCH candidates to determine the scheduling offset for PDSCH/CSI-RS, and so on, also align with proposal 9 to determine type2-HARQ codebook related. |
| vivo | Support option3. Discussion in section 2.5.3 is somehow related, can be discussed together.  If UE adopts Assumption1 to receive PDCCH with only one BD in the second PDCCH candidate, option3 seems natural.  Regarding the sub bullet in option3, it refers to FDM based PDCCH repetition, we think FDM-based is not necessary, supported PDCCH transmission scheme(s) should be discussed first. |
| Apple | With proposal 2.3.2, when would gNB configure different starting CCE index and number of CCEs? |
| Xiaomi | Support Option 1. Same reasons as Samsung. |
| Fujitsu | We are fine with FL’s proposal and prefer option 1 and 2. |

* + 1. **Rate matching**

The following companies mentioned that clarification may be needed in case both PDCCH repetitions overlap with the scheduled PDSCH in term of rate matching around both linked PDCCH candidates irrespective of which one is actually decoded: Lenovo/Motorola, vivo, Spreadtrum, Nokia/NSB, Qualcomm, DOCOMO, Ericsson, LG.

Hence, the following proposal can be considered:

***FL Proposal 7: If a PDSCH is scheduled by a DCI in PDCCH candidates that are linked for repetition, and the resources of the PDCCH candidates overlap with the resources of the PDSCH, the PDSCH is rate matched around the union of two PDCCH candidates and the corresponding DMRS.***

Please provide your input:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| NTT Docomo | Support the proposal. |
| Ericsson | Support Proposal 7 |
| InterDigital | We support FL’s proposal. |
|  |  |
| Futurewei | Support |
| QC | Support |
| CATT | It should be clarified about whether dynamic switching between single and multi-TRP transmission of PDCCH is supported or not. If dynamic switching is not supported, Proposal 7 is agreeable to us.  However, if dynamic switching is supported, the rate matching issue still needs further discussion. For example, if repetition of PDCCH is configured, but only one repetition is actually transmitted, should the PDSCH be rate matched around the union of two PDCCH candidates always? |
| Convida Wireless | Support |
| Lenovo&MotM | Support FL’s proposal. We are also fine to have more discussion in case of dynamic switching shown by CATT.  In addition to rate matching enhancement based on multiple linked PDCCH candidates, multiple CORESETs used for PDCCH repeat transmission may be considered for rate matching enhancement especially for semi-static rate matching case. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We also agree with CATT and Levono/Moto that dynamic switching between single-TRP and multi-TRP case may need further discussion. From my understanding, the rate matching of the union of both candidates is also preferable in single-TRP case, as when single-TRP transmission is used, with high probability the candidate in the other TRP is also used for other UEs otherwise multi-TRP transmission is also preferred if resources are available. However, the details may need further discussion. Therefore, we propose the following modification:  ***FL Proposal 7: If a PDSCH is scheduled by a DCI in PDCCH candidates that are linked for repetition, and the resources of the PDCCH candidates overlap with the resources of the PDSCH, the PDSCH is rate matched around the union of two PDCCH candidates and the corresponding DMRS.***   * **FFS when dynamic switching between single-TRP and multi-TRP PDCCH transmission is supported** |
| LG | Support. Even in case of dynamic switching to STRP transmission, UE does not know whether it is STRP or MTRP transmission so that UE has no choice but to do rate matching union. |
| ZTE | We are fine with HW’s revision. For single TRP PDSCH transmission, it may not be DPS, in such case only one of two PDCCHs can be rate matched. |
| Intel | We are supportive of the proposal with the assumption that the answer to CATT’s question is yes. Better to make sure that the solution applies to dynamic switching between 1-TRP and 2-TRP as well. |
| MediaTek | Support |
| OPPO | Support |
| Samsung | Support the proposal. |
| Spreadtrum | Support |
| vivo | In our view, when PDCCH candidates are linked they are used for repetition. Either they are transmitted simultaneously or both are dropped. The issue of PDCCH congestion can be handled by gNB by configuring SS set(s) for single TRP transmission. gNB can configure other search spaces in which PDCCH can be transmitted from TRP1 or TRP2 to support single TRP transmission, and UE can determine single and multi TRP PDCCH transmission based on search space. Importantly, RAN1 should strive for simpler design to support MTRP PDCCH repetition. |
| Apple | Maybe some clarification on spec impact would be needed. |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| Fujitsu | Support FL’s proposal. We prefer a unified solution no matter dynamic switch between sTRP or mTRP is supported or not. |

**2.5.3. Issues related to timing**

Additional issues for which a rule may be needed to resolve the ambiguities related to timing aspects are proposed by multiple companies as below:

* Scheduling offset for default beam for PDSCH / CSI-RS scheduling: OPPO, Lenovo/Motorola, ZTE, vivo, MediaTek, LG, Intel, Spreadtrum, NEC, Nokia/NSB, CMCC, Qualcomm, DOCOMO, Ericsson, TCL communication
* Slot offset for scheduling the same PDSCH/PUSCH/CSI-RS/SRS: OPPO, Huawei/HiSilicon (first linked candidate), Lenovo/Motorola, ZTE, MediaTek, Intel, NEC, Nokia/NSB, CMCC
* Out-of-order: Lenovo/Motorola, MediaTek (restriction: no DCI in between PDCCH repetition), Intel, Nokia/NSB, CMCC, Qualcomm, DOCOMO, Ericsson
* Timelines (N2,Z): LG, NEC, Qualcomm

Majority of companies propose to use the later PDCCH candidate as reference to resolve the ambiguity for these cases:

***FL Proposal 8: At least for the following purposes, a reference PDCCH candidate is defined as the candidate that ends later in time among the two linked PDCCH candidates:***

* ***To determine the scheduling offset to identify whether a default beam should be used for PDSCH / CSI-RS reception.***
* ***To extend the definition of out-of-order / in-order for PDCCH-PDSCH and PDCCH-PUSCH: PDCCH ending symbol is the last symbol of the reference PDCCH candidate.***
* ***For PUSCH preparation time (N2) and CSI computation time (Z): Last symbol of the PDCCH is based on the last symbol of the reference PDCCH candidate.***
* ***If inter-slot PDCCH repetition is supported, for slot offset for scheduling the same PDSCH/PUSCH/CSI-RS/SRS: The slot of the reference PDCCH candidate is used as the reference slot.***

Please provide your input:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| NTT Docomo | We support the proposal. |
| Ericsson | We support this proposal |
| InterDigital | We support FL’s proposal. |
| Futurewei | What if the reference candidate is not decoded by the UE? |
| QC | Support. |
| CATT | This issue is related to Proposal 3 and 4.  At least the UE needs to be aware of the relative position of the repetitions in time domain so as to deduce the reference PDCCH candidate in case one of the repetitions is not detected successfully.  Besides, multi-chance can also be considered to eliminate the ambiguity for all the cases listed in Proposal 8. |
| Convida Wireless | Support.  Is there a reason to use different terminology in this and the next proposal: “reference PDCCH candidate” and “reference monitoring occasion”? The latter is slightly preferred. |
| Lenovo&MotM | Support FL’s proposal in general. For the definition of out-of-order behaviour in case of scheduling by repeat PDCCH, some relaxation may be considered to increase scheduling flexibility when duration for PDCCH with repeat transmission is overlapped with duration of another PDCCH with/without repeat transmission. Also, out-of-order behaviour can be further discussed if different CORESTPoolIndex are configured for two CORESETs for PDCCH with repeat transmission. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support. |
| LG | Support. |
| ZTE | We have the similar view Lenovo in the case when different CORESETPoolIndex are configured.  For the main bullet, if two PDCCHs are transmitted without soft combining, then the link in PDCCH occasion level is enough. So the main bullet is should be changed.  ***Proposal 8: At least for the following purposes, a reference PDCCH monitoring occasion is defined as the monitoring occasion that ends later in time among the two linked PDCCH monitoring occasions:***   * ***To determine the scheduling offset to identify whether a default beam should be used for PDSCH / CSI-RS reception.*** * ***FFS*** *different CORESTPoolIndex are configured for two CORESETs for PDCCH with repeat transmission* * ***To extend the definition of out-of-order / in-order for PDCCH-PDSCH and PDCCH-PUSCH: PDCCH ending symbol is the last symbol of the reference PDCCH candidate.*** * ***For PUSCH preparation time (N2) and CSI computation time (Z): Last symbol of the PDCCH is based on the last symbol of the reference PDCCH candidate.***   ***If inter-slot PDCCH repetition is supported, for slot offset for scheduling the same PDSCH/PUSCH/CSI-RS/SRS: The slot of the reference PDCCH candidate is used as the reference slot.*** |
| Intel | Support, but add the case when the PDCCH candidates end on the same symbol: ***FFS: the case when the PDCCH candidates end on the same symbol*** |
| MediaTek | Support |
| OPPO | Support |
| Samsung | Support the proposal |
| Spreadtrum | Support |
| vivo | Support FL’s proposal in general.  The discussion above is based on Option2+case1+alt3, hence CORESET pool index discussion is not relevant, it can be discussed with the scheme of implicit PDCCH candidate linkage (e.g. Option3).  Suggest to remove the last bullet on inter-slot PDCCH repetition for now, it can be discussed later per progress on intra-slot, inter-slot repetition discussion. |
| Apple | Support FL proposal in general |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| Fujitsu | Support FL’s proposal. |

**2.5.4. Issues related to HARQ-Ack**

For DAI definition / Type-2 HARQ-Ack codebook construction, and when the two PDCCH candidates belong to different PDCCH monitoring occasions, a rule is needed to resolve the ambiguity. This is pointed out by the following companies: OPPO, Huawei/HiSilicon (first linked candidate), Lenovo/Motorola (first or last), ZTE, MediaTek, LG (first), Intel (ends earlier), Spreadtrum (first), NEC, Nokia/NSB, CMCC, Qualcomm (first), DOCOMO (first), Ericsson (first).

Most companies propose the earlier PDCCH monitoring occasion should be used as a reference in this case. This is because scheduling information for future monitoring occasions (e.g. in case of CA) may not be available at the time of transmitting the first PDCCH repetition. Hence, gNB may not know exactly how many other DCIs will be sent in the next PDCCH monitoring occasion, and as a result, the DAI value used for PDCCH repetition cannot be predicted if the later monitoring occasion is assumed as the reference.

Another issue that is somewhat related, is for determination of last DCI in order to identify PRI of which DCI should be used for PUCCH resource. This issue is pointed out by Huawei/HiSilicon.

***FL Proposal 9: If two PDCCH candidates that are linked for repetition do not belong to the same PDCCH monitoring occasion, the earlier PDCCH monitoring occasion is used as the reference for the following:***

* ***Definition of counter DAI / total DAI and Type-2 HARQ-Ack codebook construction.***
* ***Determining the last DCI for PUCCH resource determination based on the PRI field of the last DCI.***

Please provide your input:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| NTT Docomo | Support the proposal. |
| Ericsson | Supports |
| InterDigital | We support FL’s proposal. |
| Futurewei | What if the earlier candidate that is supposed to be the reference is not decoded by the UE? |
| QC | Support.  Response to Futurewei: In our understanding, the point of defining the reference candidate is irrespective of which candidate is decoded, there is no ambiguity. |
| CATT | Similar to Proposal 8, if the UE is aware of the relative position of the repetitions in time domain, Proposal 9 can be supported.  It’s also noted that, the issue in Proposal 8 can be solved with option 3, i.e. multi-chance. |
| Convida Wireless | Support |
| Lenovo&MotM | Support FL’s proposal in general. For HARQ-Ack codebook generation, we are fine with either the earlier or later PDCCH monitoring occasion as reference. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support. |
| LG | Support. |
| ZTE | Support |
| Intel | ok |
| MediaTek | Support |
| OPPO | Support the main bullet and the first sub-bullet. Do not support second bullet. We think that this is a similar problem discussed in Proposal 8 for determination of reference PDCCH candidate. The reference of last DCI can be either PDCCH monitoring occasion with the assumption that PRI fields will indicate the same value. |
| Samsung | Support the first sub-bullet, but regarding the second bullet, it should be aligned with the proposal 8. |
| Spreadtrum | Support |
| vivo | Support |
| Apple | Support in principle |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| Fujitsu | Support |

**2.5.5. Other issues**

The following issues have also been identified based on the RAN1 #104-e contributions, which may require further discussions / more supporting companies:

* **Additional issue 1**: Starting symbol for PDSCH mapping type B as well as reference symbol for SLIV: Huawei/HiSilicon (first linked candidate), Qualcomm (last linked candidate)
* **Additional issue 2**: PDSCH beam when TCI field not present in DCI (when scheduling offset is equal to or larger than *timeDurationForQCL*): LG, Qualcomm
* **Additional issue 3**: PDCCH repetitions are associated with different CORESETPoolIndex values, and the need to use one of them as reference for PDSCH scrambling / CRS rate matching / HARQ-Ack / etc.: ZTE

Please comment regarding the additional issues above, and feel free to add other similar issues (related to resolving ambiguities), if any, in the list above:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| NTT Docomo | We agree that the above issues need to be solved. |
| Ericsson | We support the FL initiative to capture a list of other issues to guide the preparation and discussion at the next meeting. |
| InterDigital | We agree that the additional issues should be discussed. |
| Futurewei | Support |
| QC | We support at least issues 1 and 2 above. In addition, we think some of the issues related to DCI formats 2\_x should be discussed additionally. However, given that UE-specific DCI formats have higher priority, we are ok to postpone such discussions. |
| CATT | Agree to discuss at least issues 1 and 2.  Regarding issue 3, we think that before the discussion on further details, it would be better to determine about whether non-ideal backhaul and M-DCI cases are considered in PDCCH enhancement or not first. |
| Convida Wireless | OK to further study and discuss these issues. |
| Lenovo&MotM | We agree more discussion can be made for above additional issues |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are fine to discuss the listed issues in future meetings considering the workload the current FL proposals. |
| LG | Ok to further study. |
| ZTE | We agree to discuss the above three issues.  Regarding issue 3, it should be noted that MDCI based MTRP can be used for both ideal and non-ideal backhaul between two TRPs. It is definitely that PDCCH repetitions can be used for any one of single-TRP, SDCI, MDCI based PDSCH MTRP.  So, we prefer to discuss one more issue first  **Additional issue 4:** clarify whether PDCCH repetition scheme can be used single-TRP, SDCI, MDCI based PDSCH MTRP. |
| Intel | we can note these for further study |
| MediaTek | Issues 1 and 2 can be further discussed. |
| Samsung | We agree to have more discussion on the above additional issues. We also believe other scenarios related to default beam assumptions need to be considered for discussion in addition to issue 2 mentioned. |
| vivo | We are fine to discuss these issues. |
| Xiaomi | OK for further study. |
| Fujitsu | We agree to further study the identified issues above. |

## **Others**

Option 2 + Case 1 is agreed for PDCCH reliability enhancements. There are still some proposals to additionally support other options:

* Option 3: Lenovo/Motorola, CATT, vivo,
* Option 1: CATT

Given the discussions in the previous meeting and the amount of work needed for the details of Option 2 + Case 1, it is suggested to focus on the above proposals first. Other options can be discussed further if a need is identified by majority of companies.

# **Detailed Proposals / Observations**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| FUTUREWEI | Confirm the Working Assumption to support Alt3 (Two SS sets associated with corresponding CORESETs), and increase the number of CORESETs to up to 5  Support a limited set of RRC configured linkages between the PDCCH candidates.  Specify the lower bound as 1 BD per DCI and the upper bound as   * + 2 BDs per DCI if dynamic network selection is not enabled; and   + 3 BDs per DCI otherwise. |
| InterDigital, Inc. | * Support at least Alt. 3 * Modify search rule to prioritize monitoring of repeated PDCCH candidates in a SS without increasing UE complexity   Support Assumption 3 for PDCCH decoding |
| OPPO | * Support association between two SS sets for PDCCH reliability enhancements with restrictions such as same period and same symbol duration * Support to use linking same PDCCH candidate index within same aggregation level in each Search Space used for PDCCH repetition. * Support assumption 3, i.e., decoding one individual and one combined PDCCH candidate at UE. * Consider to report a value used to scale the BDs by UE which indicates the decoding assumption. * Support Alt2, starting CCE index and number of CCEs in the CORESET of one of the linked PDCCH is applied to solve following issues:   + Implicit PUCCH resource determination   + DAI value   + Slot offset for scheduling the same PDSCH/PUSCH/CSI-RS/SRS   + Slot offset for default QCL assumption of PDSCH |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Confirm the working assumption, i.e., support Alt 3 for PDCCH reliability enhancements for non-SFN schemes  For the case without available CORESETs to be configured for repetition, Alt 1-3 should be supported  The following information is needed for the UE to determine the linked PDCCH candidates:   * + Monitoring occasions for the linked PDCCH candidates;   + ID of the linked PDCCH candidates   The exact linkage between PDCCH candidates in linked monitoring occasions is predefined:   * + For Alt 3, PDCCH candidates with the same AL and the same ID are linked;   + For Alt 1-3, PDCCH candidates with the same AL and different ID are linked   Assumptions 1, 3, and 4 have the same performance in the case without blockage, while in the case with blockage assumption 4 has the best performance  At least assumption 1 should be supported, and assumptions 2, 4 can also be considered  The decoding assumptions are UE capabilities,   * + If UE is capable with Assumption-4, other decoding assumptions (e.g., Assumption 1 and 2) are also assumed to be supported by the UE   For decoding Assumption 2 and 4, gNB can transmit different DCIs on the linked PDCCH candidates  For TDM based PDCCH repetition scheme, the monitoring occasion of the first linked PDCCH candidate is used for generating Type II HARQ-ACK codebook  For TDM based PDCCH repetition scheme, the monitoring occasion of the first linked PDCCH candidate is used for determining the last DCI  For TDM based PDCCH repetition scheme, the monitoring occasion of the first linked PDCCH candidate is used for determining the reference symbol/slot for SLIV indication  Alt 2 is supported for PUCCH resource determination for HARQ-ACK when the corresponding PUCCH resource set has more than eight PUCCH resources |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | * Confirm the work assumption with supporting Alt.3 for PDCCH reliability enhancements with non-SFN schemes and Option 2 + Case 1.   Support both intra-slot and inter-slot repetition schemes for PDCCH enhancement  Make restriction on CORESET parameter configuration, e.g. duration, frequencyDomainResources and on search space set parameter configuration, e.g. candidate number, monitoringSlotPeriodicityAndOffset, duration and monitoringSymbolsWithinSlot for facilitating soft combining  Further study general mapping schemes to determine combined candidates for supporting flexible parameter configuration for linked CORESETs and search space sets  Support 4 kinds of decoding behaviour assumptions and use separate counting schemes for TDM/FDM based PDCCH transmission scheme corresponding to 4 kinds of decoding behaviour assumptions, respectively.  Align the PDCCH candidate counting scheme between gNB and UE for determining blind decoding complexity  Support Alt 2. And a PUCCH resource for HARQ-ACK could be determined by the number of CCEs and the index of first CCE of PDCCH reception on the CORESET with a lowest ControlResourceSetId  If the two determined PUCCH resources are non-overlapped in time domain, a UE could transmit a same HARQ-ACK information on both PUCCH resources for higher reliability in blockage scenario  Use reference PDCCH, e.g. the first or last PDCCH, to determine DAI value or location of ACK/NACK bit(s) in HARQ-ACK codebook  Clarify separate or joint DAI counting and HACK/NACK bit concatenation for PDCCH with normal transmission and PDCCH with repeat transmission  Make PDSCH rate matching on linked resources for PDCCH repeat transmission based on linkage between CORESETs, search space sets or candidates  The transmission time of last PDCCH is used to determine QCL applying time for timeDurationForQCL and the slot offset for scheduled PDSCH/PUSCH/CSI-RS/SRS  Clarify whether out of order behaviour can be relaxed for PDSCHs/PUSCHs scheduled by enhanced PDCCHs with time domain overlapping  Clarify PDCCH ending symbol for determining order of order behaviour in case of PDSCH scheduled by PDCCH with repeat transmission  Support Option 3, i.e. separate DCIs that schedule the same PDSCH/PUSCH/RS/TB/etc or result in the same outcome  For Option 3, each DCI is transmitted independently as a R15 PDCCH candidate in valid CORESET with the corresponding TCI  Use sequence number to identify the DCIs serving the same purpose  If multiple DCIs serving the same purpose can be sent out at different time, introduce in each DCI a timing offset to the time the last DCI is sent to avoid timing ambiguity |
| ZTE | * Confirm the working assumption, i.e. option 2+case 1+alt 3 * Assumption 1 has the lowest complexity, while assumption 4 has the largest complexity at UE side * If two linked PDCCH candidates are in different slot or span, the BD counter of the later PDCCH candidate is larger than or equal to the BD counter of the former PDCCH candidate * If two linked PDCCH candidates are in the same slot, the BD counter of the PDCCH candidate with a smaller SS set index equals to the BD counter of the PDCCH candidate pair * Assumption 1, 3 and 4 show the similar performance, which are better than assumption 2 * Assumption 1 is supported * In a certain slot or span, if the BD on the paired PDCCH candidates causes overbooking, UE can drop one of the paired SSs instead of dropping both the paired SSs * One of two linked DCIs can be the reference to determine the scheduling information including default beam of PDSCH, CRS rate matching, scrambling ID, ACK/NACK feedback and scheduling slot offset * Support multi-chance PDCCH transmission without explicit linkage, i.e. Option 3 + Alt3 + Case 2   + Two DCIs from two SS associated with corresponding CORESETs can schedule the same PDSCH/PUSCH/RS/TB/etc. or result in the same outcome.   + Two DCIs can also trigger independent signalling as Rel-15/16 |
| CATT | * TDM and FDM based multiplexing schemes can both be supported * The following schemes can be supported for TDM and FDM based multiplexing,   + Intra-CORESET multiplexing   + Intra-slot inter-CORESET multiplexing   + Inter-slot multiplexing * To solve slot offset issue for scheduling the same PDSCH/PUSCH/CSI-RS/SRS, the following alternatives can be considered,   + Alt.1: Support Option 3 (multi-chance) to ensure two DCIs schedule the same PDSCH/PUSCH/CSI-RS/SRS   + Alt.2 Introduce a predefined or reference DCI or timing of DCI reception * For PUCCH resource determination when the corresponding PUCCH resource set has a size larger than eight, Alt.3 (i.e., up to the UE to determine the PUCCH resource) is preferred * Dynamic switching between STRP and MTRP can be supported explicitly, i.e., a signaling is transmitted by gNB to inform UE before the switching * The following combinations for non-SFN schemes can be supported,   + Alt. 1-1 + Option 1   + Alt. 1-2, 3 + Option 2/3 * The following linkages among multiple PDCCH candidates can be considered to reduce complexity of blind detection.   + Linkage 1: Indexes of linked PDCCH candidates or SS sets or CORESETs can be configured or predefined.   + Linkage 2: Time and frequency resources of one DCI can be indicated by other DCI.   + Linkage 3: Association of TCI states of multiple repetitions can be configured, predefined or indicated by one DCI. * In Linkage 1, time or periodicity information of the linked PDCCH candidates or SS sets or CORESETs shall be pre-defined or configured * Assumption 1 and Assumption 2 can be further considered for BD limit |
| vivo | * For non-SFN based PDCCH, only support TDM based PDCCH repetition * Compared to Alt1-2 and Alt1-3, Alt3 has higher signaling overhead, consumes larger number of CORESETs * Support intra-slot PDCCH repetition only with minimum spec impact * Alt1-2 is simpler for configuration of linking indication about PDCCH repetition * UE only decodes the combined candidate without decoding individual PDCCH candidates * Option3 and implicit linkage should be supported in order to provide scheduling flexibility at gNB in MTRP operation |
| Fraunhofer IIS, Fraunhofer HHI | * The following observations are made from the PDCCH reliability enhancement simulation results for FR1:   + PDCCH repetition and SFN-based PDCCH transmission from two TRPs improves PDCCH reliability.   + In the case of PDCCH repetition or multi-chance PDCCH from two TRPs, the hierarchy in terms of performance is as follows: hybrid decoding > soft-combining > selection decoding * The following observations can be made from the PDCCH reliability enhancement simulations for FR2   + Blockage results in error floors for all methods. Multi-TRP schemes can reduce the error floor over the single-TRP scheme.   + Soft-combining and hybrid decoding perform better than selective decoding at low and high SNRs * Confirm the following working assumption:   + For PDCCH reliability enhancements with non-SFN schemes and Option 2 + Case 1, support Alt3 (two SS sets associated with corresponding CORESETs) * The search spaces sets that contain the linked PDCCH candidates are explicitly signaled via RRC or MAC-CE. MAC-CE is preferred for dynamic or semi-persistent linkage of the PDCCH candidates * The PDCCH candidates with the same PDCCH candidate index in a given aggregation level in the two search space sets are linked with each other * Assumption 4 shall not be considered for the process of decoding a DCI transmitted on multiple PDCCH candidates. * The number of blind decoding attempts that could be counted for each method is as follows: ρ∈{0,1}   + Assumption 1 – Soft-combining only: 1+ρ   + Assumption 2 – Selection decoding: 2   + Assumption 3 – Hybrid decoding (select one candidate and decode, and soft-combining): 2+ρ * A UE capability for the number of blind decoding attempts while decoding DCI transmitted on multiple PDCCH candidates is introduced * The UE’s capability regarding soft-combining needs to be known at the gNB if gNB selection, i.e., the transmission of the DCI in only one of the associated PDCCH candidates, is allowed or possible in Option 2 + Case 1. * The search space sets containing the linked PDCCH candidates shall be of the same search space type and the DCI formats to be monitored in both the search space sets shall also be the same. * Support intra-slot repetition of PDCCH.   + FFS: Specifying inter-slot repetition |
| MediaTek Inc. | * Confirm the following working assumption. For PDCCH reliability enhancements with non-SFN schemes and Option 2 + Case 1, support Alt3 (two SS sets associated with corresponding CORESETs). * Use the second candidate as the reference point for scheduling offset for “timeDurationForQCL”, DAI determination for type-2 codebook, and slot offset for scheduling the same PDSCH/PUSCH/CSI-RS/SRS * Define that the UE doesn’t expect any other PDCCH between the first and the second candidate of PDCCH repetition for multi-TRP * Do not define new BD/CCE limit for multi-TRP PDCCH enhancement. Leave it to UE implementation. * Both intra-slot and inter-slot TDM can be supported for different use cases * Support Alt 1 to reduce the UE’s blind decoding complexity * Associate two search space sets which are mapped onto two different CORESETs for PDCCH repetition.   + Use the same configurations such as duration, nrofCandidates, monitoringSymbolsWithinSlot for two associated search space sets and cce-REG-MappingType, duration, the number of RBs for two corresponding CORESETs   + Transmit the same payload of DCI using PDCCH candidates with the same index (m\_(〖A,n〗\_CI )= m\_(〖B,n〗\_CI )) and the same aggregation level L in two associated search space sets A and B * Introduce new MAC CE to activate/deactivate the association of two search space sets for PDCCH repetition. |
| LG Electronics | * For PDCCH repetition, linkage between two MO of search space sets is defined and the linked MO pairs are mutual exclusive * For each linked MO pair, two PDCCH candidates with the same aggregation level and the same PDCCH candidate index are used to repeat the same DCI * For MTRP PDCCH repetition, UE reports its BD assumption for a PDCCH candidate pair as UE capability, and gNB indicates equal or lower complexity BD assumption than what UE reports. * For TDM based PDCCH repetition, timing values such as timeDurationForQCL, beamSwitchTiming, Z, and N2 should be defined by DCI reception time in the latest MO of a linked MO pair. * For TDM based PDCCH repetition, DAI should be counted based on the earliest MO of a linked MO pair * Clarify UE behavior for PDSCH TCI determination if TCI field is not present in repeated DCI. * For PUCCH resource determination for HARQ-Ack, apply starting CCE index and the number of CCEs in the CORESET of one of the linked PDCCH candidates. |
| Intel Corporation | * Confirm the working assumption of using Alt 3 for supporting Option 2 + Case 1. The linked SS sets SS set-1 and SS set-2 should be configured with the same SS type and at least on common DCI format for monitoring. * A baseline scheme for linkage is a fixed rule stating candidate k of SS set-1 is “linked” to candidate k of SS set-2 which creates all possible candidate-pairs. Consider further limiting the number of linked candidates for soft-combining for each AL using additional gNB → UE signalling. * In the use cases of scheduling offset for “timeDurationForQCL”, Out-of-order / in-order definition for PDCCH-to-PDSCH and PDCCH-to-PUSCH, Slot offset for scheduling the same PDSCH/PUSCH/CSI-RS/SRS, implicit PUCCH resource determination for >8 PUCCH resources in the resource set define a reference PDCCH as the one that ends later if they end in different symbols and if they end in the same symbol, the PDCCH that is associated with the lower SS set index (Alt-2). In the use case of DAI for Type-2 codebook define a reference PDCCH as the one that ends earlier if they end in different symbols and if they end in the same symbol, the PDCCH that is associated with the lower SS set index. * Do not support Assumption 1 for BD. Assumptions 2, 3 and 4 can be supported with BD=2, 2 and 3 respectively * Overbooking rules (based on current specification) at SS set level granularity can be applied to assumption 2 and extended to assumptions 3 and 4 with additional condition of SS set dropping due to linkage and can be a baseline. Further study candidate level dropping rules in order to obtain a finer granularity of dropping (particularly for span-based monitoring where the BD limits are smaller) * Support inter-slot mTRP PDCCH repetition that allows joint scheduling of PDCCH across multiple slots at the gNB to reduce blocking probability. * No additional restrictions are necessary regarding time frequency overlap of SS sets or CORESETs participating in PDCCH repetitions with the condition that soft-combining of a PDCCH candidate—pair is not expected when the corresponding CCEs are overlapped * Consider gNB → UE signalling of slots and monitoring occasions where a UE may expect PDCCH repetition transmission |
| Fujitsu | * For the blind decoding of PDCCH with repetitions, at least a UE capability is needed to be defined to support Assumption 4, which is:   + UE decodes each PDCCH candidate individually, and also decodes the combined candidate * For PUCCH resource determination for HARQ-ACK when the corresponding PUCCH resource set has a size larger than eight, Alt 2 is preferred:   + Starting CCE index and number of CCEs in the CORESET of one of the linked PDCCH candidates is applied. |
| Spreadtrum Communications | * For non-SFN based PDCCH repetition, intra-slot PDCCH repetition can be prioritized for study. * For non-SFN based PDCCH enhancement, at least consider the following for linkage between two PDCCH candidates:   + support pre-defined rule for building linkage at AL and PDCCH candidate level respectively.   + support linkage for PDCCH candidates with specific index. * For non-SFN based PDCCH repetition, consider using the second PDCCH candidate as a reference for determining scheduling offset. * For non-SFN based PDCCH enhancement, consider PDCCH monitoring occasion corresponding to the first PDCCH candidate as a reference for DAI definition. * For non-SFN based PDCCH enhancement, support PDSCH rate matching around both linked PDCCH candidates * For non-SFN based PDCCH enhancement, at least Assumption 2 can be considered for further study. * For non-SFN based PDCCH repetition, support Alt 2 for PUCCH resource determination |
| NEC | * For non-SFN based multi-TRP PDCCH, confirm the working assumption * For PUCCH resource determination, support Alt 2 * At least for scheduling offset for “timeDurationForQCL”, DAI for Type-2 codebook, Slot offset for scheduling the same PDSCH/PUSCH/CSI-RS/SRS, timing for CSI computation time and PUSCH preparation time, a reference candidate from the two PDCCH candidates can be defined, and parameters in the reference candidate will be used * For UE decoding assumption, at least the combined candidate should be decoded (either one from assumption 1, 3 or 4). And UE behavior should be clarified based on joint consideration with TRP-specific beam failure recovery in agenda item 8.1.2.3. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | * Confirm the working assumption on supporting Option 2 + Case 1 + Alt3 (two SS sets associated with corresponding CORESETs) and support this scheme for both intra-slot and inter-slot scenarios. * Higher layer configuration shall link PDCCH candidates of the two search space sets. * The UE shall determine which set of PDCCH candidates represent the “first” PDCCH and which set of PDCCH candidates represent the “second” PDCCH of the linked PDCCH candidates * For both inter-slot and intra-slot PDCCH repetition BD limits, BD count for PDCCH repetition shall be based on the UE capability reporting * To determine out-of-order / in-order definition in PDCCH repetition, the “first” PDCCH shall be used. The “second” PDCCH does not impact on the existing definitions of the out-of-order/in-order definitions. * DAI operation in PDCCH repetition, DAI counting may refer only the “first” PDCCH. * For deriving time offset for “timeDurationForQCL” and scheduling PDSCH/PUSCH/CSI-RS/SRS in PDCCH repetition, use the “second” PDCCH. * When the PDSCH symbols are overlapping with PDCCH, rate match PDSCH around “first” and/or “second” PDCCH depending on which one(s) are having overlapping symbols with PDSCH * For PUCCH resource determination for HARQ-ACK when the corresponding PUCCH resource set has a size larger than eight, starting CCE index and number of CCEs in the CORESET of “first” PDCCH candidates is applied |
| CMCC | * Support both Alt 1-3 and Alt 3 * One of the linked PDCCH candidates could be applied as the reference PDCCH candidate when multiple PDCCH candidates are transmitted with repetition scheme * Support Assumption 1(UE only decodes the combined candidate without decoding individual PDCCH candidates) for PDCCH reliability enhancements |
| Xiaomi | * To design one signaling for beam indication of two CORESETs for Multi-TRP PDCCH * Assumption 1 is supported for Multi-TRP PDCCH transmission * Support to differentiate single TRP PDCCH transmission and Multi-TRP PDCCH transmission dynamically * For inter-slot Multi-TRP PDCCH transmission, Assumption 4 for decoding is much better * Prefer Alt 2 to determine PUCCH resource by parameters of one CORESET or by parameters of each PUCCH resource determined by each CORESET * Support both intra-slot and inter-slot Multi-TRP PDCCH transmission with two as the maximum repetition number |
| Samsung | * Support both Option 2 and Option 3 for multi-TRP PDCCH repetition. Careful consideration of UE implementation complexity for Option 2 (repetition) is needed, with proper definition of UE behavior * Support modified counting rule and the maximum limit for the number of monitored PDCCH candidates and non-overlapped CCEs based on a manner of PDCCH enhancement: repetition, multi-chance * Support modified overbooking rule enabling to select the subset of PDCCH candidates and CCEs in a common or UE-specific search space sets which include repeated PDCCH candidates * Support TDM based PDCCH repetition as a starting point for Option 2 * For the new default beam behaviors, support both single TCI state and multiple TCI states configured for mTRP PDCCH scheme * For inter-slot PDCCH repetition with Option2, support PDSCH scheduling only from the last slot with PDCCH repetition and for intra-slot PDCCH repetition with Option2, support PDSCH scheduling from the same slot * For PDCCH repetition with Option2 + Alt3, support PUCCH resource determination based on one of the configuration CORESETs, where the CORESET is selected either by the gNB or the UE |
| Apple Inc. | * Support to divide the SSs into multiple SS groups (SSGs), where the SSs within a group are used for PDCCH repetitions * Support intra-slot/intra-span PDCCH repetition, where the SSs within a group and within a slot/span are used for PDCCH repetitions * For QCL-TypeD collision handling and overbooking, support to enhance the priority rule to be defined in SSG level   + The priority for each SSG is counted based on the SS with highest priority within the SSG * Support to count the number of BD/CCE in SSG level   + The BD/CCE for each SSG should be counted as X\*N, where N is the number of BD/CCE counted per SS within a SSG and N is a scaling factor reported by UE * For non-SFN scheme, for PUCCH resource determination for HARQ-Ack when the corresponding PUCCH resource set has a size larger than eight, Alt1 should be supported, where gNB should ensure same start CCE index and the same number of CCEs in the two CORESETs. |
| Convida Wireless | * Two search space sets can be linked by configuration, where the search space sets can be associated with different CORESETs and TRPs * The number of DCI repetitions across the two linked search space sets within K consecutive slots is configurable. Repetition within a monitoring occasion of a CORESET is not supported * PDCCH can be repeated across candidates with the same PDCCH candidate index * Support Alt 2: Starting CCE index and number of CCEs in the CORESET of one of the linked PDCCH candidates is applied |
| Qualcomm Incorporated | * Confirm the following working assumption * Support intra-slot PDCCH repetition * For PDCCH repetition, support   + Two SS sets are linked with each other based on higher-layer configuration.   + The two SS sets are expected to be configured with the same higher-layer parameters monitoringSlotPeriodicityAndOffse and duration.   + The two SS sets are expected to have the same number of monitoring occasions within a slot, i.e., the same number of 1’s in the two corresponding higher-layer parameter monitoringSymbolsWithinSlot.     - The i’th monitoring occasion of the first SS set is linked with the i’th monitoring occasion of the second SS set. * For PDCCH repetition, the two SS sets are expected to be configured with the same search space type, the same DCI formats to monitor, and the same number of candidates for each aggregation level.   + A PDCCH candidate in the first SS set is linked with a PDCCH candidate in the second SS set, if they have the same aggregation level and the same candidate index * PDCCH repetition with decoding Assumption 4 (separate decoding as well as soft combining) is slightly more robust in scenario 1 (blockage) and significantly more robust in scenarios 2 and 3. * UE can indicate through UE capability signalling whether it supports counting two PDCCH repetitions as two candidates or three candidates (or both) for PDCCH monitoring (toward the BD limit). * When two PDCCH repetitions are counted as three candidates for monitoring, for overbooking in the PCell, the additional/third PDCCH candidate is counted as part of SS set with higher index among the two linked SS sets. * In the case of PDCCH repetition, for PUCCH resource determination for HARQ-Ack when the corresponding PUCCH resource set has a size larger than eight, support Alt2.   + Use starting CCE index and number of CCEs in the CORESET of the PDCCH candidate that is associated with a SS set with a lower index * If a PDSCH scheduled by a DCI in PDCCH candidates that are linked for repetition, and the resources of the PDCCH candidates overlap with the resources of the PDSCH, the PDSCH is rate matched around the resources of both PDCCH candidates * When a PDSCH with mapping Type B is scheduled by a DCI in PDCCH candidates that are linked for repetition:   + The UE does not expect that the first symbol of the PDSCH to start earlier than the starting symbol of the PDCCH candidate with a later starting symbol.   + If UE is configured with ReferenceofSLIV-ForDCIFormat1\_2, and when receiving PDSCH scheduled by DCI format 1\_2 with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI, MCS-C-RNTI, CS-RNTI with K0=0, the starting symbol S is relative to the starting symbol S0 of the PDCCH candidate with a later starting symbol * When a PDSCH / CSI-RS is scheduled by a DCI in PDCCH candidates that are linked for repetition, in order to determine the QCL assumption for PDSCH / CSI-RS, scheduling offset based on the later PDCCH candidate is considered * In the case of PDCCH repetition:   + For defining out-of-order / in-order scheduling for PDCCH-PDSCH and for PDCCH-PUSCH, the ending symbol of PDCCH is the last symbol of the last PDCCH repetition.   + For PUSCH processing timeline (N2) and CSI computation timeline (Z), the last symbol of the PDCCH is the last symbol of the last PDCCH repetition * If a PDSCH is scheduled by a DCI in PDCCH candidates that are linked for repetition, the TCI field is not present in the DCI, and the scheduling offset is equal to or larger than timeDurationForQCL, PDSCH QCL assumption is based on the CORESET with lower ID among the two CORESETs associated with the two PDCCH candidates * For Type-2 HARQ-Ack codebook, the PDCCH monitoring occasion associated with a counter DAI / total DAI in a DCI detected in PDCCH candidates that are linked for repetition is the monitoring occasion of the earlier PDCCH candidate |
| NTT DOCOMO, INC | * Confirm the working assumption * Support linkage between two PDCCH candidates via fixed rule based on same PDCCH candidate index * Two SS sets for PDCCH repetition should be configured with the same periodicity * Support assumption 2 and assumption 3 for PDCCH decoding.   + Both assumption 2 and assumption 3 require two units when counting toward BD limits. * A default capability e.g. selective decoding can be defined for PDCCH repetition, and additionally UE can report whether soft combining is supported * In case two PDCCH candidates are within a same slot/span, PDCCH overbooking procedure can be enhanced that two PDCCH candidates with linkage for PDCCH repetition are allocated together.   + Further study whether to support inter-slot/inter-span PDCCH repetition * For PUCCH resource determination, starting CCE index and number of CCEs of one of the linked PDCCH candidates selected based on CORESET ID is applied * Default beam is applied for PDSCH if offset between the reception of PDCCH candidate ending latest in time of the DL DCI and the corresponding PDSCH is less than the threshold timeDurationForQCL * For out-of-order/in-order definition, the end of PDCCH is determined based on the PDCCH candidate ending latest in time. * For Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook, DAI indication is based on PDCCH candidate starting first in time and two PDCCH candidates for repetition are counted once in DAI * Both linked PDCCH candidates for repetition should be rate matched for PDSCH |
| ASUSTeK | * Support linkage of PDCCH candidates by configuring search space set index in search space configuration * For a paired of linked search space sets, RAN1 decides whether all PDCCH candidates in one search space set has respective repetition in the linked search space set |
| Ericsson | * Confirm the working assumption * When PDCCH repetition is enabled for the UE, the default is that two PDCCH candidates are linked. FFS whether more than two can be configured to be linked * Two blind decodes per PDCCH pair is counted towards BD limit for the UE when the PDCCH consists of two PDCCH candidates that are linked * Support Alt.2 and use one of the linked PDCCH candidates in a CORESET having the lowest *controlResourceSetId*  or a SS set with lowest *searchSpaceId in the linked SS sets* * The PDCCH symbol occurring latest in time in a pair of linked PDCCH candidates is defined as the last symbol regardless of which PDCCH candidate(s) the UE actually have detected * The DAI counter DAI is incremented only at the first time a PDCCH is transmitted ( i.e., at the first PDCCH occasion) in a linked pair of PDCCH candidates * The existing procedure for type 2 HARQ-ACK codebook construction is applied only for the first PDCCH occasion in case of PDCCH repetition regardless whether the PDCCH is actually detected in the first or/and the second PDCCH occasion * In case the CORESET is not configured as unavailable for PDSCH and if a PDSCH scheduled by a pair of PDCCHs overlap with resources in the CORESETs containing the PDCCHs, PDSCH rate matching is done around the union of the linked PDCCH candidates and corresponding DM-RS * DCI Format 2-2/2-3 are also supported by multi-TRP based PDCCH enhancements * Consider finalizing PDCCH enhancement with intra-slot PDCCH repetition first |
| TCL communication | * For the reference for counting slot offset for PDSCH/PUSCH/CSI-RS/SRS, the first PDCCH candidate are preferred * For BD counting assumption, assumption 1 and assumption 3 are preferred * To enhance the overbooking rule, the explicit linkage between two PDCCH candidates can be exploited in the repetition based scheme |
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# **Appendix: Previous Agreements**

**RAN1 #103-e:**

**Agreement**

For PDCCH reliability enhancements, support SFN scheme + Alt 1-1.

* FFS: TCI state activation for CORESET, impact on default beam, BFD resource for BFR

**Agreement**

For PDCCH reliability enhancements with non-SFN schemes, support at least Option 2 + Case 1.

* Maximum number of linked PDCCH candidates is two
* FFS: Details including how the two PDCCH candidates are counted toward the BD limits and impact on overbooking, if any
* Down-select at least one Alt from Alts 1-2 / 1-3 / 2 / 3
* FFS: Linking options such as a fixed rule based on the same PDCCH candidate index, based on start CCE, based on configuration, etc.
  + FFS: additional restriction to facilitate soft combining
* FFS: implicit PUCCH resource determination for >8 PUCCH resources in the resource set, scheduling offset for “timeDurationForQCL”, Out-of-order / in-order definition for PDCCH-to-PDSCH and PDCCH-to-PUSCH, DAI for Type-2 codebook, Slot offset  for scheduling the same PDSCH/PUSCH/CSI-RS/SRS, rate matching PDSCH around the scheduling DCI.
* FFS: whether and how to support for DCI format 2\_x

**Working Assumption**

For PDCCH reliability enhancements with non-SFN schemes and Option 2 + Case 1, support Alt3 (two SS sets associated with corresponding CORESETs).

**Agreement**

For PDCCH reliability enhancements with non-SFN schemes and Option 2 + Case 1, CCEs of the two PDCCH candidates are counted separately following Rel. 15/16 procedures. Further study the BD limit by considering the following

* With respect to the complexity associated with RE de-mapping / demodulation, 2 units are required
* With respect to the complexity associated with decoding, the following assumptions can be further discussed:
  + Assumption 1: UE only decodes the combined candidate without decoding individual PDCCH candidates
  + Assumption 2: UE decodes individual PDCCH candidates
  + Assumption 3: UE decodes the first PDCCH candidate and the combined candidate
  + Assumption 4: UE decodes each PDCCH candidate individually, and also decodes the combinedcandidate
* Note 1: The Assumptions 1-4 are for discussion purpose only, and they may or may not have specification impact.
  + FFS: The relationship between UE capability, RRC configuration, and the BD limit, and whether the Assumptions 1-4 are relevant for this purpose.
* Note 2: the BD /CCE limit here is counted based on the configuration of PDCCH monitoring capability (e.g. per slot or per span).

**Conclusion**

Group-common DCI formats (DCI formats 2\_x) are not precluded for multi-TRP PDCCH reliability enhancements and can be discussed with a lower priority compared to UE-specific DCI formats.

Note: Enhancements required for DCI formats 2\_x, if any, can be discussed case-by-case.

**Agreement**

When DL DCI is transmitted via PDCCH repetition (Option2 + Case 1), for PUCCH resource determination for HARQ-Ack when the corresponding PUCCH resource set has a size larger than eight:

* Alt 1: Ensure same start CCE index (based on linking options) and the same number of CCEs in the two CORESETs (based on CORESET configuration restriction)
* Alt 2: Starting CCE index and number of CCEs in the CORESET of one of the linked PDCCH candidates is applied
  + FFS:  Which one of the linked PDCCH candidates is used.
* Alt 3: It is up to the UE to determine the PUCCH resource based on the starting CCE index and number of CCEs in the CORESET of any of the two linked PDCCH candidates
* Other alternatives are not precluded.

**RAN1 #102-e:**

**Agreement**

The following is agreed for evaluation of PDCCH

* According to the evaluation scenario (e.g., at FR1 in urban macro / at FR1 in indoor hotspot / at FR2 in indoor hotspot), one of three Tables (Table A.3-1 ~ A.3-3) of 38.824 can be a baseline of EVM for Rel-17 FeMIMO item 2a.
  + System bandwidth other than those mentioned in the Tables can be considered and reported by the companies.
* In addition, the following table is used for EVM for Rel-17 FeMIMO item 2a (Common assumptions for PDCCH/PUCCH/PUSCH)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Parameters** | **Values** |
| The number of TRPs | 2 |
| Channel model | TDL for FR1 (CDL for FR1 can be optionally used)  CDL for FR2 (TDL for FR2 can be optionally used) |
| Path-loss modeling | {0,3,6} dB gap between TRPs |
| Blockage | Blockage model from Rel-16 (x dB power offset with probability p): Companies to report x and p, and other assumptions, if any. |
| Target BLER | [10^-3, 10^-4, 10^-5]: BLER values shown in plots should be based on enough number of samples, e.g., ~100/BLER samples |

* The following table is used for detailed assumptions for PDCCH

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Parameters** | **Values** |
| Baseline schemes | Option 1: Rel-15 PDCCH  Option 2: Spec transparent SFN  For FR1: Both options 1 and 2 can be considered  For FR2: Option 1. |
| AL | 8 as baseline. Companies are encouraged to simulate other AL’s additionally for different code rate regimes. |
| # of RBs/symbols | 1 or 2 symbols. Companies to report # of RBs. |
| DCI payload | 40+24(CRC)=64 as baseline. Other payload values are not precluded. |
| CCE-to-REG mapping | Both Interleaved and non-interleaved can be considered. Companies to report the assumptions including interleaverSize in the case of interleaved. |
| REG bundling size | 6 and 2 as baseline. |
| Precoding assumptions | Precoding cycling, precoder granularity=REG bundle as baseline.  Closed-loop precoding can be used optionally |
| Schemes | Details of the schemes used (including TDM,FDM, etc.) to be reported by companies. |
| Receiver assumption | Up to companies to report |

**Agreement**

To enable a PDCCH transmission with two TCI states, study pros and cons of the following alternatives:

* Alt 1: One CORESET with two active TCI states
* Alt 2: One SS set associated with two different CORESETs
* Alt 3: Two SS sets associated with corresponding CORESETs
* At least the following aspects can be considered: multiplexing schemes (TDM / FDM/ SFN / combined schemes), BD/CCE limits, overbooking, CCE-REG mapping, PDCCH candidate CCEs (i.e. hashing function), CORESET / SS set configurations, and other procedural impacts.

**Agreement**

For non-SFN based mTRP PDCCH reliability enhancements, study the following options:

* Option 1 (no repetition): One encoding / rate matching for a PDCCH with two TCI states
* Option 2 (repetition): Encoding / rate matching is based on one repetition, and the same coded bits are repeated for the other repetition. Each repetition has the same number of CCEs and coded bits, and corresponds to the same DCI payload.
  + Study both intra-slot repetition and inter-slot repetition
* Option 3 (multi-chance): Separate DCIs that schedule the same PDSCH /PUSCH /RS/TB/etc. or result in the same outcome.
  + Study both cases of DCIs in the same slot and DCIs in different slots

Note 1: Companies are encouraged to evaluate the different options based on agreed LLS assumptions for possible down-selection in RAN1#103-e.

Note 2: The actual encoding / rate matching chain for PDCCH polar coding (i.e. 38.212 Sections 5.3.1 / 5.4.1 / 7.3.3 / 7.3.4) is not changed in the options above.

**Agreement**

For mTRP PDCCH reliability enhancements, study the following multiplexing schemes

* TDM : Two sets of symbols of the transmitted PDCCH / two non-overlapping (in time) transmitted PDCCH repetitions / non-overlapping (in time) multi-chance transmitted PDCCH are associated with different TCI states
  + Aspects and specification impacts related to intra-slot vs inter-slot to be discussed
* FDM : Two sets of REG bundles / CCEs of the transmitted PDCCH / two non-overlapping (in frequency) transmitted PDCCH repetitions / non-overlapping (in frequency) multi-chance transmitted PDCCH are associated with different TCI states
* SFN : PDCCH DMRS is associated with two TCI states in all REGs/CCEs of the PDCCH
  + Note: There is dependency between this scheme and AI 2d (HST-SFN )
* Note: Combinations of the schemes are not precluded, and they can be discussed at a later stage.

**Agreement**

For Alt 1 (one CORESET with two active TCI states), study the following

* Alt 1-1: One PDCCH candidate (in a given SS set) is associated with both TCI states of the CORESET.
* Alt 1-2: Two sets of PDCCH candidates (in a given SS set) are associated with the two TCI states of the CORESET, respectively
* Alt 1-3: Two sets of PDCCH candidates are associated with two corresponding SS sets, where both SS sets are associated with the CORESET and each SS set is associated with only one TCI state of the CORESET
* Note 1: A set of PDCCH candidates contain a single or multiple PDCCH candidates, and a PDCCH candidate in a set corresponds to a repetition or chance
* Note 2: How one or more PDCCH candidates are counted for monitoring (for BD limit) is FFS
  + The note is applicable also to other alternatives

**Agreement**

For Alt 1-2/1-3/2/3, study the following

* Case 1: Two (or more) PDCCH candidates are explicitly linked together (UE knows the linking before decoding)
  + FFS: How the explicit linkage is derived/determined by the UE
* Case 2: Two (or more) PDCCH candidates are not explicitly linked together (UE does not know the linking before decoding)
  + FFS: How the UE knows the linkage after decoding