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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.

**FL Question: Whether dynamical PUCCH repetition factor indication should be applied to semi-static PUCCH?**

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Comments** |
| Samsung | No – there is no payload variation and there is no variation in the PUCCH resource. Rel-16 works fine for semi-static PUCCH. |
| Intel | No, we do not see the need. As this is semi-static PUCCH, why do we need to enable dynamic PUCCH repetition factor indication?  |
| Vivo | No need, there is no motivation. There is another tool of A-CSI which can address coverage issue, if any |
| Sharp | We don’t think dynamic PUCCH repetition factor indication is needed for semi-static PUCCH. For P/SP-CSI reporting, repetition factor can be set to 8 semi-statically for coverage. Although the semi-static configuration impacts on utilization efficiency of other channels such as HARQ-ACK reporting, this issue can be solved by dynamic PUCCH repetition factor indication for HARQ-ACK reporting. |
| Qualcomm | Yes. We think it should be applied to both CSI (e.g. periodic CSI) and SPS Ack. The justification for applying it to SPS Ack is the same as dynamic indication for HARQ Ack of scheduled PDSCH (because they have similar coverage). For CSI, it is actually more important, because the payload is larger and the need for coverage enhancement is greater (especially for L1-reprt that can have large payload and is also very important for beam management). If implicit dynamic indication of repetition factor based on configuration enhancement is adopted for HARQ Ack of scheduled PDSCH (option 1, e.g. using PRI), then the same indication in DL grant can affect can affect repetition factor for semi-static PUCCH, by appropriate configuration changes, e.g. PRI indicated for Ack of scheduled PDSCH can change the PUCCH resource set for periodic CSI, based on some preconfigured rule (not necessarily the PUCCH resource set directly indicated by that PRI). Therefore, applying dynamic indication to semi-static PUCCH is not complicated and does not need much extra specification effort from what is already envisioned for HARQ Ack PUCCH. |
| CATT | No, we don’t think there is necessity to dynamically indicate the repetition number of SP/P CSI. For the HARQ-ACK of SPS PDSCH, we think the same mechanism as the other dynamic UCI, which is indicated via the PRI carried in the activation DCI.  |
| LG | Since the UE moves, there may be coverage that requires CE or coverage that is satisfied by normal operation depending on the location, and therefore, adaption between CE UL and Normal UL is required. If only switching CE UL and Normal UL by RRC is allowed for this adaptation, this may have a problem in that signaling overhead is excessively increased or a switching time is too long to be switched at an appropriate time. |
| Panasonic | No. We don’t aware of technical merit to apply dynamic PUCCH repetition factor indication to semi-static PUCCH. |
| ZTE | For the HARQ-ACK of SPS PDSCH, we have similar understanding with CATT. For CSI in PUCCH, we prefer not to support dynamic repetition since the SP/P-CSI payload is more semi-static.  |
| OPPO | Not justified for introducing the indication. The PUCCH is already semi-static.  |
| Apple | No, it is not justified for semi-static PUCCH. |

**FL Question: How to indicate repetition factor for semi-static PUCCH dynamically. Are there other proposals besides the following?**

* **Option 1: implicitly indicated based on configuration of PUCCH resource set for each PUCCH**
* **Option 2: indicated by switching of associated PUCCH resource sets (e.g. for SPS PUCCH or PUCCH carrying CSI)**
* **Option 3: implicitly indicated based on the dynamic indication via PDCCH**
* **Option 4: indicated via activation/reactivation DCI**

The description of each of above options is not very clear in the contributions. Proponents of those options please provide clarification in the following table to clarify each of the proposals. In addition, companies are welcome to propose new options if any in the following table.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Comments** |
| Samsung | No need to dynamically indicate the repetition factor for semi-static PUCCH |
| Intel | We do not see the need. |
| Vivo | No need |
| Qualcomm | We think both options 1 and 2 can be useful and easy to adopt (by appropriate configuration changes). If indication via PRI is used for PUCCH of scheduled PDSCH, then option 2 is slightly preferred. In this case, the same indication in DL grant can affect can affect repetition factor for semi-static PUCCH, by appropriate configuration changes, e.g. PRI indicated for Ack of scheduled PDSCH can change the PUCCH resource set for periodic CSI, based on some preconfigured rule (not necessarily the PUCCH resource set directly indicated by that PRI). |
| Ericsson | **Can companies who see no need for dynamic indication of repetition factor for semi-static PUCCH answer how dynamic repetition for CSI be accomplished?** In our understanding, it is not possible to carry repeated CSI on PUCCH indicated by PRI in Rel-15/16. Does this mean you propose to allow repeated CSI on PUCCH indicated by PRI? If not, what other solution besides updating semi-static PUCCH repetition factor is there to allow dynamic repetition factor for CSI, where it is most needed according to the study item outcome?**On the detailed solution for supporting semi-static PUCCH reporting:** We have in mind using PRI to indicated a PUCCH resource in either a DL or a UL grant (and so perhaps an Option ‘2a’, since we switch PUCCH resources rather than resource sets). The PUCCH resource configuration contains a PUCCH repetition factor. When a PUCCH resource is indicated that is associated a periodic or semi-persistent CSI report, that PUCCH resource replaces the PUCCH resource currently used for the CSI report. |
| CATT | No.For P/SP CSI, if dynamic changing on repetition number is really needed, the UCI can be transmitted on the PUCCH resources indicated by the PRI, i.e. it can be transmitted in terms of A-CSI. Network has full power to guarantee that UCI can be transmitted in a robust way. |
| Ericsson2 | @CATT: thanks for addressing CSI. Unfortunately, A-CSI on PUCCH is not yet specified, if I understand the URLLC discussions correctly. And again our understanding is that in Rel-15/16 CSI can’t be repeated on a dynamically indicated PUCCH resource. |
| LG | PUCCH resources may be shared between CE UL and Normal UL, but using different time/frequency resources may be used by the base station for resource management.As a method of applying the dynamic factor indication to the semi-static PUCCH, for example, there is a method of indicating the number of repetition only by using an explicit bit for repetition. This is on the premise that PUCCH not performing repetition and PUCCH performing repetition share the same PUCCH resource. Rather, a method capable of independently indicating resources for PUCCH repetition is preferred. |
| ZTE | Fine to consider Option 4 for HARQ-ACK of SPS PDSCH. |
| OPPO | We do not see the need of configuring that for semi-static PUCCH, based on the SI conclusion. |
| Apple | We don’t see any need for dynamic indication of repetition factor for “semi-static PUCCH”.  |

On this topic, FL thanks all companies for the first round of input. Besides companies’ high level view whether dynamic PUCCH repetition factor indication is needed for semi-static PUCCH, a few technical discussion points were raised in the first of round of discussion. In the second round, FL would suggest the dive deeper into these technical points.

Discussion point 1: Whether dynamic repetition for P/SP CSI on PUCCH is needed?

* Ericsson pointed out A-CSI on PUCCH is not introduced in NR yet. For P/SP CSI, Ericsson’s view is that updating semi-static PUCCH repetition factor is the most needed on PUCCH according to the study item outcome.
* QC think that it is important to allow dynamic repetition on CSI, because the payload is larger and the need for coverage enhancement is greater, especially for L1-reprt that can have large payload and is also very important for beam management.
* Many companies think for P/SP CSI, the payload size is static and gNB can set the number of repetitions statically, which is sufficient enough.

FL would like to continue this technical discussion on P/SP CSI. Companies please share your answers/views to the following FL questions in the table below.

**FL questions: For P/SP CSI, why static semi-static repetition factor indication as in Rel-16 is not sufficient? Is there major advantage to do dynamic repetition factor indication in additional to semi-static repetition factor indication as in Rel-16? If yes, what are the advantages?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Comments** |
| Apple | Thanks FL for the further updates, although we don’t see any need to further continue this discussion. For P/SP CSI, no DCI is involved to “dynamically” indicate repetition factor. The behavior is pretty much semi-static.  |
| CATT | We don’t see the necessity to introduce dynamic repetition factor for P/SP-CSI. If coverage is really a problem for P/SP CSI reporting, gNB can trigger A-CSI transmission which is transmitted on the PUSCH. The repetition mechanisms for PUSCH has been extensively discussed and it will be specified to improve the coverage. |
| Samsung | No need to dynamically indicate the repetition factor for P/SP CSI on PUCCH. |
| Intel | We share similar view as other companies that we do not see the need to introduce dynamic repetition factor for P/SP CSI. By nature, it is semi-statically configured. It is not clear the motivation.  |
| Sharp | We don’t think dynamic PUCCH repetition factor indication is needed for semi-static PUCCH. In Rel-15/16, regardless of dynamic PUCCH or semi-static PUCCH, repetition factor is configured semi-statically. In our view, it is effective that two repetition factors for dynamic PUCCH and semi-static PUCCH are separately provided. |
| Qualcomm | We think the same motivation for introducing dynamic indication of repetition factor for PUCCH that carries A/N of scheduled PDSCH provides stronger motivation for applying it to periodic CSI on PUCCH. Dynamic indication of PUCCH repetition factor is introduced to ensure enough reliability of PUCCH in case of weakening channel. This motivation is stronger for things such as L1 report which are necessary for beam management and have larger payload size (hence more vulnerable to coverage loss, compared to small UCI payload size of Ack/Nack). The only reasonable concern can be how to provide this dynamic indication. We think the same indication for A/N PUCCH can implicitly change the repetition factor for periodic CSI or other semi-static PUCCH, based on some appropriate configured rules. |
| LG | We still do not see dynamic indication for semi-static PUCCH is needed, furthermore it is running out of time for meaningful discussion. For now, it can be deprioritized. |
| OPPO | We did not need the compelling results for supporting this CSI feedback with dynamically indicated repetition factor. Not that the CSI would require different BLER target as A/N. And we see the repetition overhead is not big issue for the coverage limited cases, e.g. you may not have frequent reports.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Don’t see the need yet. |
| Ericsson | **Overall, supporting only dynamic repetition factor for HARQ-ACK seems the opposite of what can be justified based on the SI outcome. In our view, supporting dynamic repetition for CSI is the main purpose of the work on PUCCH repetition enhancement, and so it is fundamental that it be supported.**As shown in the figure below with our analysis of the results captured in 38.830, our understanding is that PUCCH enhancement in the WI was motivated by CSI, not by HARQ-ACK. Therefore enhancements to PUCCH should support CSI. Regarding the payload sizes for CSI being fixed: even with relatively small CSI payloads like those studied in the SI, gNB may want to configure different reporting periodicities for different CSI and/or mixtures of CSI, e.g. for CQI, L1-RSRP, CRI, etc. So assuming a single fixed payload size seems overly restrictive. Also, similar to Qualcomm’s point, dynamic adjustment of repetition should support channel variation as a use case. Again, given that CSI is a bottleneck, dynamic repetition can be used to cope with that channel variation. |

Discussion point 2: Besides P/SP CSI, is there motivation to further consider dynamic repetition factor indication for SPS A/N and SR?

On this, based on companies’ initial input, it seems the motivation to introduce dynamic repetition factor indication for SPS A/N and SR is less strong. FL would like to confirm if that is the common understanding in the group.

**FL questions: Is the motivation to support dynamic repetition factor indication for SPS A/N and SR weaker than for P/SP CSI on PUCCH? If Yes, should the further RAN1 discussion on whether support dynamic repetition factor indication focus on P/SP CSI?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Comments** |
| Apple | Similar comment as above. The question is not SPS A/N is weaker or stronger use-case than P/SP CSI for dynamic indication. The main question is whether or not these are valid use-cases for dynamically indication of repetition factor.  |
| CATT | For SPS A/N, if the intention is to reuse the mechanism for normal A/N, I think it should be OK as there is PRI bit field in the activation DCI. If the intention is to introduce additional mechanism to dynamically indicate the repetition number of PUCCH for the SPS PDSCH not the initial one, we don’t think it is needed.For SR, yes, it is even weaker than P/SP CSI. |
| Samsung | Same as previous comment. No need for dynamic indication. |
| Intel | Same comments as above. No need for dynamic indication.  |
| Qualcomm | We think the same motivation for introducing dynamic indication of repetition factor for PUCCH that carries A/N of scheduled PDSCH provides motivation for applying it to SPS A/N PUCCH (the same reliability requirement and the same UCI payload size). The only reasonable concern can be how to provide this dynamic indication. We think the same indication for A/N PUCCH can implicitly change the repetition factor for SPS A/N or other semi-static PUCCH, based on some appropriate configured rules. |
| LG | Same comments as above. |
| OPPO | If we introduce the dynamic repetition ACK, seems SPS PUSCH would also need that. We general don’t think all this enhancement needed since they are already semi-statical one. |
| Nokia/NSB | We think dynamic indication is not needed for this case. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Don’t see a need yet. |
| Ericsson | We are open to consider SPS A/N and SR, but so far the motivation does seem weaker to us. |

## 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 flexibilityLarger 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.

* 20 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?, ZTE
* 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.**

* **[FFS: if the PRI field size can be expanded]**

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 |
| Sharp | We support the FL proposal. |
| Vivo | Support the proposal |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support the FL proposal. |
| InterDigital | We support the proposal from the FL. |
| CMCC | Support the proposal. |
| Panasonic | We are fine with the proposal in principle, i.e., for dynamic PUCCH repetition factor indication, enhance RRC signaling to allow configuration of PUCCH repetition factor per PUCCH resource. PUCCH repetition factor is indicated via reusing PUCCH resource indicator field. However, we prefer to add the following FFS on top of Option 1.FFS: If the PRI field size can be expandedThe reason of above FFS is following. In addition to PUCCH repetition factor indication, enabling or disabling DMRS bundling and the length of time domain window might be indicated as an additional parameter in the PUCCH resource set and PUCCH resource indicator field can be reused. In order to allow the flexibility, we would like to add FFS on the extension of PUCCH resource indicator field. |
| Qualcomm | Support the proposal |
| Samsung | Before agreeing to Option 1 we would like to understand how different number of repetitions can be supported for different UCI payloads that use a same PUCCH resource (assuming that the PUCCH resource indication flexibility is not be compromised compared to Alt. 2). Also, while Alt. 2 is simple and clearly defined, there are many variants under Option 1 (bundled under an “FFS details”). We need to know what Option 1 is if we are to agree to it.Regarding the fallback DCI for Alt.2, there is no issue. The situation is same as for any other optional field (e.g. beta\_offset) – RRC configuration is used and that is enough for fallback.   |
| FL | It seems majority companies are fine with option 1. To Ericsson and Panasonic: the formulation/split between option 1 and 2 is that, option 1 has no DCI enhancement needed, while option 2 needs DCI enhancement. If adding the FFS on expand PRI field under option 1. Then it is option 2. I am not sure all the companies supporting option 1 can accept this. To Samsung: I hope the proponents of option 1 can answer your question. I can also share my personal opinion as FL from technical point of view. I think to address the question “different number of repetitions can be supported for different UCI payloads that use a same PUCCH resource” – gNB will need to duplicate the same PUCCH resource multiple times, each with different repetition number. Then use PRI to pick one resource with appropriate repetition number. Of course, that is less flexible than option 2. The main tradeoff here is flexibility vs DCI overhead, as everyone knows. For the fallback DCI, what I meant is that with fallback DCI, the extra flexibility with option 2 is not there anyway. To Nokia: I vaguely recall some SI sim results show that, if UE specific beamforming is not available, i.e., gNB can only use omni-directional beam, then this effectively broadcast DCI is coverage bottleneck? |
| LG | To be clear, we support option 1 so basically agree with FL proposal. However, we think 1 bit DCI enhancement may be necessary for option 1, so “No DCI change or 1 bit DCI increment” would be better for us. |
| Spreadtrum | Support. |
| ETRI | We support the proposal. |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| OPPO | We basically would also like to confirm the number of different repetitions to be supported by both options. We wonder if too much repetition length to be indicated, the PRI could be insufficient.Can we agree the number together with the definition？  |
| TCL | We support the FL proposal. |

Based on the discussion in GTW on Thursday, we need further define the details of both option 1 and option 2 before make the down selection.

**FL Question: do you agree with the following formulation of option 1? If not, please provide your comments/reasons in the following table.**

* **Option 1a (without DCI enhancement): Enhance RRC signaling to allow configuration of PUCCH repetition factor per PUCCH resource. Reuse Rel-15 PUCCH indication mechanism based on “PUCCH resource indicator” (PRI) field and starting CCE index (when applicable) of DCI to indicate a PUCCH resource and its associated repetition factor.**
	+ **~~FFS: in additional to PRI and starting CCE index, use PDCCH aggregation level to indicate PUCCH repetition factor.~~**
	+ **FFS: RRC signaling enhancement details**
* **Option 1b (without DCI enhancement): Enhance RRC signaling to allow configuration of PUCCH repetition factor per PUCCH resource. Reuse Rel-15 PUCCH indication mechanism based on “PUCCH resource indicator” (PRI) field and starting CCE index (when applicable) of DCI to indicate a PUCCH resource and its associated repetition factor.**
	+ **In additional to PRI and starting CCE index, use PDCCH aggregation level to indicate PUCCH repetition factor. FFS details.**
	+ **FFS: RRC signaling enhancement details**

Companies are welcome to provide answers/comments to the above question in the following table.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Comments** |
| Samsung | No. An “Option 1” should be concrete without FFS (OK with FFS for RRC signaling details).Also, we don’t think Option 1 works. Proponents of Option 1 should describe how/whether it works by providing an example for a configuration of a PUCCH resource set together with a number of repetitions per PUCCH resource and how the gNB can then assign resources for various UCI payloads corresponding to the PUCCH resource set. |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal.  |
| CATT | Support.  |
| Vivo | We are fine with the proposal |
| TCL | Support. |
| Sharp | Support. |
| InterDigital | Support. |
| Nokia/NSB | We also think that there should not be any FFS in Option 1 but for “RRC signaling details”. To be clear, our concern is not about configuring resources via RRC. This is fine. The problem is that currently we can use implicit mechanism to select PUCCH resources only in case of common PUCCH configuration, or for PUCCH resource set 0 in case of dedicated configuration (for which up to 32 resources can be indicated via explicit + implicit signaling). This is where we start from in Option 1. However which direction would we be agreeing on? Increasing the number of resources in PUCCH resource set 0? Extending the explicit + implicit signaling to PUCCH resource sets with id>0? And how would the AL be used in this context? Wouldn’t the coverage shortage situation already force the gNB to use only higher AL to begin with? There are so many details to be worked out, or that are missing for the description of the option…Situation for Option 2 is much clearer and simpler. |
| Qualcomm | Support |
| FL | Thanks Nokia/Samsung for the comments. Now I separated option 1a with 1b. Option 1a is clear without any FFS on UE behavior except the RRC configuration details, which should be OK. Option 1b has FFS. **Can proponents of option 1b, if any, fill the details in ASAP, by using this table?**  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support the proposal and prefer option 1a |
| Ericsson | Also support the proposal and prefer option 1a |
| LG | It is necessary to maintain the same flexibility as the existing PUCCH PRI.If some of the existing 16 states of PRI are used to indicate which of CE UL and normal UL is applied, the degree of freedom of the PRI resource configuration is lowered, and it could decrease the flexibility in terms of resource operation.It would be desirable to maintain the flexibility to designate at least 16 existing resources for normal UL or CE UL. In that respect, it may be desirable to increase the PRI state to 16 or more, or to introduce a table representing the PRI state for CE in addition to the table representing the existing PRI state. |
| Panasonic | We are fine with the formulation of Option 1 and we prefer Option 1a if Option 1 is taken. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We are fine with the FL description of Option 1. |
| ZTE | Support the proposal and prefer Option 1a. |

**FL Question: do you agree with the following formulation of option 2? If not, please provide your comments/reasons in the following table.**

* **Option 2 (with DCI enhancement): PUCCH repetition factor is explicitly indicated by DCI**
	+ **Option 2a: introduce a new field in DCI to indicate PUCCH repetition factor.**
		- **FFS : the number of bits for the new field**
	+ **Option 2b: increase the number of bits of an existing field in DCI for PUCCH repetition factor indication**
		- **FFS: the existing field is PRI or other field such as TPC**
		- **FFS: the number of increased bits for the existing field**
		- **FFS: the codepoints for PRI/TPC with repetition factor indication**
	+ **~~FFS whether there is a need for RRC update~~**
		- **FFS: whether RRC signaling is enhanced to allow configuration of PUCCH repetition factor per PUCCH resource**

Companies are welcome to provide answers/comments to the above question in the following table.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Comments** |
| Samsung | Option 2a is sufficient. No apparent motivation for Option 2b.Option 2a is the simplest and allows full flexibility to the network to both indicate a PUCCH resource (no need for the scheduler to make any changes for indicating a PUCCH resource to Rel-17 UEs supporting PUCCH coverage enhancements) and to indicate the number of repetitions as needed for any UCI payload. 2 bits indicating “x, 2x, 4x, 8x” repetitions can capture a SINR range of 9 dB which is easily sufficient. It is noted that if “Option 2b” can use the TPC bits, so can “Option 2a” – no need to increase a number of bits for any existing field and no need for “Option 2b”. |
| Intel | We do not support this option.In addition to the DCI payload size increase, dynamic repetition factor indication for PUCCH can not be supported for fallback DCI. In our view, this is the main issue that for cell edge UEs, typically fallback DCI is used to schedule data transmission for good link budget. Option 1 is natural extension of existing mechanism, i.e., configuration of repetition factor per PUCCH format to per PUCCH resource.  |
| CATT | Share the same views with Intel.Additionally, we have painful experience on the DCI format design on introducing one or two bits. Introducing additional bits in a DCI format should be the last choice if the functionality is critical and cannot be realized by the other ways. We should avoid to impacting the design of DCI format at the very first place. |
| Vivo | We do not support this option. |
| Nokia/NSB | It is not clear to us why Option 2 includes an FFS saying “whether there is a need for RRC update” instead of reusing the same wording of Option 1, i.e., “whether RRC signaling is enhanced to allow configuration of PUCCH repetition factor per PUCCH resource”. In our view, increasing the size of the PRI field, e.g., as per Option 2b, may be a simpler way to indicate a larger number of configured resources via RRC instead of resorting to implicit mechanisms as per Option 1. Just to be clear, we do not wish to go for a complex design if no technical justification exists.Concerning comments on the fallback DCI, we do not agree on the rationale, given that in most cases broadcast PDCCH outperforms PUCCH in terms of coverage. Fallback formats do not target coverage shortage cases, but rather features-agnostic configurations.  |
| Ericsson | Option 2 is not clear to us. Do all companies have in mind Samsung’s proposal above, which I understand to be that the repetition field is associated with the PUCCH resource indicated by Rel-15/16 PRI in the same DCI? If not, to which PUCCH transmissions does the repetition factor apply? Also, does it apply only to the next PUCCH transmission, or can it apply to semi-static PUCCH? Regarding option 2b, we would like more information on the FFS points: which fields are proposed, what is the new number of bits in the fields, what codepoints would be reused, and what RRC updates are needed (at a high level)? |
| Samsung | To clarify the comment from Ericsson “Do all companies have in mind Samsung’s proposal above, which I understand to be that the repetition field is associated with the PUCCH resource indicated by Rel-15/16 PRI in the same DCI?”, that understanding is incorrect. The comment was about that the network can determine the PUCCH resource as it does in Rel-16 and is not be constrained by having to also match a number of repetitions to a varying UCI payload (if at all possible). The repetitions apply to the triggered PUCCH transmission. They do not apply to PUSCH, CG-PUSCH, semi-static PUCCH, or to anything else. Much like the number of repetitions in an indicated TDRA table entry for a PUSCH transmission do not apply to an SPS PDSCH transmission. What exactly is unclear about that?Also, we would like to repeat the request to companies supporting Option 1 to describe how it works. As the FL mentioned, no need to say ‘support’ – that does not add any information in favor of Option 1. Please describe how the proposal of Option 1 can work in order to make a more efficient use of GTW time. We would also prefer a complete formulation to Option 1 as reliance on ‘FFS’ means an incomplete proposal. |
| FL | **To be fair, I also suggest proponents of option 2a and 2b provide details ASAP by using this table, especially for option 2b where many things are indeed open. For option 2a, it seems Samsung is suggesting 2 bits? Is this acceptable to all proponents of option 2a?** |
| LG | Consdiering DCI enhancement, an existing table or a new table for PUCCH resource can be designated by DCI, and the existing PRI will be used as an indicator to designate the state in the table.However, if there are not enough bits in the existing DCI to select a table, the method of increasing the bit would not be desirable. A method of interworking with the CCE aggregation level of the DL or implicity indication using a parameter related to the reference signal of the PDSCH in DCI is preferable. |
| Panasonic | We think Option 2b with the FFS of “whether RRC signaling is enhanced to allow configuration of PUCCH repetition factor per PUCCH resource” seems to be extension of Option 1. |
| ZTE | We do not support this option, with similar view as Intel and CATT. |
| OPPO | We see the option 2a, is clear and the further details is number of bits. We agree with Samsung that the 2 bits should be adopted. That will be very simple solution without complicated the PUCCH resource allocation.The option 2b, seems more like variant of Option 1b. We are not proposing it. |

Now, we have 4 options, 1a, 1b, 2a, and 2b. Option 1a has no FFS. Option 2a has a relatively small FFS on # bits. Option 1b and 2b has relatively large FFS points. I’d like to start the discussion to compare the options and do the down selection. Companies please add your input in the following table.

**FL Question: Among option 1a, 1b, 2a, 2b, which option(s) you support and with what reasons?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Supporting which option(s)** | **Rationale for supporting the option(s)** |
| Samsung | 2a | Simple, it works (2 bits).Options 1a and 1b are not accurately described. The CCE index to determine the PUCCH resource is used only when the UCI payload is less than 3 bits and only when the number of PUCCH resources for that case is larger than 8. Therefore, there is no such thing as “Reuse Rel-15 PUCCH indication mechanism” and the proposal intends to introduce new aspects that we do not think it is possible for a network to implement (e.g. fine tune the selection of the first CCE index).Moreover, for yet one more time, we would repeat the basic question and we hope to eventually receive an answer. Proponents of Option 1 should provide an example for how it works. Please provide an example for a configuration of a PUCCH resource set together with a number of repetitions per PUCCH resource and how the gNB can then assign resources for various UCI payloads corresponding to the PUCCH resource set. |
| Vivo | 1a | Simple and straightforward, limited spec impact.In our understanding, there is no feasibility issue that NW configure PUCCH resource with repetition. Even if in Rel-15/16 PUCCH configuration, PUCCH repetition factor is configured for the PUCCH format, NW also need to properly determine the number of repetitions for each format semi-statically. Now the repetition factor is provided for each PUCCH resource in opt-1, it provides more flexibility for NW configuration compares with Rel-15/16. We do not find it difficult for NW to properly configure the repetition factor. |
| CATT | 1a | Limited standard impacts, universe solution and no impact to DCI design.Option 1b may introduce restrictions on PDCCH transmission if aggregation level is used to indicate the repetition level of PUCCH. Furthermore, it is impossible to derive the proper repetition number for PUCCH from PDCCH transmission if reciprocity between UL and DL is not available. |
| Ericsson | 1a | Compared to option 2: limited spec impact, efficient use of DCI, greater flexibility (since RRC can be used to configure a wide variety of PUCCH parameters), ability to extend to support P/SP-CSI. |
| LG | 1b | With reasons stated in previous proposals, we support option 1b. |
| Panasonic | 1a/1b | In signaling method using PRI, PUCCH repetition factor can be indicated as an additional parameter in the PUCCH resource set. This allows to configure different repetition factors for the PUCCH resources. It also differentiates the number of repetition factors among PUCCH resources. If current PRI size is not sufficient, to increase the number of entries for PRI is also OK for us. Extending the PRI field is more efficient than introducing a new repetition factor field in the DCI because new field means same PUCCH resource is allowed to be supported. On the other hand, extending PRI allows different number of repetitions depending on each PUCCH resource. |
| Sharp | 1a | Small spec impact and no impact on DCI formats. |
| China Telecom | 1a | Limited spec. impact and straight forward.Currently, PUCCH repetition factor is configured per PUCCH format as:PUCCH-FormatConfig ::= SEQUENCE {interslotFrequencyHopping ENUMERATED {enabled} OPTIONAL, -- Need RadditionalDMRS ENUMERATED {true} OPTIONAL, -- Need RmaxCodeRate PUCCH-MaxCodeRate OPTIONAL, -- Need RnrofSlots ENUMERATED {n2,n4,n8} OPTIONAL, -- Need Spi2BPSK ENUMERATED {enabled} OPTIONAL, -- Need RsimultaneousHARQ-ACK-CSI ENUMERATED {true} OPTIONAL -- Need R}To realize option 1a, we can configure PUCCH repetition factor per PUCCH resource instead, for example:PUCCH-Resource ::= SEQUENCE {pucch-ResourceId PUCCH-ResourceId,startingPRB PRB-Id,intraSlotFrequencyHopping ENUMERATED { enabled } OPTIONAL, -- Need RsecondHopPRB PRB-Id OPTIONAL, -- Need R nrofSlots ENUMERATED {n2,n4,n8} format CHOICE { format0 PUCCH-format0, format1 PUCCH-format1, format2 PUCCH-format2, format3 PUCCH-format3, format4 PUCCH-format4}} |
| NTT DOCOMO | 1a | Option 1 is simple approach and no impact for DCI.. |
| InterDigital | 1a | Least impact on specification and scheduling PDCCH |
| Intel | 1a | Less spec impact and support of dynamic repetition factor indication for fallback DCI.  |
| ZTE | 1a | Less spec impact and support of dynamic repetition factor indication for fallback DCI.  |
| OPPO | 2a | We see the modified the PUCCH resource set will create a new Rel-17 PUCCH resource set definition. |
| Nokia/NSB | 2b?/1a? | @China Telecom: with reference to your example. Is that the configuration of a PUCCH resource for Resource set 0, or a more generic one? In other words, are you considering max number of resources per set 0, 1 2 and 3 to be 32, 8, 8 and 8, respectively, and simply add a field nrofSlots in each one of them? If this is the case, we can be fine with Option 1a. If, conversely, you are proposing to increase the number of resources per set w.r.t. R15/R16 then we are not ok with 1a. Putting it in more general terms: for Option 1a, does the part that says*“Reuse Rel-15 PUCCH indication mechanism based on “PUCCH resource indicator” (PRI) field and starting CCE index (when applicable) of DCI to indicate a PUCCH resource and its associated repetition factor.”* Mean that the *“starting CCE index (when applicable)”* is still only applicable to the initial PUCCH resource set as in Rel-15/16, but not to the other resource sets? Again, if the answer is YES, then we are ok with Option 1a (but not OK with Option 1b).If the answer is NO, i.e., then this would imply that the concept of starting CCE index is extended to other PUCCH resource sets other than the initial one and the number of PUCCH resources configured for these non-initial resource sets can be greater than 8. In this case, the specification impact may be not so large (debatable, but let us assume it is the case), however the implementation impact could very large (for no reason). Indeed, in this case Option 1a would result in a lot of scheduling restrictions to the network, which can simply be resolved by extending the size of the PRI field, and we would not be ok with Option 1a, and willing to consider Option 2b, where more than 3 PRI bits are used to indicate more than 32, 8, 8, 8 resources per set for Resource set 0, 1, 2, and 3 respectively.  |
| China Telecom |  | @Nokia, yes, we don’t mean to increase the resources per set, we are just considering to simply adding a field for each resource.  |

Four options to support dynamic PUCCH repetition factor indication are discussed. Based on the comments received, the formulation of the 4 options are slighted updated (in red) as below.

* **Option 1a: Enhance RRC signaling to allow configuration of PUCCH repetition factor per PUCCH resource. Reuse Rel-16 PUCCH resource indication mechanism based on “PUCCH resource indicator” (PRI) field and starting CCE index (when applicable based on Rel-16 spec) of DCI to indicate a PUCCH resource and its associated repetition factor.**
	+ **FFS: RRC signaling enhancement details**
	+ **[Note: the applicability of starting CCE index to PUCCH resource indication is the same as in Rel-16 specification. It is not intended to extend the applicability of starting CCE index beyond what is specified in Rel-16.]**
* **Option 1b: Enhance RRC signaling to allow configuration of PUCCH repetition factor per PUCCH resource. Reuse Rel-15 PUCCH indication mechanism based on “PUCCH resource indicator” (PRI) field and starting CCE index (when applicable) of DCI to indicate a PUCCH resource and its associated repetition factor.**
	+ **In additional to PRI and starting CCE index, use PDCCH aggregation level to indicate PUCCH repetition factor. FFS details.**
	+ **FFS: RRC signaling enhancement details**
* **Option 2a: introduce a new field (with 2 bits) in DCI to indicate PUCCH repetition factor.**
* **Option 2b: increase the number of bits of an existing field in DCI for PUCCH repetition factor indication**
	+ **FFS: the existing field is PRI or other field such as TPC**
	+ **FFS: the number of increased bits for the existing field**
	+ **FFS: the codepoints for PRI/TPC with repetition factor indication**
	+ **FFS: whether RRC signaling is enhanced to allow configuration of PUCCH repetition factor per PUCCH resource**

Supporting companies for Option 1a (**11**): VIVO, CATT, Ericsson, Panasonic, Sharp, CT, DCM, IDC, Intel, ZTE, Nokia/NSB?

Supporting companies for option 1b (**2**): LG, Panasonic

Supporting companies for option 2a (**2**): Samsung, OPPO

Supporting companies for option 2b (**1**): Nokia/NSB?

The situation is quite clear. Majority companies supporting option 1a. The technical merits of option 1a is simplicity and small spec impact. Therefore, FL make the following proposal to adopt option 1a.

**Updated FL Proposal 1: In Rel-17, for a PUCCH with associated scheduling DCI, support the following for dynamic PUCCH repetition factor indication.**

* **Enhance RRC signaling to allow configuration of PUCCH repetition factor per PUCCH resource. Reuse Rel-16 PUCCH resource indication mechanism based on “PUCCH resource indicator” (PRI) field and starting CCE index (when applicable based on Rel-16 spec) of DCI to indicate a PUCCH resource and its associated repetition factor.**
	+ **FFS: RRC signaling enhancement details**
	+ **[Note: the applicability of starting CCE index to PUCCH resource indication is the same as in Rel-16 specification. It is not intended to extend the applicability of starting CCE index beyond what is specified in Rel-16.]**

Working assumption: In Rel-17, for a PUCCH with associated scheduling DCI, support the following for dynamic PUCCH repetition factor indication.

* Enhance RRC signaling to allow configuration of PUCCH repetition factor per PUCCH resource. Reuse Rel-16 PUCCH resource indication mechanism based on “PUCCH resource indicator” (PRI) field and starting CCE index (when applicable based on Rel-16 spec) of DCI to indicate a PUCCH resource and its associated repetition factor.
	+ FFS: RRC signaling enhancement details

**FL Question: With the above working assumption, is there a need to send LS to RAN2 to inform RAN2 this working assumption so that RAN2 can start to design the RRC configuration signaling details? If yes, any other information we should include beside the above agreed WA?**

**Please provide answers/comments in the table below to the above FL question.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Comments** |
| CATT | It may be too early to send LS to RAN2. It’s better to leave RAN1 more time for the FFS point. |
| Samsung | No need for the LS. It can wait for an LS that includes all RRC parameters considered by RAN1.  |
| Intel | Share similar view as Samsung. We can wait for an LS for all RRC parameters in RAN1 for Rel-17.  |
| Sharp | We agree with the Samsung’s comment. |
| China Telecom | We share similar views with CATT and Samsung. |
| InterDigital | We have the similar view as CATT. |
| Vivo | No need to send LS at this moment |
| LG | We also think it is too early to send LS to RAN2. It can be sent after the details of RRC signaling enhancement in FFS. |
| OPPO | It is a bit earlier to send that LS. |
| Nokia/NSB | Agree with Samsung. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We share similar views as Samsung |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Not sure if RAN2 have a plan to design RRC signaling now. If RAN1 works does not depend on the detailed RRC signaling, better to take the way as Samsung suggested. |
| Ericsson | Agree it would be better to wait so that we have a more clear view on the detailed operation. |
| Apple | Given the agreement that we made in 104e, we think RAN1 is pretty much done on RRC enhancements for dynamic PUCCH repetitions. Although we think it is a bit early to send LS to RAN2. |

**FL question: Regarding the RRC signalling enhancement details, besides the “Enhance RRC signaling to allow configuration of PUCCH repetition factor per PUCCH resource” as agreed in the WA, what other RRC signaling details RAN1 need to discuss and decide before sending LS to RAN2?**

**Please provide answers/comments in the table below to the above FL question.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | We need to collect RRCs in the final meetings. |
| Ericsson | Would like further discussion on this point in upcoming meetings. |
| Apple | Similar comment as to previous question. |

# 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 bundlingWe 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 |
| Sharp | Use cases 3, 4a, and 4b should be prioritized. Use case 5 should be deprioritized because PUCCH repetitions don’t avoid UL slots, and commonly, there are DL slots in the middle of two PUCCH repetitions across non-consecutive slots. |
| Vivo | Yes, RAN1 should prioritize a subset of use cases.Yes, Case 3, 4a, 4b, 5a, can be prioritized, and the feasibility for these cases has been confirmed by RAN4 if conditions are met. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Yes, we support to prioritize use cases 3, 4a, 4b, and 5 for DMRS bundling across PUCCH repetitions. |
| InterDigital | We are supportive of prioritizing use case 1, along with use cases 3, 4a, 4b, and 5b. Coverage enhancement for back-to-back transmission, regardless of within/across slots, should be considered in this release. |
| CMCC | Support to prioritize use case 3 and 4. Case 1 and 2 could be deprioritized. And we need more clarifications of use case 5, when will this use case happens ? |
| Panasonic | Yes, we support to prioritize a subset of agreed use cases in RAN1 study as suggested in R1-2104119. |
| Qualcomm | For now we can prioritize Cases 3 and 4a. Other cases are either not very relevant or are only feasible under rare circumstances as per RAN4 feedback as also mentioned by several other companies. |
| Samsung | Prioritize cases 3/4/5. |
| WILUS | Yes, we support to prioritize use case 3, 4a, 4b, and 5b. |
| LG | In our understanding, at least case 1 and 2 should be deprioritized and case 3, 4 and 5 should be prioritized considering PUCCH repetition is supported only for format 1, 3 and 4 that repetition is performed across number of slots, not within a slot. |
| Spreadtrum | Yes, we support to prioritize the back-to-back cases, e.g., cases 1 and 3. |
| ETRI | We support the case where no other UL transmission between repetitions. We think case 3,4a,5a,2b can be prioritized. |
| Xiaomi | Yes, we support to prioritize the case 3 4 |
| OPPO | We should support case 3 and 4 prioritized.The motivation is we only consider long formats for the enhancement, not see the point for short formats. |
| TCL | Yes, we support to prioritize use case 3,4. |

Based on companies input, majority companies support to prioritize use case 3, 4a, and 4b.

**FL proposed conclusion: For PUCCH repetitions, the following use cases are prioritized in RAN1 work.**

**   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**

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Comments** |
| Samsung | Use case 5 (PUCCH repetitions across non-consecutive slots) should be prioritized.Most NR bands are TDD and that is where the coverage needs to be mostly enhance.We are OK to include Cases 3 and 4 but they are of less importance compared to Case 5. |
| Intel | We are fine to prioritize case 3 and 4.  |
| CATT | Support the proposal. |
| vivo | We are fine with the proposed conclusion |
| Sharp | We support the FL proposed conclusion. |
| Qualcomm | Support the proposal |
| Ericsson | Regarding use case 4b: can the FL or proponents explain how the antenna port is kept constant or if the thinking is that the RAN4 requirements below can be updated? Doesn’t the current RAN4 requirement exclude use case 4b?For the case with other UL channels in between repetitions, at least if the other scheduled signals/channels during the non-zero gap have the same settings in antenna port, occupied PRBs and UL power than the repeated transmission signals/channels, it is feasible to maintain the phase continuity and power consistency across the repetitions.We are OK to treat use cases 1 & 2 with lower priority.On the other hand, we think it is premature to prioritize use cases where the off power requirements are not guaranteed. We would certainly be happy to have these additional use cases, and think we can continue to discuss how they might be supported, but the tradeoffs need to be clearly understood before agreeing that they will be supported by specifications.We agree with Samsung that use case 5 is of greatest interest, if it is feasible. As such we do not want to deprioritize it at this time.A clarification of the scope here is also needed. We are discussing prioritization in the context of PUCCH DMRS bundling, so the use cases do not apply to dynamic PUCCH repetition. This should be captured if/when we do agree on some prioritization. **So in short we are OK to deprioritize (but not exclude discussion of) cases 1 & 2, but feel that further discussion is needed to prioritize cases. Also, any conclusion on priority should say something like ‘For PUCCH repetitions, the following use cases are deprioritized/prioritized in RAN1 work on PUCCH DMRS bundling.’** |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine with the proposal |
| vivo | Support the proposal |
| LG | We have similar view with Samsung that it is desirable to prioritize use cases 3 and 4, but when considering the TDD frame structure, use case 5 should not be excluded. As Ericsson pointed out, use case 4b is likely to be impossible because 4b is only possible in the case of the same antenna port according to the LS of RAN4.Putting the opinions of companies together, it seems that the proposal can be supported by changing the proposal to :**‘For PUCCH repetitions, the use case 1 and 2 are deprioritized in RAN1 work on PUCCH DMRS bundling.’** |
| Panasonic | We are fine with the FL proposed conclusion. |
| China Telecom  | We are fine with the proposal. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support the FL conclusion. |
| ZTE | For Use case 4, our concerns in the first round are not addressed. Regarding Use case 4a, 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 4b, 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.For Use case 1, we are fine to follow majority to not prioritize it. |
| OPPO | We are fine with the proposals. |

**Updated FL proposal of conclusion: For PUCCH repetitions, the following use cases are deprioritized in RAN1 work on PUCCH DMRS bundling**

**   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**

## 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~~ design 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 |
| Sharp | We support the FL proposal. |
| vivo | SupportThere is no need to define a new mechanism for PUCCH in addition to that for PUSCH unless issues specifically for PUCCH repetitions are identified. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support the FL proposal. |
| InterDigital | We are ok with the modification from Nokia. |
| CMCC | No problem with defining a time domain window to facilitate further discussion. In the discussion in JCE of PUSCH, companies have different understanding about the time domain window. One is that it is a UE capability. In this situation, the time window should be same for PUSCH and PUCCH, unless the RAN4 provides more information stating that those two channels could have different durations. So for the FFS, based on current RAN4’s information, PUSCH and PUCCH should have the same capability of maintaining the power and phase continuity. The other is that the time domain window is used to indicate or scheduling the transmissions. Since the PUCCH repetitions could be configured in the RRC and indicated through DCI, the time domain window could be bundled with the PUCCH repetition configurations. It maybe a little different from the situation in PUSCH, in which the time domain window is also indicated through scheduling. I am hesitated to say those two kinds of design are exactly common, though the spirits are similar.  |
| Panasonic | We are fine with the FL’s proposal. |
| Qualcomm | We are okay with the proposal and changes suggested by Nokia and Ericsson. We agree with Ericsson that in all likelihood the choices of time domain window duration will be different between PUCCH and PUSCH. With PUCCH we only have to worry about pi/2 BPSK and QPSK, while with PUSCH, there are additional modulation orders to consider. Thus the configurations, and their dependence on modulation order needs more discussion and input from RAN4. |
| Samsung | Support the update from Nokia |
| WILUS | We support the FL’s proposal and also fine with the modification from Nokia. |
| LG | We support FL proposal. Since only specifying the time domain window for joint channel estimation of PUSCH is agreed and details of it is ongoing, we think time domain window for PUCCH, i.e., DMRS bundling for PUCCH repetition, should be discussed after basic framework for PUSCH is agreed. |
| Spreadtrum | We support the FL proposal. |
| ETRI | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Xiaomi | Support the FL’s proposal. |
| OPPO | We share views from Ericsson, the mechanism many not be identical.Best regards. |
| TCL | We are fine with the proposal. |

Agreement: 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 of the time domain window for PUSCH/PUCCH with DMRS bundling as much as possible.

## 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.  |
| Sharp | We support the FL proposal. |
| Vivo | We support the FL proposal. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support the FL proposal. |
| InterDigital | We support inter-slot bundling for inter-slot FH in Proposal 7 in our contribution. We are also supportive of using the same terminology as in PUSCH inter-slot FH, “inter-slot frequency hopping with inter-slot bundling”. |
| CMCC | Fine with the main bullet. For the sub bullet, it is proposed to be updated as below, * **The frequency hopping duration equals to or smaller than the size of time domain window where power consistency and phase coherency can be maintained.**
 |
| Panasonic | We prefer to postpone this issue for seeing more progress on time domain window and/or the similar issue on PUSCH.In our view, the relation with inter-slot precoder cycling should be taken into account in addition to frequency hopping. If the discussion is for UE not to support precoder cycling, we are supportive to the FL proposal. If the discussion is for UE supporting precoder cycling, we would like to discuss the sub-bullet further. |
| Qualcomm | We are in general okay with the proposal, but we can wait for more clarity on time domain window configuration. |
| Samsung | Support the proposal.  |
| WILUS | We are fine with the main-bullet in FL’s proposal. For the sub-bullet, discussion can be postponed until the output has made on PUSCH. |
| LG | We agree with enhancement of frequency hopping for DMRS bundling is needed and same DMRS bundle should belong to same frequency hop. However whether the frequency hopping duration is equal to the size of time domain window or not is being discussed in joint channel estimation for PUSCH, so for the main bullet, it should be discussed after joint channel estimation for PUSCH is agreed for unified frame structure. In short, it would be better for us:**For inter slot frequency hopping with DMRS bundling, all PUCCH repetitions in a DMRS bundle ~~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.~~**
 |
| Spreadtrum | Postpone this issue and wait for more progress of time domain window  |
| ETRI | We tend to agree with the proposal, and we prefer to have the unified solution between PUSCH and PUCCH. |
| Xiaomi | We agree with the main bullet that enhancement of frequency hopping for DMRS bundling is needed and same DMRS bundle should belong to same frequency hop. For sub-bullet, we think frequency hopping duration can be smaller or equal to the time window size, and maybe it can keep the same conclusion with the output has made on PUSCH. |
| OPPO | We suggest postpone the discussion, seem time window may be only reported by UE or other choices.  |
| TCL | Support the proposal. |

# 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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| [R1-2104849](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_105-e/Docs/R1-2104849.zip) | Discussion on PUCCH enhancements | China Telecom |
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| [R1-2105904](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_105-e/Docs/R1-2105904.zip) | PUCCH coverage enhancements | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell |