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# Introduction

As per chairman’s guidance, the email discussion is planned according to the following schedule:

[104-e-NR-R17-IIoT\_URLLC-01] Email discussion on UE feedback enhancements for HARQ-ACK – Klaus (Nokia)

* 1st check point: Jan 28
* 2nd check point: Feb 2
* 3rd check point: Feb 4

**This document is structured as follows:**

* Sections 2 to 7 include the topics to be specified or at least further studied based on previous agreements, including sub-sections for the related email discussion rounds
* Section 8 describes further suggested enhancements by different companies not directly related to the agreed study focus based on previous RAN1 agreements
* There are two appendices, one summarizing the companies’ proposals for easier referencing and one containing the agreements reached so far.

# SPS HARQ-ACK dropping for TDD

In this section, the proposed Rel-17 enhancements to prevent SPS HARQ-ACK dropping for TDD operation are summarized. During RAN1#103-e, there had been a down-selection to two alternatives to be further consider:

*Agreements: To address the issue of SPS HARQ-ACK dropping for TDD systems, focus on the following two options:*

* *Option 1: Deferring HARQ-ACK until a next (e.g., first) available PUCCH*
  + *FFS: Details including the definition of a next (e.g, first) available PUCCH, CB construction / multiplexing*
* *Option 2: Dynamic triggering of a one-shot / Type-3 CB type of re-transmission*
  + *FFS: Details on triggering and/or CB construction (incl. potential Type-3 CB optimizations) / multiplexing*

**Moderator comment: Option 2 / Type 3 CB enhancements for SPS are handled together with Type 3 type of re-transmission enhancements as part of the ‘Retransmission of cancelled HARQ’ in Sec. 5.**

**Option 1: Deferring HARQ-ACK until a first available PUCCH – 26x Yes, 1x FFS**

* **Yes (26):** ZTE [1], OPPO [2], Huawei / HiSi [3], BUPT [3], China Southern Power Grid [3], Ericsson [4], CAICT [5], CATT [6], vivo [7], Intel [9], Nokia [10], Spreadtrum [11], Sony [12], LGE [13], China Telecom [14], TCL [15], NEC [16], APT [17], Moto/Len [18], Panasonic [19], CMCC [20], Xiaomi [22], Samsung [23], Sharp [27], DOCOMO [28], WILUS [29]
* **FFS (1):** ETRI [21]

**Proposed details on Option 1:**

* What PUCCH carrying SPS HARQ-ACK / which SPS HARQ-ACK bits are subject to deferral
  + Deferral only, in case there is not any available symbol in a slot / sub-slot for PUCCH transmission: Ericsson [4]
  + The deferral is only possible for a codebook only including SPS HARQ: Ericsson [4]
  + Deferral only, if the initial resource based on *SPS-PUCCH-AN-List-r16* is not valid: CATT [6], China Telecom [14] (SS-DL symbols or SSB), CMCC [20] (SS-DL/SSB symbols), DOCOMO [28] (for any PUCCH dropping case not just SS-DL/SSB), WILUS [29] (SS-DL & flexible symbols)
  + For a given UL slot, the untransmitted HARQ-ACKs of the SPS PDSCHs before the DL slot corresponding to the indicated K1 are deferred to the given UL slot: OPPO [2]
  + A maximum of N HARQ-ACK bits is deferred (N is FFS): Sony [12], TCL [15], NEC [16], ETRI [21]
  + To limit the size, configure a subset of SPS PDSCH config for deferral: Moto/Len [18]
* Definition of next available PUCCH
  + Taking only semi-static DL & SSB symbols as invalid into account: ZTE [1], Ericsson [4], CATT [6], vivo [7], Spreadtrum [11], TCL [15], CMCC [20]
    - Determination determined by the initial PUCCH: ZTE [1]
  + In addition, different options discussed by multiple companies including semi-static flexible symbols (i.e. valid symbols only UL symbols not colliding with SSB) as well as taking SFI into account.
  + gNB configures the handling of semi-static flexible symbols: CAICT [5]
  + Set of UL slots (and related k1) is configured: OPPO [2]
  + Additional configuration of invalid UL symbols / slot/sub-slots: Ericsson [4]
  + Deferral k1 should be part of the configured K1 set: Huawei / HiSi [3], BUPT [3], China Southern Power Grid [3], CATT [6], vivo [7], TCL [15]
  + Deferral limited by the maximum k1 value: Ericsson [4], vivo [7], TCL [15], DOCOMO [28]
  + Dereral limited by a configurable number of slots per SPS configuration: APT [17]
  + Deferal limited by a configurable maximum HARQ-ACK delay (e.g. per SPS config): Moto/Len [18]
  + Taking a maximum payload size (e.g. configured) for different slot offsets into account: Xiaomi [22]
  + Increase k1 by 1 or by P (P=SPS periodicity): WILUS [29]
* PUCCH resource determination:
  + Using *SPS-PUCCH-AN-List-r16* resources only: Ericsson [4], CAICT [5], CATT [6] (FFS if the PUCCH from SPS from delayed or both, initial and delayed are candidates), Nokia [10], LGE [13] (of the same SPS configuration), APT [17], Panasonic [19], CMCC [20], WILUS [29]
  + Using PUCCH resources from *sps-PUCCH-AN-List-r16* and *PUCCH-ResourceSet*: ZTE [1], Huawei / HiSi [3], BUPT [3], China Southern Power Grid [3], vivo [7], Sony [12], China Telecom [14], TCL [15], NEC [16], CMCC [20], Samsung [23], DOCOMO [28]
  + Using *multi-CSI-PUCCH-ResourceList*: CAICT [5]
  + Configure additional PUCCH resources for defering (incl. potentially separate k1): Intel [9], Nokia [10], CMCC [20], DOCOMO [28] (REs of the PUCCH resource)
  + Following Rel-16 mechanism: OPPO [2]
* Other proposed conditions on the PUCCH resource selection:
  + Depending on the size of the HARQ-ACK codebook: ZTE [1], Ericsson [4]
  + Number of PUCCH symbols is not less than the ones from the original PUCCH: ZTE [1]
  + Selected PUCCH resource is the one with the earliest ending symbol: ZTE [1], CAICT [5], Spreadtrum [11], TCL [15] (.. the first)
* Multiplexing of deferred SPS HARQ-ACK with another HARQ-ACK codebook:
  + gNB configures if multiplexing is possible with dynamic HARQ-ACK: CAICT [5]
  + Append deferred SPS HARQ-ACK bits to another, ‘newer’ HARQ-ACK codebook: ZTE [1] (only if not contained in Type 1 CB already), NEC [16], Moto/Len [18], DOCOMO [28]
  + Include SPS HARQ-ACK bits to Type 1 CB if possible and append the rest: ZTE [1], vivo [7], Nokia [10]
  + For SPS HARQ only, the Rel-16 mechanism can be reused: vivo [7], Nokia [10], DOCOMO [28]
  + For Type 2 CB, the SPS HARQ-ACK bits can be appended reusing the Rel-16 mechanism of SPS HARQ-ACK ordering: vivo [7], Nokia [10]
  + CMCC [20]: Assuming T = periodicity of UL/DL config or periodicity of periodically configured PUCCH resource
    - For Type 1 CB: union of two K1 sets – the set K1 and the set ‘K1+T-1’ (K1 set offset by the deferred time T minus 1)
    - For Type 2 CB: append all SPS bits from slot n-k+T+1 to n-k, where k is the k1 value for the SPS configuration (based on the activation DCI)
* Other aspects:
  + Only a single deferral is possible: Ericsson [4] – further deferral possible: DOCOMO [28]
  + Out-of-order considerations due to deferred SPS HARQ-ACK needed: vivo [7], LGE [13]
  + Limitation in the deferral limited by the starting symbol of upcoming PDSCH occasion corresponding to same HARQ process ID: LGE [13]

## 2.1 First round of email discussions

*Moderator comment:*

Based on the input contributions to this meeting, **26 companies discuss in their contributions how to support Option 1 of enabling deferral of SPS HARQ in their contribution (with 1 company indicating FFS overall)**. But the input is somehow rather diverse including things such as:

* What are the conditions for SPS HARQ-ACK to be applicable for deferral?
* How to select the slot (i.e, k1) for deferred SPS HARQ-ACK transmission (incl. related restrictions) and interaction with the TDD configuration.
* Details on the PUCCH resource reselection (and related restrictions)
* Multiplexing of deferred SPS HARQ-ACK and non-deferred SPS & DG PDSCH HARQ-ACK
* …

During the GTW session on Mon. Jan 25th 2021, the following agreement on the overall support of Option 1 was made:

*Agreements:*

* *Support deferring* *SPS HARQ-ACK dropped due to TDD specific collisions until a next available PUCCH in Rel-17 based on semi-static configuration of slot format*
  + *FFS: Details (including possible conditions for such a deferring, whether or not to consider semi-statically configured flexible symbols for PUCCH availability, etc.)*
  + *Aim for minimal standardization efforts and UE complexity in implementation*

Clearly it will not be possible to discuss all of these issues (and find solutions for all of them) during RAN1#104-e. Therefore, the following **focus at least for the first phases of the email discussion is proposed**:

1. Discuss (with the intend to clarify / agree) when an SPS HARQ-ACK is applicable for deferral
   * This seems to be essential as first step and will bring clarity also to other discussions such as TDD configuration interaction when discussing what the next available PUCCH is.
2. Discuss restrictions in terms of slot/sub-slot offset on deferral (as had been mentioned by several companies during the GTW call)
3. Discuss (with the intend to clarify / agree) on the multiplexing of deferred SPS HARQ-ACK on PUCCH with other UCI (such as non-deferred SPS HARQ, HARQ of scheduled PDSCH, SP-CSI on PUCCH, SR, …)
   * This will also have an effect on the definition of the ‘next available PUCCH’ – as different cases may need to be considered.

**Further details on SPS HARQ-ACK applicable for deferral:**

First, one question is how the deferral is configured, i.e. is it applicable for HARQ or any SPS configuration, only for certain SPS configurations or is it limited to e.g. high PHY priority etc.

To have more clarity on this issue the following question is brought forward:

**Question 2.1.1: How is the deferring of SPS HACK configured / the HARQ-ACK of which SPS configurations is subject to potential deferral?**

* **Alt. 1: Joint RRC configuration of the deferral per PUCCH cell group (i.e. any SPS HARQ-ACK in principle is subject to deferral)** 
  + **Supporting companies:** China Telecom…
* **Alt. 2: RRC configuration of deferral per PUCCH configuration (i.e. can be configured for low and/or high PHY priority PUCCH separately, all SPS configurations with low and/or high PHY HARQ-ACK priority are in principle subject to deferral)** 
  + **Supporting companies: DCM,** …
* **Alt. 3: The deferral is configured per SPS configuration (i.e. part of sps-config, only HARQ-ACK of SPS PDSCH configurations is in principle subject to deferral)**
  + **Supporting companies:** vivo**, Sony, Nokia/NSB, DCM, Intel, Panasonic, NEC, Sharp**
* **Alt. 4: Other (**please provide your input below)
  + **Supporting companies:** …
  + **Indicated in the SPS Activation DCI: Sony**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *Comments or Alt. 4 – other options* |
| vivo | Alt.3. Different SPS configurations can be used for different service type, some SPS configurations may have short periodicity so it is difficult to avoid the collision between the corresponding HARQ-ACK feedback and semi-static DL/SSB. Some SPS configurations may have longer periodicity, then the configuration for its HARQ-ACK feedback can avoid the semi-static DL/SSB symbols.  Note that Alt.3 can achieve Alt.1 and Alt.2. |
| OPPO | Alt.1 is simple and Alt.3 provides flexibility. So, both Alt.1 and Alt.3 can be further studied. |
| Xiaomi | We prefer alt 3, in which the deferral is configured per SPS configuration. Different SPS configurations can has different period corresponding to different service with different latency requirements. It is suitable to configure the SPS HARQ based on per SPS configuration. Regarding to some HARQ bundling for traffic jitter and TSN cases, multiple SPS configuration can share the same deferral configuration.  The granularity of SPS configuration in alt 1 is too large and has no enough flexibility. |
| Sony | Alt.3. or Alt.4, since they provide the most flexibility. Alt.4 got the benefit that it can be changed dynamically. |
| Nokia,NSB | Per SPS config prefered |
| DCM | Alt 2 or Alt 3.  From our perspective, we don’t see other motivation to enable deferring for part of SPS configurations with the same priority than possible different HARQ-ACK reporting latency considerations for different SPS configurations.  Maybe the question is related with “Question 2.2.2”. Alt 3 can achieve Alt 2 by simultaneously enabling deferring for all activated SPS configurations with the same HARQ-ACK priority. Alt 2 can achieve Alt 3 by separately configuring maximum deferral limitation, e.g. the maximum effective deferral K1 is equal to indicated K1. |
| Samsung | Alt. 1  For alt. 2/alt. 3, it is not clear why deferring is configured per PUCCH/SPS configuration as anyhow it is evident that HARQ-ACK is dropped for all cases. In this sense, alt. 1 is simple and straightforward method. |
| Intel | Prefer Alt. 3. The reliability (and thus enabled deferring) may be needed only for a subset of services (and thus SPS configurations). |
| CATT | We think Alt. 1 is sufficient and the motivation for additional flexibility is not clear to us. |
| Panasonic | We prefer Alt.3 in which the deferral is configured per SPS configuration. |
| NEC | Alt.3 is preferred for flexibility. |
| Sharp | Alt.3 is preferred. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Alt 3 is preferred.  A certain SPS configuration of a higher HARQ-ACK priority index may be intended to serve traffics with very tight latency requirement. In this case, HARQ-ACK feedback can be simply dropped, while HARQ-ACK feedback can be deferred for other SPS configurations of the higher HARQ-ACK priority index. Alt3 allows differentiation among SPS configurations of the higher HARQ-ACK priority index. |
| WILUS | Alt. 3. Not necessary to defer HARQ-ACK for all SPS configurations. Deferring HARQ-ACK for a SPS configuration due to TDD collision can be configured by gNB based on service type of the SPS configuration. |
| Spreadtrum | We prefer Alt. 1 and Alt.3, Alt. 1 is simple and can be seen as a special case of Alt.1, while Alt.3 is flexible. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We slightly prefer Alt.1 since it is simple. However, we are fine with Alt.3 also if flexibility is really needed and seems Alt.3 can already cover Alt.2 in terms of priority. |
| ZTE | Alt.1,Joint RRC configuration of the deferral per PUCCH cell group is not applicable to the disable SPS configurations. |
| Ericsson | Between Alt1 and Alt2, Alt2 seems to be mor flexible. Once configured for a PUCCH-config, SPS HARQ-ACK in response to any SPS configuration which is associated with the PUCCH config is subject to deferral if applicable. Note that for SPS configuration which has a large periodicity, gNB can configure appropriate K1 and deferral will in principle not be relevant.  Alt 3 can result in increased complexity for HARQ-ACK codebook construction, i.e., deferral needs to be considered separately for each configuration. If the deferral is per-SPs configuration, it may create out-of-order issues as well where in CB construction, some HARQ-ACK correspond to some PDSCHs would defer and some, not. With the aim for minimal standardization efforts and UE complexity in implementation, we think this should be avoided. |
| TCL | Alt .1 is preferred. For Alt 1, it is more simple and costs less signalling overhead. For Alt2 and Alt 3, to configure the deferral per PUCCH or SPS configuration, the benefits of the additional flexibility is not obvious to us. |
| China Telecom | Alt 1 is simple and we think it is sufficient.  Any SPS HARQ-ACK in the PUCCH cell group could be deferred to avoid being dropped and PDSCH retransmission. The motivation to disable the deferral for some SPS HARQ-ACKs is not clear. Even the RRC configures the deferral for a SPS HARQ-ACK, whether it is actually deferred depends on if the conditions for such a deferring is met. |
| ETRI | Alt. 3 is preferred. |
| QC | Question (request for clarification): The reply below assumes that different alternatives in the question refer to “the next available PUCCH resource after SPS PUCCH deferral”. (?)  Support for Alt. 3  Deferral support per SPS configuration provides more flexibility. There might be SPS configurations for which SPS PUCCH HARQ is not required. Examples are:   1. URLLC IIOT scenarios with IIOT cycle not allowing retransmissions. 2. HARQ feedback for DL SPS PDSCH already expired (or about to expire).   No support for Alt. 1. Alt 1 should not be supported since it is binding for a number of PUCCHs which might correspond to different DL traffic types.  No support for Alt. 2.  The option for deferring PUCCH should be based on the DL priority and not on the PUCCH priority, in case DL priority is different than the correspond PUCCH priority. |
| LG | We prefer Alt. 3. It is possible for gNB to use different SPS for different service. Thus one configuration may be prioritized and protected necessarily, than other configuration. Alt. 1 and Alt. 2 cannot distinguish different SPS configuration.  For HARQ-ACK codebook construction, HARQ-ACK codebook for SPS is generated per SPS configuration thus Alt. 1 is more aligned with current specification at least for HARQ-ACK codebook for SPS. |
| CAICT | Support Alt. 3 for flexibility. |
| APT | Alt.3 is preferred. Whether deferring of SPS HARQ-ACK is needed depends on the service that uses the SPS configuration. |
| Apple | Support Alt. 1 |

Assuming there is a PUCCH dropped for TDD, what are the conditions that the SPS HARQ-ACK of the PUCCH is subject to deferral, would need to be discussed as well. Some companies discussed, that the only a PUCCH is subject to the deferral, if the initial PUCCH resource based on *SPS-PUCCH-AN-List-r16* is not valid (or as one company explained it, if the codebook is only to include SPS HARQ).

To see if this is something that could be a starting point, the following question is brought forward. **If you have another option in mind here, maybe add the alternative below and explain a bit more** in the table below. Please add your company name directly to the list of supporting companies in the questions below.

**Question 2.1.2: What is the condition of SPS HARQ-ACK dropped for TDD to be subject to deferal?**

* **Alt. 1: Deferral only, if the initial resource based on *SPS-PUCCH-AN-List-r16* is not valid**
  + **FFS on the definition of ‘not valid’ (incl. TDD configuration and semi-static flexible symbol handling)**
  + **Supporting companies: vivo, Nokia/NSB, DCM, Intel, Panasonic, NEC, Sharp, CAICT**
* **Alt. 2: …**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *Comments or other options/alternatives* |
| vivo | Alt.1. Note that when SPS HARQ-ACK will be further multiplexed with dynamic HARQ-ACK, no collision will be expected based on dynamic scheduling. So only the SPS HARQ-ACK can be considered when determining if a deferral should be performed. |
| OPPO | We should clarify the definition of “available PUCCH resource” firstly, which is always necessary to solve dropped SPS HARQ-ACK issue regardless deferring condition.  However deferring condition is not necessary for some definition of “available PUCCH resource”. For example, appropriate K1 is configured for each UL slot for SPS HARQ-ACK feedback. |
| Xiaomi | We are fine with alt 1. |
| Sony | Deferred if the HARQ-ACK (rather than the PUCCH resource) corresponding with the SPS cannot be sent. The SPS HARQ-ACK could be multiplexed into an overlapping PUCCH corresponding to a DG-PDSCH or into a DG-PUSCH. |
| Nokia, NSB | Multiplexing on a different PUCCH resource should not trigger deferral. |
| DCM | Support Alt 1. Agree with vivo that no collision is expected if SPS HARQ-ACK is multiplexed with dynamic HARQ-ACK. |
| Samsung | Alt. 2: **Deferral only, if there is no valid PUCCH resource in the initial slot.**   * + **FFS on the definition of ‘valid PUCCH resource’ (incl. TDD configuration and semi-static flexible symbol handling)**   As explained in our contribution [23], using the PUCCH resource configured in *PUCCH-ResourceSet* is beneficial for latency of HARQ-ACK in TDD. Because there is only one PUCCH resource in *SPS-PUCCH-AN-List-r16* for a given payload. In TDD scenario, using only the PUCCH resource in *SPS-PUCCH-AN-List-r16* may increase the latency as shown in the figure below.    Basic rule to facilitate this method is that UE firstly check whether PUCCH resource related to sps-PUCCH-AN-List-r16 is available or not, then if not satisfied, UE will check other PUCCH resources according to configured PUCCH resource index based on PUCCH-ResourceSet based on SPS HARQ-ACK payload size/index |
| Intel | Support Alt. 1. |
| CATT | We are not sure what Alt. 1 exactly means.  In general, we think whether SPS HARQ-ACK should be delayed is determined based on the PUCCH resource for SPS HARQ-ACK only regardless of whether there are HARQ-ACK(s) corresponding to dynamic PDSCH and/or SPS PDSCH release to be transmitted in the same slot/sub-slot to avoid the potential misalignment between gNB and UE in case UE misses DCI. Furthermore, there are following two options   * Option 1: The PUCCH resource used for delayed SPS HARQ-ACK only is used to determine the next available PUCCH resource   Option 2: The PUCCH resource used for both initial and all delayed SPS HARQ-ACK is used to determine the next available PUCCH resource |
| Panasonic | We support Alt.1. |
| NEC | We are fine with Alt.1. |
| Sharp | We support Alt.1. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Alt 1  HARQ-ACK for SPS PDSCH(s) is deferred only if an initial resource based on *SPS-PUCCH-AN-List-r16* or *n1PUCCH-AN* is not valid. |
| WILUS | Not clear on the meaning of “the initial resource based on *SPS-PUCCH-AN-List-r16*”. In R16 URLLC, to carry more than one SPS HARQ-ACK bits, up to 4 PUCCH resources can be provided in *SPS-PUCCH-AN-List-r16* and one PUCCH resource is selected based on SPS HARQ-ACK size. In this proposal, the initial resource can be interpreted as 1) the PUCCH resource based on “non-deferred SPS HARQ-ACK” or 2) the PUCCH resource based on “non-deferred SPS HARQ-ACK and deferred SPS HARQ-ACK.” |
| Spreadtrum | Support Alt.2 proposed by Samsung. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are fine with Alt.1 in principle. But some clarification is needed also for better understanding of Alt.1:   1. Although the initial SPS PUCCH resource is not valid, but if there is dynamic PUCCH resource in the same slot and if the SPS HARQ-ACK can be multiplexed with the dynamic PUCCH resource, then the SPS HARQ-ACK will not be delayed, right? |
| ZTE | Alt.1 |
| Ericsson | * **Alt 2 :** Defer if there is no **available** symbol for a UL transmission in a slot/sub-slot.   + When the available slot/sub-slot is determined, determine the PUCCH resource for transmission.     - FFS to increase number of PUCCH resources configured for DL-SPS only HARQ-ACK and a selection rule (e.g. lowest index **available**).   The reason is that we have to find first, a slot/sub-slot that we can transmit uplink.  When we found that slot, we can look for the PUCCH resource. FL proposal Alt 1 or Alt 2 by Samsung, the first step is missing where the “actual” deferring occurs. Please see illustration below to clarify: |
| TCL | We are fine with Alt.1. |
| China Telecom | *SPS-PUCCH-AN-List-r16* may not be configured. In case it is not configured, PUCCH resource is determined based on *n1PUCCH-AN* in *SPS-config* when only SPS HARQ-ACK is to be transmitted. Alt.1 also needs to take this case into account. |
| ETRI | About the initial resource based on *SPS-PUCCH-AN-List-r16,* we think that it is determined by the number of both initial and deferred SPS HARQ-ACK bits. Based on this understanding, we support the Alt 1. |
| QC | Support for Alt. 1  Deferral only if the initial resource based on SPS-PUCCH-AN-List-r16 is not available.  SPS-PUCCH-AN-List-r16 can be configured in a flexible symbol as well, as is the case in Rel. 16.  Question: what is the assumption on UE behaviour on i) U symbol and ii) F symbol in case of   1. UE monitors dynamic SFI 2. UE does not monitor dynamic SFI |
| LG | We support Alt. 1 |
| CAICT | Support Alt 1. |
| APT | Support Alt 1. |

**Question 2.1.3: What is the definition of ‘not valid’ of Alt. 1 of Question 2.1 (or possibly other alternatives) in term of collision?**

* **Alt. 1: Semi-static DL symbols or SSB**
  + **Supporting companies: vivo, Sony, Nokia/NSB, DCM (if type 3 HARQ-ACK feedback supported for the issue), Intel, Panasonic, NEC, Sharp, China Telecom …**
* **Alt. 2: Semi-static DL / SSB and flexible symbols** 
  + **Supporting companies: DCM (if type 3 HARQ-ACK feedback not supported for the issue) …**
* **Alt. 3: …**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *Comments or other options/alternatives* |
| vivo | Slightly prefer Alt.1.  For Alt.2, we would like to clarify that if the semi-static flexible symbol(s) is/are not overwritten by dynamic SFI/dynamic DCI as flexible/DL, then they are considered as valid; otherwise, the semi-static flexible symbol(s) is/are not valid. |
| OPPO | The same comment as Question 2.1.2.  We should clarify the definition of “available PUCCH resource” firstly rather than definition of “not valid”. Appropriate K1 configuration ensure that PUCCH resource is always valid. |
| Xiaomi | The same view as vivo and oppo. Flexible symbols in some cases belongs to the available resources and need to be clarified. |
| Sony | Preference for Alt.1 for case where the flexible symbol is reliably indicated, e.g. by UL Grant.  Note: In Rel-16, flexible symbol can be used for PUSCH transmission if that flexible symbol is indicated in the UL Grant of that PUSCH. This was introduced to overcome the reliability issue of the SFI. Hence in some case, the flexible symbol can be reliably used. |
| DCM | It depends on whether type 3 HARQ-ACK feedback is supported for the issue. If Type3 HARQ-ACK feedback is not supported, SPS HARQ-ACK deferring should solve the issue thoroughly, which means possible HARQ-ACK dropping due to collision with semi-static flexible symbol should also be considered. Then our preference is:  Alt.1 if Type 3 CB is also supported for ReTx   * Alt.2 if Type 3 CB is not supported for ReTx |
| Samsung | Alt. 1 |
| Intel | We are supportive of Alt.1 assuming that when flexible symbols are invalidated dynamically, the feedback will not be postponed, but dropped. |
| CATT | Alt. 1. |
| Panasonic | We prefer Alt.1. |
| NEC | Alt.1 is preferred. |
| Sharp | Alt. 1 |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Alt 1 is preferred.  For Alt 2, need a note, “It is not expected that dynamic SFI or dynamic DCI indicates semi-static flexible symbols overlapping with a PUCCH resource of HARQ-ACK feedback as DL or flexible symbols”. |
| WILUS | Alt. 1. Semi-static flexible symbol can be used for PUCCH transmission at least if dynamic SFI is monitored and indicates UL symbols. |
| Spreadtrum | Alt.1 is preferred. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Alt. 1. |
| ZTE | Alt. 1. The semi-static flexible symbols could be considered as valid. |
| Ericsson | **Not valid(available) slot/sub-slot:** a sub-slot/slot that does not include any available symbol (semi-static UL or flexible symbol) for a PUCCH transmission (as already defined by spec).  **Not valid(available) PUCCH resource:** A resource not supporting the payload size (as already specified by spec). |
| TCL | Alt. 1 is preferred. To improve the reliability for collision issue especially for high priority service, flexible symbol(s) should be used as available PUCCH resource for transmitting the deferred HARQ-ACK feedback. |
| China Telecom | The same view as vivo. |
| ETRI | Alt 1 is preferred. |
| QC | Need to get an answer to our question in 2.1.2 to be able to reply this one. |
| LG | If DCI format 2\_0 is not configured to monitor, Alt. 1 is preferred.  If DCI format 2\_0 is configured to monitor, Alt. 2 is preferred.  The default SPS PDSCH behavior on flexible symbol is depending on whether DCI format is configured to monitor or not. We would like to keep current principle of slot format interaction. |
| CAICT | Alt. 2 |
| APT | Same view as LG.  If DCI format 2\_0 is not configured to monitor, Alt. 1 is preferred.  If DCI format 2\_0 is configured to monitor, Alt. 2 is preferred. |
| Apple | Alt. 1 |

**Question 2.1.4: Do you think there are other things that need to be considered here when defining the applicable PUCCH / SPS HARQ-ACK for deferral (in the initial phase or overall)? If so, please provide your input below.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *Comments* |
| OPPO | Complexity, load balance, system efficiency and spec workload should be considered  Semi-static PUCCH/K1 determination is easier to implement and avoid misunderstanding due to dynamic signalling missing, e.g. dynamic SFI missing  PUCCH resource/K1 configured by gNB directly, e.g. Mapping between SPS PDSCH and UL slot is determined semi-statically, can balance PUCCH payload in limited slot/subslot, improve multiplexing efficiency and avoid workload in spec, e.g. deferring condition, definition of available resource, delay budget and so on. |
| DCM | Load balancing issue may need to be addressed considering most HARQ-ACK will be deferred to the first UL slot. Inter-UE collision and/or beam misalignment issue in FR2 is also possible for SPS HARQ-ACK deferring since UE determines PUCCH transmission timing by itself. One possible solution is that gNB can indicate permitted T/F resources for SPS HARQ-ACK deferring, e.g. only on certain slots/sub-slots according to gNB indication/configuration. |
| Samsung | Maximize re-use of LTE and Rel-15 designs when a PUCCH repetition is deferred. |
| NEC | In a configuration with both dropped and deferred SPS HARQ-ACK bits for a configured K1 set, UE may not have sent an acknowledgement even for the deferred ‘SPS HARQ-ACK’, e.g. due to misdetection. It may be better to also send the expired SPS HARQ-ACK as ‘NACK’, or else it may cause misalignment between UE and gNB. |
| Ericsson | Reuse deferral mechanism for PUCCH repetition. Reuse already existing procedures.  Only SPS HARQ-ACK can be subject to deferral.  Other HARQ-ACK bits, e.g. those corresponding to dynamic PDSCH are not subject to deferral.  If HARQ-ACK codebook includes HARQ-ACK other than SPS HARQ-ACK, the codebook is not subject to deferral. |
| QC | Concerns   1. At FR2, multiple UEs might pick the same symbol for the 1st available PUCCH resources with different uplink beams for different UEs – which may not be simultaneously received by the gNB. Need for a rule/indication from the network which schedules the selected UEs. 2. Multiple deferred SPS PUCCH HARQs for same UE do not fit in the “1st available PUCCH resource”. Need to have a defined rule/solution handling this situation. 3. SPS PUCCH with repetitions. If one SPS PUCCH repletion deferred due to collision with DL, what should be the behaviour? Need to indicate the UE a rule for its behaviour. 4. Detailed/complicated pre-scheduling so as to avoid collisions between deferred SPS PUCCH HARQ and other uplink resources for other UEs.   In some cases, the “1st available PUCCH” might not be available due to PUSCH/PUCCHs of other UEs. Need to indicate to UEs, if a certain “1st available PUCCH” is indeed available. |
| CAICT | The reliability of dynamic indication may impact the reliability of deferred HARQ-ACK feedback while exempting dynamic indicated resources as available for deferred HARQ-ACK feedback may impact the latency of HARQ-ACK. It is possible gNB has the flexibility to balance these impacts through configuration. |
|  |  |

**Further details on conditions / deferral in terms of slot/sub-slot offset for deferal:**

As also brought up today, there could be restrictions on the deferral here and there had been restrictions suggested by several companies including at least having a maximum deferral defined (or given by the max. configured k1 value), the effective overall ‘k1’ value of the deferred HARQ-ACK to be restricted to an entry of the configured K1 set).

To not conflict with what k1 here means, let’s use the following definition for our discussions here:

* ***k1*** is the slot/sub-slot offset for the SPS HARQ as given by the SPS activation DCI (based on the current understanding what ‘k1’ is)
* ***k1def*** is the slot/sub-slot offset of the deferral (i.e. slot offset between the initial, dropped PUCCH / HARQ and the slot of the deferred PUCCH / HARQ transmission)
* ***k1eff*** is the effective PDSCH to HARQ-ACK feedback offset (in slots/sub-slots) for the deferred HARQ, i.e. ***k1eff=k1+ k1def***

Now having this is in place, let’s see what different things need to be considered in terms of limitation on *k1def* and *k1eff*.

* Principle granularity of *k1def* / steps for deferral: Is the granularity 1 or given by the SPS periodicity?
  + ***Moderator comment:*** If it is given by the periodicity P, how to handle the case of two SPS HARQ-ACK on a PUCCH with different periodicity *P* configured? Proponents of P should please provide their suggested handling below.
* Should the deferral *k1def* overall be limited to a certain number of slots (e.g. *k1def ≤ k1def,max*)? Should the maximum deferral be e.g. RRC configured?
  + Target here would be to not defer too long…
* Or should instead the maximum effective PDSCH-HARQ offset be limited (e.g. *k1eff* *≤ k1eff,max*) – where e.g. *k1eff,max* is given by the largest k1 value in the K1 set (or alternatively RRC configured)?
  + ***Moderator comment:*** How to handle the case of SPS HARQ-ACK of two SPS configurations on a PUCCH with different *k1* value activated? **Proponents of this operation should please provide their suggested handling here** (e.g. is only one of them deferred for which the condition still applies – or then both not deferred as for part of the SPS HARQ-ACK the condition is violated)=
* Should *k1eff* to be limited to an existing k1 entry / value of the K1 set(s)?
  + The argument seems to be mainly coming from easier handling of type 1 CB operation (see the input on multiplexing by different companies in Sec. 2)
  + ***Moderator comment:*** Same issue as mentioned above.How to handle the case of SPS HARQ-ACK of two SPS configurations on a PUCCH with different *k1* value activated? Would only (a) only a subset of SPS HARQ-ACK be deferred with a certain slot offset (due to the limitation of the K1 set) or (b) the SPS HARQ-ACK be deferred to one slot / sub-slot satisfying conditions for all SPS HARQ applicable for deferral (potentially leading to not deferring any of the bits)? **Proponents of this condition should please provide their suggested handling here**

Looking first at some proposals (from companies, it seems the following options on the limitations have been mentioned:

**Question 2.2.1: What is the slot/subslot granularity of the SPS HARQ-ACK deferral?**

* **Alt. 1: 1 slot / sub-slot**
  + **Supporting companies: vivo, Sony, Nokia/NSB, DCM, Panasonic, NEC, Sharp,** China Telecom**…**
* **Alt. 2: P slots / sub-slots**
  + **P is determined by SPS PDSCH periodicity**
    - **Handling of different periodicities for different SPS configurations needed, proponents to provide details below**
  + **Supporting companies: …**
* **Alt. 3: Other**
  + **Number of OFDM symbols: Sony**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *Comments or other options/alternatives* |
| vivo | Alt.1. We think the deferral can be determined per slot/sub-slot, subject to the potential requirement for ***k1eff***. |
| OPPO | Alt.1. Keep the same granularity as K1. |
| Xiaomi | We prefer alt1. |
| Sony | Alt.1 or Alt.4.  Alt.1 granularity should follow the K1 granularity of the SPS.  Alt.4 provides an absolute granularity, i.e. number of symbols and so it can be independent of K1. |
| DCM | Support Alt 1. |
| Samsung | Alt. 1 |
| Intel | We think the granularity aspect is not urgent to decide, and it may be an automatic decision as part of some other discussions. For example, if a UE is provided with a dedicated PUCCH resource and k1 that can be used instead of the original PUCCH, then the granularity does not matter. |
| CATT | Alt. 1 |
| Panasonic | We prefer Alt.1. |
| NEC | Support Alt.1. |
| Sharp | Alt. 1 |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Alt 1 |
| WILUS | Alt 1 provides the earliest available slot for SPS HARQ-ACK so that it may be the best option in terms of HARQ-ACK latency. However, when considering TDD configuration, the SPS HARQ-ACK bits are deferred to the first UL slot right after consecutive DL slots. load balance of SPS HARQ-ACK bits should be discussed jointly. |
| Spreadtrum | We prefer Alt.1. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Alt.1. |
| ZTE | Alt.1, need earliest feedback to meet the latency requirement |
| Ericsson | Alt 1 |
| TCL | We prefer Alt.1. However, we are open with other options but needs more clarification. |
| China Telecom | We support Alt. 1.  With 1 slot/subslot deferral granularity, dropped SPS HARQ-ACK information can be transmitted as fast as possible. For Alt. 2, it would be more complex to avoid the out-of-order HARQ when two SPS HARQ-ACKs to be deferred have different deferral granularities, as the corresponding SPS PDSCH periodicities are different. |
| ETRI | Alt 1 |
| QC | Support for Alt 1  Since latency requirements are quite stringent at URLLC, the earliest sub-slot after the time instant at which SPS PUCCH HARQ is deferred should be available. Moreover, it is the option with the highest flexibility.  No support for Alt. 2. Difficult to motivate the relationship between SPS periodicity and time instant at which the “1st available PUCCH” is defined. |
| LG | Alt 1 or Alt. 2 |
| CAICT | Alt 1 |
| APT | Alt. 1. |

**Question 2.2.2: Limitation on the maximum deferral in time domain**

* **Alt. 1: The limitation is given in number of slots for the deferral itself by *k1def ≤ k1def,max*** 
  + **Definition of is *k1def,max* FFS**
  + **Supporting companies: Sony, Nokia/NSB, Sharp …**
* **Alt. 2: The deferral limitation is given in the total PDSCH to HARQ-ACK delay/offset, i.e. *k1eff=k1+k1def*** ***≤ k1def,max*** 
  + **Definition of *k1def,max* is FFS (e.g. max. k1 value of the configured K1 set)**
  + **Handling of different initial k1 for different SPS configurations needed, proponents to provide details below**
  + **Supporting companies: vivo, DCM, Panasonic, NEC,** China Telecom**…**
* **Alt. 3: Other**
  + **Supporting companies: …**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *Comments or other options/alternatives* |
| vivo | Based on Alt.2, the HARQ-ACK for each SPS configuration in the overall deferred SPS HARQ-ACK will be judged against *k1eff,max*, and only the SPS HARQ-ACK for which the condition is still met can be deferred, otherwise the SPS HARQ-ACK should be dropped without further deferral. |
| OPPO | Alt2. *k1def,max* is max. k1 value of the configured K1 set for DCI format 1\_1/1\_2. |
| Xiaomi | We prefer alt 1.Firstly, alt 1 is simple and common for all SPS configurations. Besides, in alt 2, different SPS configurations has different initial k1 value, so the final k1def,max is difficult to decided. For some SPS configuration, if the K1 value is close to k1def,max, SPS HARQ-ACK only can be deferred in few slots and it may lead to no available resources for choosing. |
| Sony | Alt.1. There isn’t really that much of a difference between Alt.2 and Alt.1 but in Alt.1 at least UE need only to care about this *k1def* only when it has dropped a HARQ-ACK and apply the value of *k1def* directly.  Also, in addition to *k1def*, shouldn’t there be at least some processing time between the last dropped PUCCH and the 1st available PUCCH so that UE can process the updated number of HARQ-ACK into the 1st available PUCCH? |
| Nokia, NSB | We think that having a limit per SPS HARQ bit may become a bit too complicated to operate. |
| DCM | Prefer Alt 2 since HARQ-ACK reporting latency is the motivation to limit maximum deferral offset.  Separate deferral handling for bits corresponding to different SPS configurations with different initial k1 in one HARQ-ACK CB is possible. For example, HARQ-ACK bits which can’t fulfil the deferral limitation will be dropped and HARQ-ACK bits fulfilling deferral limitation can be deferred. |
| Samsung | Alt. 1 |
| Intel | Similar to Q 2.2.1, this question seems goes too deep into one kind of solution, and thus may be premature to be discussed before a more general decision on how substitute PUCCH resource can be determined/provided. |
| CATT | We don’t think the limitation is needed since we support the next proposal. |
| Panasonic | If limitation is supported, we prefer Alt.2. |
| NEC | Support Alt.2.  We share same view with vivo that the limitation of the maximum delay for SPS HARQ-ACK feedback should be the total PDSCH to HARQ-ACK delay ***k1eff ≤ k1def,max***. |
| Sharp | We prefer Alt. 1, which is a simple and direct way. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Alt 1 |
| WILUS | We prefer Alt. 1 if limitation is supported. |
| Spreadtrum | Support Alt.1. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Additional definition of the limitation is not really necessary with limiting ***k1eff*** to an existing k1 value in the applicable K1 set as discussed in the question below.  If really need to define the limitation, Alt.2 is better with *k1def,max* equal to the max k1 value of the configured K1 set, since at least it can somehow avoid too much impact on latency. |
| ZTE | Support Alt.2, but more limitations are needed.  The deferral limitation is given in the total PDSCH to HARQ-ACK delay/offset, i.e. ***k1eff=k1+k1def≤ k1def,max***  and ***k1eff*** belongs to the original k1 set. |
| Ericsson | Alt 1.  In our view, k1def,max is determined from TDD configuration. |
| TCL | We support Alt2. The deferral limitation should be given in the total PDSCH to HARQ-ACK delay, and the ***k1def,max*** should be the maximum k1 value of the configured K1 set. |
| China Telecom | Alt 2 is preferred. ***k1def,max*** could reuse max. k1 value of the configured K1 set. When two SPS HARQ-ACK on a PUCCH are configured with different max. k1 values and only one of them could find available PUCCH with *k1eff* *≤ k1eff,max,* this HARQ-ACK is deferred and the other is not deferred. |
| ETRI | We prefer Alt 1. |
| QC | As a first step need to agree if there is a need to have a limit in maximum K1, before discussing the alternatives. |
| LG | Maximum deferring should consider other PDSCH rather than its time length itself. As Alt. 3, we suggest to keep Out-of-Order property of PDSCH. For example, HARQ-ACK deferring shouldn’t be beyond other HARQ-ACK transmission mapped to same HARQ process ID. To sum up, Limitation on the maximum deferral would be   * The starting symbol of upcoming PDSCH occasion corresponding to same HARQ process ID, and * The ending symbol of the PUCCH transmission carrying HARQ-ACK of other PDSCH reception received after the SPS PDSCH reception |
| CAICT | Alt 2 |
| APT | Alt.2 is preferred. If *k1eff* *≤ k1eff,max* for a SPS configuration, the SPS HARQ-ACK for the SPS configuration may be deferred. |

**Question 2.2.3: Should the effective total/effective PDSCH to HARQ-ACK offset *k1eff* be limited to an existing k1 value in the applicable K1 set(s)?**

* **Companies suggesting ‘Support’, please provide you handling of different k1 values activated for more than one SPS configuration with HARQ-ACK on the deferred PUCCH in below’s table (see moderator comments above)**
* **Companies supporting (Yes): vivo, ZTE…**
* **Companies not supporting (No): Sony, Nokia/NSB, DCM, NEC, Sharp,** China Telecom**…**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *Supporting companies: how to handle different k1’s in the SPS activation DCI*  *Not supporting companies: why is this restriction not needed?* |
| vivo | The comment can refer to that for Question 2.2.2. Only the part of SPS HARQ-ACK for which the condition regarding *k1eff,max* is still met can be deferred. |
| OPPO | *k1def,max* is max. k1 value of the configured K1 set for DCI format 1\_1/1\_2. |
| Xiaomi | We have no strong concern |
| Sony | Not support. We do not see any need to restrict this. Why can’t the gNB just provide a number to the UE? |
| Nokia, NSB | We see no need fur such restriction. For Type 2 CB there is no reason at all, and for Type 1 CB the bits could be amended (as discussed by several companies). So the only limitation may be the longest deferral (previous question). |
| DCM | We don’t prefer to have such limitation from the perspective of possible OOO issue. As in the example, assuming K1 set = {1,3,5,7,…}, deferred SPS HARQ-ACK for SPS PDSCH #1 is later than the later SPS PDSCH #2. |
| Samsung | No – up to the gNB. Can revisit this issue subject to minimum specification impact. |
| Intel | k1 for deferral should be controlled by gNB, thus no explicit total offset limitation is required. |
| CATT | Support to minimize the specification impact to HARQ-ACK CB construction. |
| NEC | Not support.  We understand the intention is to minimize the standardization effort. With the condition, no enhancements on Type-1 CB for delayed SPS HARQ-ACK are needed, but it seems too restrictive. For example, as shown in the figure below, the SPS HARQ-ACK for SPS configuration #1 cannot be transmitted on the deferred PUCCH resource since its ***k1eff =4*** is not in the K1 set{2,3,5,6} configured for the UE.  Regarding the Type-1 HARQ-ACK CB construction, a simple method to append the delayed SPS HARQ-ACK to the end of the Type-1 CB for non-delayed HARQ-ACK can be considered. |
| Sharp | No – up to the gNB. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Not support. We don’t think such a restriction is necessary (i.e. the max delay for deferred HARQ-ACK feedback can be larger than normal (i.e. non-deferred) HARQ-ACK feedback timing configured in K1 set). |
| WILUS | Not support. OoO issue may occur as described by DCM. Also, for type-2 CB, no benefits with such a limitation. |
| Spreadtrum | Not support. The limit is too strict and the opportunity for delay SPS to generate a codebook may be very low. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | To minimize the standard effort, limiting ***k1eff*** to an existing k1 value in the applicable K1 set is promising, since we can reuse the existing HARQ-ACK codebook generation mechanism. |
| ZTE | Support, ***k1eff*** could be the first available valid k1 value based on ascending order, the first available valid k1 corresponds to a UL slot with valid PUCCH. |
| Ericsson | No support- it should be up to gNB. We can revisit the subject. |
| China Telecom | We think this restriction is not needed.  Although the motivation seems to be easier handling of type 1 CB operation, there could be other ways to deal with the type 1 CB such as HARQ-ACK appending etc. If this restriction is applied and different k1 values are configured for different SPS HARQ-ACK, it would be more complex to avoid the out-of-order HARQ since a SPS HARQ-ACK for a previous PDSCH may use larger k1 value than a SPS HARQ-ACK for a later SPS PDSCH. |
| ETRI | The effective delay bound may not be tied to the K1 set. |
| QC | Yes, support the proposal that the effective (final) PDSCH to HARQ-ACK offset, ***k1eff***, should be limited to an existing applicable k1 value in the existing K1 set. |
| LG | Not support. It is too restrict to utilize other PUCCH resource as mentioned above. In addition to this, SPS HARQ-ACK codebook construction is not depending on K1 configuration actually. |
| CAICT | Not support. Deferred HARQ-ACK should be reported as early as possible. |
| APT | Not support. SPS HARQ-ACK is subject to deferral if PUCCH resource determined from *SPS-PUCCH-AN-List-r16* is multiplexed with another PUCCH for Type 1 HARQ-ACK codebook in a slot with *k1eff* not in the applicable K1 set. |

**Question 2.2.4: Do you see that we need to handle other limitations in terms of *k1/k1def/k1eff*? If so, please provide your input below.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *Additional proposed conditions / limitations in terms of k1/k1def/k1eff* |
| Sony | Shouldn’t there be some processing time between the last dropped PUCCH and the 1st available PUCCH? Surely the UE would need time to update the number of HARQ-ACK after the last dropped PUCCH before it can be transmitted into the 1st available PUCCH. |
| ZTE | ***k1eff*** belongs to the original k1 set. |
| China Telecom | To determine the slot/sub-slot for next available PUCCH, HARQ-ACK load balancing should also be considered. If all of the SPS HARQ-ACK intended to be transmitted in the DL slots before an UL slot are deferred to the first valid PUCCH, the HARQ-ACK transmission reliability for the first valid PUCCH may be degraded as it might be overloaded. The load balancing mechanism also has impact on the slot/sub-slot offset for deferral. |
| QC | There is no need to handle other limitations in the time domain, as imposed, by the UE processing time. |
| LG | We should avoid OoO issue due to deferring HARQ-ACK. |

**Further details on potential multiplexing of deferred SPS HARQ-ACK:**

As discussed above, the moderator has the feeling that the support of multiplexing should be discussed (and potentially) agreed early, as this may have an effect of the discussion on the definition of the next available PUCCH and which PUCCH resource sets are to be selected. Just as an example, if multiplexing of deferred SPS HARQ-ACK on a ‘scheduled’ PUCCH is possible – could this be done even though the ‘scheduled’ PUCCH resource would not be overlapping with a candidate resource for SPS HARQ-ACK deferral (or not)? Just to have an idea early, how many different cases need to be considered (with potentially different handling).

**Question 2.3.1: For multiplexing of defered SPS HARQ-ACK with other UCI, the following alternatives can be considered:**

* **Alt. 1: Multiplexing of deferred SPS HARQ-ACK with any other UCI is not supported**
  + **Supporting companies:** …
* **Alt. 2: Multiplexing of deferred SPS HARQ-ACK with non-deferred SPS HARQ-ACK is supported and/or**
  + **Supporting companies: vivo, Sony, Nokia/NSB, DCM, Panasonic, NEC, Sharp,** China Telecom…
* **Alt. 3: Multiplexing of deferred SPS HARQ-ACK with non SPS HARQ-ACK is supported and/or**
  + **Supporting companies: vivo, Sony, Nokia/NSB, DCM, Panasonic, NEC, Sharp,** China Telecom…
* **Alt. 4: Multiplexing of deferred SPS HARQ-ACK with SR/LLR is supported and/or**
  + **Supporting companies: vivo, Nokia/NSB, DCM, Panasonic, Sharp** China Telecom…
* **Alt. 5: Multiplexing of deferred SPS HARQ-ACK with CSI on PUCCH is supported and/or**
  + **Supporting companies: vivo, Nokia/NSB, DCM, Panasonic, Sharp** China Telecom…
* **Alt. 6: Other (**please provide your input below)
  + **A triggered PUCCH resource: Sony**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *Comments or Alt. 5 – other options* |
| vivo | We support Alt.2, Alt.3, Alt.4, Alt.5. We think for deferred SPS HARQ-ACK multiplexing with other UCI, legacy mechanisms in Rel-15/16 should be reused as much as possible. |
| OPPO | Alt5. If deferred SPS HARQ-ACK collides with PUCCH with other UCIs, follow multiplexing procedure without HARQ-ACK codebook restriction for deferred SPS HARQ-ACK.  Intention of Alt2-4 category is not clear for us. |
| Xiaomi | We support alt 2, alt 3, alt 4. |
| Sony | At least support Alt. 2 and Alt. 3 to provide sufficient opportunity & reliability (since they are scheduled for HARQ-ACK) to transmit the dropped PUCCH. We can consider Alt.6 where a PUCCH resource is triggered when *N* number of SPS HARQ-ACK are dropped to reduce latency if the 1st available PUCCH is too far away. |
| DCM | Alt 2 , Alt 3, Alt 4 and Alt 5.  In our opinion, if UE reports non-deferred HARQ-ACK (including dynamic HARQ-ACK and/or SPS HARQ-ACK) in one slot, and the slot is to be determined as deferred reporting slot for deferred SPS HARQ-ACK with the same priority, one HARQ-ACK CB is generated to multiplex non-deferred HARQ-ACK and deferred SPS HARQ-ACK. We understand it as R15/R16 HARQ-ACK multiplexing principle.  For multiplexing with other UCIs, it can be considered after the HARQ-ACK PUCCH is determined and R16 UCI multiplexing scheme can be reused. |
| Samsung | Alt. 6 – deferred SPS HARQ-ACK is treated as “regular”/non-deferred HARQ-ACK and Rel-16 multiplexing rules remain applicable. Otherwise, no clear benefit bothering with deferring as, in TDD, multiplexing with other UCI will be practically always needed. |
| Intel | Agree with Samsung, we view the deferral / substitution process as just a mechanism to change the possible occasions for HARQ-ACK multiplexing comparing to R15-16. But the capability of multiplexing should not change, thus support at least what can be achieved in R15-16. |
| CATT | We support Alt.2, Alt.3, Alt.4, Alt.5. |
| Panasonic | We support Alt.2, 3, 4, and 5. Multiplexing of deferred SPS HARQ-ACK with any other UCI could be considered based on Rel.15/16 specification. |
| NEC | At least support Alt.2 and Alt.3 that multiplexing for deferred SPS HARQ-ACK and non-deferred SPS HARQ-ACK and/or HARQ-ACK for DG PDSCH in a PUCCH resource is allowed in Rel-17. FFS Alt.4 and Alt.5. |
| Sharp | We are OK with Alt.2, Alt.3, Alt.4, Alt.5. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Alt 2, 3, 4, and 5.  ‘LLR’ in Alt4 seems to be a typo. Suggest changing to ‘LRR (link recovery request)’ |
| WILUS | Agree with Samsung and Intel. We think R17 deferring of SPS HARQ-ACK is just a rule to determine a PUCCH resource for SPS HARQ-ACK. Special handling on UCI multiplexing for deferred SPS HARQ-ACK is not preferred. R15/16 UCI multiplexing rules can be applied. |
| Spreadtrum | Support Alt.2, Alt.3, Alt.4, Alt.5. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Share similar view as Samsung and Intel, deferred SPS HARQ-ACK is treated as “regular”/non-deferred HARQ-ACK and Rel-16 multiplexing rules remain applicable. The worst case, at least Alt. 2 and Alt.3 should be supported. |
| ZTE | Support Alt.2, and Alt.3.  Alt.4 and Alt.5 can also be considered. |
| Ericsson | Alt 2, 3,4,5  For deferred SPS HARQ-ACK multiplexing with other UCI, existing mechanisms in Rel-15/16 should be reused as much as possible. |
| TCL | We support Alt.2, Alt.3, Alt.4, Alt.5. We share the same view with Samsung, the main purpose to bring deferred SPS HARQ-ACK is to provide another occasion for HARQ-ACK transmission and improve the transmit reliability. The multiplexing rules should be inherited, deferred SPS HARQ-ACK multiplexing with other UCI should be supported and legacy mechanisms in Rel-15/16 could be reused. |
| China Telecom | The listed alternatives Alt.2, Alt.3, Alt.4, Alt.5 could be supported. There could be no special restriction for the multiplexing operation of deferred SPS HARQ-ACK. |
| ETRI | Alt.2, Alt.3, Alt.4, Alt.5 |
| QC | Support for Alt 2, Alt 3, Alt 4, Alt 5 (there is a typo) and Alt 6  Hence, support of multiplexing of deferred SPS HARQ-ACK with   * Non deferred SPS HARQ-ACK * Non SPS HARQ-ACK * SR/LLR * CSI on PUCCH   No support for Alt 1  (NOTE: Not clear what Alt 1 exactly means. Can this be clarified?) |
| LG | We support Alt. 2,3,4,5  Deferred HARQ-ACK can be handled in codebook construction. Then, it is not necessary to consider what HARQ-ACK codebook includes in terms of UL multiplexing. |
| CAICT | We support Alt.2, Alt.3, Alt.4, Alt.5  For Alt6, DCI triggered PUCCH could be considered. Considering the reliability of deferred HARQ-ACK may be impacted by the reliability of DCI, it is possible gNB configures whether DCI triggered PUCCH could be used or not. |
| APT | We support Alt.2, Alt.3, Alt.4, Alt.5. |

## 2.2 Second and third round of email discussions

There had been good input in the first round, and we may not be able to follow up on all the points in the 2nd round (let’s leave some for the 3rd round as well, the input to the first round clearly is not forgotten).

***Moderator comment for the third round:*** The following is planned for the 3rd round – due to unclear schedule of the next GTW session, I tried to focus here more on further clarifications than discussing new things here:

* On Question 2.1.2 below (from the 2nd round):
  + To be more clear here, the question is updated to define what the ‘initial slot’ means, this is the slot that without the considering enhancement the SPS PDSCH would have been dropped, i.e. determined by k1 in the activation DCI. A not should clarify that (in green)
  + There had been discussions by email initated by Ericsson / Sorour, I added a table to have the discussion on the point raised by Sorour blow.
  + There has been a very good comment by Samsung, that having missed a DCI indicating PRI for Option 1 would lead to some different understanding if or what is to be deferred. Companies to encouraged to take this into account (with possible re-evaluation of companies positions from the first round)
* There is an update to the formulation for the multiplexing is change / please check and one additional question based on DoCoMo input.
* Based on the email approval of the two options on the configuration, maybe we could try to down-select here now (two alternative proposals, companies to indicate their preference).

Based on question 2.1.2, I would like to clarify the following:

* On Alt. 1, there had been comments that what happens if SPS HARQ-ACK is dropped and multiplexed on a dynamic PUCCH resource indicated (i.e. muxed with other UCI than SPS HARQ-ACK). At least the moderator intention was then not to consider this case for deferral (as under gNB control). Really only the SPS HARQ PUCCH transmission where the PUCCH resource is determined based on the SPS PUCCH resource list should lead to deferral. The moderator tried to modify the wording accordingly.

🡪 hope I managed

* I added also the Alternatives suggested by Ericsson & Samsung below
* Please indicated your preference below. Wording changes in the related row appreciated.

**Update 2 Question 2.1.2: What is the condition of SPS HARQ-ACK dropped for TDD to be subject to deferal?**

* **Alt. 1: Deferral only, if the SPS HARQ-ACK in the initial slot cannot be transmitted as the resulting PUCCH resource for transmission using *SPS-PUCCH-AN-List-r16* or *n1PUCCH-AN* is not valid**
  + ***Note: This means, that if SPS HARQ-ACK is multiplexed with any other UCI / dynamic PUCCH resource then it cannot be deferred!***
  + **FFS on the definition of ‘valid PUCCH resource’ (incl. TDD configuration and semi-static flexible symbol handling)**
* **Alt. 2: Deferral only, if there is no valid PUCCH resource in the initial slot.** 
  + **FFS on the definition of ‘valid PUCCH resource’ (incl. TDD configuration and semi-static flexible symbol handling)**
  + ***Note: see Samsung comments***
* **Alt. 3: Defer if there is no available symbol for a UL transmission in the initial slot/sub-slot.**
  + **When the available slot/sub-slot is determined, determine the PUCCH resource for transmission.**
    - **FFS to increase number of PUCCH resources configured for DL-SPS only HARQ-ACK and a selection rule (e.g. lowest index available).**
  + ***Note: See Ericsson comments***
* **Note: For all options, the initial slot refers to the slot for HARQ-ACK transmissions determined by the indicated k1 value in the SPS activation DCI.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | *Support* |
| Alt. 1 | Sony (with editorial update below), vivo (fine with Sony’s update), QC (support with clarification below), DCM (support in principle with clarification), TCL, Nokia/NSB (fine with Sony update), NEC(fine with Sony’s update) , ZTE( with comments), Lenovo/Motorola Mobility (with update below), Huawei/HiSilicon (fine with Sony update), LG (fine with Qualcomm’s clarification), Apple (final with Sony’s update), Panasonic (fine with Sony’s update), APT (with update below), Sharp (fine with Sony’s update) , CAICT,Xiaomi |
| Alt. 2 | Intel, Spreadtrum  Samsung: Alt. 1 is less efficient for latency as it does not use PUCCH resources in *PUCCH-ResourceSet*. Alt. 3 would require to have multiple resources for corresponding ranges of SPS HARQ-ACK payloads which is unnecessary and would complicate gNB operation. |
| Alt. 3: | Ericsson (modification is needed).  Please see below. We think formulation of Alt-1 and Alt-2 is incorrect and “initial slot/sub-slot” is misleading. These alternative are not exclusives. |
| Other alternative: | Company & alternative  CATT: For Alt. 1, if UE missed the scheduling DCI which indicate a dynamic PUCCH resource, there would be misalignment between gNB and UE whether the SPS HARQ-ACK is postponed and the subsequent HARQ-ACK feedback would be impacted. Therefore, it is our view that the dynamic indicated PUCCH resource should not impact the deferral of SPS HARQ-ACK and our proposal is as follows:  Alt. 4: Whether SPS HARQ-ACK should be delayed is determined based on the PUCCH resource for SPS HARQ-ACK only regardless of whether there are HARQ-ACK(s) corresponding to dynamic PDSCH and/or SPS PDSCH release. |
| Suggested wording changes to any of the 3 alternatives above | Sony: Perhaps we should also add sub-slot into the description in Alt.1, i.e.:   * Alt. 1: Deferral only, if the SPS HARQ-ACK in the initial slot/sub-slot cannot …   DCM: Firstly, we think it is necessary to add sub-slot description as Sony proposed. Secondly, we want to have a clarification on “**the resulting PUCCH resource for transmission**”. In our understanding, if there is deferred SPS HARQ-ACK and non-deferred SPS HARQ-ACK to be deferred/reported in the slot, the “**the resulting PUCCH resource for transmission**” stands for the resource determined by total payload size of deferred and non-deferred SPS HARQ-ACK. In other words, we think HARQ-ACK multiplexing between deferred SPS HARQ-ACK and non-deferred SPS HARQ-ACK is before deferral determination.  Intel: we change support from Alt. 1 to Alt. 2 since Alt. 2 explicitly raises the point of using other PUCCH resources before trying to defer. We also prefer Alt. 2 to consider newly configured PUCCH resources for that purpose.  Samsung: This is not suggestion. We would like to share the different point between alt. 1 and alt. 2  cid:image001.jpg@01D6F59D.F643D700  Assuming the SPS PUCCH resource for SPS PDSCH is slot 0 is not valid, there are valid PUCCHs configured in PUCCH-ResourceSet in slot 0. UE misses the DL DCI scheduling PDSCH #1.  For Alt 1, the 1 bit SPS PDSCH HARQ-ACK will be deferred to slot 1. UE will generate 2 bits HARQ-ACK for SPS PDSCH and DG PDSCH #2. However, gNB will expect the SPS PDSCH HARQ-ACK to be transmitted in slot 0 and gNB will expect 1 bit HARQ-ACK in slot 1 only for DG PDSCH #2. There will be misalignment between UE and gNB in both slots.  For Alt 2, 1 bit SPS HARQ-ACK can be transmitted in slot 0 using a PUCCH configured in PUCCH-ResourceSet without deferring to slot 1. gNB and UE will have the same understanding of the HARQ-ACK codebook in slot 1. Also, if gNB can perform blind decoding, the SPS HARQ-ACK can also be detected and the latency is reduced compared with Alt 1.  ZTE: Regarding Alt.1, if the PUCCH resource after multiplexed is valid, then the SPS HARQ-ACK can’t be deferred.  ------------------------------------------------------------------------------------  Lenovo/Motorola Mobility:   * Alt. 1: Deferral only if a PUCCH resource that would carry SPS HARQ-ACK in the initial HARQ-ACK feedback slot/sub-slot and is not determined by DCI is not valid   + Note: This means SPS HARQ-ACK multiplexed with any other UCI in a non-dynamic PUCCH resource can be deferred.   -------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------  I try to explain below why (irrespective of Ericsson preference). I think we need to reformulate these proposal.  For a PUCCH transmission:   * Step 1: Find the slot/sub-slot for transmission of HARQ-ACK   + This step determines the size of CB and whether the CB includes scheduled A/N or only for DL SPS or mixed. * Step 2: Then, based on CB size and/or DCI, determine the PUCCH resource.   **Hence, as long as (A)Step 1 is not satisfied, or (B) Step 1 is satisfied but Step 2 is not Satisfied, the UE cannot send HARQ-ACK. -> cause “defer” action.**  If only (A) is satisfied, there is a valid slot/sub-slot, but not a valid PUCCH for transmission.  If both are satisfied, there is a valid slot/sub-slot with a valid PUCCH resource that UE uses for transmission.  For DL SPS HARQ-ACK deferring with TDD, the reason for defer is first (A), due to TDD configuration. The reason (B) is caused based on PUCCH resource configuration (in fact, it is more general and not only for this case). Please note that Configuration of PUCCH resources are not coupled to the transmission time.  In that sense, Alt 3 is talking about (A).  Alt 1 and Alt 2 are about (B). Therefore, the deferring includes Alt 3 + Alt1/Al2.  On initial slot/sub-slot,  initial slot/sub-slot is that sub-slot/slot in Step 1 per Rel-16 (based on activation command and K1). When that is not valid, “defer action” is t**riggered**. But still, we have to determine what is the next slot in step 1. In other words, Step 2 is not applicable until Step 1 is satisfied.  -----------------------------------------------------------  China Telecom: We would like to hear more about Alt2. If the gNB does not sent DCI or UE misses the DCI indicating a PUCCH resource in *PUCCH-ResourceSet* in the initial slot, how to select the PUCCH resource in *PUCCH-ResourceSet* for SPS HARQ-ACK in that slot*?*  -------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------  APT: It is preferred to allow deferred SPS HARQ-ACK to be multiplexed with other UCI. At the same time, SPS HARQ-ACK codebook size should be kept the same in a slot regardless of SPS HARQ-ACK being multiplexed with other UCI in previous slot or not. Accordingly, the following modified Alt. 1 is proposed.   * Alt. 1: Deferral only, if the PUCCH resource selected from *SPS-PUCCH-AN-List-r16* for the SPS HARQ-ACK is not valid.   + Deferred SPS HARQ-ACK in a slot is set to NACK if it is multiplexed with other UCI/dynamic PUCCH resource in a previous slot.   + FFS on the definition of ‘valid PUCCH resource’.   QC  Proposal for new wording:   * **Alt. 1: Deferral only, if the SPS PUCCH (HARQ-ACK) resource as configured by *SPS-PUCCH-AN-List-r16* or *n1PUCCH-AN* is not valid in the initial slot, hence, a**t least one UL symbol is available at the current slot or sub-slot, but there no sufficient UL resources for the transmission of the total payload.   + ***Note: This means, that if SPS HARQ-ACK is multiplexed with any other UCI / dynamic PUCCH resource then it cannot be deferred!***   + **FFS on the definition of ‘valid PUCCH resource’ (incl. TDD configuration and semi-static flexible symbol handling)**   + **FFS for the behaviour in case of PUCCH repetitions** * **Alt. 2: Deferral only, if there is no valid PUCCH resource in the initial slot, hence at least one UL symbol is available at the current slot or sub-slot, but there is no sufficient UL resource for the transmission of any HARQ payload.**    + **FFS on the definition of ‘valid PUCCH resource’ (incl. TDD configuration and semi-static flexible symbol handling)**   + ***Note: see Samsung comments*** * **Alt. 3: Defer if there is no available symbol for a UL transmission in the initial slot/sub-slot.**   + **When the available slot/sub-slot is determined, determine the PUCCH resource for transmission.**     - **FFS to increase number of PUCCH resources configured for DL-SPS only HARQ-ACK and a selection rule (e.g. lowest index available).**   Moderator reply: Let’s discuss a bit more below first, if OK for QC.  Regarding the scenario described by Samsung, is it possible to clarify, why is this possible to have deferred SPS PUCCH HARQ in slot N and having a PUCCH resource set for DG PDSCH at the same slot N? What does exactly happen in this slot N that causes the deferral of the SPS PUCCH HARQ A/N?  ------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------  CAICT:  According to the UCI multiplexing principle in Rel.16, SPS HARQ-ACK could be transmitted in a semi-static PUCCH configured by SPS-PUCCH-AN-List-r16 or n1PUCCH-AN or in a dynamic PUCCH resource in the initial slot/subslot.  gNB and UE could have same understanding about whether the PUCCH is valid or not. If SPS HARQ-ACK was to be transmitted in a dynamic PUCCH while the DCI scheduling the dynamic PUCCH is missed, UE may transmit the SPS HARQ-ACK in semi-static PUCCH in that slot/subslot if the semi-static PUCCH is valid. Due to false detection on the dynamic PUCCH, gNB could try to detect semi-static PUCCH assuming DCI is missed. Then HARQ-ACK defer could be avoided and gNB and UE could have same understanding about whether SPS HARQ-ACK in the initial slot/sub-slot is deferred.  If SPS HARQ-ACK was to be transmitted in a dynamic PUCCH and the DCI is detected by UE, also no SPS HARQ-ACK defer needed.   * Alt. 1: Deferral only, if the SPS HARQ-ACK in the initial slot cannot be transmitted as the resulting PUCCH resource for transmission using *SPS-PUCCH-AN-List-r16*, *n1PUCCH-AN, or multi-CSI-PUCCH-ResourceList* is not valid   + *Note: This means, that if SPS HARQ-ACK is multiplexed with any other UCI / dynamic PUCCH resource then it cannot be deferred!*   -------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------  Spreadtrum: Alt. 2 can provide more flexibility to reduce the feedback delay and avoid misunderstanding between gNB and UE at some conditions.  In addition, we have some wording problem with the ***Note***of Alt.1. If SPS HARQ-ACK is multiplexed with any other UCI / dynamic PUCCH resource, then it can transmit on current slot and deferring is not necessary. So we do not know what “cannot be deferred  ” exactly means. Meanwhile, if SPS HARQ-ACK is multiplexed with dynamic PUCCH resource (only HARQ-ACK, excluding other UCIs),**multiplexed** should be changed to **overridden** according to the CR proposed in [104-e-NR-7.1CRs-08].  LG: Considering the deferring are based on semi-static DL/flexible symbol, it would be reasonable to treat deferring as a semi-static operation. Thus, the condition and resource determination should be based on the SPS configuration. |

I really think we would need to clarify this first before moving too much ahead with other parts here (to have some common understanding), including the definition of what resource in the intial slot is not valid (for Alt. 1 & Alt. 2 at least). Therefore, there is no follow-up on Questions 2.1.3 & 2.1.4 proposed at this time.

**Email discussion table on the issue raised by Ericsson / Sorour, if Alt. 3 is needed first and only then Alt. 1 or 2 could be applied or any other comments:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *Comments or Alt. 5 – other options* |
| Ericsson | By email / Sorour:  I try to explain below why (irrespective of Ericsson preference). I think we need to reformulate these proposal.  For a PUCCH transmission:   * Step 1: Find the slot/sub-slot for transmission of HARQ-ACK   + This step determines the size of CB and whether the CB includes scheduled A/N or only for DL SPS or mixed. * Step 2: Then, based on CB size and/or DCI, determine the PUCCH resource.   **Hence, as long as (A) Step 1 is not satisfied, or (B) Step 1 is satisfied but Step 2 is not Satisfied, the UE cannot send HARQ-ACK. -> cause “defer” action.**  If only (A) is satisfied, there is a valid slot/sub-slot, but not a valid PUCCH for transmission.  If both are satisfied, there is a valid slot/sub-slot with a valid PUCCH resource that UE uses for transmission.  For DL SPS HARQ-ACK deferring with TDD, the reason for defer is first (A), due to TDD configuration. The reason (B) is caused based on PUCCH resource configuration (in fact, it is more general and not only for this case). Please note that Configuration of PUCCH resources are not coupled to the transmission time.  In that sense, Alt 3 is talking about (A).  Alt 1 and Alt 2 are about (B). Therefore, the deferring includes Alt 3 + Alt1/Al2.  On initial slot/sub-slot,  initial slot/sub-slot is that sub-slot/slot in Step 1 per Rel-16 (based on activation command and K1). When that is not valid, “defer action” is t**riggered**. But still, we have to determine what is the next slot in step 1. In other words, Step 2 is not applicable until Step 1 is satisfied. |
| Qualcomm | Konstantinos by email:  Indeed, the question 2.1.2 is not clear. It can be interpreted in 2 ways.  Interpretation 1: UE chooses to transmit a given UCI payload, e.g. 8 HARQ bits, at a given UL slot (or sub-slot) and the UE does not modify the UCI payload.  In this case, Alt 1 and Alt 2 correspond  to case B in Sorour’s email below.  Interpretation 2: the UE is allowed to choose any valid UCI payload up to the desired UCI payload size, e.g. the UE can transmit 2 HARQ bits, at a given UL slot (or sub-slot), even if the UE desires to transmit 8 HARQ bits.  In this case,  Alt 1: the current/initial sub-slot (or slot) is indeed an UL sub-slot or slot, but there is no PUCCH resource in the UL sub-slot that can accommodate the desired UCI payload, i.e. no PUCCH resource in the UL sub-slot for 8 HARQ bits UCI payload.  Alt 2: the current/initial sub-slot (or slot) is indeed an UL sub-slot or slot, but there is an PUCCH resource in the UL sub-slot which allows for e.g. 2 HARQ bits UCI payload.  Hence, there is at least 1 available PUCCH resource in the current/initial UL sub-slot, but not for the desired UCI payload size. Should the UE transmit 2 HARQ bits among the 8 HARQ bits, or should the UE defer PUCCH transmission?  Alt 3: the current/initial sub-slot or slot is not a semi-static UL slot or sub-slot, e.g. it is a semi-static DL slot or sub-slot (Case A in Sorour’s email).  Hence, the clarification that needs to be made is what is the assumption?  Is the UE allowed to transmit at a given semi-static UL slot or sub-slot, a UCI payload smaller than the desired UCI payload size. |
| Moderator | by email:  Please note, that we are currently discussing only  - under which conditions for the slot / sub-slot determined by the k1 in the activation DCI (i.e. it is not up to the UE to select the slot, this is determined and therefore k1 defines your step 1). Based on that, Alt. 1 and Alt. 2 apply this in the slot determined by the k1 in the activation DCI your step 2 (payload size determination of HARQ for that slot/sub-slot) – please note that the PUCCH dropping is done in the end (after PUCCH resource selection) and not before (i.e. DL / UL & Flex symbols are not having an effect on the PUCCH resource selection, only payload size & PRI).  If we go for Alt. 3, this means that a slot given by the k1 in the activation DCI having e.g. some DL and some UL symbols leading to the HARQ-ACK to be dropped (e.g. due to overlap with SS-DL/SSB) would be based on Alt. 3 not even be eligible for any deferral! So would this mean that we defer only in case of Alt. 3 if we initial slot given by k1 in the activation DCI would only contain SS-DL symbols (i.e. only overlap with ‘full’ DL slots are considered)?? |
| Samsung | On the question by China Telecom (If the gNB does not sent DCI or UE misses the DCI indicating a PUCCH resource in *PUCCH-ResourceSet* in the initial slot, how to select the PUCCH resource in *PUCCH-ResourceSet* for SPS HARQ-ACK in that slot*?),* a simply solution is first step is to determine the PUCCH resource set similar as dynamic HARQ-ACK. The second step is to determine a PUCCH resource in the set, since there is no PRI, a rule should be defined, e.g., a PUCCH resource with the smallest index. If there is no available PUCCH resource in the selected set, the SPS HARQ-ACK should be deferred.  On the question by QC (Should the UE transmit 2 HARQ bits among the 8 HARQ bits, or should the UE defer PUCCH transmission?), that is basically same with Alt. 2. The only difference is whether or not a UE uses *PUCCH-ResourceSet*. For determining a PUCCH resource from *PUCCH-ResourceSet*, a UE needs to know (1) Payload size, (2) PRI. Since PRI is not applicable, the UE can determine on its own a PUCCH resource based on some rule. There is no change on payload size. That is, it is not considered that the UE transmits 2 SPS HARQ bits among 8 HARQ bits.  Regarding, QC’s assumption (Hence, there is at least 1 available PUCCH resource in the current/initial UL sub-slot, but not for the desired UCI payload size.), if QC means there is no available PUCCH in the selected set based on the SPS PDSCH HARQ-ACK payload, the SPS PDSCH HARQ-ACK should be deferred. However, a more valid assumption could be there will a available PUCCH resource in each set if there are available UL/flexible symbols in the slot/sus-slot.  Regarding the question “why is this possible to have deferred SPS PUCCH HARQ in slot N and having a PUCCH resource set for DG PDSCH at the same slot N? What does exactly happen in this slot N that causes the deferral of the SPS PUCCH HARQ A/N?”, as we clarified in our contribution as shown in the figure below, it is possible that in a slot there is not available PUCCH resource configured in SPS-PUCCH-AN-list but there are available PUCCH resource configured in PUCCH-ResourceSet. There is only one PUCCH resource for a given payload in SPS-PUCCH-AN-list, and the PUCCH is periodic in each slot. |
| DCM | In our understanding, Alt 3 has the least chance for SPS HARQ-ACK deferring, then Alt 1, then Alt 2.   * Case 1: The slot/sub-slot contains only semi-static DL symbol or SSB symbol.   + Alt 1: deferral   + Alt 2: deferral   + Alt 3: deferral * Case 2: The slot/sub-slot contains at least one symbol that is not semi-static DL symbol or SSB symbol. But all of the configured PUCCH resources overlap with semi-static DL symbol or SSB symbol.   + Alt 1: deferral   + Alt 2: deferral   + Alt 3: non-deferral, dropped * Case 3: The slot/sub-slot contains at least one symbol that is not semi-static DL symbol or SSB symbol. There is at least one PUCCH resource (maybe SPS HARQ-ACK resource with less payload size, or dynamic HARQ-ACK resource with total or less payload size) that doesn’t overlap with semi-static DL symbol or SSB symbol. But selected SPS HARQ-ACK PUCCH resource (from SPS HARQ-ACK PUCCH resource based on SPS payload size) overlaps with semi-static DL symbol or SSB symbol.   + Alt 1: deferral   + Alt 2: partial bits transmitted one of the PUCCH resources without overlapping with semi-static DL or SSB symbol, other bits may be dropped or deferred?   + Alt 3: non-deferral   Alt 3 may lead to more dropping cases without deferral. Alt 2 may lead to more complicated UE behaviour, e.g. PUCCH resource with which payload should be used, how to determine which partial bits to be transmitted, UE behaviour for other bits? |
| CATT | Our understanding of Question 2.1.2 is to discuss when SPS HARQ-ACK can be deferred from the initial slot indicated by K1 in activation DCI. We think the SPS HARQ-ACK may be further deferred if the next slot is not allowed to be used to transmit the SPS HARQ-ACK.  For Alt. 1, as we commented in the 2nd round, there would be misalignment between gNB and UE whether the SPS HARQ-ACK is postponed if UE missed the scheduling DCI which indicate a dynamic PUCCH resource. Therefore, we propose to determine whether SPS HARQ-ACK is deferred or not based on the PUCCH resource for SPS HARQ-ACK only. Accordingly, we propose the following update to Alt. 1.   * **Alt. 1: Deferral only, if the SPS HARQ-ACK in the initial slot cannot be transmitted ~~as the resulting PUCCH resource for transmission~~ using the PUCCH resource by *SPS-PUCCH-AN-List-r16* or *n1PUCCH-AN* ~~is not valid~~**   + ***~~Note: This means, that if SPS HARQ-ACK is multiplexed with any other UCI / dynamic PUCCH resource then it cannot be deferred!~~***   + **FFS on the definition of ‘valid PUCCH resource’ (incl. TDD configuration and semi-static flexible symbol handling)** |
| Intel | Alt. 2 could be realized in different way, so that UE is provided with another PUCCH resource set, thus not requiring to be connected with the legacy PUCCH resource set by PRI. Current formulation of Alt. 2 does not restrict that. |
| Nokia, NSB | On the questions by QC, we would like to echo here the explanation by Samsung: there is no HARQ-ACK codebook splitting in a slot – either all HARQ bits are transmitted or all are dropped (size determination is the first step, as Samsung point out here). Therefore, the proposed additions in the earlier table from QC don’t seem to make too much sense here. Also, it is a bit hard for us to understand what it means there is no PUCCH resource in the slot having sufficient payload size – as the payload size (and the PUCCH resource based on the payload size) is determined, there will always be a PUCCH resource. If this resource is then regarded as valid or not (e.g. overlapping with SS-DL symbols/SSB) is then a secondary question.  We do acknowledge, that Alt. 1 is prone to DCI decoding errors. If this is regarded as essential would need further discussion. If gNB configures the feature, this could be taken into account.  We agree with the DoCoMo analysis, that Alt. 3 is for sure the simplest, but will only lead to deferral if there is a collision with a ‘full DL slot’ (otherwise, no deferral), which could be a bit limiting here.  On the suggested update on the description of Alt. 1 by CATT: This looks fine, just we may need to add still the same ‘conditions’ to restrict why the PUCCH was not transmitted (e.g. only if collision with SS-DL/SSB). |
| Ericsson | Thanks for FL to incorporating our comments.  To re-iterate, Alt-3 is simplest or the first step that the other Alt are also taking into account.  In other words, take the example below (also in our contribution):  For SP= in slot n+2, there is no defer. For SPS1 in slot n+4, the initial slot is n+5. Which is DL. Then I guess somehow companies in Alt3 and Alt 3 assume that UE uses slot n+7. But determining slot n+7 has nothing to do with configuration of PUCCH resources because they are same for any slot.  Alt3 detemines how to get to slot n+7. And use already existing procedures (if cant transmit , drop PUCCH).  Alt 2 and Alt 3 (somehow don’t explain how to get to slot n+7), but assume that we got there sowhow. Then instead of conservative approach of Alt3, introduce more flexibility. Which s fine. But the point is, we have to have a mechanism to say how we get to slot n+7. It is not only about initial slot. Initial slot triggers “defer operation”. Based on procedure like in Lat 3 or similar, the next slot may or may not fit again and we have to defer again.  That’s why we explained two fundamental Steps in our email and we think we have to formulate the proposals such that we should know we step we are stalking about and for which step, we propose some rules or enhancement.s   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Example 1:** | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | DL0 SPS configured with periodicity of one slot and activated from slot n+2 with K1=1. | | | | | | | | |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | slot |  | n | n+1 | n+2 | n+3 | n+4 | n+5 | n+6 | n+7 |  | | TDD config | | D | D | D | U | D | D | D | U |  | | DL0 SPS |  |  |  | DL0 SPS0 |  | DL0 SPS1 | DL0 SPS2 | DL0 SPS3 |  |  | | DL0 SPS HARQ-ACK | |  |  | A0 |  | A1 | A2 | A3 |  |  | | PUCCH transmission | | |  |  | **Transmit P0 in slot n+3** | | |  | **Transmit P1 in slot n+7** | | |  |  |  |  |  | **CB={A0}** |  |  |  | **CB={A1,A2,A3}** | | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | **A1 is deferred 2 slots** | | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | **A2 is deferred 1 slot** | | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | **A3 is not deferred** | | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |
| QC | Answer to Samsung and Nokia. The wording around Alt 2 was not a proposal. Due to the syntax of Alt 2 lacking in clarify, what was formulated were questions aiming at understanding the ill formulated alternatives. There has never been a proposal to split HARQ codebook.  Regarding Samsung’s notes, again, the case described is very high level and lacks of solid numbers that justify the case. Can Samsung give numbers to their example and walk us through the case?  E.g. Assume an SPS configuration with SPS PUCCH A/N Format 3 transmitted within 7 symbols. This format can bear N HARQ bits. After a given slot configuration change, the slot indicated by K1, contains now e.g. 2 UL symbols. The SPS PUCCH A/N Format 3 with N HARQ bits transmitted within 7 symbols can no longer be transmitted within the current slot. It is understood that within these 2 UL symbols, it is possible to transmit PUCCH HARQ feedback for DG PDSCH. What is not readily understood is how these N HARQ bits transmitted within 7 UL symbols and with PF 3 can be multiplexed in 2 UL symbols. |

**Further details on conditions / deferral in terms of slot/sub-slot offset for deferal:**

On the limitations in terms of k1, the opinions currently seem to be rather diverse, except that at least the periodicity of the UE looking for an applicable slot should not be given by the SPS perioditity (i.e. not using P). There had comments by Qualcomm and Sony that there may be a need for a minimum processing time for the deferred PUCCH preparation (so a type of prep-time). The answer here may also be dependent on the deferral conditions (i.e. when being applicable for deferral) that are put in place. This is not forgotten here, but would be better to discuss after having more clarify on Question 2.1.2 above.

**Further details on potential multiplexing of deferred SPS HARQ-ACK and initial UCI (incl. HARQ-ACK):**

There seems to be a strong majority of companies thinking that the multiplexing should be possible, and several companies refered to the Samsung comment there. Therefore, the moderator would like to borrow the Samsung formulation and see if we potentially could get some consensus on this one:

**Moderator update on 3rd round:** I tried to address in the proposal update the combined comments from vivo & NEC (which have a good point on the k1,der and Type 1 CB relation). DoCoMo comment addressed in a separate question. Please check below Update 2 proposal 2.2 and the new question **Question 2.2.9**

**Updated 2 proposal 2.2: ~~Deferred SPS HARQ-ACK is treated as “regular”/non-deferred HARQ-ACK and~~ Rel-16 UCI multiplexing rules are reused ~~remain applicable~~ for deferred SPS HARQ-ACK, if applicable.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | *Companies* |
| Support: | (19) Vivo, QC, DCM (with additional clarification), TCL, Intel, CATT (prefer vivo’s update), Nokia/NSB (fine with any wording changes), Samsung, NEC, ZTE, Huawei/HiSilicon, Ericsson, OPPO, China Telecom, Panasonic, Sharp, CAICT,Xiaomi, APT |
| Not support: | (2) Lenovo/Motorola Mobility, LG |
| Reasons to not support | **Lenovo/Motorola Mobility**: Concatenating the deferred HARQ-ACK codebook to a non-deferred HARQ-ACK codebook is simpler, since UE doesn’t have to re-order deferred HARQ-ACK bits.  LG: We are open to multiplex HARQ-ACK for deferred PDSCH, however, it seems premature to decide for now. We should discuss how UE generate HARQ-ACK for deferred PDSCH first. |
| Suggested wording changes to the proposal | vivo: suggest to modify the wording as “Rel-16 UCI multiplexing rules remain applicable for the deferred SPS HARQ-ACK”. People may or may not have different understanding on “regular”/non-deferred HARQ-ACK”  DCM: We think the order of multiplexing and deferral determination should be clarified, i.e. whether such multiplexing will impact the deferral ***k1eff*** determination.  For example when UE determines whether a slot/sub-slot can be the deferred slot/sub-slot and UE will report dynamic HARQ-ACK in the slot, there can be two possibilities: 1) If multiplexing is considered before deferral determination (i.e. ***k1eff*** determination may be impacted by multiplexing), UE considers HARQ-ACK multiplexing first and determines PUCCH resource for transmission from dynamic HARQ-ACK PUCCH resource sets. It is expected that the PUCCH containing deferred SPS HARQ-ACK will be transmitted. In this case, ***k1eff*** is for this slot/sub-slot. 2) If deferral is considered before multiplexing (i.e. ***k1eff*** determination will not be impacted by multiplexing), UE firstly determines the deferred slot/sub-slot based on whether available SPS HARQ-ACK PUCCH resource for deferred SPS HARQ-ACK is in slot/sub-slot. Once determining the deferred slot/sub-slot, then UE considers multiplexing.  From deferral latency perspective, we prefer the option that multiplexing is considered before deferral determination (i.e. such multiplexing will impact the deferral ***k1eff*** determination), at least for multiplexing of deferred SPS HARQ-ACK with non-deferred HARQ-ACK.  NEC: Considering that there is no consensus on Q2.2.3, if the ***k1eff*** is not restricted to the K1 set, no Rel-16 multiplexing rule can be reused for multiplexing deferred SPS HARQ-ACK and DG HARQ-ACK on Type-1 CB. So we suggest to modify the wording as “ Deferred SPS HARQ-ACK is treated as “regular”/non-deferred HARQ-ACK and reuses Rel-16 UCI multiplexing rules ~~remain~~ if applicable.”  CAICT: DCM’s concern should be clarified.  APT: Agree if it means that UCI multiplexing rules is applied to multiplex a PUCCH resource selected from SPS-PUCCH-AN-List based on total payload size of deferred and non-deferred SPS HARQ-ACK with a PUCCH for HARQ-ACK for dynamic PDSCH. |

Based on the good points by DoCoMo, the following new questions is brought up:

**Question 2.2.9: The order of the multiplexing and deferral determination is given by:**

* **Alt. 1: Deferral is before multiplexing decision (i.e. the decision on the target slot of the deferral is not taking the multiplexing into account)**
* **Alt. 2: the deferral decision takes the multiplexing in the target slot into account**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | *List of companies* |
| Alt. 1 | Support: | Vivo, CATT, ZTE, Intel, LG,Xiaomi,OPPO, Nokia/NSB, APT |
| Reasons: | Vivo: Not quite clear about the question and Alt.2, our understanding is UE first determines the ’first’ available slot/subslot for the deferred HARQ-ACK for SPS, if there is HARQ-ACK for DG in the same slot/subslot, then UE performs multiplexing the HARQ-ACK into one codebook. Here the multiplexing is only considering HARQ-ACK for DG and the deferred/non-deferred HARQ-ACK for SPS, not considering multiplexing with other UCIs like SR/CSI, correct?  --------------------------------------------------------------------------  DCM’s reply for clarification of the question:  Our intention to raise the question is to clarify how to determine the so-called “first available slot/sub-slot” considering whether multiplexing impacts SPS HARQ-ACK deferring. For example as in the figure, if there is HARQ-ACK reported in S slot, the “first available slot/sub-slot” is the S slot. For Alt 1, deferral is before multiplexing and the SPS HARQ-ACK resource is used to determine the “first available slot/sub-slot”. Therefore, for Alt 1, the “first available slot/sub-slot” is the U slot after the S slot    ZTE: Alt.2 need more clarification. How to interpret “**the deferral decision takes the multiplexing in the target slot**”. Our preference on Alt.1 is UE first determines the deferring PUCCH resource slot (sub-slot) by slot (sub-slot) until UE finds the valid PUCCH resource from *PUCCH-ResourceSet and SPS-PUCCH-AN list*, if there is HARQ-ACK for DG in the same slot (subslot), UE multiplexes the HARQ-ACK for SPS and for DG into the same codebook. It is simple for UE to determine deferring slot/sub-slot before multiplexing. If multiplexing and deferral handling at the same time or multiplexing before the deferral, it will complicate UE implementation.  @DCM, Could you clarify why the UL symbols in S slot can’t be the PUCCH resources for deferring HARQ for SPS?  --------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------  DCM’s reply to ZTE:  Sorry for possible unclear expression. Firstly, I want to clarify that the question is discussed with the assumption that “only SPS HARQ-ACK resource can be used for deferred SPS HARQ-ACK unless considering multiplexing with dynamic HARQ-ACK”. When UE defers the dropped SPS HARQ-ACK, UE increases K1 to find the reporting slot/sub-slot, where determined PUCCH resource in the slot/sub-slot doesn’t overlap with semi-static DL or SSB symbol.     * For Alt 1, if multiplexing with dynamic HARQ-ACK is not taken into account when determining the reporting slot/sub-slot, UE determines whether the S slot can be the reporting slot based on selected PUCCH resource from SPS HARQ-ACK resources (the SPS HARQ-ACK resource in the figure), which overlaps with semi-static DL symbols as in the figure. Therefore, UE will further increase K1 to the later UL slot. * For Alt 2, if multiplexing with dynamic HARQ-ACK is taken into account when determining the reporting slot/sub-slot, UE determines whether the S slot can be the reporting slot based on the selected PUCCH resource after multiplexing (the dynamic HARQ-ACK resource in the figure), which doesn’t overlap with semi-static DL symbol. Therefore, UE will determine the S slot as the deferred reporting slot.   ZTE: @ DCM. I understand explanation. For Alt.1, from my understanding, the deferring before multiplexing decision may be not the final decision, if the PUCCH resources may not be available as the SPS HARQ-ACK resource in the figure), which overlaps with semi-static DL symbols. And then the HARQ-ACK for SPS can be multiplexed into the PUCCH resources for DG in slot S in your example. Maybe the interpretation of Alt.1 from FL is not aligning my thinking. But any way, from the final result of your example, I share the same consequence of yours in explanation of Alt.2. Thanks.  LG:  The reason why all we consider semi-static DL and flexible symbol is to avoid DCI ambiguity in terms of slot format. Considering this, deferring is also performed in semi-static level, without considering other DCI reception. If we consider UL multiplexing result for deferring, actual deferring is affected by one or more DCI format scheduling PDSCH. This would make an ambiguity on deferring and less reliability  Vivo2: thanks a lot DCM’s explanation. Is this to define what is the “first available PUCCH” rather than discussing the multiplexing? If for multiplexing, we also need to consider the PUCCH resource configured for SR/CSI. Right? I share the views that for the deferred HARQ-ACK for SPS, the PUCCH resource can use both *SPS-PUCCH-AN* and *PUCCH-ResourceSet.* In your example, if there is no dynamic PDSCH is scheduled, there is no dynamic HARQ-ACK in the target slot, then what is your views on whether the deferred HARQ-ACK for SPS is further deferred or it can use the available resource in *PUCCH-ResourceSet*?  DCM’s reply to vivo2: Thanks for vivo’s further discussion.  For intention on this question, we want to clarify whether multiplexing will impact determination of ***k1eff,*** or “first available slot/sub-slot” (, or “first available PUCCH” which is related with “first available slot/sub-slot”).  One thing needs to be clarified first is that the question is based on the assumption that “deferral is based on whether PUCCH resource in a slot/sub-slot overlaps with semi-static D or SSB symbol”, instead of based on “available slot definition” as proposed by Ericsson. (For Ericsson’s proposal, Alt 1 and Alt 2 makes no difference since the S slot is an available slot regardless of selected PUCCH resource overlaps with semi-static D or SSB symbol or not.) With this assumption, considering that determined PUCCH resource without considering multiplexing (Alt 1) and determined PUCCH resource with considering multiplexing (Alt 2) may be different, and it’s possible that only one of them overlaps with semi-static D or SSB symbol. Therefore, deferral results for Alt 1 and Alt 2 may be different. We are not strongly proposing Alt 2, but we think the deferral behaviour should be clarified if the assumption “deferral is based on whether PUCCH resource in a slot/sub-slot overlaps with semi-static D or SSB symbol” is applied.  For vivo’s last question, in our above example, it is assumed that only PUCCH resource from *SPS-PUCCH-AN* can be used for deferred SPS HARQ-ACK if there is no dynamic HARQ-ACK in the slot/sub-slot. I think vivo raised a valid point that the question may be related with whether *PUCCH-ResourceSet* can be used for deferred SPS HARQ-ACK if there is no dynamic HARQ-ACK in the slot/sub-slot. But we think the question (i.e. whether multiplexing will impact determination of “first available slot/sub-slot” or “first available PUCCH”) may still need to be clarified even if assuming PUCCH resource for deferred SPS HARQ-ACK can use both *SPS-PUCCH-AN* and *PUCCH-ResourceSet.* For example, for Alt 1, PUCCH resource for deferred SPS HARQ-ACK can be PUCCH resource #i from *SPS-PUCCH-AN,* PUCCH resource #j in *PUCCH-ResourceSet*. It is possible that PUCCH resource #i from *SPS-PUCCH-AN* and PUCCH resource #j both overlap with semi-static DL or SSB symbol (also possible for PUCCH resource #j since it is determined by UE according to certain rule, but without DCI indication even though the PUCCH resource is in *PUCCH-ResourceSet*). However, for Alt 2, PUCCH resource for multiplexed dynamic HARQ-ACK and deferred SPS HARQ-ACK is always expected not to collide with semi-static DL or SSB symbol. Therefore, Alt 1 and Alt 2 may still lead to different deferral result for this case.    For vivo’s another question of multiplexing with SR/CSI PUCCH, it may also need to be considered but same or different handling are possible for HARQ-ACK multiplexing case and multiplexing between different UCIs.      In summary, we just want to make UE behaviour clearer for SPS HARQ-ACK deferring. Maybe the first step is to determine whether “deferral is determined by whether PUCCH resource in a slot/sub-slot overlaps with semi-static D or SSB symbol”, or “deferral is determined by available slot as proposed by Ericsson”. For the former option, we need to clarify whether the PUCCH resource is determined with or without considering multiplexing.  Vivo3: thanks a lot for your explanation! I see. |
| Alt. 2 | Support: | Samsung, DCM, NEC |
| Reasons: | We interpret Alt. 1 to imply that only *SPS-PUCCH-AN* is used and Alt.2 to imply that *PUCCH-ResourceSet* can also be used. The latter is preferable to minimize latency.  DCM: Alt 2 can lead to smaller latency.  NEC: Based on DCM’ clarification, Alt.2 is preferred for lower latency. We also share same view with Samsung that both PUCCH in *SPS-PUCCH-AN* and *PUCCH-ResourceSet* can be used for deferred SPS HARQ-ACK transmission. |
|  | Other comments | NEC  We are not very clear of the question. In our understanding, the order of the multiplexing and deferred slot determination is related to the time of triggering SPS HARQ-ACK deferral and the scheduling timeline of DG PDSCH. For example, as shown in the figure below, for case 1, if the DG PDSCH is scheduled later than the initial slot for SPS HARQ-ACK, then when UE determines the SPS HARQ-ACK deferral, multiplexing is not considered since UE does not know that HARQ-ACK for other DG PDSCH will be multiplexed in the deferred slot. For case 2, if the DG PDSCH is scheduled before the initial slot for SPS HARQ-ACK, then multiplexing is considered when UE determines the SPS HARQ-ACK deferral. We would like to hear more views to make our decision. |

**Further down-selection of RRC configuation**

Based on the Jan. 28th check-point, the following agreement was declared by Mr. chairman:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreements:  Further down-select between the following two options for SPS HARQ-ACK deferral:   * Option 1: Joint RRC configuration of the SPS HARQ-ACK deferral per PUCCH cell group   + *Note: any SPS HARQ-ACK within a PUCCH cell group in principle is subject to deferral* * Option 2: The SPS HARQ-ACK deferral is configured per SPS configuration   + *Note: part of sps-config, only HARQ-ACK of SPS PDSCH configurations configured for deferral is in principle subject to deferral* |

**FL Proposal 2.3: The deferring of SPS HARQ-ACK dropped due to TDD specific collisions is configured by RRC**

* **Option 1: per PUCCH cell group.**
* **Option 2: per SPS configuration.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | *List of companies* |
| Option 1  Per PUCCH cell group | Support: | ~~Vivo,~~ Samsung, CATT, ZTE |
| Reasons: | That is a UE-capability and network implementation issue. No need to differentiate per SPS PDSCH configuration and no need to complicate the design. (Samsung, CATT)  ZTE: In some TDD configurations, it is hard to avoid the HARQ-ACK for SPS PDSCH would transmit in the invalid PUCCH resources, then the common signaling per PUCCH cell group is more efficient. |
| Option 2  Per SPS configuration | Support: | NEC, DCM, Intel, LG,Xiaomi,OPPO, Nokia/NSB, APT, vivo |
| Reasons: | NEC: Option 2 is more flexible.  Nokia/NSB allows the gNB to differentiate different ‘priority’ in terms of needed re-transmission/deferral of SPS HARQ-ACK of different traffic flows (i.e. reduce the need for re-deferal – if not needed otherwise).  Vivo:   * Different SPS configurations can be used for different service type, some SPS configurations may have short periodicity so it is difficult to avoid the collision between the corresponding HARQ-ACK feedback and semi-static DL/SSB. Some SPS configurations may have longer periodicity, then the configuration for its HARQ-ACK feedback can avoid the semi-static DL/SSB symbols. * Regarding the OoO issue, there is a similar discussion in Rel-16 NR-U, and it is concluded that the out-of-order issue only considers **initially assigned HARQ-ACK opportunities**. we think this conclusion should also be applied to deferred SPS HARQ-ACK, so better to be clarified or concluded here. |

## 2.3 Fourth round of email discussions

Based on the discussions in the previous rounds, there seems to be a need to update the description of the alternatives on when it can be deferred.

First as a starting point, the list of options from the 3rd round is used – where the moderator tried to take the comments of different companies incl. offline comments into account (shown changes only on top of 3rd round version). Moreover, Alt. 3 is limited for now to the operation in the intial slot/sub-slot (the definition of the target slot is the next step of discussions):

**Update 3 Question 2.1.2: What is the condition of SPS HARQ-ACK dropped for TDD to be subject to deferal?**

* **Alt. 1: Deferral only, if the SPS HARQ-ACK in the initial slot/sub-slot cannot be transmitted ~~as the resulting PUCCH resource for transmission~~ using the PUCCH by *SPS-PUCCH-AN-List-r16* or *n1PUCCH-AN* ~~is not valid~~**
  + ***~~Note: This means, that if SPS HARQ-ACK is multiplexed with any other UCI / dynamic PUCCH resource then it cannot be deferred!~~***
  + **FFS on the definition of ‘cannot be transmitted’ (i.e. TDD configuration and semi-static flexible symbol handling)**
* **Alt. 2: Deferral only, if the SPS HARQ-ACK in the initial slot/sub-slot cannot be transmitted as the resulting PUCCH resource for transmission using SPS-PUCCH-AN-List-r16, n1PUCCH-AN or other configured PUCCH resource(s) is not valid ~~if there is no valid PUCCH resource in the initial slot~~.** 
  + **FFS: other configured PUCCH resource(s) (e.g., *PUCCH-ResourceSet,* *multi-CSI-PUCCH-ResourceList*)**
  + **FFS on the definition of ’not valid’ (i.e. TDD configuration and semi-static flexible symbol handling)**
* **Alt. 3: Defer if there is no available symbol for an UL transmission in the initial slot/sub-slot.**
  + **FFS on the definition of ‘no available symbol for an UL transmission’ (i.e. TDD configuration and semi-static flexible symbol handling)**
  + **~~When the available slot/sub-slot is determined, determine the PUCCH resource for transmission.~~**
    - **~~FFS to increase number of PUCCH resources configured for DL-SPS only HARQ-ACK and a selection rule (e.g. lowest index available).~~**
  + **Note: For all options, the initial slot/sub-slot refers to the slot/sub-slot for HARQ-ACK transmissions determined by the indicated k1 value in the SPS activation DCI.**

Based on the updated description and clarifications during the 2nd and 3rd round, let’s have another check here – especially as based on latest understanding, the company positions may have been changing. Please provide still input here (again):

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | *Support / comments* |
| Alt. 1 | Vivo, DCM, Xiaomi, TCL, NEC, ZTE, LG, Huawei/HiSilicon, Sony, APT, Nokia/NSB  Ericsson (OK, it seems it effectively covers Alt3), QC. Apple, Sharp, Panasonic, CATT, OPPO |
| Alt. 2 | Samsung, Spreadtrum, Lenovo/Motorola Mobility, China Telecom (with further modification as commented below), Intel (more general than Alt.1) |
| Alt. 3: | Ericsson (see comment on Alt1) |
| Comments | Vivo (we would like to confirm, here the “initial slot” is for first time to determine whether to defter HARQ-ACK transmission; In addition, we would like to keep the note saying: if SPS HARQ-ACK is multiplexed with any other UCI / dynamic PUCCH resource **in the initial slot**, then it cannot be deferred)  Samsung: The difference between original Alt 1 and Alt 2 is that Alt 2 can use dynamic PUCCH resource when UE doesn’t receive a DL DCI (i.e. no PRI indication). Also, as We would like to add a clarification as following.   * **Alt. 2: Deferral only, if the SPS HARQ-ACK in the initial slot/sub-slot cannot be transmitted as the resulting PUCCH resource for transmission using SPS-PUCCH-AN-List-r16, n1PUCCH-AN or other configured PUCCH resource(s) is not valid ~~if there is no valid PUCCH resource in the initial slot~~ if UE does not detect a DCI with HARQ-ACK in the initial slot/sub-slot .**    + **FFS: other configured PUCCH resource(s) (e.g., *PUCCH-ResourceSet,* *multi-CSI-PUCCH-ResourceList*)**   + **FFS on the definition of ’not valid’ (i.e. TDD configuration and semi-static flexible symbol handling)**   The misalignment issue due to DTX was acknowledged by quite a few companies, we hope it is the common understanding that this issue should be addressed for each alternative. We would like to add a common Note as following,  Note: All the alternatives aim to address the misalignment issue (i.e. UE and gNB have different understanding regarding whether the HARQ-ACK is deferred.) due to DTX.  Regarding QC’s question copied below  Regarding Samsung’s notes, again, the case described is very high level and lacks of solid numbers that justify the case. Can Samsung give numbers to their example and walk us through the case?  E.g. Assume an SPS configuration with SPS PUCCH A/N Format 3 transmitted within 7 symbols. This format can bear N HARQ bits. After a given slot configuration change, the slot indicated by K1, contains now e.g. 2 UL symbols. The SPS PUCCH A/N Format 3 with N HARQ bits transmitted within 7 symbols can no longer be transmitted within the current slot. It is understood that within these 2 UL symbols, it is possible to transmit PUCCH HARQ feedback for DG PDSCH. What is not readily understood is how these N HARQ bits transmitted within 7 UL symbols and with PF 3 can be multiplexed in 2 UL symbols.  Samsung: QC assumes the configuration as shown in the figure. (hopefully we understand correctly). If UE does not receive any DCI, UE first determines the set based on the payload of N the same way as HARQ-ACK with corresponding DCI. There can be up to 4 sets. For example, the first set for payload range {0,2}. 2nd set for payload range (3-10), etc. Assume N=8, the 2nd set is selected. Next, UE chooses a valid PUCCH resource from the 2nd set according to a predefined rule. For example, smallest index. In the figure, PUCCH #1 is not valid. PUCCH #2 is the valid PUCCH with the smallest index. UE transmits the N bit SPS HARQ-ACK using PUCCH#2.  In summary, a predefined rule is used to replace PRI indication for SPS PDSCH HARQ-ACK. Everything else is the same as dynamic HARQ-ACK. Hopefully, it can help address QC’s concern.    **QC: Appreciated explanation from Samsung. The description is a walk-through the Rel. 16 behaviour and we share the same understanding. Since the beginning, the concern is the following:**  **- PUCCH #0 is (in the figure above) transmitted within *#K* UL symbols**  **- PUCCH #1 is transmitted within *#L* UL symbols**  **The slot format change results in a number *#M* of UL symbols in the slot, which is M<K so as to have SPS PUCCH HARQ deferral.**  **In reality, how probable is it that PUCCH #0 AND PUCCH #1 can fit in M < K & M<L UL symbols? (In theory, and as the figure indicates, yes, it is.) The point is that the group should prioritize solutions of realistic problems.**  Samsung2: Thank you for the feedback. Regarding last question, we have different understanding regarding the validity of the scenario. As we explained in our contribution and also in previous reply. This case is typical in TDD.  **QC: The validity of the scenario is justified with exact numbers on the number of symbols in the presented PUCCH formats. These numbers are missing here. The scenario of the figure above cannot be motivated; since UCI – which initially was supposed to be transmitted via PUCCH #0 within K symbols-can now (after deferral) be transmitted via PUCCH #2-within fewer than K symbols (e.g. L symbols < K symbols), the following question arises: why the initial HARQ payload (UCI) was not transmitted with another PUCCH format, e.g. PUCCH #0’ from the beginning? In this case, there is no need to defer SPS PUCCH HARQ.**  ZTE: We support Alt.1, But intend to differentiate the PUCCH resource used by initial slot or target slot, we propose Alt.1a to be further considered.   * **Alt. 1a: Deferral only, if the SPS HARQ-ACK in the initial slot/sub-slot cannot be transmitted ~~as the resulting PUCCH resource for transmission~~ using the PUCCH by *SPS-PUCCH-AN-List-r16* or *n1PUCCH-AN* ~~is not valid~~**   + ***~~Note: This means, that if SPS HARQ-ACK is multiplexed with any other UCI / dynamic PUCCH resource then it cannot be deferred!~~***   + **FFS on the definition of ‘cannot be transmitted’ (i.e. TDD configuration and semi-static flexible symbol handling)**   + **Once deferral is determined, the new valid PUCCH can be determined from SPS-PUCCH-AN-List-r16, n1PUCCH-AN or other configured PUCCH resource(s) in the initial slot/sub-slot.**   LG: in order to defer SPS HARQ-ACK semi-statically, the deferring should be before UL multiplexing. Thus, it would be reasonable to consider SPS HARQ-ACK and PUCCH for SPS configuration for PUCCH resource determination  **Huawei/HiSilicon**: We are fine with Alt.1, though we actually think the original Alt.1 is more accurate. This updated Alt.1 seems extend the scope of original Alt.1, e.g. it seems that even without any DCI indicate the dynamic PUCCH resource configured by ***n1PUCCH-AN***, some resource configured by ***n1PUCCH-AN*** can be used to transmit the SPS HARQ-ACK, which is not aligned with the current mechanism. The original Alt.1 is able to reuse exactly the current mechanism, but with the updated Alt.1 here might not be depending on details.  **Sony:** We share similar view with Huawei. In the new Alt-1, it isn’t clear if dynamic PUCCH resource can be used even if there is no dynamic PUCCH being scheduled that collides in the same slot/sub-slot with the SPS PUCCH. Perhaps we can clarify this for  Alt-1.  **QC**: The preference is to stick to the original Alt -1. Similar view with HW, Sony.  **Lenovo/Motorola Mobility:** Our understanding of the latest Alt 2 is that deferring of SPS PDSCH HARQ-ACK occurs, only if a resulting PUCCH resource after any necessary UCI multiplexing in the initial slot/sub-slot is a semi-statically configured resource (not indicated by DCI) and is not valid.  **China Telecom**：***n1PUCCH-AN*** is HARQ resource for DL SPS configured in SPS-Config, which we think is not dynamic PUCCH resource.  Our understanding of Alt.1 is even there is DCI scheduling a HARQ-ACK to be transmitted in a dynamic PUCCH resource in the initial slot/subslot, the SPS HARQ-ACK can’t be multiplexed in the dynamic PUCCH resource and will be deferred as PUCCH configured by *SPS-PUCCH-AN-List-r16* or *n1PUCCH-AN* is not valid. In this case, the HARQ-ACK delay would be even larger than Rel-16 so we do not prefer it.  For Alt.2, we think it does not imply the SPS HARQ-ACK can use dynamic PUCCH resource when gNB does not sent DCI or UE misses the DCI indicating a dynamic PUCCH resource (i.e. no PRI indication) in the initial slot/subslot. If SPS HARQ-ACK can use dynamic PUCCH resource in *PUCCH-ResourceSet*, the used PUCCH resource would be out of gNB control. For example, gNB sends DCI indicating PUCCH resource1 in *PUCCH-ResourceSet* and assumes SPS HARQ-ACK multiplexing in this resource. But the UE misses the DCI and PUCCH configured by *SPS-PUCCH-AN-List-r16* or *n1PUCCH-AN* is not valid, then according to a rule UE selects PUCCH resource2 in *PUCCH-ResourceSet*. gNB does not know and may schedule PUCCH resource2 to another UE. So we think whether UE can select dynamic PUCCH resource according to a rule needs further discussion.  When UE misses the DCI indicating a dynamic PUCCH resource, UE and gNB would have different understanding of **the resulting PUCCH resource**, thus there is still the misalignment issue regarding whether the HARQ-ACK is deferred. So we suggest Alt.2 to be:   * **Alt. 2: Deferral only, if the SPS HARQ-ACK in the initial slot/sub-slot cannot be transmitted as the ~~resulting~~ PUCCH resource ~~for transmission using~~ configured by SPS-PUCCH-AN-List-r16, n1PUCCH-AN or other configured PUCCH resource(s) is not valid ~~if there is no valid PUCCH resource in the initial slot~~.**    + **FFS: other configured PUCCH resource(s) (e.g., *PUCCH-ResourceSet,* *multi-CSI-PUCCH-ResourceList*)**   + **FFS on the definition of ’not valid’ (i.e. TDD configuration and semi-static flexible symbol handling)**   Samsung2: Regarding Alt1, we share similar view with China Telecom. In our understanding, this is a new UE behaviour from Rel-15/16. In our understanding, Alt1 conflicts with **Updated 2 proposal 2.2.** If we misunderstood anything, could **FL** or companies supporting both Alt1 and **Updated 2 proposal 2.2** clarify a bit?  Regarding the error case for Alt 2 mentioned by China Telecom, similar case happens in Rel-15, if UE misses the DCI, UE transmit HARQ-ACK with SPS PDSCH PUCCH resource. Also, the error case can be avoided by gNB scheduling, e.g. indicating a PRI to align with the predefined rule because gNB also knows about the predefined rule and the payload of HARQ-ACK. Everything is under the control of gNB. Using dynamic PUCCH resource can avoid the misalignment between gNB and UE regarding whether the SPS PDSCH HARQ-ACK is deferred. Therefore, we suggest following update   * **Alt. 2: Deferral only, if the SPS HARQ-ACK in the initial slot/sub-slot cannot be transmitted as the resulting PUCCH resource for transmission using SPS-PUCCH-AN-List-r16, n1PUCCH-AN, *PUCCH-ResourceSet* or other configured PUCCH resource(s) is not valid ~~if there is no valid PUCCH resource in the initial slot~~ if UE does not detect a DCI with HARQ-ACK in the initial slot/sub-slot .**    + **FFS: other configured PUCCH resource(s) (e.g., *~~PUCCH-ResourceSet,~~**multi-CSI-PUCCH-ResourceList*)**   + **FFS on the definition of ’not valid’ (i.e. TDD configuration and semi-static flexible symbol handling)**   For clarification, if UE detects a DCI with HARQ-ACK in the initial slot/sub-slot, the PUCCH should be valid, Rel-15 rules apply.  Intel: We see minor difference in how Alt. 1 and Alt. 2 can work, but Alt. 2 is more general and has additional useful considerations. Thus we can go with Alt. 2 this meeting and see if there are any issues with using additional PUCCH resources. Next time we can confirm or discard these new PUCCH resources. If modified in the following way, we can let companies to think more about this possibility: **FFS: other configured PUCCH resource(s) (e.g., none, *PUCCH-ResourceSet,* *multi-CSI-PUCCH-ResourceList, newly configured PUCCH*, etc.)** |

Now having more clarity at least on the Alternatives discussed above, it seems, that we might be able to come back to the definition of what a collision with what types of symbols (SS-DL/SSB/CORSET#0/SS-FL) we need to consider here.

**Question 2.3.1: For SPS HARQ-ACK deferral, for the determination of valid symbols in the initial slot/sub-slot a collision with the following symbols is regarded as ‘invalid’ or ‘no symbols for UL transmission’:**

* **Alt. 1: Semi-static DL symbols, SSB and CORESET#0**
* **Alt. 2: Semi-static DL / SSB / CORESET#0 and semi-static flexible symbols**
* **Alt. 3: Depending on the configuration of monitoring for DCI format 2\_0 / SFI**
  + **Alt. 1, if DCI format 2\_0 is not configured to be monitored, Alt. 1 is preferred.**
  + **Alt. 2, if DCI format 2\_0 is configured to be monitored**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | *Support / comments* |
| Alt. 1 | Vivo, Samsung, DCM, Xiaomi, TCL, Spreadtrum, NEC, ZTE, Huawei/HiSilicon, Sony, Lenovo/Motorola Mobility, Nokia/NSB, Ericsson, QC, Sharp, Panasonic, China Telecom, Apple, CATT, WILUS, OPPO, Intel |
| Alt. 2 | Lenovo/Motorola Mobility |
| Alt. 3: | LG, Huawei/HiSilicon, APT |
| Comments | LG: determination of “invalid” should consider an ambiguity of DCI missing. It would be beneficial to follow default behavior of Rel-16 UE.  Huawei/HiSilicon: In our understanding, Alt.3 is the best since it also considers the impact from dynamic SFI. However, we are fine to go with Alt.1 for simplicity.  Nokia/NSB: Alt. 1 for simplicity, Alt. 3 could work but there again the DL grant overriding may be an issue. |

**Further details on conditions / deferral in terms of slot/sub-slot offset for deferal:**

**Coming back some of the issues from the first round, namely the limitation in terms of the deferral, the following can be noted:**

* Question 2.2.1: there seems to be strong majority of the opinion, that the underlaying granularity from the initial slot/sub-slot to the target sub-slot should be 1 slot (with potential limitations of the configured K1 sets being FFS)*🡪 maybe we could try to have an agreement on this in last GTW session*
* Question 2.2.2: There seems to be the common point, that large majority of companies seems to have in mind some kind of restriction in mind – but companies are rather split between Alt. 1 & Alt. 2. Suggestion is to continue discussion next meeting (as it seems to be not possible to achieve any agreement still in this meeting).
* Question 2.2.3: A majority of companies suggesting to not limit the deferral in terms of *k1+k1def* to the k1 values, some companies are referring to the maximum deferral (of Question 2.2.2) and 4 out of 22 replies think a restriction to the existing k1 values in the K1 set (not just for maximum deferral – but basically affecting the steps size) should be done.

Based on this the following is supported:

**Proposal 2.3.1: For SPS HARQ-ACK, the deferral from the initial slot/sub-slot determined by *k1* in the activation DCI to the target slot/sub-slot determined by *k1*+ *k1def*, the UE will check the validity (TBD) of a target slot/sub-slot evaluating from one slot/sub-slot to the next sub/sub-slot (i.e. principle *k1def* granularity is 1 slot/sub-slot)**

* **FFS: if there is a limit on the minimum deferral considered the required UE processing (*k1def* >1)**
* **FFS: if there is a limit on the maximum deferral given in terms of e.g. *k1def* <=X or *k1+k1def* <=X**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | *Support / comments* |
| Support: | Vivo, Samsung (in principle, needs clarification validity and what UE impact if validity fails), DCM, Xiaomi, TCL, Spreadtrum, NEC, ZTE, Huawei/HiSilicon (in principle), Sony, APT, Lenovo/Motorola Mobility, Nokia/NSB, Ericsson, Panasonic, China Telecom, CATT, WILUS, OPPO(In principle), LG (for simplicity) |
| Do not support: |  |
| Comments | ZTE: For the first FFS, it is not necessary to consider the minimum deferral.  Huawei/HiSilicon: From the summary from feature lead, people prefer not to limit *k1def* to the k1 values, not sure if there is any misunderstanding on our reply. At least from our perspective, we meant limiting ***k1+k1def*** to an existing k1 value, not limiting *k1def* to the k1 values. The motivation is to minimize the standard effort, since we can reuse the existing HARQ-ACK codebook generation mechanism. Therefore, we propose to add the following FFS to the proposal: **FFS: if limiting *k1+k1def* to an existing k1 value in the applicable K1 set**  >>>>Moderator reply to HW/HiSi: thanks for noting the mistake above. On the additional proposed FFS, the intention was to get rid of one issue (based on the feedback from 22 vs. 4 from 2nd round).  QC: The question is not formulated properly. Is the FL intention to define a minimum deferral step, ***k1def***?  OPPO: The motivation to define minimum value of ***k1def*** is not clear. In our understanding, ***k1*** can ensure enough processing time. In addition, why must ***k1def*** be larger than 1? If there is not deferring, ***k1def=0.***  Intel: we are not in favour of arbitrary k1 values but can accept majority view |

**Further down-selection of RRC configuration**

Based on the 3rd round, there seems to be a good majority of companies supporting per SPS configuration in contrast to per PUCCH configuration. As the intention based on the earlier agreement was to down-select between the two options, the following proposal is brought forward:

**FL Proposal 2.3.2: The deferring of SPS HARQ-ACK dropped due to TDD specific collisions is configured by RRC per SPS configuration.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | *Support / comments* |
| Support: | Vivo, DCM, Xiaomi, Spreadtrum, NEC, ZTE, LG, Huawei/HiSilicon, Sony, APT, Lenovo/Motorola Mobility, Nokia/NSB, QC, Sharp, Panasonic, WILUS, OPPO, Intel |
| Do not support: |  |
| Object to proposal: | Samsung, Ericsson, Apple, CATT |
| Reason for objection: | Samsung (Motivation mentioned by supporting companies is still not that clear. For vivo’s comment “Some SPS configurations may have longer periodicity, then the configuration for its HARQ-ACK feedback can avoid the semi-static DL/SSB symbols”, what we understand is that some SPS configurations don’t need deferring configuration. If right, we don’t see any problem that gNB configures that the SPS HARQ would be deferring per PUCCH group level since the concerned SPS can avoid the collision between semi-static DL/SSB even though deferring is configured)  Ericsson: Agree with SS comment that for SPS configuration that does not require deferral, it means that there is no issue with A/N dropping that requires deferral, e.g., SPS period is long. Then even if deferral is activated for this SPS config, it does not matter anyway.  Having deferral per SPS config can complicates the CB construction procedure and cause out-of-order HARQ issues, specially in case of multi-DL SPS configuration which complicates the procedures. Please see example below for the CB sent in slot n+7.   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Example:** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | DL0 SPS configured with periodicity of one slot and activated from slot n+2 with K1=1. | | | | | | | | |  |  | | DL1 SPS configured with periodicity of two slots and activated from slot n+4 with K1=1. | | | | | | | | |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | slot |  | n | n+1 | n+2 | n+3 | n+4 | n+5 | n+6 | n+7 |  | | TDd config | | D | D | D | U | D | D | D | U |  | | DL0 SPS (defer enabled) | | |  | DL0 SPS0 |  | DL0 SPS1 | DL0 SPS2 | DL0 SPS3 |  |  | | DL0 SPS HARQ-ACK | |  |  | A0 |  | A1 | A2 | A3 |  |  | | DL1 SPS (defer diabled) | | |  |  |  | DL1 SPS0 |  | DL1 SPS1 |  |  | | DL1 SPS HARQ-ACK | |  |  |  |  | B0 |  | B1 |  |  | | PUCCH transmission | | |  |  | **PUCCH in slot n+3** | |  |  | **PUCCH in slot n+7** | | |  |  |  |  |  | **CB={A0}** |  |  |  | **CB= {A1,A2,A3,B1}** | | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |   Vivo2 replies to Samsung and Ericsson: sorry for causing the confusion. My intention is different SPS configuration are addressing different traffic with different requirements. For some SPS configurations, NW may not care about its HARQ-ACK dropping or its HARQ-ACK dropping is infrequent and is acceptable for the network; For some SPS configurations, its HARQ-ACK dropping may be frequent and NW wants to recover it.  **QC: Agreement with Vivo. In some cases, e.g. in case of IIOT scenario with 1 ms cycle operating at FR 1, deferring SPS PUCCH HARQ is of no use, since the slightest delay in SPS PUCCH HARQ transmission means that feedback is transmitted after the DL packet expiration.**  **Regarding the figure presented by Ericsson, the scenario lacks credibility. In which URLLC/IIOT traffic scenario, as described in TS 22.804, TR 38.824 the system is configured as indicated in the figure above? Is it possible to have details on the**   * **slot duration** * **traffic periodicity** * **DL packet expiration**   **Of the above figure?**  **Apple: complicated codebook construction and no obivous benefits.**  Samsung2: Thank you for the question. If I understand correctly, per SPS configuration may provide more flexibility to NW operation. It might be true. But, before we talking about the flexibility, why gNB needs to care or doesn’t care HARQ dropping depending on SPS configuration. Sorry we didn’t follow the supporting company’s logic well. We don’t think the motivation explained by vivo and QC is clear to us. Anyhow, if gNB allows HARQ-ACK dropping in some SPS configurations, there is no chance for gNB to figure out on whether a UE receives corresponding PDSCH well or not. This is the fact. So, anyhow, gNB should reschedule with maybe unnecessary PDCCH/PDSCH resources. In this sense, it is a quite straightforward for gNB NOT to allow HARQ-ACK dropping to any SPS configuration if gNB can use this feature.  CATT: Similar as Samsung, Ericsson and Apple, the motivation of a per-SPS configuration SPS HARQ-ACK dropping is not justified and it is clear that it would complicate the HARQ-ACK CB generation.  **QC: The motivation for supporting SPS PUCCH HARQ deferral per SPS is clear: in some cases, deferring SPS PUCCH HARQ will delay HARQ feedback to a time instant, which exceeds the DL packet expiration, or to a moment at which HARQ feedback is of no use at the network. In the large majority of traffic scenarios, as they are described in TS 22.804 (and as simulated in Rel. 16 URLLC item and in 5G ACIA), traffic arrives periodically, within periods of few ms typically and the packets expire when the next packet arrives. Which of these traffic scenarios has Samsung in mind by stating this?** Anyhow, if gNB allows HARQ-ACK dropping in some SPS configurations, there is no chance for gNB to figure out on whether a UE receives corresponding PDSCH well or not.  **This description does not correspond to a likely scenario with URLLC/IIOT traffic. If the network has configured certain SPS not to defer SPS PUCCH HARQ, because the network can not make any use of this deferred HARQ. In case gNB configures UEs not to defer transmission of dropped SPS PUCCH HARQ, this means, that the gNB does not want the delayed HARQ feedback. In this case, the gNB won’t retransmit DL packets.** |

**Further details on potential multiplexing of deferred SPS HARQ-ACK and initial UCI (incl. HARQ-ACK):**

There seemed to be good support in the 3rd round (19 companies, 2 companies not supporting) the updated proposal 2.2. on reusing the Rel-16 multiplexing rules. Maybe worth checking if there would be any objection on trying to take a related agreement here (track changes from 3rd round removed):

**Updated 2 proposal 2.2: Rel-16 UCI multiplexing / PUCCH overriding rules are reused for deferred SPS HARQ-ACK in the target slot, if applicable.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | *Companies / comments* |
| Support: | Vivo (with clarification: here the slot/sub-slot for multiplexing include both the “target slot” after SPS HARQ-ACK deferral and the “initial slot”? If it includes both, we are fine to remove the note in Alt.1 of **Update 3 Question 2.1.2**)  >>>>Moderator reply: the intention here was basically for the target slot / deferred SPS only. As we only need to define the behaviour if deferred, not if the SPS HARQ can be transmitted in the initial slot already.  Samsung (We would like to clarify a bit with following update. Rel-16 UCI multiplexing/HARQ-ACK overriding rules are reused for deferred SPS HARQ-ACK, if applicable.)  >>>>Moderator reply: tried to address above, using ‘PUCCH overriding’  DCM, Xiaomi, TCL, Spreadtrum, NEC, ZTE, Huawei/HiSilicon, Sony, APT, Nokia/NSB, QC, Sharp, Panasonic, CATT, WILUS, Intel  Ericsson (With respect to LG comment, in our view, the PUCCH after deferring in target slot is intended here. That is based on our reading from “deferred SPS HARQ in the target slot”. If that is not the case, needs clarification)  China Telecom  OPPO: What does “HARQ-ACK overriding” mean? Does it mean that PUCCH resource overriding procedure for dynamic downlink transmission, i.e. PUCCH resource is determined by PRI in last DCI.  LG: Fine with FL’s clarification. |
| Object: |  |
| Reason for objection: | LG: The order between SPS HARQ-ACK deferring and UCI multiplexing should be clarified first. For example, whether HP SPS HARQ-ACK PUCCH cancels LP PUCCH before the deferring. |

On question 2.2.9, if the multiplexing is considered in the determination of the target slot, it had been pointed out that:

* Alt. 1: Determining the target slot without considering multiplexing will simply the UE implementation (less complex)
* Alt. 2 can lead to lower latency

But there may be a need for further clarification, as e.g. if the multiplexing in the target slot should only consider DG HARQ or also SR &/ CSI (as pointed out by vivo). And also what PUCCH resources are to be considered when defining the target slot (resulting in a similar discussion / options as in the initial slot).

So maybe we need to go one step back and try to get input by companies of which PUCCH config should be considered when defining the target slot:

**Question 2.3.2: How should the target slot of the deferral be determined, if the PUCCH resource of which PUCCH config is at least colliding with DL/SSB (semi-static flexible symbols is FFS)**

* **Alt. 1: Only deferred SPS HARQ codebook size is considered, using SPS-PUCCH-AN-List-r16 or n1PUCCH-AN**
* **Alt. 2: Only deferred SPS HARQ codebook size is considered, using SPS-PUCCH-AN-List-r16, n1PUCCH-AN or other configured PUCCH resources(s)**
  + **FFS: other configured PUCCH resource(s) (e.g., PUCCH-ResourceSet, multi-CSI-PUCCH-ResourceList)**
* **Alt. 3: Deferred SPS HARQ and initial (SPS or DG) HARQ is considered, using SPS-PUCCH-AN-List-r16, n1PUCCH-AN or PUCCH-ResourceSet**
* **Alt. 4: …**
* **Alt. 5: …**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | *Support / comments* |
| Alt. 1 | CATT, LG |
| Alt. 2 | vivo, ZTE |
| Alt. 3: | vivo, Samsung, DCM, Xiaomi, Spreadtrum, NEC, Huawei/HiSilicon, Sony, APT, Lenovo/Motorola Mobility, Nokia/NSB, Ericsson, QC, Sharp, Panasonic, WILUS |
| Alt. 4: |  |
| Alt. 5: |  |

If you want to provide additional comments, please provide them in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *Comments* |
| vivo | We think Alt.2 and Alt.3 are not exclusive each other. If there is HARQ-ACK for DG in the target slot/sub-slot, based on current spec, HARQ-ACK for SPS should be multiplexed with HARQ-ACK for DG and use DG PUCCH resource; If there is no HARQ-ACK for DG in the target slot/sub-slot, the resource in SPS-PUCCH-AN-List-r16, n1PUCCH-AN, PUCCH-ResourceSet can be used. |
| Samsung | Rel-15/16 HARQ-ACK overriding/ rule should apply. First, the payload of HARQ-ACK codebook should include all the HARQ-ACK information that would be transmitted in a same slot/sub-slot. Then, PUCCH resource is determined according to the payload. |
| DCM | As we understand, for Alt 1 and Alt 2, deferred HARQ multiplexing with initial HARQ-ACK is not considered when determining target slot/sub-slot. The difference between Alt 1 and Alt 2 is candidate PUCCH resources for deferred SPS HARQ-ACK. While for Alt 3, deferred HARQ multiplexing with initial HARQ-ACK is considered when determining target slot/sub-slot. From lower latency perspective, we prefer Alt 3. |
| Spreadtrum | Support Alt 3, which has more scheduling flexibility and lower latency. For deferred SPS HARQ either with or W/O initial HARQ, a total UCI is applied to determine SPS PUCCH resource or PUCCH-ResourceSet (a specified way is needed to determine a PUCCH resource). In addition, we suggest a common note regarding misunderstanding between gNB and UE that mentioned by Samsung and FL should be added for the proposals. |
| NEC | For Alt. 3, from our point of view, if the determined HARQ-ACK codebook in the target slot/sub-slot includes only SPS HARQ-ACK (deferred SPS HARQ and/or initial SPS HARQ), SPS PUCCH resource (SPS-PUCCH-AN-List-r16, n1PUCCH-AN) is used; if the determined HARQ-ACK codebook in the target slot/sub-slot includes both SPS HARQ-ACK and DG HARQ-ACK, DG PUCCH resource (PUCCH-ResourceSet) is used. |
| ZTE | We prefer Alt.2, but suggest removing “*multi-CSI-PUCCH-ResourceList*” in the FFS as we are discussing HARQ-ACK deferral, not related to CSI.  We believe that determining the target slot for deferral and determining a new valid PUCCH are two separate and successive steps. In order to determine a new valid PUCCH, firstly the target slot can be found and then to validate the PUCCH resources in this slot.  It seems we can choose Alt.3 too, but I am not sure whether the initial (SPS or DG) HARQ is in the target slot or in initial slot. Before the clarification on this, we select Alt.2 by now. |
| LG | We think Alt. 1 is necessary for deterministic deferring |
| APT | For Alt. 3, we prefer not to consider DG HARQ-ACK for determination of a PUCCH resource using SPS-PUCCH-AN-List-r16 in the target slot. |
| Nokia/NSB | Alt. 3 would be preferable from performance compared to Alt. 1. If acceptable for UE/chipset side. |
| Ericsson | Same view as Samsung.  To clarify, since it is mentioned target slot, our understanding is that no more deferring occurs.  If statement in main bullet needs update. It is not clear what it means. |
| China Telecom | We would like to have clarification for Alt 3.  Does that mean if there is valid PUCCH in any of the configured SPS-PUCCH-AN-List-r16, n1PUCCH-AN or PUCCH-ResourceSet, the corresponding slot/sub-slot can be deferred slot/sub-slot? For example, there is no valid PUCCH configured by SPS-PUCCH-AN-List-r16 or n1PUCCH-AN, but there is valid dynamic PUCCH resource configured in PUCCH-ResourceSet for a slot/sub-slot. gNB sends DCI indicating the valid dynamic PUCCH resource in *PUCCH-ResourceSet* and assumes SPS HARQ-ACK multiplexing in this resource. But the UE misses the DCI, even PUCCH configured by *SPS-PUCCH-AN-List-r16* or *n1PUCCH-AN* is not valid, the slot/sub-slot is considered as the deferred slot/sub-slot and SPS HARQ-ACK would not be further deferred? |
| CATT | In our view, Alt. 1is inline with Alt. 1 while Alt. 3 is inline with Alt. 2 to question 2.1.2. We are surprised to see a large number of companies support Alt. 1 to Question 2.1.2 but support Alt. 3 here. Maybe we misunderstood the Alternatives here? |
| WILUS | A PUCCH resource is selected based on total number of HARQ-ACK bits including SPS HARQ-ACK (regardless of deferred or not) and DG HARQ-ACK in a slot/sub-slot as in Rel-15/16 |
| OPPO | The proposal is confusing. The proposal is intended to determine target slot or which PUCCH resource can be used in determined target slot? |

**Out-of-order HARQ with deferred SPS HARQ?**

The question had been raised, if there is OoO-HARQ in case SPS HARQ is deferred. In principle this could be the case, but then from UE processing time the UE based on the k1 value in the activation DCI should have the SPS PDSCH decoded in time should be ready for transmitting the SPS HARQ. Therefore, the deferral procedure of dropped SPS HARQ at least to moderator understanding should not lead to any OoO HARQ issues. There may just need to be a different handling in case the HARQ process from SPS PDSCH is not valid anymore (as e.g. a DG PDSCH has been scheduled using the same HARQ-ID).

**FL proposal 2.3.3:** **The deferring of SPS HARQ-ACK dropped due to TDD specific collisions does not lead to out-of-order HARQ restrictions.**

* **FFS: additional handling of the deferred HARQ-ACK for the SPS HARQ processes which are not valid anymore (i.e. HARQ process re-used / overwritten due to e.g. DG PDSCH or another SPS PDSCH with the same HARQ ID)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | *Support / comments* |
| Support: | Vivo (support in principle), Samsung (in principle, prefer working assumption due to unidentified potential issue), DCM, Xiaomi, TCL, ZTE, APT, Lenovo/Motorola Mobility, Nokia/NSB, QC (consider this case as working assumption, if realistic cases indicate the opposite, this can be discussed again), Sharp, CATT, WILUS, LG (with FL’s clarification) |
| Do not support: | LG (supportive to have WA for given two different HARQ process)  Ericsson (better to wait with this proposal)  OPPO ( We do agree that deferring can not cause OOO, but FFS is not clear )  Intel (agree to wait for other aspects first) |
| Comments | Vivo: we would like to understand what the FFS means. Current spec already allows SPS HARQ process overwritten by DG PDSCH with the same HARQ ID, the handling is the same; or the intention is to say “FFS: additional handling of **the deferred HARQ-ACK for the** SPS HARQ processes which are not valid anymore (i.e. HARQ process re-used / overwritten due to e.g. DG PDSCH with the same HARQ ID)”  >>>>Moderator reply: tried to address above  Samsung: The OOO issue caused by DG PDSCH can be simply avoided by gNB implementation but it may happen that there can be OOO issue between SPS PDSCH with deferred HARQ-ACK and regular SPS PDSCH. We would like to suggest the following update for the FFS. “FFS: additional handling of SPS HARQ processes which are not valid anymore (i.e. HARQ process re-used / overwritten due to e.g. ~~DG~~ another SPS PDSCH with the same HARQ ID)”  >>>>Moderator reply: tried to address above, but please note that there is no restriction on overriding with DG PUSCH, if the initial transmission failed – right? Anyhow, maybe further discussing needed on that one.  LG: we think there could be no OoO issue for given two HARQ process as FL mentioned, since UE has sufficient processing time for both. However, if HARQ-ACK for a HARQ process is deferred beyond PDSCH transmission with the same HARQ process, UE need to preserve two decoding result for a single HARQ process. It may have impact on both PHY and MAC. At least it is necessary to set next SPS PDSCH occasion with the same HARQ process as maximum deferral.  >>>>Moderator reply: I hope this issue is captured in FFS discussions (the FFS point), was specifically added by moderator to take the earlier LG comments into account.  Ericsson: We do agree, deferring should not cause OOO. Please see for example our comment about deferring per DL SPS configuration. However, it is not clear what the FFS mean. And what is the deferring procedures. So, better wait with this proposal and instead agree on the principle design (defer should not cause OOO).  **QC**: The syntax and the wording of the proposal are not clear. Is it possible to reformulate the proposal to “the working assumption is that deferred SPS PUCCH HARD in dynamic TDD does not lead in out-of-order HARQ receptions”?  Can Samsung and LG give an example with numbers for which DL traffic in URRLC/IIOT scenarios – as described in TS 22.804-OOT can occur?  LG2: Fine with the clarification from Feature lead. When SPS is configured with limited number of HARQ process and shorter periodicity, and up to deferral procedure, HARQ-ACK deferring can reach a starting of another SPS PDSCH reception with same HARQ process. If we consider multiple SPS configuration for various service or non-integer periodicity, the problem become more realistic. |

## 2.4 Fifth round of email discussions

Thanks for the input provided in the 4th round.

**Further details on SPS HARQ-ACK applicable for deferral:**

There had been comments, that the earlier alternative 1 version had been better (HW/HiSi, QC, Sony,..). I am sorry and of course would be willing to revert this. And there had been questions if Alt. 1 (in its updated version) would change the current multiplexing behaviour in the initial slot (Samsung / China Telecom).

Clearly this was not the intention, and the suggested modifications may have caused some confusion here. Therefore, it is proposed to go back to the original version! As a preparation for next meeting (as it seems to be not possible to down-select anymore), please provide suggestions on the changed wording (so that we all have the same understanding of the different alternatives).

**Update 4 Question 2.1.2: What is the condition of SPS HARQ-ACK dropped for TDD to be subject to deferal?**

* **Alt. 1: Deferral only, if the SPS HARQ-ACK in the initial slot/sub-slot cannot be transmitted as the resulting PUCCH resource for transmission using the PUCCH by *SPS-PUCCH-AN-List-r16* or *n1PUCCH-AN* is not valid**
  + ***Note: This means, that if SPS HARQ-ACK is multiplexed with any other UCI / dynamic PUCCH resource then it cannot be deferred!***
  + **FFS on the definition of ‘not valid’ (i.e. TDD configuration and semi-static flexible symbol handling)**
* **Alt. 2: Deferral only, if the SPS HARQ-ACK in the initial slot/sub-slot cannot be transmitted as the resulting PUCCH resource for transmission using SPS-PUCCH-AN-List-r16, n1PUCCH-AN or other configured PUCCH resource(s) is not valid ~~if there is no valid PUCCH resource in the initial slot~~.** 
  + **FFS: other configured PUCCH resource(s) (e.g., *PUCCH-ResourceSet,* *multi-CSI-PUCCH-ResourceList*)**
  + **FFS on the definition of ’not valid’ (i.e. TDD configuration and semi-static flexible symbol handling)**
* **Alt. 3: Defer if there is no available symbol for an UL transmission in the initial slot/sub-slot.**
  + **FFS on the definition of ‘no available symbol for an UL transmission’ (i.e. TDD configuration and semi-static flexible symbol handling)**
  + **Note: For all options, the initial slot/sub-slot refers to the slot/sub-slot for HARQ-ACK transmissions determined by the indicated k1 value in the SPS activation DCI.**

**Please provide your comments on the description of the different alternatives – but not what you support (we know your preferences already, from earlier rounds) in the table :**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *Comments* |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

Looking at the support of the different options on the determination of the valid symbols, there seems to be a strong majority (>20 companies) thinking that only semi-static DL, SSB & CORESET#0 should be used as a criteria. 3 companies think there should maybe be a different case depending on the configuration of the SFI. Maybe one could in addition argue here, that the dependence on SFI was excluded based on GTW discussions – but maybe let’s not go in that direction. To put if rather direct here, would there be a company objecting to go with the majority view here, to also have the same behaviour for the operation independently if SFI is configured or not. **So this is mainly to check from Lenovo/Moto, HW/HiSi, LGE & APT. I am not sure if we are able to have agreements still per email, but at least input by these companies could be helpful here.**

**Proposal 2.4.1: For SPS HARQ-ACK deferral, for the determination of valid symbols in the initial slot/sub-slot a collision with semi-static DL symbols, SSB and CORESET#0 is regarded as ‘invalid’ or ‘no symbols for UL transmission’.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | *Companies / comments* |
| Support: | Vivo, Samsung, DCM, Xiaomi, TCL, Spreadtrum, NEC, ZTE, Sony, , Nokia/NSB, Ericsson, QC, Sharp, Panasonic, China Telecom, Apple, CATT, WILUS, OPPO, Intel  Huawei/HiSilicon??  Lenovo/Motorola Mobility?? |
| Object: |  |
| Reason for objection: |  |

In todays GTW, we agreed on a slightly modified version of Proposal 2.3.1 of Sec. 2.3 (please check chairman’s notes), where the following FFS is noted:

* **FFS: if there is a limit on the minimum deferral considered the required UE processing (*k1def* ≥0)**

As companies were not sure if this is needed, let’s quickly check this. Maybe we could resolve this (or neglect if not indicate for a need).

**Question 2.4.1: Do you see a need for a minimum deferral in multiple of slots/sub-slots *k1def,min* to account for the needed UE processing of the HARQ deferral process?   
If so, please describe your reasons and the minimum you have in mind there.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | *Companies / comments* |
| Yes – *k1def,min* is needed  No need |  |
| Reason for a need of *k1def,min* and how to define / value(s) |  |
| Other comments |  |

And maybe as a last thing, if companies would like to urge other companies to **consider specific things or think about certain things till the next RAN1 meeting (and treat in their contributions)**, please provide below. I will try to summarize this in the final FL summary as recommendation / things to consider:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *Comments* |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# Retransmission of cancelled HARQ

In this section, the company positions on the support of retransmission of cancelled HARQ-ACK are summarized.

Overall, the following input on the **support of re-transmission of canceled HARQ-ACK** in Rel-17 was given:

* **Support:** ZTE [1], OPPO [2], vivo [7]
  + For LP HARQ-ACK: ZTE [1] (LP prioritized, same principle could be applied to HP HARQ)
  + For HP HARQ-ACK:
  + For LP & HP HARQ-ACK: vivo [7] (unified solution), Mediatek [8] (not optimized for HP HARQ) Sony [12] (mechanism also applicable to HP HARQ), APT [17]
* **No support:** Huawei / HiSi [3], BUPT [3], China Southern Power Grid [3], China Telecom [14] (‘study with low priority)
* **Cons:** Not essential for LP HARQ (e.g. in [1] Huawei / HiSi [3], BUPT [3] and China Southern Power Grid), can be avoided for HP HARQ by gNB implementation (e.g. in [1] Huawei / HiSi [3], BUPT [3] and China Southern Power Grid)

Suggested **methods to support re-transmission of canceled HARQ-ACK**:

* **Alt. 1 - Support of Type 2 CB Enhancements:** 2x Yes – 1x No
  + **Yes:** vivo [7] (but Type 3 with higher priority), APT [17]
  + **No:** Nokia [10]
  + **Cons against Type 2 CB usage:**
  + **Details:** 
    - PHY priority enhancement - two PDSCH groups per PHY priority/PUCCH configuration: vivo [7], APT [17]
* **Alt. 2 - Support of Type 3 CB Enhancements:** 19x Yes – 1x No
  + **Yes:** Ericsson [4], CAICT [5], CATT [6], vivo [7], Intel [9], Nokia [10], Sony [12], LGE [13], TCL [15], NEC [16], Moto/Len [18], ETRI [21], Xiaomi [22], Interdigital [24], Apple [25], Qualcomm [26] , Sharp [27], DOCOMO [28], WILUS [29]
  + **No:** Samsung [23]? (large Type 3 CB overhead, otherwise new codebook)
  + **Const against Type 3 usage:** large overhead (e.g. ZTE [1]), mix of HP & LP HARQ bits (e.g. ZTE [1]), need for UE to reconstruct codebook (e.g. ZTE [1]), any payload size optimization would basically mean introducing a new codebook (Samsung [23])
  + **Suggested Type 3 CB enhancements:**
    - PHY priority indication in the triggering DCI of the PUCCH carrying the Type 3 CB: Ericsson [4], Nokia [10], APT [17], Apple [25], Sharp [27], WILUS [29]
    - Only consider activated CCs: Ericsson [4]
    - Only subset of configured CCs: Nokia [10], ETRI [15], Xiaomi [22], Apple [25]
    - Only dropped HARQ-ACK: CAICT [5], TCL [15], Panasonic [19], Interdigital [24] (based on a flag)
    - DCI format support (i.e. DCI format 1\_2): CAICT [5], Nokia [10], WILUS [29]
    - Only SPS HARQ processes: Intel [9], TCL [15], NEC [16], Panasonic [19], ETRI [21], , Xiaomi [22] (including indicated subset)
      * Including a subset of SPS configurations defined by RRC or dynamic indication: NEC [16]
    - Configure if all HARQ processes or only (certain) SPS HARQ processes are included: CATT [6], LGE [13] (RNTI of the triggering DCI to distinguish), Apple [25], WILUS [29]
    - Allow the dynamic triggering to indicate a sub-set of HARQ processes / cells: vivo [7], Nokia [10], LGE [13], Xiaomi [22], WILUS [29]
    - Support grouping of HARQ processes: Intel [9]
    - Consider autonomous (without DCI) Type 3 CB triggering when *NDrop* SPS HARQ-ACKs are dropped: Sony [12]
    - Consider handling of retransmissions of cancelled HARQ-ACK with one L1 priority and/or codebook type in another HARQ-ACK codebook of different L1 priority and/or different codebook type: Sony [12]
    - Autonomous Type 3 CB transmission on CG-PUSCH resources: Moto/Len [18]
    - Separate Type 3 CB configuration for low and high PHY priority: Apple [25]
    - N bits in the Type 3 HARQ codebook, where the bits of SPS HARQ-IDs within a time window are to be mapped: Qualcomm [26]
    - HARQ processes limited to a given time window: Qualcomm [26], DOCOMO [28]
    - Separate Type 3 CB construction for HP and LP: DOCOMO [28] – either NACK for the different priority or variable size (possible ambiguity)
    - Inclusion of HARQ-ACK of SPS release DCI: WILUS [29]
* **Alt. 3 - UL grant scheduling PUSCH to carry dropped HARQ:** 3x Yes – 1x No
  + Yes: ZTE [1], Nokia [10] (UL grant re-tx triggering, semi-static configuration for CG PUSCH), Samsung [23] (without UL-SCH)
  + No: vivo [7]
* **Alt. 4 - DCI scheduling new PUCCH / PUSCH resource for LP HARQ re-transmission:** 2x Yes – 1x No
  + **Yes:** ZTE [1], OPPO [2]
  + **No:** vivo [7]
  + Triggering possible as soon as the conflict is determined: ZTE [1]

## 3.1 First round of email discussions

*Moderator comments:*

The following support / not support for the 4 different techniques have been indicated by the different companies:

* **Alt. 1 - Support of Type 2 CB Enhancements:** 1x Yes – 1x No
* **Alt. 2 - Support of Type 3 CB Enhancements:** 19x Yes – 1x No
* **Alt. 3 - UL grant scheduling PUSCH to carry dropped HARQ:** 3x Yes – 1x No
* **Alt. 4 - DCI scheduling new PUCCH / PUSCH resource for LP HARQ re-transmission:** 2x Yes – 1x No

The moderator would like to in addition note the following:

* There (at least for the moment) there seems to be **little support or interest in Alt. 1, 3 & 4 compared to Type 3 CB operation enhancements of Alt. 3**. It is therefore proposed, to **focus the related discussions (at least) during the first week on Type 3 CB enhancements**.
* It seems to be not really helping to agree to support some Type 3 codebook enhancements (without knowing which). Therefore, it is suggested to **discuss and potentially agree different Type 3 CB enhancements directly (and if needed one by one throughout the WI phase)**.
* When looking at the **details of the proposed Type 3 CB enhancements**, at least the following can be noted (without discussing all of them here, please check the summary in Sec. 3):
  + Several companies indicated the need to have the PHY priority index of the PUCCH associated with the triggered Type 3 CB defined (using the Rel-16 PHY priority indication). It seems that at least such enhancement is needed to be compatible with the Rel-16 PHY priority framework. It is therefore suggested to try to agree on this. This does not preclude any additional enhancements with respect to PHY priority operation.
  + Several companies seem to suggest to support the triggering using DCI format 1\_2 in Rel-17. The operation should be clear and just some details on the fixed bits in DCI format 1\_2 (as done in 1\_1) may be needed. Therefore, the moderator thinks the suggestion should be complete and therefore RAN1 could be in a position to agree to such related proposal (related proposal provided)
  + There have been plenty of different proposals on how to reduce the Type 3 CB size for the purpose of cancelled HARQ (for SPS and/or DG PDSCH) or specifically for retransmission of dropped SPS HARQ-ACK. The moderator feels that discussing these in the first round of email discussions may not be bringing the group too much further. At this point otherwise, there could maybe a generic agreement to have support for a Type 3 CB not including all HARQ IDs of all configured CCs (i.e. smaller codebook size compared to Rel-16).

Based on the above the following is proposed:

**FL Proposal 3.2: The indicated PHY priority index in the DCI triggering the Type 3 HARQ-ACK codebook defines the PHY priority index of the PUCCH associated with the triggered Type 3 HARQ-ACK codebook. If a priority index is not provided to a UE in the triggering DCI, the priority index is 0.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | *List of companies* |
| Support proposal 3.2 | Vivo, Sony, Nokia/NSB, DCM, Apple, InterDigital, Intel, CATT, Panasonic, NEC, Sharp, WILUS, Spreadtrum, ZTE, Ericsson, TCL, APT |
| Do not support PHY priority handling for Type 3 CB in Rel-17 | MediaTek,, Samsung, Lenovo/Motorola Mobility, Huawei/HiSilicon, China Telecom (study with low priority), QC |

Addition comments can be provided below (especially for companies not supporting the proposal at all, not even in principle):

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *Comments* |
| MediaTek | We support reusing existing Type 3 HARQ-ACK codebook. If it is not suitable for URLLC operation, we support adopting Alt. 3 “UL grant scheduling PUSCH to carry dropped HARQ”. |
| OPPO | Retransmission HARQ-ACK includes HARQ-ACKs for eMBB and URLLC. However, Type 3 HARQ-ACK codebook payload is too large to satisfy ultra-reliability requirement for URLLC in some cases. Therefore, payload reduction is the premise of that Type 3 HARQ-ACK codebook is applied for URLLC. If Type3 HARQ-ACK codebook payload cannot be reduced, we support adopting Alt 4.  The intention and benefit of PHY priority indication is not clear for us. At least, PHY priority indication can not reduce Type 3 HARQ-ACK codebook payload. |
| Xiaomi | We have no strong concern |
| Samsung | Type-3 HARQ-ACK codebook is irrelevant for the objective of retransmission of a dropped HARQ-ACK codebook. All needed is a trigger and a resource for the UE to retransmit.  Type-3 codebook is optional and a UE/gNB cannot be expected to support, even if the UE/gNB support NR-U (no need in general as Type-3 is always inferior to Type-2 which is mandatory).  Support of Type-3 HARQ-ACK codebook (and of other NR-U features) in Rel-17 IIoT/URLLC is out of scope. |
| Apple | Feedback overhead with Type 3 CB needs to be addressed so it is more suitable for URLLC |
| Intel | In general we support what is written in the proposal, but agree with OPPO that the main aspect of using Type 3 CB for re-transmission of HARQ-ACK is its payload reduction. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Rel-16 Type-3 HARQ-ACK codebook can be reused, whenever possible/applicable. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We still don’t see the motivation to support type 3 HARQ-ACK codebook for URLLC, because for type 3 HARQ-ACK codebook UE will have to provide HARQ-ACK feedback for all HARQ processes, no matter whether there is corresponding PDSCH scheduled or not, then for sure the overhead is a big concern and then it will have impact on the reliability.  Of course, then people will argue that that is the reason here to support HARQ-ACK codebook size reduction, however then the question is why we need additional standard effort here to make type 3 HARQ-ACK codebook workable for URLLC? Without type 3 HARQ-ACK codebook, URLLC can be supported well. |
| ZTE | We also support Alt.3 or Alt.4.  For Alt. 3 / Alt. 4, it is based on DCI to reschedule a PUSCH or PUCCH for the dropped HARQ-ACK codebook. The dropped HARQ-ACK codebook does not need to be reconstructed and no additional overhead is introduced. It can perfectly support the transmission of a dropped HARQ-ACK codebook in the new PUSCH/PUCCH. It only needs to design a DCI or add an indication field in the DCI to notify the UE that the DCI triggers the transmission of a dropped HARQ-ACK codebook. |
| China Telecom | As the use case to support type 3 CB for cancelled HARQ-ACK retransmission depends on the outcome of intra UE multiplexing discussion, we prefer to study with low priority. |
| QC | No need for an extra index in the DCI indicating the priority of the reported (already cancelled) HARQ IDs. Reuse rel. 16. |
| LG | We are not sure why type-3 codebook priority is needed. According to current specification, type-3 codebook includes all HARQ-ACK information for all HARQ process, which can be used for both low and high priority. Moreover, if dynamic priority indication is used, we cannot distinguish priority according to HARQ process ID. Priority discussion should be afterward of discussion on contents of type-3 HARQ-ACK codebook. |

**FL Proposal 3.3: Support triggering of Type 3 HARQ-ACK codebook reporting using DCI format 1\_2 in Rel-17.**

* **Further details are FFS.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | *List of companies* |
| Support proposal 3.3 | Vivo, Nokia/NSB, DCM, InterDigital, Intel, CATT, Panasonic, NEC, WILUS, Spreadtrum, ZTE, Ericsson, TCL, QC, LG, APT |
| Do not support | Samsung, Lenovo/Motorola Mobility, Huawei/HiSilicon, China Telecom (study with low priority) |

Addition comments can be provided below (especially for companies not supporting the proposal at all, not even in principle):

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *Comments* |
| MediaTek | We support reusing existing Type 3 HARQ-ACK codebook with DCI format 1\_2. However, if it is not suitable for URLLC operation, we support adopting Alt. 3 “UL grant scheduling PUSCH to carry dropped HARQ”. |
| OPPO | The intention to support DCI format 1\_2 triggering Type 3 HARQ-ACK codebook is not clear.  If the intention is to make triggering DCI ultra-reliable for URLLC case, then Type 3 HARQ-ACK codebook payload reduction is the premise of that Type 3 HARQ-ACK codebook is applied for URLLC. If Type3 HARQ-ACK codebook payload cannot be reduced, we support adopting Alt 4. |
| Samsung | Type-3 HARQ-ACK codebook is not relevant for Rel-17 URLLC/IIoT objectives.  The proposal is out of scope and precluded by RANP conclusions. |
| Apple | We can first have the design for DCI format 1\_1, then possibility of extending it to DCI format 1\_2 can be explored. |
| InterDigital | We support extending the support of Type-3 HARQ codebook to DCI format 1\_2. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Rel-16 Type-3 HARQ-ACK codebook can be reused, whenever possible/applicable. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We still don’t see the motivation to support type 3 HARQ-ACK codebook for URLLC, because for type 3 HARQ-ACK codebook UE will have to provide HARQ-ACK feedback for all HARQ processes, no matter whether there is corresponding PDSCH scheduled or not, then for sure the overhead is a big concern and then it will have impact on the reliability.  Of course, then people will argue that that is the reason here to support HARQ-ACK codebook size reduction, however then the question is why we need additional standard effort here to make type 3 HARQ-ACK codebook workable for URLLC? Without type 3 HARQ-ACK codebook, URLLC can be supported well. |
| China Telecom | As the use case to support type 3 CB for cancelled HARQ-ACK retransmission depends on the outcome of intra UE multiplexing discussion, we prefer to study with low priority. |
| QC | The same framework as the one used for Rel. 16 CB Type 3 should be used. |
| LG | We support this proposal. |

There was a trial in the GTW session today to agree to on some codebook size reduction today, as at least from the input documents there had been several proposals to reduce the size, e.g. for SPS HARQ only, smaller number of carriers / HARQ-IDs, only HARQ-IDs of dropped HARQ-ACK etc, HARQ-IDs within some window, etc.. But it seemed that several companies had been of the opinion that the current Type 3 CB definition (i.e. all HARQ IDs of all configured CCs) seems to be sufficient.

Therefore, let’s first try to get an idea of how many companies would support in general, the following proposal is brought forward:

**FL Proposal 3.1: Support some type of Type 3 HARQ-ACK codebook size reduction in Rel-17.**

* **Possible ways / options to reduce the size are FFS.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | *List of companies* |
| Support proposal 3.1 | Vivo, OPPO, Xiaomi, Sony, Nokia/NSB, DCM, Apple, InterDigital, Intel, Panasonic, NEC, WILUS, Spreadtrum, ZTE, Ericsson, TCL, ETRI, QC, LG, APT |
| Do not support | MediaTek, Samsung, Huawei/HiSilicon, China Telecom (study with low priority) |

Addition comments can be provided below (especially for companies not supporting the proposal at all, not even in principle):

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *Comments* |
| MediaTek | We support reusing existing Type 3 HARQ-ACK codebook. If it is not suitable for URLLC operation, we support adopting Alt. 3 “UL grant scheduling PUSCH to carry dropped HARQ”. |
| OPPO | Type 3 HARQ-ACK codebook can be triggered per carrier to avoid redundant HARQ-ACK information from all carriers.  For SPS HARQ-ACK only, only effective HARQ process ID for SPS configuration can be included in Type 3 HARQ-ACK codebook. |
| Samsung | No need for the proposal in Rel-17 URLLC/IIoT.  The proposal is also out of scope. |
| Apple | We support Type 3 enhancement, whether NDI, CBG based feedback are configured for a Type 3 codebook should be separately configured for high priority and low priority triggering, targeting URLLC and eMBB applications separately. |
| InterDigital | We support enhancing the HARQ CB type 3 to transmit only the dropped HARQ-ACK codebook instead of all configured HARQ processes. No need to indicate a set of HARQ processes, a flag that will trigger the retransmission of dropped HARQ codebook. |
| CATT | The current proposal seems to be too general. We would prefer to discuss the detailed proposals. |
| Panasonic | In Rel.16, Type 3 codebook contains HARQ-ACK bits of all HARQ processes regardless of priority in the triggering DCI. Therefore, the codebook size could large. Instead of reporting HARQ-ACK for all configured HARQ processes, only transmitting SPS HARQ processes or dropped HARQ processes can be considered. |
| WILUS | We support type-3 CB size reduction by including some of HARQ processes instead of all HARQ processes. The HARQ processes to be included can be indicated in a triggering DCI format or configured by higher layer based on output of Q3.1. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We still don’t see the motivation to support type 3 HARQ-ACK codebook for URLLC, because for type 3 HARQ-ACK codebook UE will have to provide HARQ-ACK feedback for all HARQ processes, no matter whether there is corresponding PDSCH scheduled or not, then for sure the overhead is a big concern and then it will have impact on the reliability.  Of course, then people will argue that that is the reason here to support HARQ-ACK codebook size reduction, however then the question is why we need additional standard effort here to make type 3 HARQ-ACK codebook workable for URLLC? Without type 3 HARQ-ACK codebook, URLLC can be supported well. |
| China Telecom | As the use case to support type 3 CB for cancelled HARQ-ACK retransmission depends on the outcome of intra UE multiplexing discussion, we prefer to study with low priority. |
| QC | The request can implicitly indicate that only N HARQ bits should be transmitted, where N corresponds to the amount of the cancelled HARQ bits. |
| LG | We also support this proposal to start the discussion |

If a smaller codebook size (however the codebook is constructed) would be supported, but what seems to be common to all seem to be the need to be able to differentiate for the UE if the Rel-16 codebook (i.e. all PDSCH HARQ-IDs of all configured CCs) or a smaller (to be still discussed) sub-Type 3 CB is to be triggered. Therefore, it is suggested first to discuss how to indicate to the UE the different operation here (and trying to get an idea on how many different ‘sub-Type 3’ CB could be triggered by the gNB).

The options mentioned by different companies include:

* Alt. 1: By RRC configuration (semi-static): either the Rel-16 Type 3 CB or a single ‘new’ Type 3 CB of smaller size can be triggered based on semi-static configuration
* Alt. 2: Dynamic indicating using different RNTI (e.g. C-RNTI and CS-RNTI): either triggering Type 3 CB or ‘SPS HARQ re-transmission’ specific Type 3 CB operation
  + *Moderator comment:* it should be noted here, that the Type 3 CB triggering without scheduling PDSCH is currently limited to the C-RNTI & MCS-C-RNTI (to not conflict with indication of SPS activation / release). See details in Sec. 9.1.4 of 38.213. This may limit exploring this option a bit.
* Alt. 3: Dynamic indication in the DCI – e.g. using some unused bits from the DCI triggering the Type 3 codebook (at least without scheduling a PDSCH of Sec. 9.1.4 of 38.213)
  + Depending on the number of bits N, 2^N different Type 3 CBs could be triggered.
  + This could allow to support triggering specifically of one or more different SPS HARQ Type 3 CBs (FFS details, to prevent SPS HARQ-ACK dropping for TDD) as well as supporting one or more different Type 3 CBs for re-transmission of canceled HARQ (for SPS PDSCH and/or DG PDSCH, FFS details on the codebook definition)

**Question 3.1: If smaller Type 3 CB size is supported, how to indicate the triggering of (at least one) ‘smaller’ Rel-17 Type 3 CB to distinguish from the full Rel-16 Type 3 CB:**

* **Alt. 1: by RRC configuration (either Rel-16 or the new codebook can be triggered)**
  + **Supporting companies:** Sony, DCM, …
* **Alt. 2: Using different RNTI (e.g. C-RNTI & CS-RNTI) – e.g. Rel-16 Type 3 CB and ‘SPS HARQ’ specific codebook**
  + **Supporting companies:** NEC…
* **Alt. 3: Dynamic indication in the triggering DCI using *N* unsed bits (enabling dynamic indication of up to 2^N different Type 3 CBs)**
  + **Supporting companies:** vivo, Sony, Nokia/NSB, DCM, Intel, NEC
* **Alt. 4: Other (**please provide your input below)
  + **Supporting companies:** …ZTE

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *Comments or Alt. 4 – other options* |
| vivo | We prefer Alt.3. Alt.3 has more flexibility in triggering a part of HARQ-ACK information as required and can be used to accommodate to different cases. Meanwhile, no extra overhead is introduced by reusing unused bits in the triggering DCI. |
| OPPO | Alt 1 and Alt2 are preferred.  For CA, Type3 CB size reduction is configured by RRC per carrier to optimize Type 3 HARQ-ACK codebook.  For a given carrier, Type 3 codebook payload can be further reduced according to available HARQ-ID for SPS PDSCH. |
| Xiaomi | We prefer alt 1, each SPS configuration has a period and corresponding SPS HARQ-ACK dropping or deferring is happened in a certain period or within a certain time window, so indicate the triggering of (at least one) ‘smaller’ Rel-17 Type 3 CB by RRC configuration is acceptable.  If there is N bits that can be reused without increasing the DCI overhead and changing the DCI format, alt 3 can also be considered. |
| Sony | Alt.1 or Alt.3. |
| Nokia/NSB | Alt. 3 is the most flexible allowing to consider more than one case. Alt. 2 not working (see moderator comments) and Alt. 1 to inflexible. |
| DCM | Alt 1 or Alt 3.  Alt 3 can achieve more flexibility with DCI impact. Alt 1 is simpler without any DCI impact.  Moreover, if DCI 1\_2 is enhanced to support type 3 HARQ-ACK feedback triggering, gNB can separately configure “smaller” or “normal” Type 3 HARQ-ACK CB size requested by the two DCI formats. It can also be as flexible as Alt 3. |
| Samsung | No need to discuss question 3.1 |
| InterDigital | We support dynamic indication to either request the Rel-16 HARQ CB type 3 or enhanced HARQ CB type 3. We think only one bit is needed. |
| Intel | Alt. 3 is preferred. One example where semi-static CB reduction does not work is using it for a general HARQ ReTX including dynamic PDSCH, and for SPS only, where it will not be possible to customize CB e.g. for SPS only HARQ-ACK bits.  Note, that it may not be accurate to say “unused”, since a new field may be introduced for this. |
| CATT | The details can be discussed later. |
| NEC | Alt.2 is slightly preferred. It is natural to use DCI scrambled with CS-RNTI to trigger re-transmission for SPS HARQ-ACK only.  Not sure if there is a use case that a UE needs to be configured more than 2 kinds of Type-3 CB simultaneously, if so, we are also fine to discuss the Alt.3 further. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | If a smaller Type3 codebook size is supported, we prefer Alt 3. |
| WILUS | Alt 1 or Alt 3. |
| Spreadtrum | Prefer Alt.1 or Alt.3. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Firstly, we need to discuss and see the motivation to support type 3 HARQ-ACK codebook for URLLC. |
| ZTE | Alt4, expand or reinterpretation the one shot request field to indicate a new Type 3 CB.  The one shot request field could be expand and reinterpretation to indicate a new Type 3 CB for retransmission of cancelled HARQ. It can be configured to enable or disable the new Type 3 CB construction by RRC configuration. |
| Ericsson | It is not clear to us intention of this discussion. It would be Rel-16 and Rel-17 UEs. So they are distinguished by indicating their capability. |
| TCL | Alt 1 or Alt 3. |
| China Telecom | Same view as Huawei, HiSilicon. |
| ETRI | Alt 2 as our first preference. Alt 2 seems straightforward and keep the same DCI overhead. We think the question 3.1 is related to how to generate the Rel-17 Type3 HARQ-ACK codebook if supported.  Regarding Alt 3, we think that it needs further clarifications to the necessary/maximum number of different Type3 HARQ-ACK codebooks. |
| QC | Need to agree high level concept first.  (If there is agreement on the high level concept, then:  Support for Alt. 4  DCI contains the number #N of requested HARQ bits, if this number #N is different from the default #N, as configured by RRC.  No support for Alt 1, Alt 2, Alt. 3) |
| LG | We prefer Alt. 2 and Alt. 3 for different use case. For DG PUSCH, Alt. 3 can be used and Alt 2 without NDI may be utilized for SPS PDSCH. |
| APT | Alt. 1 is preferred. Alt. 3 can be FFS. |

## 3.2 Second round of email discussions

Based on the feedback received here, there seems to be some miss-conception here if the Type 3 CB is supported in Rel-16 for licensed bands and in some of the comments it does not seem to be very clear that e.g. DCI format 1\_1 triggering is supported.

**Therefore, before going into details here, there seems to be a need to further clarify what is actually supported in Rel-16 for Type 3 CB and what is not supported (to not have repetition of false assumptions here).**

First on the generic support, there is the argument repeating that Type 3 CB is not supported in Rel-16. But during RAN1#103-e, there had been following agreement:

***Agreements:***

* ***The FG10-15/16 are also applicable to licensed bands***
* ***The FG10-20a is also applicable to licensed bands***
* ***Note: this agreement should not cause any specification impact***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 10-15 | Enhanced dynamic HARQ codebook | 1. Support of bit fields signalling PDSCH HARQ group index and NFI in DCI 1\_1 (configuration of nfi-TotalDAI-Included)  2. Support of bit field in DCI 0\_1 for other group total DAI if configured. (configuration of ul-TotalDAI-Included)  3. Support the retransmission of HARQ ACK (pdsch-HARQ-ACK-Codebook = enhancedDynamic-r16) |
| 10-16 | One-shot HARQ ACK feedback | 1. Support feedback of type 3 HARQ-ACK codebook, triggered by a DCI 1\_1 scheduling a PDSCH 2. Support feedback of type 3 HARQ-ACK codebook , triggered by a DCI 1\_1 without scheduling a PDSCH using a reserved FDRA value |

As for all features, it is clearly an optional feature and the device and gNB support (including IoT testing) is unclear, as for all Rel-16 enhancements.

**Proposed RAN1 clarification 1: One-shot HARQ-ACK triggering using Type 3 HARQ-ACK codebook is supported based on Rel-16 specifications for licensed and unlicensed band operation.**

* **Note: This is an optional feature and the device and network support is unclear**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | *List of companies* |
| Agree | Nokia/NSB, Sony, vivo, QC, DCM, TCL, Intel, CATT, NEC, ZTE, Ericsson, OPPO, MediaTek, China Telecom, InterDigital, LG, Panasonic, APT, Sharp, Spreadtrum, CAICT, Xiaomi |
| Disagree | Samsung |

If you feel to provide additional arguments, please use the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *Comments* |
| QC | Type 3 CB is the starting point for the discussion here, since it is the Rel. 16 mechanism used by the network to request re(transmission) of missing (or not) HARQ bits. |
| Samsung | The clarification is unnecessary and can be misleading. This AI is for URLLC. DCI format 1\_2 does not support One-Shot HARQ-ACK triggering (and neither does DCI format 1\_0). The issue was also discussed in RANP and concluded to not extend NR-U designs to the Rel-17 IIoT WI other than what has been clearly captured to be discussed in AI 8.3.2. *Moderator reply:* The starting point for the discussion here is, which tools the Rel-16 specification provide us here. Please note, that we are not referring to the RAN plenary discussions to not porting NR-U tools in Rel-17 – what are trying to clarify here is what the starting point for any Rel-17 URLLC enhancements is (and this includes all available NR features up to Rel-16).   The question to be answered / clarified here is what Rel-16 is doing and there is clearly a Rel-16 RAN1 decision to support this, which is also reflected in the FG description based on the updates during RAN1#103-e. Please note that NR-U specific features have the clause  the signaling is per band but is only expected for a band where shared spectrum channel access must be used and this restriction in Rel-16 (not as part of the Rel-17) work has been removed for 10-15 & 10-16 (i.e. Type 2 and Type 3 CB) and as the signaling is per band, the UE can indicate the support for Type 3 CB as for bands where there is no shared spectrum channel access. Please check the NR-U feature group descriptions there. |
| Ericsson | Type-3 is not supported by DCI 1-2 or 1\_0. It is supported by DCI 1\_1. However, this is a separate issue that whether it is supported for licensed on unlicensed. It is agreed that it is supported for unlicensed (and consequently in Rel-16 by DCI 1\_1).  Could Samsung kindly provide RANP conclusions in case we have missed?  [Samsung] Please find relevant discussion threads in the following links.  <https://list.etsi.org/scripts/wa.exe?A2=ind1912B&L=3GPP_TSG_RAN_DRAFTS&O=D&P=907858>  <https://list.etsi.org/scripts/wa.exe?A2=ind1912A&L=3GPP_TSG_RAN_DRAFTS&O=D&P=42584>  Extending Rel-16 URLLC to support operation in unlicensed spectrum through the Rel-17 IoT WI was explicitly proposed and not agreed. The fact that the WID does not mention incorporating NR-U related fields also to DCI format 1\_2 is not by accident. Similar for other URLLC designs.  For example, the following was initially proposed but it was dropped and is out of scope.  Study, identify and specify (if necessary) required changes to the existing Rel-16 URLLC/IIOT enhancements to ensure they are applicable to unlicensed spectrum operation, with particular focus on: [RAN1, RAN2]  §  HARQ/UCI enhancements  It may be argued that enhancements of Type-3 are now proposed for URLLC on licensed spectrum, but that is a 2-way street given the FG independence of Type-3 and would be equally applicable to what has been precluded at the RANP for the WID approval. |
|  |  |

Similarly, there were comments by Apple that for Type 3 CB we need to first seen how DCI format 1\_1 would trigger before agreeing on the support DCI format 1\_2. Based on the moderators understanding, based on Rel-16 specifications the Type 3 CB triggering is only supported based on DCI format 1\_1. Therefore, the following clarification would be good have to have in place to prevent additional miss-understanding.

**Proposed RAN1 clarification 2: One-shot HARQ-ACK triggering using Type 3 HARQ-ACK codebook is based on Rel-16 specifications is only supported for DCI format 1\_1.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | *List of companies* |
| Agree | Nokia/NSB, vivo, QC, DCM, Intel, CATT, Samsung, NEC, ZTE, Huawei/HiSilicon, Ericsson, OPPO, MediaTek, China Telecom, InterDigital, LG, Panasonic, APT, Sharp,Xiaomi |
| Disagree |  |

If you feel to provide additional arguments, please use the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *Comments* |
| Apple | Our intention is to clarify how one-shot feedback and priority indicator are used together for DCI 1\_1 first. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

Then, to further consider how the PHY priority handling is done for a Type 3 CB triggered with DCI format 1\_1 and the interaction of PHY priority indication. The first question is, if based on Rel-16 specs can be configured for Type 3 CB (i.e. *pdsch-HARQ-ACK-OneShotFeedback-r16*) and with priority indication in DCI format 1\_1 (i.e. *priorityIndicatorForDCI-Format1-1*)

**Question 3.2.1: Based on Rel-16 specifications, can the UE be configured with Type 3 CB (i.e. *pdsch-HARQ-ACK-OneShotFeedback-r16*) and with priority indication in DCI format 1\_1 (i.e. *priorityIndicatorForDCI-Format1-1*) .**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | *List of companies* |
| Yes | Vivo, QC, DCM, Intel, CATT, Nokia/NSB, NEC, ZTE(with comment), Lenovo/Motorola Mobility, OPPO, Panasonic, APT, Sharp |
| No | Samsung, Huawei/HiSilicon, Ericsson (It was concluded in Rel-16 that is not possible. It needs to be changed for Rel-17), InterDigital (We have the same understanding as Ericsson), LG, Apple |

If you feel to provide additional arguments, please use the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *Comments* |
| QC | These two are 2 independent features (configured by different bits, pdsch-HARQ-ACK-OneShotFeedback-r16 and priorityIndicatorForDCI-Format1-1). |
| Samsung | The answer to the question is affirmative only if the UE supports NR-U. There is no other Rel-16 FG that requires the UE to implement Type-3 codebook. Even for a UE that supports NR-U, implementation of a Type-3 codebook is optional.  *Moderator reply:* Please note that Type 3 CB (FG 10-16) has no pre-requiste other FG, i.e. it can be implemented and indication independent of any other NR-U specific FG. And as discussed above it is possible to indicated this also for licensed bands (please check FG 10-16). This feature is optional as stated, so are all the Rel-16 URLLC features (of FG 11-X & 12-X).  The question should have as conditions that a UE supports NR-U and also that the UE implements the optional feature of Type-3 codebook for NR-U. Then, the answer would be ‘yes’. Of course, the same applies for the gNB regarding the optional implementation of Type-3 codebook.  *Moderator reply:* as noted above, the decision to implement or support Type 3 CB is independent of the support of NR-U (again, no FG dependency, can be indicated for licensed bands per band as well). |
| ZTE | If the new Type 3 CB construction corresponding to different priority is needed, DCI format 1\_1 is not sufficient even though it supports the priority indication, we also need DCI format 1\_2. |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | Priority indication is associated with a PUCCH resource configuration (i.e. the first *PUCCH-Config* and the second *PUCCH-Config*), not with codebook type (i.e. type 1/2/3/). |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | As we commented before, we don't see the motivation to use type 3 HARQ-ACK codebook for URLLC, thus no need to combine with priority indication in DCI format 1\_1. |
| LG | If UE has both capability and follow specification literally, it may be possible. However, we don’t see the motivation/intention and related UE behavior at least in the release 16. |
| Apple | 38.312 has two fields under DCI 1\_1, but their joint operation has not been discussed in URLLC |

If your answer is yes to question.3.2.1, is it so that based on the current understanding, if the DCI format triggering indicates ‘1’, as a PHY priority indicator, the PUCCH carrying the HARQ-ACK is to be regarded with priority index 1? (and otherwise 0)

**Question 3.2.2: Assuming Yes to Question 3.2.1, in Rel-16 if the triggering DCI 1\_1 indicates *One-shot HARQ-ACK* request as ‘1’ and PHY priority indicator as ‘1’, what is the priority index of the PUCCH associated with Type 3 CB**

* **Alt. 1: priority index 1, as indicated in the DCI**
* **Alt. 2 priority index 0, PHY priority indicator not applicable**
  + **If you think it is Alt. 2, please provide your reasons / references to specifications**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | *List of companies* |
| Alt. 1 | Vivo, QC, DCM (with clarification), Intel, CATT, Nokia/NSB, NEC, ZTE (comments in next table.), Lenovo/Motorola Mobility, Ericsson , OPPO, InterDigital, LG, Panasonic, APT, Sharp,Xiaomi |
| Alt. 2 |  |

If you feel to provide additional arguments, please use the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *Comments* |
| QC | DCI Priority index (priorityIndicatorForDCI-Format1-1) overwrites the PHY priority indicator. |
| DCM | We think clarification is needed when different HARQ-ACK priorities are indicated for configured HARQ processes.   * Option 1: Type 3 HARQ-ACK CB includes HARQ-ACK for all configured HARQ-ACK processes. And the priority index in triggered DCI overwrites HARQ-ACK priority indicated in PDSCH scheduling DCI or SPS configuration. * Option 2: Type 3 HARQ-ACK CB only includes HARQ-ACK for HARQ-ACK processes with the same indicated HARQ-ACK priority.   Option 1 has no impact on current type 3 HARQ-ACK CB generation procedure. Option 2 has impact on current type 3 HARQ-ACK CB generation procedure.  *Moderator comment:* Agree – will need to be discussed. |
| Intel | Agree with DCM that Option 1 vs Option 2 need to be discussed |
| Samsung | It would be better to discuss aspects related to the WID itself and related solutions than to discuss Type-3 applicability.  Should we also spend some more time discussing the same questions for the enhanced Type-2 codebook? If not, why?  *Moderator comment:* It has been brought up by several companies that Type 3 CB is applicable. And a sizeable number of companies have been suggestions enhancements on top of Type 3 CB operation. It is just not possible to discuss their views but just simply stating, let’s not consider Type 3 CB at all and do something else. But there had only be little request for Type 2 CB. But if Samsung prefers, I could definitely bring another set of questions also related to licensed band operation of enhanced Type-2 CB here.  [Samsung]: The following is a partial list of features developed in NR-U that are as relevant to Rel-17 IoT as Type-3 codebook is (and also have no outside FG dependence). No, there is no need to discuss aspects that are not related to the objectives of the Rel-17 IoT WI.   * Support coreset configuration with rb-Offset * Enable configured UL transmissions when SFI field in DCI 2\_0 is configured but DCI 2\_0 is not detected * Search space set group switching with DCI 2\_0 monitoring and Joint search space group switching across multiple cells * Joint search space group switching across multiple cells * Non-numerical PDSCH to HARQ-ACK timing * Enhanced dynamic HARQ codebook |
| NEC | Agree with DCM and Intel that Option 1 vs Option 2 need to be discussed |
| ZTE | We believe that if the triggering DCI 1\_1 indicates One-shot HARQ-ACK request as ‘1’ and PHY priority indicator as ‘1’，the Type 3 codebook should only contain high priority HARQ-ACKs in all HARQ processes. But the current Rel-16 Type 3 codebook includes HARQ-ACKs in all HARQ processes regardless of the priority of these HARQ-ACKs. The current Type 3 codebook may decrease the reliability of high-priority HARQ-ACKs and increase power consumption, because the size of the Type 3 codebook is increased due to the inclusion of low-priority HARQ-ACKs.  Therefore, to retransmit the cancelled HARQ-ACK, if the triggering DCI 1\_1 indicates One-shot HARQ-ACK request as ‘1’, a new Type3 codebook should be supported. For instance, the cancelled HARQ-ACK codebook could be the reference for the new Type 3 codebook. If we need to consider the retransmission of the cancelled high priority or low priority HARQ-ACK, the corresponding PHY priority indicator can be set to as ‘1’ or ‘0’ in DCI 1\_1. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | As we commented before, we don't see the motivation to use type 3 HARQ-ACK codebook for URLLC |
| OPPO | If we go to option 2 proposed by DCM, due to HARQ process ID is indicated for each PDSCH dynamically, then Type 3 HARQ-ACK codebook turns into a dynamic HARQ-ACK codebook. It is more like Type 2 HARQ-ACK codebook, and the difference from Type 2 HARQ-ACK codebook is just HARQ-ACK bit mapping ordering.  Type 3 HARQ-ACK codebook in option 1 is still semi-static, so we prefer to option 1. |
| LG | According to current specification, there is no HARQ process dedicated to certain priority. If Option 2 by DCM is used, HARQ-ACK payload size can be changed by up to 16 DCI reception. Such vulnerability is not desirable for high priority transmission. |
| Apple | It should be discussed. |

## 3.3 Third round of email discussions

***Moderator comment:***

Based on the proposed clarification, all except one company agree to the proposed clarication that Type 3 CB is supported in Rel-16 also for licensed band operation. Maybe not worth by email to continue on this point here, but just to discuss this in a GTW (as was proposed by the moderator for today’s GTW session, but not handled due to lack of time). Moreover, the support of priority handling for Type 3 CB and the DCI format 1\_2 have been discussed in first round already (so we know where companies stand 🡪 no need to repeat)

To not get stuck on this, I thought to discuss two different things iny the 3rd round of email discussions:

* If priority support for Type 3 CB would be supported, if only bits of only HP HARQ or both would be reported on a PUCCH of the indicated priority (see discussion be DoCoMo above)
* If thinking about Type 3 CB enhancements (as proposed by many companies, it would be good to clarify what actually is still a ‘Type 3 CB enhancement’ (i.e. what are the properties of the codebook, so that it could be still considered an enhanced Type 3 CB) or what falls actually into Alt. 3 or 4, using a one-shot-trigger in the DCI to schedule a retransmission of dropped HARQ on PUCCH (or PUSCH).

On the first point, the following question is brought forward:

**Question 3.3.1: If PHY priority indication for Rel-16 Type 3 CB is supported in Rel-17, the Type 3 CB includes:**

* **Option 1: Type 3 HARQ-ACK CB includes HARQ-ACK for all configured HARQ-ACK processes. And the priority index in triggered DCI overwrites HARQ-ACK priority indicated in PDSCH scheduling DCI or SPS configuration.**
* **Option 2: Type 3 HARQ-ACK CB only includes HARQ-ACK for HARQ-ACK processes with the same indicated HARQ-ACK priority.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | *List of companies* |
| Option 1 | Support: | Sony, vivo, NEC, WILUS, DCM, CATT, Intel, Spreadtrum, LG,Xiaomi,OPPO, Nokia/NSB, Mediatek, APT, Sharp |
| Reasons: | Sony: Simpler implementation. Vivo: simpler without ambiguity. WILUS: the same HARQ process can be shared with two priorities.  No impact on type 3 HARQ-ACK CB generation procedure. (DCM)  Robust HARQ-ACK CB size. (DCM)  OPPO: To avoid impact on subsequent HARQ-ACK feedback, we suggest to remove “overwrites” but focuses on current HARQ-ACK feedback.  **Option 1: Type 3 HARQ-ACK CB includes HARQ-ACK for all configured HARQ-ACK processes. And the priority index in triggered DCI is applied for all of HARQ-ACK information in Type 3 HARQ-ACK CB. ~~overwrites HARQ-ACK priority indicated in PDSCH scheduling DCI or SPS configuration.~~**  Nokia/NSB: When having the bits for all HARQ processes available – why not using them (independent of the PHY priority of the HARQ-ACK of the SPS configurations). Option 2 is not bringing any advantage – on the contrary: if both LP & HP HARQ-ACK would need to be requested by the gNB, there would need to be two triggers and two PUCCH transmissions. Wording definitely could be changed (as OPPO noted), e.g.:   * **Option 1: Type 3 HARQ-ACK CB includes HARQ-ACK for all configured HARQ-ACK processes irrespective of their PHY priority. ~~And the priority index in triggered DCI overwrites HARQ-ACK priority indicated in PDSCH scheduling DCI or SPS configuration.~~**   Mediatek: In our understanding, the PHY priority is not associated with the HARQ process. It is rather a mapping to a codebook (i.e. into which codebook the HARQ feedback to be multiplexed) and an indication of the PUCCH priority. For example, the NW can trigger an initial transmission with LP HARQ-ACK, then a retransmission of the same packet with HP HARQ-ACK. Thus, option 2 changes the definition of the PHY priority defined in R16. Also, the second part can be removed from option-1:  **Option 1: Type 3 HARQ-ACK CB includes HARQ-ACK for all configured HARQ-ACK processes. ~~And the priority index in triggered DCI overwrites HARQ-ACK priority indicated in PDSCH scheduling DCI or SPS configuration~~.** |
| Option 2 | Support: | ZTE, InterDigital |
| Reasons: | ZTE: It is not beneficial to mix the different priority HARQ-ACK into one single CB which breaks the principle of setting priority index. Moreover, compared to Option1, Option 2 has the following advantages:   * Option 2 is simple and will not cause the ambiguity of HARQ-ACK CB size when it supports single priority HARQ-ACK CB. * Option 2 can reduce the overhead of the single CB. * Option 2 has lower overhead and can flexibly support the transmission of cancelled HARQ-ACK codebooks of any priority due to conflicts with DL/SSB. * Option 2 doesn’t need to reconstruct the HARQ-ACK CB according to the Type 3 CB mechanism.   The current Type 3 codebook may decrease the reliability of high-priority HARQ-ACKs and increase power consumption when transmitting a cancelled HARQ-ACK CB with high priority, because the size of the Type 3 codebook is increased due to the inclusion of low-priority HARQ-ACKs.  IfOption 2 is applied, we believe that only the one-shot trigger field in DCI should be maintained, and the new Type 3 CB will be considered. For example, the simplest way is to directly reuse the cancelled HARQ-ACK CB as the new Type 3 CB. |

On the second point, what are the properties of a potentially modified Type 3 CB, so that the codebook would still quality as a Type 3 codebook. **The reason to ask this question here is to get the group more in line what we are discussing with respect to Type 3 CB enhancements (Alt. 2) or one-shot-triggering of HARQ re-transmission on PUCCH/PUSCH (Alt. 3 / 4) based on the list of study issue.**

**Question 3.3.2: A modified Type 3 CB needs to still have the following properties:**

* **Property A: The codebook size of a single triggered HARQ-ACK codebook is not flexible, but at least determined by RRC configuration or activation**
  + **this would still include RRC configuration of sub-set of HARQ processes & / serving cells, only activated serving cells, SPS HARQ-ACK of SPS configuatoins or a subset of RRC configured or activated SPS configurations, …**
  + **.. but this would not include: dynamic payload size optimization based on the number of (actually) dropped SPS HARQ-ACK (incl. time domain window, etc.)**
* **Property B: The codebook construction uses HARQ processes as a bases (i.e. ordered according to HARQ-IDs and serving cells)**
  + **This allows the transmission of any dropped HARQ-ACK, as long as the bits in the codebook follow the Type 3 principle using ordering according according to HARQ-ID and serving cell**
  + **this would not allow re-transmission triggering of dropped HARQ-ACK using the same codebook as initially intended**
* **Property C: The UE is provided a trigger and a PUSCH/PUCCH resource to transmit the dropped HARQ-ACK. The main bullet is not applicable as Type-3 CB (in whatever version) is not applicable.**
* **Property X…**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | *List of companies* |
| Property A | Yes: | Sony, Apple( NDI and CGB configurations can be different for each triggered HARQ-ACK codebook), NEC, WILUS, CATT, Intel (assuming it also includes DCI-based grouping of HARQ processes) , Spreadtrum, LG,OPPO, Nokia/NSB, Mediatek, Ericsson,APT |
| Reasons: |  |
| Property B | Yes: | Vivo (We support Property B), TCL, DCM (support Property B), CATT, APT, QC |
| Reasons: | DCM: We think the type 3 HARQ-ACK feedback design can solve both “SPS HARQ-ACK dropping due to TTD collision” issue and “HARQ-ACK retransmission” issue.  Vivo2: Property B can be viewed as combination of RRC configuration and DCI indication. The optimized/flexible codebook size can be achieved by the DCI indication of which CC, which HARQ process(es) the triggered HARQ-ACK feedback for. |
| Property C | Yes: | Samsung, Mediatek, Ericsson (not clear what it means: “The main bullet is not applicable..”, InterDigital, Lenovo/Motorola Mobility, ZTE |
|  | Reasons | Type 3-CB (“modified” or not) is not in scope and is not relevant to Rel-17 IoT WID objectives. Type-3 CB (“modified” or not) is not relevant to retransmission of dropped LP HARQ-ACK codebook.  If retransmission of a HARQ-ACK codebook is to be supported, it should not rely on an optional UE feature (Type-3). It is sufficient to provide a UE with a trigger and a resource to retransmit what the UE dropped. There is no need to design new codebooks or modify Rel-16 codebooks. There is no codebook-related problem.  Ericsson:  As we indicated in previous meetings, we are also supportive of this scheme. For us it is similar to A-CSI without UL-SCH on PUSCH where not we use HAQ-ACK. Also OK to use it for PUCCH.  Our reason may differ from Samsung since in our view all these solutions would be optional. We agree that this solution achieves the same goal as well.  This is inline with our high level view that we expressed from the beginning that from NW perspective, we would like to have a mechanism to avoid re-scheduling of PDSCH (specially if they are many), in case of dropping corresponding HARQ-ACK.  Lenovo/Motorola Mobility: In the triggering DCI, a subset of SPS configurations and/or a subset of serving cells for transmission of dropped HARQ-ACK can be indicated. |
| Other properties | Please add | ZTE: From our point of view, there is no benefit from keeping property A or property B. If property A or property B is maintained, the HARQ-ACK CB will have a high overhead and cannot support a single-priority HARQ-ACK CB (if supported, it may cause CB size ambiguity as DCI misdetection), and also the HARQ-ACK codebook needs to be reconstructed according to the Type 3 CB mechanism. If the property of Type 3 CB should be maintained as FL suggested, the only property should be inherited is the one-shot-triggering in the DCI for Type 3 CB for Rel-17, i.e., the DCI could trigger the one-shot retransmission of HARQ but nothing else inherited from Type 3 CB.  OPPO: Type 3 CB is useful to specific scenario, e.g. SPS HARQ-ACK feedback, and corresponding payload reduction is efficient and benefit. However, for dynamic transmission, payload reduction is limited and redundant bits still exist to some extent. For dynamic transmission, Alt 3or 4 is preferred.  Nokia reply to ZTE: Cannot follow the argumentation of ZTE on the ambiguity of the codebook size for DCI miss-detection for Alt. 1, as there is no change based on DCI // missing a DL assignment on the codebook size. Would be nice to get clarification from ZTE on that point.  @ Nokia, ZTE has changed the position to property C. Regarding your question, the traditional Type-3 is semi-static codebook and no ambiguity of codebook size. But if only one kind of priority index is supported in one single CB, priority of HARQ process must be indicated to UE, otherwise UE will detect the priority from DCI, if DCI miss detection, the ambiguity of the codebook size may happen. |

## 3.4 Fourth and Fifth round of email discussions

***Moderator comment:***

Based on the input in the third round, the following classification for further discussion is suggested. We may not be able in this meeting to dig in any further, but at least it would then be easier in our further discussions to be able to see where companies stand (i.e. what kind of enhancements they are having).

***Moderator comments for 5th round:***

**It seems companies seem to be fine with the proposed Type of categorization (as this seems acceptable, although I don’t see that we can agree this still during RAN1#104-e). If you still have some suggestion on the wording (for RAN1#103), please provide in the table after the categorization discussions from round 4 (says ‘5th round’):**

**5th round: But just to check still, are there any suggestions the description / wording used for the categorization below? (this is not about what to support, just to get an improved wording here that can be used for further referencing during RAN1#104b-e)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *Comments* |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Proposed FL clarification: For further discussions on re-transmission of cancelled HARQ, the following categorization is to be used for further discussions in RAN1:**

* **One-shot triggering of Enhanced Type 3 CB:**
  + **The codebook size of a single triggered enhanced Type 3 HARQ-ACK codebook is not flexible, but at least determined by RRC configuration or activation**
    - **this would still include RRC configuration of sub-set of HARQ processes & / serving cells, only activated serving cells, SPS HARQ-ACK of SPS configuatoins or a subset of RRC configured or activated SPS configurations, …**
    - **this may include dynamic DCI indication of triggering one of M applicable enhanced Type 3 CBs (combination of RRC configuration and DCI indication, e.g. different subset of cells / HARQ processes, SPS HARQ only, …)**
    - **.. but this would not include: dynamic payload size optimization based on the number of (actually) dropped SPS HARQ-ACK (incl. time domain window, etc.)**
* **One-shot triggering of a ‘Type 4’ CB:** 
  + **The codebook construction uses HARQ processes as a bases (i.e. ordered according to HARQ-IDs and serving cells) but the size of the codebook is NOT given by RRC configuration and/or activation**
    - **This allows the transmission of any dropped HARQ-ACK (SPS / DG PDSCH, with or without time domain window, etc.), as long as the bits in the codebook follow the Type 3 principle using ordering according to HARQ-ID and serving cell**
    - **this would not allow re-transmission triggering of dropped HARQ-ACK using the same codebook as initially intended**
* **One-shot triggering of dropped HARQ-ACK:** 
  + **The UE is provided a trigger and a PUSCH/PUCCH resource to transmit the dropped HARQ-ACK.**
    - **This may or may not include in addition some time windowing**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | *Support / comments* |
| OK with categorization | Vivo, Samsung, DCM, TCL, Spreadtrum, NEC, ZTE, LG, Sony, APT, Lenovo/Motorola Mobility, Nokia/NSB, Ericsson, Apple, Sharp, Panasonic, CATT, WILUS, OPPO, Intel |
| Not OK: |  |
| Reasons for not OK: |  |
| Other comments:  (incl. suggestions for different wording) | Samsung: This is not a codebook design/redesign issue. Also, if optional features are to be relied upon, can skip any specifications and leave it up to the gNB to support using Rel-16 means.  QC: Rationale of this question is unclear. The same applies to the formulation of the question as well. The group has already voted to support improvements/modifications of Rel. 16 Type 3 CB. What is the difference of “Enhanced Type 3 CB” and “Type 4 CB”? It seems that the last case “1-shot triggering of dropped HARQ-ACK” is a (sub)case of “Type 4 CB”.  The whole section should be renamed to “Retransmission of Cancelled HARQ and of deferred SPS PUCCH HARQ”, since this was the GTW Agreement in January 25th. Accordingly, the term “re-transmission of cancelled HARQ” should be replaced with the term “re-transmission of cancelled HARQ and/or deferred SPS PUCCH HARQ”  ZTE: "One-shot triggering of dropped HARQ-ACK" shares the same mechanism of the UE transmitting the HARQ based on the DCI trigger and the PUSCH/PUCCH scheduling just replace the transmission to retransmission. The related UE capability of trigger and scheduling is already mandatory supported in specification. The specification effort will be very tiny compared with the first two schemes. Also it is not clear the benefits of the first two schemes over the "One-shot triggering of dropped HARQ-ACK". |

On the discussion of the PHY priority of the Rel-16 Type 3 CB, there seemed to be a slight miss-understanding. The moderator would like to point out, that the Rel-16 Type 3 CB size is fixed – so independent of how many bits are to be mapped (if only LP HARQ / HP HARQ or both), the **size of the Rel-16 Type 3 codebook is still fixed/tehs sem. This is different if companies are discussing Type 3 codebook size optimizations for a ‘Rel-17 Type 3 CB’.**

As there was a strong majority in Question 3.3.1 for Option 1 , the following proposal is brought forward (track changes on top of 3rd round):

**FL Proposal 3.4.1: If PHY priority indication for Rel-16 Type 3 CB is supported in Rel-17, the Type 3 HARQ-ACK CB includes HARQ-ACK of all ~~configured~~ HARQ-ACK processes (i.e. irrespective of their PHY priority).**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | *Companies / comments* |
| Support: | Vivo, DCM, Xiaomi, Spreadtrum, NEC, LG, Sony, APT, Nokia/NSB, Ericsson, CATT, OPPO |
| Object: | Samsung, ZTE |
| Reason for objection: | Necessity/relevance should be first established. The proposal can also apply to other Rel-16 NR-U related features, no apparent reason why Type-3 is singled out. The proposal is also out of scope (Samsung).  Huawei/HiSilicon: We also don't see the motivation to support type 3 CB for URLLC yet as we commented before, no need to repeat here. So before trying to get agreement on details, whether to support type 3 need to be justified first.  QC: Even if Rel. 16 Type 3 CB is supported for Rel. 17, the first step is to decide if the PHY priority indication of the Rel. 16 Type 3 CB should be supported. The group has already agreed to modify/enhance Rel. 16 Type 3 CB, but this priority indication is not yet agreed.  Sharp: We are not fully clear with the intention of Proposal 3.4.1. If Proposal 3.4.1 is based on Option 1 in Round 3, we are fine with it. Nonetheless, we have the similar concern as from QC.  Apple: no need to discuss it now.  ZTE: There is no evidence to show that the DCI for Type-3 codebook in Rel-16 can indicate the PHY priority for the Type-3 codebook. Therefore, we share the QC view that the group should first discuss whether Type 3 CB needs to support PHY priority.  We support the CB of HARQ-ACK retransmission only includes HARQ-ACK of the HARQ processes with the same HARQ-ACK PHY priority. The pros is from the overhead reduction compared with the proposal 3.4.1. I assume that the above schemes related to enhanced Type 3 codebook or Type-4 codebook implicitly support the proposal 3.4.1 but they may decrease the reliability of high-priority HARQ-ACKs or increase power consumption, because the size of the Type 3 codebook is increased due to the inclusion of both of low-priority and high-priority HARQ-ACKs.  Intel: we are fine, but we are not really in favour of conditional agreements/discussions |

# SPS HARQ skipping & payload size reduction (for skipped & non-skipped SPS PDSCH)

In this section, the company positions on the support as well as the related proposed Rel-17 enhancements to enable SPS HARQ-ACK skipping for ‘skipped’ SPS PDSCH and SPS payload size reduction (of ‘non-skipped’ SPS PDCH) are summarized. During RAN1#103-e, the following further down-selection of techniques has been agreed:

***Agreements: For the studies on SPS HARQ skipping for skipped SPS PDSCH, the further discussions should focus on the following reduced sets methods:***

* ***‘NACK skipping’ for (skipped) SPS PDSCH (Alt. 1)***
  + ***FFS: details including at least when to skip the HARQ-ACK as well as NACK skipping configuration details (per SPS or group of SPS configurations etc.)***
  + Note: this alternative assumes inherently no identification of a skipped SPS PDSCH by the UE
* ***Dynamic indication of skipped SPS PDSCH occasions (Alt. 3)***
  + ***FFS: details including dynamic indication methods such as e.g. DCI, MAC CE, specific DM-RS instead of SPS DM-RS, …***

***Agreements:*** For the studies on SPS HARQ payload size reduction (of non-skipped SPS PDSCH), the further discussions should focus on the following reduced sets of methods:

1. ACK skipping (NACK-only) (Alt. 1)
   1. FFS: Details
2. NACK skipping (ACK-only) (Alt. 2)
   1. FFS: Details
3. HARQ bundling / compression (Alt. 3)
   1. FFS: Details including HARQ bundling / compression window, bundling / compression technique
4. HARQ-ACK disabling /skipping for certain SPS configurations (Alt. 4)
   1. The skipping / disabling is higher-layer configured per SPS configuration
   2. FFS: HARQ-ACK skipping behaviour for Type 1 CB

It should be noted that the NACK skipping procedure for SPS PDSCH for skipping and non-skipped SPS basically is to be regarded as a single technique, as it had been clarified that no identification of skipped SPS PDSCH by the UE is to be assumed. Therefore, it will simply the handling (as proposed by the moderator) to discuss all of these in a single section in here – i.e. considering all 5 proposed features to reduce SPS HARQ in here.

Based on company inputs the following support and details have been provided:

1. **NACK skipping for SPS PDSCH (Alt. 1 for skipped / Alt. 2 for non-skipped SPS PDSCH) – 18x Yes, 5x No**
   * **Yes (18):** ZTE [1], OPPO [2], Huawei / HiSi [3], BUPT [3], China Southern Power Grid [3],Ericsson [4], CAICT [5], vivo [7], Nokia [10], Spreadtrum [11], China Telecom [14], TCL [15], NEC [16], ETRI [21], Samsung [23], Interdigital [24], Sharp [27], WILUS [29]
   * **No (5):** Mediatek [8], Panasonic [19] (motivation to be clarified), DOCOMO [28], Sony [12], Lenovo/Motorola Mobility [18]
   * **FFS (-):**
   * **Details**:
     + PUCCH transmission is skipped if PUCCH to only to carry NACK for SPS PDSCH(s) configured for NACK skipping: OPPO [2], Huawei / HiSi [3], BUPT [3], China Southern Power Grid [3], Ericsson [4], CAICT [5], vivo [7], Nokia [10], China Telecom [14], NEC [16], Samsung [23], Interdigital [24], WILUS [29]
     + FFS is only NACK for SPS PDSCH(s) is to be multiplexed with UCI other than HARQ-ACK: CAICT [5]
     + NACK skipping is separately configurable for each SPS configuration: Nokia [10], WILUS [29]
     + NACK skipping should be jointly configured for all SPS configurations: Spreadtrum [11]
     + Skipping limited to a number of consecutive instances: Moto/Len [18]
     + Only applicable when one SPS HARQ-ACK bit is present: ETRI [21]
2. **Dynamic indication of skipped SPS PDSCH occasions (Alt. 3 for skipped SPS PDSCH) – 4x Yes, 8x No, 1x FFS**
   * **Yes (4):** Sony [12] (using MAC CE), CMCC [20] (DCI or MAC CE), Qualcomm [26], DOCOMO [28]
   * **No (8):** Ericsson [4], CATT [6], Mediatek [8], Intel [9], Nokia [10], Panasonic [19] (motivation to be clarified), Samsung [23], vivo
   * **FFS (1):** NEC [16]
   * **Details:** 
     + Using MAC CE: Sony [12], CMCC [20]
     + Using DCI to indicate: CMCC [20], Qualcomm [26] (indicating one or more empty SPS PDSCH), DOCOMO [28]
       - one or more empty SPS PDSCH: Qualcomm [26], DOCOMO [28] (incl. time-line / pattern)
     + Using DM-RS to indicate - special DM-RS sequence instead of SPS PDSCH DM-RS sequence: Qualcomm [26]
3. **ACK skipping for SPS PDSCH (NACK-only, Alt. 1 for ‘non-skipped’ SPS PDSCH) - 10x Yes, 5x No, 2x FFS**
   * **Yes (10):** ZTE [1], Huawei / HiSi [3], BUPT [3], China Southern Power Grid [3], LGE [13], TCL [15], Panasonic [19], Xiaomi [22], Interdigital [24], WILUS [29]
   * **No (5):** Ericsson [4], Mediatek [8], Nokia [10], Sony [12], Lenovo/Motorola Mobility [18]
   * **FFS (2):** Spreadtrum [11], DOCOMO [28]
   * **Cons:** gNB may operate with higher target BLER (different operation strategies, Ericsson [4])
   * **Details:**
     + PUCCH transmission is skipped if PUCCH to only to carry ACK for SPS PDSCH(s) configured for ACK skipping: Huawei / HiSi [3], BUPT [3], China Southern Power Grid [3], WILUS [29]
     + Skipping limited to a number of consecutive instances: Moto/Len [18]
     + Limited to one or 2 bits HARQ-ACK case: Panasonic [19], Interdigital [24]
     + Configured per SPS configuration: WILUS [29]
4. **HARQ bundling / compression for SPS PDSCH (Alt. 3 for ‘non-skipped’ SPS PDSCH) - 9x Yes, 2x No, 1x FFS**
   * **Yes:** ZTE [1], OPPO [2], Intel [9], TCL [15] (for jitter handling), ETRI [21], Xiaomi [22], Apple [25], Qualcomm [26], DOCOMO [28] (if dynamic skipping indication is supported)
   * **No:** Ericsson [4], Mediatek [8]
   * **FFS:** Nokia [10] (continue discussion)
   * **Cons:** Bundling of several SPS where not all are used will lead to NACK (ZTE [1]), if more than process used within the bundle ACK is unclear (Sony [12])
   * **Details:**
     + The HARQ-ACK codebook for SPS PDSCHs is determined based on the HARQ processes of the multiple SPS PDSCH resources associated with the same PUCCH: OPPO [2]
     + Multiple SPS configurations are configured to share one HARQ-ACK bit: OPPO [2], Intel [9]
     + Bundling based on HARQ process IDs: Intel [9]
     + Include the number of ‘ACK’s with the bundle (e.g. using CS of PUCCH format 0): Sony [12]
     + Configure a time window / set of SPS configurations for bundling of more than one bit: ETRI [21]
     + Dynamic triggering using MAC CE / DCI: Xiaomi [22]
     + **N SPS PDSCH within a jitter window, bits are used for code states which include the successful/failed decoding at one of those N occasions or no detection of PDSCH at any of those N occasions: Apple [25]**
     + **compress multiple messages in HARQ-ACK codebook with small probability into a single message: Qualcomm [26]**
5. **HARQ-ACK disabling /skipping for certain SPS configurations (Alt.4 for non-skipped SPS PDSCH):** **7x Yes, 3x No, 1x FFS**
   * **Yes (7):** ZTE [1], OPPO [2], CATT [6], Nokia [10], Xiaomi [22], Interdigital [24], Lenovo/Motorola Mobility [18]
   * **No (3):** Ericsson [4], Mediatek [8], Sony [12]
   * **FFS (1):** DOCOMO [28]
   * **Cons:** Bundling of several SPS where not all are used will lead to NACK (ZTE [1]),
   * **Details:**
     + Do not include in Type 1 CB and remove the TDRA entry also from the Type 1 CB: ZTE [1]
     + Include only in Type 1 CB: Nokia [10]
     + Enable / disable using MAC CE / DCI: Xiaomi [22]

## 4.1 First round of email discussions

*Moderator comments:*

The following support / not support for the 5 different techniques have been indicated by the different companies:

* **NACK skipping for SPS PDSCH – 18x Yes, 5x No**
* **Dynamic indication of skipped SPS PDSCH occasions – 4x Yes, 8x No, 1x FFS**
* **ACK skipping for SPS PDSCH - 10x Yes, 5x No, 2x FFS**
* **HARQ bundling / compression for SPS PDSCH - 9x Yes, 2x No, 1x FFS**
* **HARQ-ACK disabling /skipping for certain SPS configurations - 7x Yes, 3x No, 1x FFS**

The moderator would like to in addition note the following:

* The two proposed features of **NACK and ACK skipping seems to have rather broad support** and as indicated by several companies are envisioned for different SPS operation use cases. There seems to be **common understanding on how to operate these features** with certain details to be still clarified, such as a limitation in the number of bits as well as the RRC configuration details. Therefore, the moderator feels confident that companies should have sufficient knowledge to be able to make a technically founded decision on the support of these two features and therefore **proposes to agree on the support of both of these features**.
* **HARQ bundling / compression for SPS PDSCH seems to have a rather good support.** But in contrast to e.g. ACK or NACK skipping maybe some **further discussions on the details (i.e. how to operate this) will be needed** before being able to make a technically founded decision on the support. Therefore, the moderator suggests to try to **clarify further the operation of this feature during (at least) the first meeting week**.
* About **2/3 of the companies** providing input **indicated support for** **HARQ-ACK disabling /skipping for certain SPS configurations.** As there had been less feedback overall, it is **suggested to not discuss this during the first meeting week.**
* There seems to be **more companies saying to not support dynamic indication of skipped SPS PDSCH**. The moderator therefore suggests to **not discuss this during the (at least) first meeting week**.

Please provide your views on the following two proposals:

**FL Proposal 4.1: Support ‘NACK skipping’ for SPS PDSCH, based on the following operation:**

* **A PUCCH transmission is skipped by the UE if the PUCCH is only carrying SPS PDSCH NACK(s) associated with SPS PDSCH configurations configured for NACK skipping**
* **FFS: Additional details including e.g. RRC configuration details, potential additional restrictions,…**
* **Note: ‘NACK skipping’ assumes inherently no identification of a skipped SPS PDSCH by the UE**
* ***Note: This does not preclude the support of additional methods to support HARQ-ACK skipping / payload size reduction for skipped or non-skipped SPS PDSCH***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | *List of companies* |
| Support proposal 4.1 | vivo, OPPO,Xiaomi, InterDigital, Spreadtrum, Huawei/HiSilicon, Ericsson, TCL, China Telecom, Nokia/NSB, Samsung (no per SPS configuration), Lenovo/Moto (for consecutive number of instances), CAICT |
| Do not support NACK skipping in Rel-17 | MediaTek, Sony, DCM, CATT, Panasonic, WILUS, ZTE, QC, LG |

Addition comments can be provided below (especially for companies not supporting the proposal at all, not even in principle):

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *Comments* |
| MediaTek | The following reasons show that the potential enhancement is very marginal:   * For periodic traffic, the SPS PDSCH is transmitted in all the SPS occasions. Thus, the probability of having skipped SPS PDSCH (and hence a NACK) is very low, limiting the advantage of skipping the HARQ feedback for a “skipped” SPS-PDSCH. * For aperiodic traffic, DG-PDSCH is more spectrally efficient way compared to SPS-PDSCH. For DL, as the PDCCH and PDSCH can be FDMed or have no gap at all, the scheduling DCI does not cause delay compared to UL transmission. Thus, using SPS-PDSCH for aperiodic traffic in not a typical scenario. * Skipping the SPS HARQ could save some of the PUCCH resources, but it is not expected that the PUCCH to be the bottleneck in this case, as the PUCCH resources will be very small compared to the PDSCH resources. * The PUCCH resource will be reserved to the UE, even if the UE skipped the HARQ feedback. Therefore, there is no gain in terms of saving UL resources. |
| Sony | PUCCH resource is anyhow reserved for HARQ-ACK.  All NACKs in a PUCCH is rare. |
| DCM | We think the use case for NACK skipping is rather limited since HARQ-ACK PUCCH can be skipped only when the PUCCH only include SPS HARQ-ACK with all NACK. |
| Samsung | Support NACK skipping in general as SPS PDSCH is often not transmitted (otherwise, the NACK probability is small and the proposal can be skipped).  Do not agree with the “per SPS PDSCH configuration” for NACK skipping – it makes no sense. |
| Apple | Reducing PUCCH overhead is just one aspect, another aspect is PDSCH demodulation effort. If skipping is based on NACKs for all demodulated PDSCHs, UE already consumes power for non-existing PDSCHs. |
| Intel | Neutral – don’t see much benefits, however, don’t see much work to enable dropping of a PUCCH with all NACKs |
| CATT | Marginal gain can be achieved with this enhancement. |
| Panasonic | We share same view with DOCOMO. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support skipping of HARQ-ACK feedback (both ACK and NACK) for a consecutive number of instances. Skipping for the consecutive number of instances would avoid any ambiguity for HARQ-ACK codebook construction. |
| WILUS | Not sure how much gain is achieved with “NACK” skipping only for All NACK of SPS HARQ-ACK. |
| Spreadtrum | Support NACK skipping to reduce UE encoding burden and reduce UL interference, and we agree with Samsung that “per SPS PDSCH configuration” should be revisited. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support the proposal. In RAN2 a misalignment between TSC traffic and the SPS periodicity was identified during Rel-16. The RAN2 conclusion was to use multiple SPS configurations to address the issue, and in some cases it even requires 8 SPS configurations for only one traffic. The consequence is that PDSCH skipping would thereby generate unnecessary NACK feedback. So NACK could also be skipped for this case. In addition, though the PUCCH resource is still reserved there, skipping the NACK would reduce the interference and also can save some UE power. |
| ZTE | We can support NACK skipping in principle, but the proposal is too narrow and aims a rare corner case of all NACK in a PUCCH. Meanwhile, the PUCCH resources are still kept reservation and no overhead reduction in this case.  We prefer NACK skipping in normal case which there may be NACKs or ACKs in the PUCCH resources, only NACK is skipped. |
| QC | The proposal of NACK skipping for “skipped” SPS is against the goals of the whole feature of “skipped SPS”. The motivation for handling “skipped SPS” was the following:   * + 1. Reduce UE power consumption.     2. Reduce UL other cell interference.     3. (Eventually) re-use the available UL resources for other UEs.   Skipping transmitting NACK in an URLLC does not achieve any of these goals (1-3). The question remains: what is the clear benefit of this scheme?  To the contrary, if there is indeed NACK for a transmitted SPS PDSCH, then, the NACK is very useful, as discussed in the CSI Enhancement group. It is in the case of an error, that any information is useful. This argument is more accentuated in case of multiple NACKs. |
| LG | It seems very rare case to having all NACK in PUCCH resource. If gNB want to skip multiple SPS PDSCH occasions, releasing SPS PDSCH is better for both gNB and UE than skip and blind decoding. |

**FL Proposal 4.2: Support ‘ACK skipping’ for SPS PDSCH, based on the following operation:**

* **A PUCCH transmission is skipped by the UE if the PUCCH is only carrying SPS PDSCH ACK(s) associated with SPS PDSCH configurations configured for ‘ACK skipping’**
* **FFS: Additional details including e.g. RRC configuration details, potential additional restrictions,…**
* ***Note: This does not preclude the support of additional methods to support HARQ-ACK skipping / payload size reduction for non-skipped SPS PDSCH***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | *List of companies* |
| Support proposal 4.2 | InterDigital, Huawei/HiSilicon, Ericsson (lower priority as only NACK skipping), QC, LG |
| Do not support ACK skipping in Rel-17 | Vivo, MediaTek, OPPO, Sony, Intel, CATT, WILUS, Spreadtrum, ZTE, China Telecom, Nokia/NSB |

Addition comments can be provided below (especially for companies not supporting the proposal at all, not even in principle):

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *Comments* |
| vivo | Different from NACK skipping that it is motivated by over-provision of the SPS resources to resolve the periodicity misalignment and to reduce the latency for IIoT traffic, the ACK skipping has no motivation for HARQ-ACK enhancements specific to SPS, for example, the ACK skipping can be used for dynamic scheduled PDSCH.  In addition, for ACK skipping, the DTX-to-ACK error would degrade the reliability performance. |
| MediaTek | It will impact the feedback reliability because of the DTX-to-NACK and ACK-to-NACK errors. |
| OPPO | Not support. Benefit from ACK skipping is not clear for us. Moreover, it is not clear to harmonize ACK skipping and NACK skipping. |
| Sony | gNB cannot distinguish between a missed PDSCH and an ACKed PDSCH. |
| DCM | If non-skipped SPS is accurately identified, ACK is dominant in URLLC use case, which means ACK skipping can skip most SPS HARQ-ACK PUCCHs. But as mentioned by other companies, DTX-to-NACK may impact the performance. So we think ACK skipping needs FFS. |
| Samsung | Further discussion is needed (this is “proposal 4.2” for ACK, not NACK, skipping) |
| Intel | For this feature it may not be sufficient to say that there could be services which can sustain detection errors. At this point, the probability to substantially degrade a URLLC service due to DTX-to-ACK errors does not allow to proceed in this direction. |
| CATT | Similar view as MediaTek and Intel. |
| Panasonic | Although our initial thinking is to support ACK skipping is beneficial in URLLC operation, I understand that there is the issue on DTX-to-ACK error. Further discussion is needed. |
| WILUS | There is potential miss-understanding of DTX (missing PUCCH) and ACK (skipping PUCCH). |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Since the mechanism to support NACK skipping and ACK skipping is similar, we think ACK skipping can be supported also. |
| ZTE | We also support ACK skipping in principle, but with the similar reason above, the ACK skipping details could be further studied. In this stage, we could reach a common sense, that NACK skipping or ACK skipping could be configured to UE separately. |
| Ericsson | By RRC, we can enable NACK skipping, or ACK-skipping, or disable both.  We think it depends on deployment scenario and services and configuration of traffics.  Common use case is for high periodicity DL SPS for TSN. Delay is critical but traffic load is low. Hence NACK skipping is better.  On the other hand, if we have a case with high load, but very reliable channels, maybe ACK skipping is better.  From our view, the UE skips PUCCH when CB is all NACK or all ACK. Hence, no additional complexity at UE. |
| China Telecom | Missed NACK and skipped ACK (PDSCH successfully received) can’t be distinguished. |
| QC | “ACK skipping” (or “NACK Only”) reduces UE power consumption and UL interference in a system in which statistically NACK is transmitted very rarely. |
| LG | In terms of URLLC, PDSCH transmission should be reliable in URLLC level so most feedback would be ACK. In error probability aspect, ACK skipping and NACK skipping only has small difference, however, ACK skipping have much benefit on UE power consumption. |
| Nokia/NSB | Less usage compared to NACK skipping. |

**Further details of ACK and NACK skipping:**

Looking at the details of ACK and NACK skipping, the first thing that would need to be further discussed is how to enable the ACK or NACK skipping procedure. Some companies in their discussions suggested to support the configuration per SPS configuration whereas at least one company suggested to have the configuration for all SPS configurations jointly (i.e. configuration per UE).

Therefore, companies are suggested to provide their support below directly:

**Question 4.1: The ACK or NACK skipping of SPS PDSCH is enabled by**

* **Option 1: RRC configuration per SPS configuration (i.e. within *sps-config*)**
  + **Supporting companies:** WILUS, vivo, OPPO, Nokia/NSB, IDC, Lenovo/Moto, Ericsson, ETRI, LGE, ZTE, …
* **Option 2: a single RRC configuration applies to all SPS PDSCH configurations**
  + **Supporting companies:** Spreadtrum, DCM, HW/Hisi, China Telecom…
* **Option 3: Other enabling methods** (details to be provided by supporting companies in the table below)
  + **Supporting companies:**  ZTE, …

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *Option 3 – other proposed method to enable ACK or NACK skipping* |
| vivo | Support option 1. |
| OPPO | Option 1 is preferred due to flexibility. |
| Xiaomi | We prefer option 1 |
| DCM | Option 2 is preferred.  As most companies’ common understanding is that “PUCCH transmission is skipped if PUCCH to only to carry NACK for SPS PDSCH(s) configured for NACK skipping”, option 1 will further limit use case of NACK skipping. For example, if one SPS HARQ-ACK CB includes HARQ-ACK for SPS configuration which is not configured for ACK/NACK skipping, PUCCH can’t be skipped even though other SPS HARQ-ACK bits are corresponding to SPS configurations configured for ACK/NACK skipping and all NACK for the SPS HARQ-ACK CB. |
| InterDigital | We support Option 1. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Option 1 is preferred for more flexibility. |
| WILUS | If ACK or NACK skipping is supported, we prefer option 1. |
| Spreadtrum | Option 2 is preferred. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support option 2 with similar view from DCM. |
| ZTE | Option 3: Combination of RRC configuration and DCI indication.  There are different PUCCH resources associated with different feedback mode such as ACK skipping or NACK skipping in one PUCCH resource set. The DCI can indicate the different feedback mode implicitly by PRI. There is no additional DCI overhead and this is flexible for the configuration.  Option 1 could also be accepted. |
| Ericsson | Prefer Option 1. Open towards Option 2. We can discuss pros and cons. |
| China Telecom | Support option 2 with similar view from DCM. |
| ETRI | We prefer option 1. |
| QC | Need to agree first if “Ack Skipping” or “Nack Skipping” are supported. |
| LG | We support option 1 |
| Nokia, NSB | We support option 1. The ACK/NACK skipping may be only applicable for certain traffic types etc. Moreover, option 1 by configuring all SPS configurations achieves the same as Option 2 but is less restrictive. |
| CAICT | Option 1 |

There had been suggestions by some companies to restrict the ACK or NACK skipping to e.g. 1 or 2 bits overall or the skipping to be limited to a number of consecutive instances. Companies to provide input on the need of such restrictions.

Therefore, companies are suggested to provide their support below directly:

**Question 4.2: The ACK or NACK skipping of SPS PDSCH, the following restrictions are seen as needed**

* **Option 1: limiting the skipped to a limited number of HARQ-ACK bits (e.g. 1 or 2)**
  + **Yes:** ETRI,, …
  + **No:** Nokia / NSB…
* **Option 2:** **the skipping to be limited to a number of consecutive instances**
  + **Yes:** Moto/Lenovo, Apple…
  + **No:** Nokia / NSB , …
* **Option 3: Other restrictions are seen as needed** (details to be provided by supporting companies in the table below)
  + **Yes:**  …

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *Option 3 – the following additional restrictions are needed for ACK or NACK skipping* |
| vivo | We would like to understand the necessity and benefits for above restriction firstly. |
| OPPO | Restriction is not required. |
| DCM | We don’t see the benefit of such limitations. |
| Apple | Option 2 can be supported |
| Panasonic | If the operation in Proposal 4.1 and/or 4.2 is supported, i.e., “a PUCCH transmission is skipped by the UE if the PUCCH is only carrying SPS PDSCH NACK(s)/ACK(s) associated with SPS PDSCH configurations configured for NACK/ACK skipping”, we think the restriction is not required. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Number of consecutive instances for skipping HARQ-ACK can be configured by gNB depending upon of the survival time requirement for an application. If HARQ-ACK feedback is skipped beyond a certain time, the communication service may be considered unavailable after survival time. |
| Spreadtrum | The necessarily of the restriction is not clear. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We don't see the need to introduce additional restriction. |
| ZTE | The motivation should be clarified. |
| China Telecom | The benefit of such limitations is not clear to us. |
| ETRI | The intention of Option 1 is to raise how to generate HARQ-ACK codebook with SPS HARQ-ACK skipping.  In our understanding, when many SPS HARQ-ACK bits are multiplexed, skipped/non-skipped SPS HARQ-ACK should be distinguished in the HARQ-ACK codebook if some of SPS HARQ-ACK bits are skipped. In this case, we need to put all HARQ-ACK bit in the codebook. For NACK skipping, all bits should be NACK to not transmit PUCCH, which means NACK is not skipped if this bit is included in the HARQ-ACK codebook. The option 1 seems the simplest way to do this, and we are open to discuss further. |
| QC | Clarify the rationale. What is the benefit in limiting the maximum number of “skipped SPS”? |
| LG | We don’t the reason that the restriction is needed. |
| Nokia, NSB | We do not see a need for any restrictions here (motivation unclear) |

**Further details of HARQ bundling / compression for SPS PDSCH:**

As noted already, at least to the moderator it is not fully clear on how to define the ‘jitter’ window or ‘bundling’ window. Only a few companies provided their input in their contributions, so it is suggested to get input from more companies or give here companies the chance to ask some questions on the methods proposed in the input documents, including:

1. The HARQ-ACK codebook for SPS PDSCHs is determined based on the HARQ processes of the multiple SPS PDSCH resources associated with the same PUCCH: OPPO [2]
2. Multiple SPS configurations are configured to share one HARQ-ACK bit: OPPO [2], Intel [9]
3. Bundling based on HARQ process IDs: Intel [9]
4. Include the number of ‘ACK’s with the bundle (e.g. using CS of PUCCH format 0): Sony [12]
5. Configure a time window / set of SPS configurations for bundling of more than one bit: ETRI [21]
6. Dynamic triggering using MAC CE / DCI: Xiaomi [22]
7. **N SPS PDSCH within a jitter window, bits are used for code states which include the successful/failed decoding at one of those N occasions or no detection of PDSCH at any of those N occasions: Apple [25]**
8. **compress multiple messages in HARQ-ACK codebook with small probability into a single message: Qualcomm [26]**

**Question 4.3: Companies to provide their input / clarifications / or questions on the details proposed by different companies above (1…8) or provide additional details on how to define the bundling / compression / jitter window and how to perform the bundling/compression.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *SPS HARQ bundling / compression Question on the suggested details (see above), clarifications or any additional comments* |
| OPPO | The HARQ-ACK codebook for SPS PDSCHs is determined based on the HARQ processes of the multiple SPS PDSCH resources associated with the same PUCCH.  One example is shown in Figure 1, 8 SPS PDSCH resources are associated with one PUCCH. The SPS resources of SPS configuration 1 are used to transmit HARQ process 6, 7, 8 and 0, and the SPS resources of SPS configuration 2 are used to transmit HARQ process 0, 1 and 2. Considering HARQ process 0 cannot be reused, so only 6 HARQ-ACK bits need to be included in the SPS HARQ-ACK codebook for HARQ process 0/1/2/6/7/8.    Figure1: SPS HARQ-ACK codebook determined based on the HARQ processes  Multiple SPS configurations are configured to share one HARQ-ACK bit. One example is shown in Figure 2, SPS configuration 1~3 are configured for one service to solve the jitter problem. During each periodicity, at most one SPS PDSCH will be transmitted, then only one HARQ-ACK bit should be fed back for each periodicity.    Figure 2: Multiple SPS PDSCH sources share one HARQ-ACK bit in SPS HARQ-ACK codebook |
| Sony | The bundling “window” should not be limited to only jittering. The SPS can be RRC configured to belong to a bundling window.  The UE only need to provide the *number* of ACKs in a bundling window. |
| DCM | In our view, HARQ-ACK bundling is performed for each HARQ-ACK CB without changing legacy HARQ-ACK reporting timing determination procedure. For example, UE determines HARQ-ACK bits to be reported in the same HARQ-ACK CB of the slot/sub-slot. Then UE bundles every N HARQ-ACK bits into 1 bit, resulting in M bits in the HARQ-ACK CB, where N can be fixed or M can be fixed. |
| Intel | OPPO provides good example how the CB could be constructed when different SPS occasions are configured to use the same PUCCH resource. There may be no need for explicit “jitter window” or “bundling window”. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Although, HARQ-ACK bundling/compression is not our preferred option, however, if option needs to be further considered, then one possible option for determining the bundling window could be configured by network depending up on survival time requirements. |
| QC | Compression by considering the very low NACK probability. In cases of multiple NACKs, they can be compressed to a single bit. |
| LG | It should be clarified whether gNB can configure same HARQ process ID for different SPS configuration. |
| Nokia, NSB | Looking at the bundling first, there may be an association of an SPS configuration to some bundling/compression group or similar (to defined which SPS configurations are bundled/compressed in some bits) as OPPO pointed out. So we think at least some ‘grouping’ e.g. by RRC may be needed.  The next thing that would need consideration of bundling in time is allowed (i.e. bundling/compression of bits of more than one PUCCH resource) or (b) if only bundling within a single PUCCH (resource) is to be supported (e.g. brought up by OPPO/Intel).  If (a) bundling across PUCCH resources is to be supported, then there will be a need to define some bundling/compression ‘window’. Not sure how to do this, but one option could be to define some reference SPS configuration that defines the end of the bundling window (and triggering the bundled/compressed HARQ-ACK transmission). |

## 4.2 Second round of email discussions

***Moderator comment:***

**ACK or NACK skipping summary from 1st round**

There is less support for supporting NACK or ACK skipping based on the feedback received (… and more companies saying ‘No’) as had been visible from the input contributions. For both cases there are at least 8 companies saying, they would not support introducing this (i.e. do not support).

On the potential configuration there seems to be good majority supporting per SPS configuration (compared to single RRC configuration) based on the input of Question 4.1. And there seemed that no additional restrictions seem to be needed really (based on inputs on Question 4.2).

The moderator would like to note here still, that the DTX-ACK and DTX-NACK problem raised by several companies in their reply on the general support could be handled by SPS configuration specific configuration here (i.e. only configure ACK or NACK skipping for SPS configurations the gNB is not worried about DTX-ACK or DTX-to-NACK errors).

Therefore, to check if this could help reducing the worries about NACK skipping or ACK skipping operation, the following question is brought forward:

**Question 4.4: On the DTX-to-ACK and DTX-to-NACK errors for ACK or NACK skipping, could per SPS configuration configuration (of Question 4.1) help to ease or remove this issue (as then under full gNB control)?**

* **Moderator comment:** *gNB**only configures for SPS configurations, where reliability of DTX-to-ACK or DTX-to-NACK is not considered problematic (i.e. under full gNB control)*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | *List of companies* |
| Agree | Nokia/NSB, vivo (but notice that different from “DTX-to-ACK”, No impact on reliability performance for “DTX-to-NACK”), Huawei/HiSilicon, InterDigital,Xiaomi |
| Disagree | Sony, QC, DCM, Intel (see comments), CATT, Samsung, OPPO, MediaTek, China Telecom, Panasonic, Spreadtrum, CAICT |

If you feel to provide additional arguments, please use the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *Comments* |
| QC | Indeed in both cases of ACK or NACK skipping (“Nack-only” or “Ack-Only”) the probability of DTX-to-NACK and DTX-to-ACK respectively increase. However, there are solutions to both cases, such as power boosting or repetition.  NACK-skipping (“ACK-only”) is not supported since fundamentally   * + - * + it does not provide any benefit in an URLLC system (with low BLER)         + It deprives an URLLC system from the very useful NACK feedback.   “ACK-only” was an “ad hoc” proposal aiming to support the “skipped SPS PDCH” concept.  “Skipped SPS” was initially proposed with the goals to:   * + - 1. Reduce UE power consumption       2. Reduce UL interference       3. Increase UL resources efficiency by eventually re-using the non-used PUCCH resources   None of the above 3 goals is achieved with the NACK skipping.  In addition, NACK is very useful in the radio link adaptation procedure, since it provides knowledge on what should be adapted, as discussed in the “URLL/IIOT CSI Enhancements” AI.  Only ACK-skipping (“NACK-only”) is supported.  Hence, the question needs to be formulated separately for ACK or NACK skipping. |
| DCM | Not clear how DTX-to-ACK and DTX-to-NACK issue can be solved by NACK/ACK skipping with per SPS configuration. And we still think NACK skipping with per SPS configuration will further limit use case for NACK skipping, for which the use case is rather narrow originally. |
| Intel | For ACK-skipping (NACK-only), the issue is rather in NACK-to-DTX probability, not DTX-to-ACK. Here DTX will be interpreted as ACK, thus the TB can only be recovered by higher layer retransmissions.  We can admit such use cases with reduced demand in reliability, but in our understanding, those are not part of IIOT/URLLC use case family. |
| Nokia/NSB | We think, if the gNB is worried about DTX-to-ACK/NACK for certain SPS configurations, it just would not configure it for such SPS configurations 🡪 up to gNB operation |
| Samsung | There is no DTX-to-ACK error (practically impossible) or DTX-to-NACK error (no distinction of DTX and NACK for SPS PDSCH). |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | Since both ACK and NACK are skipped for a configured time duration, gNB would not even try to detect/decode PUCCH for corresponding SPS PDSCH HARQ-ACK. |
| Ericsson | It is not clear to us how to understand the intention of question.  If it is related to have whether to have All-NACK skipping or All-ACK as in Q4.1? If yes, in our view, both are useful (more the former) depending on deployment scenario. As long as solution is the same for both, we can enable either of these modes based on deployment scenario. |
| China Telecom | We understand the DTX-to-ACK and DTX-to-NACK errors depend on the PUCCH detection performance under the corresponding channel condition. We think clarification is needed why it is related to SPS configuration, i.e. why for some SPS configurations the gNB is not worried about DTX-ACK or DTX-to-NACK errors. |
| InterDigital | We agree with Nokia’s comment. |
| LG | It is not clear to us what the question is aiming for. If gNB can avoid certain situation by configuration, of course, gNB would lose the benefit as well. We are open to make a choice for gNB, but we are not sure what has been resolved in that case. |
| Panasonic | We think the issue on DTX-to-ACK or DTX-to-NACK errors itself could not be removed by NACK/ACK skipping with per SPS configuration. |
| Spreadtrum | We think NACK/ACK skipping with per SPS configuration cannot solve DTX-to-ACK and DTX-to-NACK issue, and efficiency would further be reduced if DTX happens and ACK skipping is applied. |

Otherwise, it seems not really possible to move ahead on ACK or NACK skipping otherwise at this point of time (no new proposals brought forward).

**Further details of HARQ bundling / compression for SPS PDSCH:**

Based on the initial input given by different companies, there seems to be different opinions if a bundling or compression window is required or not.

One thing that may need further clarification is that if the bundling / compression is (a) only possible within a ‘single PUCCH occasion’ (which may not require any bundling window) or (b) ‘across PUCCH occasions’ (i.e. time domain bundling if thinking about LTE operation, the HARQ-ACKs would not be associated with the same PUCCH before the bundling operation, this would require having a bundling window). The difference is shown in the following Figure below:



(a) within a PUCCH occasion (b) across PUCCH occasions

**Question 4.5: If SPS HARQ-ACK bundling / compression is to be supported, is the bundling compression to be**

* **Alt. 1: Limited to a single PUCCH occasion (within a certain HARQ codebook)** 
  + **Note: this means, there may not be a need for a bundling window**
* **Alt. 2: Bundling / compression is also supported across PUCCH occasions / HARQ-ACK codebooks**
  + **Note: this may require definition of a bundling window**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | *List of companies* |
| Alt. 1 only | QC, DCM, Intel, LG |
| Alt. 2 also | Sony, Nokia/NSB, Lenovo/Motorola Mobility, OPPO |

If you feel to provide additional arguments, please use the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *Comments* |
| DCM | Alt 1 has less specification impact. |
| Intel | Alt.2 complicates things, thus better to focus on Alt.1 |
| Nokia/NSB | If we are serious about getting the payload size down, we would need to enable all the options. |
| OPPO | Alt.1 is one case of Alt.2. And Alt.2 could maximize the gain from bundle/compression. |
| LG | To achieve minimum performance, bundling ratio would be limited. For reducing HARQ-ACK payload size, it would be not good idea to bundle HARQ-ACKs across PUCCH occasions. |

Moreover, another thing that needs consideration is if there is a need for a ‘bundling /compression group identifier’ to be able to associate the HARQ-ACK bits potentiall to different ‘bundles / compression’. E.g. for the example below – 6 SPS PDSCH (on the same or different CCs) are applicable for bundling in first place – should there be an option to have the bundling / compression individual – e.g. for 2 groups as shown below (blue and green group, green 1 & 5 are separately comparessed from blue group with 2, 3, 4, 6)?



Example Fig. for bundling / compression group

**Question 4.6: If SPS HARQ-ACK bundling / compression is to be supported, is there a need for some ‘bunding / compression group identifier’ to enable separate bundling /compression for different groups?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | *List of companies* |
| Yes | Sony, Intel (with clarification), Nokia/NSB, OPPO |
| No | QC, LG |

If you feel to provide additional arguments, please use the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *Comments* |
| Sony | The UE needs to know which SPS Configuration are to be bundled and so there needs to be some identifier as you described in the example above. |
| QC | No need to introduce bundling group identifier. Just treating all the bits in a HARQ-ACK codebook as a single group and do compression/bundling once is enough. |
| DCM | It can be discussed after Question 4.5 is determined. The motivation to introduce such group is not clear to us now. |
| Intel | We think bundling could not be realized without any grouping, i.e. it is not good to bundle everything in a CB.  However, the grouping itself may not require a “new group identifier”, some other implicit rules or existing identifiers can be used (e.g. HARQ ID). |
| Nokia/NSB | Some grouping would be good to have. But agree with Intel, that the grouping could be also based on certain rules. |
| OPPO | Some ‘bunding / compression group identifier’ are required. FFS explicit or implicit |
| LG | Based on the current specification, SPS HARQ-ACK has already been grouped per priority. Unless we want to give a speciality to one SPS configuration in the same priority group, we think additional grouping is not necessary. |
| Apple | Some “bundling identifier” may be useful |

## 4.3 Third round of email discussions

***Moderator comment based on 3nd round:***

* *No real progress on the ACK/NACK skipping in 2nd round. No discussions during 3rd round planned (situation on support can be found in Sec. 4.1 / First round)*
* *I guess companies have now a better understanding on what companies having in mind in terms of the need for bundling of different companies. There is a slight difference in opinion if some bundling / compression association is needed (e.g. for jitter control) or not – as well as if the bundling / compression is to go across PUCCHs or is limited to a single PUCCH. Maybe not possible to down-select here further before having the full picture here*

What we have not discussed yet (which I would like to do in the 3rd round) is what type of bundling or compression companies are having in mind here. Let’s assume that N HARQ-ACK bits (of a group – group can be all bits, this is FFS) are applicable for bundling / compression, how is the information bundled or compressed.

**Question 4.3.1: How are X bits to be bundled or compressed?**

* **Alt. 1: HARQ-ACK bundling of N bits using logical ‘AND’ or ‘OR’ to a single bit**
* **Alt. 2: HARQ-ACK bundling of N bits using logical ‘AND’ or ‘OR’ to M bits**
  + **How to define M?**
* **Alt. 3: SPS jitter window specific solution: N SPS PDSCH within a jitter window, bits are used for code states which include the successful/failed decoding at one of those N occasions or no detection of PDSCH at any of those N occasions: Apple [25]**
* **Alt. 4: Compress multiple messages in HARQ-ACK codebook with small probability into a single message: Qualcomm [26]**
* **Alt. 5. HARQ-ACK bundling is to indicate the *number* of ACKs, e.g. if N=6 and there are 4 NACKs and 2 ACKs, the UE report 2 to the gNB, which requires 3 bits at most. PUCCH Format 0 can be used to indicate total number of ACKs for a maximum of 8 SPS PDSCH in a bundle group: Sony**
* **Alt 6. ???**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | *List of companies* |
| *Alt. 1* | Vivo (would be fine with Alt.1 for simplicity), TCL(Simpler implementation), WILUS, Intel, LG,Xiaomi,OPPO, Nokia/NSB, Lenovo/Motorola Mobility |
| *Alt. 2* | DCM, Sharp |
| *Alt. 3* | Apple |
| *Alt. 4* | Samsung (as FFS) , Spreadtrum, QC |
| *Alt. 5* | Sony, Lenovo/Motorola Mobility (**Alt. 5. HARQ-ACK bundling is to indicate the *number* of ACKs, or number of NACKs)** |
| *Other alternatives* |  |

Further questions, explanations or comments can be provided in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *Comments* |
| Samsung | No need to support bundling. The cost outweighs saving a few bits. Alt. 4 can be FFS. |
| DCM | We think Alt 2 can achieve Alt 1 with M=1. For determination of M, it may be configured by RRC, or calculated according to N and “bundle unit”, i.e. M=. |
| Intel | We are not sure how Alt. 2 is different from Alt. 1 if e.g. in Alt. 2 N is replaced by N/M and M is replaced by 1. |
| Nokia/NSB | If bundling is supported, then clearly just a simple scheme should be supported (i.e. Alt. 1). Alt. 1 could be operated with having more than one bundle (i.e. gNB control which SPS configurations are to be bundled).  Alt. 3: unclear why gNB needs to know which one it was (from them) if anyhow only one of them is expected to be successfully decoded. The additional information for the gNB compared to Alt. 1 is unclear.  Alt. 4: Unclear operation, if the UE does not know the BLER operation point.  Alt. 5: Unclear how this is helping the gNB if it knows that 2 were successful. If 3 of them were sent, the gNB anyhow would need to trigger the re-tx of all 3 of them. |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | Combining two or more alternatives should not be precluded. |
| Apple |  |
| QC | To Nokia: regardless of BLER operation point, UE expect much high probability of PDSCH decoding pass then failure, no? As long as there is asymmetricity between ACK and NACK probability, this scheme is beneficial to reduce HARQ-ACK payload size and minimize the impact to DL PDSCH throughput.  Also, we agree with Lenovo that supporting two alternatives should not be precluded. If needed, we can do the following (just a example): use scheme A for type 1 codebook, use scheme B for type 2 codebook. |

## 4.4 Fourth round of email discussions

**Moderator comments:**

Based on the discussions during the 3rd round, companies clarified their compression / bundling schemes. There seems a majority of companies of simple bundling - but at least companies now should have a better understanding of all the different options that could be done for SPS HARQ skipping and payload size reduction.

So, I guess (based on improved technical understanding) on each of the Alternatives, it is asked once again what we could potentially support in Rel-17. Please note, that we could be supporting one or more of the options below. If we are unable to agree / reach consensus on any of the methods– nothing will be supported in the end.

Therefore, again just some indicative support would be welcome to see if we potentially could agree one or more of the methods below maybe in a potential last GTW session this week.

**Questions 4.4.1: Which of the following method(s) should be supported in Rel-17 for handling SPS HARQ skipping and/or payload size reduction (more than one could be supported in Rel-17):**

1. **‘NACK skipping’ for SPS PDSCH, based on the following operation:**
   * **A PUCCH transmission is skipped by the UE if the PUCCH is only carrying SPS PDSCH NACK(s) associated with SPS PDSCH configurations configured for NACK skipping**
   * **FFS: Additional details including e.g. RRC configuration details, potential additional restrictions, …**
   * **Note: ‘NACK skipping’ assumes inherently no identification of a skipped SPS PDSCH by the UE**
   * ***Note: This does not preclude the support of additional methods to support HARQ-ACK skipping / payload size reduction for skipped or non-skipped SPS PDSCH***
2. **Dynamic indication of skipped SPS PDSCH occasions** 
   * **FFS: details including dynamic indication methods such as e.g. common/UE-specific DCI, MAC CE, specific DM-RS instead of SPS DM-RS**
3. **‘ACK skipping’ for SPS PDSCH, based on the following operation:**
   * **A PUCCH transmission is skipped by the UE if the PUCCH is only carrying SPS PDSCH ACK(s) associated with SPS PDSCH configurations configured for ‘ACK skipping’**
   * **FFS: Additional details including e.g. RRC configuration details, potential additional restrictions, …**
4. **HARQ bundling / compression** 
   * **FFS: Details including HARQ bundling / compression window, bundling / compression technique**
5. **HARQ-ACK disabling /skipping for certain SPS configurations** 
   * **The skipping / disabling is higher layer configured per SPS configuration**
   * **FFS: HARQ-ACK skipping behaviour for Type 1 CB**
6. **Do NOT support any enhancements in Rel-17 to handle SPS PDSCH skipping and/or SPS playload size reduction**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | *List of companies* |
| **1. NACK  skipping** | Support | Vivo, Samsung (to cover typical cases of no actual SPS PDSCH transmission),TCL, Spreadtrum, ZTE, Huawei/HiSilicon, Nokia/NSB, Ericsson, Apple, China Telecom |
| No / Object | DCM, MediaTek, Sony, QC (Proponents of “NACK skipping” (ACK-only) should a give a single (1) case in which HARQ payload is reduced with this feature. In an URRLC system, in which statistically out of 1000 HARQ transmission, 999 will be ACK and only 1 will be skipped), Panasonic, CATT, WILUS, Intel (but OK with simple solution + Alt. 4) |
| **2. Dyn. SPS  skipping indication** | Support | DCM, TCL, Sony, QC |
| No / Object | Vivo, Samsung (highly negative trade-off for benefit vs. cost), Spreadtrum, LG, Huawei/HiSilicon, MediaTek, Nokia/NSB, Ericsson, Apple, Sharp, Panasonic, China Telecom, CATT, Intel |
| **3. ACK  skipping** | Support | Samsung (to cover typical cases of all transmitted SPS PDSCH being correctly received), DCM (with dynamic SPS skipping indication), Xiaomi, TCL, ZTE, LG, Huawei/HiSilicon, Ericsson, QC, Panasonic, WILUS |
| No / Object | Vivo, MediaTek, Sony, Nokia/NSB, China Telecom, CATT, Intel |
| **4. HARQ bundling / compr.** | Support | vivo (with condition of simple solution), DCM (with dynamic SPS skipping indication, compression only within one PUCCH occasion),Xiaomi, TCL, Lenovo/Motorola Mobility, QC, Apple, OPPO, Intel (simple + there are use cases) |
| No / Object | Samsung (loss is too large to justify saving a few bits – if a UE has problem transmitting few HARQ-ACK bits, UE has much bigger problems to worry about) , Huawei/HiSilicon, MediaTek (not for URLLC, possibly for eMBB in intra-UE multiplexing), Ericsson, CATT |
| **5. HARQ disabling / skipping based on RRC config** | Support | ZTE, Lenovo/Motorola Mobility, Nokia/NSB, vivo, QC, CATT,OPPO, Intel (open) |
| No / Object | ~~Vivo,~~ Samsung (useless feature, no reason for gNB to pick some HARQs for HARQ-ACK feedback and pick some other HARQs for no HARQ-ACK), DCM, TCL, Spreadtrum, MediaTek, Sony, Ericsson, Apple |
| **6. No support in Rel-17 (none of the above)** | Support | MediaTek |

If you want to provide additional comments, please provide them in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *Comments* |
| QC | Dynamic skipping indication is useful in case of a single indication used for several SPS PDSCH skipped occasions – mainly in cases of multiple SPS configurations for single traffic. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## 4.5 Fifth round of email discussions

**Moderator comments:**

Well – as somehow expected, the situation has not really changed too much on the positions of different companies. As noted already in the last round, if we are not able to agree on any method – there will be no support of any type of SPS HARQ optimization for skipped or non-skipped SPS PDSCH.

Companies are encouraged to think about potential grouping of alternatives or similar till the next meeting. Clearly, we need to have some conclusion next time, and if it is just that there is no consensus on any enhancements there.

I am a bit out of questions or potential proposals for this meeting, as it seems that none of them based on current status seem to be agreeable.

**If you have any suggestions or comments – and what could be done or how to resolve this issue, please provide them below:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *Comments* |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# PUCCH repetition enhancements (at least for HARQ-ACK), e.g., sub-slot based, etc.

In this section, the company positions on the support of PUCCH repetition enhancements (incl. sub-slot type of PUCCH repetition) are summarized. There had only be little progress in RAN1, but RAN plenary was able to clarify the focus a bit better based on the following conclusion taken during RAN#90:

***RAN conclusion on IIoT scope:***

* *For handling of the PUCCH repetitions it is proposed to proceed as follows:*

1. *RAN1 to continue discussion on PUCCH repetition, whether to specify or not, in the IIoT/URLLC WI for single TRP.*
   1. *The following items are not within scope of the continued discussions in the IIoT/URLLC WI:*
      1. *DMRS-less PUCCH with UCI payload up to 11 bits*
      2. *PUSCH-repetition-Type-B like PUCCH repetition*
      3. *DMRS bundling across PUCCH repetitions*
2. *PUCCH repetition issues with multi-TRP to be handled in Fe-MIMO WI.*

* *For the UE CSI/HARQ-ACK feedback enhancements in the IIoT/URLLC WI, RAN1 work to continue the discussions. Status to be checked in March if any RAN level guidance needed.*
  + *RAN1 to continue discussion on A-CSI on PUCCH, whether to specify or not.*

The following **alternatives to support ‘sub-slot type of PUCCH repetition’** have been mentioned by different companies.

* **Alt. 1: Sub-slot based PUCCH repetition** (same start / duration / PUCCH resource in each subslot, one repetition per subslot): 15x, 1x No, 1x FFS
  + **Yes:** ZTE [1], Huawei / HiSi [3], BUPT [3], China Southern Power Grid [3], Ericsson [4], CATT [6], Nokia [10], Spreadtrum [11], LGE [13], China Telecom [14], Panasonic [19], ETRI [21], Xiaomi [22] (for longer PUCCH formats), Samsung [23], DOCOMO [28]
  + **No:** Mediatek [8] (…don’t proceed with PUCCH repetition enhancement studies, allow PUCCH to cross the sub-slot boundary instead)
  + **FFS:** Sony [12]
* **Alt. 2: Back-to-back PUCCH repetition with short formats:** Xiaomi [22] – 1 Yes
  + *Moderator comment:*back-to-back, i.e. PUSCH repetition Type B PUCCH repletion has been excluded from the WI based on the RAN plenary conclusion above
* **Alt. 3: Repetitions to support different starting point & duration based on PUCCH configuration:** Intel [9] – 1x Yes

**Support PUCCH repetition for short PUCCH formats (F0 & F2):** - 10x Yes

* **Support:** ZTE [1], Ericsson [4], Nokia [10], Spreadtrum [11], China Telecom [14], Panasonic [19], Xiaomi [22], Samsung [23], DOCOMO [28], Xiaomi [22]
* **No support:** -

**Other suggested enhancements for PUCCH repetition** (not limited to ‘sub-slot type PUCCH repetition):

* Dynamic indication of PUCCH repetition factor: Huawei / HiSi [3], BUPT [3], China Southern Power Grid [3], Ericsson [4], CATT [6] (repetition factor configured for each PUCCH resource), Intel [9] (per triggered PUCCH format), Spreadtrum [11], Panasonic [19] (from Cov. Env. should be applicable here), ETRI [21]
  + ***Moderator comment:*** *It has been agreed to be supported as part of the Coverage Enhancements WI – therefore, not to be treated / discussed here.*
* Per repetition PUCCH dropping rules concerning overlapping with DG PUSCH: Nokia [10] (FFS)
* Support of sub-slot based PUCCH repetition to be also applicable for SR and/or CSI: Nokia [10] (FFS)
* Enabling multiplexing of different UCI types within a PUCCH repetition bundle: Nokia [10] (FFS)
* Reducing the priority of a repetition according to the number of repetitions that have already been transmitted: Sony [12]
* Discuss multiplexing / prioritization rules: LGE [13]
* Introduce additional PUCCH repetition factors: ETRI [21]
* Support of dynamic bundling for PUCCH repetition to limit the payload size: QC [26]
  + Incl. gNB configurable compression / bundling threshold or dynamic bundling/compression indication in the DCI

## 5.1 First round of email discussions

*Moderator comments:*

**Sub-slot type of PUCCH repetition**

* There seems to be **strong support (15x Yes, 1x No, 1x FFS) to support sub-slot based PUCCH repetition based on the Rel-15 PUCCH repetition framework (i.e. same start / duration / PUCCH resource in each subslot, one repetition per subslot)**
* One company suggesting back-to-back PUCCH repetition framework, which based on the moderator’s understanding was excluded from the WI scope by the RAN#90 conclusion. 🡪 to be not considered
* One company suggesting a different sub-slot type of PUCCH repetition framework (with different PUCCH resources configured for each repetition)
* Based on this, the **moderator suggest trying to agree on the support of sub-slot based PUCCH repetition** (based on the Rel-16 framework) during this meeting.

**Other suggested enhancements:**

* The support of **PUCCH repetition for shorter PUCCH formats** received rather good support. And if sub-slot based PUCCH repetition is to be supported also for 2OS sub-slots this will be needed. Therefore, moderator **suggesting to agree on the support** on repetition of short PUCCH formats **at least for sub-slot based PUCCH repetition**.
* Many companies mentioned the support of **dynamic PUCCH repetition**. The moderator would like to note here, that the support of dynamic PUCCH repetition indication is **covered in the Coverage Enhancements WI**. Therefore, as this is to be supported in Rel-17 already, there is no need to duplicate the related discussions in this WI / AI. Therefore, the moderator suggests to **not discussing this**.
* There had been **other** **single company proposals** on PUCCH repetition enhancements brought to this meeting. It is suggested to at least **not discuss them during the (at least) first meeting week**

**Based on the discussions during the GTW call – the proposal has been updated trying to address the following comments:**

* Do not refer to the specifications (to not imply a CR/TP, but try to be more generic in the formulation
* Repetition to be limited to HARQ-ACK (other UCI types could still be discussed / FFS)
* Dynamic repetition indication to be supported also for sub-slot PUCCH. Trying to leverage the Cov. Enh. WI outcome as much as possible
  + ***Moderator comment:*** If the dynamic repetition indication is indicated by a field in the DCI directly, then this can be equally applied for the sub-slot PUCCH. If the dynamic repetition indication would be part of the pucch-resource config (and PRI indicating the repetition factor), then the same applies as basically this would be clearly part of PUCCH config (independently if it is of slot or sub-slot type). So we may need to wait a bit on the outcome of the Cov. Enh. WI discussions there (proposed to put detailed discussions on hold for the moment…)

**Updated FL Proposal 5.1: Support sub-slot based PUCCH repetition for HARQ-ACK based on the Rel-16 PUCCH procedure for slot-based PUCCH applied to sub-slot based PUCCH.**

* **Dynamic repetition indication is supported also for sub-slot based PUCCH in Rel-17**
  + **FFS: if the method to be specified in Cov. Enh WI for slot-based PUCCH repetition can be directly applied to sub-slot PUCCH or if changes are needed**
* **FFS: sub-slot based PUCCH repetition for other UCI types**
* **FFS: Additional PUCCH repetition enhancements**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | *List of companies* |
| Support proposal 5.1 | Vivo, Xiaomi, Sony, Nokia/NSB, DCM, Samsung, CATT, Panasonic, NEC, Sharp, WILUS, Spreadtrum, Huawei/HiSilicon, ZTE, Ericsson, China Telecom, ETRI, QC, LG, APT |
| Do not support sub-slot PUCCH repetition in Rel-17 | MediaTek |

Addition comments can be provided below (especially for companies not supporting the proposal at all, not even in principle):

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *Comments* |
| MediaTek | If the latency allows having sub-slot PUCCH repetition, the UE can be configured with longer sub-slot length.  There is no direct comparison between slot-based and sub-slot based PUCCH repetitions. Unlink sub-slot based PUCCH transmission; the UE cannot be configured with slot length more than 14 symbols. Thus, there is no need to extend the slot-based PUCCH repetition to sub-slot. |
| Sony | Note that in Rel-16 sub-slot PUCCH was introduced solely for HARQ-ACK. Hence we should only consider this for HARQ-ACK. |
| Nokia/NSB | Could be limited to HARQ only. |
| Samsung | It is understood that a benefit may not exist in case semi-static repetitions but the reasons to support are same as for “slot-based” transmissions in case of dynamic repetitions. |
| Intel | With currently available sub-slot configuration of 2 and 7 symbols, we are not sure simple enabling of PUCCH repetitions over sub-slots can bring much benefits.  Since MIMO also intends to utilize URLLC repetition framework for multi-TRP, this kind of design may be limiting. For example, in many cases of achieving transmit diversity over repetitions (both multi-TRP and single-TRP), a transient/switching gap is required, which may be in the order of symbols for large sub-carrier spacings. This may only be achieved by inefficient combinations of PUCCH duration less than sub-slot.  The above limitation may need to be discussed and avoided by introducing a more general PUCCH repetition framework, as was proposed in our contributions. |
| WILUS | Sub-slot PUCCH repetition should be applied to HARQ-ACK only. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | If the concern is on “based on the Rel-16 PUCCH procedure for slot-based PUCCH applied to sub-slot based PUCCH”, at least let’s agree to support sub-slot based PUCCH repetition with dynamic indication of repetition number first. |

**FL Proposal 5.2: Support PUCCH repetition for PUCCH formats 0 and 2 at least for sub-slot based PUCCH repetition.**

* **FFS: Support for slot-based PUCCH repetition**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | *List of companies* |
| Support proposal 5.2 | Vivo, Nokia/NSB, DCM, Samsung, CATT, Panasonic, NEC, Sharp, WILUS, Spreadtrum, Huawei/HiSilicon, ZTE, Ericsson, China Telecom, QC, LG, APT |
| No | MediaTek |

Addition comments can be provided below (especially for companies not supporting the proposal at all, not even in principle):

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *Comments* |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## 5.2 Third round of email discussions

In todays session we made the following two agreements:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreements: Support sub-slot based PUCCH repetition for HARQ-ACK based on the Rel-16 PUCCH procedure for slot-based PUCCH applied to sub-slot based PUCCH   * Note: the intention is to take the Rel-16 slot-based PUCCH by replacing with “sub-slot” appropriately, without further optimization unless necessary * FFS whether or not there is any restriction for the applicability of sub-slot based PUCCH repetition for HARQ-ACK * Dynamic repetition indication is supported also for sub-slot based PUCCH in Rel-17   + FFS: if the method to be specified in Cov. Enh WI for slot-based PUCCH repetition can be directly applied to sub-slot PUCCH or if changes are needed   Agreements: Support PUCCH repetition for PUCCH formats 0 and 2 at least for sub-slot based PUCCH repetition.  FFS: Support for slot-based PUCCH repetition |

As we are all having some bandwidth limitation, I put some questions here – but clearly we may not be addressing the outcome by the end of this meeting.

Looking at the 2nd agreement, one a quick check if companies would be fine to support Format 0 & 2 also for slot-based repetitions.

**FL Proposal 5.3: Support PUCCH repetition for PUCCH formats 0 and 2 also for slot based PUCCH repetition in Rel-17.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | *List of companies / reasons for objection or support* |
| Yes: | DCM, ZTE, Intel, Huawei/HiSilicon (fine), Nokia/NSB, Ericsson (we think it is already supported based on MIMO agreement), Sharp, QC |
| No: | Samsung (prefer FFS), Mediatek, Lenovo/Motorola Mobility |
| Reasons to support: | DCM: Firstly, it has been agreed to support slot based repetition with short PUCCH for MTRP in feMIMO WID. Therefore, it is straightforward to support the same functionality for single TRP case as well . In addition, it is beneficial from CovEnh perspective. For example, in FR2, different beams are allocated to each 2 OSs in a UL slot, and the same beam pattern is repeated across slots, which aligned with slot-based repetition pattern with short PUCCH formats, because FR2 has more beams and cannot use a slot for a certain beam (e.g. long PUCCH format) considering the resource utilization.  Intel: at least to align with MIMO decisions  Huawei/HiSilicon: We also don't see the motivation to support slot-based PUCCH repetition for PUCCH format 0/2 for URLLC, however since it is already agreed in MIMO session we are fine to include it. |
| Reasons for not supporting: | The “long” PUCCH formats can be used for slot-based PUCCH repetitions. There is no reason to support slot-based repetitions for PUCCH formats 0 and 2. However, this issue is not critical and can be deferred until the sub-slot based repetition design is complete. If no other specification impact, it can be considered to be generalized for slot-based repetitions. (Samsung)  (Mediatek) We don’t see the justifications to support slot based PUCCH repetition for short-PUCCHs. If it is beneficial from CovEnh perspective (as DCM mentioned), then the CovEnh WI should introduce this feature.  Lenovo/Motorola Mobility: should be discussed under CovEnh WI. For enhanced URLLC/IIoT, difficult to justify motivation. |

And then maybe an option question here (most probably cannot be resolved this time) – but that companies have an idea about what you are still having in mind for sub-slot PUCCH repletion, would be good if you could provide some of your views what in addition for sub-slot PUCCH repetition would need to be discussed itself. Let’s try to collect a list of issues here. But there had been specifically the question on support for different UCI types.

**Question 5.2.1: Should sub-slot based PUCCH repetition be supported for other UCI types, such as SR and/or CSI? Please indicate for each type below (if not thinking at all – no to both)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | *List of companies* |
| Support  for SR | Yes: | Vivo, DCM, CATT, ZTE, Spreadtrum, LG,OPPO, Ericsson, Sharp, QC  Ericsson:  In general, we don’t see the specification should create so many fragmentations. We face a use case soon that it is needed for SR, and then we have to spend a lot of work to remove the restrictions we impose.  PUCCH repetition in Rel-15 is broken: Repetition is per formant, no matter what the content is and whether a SR/CSI configuration needs that or not. By introduction of different services, etc, more flexibility is needed in operations. Maybe NW want to use an SR configuration with repetition and maybe sub-slot to increase reliability, and doesn’t want to waste resources for another SR used for eMBB.  We are having a hard time to understand why we keep on imposing restrictions by thinking about limited scenarios.  Vivo2: also easier for gNB to control UCI multiplexing rather than always dropping the PUCCH without repetition. |
| No: | Samsung (no reason for RRC configured PUCCH)  Huawei/HiSilicon, Nokia/NSB: Need to understand more the motivation first then easier to judge whether it is necessary or not. Probably for SR it can be considered since there is high priority for SR also. |
| Support for CSI | Yes: | Vivo, DCM, CATT, ZTE, Spreadtrum, LG,OPPO, Ericsson  Ericsson: Comments for SR applicable here too. |
| No: | Samsung (no reason for RRC configured PUCCH)  Huawei/HiSilicon, Nokia/NSB: Need to understand more the motivation |

**Question 5.2.2: What other issues /clarifications or enhancements do you think would still need to be considered in Rel-17 for sub-slot based PUCCH repetition?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *Issue / enhancement to be further considered for sub-slot based PUCCH repetiton* |
| LG | It is necessary to specify how to handle sub-slot PUCCH repetition overlapping with a PUSCH transmission. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## 5.3 Forth round of email discussions

**Moderator comments:**

**PUCCH format 0 & 2 for slot based PUCCH repetition**

There seems to be different opinions if the support of PUCCH repetition of PUCCH formats 0 and 2 from M-TRP decision also applies to MIMO – or this is needs a separate agreement. At least from the feedback received, it seems that not all companies would be will to agree the support in URLLC now. Therefore, the moderator suggests to not handle the support of PUCCH formats 0 & 2 in this AI during RAN1#104-e. **URLLC delegates are encouraged till the next RAN1 meeting to synchronize with their Cov. Enh. & M-TRP colleagues there and bring their respective proposals to the next meeting.**

**PUCCH repetition for sub-slot PUCCH for other UCI types (i.e. SR or CSI)**

Based on the answers in the last round, there is no clear guidance here. As Ericsson pointed out, the PUCCH repetition in Rel-15 is configured per PUCCH format – so in principle PUCCH repetition is supported for slot-based PUCCH for SR and CSI as well, but for PUCCH repetition only a single UCI type with the following priority order can be multiplexed on the PUCCH:

* HARQ-ACK > SR > CSI with higher priority > CSI with lower priority – see details in Sec. 9.2.6 of 38.213

Therefore, as the decision indicated to use the slot-based PUCCH repetition operation principle also for sub-slot PUCCH, there is then of course the question why not the same would apply also in terms of UCI handling, as detailed in 38.213 Sec. 9.2.6. **Also on this point it is maybe recommended to check offline and discuss with colleagues especially from Cov. Enh., if e.g. the dynamic repetition indication discussed there would change something (e.g. if this is per PUCCH resource or if this would a change of meaning here). Companies are therefore encouraged to bring their proposals to the next meeting.**

# Type 1 HARQ codebook based on sub-slot PUCCH config

First, during RAN1#103-e it was clarified that Type 1 CB for sub-slot PUCCH is not supported in Rel-16. Moreover, there had been good support for the feature in Rel-17 overall but it was discussed that further details may need to be clarified before agreeing the support in Rel-17.

Overall, the following on the support in Rel-16 or in Rel-17 based on company inputs in their input contributions can be noted.

**Support for Type 1 HARQ-ACK codebook for sub-slot PUCCH in Rel-17: 16x Yes, 2x No**

* **Support in Rel-17 (16 companies):** ZTE [1], OPPO [2], Huawei / HiSi [3], BUPT [3], China Southern Power Grid [3], Ericsson [4], CATT [6], Nokia [10], Spreadtrum [11], LGE [13], NEC [16], CMCC [20], Samsung [22] (subject to min. specs & implementation effort), Qualcomm [26], DOCOMO [28], WILUS [29]
* **No (2 companies):** Mediatek [8], Xiaomi [22] (‘low priority’)

**Ways to support the Type 1 HARQ-ACK CB for sub-slot PUCCH:**

* ZTE [1]:
  + *“…if one UL sub-slot overlaps with one or more DL slots, the existing mechanism is reused, for example, loop multiple DL slots within one UL slot”*
  + Following steps are proposed:
    - *Divide the PDSCH TDRA in a slot into different SLIV groups (already supported in Rel-15/16);*
    - *Associate a SLIV group with a sub-slot according to the latest end symbol of the PDSCHs in the SLIV group;*
    - *Generate HARQ-ACK information for each SLIV group in each sub-slot and concatenate the HARQ-ACK information to form type1 HARQ-ACK codebook.*
* OPPO [2]: “*For a given subslot, if the last symbols of the PDSCH time resource derived by a TDRA row r is not in the subslot, row r is removed from the cardinality of TDRA rows.”*
* Huawei / HiSi [3], BUPT [3], China Southern Power Grid [3]:
  + *For example, the associated sub-slots of a given UL sub-slot can be determined based on the configured K1 set, then for each sub-slot the SLIVs whose ending symbols are located in this sub-slot are selected from the configured SLIV set and the SLIV splitting is performed for these SLIVs belonging to the same sub-slot to get the PDSCH occasion per sub-slot.*
* Ericsson [4]
  + *Support Type-1 HARQ codebook for sub-slot HARQ-ACK by updating the pseudo code for determining a set of occasions for candidate PDSCH reception where the ratio is changed to , where N is the number of sub-slots in an UL slot.*
  + *…..further optimization to reduce Type-1 codebook size can be considered*
* CATT [6]
  + *find all the PDSCH occasions based on the boundary of UL sub-slot so that the redundant HARQ-ACK bit(s) can be removed and all the PDSCH occasions can be included, where a PDSCH occasion is associated with a UL sub-slot if the end of the PDSCH overlaps with the UL sub-slot*
    - *For the case of an UL sub-slot spans multiple DL slots, the loop condition “while ” for Type-1 codebook should be replaced by “while ” for HARQ-ACK in a UL sub-slot;*
    - *For the case of one DL slot spans multiple UL sub-slots, only the PDSCH SLIV which falls into the HARQ-ACK multiplexing window are considered to determine the HARQ-ACK codebook, A PDSCH SLIV is associated with a UL sub-slot if the end of the PDSCH overlaps with the UL sub-slot. The HARQ-ACK multiplexing window is determined based on the HARQ-ACK timing set and sub-slot length.*
* Nokia [10]
  + *The HARQ-ACK multiplexing window is defined based on the HARQ-ACK timing set K1 and sub-slot length.*
    - *The applicable K1 set considering the applicable DCI formats for the PUCCH configuration based on Sec. 9.1.1.1 of TS 38.213 is reused.*
  + *Definition of the union set of TDRA entries: A PDSCH TDRA is associated with an UL / PUCCH sub-slot if the end of the PDSCH overlaps with the UL sub-slot.*
  + *The pruning is performed per PUCCH sub-slot based on the TDD configuration (as in Rel-15, but per sub-slot)*
  + *FFS: additional codebook size optimizations*
* Spreadtrum [11]: *Similar as Rel-16 type 1 codebook, the union set of row indexed of TDRAs are used to determine the PDSCH occasions, including for DCI formats the UE is configured to monitor PDCCH and reference of SLIV if it is configured.*

1. *For a UCI to be sent in sub-slot n, determine the union set of K1 values in unit of sub-slot according to the DCI formats the UE is configured to monitor PDCCH.*
2. *Determine the union set of row indexed of TDRAs for DCI formats the UE is configured to monitor PDCCH*
   1. *At sub-slot n-K1 with the given value K1, all the PDSCH occasions indicated in the TDRA tables configured by higher layers are considered to determine the codebook size.*
   2. *If PDCCH starting symbol as the reference of SLIV is supported, the corresponding SLIVs with starting symbol replaced by should also be added into candidate PDSCH occasion sets.*
3. *The* *PDSCH occasions that conflict with TDD DL/UL configuration are removed first. The remaining PDSCH occasions selection for determining the codebook size is given as the procedure below:*
4. *Select T to be smallest end symbol index of all the available SLIVs in sub-slot n-K1.*
5. *Move the corresponding SLIV with ending symbol T into the chosen SLIV set .*
6. *Cancel the remaining SLIVs that starts no later than T.*
7. *Go back to step 1) until all the SLIVs ending in sub-slot n-K1 are looped and get the final SLIV set to generate HARQ-ACK bits.*

* LGE [13]
  + *it is necessary to remove unusable candidate PDSCH reception in type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook from the following cases:*
    - *A K1 value is corresponding to only one DCI format*
    - *A TDRA entry is corresponding to only one DCI format*
* NEC [16]
* *When DL and UL are configured with same numerology, the sub-slot based semi-static HARQ-ACK codebook can be determined based on following three-steps:*
  + *Step 1: Determine the HARQ-ACK multiplexing window based on the HARQ-ACK timing set and sub-slot length.*
  + *Step 2: Split the TDRA table into N sub-tables based on the sub-slot length and PDSCH-to UL sub-slot association. N is the number of sub-slots within a slot.*
  + *Step 3: Do pruning based on TDD configuration and sub-table per sub-slot similar as Rel-15.*
* *When DL and UL are configured with different numerologies, further study the sub-slot based semi-static HARQ-ACK codebook determination.*
* *Optionally, the C-DAI/T-DAI counters can be reused/redefined for the pruned sub-slot based HARQ-ACK codebook (enhanced reliability for URLLC).*
* Samsung [23]
  + *Determine candidate UL sub-slots and corresponding DL slots for candidate PDSCH receptions based on the HARQ-ACK timing set (sub-slot-level K1) and number of UL sub-slots N per UL slot on top of existing procedure for different DL/UL numerologies.*
  + *Do pruning based on TDD configuration and SLIVs for each DL slot, wherein the SLIVs end in candidate UL sub-slots*
* Qualcomm [26]
  + *A PDSCH occasion (i.e., time-domain resource allocation) is associated with an uplink sub-slot that contains the end of the PDSCH occasion.*
* DOCOMO [28]
  + *…. logical steps proposed in RAN1#103-e can be used for Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook for sub-slot based HARQ-ACK*
    - *Step 1: Determine the HARQ-ACK multiplexing window based on the HARQ-ACK timing set and sub-slot length.*
    - *Step 2: If a UL sub-slot in the HARQ-ACK window spans multiple DL slots, create a new TDRA table which is the union of the configured TDRA table and the configured TDRA table offset by 14 symbols.*
    - *Step 3: Split the TDRA table into N sub-tables based on the sub-slot length and PDSCH-to UL sub-slot association. A PDSCH TDRA is associated with a UL sub-slot if the end of the PDSCH overlaps with the UL sub-slot. N is the number of sub-slots within a slot.*
    - *Step 4: Do pruning based on TDD configuration and sub-table per sub-slot similar as Rel-15.*
* WILUS [29]
  + *For a given (****sub-slot-level****) K1 value k1, find the DL slot corresponding to the UL sub-slot n-k1.*
    - *Validity of each SLIV in a TDRA table R for the DL slot is checked. The invalid SLIVs are removed from the TDRA table R.*
      * *The validity is checked based on semi-static UL/DL configuration, i.e., if a symbol corresponding to an SLIV overlaps with semi-static UL symbol, then the SLIV is invalid.*
      * *And the validity is further checked based on the last symbol of an SLIV, i.e., the last symbol of an SLIV does not overlaps with the UL sub-slot n-k1, then the SLIV is invalid.*
    - *If the TDRA table R is not empty, then generate type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook for the DL slot.* 
      * *If a UE has no capability to receive more than one unicast PDSCH per DL slot, then one HARQ-ACK occasion is added to the type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook.*
      * *If a UE has capability to receive more than one unicast PDSCH per DL slot, overlapping of SLIVs are further checked and then find a set of SLIVs to be represented as one HARQ-ACK occasion.*

Other suggested Type 1 CB enhancements – not necessarily related to Type 1 CB for sub-slot PUCCH:

* Reduce redundant bits – by taking the configured DCI monitoring occasions (e.g. for DCI format 1\_2) into account: CATT [6] (Figure in Appendix [6])
* Configuration of ‘feedback TDRA’ table for Type 1 CB size reduction: Nokia/NSB [10] (Figures see Appendix [10])
* Using DAI for Type 1 CB size reduction: NEC [16] (use existing C-DAI and re-defined T-DAI for Type 1 CB)
* The sub-slot based Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook ACK/NACK bits will only be present if the corresponding slot or sub-slot has at least one PDCCH transmission: NEC [16]
* Enhancements for multi-TRP PDSCH repetition: Samsung [23] (Figure see Appendix [23])

## 6.1 First round of email discussions

*Moderator comments:*

* Based on companies’ position, there is a **large majority of companies suggesting supporting Type 1 CB for sub-slot PUCCH in Rel-17**. But looking at the details provided, there seem to be a common understanding on the PDSCH TDRA to UL/PUCCH sub-slot association. Otherwise, the proposals from different companies seems to be mainly diverging in terms of how to describe this. It should be noted here, that it seems to be sufficient to agree on the properties of the Type 1 CB for sub-slot PUCCH and the detailed implementation could be left to the editor when providing the first version of the Rel-17 38.213 specifications. Therefore, it is **proposed in the first round trying to agree on the support of Type 1 CB for sub-slot PUCCH with some baseline property(ies)**
* After having clarify on the support based on baseline properties, **additional needed Type 1 CB properties** for sub-slot PUCCH to be clarified could be discussed in the **next phase of email discussion**.
* **Additional Type 1 CB enhancements** have been proposed by different companies. It is suggested here to **not discuss them in the early phases of email discussions** during RAN1#104-e.

Therefore, the following proposal is suggested:

**FL Proposal 6.1: Support Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook for sub-slot based PUCCH configuration in Rel-17.**

* **The properties of the Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook for sub-slot PUCCH at least includes that a PDSCH TDRA is associated with a UL /PUCCH sub-slot if the end of the PDSCH overlaps with the UL /PUCCH sub-slot.**
* **FFS: Additional properties that may need clarification**
* **FFS: Other Type 1 HARQ-ACK CB construction enhancements (for sub-slot based &/ slot based HARQ-ACK feedback)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | *List of companies* |
| Support proposal 6.1 (at least in principle) | OPPO, Nokia / NSB, DCM, Samsung, CATT, NEC, Sharp, WILUS, Spreadtrum, Huawei/HiSilicon, ZTE(Conditional support), China Telecom, QC, LG |
| Do not support Type 1 CB for sub-slot PUCCH in Rel-17 | MediaTek,Xiaomi |

Addition comments can be provided below (especially for companies not supporting the proposal at all, not even in principle):

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *Comments* |
| MediaTek | We don’t see Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook suitable for URLLC applications, the high payload of the feedback will jeopardize the reliability. Thus, it will only add UE implementation complexity without real benefits. |
| Xiaomi | Sub-slot based Type 1 codebook is already supported. As to the miss detection performance of Type 1 and Type 2 HARQ-ACK codebook, a typical case for URLLC HARQ-ACK codebook is that it only contains HARQ-ACK information of one actually scheduled PDSCH. And if the one PDSCH is miss detected, UE will not feedback any HARQ-ACK information no matter Type 1 or Type 2 codebook is applied. In this case, Type 1 and Type 2 codebook shows no difference on miss detection performance. |
| Samsung | We want to ask for the clarification for the intention of “a PDSCH TDRA is associated with a UL /PUCCH sub-slot if the end of the PDSCH overlaps with the UL /PUCCH sub-slot.” In our understanding, it just simply clarifies how to determine the candidate PDSCH reception occasions for sub-slot based PUCCH by replacing existing UL slot with UL sub-slot. It does not imply the PDSCH TDRA grouping per DL sub-slot. If yes, we support the proposal. If it implies the PDSCH TDRA grouping, we object to it, because it has large standard impact without any benefit. |
| WILUS | We are generally fine with this proposal. But, we think it is not necessary to define complicate TDRA grouping (according to UL sub-slots) or TDRA extension (to cover different DL/UL numerology). To minimize specification impacts, validity of a SLIV in TDRA can be further checked based on the end of the SLIV and UL sub-slot. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support the proposal in principle. However, some clarification as below:  For the sub-bullet, it looks like that the ending of the PDSCH is located in the same sub-slot for PUCCH transmission, however it should not be true and I guess it should not be the intention of this proposal. Propose to change “overlaps with the UL/PUCCH sub-slot” to “overlaps with the associated sub-slot determined by K1”. |
| ZTE | We can support the proposal 6.1 if the PDSCH TDRA associated with UL/PUCCH sub-slot would decouple with the SLIV grouping procedure. From our point of view, the SLIV grouping process should be done based on slot level before the PDSCH TDRA is associated with the sub-slot according to the latest end symbol of the PDSCHs in the SLIV group.  Moreover, Type 1 HARQ-ACK CB overhead reduction should be further studied. |
| LG | We support to use type 1 HARQ-ACK CB and study its overhead reduction in general. |

## 6.2 Third round of email discussions

The following proposal (trying to address the comments of Jan. 28th deadline discussion into account (see Sec. 3), the following proposal was brought to the chairman to be handled in the GTW session but could not be treated.

**Update 2 FL Proposal 6.1: Support Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook for sub-slot based PUCCH configuration in Rel-17.**

* **The properties of the Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook for sub-slot PUCCH at least includes that a PDSCH TDRA is associated with a UL /PUCCH sub-slot if the end of the PDSCH overlaps with the associated sub-slot determined by a k1 in the set of sub-slot timing values K1 s~~UL /PUCCH sub-slot~~.**
  + **FFS: PDSCH TDRA grouping per ~~(DL)~~ sub-slot**
* **FFS: Additional properties that may need clarification**
* **FFS: Other Type 1 HARQ-ACK CB ~~construction~~ enhancements (for sub-slot based &/ slot based HARQ-ACK feedback)**

Knowing, that the company positions are rather divergent on the support, it seems to be not possible to resolve the worries of ‘objecting’ companies by email. But what we could try is at least trying to fine-tune the wording. The green changes tried to address the comments by Qualcomm (K1 set reference) as well as the comments by ZTE (remove DL from sub-slot, FFS now more generic – I guess this should include size optimizations).

**Question 6.2.1: Any formulation changes you propose to Update 2 FL Proposal 6.1 before having this treated in one of the next GTW sessions still?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *Comments* |
| WILUS | We are generally fine with this proposal. It is preferred to discuss how to apply/modify type-1 CB with sub-slot based PUCCH, not slot-based. Type-1 CB for slot-based PUCCH has been discussed and optimized during Rel-15/16 so we suggest to remove “slot-base HARQ-ACK feedback” in the last FFS. |
| Samsung | We prefer to change first FFS as “FFS: whether or not to consider PDSCH TDRA grouping per sub-slot” since current formulation seems to be interpreted to support TDRA grouping implicitly. |
| ZTE | Fine with the FL proposal with Samsung’s revision on first FFS. |
| OPPO | We are fine with FL proposal |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are fine with the proposal in principle. For the first FFS, we are thinking it might be better to leave some room for PDSCH TDRA grouping per slot also, since in some cases if we do the grouping per slot it can further reduce the redundant feedback. However, we can do detailed analysis or comparison later. Therefore, we suggest the changes as below:  **FFS: PDSCH TDRA grouping per ~~(DL)~~ sub-slot and/or per slot** |
| Nokia, NSB | We could be fine with the proposed changed wording by Samsung, but don’t understand the ‘per slot’ by Huawei above. |
| Vivo2 | We prefer Samsung proposed update. |

## 6.3 Fourth round of email discussions

**Moderator comments:**

Unfortunately, we seemed to be not able to agree this in the GTW call. You may have seen the proposal from the chairman’s notes with the updates in blue (on top of 3rd round). I don’t know what we can still do here, except trying to ask if / how we could address the worries of objecting companies:

**Update 3 FL Proposal 6.1: Support Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook for sub-slot based PUCCH configuration in Rel-17.**

* **The properties of the Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook for sub-slot PUCCH at least includes that a PDSCH TDRA is associated with a UL /PUCCH sub-slot if the end of the PDSCH overlaps with the associated sub-slot determined by a k1 in the set of sub-slot timing values K1.**
  + **FFS:** **whether or not to consider PDSCH TDRA grouping per sub-slot**
* **FFS: Additional properties that may need clarification**
* **FFS: Other Type 1 HARQ-ACK CB enhancements (for sub-slot based &/ slot based HARQ-ACK feedback)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | *Companies / comments* |
| Support: | Vivo, Samsung (in order to resolve the MTK’s concern, we would like to suggest to put additional sentence as follows. “Aim for minimal standardization efforts and UE complexity in implementation”), DCM, Xiaomi, Spreadtrum, NEC, ZTE, LG, Huawei/HiSilicon, Nokia/NSB, Ericsson, QC, Sharp, China Telecom, CATT, OPPO |
| Object: | MediaTek |
| Reason for objection: | (MediaTek): thank you for the suggestion from Samsung on minimizing the spec impact. However, we still have concern with supporting Type-1 HARQ-ACK for sub-slot. The high payload of the feedback will jeopardize HARQ-ACK the reliability. |
| Any changes that could be done to re-evaluate your objection? |  |

On parallel, just not too loose the option to get some different input (for the follow-up meetings), maybe we could try to gather the input of different companies on the FFS of *whether or not to consider PDSCH TDRA grouping per sub-slot.* Maybe it would be good to get some input from different companies here:

**Question 6.3.1: If Type 1 CB for sub-slot PUCCH is to supported in Rel-17, should PDSCH TDRA grouping per sub-slot for Type 1 CB with sub-slot based PUCCH be considered / supported?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | *Support / comments* |
| Yes | Huawei/HiSilicon (in principle), Nokia/NSB, vivo |
| No: | Samsung (Not needed, it makes type-1 HARQ CB construction more complicated)  ZTE: TDRA grouping per slot in the current specification would be applicable as well, if Type 1 CB for sub-slot PUCCH is supported. No specification effort on the TDRA grouping is needed. No additional overhead is introduced.  WILUS: Our understanding is that TDRA grouping is just one way to exclude the invalid SLIVs for a given sub-slot. (As per the agreement, if the end of a SLIV does not overlap with the associated sub-slot determined by a k1 in the set of sub-slot timing values K1, then the SLIV is invalid). Rather than introducing the complicate TDRA grouping, we can directly decide if a SLIV is invalid or not for a given sub-slot in the while loop “while ”. |
| Comments | Huawei/HiSilicon, Nokia/NSB: Maybe Samsung and ZTE can clarify a little bit more on the per slot way, e.g. whether it can also avoid redundant transmission as much as possible.  @Huawei, We try to clarify the reason of no additional overhead. You can check the below example.    If TDRA grouping is based on slot level (already supported in specification), the groups will be group {#1, #2}, group {#3, #4}, group {#5, #8}, group {#6} and group {#7}, which generate 5 bits feedback.  But if TDRA grouping is based on sub-slot level as you will (7 symbols sub-slot), the groups will be group {#1, #2}, group {#3} in the sub-slot1, group {#4}, group {#5, #8}, group {#6} and group {#7} in the sub-slot2, which generate 6 bits feedback. The 1 additional bit is redundant and not necessary. The situation will be more serious when sub-slot is 2-symbol length. Moreover the TDRA grouping need more specification effort. It is weird to make more overhead by more specification effort.  Note: The sub-slot length in above example is for UL sub-slot, the length is mapping to the DL transmission and DL transmission divides into two parts to illuminate the grouping. There is no DL sub-slot definition in this example. |

## 6.4 Fifth round of email discussions

**Moderator comments:**

There is still one objecting company and there seems to be not technical way to please the opponent. Therefore, no new questions or discussions are suggested for the 5th round.

**If you have any suggestions or comments – and what could be done or how to resolve this issue, please provide them below:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *Comments* |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# PUCCH carrier switching for HARQ feedback

In the RAN1#103-e meeting, the following agreement was reached.

*Agreements: In the studies on PUCCH carrier switching for HARQ-ACK, PUCCH carrier switching for different cells operated is considered only for cells that are part of the active UL CA configuration.*

The following feedback on how to **support PUCCH carrier switching in Rel-17** was received:

* **Alt. 1 - Dynamic indication of PUCCH carrier switching: 6x Yes, 2x No, 1x FFS** 
  + **Support (6) :** ZTE [1], Huawei / HiSi [3], BUPT [3], China Southern Power Grid [3], Mediatek [8], APT [17]
  + **No (2):** Ericsson [4], vivo [7]
  + **FFS (1):** Nokia [10] (focus of further discussions on the support)
  + **Cons:** large specs impact & unclear benefit (Ericsson [4]), missed DCI indication (QC [26]),
  + **Details:**
    - PUCCH configuration could be a combination of ‘per PUCCH group’ and ‘per PUCCH carrier’: Mediatek [8]
    - PUCCH carrier selection reliability can be helped by not changing the indicated PUCCH carrier index : Mediatek [8]
    - Separate TPC configuration and TPC loop for PUCCH per PUCCH carrier: Mediatek [8]
    - FFS if dynamic switching between different PUCCH cell groups is allowed: APT [17]
* **Alt. 2 – PUCCH cell switching based on semi-static configuration:** **4x Yes, 1x No, 3x FFS**
  + **Support (4):** Ericsson [4], NEC [16], Moto/Len [18], Qualcomm [26]
  + **FFS (3):** China Telecom [14] (based on predefined rules, if supported), APT [17] (if dynamic indication is not supported), DOCOMO [28]
  + **No (1):** vivo [7]
  + **Details:**
    - Configuration of pucch-Cell on PCell to indicate another serving cell within the same cell group to use for PUCCH: Ericsson [4]
    - Based on pre-defined rules: China Telecom [14], APT [17], Moto/Len [18] (chose carrier with lowest latency), Qualcomm [26] (applicable cell with lowest cell index, PCC as reference numerology)
    - Using the k1 of a reference numerology and cell priority: NEC [16]
    - Limited to a single PUCCH transmission at time within a PUCCH cell group (i.e. no PUCCH carrier diversity transmission): Qualcomm [26]
    - Further study based on the outcome of Rel-16 processing order for Intra-UE mux/prio & UL cancelation due to TDD configuration: DOCOMO [28]

**Additional provided input on the PUCCH carrier switching:**

* APT in [17] proposes as a compromise to support both, Alt. 1 and Alt. 2 (based on configuration).
* Should be limited to inter-band CA in Rel-17: Samsung [23]
* Should be applicable for HARQ; SR/LLR & CSI: Samsung [23]
* HARQ-ACK timing indicator counts only slots with PUCCH resources for PUCCH carrier switching: Samsung [23]

## 7.1 First round of email discussions

*Moderator comments:*

Looking at the feedback provided, companies seem to be split between dynamic indication and semi-static operation. It seems the operation of the dynamic indication seems to be more clear (incl. the disadvantages of such as DCI overhead & missed detection issues) – whereas the moderator has the feeling that still some more clarification on Alt. 2 would be needed for the group to be able to make a clear technical decision which of these alternatives to pursue further.

At least it seems, that from the input given on Alt. 2 there currently seem to be at least two flavors there:

* Alt. 2A having a semi-statically ‘fixed’ UL serving cell carrying the PUCCH (as e.g. based on the proposal by Ericsson)
* Alt. 2B by applying certain rules on how to determine the applicable cell for PUCCH transmission (from the set of possibly applicable cells). This will allow to have a dynamic change of the PUCCH cell based on these rules. Similar as in the discussions on SPS HARQ-ACK dropping, specifically it would need to be discussed on how such rules at least about would interact with semi-static DL & flexible symbols. Or how the UE would determine the cell in case of different SCS, etc.

For the first round it is suggested to gather a bit more input on Alt. 2A (fixed PUCCH cell based on RRC configuration which can be another cell than Pcell) and Alt. 2B (dynamic PUCCH cell switching based on certain ‘rules) or any other options for PUCCH cell switching based on semi-static configuration not covered by 2A & 2B are envisioned. And slightly more input on the rules for Alt. 2B supporting companies would be appreciated, such as interaction with the TDD pattern, handling of different SCS on different UL serving cells, etc.

**Question 7.1: Related to PUCCH cell switching based on semi-static configuration, please provide your input on the Alt. 2A (fixed PUCCH cell based on RRC configuration which can be another cell than Pcell) and Alt. 2B (dynamic PUCCH cell switching based on certain ‘rules) including the interaction with TDD configurations as well as handling of different SCS. If your envisioned operation is neither captured by Alt. 2A or Alt. 2B, please provide further details.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *Comments* |
| MediaTek | In our view, similar to the approach adopted for the other proposals, we should focus on commonality between Alt-1 and Alt-2, which is supporting PUCCH carrier switching in Rel-17. The rest of the details, such as dynamic or semi-static switching, can be discussed in later stages. |
| DCM | For Alt 2A, we think one possible method is that gNB configures a PUCCH cell timing pattern, e.g. indicating Pcell is used for some time and another PUCCH cell to be used in other time. The pattern is configured based on slot format configuration of different CCs.  For Alt 2B, a rule can be defined for PUCCH cell determination. For example, UE determines HARQ-ACK reporting timing as in R15/16, and if the PUCCH on PCell overlaps with invalid symbol, UE will select another PUCCH cell with corresponding HARQ-ACK reporting timing and the PUCCH on the cell doesn’t overlap with invalid symbol. From gNB complexity perspective, it’s better not to consider dynamic SFI indication for the “invalid symbol” definition. |
| Samsung | Alt. 2B - has to be dynamic – e.g. based on indicated PUCCH resource - as UCI payload is dynamic and PUCCH resource is dynamic. |
| Apple | Just making a choice between 2A and 2B, 2A is less complicated than 2B. But the UE implementation complexity for PUCCH switching even with 2A should be addressed first |
| NEC | For Alt.2B, a rule can be defined as follows:   * A set of cells with different priority levels are configured for PUCCH transmission by RRC within a PUCCH cell group. * UE firstly determines the slot for PUCCH transmission based on the indicated k1 value with a reference numerology (e.g., largest SCS) when different SCS are configured for the multiple PUCCH cells. * According to the descending order of priority, UE finds a cell that having enough valid symbols corresponding to the determined slot. The valid symbols at least include configured UL symbols, FFS flexible symbols. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Alt 2B.  If PUCCH on PCell overlaps with an invalid symbol(s), UE can choose to transmit HARQ-ACK feedback in one of configured PUCCH carriers within the maximum allowed HARQ-ACK feedback delay where the earliest available/valid PUCCH is. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We still prefer dynamic indication since simple extension can be supported. However, if majority companies would like to go with Alternative 2, it seems Alt.2B is better, some example for the details of Alt.2B can be as below:   * If PUCCH collides with semi-static DL symbols or flexible symbol indicated for DL transmission by SFI, UE will switch to another cell to feedback; * UE firstly determines the slot for PUCCH transmission based on the indicated k1 value based on the SCS of the PCell, then UE will firstly determine if any SCell with same SCS as PCell available or not,   + if available then the corresponding cell will be used to transmit PUCCH;   + if not available, then UE will chose the one with the closest SCS for PUCCH transmission and the PUCCH will be transmitted on the earliest slot on the cell with smaller SCS. |
| ZTE | Support Alt. 2B  A cell set is configured for PUCCH carrier switching, and the cell set should include UL Pcell and Scell.  Then, the UE uses k1 and PRI in the DCI, combined with the UCI size, and tries to determine a valid PUCCH in the set of cells from each cell in ascending order of the cell index.  Once a valid PUCCH is determined from a cell, the PUCCH will be used and transmitted in the cell. |
| China Telecom | Support Alt. 2B. The HARQ-ACK feedback for both dynamically scheduled PDSCH and SPS PDSCH could be switched to another carrier with Alt. 2B. |
| QC | According to our understanding, there is no Alt. 2A and 2B. They belong to the same/single alternative. The formulated 2A and 2B are just two steps of Alt 2.   * Step 1 is 2A which gNB configure X (e.g., X=1 in Ericsson proposal) fixed UL serving cells (SCCs) to carry PUCCH. * Step 2 is 2B. With multiple CCs (PCC+X SCCs) can carry PUCCH, in a slot where K1 pointing to transmit PUCCH, UE need to decide to transmit PUCCH on which CC, following certain rules. The proposed rule is very simple as below   + UE just scan the 1+X CCs following an order of PCC to SCC1, then SCC2, …   + The first CC which has enough UL OFDM symbol to transmit the indicated PUCCH resource (following PRI) is the CC to transmit the PUCCH     - Note: this is very similar to the rule to determine “the first available PUCCH for deferred SPS A/N”. We just replace the scan from time domain to CC domain.   Below the details of our proposal 2.    **Fig : An example of HARQ-ACK CC switch based on a static rule**  ***Proposal: With PUCCH carrier switch, similar to Rel-15, the slot to transmit HARQ-ACK follows the K1 indicated in DCI, and the granularity of K1 follows the numerology of PCC.***  ***Proposal :*** ***With PUCCH carrier switch, the following static rule is applied to determine the CC to transmit HARQ-ACK, in a given slot.***   * ***The CC which has enough UL OFDM symbols to accommodate the HARQ-ACK PUCCH resource and has the last UL symbol finishing at the earliest time, is selected to transmit the HARQ-ACK.*** |
| LG | Between Alt. 2A and 2B, we support Alt. 2A. however, we think it would be better to discuss between Alt. 1 and 2. |
| Nokia, NSB | Looking at these options clearly Alt. 2A (or a flavor of Alt. 2A) would be much easier to specify and operation compared to Alt. 2B. Specifically when looking at Alt. 2B, we are worried about all the different cases that would need to be considered there for the selection, especially also different SCS as well as (again) the handling of DL/UL/Flex symbols and the related overriding possible on each of the involved carriers.  But we do agree with other companies, that the Ericsson proposal of Alt. 2A would be very restrictive here and not really change. From this perspective, the DoCoMo proposal of configuring some PUCCH cell timing pattern could provide the intended flexibility and still keep the operation control at gNB (which we are very much worried considering defining fixed rules, that may not be preferable in operation in the end, this had been also one reason for us to prefer dynamic indication (if to be supported here).  So maybe we should split the Ericsson 2A and the DoCoMo 2A to two different options for the next round. Looking then at 2A1 (Ericsson), 2A2 (DoCoMo) and 2B, our preference on these three would be the DoCoMo proposal of 2A2, as it enables change in operation, keeps the control at the gNB and is much easier to specify compared to Alt. 2B. |
| APT | Before going to the further detail, we may need to clarify whether the switching can be applied across different PUCCH cell groups or within the same PUCCH cell group at first. Besides, for Alt.2B, the candidate cells that UE can be switched to can depend on whether there is available PUCCH resource in the indicated slot through K1. Then a predefined rule, for instance, serving cell index can be applied accordingly. Also, a reference SCS configuration may also need to be specified since the candidate cells and PCell may have different SCS configurations. |

## 7.2 Second & third round of email discussions

Thanks for the input on the 1st round here. When looking at the replies here now, it seems there are now (based on DoCoMo input – another option of what semi-static configuration may mean), actually 3 different sub-options for Alt. 2.

***Moderator comment for 3rd round: Based on the discussions from the 2nd round, the following is to be noted:***

* ***There seems to be some unclarity of 2A (by Ericsson) and 2C (DoCoMo). Maybe DoCoMo and Ericsson could change the FL description of the alternatives below directly to clarify their proposal.***
* ***Maybe based on the clarifications, companies may reconsider their position based on the additional information given.***

So to check first, do we have now all the different options noted below here:

* **Alt. 1: Dynamic indication of PUCCH carrier switching** 
  + Dynamic indication such as DCI signaling is FFS
* **Alt. 2A: Semi-static configuration of pucch-Cell on PCell to indicate another serving cell within the same cell group to use for PUCCH**
  + Enables semi-static PUCCH cell change – but no dynamic PUCCH cell switching (without RRC re-configuration), see e.g. Ericsson contribution in [4]
  + Ericsson: Please see clarification/updated proposal below in 2A. We believe this is needed prior to any Alt 1/2B/2C
* **Alt. 2B: Dynamic PUCCH cell switching based on certain (semi-static) ‘rules’**
  + FSS: Semi-static rules including interaction with TDD UL/DL config, cell selection e.g. in certain (priority order) etc.
* **Alt. 2C: Dynamic PUCCH cell switching based on RRC configured PUCCH cell timing pattern of applicable PUCCH cells**
  + See the DoCoMo input in Sec. 7.1
  + Further details are FFS

**Question 7.2: Which of the above options Alt. 1, 2A, 2B, 2C do you think should be further considered? What are the pros / cons for each of the options? Please provide your input in the table below directly!**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | *List of companies* |
| **Alt. 1**  **Dynamic indication of PUCCH cell switching** | Yes | CATT, Nokia/NSB, Samsung, ZTE, Huawei/HiSilicon, MediaTek, APT, LG |
| No | vivo, DCM, Apple |
| Pros | Under gNB’s control so that gNB can indicate a proper carrier to avoid impact to other UEs. (CATT, Nokia/NSB)  No rules needed, gNB has full freedom to indicate carrier (Samsung) |
| Cons | DCI miss-detection, complex, no real deployment scenario (vivo),  Inapplicable to PUCCH without associated DCI, e.g. SPS HARQ-ACK PUCCH. (DCM)  1-2 bits DCI overhead (Samsung) |
| **Alt. 2A**  **Semi-static cell switching based on RRC config** | Yes | Ericsson   * **Disagree w comments made by Nokia/Samsung. Proposal is misunderstood.** Currently, the HARQ-ACK of PDSCH on Pcell can be carried by PUCCH on PCell, not SCell.   The proposal is to remove this restriction such that in PUCCH group, feedback of PCell DL can be sent on SCell. This is important for NW operation for load and PDCCH balancing among users. It provides benefits claimed for dynamic carrier switching in semi-static way, by removing a restriction and find a carrier with an uplink opportunity in semi-static way (by removing restriction). It is not about 1-2 bits overhead saving.   * Maybe, proposal can be reformulated as the following:   **A2: Support PUCCH-Cell for PDSCHs on PCell to be configured on Scell in addition to Pcell**  Apple  Ericsson:   * The issue is that currently, in a PUCCH group, the HARQ-ACK of PDSCH on PCell, can be only transmitted on the UL PCell. As long as we have this restriction (by RRC configuration), the potential advantage of any schemes proposed under other alternatives, would be limited for the HARQ-ACK corresponding for any **PDSCH on only SCell.**      * That means **that dynamic switching operation would be very limited and not sure meaningful as long as this constraint is in place**. Hence, to discuss any of these schemes, first we should remove constraint in configuration for PUCCH group to have a framework, that we can play around with indication carrier for PUCCH dynamically. Otherwise, any of dynamic carrier switching either could be used only for PDSCH scheduled on Scell. * Maybe it is clear if we update Alt. 2A as the following:   **Alt. 2A(updated): In configuration of a PUCCH group, support the condition that the HARQ-ACK corresponding to PDSCH on PCell can be sent on a PUCCH on SCell.** |
| No | Nokia/NSB, Samsung, Huawei/HiSilicon, MediaTek |
| Pros | Possibly save 1-2 bits of signalling (Samsung)  Ericsson: The proposal is to remove this restriction such that in PUCCH group, feedback of PCell DL can be sent on SCell. This is important for NW operation for load and PDCCH balancing among users. It provides benefits claimed for dynamic carrier switching in semi-static way, by removing a restriction and find a carrier with an uplink opportunity in semi-static way (by removing restriction). It is not about 1-2 bits overhead saving. |
| Cons | Unclear use case/benefit (CATT)  Still semi-static operation (Nokia/NSB, Huawei/HiSilicon)  gNB has no real-time control and needs to predict the future, against the motivation of PUCCH carrier switching for HARQ feedback (Samsung) |
| **Alt. 2B**  **Dynamic cell switching based on semi-static rules** | Yes | QC, DCM, Samsung, NEC, ZTE, Lenovo/Motorola Mobility, Huawei/HiSilicon (can accept), MediaTek (as an addition to Alt. 1), China Telecom, APT, Spreadtrum |
| No | Nokia/NSB, Intel (prefer to avoid implicit rules)  Not sure: [Ericsson: We would like to understand more about semi-static rule such that effectively, PUCCH switching is predictable. Then we can reconsider our position] |
| Pros | Predicted behaviour on CC selection.  Both gNB and UE follow the same procedure to determine CC index for PUCCH transmission.  Provides flexibility to gNB to use K1 to switch PUCCH carrier effectively.  Applicable to PUCCH with or without associated DCI. (DCM)  gNB has some freedom to select carrier (Samsung)  Our scheme in first round discussion naturally inherit the current signalling structure, no much specification effort is needed. Keep the flexibility and no new DCI indication is needed. (ZTE)  Flexible resource utilization without explicit DCI signalling (Lenovo/Motorola M.) |
| Cons | UE complexity for PUCCH cell selection based on a rule and possible additional processing time. (DCM, Nokia/NSB)  Out of gNB’s control which may impact the UEs on the serving cell which the UE determines to switch to. (CATT, Nokia/NSB)  Complicated specification effort (defining all the rules) (Nokia/NSB)  Rules are needed, additional spec/UE complexity (e.g. to check PUCCH resources). It is not preferred to have a carrier indicated as part of the PUCCH resource – mixing functionalities should be avoided and no overhead savings exist over direct carrier indication (Samsung) |
| **Alt. 2C**  **Dynamic cell switching based on semi-static PUCCH cell timing pattern** | Yes | DCM, Nokia/NSB |
| No | Samsung, Apple, Intel  Not sure: [Ericsson: We would like to understand more about semi-static timing pattern such that effectively, PUCCH switching is predictable. Then we can reconsider our position].  ---------------------------------------  DCM’s clarification for Alt 2C:  We think the timing pattern can be a bitmap to indicate which PUCCH cell to be applied for each slot (slot defined by SCS of Pcell). For example, UE first determines HARQ-ACK reporting slot on Pcell. Then the slot is associated with a PUCCH cell according to the timing pattern. The timing pattern may be configured by considering semi-static TDD configuration of candidate PUCCH cells. In this way, no ambiguity between gNB and UE. Moreover, the behaviour is less complicated than Alt 2B for UE to select PUCCH cell based on a rule. |
| Pros | Applicable to PUCCH with or without associated DCI. (DCM, Nokia/NSB)  Less UE complexity than Alt 2B since PUCCH cell is determined by the PUCCH report timing and the indicated pattern. (DCM, Nokia/NSB)  Keeps control at the gNB by configuration - incl. different time patterns for different UEs compared to Alt. 2B (Nokia/NSB) |
| Cons | Ad-hoc, similar cons as Alt. 2A (Samsung) |

**In case there are options missing (not in the list above), please indicate in the table below:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *Missing options (not covered by Alt. 1, 2A, 2B, 2C)* |
| Samsung | To be discussed whether dynamic carrier switching is to be limited to dynamic HARQ-ACK or include other UCI types as this may affect the preferred solution.  To be discussed whether more than one Alt can be supported depending on whether UCI is triggered by DCI or is configured by RRC. |
| MediaTek | Responding to vivo’s comment on Alt. 1,“*Cons: DCI miss-detection, complex, no real deployment scenario*”   * DCI miss-detection: As long as there is no overriding to the CC that caries the HARQ, there is no issue with DCI miss-detection. If the UE receives at least one DCI pointing to sub-slot/slot and a CC, there is no ambiguity between the gNB and the UE. * Complex: there is no added complexity by having the CC indicated in the DCI compared to using some static rules.   No real deployment scenario: On the contrary, this scheme addresses a real deployment where most of the 5G deployed bands are TDD. We can’t assume that operators will have access to FDD bands that they can operate URLLC service on them. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Some question based on the clarification for 2A and 2C.  1. Based on the clarification on 2A from Ericsson, the following two follow-up questions for further clarify:  **Question 1**: How many SCell(s) can be configured?  **Question 2**: UE will transmit HARQ-ACK assuming dynamic switching between PCell and the configured SCell? Or just directly transmit the HARQ-ACK on the configured SCell?  2. For Alt. 2C, based on the clarification from DOCOMO, it seems that Alt.2C is a sub-set of Alt.2B? That is “**semi-static PUCCH cell timing pattern”** in Alt.2C correspond to semi-static rule in Alt.2B? |
| Nokia/NSB | In contrast to HW/HiSi, we don’t see option 2C as a subset of 2B, as for Alt. 2B there are certain rules defined (in the specification, which the gNB cannot affect). But for our reading of Alt. 2C, the gNB can just be configuration, e.g. with a slot pattern, directly tell the cell which it prefers. This would include depending on the number of CCs the UE supports and/or traffic type having different pattern for different UEs. We really insist that gNB can keep more control here – therefore just defining certain rules is not seen sufficient for us (would object to Alt. 2B). We are open to any other method where the gNB can keep the control and manage it on a UE per UE basis (which includes Alt. 1, Alt. 2A and Alt. 2C). |
| APT | For Alt.2A, if the restriction is removed and there are more than one SCell could be configured to transmit PUCCH, how to determine which SCell has the priority to transmit the PUCCH?  For Alt.2B, do we need to clarify whether the indication could be applied to different PUCCH cell group at first?  For Alt.2C, we share the same view with Huawei. It seems that the method in Alt.2C could be accomplished by Alt.2B since there may have multiple PUCCH candidate cells by considering available timing pattern. If there are more than one candidate cell, it still needs a rule to define which cell has the priority to be switched to. Maybe more clarification is needed. |
| QC | Similar view as HW and APT, option 2C is just a special case (simplified version) of option 2B. With option 2C, gNB use RRC configuration to make sure on one slot, there is at most a single CC can transmit PUCCH, where this CC can be CC X on slot A, CC Y on slot B. Then UE does not need to run any rule to determine which CC to use on slot A/B. With option 2B, there is no such restriction of “at most 1 PUCCH CC per slot”, then on a slot, UE need to run a static rule to find out which CC to use to transmit PUCCH. And the rule can be a simple scan cross CCs following a predefined ordering. So in our view, option 2C can be implemented as a special case of option 2B by gNB RRC configuration. If gNB want to introduce this restriction of “at most 1 PUCCH CC per slot”, gNB can always do that in option 2B framework.  To Nokia: To clarify, as explained above, option 2B is a superset of 2C. Using a special RRC configuration, option 2B can be reduced to option 2B. Maybe there were some confusion about option 2B. Regarding Nokia comment on option 2B: “out of gNB’s control which may impact the UEs on the serving cell which the UE determines to switch to”, we would like to clarify that option 2B gives gNB more (at least the same) flexibility than option 2C. With option 2B, based on the static rule, let’s say it ends up with PUCCH on CC X on slot A, CC Y on slot B. gNB then can use K1 to point to slot A or B, so effectively gNB can control the PUCCH switch cross CC X and Y. |

**Proposal 7.1: In NR Rel-17, support PUCCH carrier switching at least for HARQ-ACK feedback**

* **FFS: the signaling of indication of PUCCH carrier switching for HARQ-ACK feedback.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | *List of companies / reasons for support – not support* |
| Yes: | Mediatek,APT, QC, ZTE |
| No: | Nokia/NSB, vivo |
| Reasons to support: | (Mediatek) Sub-6GHz TDD bands are widely deployed for 5G-NR. The UL/DL TDD pattern is the bottleneck for the URLLC latency for deployment on these bands, where PUCCH alignment adds to the latency for TDD operation with DL-heavy patterns. Dynamic selection of the CC used for the PUCCH transmission will help reducing the latency in CA operation with two or multiple inter-band carriers, by utilizing the nearest UL transmission opportunity on different CCs for PUCCH transmission. Our results in R1-2100574 show that with dynamic cross-carrier PUCCH up to 30% latency reduction can be achieved. This translates to an increase in the system capacity (in our results, the capacity is doubled from 7 UEs with the baseline CA to 14 UEs using the dynamic cross-carrier PUCCH)  APT: It would be meaningful to discuss detailed signalling when support of PUCCH carrier switching could be determined at first. Regardless of dynamic indication or semi-static configuration, the benefits for allowing PUCCH to be transmitted on other candidate cells are identified by many companies.  QC: the benefit of this enhancement is clear. It can greatly reduce HARQ-ACK feedback latency. It can also improve HARQ-ACK reliability because it offers gNB some flexibility to switch between CCs. The detailed questions VIVO raised can be studied after the high level agreement is made. This top-to-bottle design principle is used many times in RAN1. For example, for the delay SPS HARQ-ACK, the same details as VIVO mentioned (how to select the PUCCH resource, how to interact with TDD configuration/dynamic SFI, how to deal with different SCS) were not clear to us at all. Yet we still made the compromise to support the high level scheme. Also, it is not fair to say that we are supporting this scheme “blindly”. There were a lot of details already discussed around alternative 1/2A/2B/2C and we have touched upon many of the issues VIVO mentioned, if not all of them. |
| Reasons for not supporting: | Nokia/NSB: as explained above, we cannot agree to the support unconditionally – Alt. 2B is a no-go for us, as this removes the ability for the gNB to have the ‘rules’ or ‘switching’ behaviour operated on a UE per UE bases (which having rules defined is not really helping). We would like to note here, that this is very important considering the operation based on cell level as well – as this includes UEs with different CC capabilities as well as UEs supporting this feature (incl. pre-Rel-17 UEs). Moreover, the gains will very much depend on the Alt. chosen (e.g. Alt. 2A seems to have some limitations there).  Vivo: thanks a lot MTK for the detailed explanation. In your paper R1-2100574, about the test case, TDD pattern CC1 = [D D D S U D D S U U]; TDD pattern CC2 = [S U U U D S U U U D] which is [D S U U U D U U U] with offset = 1; firstly, we are not sure any actual deployment requiring the inter-band CA with the 2nd TDD configuration on CC2, in addition, we are not sure any deployment also requires both NW and UE to support the CA with non-aligned frame boundaries for URLLC purpose. The root of the bad performance for latency and capacity comes from the TDD configuration where the baseline with unequal DL-UL configuration. In addition, without clarifying how the PUCCH carrier switching for HARQ-ACK works with other UCIs, how to handle the different SCSs, TDD configuration/dynamic SFI, it is difficult for us to support it blindly. |

## 7.3 Fourth round of email discussions

**Moderator comments:**

Based on the 3rd round, there seems to be no clear majority (yet) on the overall decision if to support an enhancement in this area. Therefore, and based on the clarifications, the moderator tried to re-structure the options a bit more. Similar input is requested – but at least now the operation seems to be clear between the different options. Based on the feedback by Ericsson, I further tried to clariy that also for the PDSCH carried on Pcell HARQ-ACK could be transmitted on the PUCCH of an SCell

**Update descriptions and sorting**

* **Option 1: Support semi-static PUCCH carrier switching (Alt. 2A)**
  + In configuration of a PUCCH group, support the condition that the HARQ-ACK corresponding to PDSCH on PCell can be sent on a PUCCH on SCell.
* **Option 2: Support dynamic PUCCH carrier switching (Alt. 1 / 2B / 2C)**
  + **Alt. 1: Dynamic indication of PUCCH carrier switching**
  + *Note: This may include a Scell also for a PUCCH group containing the Pcell and the HARQ-ACK corresponding to PDSCH on Pcell can be send on a PUCCH on Scell based on the dynamic indication*
  + Dynamic indication such as DCI signaling is FFS
  + **Alt. 2B: Dynamic PUCCH cell switching based on certain (semi-static) ‘rules’**
  + *Note: This may include a Scell also for a PUCCH group containing the Pcell and the HARQ-ACK corresponding to PDSCH on Pcell can be send on a PUCCH on Scell based on the semi-static rules*
  + FSS: Semi-static rules including interaction with TDD UL/DL config, cell selection e.g. in certain (priority order) etc.
  + **Alt. 2C: Dynamic PUCCH cell switching based on RRC configured PUCCH cell timing pattern of applicable PUCCH cells**
  + *Note: This may include a Scell also for a PUCCH group containing the Pcell and the HARQ-ACK corresponding to PDSCH on Pcell can be send on a PUCCH on Scell based on the semi-static PUCCH cell timing pattern*
  + FFS details of the configured timing pattern – such as a timing pattern (e.g. bitmap) to indicate which PUCCH cell to be applied for each slot (slot defined by SCS of Pcell)

As there is a strong difference on what can be achieved, maybe we could first see if we want to consider dynamic switching (for latency benefit, Option 2 – including Alt. 1 / 2B / 2C) or if could be fine Alt. 2A.

**Question 7.3.1: If PUCCH carrier switching is supported in Rel-17, what is your preference on the two baseline operation modes – semi-static or dynamic switching?**

* **Option 1: Support semi-static PUCCH carrier switching (Alt. 2A)**
* **Option 2: Support dynamic PUCCH carrier switching (Alt. 1 / 2B / 2C)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | *Companies / comments* |
| **Option 1:** | vivo (if support), Ericsson, Intel |
| **Option 2:** | Samsung, DCM (if support) , Spreadtrum, NEC, ZTE, Huawei/HiSilicon, MediaTek, APT, Lenovo/Motorola Mobility, Nokia/NSB (if supported), QC, China Telecom, CATT, Intel (as 2nd preference) |
| **Comments** | Vivo: Compared to other schemes, less specification efforts  Samsung: Can also first discuss pros-cons of specific schemes. We expect indication of the carrier by 1-bit in the DCI to be the simplest and best for NW and UE to support.  DCM: We are negative of PUCCH carrier switching based on the agreement of multiplexing order in this meething. Scheduling a PUSCH on another CC can report UCI similar to PUCCH carrier switching. PUCCH carrier switching has small Pros of no UL grant/PUSCH, but it might be minor while much speficication work is expected. There is no strong motivation to introduce PUCCH carrier switching. But if PUCCH carrier switching is supported,  we prefer Option 2.  **Agreement**  ***To address collision with semi-static DL symbols and SSB, the following easy way is suggested:***  Ÿ   ***Step1: Perform intra UE prioritization (including multiplexing, overriding) according to related working assumption in 102 e-meeting if confirmed and produce final PUCCHs/PUSCHs.***  Ÿ   ***Step 2: Final PUCCHs/PUSCHs is cancelled by semi-static DL symbols and SSB symbols.***  Huawei/HiSilicon: Dynamic indication can ensure more chance to get resource to provide the feedback, and thus reduce the latency.  Nokia/NSB: we see that Option 1 cannot really help the latency issue that was the initial idea behind it (i.e. different TDD config on different serving cells), but can only be used for semi-static load balancing (which is not URLLC specific – more TEI-17 related). If something is to be supported in Rel-17, then should be able to somehow take different UL/DL configurations into account (incl. timing offset between cells).  Ericsson: Comment to Nokia: We think Option 1 is needed for any schemes under Option 2 (if supported). The reason is any solutions in Option 2, would be applicable only to SCell.  QC: To Ericsson, still confusion on how option 1 can work. Agreement on allowing PUCCH carrier switch, regardless of semi-static or dynamic configuration, RRC signaling enhancement is needed to remove the restriction that Ericsson mentioned and allow PUCCH to be transmitted on a Scell. But what’s next after this? Let’s say now we have both PCC and a sCC X which can transmit PUCCH. Can Ericsson please clarify based on your proposal, given a K1 value, which CC (PCC or the sCC X) UE would use to transmit HARQ-ACK? To me, Ericsson proposal is not completed. It only has the RRC configuration part (which is needed anyway for all options), but missing the CC switch part.  Intel: we think that semi-static PUCCH carrier assignment enhancement should be considered as a first step regardless of support of the dynamic option. |

**Question 7.3.2: If dynamic PUCCH carrier switching is supported in Rel-17, what is your preference from the three different alternatives?**

* + **Alt. 1: Dynamic indication of PUCCH carrier switching**
  + *Note: This may include a Scell also for a PUCCH group containing the Pcell and the HARQ-ACK corresponding to PDSCH on Pcell can be send on a PUCCH on Scell based on the dynamic indication*
  + Dynamic indication such as DCI signaling is FFS
  + **Alt. 2B: Dynamic PUCCH cell switching based on certain (semi-static) ‘rules’**
  + *Note: This may include a Scell also for a PUCCH group containing the Pcell and the HARQ-ACK corresponding to PDSCH on Pcell can be send on a PUCCH on Scell based on the semi-static rules*
  + FSS: Semi-static rules including interaction with TDD UL/DL config, cell selection e.g. in certain (priority order) etc.
  + **Alt. 2C: Dynamic PUCCH cell switching based on RRC configured PUCCH cell timing pattern of applicable PUCCH cells**
  + *Note: This may include a Scell also for a PUCCH group containing the Pcell and the HARQ-ACK corresponding to PDSCH on Pcell can be send on a PUCCH on Scell based on the semi-static PUCCH cell timing pattern*
  + FFS details of the configured timing pattern – such as a timing pattern (e.g. bitmap) to indicate which PUCCH cell to be applied for each slot (slot defined by SCS of Pcell)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | *List of companies* |
| **Alt. 1**  **Dynamic indication of PUCCH cell switching** | Yes | ZTE, LG, Huawei/HiSilicon, MediaTek, APT, Nokia / NSB (if supported), QC (3rd preference), CATT, Intel (if supported) |
| No / Object |  |
| **Alt. 2B**  **Dynamic cell switching based on semi-static rules** | Yes | DCM, Spreadtrum, NEC, ZTE, Huawei/HiSilicon (can accept), APT, Lenovo/Motorola Mobility, QC (1st preference), China Telecom |
| No / Object | SSS, Nokia / NSB (object), Intel |
| **Alt. 2C**  **Dynamic cell switching based on semi-static PUCCH cell timing pattern** | Yes | DCM, Nokia/NSB, QC (2nd preference) |
| No / Object |  |

If you want to provide additional comments, please provide them in the table below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *Comments* |
| vivo | First, thanks proponents for explanation of the details. Our concerns are following:   1. We did not see any actual deployment scenarios that have specific DL-UL patterns for TDD inter-band CA from operators or service providers requiring the PUCCH carrier switching. 2. We think by using existing way like selecting the TDD carrier with balanced DL/UL configuration or UL-dominant configuration as PCell or support PUCCH SCell so that we can have two cells transmitting PUCCHs can already improve the HARQ-ACK performance. 3. Dynamic carrier switching require much specification efforts.   If we need to support one, we would like to select the one with small specification efforts, and current some operation of PUCCH Scell can be considered as baseline. |
| MediaTek | Regarding the following comments from Vivo:   * “*We did not see any actual deployment scenarios that have specific DL-UL patterns for TDD inter-band CA from operators or service providers requiring the PUCCH carrier switching*”.   DL-UL patterns for TDD patterns are currently configured based on eMBB service, which is DL heavily, and introduces delay to the HARQ-ACK for URLLC service.   * “*We think by using existing way like selecting the TDD carrier with balanced DL/UL configuration or UL-dominant configuration as PCell or support PUCCH SCell so that we can have two cells transmitting PUCCHs can already improve the HARQ-ACK performance*”   For outdoor deployments, the DL-UL patterns cannot be changed/optimized based on URLLC requirements because the eMBB traffic/service is dominating in these scenarios (i.e. optimizing for URLLC will heavily penalize eMBB). Similar issues raise for indoor deployments due to the inter-cell interference between indoor and outdoor cells, the need to address different service requirements (eMBB & URLLC).  Vivo’s replies to MTK: thanks a lot for clarification. About no actual deployment scenario we see is based on your paper R1-2100574, for the test case, the assumption for TDD pattern CC1 = [D D D S U D D S U U]; TDD pattern CC2 = [S U U U D S U U U D] which is [D S U U U D U U U] with offset = 1; Currently, we are not sure any actual deployment requiring the inter-band CA with the 2nd TDD configuration on CC2 and requiring both NW and UE to support the CA with non-aligned frame boundaries for URLLC purpose. In addition, we think HARQ-ACK performance, capacity can also be improved if we fix the PCell is CC2 using the pattern CC2 = [S U U U D S U U U D] or support PUCCH SCell for CC2 to have two PUCCH transmissions with marginal specification impacts. |
| Nokia/NSB | We object to Alt. 2B as already explained earlier, we would be in principle OK with Alt. 1 or Alt. 2C (if the PUCCH carrier switching is supported at all). The reason is that as explained earlier, with Alt. 2B the gNB looses the option to keep control of the PUCCH resource usage on different cells considering Rel-16 UEs, and Rel-17 UEs supporting this feature with different CA capabilities (please note that the CA configuration / number of cells is UE specific). |
| QC | To VIVO: please consider this scenario, there are two TDD CCs, both with TDD configuration DDSU. Assume every D slot has DL traffic on both CCs. Assume the UE is at cell edge. It needs a whole U slot to transmit 2-bits HARQ-ACK, due to bad link budget. Can we operate the system for the cell edge UE? To me, the answer is no because # U slots is not enough. With PUCCH carrier switch, one sCell can be configured with UDDS. With this staggered TDD pattern + PUCCH carrier switch, at least we can operate the system.  We admit the above is just a toy example. But hope it can show the motivation of this proposal. This proposal essentially unlocks more UL slots for a system and they can be used in many scenarios when UL resources are the system bottleneck.  Last but not least, we are not sure since when “there is no deployment TODAY” becomes a showstopper for a scheme. If we take this as design principle. Fine, many of the features we are discussing now are not needed at all. As far as I know, even many Rel-15 features are not deployed yet. Since the deployment and market are still on Rel-15, why do we need develop and discuss Rel-17 features? Can VIVO please show us which applications that cannot operate without enhancement of deferred SPS HARQ-ACK? And which operator/service provider has such applications running online in today’s network?  FFS: PUCCH repetitions |
| Vivo replies to QC | Very appreciated QC’s comments. We understand the scheme. From our perspective, we think for the feature having big specification impacts, better to have common understanding that it will have possible deployment scenario in the future. Sorry to say, but we failed to see the real commercial deployment plan that provides the promising scenario for this feature, as it requires the follwoing at the same time   * Inter-band CA with DL-UL configruaitons complementary to each other and/or * Support TDD CA with non-aligned frame boundary * Inter-band UL CA for the UE   TDD sync. is necessary among operators. Unaligned TDD pattern reduces throughput of UEs configured with TDD CA but not supporting unaligned TDD patterns. Defer SPS HARQ-ACK due to TDD configuration or NACK skipping due to over-provision the SPS resource for supporting the TSN traffic having 16.667ms or 0.833ms periodicity on the other hand having real use case, refer to TS 22.104 and TR 38.825. |

## 7.4 Fifth round of email discussions

Unfortunately, we were not able to agree on a slightly more focused discussion for RAN1#104b to focus on dynamic carrier switching in the GTW session. We clearly in the remaining time will not be able to proceed here too much more in RAN1#104-e.

And maybe as a last thing, if **you would like to urge other companies to** **consider specific things or think about certain things till the next RAN1 meeting (and treat in their contributions)**, please provide below. This could be ver helpful for our further discussions. I will try to summarize this in the final FL summary as recommendation / things to consider:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Company* | *Comments* |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# Other suggested HARQ-ACK feedback enhancements

## 8.1 CB size reduction for HP HARQ-ACK: Single HARQ-ACK bit per TB for HP HARQ-ACK CB

As discussed by Huawei / HiSi [3], BUPT [3], China Southern Power Grid in [3], in Rel-15, the gNB can use higher layer signaling to configure the maximum number of code words i.e. {1 or 2} that a single DCI (i.e. DCI format 1\_1) may schedule. If the maximum number of code words is configured as 2, then it means that DCI format 1\_1 can schedule 1 or 2 code words. In order to avoid misaligned HARQ-ACK codebook sizes between the gNB and the UE, due to potential DCI miss detection, the HARQ-ACK codebook is constructed based on 2 code words no matter if the DCI schedules one or two code words. It should be noted here, that DCI format 1\_2 supports only single codeblock PDSCH scheduling, meaning that always two bits of HARQ-ACK will be generated (if maximum number of codewords is configured as 2) even when only scheduling HP traffic with DCI format 1\_2.

**Regardless of the configured maximum number of code words, HARQ-ACK codebook construction based on only one code word could be considered for HARQ-ACK codebook with high priority in Rel-17.**

## 8.2 Retain PUSCH reception robustness with increased number of (SPS) HARQ-ACK bits

Samsung discussed in [23], it is discussed that in Rel-15, if UE multiplexes HARQ-ACK bits on PUSCH, and the number of HARQ-ACK bits is not greater than 2, UE reserves REs for up to 2 HARQ-ACK bits to avoid PUSCH decoding error due to an incorrect HARQ-ACK payload size caused by a missed PDCCH. In other words, this targets to handle vulnerability with up to 2 DG HARQ-ACK bits; 1 or 2 DG HARQ-ACK bits depending on the existence of SPS HARQ-ACK bit. In Rel-16, while such vulnerability with small number of DG HARQ-ACK bits still needs to be handled, multiple active SPS configurations and smaller SPS periodicity may result in multiple SPS HARQ-ACK bits. As a result, the incorrect HARQ-ACK payload size caused by small number of DG HARQ-ACK bits may happen for a larger number of HARQ-ACK bits when many SPS HARQ-ACK bits are present.

In this sense, the condition of 2 bits is not suitable and hence it needs enhancement, for example, increasing the threshold values to more than 2 bits (i.e. more reserved REs) in order to improve reliability of HARQ-ACK which could be transmitted on PUSCH.

**Maintain PUSCH reception robustness due to multiplexing 1-2 HARQ-ACK bits from dynamic scheduling also when multiple HARQ-ACK bits from SPS PDSCH receptions are multiplexed in the PUSCH.**

## Jitter window for SPS occasions

Apple in [25] discusses using a jitter window instead of NACK skipping for ‘skipped’ SPS handling, the introduction of a jitter window around a nominal SPS occasion
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Figure 2: Jitter window to limit UE demodulation effort and HARQ generation

## Different TX power levels for ‘ACK’ and ‘NACK’

Mediatek in [8] based on extensive evaluations in Sec. 3 identified (based on different DTX-to-ACK, NACK-to-ACK etc. performance) that the current operation may not be sufficient. The interested reader is refered to the TDoc there directly.

What is proposed:

***Support different PUCCH transmission power levels depending on whether ACK or NACK is transmitted.***

## 8.5 MAC CE based switching between different sub-slot PUCCH configurations

In R16, the sub-slot configuration is RRC configured which does not allow for a more frequent change of the applicable sub-slot configuration of a PUCCH config (i.e. only slow adaptation possible).

QC in [26] proposes that the gNB could configure multiple sub-slot configurations to the UE by RRC, which can then be (more) dynamically selected based on MAC CE signaling.



**MAC-CE based sub-slot configuration switch**

# Proposals for Jan. 28th deadline check

This section here is made to clearly differentiate the general discussions from the potential agreements declared by Mr. Chairman based on the discussion status. My intention here is to have this here for about one day, and then bring the ones that could have a chance for email approval moved to email discussion

## 9.1 For Jan. 28th check: SPS HARQ-ACK dropping for TDD

On question 2.1.1, **how the SPS HARQ deferring is configured** the following input can be summarized based on the first round of email discussions:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | *List of companies* |
| Alt. 1: RRC per PUCCH cell group | **(8)** OPPO, Samsung, CATT, Spreadtrum, HW/HiSi, TCL, China Telecom, ZTE , Ericsson |
| Alt. 2: RRC per PUCCH configuration | **(2)** DCM, Ericsson |
| Alt. 3: RRC per SPS configuration | **(17)** vivo, OPPO, Xiaomi, Sony, Nokia/NSB, DCM, Intel, Panasonic, NEC, Sharp, Lenovo/Moto, WILUS, Spreadtrum, HW/HiSi, QC, LG, CAICT |
| New Alt. 4: dynamically indicated in activation DCI | **(1)** Sony |

Therefore, it is suggested to restrict further discussions on Alt. 1 & Alt. 3 only (to restrict the number of options here).

**FL Proposal X: Further down-select between the following two options for SPS HARQ-ACK deferral:**

* **Option 1: Joint RRC configuration of the SPS HARQ-ACK deferral per PUCCH cell group** 
  + ***Note: any SPS HARQ-ACK within a PUCCH cell group in principle is subject to deferral***
* **Option 2: The SPS HARQ-ACK deferral is configured per SPS configuration**
  + ***Note: part of sps-config, only HARQ-ACK of SPS PDSCH configurations configured for deferral is in principle subject to deferral***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | *List of companies / reasons for objection* |
| Support: | Vivo, QC, Intel, CATT, Nokia/NSB, Samsung, ZTE, Lenovo/Motorola Mobility, Huawei/HiSilicon, Ericsson, China Telecom, Sharp |
| Object: |  |
| Reasons for objection: |  |

## 9.2 For Jan. 28th check: Sub-slot based PUCCH repetition

On the support of **PUCCH repetition for sub-slot PUCCH**  the following input was provided on the support:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | *List of companies* |
| Support sub-slot based PUCCH repetition. | **(19)** Vivo, Xiaomi, Sony, Nokia/NSB, DCM, Samsung, CATT, Panasonic, NEC, Sharp, WILUS, Spreadtrum, Huawei/HiSilicon, ZTE, Ericsson, China Telecom, ETRI, QC, LG |
| Do not support sub-slot PUCCH repetition in Rel-17 | **(1)** MediaTek |

There had been no real technical show-stoppers identified, but some companies (as already indicated in the GTW session on Monday) think it should be limited to HARQ-ACK only.

**Mediatek not supporting the proposal indicating that if longer PUCCH is needed a longer sub-slot length can be configured. *Moderator comment:* Having noted this, the moderator would hereby like to point out that e.g. the dynamic repetition indication in Rel-17 is bringing more flexibility here compared to just having a longer sub-slot length (especially as for small payload sizes or e.g. Format 0, the sub-slot length is not improving the reliability here). So, Mediatek has a good for larger payload sizes BUT for small payload sizes (e.g. using e.g. Format 0), having a longer sub-slot length or even using slot based repetition is not helping here.**

Based on the comments received (only applicable to HARQ-ACK), the update as distributed before todays call is again noted below. As all the technical details have been discussed & clarificy, it would really be good to see if we have an official objection on the support (considering 19 companies think this is essential to be supported). The moderator has just the feeling, that technical discussions here are not helping too much enym Just prolonging the discussions will not help

**Update 2 FL Proposal 5.1: Support sub-slot based PUCCH repetition for HARQ-ACK based on the Rel-16 PUCCH procedure for slot-based PUCCH applied to sub-slot based PUCCH.**

* **Dynamic repetition indication is supported also for sub-slot based PUCCH in Rel-17**
  + **FFS: if the method to be specified in Cov. Enh WI for slot-based PUCCH repetition can be directly applied to sub-slot PUCCH or if changes are needed**
* **~~FFS: sub-slot based PUCCH repetition for other UCI types~~**
* **FFS: Additional PUCCH repetition enhancements**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | *List of companies / reasons for objection* |
| Support: | Vivo, QC, CATT (Although we do not have a strong preference, it is not clear to us why sub-slot based PUCCH repetition cannot be applied to other UCI types.), Samsung, ZTE, Huawei/HiSilicon, China Telecom, Sharp |
| Object: | Intel (slight), MediaTek |
| Reasons for objection: | Intel: We think simple sub-slot repetitions do not cover all use cases. In our understanding, MIMO is going to reuse intra-slot PUCCH repetitions framework from URLLC, once available. But MIMO would require more sophisticated repetition scheme since changing beams requires gaps in many cases (pending RAN4 feedback). We don’t see how these gaps can be efficiently handled by simple extension of R16 PUCCH repetitions to sub-slots.  MediaTek: We still see no benefit in supporting sub-slot repetitions compared to using larger sub-slot length. With larger sub-slot length, there is more flexibility in selecting the PUCCH resource length to achieve the required reliability (instead on using multiples of the PUCCH-length as in the sub-slot repetition scheme). |

If has been discussed, that short formats need to be supported for sub-slot based PUCCH repetition. The following input was given in the first round:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | *List of companies in first round* |
| Support Format 0 & 2 PUCCH repetition at least for sub-slot PUCCH | **(16)** Vivo, Nokia/NSB, DCM, Samsung, CATT, Panasonic, NEC, Sharp, WILUS, Spreadtrum, Huawei/HiSilicon, ZTE, Ericsson, China Telecom, QC, LG  Ericsson (clarify that **repetition indication can be implicit**, similarly to dynamic PUSCH repetition in Rel-16) |
| No | **(1)** MediaTek |

The reasons for Mediatek saying ‘No’ are not clear, but may be related to not supporting sub-slot based PUCCH in first place. Anyhow, the same procedure is suggested here as well – objecting companies to provide their (technical) reasons below:

**FL Proposal 5.2: Support PUCCH repetition for PUCCH formats 0 and 2 at least for sub-slot based PUCCH repetition.**

* **FFS: Support for slot-based PUCCH repetition**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | *List of companies / reasons for objection* |
| Support: | Vivo, QC, CATT, Nokia/NSB, Samsung, ZTE, Huawei/HiSilicon , Ericsson, China Telecom, Sharp  Ericsson: We would like to raise attention that the following agreement was made in eMIMO yesterday:  **Agreement**  For M-TRP PUCCH scheme 1,   * For PUCCH formats 1/3/4, values for the total number of repetitions at least contain values 2, 4, and 8.   + FFS: maximum repetition number can be extended to 16. * For PUCCH formats 0/2, the total number of repetitions at least contain 2.   + FFS: other values. * RRC configured number of slots (repetitions) are applied across both TRPs (e.g if the number of repetitions given by *nrofSlots* in *PUCCH-config* is 8, per TRP limit is 4). |
| Object: |  |
| Reasons for objection: |  |

## 9.3 For Jan. 28th check: Type 1 CB for sub-slot PUCCH

**On Type 1 HARQ-ACK codebook for subslot PUCCH** the following feedback had been received

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | *List of companies* |
| Support Type 1 CB for sub-slot PUCCH (at least in principle) | **(14)** OPPO, Nokia / NSB, DCM, Samsung, CATT, NEC, Sharp, WILUS, Spreadtrum, Huawei/HiSilicon, ZTE(Conditional support), China Telecom, QC, LG, Ericsson |
| Do not support Type 1 CB for sub-slot PUCCH in Rel-17 | **(2)** MediaTek, Xiaomi |

From the two companies not supporting: Mediatek commented that it is not suitable for URLLC applications (high payload size). Xiaomi claiming that Type 1 CB for sub-slot PUCCH is supported in Rel-16 already. As the moderator commented also by email, this is clearly not the case – based on the RAN1#103-e agreement:

***Conclusion***

*Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook is not supported for sub-slot based HARQ-ACK feedback in Rel-16.*

Based on the other comments received (needed clarification on grouping per sub-slot / Samsung, wording change / Huawei), the following further update was made for todays GTW session:

**Updated FL Proposal 6.1: Support Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook for sub-slot based PUCCH configuration in Rel-17.**

* **The properties of the Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook for sub-slot PUCCH at least includes that a PDSCH TDRA is associated with a UL /PUCCH sub-slot if the end of the PDSCH overlaps with the associated sub-slot determined by k1 ~~UL /PUCCH sub-slot~~.**
  + **FFS: PDSCH TDRA grouping per (DL) sub-slot**
* **FFS: Additional properties that may need clarification**
* **FFS: Other Type 1 HARQ-ACK CB construction enhancements (for sub-slot based &/ slot based HARQ-ACK feedback)**

Please provide below your input on Proposal 6.1, if you support the proposal as it is, if you support Type 1 CB but e.g. the FFS on PDSCH TDRA grouping would need to be resolved (wording proposals welcome) or if you object on the support for any Type 1 CB construction in Rel-17. *But please refrain from putting your steps here again, we are only talking about the properties here (the steps etc. to get there can be left to 38.213 editor)*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | *List of companies / reasons for objection* |
| Support Updated FL Proposal 6.1: | Vivo  QC  (suggested wording:  **The properties of the Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook for sub-slot PUCCH at least includes that a PDSCH TDRA is associated with a UL /PUCCH sub-slot if the end of the PDSCH overlaps with the associated sub-slot determined by a K1 in the set of configured K1 values** )  CATT, Nokia/NSB, Samsung, Huawei/HiSilicon , Ericsson, China Telecom, Sharp |
| Support Type 1 CB in Rel-17, but the following change to the proposal would need to be made | Company & change  ZTE supports the proposal in principle. Just two comments and changes for the FFS bullets:  **FFS: PDSCH TDRA grouping per ~~(DL)~~ sub-slot ///** We just propose the PDSCH TDRA grouping is based on DL slot as current specification does, but not based on any DL or UL sub-slot.  **FFS: Other Type 1 HARQ-ACK CB construction enhancements (for sub-slot based &/ slot based HARQ-ACK feedback, CB overhead reduction enhancement)** |
| Object Type 1 CB supporting in Rel-17 | MediaTek |
| Reasons for objecting to the Type 1 CB in general | MediaTek: We don’t see Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook suitable for URLLC applications, the high payload of the feedback will jeopardize the reliability. Thus, it will only add UE implementation complexity without real benefits. |
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# Appendix: RAN1 agreements on HARQ-ACK feedback enhancements for NR Rel-17 URLLC/IIoT

**RAN1#102-e (Aug. 2020)**

Agreements:

Support Rel-17 enhancements to avoid SPS HARQ-ACK dropping for TDD due to PUCCH collision with at least one DL or flexible symbol.

* This topic is to be considered as high priority
* FFS detailed solution(s)

Agreements:

* Simultaneous PUSCH / PUCCH within a cell group (of Sec. 6.13 of R1-2007216) and enhanced (sub-slot) HARQ-ACK multiplexing on PUSCH (of Sec. 4.3 of R1-2007216) can be further discussed as part of AI 8.3.3 in this WI (but not as part of AI 8.3.1.1).

Agreements:

Study further at least the following schemes:

* SPS HARQ skipping for ‘skipped’ SPS PDSCH
* PUCCH repetition enhancements (at least for HARQ-ACK), e.g., sub-slot based, etc.
* Retransmission of cancelled HARQ
* SPS HARQ payload size reduction and / or skipping for ‘non-skipped’SPS PDSCH
* Type 1 HARQ codebook based on sub-slot PUCCH config
* PUCCH carrier switching for HARQ feedback

**RAN1#103-e (Oct/Nov. 2020)**

Agreements: To address the issue of SPS HARQ-ACK dropping for TDD systems, focus on the following two options:

* Option 1: Deferring HARQ-ACK until a next (e.g., first) available PUCCH
  + FFS: Details including the definition of a next (e.g, first) available PUCCH, CB construction / multiplexing
* Option 2: Dynamic triggering of a one-shot / Type-3 CB type of re-transmission
  + FFS: Details on triggering and/or CB construction (incl. potential Type-3 CB optimizations) / multiplexing

**Agreements: In the studies on PUCCH carrier switching for HARQ-ACK, PUCCH carrier switching for different cells operated is considered only for cells that are part of the active UL CA configuration.**

**Agreements: For the studies on SPS HARQ skipping for skipped SPS PDSCH, the further discussions should focus on the following reduced sets methods:**

* **‘NACK skipping’ for (skipped) SPS PDSCH (Alt. 1)**
  + **FFS: details including at least when to skip the HARQ-ACK as well as NACK skipping configuration details (per SPS or group of SPS configurations etc.)**
  + Note: this alternative assumes inherently no identification of a skipped SPS PDSCH by the UE
* **Dynamic indication of skipped SPS PDSCH occasions (Alt. 3)**
  + **FFS: details including dynamic indication methods such as e.g. DCI, MAC CE, specific DM-RS instead of SPS DM-RS, …**

**Agreements:** For the studies on SPS HARQ payload size reduction (of non-skipped SPS PDSCH), the further discussions should focus on the following reduced sets of methods:

1. ACK skipping (NACK-only) (Alt. 1)
   1. FFS: Details
2. NACK skipping (ACK-only) (Alt. 2)
   1. FFS: Details
3. HARQ bundling / compression (Alt. 3)
   1. FFS: Details including HARQ bundling / compression window, bundling / compression technique
4. HARQ-ACK disabling /skipping for certain SPS configurations (Alt. 4)
   1. The skipping / disabling is higher-layer configured per SPS configuration
   2. FFS: HARQ-ACK skipping behaviour for Type 1 CB

**RAN#89 (Dec. 2020) – see agreed conclusion from** [RP-202872](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/TSG_RAN/TSGR_90e/Docs/RP-202872.zip)

**RAN conclusion on IIoT scope:**

* For handling of the PUCCH repetitions it is proposed to proceed as follows:

1. RAN1 to continue discussion on PUCCH repetition, whether to specify or not, in the IIoT/URLLC WI for single TRP.
   1. The following items are not within scope of the continued discussions in the IIoT/URLLC WI:
      1. DMRS-less PUCCH with UCI payload up to 11 bits
      2. PUSCH-repetition-Type-B like PUCCH repetition
      3. DMRS bundling across PUCCH repetitions
2. PUCCH repetition issues with multi-TRP to be handled in Fe-MIMO WI.

* For the UE CSI/HARQ-ACK feedback enhancements in the IIoT/URLLC WI, RAN1 work to continue the discussions. Status to be checked in March if any RAN level guidance needed.
  + RAN1 to continue discussion on A-CSI on PUCCH, whether to specify or not.

**RAN1#104-e (Jan/Feb. 2021)**

Agreements:

* Support deferring SPS HARQ-ACK dropped due to TDD specific collisions until a next available PUCCH in Rel-17 based on semi-static configuration of slot format
  + FFS: Details (including possible conditions for such a deferring, whether or not to consider semi-statically configured flexible symbols for PUCCH availability, etc.)
  + Aim for minimal standardization efforts and UE complexity in implementation

# Appendix: Summary of companies’ proposals

In here, the proposals and some example figures are collected for easier referencing.

### R1-2100101 Discussion on HARQ-ACK enhancements for eURLLC ZTE

***Observation 1:*** *The cancelled HARQ-ACK codebook can be triggered for transmission at the earliest after the conflict is determined.*

***Proposal 1:*** *For deferring HARQ-ACK until a next (e.g., first) available PUCCH, the PUCCH could be chosen from PUCCH resource sets for either SPS configuration or DG PDSCH.*

***Proposal 2:*** *For deferring HARQ-ACK until a next (e.g., first) available PUCCH, flexible symbols that from the start symbol of the original deferred PUCCH could be used for the available PUCCH for the deferred HARQ-ACK codebook.*

***Proposal 3:*** *For the next (e.g., first) available PUCCH for deferring HARQ-ACK, it needs to meet the following conditions in a slot:*

* *The size of the deferred HARQ-ACK codebook is within the UCI size range configured for the selected PUCCH.*
* *The number of the selected PUCCH symbols is not less than the number of original PUCCH symbols.*
* *The selected PUCCH has the earliest end symbol.*

***Proposal 4:*** *If the next available PUCCH for the deferred HARQ-ACK codebook for SPS PDSCH is determined in slot n and another PUCCH for the HARQ-ACK codebook for DG PDSCHs is also indicated in slot n, then the two HARQ-ACK codebooks should be multiplexed together in a same PUCCH determined by PRI in the last DCI.*

* *If the slot with SPS PDSCH is contained in the semi-static HARQ-ACK codebook window corresponding to the semi-static HARQ-ACK codebook for the DG PDSCHs, then UE constructs a new HARQ-ACK codebook containing the deferred HARQ-ACK and HARQ-ACKs of the DG PDSCHs according to the semi-static HARQ-ACK codebook mechanism, but the actual HARQ-ACK is always generated for the slot with SPS PDSCH.*
* *Otherwise, regardless of whether the UE is configured with a dynamic codebook or a semi-static codebook, the UE always concatenates the delayed HARQ-ACK codebook after the HARQ-ACK codebook for DG PUSCHs to generate a new HARQ-ACK codebook.*

***Proposal 5:*** *Both NACK skipping (ACK only) and ACK skipping (NACK only) should be supported, and the feedback mode can be configured by the base station.*

***Proposal 6:*** *For SPS HARQ payload size reduction, support Alt. 3 (HARQ bundling) and Alt. 4 (HARQ-ACK disabling /skipping for certain SPS configurations)*

* *For Alt. 3, the bundling mechanism for SPS configuration should be further studied.*
* *For Alt. 4,*
  + - *If an SPS configuration is disabled for feedback, when the UE constructs a semi-static HARQ-ACK codebook corresponding to only the SPS configuration, the semi-static HARQ-ACK codebook should not include the SPS configuration disabled for feedback.*
    - *If an SPS configuration is disabled for feedback, when the UE constructs a semi-static HARQ-ACK codebook corresponding to the SPS configurations and DG PDSCH, the semi-static HARQ-ACK codebook should not include the PDSCH TDRA corresponding to the SPS configuration.*

***Proposal 7:*** *Sub-slot based PUCCH repetition enhancements is supported:*

* *Similar mechanism of the slot-based PUCCH repetition in Rel-15/16 can be applied to the sub-slot based PUCCH repetition, and the PUCCH format includes PUCCH F0/F2.*

***Proposal 8:*** *The standardization work for retransmission of the low-priority HARQ-ACK codebook should be considered first.*

* *The similar principle could be applied for high priority HARQ-ACK retransmission if it does not require a lot of extra standardization work compared to low priority HARQ-ACK.*

***Proposal 9:*** *For the transmission of the dropped HARQ-ACK codebook, Alt. 3/Alt. 4 should be supported.*

* *Alt. 3: DCI scheduling PUSCH to carry dropped HARQ-ACK codebook.*
* *Alt. 4: DCI scheduling PUCCH to carry dropped HARQ-ACK codebook.*

***Proposal 10:*** *For the type 1 HARQ-ACK codebook, if one UL sub-slot overlaps with one or more DL slots, the existing mechanism is reused, for example, loop multiple DL slots within one UL slot.*

***Proposal 11:*** *Determine the type1 HARQ-ACK codebook based on sub-slot with the following procedure:*

* *Divide the PDSCH TDRA in a slot into different SLIV groups (already supported in Rel-15/16);*
* *Associate a SLIV group with a sub-slot according to the latest end symbol of the PDSCHs in the SLIV group;*
* *Generate HARQ-ACK information for each SLIV group in each sub-slot and concatenate the HARQ-ACK information to form type1 HARQ-ACK codebook.*

***Proposal 12:*** *Dynamic PUCCH carrier switching should be supported in HARQ-ACK enhancement in Rel-17 URLLC.*

### R1-2100181 HARQ-ACK enhancements for Rel-17 URLLC/IIoT OPPO

***Proposal 1: Subslot-based type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook should be supported in Rel-17.***

***Proposal 2: If subslot- based type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook is supported, to determine the occasions for candidate PDSCH receptions, the following limitation should be considered:***

* ***For a given subslot, if the last symbols of the PDSCH time resource derived by a TDRA row r is not in the subslot, row r is removed from the cardinality of TDRA rows.***

***Proposal 3:*** ***Retransmission of cancelled HARQ-ACK should be supported for Rel-17 URLLC.***

***Proposal 4: A DL grant used to indicate a PUCCH resource for UCI retransmission should be supported.***

***Proposal 5: Deferring SPS HARQ-ACK until a next (e.g., first) available PUCCH.***

* ***A set of UL slots is configured to transmit SPS HARQ-ACK, and separated K1 is configured for each UL slot.***
* ***For a given UL slot, the untransmitted HARQ-ACKs of the SPS PDSCHs before the DL slot corresponding to the indicated K1 are deferred to the given UL slot.***
* ***A PUCCH resource within the slot is determined based on Rel-16 mechanism.***

***Proposal 6: For a HARQ-ACK codebook only including HARQ-ACK corresponding to the SPS configurations with NACK skipping, if all of the information is NACK, UE can skip the HARQ-ACK codebook.***

***Proposal 7: The following two methods for SPS HARQ-ACK compression should be supported:***

* ***The HARQ-ACK codebook for SPS PDSCHs is determined based on the HARQ processes of the multiple SPS PDSCH resources associated with the same PUCCH.***
* ***Multiple SPS*** ***configurations are configured to share one HARQ-ACK bit.***



Figure 3: SPS HARQ-ACK codebook determined based on the HARQ processes



Figure 4: Multiple SPS PDSCH sources share one HARQ-ACK bit in SPS HARQ-ACK codebook

***Proposal 8: The HARQ-ACK skipping/disabling is higher-layer configured per SPS configuration.***

* **The payload size of *Type*-1 HARQ-ACK codebook including HARQ-ACK corresponding to a DCI for SPS release or dynamic PDSCH is not changed.**

### R1-2100226 UE feedback enhancements for HARQ-ACK Huawei, BUPT, China Southern Power Grid, HiSilicon

***Proposal 1*：*Deferring HARQ-ACK until the first available PUCCH resource should be supported to avoid SPS HARQ-ACK dropping for TDD.***

* ***The first available PUCCH resource can be either the PUCCH resource configured for SPS PDSCH only HARQ-ACK (i.e. PUCCH resources configured in sps-PUCCH-AN-List-r16) or the PUCCH resource for dynamic PDSCH HARQ-ACK (i.e. PUCCH resources configured in PUCCH-ResourceSet), depending on which one is the first to be available.***
* ***The time difference between the slot with the end of the SPS PDSCH and the slot with the first available PUCCH resource should be one of the k1 values in the configured K1 set.***

***Proposal 2：Sub-slot based type 1 HARQ-ACK codebook construction should be supported in Rel-17.***

***Proposal 3：PUCCH repetitions over sub-slots should be supported in Rel-17, and dynamic indication of the number of repetitions should be supported.***

***Observation 1: Requiring the UE to always send HARQ feedback for all candidate PDSCHs can result in large overhead and unnecessary UL interference, when multiple DL SPS configurations with low periodicity are configured.***

***Proposal 4：ACK skipping and/or NACK skipping should be supported for DL SPS in Rel-17.***

***Proposal 5：ACK skipping or NACK skipping is performed when the corresponding PUCCH only carries ACKs or NACKs of SPS PDSCH(s), respectively.***

***Proposal 6：Dynamic PUCCH carrier switching could be considered for TDD carriers in Rel-17.***

***Observation 2: If the gNB configures up to two code words that one DCI may schedule, the high priority HARQ-ACK codebook construction based on two code words may increase its size unnecessarily.***

***Proposal 7: Regardless of the configured maximum number of code words, HARQ-ACK codebook construction based on only one code word could be considered for HARQ-ACK codebook with high priority in Rel-17.***

***Proposal 8：Retransmission of cancelled HARQ is not necessary in Rel-17.***

### R1-2100268 HARQ-ACK Enhancements for IIoT/URLLC Ericsson

In the previous sections we made the following observations:

**Observation 1 In the proposed deferring procedure, once the next available slot/sub-slot to use for the deferred SPS HARQ-ACK is determined, the SPS HARQ-ACK can be transmitted in that slot/sub-slot without deferring further.**

**Observation 2 In the proposed deferring procedures, the existing procedures for HARQ-ACK codebook construction is used for construction of the deferred SPS HARQ-ACK.**

**Observation 3 In the proposed deferring procedures, the existing multiplexing rule for multiplexing the deferred SPS HARQ-ACK with other HARQ-ACK bits in the same slot/sub-slot is used.**

**Observation 4 In the proposed deferring procedures, if the deferred HARQ-ACK bit is multiplexed with only HARQ-ACK bits in response to one or more SPS receptions and the UE is provided SPS-PUCCH-AN-List-r16, then the UE determines a PUCCH resource to use for the multiplexed HARQ-ACK bits from sps-PUCCH-AN-ResourceID as defined in the current specification.**

**Observation 5 When SPS occasions are over-provisioned to minimize the alignment delay to the actual transmission, there can be many unnecessary UE feedback transmission (NACK) corresponding to unused SPS occasions with no actual SPS PDSCH transmitted.**

**Observation 6 There is no need to support HARQ-ACK skipping for other multiplexing cases, e.g., multiplexing of HARQ-ACK bits of skipped SPS PDSCH and non-skipped PDSCHs.**

**Observation 7 There is no need for UE to have an independent step to identify the ‘skipped’ SPS PDSCH.**

**Observation 8 The existing PUCCH repetition framework is restrictive as it is only enabled by semi-static configuration and the configuration is tied to PUCCH format.**

**Observation 9 Target BLER of PDSCH transmission depends on use case requirements where different scheduling strategies may be performed considering spectral efficiency. When PDSCH is not always transmitted with extremely low BLER, the benefit of skipping SPS HARQ-ACK with only ACK bits becomes less clear.**

**Observation 10 Large specification impact is expected from dynamic PUCCH carrier switching whereas latency benefit is unclear as it heavily depends on TDD pattern of the carriers.**

**Observation 11 It is sufficient to have semi-static configuration of the PUCCH cell other than PCell to use for HARQ-ACK feedback.**

Based on the discussion in the previous sections we propose the following:

**Proposal 1 Adopt the following procedures when deferring DL SPS only HARQ-ACK is enabled:**

**Proposal 2 SFI is not considered to cause SPS HARQ-ACK deferring.**

**• Note: If the UE detects SFI which turns flexible to DL symbols, causing PUCCH carrying SPS HARQ-ACK to collide with invalid symbols, then the UE simply follows the already existing behavior.**

**Proposal 3 Allow configuration of additional “invalid symbols or slot/sub-slots” which are considered invalid and cannot be used for the deferred SPS HARQ-ACK.**

**Proposal 4 If needed, the maximum number of slots for which SPS HARQ-ACK deferring is allowed is limited by the maximum K1 value in the set of configured slot timing values.**

**Proposal 5 Support HARQ-ACK feedback skipping for a codebook with only DL-SPS HARQ ACK feedback when all HARQ-ACK bits in the codebook are NACK.**

**Proposal 6 Do not support dynamic indication of skipped SPS PDSCH occasions.**

**Proposal 7 Support sub-slot based PUCCH repetition where PUCCH repetition is performed across multiple sub-slots and each repetition uses the same resource (i.e., same starting symbol within a sub-slot, duration, and number of PRBs).**

**Proposal 8 Support having a repetition factor for PUCCH repetition as part of the configuration of PUCCH resources.**

**Proposal 9 PUCCH repetition is supported for all PUCCH formats.**

**Proposal 10 If the scenario of cancelled HARQ-ACK is still present in Rel-17, support HARQ feedback based on Type-3 HARQ-ACK codebook to recover the cancelled HARQ-ACK.**

**Proposal 11 Support Type-3 HARQ-ACK codebook with priority indication in the triggering DCI.**

**Proposal 12 Support Type-3 HARQ-ACK codebook where only A/N of “activated CCs” are included in the codebook instead of all “configured CCs”.**

**• Study other methods for size reduction for Type 3 HARQ-CB**

**Proposal 13 Do not support SPS HARQ payload size reduction.**

**Proposal 14 Support Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook for sub-slot in Rel17.**

**Proposal 15 Support Type-1 HARQ codebook for sub-slot HARQ-ACK by updating the pseudo code for determining a set of occasions for candidate PDSCH reception where the ratio 2μDL-μUL is changed to 2μDL-μUL/N, where N is the number of sub-slots in an UL slot.**

**Proposal 16 Once Type-1 codebook for sub-slot is supported, further optimization to reduce Type-1 codebook size can be considered.**

**Proposal 17 Do not support dynamic PUCCH carrier switching.**

**Proposal 18 Support a configuration of pucch-Cell on PCell to indicate another serving cell within the same cell group to use for PUCCH.**

### R1-2100302 UE feedback enhancements for HARQ-ACK CAICT

***Observation 1: Always exempting semi-static F symbols from being valid symbols is detrimental from the latency performance point of view for URLLC.***

***Proposal 1: gNB configures whether UL symbols indicated by SFI could be valid symbols when decide available PUCCH or not.***

***Proposal 2: To decide the number of contiguous symbols for available PUCCH transmission, PUCCH parameters configured by n1PUCCH-AN/SPS-PUCCH-AN-List-r16 could be reused, or special PUCCH configuration for deferred HARQ-ACK could be considered.***

***Proposal 3: Semi-static configured PUCCH transmission according to SPS-PUCCH-AN-List-r16 or multi-CSI-PUCCH-ResourceList could be used as available PUCCH.***

***Proposal 4: gNB configures whether PUCCH transmission scheduled for dynamic HARQ-ACK could be used as available PUCCH or not.***

***Proposal 5: The next available PUCCH is the earliest one within the PUCCHs decided within available symbols and the PUCCHs which was to be transmitted according to Rel.16 procedure.***

***Observation 2: The current triggering procedure is flexible.***

***Proposal 6: Optimize one-shot HARQ CB triggering if CB optimization is supported.***

***Proposal 7: SPS HARQ-ACK skipping is used when one PUCCH only includes SPS HARQ-ACK for skipped SPS PDSCH and all the HARQ-ACKs are NACK. If twice blind detecting could be supported, SPS HARQ-ACK skipping could be used in one PUCCH which SPS HARQ-ACK skipping is multiplexed with other UCI and all the SPS HARQ-ACKs are NACK.***

### R1-2100376 UE feedback enhancements for HARQ-ACK CATT

***Proposal 1: Whether SPS HARQ-ACK should be delayed is determined based on the PUCCH resource for SPS HARQ-ACK only regardless of whether there are HARQ-ACK(s)*** ***corresponding to dynamic PDSCH and/or SPS PDSCH release to be transmitted in the same slot/sub-slot.***

***Proposal 2: FFS which PUCCH resource should be used to determine the next available PUCCH resource when there is initial SPS HARQ-ACK in a slot with the following options:***

* ***Option 1: The PUCCH resource used for delayed SPS HARQ-ACK only is used to determine the next available PUCCH resource***
* ***Option 2: The PUCCH resource used for both initial and all delayed SPS HARQ-ACK is used to determine the next available PUCCH resource***

***Proposal 3: If PUCCH for SPS HARQ-ACK collides with semi-static DL symbol(s) or SSB symbols, the SPS HARQ-ACK feedback can be delayed to an earliest subsequent slot/sub-slot with a PUCCH symbol allocation for SPS only feedback within the slot/sub-slot which does not collide with semi-static DL symbol(s) or SSB symbols.***

***Proposal 4: SPS HARQ-ACK can only be delayed to a slot/sub-slot included in configured K1 set, otherwise the SPS HARQ-ACK should be dropped.***

***Proposal 5: One-shot codebook type can be used for SPS HARQ-ACK re-transmission, and one-shot codebook can be configured to include HARQ-ACK for HARQ processes of SPS PDSCHs only.***

***Proposal 6: Enhance sub-slot based Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook to reduce redundant HARQ-ACK bit(s) and to include all the PDSCH occasions.***

***Proposal 7: Extending SLIVs in a serving cell for Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook should be enhanced by considering the SLIVs in slot(s) configured with DCI format 1\_2 monitoring only and considering PDCCH monitoring occasions in that slot only in case repetitions is not configured for the serving cell.***



Figure 5: Issue of extending reference SLIV for Type-1 codebook



Figure 6: Issue of extending reference SLIV for Type-1 codebook

***Proposal 8: Dynamic indication of skipped SPS PDSCH occasions is not supported in Rel-17.***

***Proposal 9: Disable HARQ-ACK feedback for one or multiple SPS configurations can be considered for SPS HARQ payload size reduction.***

***Proposal 10: Configuring the number of repetition times for each PUCCH resource can be considered in Rel-17.***

### R1-2100436 HARQ-ACK enahncements for Rel-17 URLLC vivo

***Proposal 1: The PUCCH resource(s) for the deferred SPS HARQ-ACK should re-use the PUCCH resource(s) for HARQ-ACK corresponding to DL dynamic scheduling configured in one or more PUCCH resource sets and the PUCCH resource(s) configured for SPS HARQ-ACK transmissions in Rel-15/16.***

***Proposal 2:*** ***It should be discussed how to determine an available PUCCH resource in time domain, and the following options could be considered:***

* ***Option 1: Based only on RRC configurations, and considering only semi-static UL symbol(s).***
* ***Option 2: Based only on RRC configurations, and considering both semi-static UL symbol(s) and semi-static flexible symbol(s).***
* ***Option 3: Based on both RRC configuration and L1 signalling, and reusing Rel-15/16 rules to validate a transmission corresponding to a PUCCH resource.***

***Proposal 3: It should be clarified whether the case is regarded as out-of-order or not when the HARQ-ACK feedback corresponding to dynamically scheduled PDSCH(s) starting later than the SPS PDSCH(s) is transmitted before the determined available PUCCH resource conveying the deferred SPS HARQ-ACK.***

***Proposal 4: To determine an available PUCCH resource for conveying the deferred SPS HARQ-ACK, consider only the RRC configurations, and both semi-static UL symbol(s) and semi-static flexible symbol(s) can be used for the available PUCCH resource.***

***Proposal 5:*** ***It should be determined if there is any limitation for feedback offset applied to deferred SPS HARQ-ACK, and regarding the limitation, following options could be considered:***

* ***Option 1: The feedback offset should not exceed the maximum K1 configured by high layer.***
* ***Option 2: The feedback offset should correspond to a candidate K1 in the K1 set configured by high layer.***

***Proposal 6:*** ***It should be discussed how to construct the HARQ-ACK codebook containing deferred SPS HARQ-ACK, and for type-1 codebook the codebook construction is highly dependent on the determination of feedback offset for deferred SPS HARQ-ACK.***

***Proposal 7:*** ***It should be discussed to control or reduce the codebook size when a type-3 codebook is triggered to retrieve deferred SPS HARQ-ACK.***

***Proposal 8:*** ***The two options to address the issue of SPS HARQ-ACK dropping for TDD systems can complement each other, and both can be supported.***

***Proposal 9:*** ***NACK skipping for SPS PDSCH should mainly focus on the case of HARQ-ACK codebooks containing only SPS HARQ-ACK.***

***Proposal 10:*** ***At least support NACK skipping, which can be applied for both skipped SPS PDSCH and non-skipped SPS PDSCH without explicit identification.***

***Proposal 11:*** ***Unified method(s) is supported for retransmission of cancelled HARQ-ACK for low priority and high priority.***

***Proposal 12:*** ***HARQ-ACK retransmission mechanisms introduced in NR-U Rel-16 are considered as a starting point, and there is no need to introduce additional ones.***

***Proposal 13:*** ***Type-3 codebook and/or enhanced type-2 codebook can be clarified and enhanced further as required.***

***Proposal 14:*** ***Type-3 codebook is prioritized for clarifications and potential enhancements.***

***Proposal 15:*** ***Do not support PUCCH carrier switching for HARQ-ACK for URLLC Rel-17 unless practical deployment scenarios are identified.***

### R1-2100574 On UE feedback enhancements for HARQ-ACK MediaTek Inc.

***Observation 1: PUCCH alignment adds to the latency especially for TDD operation with DL-heavy patterns hence compromising both the latency and the reliability.***

***Observation 2: The sub-6 TDD bands are widely deployed for 5G-NR. They suffer however from large latency, penalizing the URLLC deployment in these bands.***

***Observation 3: Use of mini-slots scheduling and UE processing time capability #2 don’t deliver any substantial latency advantage for TDD patterns with large UL/DL periodicity.***

***Observation 4: The UL/DL TDD pattern is the bottleneck for the URLLC latency for deployment on sub-6 TDD bands.***

***Observation 5: Dynamic cross-carrier PUCCH allows for up to 30% latency reduction.***

***Observation 6: Dynamic cross-carrier PUCCH doubles the network capacity and reduces the resource utilization compared to the Carrier Aggregation baseline operation.***

***Observation 7: Receive diversity is essential for enhancing the reliability of PUCCH.***

***Observation 8: The required SNR for achieving the target NACK-to-ACK error rate is generally higher than the required SNR for achieving the target missed ACK rate.***

***Observation 9: The difference between the required SNR for achieving the target missed ACK and NACK-to-ACK error rates depends on the system setting (e.g. number of PRBs and number of receive antennas).***

1. ***Support dynamic cross-carrier PUCCH for Carrier Aggregation.***
2. ***All DCIs pointing to the same PUCCH carry the same PUCCH carrier index, hence no overriding and no risk if one DCI is missed.***
3. ***Selection between Option-1 and Option-2 for the PUCCH configuration:***

* ***Option 1: A PUCCH configuration per PUCCH carrier.***
* ***Option 2: Define two levels of PUCCH configuration, “per PUCCH group” and “per PUCCH carrier”.***

1. ***Each cell carrying PUCCH has its own TPC configuration (PUCCH-PowerControl) and has its own TPC loop. When switching the PUCCH carrier, UE changes the power control parameters to use the ones associated to the new PUCCH carrier.***
2. ***Support different PUCCH transmission power levels depending on whether ACK or NACK is transmitted.***
3. ***Don’t proceed with the SPS HARQ skipping for “skipped” SPS PDSCH study in RAN1.***
4. ***Don’t proceed with the PUCCH repetition enhancement study in RAN1.***
5. ***Support retransmission of cancelled low priority and high priority HARQ.***
6. ***Don’t proceed with SPS HARQ payload size reduction study in RAN1***
7. ***Don’t proceed with sub-slot based type 1 HARQ-ACK codebook for URLLC in RAN1 Rel-17***

### R1-2100649 UE HARQ feedback enhancements for URLLC/IIoT Intel Corporation

**Proposal 1**

* *To address the issue of SPS HARQ-ACK dropping for TDD systems, support both Option 1 and Option 2 defined in RAN1#103-e.*

**Proposal 2**

* *For Option 1, addressing the issue of SPS HARQ-ACK dropping for TDD systems,*
  + *Support configuration of additional PUCCH resource(s) to a UE for searching for the next available PUCCH resource, with possibly different PUCCH format, start symbol, length symbol, K1 value for DL SPS HARQ-ACK:*
    - *The additional PUCCH resource can be used whenever the original PUCCH resource could not be mapped due to collision with DL symbols or flexible symbols if SFI is not configured, FFS case if SFI is configured.*

**Proposal 3**

* *For Option 2, addressing the issue of SPS HARQ-ACK dropping for TDD systems,*
  + *Support configuring Type 3 CB to carry only DL SPS HARQ-ACK information on a given carrier;*
  + *Support grouping DL SPS HARQ-ACK processes on a carrier to be multiplexed in a given Type 3 CB.*

**Proposal 4**

* *Support enhanced PUCCH repetition mechanism resulting in repetitions within a slot or across slots, each repetition possibly having different starting symbol and duration.*
  + *FFS details*

**Proposal 5**

* *Support enhanced PUCCH repetition mechanism with dynamic indication of the total PUCCH duration, i.e. dynamic indication of number of repetitions.*
  + *PUCCH resource ID in this case points to the number of PUCCH repetitions associated with the triggered PUCCH format.*

**Observation 1**

* ***Feasibility and benefits of SPS HARQ skipping for skipped SPS PDSCH based on dynamic indication of skipped SPS PDSCH occasions (Alt. 3) in case of realistic system operation conditions are not proven.***

**Observation 2**

* ***‘NACK skipping’ for (skipped) SPS PDSCH under the assumption of no detection of skipped PDSCH is beneficial in a limited number of cases, but can be considered as a*** *dropping of a PUCCH containing only SPS HARQ-ACK with only NACKs.*
* ***‘NACK skipping’ for (skipped) SPS PDSCH under the assumption of no detection of skipped PDSCH should be considered against other options classified as*** *SPS HARQ payload size reduction.*

**Proposal 6**

* *For SPS HARQ payload size reduction, support (Alt. 3) grouping of SPS PDSCH occasions which are bundled into a single HARQ-ACK bit.*
  + *Bundling can be performed based on explicit configuration or based on HARQ process IDs.*

### R1-2100728 HARQ-ACK Feedback Enhancements for URLLC/IIoT Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell

The discussions **in Sec. 2 on dropping of SPS HARQ-ACK feedback in TDD operation** can be summarized in the following related observations and proposals:

**Proposal 2.1: Support deferring HARQ-ACK until a next (e.g., first) available PUCCH to address the issue of SPS HARQ-ACK dropping for TDD systems.**

* **FFS: Details including the definition of a next (e.g., first) available PUCCH, CB construction / multiplexing**

**Proposal 2.2: To address the issue of SPS HARQ-ACK dropping for TDD systems, the details and enhancements related to “Dynamic triggering of a one-shot / Type-3 CB type of re-transmission” (Option 2) are jointly discussed with “re-transmission of canceled HARQ-ACK” topic.**

**Proposal 2.3: For the deferring of SPS HARQ-ACK until a next available PUCCH, the next available PUCCH is defined as the next applicable PUCCH resource having no overlap at least with semi-static DL or SSB symbols.**

* **FFS: whether SFI is taken into account (Nokia preference) or having no overlap with semi-static flexible symbols**

***Observation 2.1: Selecting a PUCCH resource for deferred SPS HARQ-ACK from the PUCCH resource pool configured for dynamic PDSCH may require large specification effort due to the large amount of PUCCH resources to choose from.***

**Proposal 2.4: For the deferring of SPS HARQ-ACK until a next available PUCCH, the PUCCH resource in case of SPS HARQ-ACK only is selected among the PUCCH resources configured for HARQ-ACK of SPS PDSCH.**

* **FFS: whether to provide an additional set of candidate PUCCH resources to the UE in addition to those in *sps-PUCCH-AN-List-r16* to increase flexibility and reduce the HARQ-ACK latency.**

***Observation 2.2: For the case where the HARQ-ACK codebook only contains HARQ-ACK bits from multiple (deferred and/or non-deferred) SPS PDSCHs (i.e. no HARQ-ACK bits of PDSCH scheduled by a DCI), existing SPS-only codebook construction mechanism/pseudocode in TS 38.213 Clause 9.1.2 can be used.***

***Observation 2.3: For Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook construction with a mix of SPS and dynamic PDSCH HARQ-ACK, SPS HARQ-ACK bits can be appended to the end of the codebook and sorted in the same way as for the SPS-only case. No significant changes are foreseen to support the deferring operation.***

**Proposal 2.5: In case the deferred SPS HARQ-ACK is multiplexed with dynamic PDSCH HARQ-ACK on a Type-1 codebook, one bit per postponed SPS PDSCH HARQ-ACK is appended to the Type-1 codebook in case the PDSCH to HARQ-ACK timing is not covered by the configured K1 set.**

The discussions **in Sec. 3 on SPS HARQ skipping for ‘skipped’ SPS PDSCH** can be summarized in the following related observations and proposals:

**Proposal 3.1: Support NACK skipping for SPS PDSCH**

* **NACK skipping is separately configurable for each SPS configuration.**
* **The skipping procedure is to be limited to the single case of only SPS NACK feedback is to be reported on the PUCCH. For all other cases, such as a mix of SPS ACK and NACK (or HARQ ACK for dynamic PDSCH), or other type of UCI to be mapped to PUCCH/PUSCH or if SPS NACK for skipped SPS PDSCH is the only UCI to be mapped to PUSCH, the UE should not skip the HARQ transmission / mapping.**

***Observation 3.1: Supporting dynamic indication of skipped SPS PDSCH occasions may lead to wrong CB size assumption, create unwanted PUCCH collisions and loss of soft-channel bits.***

***Observation 3.2: In current Release 16, the timeline for overwriting a SPS PDSCH with dynamic PDSCH is at least 14 OFDM symbols as the UE needs some time to prepare for the PDSCH reception. Dynamic indication of skipped/cancelled SPS PDSCH occasions may possible be subject to similar timeline.***

**Proposal 3.2: Do not support dynamic indication of skipped SPS PDSCH occasions.**

The discussions **in Sec. 4 on enhancements for SPS HARQ ACK payload reduction** can be summarized in the following related observations and proposals:

**Proposal 4.1: For SPS PDSCH HARQ-ACK feedback reduction, consider the following:**

* **Support SPS HARQ disabling/skipping for certain SPS configurations (Alt. 4)**
  + **The HARQ-ACK information is mapped only in case HARQ-ACK of a PDSCH scheduled by a DCI is mapped and Type-1 CB operation. Otherwise, the HARQ-ACK information is not mapped / skipped.**
* **Continue the discussion on SPS HARQ-ACK bundling/compression (Alt. 3)**
  + **Note: There should not be any restrictions regarding the number of SPS PDSCHs that can be scheduled to the UE in each SPS bundle**
* **Do not support ACK skipping (Alt. 1)**

The discussions **in Sec. 5 on PUCCH repetition enhancements** can be summarized in the following related observations and proposals:

***Observation 5.1: Based on our understanding, the RAN plenary decision implies that Alt. 2 (Back-to-back PUCCH repetition – i.e. ‘PUSCH Rep. B Type’, repetition within a subslot) and Alt. 3 (Repetitions to support different starting point & duration based on PUCCH configuration) are not considered as part of this WI any longer.***

**Proposal 5.1: Support sub-slot based PUCCH repetition (same start / duration / PUCCH resource in each subslot, one repetition per subslot) at least for HARQ-ACK.**

* **FFS: per repetition PUCCH dropping rules concerning overlapping with DG PUSCH**
* **FFS: support of sub-slot based PUCCH repetition to be also applicable for SR and/or CSI**
* **FFS: enabling multiplexing of different UCI types within a PUCCH repetition bundle**

The discussions **in Sec. 6 on retransmissions of dropped HARQ-ACK** can be summarized in the following related observations and proposals:

***Observation 6.1: In case that HARQ ACK multiplexed on PUSCH is dropped, triggering retransmission of dropped HARQ-ACK via DCI scheduling UL grant and/or via semi-static configuration at least for CG PUSCH could decrease the downlink control overhead.***

**Proposal 6.1: e-Type 2 CB enhancements for URLLC are not specified in Rel-16.**

**Proposal 6.2: RAN 1 to specify Type 3 codebook enhancements for URLLC, including**

* **Limiting the Type 3 CB to only a subset of the HARQ ACK processes to the codebook. A method for further studies is indicating in the triggering DCI which preconfigured set of processes is included.**
* **Including the support for Type 3 CB triggering using DCI format 1\_2.**
* **Triggering DCI including a PHY priority indication for the PUCCH carrying the Type-3 CB.**

**Proposal 6.3: Study triggering the retransmission of dropped HARQ-ACK on PUSCH via DCI scheduling the PUSCH and via semi-static configuration (at least for CG PUSCH).**

The discussions **in Sec. 7 on Type 1 HARQ ACK Codebook enhancements** which summarize only on additional possible enhancements can be summarized in the following related observations and proposals:

**Proposal 7.1: Focus the discussions on the Type-1 CB for sub-slot PUCCH on the properties of the codebook and not necessarily the detailed implementation steps (which could be left to the 38.213 editor).**

**Proposal 7.2: Support Type-1 CB for sub-slot PUCCH based on the following codebook properties:**

* **The HARQ-ACK multiplexing window is defined based on the HARQ-ACK timing set K1 and sub-slot length.**
  + **The applicable K1 set considering the applicable DCI formats for the PUCCH configuration based on Sec. 9.1.1.1 of TS 38.213 is reused.**
* **Definition of the union set of TDRA entries: A PDSCH TDRA is associated with an UL / PUCCH sub-slot if the end of the PDSCH overlaps with the UL sub-slot.**
* **The pruning is performed per PUCCH sub-slot based on the TDD configuration (as in Rel-15, but per sub-slot)**
* **FFS: additional codebook size optimizations**

**Proposal 7.3: To reduce the Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook size, the gNB should be able to configure the UE with a special “feedback” TDRA tables used for Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook construction. This “feedback” TDRA table is used in the Type-1 HARQ-ACK CB construction pruning process and maps the possible DL assignment for PDSCH (e.g. SPS) into the entries of the “feedback” TDRA table.**



Figure 7.1. Example TDRA table with 6 rows.



Figure 7.2. HARQ-ACK bit position after R15 pruning. For this we need a codebook of 4 bits.

If a separate TDRA table is configured (let’s call it Feedback TDRA (F-TDRA) table), such as the one illustrated in Figure 7.3, then the resulting HARQ-ACK bit number to each entry in the example TDRA table in Figure 7.1 is illustrated in Figure 7.4.



Figure 7.3. Example of a F-TDRA table.



Figure 7.4. HARQ-ACK bit position after pruning of the TDRA table of Figure 7.1 into the example F-TDRA table of Figure 7.3. With the configured example F-TDRA, the codebook size is reduced to 2 bits.

The discussions **in Sec. 8 on dynamic PUCCH carrier switching** can be summarized in the following related observations and proposals:

**Proposal 8.1: To decide if PUCCH carrier switching will be specified, focus the further complexity versus gain analysis on dynamic indication of PUCCH carrier switching of Alt. 1.**

### R1-2100803 Discussion on physical Layer feedback enhancements Spreadtrum Communications

***Proposal 1. Semi-static flexible symbol can be considered for available PUCCH transmission.***

***Proposal 2. For all the available PUCCH resources in the slot/sub-slot, a first PUCCH resource should be selected, e.g., the one with earliest starting/ending symbol.***

***Proposal 3. NACK skipping is supported, and it can be applied by both skipped and non-skipped SPS PDSCH.***

***Proposal 4. NACK skipping scheme can be configured by RRC signalling for all configured SPSs.***

***Proposal 5. ACK skipping scheme can be considered for SPS HARQ payload size reduction of non-skipped SPS PDSCH.***

***Proposal 6: Format 0 and format 2 can be supported sub-slot based PUCCH repetition transmission.***

***Proposal 7: Support dynamic indication of repetition number of PUCCH transmission, existing bit filed can be used to jointly indicate the PUCCH repetition number, such as PRI field.***

***Proposal 8. Support sub-slot based type1 HARQ-ACK codebook in Rel-17 URLLC to further enhancement UCI reliability.***

***Proposal 9. The codebook size should be constrained for sub-slot based type 1 codebook.***

***Proposal 10. Similar as Rel-16 type 1 codebook, the union set of row indexed of TDRAs are used to determine the PDSCH occasions, including for DCI formats the UE is configured to monitor PDCCH and reference of SLIV if it is configured.***

### R1-2100855 Considerations on HARQ-ACK enhancements for URLLC Sony

**Observation 1: The first available PUCCH may be overloaded due to accumulation of dropped SPS HARQ-ACKs.**

**Observation 2: Using DCI to trigger for Type-3 CB for retransmission of dropped SPS HARQ-ACK may lead to PDCCH blocking and latency in providing the HARQ-ACK retransmission.**

**Observation 3: If the HARQ-ACK for a group of SPS’s are bundled using an “OR” operator then the gNB would not be able to determine when there is more than one ACKed PDSCH if the gNB sends more than 1 PDSCH to the UE and would be unable to issue a PDSCH retransmission.**

**Observation 4: Sub-slot PUCCH repetitions would lead to intra-UE PUCCH collision where PUCCH repetitions in a sub-slot collide with another PUCCH in another sub-slot.**

**Observation 5: The 2 levels L1 priority introduced in Rel-16 for UL intra-UE prioritization is not sufficient to handle inter sub-slot PUCCH repetitive collisions.**

**Observation 6: The 1st PUCCH repetition has the highest importance compared to subsequent repetitions of the same PUCCH.**

We therefore propose the following:

**Proposal 1: The first available PUCCH to carry retransmission of dropped SPS HARQ-ACK can be a PUCCH carrying HARQ-ACK for other SPS’s or DG-PDSCHs.**

**Proposal 2: Up to *NHARQ* SPS HARQ-ACKs that are dropped due to collision with DL symbols or invalid symbols in TDD can be retransmitted by multiplexing into the first available PUCCH resource. Value of *NHARQ* is FFS.**

**Proposal 3: Consider triggering for PUCCH to carry Type-3 CB for the dropped SPS HARQ-ACK retransmission without using DCI but instead the Type-3 CB is triggered when *NDrop* SPS HARQ-ACKs are dropped.**

**Proposal 4: If SPS HARQ skipping is supported, consider using MAC CE in a transmitted SPS PDSCH to indicate dynamically which SPSs are skipped.**

**Proposal 5: If reduction of SPS HARQ-ACK overhead is required, use HARQ bundling where the UE feeds back the number of ACKs observed in a defined group of SPS’s.**

* **PUCCH Format 0 with 8 cyclic shifts can be used to indicate up to 7 ACKs.**

**Proposal 6: If sub-slot PUCCH repetition is introduced, consider reducing the priority of a repetition according to the number of repetitions that have already been transmitted.**

**Proposal 7: Consider retransmission of cancelled Low L1 priority and High L1 priority HARQ-ACKs.**

**Proposal 8: Consider using e-Type 2 and/or Type 3 HARQ-ACK codebooks as a starting point in designing the mechanism to handle retransmission of cancelled HARQ-ACKs.**

**Proposal 9: Consider handling of retransmissions of cancelled HARQ-ACK with one L1 priority and/or codebook type in another HARQ-ACK codebook of different L1 priority and/or different codebook type.**

### R1-2100880 Discussion on UE feedback enhancement for HARQ-ACK LG Electronics

Proposal 1: Consider to shift the HARQ-ACK feedback for SPS PDSCH from invalid PUCCH resource to next available PUCCH resource.

Proposal 2: For SPS PUCCH occasion overlapping semi-static DL symbol, postpone HARQ-ACK transmission to next SPS PUCCH occasion of corresponding SPS configuration.

* FFS: whether to use SPS PUCCH occasion for different SPS configuration.

Proposal 3: When delaying HARQ-ACK transmission for SPS PDSCH reception is supported, the end of delayed HARQ-ACK transmission should be no later than,

* The starting symbol of upcoming PDSCH occasion corresponding to same HARQ process ID, and
* The ending symbol of the PUCCH transmission carrying HARQ-ACK of other PDSCH reception received after the SPS PDSCH reception.

Proposal 4: Support type-3 HARQ-ACK codebook only for a part of HARQ process IDs and/or serving cells (e.g. the serving cells/HARQ process IDs configured for SPS PDSCH).

Proposal 5: if type-3 HARQ-ACK codebook is supported only for SPS PDSCH, it can be considered to separate the codebook for dynamic PDSCH and for SPS PDSCH.

Proposal 6: Consider to support NACK only HARQ-ACK feedback based on PUCCH resource request in order for reducing PUCCH overhead.

Proposal 7: Consider to support sub-slot based PUCCH repetition with following aspects.

* Take Rel-15/16 slot-based PUCCH repetition structure as a baseline

Proposal 8: Support type-3 HARQ-ACK codebook for re-transmission of cancelled HARQ-ACK with reduced HARQ-ACK payload size if necessary.

Proposal 9: it is necessary to remove unusable candidate PDSCH reception in type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook from the following cases:

* A K1 value is corresponding to only one DCI format
* A TDRA entry is corresponding to only one DCI format

### R1-2100911 Discussion on UE feedback enhancements for HARQ-ACK China Telecom

***Proposal 1: To avoid SPS HARQ-ACK dropping for TDD systems, support HARQ-ACK deferring until a next (e.g., first) available PUCCH as a prior option.***

***Proposal 2: SPS HARQ-ACK is deferred until a next (e.g., first) available PUCCH only when it collides with semi-statically configured DL symbol or SSB symbol.***

***Proposal 3: The available PUCCH for SPS HARQ-ACK deferring is consist of at least semi-static uplink symbol(s).***

***Proposal 4: Reuse the Rel-15/Rel-16 mechanism for SPS HARQ-ACK feedback to multiplex the deferred SPS HARQ-ACK with other HARQ-ACK and determine the PUCCH resource.***

***Proposal 5: When a PUCCH HARQ-ACK codebook only contains HARQ-ACK for SPS PDSCH, and all of the HARQ-ACK for these SPS PDSCH are going to be NACK, the UE does not send the PUCCH.***

***Proposal 6: Support sub-slot based PUCCH repetition as well as PUCCH format 0/2 repetition in Rel-17. For PUCCH repetition in multiple sub-slots, the same PUCCH resource (starting symbol, duration and PRB number) is used in each sub-slot.***

***Proposal 7: Retransmission of cancelled HARQ should be studied with low priority as the use case depends on the outcome of intra UE multiplexing discussion.***

***Proposal 8: If PUCCH carrier switching is supported in Rel-17, it is switched based on static predefined rules for both dynamically scheduled PDSCH and SPS PDSCH HARQ-ACK feedback.***

### R1-2100920 UE feedback enhancements for HARQ-ACK TCL Communication Ltd.

**Observation 1: If the determination of this available PUCCH is performed by UE, it may be misalignment between the base station and UE.**

**Proposal 1: The PUCCH which carries the deferred HARQ-ACK feedback should be the first instance of PUCCH which does not collide with any invalid or downlink symbols and this PUCCH resource should not be restricted to the PUCCH for SPS only.**

**Proposal 2: Flexible symbol(s) should be used as available PUCCH resource for transmitting the deferred HARQ-ACK feedback.**

**Proposal 3: The total number of deferred HARQ-ACK bits needs to be limited**

**Proposal 4: The time interval between the deferred HARQ-ACK feedback and receiving the corresponding SPS PDSCH should not exceed the maximum value of k1.**

**Proposal 5: Candidate k1 value(s) should be provided for UE to determine the available PUCCH for transmitting deferred HARQ-ACK feedback.**

**Observation 2: Reuse Type-3 HARQ-ACK codebook in Rel-16 to retransmit the dropped SPS HARQ-ACK feedback would lead to redundancy overhead.**

**Proposal 6: The enhancement for reducing the Type-3 HARQ-ACK codebook size should be studied, e.g. only transmitting the dropped HARQ-ACK processes or SPS HARQ processes.**

**Proposal 7: Using one-shot HARQ-ACK codebook for retransmission of dropped SPS HARQ-ACK feedback and cancelled HARQ-ACK feedback should be discussed separately.**

**Proposal 8： ACK skipping and/or NACK skipping mechanism for shorter SPS periodicity or multiple SPS configurations should be supported.**

**Proposal 9： HARQ bundling/compression should be supported especially for jitter handling.**

### R1-2100948 UE feedback enhancements for HARQ-ACK NEC

**Proposal 1:**

* *Semi-static HARQ-ACK codebook for sub-slot based HARQ-ACK feedback procedure should be supported in Rel-17.*

**Proposal 2:**

* *When DL and UL are configured with same numerology, the sub-slot based semi-static HARQ-ACK codebook can be determined based on following three-steps:*
  + *Step 1: Determine the HARQ-ACK multiplexing window based on the HARQ-ACK timing set and sub-slot length.*
  + *Step 2: Split the TDRA table into N sub-tables based on the sub-slot length and PDSCH-to UL sub-slot association. N is the number of sub-slots within a slot.*
  + *Step 3: Do pruning based on TDD configuration and sub-table per sub-slot similar as Rel-15.*
* *When DL and UL are configured with different numerologies, further study the sub-slot based semi-static HARQ-ACK codebook determination.*

**Proposal 3:**

* *In case PUCCH resource for SPS HARQ-ACK is not available due to collision with DL symbol or flexible symbol, support deferring HARQ-ACK for SPS PDSCH until a next available PUCCH* 
  + *The next available PUCCH is the earliest PUCCH resource not overlapped with invalid symbol among next PUCCH resources configured for SPS PDSCH and indicated for dynamic scheduled PDSCH.*
    - *If the number of HARQ-ACK bits carried in a configured PUCCH resource exceeds the value M, then the PUCCH resource is not valid for the delayed HARQ-ACK.*
  + *Support multiplexing the delayed HARQ-ACK for SPS PDSCH and HARQ-ACK for dynamically scheduled PDSCH(s) on a HARQ-ACK codebook.*
    - *Append the delayed HARQ-ACK bits for SPS PDSCH after the HARQ-ACK codebook for dynamically scheduled PDSCH(s).*

**Proposal 4:**

* *Support dynamic triggering of a one-shot / Type-3 CB type of HARQ-ACK re-transmission for SPS PDSCH due to collision between PUCCH resource and invalid symbol.* 
  + *Following options can be considered to reduce the Type-3 HARQ-ACK codebook size:*
    - *Alt.1: The requested HARQ-ACK codebook contains the number of all DL HARQ processes for all the configured/activated SPS configuration(s) in the activated CC(s).*
    - *Alt.2: The requested HARQ-ACK codebook contains only the number of DL HARQ processes for the indicated SPS configuration(s) in the activated CC(s).*
    - *Alt.3: The requested HARQ-ACK codebook contains a set of DL HARQ processes for the configured/activated SPS configuration(s) in the activated CC(s).*
  + *FFS the PUCCH resource determination for the triggered Type-3 HARQ-ACK codebook for SPS PDSCH only.*

**Proposal 5:**

* *Support skipping PUCCH transmission if all HARQ-ACK bits in the PUCCH resource for SPS PDSCH only are NACK.*

**Proposal 6：**

* *Further study whether support dynamic indication of skipped SPS PDSCH occasions in Rel-17.*

**Proposal 7：**

* *Support semi-static indication for PUCCH carrier switching for HARQ-ACK in Rel-17.*

**Proposal 8：**

* *Further study the PUCCH power control if PUCCH carrier switching for HARQ-ACK is supported.*

**Proposal 9:**

* *The Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook ACK/NACK bits will only be present if the corresponding slot or sub-slot has at least one PDCCH transmission, and the reliability of Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook for URLLC service can be further enhanced by the reuse of DAI counters.*

### R1-2100968 Discussion on UE feedback enhancements for HARQ-ACK Asia Pacific Telecom, FGI

Observation 1 Both a high priority HARQ-ACK codebook and a low priority HARQ-ACK codebook may be cancelled.

Proposal 1 The maximum number of slots that can be deferred for SPS HARQ-ACK is configured per SPS configuration.

Proposal 2 The first available PUCCH resource for a SPS HARQ-ACK is defined as the first PUCCH resource selected from SPS-PUCCH-AN-List in a slot after the original slot indicated by K1 for the SPS HARQ-ACK, based on the payload size of deferred SPS HARQ-ACK and non-deferred SPS HARQ-ACK in the slot, if the symbols conatining the PUCCH resource includes semi-UL symbols in the slot. FFS if the first PUCCH resource includes semi-flexible symbols.

Proposal 3 Study mechanism for retransmission of high priority HARQ-ACK codebook and low priority HARQ-ACK codebook using enhanced Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook and Type-3 HARQ-ACK codebook as a starting point.

Proposal 4 Support triggering a Type-3 HARQ-ACK codebook by a DCI indicating low priority or indicating high priority.

Proposal 5 Determine whether to support PUCCH carrier switching between different PUCCH cell groups.

Proposal 6 Support dynamic indication (e.g., DCI field) for PUCCH carrier switching for HARQ-ACK.

Proposal 7 Some semi-static rules for PUCCH carrier switching for HARQ-ACK could be considered.

Proposal 8 Consider a configurable indication for selecting between dynamic indication and semi-staic rule as a compromised option.

### R1-2100993 HARQ-ACK feedback enhancement for IIoT/URLLC Lenovo, Motorola Mobility

* **Observation 1: In SPS operation for IIoT, delaying HARQ-ACK feedback beyond a certain time may not be useful, since the communication service may be considered unavailable after survival time.**
* **Proposal 1: Define the maximum allowed HARQ-ACK feedback delay for a given SPS PDSCH or a set of consecutive SPS PDSCHs.**
* **Proposal 2: If UE cannot transmit HARQ-ACK information within the configured maximum HARQ-ACK feedback delay, the UE may discard the HARQ-ACK information.**
* **Proposal 3: Support deferred HARQ-ACK transmission with concatenation of a delayed HARQ-ACK codebook and a current scheduled HARQ-ACK codebook to construct an aggregated HARQ-ACK codebook.**
* **Proposal 4: Support one shot HARQ-ACK transmission for all HARQ processes in a CG-PUSCH resource.**
* **Proposal 5: In NR URLLC Rel-17, support skipping of HARQ-ACK feedback (both ACK and NACK) for a consecutive number of instances:**
  + **Number of consecutive instances for skipping HARQ-ACK can be configured by gNB depending upon of the survival time requirement for the application (this avoids any ambiguity for HARQ-ACK codebook construction)**
* **Observation 2: Configuring a UE with multiple PUCCH carriers and allowing the UE to dynamically switch across the configured PUCCH carriers can provide the UE with more HARQ-ACK transmission opportunities under dynamic TDD operation.**
* **Proposal 6: Support dynamic PUCCH carrier switching, in order to avoid frequent cancellation of HARQ-ACK transmission for SPS PDSCHs with short periodicities.**

### R1-2101013 Discussion on UE feedback enhancements for HARQ-ACK Panasonic Corporation

**Proposal 1: For support avoiding SPS HARQ-ACK dropping for TDD, both Option 1 and Option 2 are supported in Rel.17.**

* **Option 1: Deferring HARQ-ACK until a next (e.g., first) available PUCCH**
* **Option 2: Dynamic triggering of a one-shot / Type 3 CB type of retransmission**

**Proposal 2: For deferring HARQ-ACK until a next available PUCCH (Option 1),**

* **On determining a next available PUCCH, at least semi-static UL symbols that are not SS/PBCH block symbols should be considered.**
* **On PUCCH resource for the next available PUCCH, PUCCH resource for SPS PDSCH (PUCCH resources configured in sps-PUCCH-AN-List-r16) should be considered.**

**Proposal 3: For Dynamic triggering of a one-shot / Type 3 CB type of retransmission (Option 2)**

* **The design should be unified for SPS HARQ dropping for TDD and retransmission of cancelled HARQ-ACK.**
* **Instead of reporting HARQ-ACK for all configured HARQ processes, only transmitting SPS HARQ processes or dropped HARQ processes can be considered.**

**Observation 1: The motivation to considering ‘skipped’ SPS PDSCH should be clarified.**

**Observation 2: In low BLER operation, ACK skipping is more reasonable than NACK skipping.**

**Observation 3: Involving HARQ codebook may not provide gain of HARQ skipping.**

**Proposal 4: ACK skipping for SPS PDSCH is supported for one or two bits HARQ-ACK case.**

**Proposal 5: Sub-slot-based PUCCH repetition is supported in Rel.17.**

**Proposal 6: For sub-slot-based PUCCH repetition, PUCCH formats 0 or 2 should also be applicable for PUCCH repetition.**

**Proposal 7: Dynamic indication of the number of repetitions to be specified in NR coverage enhancement should also be applicable to sub-slot-based PUCCH repetition.**

### R1-2101039 Discussion on UE feedback enhancements for HARQ-ACK CMCC

**Proposal 1: Support defer HARQ-ACK for SPS PDSCH to next (e.g., first) available PUCCH resource in case it collides with downlink symbols configured by TDD-UL-DL-ConfigCommon/Dedicated.**

**Proposal 2: For definition of next available PUCCH resource, the following alternatives can be further studied:**

* **Alt.1: first in time -after the instant of deferred SPS HARQ-ACK, available set of symbols without DL symbol(s) configured by TDD-UL-DL-ConfigCommon or TDD-UL-DL-ConfigDedicated;**
* **Alt.2: periodically configured PUCCH resource/slot, and UE could expect that the configuration of periodic PUCCH resource/slot is always aligned with semi-static UL/DL configuration;**
* **Alt 3: PUCCH resources for SPS HARQ-ACK only (PUCCH resources configured in sps-PUCCH-AN-List-r16)**
* **Alt 4: PUCCH resources for dynamic HARQ-ACK (PUCCH resources configured in PUCCH-ResourceSet)**

**Proposal 3: Support defer HARQ-ACK for SPS PDSCH to a first slot/sub-slot containing the available PUCCH resource defined in proposal 2.**

**Proposal 4: It is supported that deferred SPS HARQ-ACK is multiplexed with dynamic scheduled HARQ-ACK in a same HARQ-ACK codebook.**

**Proposal 5: Both type-1 and type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook construction need to be enhanced to accommodate the deferred SPS HARQ-ACK bits.**

**Proposal 6: For type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook, if the originally configured or defined K1 set is {K1,1, K1,2……K1,n}, it should be updated to be the union of { K1,1 ，K1,1+T-1 },{ K1,2 ，K1,2+T-1 }…{ K1,n ，K1,n+T-1 }, where T is the periodicity in semi-static UL/DL configuration or the periodicity of periodically configured PUCCH resource/slot.**

**Proposal 7: For type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook, the total bits to be appended for one activated SPS configuration needs to contain all the HARQ-ACK bits for SPS PDSCH reception activated from slot n- K1,c -T+1 to slot n- K1,c, where K1,c is the PDSCH-to-HARQ-feedback timing value in DCI activating the corresponding SPS configuration.**

**Proposal 8: For SPS HARQ skipping for ‘skipped’ SPS PDSCH, dynamic indication of skipped SPS PDSCH occasions is supported.**

**Proposal 9: Support Type 1 HARQ codebook based on sub-slot PUCCH config in R17.**

### R1-2101075 UE feedback enhancements for HARQ-ACK ETRI

**Proposal 1**: **Adopt Option 2 (re-transmitting HARQ-ACK) and further discuss Option 1 (deferring HARQ-ACK).**

**Proposal 2**: **Type-3 HARQ-ACK codebook having a subset of configured HARQ process is considered.**

**Proposal 3**: **For skipped SPS PDSCH, the ‘NACK skipping’ is introduced.**

**Proposal 4**: **The ‘NACK skipping’ is applicable only when one SPS HARQ-ACK bit is present.**

**Proposal 5**: **When more than one bits of SPS HARQ-ACK is transmitted, the HARQ-ACK bundling is introduced to reduce the overhead.**

**Proposal 6**: **Sub-slot based PUCCH repetition is supported, and additionally consider more repetition factors are required.**

**Proposal 7**: **The scheduling DCI can indicate the repetition factor for PUCCH.**

### R1-2101114 UE feedback enhancement for HARQ-ACK Xiaomi

*Proposal 1: The definition of “next available PUCCH” should consider payload size for each PUCCH resource to avoid unbalanced payload issue.*

***Proposal 2: gNB can take load balancing into consideration and explicit or implicit indicate the mapping rule of actual SPS PDSCH (M) transmission and available PUCCH resources (N) within a time window based on slot configuration period.***

***Proposal 3: As for*** ***dynamic triggering of a one-shot / Type-3 CB type of re-transmission, some enhancements can be considered for HARQ-ACK codebook reduction.***

***Proposal 4: Alt 1 and alt 2 for SPS HARQ payload size reduction should be discussed jointly with SPS HARQ-ACK skipping for ‘skipped’ SPS PDSCH and we prefer alt1.***

***Proposal 5: For alt 3and alt 4, HARQ bundling granularity or certain SPS configurations can be configured by gNB through RRC signal and mechanism can be dynamically triggered by gNB through MAC-CE/DCI.***

***Proposal 6: Retransmission of cancelled HARQ issue can be discussed jointly with the alt 2 of “SPS HARQ-ACK dropping for TDD systems”.***

***Proposal 7: It is better to support Back-to-back PUCCH repetition for short format PUCCH, and support Sub-slot based PUCCH repetition for long format PUCCH respectively.***

***Proposal 8: Enhancement for Type 1 HARQ codebook based on sub-slot PUCCH config should be low priority.***

### R1-2101201 On HARQ-ACK reporting enhancements Samsung

**Proposal 1: Support option 1 (deferring HARQ-ACK until a next available PUCCH) for SPS HARQ-ACK dropping in TDD.**

**Proposal 2: Support using PUCCH resources configured in both *sps-PUCCH-AN-List-r16* and *PUCCH-ResourceSet* to transmit HARQ-ACK of SPS PDSCH in TDD.**

**Proposal 3: SPS HARQ-ACK skipping for ‘skipped’ SPS PDSCHs is not supported.**

**Proposal 4: Support skipping of a PUCCH transmission with NACK-only HARQ-ACK information.**

**Proposal 5: Support sub-slot based PUCCH repetitions for all PUCCH formats.**

**Proposal 6: Use an UL grant scheduling a PUSCH without UL-SCH to request HARQ-ACK information that was multiplexed in a dropped PUSCH/PUCCH transmission.**

**Proposal 7: Consider potential support of Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook based on sub-slot PUCCH configuration subject to minimal additional specification/implementation complexity.**

* **Determine candidate UL sub-slots and corresponding DL slots for candidate PDSCH receptions based on the HARQ-ACK timing set (sub-slot-level K1) and number of UL sub-slots *N* per UL slot on top of existing procedure for different DL/UL numerologies.**
* **Do pruning based on TDD configuration and SLIVs for each DL slot, wherein the SLIVs end in candidate UL sub-slots.**

**Proposal 8: Consider potential Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook enhancements for intra slot repetition and for removing duplicated HARQ-ACK information in Rel-17.**



**Figure 2. An example of extended SLIV for intra slot repetition**

**Proposal 9: Consider only inter-band CA for supporting PUCCH cell selection for PUCCH transmission in Rel-17.**

**Proposal 10: The HARQ-ACK timing indicator counts only slots with PUCCH resources for PUCCH carrier switching.**

**Proposal 11: Maintain PUSCH reception robustness due to multiplexing 1-2 HARQ-ACK bits from dynamic scheduling also when multiple HARQ-ACK bits from SPS PDSCH receptions are multiplexed in the PUSCH.**

### R1-2101290 HARQ-ACK enhancements for IIoT and URLLC InterDigital, Inc.

***Proposal 1:*** *The UE can be dynamically triggered to transmit Type-3 HARQ-ACK CodeBook to retransmit a dropped SPS HARQ-ACK.*

***Proposal 2:*** *The UE can be triggered to transmit only the SPS HARQ-ACK(s) of PUCCH(s) that collide with DL or flexible symbols.*

***Proposal 3:*** *To reduce the SPS HARQ payload size:*

* *The UE can be configured to skip NACK transmission or skip ACK transmission (Alt. 1 and Alt2) per SPS configuration.*
* *The UE can be configured to disable HARQ-ACK transmission per SPS configuration (Alt. 4)*

***Proposal 4:*** *The UE can skip NACK transmission for skipped SPS PDSCH (Alt. 1).*

***Proposal 5:*** *The UE can retransmit a cancelled HARQ using enhanced Type 3 CB.*

### R1-2101378 Views on UE feedback enhancements for HARQ-ACK Apple

**Observation: If non-integer periodicity for DL SPS can be configured, HARQ feedback overhead can be reduced compared with solutions available in Rel-16.**

**Proposal 1: Without changing the current SPS configuration design, consider the introduction of jitter window around a nominal arrival time to limit occasions for DL SPS reception and HARQ generation/feedback.**

**Proposal 2: HARQ bundling is supported for non-skipped SPS PDSCHs. With N SPS PDSCH transmission occasions within a jitter window, bits are used for code states which include the successful/failed decoding at one of those N occasions or no detection of PDSCH at any of those N occasions.**

**Proposal 3: to control feedback overhead, the presence of NDI and utilization of CBG based feedback can be separately configured for code states in the “priority indicator”.**

### R1-2101459 HARQ-ACK enhancement for IOT and URLLC Qualcomm Incorporated

***Proposal 1: gNB explicitly requests via DCI for a UE to transmit modified HARQ-ACK codebook Type 3, in which the UE reports #N (a number N of) HARQ-ACK feedback for #N SPS HARQ-IDs occurring after a time instant t0.***

***Proposal 2: Study the following two options for empty SPS indication.***

* ***Option 1: Explicit DCI indicating a single or multiple empty (‘skipped’) SPS PDSCH occasion.***
* ***Option 2: send a special DMRS sequence on nominal DMRS OFDM symbols in a SPS occasion to indicate the SPS occasion is empty.***

***Proposal 3:* *Support dynamic bundling/compression of UCI.***

***Proposal 4: Support modified HARQ-ACK codebook Type 3 for retransmission of cancelled HARQ-ACK.***

***Proposal 5: Support compress multiple messages in HARQ-ACK codebook with small probability into a single message, to reduce HARQ-ACK payload size.***

***Proposal 6: Support NACK only HARQ-ACK feedback in which only NACK transmission takes place and ACK is skipped.***

***Proposal 7: With PUCCH carrier switch, similar to Rel-15, the slot to transmit HARQ-ACK follows the K1 indicated in DCI, and the granularity of K1 follows the numerology of PCC.***

***Proposal 8: With PUCCH carrier switch, the following static rule is applied to determine the CC to transmit HARQ-ACK, in a given slot.***

* ***The lowest indexed CC which has enough UL OFDM symbols to accommodate the HARQ-ACK PUCCH resource is selected to transmit the HARQ-ACK.***

***Proposal 9: In Rel-17, do not support simultaneous HARQ-ACK transmission on multiple CCs.***

***Proposal 10: Use MAC-CE to switch between multiple sub-slot configurations for HARQ-ACK feedback.***

***Proposal 11: Support sub-slot based Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook construction in NR Rel-17. A PDSCH occasion (i.e., time-domain resource allocation) is associated with an uplink sub-slot that contains the end of the PDSCH occasion.***

### R1-2101539 UE feedback enhancements for HARQ-ACK Sharp

**Proposal 1:**

* To avoid SPS PDSCH HARQ-ACK dropping for TDD, the SPS HARQ-ACK is allowed to be transmitted in a later PUCCH by deferring HARQ-ACK until the first available valid PUCCH resource.

**Proposal 2:**

* **‘NACK skipping’ for (skipped) SPS PDSCH is supported**.

**Proposal 3:**

* As a potential solution for retransmission of cancelled HARQ and/or SPS HARQ-ACK dropping, support Type-3 HARQ-ACK codebook corresponding to mixed priorities.

### R1-2101612 Discussion on HARQ-ACK feedback enhancements for Rel.17 URLLC NTT DOCOMO, INC.

**Proposal 1: Support both option 1 and option 2 to avoid SPS HARQ-ACK dropping for TDD.**

**Proposal 2: The “next available PUCCH resource” is the PUCCH resource in the earliest sub-slot/slot after the K1 indicated sub-slot/slot considering at least following conditions:**

* **the PUCCH resource in the sub-slot/slot doesn’t exceed latency limitation (e.g. K1)**
* **the PUCCH in the sub-slot/slot has no collision with any invalid symbol, where the invalid symbol includes semi-static DL symbol and semi-static flexible symbol when SFI is configured.**

**Proposal 3: Possible PUCCH resource can be SPS HARQ-ACK resource and dynamic HARQ-ACK resource.**

**Proposal 4: The “next available PUCCH resource” can consider an additional condition that “REs of the PUCCH resource in the sub-slot/slot allowed for SPS HARQ-ACK deferring can be configured/indicated by NW”.**

**Proposal 5: SPS HARQ-ACK can be deferred when conditions for latency and TDD collision are satisfied.**

* **With regard to TDD collision condition, SPS HARQ-ACK deferring can be applied for SPS HARQ-ACK dropping due to collision with semi-static DL symbol and SSB/CORESET#0 symbol, and also collision with semi-static flexible symbols considering SFI indication/missing and DL grant DCI.**

**Proposal 6: If SPS HARQ-ACK is deferred to a slot/sub-slot where UE will report HARQ-ACK (with the same priority) indicated by K1 (i.e. non-deferred HARQ-ACK), one HARQ-ACK CB is generated for deferred SPS HARQ-ACK bits and non-deferred HARQ-ACK bits.**

* **If the non-deferred HARQ-ACK bits include HARQ-ACK associated with DCI(s), PUCCH resource is determined based on the PRI indicated by associated DCI(s).**
* **If the non-deferred HARQ-ACK bits only include SPS HARQ-ACK without associated DCI,** 
  + **If the determined PUCCH resource is valid, HARQ-ACK will be reported on the PUCCH.**
  + **If the determined PUCCH resource is invalid, SPS HARQ-ACK will be further deferred if deferring condition is met.**

**Proposal 7: For HARQ-ACK CB construction for SPS HARQ-ACK deferring**

* **If UE reports only deferred SPS HARQ-ACK information in the HARQ-ACK CB, simply order deferred SPS HARQ-ACK bits.**
* **If UE reports non-deferred HARQ-ACK information and deferred SPS HARQ-ACK information in the HARQ-ACK CB, deferred SPS HARQ-ACK bits are appended after non-deferred bits.**
* **For ordering deferred SPS HARQ-ACK bits, Rel.16 SPS HARQ-ACK bit order principle as in clause 9.1.2 of TS38.213 can be the baseline, i.e. based on serving cell index, SPS configuration index, SPS PDSCH slot index.**

**Proposal 8: Discuss whether DCI 1\_1 can be simultaneously configured with one-shot HARQ-ACK feedback and priority indicator field existing in DCI 1\_1. If permitted, discuss how to construct type 3 HARQ-ACK CB considering different priorities of HARQ-ACK for different HARQ process IDs.**

**Proposal 9: If optimization for type 3 HARQ-ACK size reduction is supported, reported HARQ-ACK in type 3 is determined as HARQ-ACK bits of HARQ-ACKs in a time window.**

**Proposal 10: Support DCI indicating skipping pattern for multiple SPS PDSCH occasions. More details need to be further studied such as DCI format, indication for one or multiple SPS configurations, skipping pattern application time and update, etc.**

**Proposal 11: For SPS HARQ payload size reduction (of non-skipped SPS PDSCH),**

* **Support HARQ-ACK bundling in condition that dynamic indicated SPS skipping pattern is supported.**
* **FFS whether to support ACK skipping in condition that dynamic indicated SPS skipping pattern is supported.**
* **FFS whether to support HARQ-ACK disabling /skipping for certain SPS configurations, including details on whether/how to skip HARQ-ACK of SPS PDSCH for the case when SPS HARQ-ACK and dynamic HARQ-ACK to be reported in one type 1 HARQ-ACK CB.**
* **NACK skipping is not supported.**

**Proposal 12: Support repetition of short PUCCH formats and sub-slot based PUCCH repetition.**

**Proposal 13: Support one-shot HARQ feedback for the retransmission of cancelled HARQ.**

**Proposal 14: Support type 1 HARQ codebook for sub-slot based HARQ-ACK feedback in Rel.17.**

**Proposal 15:**

* **Further study PUCCH carrier switching for HARQ feedback based on the outcome of the processing order of intra-UE UL multiplexing/prioritization and UL cancellation due to TDD configuration in Rel.16 URLLC.**
* **Only focus on PUCCH carrier switching based on semi-static configuration if PUCCH carrier switching is supported.**

### R1-2101675 Discussion on HARQ-ACK enhancement for URLLC/IIoT WILUS Inc.

* ***Proposal 1: Support option 1, i.e., Deferring HARQ-ACK until a next (e.g., first) available PUCCH, and discuss whether to support option 2 for the cancelled HARQ-ACK (not only for SPS HARQ-ACK).***
* ***Proposal 2: The DL and flexible symbols configured by semi-static DL/UL configuration are considered to determine SPS PUCCH collision.***
* ***Proposal 3: Further consider the following two options to define the next available PUCCH slot with considering latency and balance of SPS HARQ-ACK.***
* ***Proposal 4: The PUCCH resources for HARQ-ACK information of SPS configuration(s) are considered as the available valid PUCCH resource.*** 
  + ***FFS: if multiple SPS PDSCHs are configured***
  + ***FFS: when SPS release DCI is received***
* ***Proposal 5: If SPS HARQ-ACK skipping is supported in Rel-17 URLLC/IIoT WI, one of ACK skipping or NACK skipping can be configurable to a UE per SPS configuration.***
* ***Proposal 6: One-shot HARQ-ACK codebook is used for re-sending of cancelled HARQ-ACK information and the following should be further enhanced.***
  + ***Reduction of Type-3 CB size, Determination of type-3 CB priority, Support of DCI format 1\_2 triggering type-3 CB, and inclusion of HARQ-ACK of SPS release DCI.***
* ***Proposal 7: To support type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook with sub-slot K1 granularity, the following general rules are considered.***
* For a given (***sub-slot-level***) K1 value *k1*, find the DL slot corresponding to the UL sub-slot *n*-*k1.*
  + Validity of each SLIV in a TDRA table *R* for the DL slot is checked. The invalid SLIVs are removed from the TDRA table *R*.
    - The validity is checked based on semi-static UL/DL configuration, i.e., if a symbol corresponding to an SLIV overlaps with semi-static UL symbol, then the SLIV is invalid.
    - And the validity is further checked based on the last symbol of an SLIV, i.e., the last symbol of an SLIV does not overlaps with the UL sub-slot *n-k1*, then the SLIV is invalid.
  + If the TDRA table *R* is not empty, then generate type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook for the DL slot.
    - If a UE has no capability to receive more than one unicast PDSCH per DL slot, then one HARQ-ACK occasion is added to the type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook.
    - If a UE has capability to receive more than one unicast PDSCH per DL slot, overlapping of SLIVs are further checked and then find a set of SLIVs to be represented as one HARQ-ACK occasion.