3GPP TSG RAN WG1 #105-e R1-2106063

e-Meeting, May 12th – 20th, 2021

Source: Moderator (OPPO)

Title: Summary#2 of email thread [104b-e-NR-R17-IIoT\_URLLC-04]

Agenda Item: 8.3.3

Document for: Discussion and Decision

# Introduction

In this paper, discussions under the following email thread in RAN1#105-e are summarized.

[105-e-NR-R17-IIoT-URLLC-04] Email discussion on intra-UE multiplexing/prioritization – Jia (OPPO)

* 1st check point: 5/21
* 2nd check point: 5/25
* Final check: 5/27

# Framework for intra-UE multiplexing/prioritization (order, slot/sub-slot mux, >2 channels)

## Agreements in previous meetings

Agreements:

*For multiplexing UCIs of different priorities in a PUCCH in R17,*

* *Support of multiplexing between different resources not confined within a sub-slot if conditions are met*
  + *FFS: Details*
* *Support multiplexing in case a PUCCH overlaps with more than one PUCCH if conditions are met*
  + *FFS details*

## Potential frameworks

From E/// Tdoc:



**Figure 1: Rel-17 A1 and A2 candidate frameworks for Intra-UE multiplexing of overlapping PUCCHs/PUSCHs**



**Figure 2: Rel-17 B1 and B2 candidate frameworks for simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH transmission of overlapping PUCCHs/PUSCHs. In case of B1, B2 is discarded and vice-versa**.

Figure 3: Rel-17 A1-B1, A2-B1 and A2-B2 candidate frameworks for intra-UE multiplexing of overlapping PUCCH/PUSCH enabled with simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH. In case of B1, B2 is discarded and vice-versa.



Figure 4: Examples of overlapping resolution of PUCCHs/PUSCHs in a PUCCH group with single carrier based on different candidate frameworks



Figure 5: Examples of overlapping resolution of PUCCHs/PUSCHs in a PUCCH group with inter-band carriers based on different candidate frameworks

From Apple Tdoc:

Diagram

Description automatically generated

Figure 3 Alt. 1 of Rel-17 UCI multiplexing flow

Diagram
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Figure 5 Alt. 2 of Rel-17 UCI multiplexing flow

## Proposals from Tdocs

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Proposals/observations from Tdocs |
| Ericsson | 1. Prioritize work to stablish early on a common understanding on the overall framework of the expected procedures than detailed solutions. 2. Investigate the candidate frameworks A1, A2, B1, B2 and their combinations for gain and complexity analysis, starting with B2 and A2-B2. 3. Consider investigating the complexity of potential features for multiplexing UCI with different priority in PUCCH/PUSCH. |
| HW | ***Proposal 9: The discussion about multiplexing more than 2 PUCCHs should be postponed until the multiplexing rules for two colliding PUCCHs are agreed.***  ***Observation 2: If simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH transmission of different PHY priorities over different cells is configured, the prioritization of LP PUCCH/PUSCH can be performed as follows.***   * ***Step 1: Perform the multiplexing of LP PUCCH(s)/PUSCH assuming no overlapping HP UL channels and determine the final LP PUCCH/PUSCH;***   *Step 2: Judge whether the final LP PUCCH/PUSCH is overlapping with any HP UL channels before and/or after multiplexing of HP UL channels, and if an overlapping happens on the same serving cell or cells within the same band, the LP PUCCH/PUSCH is dropped.* |
| Nokia | **Proposal 3.13: For handling the scenarios where a PUCCH of a given priority crosses the sub-slot boundary of the PUCCH config of another priority and overlaps with a PUCCH of another priority, adopt the following procedure:**   * **Multiplexing of low-priority PUCCH and high-priority PUCCH, is allowed only if this multiplexing is done on a high-priority PUCCH resource. In addition:**    + **UE does not expect an overlap between the resulting PUCCH resource to be used for multiplexing and another high-priority PUCCH;**   + **and if the resulting PUCCH resource overlaps with a low-priority PUCCH, the low-priority PUCCH is then dropped.**   + **Additional conditions are FFS.**   **Proposal 3.14: For handling the scenarios with more than two overlapping PUCCHs of different priorities, adopt the following procedure:**   * **Allow a single checking/multiplexing step between channels of different priorities, where in case multiplexing is feasible:**    + **UE does not expect an overlap between the resulting resource to be used for multiplexing and a high-priority PUCCH;**   + **and if the resulting PUCCH resource overlaps with a low-priority PUCCH, the low-priority PUCCH is then dropped.**   ***Observation 3.3: Multiplexing of more than one PUCCH carrying HARQ-ACK on a PUSCH of different priority should not be supported, as the multiplexing is also not supported for the same priority.***  ***Observation 3.4: Multiplexing of more than one high-priority PUCCH, where one of them is carrying HARQ-ACK and the other one carrying SR, on a low-priority PUSCH could be supported.***  ***Observation 3.5: Potential multiplexing restrictions or partial UCI dropping for low-priority UCI of more than one overlapping PUCCH multiplexed on an overlapping high-priority PUSCH may be acceptable, whereas partial dropping or multiplexing restrictions of high-priority UCI is not acceptable.***  **Proposal 3.22: RAN1 needs to take the cases of more than two overlapping channels (involving at least one PUSCH) of different priorities into account when deciding whether to support certain multiplexing enhancements in first place. This is specifically important when considering the support of multiplexing of high-priority UCI on low-priority PUSCH.** |
| ZTE | ***Proposal 12:*** *Determine the multiplexing rules for the UCI multiplexing rules of more than two overlapping PUCCHs with different priorities after the UCI multiplexing rules for two overlapping PUCCHs is clear.* |
| vivo | ***Proposal 21: To avoid the dropping of LP UCI, the overlapping handling order may need be reconsidered.***  ***Proposal 22: It should be clarified whether and how the two mechanisms i.e., simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH of different priorities and multiplexing of different priorities can be configured to work together.*** |
| CATT | ***Proposal 1: The time unit of high priority PUCCH is used as the time unit for multiplexing.***  ***Proposal 2: For a low priority PUCCH which goes across multiple time units for multiplexing, the low priority PUCCH joins the multiplexing procedure in each of the overlapping time units for multiplexing from the first overlapping time unit, unless the low priority PUCCH is determined to be dropped or multiplexed with other channels.***  ***Proposal 14: For overlapping between PUCCH and multiple PUSCHs with different priorities, it is proposed that UCI of PUCCH is multiplexed on a PUSCH with different priority only when there is no PUSCH with same priority overlaps with the PUCCH.*** |
| CMCC | **Proposal 3: Support multiplexing in case a PUCCH overlaps with more than one PUCCH with principle of ensuring the performance of each HP PUCCH.**  **Proposal 4: The low priority PUCCH and the first high priority PUCCH satisfying the multiplexing conditions are multiplexed only if the PUCCH carrying multiplexed UCI(s) do not overlap with any other high priority PUCCH.**  **Proposal 8: Multiplexing in case a PUSCH/PUCCH overlaps with more than one PUCCH/PUSCH is supported with principle of ensuing the performance of each HP PUCCH/PUSCH.** |
| Intel | **Proposal 15: Instead of two-step approach, consider joint multiplexing of UCIs of different priorities into a PUCCH resource if UE supports intra-UE multiplexing across different priorities.**  **Proposal 17: If a PUSCH overlaps with two sub-slot based PUCCHs, multiplex the UCIs from the PUCCHs onto the PUSCH if timeline conditions are met. If timeline conditions are not met, drop the low priority channel and transmit the high priority channel.**   * **FFS: whether to apply Rel16 intra-UE prioritization in this case.**   **Proposal 18: If a PUCCH overlaps with two PUSCHs, following behaviors can be considered, assuming timeline conditions are met:**   * **If PUCCH is of high priority, PUCCH is multiplexed onto first PUSCH.** * **If first (second) PUSCH is of high (low) priority, UCI from PUCCH is multiplexed onto second PUSCH if the PUCCH is of low priority.**   **Proposal 19: If a PUSCH overlaps with a PUCCH repetition in a slot, multiplex the UCI onto the PUSCH and drop the PUCCH repetition.**   * **FFS whether this is only applicable if PUSCH is of high priority and/or PUCCH is of low priority.**   **Proposal 20: If UE is configured with both simultaneous PUSCH and PUCCH transmissions over different carriers and Rel16 or Rel17 intra-UE prioritization, option of simultaneous transmissions should take precedence over the intra-UE prioritization.** |
| Apple | **Proposal 2-1: Study alternatives with introducing an inter-L1 priority PUCCH multiplexing with PUCCH resources Z as inputs.** |
| TCL | **Proposal 4: The scenario of multiplexing more than two overlapping channels should be further studied.** |
| ETRI | **Proposal 2: Multiplex HP UCI, and check to multiplex each LP UCI at earliest order.** |
| NEC | ***Proposal 4:*** *Further study the order of prioritization or multiplexing for collision cases involving PUSCH and PUCCH with different priorities when simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH transmission of different priorities over different cells is configured.* |
| Samsung | **Observation 2: For determination of the PUCCH time unit for handling PUCCH collisions with different PUCCH time units (i.e. slot and sub-slot PUCCH configuration) of different priorities, when A LP HARQ-ACK PUCCH overlaps with more than one HP sub-slot, at least following cases should be considered.**   * **Case 1) Each HP sub-slot contains zero or more HP SR PUCCH resource.** * **Case 2) Each HP sub-slot contains zero or one HP HARQ-ACK PUCCH resource.** * **Case 3) Each HP sub-slot contains zero or more HP SR PUCCH resource and zero or one HP HARQ-ACK PUCCH resource.** * **Note: Multiplexing of PUCCH with different priorities is performed within a PUCCH time unit (i.e. either within a slot or a sub-slot). E.g. for each PUCCH time unit, put all the associated PUCCHs (e.g. for a same priority, associated PUCCHs are the PUCCHs within the PUCCH time unit) in the corresponding set Q and then reuse Rel-15/Rel-16 rules.** * **Aiming to reuse Rel-15/16 pseudo code for PUCCH multiplexing with limited optimization.**   **Proposal 10: The time unit for solving the collision of PUCCHs with different L1 priority indexes should be the HP PUCCH time unit.**   * **If a LP HARQ-ACK PUCCH overlaps with multiple HP PUCCH time units, determine an associated HP PUCCH time unit for the LP HARQ-ACK PUCCH.**    + **FFS details.**   **Proposal 11: Down select from the following options for multiplexing/prioritizing LP HARQ-ACK PUCCH, HP HARQ-ACK PUCCH and HP SR PUCCH on a same PUCCH. FFS potential enhancements.**   * **Option 1) All PUCCHs are viewed with same priority – Rel-15 multiplexing applies.** * **Option 2) First, multiplex overlapping HP HARQ-ACK PUCCH and LP HARQ-ACK, then multiplex resulting PUCCH and SR PUCCH (if there is overlapping)**   **Proposal 12: Consider solutions to ensure the reliability of data in a HP PUSCH if a LP Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook is multiplexed in the HP PUSCH.**  **Proposal 13: Determine order for resolving overlapping among HP/LP PUCCHs and HP/LP PUSCHs.**  **Observation 4: Support of simultaneous PUCCH and PUSCH transmissions need not have any RAN1 specification impact other than that a UE does multiplex UCI of an overlapping PUCCH in a PUSCH on an SCell (and instead transmits the PUCCH on the primary cell and the PUSCH on the SCell).**  **Proposal 15: For UCI to be multiplexed on a PUSCH, the following conditions should be satisfied.**   * **Simultaneous PUSCH and PUCCH transmission does not apply.** * **The PUSCH satisfies the reliability requirements of the UCI.** * **FFS potential solutions to ensure the reliability of UCI on a LP PUSCH.** |
| LGE | **Proposal #4: Discuss and decide the overall multiplexing procedures/steps for the inter-priority multiplexing of UCIs on PUCCH/PUSCH.**   * **It is desirable to proceed the multiplexing and transmission at least for HP PUCCH/PUSCH (if the timeline requirements among the HP PUCCH/PUSCH are met) even in case when the timeline requirements with LP are not met.**   **Proposal #17: Consider the framework designed in Rel-10 LTE-A as the baseline for supporting simultaneous transmission of PUCCH and PUSCH in Rel-17 NR.** |
| Xiaomi | ***Proposal 3: When a LP PUCCH overlaps with multiple HP PUCCHs contained in multiple subslots, whether multiplexing timeline is met is only determined by the LP PUCCH and HP PUCCH(s) contained in one subslot, rather than by the LP PUCCH and HP PUCCH(s) in all the subslots.***  ***Proposal 11: The R16 agreement about multiplexing/cancelling order is not applicable in some cases and needs to be reconsidered. It is more nature for UE to operate in a“first come first process” manner.*** |
| DCM | **Proposal 12:**  For overlapping of more than two PUCCHs/PUSCHs with same and different priorities, two options should be considered for muliplexings:   * Option 1: Resolve overlapping among HP and LP PUCCHs first. Then resolve PUCCH and PUSCH overlapping. * Option 2: Resole overlapping among UL channels with the same priority (as in Rel-16) first. Then resolve overlapping among different priorities.   **Proposal 13:**  For the case when one PUCCH overlaps with multiple PUSCHs of the different priority, how to select the multiplexed PUSCH needs to be discussed.  **Proposal 14:**  For the case when one PUCCH including HP and LP UCI overlaps with multiple HP and LP PUSCHs , how to multiplex HP and LP UCI needs to be discussed.  **Proposal 15:**  For the case when one HP/LP PUCCH overlapping with a LP/HP PUCCH overlaps with LP/HP PUSCH(s) simultaneously, multiplexing behavior needs to be clarified.  **Proposal 16:**   * *Discuss processing order of intra-UE multiplexing with different priorities and cancellation due to dynamic SFI/UL CI/semi-static TDD and SSB.* |
| MTK | 1. Multiplexing allowed only if the resulted PUCCH is confined within the sub-slot of the HP-PUCCH sub-slot. |
| Moto/Leno | * **Proposal 5:** If a PUCCH resource to multiplex HP UCI and LP UCI overlaps in time with one or multiple PUSCHs including at least one HP PUSCH, a PUSCH to multiplex the HP UCI and the LP UCI is selected from the at least one HP PUSCH. * **Proposal 6:** If a PUCCH resource to multiplex HP UCI and LP UCI overlaps in time with one or multiple PUSCHs without at least one HP PUSCH, a PUSCH to multiplex the HP UCI and the LP UCI is selected according to Rel-15 PUSCH selection rules. |

## 1st round discussion

Void.

## 2nd round discussion

For triggering the discussion in this part, the following proposals are suggested first. Your suggestion on other proposals are welcome.

Proposal for 2nd round discussion:

For handling the scenarios with more than two overlapping PUCCHs of different priorities, consider the following options:

Option 1: Use R15 multiplexing as baseline, i.e. a single checking/multiplexing step among all channels.

Option 2: Allow a single checking/multiplexing step between channels of different priorities after multiplexing (if any) between overlapping channels of the same priority is already done.

Status: Most of companies support the proposal with FFS points suggested by Samsung.

Proposal for 2nd round discussion:

For handling the scenarios where a PUCCH of a given priority crosses the sub-slot boundary of the PUCCH config of another priority and overlaps with a PUCCH of another priority, adopt the following procedure:

* The time unit of high priority PUCCH is used as the time unit for multiplexing of low-priority PUCCH and high-priority PUCCH.
* The low priority PUCCH performs multiplexing or dropping procedure in the first overlapping time unit.
  + The low priority PUCCH is not considered in the later time unit.

Status: Some companies support the proposal with replacing second sub-bullet with FFS point suggested by Samsung. Some companies suggest to postpone the discussion.

Proposal for 2nd round discussion:

If simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH over different cells is configured,

* Perform PUCCH/PUSCH multiplexing per priority per PUCCH group
* If an overlap still happens on the same cell or cells within the same band, the LP PUCCH/PUSCH is dropped.
* Then perform simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH over different cells.

Status: Most of companies suggest to postpone the discussion. Some companies provide options.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Sony | Perhaps we can consider these issues after we sort out the basic collision of one LP UCI + one HP UCI first. |
| QC | For first proposal, we prefer option 1 because of its simplicity. Option 2 has extra steps than option 1. We are open to discuss if there is any benefit of option 2 over option 1.  For second proposal, we don’t see the urgency to discuss it now. This multiplexing with mixed slot-based and sub-slot based channels can be studied later, after we solve the issue of multiplexing channels with same time unit.  For the third proposal. On this topic, the procedure seems very simple as below.  If simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH over different cells is configured,   * The PUCCH/PUSCH on different cells are transmitted simultaneously * The PUCCH/PUSCH on a same cell are multiplexed, following the same procedure with simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH disabled.   We don’t see why in the FL proposal there is dropping based on priorities involved. |
| Apple | We are thankful to FL’s effort to start the discussion on a very important topic, we support proposal 1, proposal 2 seems reasonable, but it may be better to discuss the issue together with the case sub-slot boundary is not crossed for a unified solution. |
| Sharp | Thanks for the effort of discussing the framework. However, the more than 2 channel cases may be discussed after 2 channel cases are concluded.  For Proposal 1, we prefer Option1. For Proposal 2, we support the principle to use time unit of HP PUCCH for collision resolution.  We agree with QC on Proposal 3. Multiplexing/dropping is applied if the cell cannot perform simultaneous transmission. Also, whether simultaneous transmission is limited to different priorities or can be applied for the same priority should be determined by simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH first. |
| LG | Thanks FL for the update.  We are fine with Proposal 1.  On Proposals 2 and 3, it seems a bit premature to discuss/decide them at this stage, then it is better to focus basic case, e.g., multiplexing of LP/HP PUCCH/PUSCH with same time unit, as Sony and QC commented. |
| Samsung | Thank you FL for the proposals, we really should start the discussion of multiple overlapping channels. This is a complicated issue and cannot be avoided in Rel-17. If we postpone the discussion until we are clear about two overlapping channels, we cannot finish the issue of more than two overlapping channel before the end of the year. To avoid long CR phase discussion, we encourage companies to start to discuss the issue ASAP.  For the first proposal, we think it is too early to only consider the two options, the possible cases should be identified first. For example, at least following cases should be considered.    Case a    Case b    Case c    Case d  To make progress we can compromise with the following update to clarify that other options are not excluded.  For handling the scenarios with more than two overlapping PUCCHs of different priorities, consider the following options:  Option 1: Use R15 multiplexing as baseline, i.e. a single checking/multiplexing step among all channels.  Option 2: Allow a single checking/multiplexing step between channels of different priorities after multiplexing (if any) between overlapping channels of the same priority is already done.  Other options are not excluded.  Note: the candidate cases should be identified first.  For the 2nd proposal, we are fine with the first sub-bullet, for the 2nd sub-bullet, more discussions are necessary, for example, a LP HARQ-ACK overlaps with 2 HP sub-slots, there is no HP PUCCH in the first HP sub-slot but there is HP HARQ-ACK in the 2nd HP sub-slot. The 2nd sub-bullet does not work in this case. Similar as the first proposal, we think the candidate cases should be identified first. We suggest the following update  For handling the scenarios where a PUCCH of a given priority crosses the sub-slot boundary of the PUCCH config of another priority and overlaps with a PUCCH of another priority, adopt the following procedure:   * The time unit of high priority PUCCH is used as the time unit for multiplexing of low-priority PUCCH and high-priority PUCCH. * FFS: How to determine an associated HP PUCCH time unit for the LP HARQ-ACK PUCCH if the LP HARQ-ACK PUCCH overlaps with multiple HP PUCCH time units. * ~~The low priority PUCCH performs multiplexing or dropping procedure in the first overlapping time unit.~~    + ~~The low priority PUCCH is not considered in the later time unit.~~   For the third proposal, we do not agree with the proposal. The UE should not have yet another multiplexing procedure depending on whether PUSCH + PUCCH is supported. Also, the UE should not have yet another multiplexing procedure depending on whether or not HP/LP multiplexing is supported (when PUSCH + PUCCH is supported). There should be no change to any multiplexing procedure because of PUSCH+PUSCCH – only at the final step, PUSCHs on a SCell can be ignored. Basically, we do not agree with introducing even more UE procedures to resolve overlapping just because of PUSCH + PUCCH. |
| Quectel | For the 1st proposal, we are fine to discuss these options.  For the 2nd and 3rd proposals, similar views as some other companies. We can firstly focus on the basic case (i.e., one-one multiplexing) then come back to the more complicated cases. |
| DOCOMO | Thank you FL for kicking-off the discussion.  On the 1st proposal, we generally fine with the FL proposal but Samsung’s suggestion seems reasonable. Among the current potential options, we prefer Option 1 because of its simplicity but we are open to discuss it further for down-selection.  On the 2nd proposal, we think this should be discussed after we solve the issue of multiplexing channels with same time unit, i.e. slot vs. slot and sub-slot vs. sub-slot.\  On the 3rd proposal, we share same view as QC. |
| ITRI | Support first proposal with option 1.  For the second and third proposals, share same views with LG |
| Spreadtrum | Fine with the first proposal.  For the 2nd proposals, the solutions for more general cases, such as more than two overlapping PUCCHs, should be determined first, before we go into more special crossing sub-slot boundary cases.  For the 3rd proposals, agree with QC’s view. |
| vivo | For the 1st proposal, we are fine.  For the 2nd proposal, we don’t see the urgency to discuss it now. In addition, we don’t think different time units are needed for Rel-16 prioritization and Rel-17 multiplexing of UCI with different priorities.  For the 3rd proposal, it is not clear to us.  For the second sub-bullet, we think the overlapping may include the overlapping of HP PUCCH+LP PUCCH on the same cell, or HP PUCCH +LP PUSCH on the same cell or cells within same band, or LP PUCCH+HP PUSCH on the same cell or cells within same band, HP PUSCH +LP PUSCH on the same cell. We think the overlapping of HP PUSCH and LP PUSCH on the same cell should be solved firstly before the handling of PUCCH/PUSCH. |
| CATT | We are fine with the first proposal. Between the two options, we prefer option 1 which is simpler.  For the second proposal, we are fine with the first bullet but not fine with the second bullet. Our proposal is that for a low priority PUCCH which goes across multiple time units for multiplexing, the low priority PUCCH joins the multiplexing procedure in each of the overlapping time units for multiplexing from the first overlapping time unit, unless the low priority PUCCH is determined to be dropped or multiplexed with other channels.  For the third bullet, we also prefer to revisit later. |
| ZTE | Fine with the proposal 1 to further discussion, for option 1, if the timeline is not satisfied, all the overlapping channels will be dropped according to Rel-15 principle, so I slightly prefer option 2.  On the second proposal, I think the second sub-bullet need more study, I agree with the revision from Samsung, add a FFS for the second sub-bullet.  On the third proposal, I assume the simultaneous PUCCHs transmission on different cells is not our common intention. Then it seems multiplexing/dropping on one cell before considering the simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH on different cells is reasonable.  I agree with most of above companies’ comments that proposals 2 and 3 are bit premature to discuss/decide them at this stage. |
| Nokia, NSB | **- For the first and second proposal**: although we discuss some of these aspects in our Tdoc, we are fine to discuss the related issues later (after concluding on the basic aspects).  **- For the third proposal**, if the inter-band simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH transmission of different priorities is configured, the impact is only on the prioritization process between the final LP channel and the overlapping HP channels. Therefore, the overall procedure can be simplified as:  Step 1: The UE performs PHY multiplexing decision for low priority channels – and determines the final LP UL transmission.  Step 2:   * The UE determines the overlapping of the resulting LP channel with HP PUCCH/PUSCH before and/or after HP UL channel multiplexing across all serving cells.   Based on the overlapping determination, the UE cancels the resulting LP channel if overlapping with a HP channel across all serving cells of the same band. |
| Panasonic | We are fine with the first proposal.  On the second, proposal, we think it would be better to discuss after the issue of multiplexing channels with same time unit is solved. |
| OPPO | Support 3 proposals in principle  For proposal 1, we are open to other options. With respect to modification from **@Samsung**, we prefer to list some specific solutions as far as possible other than general description. With respect to candidate cases, the agreed cases should be considered and unified solution framework is our preference.  For proposal 2, in our understanding, discussion on time unit for multiplexing between overlapping channels with different *subslotLengthForPUCCHs* is an inevitable issue. Moreover, it does not depend on discussion for multiplexing between overlapping channels with the same *subslotLengthForPUCCH*. So we prefer to start to discuss it now.  We share the view as **@Spreadtrum** that the time unit determination for multiplexing between overlapping channels with different *subslotLengthForPUCCHs* should be a unified solution, regardless crossing sub-slot boundary or not. So we suggest to pick the 1st sub-bullet up as an separate proposal:  Proposal:  The time unit of high priority PUCCH is used as the time unit for multiplexing of low-priority PUCCH and high-priority PUCCH.  Proposal:  For handling the scenarios where a PUCCH of a given priority crosses the sub-slot boundary of the PUCCH config of another priority and overlaps with a PUCCH of another priority, adopt the following procedure:   * The low priority PUCCH performs multiplexing or dropping procedure in the first overlapping time unit.   + The low priority PUCCH is not considered in the later time unit.   With respect to case from **@Samsung**, the 2nd sub-bullet works. 2nd HP sub-slot is the first overlapping sub-slot, so LP will be multiplexed in the 2nd HP sub-slot.  For proposal 3, we support and we are also open to simple solution. However, in our understanding, the intention to support simultaneous PUCCH and PUSCH transmission is to avoid LP PUCCH drop. This is why we focus on case with different priorities in the following agreement.  Agreements:  Per UE with the capability of inter-band CA, simultaneous PUCCH and PUSCH transmission of different PHY priorities over different cells can be RRC configured within the same PUCCH group   * FFS: dynamic indication   So, in our understanding, simultaneous PUCCH and PUSCH transmission is enhancement based on intra UE prioritization. In proposal, step 1 and 2 is intra UE prioritization procedure and step 3 is simultaneous PUCCH and PUSCH to avoid LP PUCCH drop in one carrier due to HP channel from another carrier.  Certainly, we also can assume that simultaneous PUCCH and PUSCH transmission is decoupled from intra UE prioritization. But if UE supports R15 or R17 multiplexing, UCI in LP PUCCH can be transmitted, why do we support simultaneous PUCCH and PUSCH transmission? Hope to hear more views.  With respect to simplified solution proposed by **@Qualcomm**, especially for step 2. We agree the intention to strive to a unified solution whatever simultaneous PUCCH and PUSCH transmission is enabled or not. However, step 2 in QC’s proposal is not an existing multiplexing solution. R15 multiplexing and R16 intra UE prioritization is performed within one PUCCH group.   * R15 multiplexing: PUCCH/PUSCH multiplexing within one PUCCH group * R16 intra UE prioritization: PUCCH/PUSCH multiplexing per priority and prioritization between different priorities within one PUCCH group   So to follow procedure without simultaneous PUCCH and PUSCH transmission, we perform multiplexing within one PUCCH group other than within one carrier.  With respect to solution proposed by **@Nokia**, we are open but it depends on R16 prioritization discussion status. |
| Huawei | **For proposal 1**, we are supportive, and the modification by Samsung is also good for us.  **For proposal 2**, we share the same view with other companies that we may discuss it after the multiplexing rule for the same granularity is finished.  **For proposal 3**, we think it is too early to achieve an agreement now since it is coupled with proposal 1. E.g., if proposal 1 goes to Option 1, proposal 3 may also need to handle the inter-priority multiplexing on the first step to keep consistent, instead of “Perform PUCCH/PUSCH multiplexing **per priority**”. Therefore we propose to discuss the cross carrier simultaneous transmission issue after the multiplexing rule for per carrier is finished. |
| Intel | P1 and P2 are OK. For P3 agree with Nokia. |
| InterDigital | OK with proposal 1 and 2. For proposal 2, we also think the sub-bullet is OK.  For proposal 3, does this apply for the case where intra-UE multiplexing between different priorities is disabled? |
| Ericsson | 1st proposal:  In general, our view is closer to Option 1, i.e., Rel-15 procedure with suitable adjustments for the new UCI combinations. For the cases shown by Samsung, we consider them to be taken care of by the adjustments.  2nd proposal:   * Need to clarify that: time unit of PUCCH of high priority is expected to be equal to or smaller than that of low priority. * Change 2nd sub-bullet to: “The low priority PUCCH performs multiplexing or dropping procedure in the first overlapping time unit that contains high priority PUCCH”   3rd proposal:  Since simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH is supported at least for inter-band CA, we are fine to discuss this topic. On the other hand, the FL proposal is confusing to us on some basic understanding.   * 1st bullet: why mux per priority group? We think simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH can be used for same priority channels as well. * 2nd bullet: why “within the same band”? It’s FFS if simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH is supported for intra-band CA. This bullet precludes intra-band and we cannot agree at the moment. * 3rd bullet: our understanding is, in the end, simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH transmission is allowed over different cells for a given PUCCH group. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine with the first proposal.  For the second proposal, we suggest the following modification:  “For handling the scenarios where a PUCCH of a given priority crosses the sub-slot boundary of the PUCCH config of another priority and overlaps with a PUCCH of another priority, adopt the following procedure:   * The time unit of high priority PUCCH is used as the time unit for multiplexing of low-priority PUCCH and high-priority PUCCH. * FFS timing for multiplexing of LP PUCCH and HP PUCCH if the LP PUCCH overlaps with multiple HP PUCCH time units * ~~The low priority PUCCH performs multiplexing or dropping procedure in the first overlapping time unit.~~    + ~~The low priority PUCCH is not considered in the later time unit.”~~   For the third proposal, we think that overlapping handling for simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH over different cells can be discussed after deciding rules for one UL channel transmission. |
| APT/FGI | For the first proposal, we agree with Samsung that other options can be considered.  For the second proposal, it seems it does not work with option 2 in the first proposal, we think it can be discussed after the general framework is decided.  For the third proposal, the first step seems to assume option 2 in the first proposal. Clarification is needed. |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## 3rd round discussion

It is time to start the discussion, even although the simpler overlapping scenarios are prioritized. Studies on the topics below are encouraged even if the proposals are not agreed in this meeting. High-level principles are expected to be agreed in next meeting.

Proposal for 3rd round discussion:

For handling the scenarios with more than two overlapping PUCCHs of different priorities, consider the following options:

* Option 1: Use R15 multiplexing as baseline, i.e. a single checking/multiplexing step among all channels.
* Option 2: Allow a single checking/multiplexing step between channels of different priorities after multiplexing (if any) between overlapping channels of the same priority is already done.
* Other options are not excluded.
* Note: the candidate cases should be identified first.

Proposal for 3rd round discussion:

For handling the scenarios where a PUCCH of a given priority crosses the sub-slot boundary of the PUCCH config of another priority and overlaps with a PUCCH of another priority, adopt the following procedure:

* The time unit of high priority PUCCH is used as the time unit for multiplexing of low-priority PUCCH and high-priority PUCCH. (assuming the time unit of HP PUCCH is equal to or smaller than that of LP PUCCH.)
* FFS: How to determine an associated HP PUCCH time unit for the LP HARQ-ACK PUCCH if the LP HARQ-ACK PUCCH overlaps with multiple HP PUCCH time units. Options under consideration include:
  + Option 1: The low priority PUCCH performs multiplexing or dropping procedure in the first overlapping time unit that contains high priority PUCCH.

Proposal for 3rd round discussion:

If simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH over different cells is configured, further study the following options:

* Option 1:
  + The PUCCH/PUSCH on different cells are transmitted simultaneously
  + The PUCCH/PUSCH on a same cell are multiplexed, following the same procedure with simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH disabled.
* Option 2:
  + Perform PUCCH/PUSCH multiplexing per priority per PUCCH group
  + If an overlap still happens on the same cell or cells within the same band, the LP PUCCH/PUSCH is dropped.
  + Then perform simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH over different cells.
* Option 3:
  + Performs PHY multiplexing decision for low priority channels – and determines the final LP UL transmission.
  + The UE determines the overlapping of the resulting LP channel with HP PUCCH/PUSCH before and/or after HP UL channel multiplexing across all serving cells.
  + Based on the overlapping determination, the UE cancels the resulting LP channel if overlapping with a HP channel across all serving cells of the same band.
* Other options are not excluded.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| OPPO | Support all proposal in principle  For the second proposal, in our understanding, the intention of option 1 is the low priority PUCCH performs multiplexing or dropping procedure in the first overlapping time unit, in which the low priority channel overlaps with high priority channels.  “contains high priority PUCCH” is not accurate. If the first overlapping time unit includes high priority PUCCH, which does not overlap with low priority channel. The low priority channel can not perform multiplexing or dropping.  So we suggest to modify option 1   * + Option 1: The low priority PUCCH performs multiplexing or dropping procedure in the first overlapping time unit ~~that contains high priority PUCCH~~ ,in which the low priority channel overlaps with at least one high priority channel.   If I misunderstand the intention of option 1, we prefer to add option 2   * + Option 1: The low priority PUCCH performs multiplexing or dropping procedure in the first overlapping time unit that contains high priority PUCCH.   + Option 2：The low priority PUCCH performs multiplexing or dropping procedure in the first overlapping time unit, in which the low priority channel overlaps with at least one high priority channel. |
| ZTE | 1st proposal: Support  2nd proposal: Support, but one more options need to be considered as below:   * Option 2: The low priority PUCCH performs multiplexing or dropping procedure in the first overlapping time unit containing high priority PUCCH if overlapped low priority PUCCH and high priority PUCCH meet the multiplexing timeline. * Other options are not excluded   The reason for adding option 2 is, the first overlapping time unit may not satisfy the multiplexing timeline requirement. For example, if the UE capabilities are not same for high and low priority transmission, and N2 for high and low priority transmission are different, it is possible N2 of low priority transmission is larger than N2 of high priority transmission. Although LP transmission overlaps with the first time unit containing the HP transmission, but the multiplexing timeline of LP transmission is later than the first HP time unit and satisfy in the second HP time unit.    3rd proposal: Support in principle. Some comments are to be clarified.  Option 1: “The PUCCH/PUSCH on different cells are transmitted simultaneously”, if the different cells means intra band cells, this doesn’t satisfy the motivation of simultaneously transmission agreed in inter band. “The PUCCH/PUSCH on a same cell are multiplexed”, the same cell should include the cells in the same intra band.  Option 2: “Perform PUCCH/PUSCH multiplexing per priority per PUCCH group”, can we confirm the PUCCH group here is in the same band?  Option 2 and Option 3 don’t consider the multiplexing between different priorities which is under discussion in Rel-17. It should not only limit to Rel-16 dropping behavior. |
| CATT | For the first proposal, we do not quite understand the intention of the note. Does it mean that we need to identify all the cases before discussing the options? We do not think the note is needed. We are fine with the proposal without the note.  For the second proposal, we do not think “assuming …” in parentheses is needed. The reason to use time unit of HP PUCCH for multiplexing is that the UCI is multiplexed in the HP PUCCH resource regardless of duration of time units in our view. In addition, we propose to add option 2 for further discussion.  For handling the scenarios where a PUCCH of a given priority crosses the sub-slot boundary of the PUCCH config of another priority and overlaps with a PUCCH of another priority, adopt the following procedure:   * The time unit of high priority PUCCH is used as the time unit for multiplexing of low-priority PUCCH and high-priority PUCCH. ~~(assuming the time unit of HP PUCCH is equal to or smaller than that of LP PUCCH.)~~ * FFS: How to determine an associated HP PUCCH time unit for the LP HARQ-ACK PUCCH if the LP HARQ-ACK PUCCH overlaps with multiple HP PUCCH time units. Options under consideration include:   + Option 1: The low priority PUCCH performs multiplexing or dropping procedure in the first overlapping time unit that contains high priority PUCCH.   + Option 2: The low priority PUCCH joins the multiplexing procedure in each of the overlapping time units for multiplexing from the first overlapping time unit, unless the low priority PUCCH is determined to be dropped or multiplexed with other channels   For the third proposal, we still prefer to postpone the discussion. |
| Nokia, NSB | We are fine with all three proposals (assuming all the options there remain for the moment). |
| LG | Proposal 1: Fine with the proposal.  Proposal 2: Prefer to add another Option 2 as below, and not preclude other options at this stage.  **For handling the scenarios where a PUCCH of a given priority crosses the sub-slot boundary of the PUCCH config of another priority and overlaps with a PUCCH of another priority, adopt the following procedure:**   * **The time unit of high priority PUCCH is used as the time unit for multiplexing of low-priority PUCCH and high-priority PUCCH. (assuming the time unit of HP PUCCH is equal to or smaller than that of LP PUCCH.)** * **FFS: How to determine an associated HP PUCCH time unit for the LP HARQ-ACK PUCCH if the LP HARQ-ACK PUCCH overlaps with multiple HP PUCCH time units. Options under consideration include:**   + **Option 1: The low priority PUCCH performs multiplexing or dropping procedure in the first overlapping time unit that contains high priority PUCCH.**   + **Option 2: The low priority PUCCH performs multiplexing or dropping procedure in the first overlapping time unit that contains high priority HARQ-ACK.**   + **Other options are not precluded.**   Proposal 3: Prefer to postpone the discussion. |
| Sony | If the intention is to initiate discussion on multiple overlapping UCIs of different priorities, perhaps we do not need to narrow down the options at this point since some companies suggested other options. That is, we can simply agree on the following:  **Study the following scenarios:**   * **The handling of more than two overlapping PUCCHs of different priorties** * **The handling of a PUCCH that crosses sub-slot boundaries of the PUCCH config of another L1 priority and overlaps with a PUCCH of another priority** * **The handling of UCI multiplexing of different priorities when simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH transmission over different cells is configured**   Companies can then consider different options including those in this summary document. |
| Intel | Support P1  In P2 prefer to delete options under the FFS  In P3, agree it is premature to discuss |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# Multiplexing UCIs of different priorities in a PUCCH

## Agreements in previous meetings

Agreements:

*Support multiplexing for following scenarios in R17:*

* *Multiplexing a high-priority HARQ-ACK and a low-priority HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH in R17.*
* *Multiplexing a low-priority HARQ-ACK and a high-priority SR into a PUCCH for some HARQ-ACK/SR PF combinations (FFS applicable combinations).*
* *Multiplexing a low-priority HARQ-ACK, a high-priority HARQ-ACK and a high-priority SR into a PUCCH.*

*For the above multiplexing scenarios,*

* *FFS conditions, if needed, for the multiplexing, e.g*
  + *Whether to support multiplexing between different resources not confined within a sub-slot.*
  + *Whether to support multiplexing in case a PUCCH overlaps with more than one PUCCH.*
  + *Timeline requirements.*
* *FFS: details, if needed, of the multiplexing scheme, e.g.*
  + *How to minimize impact on the latency for high-priority HARQ-ACK.*
  + *How to determine the PUCCH resource used for multiplexing (e.g. HP or LP PUCCH resource, or a dedicated PUCCH resource for the multiplexing).*
  + *How to multiplex the HARQ-ACK bits (e.g. multiplexing, bundling).*
  + *How to encode the UCIs with different priorities (e.g. separate coding vs. joint coding)*
  + *How to guarantee the target code rate (e.g. payload control, multiplexing priority, LP HARQ-ACK compression/compaction).*
  + *Explicit indication for enabling multiplexing.*

*Multiplexing rule and order (e.g. HP/LP multiplexing is after resolving collision within the same priority).*

Agreements:

*For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH in R17, when the total number of LP and HP HARQ-ACK bits are more than 2 bits, down-select from the following options in RAN1#104-e:*

* *Option 1: Support joint coding.*
* *Option 2: Support separate coding.*
* *Option 3: Combination of Option1 and 2.*
* *FFS the details*

*For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH in R17, when the total number of LP and HP HARQ-ACK bits is 2 bits, provide design details for decision for the following cases in RAN1#104-e:*

* *Multiplexing on a PUCCH format 0*
* *Multiplexing on a PUCCH format 1*

Agreements:

*For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH in R17, support a mechanism for gNB to enable/disable the multiplexing.*

* *FFS the type of the mechanism, e.g. DCI indication and/or RRC configuration*
* *FFS: Interaction between the enable/disable mechanism and other multiplexing conditions*
* *FFS for other types of UCI.*

Agreements:

*For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH in R17,*

* *Use a PUCCH resource in the second PUCCH-Config (the PUCCH-config containing the PUCCH resource of the HP HARQ-ACK) at least in case the total number of LP and HP HARQ-ACK bits is more than 2.*
* *FFS: The PUCCH resource is configured dedicated for multiplexing of HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK.*
* *FFS in case the total number of LP and HP HARQ-ACK bits is 2.*
* *FFS details*

Working assumption:

*Reuse Rel-15 intra-UE PUCCH/PUSCH multiplexing timeline requirements for Rel-17 intra-UE PUCCH/PUSCH multiplexing with different priorities*

* *FFS whether or not to specify a different behavior than Rel-15 when the timeline requirements are not met*

Agreements:

*When a PUCCH carrying HP SR with PF0 overlaps with a PUCCH carrying LP HARQ-ACK with PF0, further study the following options (proponents are encouraged to provide more details and analysis):*

* *Opt.1: The positive SR and HARQ-ACK are multiplexed and transmitted on the SR resource.*
  + *Opt.1a: The UE does not transmit negative SR.*
  + *Opt.1b: For negative SR, the UE transmit only HARQ-ACK on the HARQ-ACK resource.*
  + *Opt.1c: For negative SR, the UE transmits SR and HARQ-ACK on the SR resource*
  + *FFS: whether with power boost to transmit multiplexed payload or not.*
* *Opt.2: The SR and HARQ-ACK are multiplexed and transmitted on the HARQ-ACK resource.*
  + *Opt.2a: If SR is positive, an offset (e.g. 1 PRB) is added to the starting PRB of the HARQ-ACK PUCCH resource.*
  + *Opt.2b: Using 4 CS values as for SR+1-bit HARQ-ACK in Rel-15/16. For the case of 2-bit HARQ-ACK, the HARQ-ACK is reduced/compressed to 1-bit.*
  + *Opt.2c: If SR is positive, SR is multiplexed on HARQ-ACK resource in the same way as Rel-15. If SR is negative, transmit only HARQ-ACK on HARQ-ACK resource.*
* *Opt.3: No enhancement over Rel-16.*
* *Other options not excluded.*
* *FFS: Whether/How to differentiate HP SR and LP SR when multiplexed with LP HARQ-ACK?*

Agreements:

*When a PUCCH carrying HP SR with PF0 overlaps with a PUCCH carrying LP HARQ-ACK with PF1, further study the following options (proponents are encouraged to provide more details and analysis):*

* *Opt.1: The positive SR and HARQ-ACK are multiplexed and transmitted on the SR resource.*
  + *Opt.1a: The UE does not transmit negative SR.*
  + *Opt.1b: For negative SR, the UE transmit only HARQ-ACK on the HARQ-ACK resource.*
  + *Opt.1c: For negative SR, the UE transmits SR and HARQ-ACK on the SR resource*
  + *FFS: whether with power boost to transmit multiplexed payload or not.*
* *Opt.2: The SR and HARQ-ACK are multiplexed and transmitted on the HARQ-ACK resource.*
  + *Opt.2a: If SR is positive, an offset (e.g. 1 PRB) is added to the starting PRB of the HARQ-ACK PUCCH resource.*
  + *Opt.2b: Applying QPSK for SR+1-bit HARQ-ACK. For the case of 2-bit HARQ-ACK, the HARQ-ACK is reduced/compressed to 1-bit.*
  + *FFS on conditions of multiplexing.*
* *Opt.3: For positive SR, transmit HARQ-ACK on the SR resource. For negative SR, transmit HARQ-ACK on the HARQ-ACK resource.*
* *Opt.4: For positive SR, transmit SR on the SR resource and drop HARQ-ACK. For negative SR, transmit HARQ-ACK on the HARQ-ACK resource.*
* *Opt.5: No enhancement over Rel-16.*
* *Other options not excluded.*
* *FFS: Whether/How to differentiate HP SR and LP SR when multiplexed with LP HARQ-ACK?*

Agreements:

*When a PUCCH carrying HP SR with PF1 overlaps with a PUCCH carrying LP HARQ-ACK with PF0, further study the following options (proponents are encouraged to provide more details and analysis):*

* *Opt.1: The SR and HARQ-ACK are multiplexed and transmitted on the SR resource.*
  + *Opt.1a: For positive SR, the UE transmits the PUCCH in the resource using PUCCH format 1 for SR. The value of cyclic shift of sequence, i.e., , of this PUCCH format 1 is determined by HARQ-ACK, and the bit, i.e., b(0), of this PUCCH format 1 is determined by SR. For negative SR, the UE transmits only a PUCCH with HARQ-ACK information and drops the PUCCH with negative SR.*
  + *Opt.1b: SR and HARQ-ACK are multiplexed and modulated to be transmitted on the SR resource*
* *Opt.2: The SR and HARQ-ACK are multiplexed and transmitted on the HARQ-ACK resource.*
  + *Opt.2a: If SR is positive, an offset (e.g. 1 PRB) is added to the starting PRB of the HARQ-ACK PUCCH resource.*
  + *Opt.2b: Using 4 CS values as for SR+1-bit HARQ-ACK in Rel-15/16. For the case of 2-bit HARQ-ACK, the HARQ-ACK is reduced/compressed to 1-bit.*
  + *Opt.2c: If SR is positive, SR is multiplexed on HARQ-ACK resource in the same way as Rel-15. If SR is negative, transmit only HARQ-ACK on HARQ-ACK resource.*
  + *Opt.2d: HP SR and LP HARQ-ACK are multiplexed by the Rel-15 cyclic shift only if latency requirement for HP SR is met. Otherwise, drop the LP HARQ-ACK and only transmit the HP SR on its resource.*
* *Opt.3: For positive SR, transmit HARQ-ACK on the SR resource. For negative SR, transmit HARQ-ACK on the HARQ-ACK resource.*
* *Opt.4: No enhancement over Rel-16.*
* *Other options not excluded.*
* *FFS: Whether/How to differentiate HP SR and LP SR when multiplexed with LP HARQ-ACK?*

Agreements:

*For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH in R17, when the total number of LP and HP HARQ-ACK bits is more than 2, support separate coding for the two HARQ-ACKs.*

* *FFS for HP HARQ-ACK or LP HARQ-ACK of 1-2 bit(s).*
* *(working assumption) Drop CSI (including part 1 and part2, if exist) if CSI would multiplex on a PUCCH which has HP A/N.*
  + *FFS Strive to let HP A/N reuse the encoder, rate matching equation, and RE mapping rules in Rel-15 for A/N+CSI-1.*
  + *FFS Strive to let LP A/N reuse the encoder, rate matching equation, and mapping rules in Rel-15 for CSI-2.*

## Coding, rate matching, RE mapping and power control

## Inputs from Tdocs

**Details of separate coding when the total number of LP and HP HARQ-ACK bits > 2:**

* **Encoder for HP HARQ-ACK or LP HARQ-ACK >2 bit(s):**
  + HP A/N reuse the encoder, rate matching equation, and RE mapping rules in Rel-15 for A/N+CSI-1.
  + LP A/N reuse the encoder, rate matching equation, and RE mapping rules in Rel-15 for CSI-2.
    - Nokia, ZTE, QC, vivo, Apple
  + Enhanced rate matching
    - OPPO, Quectel, DCM
  + Consider enhanced RE mapping
    - HW, Samsung
* **Encoder for HP HARQ-ACK or LP HARQ-ACK of 1-2 bit(s):**
  + Option 1: Separate coding
    - DCM, vivo, Sony
    - Option 1a:
      * HP A/N reuse the Rel-15 1-2 bits UCI coding methods, i.e., repetition code/simplex code.
      * LP A/N reuse the Rel-15 1-2 bits UCI coding methods, i.e., repetition code/simplex code.
      * E///, HW, QC, CATT, Quectel
    - Option 1b: Reuse the Rel-15 less than 3 bits CSI part 2 coding method for UCI on PUCCH, where zero(s) are appended to the UCI bit sequence to expand it to 3 bits before performing the RM coding.
      * HW, Samsung, LGE
    - Option 1c: (3,2) coding scheme for HP or LP HARQ-ACK with 2 bits and then repeat; Repetition scheme for HP or LP HARQ-ACK with 1 bit.
      * ZTE (simulation)
    - Option 1d: use RM coding without appending CRC
      * Intel
  + Option 5: Joint coding
    - China Telecom, Sharp
* **CSI dropping or not:**
  + Option 1: Confirm WA: Drop CSI (including part 1 and part2, if exist) if CSI would multiplex on a PUCCH which has HP A/N.
    - E///, HW, Nokia, QC, Quectel, Sony, Apple (for LP CSI)
  + Option 2: Drop CSI part 2 if CSI would multiplex on a PUCCH which has HP A/N. Drop CSI part 1 if resource is insufficient.
    - ZTE, LGE
* **Separate code rate configurations:**
  + Support gNB to configure coding rates separately for HP and LP HARQ-ACK.
    - QC (For a given priority, support gNB to configure multiple coding rates for HARQ-ACK based on the payload size), vivo, Spreadtrum, CMCC, Intel, Samsung, Sharp, WILUS
* **Separate power control configurations:**
  + Two open-loop power control P0 values are configured for multiplexing LP and HP UCI
    - QC

**When the total number of LP and HP HARQ-ACK bits is 2,**

* Option 1: Treat the two bits as HARQ-ACK bits with HP priority and following the existing mechanism.
  + HW, Nokia, ZTE, vivo, CATT, OPPO, ~~China Telecom,~~ Intel, Pana, NEC, ~~Samsung~~, Sharp
* Option 2:
  + For multiplexing on a PUCCH format 0, support HARQ-ACK values to CS indices mapping with unequal distance between mapped CS indices.
  + For multiplexing on a PUCCH format 1, support transmit the 2-bits HARQ-ACK values via two orthogonal sequences S1 and S2.
    - S1 and S2 are generated based on the same base sequence S with different CS indices CS1 and CS2.
    - 1-bit is transmitted via sequence selection between S1 and S2, while the other bit is transmitted using the selected sequence following legacy Rel-15 PF1 with 1-bit payload.
    - gNB can signal either HP 1-bit or LP 1-bit is transmitted via sequence selection.
  + QC (simulation), WILUS (only support enhancement for PF0)
* Option 3: Drop LP HARQ-ACK
  + Samsung

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Proposals/observations from Tdocs |
| E/// | 1. Support separate coding for LP and HP HARQ-ACK for all payload sizes, using the channel codes for small block lengths defined in Rel-15. 2. Allow CSI consisting of one part to be encoded together with LP HARQ-ACK and be multiplexed with HP HARQ-ACK. |
| HW | ***Proposal 2: For multiplexing HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK on PUCCH in case that the total number of bits is 2 bits, the 1-bit HP HARQ-ACK and the 1-bit LP HARQ-ACK are concatenated and transmitted on PUCCH format 0 or PUCCH format 1 following the existing mechanism.***  ***Proposal 3: For the encoders* *of LP and HP HARQ-ACK bits with more than 2 bits total payload***,   * ***Confirm the working assumption, i.e., drop CSI (including part 1 and part2, if exist) if CSI would multiplex on a PUCCH which has HP A/N.*** * ***HP HARQ-ACK can reuse the encoder and rate matching equation of Rel-15 HARQ-ACK+CSI part 1.*** * ***LP HARQ-ACK can reuse the encoder and rate matching equation of Rel-15 CSI part 2.*** * ***Separate PUCCH coding rates should be adopted for HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK.***   ***Observation 1: It is feasible to consider enhanced RE mapping rule in Rel-17 as the changing on RE mapping would be less challenging in implementation.***  ***Proposal 4: For multiplexing of HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK with more than 2 bits total payload and 1-2 bit(s) HP or LP HARQ-ACK, one of the following two alternatives can be considered for HP HARQ-ACK or LP HARQ-ACK of 1-2 bit(s):***   * ***Alt.1: Reuse the Rel-15 1-2 bits UCI coding methods for UCI on PUSCH, i.e., repetition code/simplex code.*** * ***Alt.2: Reuse the Rel-15 less than 3 bits CSI part 2 coding method for UCI on PUCCH, where zero(s) are appended to the UCI bit sequence to expand it to 3 bits before performing the RM coding.*** |
| Nokia | **Proposal 3.4: For the scenario where a PUCCH carrying high-priority HARQ-ACK overlaps with another PUCCH carrying low-priority HARQ-ACK and the total payload size is two bits, multiplexing can be done on the high-priority PUCCH resource by treating the two bits as high-priority HARQ-ACK bits and using existing rules of mapping two HARQ-ACK bits of the same priority. The order of the two bits could be [high-priority HARQ-ACK bit, low-priority HARQ-ACK bit].**  **Proposal 3.6: For the multiplexing of high-priority HARQ-ACK and low-priority HARQ-ACK where the high-priority or low-priority HARQ-ACK is 1-2 bits, adopt separate encoding:**   * **In case HARQ-ACK is 1 bit: use the existing 1-bit information encoding scheme in TS 38.212 Sec. 5.3.3.1 to encode this HARQ-ACK.** * **In case HARQ-ACK is 2 bits: use the existing 2-bit information encoding scheme in TS 38.212 Sec. 5.3.3.2 to encode this HARQ-ACK.**   **Proposal 3.7: Confirm the Working Assumption to not support multiplexing of CSI (include part 1 and part 2, if any) and high-priority HARQ-ACK and thus to drop the CSI and prioritize the high-priority HARQ-ACK.**  **Proposal 3.8: For the multiplexing of high-priority HARQ-ACK and low-priority HARQ-ACK, reuse Rel-15 operation for two UCI parts to determine the rate matching output sequence length for each of the high-priority HARQ-ACK and low-priority HARQ-ACK.**  **Proposal 3.9: For the multiplexing of high-priority HARQ-ACK and low-priority HARQ-ACK on PUCCH, adopt the Rel-15 operation of ‘multiplexing of coded UCI bits to PUCCH’ given in TS 38.212 Sec. 6.3.1.6.** |
| ZTE | ***Proposal 1:*** *Adopt (3,2) coding scheme for HP or LP HARQ-ACK with 2 bits and then repeat when the total payload of the UCIs is more than 2 bits.*   * *Note: (3,2) coding means (A,B) encodes to (A,B, A XOR B)*   In the same way, it is beneficial to use repetition scheme for HP or LP HARQ-ACK with 1 bits.  Table 1 Coding schemes for 2 information bits.   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Case 1 | (3,2) + repetition | | Case 2 | 2bits RM | | Case 3 | 2bits + "0" padding, RM, 3bits Decode | | Case 4 | 2bits + "1" padding, RM, 3bits Decode | | Case 5 | 2bits + "1" padding, RM, 2bits Decode |   Theoretically, the coding scheme with the largest minimum Hamming distance has the best performance.  The minimum Hamming distance of case 1 scheme is the largest among the 5 coding alternatives. Therefore, the performance is expected to be the best, which is verified in simulations. Here (3,2) coding means (A,B) encodes to (A,B, A XOR B).    Figure 1: Comparison of average performance of 2 bits among different coding schemes  ***Proposal 2:*** *Adopt repetition scheme for HP or LP HARQ-ACK with 1 bits when the total payload of the UCIs is more than 2 bits.*  ***Proposal 3:*** *When the two UCIs with different priorities will be multiplexed on a PUCCH format 2/3/4 by separate coding, for a certain priority UCI,*   * *If the payload size is more than 2 but less than 12, RM code is performed.* * *If the payload is more than 11 bits, Polar coding is performed.*   ***Proposal 4:*** *For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH in R17, when the total number of LP and HP HARQ-ACK bits is 2, treat the two bits as HARQ-ACK bits with HP priority, R15 design is reused without power boosting.*  ***Proposal 9:*** *Modify the working assumption:*  *Drop CSI part 2 if CSI would multiplex on a PUCCH which has HP A/N.*   * *HP A/N occupies one encoder chain.* * *LP A/N + CSI part 1(drop CSI part 1 if resource is insufficient) occupies the other encoder chain.* * *Intend to reuse the rate matching equation, and RE mapping principles in Rel-15.* |
| vivo | ***Proposal 3: For HP HARQ-ACK or LP HARQ-ACK of 1-2 bit(s), separate coding is suggested.***  ***Proposal 4: Confirm the working assumption that drop CSI (including part 1 and part2, if exist) if CSI would multiplex on a PUCCH which has HP A/N.***  ***Proposal 5: The following principle should be baseline for UCI multiplexing with different priorities***   * ***HP A/N reuse the encoder, rate matching equation, and RE mapping rules in Rel-15 for A/N+CSI-part 1.*** * ***LP A/N reuse the encoder, rate matching equation, and mapping rules in Rel-15 for CSI-part 2.***   ***Proposal 6: For both HP and LP A/N on PUCCH, two maximum code rates are configured for each PUCCH format corresponding to HP and LP HARQ-ACK, respectively.***  ***Proposal 11:*** ***For multiplexing a HP HARQ-ACK and a LP HARQ-ACK, when the total number of LP and HP HARQ-ACK bits is 2 bits.***   * ***On PUCCH format 0: HP HARQ-ACK bit and LP HARQ-ACK bit are mapped into a cyclic shift as in R15/R16.*** * ***On PUCCH format 1: HP HARQ-ACK bit and LP HARQ-ACK bit are modulated into a QPSK symbol as in R15/R16.*** |
| Spreadtrum | 1. ***For separate coding of the two HARQ-ACKs with HARQ-ACK bits being more than 2, the max coderates for HP and LP HARQ-ACK can be different.*** 2. ***Support separate coding if HP HARQ-ACK or LP HARQ-ACK is of 1-2 bit.*** |
| CATT | ***Proposal 3: For multiplexing of HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK when total number of bits is 2, 1 bit HP HARQ-ACK and 1 bit LP HARQ-ACK are treated as two HP HARQ-ACK bits and transmitted on the time-frequency resource for the HP HARQ-ACK transmission.***  ***Proposal 7: For multiplexing of HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK on PUCCH when total number of bits is more than 2 and when HP HARQ-ACK or LP HARQ-ACK includes only 1 or 2 bits, reuse the 1/2 bits coding scheme used for UCI on PUSCH.***  ***Proposal 8: For separate coding of HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK when multiplexing on PUCCH:***   * ***Let HP A/N reuse the encoder, rate matching equation, and RE mapping rules in Rel-15 for A/N+CSI-1;*** * ***Let LP A/N reuse the encoder, rate matching equation, and mapping rules in Rel-15 for CSI-2.*** |
| CMCC | **Proposal 5: For determining the code rates for HP UCI and LP UCI when multiplexing, two maxCodeRates can be configured for PUCCH resource used for multiplexing, one is used for LP UCI and the other is used for HP UCI.** |
| QC | ***Proposal 1*: For 1-bit high priority HARQ-ACK and 1-bit low priority HARQ-ACK transmitted in a PUCCH format 0 resource, support HARQ-ACK values to CS indices mapping with unequal distance between mapped CS indices.**   * **FFS: Solution for 1-bit HP HARQ-ACK and 1-bit LP HARQ-ACK multiplexing with 1-bit HP or LP SR on PUCCH format 0**   ***Proposal 2*: For 1-bit high priority HARQ-ACK and 1-bit low priority HARQ-ACK transmitted in a PUCCH format 1 resource, support transmit the 2-bits HARQ-ACK values via two orthogonal sequences S1 and S2.**   * **S1 and S2 are generated based on the same base sequence S with different CS indices CS1 and CS2.** * **1-bit is transmitted via sequence selection between S1 and S2, while the other bit is transmitted using the selected sequence following legacy Rel-15 PF1 with 1-bit payload.** * **gNB can signal either HP 1-bit or LP 1-bit is transmitted via sequence selection.**   **FFS: Solution for 1-bit HP HARQ-ACK and 1-bit LP HARQ-ACK multiplexing with 1-bit HP or LP SR on PUCCH format 1**  ***Proposal 3*: Confirm the working assumption in the following.**  **For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH in R17, when the total number of LP and HP HARQ-ACK bits is more than 2, support separate coding for the two HARQ-ACKs.**   * **FFS for HP HARQ-ACK or LP HARQ-ACK of 1-2 bit(s).** * **(working assumption) Drop CSI (including part 1 and part2, if exist) if CSI would multiplex on a PUCCH which has HP A/N.**   + **FFS Strive to let HP A/N reuse the encoder, rate matching equation, and RE mapping rules in Rel-15 for A/N+CSI-1.**   + **FFS Strive to let LP A/N reuse the encoder, rate matching equation, and mapping rules in Rel-15 for CSI-2.**   ***Proposal 4*: For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into PUCCH format 3 or format 4, when the total number of LP and HP HARQ-ACK bits is more than 2,**   * **With >2 bits HP A/N payload, HP A/N reuse the encoder, rate matching equation, and RE mapping rules in Rel-15 for A/N+CSI part 1. With <=2 bits HP A/N, HP A/N use repetition encoding (for 1 bit) or simplex encoding (for 2 bits), reuse rate matching equation, and RE mapping rules in Rel-15 for A/N+CSI part 1.** * **With >2 bits LP payload, LP A/N reuse the encoder, rate matching equation, and RE mapping rules in Rel-15 for CSI part 2. With <= 2 LP payload, LP A/N use repetition encoding (for 1 bit) or simplex encoding (for 2 bits), reuse rate matching equation, and RE mapping rules in Rel-15 for CSI part 2.** * **FFS: rate matching and RE mapping for HP and LP HARQ-ACK multiplexed on PUCCH format 2**   ***Proposal 5*: In NR Rel-17, for multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into PUCCH, when the total number of low priority (LP) and high priority (HP) HARQ-ACK bits is more than 2**   * **Support gNB to configure coding rates separately for HP and LP HARQ-ACK.** * **For a given priority, support gNB to configure multiple coding rates for HARQ-ACK based on the payload size.**   ***Proposal 6*: For HP UCI and LP HARQ-ACK (in type 2 codebook) multiplexing on a PUCCH, round up LP HARQ-ACK size to a nearest reference size, in the calculation of total number of RBs for HP and LP UCI.**  ***Proposal 8*: For HP UCI and LP UCI multiplexing on PUCCH format 2, support mapping encoded HP UCI bits first with a distributed RE mapping in frequency domain, followed by mapping encoded LP UCI bits onto remaining REs.**   * **FFS: how to determine distance d between adjacent REs in frequency domain for HP UCI.**   ***Proposal 9*: For HP UCI and LP UCI multiplexing on PUCCH format 2/3/4, support the following**   * **Two open-loop power control P0 values are configured for multiplexing LP and HP UCI** * **Two separate powers are computed for LP UCI and HP UCI (following TS 38.213 Section 7.2.1) based on the corresponding and BPRE for LP and HP UCI respectively, and based on the total number of RBs used to HP and LP UCI** * **The final PUCCH power is determined based on the max power of the HP and LP powers** |
| OPPO | ***Proposal 3: The rate matching output sequence lengths for HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK should be determined as follows***  ***Proposal 4:*** ***Except the determination of the number of PRBs for PUCCH transmission and the rate matching output sequence lengths for HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK, other Rel-15 procedures for multiplexing HARQ-ACK and CSI should be reused.***  ***Proposal 5: No enhancement is supported for multiplexing of 1-bit HP HARQ-ACK and 1-bit LP HARQ-ACK on a PUCCH format 0/1.***  ***Proposal 14: To support multiplexing UCI in one PUSCH with different priority, reuse the encoder, rate matching equation, and RE mapping rules in Rel-15:***   * + ***Treat HP HARQ-ACK as Rel-15 HARQ-ACK;***   + ***Treat LP HARQ-ACK as Rel-15 CSI-Part1;***   + ***Treat CSI-Part1 as Rel-15 CSI-Part 2;***   + ***CSI-Part 2 is dropped.*** |
| China Telecom | **Proposal 3: For multiplexing a HP HARQ-ACK and a LP HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH when the total number of bits is 2,**   * **Use R15 mapping rules for 2 bits HARQ-ACK as a baseline.** * **Use a PUCCH resource in the second *PUCCH-Config* (the *PUCCH-config* containing the PUCCH resource of the HP HARQ-ACK).**   **Proposal 4: For multiplexing a HP HARQ-ACK and a LP HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH when the total number of bits is more than 2, and the number of HP HARQ-ACK or LP HARQ-ACK bits is 1-2, support joint coding for the two HARQ-ACKs.** |
| Intel | **Proposal 3: When combined payload is 2 bits, multiplexing LP and HP HARQ-ACK bits follow Rel-15 approach assuming both bits are HP.**  **Proposal 4: Separate encoding of HARQ-ACK, SR, CSI Part1 and CSI Part 2 and the multiplexing procedure defined in Rel-15 can be used as a starting point for LP and HP HARQ-ACK multiplexing into a PUCCH in Rel-17.**  **Proposal 5: A set of *maxCodeRate* values canbe configured to UE for UCI multiplexing into PUCCH.**   * **FFS: Identification of applicable *maxCodeRate* value for PUCCH transmission**   **Proposal 6: At least PUCCH format 3 and 4 are supported for LP and HP HARQ-ACK multiplexing**   * **FFS: PUCCH format 2**   **Proposal 7: When LP or HP HARQ-ACK payload is less than 3 bits, use RM coding without appending CRC.** |
| Apple | **Proposal 5-1: considering coding rates of UCI parts in the PRB number adjustment/interlace number adjustment.**  **Proposal 5-2: The condition to trigger PRB number adjustment is given by**    **And the stop condition for PRB number adjustment is as follows:**    **Proposal 6-1: Consider different coding rates for UCI parts in UCI omission rule.**  **Proposal 6-2: With two UCI parts, the omission rule is as follows:**  **the following conditions are used for UCI omission:**    **If all UCI part II is dropped, then the the following is examined to determine remaining UCIs in UCI part I:**  **.**  **Proposal 9-1: leverage the Rel-15 design, LP HARQ-ACK is mapped to UCI Part II in separate encoding, adopt the UCI mapping in Figures 9-6a/9-6b.**  Text  Description automatically generated  Figure 9-6(a) UCI mapping for separate encoding of HP/LP HARQ-ACK (1),  Text  Description automatically generated  Figure 9-6(b) UCI mapping for separate encoding of HP/LP HARQ-ACK (2),  **Proposal 9-2:**  **Consider for PUCCH format 2 to support multiplexing of HP UCI(s) and LP UCI(s):**  **generating two encoded sequences for HP-ACK (with r1) and LP-ACK (with r2) separately and then concatenating those two encoded sequences into one encoded sequence, UCI mapping is not changed for PUCCH Format 2.** |
| Sony | **Proposal 1: Confirm the following working assumption:**  **For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH in R17, when the total number of LP and HP HARQ-ACK bits is more than 2, support separate coding for the two HARQ-ACKs.**   * **Drop CSI (including part 1 and part2, if exist) if CSI would multiplex on a PUCCH which has HP A/N.**   **Proposal 2: Encoded UCI symbols for HP UCI are mapped to earlier OFDM symbols of the PUCCH whilst those for LP UCI are mapped to later OFDM symbols.** |
| Quectel | **Proposal 1**: The working assumption is confirmed with clarification: Drop CSI (including part 1 and part2, if exist) if CSI would multiplex on a PUCCH which has HP A/N if CSI is for a report quantity as defined in Rel-15/16.  **Proposal 2**: Repetition coding or simplex coding is supported for HP HARQ-ACK or LP HARQ-ACK of 1-2 bit(s) when the total number of HP or LP HARQ-ACK bits multiplexed on the PUCCH is larger than 2.  **Proposal 3**: Placeholder bits “y” are introduced for the scrambling of PUCCH.  **Proposal 4**: Rate matching output sequence lengths respectively for HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK are computed based on a single coding rate  configured for HP HARQ-ACK when the total number of HP or LP HARQ-ACK bits multiplexed on the PUCCH is larger than 2.  **Proposal 5**: A configuration dedicated for HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK rate matching is supported when the total number of HP or LP HARQ-ACK bits multiplexed on the PUCCH is larger than 2. |
| NEC | ***Observation 1****: The straightforward method for multiplexing two Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebooks on a PUCCH by constructing two Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebooks separately as Rel-16 and pasting them together as a multiplexed HARQ-ACK codebook may lead to unnecessary redundancy.*  ***Proposal 1:***  *For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH in R17, support joint coding when the total number of LP and HP HARQ-ACK bits is 2.*  ***Proposal 2:***  *Support multiplexing of two Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebooks of different priorities on a PUCCH in Rel-17 as follows:*   * *Firstly, UE constructs the high-priority Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook based on K1 set of high-priority HARQ-ACK as Rel-16, and constructs low-priority Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook based on K1’ set obtained by removing values in the intersection of the two separate HARQ-ACK timing K1 sets of two Type-1 CBs from the K1 set of low-priority HARQ-ACK.* * *Then, UE pastes the two HARQ-ACK codebooks together as a multiplexed HARQ-ACK codebook.* |
| Samsung | **Proposal 3: Reuse Rel-16 for the case where a PUCCH with 1 bit LP HARQ-ACK overlaps with a PUCCH with 1 bit HP HARQ-ACK in the time domain.**  **Proposal 4: Zeros should be appended to the LP/HP HARQ-ACK information bits if the payload of LP/HP HARQ-ACK is less than 3 bits when multiplexing HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK in a PUCCH.**  **Proposal 6: When multiplexing a HP HARQ-ACK and a LP HARQ-ACK in a PUCCH format,**   * **Reuse the maxCodeRate configured in the second PUCCH-Config for HP HARQ-ACK.** * **Consider following two options to determine the maxCodeRate for LP HARQ-ACK.**   + **Option 1) Reuse the maxCodeRate configured in the first PUCCH-Config of the same PUCCH format.**   + **Option 2) RRC configures a separate maxCodeRate for LP HARQ-ACK per PUCCH format in the second PUCCH-Config.**   **Observation 1: Multiplexing of LP HARQ-ACK codebook and HP HARQ-ACK codebook with same and/or different HARQ-ACK codebook types can be enabled via the configuration for HP/LP multiplexing.**  **Proposal 7: Consider solutions to ensure the reliability of multiplexing of LP Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook and HP HARQ-ACK codebook and/or HP data.** |
| LGE | **Proposal #1: Consider the following aspects related to the support of separate coding for HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK multiplexed on a PUCCH.**   * **Bit-padding for HP/LP HARQ-ACK of up to 2 bits (to make 3-bit payload) in order to reuse current coding chains/procedures for UCI on PUCCH** * **Multiplexing of (separate encoding for) HP HARQ-ACK and CSI part 1 on at least PUCCH format 3/4 (by dropping CSI part 2)** * **Multiplexing of HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK by separate encoding for the two HARQ-ACKs on PUCCH format 2**   **Proposal #2: Decide UCI bit mapping used for cyclic shift or QPSK modulation for multiplexing of LP UCI and HP UCI on PUCCH format 0/1 with the total UCI payload size of 2 bits.**   * **HP UCI bit and LP UCI bit are mapped to MSB and LSB, respectively.** |
| Sharp | **Proposal 5: When the total number of LP and HP HARQ-ACK bits is 2 bits, the LP-HARQ-ACK is appended to HP HARQ-ACK, and the concatenated HARQ-ACK bits are reported on the original PUCCH resource for the HP HARQ-ACK.**  **Proposal 6: For UCI multiplexing on PUCCH, apply joint coding method at least to the cases when both HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK is up to 2 bits.**   * **FFS optimization on reporting joint HARQ-ACK bits on PUCCH format 0/1.**   **Proposal 7: For multiplexing a HP HARQ-ACK and a LP HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH with separate coding,**   * **Code rate for HARQ-ACK with different priorities are determined based on existing or additional maxCoderate parameters, or separate scaling factor configurations.** * **A HP PUCCH resource is selected based on a derived effective payload.** |
| DCM | **Proposal 1:**   * *It is preferred to support separate coding for the case where either of HP HARQ-ACK or LP HARQ-ACK is 1-2 bit(s) when the combined UCI bits are more than 2 bits, while we are open to discuss introduction of joint coding for the cases.*   **Proposal 2:**   * *Agree the working assumption for CSI dropping with small modification for rate-matching output sequence equation for separate coding of HP and LP HARQ-ACKs when the combined UCI bits are more than 2 bits.*   **Proposal 3:**   * *For separate coding, a scaling factor can be introduced for HP and LP UCI coding rate determination.* |
| Leno/Moto | * **Proposal 2:** Support indicating two values of *maxCodeRate*, a first value for HP UCI and a second value for LP UCI in a PUCCH configuration corresponding to a high priority index, in order to support different coding rates for HP UCI and LP UCI that are multiplexed in a PUCCH. |
| WILUS | * ***Proposal 1****. To determine a code rate for LP HARQ-ACK for multiplexing, consider the following two options.*   + *Option 1. Additional code rate for LP HARQ-ACK in a HP PUCCH format is configured by RRC.*   + *Option 2. Code rate configured in LP PUCCH format is reused.* * ***Proposal 2:*** *Further discuss whether/how to multiplex HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK in a PUCCH resource if the second PUCCH-Config contains only the first PUCCH resource (for 1- or 2-bit HARQ-ACK information).* * ***Proposal 3:*** *For PUCCH format 3/4,*    + *To maximize reliability of HP HARQ-ACK, the mapping rule of PUCCH format 3/4 in Rel-15 can be reused., i.e., the HP HARQ-ACK is mapped to adjacent symbols to DMRS symbols.*   + *To minimize latency of HP HARQ-ACK, the HP HARQ-ACK can be mapped to earlier symbols.* * ***Proposal 4:*** *For PUCCH format 2,*   + *Support PUCCH format 2 to multiplex with LP HARQ-ACK and HP HARQ-ACK*   + *To maximize a reliability of HP HARQ-ACK, the HP HARQ-ACK is distributed to REs across RBs as much as possible.* * ***Proposal 6:***    + *To multiplex with 1-bit LP HARQ-ACK and 1-bit HP HARQ-ACK in PF0, use the new CS mapping.*     - *CS=0, 3, 6, 9 for (HP HARQ-ACK, LP HARQ-ACK)=(NACK, NACK), (NACK, ACK), (ACK, NACK), (ACK,ACK) respectively*   + *To multiplex with 1-bit LP HARQ-ACK in PF1 and 1-bit HP HARQ-ACK in PF1, reuse Rel-15 multiplexing rules without any modification.* |

## 1st round discussion

Proposal for 1st round discussion:

Confirm the working assumption in the following:

For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH in R17, when the total number of LP and HP HARQ-ACK bits is more than 2, support separate coding for the two HARQ-ACKs.

* For HP HARQ-ACK or LP HARQ-ACK of 1-2 bit(s), support separate coding and reuse the Rel-15 1-2 bits UCI coding methods, i.e., repetition code/simplex code.
* For HP HARQ-ACK or LP HARQ-ACK >2 bit(s),
  + For HP A/N, Reuse the Rel-15 encoder for A/N+CSI-1.
    - FFS rate matching equation and RE mapping rules but treat Rel-15 as baseline.
  + For LP A/N, Reuse the Rel-15 encoder for CSI-2.
    - FFS rate matching equation and RE mapping rules but treat Rel-15 as baseline.
* Drop CSI (including part 1 and part2, if exist) if CSI would multiplex on a PUCCH which has HP A/N.

Proposal for 1st round discussion:

For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH in R17, when the total number of LP and HP HARQ-ACK bits is 2, the baseline is to treat the two bits as HARQ-ACK bits with HP priority ~~and use R15 mapping rules~~.

* + FFS details, e.g. reuse R16 design for the two bits, or reuse R15 design with power boost for the two bits.

Proposal after 1st round discussion:

~~Confirm the working assumption in the following:~~

For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH in R17, when the total number of LP and HP HARQ-ACK bits is more than 2, ~~support separate coding for the two HARQ-ACKs.~~

* For HP HARQ-ACK or LP HARQ-ACK of 1-2 bit(s), support separate coding. Down-select from the two options:
  + Option 1: Reuse the Rel-15 1-2 bits UCI coding methods, i.e., repetition code/simplex code.
  + Option 2: Reuse the Rel-16 coding method of Type-2 CSI report, i.e., padding to 3 bits and using RM coding.
* For HP HARQ-ACK or LP HARQ-ACK >2 bit(s),
  + For HP A/N, reuse the Rel-15 ~~encoder~~coding method for A/N+CSI-1.
    - ~~FFS rate matching equation and RE mapping rules but treat Rel-15 as baseline.~~
  + For LP A/N, reuse the Rel-15 ~~encoder~~coding method for CSI-2.
    - ~~FFS rate matching equation and RE mapping rules but treat Rel-15 as baseline.~~
* FFS rate matching equation and RE mapping rules. Rel-15 is baseline for PUCCH format 3/4.
* Confirm the working assumption as: Drop LP CSI (including part 1 and part2, if exist) if the CSI would multiplex on ~~a~~the PUCCH ~~which has HP A/N~~.
  + FFS for HP CSI on PUCCH if supported.

Proposal after 2nd round discussion:

For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH in R17, when the total number of LP and HP HARQ-ACK bits is 2, ~~the baseline is to treat~~ the two bits as HARQ-ACK bits with High priority ~~and use R15 mapping rules~~.

* + ~~FFS details, e.g. reuse R16 design for the two bits, or reuse R15 design with power boost for the two bits.~~
  + Note: It has been agreed that multiplexing a high-priority HARQ-ACK and a low-priority HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH is supported in R17.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Sony | Agree to both proposals. |
| Nokia, NSB | Support the first proposal  Support the second proposal. We don’t think the FFS points are needed. |
| vivo | For the first proposal, ok  For the second proposal, we think R15/R16 mapping rule is the same and should be reused. Power boost is not needed. |
| Huawei | **For the first proposal**, we are in principle OK. But as an editorial comment, we think the main bullet, i.e., ‘separate coding for more than 2 bits’, has already been agreed in the last meeting, so the confirmation of the WA should only be applied for the last bullet, i.e., ‘Drop CSI (including part 1 and part2, if exist) if CSI would multiplex on a PUCCH which has HP A/N’. In addition, the rate matching equation and RE mapping rules is relatively decoupled with the coding method, and may also be applied for the 1-2 bit(s) HP HARQ-ACK or LP HARQ-ACK case. Therefore, we would recommend to reorganize the proposal 1 as:  “  For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH in R17, when the total number of LP and HP HARQ-ACK bits is more than 2, ~~support separate coding for the two HARQ-ACKs~~   * For HP HARQ-ACK or LP HARQ-ACK of 1-2 bit(s), support separate coding and reuse the Rel-15 1-2 bits UCI coding methods, i.e., repetition code/simplex code. * For HP HARQ-ACK or LP HARQ-ACK >2 bit(s),   + For HP A/N, Reuse the Rel-15 encoder for A/N+CSI-1.     - ~~FFS rate matching equation and RE mapping rules but treat Rel-15 as baseline.~~   + For LP A/N, Reuse the Rel-15 encoder for CSI-2.     - ~~FFS rate matching equation and RE mapping rules but treat Rel-15 as baseline.~~ * FFS rate matching equation and RE mapping rules but treat Rel-15 as baseline. * Drop CSI (including part 1 and part2, if exist) if CSI would multiplex on a PUCCH which has HP A/N.   ”  **For the second proposal**, we are in principle OK. As editorial comment for the FFS details, ‘reuse R16 design for the two bits’, i.e., dropping the LP, is conflict with the main bullet where the two bits are multiplexed. So we would like to change as ‘FFS details, e.g. reuse R16 design for the two bits if the multiplexing is disabled, or reuse R15 design with power boost for the two bits.’ |
| ZTE | Not fully support the first proposal. CSI-1 report is important for the scheduler, dropping CSI-1 should be avoid, if the resource is sufficient, CSI-1 could be multiplex together with LP A/N to reuse the Rel-15 encoder for CSI-2. Then we suggest to modify the bullet to:   * + For LP A/N together with CSI-1, Reuse the Rel-15 encoder for CSI-2.   Not fully support the second proposal. The power boosting is not needed when R15 design is reused as 2 bits HARQ-ACK has been supported by the PUCCH transmission and no need to optimize the power control. To be more specific, the FFS could be revised to:  FFS details, e.g. reuse R16 design for the two bits, or reuse R15 design ~~with power boost~~ for the two bits. |
| Samsung | We do not support the first sub-bullet of the first proposal. It is preferable to avoid introducing additional specification/UE implementation for separate coding of 1-2 UCI and re-use the Rel-16 specifications for separate coding of Type-2 CSI report (pad to 3 bits and use RM coding).  OK with the second sub-bullet of the first proposal  The third sub-bullet can be postponed because we don’t have PUCCH with HP CSI. Even if PUCCH with HP CSI is agreed, HP Part 1 CSI can be joint coding with HP HARQ-ACK.  We do not support the second proposal.  LP/HP UCI multiplexing is already becoming complicated and marginal cases should not be optimized. LP A/N can be dropped in such case and the impact will be similar to a LP PDSCH BLER. That happens with probability of ~10% which is already much larger than the probability that 1 bit LP A/N will collide with 1 bit HP A/N (i.e. no benefit to support anything beyond Rel-16). |
| Quectel | **For the 1st proposal**  Support the revised version by Huawei. A clarification question: what’s the difference between the term “coding methods” and “encoder”? We think it is clearer to align them if no difference exists.  **For the 2nd proposal**  Support the main bullet. FFS points are not needed. |
| Panasonic | We are fine with the 1st proposal.  We are supportive to the second proposal. On the other hand, we think Rel.16/16 mapping rule should be reused and power boosting is not needed. Therefore, we don't think the FFS points are needed. |
| LG | On the first proposal, firstly, regarding the part “but treat Rel-15 as baseline”, it should be limited to PF3/4 since there have been no two UCI encoding on PF2 so far, thus related discussion is necessary.  Secondly, regarding the last bullet, it should also be limited to the case when the PUCCH has both HP A/N and LP A/N since there seems no reason to drop CSI even in case with HP A/N only without LP A/N.  For the above reason, we suggest the following modification.  Proposal for 1st round discussion:  Confirm the working assumption in the following:  For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH in R17, when the total number of LP and HP HARQ-ACK bits is more than 2, support separate coding for the two HARQ-ACKs.   * For HP HARQ-ACK or LP HARQ-ACK of 1-2 bit(s), support separate coding and reuse the Rel-15 1-2 bits UCI coding methods, i.e., repetition code/simplex code. * For HP HARQ-ACK or LP HARQ-ACK >2 bit(s),   + For HP A/N, Reuse the Rel-15 encoder for A/N+CSI-1.     - FFS rate matching equation and RE mapping rules but treat Rel-15 as baseline for PUCCH format 3/4.     - FFS rate matching equation and RE mapping rules for PUCCH format 2   + For LP A/N, Reuse the Rel-15 encoder for CSI-2.     - FFS rate matching equation and RE mapping rules but treat Rel-15 as baseline for PUCCH format 3/4.     - FFS rate matching equation and RE mapping rules for PUCCH format 2 * Drop CSI (including part 1 and part2, if exist) if CSI would multiplex on a PUCCH which has both HP A/N and LP A/N.   On the second proposal, we agree with Nokia that the FFS point is not needed.  Assuming to delete the FFS point, we are supportive to the proposal. |
| QC | Support Proposal 1.  For proposal 2, we have a question for clarification, if the two bits are both treat as HP, then how do we use Rel-16 design to drop one bit and transmit another bit? If the main bullet is agreed, then the only choice is use Rel-15 design with FFS power boost. |
| DOCOMO | Support the first proposal with HW’s updates.  Support the second proposal in general but we don’t think power boost is needed in the FFS. Besides, we are fine with the addition from HW for the FFS. |
| Spreadtrum | Support Proposal 1.  For Proposal 2, share the same view as Huawei. |
| TCL | We support both proposals. |
| ITRI | Support proposal 1  Support main bullet of proposal 2, FFS part is not needed |
| OPPO | Support proposal 1  Support proposal 2 without FFS |
| CATT | We support proposal 1.  For proposal 2, we have the same question as Qualcomm. Regarding power boosting, we don’t think it is needed. So we think we can just reuse Rel-15 design for the two bits. |
| WILUS | For the first proposal, we support HW’s proposal. And, as mentioned by LG, whether/how to support rate matching equation and RE mapping rules for PF2 should be discussed.  For the second proposal, it is unclear to us on difference between Rel-15 rule and Rel-16 rule. |
| Intel | Support P1 in principle, but would like a more clear wording what is confirmed from the RAN1#104bis-e meeting and what is new.  Support P2 assuming it means in R17 there is an option to configure that LP and HP bits are multiplexed assuming both are high priority. BTW “HP priority” is better to be corrected to “high priority” or “HP”. |
| InterDigital | Support both proposals |
| China Telecom | Regarding proposal 2, we have the same question as Qualcomm. In principle we support R15 mapping rules for 2 bits HARQ-ACK as a baseline. However, we think the optimization to ensure no DTX-to-ACK error for gNB detection when the DCI for LP HARQ-ACK is missed by the UE can be considered if it does not bring much complexity. A simple way for PF0 could be use CS=0, 3, 6, 9 for (HP HARQ-ACK, LP HARQ-ACK)=(NACK, NACK), (NACK, ACK), (ACK, NACK), (ACK,ACK) respectively.  So we suggest:  For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH in R17, when the total number of LP and HP HARQ-ACK bits is 2, the baseline is ~~to treat the two bits as HARQ-ACK bits with HP priority and use~~ R15 mapping rules.   * + FFS details, e.g. ~~reuse R16 design for the two bits, or reuse R15 design with~~ power boost for the two bits, ensure no DTX-to-ACK error for gNB detection when the DCI for LP HARQ-ACK is missed. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | For the 1st proposal, we support Huawei’s suggested modification, and suggest further modification on CSI as follows:   * Drop Rel-15/16 CSI (including part 1 and part2, if exist) if CSI would multiplex on a PUCCH which has HP A/N.   For the 2nd proposal, we suggest the following modification:  For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH in R17, when the total number of LP and HP HARQ-ACK bits is 2, ~~the baseline is~~ ~~to~~ treat the two bits as HARQ-ACK bits with HP priority ~~and use R15 mapping rules~~.   * + FFS details~~, e.g. reuse R16 design for the two bits, or reuse R15 design with power boost for the two bits~~. |
| Sharp | Support the proposals. |
| ETRI | For the 1st proposal, we agree with Huawei’s update. For the 2nd proposal, FFS is not clear to us as other companies already commented. |
| Ericsson | For the 1st proposal:  As commented by several companies, the proposal is substantially different from the previous WA. Thus it should be phrased as “Support the following which also incorporates the WA from RAN1#104bis.  “For HP A/N, Reuse the Rel-15 encoder for A/N+CSI-1”, “For LP A/N, Reuse the Rel-15 encoder for CSI-2”:  We don’t follow what these encoders refer to. There is no special encoder for A/N+CSI-1; no special encoder for CSI-2. Suggest changing the 2nd bullet to:  “For HP HARQ-ACK or LP HARQ-ACK >2 bit(s), reuse Rel-15 encoders for the relevant information size K range, i.e., for 3<=K<=11, use RM code as described in section 5.3.3.3 of 38.212; for K>11, use Polar code as described in section 5.3.1 of 38.212.   * FFS rate matching equation and RE mapping rules but treat Rel-15 as baseline.”   For the 2nd proposal:   * + We are OK with main bullet, except typo: “HP priority”   + Delete FFS bullet. |
| NEC | Support the 1st proposal. For the 2nd proposal, we think the FFS bullet is not needed. |

## 2nd round discussion

Proposal for 2nd round discussion:

For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH in R17, when the total number of LP and HP HARQ-ACK bits is more than 2,

* For HP HARQ-ACK or LP HARQ-ACK of 1-2 bit(s), support separate coding. Down-select from the two options:
  + Option 1: Reuse the Rel-15 1-2 bits UCI coding methods, i.e., repetition code/simplex code.
  + Option 2: Reuse the Rel-16 coding method of Type-2 CSI report, i.e., padding to 3 bits and using RM coding.
* For HP HARQ-ACK or LP HARQ-ACK >2 bit(s),
  + HP HARQ-ACK reuses the coding method used for A/N+CSI-1 in Rel-15.
  + LP HARQ-ACK reuses the coding method used for CSI-2 in Rel-15.
* FFS rate matching equation and RE mapping rules. Rel-15 is baseline for PUCCH format 3/4.
* Confirm the working assumption as: Drop LP CSI (including part 1 and part2, if exist) if the CSI would multiplex on the PUCCH.
  + FFS for HP CSI on PUCCH if supported.

Support: Sony, QC, Apple, Sharp, LG, Samsung (if postpone confirming the WA in last bullet), Quectel, DCM, ITRI, Spreadtrum, vivo, CATT, ZTE, Nokia, Pana, OPPO, HW, Intel, IDC, Lenovo/Moto, APT

Not support: E/// (not differentiate coding method for different UCIs)

Proposal for 2nd round discussion:

For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH in R17, when the total number of LP and HP HARQ-ACK bits is 2, the two bits as HARQ-ACK bits with High priority.

* + Note: It has been agreed that multiplexing a high-priority HARQ-ACK and a low-priority HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH is supported in R17.

Support: Sony, QC (if adding QC’s concern), Apple, Sharp, LG, Samsung (no enhancement), Quectel, DCM, ITRI, Spreadtrum, vivo, CATT, ZTE, Nokia (reuse R15), Pana, OPPO, HW, Intel, IDC, Lenovo/Moto, APT (share QC’s concern)

Proposal for 2nd round discussion:

maxCodeRate can be separately configured for HP and LP HARQ-ACK in R17.

Support: Sony, QC, Apple, Sharp, Samsung (if for PUCCH PF3/4), DCM, ITRI, Spreadtrum, vivo, Nokia, Pana, OPPO, HW, Intel, IDC, Lenovo/Moto, APT

Reusing R16 is kept as another option now: Quectel, LG, ZTE

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Sony | Support all 3 proposals. |
| QC | Support the 1st proposal and 3rd proposal.  For the second proposal, we have deep concern on performance degradation of HP bit by treating LP bit as HP bit. But for the progress, we are OK with this proposal, if a note as following is added to capture QC’s concern.   * Note: QC had strong concern on above scheme. The scheme cannot provide unequal error protection between the HP bit and LP bit hence could suffer from performance degradation for the HP bit. QC accept the scheme for the sake of progress in RAN 1 with the concern on the performance reserved. |
| Apple | We support all 3 proposals |
| Sharp | Support all 3 proposals. |
| LG | Thanks FL for the update.  We also support Proposal 1 and 2.  On Proposal 3, it seems to need some clarification since max UCI coding rate is already being configured per each of HP and LP HARQ-ACK separately even in Rel-16.  For this reason, we prefer to reuse the max UCI coding rate per priority in Rel-16 for multiplexing of LP/HP HARQ-ACK on a same PUCCH. |
| Samsung | For the first proposal, we don’t support to confirm the WA as explained in the first round. We are fine with the other sub-bullets.  For the 2nd proposal, we can compromise to make progress without any further enhancements.  For the 3rd proposal, we support the intention, we suggest the following update  maxCodeRate can be separately configured for HP and LP HARQ-ACK if multiplexed in a PUCCH PF3/4 in R17.   * A separate maxCodeRate for LP HARQ-ACK is configured for HP PUCCH format 3 and 4. |
| Quectel | We support the 1st and 2nd proposal.  For the 3rd proposal, similar question as LG. In existing PUCCH design, is configured per PF per PUCCH configuration so separate configurations have already been supported in Rel-16.  We guess the intention of FL is to propose “maxCodeRate can be separately configured for HP and LP HARQ-ACK per PF3/4 per PUCCH configuration in R17”. Is our understanding correct?  If our understanding is correct, we do not support the 3rd proposal. In our understanding maxCodeRate  configuration could mainly serve three purposes: 1) calculations of rate matching output sequence length; 2) calculations of minimum number of PUCCH PRB; 3) PUCCH resource set determination if a coding rate based payload scaling is applied.  For the first purpose, we do not see any need to separately configure for HP and LP HARQ-ACK for a same PF and a same PUCCH-config. We can reuse Rel-15 design, wherein a rate matching output sequence length for HP HARQ-ACK is calculated based on the configured for HP HARQ-ACK(the  for HP HARQ-ACK) and the rate matching output sequence length for LP HARQ-ACK is -( the  for LP HARQ-ACK).  For the second purpose, whether to support a smaller number of PUCCH PRBs than the one indicated by PRI and whether separate configurations for HP and LP HARQ-ACK are required for the calculations of minimum number of PUCCH PRB need be first discussed. In our mind, a number of alternative ways could be at least considered for the calculations of minimum number of PUCCH PRB (if supported):   * Alt-1: LP HARQ-ACK is regarded high priority when multiplexing (similar to the two bits case in the 2nd proposal, also implying UCI payload size = the number of HP UCI bits + the number of LP UCI bits is used for PUCCH resource determination); * Alt-2: Only the number of HP HARQ-ACK is used; * Alt-3: UCI payload size = the number of HP UCI bits + the number of LP UCI bits \* scaling factor is used. However, it may be simpler to directly configure the scaling factor or directly configure “the number of LP UCI bits \* scaling factor”(can be regarded as an equivalent number of HP UCI bits) rather than configure a separate for LP HARQ-ACK;   Other solutions are not precluded. For all these alternatives, a separate configuration of for LP HARQ-ACK is not needed.  For the third purpose, similar to the second one, there could be alternatives rather than separate configurations could be used, e.g, directly configure a scaling factor or an equivalent number of HP HARQ-ACK bits.  We are open for the discussions, but it seems premature to agree separate configuration given such a lot of open issues. We think a more suitable way forward is to list the options then down select one in future especially considering this is the first meeting to formally discuss this issue. |
| WILUS | We are fine with the 1st proposal and the 2nd proposal. For the 3rd proposal, if the intention is to configure a new LP code rate for multiplexing in HP PUCCH format 3/4, then we are also fine. |
| LG | According to companies’ views in above, there seems to be two options, so we suggest the following modification on Proposal 3.   * Option 1: maxCodeRate configured for LP PUCCH format is reused for multiplexing of LP and HP HARQ-ACK on a PUCCH * Option 2: Separate maxCodeRate for LP HARQ-ACK is configured for HP PUCCH format for multiplexing of LP and HP HARQ-ACK on a PUCCH |
| DOCOMO | Support all 3 proposals. |
| ITRI | Support these proposals |
| Spreadtrum | Support all 3 proposals. |
| vivo | Support all 3 proposals. |
| CATT | We support the first proposal.  For the second proposal, we are fine with it with editorial update in red.  For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH in R17, when the total number of LP and HP HARQ-ACK bits is 2, the two bits are treated as HARQ-ACK bits with High priority.   * + Note: It has been agreed that multiplexing a high-priority HARQ-ACK and a low-priority HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH is supported in R17.   For the third proposal, the max code rate is configured per PUCCH format in the current specification. Is the intention of the proposal to configure separate maxCodeRate for HP and LP HARQ-ACK per PUCCH format in the second *PUCCH-Config* (the *PUCCH-config* containing the PUCCH resource of the HP HARQ-ACK)? |
| China Telecom | For proposal 2, we think the study on the problem of DCI missing for LP HARQ-ACK should not be precluded by the wording “the two bits as HARQ-ACK bits with High priority”. For example, when DCI missing happens, the UE transmits 1-bit HP HARQ-ACK using CS 6 for ACK, but the gNB regards CS 6 as all ACK for both HP and LP HARQ-ACK. Thus the PDSCH corresponding to LP HARQ-ACK will not be retransmitted.  The problem of incorrect LP HARQ-ACK Type-2 codebook size determination due to DCI mis-detection is also discussed in 3rd proposal of section 3.4.3, the 2 total bits case should be considered as well.  We understand the intention of this proposal is reusing Rel-15 CS for PF 0 and mechanism to convey HARQ-ACK information by modulated symbols for PF1, so we suggest:  For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH in R17, when the total number of LP and HP HARQ-ACK bits is 2, ~~the two bits as HARQ-ACK bits with High priority~~ the base line is Rel-15 rules for 2 bits HARQ-ACK transmission.   * + Note: It has been agreed that multiplexing a high-priority HARQ-ACK and a low-priority HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH is supported in R17.   + FFS on the problem of DCI missing for LP HARQ-ACK. |
| ZTE | Support first 2 proposals. And the third proposal need clarification as LG gave two options. I am open to the options of the interpretation on separate maxCodeRate.  Agree with CTC, that DCI missing issue in 2 total bits case should be considered as well. |
| Nokia, NSB | - Support the first proposal.  - We are fine with the second proposal. We would have preferred to also agree, in the same proposal, on relying on Rel-15 bit-mapping (for PF0 and PF1) as this has been the large majority view so far.  - We are fine with the third proposal in principle. However, we are wondering what the implication of this proposal would be, as from Rel-16 the maxCodeRate can already be separately configured for HP and LP HARQ-ACK through their corresponding PUCCH configurations (as LGE pointed out as well). |
| Panasonic | We are fine with all three proposals. |
| OPPO | Support all 3 proposals in principle. For 3rd proposal, we prefer to modification from Samsung. |
| Huawei | **For proposal 1**, we are OK in principle. But as a clarification for Option 2, padding to 3 bits is Rel-15 behavior applied for CSI part 2, so we think it is more generic to modify it as “Reuse the Rel-15/Rel-16 coding method of ~~Type-2~~ CSI report, i.e., padding to 3 bits and using RM coding.”  **For proposal 2**, we are OK in principle. In addition, we think the “Note: It has been agreed that multiplexing a high-priority HARQ-ACK and a low-priority HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH is supported in R17” is commonly understood and could be removed. In addition, we share the same view with China Telecom and ZTE that that DCI missing issue should be added as FFS.  **For proposal 3**, we are supportive. |
| Intel | Support the proposals |
| InterDigital | OK with the three proposals |
| Ericsson | Proposal 1   * Do not agree with 2nd bullet. What’s “coding method used for A/N+CSI-1” and “coding method used for CSI-2”? In our understanding, there is no different coding method for different UCI. For both, RM code is used for 3<=A<=11, Polar code is used for A>11, where A is the number of info bits. * Do not agree with last bullet (WA). It’s not good for link adaptation if CSI is always dropped. In our view, if CSI consists of one part, or CSI-part1, the LP CSI should be encoded together with LP HARQ-ACK, and transmitted with HP HARQ-ACK. We are fine with dropping CSI-part2.   Proposal 3  We are fine with the intention of the proposal. But similar to LG and Nokia, we also observe that HP and LP HARQ-ACK can already have separately configured maxCodeRate in Rel-16. What does this proposal achieve? |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support all three proposals in principle.  Suggest the following modifications (in red):  Proposal for 2nd round discussion:  For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH in R17, when the total number of LP and HP HARQ-ACK bits is 2, treat the two bits as HARQ-ACK bits with High priority.   * + Note: It has been agreed that multiplexing a high-priority HARQ-ACK and a low-priority HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH is supported in R17.   Proposal for 2nd round discussion:  maxCodeRate can be separately configured for HP and LP HARQ-ACK in one PUCCH configuration (i.e. in the second *PUCCH-Config*) in R17. |
| APT/FGI | We support the first proposal and the third proposal.  For the second proposal, we share the same concern with QC. |

## 3rd round discussion

The proposals are improved to capture companies’ comments.

Proposal for 3rd round discussion:

For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH in R17, when the total number of LP and HP HARQ-ACK bits is more than 2,

* For HP HARQ-ACK or LP HARQ-ACK of 1-2 bit(s), support separate coding. Down-select from the two options:
  + Option 1: Reuse R15 TS 38.212 Clause 5.3.3.1 for 1-bit. Reuse R15 TS 38.212 Clause 5.3.3.2 for 2-bit.
  + Option 2: Reuse R15 TS 38.212 Clause 5.3.3.3, i.e., padding to 3 bits and using RM coding.
* For HP HARQ-ACK or LP HARQ-ACK >2 bit(s), HP HARQ-ACK LP HARQ-ACK are separately encoded according to TS 38.212 Clause 5.3.3.3.
* FFS rate matching equation and RE mapping rules. Rel-15 is baseline for PUCCH format 3/4.

Proposal for 3rd round discussion:

For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH in R17, when the total number of LP and HP HARQ-ACK bits is 2, treat the two bits as HARQ-ACK bits with High priority.

* + Reuse Rel-15 bit-mapping (for PF0 and PF1).
  + FFS on the problem of DCI missing for LP HARQ-ACK.
  + Note: QC had strong concern on above scheme. The scheme cannot provide unequal error protection between the HP bit and LP bit hence could suffer from performance degradation for the HP bit. QC accept the scheme for the sake of progress in RAN 1 with the concern on the performance reserved.

Proposal for 3rd round discussion:

Down-select from the two options:

* + Option 1: maxCodeRate can be separately configured for HP and LP HARQ-ACK in a PUCCH configuration if multiplexed in a PUCCH PF3/4 in R17.
    - A separate maxCodeRate for LP HARQ-ACK is configured for HP PUCCH format 3 and 4.
  + Option 2: No enhancement over Rel-16, i.e., maxCodeRate is configured per PF per PUCCH configuration.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| OPPO | Support 1st proposal with modification. PUCCH format 2 is added  **Proposal**  For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH in R17, when the total number of LP and HP HARQ-ACK bits is more than 2,   * For HP HARQ-ACK or LP HARQ-ACK of 1-2 bit(s), support separate coding. Down-select from the two options:   + Option 1: Reuse R15 TS 38.212 Clause 5.3.3.1 for 1-bit. Reuse R15 TS 38.212 Clause 5.3.3.2 for 2-bit.   + Option 2: Reuse R15 TS 38.212 Clause 5.3.3.3, i.e., padding to 3 bits and using RM coding. * For HP HARQ-ACK or LP HARQ-ACK >2 bit(s), HP HARQ-ACK LP HARQ-ACK are separately encoded according to TS 38.212 Clause 5.3.3.3. * FFS rate matching equation and RE mapping rules. Rel-15 is baseline for PUCCH format 2/3/4.   Support 2nd proposal with modification. “Reuse Rel-15 bit-mapping” is not clear for us. In our understanding, the intention of proposal is to reuse R15 mapping table from HARQ-ACK information bit to sequence (CS).  **Proposal**  For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH in R17, when the total number of LP and HP HARQ-ACK bits is 2, treat the two bits as HARQ-ACK bits with High priority.   * + Reuse R15 mapping table from HARQ-ACK information bit to sequence (CS) (for PF0 and PF1).   + FFS on the problem of DCI missing for LP HARQ-ACK.   + Note: QC had strong concern on above scheme. The scheme cannot provide unequal error protection between the HP bit and LP bit hence could suffer from performance degradation for the HP bit. QC accept the scheme for the sake of progress in RAN 1 with the concern on the performance reserved.   Support 3rd proposal. |
| ZTE | Support the 3 proposals.  For 1st proposal, can we assume that we have supported separate coding for LP and HP HARQ-ACK for PUCCH Format 2? The question is PF2 doesn’t support CSI and only one coding chain in legacy mode, then anyway, if separate coding is supported, there are two coding chains. Also there is no legacy rate matching and RE mapping rules for this scenario, then the scheme of rate matching and RE mapping for PF2 should be further investigated.  For 3rd proposal, Option 2 is sufficient, the motivation of Option 1 should be further investigated. |
| CATT | For the first proposal, polar coding needs to be considered as well as suggested below. In addition, it is our understanding that further discussion is needed on whether/how to support separate coding for PF2.  For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH in R17, when the total number of LP and HP HARQ-ACK bits is more than 2,   * For HP HARQ-ACK or LP HARQ-ACK of 1-2 bit(s), support separate coding. Down-select from the two options:   + Option 1: Reuse R15 TS 38.212 Clause 5.3.3.1 for 1-bit. Reuse R15 TS 38.212 Clause 5.3.3.2 for 2-bit.   + Option 2: Reuse R15 TS 38.212 Clause 5.3.3.3, i.e., padding to 3 bits and using RM coding. * For HP HARQ-ACK or LP HARQ-ACK >2 bit(s), HP HARQ-ACK LP HARQ-ACK are separately encoded according to TS 38.212 Clause 5.3.3.1 and Clause 5.3.3.3. * FFS rate matching equation and RE mapping rules. Rel-15 is baseline for PUCCH format 3/4.   We are fine with the second proposals.  For the third proposal, we would like to modify option 1 as follows. Our understanding is to keep the maxCodeRate configuration per PF and only support separate configurations for the second PUCCH-Config. In addition, we would like to have an FFS for PF2. The detailed signaling design can be discussed later if necessary.  Down-select from the two options:   * + Option 1: maxCodeRate can be separately configured for HP and LP ~~HARQ-ACK~~UCI ~~in a PUCCH configuration if multiplexed in a PUCCH~~ for PF3/4 in the second *PUCCH-Config* in R17.     - FFS PF2     - ~~A separate maxCodeRate for LP HARQ-ACK is configured for HP PUCCH format 3 and 4.~~   + Option 2: No enhancement over Rel-16, i.e., maxCodeRate is configured per PF per PUCCH configuration. |
| vivo | We support the three proposals in principle  For the 2nd proposal, we share similar view with ZTE and CATT. We think separate coding has been agreed for PUCCH format 2. since there is no legacy rate matching and RE mapping rules for this scenario, then the scheme of rate matching and RE mapping for PF2 should be further investigated  For the 3rd proposal, CATT’s update seems better. |
| Nokia, NSB | - Fine with the first proposal. We prefer Option 1. The case with PF2 can be FFS.  - Support the second proposal.  - Support the third proposal, we are fine with the updates there by CATT. |
| LG | Proposal 1: Fine with the proposal.  Proposal 2: Fine with the proposal.  Proposal 3: Option 2 seems to cause some misunderstanding due to the expression of “no enhancement”. For this reason, we suggest the following modification.  **Down-select from the two options:**   * + **Option 1: maxCodeRate can be separately configured for HP and LP HARQ-ACK in a PUCCH configuration if multiplexed in a PUCCH PF3/4 in R17.**      - **A separate maxCodeRate for LP HARQ-ACK is configured for HP PUCCH format 3 and 4.**   + **Option 2: Reuse ~~No enhancement over Rel-16, i.e.,~~ maxCodeRate ~~is~~ configured per PF per PUCCH configuration for the multiplexing of HP and LP HARQ-ACK on a same PUCCH.** |
| Sony | We support all 3 proposals |
| Intel | Support P1, and accept adding PF2 in the last FFS  Support P2  Support P3 to move forward, although there are clear benefits in using Option 1 directly. |
| Apple | Support all 3 proposals. Note it may happen LP HARQ-ACK has 20 bits, but HP HARQ-ACK has 2 bits, the second sub-bullet does not cover that case. So we suggest moving the separate encoding part to one level higher.  Agree with CATT’s on polar code, also fix a typo in CATT’s proposal:  Proposal for 3rd round discussion:  For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH in R17, when the total number of LP and HP HARQ-ACK bits is more than 2, LP and HP HARQ-ACK bits are separately encoded:   * For HP HARQ-ACK or LP HARQ-ACK of 1-2 bit(s), support separate coding. Down-select from the two options:   + Option 1: Reuse R15 TS 38.212 Clause 5.3.3.1 for 1-bit. Reuse R15 TS 38.212 Clause 5.3.3.2 for 2-bit.   + Option 2: Reuse R15 TS 38.212 Clause 5.3.3.3, i.e., padding to 3 bits and using RM coding. * For HP HARQ-ACK or LP HARQ-ACK >2 bit(s), HP HARQ-ACK/ LP HARQ-ACK is ~~are separately~~ encoded according to TS 38.212 Clause 5.3.3.3 (RM code) and 5.3.1 (polar code). * FFS rate matching equation and RE mapping rules. Rel-15 is baseline for PUCCH format 3/4. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## Multiplexing enable/disable mechanism

## Inputs from Tdocs

* Option 1: DCI indication
  + E///, Nokia (Mux is not supported for SPS HARQ-ACK), ZTE, vivo, Spreadtrum, Intel, Pana, Sony, Quectel, Samsung, IDC, ETRI
  + Not support: MTK
* Option 2: RRC configuration
  + HW, ZTE, QC, Spreadtrum, CATT CMCC, China Telecom, Pana, Quectel, TCL, Samsung, LGE, IDC (for SPS), Xiaomi, Sharp, DCM, MTK

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Arguments | Counter arguments |
| Advantages | Flexibility | Even if the multiplexing timelines are met, the latency and reliability of high priority transmission should not be affected.  Straightforward method to select from Rel-16 and Rel-17 behaviors  URLLC traffic usually has a sporadic or periodic pattern, overlapping cases occur either occasionally or predictably.  Semi-static indication for periodic or predictable URLLC transmissions. Dynamic indication based on multiplexing conditions, e.g. latency requirement, channel condition, number of UCI bits. |  |
| Problems of DCI-based indication | Not a unified solution | Not applicable in some cases, e.g. the case of HARQ-ACK for PDSCH(s) scheduling by fallback DCI or SPS HARQ-ACKs.  HW[4]: Not applicable for the case of multiplexing LP HARQ-ACK and HP SR also, since it is impossible for gNB to predict the state of SR. | [vivo]: Unified solution for DG PUCCH and configured PUCCH is never needed. For DG PUCCH, it can naturally get the benefits from dynamic indication. For the configured PUCCH, whether multiplexing between different priorities is supported can be RRC configured. For example, in NR Rel-16, similar mechanism is used for priority index indication. |
| extra DCI overhead |  |  |
| UE complexity | [MTK] Very complex to handle at the UE side and requires a lot of implementation effort as the UE needs to accommodate two scenarios for each case which will complicate the implementation. | [vivo]: For UE supports multiplexing, UE anyway needs to handle the case of multiplexing, there is no additional complexity for prioritization. In addition, even RRC configuration method is used, some additional conditions may be needed, such as reliability requirement, latency requirement, etc. UE implementation may be more complex in that case. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Proposals/observations from Tdocs |
| E/// | Proposal 6 In case of overlapping between PUCCH and/or PUSCH resources in a slot with different priorities, dynamically enabling or disabling UCI multiplexing on PUCCH or PUSCH is supported. |
| Huawei | ***Proposal 1: Adopt RRC configuration to enable/disable the multiplexing of HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK on PUCCH, and the multiplexing of HARQ-ACK on PUSCH with different priorities.***   * ***Additional conditions shall be specified to further guarantee the latency/reliability of the HP HARQ-ACK for the overlapping case.*** |
| Nokia | **Proposal 3.1: The gNB dynamically indicates, via an explicit field in the DCI scheduling high-priority HARQ-ACK, whether multiplexing of high-priority HARQ-ACK and low-priority HARQ-ACK (or more generally low-priority multiplexed UCIs) is enabled or disabled.**  **Proposal 3.5: For the scenario where a PUCCH carrying high-priority HARQ-ACK overlaps with another PUCCH carrying low-priority HARQ-ACK: If the high-priority HARQ-ACK does not have a corresponding PDCCH, the multiplexing is not supported.** |
| ZTE | ***Proposal 5****: For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH in R17, support DCI+RRC configuration for gNB to enable/disable the multiplexing when DCI is applied.*   * *For SPS HARQ-ACK, the enable/disable scheme falls back to RRC configuration.*   ***Proposal 6****: The indicator of intra-UE multiplexing UCI with different priorities should be carried on the scheduling DCI or RRC parameter for the high priority transmission.* |
| vivo | ***Proposal 17: Dynamic indication of intra-UE multiplexing and prioritization manner can be supported in Rel-17.***  ***Proposal 18: For dynamic indication, multiplexing or prioritization indication field can be included in DCI for HP or LP or both HP and LP service.*** |
| Spreadtrum | 1. ***For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH, support RRC configuration to enable/disable the multiplexing as a baseline. RRC+DCI-based enabling/disabling can be considered as an optional feature.*** |
| CATT | ***Proposal 10: Semi-static RRC configuration to enable/disable the multiplexing between channels with different priorities is supported.*** |
| CMCC | **Proposal 6: For multiplexing HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK into one PUCCH in R17, RRC signaling is used for gNB to enable/disable the multiplexing.** |
| QC | ***Proposal 22:* The Rel-17 intra-UE multiplexing feature is enabled/disabled via RRC configuration on per UE basis.** |
| China Telecom | **Proposal 1: For multiplexing UCI/PUSCH with different priorities on PUCCH or PUSCH in R17, support RRC configuration to enable/disable the multiplexing as a base line.** |
| Intel | **Proposal 9: DCI triggering HARQ-ACK may include an indication for enabling or disabling multiplexing.**   * **The indication may be applicable to both HARQ-ACK/HARQ-ACK and HARQ-ACK/SR multiplexing.** |
| Pana | **Proposal 5:**   * **For multiplexing a HP HARQ-ACK and a LP HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH in Rel.17, the multiplexing is RRC configured.**   + **Dynamic indication for enabling should also be supported.** |
| Sony | **Proposal 3: The gNB dynamically enables/disables multiplexing in an HP PUCCH by an indication in the DL Grant scheduling the HP PUCCH.**  **Proposal 4: When a HP PUCCH scheduled by multiple DL Grants overlap with LP HARQ-ACKs, the decision to multiplex the HP & LP HARQ-ACKs is determined by the indicator in the last DL Grant scheduling the HP PUCCH.** |
| Quectel | **Proposal 7**: Dynamic enabling/disabling by DCI for HARQ-ACK multiplexing on PUCCH with different priorities is supported on top of RRC configuration. |
| TCL | **Proposal 1: Support explicit indication to enable multiplexing procedure between HP UCI and LP UCI via RRC configuration.** |
| Samsung | **Proposal 1: Support multiplexing UCI of different priorities subject to timeline conditions and RRC configuration and/or dynamic indication from gNB.**  **Proposal 2: The UCI types with first priority that can be multiplexed on a PUCCH/PUSCH of a second priority are configurable by the network.** |
| LGE | **Proposal #5: Prefer RRC configuration for the mechanism to enable/disable the multiplexing of HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK on PUCCH or the multiplexing of HARQ-ACK on PUSCH with different priority, with consideration of potential UE complexity and UCI/PUSCH reliability.** |
| IDC | ***Proposal 2: DCI indicating HP HARQ-ACK also indicates if UE multiplexes HP HARQ-ACK with LP HARQ-ACK.***  ***Proposal 3: RRC configuration of SPS with HP HARQ-ACK includes an indication of whether the UE can multiplex HP HARQ-ACK with LP HARQ-ACK.***  ***Proposal 4: RRC configuration of a HP SR resource includes an indication of whether the UE can multiplex HP SR with LP HARQ-ACK.*** |
| Xiaomi | ***Proposal 9: For enabling/disabling multiplexing of channels of different priorities, semi-static configuration is preferred.*** |
| Sharp | **Proposal 2: RRC configuration is used as the mechanism to enable/disable the multiplexing of HP HARQ-ACK and a LP HARQ-ACK on PUCCH.** |
| DOCOMO | **Proposal 7:**   * *RRC configuration should be baseline for enabling/disabling multiplexing of LP and HP PUCCH* |
| MTK | 1. Dynamic indication of the multiplexing activation/de-activation is not supported. |
|  |  |

## 1st round discussion

Proposal for 1st round discussion:

For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH in R17, support RRC configuration and DCI indication for gNB to enable/disable the multiplexing at least for HARQ-ACK with DCI.

* FFS for HARQ-ACK for SPS PDSCH.
* FFS: Interaction between the enable/disable mechanism and other multiplexing conditions
* FFS for other types of UCI.

Proposal after 1st round discussion:

For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH in R17, at least support RRC configuration for gNB to enable/disable the multiplexing.

* FFS whether or not to additionally introduce DCI indication to enable/disable the multiplexing.
* FFS: Interaction between the enable/disable mechanism and other multiplexing conditions
* FFS for other types of UCI.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Sony | Agree. We assume that in this proposal, the RRC configuration is a to configure the new Enable/Disable field in the DCI. |
| Nokia, NSB | Support the proposal.  On the SPS case: when the high-priority HARQ-ACK does not have a corresponding PDCCH, multiplexing of high-priority HARQ-ACK bits with low-priority HARQ-ACK bits is not preferred. This is because, in this case, there cannot be a dynamic indication/control regarding (i) the (high-priority) PUCCH resource selection, as the PUCCH resource(s) for SPS are only semi-statically configured via RRC as part of the corresponding SPS configuration, and (ii) the enabling/disabling of multiplexing. Without such control by the network, the high-priority HARQ-ACK could be impacted if multiplexed with low-priority HARQ-ACK. So at least there should be separate configurability (from the dynamic indication) if mux of HP HARQ-ACK without a corresponding DCI together with LP HARQ-ACK on PUCCH is to be performed. |
| vivo | Support.  We think the HARQ-ACK for SPS PDSCH, it can be either RRC configured or indicated by activation DCI. for the other types of UCI, it can be RRC configured |
| Apple | As we indicated at RAN1 #104bis-e, we don’t support dynamic signaling to enable HP/LP UCI multiplexing in Rel-17. |
| Huawei | We cannot agree with this proposal. As mentioned in our paper, the DCI enabling/disabling cannot be applied for the fallback DCI/semi-static UCI, and thus is not a unified solution. On the contrary, the enabling/disabling by RRC should be considered as a starting point as anyhow we need to introduce RRC signaling for enabling/disabling regardless the type of DCI or UCI. |
| ZTE | Support |
| Samsung | Support.  Relying only on RRC configuration is too inflexible to address real-time variations in UE operating conditions and gNB scheduling decisions. |
| Quectel | Support |
| Panasonic | We support the proposal. |
| LG | We do not support this proposal, and share the same view with Apple and Huawei.  To avoid any ambiguity/misalignment between UE and gNB involved with semi-static CSI/SR/SPS PUCCH and fallback DCI based scheduling, RRC based enabling/disabling should be the baseline. |
| QC | Disagree with the proposal. We suppose use RRC to enabling/disabling of this Rel-17 UCI multiplexing feature. We don’t support DCI based dynamic enabling/disabling of this feature.  The situation is very clear. Every company think RRC enabling/disabling Rel-17 UCI multiplexing feature should be supported. The question is whether DCI based dynamic enabling/disabling of this feature is needed or not. Isn’t that the WF should be something like “support RRC based enabling/disabling Rel-17 UCI multiplexing feature. FFS additional DCI based signaling to enabling/disabling this feature”?  From technical point of view, DCI based enabling/disabling Rel-17 UCI multiplying significantly increases UE implementation complexity. It also have problem due to missing DCI where gNB intent to instruct UE to do Rel-17 UCI multiplexing in latest DCI, but UE could miss that DCI and follow previous DCI to do Rel-16 UCI prioritization. |
| DOCOMO | Support but different understanding from Sony. In our understanding, RRC configuration here means semi-static enable/disable mechanism of the multiplexing but not presenting of the DCI field to enable/disable the multiplexing. If UE receives DCI(s) indicating enabling/disabling, indication by DCI overrides indication by RRC configuration.  It can be further discussed such enabling/disabling is based on the DCI associated with HP HARQ-ACK, or LP HARQ-ACK, or either/both DCI. After this decided, we can further discuss handling for SPS HARQ-ACK cases (e.g. HP SPS HARQ-ACK vs. LP dynamic HARQ-ACK, HP dynamic HARQ-ACK vs. LP SPS HARQ-ACK, and HP SPS HARQ-ACK vs. LP SPS HARQ-ACK). |
| Spreadtrum | Support in general. RRC based enabling/disabling can be a baseline, and the DCI enabling/disabling should be FFS. |
| TCL | We do not support the proposal.  DCI indication to enable/disable multiplexing may cost more DCI resources, and it is not feasible for the fallback DCI format. DCI miss detection also lead to extra issues. And we share the same view with QC, RRC enabling/disabling UCI multiplexing should be supported, and DCI enabling/disabling can be FFS. |
| ITRI | Support this proposal. |
| OPPO | We do not support this proposal due to DCI based enabling/disabling has its own limitations:   1. It does not work for semi-static PUCCH resource, e.g. PUCCH for SR/SPS HARQ-ACK. 2. Misunderstanding among gNB and UE due to DCI missing.   In addition, potential DCI based enabling/disabling solution is not clear for us. If we support DCI based enabling/disabling solution, we’d better know how DCI based enabling/disabling solution works.  So we prefer to support RRC configuration and FFS for DCI |
| CATT | We also think that RRB based enabling/disabling should be agreed and DCI based enabling/disabling can be further discussed. |
| WILUS | We support RRC-based enabling/disabling. If DCI indication overrides RRC configuration, there are potential mis-understanding between gNB and UE. |
| Intel | We are supportive of the proposal. DCI can help to have more explicit handling in many cases, while RRC only may be much more complicated. |
| InterDigital | Support the proposal |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We do not support the proposal.  DCI based enabling/disabling increases ambiguity for PUCCH transmission and corresponding UCI, in case of missed DCI. For guaranteeing HP UCI performance, RAN1 should consider methods applicable to both dynamic PDSCH and SPS PDSCH. |
| Sharp | Do not support the proposal.  The RRC configuration should be supported as baseline since UE has to perform timeline requirements check for UCI multiplexing.  Will the DCI indication overrides the timeline requirements? How to handle conflict cases with the timeline evaluation? |
| APT/FGI | Support the proposal. |
| ETRI | Support the proposal. |
| Ericsson | Do not support.  RRC configuration to enable/disable is sufficient. We don’t see the need to additionally use DCI indication to enable/disable. RRC configuration can cover HARQ-ACK for SPS PDSCH as well as HARQ-ACK for dynamically scheduled PDSCH. |
| NEC | Support the proposal. |

## 2nd round discussion

Based on the 1st round discussion, even more companies are against agreeing on RRC+DCI mechanism than those were against firstly agreeing on RRC only. So it is suggested to come back to the proposal last meeting that firstly agrees on RRC, and FFS additional DCI. If we like to progress on this issue, it is encouraged to agree on the following proposal.

Proposal for 2nd round discussion:

For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH in R17, at least support RRC configuration for gNB to enable/disable the multiplexing.

* FFS whether or not to additionally introduce DCI indication to enable/disable the multiplexing.
* FFS: Interaction between the enable/disable mechanism and other multiplexing conditions
* FFS for other types of UCI.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Sony | Not support. We prefer the original proposal that support enabling/disabling with DCI, i.e.:  *For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH in R17, support RRC configuration and DCI indication for gNB to enable/disable the multiplexing at least for HARQ-ACK with DCI.* |
| QC | Support the FL proposal |
| Apple | Support FL’s proposal |
| Sharp | Support the proposal |
| TCL | Support FL’s proposal |
| LG | We also support FL’s proposal. |
| Samsung | Do not support, a NW should be able to choose between ‘RRC-only’ and ‘RRC+DCI’ – a decision for multiplexing should not be (practically) frozen in time and unable to adjust to real-time situations such as available resources, power, initial transmission/retransmission, channel conditions, etc. A decision should be made for one of the two approaches instead of implicitly trying to agree to ‘RRC-only’ by having the ‘at least’ |
| Quectel | Not support.  In our understanding, almost all proponents of DCI indication agree that a RRC based enabling/disabling is the basis. This proposal provides no progress after round-after-round discussions in a number of meetings. We prefer to decide whether DCI indication is supported at this meeting. |
| WILUS | Support FL’s proposal. |
| DOCOMO | Support the FL proposal |
| ITRI | Not support, prefer original proposal (i.e., enable/disable with DCI) |
| Spreadtrum | Support FL’s proposal |
| vivo | Do not support. The proposal is not clear to us. What’s the meaning of “at least support RRC configuration”, “other multiplexing conditions”, does it point to the RRC-only option or it can be RRC+ some implicit rules, such as latency requirement, reliability requirement, etc.  Even if it is RRC only, then, for the following two cases, we think UE behavior in Case 2 needs to be discussed. For example, it can be error case if the multiplexing timeline is not met, or Rel-16 prioritization is implemented if the multiplexing timeline is not met but the cancellation timeline defined in Rel-16 is met.  Case 1: RRC enable + timeline for multiplexing is met🡪multiplexing  Case 2: RRC enable + timeline for multiplexing is not met🡪 error case or Rel-16 prioritization if the cancellation timeline defined in Rel-16 is met.  In addition, based on the company's' comments, RRC configuration is needed anyway. So, the proposal should be more on whether to additionally have the DCI indication. If DCI indication is adopted, we think it is obviously error case when DCI indicates multiplexing but the multiplexing timeline is not met (Case 4).  Case 3: DC enable + timeline for multiplexing is met  Case 4: DCI enable + timeline for multiplexing is not met🡪error case |
| CATT | We support the proposal. |
| China Telecom | Support the proposal. |
| ZTE | Not support, share the view with Sony and Samsung. |
| Nokia, NSB | Not support  We agree on the RRC aspect (as it would be anyhow needed) but not without the DCI indication. So we prefer the related proposal from the first round.  **As we already explained, without such dynamic support, the reliability and latency requirements cannot be guaranteed. Otherwise, we would need to define a set of complicated rules/conditions for the UE to decide whether mux is OK or not in such a way that the latency and reliability requirements are not impacted. In addition to the complexity that this would bring, this will require a large specification effort and thus should be really avoided (as we don’t have the luxury of time).**  Finally, as we explained in the first round of discussions, when the high-priority HARQ-ACK does not have a corresponding PDCCH (i.e. SPS case), multiplexing of high-priority HARQ-ACK bits with low-priority HARQ-ACK bits should not be supported. |
| Panasonic | We are OK with the proposal, although we prefer original proposal. |
| OPPO | Support |
| Huawei | Support. |
| Intel | RRC-based configuration is already implicitly supported. The proposal should focus on whether to use DCI for indication, otherwise not much point to discuss.  Still think the flexibility and simplicity of using DCI is motivating to go this direction, thus not support current version, support the previous version. |
| InterDigital | Not support, for the same reasons as Samsung/Nokia. |
| Ericsson | We are fine with this proposal as a first step as suggested by FL.  For DCI indication: we’d like to clarify that dynamic enable/disable by reusing existing field (if applicable), e.g. using beta\_offset=0 to disable multiplexing on PUSCH, can be easily supported. For multiplexing HARQ-ACKs on PUCCH, we are open to further study. It should also be considered whether/how to handle cases without usable DCI indication, e.g., PDSCH scheduled by DCI 0\_0, SPS PDSCH.  Edits for 1st sub-bullet: “FFS whether or not to additionally support ~~introduce DCI indication~~ to enable/disable the multiplexing dynamically.” |
| Apple | We support an RRC-only based solution. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support |
| APT/FGI | Not support. DCI indication should be included as in the original proposal. |

## PUCCH resource determination and mapping for multiplexing between HARQ-ACKs with different priorities

## Inputs from Tdocs

**In case the total number of LP and HP HARQ-ACK bits is 2:**

* Option 1: Select the PUCCH resource from the second *PUCCH-Config*.
  + HW, Nokia, ZTE, Spreadtrum, CATT, China Telecom, IDC, Xiaomi, Sharp, DCM

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Arguments | Counter arguments |
| Option 1 | Advantages | It can be guaranteed that the selected PUCCH resource uses the same power control as well as spatial processing as the PUCCH resource carrying the HP HARQ-ACK, and hence ensures the reliability of the HP transmission.  Unified solution with HARQ-ACK bits >2. |  |

**UCI payload size for PUCCH resource set selection**

* Option 1: the number of HP UCI bits + the number of LP UCI bits
* Option 2: the number of HP UCI bits + the number of LP UCI bits \* scaling factor. The scaling factor can be a function of code rate for HP UCI and LP UCI.
  + vivo, Apple, DCM

**Consider enhanced PRB number determination**

* + OPPO, Samsung, DCM

**Handling incorrect LP HARQ-ACK codebook size determination (due to DCI mis-detection)**

* Option 1: Configure a dedicated PUCCH resource for HP+LP
  + HW, Pana, Quectel, ETRI
* Option 2: PRI+x in the HP DCI is used to implicitly determine an extended PUCCH resource
  + ZTE, OPPO
* Option 3: the PUCCH resource set is determined based on a reference number (e.g. a weighted sum) of the LP and HP HARQ-ACK payload size
  + QC, CATT
* Option 4: Additional DCI field in DCI corresponding HP HARQ-ACK for determining the number of LP HARQ-ACK bits
  + CATT

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Resource determination for multiplexing between HARQ-ACKs with different priorities | | | |
|  | | Arguments | Counter arguments |
| Option 1 | Advantages | Avoid the decoding error of HP HARQ-ACK due to the ambiguity of the LP HARQ-ACK number. The gNB can configure different PUCCH resources (RB/CS/OCC) for HP only and hybrid HP+LP, respectively, and simply perform the blind detection of PUCCH DMRS on the two hypotheses for easy verification of the LP DCI missing. | The ambiguity due to the uncertainty of LP HARQ-ACK multiplexing with HP HARQ-ACK can be solved by gNB implementation, i.e. blind decoding the PUCCH based on the hypothesis of different payload size under the condition that whether the LP HARQ-ACK is multiplexed with HP HARQ-ACK or not. |
| Problems | Considering that maximum 16 resources can be configured in each PUCCH-resource-set, and the reliability of scheduling DCI for HP HARQ-ACK is generally high enough to avoid miss detection, we do not see much necessity to configure dedicated PUCCH resources for multiplexing. |  |

**Resource determination when HP HARQ-ACK is SPS HARQ-ACK**

* Option 1: The LP DCI determines the final PUCCH resource.
  + ETRI
* Option 2: Multiplexing is not allowed in this case
  + Nokia

**If no enough resource for both HP and LP HARQ-ACK:**

* Option 1: LP HARQ-ACK is compressed/bundled/compaction.
  + ZTE, QC, OPPO, TCL, MTK, WILUS, Apple
* Option 2: LP HARQ-ACK is dropped.
  + LGE, Sony
* Option 3: LP HARQ-ACK is partially dropped.
  + Intel, TCL

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Proposals/observations from Tdocs |
| E/// | 1. Resolve overlapping between PUCCH resources based on Rel-15 procedures where the overlapping is resolved starting from the first set of mutually overlapping PUCCH resources in a slot (a.k.a. set Q) until there are no overlapping PUCCH resources in the slot. 2. To determine a single PUCCH resource for a set of mutually overlapping PUCCH resources with different priority, drop SR and CSI of low priority, if any. Then, use sub-slot PUCCH resources if there is a sub-slot HARQ-ACK PUCCH in the set, starting from the earlier and smaller sub-slot. |
| Huawei | ***Proposal 5: Support a group of dedicated PUCCH sets in the second PUCCH-Configuration to carry the multiplexed HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK.*** |
| Nokia | **Proposal 3.2: For the scenario where a PUCCH carrying 1-bit high-priority HARQ-ACK overlaps with another PUCCH carrying 1-bit low-priority HARQ-ACK, the multiplexing of high-priority HARQ-ACK and low-priority HARQ-ACK is done on the high-priority PUCCH resource.**  **Proposal 3.3: Dedicated PUCCH resource configuration for multiplexing of high- and low-priority HARQ-ACK is not supported.**  **Proposal 3.4: For the scenario where a PUCCH carrying high-priority HARQ-ACK overlaps with another PUCCH carrying low-priority HARQ-ACK and the total payload size is two bits, multiplexing can be done on the high-priority PUCCH resource by treating the two bits as high-priority HARQ-ACK bits and using existing rules of mapping two HARQ-ACK bits of the same priority. The order of the two bits could be [high-priority HARQ-ACK bit, low-priority HARQ-ACK bit].**  **Proposal 3.5: For the scenario where a PUCCH carrying high-priority HARQ-ACK overlaps with another PUCCH carrying low-priority HARQ-ACK: If the high-priority HARQ-ACK does not have a corresponding PDCCH, the multiplexing is not supported.**  **Proposal 3.10: Discuss the selection of PUCCH resource set and the number of RBs for the multiplexing of high-priority HARQ-ACK and low-priority HARQ-ACK.**  ***Observation 3.1: Errors in low-priority HARQ-ACK codebook size determination may cause selection of different PUCCH resource set or use of smaller number of RBs for the multiplexed high-priority and low-priority HARQ-ACKs feedback than what gNB would expect.***  **Proposal 3.11: RAN1 to define how to avoid discrepancy between the UE and the gNB on the determination of PUCCH resource set and number of RBs for UCI containing multiplexed high-priority and low-priority HARQ-ACKs.**  ***Observation 3.2: In principle, multiplexing could be supported for all four possible combinations of high-priority HARQ-ACK overlapping with low-priority HARQ-ACK considering Type-1 and Type-2 codebooks. If there would be a need to prioritize some cases for the discussions, the cases involving same HARQ-ACK codebook type (Type-1/Type-2) could be discussed first. The case corresponding to multiplexing high-priority Type-1 HARQ-ACK and low-priority Type-2 HARQ-ACK could also be of interest.*** |
| ZTE | ***Proposal 7****: For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH in R17, use a PUCCH resource in the second PUCCH-Config (the PUCCH-config containing the PUCCH resource of the HP HARQ-ACK) in case the total number of LP and HP HARQ-ACK bits is 2.*  ***Proposal 8****: For the case that the total number of bits is no more than 2 bits, the PRI+x in the HP DCI is used to implicitly determine an extended PUCCH resource from the PUCCH set in the PUCCH-config with high priority for the multiplexed UCI.*  *- x is predefined, e.g., x=1.*  ***Proposal 16:*** *LP UCI compression is slightly preferred in case there is no enough resource left for LP UCI.* |
| vivo | ***Proposal 7: A scaling factor to determine a target reference UCI payload size should be considered for PUCCH resource set selection due to the different code rates for HP and LP UCI. The scaling factor can be a function of code rate for HP and LP UCI.*** |
| Spreadtrum | 1. ***Support to multiplex on the HP PUCCH resources if a 1 bit LP HARQ-ACK overlaps with a 1 bit HP*** |
| CATT | ***Proposal 9: The following two options can be considered to avoid the impact on HP HARQ-ACK(s) due to missing DCIs corresponding to LP HARQ-ACK codebook.***   * ***Option 1: Define a reference number of bits for LP HARQ-ACK codebook*** * ***Option 2: Indicate information for determine the number of LP HARQ-ACK bits by DCI corresponding to HP HARQ-ACK***   ***Proposal 13: An additional UL DAI bit field can be considered to be added in the UL DCI for multiplexing PUCCH and PUSCH with different priorities.*** |
| QC | ***Proposal 7*: For HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK multiplexing on a PUCCH, the PUCCH resource set is determined based on a weighted sum of the LP and HP HARQ-ACK payload size**  **where**   * **is the payload size of the HP HARQ-ACK** * **is a reference payload size for the LP HARQ-ACK, which is obtained by round up the LP HARQ-ACK size to a nearest reference size as in Proposal 6** * **is a weight factor** * **FFS: how to signal/determine the weigh factor .**   ***Proposal 18:* In Rel-17 UCI multiplexing, support low priority HARQ-ACK compression.**   * **FFS conditions to trigger low priority HARQ-ACK compression** * **FFS details of compression scheme.** |
| OPPO | ***Proposal 1: The number of PRBs used to transmit HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK should result to:***  , and  ***Proposal 2: If , the UE transmits the PUCCH over  PRBs. LP HARQ-ACK should be compressed into bits that satisfy:***  , and  ***Proposal 6: A PUCCH resource in the PUCCH resource set configured for HP HARQ-ACK is used to transmit HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK.***  ***Proposal 7: The PUCCH resource for multiplexing HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK is determined based on the PRI indicated in the last HP DCI and an offset.***   * ***If the value of C-DAI in the last LP DCI is even or no LP DCI is received, ;*** * ***Otherwise, .***   ***Proposal 7: The PUCCH resource for multiplexing HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK is determined based on the PRI indicated in the last HP DCI and an offset.***   * ***If the value of C-DAI in the last LP DCI is even or no LP DCI is received, ;*** * ***Otherwise, .***   ***Proposal 8: To determine the PUCCH resource set Q, described in TS 38.213 section 9.2.5, in a slot/subslot:***   * ***If a set of overlapping PUCCHs contains a first PUCCH carries HP HARQ-ACK and a second PUCCH carrying CSI or LP SR, delete the second PUCCH from set Q.*** * ***If a set of overlapping PUCCHs contains a first PUCCH carries HP SR and a second PUCCH carrying CSI, delete the second PUCCH from set Q.***   ***Proposal 10: When the total number of HP HARQ-ACK/SR and LP HARQ-ACK exceeds the capacity of the multiplexing PUCCH,***   * ***If CBG-based HARQ-ACK, HARQ-ACK bundling across multiple CBGs of one TB is firstly used for LP HARQ-ACK;*** * ***For TB-based HARQ-ACK, HARQ-ACK bundling across multiple PDSCHs on one serving cell can be used for LP HARQ-ACK.*** * ***If after time-domain TB-based HARQ-ACK bundling, the number of bundled bits is still more than , LP HARQ-ACK can be dropped.*** |
| China Telecom | **Proposal 3: For multiplexing a HP HARQ-ACK and a LP HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH when the total number of bits is 2,**   * **Use R15 mapping rules for 2 bits HARQ-ACK as a baseline.** * **Use a PUCCH resource in the second *PUCCH-Config* (the *PUCCH-config* containing the PUCCH resource of the HP HARQ-ACK).** |
| Intel | **Proposal 8: LP HARQ-ACK payload bits can be partially dropped**   * **FFS: How to partition LP HARQ-ACK payload bits** |
| Apple | **Proposal 4-1: is used for PUCCH resource set selection.**  **Proposal 8-1: consider joint PUCCH resource set selection and PUCCH resource selection.**  **Proposal 8-2: if joint PUCCH resource set selection and PUCCH resource selection is supported, and are configured per PUCCH format or per PUCCH resource.**  **Proposal 10-1: consider PRB # adjustment and CSI omission/HARQ compaction for the PUCCH resource under multi-CSI-PUCCH-ResourceList and pucch-CSI-ResourceList.** |
| Pana | **Proposal 6: In case the total number of LP and HP HARQ-ACK bits is more than 2, dedicated PUCCH resource is configured for multiplexing of HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK.** |
| Quectel | **Proposal 6**: Optional configuration of a set or subset of PUCCH resources dedicated for multiplexing of UCIs with different priorities is supported. |
| TCL | **Proposal 2: If the total UCI bits exceed the payload of the multiplexed PUCCH resource, partially dropped low priority UCI and/or compressed/bundled low-priority HARQ-ACK should be supported.** |
| ETRI | **Proposal 3: Further study how to adjust the power of PUCCH for payload from the other priority.**  **Proposal 5: The LP DCI determines the final PUCCH resource in at least for the HP SPS case.** |
| Samsung | **Proposal 5: For PRB determination and RE mapping when multiplexing a HP HARQ-ACK and a LP HARQ-ACK in a PUCCH, consider following two options.**  **Option 1) Reuse Rel-15 rules of separate coding in a PUCCH.**  **Option 2) PRB determination and RE mapping are performed separately for HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK for PF2/3.**  **FFS: How to ensure the reliability of HP HARQ-ACK.** |
| LGE | **Proposal #7: Consider the partial dropping for LP HARQ-ACK according to HARQ-ACK codebook type for the case of exceeding the maximum UCI coding rate on PUCCH.**  **Proposal #8: Discuss and decide at least the following details for PUCCH resource determination based on the agreed HP PUCCH configuration.**   * **How to select one of multiple HP PUCCH resource sets** * **How to determine a PUCCH resource in the selected HP PUCCH resource set**   **Proposal #9: Consider how to generate the HARQ-ACK payload per each of LP and HP for the multiplexing of LP/HP HARQ-ACK on PUCCH (or PUSCH), according to HARQ-ACK codebook type (e.g. Type-1/2/3 codebook).** |
| IDC | ***Proposal 5: DCI indicating HP HARQ-ACK also indicates the PUCCH resource for multiplexing HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK.***  ***Proposal 6: The PUCCH resource for multiplexing HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK is from the PUCCH configuration for HP HARQ-ACK (for any total number of LP and HP bits).***  ***Proposal 7: DCI indicating HP HARQ-ACK includes an indication of the DAI of LP HARQ-ACK.*** |
| Xiaomi | ***Proposal 4: Configuring dedicated resources for multiplexing of HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK is not necessary.***  ***Proposal 5: When the total number of LP and HP HARQ-ACK bits is 2, PUCCH resource of the HP HARQ-ACK should be adopted as the resource for multiplexing.*** |
| Sharp | **Proposal 4: A HP PUCCH resource configured for HP HARQ-ACK should be used for HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK multiplexing on PUCCH for all case.** |
| DOCOMO | **Proposal 4:**   * *For separate coding, an effective UCI payload size is introduced for PUCCH resource selection and PRB determination procedure, where is determined by HP UCI payload size, LP UCI payload size, HP UCI coding rate for multiplexing, LP UCI coding rate for multiplexing, and also additional CRC bits introduced by separate coding.*   **Proposal 5:**   * *For PRB determination for separate coding, introduce the following procedure:*   + *If ,*      - *PRB number is determined as the minimum number of , satisfying ;*   + *Otherwise,*      - *PRB number is determined as*   **Proposal 6:**   * *PUCCH resource for HP HARQ-ACK is used for multiplexing LP HARQ-ACK and HP HARQ-ACK when total UCI bit size is 2bits.* |
| MTK | Group-bundling is supported when multiplexing and when the resulted UCI payload is large. |
| Leno/Moto | * **Proposal 1:** A PUCCH resource configured by the second *PUCCH-Config*for multiplexing UCI of mixed priorities including up to 2bit HARQ-ACK information with/without a positive HP SR is determined based on:   + a last DCI format indicating a higher priority index, or   + a last DCI format if no DCI format indicating a higher priority index is detected, or   + a PUCCH resource configured for UCI of mixed priorities for up to 2 HARQ-ACK bits with a positive SR, when there is no corresponding DCI format. * **Proposal 3:** UE determines whether to multiplex LP HARQ-ACK with HP UCI in a PUCCH resource of PUCCH format 2, 3, or 4 of higher priority index, based on the total UCI payload size and configured max. code rate/max PRB parameters. |
| WILUS | ***Proposal 5:*** *If the required # of RBs for low-priority HARQ-ACK information exceeds the limit of PUCCH formats, then bundle the low-priority HARQ-ACK information. Detail bundling rules should be further discussed in Rel-17 URLLC/IIoT WI.* |

## 1st round discussion

Proposal for 1st round discussion:

For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH in R17,

* Use a PUCCH resource in the second *PUCCH-Config* (the *PUCCH-config* containing the PUCCH resource of the HP HARQ-ACK) in case the total number of LP and HP HARQ-ACK bits is 2.

Proposal for 1st round discussion:

For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH in R17, UCI payload size for PUCCH resource set selection is determined by (the number of HP UCI bits + the number of LP UCI bits \* scaling factor).

* The scaling factor can be a function of code rate for HP UCI and LP UCI.

Proposal for 1st round discussion:

For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH in R17, to avoid the incorrect LP HARQ-ACK codebook size determination due to DCI mis-detection, further study the following options:

* Option 1: Configure a dedicated PUCCH resource for HP+LP
* Option 2: PRI+x in the HP DCI is used to implicitly determine an extended PUCCH resource
* Option 3: the PUCCH resource set is determined based on a reference number (e.g. a weighted sum) of the LP and HP HARQ-ACK payload size
* Option 4: Additional DCI field in DCI corresponding HP HARQ-ACK for determining the number of LP HARQ-ACK bits
* Other solutions are not precluded.

Proposal after 2nd round discussion:

For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH in R17, down-select from the two options in case the total number of LP and HP HARQ-ACK bits is 2:

* Option 1: Use a PUCCH resource in the second *PUCCH-Config* (the *PUCCH-config* containing the PUCCH resource of the HP HARQ-ACK).
  + FFS: The PUCCH resource is configured dedicated for multiplexing of HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK
* Option 2: Use the PUCCH resource with more OFDM symbols between the original two PUCCH resources for the HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK.

Proposal after 2nd round discussion:

For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH in R17, down-select from the options on how to determine UCI payload size for PUCCH resource ~~set selection~~determination:

* Option 1: UCI payload size = the number of HP UCI bits + the number of LP UCI bits
* Option 2: UCI payload size = the number of HP UCI bits + the number of LP UCI bits \* scaling factor.
  + FFS: The scaling factor can be a function of code rate for HP UCI and LP UCI.
  + FFS: solutions to solve the LP UCI size misalignment between gNB and UE due to missing DL DCI.

Proposal after 2nd round discussion:

For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH in R17, further study the problem of ~~to avoid the~~ incorrect LP HARQ-ACK Type-2 codebook size determination due to DCI mis-detection~~, further study~~including the following options:

* Option 1: Configure a dedicated PUCCH resource for HP+LP in the second *PUCCH-Config*
* Option 2: PRI+x in the HP DCI is used to implicitly determine an extended PUCCH resource
* Option 3: ~~the PUCCH resource set is determined based on a reference number (e.g. a weighted sum) of the LP and HP HARQ-ACK payload size~~The LP type 2 codebook size is quantized/rounded up to a nearest reference size. FFS reference size granularity.
* Option 4: Additional DCI field in DCI corresponding HP HARQ-ACK for determining the number of LP HARQ-ACK bits
* Option 5: Provide indication on at least the number of RBs and/or PUCCH resource set index to be used in the PUCCH transmission, where the indication is included in the high-priority DL assignment.
* Other solutions are not precluded.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Sony | **1st Proposal: Agree**  **2nd Proposal: Not Agree:**   * Why is the scaling done at the info bits level? The Code Rate is applied during the encoding stage and we can have different Code Rat for HP UCI and LP UCI. This seemed to apply code rate BEFORE the UCI info bits are encoded.   **3rd Proposal: Not Agree**   * Is there even an issue with miss detection of LP DCI? One of the benefits of separate encoding is to handle missed detection. The LP UCI and HP UCI are separately encoded and so if the LP UCI has missed bits, it won’t affect the HP UCI. Hence, it isn’t clear we need yet another mechanism to handle this or at least we should discuss whether there is even a problem to begin with. |
| Nokia, NSB | **Support the first proposal**  **Support the second proposal.**  On the third proposal: this is an important issue that needs to be handled. **We thus support this 3rd proposal but first would like adding one more alternative as follows**:  *For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH in R17, to avoid the incorrect LP HARQ-ACK codebook size determination due to DCI mis-detection, further study the following options:*   * *Option 1: Configure a dedicated PUCCH resource for HP+LP* * *Option 2: PRI+x in the HP DCI is used to implicitly determine an extended PUCCH resource* * *Option 3: the PUCCH resource set is determined based on a reference number (e.g. a weighted sum) of the LP and HP HARQ-ACK payload size* * *Option 4: Additional DCI field in DCI corresponding HP HARQ-ACK for determining the number of LP HARQ-ACK bits* * *Option 5: Provide indication on at least the number of RBs and/or PUCCH resource set index to be used in the PUCCH transmission, where the indication is included in the high-priority DL assignment.* * *Other solutions are not precluded.*   In addition, under Option 3, the “(e.g. a weighted sum)” is not clear to us and prefer either to remove this parenthesis or adding that as separate option. |
| vivo | For the first two proposals, support.  For the third proposal, we think the whole proposal including the main bullet can be further study. |
| Apple | Support first proposal and the second proposal. |
| Huawei | **For the first proposal**, we recommend to add ‘FFS: The PUCCH resource is configured dedicated for multiplexing of HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK’ as a sub-bullet to keep it aligned with the more than 2 bits case. This is also to guarantee the HP performance in case LP DCI is missed.  **For the second proposal**, we are generally OK with it.  **For the third proposal**, maybe it is better to first clarify the ambiguity case(s) and the impact to HP HARQ-ACK before discussing the solutions. As per our understanding, missing LP DCI may lead to several cases if we assume the rate matching between LP HARQ-ACK and HP HARQ-ACK (taking >2 bits as an example):  **Case 1:** The UE misses all the LP DCIs (in case small payload of LP HARQ-ACK), i.e., ambiguity between HP only and HP+LP. For this case, the rate matching formulas for HP HARQ-ACK under the HP only case and the HP + LP case are different, as shown in the following figures. **This is the ambiguity case where we need to resolve** in our understanding.  cid:image002.jpg@01D74CCA.717189D0  **Case 2:** The UE misses the last LP DCI and there is ambiguity on the LP HARQ-ACK payload number. There are two sub-cases as follows:   * **Case 2-1:** The total RB number calculated for format 2/3 is the same between gNB (with correct LP payload) and UE (with wrong and smaller LP payload) for rate matching, i.e. the wrong LP HARQ-ACK payload does not impact the calculated PRB number. Under this case, we think **it does not impact the accuracy of decoding the HP HARQ-ACK** since the HP HARQ-ACK REs are mapped in higher priority and independent with LP HARQ-ACK REs.   cid:image003.jpg@01D74CCA.717189D0   * **Case 2-2:** The total RB numbers calculated for format 2/3 are different between gNB (with correct LP payload) and UE (with smaller LP payload, resulting in smaller RB number) for rate matching. Under this case, the gNB can perform the PUCCH DMRS blind detection to identify the bandwidth of the PUCCH transmitted by the UE, then perform the decoding according to the detected bandwidth, so **it does not impact the accuracy of decoding the HP HARQ-ACK**.   cid:image004.jpg@01D74CCA.717189D0  Based on the above analysis, we think Case 1: **ambiguity on the existence of LP HARQ-ACK should be the target case** for considering the solutions. To this end, separate PUCCH resources for HP only and hybrid HP+LP would be a simple way in our understanding, and applicable also for the multiplexing between semi-static HP UCI and LP UCI where there is no HP DCI.  BTW, we are a little confused on “Option 3: the PUCCH resource set is determined based on a reference number (e.g. a weighted sum) of the LP and HP HARQ-ACK payload size.” Could FL clarify how it can resolve the ambiguity case? |
| ZTE | Support the first and third proposal.  Not support the second proposal. No need to define the scaling factor for LP UCI bits. Directly using the number of HP UCI bits + LP UCI bits to determine the PUCCH resource set selection would not cause resource waste issue, as after the encoding according to the real coding rate for HP UCI and LP UCI, the unused PUCCH resources will be automatically released for other UE’s usage. |
| Samsung | We do not support the first proposal. It also relates to a previous proposal which has not been agreed. There is no reason to optimize for the case of 2 LP/HP A/N bits (the opposite is true).  For the second proposal, we should first discuss how to determine the code rate of LP HARQ-ACK – the determination of the PUCCH resource (set) can then follow.  We support the third proposal. |
| Quectel | **1st proposal**: support.  **2nd proposal**: not support. We think this proposal is tightly related with whether separate coding rates are configured for HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK and whether a reference payload size in Option 3 of the 3rd proposal is introduced. If a single coding rate is configured (reuse Rel-15 rate matching formulas), how to define the scaling factor? If reference payload size is introduced, is the reference payload size or the actual payload size used for the PUCCH resource determination? We think the proposal should be postponed waiting for the outcome of discussions of the coding rate configuration and the 3rd proposal.  **3rd proposal**: support. |
| Panasonic | We support the first and third proposal.  On the second proposal, we are not clear why the scaling factor for LP HARQ-ACK bits is required. We are not against the proposal if the reason is clarified. |
| LG | On the first proposal, we are supportive to it.  On the second proposal, we do not support the proposal and agree with ZTE.  The reason is that, currently there is no restriction that all the PUCCH resources within a resource set should be set with the number of REs/RBs corresponding to the maximum payload size configured for the resource set. It means that some PUCCH resources could be set with less REs/RBs, and other PUCCH resources could be set with even more REs/RBs than that corresponding to the maximum payload size. Even in case when a large PUCCH resource is selected compared to the actual payload size, there would be no resource waste since the UE would only use a required number of RBs within the resource.  On the third proposal, we are open to the study. |
| QC | We don’t support option 1. For proposal 1, we don’t see the motivation of pick HP resource. We think a better approach should be always selecting the resource with more OFDM symbols, which allows to transmit with more energy to deliver the multiplexed two bits reliably. The power control for the multiplexed 2 bits can be based on HP bit.  So we have the following proposal for this 1+1 bits case.  **Proposal 1: For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH in R17,**   * **Use the PUCCH resource with more OFDM symbols between the original two PUCCH resources for the HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK, in case the total number of LP and HP HARQ-ACK bits is 2.**   For proposal 2, we support its principle. But there is a caveat in current proposal 2. LP HARQ-ACK size could have mismatch between UE and gNB due to missing DCI, which is the same issue as proposal 3 tries to address. To address this, we could update proposal 2 as following.  **Proposal 2: For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH in R17, UCI payload size for PUCCH resource set selection is determined by (the number of HP UCI bits + the number of LP UCI bits \* scaling factor).**   * **The scaling factor can be a function of code rate for HP UCI and LP UCI.** * **FFS: solutions to solve the LP UCI size misalignment between gNB and UE due to missing DL DCI.**   For proposal 3, we support the main bullet, with a minor comment that this only applies to type 2 codebook. Regarding the option3, we think QC proposed alternative is not accurately captured in option 3. We suggest the following update of the proposal 3.  **Proposal 3: For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH in R17, to avoid the incorrect LP HARQ-ACK type 2 codebook size determination due to DCI mis-detection, further study the following options:**   * **Option 1: Configure a dedicated PUCCH resource for HP+LP** * **Option 2: PRI+x in the HP DCI is used to implicitly determine an extended PUCCH resource** * **Option 3: ~~the PUCCH resource set is determined based on a reference number (e.g. a weighted sum) of the LP and HP HARQ-ACK payload size~~ The LP type 2 codebook size is quantized/rounded up to a nearest reference size. FFS reference size granularity.** * **Option 4: Additional DCI field in DCI corresponding HP HARQ-ACK for determining the number of LP HARQ-ACK bits** * **Other solutions are not precluded.** |
| DOCOMO | Support the three proposals but some comments are provided below:  For the second proposal, it is not sure that multiplexed HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK will be transmitted in *PUCCH-ResourceSet*(s). We only have agreement that “Use a PUCCH resource in the second *PUCCH-Config* (the *PUCCH-config* containing the PUCCH resource of the HP HARQ-ACK)”, where the PUCCH resource may be one of resources from *PUCCH-ResourceSet*(s), and it may also be a PUCCH resource from *SPS-PUCCH-AN-List*. Note that we have no agreements to preclude SPS HARQ-ACK multiplexing so far. So we suggest to modify the second proposal as:  For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH in R17, UCI payload size for PUCCH resource (set) selection is determined by (the number of HP UCI bits + the number of LP UCI bits \* scaling factor).   * The scaling factor can be a function of code rate for HP UCI and LP UCI.   For the third proposal, we agree with the principle to avoid ambiguity caused by incorrect LP HARQ-ACK CB size. More details can be FFS. |
| Spreadtrum | **1st proposal**: support.  **2nd proposal**: not support. The code rate of LP HARQ-ACK should be determined firstly.  **3rd proposal**: support. |
| TCL | We support the first two proposals. For the third proposal, we are open for further study. |
| ITRI | Support the 1st proposal.  For the 2nd and 3rd proposals, the scope is not clear for us. What is the range for the total number of LP and HP HARQ-ACK bits? |
| OPPO | Support 1st and 3rd proposal  For 2nd proposal, we do not support it now.  Actual used PRB of PUCCH resource is determined by actual payload(s) and actual code rate(s). In other words, actual used PRB can be smaller than configured PRB. So, there is no resource waste issue even if the PUCCH resource set is determined by total payload of HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK.  In addition, it is not clear how to determine code rate for HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK. Code rate and PUCCH resource set determination is a chicken-and-egg issue. According to current spec, code rate relates with PUCCH format of determined PUCCH resource. Before PUCCH resource and PUCCH resource set is determined, code rate is not defined for UE. For HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK multiplexing case, one potential solution is that code rate for UCI payload calculation is determined by individual PUCCH resource for HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK before multiplexing, however, the code rate for UCI payload calculation maybe different from the code rate for multiplexing PUCCH resource. It is strange to determine PUCCH resource set including multiplexing PUCCH resource by payload, which is calculated by different code rates from multiplexing PUCCH resource. |
| CATT | We support the first and the third proposals.  For the second proposal, we do not think scaling factor is needed. There will be no waste of RBs since RBmin will be used. |
| WILUS | We are fine with the 1st proposal and the 3rd proposal.  For the 2nd proposal, we do not support to introduce scaling factor. Actually used REs/RBs may be determined based on the code rate, not PUCCH Resource Set. So, we don’t see any redundant REs/RBs when using the number of HP UCI bits + the number of LP UCI bits directly. |
| Intel | Support P1, we think gNB would ensure the second PUCCH-Config resource has enough OFDM symbols, and appropriate start/end to handle the multiplexing with LP w/o penalty to URLLC service.  P2 is not completely clear to us, especially how to handle the ambiguity due to missed DCI, as discussed in P3. Prefer to postpone discussion.  For P3, more discussion on options is needed first. For example, Option 1 does seem contradict to P1 and the previous agreement that the second PUCCH-Config is used, if we understand it correctly. |
| InterDigital | Support all proposals.  Picking the HP resource ensures that sufficient power is provided. Since the HP resource is typically scheduled later than the LP resource, the network can make sure that the HP resource is suitable for multiplexing. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | 1. Support the first and third proposals. 2. For the second proposal, we think whether to apply same or different max code rates to HP UCI and LP UCI need to be decided first. Also, whether the second proposal is relevant/necessary is dependent on solutions to the issue mentioned in the third proposal. |
| Sharp | Support the 1st proposal and the 2nd proposal.  For the 3rd proposal, open for further discussion. |
| APT/FGI | Support the first and the second proposal. For the third proposal, support the updated proposal by Nokia. |
| ETRI | We support three proposals.  Regarding the scaling factor in the second proposal, we think the bullet of scaling factor can be put with FFS or Note because the proposal is whether to introduce this factor. |
| Ericsson | 1st proposal: OK  2nd proposal:   * OK with main proposal. * Disagree with the bullet. We don’t see the need of complicated definition for scaling factor. It’s also unclear how is the code rate for HP UCI and LP UCI is obtained. Currently maxCodeRate is a parameter of the PUCCH format; not specifically for HARQ-ACK.   3rd proposal:   * It’s not clear why there is a need to focus on DCI misdetection for LP HARQ-ACK CB. * For Type 1 CB, there is no CB size determination issue; * For Type 2 CB, there are known issues related to mis-detection of last DCI. This potential error exists for both HP and LP CB. |
| NEC | Support the 1st proposal. For the 2nd proposal and the 3rd proposal, we are open for further study. |

## 2nd round discussion

Proposal for 2nd round discussion:

For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH in R17, down-select from the two options in case the total number of LP and HP HARQ-ACK bits is 2:

* Option 1: Use a PUCCH resource in the second *PUCCH-Config* (the *PUCCH-config* containing the PUCCH resource of the HP HARQ-ACK).
  + FFS: The PUCCH resource is configured dedicated for multiplexing of HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK
* Option 2: Use the PUCCH resource with more OFDM symbols between the original two PUCCH resources for the HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK.

Support: QC, Sharp, TCL, LG, WILUS, DCM, ZTE, Nokia, Pana, OPPO, Intel, E///, APT/FGI

Not support option 2: Sony, Quectel, ITRI, Spreadtrum, vivo, CATT, IDC, HW, IDC, Leno/Moto

Postpone the discussion: Samsung

Proposal for 2nd round discussion:

For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH in R17, down-select from the options on how to determine UCI payload size for PUCCH resource determination:

* Option 1: UCI payload size = the number of HP UCI bits + the number of LP UCI bits
* Option 2: UCI payload size = the number of HP UCI bits + the number of LP UCI bits \* scaling factor.
  + FFS: The scaling factor can be a function of code rate for HP UCI and LP UCI.
  + FFS: solutions to solve the LP UCI size misalignment between gNB and UE due to missing DL DCI.

Support: QC, Apple, Sharp. TCL, LG, WILUS, DCM, ITRI, vivo, CATT, ZTE, Nokia, Pana, OPPO, HW (remove 2nd FFS), IDC, E/// (question FFS points), Leno/Moto, APT/FGI

Not support option 2: Sony, Samsung (postpone the discussion), Spreadtrum (postpone the discussion),

Proposal for 2nd round discussion:

For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH in R17, further study the problem of incorrect LP HARQ-ACK Type-2 codebook size determination due to DCI mis-detection and potential solutions including:

* Option 1: Configure a dedicated PUCCH resource for HP+LP in the second *PUCCH-Config*
* Option 2: PRI+x in the HP DCI is used to implicitly determine an extended PUCCH resource
* Option 3: The LP type 2 codebook size is quantized/rounded up to a nearest reference size. FFS reference size granularity.
* Option 4: Additional DCI field in DCI corresponding HP HARQ-ACK for determining the number of LP HARQ-ACK bits
* Option 5: Provide indication on at least the number of RBs and/or PUCCH resource set index to be used in the PUCCH transmission, where the indication is included in the high-priority DL assignment.
* Other solutions are not precluded.

Support: QC, Sharp, LG, Samsung, Quectel, DCM, Spreadtrum, CATT, Nokia, Pana, OPPO, IDC, Leno/Moto, APT/FGI

Not see the problem: Sony,

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Sony | **1st Proposal**   * We do not see the need for Option 2. The gNB is in control on the PUCCH resources in the 2nd *PUCCH-config*. Also more OFDM symbols may lead to higher latency as it takes longer for the transmission to end.   **2nd Proposal**   * We do not see the need for Option 2. There is already a proposal in Section 3.2.3 that the gNB can configured separate *maxCodeRate* for LP & HP, so why do we need scaling factors prior to the encoding process?   **3rd Proposal**   * We do not see any issue with missed detect LP DCI. We already agree that LP & HP UCIs are separately encoded so the HP UCI should not be affected if the number of LP UCIs is not accurate. |
| QC | For first proposal, we are fine in general. We have two comments. 1) Option 1 is incomplete while option 2 is complete. It is not a fair down selection with option 1 still have FFS. 2) We’d like to clarify the power control with option 2 is still used on the HP power control parameters.  Option 2: Use the PUCCH resource with more OFDM symbols between the original two PUCCH resources for the HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK. The power control parameters are reused from the PUCCH resource of HP HARQ-ACK.  @ Sony, this is with 1-2 bits, gNB can be earlier decoding with PUCCH format 1 so latency is not an issue, as illustrate in the following. But the advantage option 2 is that it can transmit with more energy with more OFDM symbols, especially for power limited UE (cell edge for example).    We support proposal 2.  The motivation to introduce scaling factor is to count for the different coding rate for HP and LP. For example, given total payload size is 20 bits, the needed resource for 10 bits HP +10 bits LP is very different from 1 bit HP + 19 bits LP. To make sure the PUCCH resource set selection is accurate, option 2 is better.  We support proposal 3.  The impact of LP payload size misalignment to HP UCI decoding is already clearly explained in the figures in at least HW and QC contributions and in the figures provided by HW in the first round of email discussion. For readers’ convenience, the figure from QC contribution is pasted below. There are obvious two issues:   1. Junk RBs are included in HP UCI decoding 2. Valid RBs are missed in HP UCI decoding |
| Apple | We support proposal 2, and we are open for discussion on proposal 1 and proposal 3. |
| Sharp | For Proposal 1: we support Option 1. A HP PUCCH configured for up to 2 bits already provide sufficient performance for 2 bits. For option 2, if the UE is only configured with PUCCH format 0 for HP PUCCH resources, does Option 2 mean that the multiplexing of 1-bit HP and 1-bit LP cannot be done?  We support Proposal 2. However, Option 1 using the total of HP and LP UCI sides is more applicable to joint coding instead of separate coding. Since different coding rates are applied on UCIs with different priorities, Option 2 is more reasonable.  Proposal 3: The issue of missing DCI or wrong payload size for LP UCI is unclear to us. At least Options 1, 3, 5 can indicate the PUCCH resources, and cannot solve the issue raised for discussion. The PUCCH resource should be determined by the payload, indicate a PUCCH resource cannot determine the payload because the payload is a range.  However, we support to further study some options in Proposal 3 esp. if LP payload reduction methods are considered. |
| TCL | We support the first two proposals. For the third proposal, we are open for further study. |
| LG | Thanks FL for the update.  We are fine with Proposals 1 and 2, although we don’t see the need of scaling factor in Proposal 2 since there is no resource waste by applying adaptation of RB number actually used in a PUCCH resource.  On Proposal 3, we are open to study the issue, and suggest small modification (in red) as below.   * Option 4: Additional DCI field in DCI corresponding HP HARQ-ACK or HP PUSCH for determining the number of LP HARQ-ACK bits |
| Samsung | For the 1st and 2nd proposals, we don’t support. The discussion should be postponed as we have explained in the 1st round.  Support the 3rd proposal. |
| Quectel | For the 1st proposal, we do not see the need for Option 2. The argument for Option 2 is more energy accumulation with latency of HP not being affected. In our view, the energy accumulated for HP HARQ-ACK will not be increased so the potential benefit is only for LP HARQ-ACK. The latency of HP HARQ-ACK may be increased because the gNB may wait for the last DMRS for channel estimation. The usage of cover code may also require the gNB to start decoding after receiving all PUCCH symbols.  For the 2nd proposal, generally we think other options should not be precluded (e.g., use a reference payload size instead of the actual payload size for the PUCCH resource determination as Option 3 in the 3rd proposal). We are not OK for the first FFS bullet. It seems separate coding rate configuration per PF per PUCCH-config has already been agreed. More generic descriptions are preferred, e.g.,   * + FFS: The scaling factor   Moreover, does this proposal imply that a same UCI payload size is used for both PUCCH resource set determination and minimum PUCCH resource determination? This needs be clarified.  For the 3rd proposal, we are supportive. |
| QC2 | For option 2 for second proposal. Our original thought is that “the number of LP UCI bits” could be actual # LP UCI bits or a reference # of LP UCI bits, because of the size mis-alignment issue due to missing DCI. That is why we suggested to add the 2nd FFS for option 2. After reading Quectel’s comment, we agree with Quectel that to be more precise, we should add another FFS for option 3 “FFS: the number of LP UCI bits should be the actual number of LP UCI bits that UE generates based on DCI or RRC configuration or a reference LP UCI bits”   * Option 2: UCI payload size = the number of HP UCI bits + the number of LP UCI bits \* scaling factor.   + FFS: The scaling factor can be a function of code rate for HP UCI and LP UCI.   + FFS: solutions to solve the LP UCI size misalignment between gNB and UE due to missing DL DCI.   @Sharp, about option 2 for proposal 1, “A HP PUCCH configured for up to 2 bits already provide sufficient performance for 2 bits. For option 2, if the UE is only configured with PUCCH format 0 for HP PUCCH resources, does Option 2 mean that the multiplexing of 1-bit HP and 1-bit LP cannot be done?” – No, in that case, both HP and LP will use PUCCH format 0 and option 2 will pick a the PUCCH format 0 resource with 2 OFDM symbols (if there is one such resource). If both resource are with 1 OFDM symbol, then it does not matter use which resource, as long as the power control parameters are based on HP.  @Quectel, “In our view, the energy accumulated for HP HARQ-ACK will not be increased so the potential benefit is only for LP HARQ-ACK.” – With option 2, if the resulting PUCH resource is PUCCH format 1 and the two bits will be transmitted with PF1, energy split between HP and LP is half and half. I don’t follow why the energy accumulated for HP HARQ-ACK will not be increased. To me, obvious, there are more energy used on HP as well. Maybe you understand our scheme in a wrong way by assuming we let HP puncture the LP transmission in the long PUCCH? I’d like to clarify that is not our proposal. Our proposal is transmit the 2 bits in the longer resource follow legacy PF1 or PF0 (if longer resource has only 1-2 OFDM symbol).  Regarding the comment on OCC codes, I agree that time domain OCC may prevent gNB to do earlier decoding. However, a smarter gNB can walk around this hurdle by using special paring of OCC such as [1, 1, 1, 1, …, 1,1] and [1, -1, 1, -1, 1, -1, …, 1, -1]. In this example, as long as gNB get the first 2 OFDM symbol, it can start to do de-OCC, channel estimation, and decode.  Anyway, my point is that option 2 can transmit with more energy. In the following example, assuming the LP is with 8 OFDM symbol and the HP is with 1 OFDM symbol which aligns with symbol 4 on LP. Isn’t by earlier decoding, at least 4 time more energy can be used to transmit the payload, by using the long PUCCH resource rather than the short PUCCH resource. If this URLLC service is not that delay sensitive, then 8 time more energy can be harvest, by not doing earlier decoding. |
| WILUS | We are fine with the first two proposal.  For the third proposal, our understanding is there is still potential LP HARQ-ACK codebook size ambiguity in case of LP type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook. For example, if a UE misses all DCI formats indicating LP type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook, the UE determines there is no LP type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook to be multiplexed. This case can be also considered/addressed in the third proposal. So, we propose to change the main bullet as follows:  For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH in R17, further study the problem of incorrect LP HARQ-ACK ~~Type-2~~ codebook size determination due to DCI mis-detection, including the following options: |
| LG | We share the same view with WILUS (I missed this comment in first input) that we need to consider/study on potential issue even with Type-1 CB (as well as Type-2 CB), for example, whether LP HARQ-ACK is present or whether LP HARQ-ACK is full codebook, and so on.  For this reason, we suggest the following modification on Proposal 3.  **For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH in R17, further study the problem of incorrect LP HARQ-ACK ~~Type-2~~ codebook size determination due to DCI mis-detection, including the following options:**   * **Option 1: Configure a dedicated PUCCH resource for HP+LP in the second *PUCCH-Config*** * **Option 2: PRI+x in the HP DCI is used to implicitly determine an extended PUCCH resource** * **Option 3: The LP type 2 codebook size is quantized/rounded up to a nearest reference size. FFS reference size granularity.** * **Option 4: Additional DCI field in DCI corresponding HP HARQ-ACK or HP PUSCH** **for determining the number of LP HARQ-ACK bits multiplexed on PUCCH/PUSCH.** * **Option 5: Provide indication on at least the number of RBs and/or PUCCH resource set index to be used in the PUCCH transmission, where the indication is included in the high-priority DL assignment.** * **Other solutions are not precluded.** |
| DOCOMO | We are generally fine with the proposals and open to discuss down-selection among the options for each proposal.  For the first proposal, we prefer option 1 since option 2 may cause latency issue.  For the second proposal,  We support option 2 since one of key advantages for separate coding is more efficient resource utilization. If total HP and LP UCI bits are considered without any differentiation, the resource efficiency will be low as the example given by Qualcomm.  For the second FFS under option 2 “FFS: solutions to solve the LP UCI size misalignment between gNB and UE due to missing DL DCI”, we understand it is common issue for both option 1 and option 2. Moreover, we think the FFS can be removed if the third proposal is agreed since the third proposal is talking about the same issue as the FFS.  For the third proposal, we are open to discuss solution for this issue. |
| ITRI | Support first proposal with 1st option.  Support second proposal.  For the third proposal, we are open to further discuss. |
| Spreadtrum | For 1st proposal, Option 2 is not preferred. A simpler and more unified solution is supported.  For 2nd proposal, suggest to discuss after separate max coderate configuration is determined.  Support the 3rd proposal. |
| vivo | For the first proposal, we don’t think option 2 is needed.  For the second proposal, we are fine.  For the third proposal, we are open for further study. |
| CATT | For the first proposal, we do not see the need of option 2. Option 1 is sufficient to have a unified solution for 2-bit and >2 bits cases. In addition, option 2 may complicate the UCI multiplexing e.g. a HP HARQ-ACK may be multiplexed in a LP PUCCH which goes across sub-slot boundary for HP HARQ-ACK results in further multiplexing with HP HARQ-ACK in another sub-slot.  For the second proposal, we are fine to keep the options for now given that it has not been discussed before although we are not convinced to have the scaling factor for now.  We are fine with the third proposal. |
| ZTE | Fine with the 1st proposal and 2nd proposal.  Propose to additionally consider the potential issue with Type-1 CB as well as Type-2 CB in the 3rd proposal  More comments:  For 1st proposal, option 2 is not convinced.  For 2nd proposal, option 1 is our preference. The issue raised by option 2 is not valid as LG said.  For the 3rd proposal, I agree with LG and WILUS, that we need to consider potential issue even with Type-1 CB as well as Type-2 CB. |
| Nokia, NSB | **- For the first proposal**: fine with the proposal and we support Option 1, and we don’t see a need for the FFS point. Option 2 is not acceptable to us.  **- For the second proposal**: support the proposal. Although we don’t have a strong preference, Option 2 may be better as it would consider the ‘effective’ payload size for the PUCCH resource set determination.  - **For the third proposal:** We agree with other companies that this is an important issue that needs to be addressed. Indeed, as we explain in our Tdoc (R1-2104310), errors in LP HARQ-ACK codebook size determination (due to missing last corresponding DCI(s)) can cause selection by the UE of different PUCCH resource set or use of smaller number of RBs for the multiplexed HP and LP HARQ-ACKs feedback than what the gNB would expect. And if this happens, the HP HARQ-ACK performance would be impacted.  Option 1 is not preferrable, and Option 2 is not really clear. On Option 3, we can consider it only if a single reference size would be adopted. If this is not the intention of the current Option, we thus would like to add the following option:  *For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH in R17, further study the problem of incorrect LP HARQ-ACK Type-2 codebook size determination due to DCI mis-detection, including the following options:*   * *Option 1: Configure a dedicated PUCCH resource for HP+LP in the second PUCCH-Config* * *Option 2: PRI+x in the HP DCI is used to implicitly determine an extended PUCCH resource* * *Option 3-1: The LP type 2 codebook size is quantized/rounded up to a nearest reference size. FFS reference size granularity.* * *Option 3-2: Configuration of semi-static size reservation for LP HARQ-ACK payload is provided by RRC. LP HARQ-ACK semi-static size reservation is used instead of determined LP HARQ-ACK codebook size when selecting the PUCCH resource set.* * *Option 4: Additional DCI field in DCI corresponding HP HARQ-ACK for determining the number of LP HARQ-ACK bits* * *Option 5: Provide indication on at least the number of RBs and/or PUCCH resource set index to be used in the PUCCH transmission, where the indication is included in the high-priority DL assignment.* * *Other solutions are not precluded.* |
| Panasonic | We are fine with the three proposal in principle.  For first proposal, we prefer Option 1.  For the 2nd proposal, we share the similar view with Sony. Option 1 is preferred.  For the 3rd proposal, we are open to further discussion. |
| OPPO | Support all proposals in principle.  Option 2 in 2nd proposal should be discussed after separate max coderate configuration is determined |
| Huawei | **For proposal 1**, we have strong concern on Option 2 from the network vendor perspective, because the earlier demodulation (to ensure the latency) forces the gNB to perform detection before fully receiving the whole PUCCH which is a quite different behavior from Rel-15/16 and with higher complexity. In addition, we hope a unified solution would be applied for up to 2 bits and for more than 2 bits.  **For proposal 2**, we are OK with the main bullet, but for the second FFS: “solutions to solve the LP UCI size misalignment between gNB and UE due to missing DL DCI”, it is not clear for us since in our understanding, if the misalignment may lead to different PUCCH resource sets, the gNB can simply perform the blind detection of PUCCH DMRS to identify the actually occupied PUCCH resource. So we recommend to remove the FFS.  **For proposal 3**, the second bullet is a bit confused by saying ‘study the **problems** of …, including the **solutions** of …’ as the solutions are not the problems but the ways to solve them. From the first round discussion, we think companies are still not convergent on the ambiguity cases (whether there is mismatch issue due to LP DCI missing, and which cases have to be resolved by spec), so it may be better to first encourage companies to investigate the cases of LP HARQ-ACK ambiguity due to the LP DCI mis-detection, and then discuss the candidate solutions based on the observed cases.  In addition, as we described in the first round, missing LP DCI may lead to the ambiguity on two cases as mentioned in our first round comments, **Case 1**: ambiguity on the existence of the LP HARQ-ACK which is **applicable for** **both type 1 codebook and type 2 codebook**, and **Case 2**: ambiguity on the payload of the LP HARQ-ACK (**Case 2-1**: the ambiguous LP payload does not impact the total RB number, and **Case 2-2**: the ambiguous LP payload results in ambiguous total RB number), which is applicable to type 2 codebook. From our perspective, Case 1 should be resolved by spec and Case 2 can be resolved by gNB implementation, i.e., PUCCH DMRS blind detection. We are open for discussions, but we hope the proposal can somewhat reflect the above ambiguity cases.   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **Case 1** | **Case 2-1** | **Case 2-2** |   So we suggest the proposal is modified as:  “For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH in R17, further study the problem of ~~incorrect LP HARQ-ACK Type-2 codebook size determination~~ ambiguity on LP HARQ-ACK existence or LP HARQ-ACK type-2 codebook size due to DCI mis-detection, and the candidate solutions, including the following options:   * Option 1: Configure a dedicated PUCCH resource for HP+LP in the second *PUCCH-Config* * Option 2: PRI+x in the HP DCI is used to implicitly determine an extended PUCCH resource * Option 3: The LP type 2 codebook size is quantized/rounded up to a nearest reference size. FFS reference size granularity. * Option 4: Additional DCI field in DCI corresponding HP HARQ-ACK for determining the number of LP HARQ-ACK bits * Option 5: Provide indication on at least the number of RBs and/or PUCCH resource set index to be used in the PUCCH transmission, where the indication is included in the high-priority DL assignment. * Other solutions are not precluded. * FFS: ambiguity cases should be identified.   ” |
| Intel | Ok with P1 to move forward and prefer Option 1.  Ok with P2, but don’t see much progress with it, thus fine to stop this discussion.  For P3, we actually think that the issue of the size mismatch needs further confirmation before collecting the options to solve. |
| InterDigital | First proposal: OK but we should select Option 1. Option 2 seems to be a solution to a problem that does not exist with sensible network behaviour.  Support second proposal, with preference for Option 2.  Support third proposal. Also OK with modification by Nokia. |
| Ericsson | 1st Proposal:  Support Option 1. Delete the FFS bullet.  For Option 2: if there is a benefit to use more OFDM symbols (e.g., cell edge UE and no concern of latency), then gNB can configure more symbols for the second *PUCCH-Config*. Thus Option 1 is sufficient and can provide the benefits of Option 2 also.  2nd Proposal:  Fine with down-selection between Option 1 and Option 2 for PUCCH resource determination. However, the two FFS bullets are problematic.  First FFS: what’s code rate here? Actual HARQ-ACK CB size over actual coded bits to be transmitted? But this is unknown at PUCCH resource determination step.  Second FFS: this is common problem to both Option 1 and 2. Additionally, missing DCI issue exists for HP UCI also.  3rd Proposal:  We acknowledge the issue and open for further study. We agree with several other companies that the DCI misdetection issue exist for other cases as well, e.g.,   * LP HARQ-ACK Type-1 CB; * HP SR + LP HARQ-ACK; * HP SR + HP HARQ-ACK + LP HARQ-ACK;   Unified approach for handling DCI misdetection for all relevant cases is preferred. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | For the first proposal, we don’t think option 2 is necessary.  For the second and third proposals, can further discuss based on listed options. |
| QC3 | For proposal 1, for those companies think gNB can take care of everything, I’d like to remind the group that there is SPS A/N. Yes, a sensible gNB can adjust # OFDM symbols for HP resource for dynamic A/N. But it cannot adjust for HP SPS A/N. In case of HP SPS A/N overlap with LP dynamic A/N, option 1 cannot allow gNB adjust # OFDM symbols to transmit the muxed 2 bits, while option 2 allows it by adjusting # OFDM symbols for the LP dynamic A/N. |
| APT/FGI | We are fine with the proposals.  For the second proposal, option 2 is preferred. |

## 3rd round discussion

Proposal for 3rd round discussion:

For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH in R17, down-select from the two options in case the total number of LP and HP HARQ-ACK bits is 2:

* Option 1: Use a PUCCH resource in the second *PUCCH-Config* (the *PUCCH-config* containing the PUCCH resource of the HP HARQ-ACK).
* Option 2: Use the PUCCH resource with more OFDM symbols between the original two PUCCH resources for the HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK. The power control parameters are reused from the PUCCH resource of HP HARQ-ACK.

Proposal for 3rd round discussion:

For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH in R17, down-select from the options on how to determine UCI payload size for PUCCH resource determination:

* Option 1: UCI payload size = the number of HP UCI bits + the number of LP UCI bits
* Option 2: UCI payload size = the number of HP UCI bits + the number of LP UCI bits \* scaling factor.
  + FFS: The scaling factor can be a function of code rate for HP UCI and LP UCI.
* FFS: the number of LP UCI bits should be the actual number of LP UCI bits that UE generates based on DCI or RRC configuration or a reference number of LP UCI bits

Proposal for 3rd round discussion:

For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH in R17, further study the problem of ambiguity on LP HARQ-ACK existence or LP HARQ-ACK type-2 codebook size due to DCI mis-detection and the candidate options:

* Option 1: Configure a dedicated PUCCH resource for HP+LP in the second *PUCCH-Config*
* Option 2: PRI+x in the HP DCI is used to implicitly determine an extended PUCCH resource
* Option 3a: The LP type 2 codebook size is quantized/rounded up to a nearest reference size. FFS reference size granularity.
* Option 3b: Configuration of semi-static size reservation for LP HARQ-ACK payload is provided by RRC. LP HARQ-ACK semi-static size reservation is used instead of determined LP HARQ-ACK codebook size when selecting the PUCCH resource set.
* Option 4: Additional DCI field in DCI corresponding HP HARQ-ACK or HP PUSCH for determining the number of LP HARQ-ACK bits multiplexed on PUCCH/PUSCH.
* Option 5: Provide indication on at least the number of RBs and/or PUCCH resource set index to be used in the PUCCH transmission, where the indication is included in the high-priority DL assignment.
* Other solutions are not precluded.
* FFS ambiguity cases.
* FFS whether the issue needs to be considered for Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| OPPO | Support all proposals |
| ZTE | Fine with all the proposals.  For 1st proposal, we prefer option 1.  For 2nd proposal, we prefer option 1.  For 3rd proposal, we are open to further study the options. |
| CATT | For the first proposal, similar as we commented before, we do not see the need of option 2. Option 1 is sufficient to have a unified solution for 2-bit and >2 bits cases. In addition, option 2 may complicate the UCI multiplexing e.g. a HP HARQ-ACK may be multiplexed in a LP PUCCH which goes across sub-slot boundary for HP HARQ-ACK results in further multiplexing with HP HARQ-ACK in another sub-slot.  We are fine with the second and the third proposals. |
| vivo | Generally fine with all the proposals.  For the first proposal, we don’t think option 2 is needed. Unified solution as the case of more than 2bits is preferred.  For the second proposal, we are fine. Option 2 is preferred considering separate coding rates for LP HARQ-ACK and HP HARQ-ACK.  For the third proposal, we are open for further study. Option 2 is not clear to us. What’s the mean of “extended PUCCH resource”? |
| Nokia, NSB | **- For the first proposal**: OK with the proposal and we support Option 1. Option 2 is not acceptable to us.  **- For the second proposal**: support the proposal. As we commented earlier, although we don’t have a strong preference, Option 2 may be better as it would consider the ‘effective’ payload size for the PUCCH resource set determination.  - **For the third proposal:** Support the proposal. |
| LG | Proposal 1: Fine with the proposal.  Proposal 2: Fine with the proposal.  Proposal 3: We think that potential issue with LP HARQ-ACK payload size is not limited to Type-2 codebook but also involved with Type-1 codebook. For this reason, we prefer the following modification.  **For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH in R17, further study the problem of ambiguity on LP HARQ-ACK existence or LP HARQ-ACK type-1/2 codebook size due to DCI mis-detection and the candidate options:**   * **Option 1: Configure a dedicated PUCCH resource for HP+LP in the second *PUCCH-Config*** * **Option 2: PRI+x in the HP DCI is used to implicitly determine an extended PUCCH resource** * **Option 3a: The LP type 2 codebook size is quantized/rounded up to a nearest reference size. FFS reference size granularity.** * **Option 3b: Configuration of semi-static size reservation for LP HARQ-ACK payload is provided by RRC. LP HARQ-ACK semi-static size reservation is used instead of determined LP HARQ-ACK codebook size when selecting the PUCCH resource set.** * **Option 4: Additional DCI field in DCI corresponding HP HARQ-ACK or HP PUSCH for determining the number of LP HARQ-ACK bits multiplexed on PUCCH/PUSCH.** * **Option 5: Provide indication on at least the number of RBs and/or PUCCH resource set index to be used in the PUCCH transmission, where the indication is included in the high-priority DL assignment.** * **Other solutions are not precluded.** * **FFS ambiguity cases.** * **~~FFS whether the issue needs to be considered for Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook.~~** |
| Sony | 1st Proposal:   * We do not agree with Option 2 but we can keep it for this meeting for further considerations   2nd Proposal:   * Option 2 isn’t clear on what the scaling factor does. If there are LP UCI bits = 5 and scaling factor = 0.75, how are these “scaled” LP UCI bits represented? Is there an already agreed compression mechanism to scale these LP UCI bits? Furthermore, we agreed that HP & LP UCI bits are separated encoded in which case separate code rate can be applied to these bits, so why do we need a scaling factor at the front of the encoding chain?   3rd Proposal:   * Option 2 is unclear. What does *PRI+x* means? Does this mean that the number of bits for the PRI field is increased? How is this *x* determined? * What’s the link between Option 3a and Option 3b (since they are under a missing Option 3)? Option 3a is about a dynamic Type 2 CB and Option 3b talks about some semi-static CB. |
| Intel | Fine with P1, although we don’t see value in opening Option 2 discussion which is not aligned with > 2 bit case.  Fine with P2 to move forward.  In P3, the list of options becomes uncontrollable and of different level of details. At most we are open to agree on the main bullet with the options removed. |
| Apple | We support Proposal 1 and Proposal 2, we are open to the study for P3, Option 2 is not clear, we agree with Sony on that. Option 5 is about determination the number of coded bits, not about the determination of information bits, which is a problem with missed detection; Option 5 does not belong. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## Timeline and latency requirements

## Inputs from Tdocs

**Latency requirements:**

* Option 1: The latency requirement can be defined as the ending symbol of PUCCH resource for multiplexed UCI transmission is not later than X symbols after the ending symbol of PUCCH for the higher priority UCI.
  + - Option 1a: X=0.
      * HW, China Telecom, TCL
    - Option 1b: X>0.
      * CMCC

**For the case where the timeline requirements are not met,**

* Option 1: UE behavior fallbacks to Rel-16 prioritization.
  + Intel, Xiaomi, Sharp
* Option 2:
  + If a UE doesn’t support Rel-16 prioritization, the UE doesn’t expect the multiplexing timeline conditions are not satisfied.
  + If the UE support Rel-16 prioritization, UE behavior fallbacks to Rel-16 prioritization.
  + OPPO

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Proposals/observations from Tdocs |
| Huawei | ***Proposal 6: For HP HARQ-ACK overlapping with LP HARQ-ACK, the multiplexing is allowed only when the PUCCH carrying the multiplexed UCI ends no later than the PUCCH carrying HP HARQ-ACK.*** |
| QC | ***Proposal 19:* On top of Rel-16 cancellation time (N2+d1) for PUCCH/PUCCH or PUCCH/PUSCH collision, additional time d2 is needed (which results N2+d1+d2 in total cancellation time) for LP CG-PUSCH and HP DG-PUSCH collision resolution. The additional number of OFDM symbols (d2) needed is listed in following table**  Table 3. d2 for LP CG-PUSCH and HP DG-PUSCH collision resolution   |  |  | | --- | --- | |  | d2 [symbols] | | **0** | **1** | | **1** | **2** | | **2** | **4** | | **3** | **8** |   ***Proposal 20:* For d1 defined for PUCCH vs PUCCH or PUCCH vs PUSCH cancellation with different priorities, support subcarrier spacing dependent d1 values. FFS exact d1 values for each subcarrier spacing.**  ***Proposal 21:* Confirm the working assumption made in #104-e to reuse Rel-15 intra-UE PUCCH/PUSCH multiplexing timeline requirements for Rel-17 intra-UE PUCCH/PUSCH multiplexing with different priorities.** |
| CMCC | **Proposal 2: The following conditions can be considered for multiplexing of LP HARQ-ACK and HP HARQ-ACK/HP SR on top of reusing Rel-15 intra-UE PUCCH multiplexing timeline requirements:**   * **Latency check, i.e. the last symbol of PUCCH resource carrying multiplexed LP UCI and HP UCI is not X symbol(s) later than the original PUCCH resource for HP UCI;**   **Reliability check, i.e. the code rate or the total REs of the HP UCI after multiplexing is not larger than the code rate or less than the total REs before multiplexing** |
| OPPO | ***Proposal 9: Reuse Rel-15 intra-UE PUCCH/PUSCH multiplexing timeline conditions for Rel-17 intra-UE multiplexing with different priorities:***   * ***If a UE doesn’t support Rel-16 prioritization, the UE doesn’t expect the multiplexing timeline conditions are not satisfied.*** * ***If the UE support Rel-16 prioritization, when the timeline conditions are not met, UE behavior fallbacks to Rel-16 prioritization.*** |
| China Telecom | **Proposal 2: Multiplexing for channels with different priorities is allowed only when the ending symbol of PUCCH or PUSCH resource carrying the multiplexed UCI is no later than the ending symbol of channel carrying HP traffic.** |
| Intel | **Proposal 16: When UCIs of different priorities overlap and if at least one is based on a DCI, UE may drop the low priority UCI and transmit the high priority UCI, when timeline conditions are not satisfied.** |
| TCL | **Proposal 3: Multiplexing for UCIs with different priorities should only be allowed when the PUCCH carrying the multiplexed UCI ends no later than the PUCCH carrying high-priority UCI.** |
| LGE | **Proposal #3: Consider additional condition for the processing of inter-priority multiplexing and the latency requirement for HP UCI.** |
| Xiaomi | ***Proposal 1: Confirm the working assumption to reuse Rel-15 intra-UE PUCCH/PUSCH multiplexing timeline requirements for Rel-17 intra-UE PUCCH/PUSCH multiplexing with different priorities.***  ***Proposal 2:*** ***When the multiplexing timeline is not met, HP channels can be transmitted and LP channels is dropped.*** |
| Sharp | **Proposal 1: Confirm the working assumption of reusing Rel-15 intra-UE PUCCH/PUSCH multiplexing timeline requirements for Rel-17 intra-UE PUCCH/PUSCH multiplexing with different priorities.**   * **The Rel-16 dropping rule is reused if the multiplexing timeline requirements are not met.** |
| MTK | 1. Guard gap timeline of the new multiplexed PUCCH is of the earliest PUCCH. |
|  |  |

## Multiplexing HARQ-ACK and SR with different priorities

## Inputs from Tdocs

**When a PUCCH carrying HP SR with PF0 overlaps with a PUCCH carrying LP HARQ-ACK with PF0**

* Opt.1: The positive SR and HARQ-ACK are multiplexed and transmitted on the SR resource.
  + Opt.1a: The UE does not transmit negative SR.
  + Opt.1b: For negative SR, the UE transmit only HARQ-ACK on the HARQ-ACK resource.
    - Nokia, ZTE, CATT, China Telecom, Quectel, Sharp, DCM, WILUS
  + Opt.1c: For negative SR, the UE transmits SR and HARQ-ACK on the SR resource
    - Nokia, Xiaomi
  + Opt.1d: with a power boost
    - QC
* Opt.2: The SR and HARQ-ACK are multiplexed and transmitted on the HARQ-ACK resource.
  + Opt.2a: If SR is positive, an offset (e.g. 1 PRB) is added to the starting PRB of the HARQ-ACK PUCCH resource.
    - E///, LGE
  + Opt.2b: Using 4 CS values as for SR+1-bit HARQ-ACK in Rel-15/16. For the case of 2-bit HARQ-ACK, the HARQ-ACK is reduced/compressed to 1-bit.
  + Opt.2c: If SR is positive, SR is multiplexed on HARQ-ACK resource in the same way as Rel-15. If SR is negative, transmit only HARQ-ACK on HARQ-ACK resource.
    - HW, vivo, Spreadtrum, Intel, Pana, Sony
* Opt.3: No enhancement over Rel-16.
  + OPPO (R15 or R16 according to the number of PUCCH symbols.), Samsung

**When a PUCCH carrying HP SR with PF0 overlaps with a PUCCH carrying LP HARQ-ACK with PF1**

* Opt.1: The positive SR and HARQ-ACK are multiplexed and transmitted on the SR resource.
  + Opt.1a: The UE does not transmit negative SR.
  + Opt.1b: For negative SR, the UE transmit only HARQ-ACK on the HARQ-ACK resource.
    - Nokia, ZTE, CATT, China Telecom, Sony, Sharp, DCM
  + Opt.1c: For negative SR, the UE transmits SR and HARQ-ACK on the SR resource
    - Nokia, Xiaomi
* Opt.2: The SR and HARQ-ACK are multiplexed and transmitted on the HARQ-ACK resource.
  + Opt.2a: If SR is positive, an offset (e.g. 1 PRB) is added to the starting PRB of the HARQ-ACK PUCCH resource.
    - E///
  + Opt.2b: Applying QPSK for SR+1-bit HARQ-ACK. For the case of 2-bit HARQ-ACK, the HARQ-ACK is reduced/compressed to 1-bit.
    - LGE, WILUS
* Opt.3: For positive SR, transmit HARQ-ACK on the SR resource. For negative SR, transmit HARQ-ACK on the HARQ-ACK resource.
  + QC, DCM
* Opt.4: For positive SR, transmit SR on the SR resource and drop HARQ-ACK. For negative SR, transmit HARQ-ACK on the HARQ-ACK resource (i.e. No enhancement over Rel-16).
  + HW, OPPO, vivo, Spreadtrum, Intel, Pana, Quectel, Samsung, Sharp

**When a PUCCH carrying HP SR with PF1 overlaps with a PUCCH carrying LP HARQ-ACK with PF0**

* Opt.1: The SR and HARQ-ACK are multiplexed and transmitted on the SR resource.
  + Opt.1a: For negative SR, the UE transmit only HARQ-ACK on the HARQ-ACK resource.
    - CATT
  + Opt.1b: SR and HARQ-ACK are multiplexed and modulated to be transmitted on the SR resource
* Opt.2: The SR and HARQ-ACK are multiplexed and transmitted on the HARQ-ACK resource.
  + Opt.2a: If SR is positive, an offset (e.g. 1 PRB) is added to the starting PRB of the HARQ-ACK PUCCH resource.
    - LGE
  + Opt.2b: Using 4 CS values as for SR+1-bit HARQ-ACK in Rel-15/16. For the case of 2-bit HARQ-ACK, the HARQ-ACK is reduced/compressed to 1-bit.
  + Opt.2c: If SR is positive, SR is multiplexed on HARQ-ACK resource in the same way as Rel-15. If SR is negative, transmit only HARQ-ACK on HARQ-ACK resource.
    - HW, ZTE, vivo, Spreadtrum, Intel, Sony
  + Opt.2d: HP SR and LP HARQ-ACK are multiplexed by the Rel-15 cyclic shift only if latency requirement for HP SR is met. Otherwise, drop the LP HARQ-ACK and only transmit the HP SR on its resource.
* Opt.3: For positive SR, transmit HARQ-ACK on the SR resource. For negative SR, transmit HARQ-ACK on the HARQ-ACK resource.
  + Nokia, QC, China Telecom, Quectel, Xiaomi, Sharp, DCM
* Opt.4: No enhancement over Rel-16.
  + OPPO, Pana, Samsung

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Proposals/observations from Tdocs |
| E/// | [Proposal 7 When PUCCH with HP SR overlaps with PUCCH with LP HARQ-ACK:](#_Toc68676144)  [ For 1-2 LP HARQ-ACK bits: The PUCCH resource for HARQ-ACK is used for multiplexing of the HP SR and LP HARQ-ACK. If SR is positive, an offset (e.g. 1 PRB) is added to the starting PRB of the HARQ-ACK PUCCH resource (i.e. Opt. 2a).](#_Toc68676145)  [ For more than 2 LP HARQ-ACK bits: Rel-15 rules are used for multiplexing HARQ-ACK and SR in a PUCCH resource. If SR is positive, an offset (e.g. 1 PRB) is added to the starting PRB of the PUCCH resource (i.e. Opt. 2a).](#_Toc68676146)  [Proposal 8 When PUCCH with HP HARQ-ACK/SR overlaps with PUCCH with LP HARQ-ACK:](#_Toc68676147)  [ First, a PUCCH resource set associated to HP HARQ-ACK based on the total number of HP HARQ-ACK/SR and LP HARQ-ACK is determined. Then, a PUCCH resource in the PUCCH resource set to carry both HP and LP HARQ-ACK based on the last DCI corresponding to the HP HARQ-ACK is determined.](#_Toc68676148) |
| HW | ***Proposal 7: For multiplexing HP SR and LP HARQ-ACK with PF0/PF1,***   * ***For the case of HP SR with PF0 vs LP HARQ-ACK with PF0, SR is multiplexed on HARQ-ACK resource in the same way as Rel-15 if SR is positive and transmit only HARQ-ACK on HARQ-ACK resource if SR is negative (i.e. option 2c);*** * ***For the case of HP SR with PF0 vs LP HARQ-ACK with PF1, drop LP HARQ-ACK if HP SR is positive (i.e. option 4/5);*** * ***For the case of HP SR with PF1 vs LP HARQ-ACK with PF0,*** ***Opt.2c should be supported. That is SR is multiplexed on HARQ-ACK resource in the same way as Rel-15 if SR is positive and transmit only HARQ-ACK on HARQ-ACK resource if SR is negative (i.e. option 2c);*** * ***For the case of HP SR with PF1 vs LP HARQ-ACK with PF1, reuse the resource selection method in Rel-15.***   ***Proposal 8: For multiplexing HP SR and LP HARQ-ACK with format2/3/4,***   * ***Adopt separate coding to HP SR and LP HARQ-ACK on one PUCCH resource*** * ***The PUCCH resource is selected from dedicated PUCCH resource sets in the second PUCCH-Config for multiplexing HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK*** * ***The multiplexing is only allowed if the ending symbol of the PUCCH resource carrying multiplexed SR and HARQ-ACK is no later than the ending symbol of the PUCCH resource carrying SR.*** |
| Nokia | **Proposal 3.12: For the scenario where a PUCCH carrying high-priority SR overlaps with a PUCCH carrying low-priority HARQ-ACK:**   * **If SR is with F0 and HARQ-ACK is with F0/F1, adopt one of the following options:**    + **Opt.1b: the positive SR and HARQ-ACK are multiplexed and transmitted on the SR resource. For negative SR, the UE transmits only HARQ-ACK on the HARQ-ACK resource.**   + **Opt.1c: the SR and HARQ-ACK are multiplexed and transmitted on the SR resource.** * **If SR is with F1 and HARQ-ACK is with F0/F1, adopt Opt.3: Transmit HARQ-ACK on the SR resource if SR is positive; and transmit HARQ-ACK on the HARQ-ACK resource when SR is negative.** * **If SR is with F0/F1 and HARQ-ACK is with F2/F3/F4: If SR is positive, transmit SR on the SR resource and drop HARQ-ACK; if SR is negative, transmit HARQ-ACK-only on the HARQ-ACK resource.** |
| ZTE | ***Proposal 10:*** *For positive SR, transmit HARQ-ACK on the SR resource. For negative SR, transmit HARQ-ACK on the HARQ-ACK resource. The principle is applied at least for three cases:*   * *PUCCH carrying HP SR with PF0 overlaps with a PUCCH carrying LP HARQ-ACK with PF0* * *PUCCH carrying HP SR with PF0 overlaps with a PUCCH carrying LP HARQ-ACK with PF1* * *PUCCH carrying HP SR with PF1 overlaps with a PUCCH carrying LP HARQ-ACK with PF0*   ***Proposal 11:*** *Adopt the following rules to multiplex high priority SR and low priority HARQ-ACK.*   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | *HARQ-ACK*  *SR* | *PUCCH format 0* | *PUCCH format 1* | *PUCCH format 2/3/4* | | *PUCCH format 0* | *For positive SR, the UE transmits the PUCCH in the resource using PUCCH format 0 in PRB(s) for SR. The same way in Rel-15 can be reused for the UE to determine the value of  and  for computing the value of cyclic shift .*  *For negative SR, the UE transmits only a PUCCH with HARQ-ACK information.* | | *For positive SR, the UE Reuse Rel-15 rules.*  *For negative SR, the UE transmits only a PUCCH with HARQ-ACK information and drops the PUCCH with negative SR.* | | *PUCCH format 1* | *For positive SR, the UE transmits the PUCCH in the resource using PUCCH format 1 in PRB(s) for SR. The value of cyclic shift of sequence, i.e., , of this PUCCH format 1 is determined by HARQ-ACK, and the bit, i.e., b(0), of this PUCCH format 1 is determined by SR*  *For negative SR, the UE transmits only a PUCCH with HARQ-ACK information and drops the PUCCH with negative SR.* | *Reuse Rel-15 rules.* | |
| vivo | ***Proposal 1: Support multiplexing a high-priority HARQ-ACK and a low-priority SR into a PUCCH in Rel-17.***  ***Proposal 2: The priorities of investigation scenarios bases on Table 1.***  **Table 1 UCI multiplexing scenarios**   |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | **HP SR** | **HP HARQ-ACK** | **HP HARQ-ACK+SR** | **HP PUSCH (UL-SCH only)** | **HP PUSCH + HP HARQ-ACK and/or CSI** | | **LP HARQ-ACK** | agreed | agreed | agreed | agreed | agreed | | **LP PUSCH (UL-SCH only)** | Medium | agreed | agreed | \* | \* | | **LP PUSCH + LP HARQ-ACK and/or CSI** | Medium | agreed | agreed | \* | \* | | **LP SR** | Medium | High | Medium | Medium | Medium | | **CSI** | low | low | low | low | low |   ***Proposal 8: When a PUCCH carrying HP SR with PF0 overlaps with a PUCCH carrying LP HARQ-ACK with PF0, option 2c is adapted.***   * ***If SR is positive, SR is multiplexed on HARQ-ACK resource in the same way as Rel-15. If SR is negative, transmit only HARQ-ACK on HARQ-ACK resource.***   ***Proposal 9: When a PUCCH carrying HP SR with PF0 overlaps with a PUCCH carrying LP HARQ-ACK with PF1, option 4 is adapted.***   * ***For positive SR, transmit SR on the SR resource and drop HARQ-ACK. For negative SR, transmit HARQ-ACK on the HARQ-ACK resource.***   ***Proposal 10: When a PUCCH carrying HP SR with PF1 overlaps with a PUCCH carrying LP HARQ-ACK with PF0, option 2c is adapted.***   * ***If SR is positive, SR is multiplexed on HARQ-ACK resource in the same way as Rel-15. If SR is negative, transmit only HARQ-ACK on HARQ-ACK resource.***   ***Proposal 12: Define UCIs of different priorities multiplexing rule at least for the following cases***   * + ***LP HARQ-ACK using PF 1 and HP HARQ-ACK and LP SR using PF 0.***   + ***HP HARQ-ACK using PF 1 and LP HARQ-ACK and HP SR using PF 0.*** |
| Spreadtrum | 1. ***If a PUCCH carrying HP SR with PF0 overlaps with a PUCCH carrying LP HARQ-ACK with PF0, if SR is positive, SR is multiplexed on HARQ-ACK resource in the same way as Rel-15. If SR is negative, transmit only HARQ-ACK on HARQ-ACK resource.*** 2. ***When a PUCCH carrying HP SR with PF0 overlaps with a PUCCH carrying LP HARQ-ACK with PF1, for positive SR, LP HARQ-ACK can be dropped or transmitted on the SR resource. For negative SR, transmit HARQ-ACK on the HARQ-ACK resource.*** 3. ***If a PUCCH carrying HP SR with PF1 overlaps with a PUCCH carrying LP HARQ-ACK with PF0, if SR is positive, SR is multiplexed on HARQ-ACK resource in the same way as Rel-15. If SR is negative, transmit only HARQ-ACK on HARQ-ACK resource.*** |
| CATT | ***Proposal 4: For multiplexing of HP SR and LP HARQ-ACK with PF0/1,***   * ***positive SR and HARQ-ACK are multiplexed on the SR resource;*** * ***for negative SR, the UE transmits only HARQ-ACK on the HARQ-ACK resource.***   ***Proposal 5: For multiplexing of HP SR and LP HARQ-ACK with PF2/3/4,***   * ***for positive SR, drop LP HARQ-ACK;*** * ***for negative SR, transmit only HARQ-ACK on the HARQ-ACK resource.***   ***Proposal 6: For multiplexing of 1 bit HP HARQ-ACK, 1 bit LP HARQ-ACK and 1 bits HP SR, the following two options can be further considered:***   * ***Option 1: Multiplexing of 1 bit HP HARQ-ACK, 1 bit LP HARQ-ACK and 1 bit HP SR to a PUCCH resource with PF 2/3/4 for HP HARQ-ACK*** * ***Option 2: Multiplexing of 1 bit HP HARQ-ACK, 1 bit LP HARQ-ACK and 1 bit HP SR to a PUCCH resource with PF 0/1 for HP HARQ-ACK*** |
| QC | ***Proposal 10*: In NR Rel-17, if a HARQ-ACK (with single priority) transmission on PUCCH format 0 or PUCCH format 1 collide with one SR, the UE performs the actions in Table 2 to resolve the collision.**   * **FFS: collision resolution for 1-bit HP HARQ-ACK and 1-bit LP HARQ-ACK overlapping with 1-bit HP or LP SR**   Table 2. Collision resolution for overlapping HARQ-ACK and SR in NR Rel-17   |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | Ack: PF0, LP | Ack: PF1, LP | Ack: PF0, HP | Ack: PF1, HP | | SR: PF 0, LP | Same as Rel-15 (i.e., multiplex on HARQ-ACK resource). | Same as Rel-15 (i.e., drop SR) | Multiplex the HARQ-ACK and SR on the HARQ-ACK resource (as in Rel-15), with a power boost to the multiplexed transmission. | Same as Rel-15 (drop SR). | | SR: PF1, LP | Same as rel-15 (i.e., multiplex on HARQ-ACK resource) | Same as Rel-15 (RB selection) | Multiplex the HARQ-ACK and SR on the HARQ-ACK resource (as in Rel-15), with a power boost to the multiplexed transmission. | RB selection (as in Rel-15) but with the enhancement that, if SR is positive, the power of the PUCCH transmission follows the power of the HARQ-ACK resource. | | SR: PF0, HP | Use the SR resource to transmit multiplexed SR and HARQ-ACK, with a power boost to the multiplexed transmission. | Perform RB selection (i.e., if SR is negative, then transmit HARQ-ACK on the HARQ-ACK resource. Otherwise, transmit HARQ-ACK on the SR resource.) | Same as Rel-15 | Same as Rel-15 | | SR: PF1, HP | Perform RB selection (i.e., if SR is negative, then transmit HARQ-ACK on the HARQ-ACK resource. If SR is positive, transmit HARQ-ACK on the SR resource.) | Same as Rel-15 (i.e., RB selection). | Same as Rel-15 | Same as Rel-15 |   ***Proposal 11*: In NR Rel-17, for the case of multiplexing 1 bit SR and up to 2 bits HARQ-ACK with different priorities in a PUCCH format 0, adopt the multiplexed payload to CS indices mapping as shown in Fig 12 and Fig 13.**  ***Proposal 12*: In NR Rel-17, if a HARQ-ACK transmission on PUCCH format 2/3/4 collide with K SR transmissions including HP SRs and LP SRs, the UE append bits to the HARQ-ACK payload. Furthermore, if any of the HP SR is positive, thebits shall indicate a positive HP SR.** |
| OPPO | ***Proposal 11: Rel-15 or Rel-16 mechanism should be reused to support multiplexing of HARQ-ACK and SR with different priorities.***  ***Proposal 12: When PF0 is used by both HP SR and LPHARQ-ACK , whether to use Rel-15 multiplexing or Rel-16 prioritization can be determined according to the number of PUCCH symbols. The details are summarized in the table 2.***  Table 2: Multiplexing of LP HARQ-ACK and HP SR   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | | LP HARQ-ACK | | | PF 0 | PF 1 | | HP SR  (positive) | PF 0 | If , Rel-15 multiplexing;  Otherwise, Rel-16 prioritization. | Rel-16 prioritization | | PF 1 | Rel-16 prioritization | Rel-15 multiplexing | |
| China Telecom | **Proposal 5: Resource selection is adopted in Rel-17 when a PUCCH carrying HP SR overlaps with a PUCCH carrying LP HARQ-ACK:**   * **When HP SR is positive, SR resource is used for the transmission.**   + **If SR resource corresponds to PF0, positive HP SR and LP HARQ-ACK are multiplexed using the cyclic shift values the same as in Rel-15.**   + **If SR resource corresponds to PF1, HARQ-ACK is transmitted on the SR resource to indicate the positive SR.** * **When HP SR is negative, the UE transmits only LP HARQ-ACK on the HARQ-ACK resource.** |
| Intel | **Proposal 14:**  **HP SR PF0, LP HARQ PF0**:   * If SR is positive, SR is multiplexed on HARQ-ACK resource in the same way as Rel-15. If SR is negative, transmit only HARQ-ACK on HARQ-ACK resource.   **HP SR PF0, LP HARQ PF1**:   * For positive SR, transmit SR on the SR resource and drop HARQ-ACK. For negative SR, transmit HARQ-ACK on the HARQ-ACK resource   **HP SR PF1, LP HARQ PF0**:   * If SR is positive, SR is multiplexed on HARQ-ACK resource in the same way as Rel-15. If SR is negative, transmit only HARQ-ACK on HARQ-ACK resource.   **Collision handling LP SR and HP HARQ-ACKs**   |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | **HARQ-ACK with PF0** | **HARQ-ACK with**  **PF1** | **HARQ-ACK with PF2** | **HARQ-ACK with**  **PF3 or PF4** | | SR with PF0 | Multiplexed UCI is transmitted using PF0 on HARQ-ACK resource | Drop SR and transmit HARQ-ACK on HARQ-ACK resource | Multiplexed UCI is transmitted using PF 2 on HARQ-ACK resource if SR is with PF 0. SR is dropped if it is PF 1 | Multiplex HARQ-ACK and SR according to Rel-15 procedure. | | SR with PF1 | SR is dropped | Multiplexed UCI is transmitted using PF 1 on HARQ-ACK resource | |
| Pana | **Proposal 8: When a PUCCH carrying HP SR with PF0 overlaps with a PUCCH carrying LP HARQ-ACK with PF0, the SR and HARQ-ACK are multiplexed and transmitted on the HARQ-ACK resource.**  **Proposal 9:**   * **When a PUCCH carrying HP SR with PF0 overlaps with a PUCCH carrying LP HARQ-ACK with PF1, either of following options is supported.**   + **Option 4: For positive SR, transmit SR on the SR resource and drop HARQ-ACK. For negative SR, transmit HARQ-ACK on the HARQ-ACK resource.**   + **Option 5: No enhancement over Rel.16**   **Proposal 10: When a PUCCH carrying HP SR with PF1 overlaps with a PUCCH carrying LP HARQ-ACK with PF0, no enhancement is necessary over Rel.16.**  **Proposal 11:**   * **When a PUCCH carrying HP SR with PF1 overlaps with a PUCCH carrying LP HARQ-ACK with PF1, either of following options is supported.**   + **Option 1: Same multiplexing mechanism as in Rel.15/16.**   + **Option 2: The SR and HARQ-ACK are multiplexed and transmitted on the SR resource.**     - **1-bit for LP HARQ-ACK information bit is appended to SR information bit. For 2-bits HARQ-ACK information, bundling is used.**   **Proposal 12:**   * **When a PUCCH carrying HP SR with PF0 or PF1 overlaps with a PUCCH carrying LP HARQ-ACK with PF2, 3, or 4, following options are supported.**   + **The SR and HARQ-ACK are multiplexed and transmitted on the HARQ-ACK resource if the latency condition is satisfied; otherwise, LP HARQ-ACK is dropped and HP SR is transmitted.**   **Proposal 13:**   * **For multiplexing a LP HARQ-ACK, a HP HARQ-ACK and HP SR into a PUCCH, following two procedures are studied.**   + **Option 1: UE first resolve the overlapping for PUCCH transmission of HP HARQ-ACK and HP SR. After resolving the overlapping, multiplexing of LP HARQ-ACK is handled.**   + **Option 2: How UCIs are concatenated up to certain size is handled as one step procedure, e.g., with the priority of HP HARQ-ACK > HP SR > LP HARQ-ACK.** |
| Sony | **Proposal 5: When HP SR using PF0 multiplexes with LP HARQ-ACK using PF0:**   * **If SR is positive, SR is multiplexed on HARQ-ACK resource in the same way as Rel-15.** * **If SR is negative, transmit only HARQ-ACK on HARQ-ACK resource.**   **Proposal 6: When HP SR using PF0 multiplexes with LP HARQ-ACK using PF1:**   * **The positive SR and HARQ-ACK are multiplexed and transmitted on the SR resource** * **For negative SR, the UE transmit only HARQ-ACK on the HARQ-ACK resource.**   **Proposal 7: When HP SR using PF1 multiplexes with LP HARQ-ACK using PF0:**   * **If SR is positive, SR is multiplexed on HARQ-ACK resource in the same way as Rel-15.** * **If SR is negative, transmit only HARQ-ACK on HARQ-ACK resource.** |
| Quectel | **Proposal 12**: When a PUCCH carrying HP SR with PF0 overlaps with a PUCCH carrying LP HARQ-ACK with PF0, Opt.1b (i.e., The positive SR and HARQ-ACK are multiplexed and transmitted on the SR resource, and the UE transmits only HARQ-ACK on the HARQ-ACK resource for negative SR) is supported.  **Proposal 13**: When a PUCCH carrying HP SR with PF0 overlaps with a PUCCH carrying LP HARQ-ACK with PF1, Opt.4 (i.e., for positive SR, transmit SR on the SR resource and drop HARQ-ACK. For negative SR, transmit HARQ-ACK on the HARQ-ACK resource) is supported.  **Proposal 14**: When a PUCCH carrying HP SR with PF1 overlaps with a PUCCH carrying LP HARQ-ACK with PF0, Opt 3 (i.e., for positive SR, transmit HARQ-ACK on the SR resource. For negative SR, transmit HARQ-ACK on the HARQ-ACK resource) is supported. |
| Samsung | **P Proposal 8: Drop LP HARQ-ACK PUCCH when a LP HARQ-ACK PF0/1 overlaps with a HP SR PUCCH.**  **Proposal 9: Support multiplexing of LP HARQ-ACK and HP SR when HARQ-ACK is transmitted on PUCCH format 2/3/4**   * **Use Rel-15 mechanism as a baseline assuming HARQ-ACK and SR have the same priority.** * **FFS: how to ensure the latency and reliability of HP SR.** |
| LGE | **Proposal #10: Consider to support Opt 2b for the combinations of {SR PF0 + HARQ-ACK PF0} and {SR PF0 + HARQ-ACK PF1} and {SR PF1 + HARQ-ACK PF0}, to ensure HP SR reliability as well as to keep PUCCH resource overhead.**  **Proposal #11: Consider to support Opt 2a for the combinations of {SR PF0 + HARQ-ACK PF0} and {SR PF0 + HARQ-ACK PF1} and {SR PF1 + HARQ-ACK PF0}, to guarantee LP HARQ-ACK performance on top of HP SR reliability.** |
| IDC | ***Proposal 1: Support multiplexing for following additional scenarios:***   * ***High-priority SR in a low-priority PUSCH (UL-SCH only)*** * ***High-priority SR and HARQ-ACK in a low-priority PUSCH (UL-SCH only)*** * ***High-priority SR in a low-priority PUSCH (UL-SCH + low-priority HARQ-ACK and/or CSI)*** * ***High-priority SR and HARQ-ACK in a low-priority PUSCH (UL-SCH + low-priority HARQ-ACK/CSI)***   ***Proposal 8: In case PUCCH format 0 carrying HP SR overlaps with PUCCH format 0/1 carrying LP HARQ-ACK, the UE multiplexes HARQ-ACK and SR on the PUCCH resource for HP SR.***  ***Proposal 9: In case PUCCH format 1 carrying positive HP SR overlaps with PUCCH format 0/1 carrying LP HARQ-ACK, the UE transmits HARQ-ACK on the PUCCH resource for HP SR.***  ***Proposal 10: In case PUCCH format 1 carrying negative HP SR overlaps with PUCCH format 0/1 carrying LP HARQ-ACK, the UE transmits HARQ-ACK on the PUCCH resource for LP HARQ-ACK.*** |
| Xiaomi | ***Proposal 6:*** ***When a PUCCH carrying HP SR with PF0 overlaps with a PUCCH carrying LP HARQ-ACK with PF0/PF1, support Opt1 and Opt 1c.***  ***Proposal 7:*** ***Power boosting is not needed to transmit multiplexed payload for*** ***HP SR and LP HARQ-ACK.***  ***Proposal 8:*** ***when a PUCCH carrying HP SR with PF1 overlaps with a PUCCH carrying LP HARQ-ACK with PF0,*** ***support Opt 3, that is, for positive SR, transmit HARQ-ACK on the SR resource. For negative SR, transmit HARQ-ACK on the HARQ-ACK resource.***  ***Proposal 10: Solutions such as direct puncture or treating HP SR as HARQ-ACK/CSI bit in multiplexing can be considered for HP SR on LP PUSCH.*** |
| Sharp | **Proposal 8: When a PUCCH carrying HP SR with PF1 overlaps with a PUCCH carrying LP HARQ-ACK with PF0,**   * **Transmit LP HARQ-ACK on the HP SR resource for positive HP SR, and** * **Transmit LP HARQ-ACK on the LP HARQ-ACK resource for negative HP SR.**   **Proposal 9: When a PUCCH carrying HP SR with PF0 overlaps with a PUCCH carrying LP HARQ-ACK with PF0,**   * **Multiplex positive HP SR on LP HARQ-ACK PUCCH by a CS is preferred, esp. if different CS or transmit power is applied to differentiate a HP positive SR from a LP positive SR.** * **Alternatively, multiplex positive HP SR and LP HARQ-ACK on a HP SR PUCCH can be considered if a HP SR PUCCH PF0 resource is configured with multiple reserved CS values.**   **Proposal 10: When a PUCCH carrying HP SR with PF0 overlaps with a PUCCH carrying LP HARQ-ACK with PF1, the Rel-16 dropping behaviour may be applied.**   * **Alternatively, positive HP SR and LP HARQ-ACK multiplexing on the HP SR PUCCH with PF0 can be considered if the HP SR PUCCH PF0 resource is configured with multiple reserved CS values.**   **Proposal 11: For multiplexing of HP SR with LP HARQ-ACK with PUCCH format 2/3/4,**   * **HP SR bits can be generated based on the number of overlapping HP SR PUCCH resources.** * **FFS on the ordering of HP SR and LP HARQ-ACK** * **FFS on if LP SR bits should also be included.**   **Proposal 12: For multiplexing of HP HARQ-ACK, LP HARQ-ACK and SR, the multiplexing order and SR bit generation methods should be further clarified.** |
| DOCOMO | **Proposal 8:**   * *Agree the table for UE behavior on multiplexing eMBB HARQ-ACK and URLLC SR as a baseline. Further considerations are needed for down-selection.*  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | |  | **URLLC SR PF0** | **URLLC SR PF1** | | **eMBB HARQ-ACK PF0** | * Opt.1b: For positive SR, same as Rel-15/16 multiplexing for same priority to multiplex eMBB HARQ-ACK bit(s) and URLLC SR bit, but transmitted on URLLC SR PF0 resource. For negative SR, the UE transmits only HARQ-ACK on the HARQ-ACK resource. | * Opt 3: eMBB HARQ-ACK transmitted on URLLC PF1 resource if URLLC SR positive, while eMBB HARQ-ACK transmitted on eMBB PF0 resource if URLLC SR negative. | | **eMBB HARQ-ACK PF1** | * Opt.1b/Opt.3: eMBB HARQ-ACK transmitted on URLLC PF0 resource if URLLC SR positive, while eMBB HARQ-ACK transmitted on eMBB PF1 resource if URLLC SR negative. | * Same as Rel-15/16 multiplexing for same priority, i.e transmit eMBB HARQ-ACK on HARQ-ACK resource if SR negative, transmit eMBB HARQ-ACK on SR resource if SR positive. | | **eMBB HARQ-ACK PF2/3/4** | * Opt 1: If latency and reliability condition satisfied for eMBB HARQ-ACK resource, URLLC SR is appended after eMBB HARQ-ACK and transmitted on eMBB HARQ-ACK resource. Otherwise, eMBB HARQ-ACK is dropped and URLLC SR is transmitted. * Opt 2: eMBB HARQ-ACK is dropped and URLLC SR is transmitted. | |   **Proposal 9:**   * *For collision handling among LP HARQ-ACK, HP HARQ-ACK, and HP SR, following UE behaviour is proposed:*   + *Step 1: multiplexing of HP HARQ-ACK and HP SR by following Rel-16 procedure.*   + *Step 2: multiplexing of the outcome of step 1 and LP HARQ-ACK by following Case 1.* |
| WILUS | * ***Proposal 7:*** *To multiplex with HP-SR with PF0 and LP HARQ-ACK with PF0, we propose*   + *If HP-SR is negative, then transmit LP HARQ-ACK on HARQ-ACK resource.*     - *In case of 1-bit LP HARQ-ACK, use 2 CSs, i.e., {0, 6} CS index*     - *In case of 2-bit LP HARQ-ACK, use 4 CSs, i.e., {0, 3, 6, 9} CS index*   + *If HP-SR is positive, then transmit LP HARQ-ACK and HP-SR on HARQ-ACK resource*     - *In case of 1-bit LP HARQ-ACK, use 2 CSs, i.e., {3, 9} CS index*     - *In case of 2-bit LP HARQ-ACK, use 4 CSs, i.e., {1, 4, 7, 11} CS index*        * *To enhance HP-SR reliability, 2-bit LP HARQ-ACK can be bundled to 1-bit and then the 1-bit bundled LP HARQ-ACK is treated as 1-bit LP HARQ-ACK, i.e., use 2 CSs, {3, 9} CS index .* * ***Proposal 8:*** *We propose to support Option 2b for multiplexing with HP-SR with PF0 and LP HARQ-ACK with PF1.*   + *To multiplex with HP-SR with PF0 and LP HARQ-ACK with PF1, use the HARQ-ACK resource.*      - *Applying QPSK for SR+1-bit HARQ-ACK. For the case of 2-bit HARQ-ACK, the HARQ-ACK is reduced/compressed to 1-bit.* * ***Proposal 9:*** *To multiplex with HP-SR with PF1 and LP HARQ-ACK with PF0, reuse multiplexing rule for HP-SR with PF0 and LP HARQ-ACK with PF0.* |

## 1st round discussion

Proposal for 1st round discussion:

When a PUCCH carrying HP SR with PF0 overlaps with a PUCCH carrying LP HARQ-ACK with PF0, down-select the following options:

* Opt.1b: The positive SR and HARQ-ACK are multiplexed and transmitted on the SR resource. For negative SR, the UE transmit only HARQ-ACK on the HARQ-ACK resource.
* Opt.2c: If SR is positive, SR is multiplexed on HARQ-ACK resource in the same way as Rel-15. If SR is negative, transmit only HARQ-ACK on HARQ-ACK resource.
* Opt.3: No enhancement over Rel-16.
* FFS: Whether/How to differentiate HP SR and LP SR when multiplexed with LP HARQ-ACK?

Proposal for 1st round discussion:

When a PUCCH carrying HP SR with PF0 overlaps with a PUCCH carrying LP HARQ-ACK with PF1, down-select the following options:

* Opt.1b: The positive SR and HARQ-ACK are multiplexed and transmitted on the SR resource. For negative SR, the UE transmit only HARQ-ACK on the HARQ-ACK resource.
* Opt.4: For positive SR, transmit SR on the SR resource and drop HARQ-ACK. For negative SR, transmit HARQ-ACK on the HARQ-ACK resource (i.e. No enhancement over Rel-16).
* FFS: Whether/How to differentiate HP SR and LP SR when multiplexed with LP HARQ-ACK?

Proposal for 1st round discussion:

When a PUCCH carrying HP SR with PF1 overlaps with a PUCCH carrying LP HARQ-ACK with PF0, down-select the following options:

* Opt.3: For positive SR, transmit HARQ-ACK on the SR resource. For negative SR, transmit HARQ-ACK on the HARQ-ACK resource.
* Opt.4: No enhancement over Rel-16.
* FFS: Whether/How to differentiate HP SR and LP SR when multiplexed with LP HARQ-ACK?

Proposal after 1st round discussion:

When a PUCCH carrying HP SR with PF0 overlaps with a PUCCH carrying LP HARQ-ACK with PF0, down-select the following options:

* Opt.1b: The positive SR and HARQ-ACK are multiplexed and transmitted on the SR resource. For negative SR, the UE transmit only HARQ-ACK on the HARQ-ACK resource.
* Opt.2c: If SR is positive, SR is multiplexed on HARQ-ACK resource in the same way as Rel-15. If SR is negative, transmit only HARQ-ACK on HARQ-ACK resource.
* Opt.3: No enhancement over Rel-16.
* FFS: Whether/How to differentiate HP SR and LP SR when multiplexed with LP HARQ-ACK?

Proposal after 1st round discussion:

When a PUCCH carrying HP SR with PF0 overlaps with a PUCCH carrying LP HARQ-ACK with PF1, down-select the following options:

* Opt.1b: The positive SR and HARQ-ACK are multiplexed and transmitted on the SR resource. For negative SR, the UE transmit only HARQ-ACK on the HARQ-ACK resource.
* Opt.4: For positive SR, transmit SR on the SR resource and drop HARQ-ACK. For negative SR, transmit HARQ-ACK on the HARQ-ACK resource (i.e. No enhancement over Rel-16).
* FFS: Whether/How to differentiate HP SR and LP SR when multiplexed with LP HARQ-ACK?

Proposal after 1st round discussion:

When a PUCCH carrying HP SR with PF1 overlaps with a PUCCH carrying LP HARQ-ACK with PF0, down-select the following options:

* Opt.2c: If SR is positive, SR is multiplexed on HARQ-ACK resource in the same way as Rel-15. If SR is negative, transmit only HARQ-ACK on HARQ-ACK resource.
* Opt.3: For positive SR, transmit HARQ-ACK on the SR resource. For negative SR, transmit HARQ-ACK on the HARQ-ACK resource.
* Opt.4: No enhancement over Rel-16.
* FFS: Whether/How to differentiate HP SR and LP SR when multiplexed with LP HARQ-ACK?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Sony | Agree with all 3 proposals. |
| Nokia, NSB | - We are fine with the first proposal. We can be OK with either Opt.1b or Opt.3 (as a second preference). In our view, Opt. 2c should not be supported as multiplexing on the LP HARQ-ACK PUCCH resource may impact the HP SR performance.  - We are fine with the second proposal. We can be OK with either Opt.1b or Opt.4 (as a second preference).  - We are fine with the third proposal. We can be fine with either Opt.3 or Opt.4 (as a second preference). |
| vivo | For the first proposal, Opt.2c is supported.  For the second proposal, Opt.4 is supported.  For the third proposal, we think the same rule can be applied as case of HP SR with PF0 overlapping with a PUCCH carrying LP HARQ-ACK with PF0. i.e., If SR is positive, SR is multiplexed on HARQ-ACK resource in the same way as Rel-15. If SR is negative, transmit only HARQ-ACK on HARQ-ACK resource |
| Huawei | For the first and second proposals, we are OK.  For the third proposal, we do not agree. We think the logic of *HP SR PF1 with LP HARQ-ACK PF0* should be the same logic with *HP SR PF0 with LP HARQ-ACK PF0*, so the original Opt.2c should be added, i.e., “If SR is positive, SR is multiplexed on HARQ-ACK resource in the same way as Rel-15. If SR is negative, transmit only HARQ-ACK on HARQ-ACK resource.” |
| ZTE | Support the third proposal and partially support the first and second proposals.  For option 1b, we want to clarify our understanding, if the SR is positive, HARQ-ACK should be transmitted on the SR resource, it means the CS mapping location in this case will reuse the Rel-15 rules but not define a new CS mapping rule to multiplex SR and HARQ. If option 1b doesn’t exclude this understanding, we can support the first and second proposals. |
| Samsung | Fine with the proposals. We support reusing Rel-16 for all proposals. |
| Quectel | Support the three proposals. Down selection could be carried out at a later stage. |
| Panasonic | We are fine with all three proposals.  For the first proposal, our preference is Option 2c since it has less specification impact. The potential concern about Option 2c would be an impact on the latency for HP SR, but since both HP HARQ-ACK and HP SR are PUCCH format 0, the impact on the latency would not be a critical issue.  For the second proposal. our preference is Option 4. On Option 1, LP HARQ-ACK originally to be transmitted in PUCCH format 1 is multiplexed on PUCCH format 0 with HP SR, and then, performance of LP HARQ-ACK may not be guaranteed.  For the third proposal, either Option 3 or Option 4 can be used. In our view, this scenario might be corner case and not required to have optimization. |
| LG | On the first and second proposals, we have similar comment with ZTE that Opt.1b should be considered as “For positive SR, the UE transmit HARQ-ACK on the SR resource.” to avoid any misreading and confusion.  In this sense, we suggest the following modification.  Opt.1b: For positive SR, the UE transmit HARQ-ACK on the SR resource. For negative SR, the UE transmit HARQ-ACK on the HARQ-ACK resource.  On the third proposal, we are support to it. |
| QC | We don’t support the first proposal. For this case, why not reuse Rel-15 with a minor modification to transmit the multiplexed payload on SR (which is the HP) resource? The principle is to use HP resource to transmit multiplexed payload such that power loop/power control is based on HP PUCCH resource. Basically, what I propose is same as option 2c, except the highlighted change. We don’t see why the LP HARQ-ACK resource with LP power control should be used.   * Opt.2c: If SR is positive, SR is multiplexed on ~~HARQ-ACK~~ HP SR resource in the same way as Rel-15. If SR is negative, transmit only HARQ-ACK on ~~HARQ-ACK~~ HP SR resource.   We support the 2nd and 3rd proposal. |
| DOCOMO | Support the three proposals. One note is that we corrected our positions captured in 3.6.1 since they were misplaced. |
| Spreadtrum | Fine with the first two proposals. For proposal 3, suggest to add Opt.2c. |
| ITRI | For the first proposal, Opt.2c is preferred.  For the second proposal, Opt.4 is preferred.  For the third proposal, share same view with Huawei. |
| OPPO | Support three proposals in principle  With respect to “no enhancement over R16”, it means high priority channel will be transmitted in these cases, it does not mean R16 intra UE prioritization feature should be supported together with R17 multiplexing feature. |
| CATT | We support all the three proposals. |
| Intel | Support the proposals. |
| InterDigital | Support the proposals. |
| China Telecom | Support the proposals. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support all three proposals.  For the second proposal, we prefer option 4, since neither LP HARQ-ACK target detection performance nor HP SR target detection performance may be satisfied, if multiplexed in PF0. |
| Sharp | Support all three proposals. |
| APT/FGI | For the first proposal, option 3 is preferred.  For the second proposal, option 4 is preferred.  Support the third proposal. |
| Ericsson | Fine with the 3 proposals |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## Other enhancements

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Proposals/observations from Tdocs |
| ETRI | **Proposal 3: Further study how to adjust the power of PUCCH for payload from the other priority.** |
|  |  |
| DOCOMO | **Proposal 7:**   * *For collision handling among LP HARQ-ACK, HP HARQ-ACK, and HP SR, following UE behaviour is proposed:*   + *Step 1: multiplexing of HP HARQ-ACK and HP SR by following Rel-16 procedure.*   + *Step 2: multiplexing of the outcome of step 1 and LP HARQ-ACK by following Case 1.* |
| Leno/Moto | * **Proposal 4:** If LP HARQ-ACK not multiplexed due to payload size limitation, UE can further check possible multiplexing in the next sub-slot, unless a PUCCH of low priority index for LP HARQ-ACK is limited up to a current sub-slot. |
| Ericsson | Rather than spending time to reduce the options for the 3 combinations, it’s more efficient if framework type of issues are addressed first. If we go one by one for each specific combination, it’s time consuming and inefficient.  For example, just for the question of HP SR + LP X, there are still many combinations to go through:   * HP SR + LP HARQ-ACK:   + What to do for HP SR on PF1 and LP HARQ-ACK on PF1?   + What to do for SR on PF0 or PF1, HP HARQ-ACK on PF 2/3/4? * HP SR + HP HARQ-ACK + LP HARQ-ACK: this is agreed to be supported in Rel-17   + If we follow the way the 3 proposals were handled, then all the PF combinations have to be listed, each with possible options, then down-select. * HP SR + LP SR? * HP SR + LP CSI? * HP + LP PUSCH?   Thus, for the HP SR + LP HARQ-ACK, the 3 proposals are preferably combined into one:   * For positive SR, transmit HARQ-ACK on the SR resource. For negative SR, transmit HARQ-ACK on the HARQ-ACK resource. |
|  |  |

# Multiplexing UCIs of different priorities in a PUSCH

## Agreements in previous meetings

Agreements:

*Support multiplexing for following scenarios in R17:*

* *Multiplexing a low-priority HARQ-ACK in a high-priority PUSCH (conveying UL-SCH only).*
* *Multiplexing a high-priority HARQ-ACK in a low-priority PUSCH (conveying UL-SCH only)*
* *Multiplexing a low-priority HARQ-ACK, a high-priority PUSCH conveying UL-SCH, a high-priority HARQ-ACK and/or CSI.*
* *Multiplexing a high-priority HARQ-ACK, a low-priority PUSCH conveying UL-SCH, a low-priority HARQ-ACK and/or CSI.*

*For the above multiplexing scenarios,*

* *Support separate configurations of at least beta-offset values (FFS for alpha) for multiplexing with different priority combinations.*
  + *FFS for other separate configurations.*
  + *FFS: value range of beta-offset (e.g. <1).*
* *FFS the conditions, if needed, for multiplexing, e.g.*
  + *FFS: Whether to support multiplexing in case a PUCCH/PUSCH overlaps with more than one PUCCH/PUSCH.*
  + *Timeline requirements.*
* *FFS: details, if needed, of the multiplexing scheme, e.g.*
  + *How to minimize impact on the latency for high-priority HARQ-ACK.*
  + *How to multiplex the HARQ-ACK bits (e.g. multiplexing, bundling)?*
  + *How to encode the UCIs with different priorities (e.g. separate coding vs. joint coding).*
  + *How to guarantee the target code rate (e.g. payload control, multiplexing priority, LP HARQ-ACK compression/compaction).*
  + *Explicit indication for multiplexing.*
  + *Multiplexing rule and order (e.g. HP/LP multiplexing is after resolving collision within the same priority).*
  + *How to handle multiplexing of UCI of different priorities and CG-UCI in a CG-PUSCH*

Agreements:

*For HARQ-ACK multiplexing on PUSCH of different priority in R17, support a mechanism for gNB to enable/disable the multiplexing.*

* *FFS the type of the mechanism, e.g. DCI indication and/or RRC configuration, beta\_offset=0*
* *FFS: Interaction between the enable/disable mechanism and other multiplexing conditions*
* *FFS for other types of UCI.*

Working assumption:

*Reuse Rel-15 intra-UE PUCCH/PUSCH multiplexing timeline requirements for Rel-17 intra-UE PUCCH/PUSCH multiplexing with different priorities*

* *FFS whether or not to specify a different behavior than Rel-15 when the timeline requirements are not met*

Agreements:

*For multiplexing LP HARQ-ACK in a HP PUSCH, support 0< beta-offset <1.*

* *FFS value(s)*
* *FFS to additionally support beta-offset =0 or a value disabling the multiplexing*
* *Aim to NOT increase the corresponding bitwidth in the DCI (compared to Rel-16)*

Agreement:

*For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUSCH in R17, support separate coding for the two HARQ-ACKs.*

* *It is understood that it is intended that the number of encoding chains for all UCI multiplexing combinations in Rel-17 should not exceed that in Rel-15/16.*

## Details of separate coding, rate matching and RE mapping

## Inputs from Tdocs

**Encoder and CSI dropping:**

* If HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK would be transmitted on HP/LP PUSCH without CSI,
  + the LP HARQ-ACK can be multiplexed by reusing the encoder chain for legacy CSI part 1.
    - HW, OPPO, Nokia, Apple
* If HP HARQ-ACK, LP HARQ-ACK, and LP CSI would be transmitted on LP PUSCH,
  + Option 1: Both CSI part 1 and part 2 are dropped, the LP HARQ-ACK can be multiplexed by reusing the encoder chain for legacy CSI part 1.
    - Nokia, vivo
  + Option 2: Only the CSI part 2 is dropped, consider following sub-options:
    - Option 2a: LP HARQ-ACK reuses the encoder chain for legacy CSI part 2.
    - Option 2b: LP HARQ-ACK reuses the encoder chain for legacy CSI part 1, and CSI part 1 reuses the encoder chain for legacy CSI part 2.)
    - Option 2c: LP HARQ-ACK and LP CSI part 1 are encoded jointly and the same manner with CSI part 1 is reused for LP HARQ-ACK and LP CSI part 1.
    - HW, QC, OPPO, vivo, Quectel
  + Option 3:
    - HP HARQ-ACK reuse the ecndoer chain for legacy HARQ-ACK
    - LP HARQ-ACK and LP CSI part 1 reuse the encoder chain for legacy CSI part 1
    - LP CSI part 2 reuse the encoder chain for legacy CSI part 2
* If HP HARQ-ACK, LP HARQ-ACK, and HP A-CSI would be transmitted on HP PUSCH,
  + Drop LP HARQ-ACK, and
    - HP A/N reuse encoder and rate matching equation for Rel-15 A/N
    - HP CSI part 1 reuse encoder and rate matching equation for Rel-15 CSI part 1
    - HP CSI part 2 reuse encoder and rate matching equation for Rel-15 CSI part 2
    - QC, HW
  + LP HARQ-ACK is jointly encoded with CSI part 1 or CSI part 2.
    - Vivo, Apple

**Rate matching:**

* For collision of HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK with PUSCH, if the LP HARQ-ACK is to be multiplexed on PUSCH, it should be rate matched with the UL-SCH and/or CSI regardless of the LP HARQ-ACK payload.
  + HW

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Proposals/observations from Tdocs |
| Huawei | ***Proposal 14: If HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK would be transmitted on HP/LP PUSCH without CSI, the LP HARQ-ACK can be multiplexed by reusing the encoder chain for legacy CSI part 1 or CSI part 2.***  ***Proposal 15: If HP HARQ-ACK, LP HARQ-ACK, and CSI would be transmitted on LP PUSCH, or, if HP HARQ-ACK, LP HARQ-ACK, and semi-static CSI would be transmitted on HP PUSCH, the CSI part 2 should be dropped, and following two candidates can be further studied:***   * ***Candidate 1: HP HARQ-ACK reuses the encoder chain for legacy HARQ-ACK, and LP HARQ-ACK reuses the encoder chain for legacy CSI part 2.*** * ***Candidate 2: HP HARQ-ACK reuses the encoder chain for legacy HARQ-ACK, LP HARQ-ACK reuses the encoder chain for legacy CSI part 1, and CSI part 1 reuses the encoder chain for legacy CSI part 2.***   ***Proposal 16: If HP HARQ-ACK, LP HARQ-ACK, and A-CSI would be transmitted on HP PUSCH, the LP HARQ-ACK should be dropped.***  ***Proposal 17: For collision of HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK with PUSCH, if the LP HARQ-ACK is to be multiplexed on PUSCH, it should be rate matched with the UL-SCH and/or CSI regardless of the LP HARQ-ACK payload.*** |
| Nokia | **Proposal 3.19: For the scenario where multiplexing both high-priority HARQ-ACK bits and low-priority HARQ-ACK bits into a low-priority PUSCH, drop CSI (including part 1 and part 2, if exist) if CSI would be multiplexed into the same PUSCH.** |
| vivo | ***Proposal 15: When HP and LP HARQ-ACK are multiplexed on a LP PUSCH with LP CSI, the following alternatives can be investigated***   * + ***Alt 1: drop LP CSI part 2, LP HARQ-ACK is handled as the same manner as CSI part 2.***   + ***Alt 2: LP HARQ-ACK and LP CSI part 1 are encoded jointly and the same manner with CSI part 1 is reused for LP HARQ-ACK and LP CSI part 1.***   + ***Alt 3: drop LP CSI, LP HARQ-ACK is handled as the same manner as CSI part 1.***   ***Proposal 16: When HP and LP HARQ-ACK are multiplexed on a HP PUSCH with HP CSI, the following alternatives can be investigated***   * + ***Alt 1: LP HARQ-ACK is dropped.***   + ***Alt 2: LP HARQ-ACK is jointly encoded with CSI part 1 or CSI part 2.*** |
| Spreadtrum | 1. ***If more than three encoding chains are needed in Rel-17 UCI multiplexing on PUSCH, some solutions are needed to compress number of encoding chains to be no more than three*** |
| QC | ***Proposal 13*: For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUSCH in R17, if CSI would multiplex on the same PUSCH,**   * **Drop CSI part 2, if CSI is a low priority CSI.**    + **HP A/N reuse encoder and rate matching equation for Rel-15 A/N**   + **LP A/N reuse encoder and rate matching equation for Rel-15 CSI part 1**   + **LP CSI part 1 reuse encoder and rate matching equation for Rel-15 CSI part 2** * **Drop LP HARQ-ACK, if CSI is a high priority CSI.**    + **HP A/N reuse encoder and rate matching equation for Rel-15 A/N**   + **HP CSI part 1 reuse encoder and rate matching equation for Rel-15 CSI part 1**   + **HP CSI part 2 reuse encoder and rate matching equation for Rel-15 CSI part 2** * **FFS: RE mapping rules.**   ***Proposal 16*: For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUSCH in R17, the following RE mapping rules are supported.**   * **HP HARQ-ACK is rate match around by other UCIs (if exist) and UL-SCH (if exist)** * **LP HARQ-ACK is padded to 2 bits if it is 0 or 1 bit. The padded LP HARQ-ACK is rate matched around by other UCIs (if exist) and UL-SCH (if exist)** |
| Intel | **Proposal 10: Separate encoding is used for multiplexing LP and HP HARQ-ACK bits onto the PUSCH.**   * **Separate beta offset configuration can be used depending on the combination of PUSCH and HARQ-ACK to be multiplexed** * **LP HARQ-ACK payload bits can be partially dropped if needed.** |
| Apple | **Proposal 7-1**  **when HP CSI is present, only the following UCIs are carried in UCI part I and part II:**  **HP HARQ-ACK > HP SR > (HP CSI) > LP HARQ-ACK > (LP SR)**  **When HP CSI is absent, only the following UCIs are carried UCI part I and part II**  **HP HARQ-ACK > HP SR > LP HARQ-ACK > (LP SR) > LP CSI**  **Proposal 11-1: Between two options of mapping LP HARQ-ACK into UCI Part I and UCI Part II, RAN1 select one of them consistently across multiplexing scenarios.**  **Proposal 11-2: Adopt Alt. 1 or Alt. 2 design from Tables 11-1 and 11-2.** |
| Quectel | **Proposal 8**: CSI part II (if exists) is dropped when HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK are multiplexed on a PUSCH. |
| ETRI | **Proposal 7: The TB is rate matched with the UCI assumption of total number of LP UCI and HP UCI.**  **Proposal 8: For HARQ-ACK codebook construction, sub-slot based HARQ-ACK codebooks are concatenated, and may be transmitted for PUSCH repetition.**  **Proposal 9: DL-DCI for HP UCI which is received after UL-DCI for LP TB may affect the PUSCH mapping.**  **Proposal 10: HP UCI may not be mapped at the second hop of the PUSCH.** |
| NEC | ***Proposal 3:*** *When multiplexing both low-priority HARQ-ACK and high-priority HARQ-ACK on a PUSCH scheduled by an UL non-fallback DCI with a DAI field, which HARQ-ACK codebook the DAI field is applied to should be configured by gNB.* |
| LGE | **Proposal #14: Consider how to determine the priority of CG-UCI and how to encode the CG-UCI payload in case of UCI multiplexing on NR-U CG PUSCH with different priority.**  **Proposal #15: Consider to keep the reserved HARQ-ACK REs for same priority with PUSCH in case of piggybacking HARQ-ACK on PUSCH for different priority.**  **Proposal #16: Consider the mapping of HP HARQ-ACK starting from the first symbol in LP PUSCH with consideration of latency requirement for HP UCI.** |
| Sharp | **Proposal 14: For HP HARQ-ACK with or without LP HARQ-ACK on LP PUSCH, details should be further studied on**   * **Multiplexing location, e.g. starting/ending symbol** * **Detailed multiplexing methods, etc.**   **Proposal 15: For multiplexing a 1-bit high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a 1-bit low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUSCH in R17, support joint coding by concatenating the HP and LP HARQ-ACK bits into 2 bits, and treat the concatenated 2 bits as HP.** |
| WILUS | * ***Proposal 10:*** *To multiplex with LP HARQ-ACK and HP HARQ-ACK into a PUSCH in case of UCI on PUSCH, reuse Rel-15 rules as much as possible.*   + *The number of REs for LP HARQ-ACK and HP HARQ-ACK is determined by Rel-15 RE calculation rules for HARQ-ACK.*   + *RE positions for LP HARQ-ACK and HP HARQ-ACK in a PUSCH are determined by Rel-15 RE mapping rules for HARQ-ACK.* * ***Proposal 11:*** *In case of HP-PUSCH or LP-PUSCH contains LP HARQ-ACK and HP HARQ-ACK, it should be discussed how to indicate the presence of LP HARQ-ACK and/or HP HARQ-ACK to be multiplexed and “beta offset” for LP HARQ-ACK and/or HP HARQ-ACK.* |
| Samsung | **Proposal 12: Consider solutions to ensure the reliability of data in a HP PUSCH if a LP Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook is multiplexed in the HP PUSCH.** |

## 1st round discussion

Proposal for 1st round discussion:

For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUSCH in R17,

* If HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK would be transmitted on HP/LP PUSCH without CSI, the LP HARQ-ACK can be multiplexed by reusing the encoder chain for legacy CSI part 1.
* If HP HARQ-ACK, LP HARQ-ACK, and LP CSI would be transmitted on LP PUSCH, the CSI part 2 is dropped, consider following sub-options:
  + Option 2a: LP HARQ-ACK reuses the encoder for Rel-15 CSI part 2.
  + Option 2b: LP HARQ-ACK reuses the encoder for Rel-15 CSI part 1, and CSI part 1 reuses the encoder for Rel-15 CSI part 2.
  + Option 2c: LP HARQ-ACK and LP CSI part 1 are encoded jointly and the same manner with Rel-15 CSI part 1 encoder is reused for LP HARQ-ACK and LP CSI part 1.
* If HP HARQ-ACK, LP HARQ-ACK, and HP A-CSI would be transmitted on HP PUSCH, drop LP HARQ-ACK, and reuse Rel-15 encoders

Proposal after 1st round discussion:

For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUSCH in R17,

* HP HARQ-ACK reuses the coding method for HARQ-ACK in Rel-15.

Proposal after 1st round discussion:

For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUSCH in R17, if HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK would be transmitted on HP/LP PUSCH without CSI,

* LP HARQ-ACK reuses the coding method for CSI part 1 in Rel-15.

Proposal after 1st round discussion:

For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUSCH in R17, Iif HP HARQ-ACK, LP HARQ-ACK, and LP CSI would be transmitted on HP/LP PUSCH, further study the following options:

* Option 2: The CSI part 2 is dropped, ~~consider following sub-options:~~
  + Option 2a: LP HARQ-ACK reuses the ~~encoder~~coding method used for CSI part 2 in Rel-15. CSI part 1 reuses the coding method used for CSI part 1 Rel-15.
  + Option 2b: LP HARQ-ACK reuses the ~~encoder~~coding method used for CSI part 1 in Rel-15, and CSI part 1 reuses the ~~encoder~~coding method used for CSI part 2 in Rel-15.
  + ~~Option 2c: LP HARQ-ACK and LP CSI part 1 are encoded jointly and the same manner with Rel-15 CSI part 1 encoder is reused for LP HARQ-ACK and LP CSI part 1.~~
* Option 3: No CSI is dropped,
  + LP HARQ-ACK and LP CSI part 1 are jointly encoded and reuse the coding method used for CSI part 1 in Rel-15. CSI part 2 reuses the coding method used for CSI part 2 in Rel-15.
    - Details need to be identified e.g. How to determine code rate for joint coding? Which beta offset should be used?
* Note: It has been agreed to support multiplexing HP HARQ-ACK, LP HARQ-ACK and CSI in a PUSCH.

Proposal after 1st round discussion:

For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUSCH in R17, if HP HARQ-ACK, LP HARQ-ACK and HP A-CSI would be transmitted on HP PUSCH, further study the following options:

* Option 1: Drop LP HARQ-ACK. CSI part 1 and 2 reuse the Rel-15 coding methods for CSI part 1 and 2 respectively.
* Option 2: LP HARQ-ACK is jointly encoded with A-CSI part 1 or part 2. The other A-CSI part reuses the corresponding Rel-15 coding methods for the CSI part.
  + FFS which A-CSI part is jointly encoded with LP HARQ-ACK
  + Details need to be identified e.g. How to determine code rate for joint coding? Which beta offset should be used?
* Note: It has been agreed to support multiplexing HP HARQ-ACK, LP HARQ-ACK and CSI in a PUSCH.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Sony | I think it is sufficient to just say what is dropped. There is no need to specify which encoder the UE uses as this should be UE implementation. Hence we do not need Option 2a, 2b & 2c. That is the proposal can simply be:  *For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUSCH in R17,*   * *If HP HARQ-ACK, LP HARQ-ACK, and LP CSI would be transmitted on LP PUSCH, the CSI part 2 is dropped,* * *If HP HARQ-ACK, LP HARQ-ACK, and HP A-CSI would be transmitted on HP PUSCH*, drop LP HARQ-ACK, |
| Nokia, NSB | Do not support  We agree with the first and last bullet, but suggest the same handling for PUSCH and PUCCH in terms of CSI dropping- i.e. drop all the CSI, i.e.  *For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUSCH in R17,*   * *If HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK would be transmitted on HP/LP PUSCH without CSI, the LP HARQ-ACK can be multiplexed by reusing the encoder chain for legacy CSI part 1.* * *If HP HARQ-ACK, LP HARQ-ACK, and LP CSI would be transmitted on LP PUSCH, the CSI part 1 and 2 is dropped, the LP HARQ-ACK can be multiplexed by reusing the encoder chain for legacy CSI part 1.~~consider following sub-options:~~*   + *~~Option 2a: LP HARQ-ACK reuses the encoder for Rel-15 CSI part 2.~~*   + *~~Option 2b: LP HARQ-ACK reuses the encoder for Rel-15 CSI part 1, and CSI part 1 reuses the encoder for Rel-15 CSI part 2.~~*   + *~~Option 2c: LP HARQ-ACK and LP CSI part 1 are encoded jointly and the same manner with Rel-15 CSI part 1 encoder is reused for LP HARQ-ACK and LP CSI part 1.~~*     - *If HP HARQ-ACK, LP HARQ-ACK, and HP A-CSI would be transmitted on HP PUSCH, drop LP HARQ-ACK, and reuse Rel-15 encoders* |
| vivo | Support in principle. One comment for the last sub-bullet is that for PUSCH with CSI, it can also be PUSCH with SP-CSI. |
| Apple | We don’t support the proposal “If HP HARQ-ACK, LP HARQ-ACK, and HP A-CSI would be transmitted on HP PUSCH, drop LP HARQ-ACK”. It would be very strange to support HP/LP UCI multiplexing over PUCCH but drop LP-HARQ-ACK for the case at hand: PUSCH can often have more payload than PUCCH. In this case, multiplexing LP HARQ-ACK with CSI part 1 or CSI part 2 is a reasonable solution. Note HARQ-ACK and CSI part-1 multiplexing over PUCCH is supported since Rel-15, we don’t see UE implementation an issue here.  For the case “If HP HARQ-ACK, LP HARQ-ACK, and LP CSI would be transmitted on LP PUSCH,”, FL missed our proposal:   * + Option 3:     - HP HARQ-ACK reuse the ecndoer chain for legacy HARQ-ACK     - LP HARQ-ACK and LP CSI part 1 reuse the encoder chain for legacy CSI part 1     - LP CSI part 2 reuse the encoder chain for legacy CSI part 2   In our view, this is a better choice than dropping CSI part 2 as AP CSI is key for gNB scheduling. With such a treatment, we have a unified treatment for all cases. |
| Huawei | We are in principle OK with the proposal. But as one question, it looks the case of *HP HARQ-ACK, LP HARQ-ACK, and LP CSI would be transmitted on HP PUSCH* is not included in the proposal. Maybe the second bullet can be modified as:  “   * If HP HARQ-ACK, LP HARQ-ACK, and LP CSI would be transmitted on HP/LP PUSCH, the CSI part 2 is dropped, consider following sub-options:   + Option 2a: LP HARQ-ACK reuses the encoder for Rel-15 CSI part 2.   + Option 2b: LP HARQ-ACK reuses the encoder for Rel-15 CSI part 1, and CSI part 1 reuses the encoder for Rel-15 CSI part 2.   + Option 2c: LP HARQ-ACK and LP CSI part 1 are encoded jointly and the same manner with Rel-15 CSI part 1 encoder is reused for LP HARQ-ACK and LP CSI part 1.   ” |
| ZTE | Fine with the proposals in principle. |
| Samsung | NOT support.  We have the following agreements  Agreements:  *Support multiplexing for following scenarios in R17:*   * *Multiplexing a low-priority HARQ-ACK in a high-priority PUSCH (conveying UL-SCH only).* * *Multiplexing a high-priority HARQ-ACK in a low-priority PUSCH (conveying UL-SCH only)* * *Multiplexing a low-priority HARQ-ACK, a high-priority PUSCH conveying UL-SCH, a high-priority HARQ-ACK and/or CSI.* * *Multiplexing a high-priority HARQ-ACK, a low-priority PUSCH conveying UL-SCH, a low-priority HARQ-ACK and/or CSI.*   Dropping LP HARQ-ACK is against the above agreements  To avoid dropping LP HARQ-ACK or CSI, we prefer joint coding for LP HARQ-ACK and Part 1 CSI as for the PUCCH. |
| Quectel | Support the proposals in principle. |
| Panasonic | We support Nokia’s update. |
| LG | We do not support this proposal for several reasons.   1. Need to consider RE mapping (based on reserved REs and puncturing) in case with LP A/N of up to 2 bits 2. Need to consider the case of LP PUSCH without UL-SCH (e.g. whether to drop LP CSI part 2 even in this case) 3. Need to discuss which one is dropped between LP A/N and HP CSI part 2 (and whether dropping some UCI is needed even on HP PUSCH without UL-SCH) 4. Need to discuss whether dropping some UCI (e.g. LP A/N) is needed even in case where HP CSI is single-part CSI |
| QC | We are fine with the proposal in general. |
| DOCOMO | We don’t support the proposal.  For the second bullet, if option 2c is applied, there is no need to drop CSI part-2.  For the third bullet, the behavior is the same as Rel-16. Since it was agreed in RAN1#102-e that “Multiplexing a low-priority HARQ-ACK, a high-priority PUSCH conveying UL-SCH, a high-priority HARQ-ACK and/or CSI”. We think the dropping of LP HARQ-ACK is contradicted with the agreement. We agree with Apple’s comment that the LP HARQ-ACK can be jointly encoded with HP CSI-part 1 or HP CSI-part 2. |
| Spreadtrum | NOT support.  For the second bullet, if option 2c is applied, CSI part-2 can be maintained and reuse the encoder for Rel-15 CSI part 2.  For the third bullet, do not support to drop LP HARQ-ACK, and LP HARQ-ACK can be jointly encoded with CSI. |
| ITRI | Support first and second bullets in general.  For the third bullet, we can support it if the HP PUSCH is a CG PUSCH. |
| OPPO | We support proposal in principle  However, we cannot agree joint coding of LP HARQ-ACK and CSI. It changes R15 encoder principle significantly and leads new issue, e.g. how to determine code rate for joint coding of LP HARQ-ACK and CSI. |
| CATT | We have the following comments on the proposal:   1. HP PUSCH should be included for the second bullet as proposed by Huawei 2. For the second case, why does it matter which encoder is used by LP HARQ-ACK/CSI part 1? For both option 2a and option 2b, it seems to us that the idea is to use the three encoders for HP HARQ-ACK, LP HARQ-ACK and CSI part 1 respectively. Isn’t that sufficient? 3. For Option 2c, given that CSI part 2 is dropped, why CSI part 1 and LP HARQ-ACK needs to be encoded jointly? We think it would complicate the design. For example, which beta offset should be used? Therefore, we would like to remove this option. 4. For the third case, if there is only part1 CSI, would LP HARQ-ACK be dropped as well? |
| Intel | The first sub-bullet is OK, while the other two require more discussion as pointed out by companies. |
| InterDigital | Support Nokia’s update. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We propose the following modification in the proposal:  For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUSCH in R17,   * If HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK would be transmitted on HP/LP PUSCH without CSI, the LP HARQ-ACK can be multiplexed by reusing the encoder chain for legacy CSI part 1. * If HP HARQ-ACK, LP HARQ-ACK, and LP CSI would be transmitted on LP PUSCH, ~~the CSI part 2 is dropped~~, consider following sub-options:   + Option 2a: LP HARQ-ACK reuses the encoder for Rel-15 CSI part 2, with dropping LP CSI part2.   + Option 2b: LP HARQ-ACK reuses the encoder for Rel-15 CSI part 1, and LP CSI part 1 reuses the encoder for Rel-15 CSI part 2, with dropping LP CSI part2.   + Option 2c: LP HARQ-ACK and LP CSI part 1 are encoded jointly and the same manner with Rel-15 CSI part 1 encoder is reused for LP HARQ-ACK and LP CSI part 1, and LP CSI part 2 reuses the encoder for Rel-15 CSI part2. * If HP HARQ-ACK, LP HARQ-ACK, and HP A-CSI would be transmitted on HP PUSCH, ~~drop LP HARQ-ACK, and reuse Rel-15 encoders~~   + Option 3a: drop LP HARQ-ACK, and reuse Rel-15 encoders   + Option 3b: HP CSI part 1 reuses the encoder for Rel-15 CSI part 1, and HP CSI part 2 and LP HARQ-ACK are jointly encoded with reusing the encoder for Rel-15 CSI part 2. |
| Apple-2 | We share the same observation as other companies such as DoCoMo and Spreadtrum, and the comment from Samsung on the previous agreement is also to the point, so dropping LP HARQ-ACK over HP PUSCH is not an option. We suggest to consider the options below (based on Lenovo/Mot’s version), note with the addition, Option 2C and Option 3C essentially follow the same design, and Option 2D and Option 3B follow the same design.    For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUSCH in R17,   * If HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK would be transmitted on HP/LP PUSCH without CSI, the LP HARQ-ACK can be multiplexed by reusing the encoder chain for legacy CSI part 1. * If HP HARQ-ACK, LP HARQ-ACK, and LP CSI would be transmitted on LP PUSCH, ~~the CSI part 2 is dropped~~, consider following sub-options:   + Option 2a: LP HARQ-ACK reuses the encoder for Rel-15 CSI part 2, with dropping LP CSI part2.   + Option 2b: LP HARQ-ACK reuses the encoder for Rel-15 CSI part 1, and LP CSI part 1 reuses the encoder for Rel-15 CSI part 2, with dropping LP CSI part2.   + Option 2c: LP HARQ-ACK and LP CSI part 1 are encoded jointly and the same manner with Rel-15 CSI part 1 encoder is reused for LP HARQ-ACK and LP CSI part 1, and LP CSI part 2 reuses the encoder for Rel-15 CSI part2.   + Option 2d: LP HARQ-ACK and LP CSI part 2 are encoded jointly and the same manner with Rel-15 CSI part 2 encoder is reused for LP HARQ-ACK and LP CSI part 2, and LP CSI part 1 reuses the encoder for Rel-15 CSI part2. * If HP HARQ-ACK, LP HARQ-ACK, and HP A-CSI would be transmitted on HP PUSCH, ~~drop LP HARQ-ACK, and reuse Rel-15 encoders~~   + ~~Option 3a: drop LP HARQ-ACK, and reuse Rel-15 encoders~~   + Option 3b: HP CSI part 1 reuses the encoder for Rel-15 CSI part 1, and HP CSI part 2 and LP HARQ-ACK are jointly encoded with reusing the encoder for Rel-15 CSI part 2.   + Option 3c: HP CSI part 2 reuses the encoder for Rel-15 CSI part 2, and HP CSI part 1 and LP HARQ-ACK are jointly encoded with reusing the encoder for Rel-15 CSI part 1. |
| Sharp | Support the proposals in principle.  For the last proposal, the CSI may be high priority CSI, including HP A-CSI or potential new CSI report agreed for URLLC under 8.3.1.2. |
| APT/FGI | Fine with the proposal. |
| ETRI | We tend to agree with Sony’s comment where dropping UCI type is clarified. Also, we think that dropping the LP CSI part1 can be further considered, i.e.,  If HP HARQ-ACK, LP HARQ-ACK, and LP CSI would be transmitted on LP PUSCH, ‘at least’ the CSI part 2 is dropped, consider following sub-options: |
| Ericsson | For the 1st bullet, why “reusing encoder chain for legacy CSI part 1”? There are only HARQ-ACK bits, and it should be “reusing encoder chain for HARQ-ACK on PUSCH”.  For the 2nd bullet, we agree that CSI part 2 should not be always dropped. It may or may not dropped according to existing design.  For the 3rd bullet: what’s the difference from Rel-16 where LP HARQ-ACK is not multiplexed with HP channels? |

## 2nd round discussion

Proposal for 2nd round discussion:

For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUSCH in R17,

* HP HARQ-ACK reuses the coding method for HARQ-ACK in Rel-15.

Support: Sony, QC, Apple, Sharp, LG, Quectel, WILUS, DCM, ITRI, Spreadtrum, CATT, Nokia, OPPO, Pana, HW, Intel, IDC, Leno/Moto, APT

Proposal for 2nd round discussion:

For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUSCH in R17, if HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK would be transmitted on HP/LP PUSCH without CSI,

* LP HARQ-ACK reuses the coding method for CSI part 1 in Rel-15.

Support: QC, Apple, Sharp, LG, Samsung, Quectel, WILUS, DCM, ITRI, Spreadtrum, CATT, Nokia, OPPO

Not support: Sony (consider reuse R15 CSI-2), Pana, HW, Intel, IDC, Leno/Moto, APT

Proposal for 2nd round discussion:

For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUSCH in R17, Iif HP HARQ-ACK, LP HARQ-ACK, and LP CSI would be transmitted on HP/LP PUSCH, further study the following options:

* Option 2: The CSI part 2 is dropped,
  + Option 2a: LP HARQ-ACK reuses the coding method used for CSI part 2 in Rel-15. CSI part 1 reuses the coding method used for CSI part 1 Rel-15.
  + Option 2b: LP HARQ-ACK reuses the coding method used for CSI part 1 in Rel-15, and CSI part 1 reuses the coding method used for CSI part 2 in Rel-15.
* Option 3: No CSI is dropped,
  + LP HARQ-ACK and LP CSI part 1 are jointly encoded and reuse the coding method used for CSI part 1 in Rel-15. CSI part 2 reuses the coding method used for CSI part 2 in Rel-15.
    - Details need to be identified e.g. How to determine code rate for joint coding? Which beta offset should be used?
* Note: It has been agreed to support multiplexing HP HARQ-ACK, LP HARQ-ACK and CSI in a PUSCH.

Support: Sony, QC, Apple, Sharp, LG, Samsung, Quectel, WILUS, DCM, ITRI, Spreadtrum, CATT, Nokia, OPPO, Pana, Intel, IDC, Leno/Moto, APT

Proposal for 2nd round discussion:

For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUSCH in R17, if HP HARQ-ACK, LP HARQ-ACK and HP A-CSI would be transmitted on HP PUSCH,

* Option 1: LP HARQ-ACK is jointly encoded with A-CSI part 1 or part 2. The other A-CSI part reuses the corresponding Rel-15 coding methods for the CSI part.
  + FFS which A-CSI part is jointly encoded with LP HARQ-ACK
  + Details need to be identified e.g. How to determine code rate for joint coding? Which beta offset should be used?
* Option 2: No enhancement over R16.
* Note: It has been agreed to support multiplexing HP HARQ-ACK, LP HARQ-ACK and CSI in a PUSCH.

Support: Sony, QC, Sharp, LG, Quectel, WILUS, ITRI, Spreadtrum, CATT, OPPO, Leno/Moto, APT

Option 2 should be removed: Apple, Samsung, DCM, Nokia, Pana

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Sony | **1st Proposal:** Agree  **2nd Proposal:** Not Agree   * In section 2.3.2, there is a proposal that LP HARQ-ACK reuses coding method for CSI-2. It will be good to be consistent.   **3rd Proposal:** Agree  **4th Proposal:** Agree |
| QC | Thanks Sony for adding this table.  For the 1st and 2nd proposal, we support them.  For the 3rd and 4th proposal, we are fine in general. But we think an FFS is needed for both of them. The FFS is “FFS: solutions to solve the LP UCI size misalignment between gNB and UE due to missing DL DCI” |
| Apple | * We are fine with Proposals 1 and 2, * we can live with Proposal 3. * For Proposal 4, Option 2 (Option 2: No enhancement over R16) should be removed:   + as it is clearly in contradiction with the previous agreement to support multiplexing HP HARQ-ACK, LP HARQ-ACK and CSI in a PUSCH.   + Option 2 should be checked with another activity to bring Option 2’s proposal into perspective: companies are discussing multiplexing 1 bit HP HARQ-ACK /1 bit LP HARQ-ACK over PUCCH, this is like one is studying how to squeeze two people into a compact car (PUCCH), but with Option 2, then it is like kicking one person off a big bus (PUSCH). |
| Sharp | We are fine with all proposal in principle.  However, for proposal 3, it is better to separate the case with LP PUSCH and HP PUSCH. For example, Option 2 for HP PUSCH and Option 3 for LP PUSCH. |
| LG | Thanks FL for the update.  Proposal 1: We are fine with the proposal.  Proposal 2: It seems to need some clarification on “LP HARQ-ACK reuses the coding method for CSI part 1 in Rel-15”. Is this also intended to use CSI part 1 coding and apply rate-matching even for LP HARQ-ACK of up to 2 bits?  Proposal 3: We suggest the following modification (in red) by putting FFS for the case of single part CSI and for the case of PUSCH without UL-SCH since there seems a room of encoding to accommodate more UCI.  (BTW, it seems to need similar clarification on “LP HARQ-ACK reuses the coding method used for CSI part 1 in Rel-15” even in here)  **For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUSCH in R17, if HP HARQ-ACK, LP HARQ-ACK, and LP CSI consisting of two parts would be transmitted on HP/LP PUSCH conveying UL-SCH, further study the following options:**   * **Option 2: The CSI part 2 is dropped,**   + **Option 2a: LP HARQ-ACK reuses the coding method used for CSI part 2 in Rel-15. CSI part 1 reuses the coding method used for CSI part 1 Rel-15.**   + **Option 2b: LP HARQ-ACK reuses the coding method used for CSI part 1 in Rel-15, and CSI part 1 reuses the coding method used for CSI part 2 in Rel-15.** * **Option 3: No CSI is dropped,**   + **LP HARQ-ACK and LP CSI part 1 are jointly encoded and reuse the coding method used for CSI part 1 in Rel-15. CSI part 2 reuses the coding method used for CSI part 2 in Rel-15.**     - **Details need to be identified e.g. How to determine code rate for joint coding? Which beta offset should be used?** * **FFS for LP CSI consisting of single part** * **FFS for HP/LP PUSCH not conveying UL-SCH** * **Note: It has been agreed to support multiplexing HP HARQ-ACK, LP HARQ-ACK and CSI in a PUSCH.**   Proposal 4: We suggest similar modification as above, and prefer to add another Option 3 with dropping of CSI part 2 as below (in red).  **For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUSCH in R17, if HP HARQ-ACK, LP HARQ-ACK and HP A-CSI consisting two parts would be transmitted on HP PUSCH conveying UL-SCH,**   * **Option 1: LP HARQ-ACK is jointly encoded with A-CSI part 1 or part 2. The other A-CSI part reuses the corresponding Rel-15 coding methods for the CSI part.**   + **FFS which A-CSI part is jointly encoded with LP HARQ-ACK**   + **Details need to be identified e.g. How to determine code rate for joint coding? Which beta offset should be used?** * **Option 2: No enhancement over R16.** * **Option 3: CSI part 2 is dropped.** * **FFS for HP CSI consisting of single part** * **FFS for HP PUSCH not conveying UL-SCH** * **Note: It has been agreed to support multiplexing HP HARQ-ACK, LP HARQ-ACK and CSI in a PUSCH.** |
| Samsung | We support the 1st and 2nd proposals.  For proposal 3, we are generally fine. LP CSI cannot be transmitted in HP PUSCH, we suggest the following update  For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUSCH in R17, ~~I~~if HP HARQ-ACK, LP HARQ-ACK, and LP CSI would be transmitted on ~~HP/~~LP PUSCH, further study the following options:   * Option 2: The CSI part 2 is dropped,   + Option 2a: LP HARQ-ACK reuses the coding method used for CSI part 2 in Rel-15. CSI part 1 reuses the coding method used for CSI part 1 Rel-15.   + Option 2b: LP HARQ-ACK reuses the coding method used for CSI part 1 in Rel-15, and CSI part 1 reuses the coding method used for CSI part 2 in Rel-15. * Option 3: No CSI is dropped,   + LP HARQ-ACK and LP CSI part 1 are jointly encoded and reuse the coding method used for CSI part 1 in Rel-15. CSI part 2 reuses the coding method used for CSI part 2 in Rel-15.     - Details need to be identified e.g. How to determine code rate for joint coding? Which beta offset should be used? * Note: It has been agreed to support multiplexing HP HARQ-ACK, LP HARQ-ACK and CSI in a PUSCH.   For the 4th proposal, we don’t support. Option 2 reverts previous agreements as we explained in the first round. Option 1 is the only option. |
| Quectel | For the 1st proposal: support.  For the 2nd proposal: support.  For the 3rd proposal: support updates from LG  For the 4th proposal: support |
| WILUS | We are generally fine with all 4 proposal. For the 4-th proposal, we share the same view with Samsung that option 2 should be removed. |
| DOCOMO | We are fine with the proposals but for Proposal 4, we share similar view as Apple. Option 2 should be removed as it contradicts to the previous agreement to support multiplexing of HP HARQ-ACK/LP HARQ-ACK/CSI on PUSCH. |
| ITRI | We are fine with these proposals. |
| Spreadtrum | Support all proposals in general. For the 3rd proposal, also support updates from LG. |
| CATT | We are in general fine with the proposals and agree with LG to add another option to drop CSI part 2. |
| ZTE | Fine with all the 4 proposals, and more comments as below.  For the option 2a and 2b in third proposal, is there any solid difference between the two options? These options are not related to RE mapping. |
| Nokia, NSB | - We support the 1st and 2nd proposal.  - For the 3rd proposal, generally we are fine. But we do not agree that the support of multiplexing LP CSI on HP PUSCH as also Samsung pointed out. Multiplexing LP CSI on HP PUSCH has not been agreed in RAN1 yet (?) This should be discussed first before looking at further details. Suggest to update the proposal as (similar as Samsung but in addition the note to be removed):  “For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUSCH in R17, ~~I~~if HP HARQ-ACK, LP HARQ-ACK, and LP CSI would be transmitted on ~~HP/~~LP PUSCH, further study the following options:   * Option 2: The CSI part 2 is dropped,   + Option 2a: LP HARQ-ACK reuses the coding method used for CSI part 2 in Rel-15. CSI part 1 reuses the coding method used for CSI part 1 Rel-15.   + Option 2b: LP HARQ-ACK reuses the coding method used for CSI part 1 in Rel-15, and CSI part 1 reuses the coding method used for CSI part 2 in Rel-15. * Option 3: No CSI is dropped,   + LP HARQ-ACK and LP CSI part 1 are jointly encoded and reuse the coding method used for CSI part 1 in Rel-15. CSI part 2 reuses the coding method used for CSI part 2 in Rel-15.     - Details need to be identified e.g. How to determine code rate for joint coding? Which beta offset should be used? * ~~Note: It has been agreed to support multiplexing HP HARQ-ACK, LP HARQ-ACK and CSI in a PUSCH.~~”   - For the 4th proposal, not agree. Option 2 should be removed as we agreed to support multiplexing LP HARQ-ACK on HP PUSCH already. Moreover, the Note should be removed as for the 3rd proposal as well due to the same reason as discussed above. |
| Panasonic | We are fine with all four proposals in principle. For the fourth proposal, we agree with Apple and DOCOMO that Option 2 can be removed. |
| OPPO | Support all proposals in principle  For the 4th proposal, option 2 does not revert previous agreement. In our understanding, multiplexing in any case is supported under some conditions, e.g. multiplexing timeline, the number of encoder chain and so on. For the 4th proposal, it exceeds upper limit of number of encoder chain, so it fallbacks to R16 intra UE prioritization. |
| Huawei | **For proposal 1**, we are supportive.  **For proposal 2**, we are supportive.  **For proposal 3**, we are against Option 3 due to the following reasons   * We believe the same principle can be applied for PUCCH and PUSCH on joint encoding; if we further discuss the option to jointly encoding CSI part 1 and LP HARQ-ACK by reusing the legacy CSI part 1 coding chain, does it mean we need also to revisit the working assumption for PUCCH in 3.2.3, i.e. both CSI part 1 and CSI part 2 are dropped? Because the CSI can also be jointly encoded with LP HARQ-ACK in PUCCH following the same theory. * Further problems of determining the coding rate as mentioned by the FL. * The solutions could be more divergent if we further discuss the new combinations of at least two of the UCIs for joint coding on PUSCH. E.g., Option 3A: LP HARQ-ACK reuses legacy CSI part 1 chain, while CSI part 1 and CSI part 2 are jointly encoded and reuse legacy CSI part 2 chain.   But if other companies have a strong with to keep it, we can live with it.  **For proposal 4**, we are against Option 1. Besides the reasons raised for Proposal 3, following drawbacks are further observed:   * Joint encoding of LP UCI and HP UCI will harm the HP performance: if the HP coding rate is applied for joint LP+HP, overbooked resources will be assigned to LP, leading to possibly insufficient resource left for HP PUSCH; if the LP coding rate is applied, the jointly coded HP CSI will be harmed. * Ambiguity of LP HARQ-ACK payload will lead to wrongly decoded HP A-CSI. |
| Intel | Ok with P1.  Ok with P2.  P3 is fine with the modifications from Samsung  P4 requires clarification under which conditions Option 2 is assumed |
| InterDigital | Support the proposals, except the last one because of Option 2. |
| Ericsson | Disagree with 1st and 2nd Proposal.  We don’t follow exactly what’s being proposed here.  In general, it is wrong to say “coding method for HARQ-ACK”, “coding method for CSI part 1” etc. There is no coding method defined for each UCI. **All UCI uses the same set of coding methods. Different coding methods (Repetition, Simplex, RM, Polar) are applied for different UCI size range, regardless of the UCI type.**  For different UCI types, the encode input sequence/size and rate matcher output size differ among different UCI types. For example, 38.212 has (a) separate sequence generation procedure for different UCI types; (b) separate procedure for determining the number of coded modulation symbols for rate matching. However, (a)-(b) would be new when multiplex HP and LP HARQ-ACKs.  3rd Proposal  Fine with study “CSI part 2 is dropped” and “No CSI is dropped”.  It is wrong to say “reuse coding method for CSI part 1” etc, as explained above.  Suggest to modify to:  “Option 2: The LP CSI part 2 is dropped, LP HARQ-ACK is coded separately from HP HARQ-ACK and CSI part 1   * Option 2a: LP HARQ-ACK has lower priority than LP CSI part 1, and LP HARQ-ACK may be dropped (similar to Rel-15 CSI-part2); * Option 2b: LP HARQ-ACK has higher priority than LP CSI part 1, and LP CSI part 1 may be dropped (similar to Rel-15 CSI-part2);   Option 3: No CSI is dropped.   * LP HARQ-ACK and LP CSI part 1 are jointly encoded, and has higher priority than LP CSI part 2.”   4th Proposal  Delete: “The other A-CSI part reuses the corresponding Rel-15 coding methods for the CSI part.” |
| Apple-2 | Looking at the points by Samsung and Nokia, consider LP CSI over HP PUSCH, suggest to consider Option 2C also to be considered (which then has the same treatment as for PUCCH):  “For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUSCH in R17, ~~I~~if HP HARQ-ACK, LP HARQ-ACK, and LP CSI would be transmitted on ~~HP/~~LP PUSCH, further study the following options:   * Option 2: The CSI part 2 is dropped,   + Option 2a: LP HARQ-ACK reuses the coding method used for CSI part 2 in Rel-15. CSI part 1 reuses the coding method used for CSI part 1 Rel-15.   + Option 2b: LP HARQ-ACK reuses the coding method used for CSI part 1 in Rel-15, and CSI part 1 reuses the coding method used for CSI part 2 in Rel-15.   + Option 2c: : LP HARQ-ACK reuses the coding method used for CSI part 1 in Rel-15, and CSI part 1is dropped. * Option 3: No CSI is dropped,   + LP HARQ-ACK and LP CSI part 1 are jointly encoded and reuse the coding method used for CSI part 1 in Rel-15. CSI part 2 reuses the coding method used for CSI part 2 in Rel-15. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Fine with the proposals. |
| APT/FGI | We are generally fine with the proposals.  For the third proposal, same as other companies, we don’t think multiplexing LP CSI on HP PUSCH should be included. |

## 3rd round discussion

Proposal for 3rd round discussion:

For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUSCH in R17,

* Reuses R15 TS 38.212 Clause 5.3.3 for HP HARQ-ACK.

Proposal for 3rd round discussion:

For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUSCH in R17, if HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK would be transmitted on HP/LP PUSCH without CSI,

* Reuses R15 TS 38.212 Clause 5.3.3 for LP HARQ-ACK.

Proposal for 3rd round discussion:

For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUSCH in R17, if HP HARQ-ACK, LP HARQ-ACK, and LP CSI consisting of two parts would be transmitted on LP PUSCH conveying UL-SCH, further study the following options:

* Option 2: The CSI part 2 is dropped, LP HARQ-ACK is coded separately from HP HARQ-ACK and CSI part 1
  + Option 2a: LP HARQ-ACK has lower priority than LP CSI part 1, and LP HARQ-ACK may be dropped (similar to Rel-15 CSI-part2);
  + Option 2b: LP HARQ-ACK has higher priority than LP CSI part 1, and LP CSI part 1 may be dropped (similar to Rel-15 CSI-part1);
* Option 3: The CSI part 1 is dropped. CSI part 2 is similarly treated as CSI part 1 in Option 2.
* Option 4 No CSI is dropped,
  + LP HARQ-ACK and LP CSI part 1 are jointly encoded and reuse the coding method used for CSI part 1 in Rel-15. CSI part 2 reuses the coding method used for CSI part 2 in Rel-15.
    - Details need to be identified e.g. How to determine code rate for joint coding? Which beta offset should be used?
* FFS for LP CSI consisting of single part
* FFS for HP/LP PUSCH not conveying UL-SCH

Proposal for 3rd round discussion:

For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUSCH in R17, if HP HARQ-ACK, LP HARQ-ACK and HP A-CSI consisting of two parts would be transmitted on HP PUSCH conveying UL-SCH, further study the following options:

* Option 1: LP HARQ-ACK is jointly encoded with A-CSI part 1 or part 2.
  + FFS which A-CSI part is jointly encoded with LP HARQ-ACK
  + Details need to be identified e.g. How to determine code rate for joint coding? Which beta offset should be used?
* Option 2: CSI part 2 is dropped.
* FFS for LP CSI consisting of single part
* FFS for HP/LP PUSCH not conveying UL-SCH

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| OPPO | Support 1st and 2nd proposals in principle with modification  Considering multiple clauses in TS 38.212 relate with UCI types, we suggest to cover TS 38.212, NOT restricted to Clause 5.3.3.  **Proposal**  For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUSCH in R17,   * HP HARQ-ACK replaces HARQ-ACK in TS 38.212.   **Proposal**  For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUSCH in R17, if HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK would be transmitted on HP/LP PUSCH without CSI,   * LP HARQ-ACK replaces CSI-part 1 in TS 38.212.   Support 3rd proposal without option 3. Option 3 does not work due to CSI-part 2 can not be decoded without CSI-part 1 information.   * ~~Option 3: The CSI part 1 is dropped. CSI part 2 is similarly treated as CSI part 1 in Option 2.~~   Do not support 4th proposal, we prefer to add option 3 in 4th proposal. Some companies say it reverts previous agreement. However, multiplexing in any case is supported under some conditions, e.g. multiplexing timeline, the number of encoder chain and so on. For the 4th proposal, it exceeds upper limit of number of encoder chain, so it is nature to fallback to R16 intra UE prioritization.  **Proposal**  For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUSCH in R17, if HP HARQ-ACK, LP HARQ-ACK and HP A-CSI consisting of two parts would be transmitted on HP PUSCH conveying UL-SCH, further study the following options:   * Option 1: LP HARQ-ACK is jointly encoded with A-CSI part 1 or part 2.   + FFS which A-CSI part is jointly encoded with LP HARQ-ACK   + Details need to be identified e.g. How to determine code rate for joint coding? Which beta offset should be used? * Option 2: CSI part 2 is dropped. * Option 3: No enhancement over R16. * FFS for LP CSI consisting of single part * FFS for HP/LP PUSCH not conveying UL-SCH |
| ZTE | Fine with the 4 proposals.  Share the same view with OPPO on option 3 of 3rd proposal. |
| CATT | For the first two proposals, TS 38.212 Clause 5.3.1 needs to be included as well.  Proposal for 3rd round discussion:  For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUSCH in R17,   * Reuses R15 TS 38.212 Clause 5.3.1 and Clause 5.3.3 for HP HARQ-ACK.   Proposal for 3rd round discussion:  For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUSCH in R17, if HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK would be transmitted on HP/LP PUSCH without CSI,   * Reuses R15 TS 38.212 Clause 5.3.1 and Clause 5.3.3 for LP HARQ-ACK.   We are fine with the 3rd and 4th proposals and agree with OPPO to remove option 3 in the 3rd proposal. |
| vivo | For the first two proposals, we support these in principle.  For the 3rd proposal, same view with OPPO/ZTE/CATT. The decoding of CSI part 2 depends on CSI part 1. If CSI part 1 is dropped, gNB can’t decode CSI part 2.  For the 4th proposal, we are fine with it. There seems a typo in the 3rd sub-bullet, it should be HP CSI, “FFS for ~~L~~HP CSI consisting of single part” |
| Nokia, NSB | We support the 1st and 2nd proposal.  For the 3rd proposal, although we prefer dropping CSI all together, we could be fine for the matter of propress.  However, we do not see the need to include Option 2a and 2b. With Option 2, the CSI part 2 is dropped, then the 3 encoding chains can be used for: HP HARQ-ACK, LP HARQ-ACK and CSI part 1, why need to drop LP HARQ-ACK (in Option 2a) or LP CSI part 1 (in Option 2b)? Suggest to update the proposal as below:  “For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUSCH in R17, if HP HARQ-ACK, LP HARQ-ACK, and LP CSI consisting of two parts would be transmitted on LP PUSCH conveying UL-SCH, further study the following options:   * Option 2: The CSI part 2 is dropped, LP HARQ-ACK is coded separately from HP HARQ-ACK and CSI part 1   + ~~Option 2a: LP HARQ-ACK has lower priority than LP CSI part 1, and LP HARQ-ACK may be dropped (similar to Rel-15 CSI-part2);~~   + ~~Option 2b: LP HARQ-ACK has higher priority than LP CSI part 1, and LP CSI part 1 may be dropped (similar to Rel-15 CSI-part1);~~ * Option 3: The CSI part 1 is dropped. CSI part 2 is similarly treated as CSI part 1 in Option 2. * Option 4 No CSI is dropped,   + LP HARQ-ACK and LP CSI part 1 are jointly encoded and reuse the coding method ~~used for CSI part 1~~ in Rel-15. CSI part 2 reuses the coding method ~~used for CSI part 2~~ in Rel-15.     - Details need to be identified e.g. How to determine code rate for joint coding? Which beta offset should be used? * FFS for LP CSI consisting of single part * FFS for ~~HP/~~LP PUSCH not conveying UL-SCH”   We do not support the 4th proposal, A-CSI is with high priority, how can we drop HP A-CSI for sending LP HARQ-ACK in Option 2? In our view, dropping LP HARQ-ACK is the simplest and most logical solution. |
| LG | Proposal 1: Fine with the proposal.  Proposal 2: Fine with the proposal.  Proposal 3: Option 2 seems a bit confused, and there seems typo in FFS. So, we suggest the following modification.  **For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUSCH in R17, if HP HARQ-ACK, LP HARQ-ACK, and LP CSI consisting of two parts would be transmitted on LP PUSCH conveying UL-SCH, further study the following options:**   * **Option 2: The CSI part 2 is dropped. ~~, LP HARQ-ACK is coded separately from HP HARQ-ACK and CSI part 1~~**   + **Option 2a: LP HARQ-ACK is coded separately from HP HARQ-ACK and CSI part 1;**   + **Option 2a: LP HARQ-ACK has lower priority than LP CSI part 1, and LP HARQ-ACK may be dropped (similar to Rel-15 CSI-part2);**   + **Option 2b: LP HARQ-ACK has higher priority than LP CSI part 1, and LP CSI part 1 may be dropped (similar to Rel-15 CSI-part1);** * **Option 3: The CSI part 1 is dropped. CSI part 2 is similarly treated as CSI part 1 in Option 2.** * **Option 4 No CSI is dropped,**   + **LP HARQ-ACK and LP CSI part 1 are jointly encoded and reuse the coding method used for CSI part 1 in Rel-15. CSI part 2 reuses the coding method used for CSI part 2 in Rel-15.**     - **Details need to be identified e.g. How to determine code rate for joint coding? Which beta offset should be used?** * **FFS for LP CSI consisting of single part** * **FFS for ~~HP/~~LP PUSCH not conveying UL-SCH**   Proposal 4: There seems typo in FFS. So, we suggest the following modification.  **For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUSCH in R17, if HP HARQ-ACK, LP HARQ-ACK and HP A-CSI consisting of two parts would be transmitted on HP PUSCH conveying UL-SCH, further study the following options:**   * **Option 1: LP HARQ-ACK is jointly encoded with A-CSI part 1 or part 2.**   + **FFS which A-CSI part is jointly encoded with LP HARQ-ACK**   + **Details need to be identified e.g. How to determine code rate for joint coding? Which beta offset should be used?** * **Option 2: CSI part 2 is dropped.** * **FFS for ~~L~~HP CSI consisting of single part** * **FFS for HP~~/LP~~ PUSCH not conveying UL-SCH** |
| Sony | We are fine with the 1st and 2nd Proposal.  3rd Proposal:   * We share similar view with OPPO/ZTE/CATT/vivo that Option 3 doesn’t work and can be removed.   Fine with 4th Proposal |
| Intel | For the first two proposals, the sub-bullets are better to be rephrased, otherwise they may confuse:  HP HARQ-ACK channel coding reuses R15 TS 38.212 Clause 5.3.3 ~~for HP HARQ-ACK~~  LP HARQ-ACK channel coding reuses R15 TS 38.212 Clause 5.3.3 ~~for LP HARQ-ACK~~  For the third proposal, we are also confused how Option 3 works if it is captured correctly.  For the fourth proposal, we are fine |
| Apple | On Proposals 1 & 2, we support OPPO’s modifications, with a slight wording change:  **Proposal**  For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUSCH in R17,   * HP HARQ-ACK undergoes the same processing of HARQ-ACK in TS 38.212 in Rel-16.   **Proposal**  For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUSCH in R17, if HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK would be transmitted on HP/LP PUSCH without CSI,   * LP HARQ-ACK undergoes the same processing of CSI-part 1 in TS 38.212 in Rel-16.   For Proposal 3, Option 5 should be added:  For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUSCH in R17, if HP HARQ-ACK, LP HARQ-ACK, and LP CSI consisting of two parts would be transmitted on LP PUSCH conveying UL-SCH, further study the following options:   * Option 2: The CSI part 2 is dropped, LP HARQ-ACK is coded separately from HP HARQ-ACK and CSI part 1   + - Option 2a: LP HARQ-ACK has lower priority than LP CSI part 1, and LP HARQ-ACK may be dropped (similar to Rel-15 CSI-part2);     - Option 2b: LP HARQ-ACK has higher priority than LP CSI part 1, and LP CSI part 1 may be dropped (similar to Rel-15 CSI-part1); * Option 3: The CSI part 1 is dropped. CSI part 2 is similarly treated as CSI part 1 in Option 2. * Option 4 No CSI is dropped,   + - LP HARQ-ACK and LP CSI part 1 are jointly encoded and reuse the coding method used for CSI part 1 in Rel-15. CSI part 2 reuses the coding method used for CSI part 2 in Rel-15.       * Details need to be identified e.g. How to determine code rate for joint coding? Which beta offset should be used? * Option 5: both CSI part 1 and CSI part 2 are dropped, LP HARQ-ACK is coded separately from HP HARQ-ACK * FFS for LP CSI consisting of single part * FFS for HP/LP PUSCH not conveying UL-SCH   For proposal 4, it seems that OPPO and ZTE’s intention to say when LP HARQ-ACK cannot be multiplexed with HP UCI due to payload limit, then LP HARQ-ACK can be dropped, then we can be open to add a note “when LP HARQ-ACK cannot be multiplexed with HP UCI due to payload limit, then LP HARQ-ACK can be dropped.”, but that is a consequence of limited payload, should be listed as a design goal.  Proposal for 3rd round discussion:  For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUSCH in R17, if HP HARQ-ACK, LP HARQ-ACK and HP A-CSI consisting of two parts would be transmitted on HP PUSCH conveying UL-SCH, further study the following options:   * Option 1: LP HARQ-ACK is jointly encoded with A-CSI part 1 or part 2.   + FFS which A-CSI part is jointly encoded with LP HARQ-ACK   + Details need to be identified e.g. How to determine code rate for joint coding? Which beta offset should be used? * Option 2: CSI part 2 is dropped. * FFS for HP CSI consisting of single part * FFS for HP~~/LP~~ PUSCH not conveying UL-SCH * Note: when LP HARQ-ACK cannot be multiplexed with HP UCI due to payload limit, then LP HARQ-ACK can be dropped   + FFS omission rules |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## Enhancements for multiplexing parameters

## Beta-offset value and configuration

#### Inputs from Tdocs

**Support Beta-offset =0?**

* Yes
  + E///, HW, Nokia, CATT, China Telecom, Pana, DCM, ITRI
* No
  + ZTE, Sharp

**Other Beta-offset values**

* Non-numerical
  + Pana, Sony

**Separate configurations of Beta-offset values for different priorities.**

* + E///, HW, OPPO, Intel, LGE, DCM
  + Option 1: 3 sets of beta-offset values
    - Multiplexing HARQ-ACK on the PUSCH with same priority
    - Multiplexing LP HARQ-ACK on HP PUSCH
    - Multiplexing HP HARQ-ACK on LP PUSCH
    - Nokia, ZTE, vivo, China Telecom
  + Option 2: 4 sets of beta-offset values
    - Multiplexing LP HARQ-ACK/UCI on LP PUSCH
    - Multiplexing LP HARQ-ACK/UCI on HP PUSCH
    - Multiplexing HP HARQ-ACK/UCI on LP PUSCH
    - Multiplexing HP HARQ-ACK/UCI on HP PUSCH
    - QC, Pana, IDC, Sharp, Sony
  + Option 3: 2 sets of beta-offset values, i.e. one for HP, one for LP

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Proposals/observations from Tdocs |
| E/// | [Proposal 15 For UCI multiplexing on PUSCH, a different target code rate and beta factor is considered for high priority HARQ-ACK.](#_Toc68676154)  [Proposal 16 Support dynamically enable/disable multiplexing by beta factor (e.g. beta=0 to disable mux)](#_Toc68676155) |
| HW | ***Proposal 10: For multiplexing LP HARQ-ACK on HP PUSCH scheduled dynamically by UL grant, support beta-offset = 0 to disable the multiplexing.***  ***Proposal 12: For multiplexing HP HARQ-ACK/CSI and LP HARQ-ACK/CSI on one PUSCH, support different beta-offsets for these two UCIs.***  ***Proposal 13: For DCI format 0\_1/0\_2 with existing beta-offset bit-field, one codepoint of the field is linked to a quadruple {,,,} to jointly indicate the beta-offset values for HP HARQ-ACK, LP HARQ-ACK, CSI part 1 and CSI part 2.*** |
| Nokia | **Proposal 3.15: For the scenarios of multiplexing HARQ-ACK bits in DG PUSCH of different priorities,** gNB dynamically indicates via beta\_offset (e.g. beta\_offset = 0) in the corresponding scheduling DCI whether to multiplex HARQ-ACK in PUSCH of different PHY priority or not**. FFS whether to support multiplexing of HARQ-ACK bits on CG PUSCH of a different PHY priority.**  **Proposal 3.16: For the scenarios of multiplexing HARQ-ACK bits in PUSCH of different priorities, RAN1 should specify:**   * **three sets of beta\_offset values for:**   + **multiplexing HARQ-ACK on the PUSCH with the same priority (specified already);**   + **multiplexing low-priority HARQ-ACK on high-priority PUSCH;**   + **multiplexing high-priority HARQ-ACK on low-priority PUSCH;** * **for multiplexing of both low-priority and high-priority HARQ-ACK, the beta\_offset indicator field in the DCI points to the respective two sets of beta\_offset values to be applied respectively for low- and high-priority HARQ-ACK;** |
| ZTE | ***Proposal 13****: The beta-offset should not be used to disable the intra-UE multiplexing UCI with data*.  ***Proposal 14****: The indicator of intra-UE multiplexing UCI with data exists in the scheduling DCI or RRC parameter for the high priority transmission.*  ***Proposal 15****: In NR Rel-17, up to three sets of beta offset values can be configured to the UE to indicate separate beta\_offset values for the following cases:*   * *Multiplexing HARQ-ACK on the PUSCH with same priority* * *Multiplexing LP HARQ-ACK on HP PUSCH* * *Multiplexing HP HARQ-ACK on LP PUSCH* |
| vivo | ***Proposal 13: For HP and LP UCI on PUSCH with UL-SCH, UE can be configured with 3 beta-offset sets including***   * + ***beta-offset set 1 for UCI multiplexing with a single priority***   + ***beta-offset set 2 for HP UCI multiplexing on LP PUSCH***   + ***beta-offset set 3 for LP UCI multiplexing on HP PUSCH***   ***Proposal 14: UE determines beta-offset set based on the priority of scheduled target PUSCH and the priority of multiplexed target UCI.*** |
| CATT | ***Proposal 12: For a UE supporting multiplexing between different priorities, consider enhancements to UCI multiplexed on PUSCH based on independent beta offsets for different priority combinations of UCI and PUSCH.*** |
| QC | ***Proposal 14*: In NR Rel-17, up to four sets of beta offset values can be configured to the UE to indicate separate beta offset values for the following cases:**   * **Multiplexing LP HARQ-ACK/UCI on LP PUSCH** * **Multiplexing LP HARQ-ACK/UCI on HP PUSCH** * **Multiplexing HP HARQ-ACK/UCI on LP PUSCH** * **Multiplexing HP HARQ-ACK/UCI on HP PUSCH** |
| OPPO | ***Proposal 15: Beta-offset values should be separately configured for different priority combinations.*** |
| China Telecom | **Proposal 6: Up to three sets of beta-offset values can be configured by RRC signal corresponding to the cases for multiplexing a LP HARQ-ACK in a HP PUSCH, multiplexing a HP HARQ-ACK in a LP PUSCH, and multiplexing HARQ-ACK on the PUSCH with same priority.**   * **Beta-offset =0 can be configured in the value set for multiplexing a LP HARQ-ACK in a HP PUSCH.** |
| Apple | **Proposal 12-1: a beta offset set can be looked up according to physical layer priority, beta offset selection, and the presence of mixed UCIs.** |
| Pana | **Proposal 14:**   * **For multiplexing a LP HARQ-ACK in a HP PUSCH (conveying UL-SCH only), enhancement of beta-offset values including , which allows for dropping LP HARQ-ACK should be supported.** * **For multiplexing a HP HARQ-ACK in a LP PUSCH (conveying UL-SCH only), enhancement of beta-offset values including specific or non-numerical value, which allows for dropping LP PUSCH should be supported.** |
| Sony | **Proposal 8: For multiplexing of UCI into PUSCH of different L1 priorities, the gNB is able to configure four different sets of ** offsets.** |
| LGE | **Proposal #12: Support separate configuration of beta offset as well as alpha factor per each of UCI priority or per UCI priority combination (e.g. for LP and HP, or for LP only case and other cases) for each priority (e.g. LP, HP) of PUSCH, to ensure reliability/protection of HP PUSCH.** |
| IDC | ***Proposal 11: Support separate configuration of beta\_offset parameters for the following cases:***   * ***LP HARQ-ACK multiplexed in LP PUSCH*** * ***LP HARQ-ACK multiplexed in HP PUSCH*** * ***HP HARQ-ACK multiplexed in LP PUSCH*** * ***HP HARQ-ACK multiplexed in HP PUSCH***   ***Proposal 12: DCI format 0\_1 and 0\_2 can be configured with two beta\_offset indicator fields, where one is applicable to LP HARQ-ACK and the other to HP HARQ-ACK.*** |
| Sharp | **Proposal 13: Support up to 4 different beta-offsets for different UCI and PUSCH priority combinations, and do not support beta offset = 0 for UCI disabling signalling.** |
| DOCOMO | **Proposal 10:**   * *Support beta-offset =0 or a value disabling the UCI multiplexing on PUSCH of different priorities*   **Proposal 11:**   * *Introduce new RRC parameter for the new beta-offset range (i.e. 0 < beta-offset < 1) in order to let UE to use different beta-offset values for different multiplexing scenario.* |
| MTK | 1. Two sets of beta-offset could be defined one for high priority UCI and one for low priority UCI multiplexing. |
| ITRI | **Proposal 5:**  When UCIs corresponding to different priorities are decided to multiplex in a PUSCH:   * The beta-offset of UCI with the same priority as PUSCH is determined by RRC; while the beta-offset of UCI with different priority from the PUSCH is determined by the UL grant DCI.   **Proposal 6:**  For PUCCH multiplexed in PUSCH, beta-offset configuration can be used to enable or disable the multiplexing. The multiplexing disabled if beta-offset=0; otherwise the UE should perform the multiplexing. |
|  |  |

#### 1st round discussion

Proposal for 1st round discussion:

In NR Rel-17, up to three sets of beta offset values can be configured to the UE to indicate separate beta\_offset values for the following cases:

* Multiplexing HARQ-ACK on the PUSCH with same priority
* Multiplexing LP HARQ-ACK on HP PUSCH
* Multiplexing HP HARQ-ACK on LP PUSCH

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Sony | Not agree.  For same priority HARQ-ACK + PUSCH, different beta should be used for:   * HP HARQ-ACK + HP PUSCH * LP HARQ-ACK + LP PUSCH |
| Nokia, NSB | Support the proposal. |
| vivo | Fine. |
| Apple | Our proposal is missing in the summary. Defer the discussion. |
| Huawei | Support |
| ZTE | Support |
| Samsung | We agree with Sony |
| Quectel | Support |
| Panasonic | We support the proposal. |
| LG | We share the similar view with Sony.  We think there seems two ways to formulate this issue, so we suggest the followings.  [First way]  In NR Rel-17, four sets of beta offset values can be configured to the UE to indicate separate beta offset values for the following cases:   * Multiplexing HP HARQ-ACK on HP PUSCH * Multiplexing LP HARQ-ACK on HP PUSCH * Multiplexing LP HARQ-ACK on LP PUSCH * Multiplexing HP HARQ-ACK on LP PUSCH   [Second way]  In NR Rel-17, in addition to beta offset configuration for each priority in Rel-16, two sets of beta offset values can be configured to the UE to indicate separate beta offset values for the following cases:   * Multiplexing LP HARQ-ACK on HP PUSCH * Multiplexing HP HARQ-ACK on LP PUSCH |
| QC | We agree with Sony. |
| DOCOMO | Support |
| Spreadtrum | Support |
| ITRI | Support this proposal. |
| OPPO | Support this proposal |
| CATT | We share the same view as Sony. Different beta offset values for the two cases is already supported in Rel-16. Why is it not supported in Rel-17? |
| WILUS | We agree with Sony. |
| Intel | Suggest putting options on the table, similar to LGE proposal, and down-select a bit later. |
| InterDigital | Support the proposal. |
| China Telecom | Support |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support |
| Apple-2 | Agree with Sony on its observation. Actually, we should talk about of “groups” of sets instead of “sets”. Note once the beta offset for HP HARQ-ACK is changed, then UCI part1 beta offset and UCI part2 beta offset can change also. Hence, there should be four groups of sets:   * Group 1: beta Offsets sets for LP UCIs (all UCIs are at LP) over LP PUSCH as in the Rel-16 legacy design * Group 2: beta Offsets sets for HP UCIs (all UCIs are at HP) over HP PUSCH as in the Rel-16 legacy design * Group 3: beta Offsets sets for UCI(s) with at least one UCI at HP over LP PUSCH * Group 4: beta Offsets sets for UCI(s) with at least one UCI at LP over HP PUSCH |
| Sharp | Support |
| APT/FGI | Do not support the proposal. We agree with Sony. |
| ETRI | Support the proposal. |
| Ericsson | Support |
| NEC | Support |

#### 2nd round discussion

It is encouraged that proponents provide answers to following questions?

Question 1 for 2nd round discussion:

Why should different sets of beta offset values be configured for following cases:

* Multiplexing HP HARQ-ACK on HP PUSCH
* Multiplexing LP HARQ-ACK on LP PUSCH

Support 4 sets: Sony, QC, Sharp, LG, Samsung, WILUS, ITRI, Spreadtrum, CATT, IDC, APT/FGI

Support 3 sets: vivo, China Telecom, ZTE, Nokia, HW, Intel

Question 2 for 2nd round discussion:

To Apple: Could you further elaborate your proposal?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Sony | A HP HARQ-ACK should have higher protection than a LP HARQ-ACK. Consequently, a LP HARQ-ACK shouldn’t occupy more REs in a HP PUSCH compared to those occupied by a HP HARQ-ACK in a HP PUSCH. |
| QC | Same comment as Sony. |
| Apple | Answer to Question 2:  A quick review on Rel-16 design:  To simplify the discussion, let us focus on DG PUSCH with dynamically indicated Beta offsets. With DCI format 0\_1, there can be 2 “groups” of sets of betaOffsets, one corresponds to HP HARQ-ACK (over HP PUSCH) another corresponds to LP HARQ-ACK (over LP PUSCH).  Each group can be include 4 sets of BetaOffsets, and the selection of the group is through the DCI field beta offset indicator.    For DCI 0\_1: there are group 1 (for HP UCIs over HP PUSCH) : { {S\_{high,1}, S\_{high,2}, S\_{high,3}, S\_{high,4}}} and group 2 (for LP UCIs over LP PUSCH): { {S\_{low,1}, S\_{low,2}, S\_{low,3}, S\_{low,4}}}  Now considering UCIs of mixed types can be carried over HP PUSCH and LP PUSCH, we need group 3 (for mixed UCIs over HP PUSCH): : { {S\_{mixed,HP\_PUSCH,1}, S\_{ mixed,HP\_PUSCH,2}, S\_{ mixed,HP\_PUSCH,3}, S\_{ mixed,HP\_PUSCH,4}}} and group 4: (for mixed UCIs over LP PUSCH): : { {S\_{mixed,LP\_PUSCH,1}, S\_{ mixed,LP\_PUSCH 2}, S\_{ mixed,LP\_PUSCH,3}, S\_{ mixed,LP\_PUSCH,4}}}  Note for each S\_{X,Y}, there can be up to 3 beta offset values for HARQ-ACK at 3 size ranges , 2 beta offset values for CSI part 1 for 2 size ranges, and 2 beta offset values for CSI part 2 for 2 size ranges.  So in total, 4 groups are needed:   * Group 1: beta Offsets sets for LP UCIs (all UCIs are at LP) over LP PUSCH as in the Rel-16 legacy design * Group 2: beta Offsets sets for HP UCIs (all UCIs are at HP) over HP PUSCH as in the Rel-16 legacy design * Group 3: beta Offsets sets for UCI(s) with at least one UCI at HP over LP PUSCH * Group 4: beta Offsets sets for UCI(s) with at least one UCI at LP over HP PUSCH   The same consideration can be applied to the beta offset design for DCI format 0\_2, and configured grant PUSCH.  Since the UE knows whether UCIs of the same L1 priority or UCIs of different L1 priorities are mapped to PUSCH, our initial thought is no extra signaling in DCI is needed. Note some finer points can be further discussed on that. |
| Sharp | Should the question be why different beta offsets between “HP HARQ-ACK on HP-PUSCH” and “LP-HARQ-ACK on LP PUSCH”?  Given the BER/BLER curves, the beta offset required to achieve 1% (LP HARQ-ACK) from 10% (LP-PUSCH), can be different from 10^-6 (HP HARQ-ACK) to 10^-5 (HP PUSCH) as an example. The offsets may be close enough so that one value can be applied to both cases.  Thus, it is better to have 4 sets of beta offsets for different UCI and PUSCH priority combination. But 3 sets are also acceptable to us, where one set is used for HARQ-ACK and PUSCH with the same priority (HP or LP) |
| LG | We also share the same view with Sony and QC. |
| Samsung | We agree with Sony. |
| Quectel | Similar clarification question as Sharp, i.e., isn’t the question from FL for “HP HARQ-ACK on HP-PUSCH” vs. “LP-HARQ-ACK on LP PUSCH”? |
| WILUS | Agree with Sony. |
| DOCOMO | Although we were not proponents, we provide some comments here. Firstly, we share the same question as Sharp. The correct question should be “why different beta offsets between “HP HARQ-ACK on HP-PUSCH” and “LP-HARQ-ACK on LP PUSCH.” We think Sharp’s comment is valid and are open to introduce 4 sets of beta-offsets. |
| ITRI | Agree with Sony |
| Spreadtrum | Agree with Sony. |
| vivo | Similar clarification question as Sharp, should the question be why different beta offsets between “HP HARQ-ACK on HP-PUSCH” and “LP-HARQ-ACK on LP PUSCH”? In Rel-16, the same beta offsets are used for “HP HARQ-ACK on HP-PUSCH” and “LP-HARQ-ACK on LP PUSCH”. We think the same rule can be applied in Rel-17. |
| CATT | Agree with Sony. We also think there is a typo in the question. |
| China Telecom | Similar clarification question as Sharp and agree 3 sets of beta offsets. |
| ZTE | Agree with Sharp/Quectel/DOCOMO’s comments, maybe there is a typo in the question.  Propose 3 sets for *beta\_offsets*. |
| Nokia, NSB | Same comment as Sharp, seems it should be LP HARQ on LP PUSCH:  “Why should different sets of beta offset values be configured for following cases:   * Multiplexing HP HARQ-ACK on HP PUSCH * Multiplexing LP HARQ-ACK on ~~H~~LP PUSCH”   It is quite obvious that different beta offset values should be configured for multiplexing HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK on HP PUSCH due to different reliability issue.  We understand the intention of the question is: why need to have different sets of beta offset values for the cases when HARQ-ACK and PUSCH are of the same priority.  In Rel-16, one set of beta offset values is sufficient for multiplexing HARQ-ACK on PUSCH of the same priority, what is the difference in Rel-17 considering the cases where HARQ-ACK and PUSCH are of the same priority? |
| Panasonic | We share the same view as Sharp. Both 3 and 4 sets of beta-offsets are OK for us. |
| Huawei | Agree with other companies that there may be a typo error on the proposal. From our point of view, we slightly prefer 3 sets, since there is no extra motivation to specify two sets of beta-offsets for UCI-on-PUSCH of the same priority in Rel-17 compared with Rel-16 (as mentioned by Nokia), and it is more important to specify the beta-offsets for UCI-on-PUSCH of different priorities than the same priority. |
| Intel | There is clear justification for having up to 3 sets, as pointed out by companies. |
| InterDigital | If there was no typo in the question, same answer as Sony.  If there was a typo as per Sharp’s comment, the rationale would be that the sets of beta factors that result in matching desired respective BLER operating points between UCI and data are not necessarily the same between the two cases.  In our understanding, R16 supports two sets of beta offset values for this (one for multiplexing LP UCI in LP PUSCH and a second for multiplexing HP UCI in HP PUSCH, configured by e.g. uci-OnPUSCH-ListDCI-0-1), as explained by Apple above. Thus it would make sense to support 4 sets for R17. |
| Ericsson | We share similar view as other companies that different sets of beta offsets are needed for the new combinations.  On the other hand, we think the statement should be expanded in scope to refer to UCI-OnPUSCH, which includes not only the BetaOffsets, but also dynamic vs semiStatic, and scaling (i.e., alpha in 38.212 formulae). Also this should be discussed for both DCI 0\_1 and 0\_2; and also discuss CG-UCI-OnPUSCH.  UCI-OnPUSCH ::= SEQUENCE {  betaOffsets CHOICE {  dynamic SEQUENCE (SIZE (4)) OF BetaOffsets,  semiStatic BetaOffsets  } OPTIONAL, -- Need M  scaling ENUMERATED { f0p5, f0p65, f0p8, f1 }  }  UCI-OnPUSCH-DCI-0-2-r16 ::= SEQUENCE {  betaOffsetsDCI-0-2-r16 CHOICE {  dynamicDCI-0-2-r16 CHOICE {  oneBit-r16 SEQUENCE (SIZE (2)) OF BetaOffsets,  twoBits-r16 SEQUENCE (SIZE (4)) OF BetaOffsets  },  semiStaticDCI-0-2-r16 BetaOffsets  } OPTIONAL, -- Need M  scalingDCI-0-2-r16 ENUMERATED { f0p5, f0p65, f0p8, f1 }  }  CG-UCI-OnPUSCH ::= CHOICE {  dynamic SEQUENCE (SIZE (1..4)) OF BetaOffsets,  semiStatic BetaOffsets  } |
| APT/FGI | We share the same view as Sony. |
|  |  |
|  |  |

#### Discussion status (no need for 3rd round discussion)

Proposal for 3rd round discussion:

In NR Rel-17, consider the two options below:

* Option 1: Up to 3 sets of beta offset values can be configured to the UE to indicate separate beta\_offset values for the following cases:
  + Multiplexing HARQ-ACK on the PUSCH with same priority
  + Multiplexing LP HARQ-ACK on HP PUSCH
  + Multiplexing HP HARQ-ACK on LP PUSCH
* Support: vivo, China Telecom, ZTE, Nokia, HW, Intel
* Argument:
  + In Rel-16, the same beta offsets are used for “HP HARQ-ACK on HP-PUSCH” and “LP-HARQ-ACK on LP PUSCH”. The same rule can be applied in Rel-17.
  + Given the BER/BLER curves, the beta offset required to achieve 1% (LP HARQ-ACK) from 10% (LP-PUSCH), can be different from 10^-6 (HP HARQ-ACK) to 10^-5 (HP PUSCH) as an example. The offsets may be close enough so that one value can be applied to both cases.
* Option 2: Up to 4 sets of beta offset values can be configured to the UE to indicate separate beta\_offset values for the following cases:
  + Multiplexing LP HARQ-ACK/UCI on LP PUSCH
  + Multiplexing LP HARQ-ACK/UCI on HP PUSCH
  + Multiplexing LP HARQ-ACK on HP PUSCH
  + Multiplexing HP HARQ-ACK on LP PUSCH
* Support: Sony, QC, Sharp, LG, Samsung, WILUS, ITRI, Spreadtrum, CATT, IDC, APT/FGI
* Argument: A HP HARQ-ACK should have higher protection than a LP HARQ-ACK. Consequently, a LP HARQ-ACK shouldn’t occupy more REs in a HP PUSCH compared to those occupied by a HP HARQ-ACK in a HP PUSCH.
* Option 3: Up to 4 groups of beta offset set can be configured to the UE to indicate separate beta\_offset values for the following cases:
  + Group 1: beta Offsets sets for LP UCIs (all UCIs are at LP) over LP PUSCH as in the Rel-16 legacy design
  + Group 2: beta Offsets sets for HP UCIs (all UCIs are at HP) over HP PUSCH as in the Rel-16 legacy design
  + Group 3: beta Offsets sets for UCI(s) with at least one UCI at HP over LP PUSCH
  + Group 4: beta Offsets sets for UCI(s) with at least one UCI at LP over HP PUSCH
* Support: Apple

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| LG | We prefer Option 2 with slight modification as below.   * Option 2: Up to 4 sets of beta offset values can be configured to the UE to indicate separate beta\_offset values for the following cases:   + Multiplexing LP HARQ-ACK/UCI on LP PUSCH   + Multiplexing HP~~LP~~ HARQ-ACK/UCI on HP PUSCH   + Multiplexing LP HARQ-ACK on HP PUSCH   + Multiplexing HP HARQ-ACK on LP PUSCH |
| Sony | We prefer Option 2 and agree with LG’s modification. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## Separate configurations of alpha values?

#### Inputs from Tdocs

* Yes
  + QC, CMCC, Sony, Quectel, ITRI
  + Arguments:
    - To guarantee HP PUSCH reliability (with LP UCI piggybacking), similar to the reason for beta offset.
    - R16 has supported separate alpha values for HP PUSCH and LP PUSCH.
* No
  + Nokia, China Telecom
  + Arguments:
    - The same goal on controlling number of REs can be achieved with combination of alpha and different beta values

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Proposals/observations from Tdocs |
| Nokia | **Proposal 3.17: For the scenarios of multiplexing HARQ-ACK bits in a PUSCH of different priorities, do not support separate configurations of the scaling factor “alpha”.** |
| CMCC | **Proposal 9: Support separate configuration of alpha for multiplexing with different priority combinations of HARQ-ACK and PUSCH.** |
| QC | ***Proposal 15*: In NR Rel-17, up to four sets of scaling factors alpha can be configured to the UE to indicate separate alpha values for the following cases:**   * **Multiplexing LP HARQ-ACK/UCI on LP PUSCH** * **Multiplexing LP HARQ-ACK/UCI on HP PUSCH** * **Multiplexing HP HARQ-ACK/UCI on LP PUSCH** * **Multiplexing HP HARQ-ACK/UCI on HP PUSCH** |
| China Telecom | **Proposal 7: For multiplexing HARQ-ACK and PUSCH with different priority combinations, there is no need for further extension to configure more separate alpha values.** |
| Sony | **Proposal 9: For multiplexing of UCI into PUSCH of different L1 priorities, the gNB is able to configure separate ** offsets for different PUSCH L1 priorities.** |
| Quectel | **Proposal 9**: Separate configuration of scaling factors (“alpha”) is supported for UCI-PUSCH multiplexing with different priority combinations. |
| ITRI | **Proposal 4:**  Support separate configuration of alpha for multiplexing with different priority combinations of HARQ-ACK and PUSCH. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| Leno/Moto | * **Proposal 9:** Support configuring more than one scaling value for the variable , to allocate different maximum numbers of resource elements to UCI with different priorities. |
|  |  |

## Multiplexing enable/disable mechanism

## Inputs from Tdocs

Multiplexing enable/disable mechanism

* Option 1: By beta\_offset (e.g. beta=0 or non-numerical value to disable mux)
  + CATT, CMCC, Sony, IDC, DCM
* Option 2: By new DCI field
  + E///, ZTE (in HP DCI or RRC), vivo, Intel, Quectel, ETRI, IDC
* Option 3: By RRC configuration
  + ZTE (in HP DCI or RRC), QC, CATT, CMCC, China Telecom, Intel, Quectel, TCL, ETRI (when no DCI indication), LGE, IDC (for CG PUSCH and SPS), Xiaomi, Sharp, MTK

The arguments are similar to that for Section 2.3.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Proposals/observations from Tdocs |
| E/// | Proposal 6 In case of overlapping between PUCCH and/or PUSCH resources in a slot with different priorities, dynamically enabling or disabling UCI multiplexing on PUCCH or PUSCH is supported. |
| ZTE | ***Proposal 10****: The indicator of intra-UE multiplexing UCI with data exists in the scheduling DCI or RRC parameter for the high priority transmission.* |
| Vivo | ***Proposal 17: Dynamic indication of intra-UE multiplexing and prioritization manner can be supported in Rel-17.***  ***Proposal 18: For dynamic indication, multiplexing or prioritization indication field can be included in DCI for HP or LP or both HP and LP service.*** |
| CATT | ***Proposal 10: Semi-static RRC configuration to enable/disable the multiplexing between channels with different priorities is supported.***  ***Proposal 11: A value of zero for beta-offset in a DCI can be used to dynamically indicate that LP UCI is not multiplexed on the HP PUSCH scheduled by the DCI.*** |
| CMCC | **Proposal 10: For multiplexing HARQ-ACK on PUSCH of different priorities, RRC signaling and/or beta-offset=0 can be used for gNB enable/disable the multiplexing.** |
| QC | ***Proposal 22:* The Rel-17 intra-UE multiplexing feature is enabled/disabled via RRC configuration on per UE basis.** |
| China Telecom | **Proposal 1: For multiplexing UCI/PUSCH with different priorities on PUCCH or PUSCH in R17, support RRC configuration to enable/disable the multiplexing at least.** |
| Intel | **Proposal 13: DCI and higher layer indication can be provided to enable multiplexing of UCI onto DG PUSCH and CG PUSCH, respectively.** |
| Sony | **Proposal 11: The gNB dynamically indicates whether to enable/disable multiplexing of UCI bits into PUSCH of different L1 priorities.**  **Proposal 12: The “*beta\_offset indicator*” DCI field in the UL Grant scheduling the PUSCH is used to enable/disable multiplexing of UCI bits into PUSCH, where some of the indices have non-numerical value, i.e. “NOT MULTIPLEX”, to indicate that multiplexing is not used and that the UE performs prioritisation. That is:**   * **If *beta\_offset indicator* is numerical then:**   + **LP UCI is multiplexed into HP PUSCH using the indicated ** offset value**   + **HP UCI is multiplexed into LP PUSCH using the indicated ** offset value** * **If *beta\_offset indicator* = “NOT MULTIPLEX” or non-numerical then:**   + **For the case of LP UCI & HP PUSCH, the LP UCI is dropped and HP PUSCH is transmitted**   + **For HP UCI & LP PUSCH, the LP PUSCH is dropped and HP UCI is transmitted on PUCCH** |
| Quectel | **Proposal 11**: Dynamic enabling/disabling by DCI for UCI-PUSCH multiplexing with different priorities is supported on top of RRC configuration. |
| TCL | **Proposal 5: RRC configuration for enabling UCI multiplexing on PUSCH with different priorities should be supported.** |
| ETRI | **Proposal 6: The scheduling UL-DCI has an additional field whether or not to allow multiplex HP UCI and LP UCI, or otherwise by the RRC signalling.** |
| LGE | **Proposal #5: Prefer RRC configuration for the mechanism to enable/disable the multiplexing of HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK on PUCCH or the multiplexing of HARQ-ACK on PUSCH with different priority, with consideration of potential UE complexity and UCI/PUSCH reliability.** |
| IDC | ***Proposal 13: DCI scheduling HP PUSCH indicates if UE multiplexes LP HARQ-ACK in HP PUSCH.***  ***Proposal 14: DCI indicating HP HARQ-ACK also indicates if UE multiplexes HP HARQ-ACK in LP PUSCH.***  ***Proposal 15: A beta\_offset indicator field set to 0 indicates that UE disables multiplexing of LP HARQ-ACK in HP PUSCH.***  ***Proposal 16: RRC configuration for each HP CG configuration includes an indication of whether the UE can multiplex LP HARQ-ACK in corresponding HP PUSCH.***  ***Proposal 17: RRC configuration of SPS with HP HARQ-ACK includes an indication of whether the UE can multiplex HP HARQ-ACK in LP PUSCH.***  ***Proposal 18: DCI scheduling PUSCH includes a single DAI value. In case both LP and HP HARQ-ACK are multiplexed in PUSCH, the DAI corresponds to HP HARQ-ACK only.***  ***Proposal 19: Support multiplexing of high-priority SR in PUSCH by selection of DMRS sequence in PUSCH.*** |
| Xiaomi | ***Proposal 9: For enabling/disabling multiplexing of channels of different priorities, semi-static configuration is preferred.*** |
| Sharp | **Proposal 3: RRC configuration is used to separately enable/disable of UCI multiplexing on PUSCH for each scenario.** |
| MTK | 1. Dynamic indication of the multiplexing activation/de-activation is not supported. |
|  |  |
| APT | Proposal 8 Dynamic indication is supported for indicating whether to multiplex overlapping high priority PUSCH and low priority PUCCH. FFS the indication method when semi-static beta offsets are configured. |
| DOCOMO | **Proposal 8:**   * *Support beta-offset =0 or a value disabling the UCI multiplexing on PUSCH of different priorities* |
| ITRI | **Proposal 7:**  For PUCCH multiplexed in PUSCH, beta-offset configuration can be used to enable or disable the multiplexing. The multiplexing disabled if beta-offset=0; otherwise the UE should perform the multiplexing. |
|  |  |

## 1st round discussion

Proposal for 1st round discussion:

For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUSCH in R17, support RRC configuration and DCI indication for gNB to enable/disable the multiplexing at least for HARQ-ACK with DCI.

* FFS: Interaction between the enable/disable mechanism and other multiplexing conditions
* FFS for other types of UCI.

Proposal after 1st round discussion:

For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUSCH in R17, support RRC configuration and DCI indication for gNB to enable/disable the multiplexing at least for ~~HARQ-ACK~~PUSCH with DCI.

* FFS for PUSCH without a DCI (including whether multiplexing is allowed in this case)
* FFS: Interaction between the enable/disable mechanism and other multiplexing conditions
* FFS for other types of UCI.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Sony | Agree.  We assume that in this proposal, the RRC configuration is a to configure the the beta-factors or new field to Enable/Disable field in the DCI. |
| Nokia, NSB | Support only the intention of the proposal  For DCI indication based enable/disable scheme, it should be appliable to the case “at least for PUSCH with DCI” other than “HARQ-ACK with DCI”. Suggest to update the proposal as:  *“For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUSCH in R17, support RRC configuration and DCI indication for gNB to enable/disable the multiplexing at least for ~~HARQ-ACK~~ PUSCH with DCI.*   * *FFS: Interaction between the enable/disable mechanism and other multiplexing conditions* * *FFS for other types of UCI.”*   For multiplexing on PUSCH without a DCI (similar as in our reply to SPS HARQ-ACK / PUCCH without a DCI in Sec. 3.3.2), we don’t prefer to support this. Thus, there should be at least a separate configurability (from the dynamic indication) only applicable for PUSCH without a DCI. |
| vivo | Support the update from Nokia. |
| Huawei | Similar with 3.3.2, the enabling/disabling by RRC should be considered as a starting point. |
| ZTE | Support in principle. |
| Samsung | Support the update from Nokia. |
| Quectel | Support the revisions by Nokia |
| Panasonic | We support the Nokia’s update. |
| LG | Not supportive similarly with the PUCCH case, and share the same view with Huawei.  To avoid any ambiguity/misalignment between UE and gNB involved with CG based or fallback DCI based PUSCH and potential DCI missing case, RRC based enabling/disabling should be the baseline. |
| QC | Disagree with this proposal. Similar comment as in 3.3.2. RRC based enabling/disabling should be baseline. DCI based signaling can be FFS.  For this case of UCI multiplexing on PUSCH, because current spec requires UL grant of the PUSCH is the last grant, there is no motivation to dynamically disable/enable multiplexing in DCI, because gNB can always schedule enough PUSCH RBs to make sure the multiplexing can work. |
| DOCOMO | Support the update from Nokia. |
| Spreadtrum | Support the update from Nokia. |
| TCL | We share the same view with Huawei, the enabling/disabling by RRC should be considered as a starting point. |
| ITRI | Support the update from Nokia |
| OPPO | Similar with 3.3.2, RRC can be a starting point. |
| CATT | We support the update from Nokia. |
| WILUS | We share the same view with Huawei, i.e, the enabling/disabling by RRC should be considered as a starting point |
| Intel | Support, as in 3.3.2. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | At least RRC based enabling/disabling should be a baseline. |
| Sharp | RRC should be defined as baseline, FFS on DCI. |
| APT/FGI | Support the update from Nokia. |
| ETRI | We support the feature lead’s proposal. |
| Ericsson | Disagree  RRC based enable/disable is sufficient without DCI trigger. |
| NEC | Support the update from Nokia. |

## 2nd round discussion

Based on the 1st round discussion, even more companies are against agreeing on RRC+DCI mechanism than those were against firstly agreeing on RRC only. So it is suggested to come back to the proposal last meeting that firstly agrees on RRC, and FFS additional DCI. If we like to progress on this issue, it is encouraged to agree on the following proposal.

Proposal for 2nd round discussion:

For multiplexing a HARQ-ACK into a PUSCH with different priorities in R17, at least support RRC configuration for gNB to enable/disable the multiplexing.

* FFS whether or not to additionally introduce dynamic mechanism, e.g. DCI indication, beta\_offset=0
* FFS: Interaction between the enable/disable mechanism and other multiplexing conditions
* FFS for other types of UCI.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Sony | Not Support:  We prefer the original proposed using DCI to enable/disable multiplexing, i.e.:  *For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUSCH in R17, support RRC configuration and DCI indication for gNB to enable/disable the multiplexing at least for HARQ-ACK with DCI.* |
| QC | We support FL proposal |
| TCL | Support FL’s proposal |
| LG | We also support FL’s proposal |
| Samsung | Do not support, a NW should be able to choose between ‘RRC-only’ and ‘RRC+DCI’ – a decision for multiplexing should not be (practically) frozen in time and unable to adjust to real-time situations such as available resources, power, initial transmission/retransmission, channel conditions, etc. A decision should be made for one of the two approaches instead of implicitly trying to agree to ‘RRC-only’ by having the ‘at least’ |
| Quectel | Not support.  In our understanding, almost all proponents of DCI indication agree that a RRC based enabling/disabling is the basis. This proposal provides no progress after round-after-round discussions in a number of meetings. We prefer to decide whether DCI indication is supported at this meeting. |
| WILUS | Support FL’s proposal |
| DOCOMO | Fine with the proposal. |
| Spreadtrum | Support FL’s proposal |
| vivo | Do not support  Same comments in section 3.3.3. More clarifications are needed for the proposal, we can’ t agree to introduce some implicit rules to determine multiplexing when RRC enable it. We think UE behavior is not clear when RRC enables multiplexing but the multiplexing timeline is not met and cancellation timeline is met. We prefer to support DCI indication. |
| CATT | Support the proposal. |
| China Telecom | Support the proposal. |
| ZTE | Not Support. We prefer the original proposed using DCI to enable/disable multiplexing |
| Nokia, NSB | Not support the proposal, prefer the original proposal.  Similar as commented in 3.3.3, RRC configuration is needed for enabling/disabling as a baseline. On top of this, gNB should be able to dynamically enable/disable multiplexing HARQ-ACK in PUSCH of different priorities especially considering beta\_offset is **already** part of the DCI. In addition, supporting dynamic indication can avoid introducing any complicated/additional conditions for multiplexing which will reduce the standardization efforts significantly. Suggest to update the proposal:  “For multiplexing a HARQ-ACK into a PUSCH with different priorities in R17, ~~at least~~ in addition to ~~support~~ RRC configuration, support dynamic indicaiton for gNB to enable/disable the multiplexing at least for PUSCH with DCI.   * FFS ~~whether or not to additionally introduce dynamic~~ mechanism for dynamic enabling/disabling of multiplexing, e.g. ~~DCI indication,~~ beta\_offset=0 * FFS: Interaction between the enable/disable mechanism and other multiplexing conditions   FFS for other types of UCI.” |
| Panasonic | We are OK with the proposal, although we prefer original proposal. |
| OPPO | Support |
| Huawei | Support. |
| Intel | Aligning with the latest 3.3.3, we are supportive of the 1st round version, otherwise no much point to discuss. |
| InterDigital | Do not support. Would support Nokia’s edits. |
| Ericsson | We are fine with this proposal as a first step as suggested by FL.  For DCI indication: we’d like to clarify that dynamic enable/disable by reusing existing field e.g. using beta\_offset=0 to disable multiplexing on PUSCH, can be easily supported. But there are also cases where there is no such existing DCI field, e.g., PDSCH scheduled by DCI 0\_0, SPS PDSCH. We are open to further study whether/how to handle all these cases with dynamic mechanism. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support |
| APT/FGI | Not support the proposal, prefer the original proposal. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## If no enough resource for both HP and LP HARQ-ACK

## Inputs from Tdocs

* Option 1: The LP UCI is (partly or fully) dropped
  + Intel, Sony, TCL, LGE
* Option 2: The LP UCI is compressed/bundled.
  + QC, OPPO, ZTE, TCL, LGE, MTK

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Proposals/observations from Tdocs |
| OPPO | ***Proposal 8: To support multiplexing UCI in one PUSCH when the UE would transmit multiple overlapping PUCCH and PUSCH with different priority, the following mechanisms should be supported to ensure the latency and reliability of high-priority information:***   * ***The timeline of ending symbols used for UCI transmission should be considered.*** * ***Beta-offset values and*** ***scaling factors should be separately configured for different priorities.*** * ***Low-priority HARQ-ACK should be compressed when the actual coding rate is higher than a threshold.***   ***Proposal 16: LP HARQ-ACK transmitted on HP PUSCH should be compressed when the actual coding rate is higher than a threshold.*** |
| ZTE | ***Proposal 11:*** *LP UCI compression is slightly preferred in case there is no enough resource left for LP UCI.* |
| Sony | **Proposal 10: When multiplexing UCI bits into PUSCH of different L1 priorities, if there are insufficient REs in a PUSCH to carry the UCI bits, the LP UCI bits are dropped.** |
| TCL | **Proposal 6: For the multiplexing between low priority UCI and high priority PUSCH, if the resource is not sufficient for the multiplexing, considering bundling or partially drop the low priority UCI.** |
| LGE | **Proposal #13: Consider the bundling/dropping of LP UCI on PUSCH based on the maximum UCI coding rate as for the case of LP UCI on PUCCH.** |
| MTK | Group-bundling is supported when multiplexing and when the resulted UCI payload is large. |
|  |  |

## Timeline and latency requirements

## Inputs from Tdocs

**Latency requirement:**

* Option 1: Multiplexing is only allowed when the ending symbol of the LP PUSCH is no later than the ending symbols of PUCCHs carrying HP HARQ-ACK
  + HW, ZTE, China Telecom, TCL, ITRI
* Option 2: Multiplexing is performed only if the last symbol of PUSCH resource carrying multiplexed UCI and UL-SCH is not X symbol(s) later than the original PUCCH resource for HP HARQ-ACK
  + CMCC
* Option 3: Multiplexing is only allowed when the ending symbol used for UCI transmission in a LP PUSCH is not later than the ending of HP PUCCH.
  + OPPO

**For the case where the timeline requirements are not met,**

* Option 1: UE behavior fallbacks to Rel-16 prioritization.
  + Intel, Xiaomi, Sharp, ITRI
* Option 2:
  + If a UE doesn’t support Rel-16 prioritization, the UE doesn’t expect the multiplexing timeline conditions are not satisfied.
  + If the UE support Rel-16 prioritization, UE behavior fallbacks to Rel-16 prioritization.
  + OPPO

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Proposals/observations from Tdocs |
| Huawei | ***Proposal 11: For HP HARQ-ACK overlapping with LP PUSCH, the multiplexing is only allowed when the ending symbol of the LP PUSCH is no later than the ending symbol of the PUCCH carrying HP HARQ-ACK.*** |
| Nokia | **Proposal 3.18: For the scenario of the multiplexing between HARQ-ACK and PUSCH with different priorities,**   * **RAN1 should confirm the working assumption of Rel-15 timeline conditions for multiplexing HARQ-ACK and PUSCH can be reused.** * **If multiplexing timeline conditions are not met or no multiplexing is indicated from gNB, Rel-16 prioritization rule should be applied (i.e. the transmission of the low-priority channel(s) is cancelled)**. |
| ZTE | ***Proposal 17:*** *For the overlapping between high priority HARQ-ACK and low priority PUSCH, if the gNB allows a UE to multiplex the HARQ-ACK on PUSCH, the UE maps this HARQ-ACK to PUSCH resource elements no later than the last symbol of PUCCH resource for HARQ-ACK.* |
| CMCC | **Proposal 7: The following conditions can be considered for multiplexing of HARQ-ACK into PUSCH with different priorities on top of reusing Rel-15 intra-UE PUCCH/PUSCH multiplexing timeline requirements:**   * **Latency check, i.e. for multiplexing of HP HARQ-ACK into LP PUSCH, multiplexing is performed only if the last symbol of PUSCH resource carrying multiplexed UCI and UL-SCH is not X symbol(s) later than the original PUCCH resource for HP HARQ-ACK** |
| QC | ***Proposal 20:* For d1 defined for PUCCH vs PUCCH or PUCCH vs PUSCH cancellation with different priorities, support subcarrier spacing dependent d1 values. FFS exact d1 values for each subcarrier spacing.**  ***Proposal 21:* Confirm the working assumption made in #104-e to reuse Rel-15 intra-UE PUCCH/PUSCH multiplexing timeline requirements for Rel-17 intra-UE PUCCH/PUSCH multiplexing with different priorities.** |
| OPPO | ***Proposal 13: To support multiplexing UCI in one PUSCH with different priority, the ending symbol used for UCI transmission in a low-priority PUSCH is not later than the ending of high-priority PUCCH.***   * ***If a UE doesn’t support Rel-16 prioritization, the UE doesn’t expect the conditions are not satisfied.*** * ***If the UE support Rel-16 prioritization, when the timeline conditions are not met, UE behavior fallbacks to Rel-16 prioritization.*** |
| China Telecom | **Proposal 2: Multiplexing for channels with different priorities is allowed only when the ending symbol of PUCCH or PUSCH resource carrying the multiplexed UCI is no later than the ending symbol of channel carrying HP traffic.** |
| TCL | **Proposal 7: Multiplexing for UCI and PUSCH with different priorities should only be allowed when the ending symbol of multiplexed PUSCH is no later than the ending symbol of high-priority UCI.** |
| LGE | Proposal #19: Consider to introduce new timeline or offset in case of PUSCH collision handling with different priority. |
| Xiaomi | ***Proposal 1: Confirm the working assumption to reuse Rel-15 intra-UE PUCCH/PUSCH multiplexing timeline requirements for Rel-17 intra-UE PUCCH/PUSCH multiplexing with different priorities.***  ***Proposal 2:*** ***When the multiplexing timeline is not met, HP channels can be transmitted and LP channels is dropped.*** |
| Sharp | **Proposal 1: Confirm the working assumption of reusing Rel-15 intra-UE PUCCH/PUSCH multiplexing timeline requirements for Rel-17 intra-UE PUCCH/PUSCH multiplexing with different priorities.**  **The Rel-16 dropping rule is reused if the multiplexing timeline requirements are not met.** |
| MTK | 1. Guard gap timeline of the new multiplexed PUCCH is of the earliest PUCCH.   Multiplexing allowed only if the resulted PUCCH is confined within the sub-slot of the HP-PUCCH sub-slot. |
| ITRI | **Proposal 1:**  The UE can multiplex HP UCI in a LP PUSCH only if the processing time of HP UCI is sufficient. Otherwise, the UE should not perform the multiplexing and the LP PUSCH should be dropped.  **Proposal 2:**  The HP UCI should only multiplexed on a set of LP PUSCH resource even if the LP PUSCH is configured with frequency hoping, and the set of PUSCH resource is selected from the first DMRS symbol of the LP PUSCH that can satisfy the timeline requirement.  **Proposal 3:**  To ensure the acknowledgement response validity, a UE should perform the multiplexing procedure only if the latest symbol for multiplexing the HP UCI is not later than the latest symbol of the PUCCH. Otherwise, the UE should not perform the multiplexing. |
|  |  |

## Other enhancements

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Proposals/observations from Tdocs |
| E/// | 1. For UCI multiplexing on PUSCH, one or more PUCCH can overlap with PUSCH where the corresponding UCI can be multiplexed in the PUSCH. 2. In case of overlapping between PUCCH and/or PUSCH resources in a slot with different priorities, methods based on partial puncturing with or without resuming and HARQ-ACK bundling as part of overlapping resolution procedures are not supported. 3. In case of overlapping between PUCCH and/or PUSCH resources in a slot with different priorities, only UCI multiplexing methods on PUCCH or PUSCH resources that are extension of already existing UCI multiplexing methods are supported. |
| Nokia | **Proposal 3.20: For the scenario where multiplexing high-priority HARQ-ACK bits on a low-priority PUSCH, RAN1 to investigate UL power control aspects to guarantee the required reliability of high-priority HARQ-ACK bits.**  **Proposal 3.21: Multiplexing high-priority SR in low-priority PUSCH is supported. FFS detailed ways of carrying high-priority SR information.** |
| QC | ***Proposal 17*: For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUSCH in R17, reuse the same power control formula as in Rel-15.** |
| CATT | **Proposal 1: Support multiplexing a high priority SR in a low priority PUSCH conveying UL-SCH and/or low priority HARQ-ACK/CSI in R17.** |
| Intel | **Proposal 11: CG-UCI is regarded as high priority and can be multiplexed in a similar manner as HP HARQ-ACK onto PUSCH.**  **Proposal 12: If both HP and LP HARQ-ACK are to be multiplexed onto CG-PUSCH that includes CG-UCI, CG-UCI is jointly encoded with HP HARQ-ACK with same beta offset.** |
| Quectel | **Proposal 10**: When multiplexing of a HP HARQ-ACK associated to a later DCI and a LP PUSCH scheduled by an earlier DCI is enabled, two possible solutions (or a hybrid of the two solutions) could be considered:   * The HP HARQ-ACK is punctured on the LP PUSCH; * The multiplexing is expected to be applied only when certain timeline criterion are met. |
| ETRI | **Proposal 11: Further study how to adjust the power of PUSCH for payload from the other priority.** |
| LGE | Proposal #20: Consider enhanced collision handling between HP PUSCH and LP PUSCH with UCI piggybacking. |
| Moto/Leno | * **Proposal 7:** UE does not multiplex SR of a given physical layer priority into a PUSCH of the given physical layer priority but may multiplex SR of a physical layer priority different than the given physical layer priority into the PUSCH. * **Proposal 8:** If a UE would transmit semi-persistent or aperiodic CSI on a PUSCH determined for multiplexing mixed priority UCI of PUCCH, the UE may multiplex the semi-persistent or aperiodic CSI with the mixed priority UCI of PUCCH in the PUSCH. * **Proposal 9:** Further study encoding and rate-matching when multiplexing semi-persistent/aperiodic CSI of a PUSCH with mixed priority UCI of a PUCCH in the PUSCH. |
| WILUS | ***Proposal 10: In case of HP-PUSCH or LP-PUSCH contains LP-HARQ and HP-HARQ, it should be discussed how to indicate the presence of LP-HARQ and/or HP-HARQ to be multiplexed and “beta offset” for LP-HARQ and/or HP-HARQ.*** |

# PHY prioritization between DG and CG PUSCHs with different priorities

## Agreements and discussion status in previous meetings

In Rel-16, it was agreed in the RAN1 #98b meeting that the HP PUSCH can puncture the LP PUSCH. However, this agreement was re-discussed in the RAN1 101-e meeting, and only the prioritization of two CG PUSCHs with different priorities was agreed while there was no consensus on the prioritization of DG PUSCH and CG PUSCH with different priorities. In the RAN1 #101-e meeting, the following proposals are provided.

|  |
| --- |
| **Proposal from Feature Lead**   * For collision handling between high priority CG and low priority DG, down-select following options.   + Option 1: define a UE capability for collision handling between the CG and DG with different priorities in PHY layer.     - If UE supports the capability, PHY layer can make the prioritization so that the UE is expected to transmit the PUSCH corresponding to the configured grant, and cancel the PUSCH transmission scheduled by the PDCCH at latest starting at the first symbol of the PUSCH corresponding to the configured grant.     - Otherwise, MAC layer should make the prioritization so that only one MAC PDU is delivered to PHY layer.   + Option 2: re-use Rel.15 timeline, MAC layer should make the prioritization so that only one MAC PDU (e.g. the one with higher priority) is delivered to PHY layer.     - Supported by QC, Intel, LG, Apple   + Option 3: PHY layer can make the prioritization so that the UE is expected to transmit the PUSCH corresponding to the configured grant, and cancel the overlapping low priority PUSCH scheduled by the PDCCH at latest starting at the first symbol of the PUSCH corresponding to the configured grant.     - Supported by Nokia, NSB, Huawei/HiSilicon, CATT, NEC, MTK, ZTE * No PHY collision handling necessary if MAC does not generate a PDU for the CG. * PHY does not expect MAC to generate a PDU for a later, lower-priority, CG PUSCH, which overlaps with an earlier, higher-priority, DG PUSCH.   **Proposal from Feature Lead**   * For collision handling between high priority DG and low priority CG, down-select following options:   + Option 1: Define a UE capability for collision handling between the CG and DG with different priorities in PHY layer.     - If a UE supports the capability, the UE is expected to cancel the overlapping low priority CG by the first overlapping symbol at the latest. Further, a UE expects that the first [overlapping] symbol of the high priority DG is not earlier than Tproc,2+d1 after the last symbol of the PDCCH with the DCI format scheduling the high priority DG.     - Otherwise, the UE can only cancel the entire PUSCH transmission corresponding to the configured grant starting in a symbol 𝑗, if the end of symbol 𝑖 for PDCCH scheduling the PUSCH is at least 𝑁2 symbols before the beginning of symbol 𝑗.   + Option 2: Rel.15 timeline is reused to support cancellation of the low priority CG PUSCH.     - A UE is not expected to be scheduled by a PDCCH ending in symbol *i* to transmit a high priority DG PUSCH on a given serving cell overlapping in time with a transmission occasion, where the UE is allowed to transmit a CG PUSCH with low priority, starting in a symbol *j* on the same serving cell if the end of symbol *i* is not at least *N2* symbols before the beginning of symbol *j*.   + Option 3: PHY layer can make the prioritization so that the UE is expected to cancel the overlapping low priority CG PUSCH by the first overlapping symbol at the latest. Further, a UE expects that the first [overlapping] symbol of the high priority DG PUSCH is not earlier than *T*proc,2+d1 after the last symbol of the PDCCH with the DCI format scheduling the high priority channel. * No PHY collision handling necessary if MAC does not generate a PDU for the CG. |

In the RAN1 #102-e and #103-e meetings, the following agreement was achieved.

Agreements:

*Support PHY prioritization for the case where low-priority DG-PUSCH collides with high-priority CG-PUSCH in R17.*

* *FFS details*
* *Clarify R16 baseline if needed.*

Agreements:

*Support PHY prioritization of overlapping high-priority dynamic grant PUSCH and low-priority configured grant PUSCH on a BWP of a serving cell in R17.*

* *FFS the related cancelation behavior for the PUSCH of lower PHY priority and other details.*
  + *First clarify what is the scope of this feature, e.g. if overlapping between more than 2 channels is considered.*
* *FFS the timeline requirements.*
  + *First clarify what is the behavior of Rel-16 UE in case of DG/CG/UCI overlapping, with and without uplink skipping enabled.*
* *FFS UE capability for this feature.*
* *Note: The main bullet has been agreed in the WID by RAN Plenary.*
* *FFS details*
* *Clarify R16 baseline if needed.*

## Collision handling between LP DG-PUSCH and HP CG-PUSCH

## Inputs from Tdocs

* Option 1: For collision between HP CG PUSCH and LP DG PUSCH, PHY layer can make the prioritization so that the UE is expected to transmit the CG PUSCH and cancel the overlapping DG PUSCH at latest from the first symbol that is overlapping with the CG PUSCH.
  + HW, Nokia, ZTE, vivo, CMCC, Intel, Samsung, Sharp, MTK
* Option 2: PHY collision handling of low priority DG PUSCH and high priority CG PUSCH is left up to UE implementation and no RAN1 specification change is necessary.
  + Xiaomi

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Proposals/observations from Tdocs |
| Huawei | ***Proposal 18: For collision between HP CG PUSCH and LP DG PUSCH, PHY layer can make the prioritization so that the UE is expected to transmit the CG PUSCH and cancel the overlapping DG PUSCH at latest from the first symbol that is overlapping with the CG PUSCH.*** |
| Nokia | ***Observation 2.1: For the scenarios CG PUSCH vs. DG PUSCH of different PHY priorities, the aspects related to handling the cases where a PUCCH overlaps with at least one of the overlapping PUSCHs and the impact of uplink skipping can be discussed after reaching a conclusion on the related Rel-16 discussions.***  **Proposal 2.1: For the scenario high-priority CG PUSCH vs. low-priority DG PUSCH, it is up to UE implementation to ensure that the low-priority DG PUSCH is cancelled, at the latest, from the first symbol that is overlapping with the high-priority CG PUSCH.** |
| ZTE | ***Proposal 18:*** *For the overlapping between HP CG and LP DG, PHY layer can make the prioritization so that the UE is expected to transmit the PUSCH corresponding to the configured grant, and cancel the overlapping low priority PUSCH scheduled by the PDCCH at latest starting at the first symbol of the PUSCH corresponding to the configured grant.* |
| vivo | ***Proposal 19: For collision handling between high priority CG and low priority DG, the UE is expected to transmit the PUSCH corresponding to the configured grant, and cancel the overlapping low priority PUSCH scheduled by the PDCCH at the first overlapping symbol of the PUSCH corresponding to the configured grant at the latest.*** |
| CMCC | **Proposal 11: For collision handling between high priority CG and low priority DG, UE is expected to transmit the PUSCH corresponding to the configured grant, and cancel the low priority DG-PUSCH at the latest, by the first symbol that is overlapping with the high priority CG-PUSCH.** |
| Intel | **Proposal 1: UE is expected to transmit the CG PUSCH and cancel the overlapping DG PUSCH at the latest from the first symbol that is overlapping with the CG PUSCH when collision between HP CG PUSCH and LP DG PUSCH occurs.**  **Sufficient to capture the above in RAN1 specification.** |
| Apple | **Proposal 13-1: Clarify the Rel-16 UE behavior concerning DG/CG transmission.** |
| Samsung | **Proposal 16: If transmission of a CG-PUSCH with priority 1 starts after a transmission of a DG-PUSCH with priority 0 from a UE on a same serving cell and the two PUSCHs overlap, the UE is expected to cancel the DG-PUSCH before the first overlapping symbol.** |
| Xiaomi | ***Proposal 12:*** ***The case of HP CG-PUSCH overlapping with LP DG-PUSCH should be handled by UE implementation.*** |
| Sharp | **Proposal 16: PHY layer can make the prioritization so that**   * **For collision between HP CG-PUSCH and LP DG PUSCH, the UE is expected to transmit the HP CG-PUSCH and cancel the LP DG-PUSCH at least from the first overlapping symbol.** * **For collision between LP CG-PUSCH and HP DG PUSCH, the UE is expected to transmit the HP DG-PUSCH and cancel the LP CG-PUSCH at least from the first overlapping symbol, but not before Tproc,2+d1 after the scheduling DCI of the HP DG-PUSCH.** |
| DOCOMO | **Proposal 17:**   * *Wait for Rel-16 discussion outcome on DG PUSCH/CG PUSCH/UCI collision handling*   + *If only one MAC PDU is delivered to PHY for all the collision cases, no need to further discuss PHY prioritization between DG PUSCH and CG PUSCH with different priorities.* |
| MTK | 1. The UE is expected to transmit the HP-CG PUSCH and cancel the overlapping LP-DG PUSCH scheduled by the PDCCH starting at latest at the first symbol of the CG PUSCH. |

## Collision handling between HP DG-PUSCH and LP CG-PUSCH

## Inputs from Tdocs

* Option 1: For the overlapping between LP CG and HP DG, PHY layer can make the prioritization so that the UE is expected to cancel the overlapping low priority CG PUSCH by the first overlapping symbol at the latest.
  + Option 1a:The UE expects that the first [overlapping] symbol of the high priority DG PUSCH is not earlier than Tproc,2+d1 after the last symbol of the PDCCH scheduling the DG PUSCH.
    - ZTE, vivo, CMCC, Samsung, Sharp, MTK
  + Option 1b: The UE expects to transmit the DG PUSCH no earlier than Tproc,2+d2 after the last symbol of the PDCCH scheduling the DG PUSCH.
    - HW
* Option 2: The Rel-16 handling of the scenarios where a dynamically scheduled high-priority channel overlaps with a low-priority channel is adopted.
  + Nokia, Xiaomi
* Option 3: On top of Rel-16 cancellation time (N2+d1) for PUCCH/PUCCH or PUCCH/PUSCH collision, additional time d2 is needed (which results N2+d1+d2 in total cancellation time) for LP CG-PUSCH and HP DG-PUSCH collision resolution.
  + QC
* Option 4: Per UE capability.
  + Intel

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Proposals/observations from Tdocs |
| Huawei | ***Proposal 19: For collision between HP DG PUSCH and LP CG PUSCH, PHY layer can make the prioritization so that the UE is expected to transmit the DG PUSCH and cancel the CG PUSCH by the first overlapping symbol at the latest.***   * ***The UE expects to transmit the DG PUSCH no earlier than Tproc,2+d1 after the last symbol of the PDCCH scheduling the DG PUSCH.*** |
| Nokia | **Proposal 2.2: The Rel-16 handling of the scenarios where a dynamically scheduled high-priority channel overlaps with a low-priority channel is adopted for the scenario of overlapping between high-priority DG PUSCH and low-priority CG PUSCH.** |
| ZTE | ***Proposal 19:*** *For the overlapping between LP CG and HP DG, PHY layer can make the prioritization so that the UE is expected to cancel the overlapping low priority CG PUSCH by the first overlapping symbol at the latest. Further, a UE expects that the first [overlapping] symbol of the high priority DG PUSCH is not earlier than Tproc,2+d1 after the last symbol of the PDCCH with the DCI format scheduling the high priority channel.* |
| vivo | ***Proposal 20: For collision handling between high priority DG and low priority CG, the UE is expected to cancel the overlapping low priority CG PUSCH by the first overlapping symbol at the latest. Further, a UE expects that the first overlapping symbol of the high priority DG PUSCH is not earlier than Tproc,2+d1 after the last symbol of the PDCCH with the DCI format scheduling the high priority channel, where d1 is determined by a reported UE capability.*** |
| CMCC | **Proposal 12: For collision handling between high priority DG-PUSCH and low priority CG-PUSCH, UE is expected to cancel the overlapping low priority CG PUSCH by the first overlapping symbol at the latest. Further, a UE expects that the first symbol of the high priority DG PUSCH is not earlier than Tproc,2+d1 after the last symbol of the PDCCH with the DCI format scheduling the high priority channel.** |
| QC | ***Proposal 19:* On top of Rel-16 cancellation time (N2+d1) for PUCCH/PUCCH or PUCCH/PUSCH collision, additional time d2 is needed (which results N2+d1+d2 in total cancellation time) for LP CG-PUSCH and HP DG-PUSCH collision resolution. The additional number of OFDM symbols (d2) needed is listed in following table**  Table 3. d2 for LP CG-PUSCH and HP DG-PUSCH collision resolution   |  |  | | --- | --- | |  | d2 [symbols] | | **0** | **1** | | **1** | **2** | | **2** | **4** | | **3** | **8** | |
| Intel | **Proposal 2. Define a new UE capability for collision handling between the LP CG and HP DG PUSCH in PHY layer.**   * **If UE supports the capability, the UE is expected to cancel the overlapping low priority CG PUSCH by the first overlapping symbol at the latest. Further, the UE expects that the first symbol of the high priority DG PUSCH is not earlier than Tproc,2+min(d1,d2) after the last symbol of the PDCCH with the DCI format scheduling the high priority DG PUSCH, where d1 and d2 can be from {0, 1, 2} symbols, and correspond to the additional margins for cancelation and preparation times respectively in case of intra-UE prioritization and reported as UE capability.** * **Otherwise, the UE can only cancel the entire PUSCH transmission corresponding to the configured grant starting in a symbol 𝑗, if the end of symbol 𝑖 for PDCCH scheduling the PUSCH is at least Tproc,2 before the beginning of symbol 𝑗.** |
| Samsung | **Proposal 17: If transmission of a DG-PUSCH with priority 1 starts after a transmission of a CG-PUSCH with priority 0 from a UE on a same serving cell and the two PUSCHs overlap, a UE is expected to cancel the CG-PUSCH before the first overlapping symbol.** |
| LGE | Proposal #18: For PHY prioritization for the case where low-priority CG-PUSCH collides with high-priority DG-PUSCH, Rel-15 timeline requirements between dynamic grant and configured grant is applied. |
| Xiaomi | ***Proposal 13:*** ***For LP CG-PUSCH overlaps with HP DG-PUSCH, related cancelation behaviour for LP CG-PUSCH defined in R16 can be reused.*** |
| Sharp | **Proposal 16: PHY layer can make the prioritization so that**   * **For collision between HP CG-PUSCH and LP DG PUSCH, the UE is expected to transmit the HP CG-PUSCH and cancel the LP DG-PUSCH at least from the first overlapping symbol.** * **For collision between LP CG-PUSCH and HP DG PUSCH, the UE is expected to transmit the HP DG-PUSCH and cancel the LP CG-PUSCH at least from the first overlapping symbol, but not before Tproc,2+d1 after the scheduling DCI of the HP DG-PUSCH.** |
| DOCOMO | **Proposal 17:**   * *Wait for Rel-16 discussion outcome on DG PUSCH/CG PUSCH/UCI collision handling*   + *If only one MAC PDU is delivered to PHY for all the collision cases, no need to further discuss PHY prioritization between DG PUSCH and CG PUSCH with different priorities.* |
| MTK | 1. Support PHY prioritization for the case where high-priority DG-PUSCH collides with low-priority CG-PUSCH. 2. The UE is expected to transmit the HP-DG PUSCH and cancel the overlapping LP-CG PUSCH. Further, the UE expects that the first overlapping symbol of the high priority DG is not earlier than Tproc,2+d1 after the last symbol of the PDCCH scheduling the HP-DG PUSCH. |

# Simultaneous x-CC PUCCH/PUSCH transmissions for inter-band CA

## Agreements in previous meetings

Agreements:

*Support simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH transmissions on different cells at least for inter-band CA.*

* *FFS how to trigger this function.*
* *FFS for intra-band CA.*

Agreements:

*Per UE with the capability of inter-band CA, simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH transmission of different PHY priorities over different cells can be RRC configured within the same PUCCH group*

* *FFS: dynamic indication*

## How to trigger this function?

## Inputs from Tdocs

Support dynamic indication?

* Yes:
  + E/// (RRC + dynamic disable)
* No
  + Nokia, CATT, TCL, QC

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Proposals/observations from Tdocs |
| E/// | Proposal 4 Support simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH transmission of same PHY priorities over different cells can be RRC configured within the same PUCCH group  Proposal 5 When simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH transmissions is enabled by RRC configuration, simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH transmissions can be dynamically disabled. |
| Nokia | **Proposal 4.5: For UE with the capability of inter-band CA, simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH transmission over different cells can be triggered via higher layer signalling (e.g. RRC signalling).** |
| QC | ***Proposal 23:* The enabling/disabling of the feature of simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH transmission for inter-band CA is via RRC configuration on per CC basis. For a CC where RRC enables simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH transmission, this CC is dedicated to PUSCH transmission and UCI is not multiplexed on this CC.** |
| CATT | ***Proposal 15: Dynamic indication of simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH transmission is not supported.*** |
| TCL | **Proposal 8: Dynamic indication for simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH should not be supported.** |
| MTK | 1. Simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH transmissions is enabled based on specific conditions. E.g. LP-PUCCH carrying HARQ feedback. |

## Use cases for simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH transmission

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Proposals/observations from Tdocs |
| Nokia | * **Proposal 4.1: RAN1 to clarify the intention of the support of simultaneous PUCCH / PUSCH, namely what to improve in terms of e.g. LP channel or information dropping, latency, reliability, efficiency or the like.** * ***Observation 4.1: For the scenario of only having PUCCH for a certain priority, the support of simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH transmission of different PHY priorities on different serving cells at least for inter-band CA requires changes to the overlapping determination and related cancelation behaviour of Rel-16 PHY prioritization operation.*** * ***Observation 4.2: When considering more than two overlapping channels, the support of simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH transmissions of different PHY priorities on different serving cells at least for inter-band CA to reduce the LP channel dropping in Rel-17 requires changes to all logical steps of the Rel-16 PHY prioritization operation, namely (i) the order of LP multiplexing and PHY prioritization, (ii) the order of PHY prioritization and HP UL multiplexing, (ii) the overlapping determination and (iv) the related cancelation behaviour of Rel-16 PHY prioritization operation.*** * ***Observation 4.3: The support of simultaneous PUSCH/PUCCH of the same PHY priority will increase low-priority information and channel dropping when taking the PHY prioritization into account.*** * **Proposal 4.2: RAN1 to discuss and clarify, for which cases simultaneous PUCCH / PUSCH operation of different priorities should be supported with respect to the required changes to the PHY prioritization operation / behavior, including at least:**    + **Are changes to the processing order of LP multiplexing and PHY prioritization in scope?**   + **Are changes to the processing order of PHY prioritization and HP UL channel multiplexing in scope?**   + **Is the intention to support case-specific optimized solutions to enable simultaneous PUSCH/PUCCH of different PHY priorities for all possible overlapping cases or instead a generic enhancement of the PHY prioritization framework / procedure (with limitations for some cases)?** |

## Support simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH transmission of same PHY priority?

#### Inputs from Tdocs

* Yes:
  + E///, CATT, MTK
* No:
* Nokia, DCM

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Proposals/observations from Tdocs |
| E/// | 1. Support simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH transmission of same PHY priorities over different cells can be RRC configured within the same PUCCH group |
| Nokia | **Proposal 4.3: The simultaneous transmission of PUCCH and PUSCH on different serving cells is applicable only for the case when PUCCH and PUSCH are of different PHY priority.** |
| CATT | ***Proposal 16: Simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH transmission of same PHY priority over different cells for inter-band CA can be supported.*** |
| DCM | **Proposal 18:**  *Not to introduce the simultaneous PUCCH and PUSCH transmission for same priority case.* |
| MTK | 1. Per UE with the capability of inter-band CA, simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH transmission of the same PHY priority over different cells can be RRC configured within the same PUCCH group. |

#### 1st round discussion

Void

#### 2nd round discussion

Void

#### 3rd round discussion

Proposal for 3rd round discussion:

Per UE with the capability of inter-band CA, simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH transmission of the same PHY priority over different cells can be RRC configured within the same PUCCH group.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| OPPO | Support |
| CATT | Support |
| vivo | Support |
| Nokia, NSB | Object to this proposal.  Multiplexing PUCCH/PUSCH of the same PHY priority over different cells already supported since Rel-15. Even more important, the support of simultaneous PUSCH/PUCCH of the same PHY priority will increase low-priority information and channel dropping as discussed in our Tdoc (R1-2104310). In addition, the high-priority PUSCH may be transmitted with a reduced Tx power because following the Tx power allocation procedure (Section 7.5 of TS 38.213), the UE prioritizes power allocation for the carrier where UE is configured to transmit PUCCH. Moreover, we fail to see any advantages of supporting simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH of the same priority and have not heard from any companies why this should be supported in the first place (i.e. the merits of doing so) |
| LG | Supportive to this proposal.  Furthermore, according to the agreement made in the first WI meeting, simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH transmission of either same priority or different priority is to be enabled by a single RRC parameter. |
| Intel | Fine |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## Support simultaneous PUSCH/PUCCH transmission for intra-band CA or not?

#### Inputs from Tdocs

* Support with conditions
  + CATT, Apple (introducing PTRS for PUCCH to handle phase discontinuity problem) , Samsung (no need to differentiate between intra-band CA and inter-band CA), MTK (for some cases)
  + Arguments:
    - In NR Rel-15, multiple PUSCHs transmission on different carries and one among them with the piggy-backed UCI has been already supported for both inter band CA and intra band CA.
* Not support.
  + Nokia, Intel
  + Arguments:
    - Considering the most efficient implementation with a single PA (most likely case of intra-band CA), e.g. Tx discontinuity, Large Tx power back-off.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Proposals/observations from Tdocs |
| Nokia | **Proposal 4.4: For intra-band CA, simultaneous transmission of PUCCH and PUSCH on different cells is not supported.** |
| CATT | ***Proposal 17: Simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH transmission for intra-band CA can be supported.*** |
| Intel | **Proposal 21: Discussion on support of simultaneous transmission of PUSCH and PUCCH over different carriers for intra-band CA is deprioritized.** |
| Apple | **Proposal 14-1: Simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH transmission for intra-band CA is not supported if phase discontinuity problem cannot be addressed.**  **Proposal 14-2: consider the feasibility of introducing PTRS for PUCCH to handle phase discontinuity problem in simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH transmissions for intra-band CA.** |
| Samsung | **Observation 3: In RAN1 specifications, there needs to be no differentiation between intra-band CA and inter-band CA for simultaneous PUSCH and PUCCH transmissions from a UE.**  **Proposal 14: Send an LS to RAN4 to inquire about the feasibility/MPR for simultaneous PUCCH and PUSCH transmissions on a same cell.** |
| MTK | 1. Support simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH transmissions on different cells for intra-band CA for the same numerology both with aligned and non-aligned channel case. 2. Support simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH transmissions on different cells for intra-band CA for different numerology if the transmissions are aligned on symbol-level (with the symbol of the lowest SCS as a reference).  * i.e. Allocation on the carrier with higher numerology doesn’t start during an ongoing symbol on the other carrier with the smaller numerology.  1. The UE is to be configured separately for inter-band and intra-band simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH transmissions. |
|  |  |

## Support simultaneous PUSCH/PUCCH transmission on a same cell?

#### Inputs from Tdocs

* No:
  + Apple, DCM

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Proposals/observations from Tdocs |
| Apple | **Proposal 14-3: Simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH transmission on the same CC is not supported.** |
| DOCOMO | **Proposal 13:**   * *Not to introduce the simultaneous PUCCH and PUSCH transmission for same priority case.* |
|  |  |

## Other enhancements

## Inputs from Tdocs

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Proposals/observations from Tdocs |
| Qualcomm | ***Proposal 24:* Support the PHR for simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH for inter-band CA with either of the following two options.**   * **Option 1: reuse LTE type 2 PHR for PUCCH transmission on PCC with a virtual/reference PUSCH** * **Option 2: define a type 4 PHR for PUCCH transmission on a component carrier.** |
| DOCOMO | **Proposal 19:**   * *Support PHR for simultaneous PUCCH and PUSCH transmission on different carriers.*   **Proposal 20:**   * *Discuss the interaction between capabilities for two PUCCH groups and the new capability for simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH transmission on different carriers.* |
|  |  |
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