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# Introduction

In this document, a summary of companies’ proposals for PUCCH coverage enhancement is provided.

# Dynamic PUCCH repetition factor indication

## Scope of dynamic PUCCH repetition factor indication

Regarding whether dynamic PUCCH repetition factor indication should be applied to semi-static PUCCH, there are diverged views based on submitted contribution from companies.

Spreadtrum, QC, ETRI, and Ericsson support dynamic PUCCH repetition factor indication to P/SP PUCCH as well. On the other hand, CATT and LG don’t support dynamic PUCCH repetition factor indication for P/SP PUCCH.

## Options for dynamic PUCCH repetition factor indication

In RAN1 104-e meeting, the following agreements were made regarding dynamic PUCCH repetition factor indication.

Agreements: Down select from the following two options to support dynamic PUCCH repetition factor indication.

* Option 1 (without DCI enhancement): Enhance RRC signaling to allow configuration of PUCCH repetition factor per PUCCH resource. PUCCH repetition factor is implicitly indicated by DCI.
  + FFS details, e.g., via reusing the “PUCCH resource indicator” field (without increase # bits of it), starting CCE index (when applicable) of DCI, by PDCCH aggregation level, etc.
  + FFS: RRC signaling enhancement details
* Option 2 (with DCI enhancement): PUCCH repetition factor is explicitly indicated by DCI
  + e.g., introduce a new field or increase the number of bits of an existing field (e.g., PRI) in DCI for PUCCH repetition factor indication
  + FFS whether there is a need for RRC update

Based on companies’ contribution, the pros and cons of the three options can be summarized in the below table.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Pros | Cons |
| Option 1 | Minimum spec change (only has RRC change. NO DCI change)  **Applicable to fallback DCI** | Less flexibility |
| Option 2 | Maximal flexibility  Larger spec impact (Need DCI change. May need RRC change depends on detailed solution of option 2) | Increased DCI size/new DCI field  **Not applicable to fallback DCI** |

According to companies’ contributions, the split of supporting companies for option 1 and option 2 are as follows.

* 19 Companies supporting option 1: Huawei/HiSi, VIVO, CT (2nd preference), CATT (1st preference), CMCC(1st preference), IDC, Intel, Apple, Panasonic, Spreadtrum, ETRI, Xiaomi, Sharp, Ericsson, Docomo, Lenovo/Moto, LG?
* 9 companies supporting option 2: ZTE, OPPO, CT (1st preference), Samsung, CATT (2nd preference), CMCC (2nd preference), Nokia/NSB, LG?

Both options can work to support dynamic PUCCH repetition indication. Considering that option 2 cannot be used with fallback DCI, which is typical used DCI for coverage limited UE, from technical point of view, option 1 seems better. Furthermore, majority companies support option 1. Therefore, FL recommend the group to take option 1 to move forward.

**FL Proposal 1: Option 1 (as agreed in RAN1 104-e) is adopted to support dynamic PUCCH repetition factor indication.**

Companies are welcome to provide comments to the above proposal in the following table.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Support. |
| ZTE | Support.  We’d like to clarify our position as indicated in our tdoc. We support Option 1, and also fine with Option 2 with enhancing the PRI bit filed on top of Option 1. |
| Nokia/NSB | According to TR 38.830, coverage difference between PDCCH and PUCCH is quite significant, in favor of the former. Remarkably, a 40-bit payload was assumed during the SI, which is compatible with non-fallback DCI format payload sizes. This seems to indicate that typical use case of fallback DCI may not be for coverage shortage situations, but rather for configuring a UE in a capability-agnostic way. Of course, smaller DCI payloads could offer larger coverage. However, since PDCCH coverage as such is not a problem, it does not seem meaningful to focus on it to decide which Option should be retained.  In our view, for instance, potential limitations of Option 1 for the flexibility of the PDCCH scheduling operations at gNB are source of larger concerns, given that what is currently possible for indicating PUCCH resources belonging to PUCCH resource set with ID 0 (which can already be configured with up to 32 PUCCH resources) would be extended to PUCCH resource sets with ID>0. This would force gNB to consider a much larger set of constraints and limitations while scheduling PDDCH, since specific choices could imply potential indications UE would consider for PUCCH resource selection. In this sense, limiting this number of possibilities seems wiser from implementation perspective, especially if we consider that DCI-base alternatives exist can be adopted with much smaller impact on gNB’s scheduler, with arguably negligible impact on the coverage of PDCCH (which again has been concluded not to be a problem during the SI). |
| China Telecom | Support. |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Ericsson | **Fine with the spirit of the proposal, but prefer the following FFSs on top of Option 1.** Allowing for UL in addition to DL grants and/or a larger field size may help with companies concerned about scheduler flexibility. (More on this first point below)   * FFS: DCI 0\_1 enhancement for P/SP-CSI * FFS: if the PRI field size can be expanded.   **We think it is fundamental for this feature that DCI is able to be used to control P/SP-CSI repetition.** Because CSI was identified as the tightest bottleneck for PUCCH in the SI, PUCCH repetition enhancement should be motivated primarily by CSI. Unfortunately, PUCCH repetition that carries CSI and whose resource is indicated by DCI is not supported today. While we’d like to see this fixed, this means that periodic & semi-persistent CSI is a more natural starting point for dynamic PUCCH repetition carrying CSI.  DCI could control P/SP-CSI repetition in either UL or DL grants. If a DL grant is used, we think this could be done with Option 1. However, a UL grant would require new information in DCI, and so Option 2 would be needed in that case. While we think this is not a crucial feature to have, and should be in addition to a DL grant based solution, it could provide additional scheduler flexibility (e.g. when there is not DL data for the UE). So then instead of a completely different option, we would prefer to extend Option 1 specifically for the P/SP-CSI case. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support the FL proposal |
| Apple | Support the proposal |

# DMRS bundling across PUCCH repetitions

The second objective of this agenda item is to “specify mechanism to support DMRS bundling across PUCCH repetitions.” Under this objective, a few topics are addressed in companies’ contributions. The topics are summarized as below.

## Use cases

In the LS R1-2104119 sent to RAN4, the following use cases were agreed.

For PUCCH repetitions, the following use cases are considered in RAN1. Among the following cases, RAN1 suggest RAN4 to prioritize the study on use case 3, 4a, 4b, and 5b for PUCCH repetitions.

   Use case 1: back-to-back PUCCH repetitions within one slot.

   Use case 2: non-back-to-back PUCCH repetitions within one slot.

‐   Use case 2a: no uplink transmission in the middle of two PUCCH repetitions

‐   Use case 2b: other uplink transmissions in the middle of two PUCCH repetitions

   Use case 3: back-to-back PUCCH repetitions across consecutive slots.

   Use case 4: non-back-to-back PUCCH repetitions across consecutive slots.

‐   Use 4a: no uplink transmission in the middle of two PUCCH repetitions

‐   Use 4b: other uplink transmissions in the middle of two PUCCH repetitions

   Use case 5: PUCCH repetitions across non-consecutive slots.

‐   Use case 5a: no uplink transmission in the middle of two PUCCH repetitions

‐   Use case 5b: other uplink transmissions in the middle of two PUCCH repetitions

Note: RAN1 assumes “back-to-back PUCCH repetitions” has zero gap in-between adjacent PUCCH repetitions.

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

In the contributions submitted to this meeting, there are proposals to further prioritize several use cases for PUCCH repetitions.

ZTE Proposal 2: Support Use case 1 and Use case 3 for joint channel estimation or joint detection of PUCCH repetitions.

* Clarify that Use case 1 includes both PUCCH format 0 and PUCCH format 2.

ZTE Proposal 3: Decide whether to support Use case 2a/4a/5a for PUCCH repetitions depending on RAN4 further discussion.

ZTE Proposal 4: Do not support joint channel estimation for Use case 2b/4b/5b for PUCCH repetitions.

QC Proposal 5: Support the following use cases:

   Use case 3: back-to-back PUCCH repetitions across consecutive slots.

   Use case 4: non-back-to-back PUCCH repetitions across consecutive slots.

‐   Use 4a: no uplink transmission in the middle of two PUCCH repetitions

VIVO Proposal 2: Optimizations specifically for use case 1 and use case 2 for DMRS bundling for PUCCH repetitions should be avoided.

Given that only three companies discussed this topic in their contribution, FL would like to collect more input from companies before draw a conclusion on this topic. Companies please provide your answers/comment to the following questions.

**FL Question: Should RAN1 prioritize a subset of agreed use cases in RAN1 study? If Yes, should RAN1 prioritize use cases 3, 4a, 4b, and 5b as RAN1 suggested in R1-2104119 for RAN 4 study? If No, what are the use cases RAN1 should prioritize?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Answer/comment to the above questions** |
| CATT | Yes, RAN1 should further prioritize a subset of agreed use cases in RAN1 study. From our perspective, use case 3, use case 4a and use case 4b should be prioritized.  For use case 1 and use case 2, they are simply not typical for coverage enhancement scenario which implies PUCCH format with short duration is applied.  For use 5, we also don’t think it is typical as it can only happens in the following scenarios:   1. Invalid symbols in-between in TDD band which depends on RAN4’s further reply 2. UL transmission with higher priority overrides one of the PUCCH transmissions, which should be avoided to guarantee the coverage performance. |
| ZTE | Yes, we suggest to prioritize Use case 1 and Use case 3.  Regarding Use case 1, short PUCCH repetition within one slot has been supported in Rel-17 URLLC WI. From the perspective of the requirements to keep phase continuity, there is no difference compared to Use case 3 according to RAN4 reply LS.  Regarding Use case 2a/4a/5a, it depends on further RAN4 reply since RAN4 only confirms the feasibility of keeping phase continuity when UE is not required to meet the existing off power requirements. However, whether or how to define new off power requirements are still not decided yet.  As for Use case 2b/4b/5b, it is very difficult or even impossible to make the other signals (e.g., PUSCH and SRS etc.) transmitted in the middle of two PUCCH repetitions have the same antenna port, occupied PRBs and UL power etc. Thus, we don’t think RAN1 should support such rather rare case. |
| Nokia/NSB | Yes, RAN1 should prioritize use cases 3, 4a, 4b, and 5b as suggested in R1-2104119 for RAN 4 study. If further prioritization must occur, then our preference is 3 > 4a > 4b > 5b. |
| China Telecom | Yes, we support to prioritize Use case 3 and 4. |
| Intel | We are fine to prioritize the study in RAN1. We suggest to focus on case 3/4a.  We do not think PUCCH repetition in a slot needs to be studied for joint channel estimation as this is not for coverage enhancement. |
| Ericsson | **We think use cases 1-5 apply, but use cases 1 & 2 could be treated at a lower priority. Use cases 2b/4b/5b do not seem feasible and so don’t seem to need further consideration unless RAN4 can loosen the constraints on antenna port and possibly PRB and power.**  At least inter-slot DMRS bundling should be beneficial from a coverage enhancement perspective. Use case 3 is the most straightforward, while use cases 4 and 5 should be beneficial especially for TDD, if they are indeed feasible. Prioritization among these cases can be after we have more clarity from RAN4.  Sub-slot repetition for PUCCH is supported in Rel-17 for URLLC, and so use cases 1 & 2 can be of interest. However, we understand that common use cases for sub-slot repetition are for diversity and/or beam blocked scenarios. So one way forward would be to list use cases 1 & 2 as a lesser priority.  Regarding the ‘a’ cases, we share ZTE’s concerns about the off power requirement, and would like further clarity on this from RAN4 before prioritizing these options. If the network will experience greater interference when DMRS bundling is configured, this will likely reduce the net benefit of the feature.  For the ‘b’ cases, since PUCCH is a different set of antenna ports than SRS or PUSCH, we don’t see how the RAN4 restrictions to using the same antenna port can be maintained. But even if RAN4 can alleviate this restriction, PUCCH tends to have a different number of PRBs, and probably different power, than SRS or PUSCH. So unless RAN4 can loosen these constraints somehow, we don’t see why they should affect the design of DMRS bundling. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Yes, we support prioritization of use cases in RAN1 for PUCCH repetition enhancements with DMRS bundling  We suggest prioritizing back-to-back cases i.e. use case 1 and 3. For non-back-to-back cases, we would suggest to further wait for additional RAN4 reply for all remaining cases where phase continuity and power consistency could be an issue. |
| Apple | Support FL’s proposal |

## Signalling mechanism to enable DMRS bundling across PUCCH repetitions

In RAN1 104-e, the following agreements were made.

Agreements:

Subject to the prerequisites of DMRS bundling for PUCCH repetitions, support enabling PUCCH repetitions with DMRS bundling via RRC configuration.

* FFS: the configuration is per UE or per PUCCH resource.
* FFS: whether additional dynamic signaling is needed to enable/disable PUCCH repetitions with DMRS bundling
* FFS: necessity of additional signaling/configuration of DMRS bundling duration/window and associated size

Based on the above agreement. There are three open issues for further study.

Question 1: the RRC configuration to enable PUCCH repetition is per UE or per PUCCH resource?

Companies’ views submitted in the contributions are the following:

* Per UE: HW/HiSi, CATT, ETRI, Samsung, Xiaomi, Nokia
* Per PUCCH resource: QC, Apple, NEC, DCM

Question 2: whether additional dynamic signaling is needed to enable/disable PUCCH repetitions with DMRS bundling?

Companies’ views submitted in the contributions are the following:

* Not needed: CT, HW/HiSi, Nokia
* Needed: Xiaomi, Interdigital

Regarding the details of dynamic signaling, there are a few proposals.

Interdigital Proposal 3: Support a grant-type dependent index which indicates to the UE which PUCCH repetitions to bundle

Xiaomi Proposal 4: Multiple semi-static DMRS bundling configurations can be configured by RRC for per UE, and one of the configurations is activated through DCI signaling.

Question 3: Whether/how to design additional signaling/configuration of DMRS bundling duration/window and associated size?

The following proposals are submitted in contributions.

HW Proposal 5: A common design for both PUCCH and PUSCH is supported, regarding to the signaling/configuration of DMRS bundling duration/window and associated size.

ZTE Proposal 5: Specify a time domain window for PUCCH repetition.

* A UE reports a same time domain window size for PUSCH and PUCCH.

CMCC Proposal 3:

* For the design of frequency hopping, the DMRS bundling of PUSCH should could be the starting point of PUCCH.

QC Proposal 6: Similar to PUSCH joint channel estimation, RAN1 specifies time domain window(s) over which a UE is expected to maintain power consistency and phase continuity among PUCCH transmissions subject to power consistency and phase continuity requirements.

* Support multiple non-overlapping time domain windows for joint channel estimation over PUCCH repetitions.
* Window is determined based on semi-static slot format configuration.
* Window duration is in unit of physical slots.
* All windows have the same window duration.
* FFS: determine start of a window.

CT Proposal 5: For joint channel estimation, specify a time domain window during which a UE is expected to maintain power consistency and phase continuity among PUCCH repetitions subject to power consistency and phase continuity requirements.

Interdigital Proposal 4: For a hopping pattern that includes all of K repetitions in a hop, configure one time window matching the duration of a hop.

Intel Proposal 2

* A time domain window is specified for joint channel estimation over multiple PUCCHs, during which a UE is expected to maintain power consistency and phase continuity.
  + The time domain window is defined based on the number of repetitions or slots.
  + The time domain window may be configured by higher layers.
  + When inter-slot frequency hopping with inter-slot bundling is applied, the time domain window is determined by the bundle size.
* Within the time domain window, UE needs to maintain same Tx power, precoder and frequency resource for joint channel estimation over multiple PUCCHs.

Panasonic Proposal 2: Specify a time domain window during which a UE is expected to maintain power consistency and phase continuity among PUCCH transmissions subject to power consistency and phase continuity requirements.

Panasonic Proposal 3: For the indication of the length of time domain window, enhance RRC signaling to allow configuration of the length of time domain window per PUCCH resource. Enabling/disabling and the length of time domain window are indicated via reusing PUCCH resource indicator field. PUCCH resource indicator field should be extended for further flexibility.

LG Proposal 3: We should revisit DMRS bundling across PUCCH repetitions after joint channel estimation for PUSCH

Sharp Proposal 4: For DMRS bundling, a time domain window during which a UE is expected to maintain power consistency and phase continuity among PUCCH transmissions subject to power consistency and phase continuity requirements should be adopted.

DCM Proposal 2: The same mechanism of DMRS bundling across repetitions discussed in PUSCH enhancement can be applied for PUCCH enhancement.

Lenovo Proposal 2: For supporting joint channel estimation with DM-RS bundling across multiple PUCCHs for coverage enhancements in NR Rel-17, specify a time domain window during which a UE is expected to maintain power consistency and phase continuity among PUSCH transmissions subject to power consistency and phase continuity requirements.

Nokia Proposal 4. No additional semi-static/dynamic signalling is introduced for configuring DMRS bundling window and associated size.

For DMRS bundling for PUCCH repetitions, majority companies support to define a time domain window, similar to what was agreed for PUSCH repetition. Therefore, the following FL proposal is made.

**FL proposal 2: For DMRS bundling for PUCCH repetitions, specify a time domain window during which a UE is expected to maintain power consistency and phase continuity among PUCCH repetitions subject to power consistency and phase continuity requirements.**

* **Strive for common signaling mechanism of the time domain window for PUSCH/PUCCH with DMRS bundling as much as possible.**
* **FFS whether use the same time domain window size for PUCCH repetitions and PUSCH repetitions.**

Companies are welcome to provide comments to the above proposal in the following table.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Comments** |
| CATT | We are generally fine with the proposal.  For the FFS point, the intention is to use the same set of time domain window sizes for a UE instead of mandating an exact same window size for PUSCH transmission and PUCCH transmission? Or the same window size is always configured/indicated per UE which is applied to both PUCCH and PUSCH equally? |
| ZTE | Fine with the proposal in general.  Regarding the FFS point, we also want to clarify that whether it is from UE capability reporting perspective or from gNB configuration perspective or both? |
| Nokia/NSB | Fine with the main sentence of the proposal. Not fine with the first bullet, given that RAN1 has not agreed how the time domain window is to be defined, and if it requires configuration (it depends on the design). We suggest the following modifications:  **FL proposal 2: For DMRS bundling for PUCCH repetitions, specify a time domain window during which a UE is expected to maintain power consistency and phase continuity among PUCCH repetitions subject to power consistency and phase continuity requirements.**   * **Strive for common design ~~signaling mechanism~~ of the time domain window for PUSCH/PUCCH with DMRS bundling as much as possible.** * **FFS whether use the same time domain window size for PUCCH repetitions and PUSCH repetitions.** |
| China Telecom | We support this proposal. Nokia’s modification is also fine with us. |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Ericsson | **Agree with the proposal as modified by Nokia, except that we prefer the FFS on window size be dropped.**  **FL proposal 2: For DMRS bundling for PUCCH repetitions, specify a time domain window during which a UE is expected to maintain power consistency and phase continuity among PUCCH repetitions subject to power consistency and phase continuity requirements.**   * **Strive for common design ~~signaling mechanism~~ of the time domain window for PUSCH/PUCCH with DMRS bundling as much as possible.** * **~~FFS whether use the same time domain window size for PUCCH repetitions and PUSCH repetitions.~~**   It seems too early to address whether the same window size is used for PUSCH and PUCCH. This seems to assume that PUSCH and PUCCH are transmitted in a sufficiently similar way that the same size can be used. PUSCH and PUCCH may have different spatial relations; PUCCH is transmitted on its own (single) antenna port, while PUSCH supports UL MIMO; PUCCH is transmitted with few PRBs, while PUSCH is not necessarily so, and requirements for PUCCH or PUSCH coherence could vary given all these factors. So we would prefer further discussion, and probably more inputs from RAN4 on window size determination, before concluding on any commonality between PUCCH and PUSCH. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support the FL proposal and agree to that the enhancements agreed for PUSCH should be applicable for PUCCH, whenever possible. |
| Apple | Support FL’s proposal |

## Inter slot freq hopping enhancement with DMRS bundling

In RAN1 104e, the following agreements were made.

Agreements: Subject to the prerequisite of DMRS bundling for PUCCH repetitions, enhance inter-slot frequency hopping pattern for PUCCH repetitions with DMRS bundling.

* FFS: details in inter-slot frequency hopping pattern enhancement, e.g., additional frequency hopping patterns than Rel-16.
* Strive for common design for PUSCH/PUCCH with DMRS bundling as much as possible

In companies’ contributions, the following proposals are made regarding to the topic of inter slot frequency hopping enhancement with DMRS bundling.

HW Proposal 2: Inter-slot frequency hopping pattern with inter-slot bundling can be considered for the inter-slot frequency hopping pattern enhancement.

ZTE Proposal 6: Inter-slot frequency hopping with inter-slot bundling to enable cross-slot channel estimation among repetitions per bundle is supported.

Spreadtrum: For example, to facilitate joint channel estimation, the repetitions of PUCCH in consecutive UL slots can be mapped to the same hop as many as possible.

CATT Proposal 6: Hopping interval of the enhanced inter-slot frequency hopping pattern can be equal to the DMRS bundling window duration/size.

QC Proposal 8: When the PUCCH repetition is enabled, the frequency hop for PUCCH repetition transmission is determined based on the repetition count for each PUCCH transmission occasion.

QC Proposal 9: When inter-slot frequency hopping is configured with DMRS bundling, all PUCCH transmissions in a single time domain DMRS bundling window belong to the same hop.

OPPO Proposal 4: For enhancement, the PUCCH repetition with frequency hopping can introduce 2 bundles of slots. Each bundle of slots can be transmitted in different PRBs.

Interdigital Proposal 5: Support a hopping pattern with DMRS bundling where during one hop, all of K repetitions are included.

Intel Proposal 3

* Inter-slot frequency hopping with inter-slot bundling is supported for PUCCH enhancement.
  + The bundle size may be configured higher layers or determined based on the number of repetitions.

Apple Proposal 3: Specify the inter-slot frequency hopping pattern to enable the conjunction operation of repetition, frequency hopping and joint channel estimation.

Panasonic Proposal 4: One or more lengths of time domain windows are configured to be jointly used with inter-slot frequency hopping / precoder cycling.

* Each of the one or more lengths of time domain windows is used for the same frequency allocation in inter-slot frequency hopping procedure.

ETRI: Proposal 4: If inter-slot frequency hopping is enabled, then the PUCCH repetition may hop in the middle of slot, depending on the TDD slot pattern and the number of repetitions, and the coherence can be kept in the same split.

Xiaomi: Proposal 3：Introduce configurable additional inter-slot frequency hopping patterns for PUCCH repetitions with DMRS bundling.

DCM Proposal 4: The duration per frequency hop should be implicitly determined by the time domain window, where the duration per frequency hop is equal to a time domain window size for joint channel estimation.

Lenovo Proposal 3: For supporting joint channel estimation with DM-RS bundling across multiple PUCCHs for coverage enhancements in NR Rel-17, support multi-slot frequency hopping and multi-slot DM-RS bundling for joint channel estimation for entire hop:

* Association between frequency hop duration and time-domain window should be supported such that explicit indication of both the frequency hop duration and time-domain window is not needed
  + Time-domain window size can be equal to the frequency hop duration
* At least hop duration of 2 slots should be supported with DM-RS bundling

Nokia Proposal 5. For inter-slot frequency hopping with inter-slot bundling to enable joint channel estimation:

* RAN1 to specify at least the following frequency hopping approach:
  + UE switches frequency hop for the repetitions after a DL reception occasion that the UE is expected/configured to monitor/receive or after an UL transmission with different settings (e.g., in antenna port, occupied PRBs and UL power) than the PUCCH repetitions.

For inter slot frequency hopping with DMRS bundling, majority companies support additional frequency hopping patterns than Rel-16 to allow DMRS bundling within a duration per frequency hopping (a.k.a., time domain hopping interval as defined for PUSCH repetition). Majority companies support to set the bundle size equal to the time domain window size (to keep power consistency and phase coherency).

**FL Proposal 3: For inter slot frequency hopping with DMRS bundling, all PUCCH repetitions in a frequency hopping duration (similar to the time domain hopping interval defined for PUSCH repetition) belong to the same frequency hop.**

* **The frequency hopping duration equals to the size of time domain window where power consistency and phase coherency can be maintained.**

Companies are welcome to provide comments to the above proposal in the following table.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Comments** |
| CATT | Support. |
| ZTE | Though, we are fine with the proposal, we feel it may be better to first decide how to determine the time domain window (e.g., the start and the length etc.), and then to decide whether the FH could be based on the time domain window. |
| Nokia/NSB | Fine with the general principle underlying the proposal, however we also think that further discussions should be had before agreeing to it.  More specifically: shouldn’t we first discuss details of the time domain window, to understand how the UE should handle events like DL monitoring occasions within the window, if any/applicable, UL transmissions with different settings within the window, if any/applicable, and so on? We think that once framework is clear in this regard, adding support to inter-slot FH on top of it is quite an incremental effort.  We prefer avoiding putting the cart before the horse, if possible. |
| China Telecom | Since similar issue is also discussed for PUSCH about the relationship between time domain window size and DMRS bundling size. We think we can postpone this issue after the agreement for PUSCH is achieved. |
| Intel | We are fine with the main bullet in principle, but we suggest to follow similar terminology as agreed for PUSCH enhancement, e.g., inter-slot frequency hopping with inter-slot bundling is supported for PUCCH.  For the sub-bullet, our view is that time domain window size can be larger than bundle size for inter-slot frequency hopping. But within the bundle size, power consistency and phase continuity need to be maintained. |
| Ericsson | Also prefer to postpone.  For us, what is more critical to agree is how the hopping pattern is adjusted. The phase continuity & power consistency constraints can then determine which DMRSs in which hops can be combined. Tradeoffs on channel estimation gain vs. frequency hopping gain should be quantified to allow the right frequency hopping patterns to be defined. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support the FL proposal. |
| Apple | Let’s have more progress on time window. |

# Others

There are a few other proposals mentioned in submitted contributions to this agenda. FL’s initial assessment is that the discussion of those proposals can be deprioritized, comparing to proposals in Section 2 and Section 3.

[[R1-2105328](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_105-e/Docs/R1-2105328.zip)]: The maximum number of repetitions for transmission of PUCCH repetition is 32.

[[R1-2105655](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_105-e/Docs/R1-2105655.zip)]: The dynamic PUCCH repetition mechanism should be applied to all PUCCH formats and all UCI types including A-CSI.

[[R1-2105655](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_105-e/Docs/R1-2105655.zip)]: Further study the benefit of gNB estimated inter-slot relative phase correction for PUCCH, addressing how frequency selective such phase corrections would need to be for UEs and/or conditions that do not sufficiently support maintaining inter-slot relative phase.

* Consider operation with and without frequency hopping and with and without transparent transmit diversity.

[[R1-2105122](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_105-e/Docs/R1-2105122.zip)]: For a PUCCH (or PUSCH) repetition with DMRS bundling, only TPC indicated by a unicast DCI is applied, i.e. TPC on GC-DCI 2-2 is ignored.

[[R1-2105122](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_105-e/Docs/R1-2105122.zip)]: Unicast DCI with a TPC command implicitly indicates that DMRS bundling is off, from the occasion that new TPC is applied.

[[R1-2105122](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_105-e/Docs/R1-2105122.zip)]: Specify conditions under which a PUCCH with dynamic indication of repetition number may overlap with another PUCCH repetitions without dynamic indication of repetitions.

[[R1-2105122](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_105-e/Docs/R1-2105122.zip)]: If DMRS bundling is supported, specify conditions under which phase continuity is kept for a PUCCH with DMRS bundling overlapping in one (or more) occasions with a second PUCCH without DMRS bundling.

[[R1-2105328](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_105-e/Docs/R1-2105328.zip)]: A UE updates the CLPC adjustment state per time domain window.
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