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# Introduction

In this paper, discussions under the following email thread in RAN1#106-e are summarized.

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

* 1st check point: August 19
* 2nd check point: August 25
* 3rd check point: August 27

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

## Agreements in previous meetings

Agreements:

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

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

## Potential frameworks

From E/// Tdoc:



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



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

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



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



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

From Apple Tdoc:

Diagram

Description automatically generated

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

## Proposals from Tdocs

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Proposals/observations from Tdocs |
| Ericsson | [Observation 1 Without a common understanding on the overall framework of the expected procedures, detailed solutions are difficult to agree.](#_Toc79181275)  [Observation 2 The different candidate frameworks are A1, A2, B1, B2 and their combinations. B2 and A2-B2 seem most promising from a gain and complexity analysis,](#_Toc79181276)  [Observation 3 The complexity of potential features for multiplexing UCI with different priority in PUCCH/PUSCH is a large consideration.](#_Toc79181277)  [Proposal 1 When simultaneous PUCCH and PUSCH transmission is supported, perform UCI multiplexing on PUCCH and PUSCH per priority before considering simultaneous PUCCH and PUSCH transmission, i.e. A2-B2.](#_Toc79181278)   1. Resolve overlapping between PUCCH resources based on Rel-15 procedures where the overlapping is resolved starting from the first set of mutually overlapping PUCCH resources in a slot (a.k.a. set Q) until there are no overlapping PUCCH resources in the slot. 2. To determine a single PUCCH resource for a set of mutually overlapping PUCCH resources with different priority, drop SR and CSI of low priority, if any. Then, use sub-slot PUCCH resources if there is a sub-slot HARQ-ACK PUCCH in the set, starting from the earlier and smaller sub-slot. |
| HW | ***Proposal 22: Support flexible UE capability configuration on handling inter-priority multiplex/prioritization:***   * ***1) Rel-16 inter-priority prioritization and Rel-15 intra-priority multiplexing.*** * ***2) Rel-17 inter-priority multiplexing and Rel-15 intra-priority multiplexing.*** * ***3) Rel-17 inter-priority multiplexing, Rel-16 inter-priority prioritization and Rel-15 intra-priority multiplexing.***   ***Proposal 23: For Rel-17 inter-priority multiplexing order, support the second option, i.e. to handle the multiplexing of overlapped PUCCHs with intra-priority first, and then handle the multiplexing between inter-priority.***  ***Observation 3: If simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH transmission of different PHY priorities over different cells is configured, the prioritization of LP PUCCH/PUSCH can be performed as follows.***   * ***Step 1: Perform the multiplexing of LP PUCCH(s)/PUSCH assuming no overlapping HP UL channels and determine the final LP PUCCH/PUSCH;*** * ***Step 2: Judge whether the final LP PUCCH/PUSCH is overlapping with any HP UL channels before and/or after multiplexing of HP UL channels, and if an overlapping happens on the same serving cell or cells within the same band, the LP PUCCH/PUSCH is dropped.*** |
| Nokia | **Proposal 3.15: For handling the scenarios where a PUCCH of a given priority crosses the sub-slot boundary of the PUCCH config of another priority and overlaps with a PUCCH of another priority, adopt the following procedure:**   * **Multiplexing of low-priority PUCCH and high-priority PUCCH, is allowed only if this multiplexing is done on a high-priority PUCCH resource. In addition:**    + **UE does not expect an overlap between the resulting PUCCH resource to be used for multiplexing and another high-priority PUCCH;**   + **and if the resulting PUCCH resource overlaps with a low-priority PUCCH, the low-priority PUCCH is then dropped.**   + **Additional conditions are FFS.**   **Proposal 3.16: For handling the scenarios with more than two overlapping PUCCHs of different priorities, adopt the following procedure:**   * **Allow a single checking/multiplexing step between channels of different priorities, where in case multiplexing is feasible:**    + **UE does not expect an overlap between the resulting resource to be used for multiplexing and a high-priority PUCCH;**   + **and if the resulting PUCCH resource overlaps with a low-priority PUCCH, the low-priority PUCCH is then dropped.**   **Proposal 3.27: Multiplexing of more than one PUCCH carrying HARQ-ACK on a PUSCH of different priorities should not be supported, as the multiplexing is also not supported for the scenario where PUSCH and HARQ-ACK are with the same priority.**  **Proposal 3.28:Multiplexing of more than one high-priority PUCCH, where one of them is carrying HARQ-ACK and the other one carrying SR, on a low-priority PUSCH could be supported.**  ***Observation 3.4: Potential multiplexing restrictions or partial UCI dropping for low-priority UCI of more than one overlapping PUCCH multiplexed on an overlapping high-priority PUSCH may be acceptable, whereas partial dropping or multiplexing restrictions of high-priority UCI is not acceptable.***  **Proposal 3.29: RAN1 needs to take the cases of more than two overlapping channels (involving at least one PUSCH) of different priorities into account when deciding whether to support certain multiplexing enhancements in first place. This is specifically important when considering the support of multiplexing high-priority UCI on low-priority PUSCH.**  **Proposal 4.1: RAN1 to clarify the intention of the support of simultaneous PUCCH / PUSCH, namely what to improve in terms of e.g. LP channel or information dropping, latency, reliability, efficiency, or the like.**  ***Observation 4.1: For the scenario of only having PUCCH for a certain priority, the support of simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH transmission of different PHY priorities on different serving cells at least for inter-band CA requires changes to the overlapping determination and related cancelation behaviour of Rel-16 PHY prioritization operation.***  ***Observation 4.2: When considering more than two overlapping channels, the support of simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH transmissions of different PHY priorities on different serving cells at least for inter-band CA to reduce the LP channel dropping in Rel-17 requires changes to all logical steps of the Rel-16 PHY prioritization operation, namely (i) the order of LP multiplexing and PHY prioritization, (ii) the order of PHY prioritization and HP UL multiplexing, (ii) the overlapping determination and (iv) the related cancelation behaviour of Rel-16 PHY prioritization operation.***  ***Observation 4.3*: *The support of simultaneous PUSCH/PUCCH transmission of the same PHY priority would increase low-priority information and channel dropping when taking the PHY prioritization into account.* *Moreover, multiplexing enhancements of the same PHY priority are not in scope of the WI objective.***  **Proposal 4.2: RAN1 to discuss and clarify, for which cases simultaneous PUCCH / PUSCH operation of different priorities should be supported with respect to the required changes to the PHY prioritization operation / behavior, including at least:**   * **Are changes to the processing order of LP multiplexing and PHY prioritization in scope?** * **Are changes to the processing order of PHY prioritization and HP UL channel multiplexing in scope?** * **Is the intention to support case-specific optimized solutions to enable simultaneous PUSCH/PUCCH of different PHY priorities for all possible overlapping cases or instead a generic enhancement of the PHY prioritization framework / procedure (with limitations for some cases)?** |
| ZTE | ***Proposal 15:*** *For handling the scenarios with more than two overlapping PUCCHs of different priorities, allow a single checking/multiplexing step between channels of different priorities after multiplexing (if any) between overlapping channels of the same priority is already done.*  ***Proposal 16:*** *To determine an associated HP PUCCH time unit for the LP HARQ-ACK PUCCH if the LP HARQ-ACK PUCCH overlaps with multiple HP PUCCH time units, the low priority PUCCH performs multiplexing or dropping procedure in the first overlapping time unit that contains high priority PUCCH if overlapped low priority PUCCH and high priority PUCCH meet the multiplexing timeline.* |
| Samsung | **Proposal 10: The time unit for resolving a collision of PUCCHs with different L1 priority indexes is the HP PUCCH time unit.**   * **FFS an associated HP PUCCH time unit for LP HARQ-ACK PUCCH if it overlaps with multiple HP PUCCH time units.**   **Proposal 11: Down select from the following options for multiplexing LP HARQ-ACK PUCCH, HP HARQ-ACK PUCCH and HP SR PUCCH in a PUCCH.**   * **Option 1) All PUCCHs are viewed with same priority – Rel-15 multiplexing applies.** * **Option 2) First, resolve overlapping of LP/HP PUCCHs with HARQ-ACK and then overlapping of resulting PUCCH and SR PUCCH (if any)**   **Proposal 12: For multiplexing a LP Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook in a HP PUSCH**   * **RRC configures an additional T-DAI field in a UL DCI format scheduling the HP PUSCH to indicate the T-DAI of LP HARQ-ACK.** * **A number of REs is reserved for LP HARQ-ACK in a HP CG-PUSCH.**   **Proposal 13: Intra-UE multiplexing is performed in the following order**   * **Step1: Resolve overlapping PUCCH(s) and/or PUSCH(s) with same priority index.** * **Step2: Resolve overlapping PUCCH(s) and/or PUSCH(s) with different priority indexes.**   **Proposal 16: For UCI to be multiplexed on a PUSCH, the following conditions should be satisfied.**   * **Simultaneous PUSCH and PUCCH transmission does not apply.** * **The PUSCH satisfies the reliability requirements of the UCI.** * **The LP PUSCH with (HP) HARQ-ACK should not be canceled by a HP PUSCH or a HP SR PUCCH.** |
| vivo | ***Proposal 20: To avoid the dropping of LP UCI, the multiplexing order may need be reconsidered.***  ***Proposal 21: When simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH over different cells is only configured, the following multiplexing procedure can be considered.***   * + ***Step 1: Perform PUCCH multiplexing per priority per PUCCH group.***   + ***Step 2: If an overlap happens between HP PUSCH and LP PUSCH on the same cell, the LP PUSCH is canceled.***   + ***Step 3: If LP PUCCH is overlapped with HP PUCCH, perform PUCCH/PUSCH multiplexing for LP or HP channel per PUCCH group.***     - ***If there is HP PUSCH or LP PUSCH, the UCI of HP or LP PUCCH would be multiplexed on the PUSCH with the same priority.***     - ***If there are both HP PUSCH and LP PUSCH, the UCI on LP PUCCH would be multiplexed on the LP PUSCH.***     - ***Otherwise, LP PUCCH is cancelled.***   + ***Step 4: The PUCCH/PUSCH on different cells are transmitted simultaneously.***   ***Proposal 22: It should be clarified whether and how the two mechanisms i.e., simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH of different priorities and multiplexing of different priorities can be configured to work together.*** |
| CATT | ***Proposal 1: The time unit of high priority PUCCH is used as the time unit for multiplexing.***  ***Proposal 2: For a low priority PUCCH which goes across multiple time units for multiplexing, the low priority PUCCH joins the multiplexing procedure in each of the overlapping time units for multiplexing from the first overlapping time unit, unless the low priority PUCCH is determined to be dropped or multiplexed with other channels.***  ***Proposal 15: For overlapping between PUCCH and multiple PUSCHs with different priorities, it is proposed that UCI of PUCCH is multiplexed on a PUSCH with a different priority only when there is no PUSCH with same priority overlaps with the PUCCH.*** |
| OPPO | ***Proposal 11: If*** ***multiple PUCCHs carrying HP HARQ-ACK overlap with a PUCCH carrying LP HARQ-ACK, LP HARQ-ACK should be multiplexed with the HP HARQ-ACK transmitted on the earliest HP PUCCH which is in response to a DCI and satisfies the multiplexing timeline conditions.***   * ***A PUCCH resource in the PUCCH resource set configured for HP HARQ-ACK should be used.***   ***Proposal 12: If*** ***a PUCCH carrying HP dynamic HARQ-ACK overlaps with multiple PUCCHs carrying LP HARQ-ACK,***   * ***HP HARQ-ACK should be multiplexed with the LP HARQ-ACK transmitted on the LP PUCCHs satisfying the multiplexing timeline conditions, and a PUCCH resource in the PUCCH resource set configured for HP HARQ-ACK should be used;*** * ***Cancel the LP PUCCH does not satisfy the multiplexing timeline conditions (Rel-16 cancellation timeline should be satisfied).***   ***Proposal 13: The PUCCH resource for multiplexing HP dynamic HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK is determined based on the PRI indicated in the last HP DCI and an offset.***   * ***If the value of C-DAI in the last LP DCI is even or no LP DCI is received, ;*** * ***Otherwise, .***   ***Proposal 14: To determine the PUCCH resource set Q, described in TS 38.213 section 9.2.5, in a slot/subslot:***   * ***If a set of overlapping PUCCHs contains a first PUCCH carries HP HARQ-ACK and a second PUCCH carrying CSI or LP SR, delete the second PUCCH from set Q.*** * ***If a set of overlapping PUCCHs contains a first PUCCH carries HP SR and a second PUCCH carrying CSI, delete the second PUCCH from set Q.*** |
| LGE | **Proposal #6: Consider the overall procedures for the inter-priority multiplexing of UCIs on PUCCH/PUSCH.**   * **It is desirable to proceed the multiplexing and transmission at least for HP PUCCH/PUSCH (if the timeline requirements among the HP PUCCH/PUSCH are met) even in case when the timeline requirements with LP are not met.**   **Proposal #7: Consider the following approach as the procedure for the inter-priority multiplexing of UCIs on PUCCH/PUSCH, in order to avoid/reduce dropping of UCI (and loss of PUSCH code rate) and timeline checking complexity.**   * **The intra-priority multiplexing defined in Rel-16 is applied per each of LP PUCCH/PUSCH and HP PUCCH/PUSCH as the first step.** * **As the second step, the inter-priority multiplexing is performed for the outcomes of the first step, specifically between the (intra-priority) multiplexed LP PUCCH/PUSCH and the (intra-priority) multiplexed HP PUCCH/PUSCH.** |
| Intel | **Proposal 17: Instead of two-step approach, consider a single checking step among all channels for** **multiplexing of UCIs of different priorities into a PUCCH resource if UE supports intra-UE multiplexing across different priorities.**  **Proposal 18: When UCIs of different priorities overlap and if at least one is based on a DCI, UE may drop the low priority UCI and transmit the high priority UCI, when timeline conditions are not satisfied.**  **Proposal 19: If a PUSCH overlaps with two sub-slot based PUCCHs, multiplex the UCIs from the PUCCHs onto the PUSCH if timeline conditions are met. If timeline conditions are not met, drop the low priority channel and transmit the high priority channel.**   * **FFS: whether to apply Rel16 intra-UE prioritization in this case.**   **Proposal 20: If a PUCCH overlaps with two PUSCHs, following behaviors can be considered, assuming timeline conditions are met:**   * **If PUCCH is of high priority, PUCCH is multiplexed onto first PUSCH.** * **If first (second) PUSCH is of high (low) priority, UCI from PUCCH is multiplexed onto second PUSCH if the PUCCH is of low priority.**   **Proposal 21: If a PUSCH overlaps with a PUCCH repetition in a slot, multiplex the UCI onto the PUSCH and drop the PUCCH repetition.**   * **FFS whether this is only applicable if PUSCH is of high priority and/or PUCCH is of low priority.**   **Proposal 22: If UE is configured with both simultaneous PUSCH and PUCCH transmissions over different carriers and Rel16 or Rel17 intra-UE prioritization, option of simultaneous transmissions should take precedence over the intra-UE prioritization.** |
| Apple | **Proposal 2-1: Study alternatives with introducing an inter-L1 priority PUCCH multiplexing with PUCCH resources Z as inputs.** |
| Pana | **Proposal 8: For multiplexing a high-priority HARQ-ACK and a low-priority HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH, after resolving the overlapping for PUCCH transmissions of same priority index, UE procedure for multiplexing HARQ-ACK codebooks with different priority indexes should be performed.** |
| IDC | ***Proposal 1: For intra-UE multiplexing and prioritization, focus efforts on multiplexing transmissions of different priorities on same resource (first priority) and physical layer prioritization between DG and CG PUSCH (second priority).*** |
| TCL | **Proposal 4: Regarding the scenario of multiplexing more than two overlapping channels, one checking/multiplexing step between channels of different priorities after multiplexing/prioritization (if any) between overlapping channels of the same priority is already done should be further studied.** |
| ETRI | **Proposal 2: Multiplex HP UCI, and check to multiplex each LP UCI at earliest order.** |
| NEC | ***Proposal 3:*** *Further study the order of prioritization or multiplexing for collision cases involving PUSCH and PUCCH with different priorities when simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH transmission of different priorities over different cells is configured.* |
| DCM | **Proposal 13:**  For overlapping of more than two PUCCHs/PUSCHs with same and different priorities, two options should be considered for muliplexings:   * Option 1: Resolve overlapping among HP and LP PUCCHs first. Then resolve PUCCH and PUSCH overlapping. * Option 2: Resole overlapping among UL channels with the same priority (as in Rel-16) first. Then resolve overlapping among different priorities.   **Proposal 14:**  For the case when one PUCCH overlaps with multiple PUSCHs of the different priority, how to select the multiplexed PUSCH needs to be discussed.  **Proposal 15:**  For the case when one PUCCH including HP and LP UCI overlaps with multiple HP and LP PUSCHs , how to multiplex HP and LP UCI needs to be discussed.  **Proposal 16:**  For the case when one HP/LP PUCCH overlapping with a LP/HP PUCCH overlaps with LP/HP PUSCH(s) simultaneously, multiplexing behavior needs to be clarified.  **Proposal 17:**   * *Discuss processing order of intra-UE multiplexing with different priorities and cancellation due to dynamic SFI/UL CI/semi-static TDD and SSB.* |
| MTK | Proposal 3: Multiplexing allowed only if the resulted PUCCH is confined within the sub-slot of the HP-PUCCH sub-slot. |
| Moto/Leno | * **Proposal 5:** If a PUCCH resource to multiplex HP UCI and LP UCI overlaps in time with one or multiple PUSCHs including at least one HP PUSCH, a PUSCH to multiplex the HP UCI and the LP UCI is selected from the at least one HP PUSCH. * **Proposal 6:** If a PUCCH resource to multiplex HP UCI and LP UCI overlaps in time with one or multiple PUSCHs without at least one HP PUSCH, a PUSCH to multiplex the HP UCI and the LP UCI is selected according to Rel-15 PUSCH selection rules. |

## 1st round discussion

Proposal for 1st round discussion:

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

* The time unit of high priority PUCCH is used as the time unit for multiplexing of low-priority PUCCH and high-priority PUCCH. (assuming the time unit of HP PUCCH is equal to or smaller than that of LP PUCCH.)
* FFS: How to determine an associated HP PUCCH time unit for the LP HARQ-ACK PUCCH if the LP HARQ-ACK PUCCH overlaps with multiple HP PUCCH time units. Options under consideration include:
  + Option 1: The low priority PUCCH performs multiplexing or dropping procedure in the first overlapping time unit that contains high priority PUCCH.
* Support: Leno/Moto, OPPO, DCM (FFS other options), Spreadtrum, Nokia, Samsung, ZTE, Ericsson, NEC
* First determine the baseline (R15 vs R16): QC, vivo

Proposal for 1st round discussion:

For R17 intra-UE multiplexing, the following order is performed:

* Step1: Resolve overlapping between channels with same priority.
* Step2: Resolve overlapping between channels with different priorities.
* Support: DCM, Spreadtrum. LGE, Nokia, Samsung, ZTE, Huawei, Ericsson, NEC
* First determine the baseline (R15 vs R16): Leno/Moto, OPPO, QC, vivo, Sony

Proposal for 1st round discussion:

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

* Option 1: Use R15 multiplexing as baseline, i.e. a single checking/multiplexing step among all channels.
  + Leno/Moto, OPPO, QC, vivo
* Option 2: Allow a single checking/multiplexing step between channels of different priorities after multiplexing (if any) between overlapping channels of the same priority is already done.
  + DCM, Spreadtrum, LGE, Nokia, ZTE, Huawei, Ericsson, NEC
* Other options are not excluded.
* Note: the candidate cases should be identified first.

Proposal for 1st round discussion:

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

* Option 1:
  + The PUCCH/PUSCH on different cells are transmitted simultaneously
  + The PUCCH/PUSCH on a same cell are multiplexed, following the same procedure with simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH disabled.
  + Leno/Moto, QC
* Option 2:
  + Perform PUCCH/PUSCH multiplexing per priority per PUCCH group
  + If an overlap still happens on the same cell or cells within the same band, the LP PUCCH/PUSCH is dropped.
  + Then perform simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH over different cells.
  + Nokia, Huawei
* Option 3:
  + Performs PHY multiplexing decision for low priority channels – and determines the final LP UL transmission.
  + The UE determines the overlapping of the resulting LP channel with HP PUCCH/PUSCH before and/or after HP UL channel multiplexing across all serving cells.
  + Based on the overlapping determination, the UE cancels the resulting LP channel if overlapping with a HP channel across all serving cells of the same band.
  + Nokia, Huawei
* Other options are not excluded.
* First discuss Section 6: OPPO, DCM, Spreadtrum, Sony, vivo (whether simultaneous PUCCH and PUSCH transmission and multiplexing of different priorities can be configured simultaneously should be discussed first.), NEC

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Fine with the first proposal.  For the second proposal, we think that a UE, first, should identify all overlapping PUCCHs of different priorities, and secondly, determine a PUCCH resource of a higher priority based on multiplexing/dropping rules for different types of UCI of different priorities (e.g. drop LP CSI, multiplex LP HARQ-ACK and LP SR).  For the third proposal, we support Option 1, “Use R15 multiplexing as baseline, i.e. a single checking/multiplexing step among all channels.”  For the fourth proposal, we support Option 1. |
| OPPO | Fine with 1st proposal  For the 2nd proposal, before we discuss it, we’d better to clarify which procedure, R15 multiplexing or R16 intra-UE prioritization, is considered as baseline for R17 multiplexing enhancement. According to previous working assumption in RAN1 104e on timeline in the following:  Working assumption:  Reuse Rel-15 intra-UE PUCCH/PUSCH multiplexing timeline requirements for Rel-17 intra-UE PUCCH/PUSCH multiplexing with different priorities   * FFS whether or not to specify a different behavior than Rel-15 when the timeline requirements are not met   We think R15 multiplexing is the baseline for R17 multiplexing enhancement. If R15 multiplexing is baseline, one step is enough, i.e. one Q set can be reused for all PUCCH, including high priority and low priority PUCCH, with the following enhancement, i.e. adding step 4:   * + *Step 4 (Rel-17 enhancements):*      - *If the set X contains a first PUCCH carries HP HARQ-ACK and a second PUCCH carrying CSI or LP SR, delete the second PUCCH from both set X and set Q.*     - *If the set X contains a first PUCCH carries HP SR and a second PUCCH carrying CSI, delete the second PUCCH from both set X and set Q.*   Set X: The reference PUCCH resource and all PUCCH resources that are in set Q and meanwhile overlapping with the reference PUCCH resource are also recorded into another set, namely set X;  For the 3rd proposal, in our understanding, it discuss the same issue as the 2nd proposal. And we prefer to option1.  For the 4th proposal, it’s better to discuss section 6 firstly and then review this proposal. |
| DOCOMO | For the first proposal, we support the first bullet but we don’t support the only option 1 under the FFS bullet. We think a more reasonable solution is:   * If the low priority HARQ-ACK PUCCH overlaps with any HP HARQ-ACK PUCCH, the first overlapping HP time unit in which the LP HARQ-ACK PUCCH overlaps with HP HARQ-ACK is selected.      * Otherwise (if the LP HARQ-ACK PUCCH doesn’t overlap with any HP HARQ-ACK PUCCH), the first overlapping HP time unit in which the LP HARQ-ACK PUCCH overlaps with HP PUCCH is selected.   For the 2nd proposal, we support it.  For the 3rd proposal, option 2 is preferred since it has the same principle as Rel-16 collision handling (i.e. handling for same priority first, then handling for inter priorities). The difference compared to Rel-16 handling is that different solutions are used for the inter-priority collision handling.  For the 4th proposal, it’s better to discuss the framework after we have clearer understanding on simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH Tx feature as discussed in section 6 (e.g. it’s not clear whether the feature is applicable for PUCCH and PUSCH with the same priority) and the framework of UL collision handling (e.g. when to resolve PUCCH/PUCCH collision for what priority, and when to resolve PUCCH/PUSCH collision for what priority). In our understanding, UCI/PUSCH multiplexing and simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH Tx are two alternate solutions to resolve PUCCH and PUSCH overlapping.  More specifically, considering there are four possible UL collision scenarios including “PUCCH and PUCCH collision for the same priority”, “PUCCH and PUSCH collision for the same priority”, “PUCCH and PUCCH collision for different priorities”, “PUCCH and PUSCH collision for different priorities”. After we have the overall framework to resolve the collision, we can further discuss whether UCI/PUSCH multiplexing or simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH Tx or both will be applied for resolving “PUCCH and PUSCH collision for the same priority” and/or “PUCCH and PUSCH collision for different priorities”. |
| QC | For the 1st proposal, like we commented in the GTW session, it highly depends on the discussion on the 2nd and 3rd proposal. In our view, if we adopt Rel-15 UCI multiplexing framework, then all the PUCCH resources, regardless slot based or sub-slot based, can be handled by the set Q as in Rel-15 spec. We then don’t see the need to discussion the 1st proposal.  For the 2nd proposal, the necessity to discuss it again depends on the 3rd proposal. If Option 1 is adopted in the 3rd proposal, again we don’t see the need for the 2nd proposal.  For the 3rd proposal, we think option 2 unnecessarily complicates the procedure. Let’s consider a simple example. There are 4 overlapping PUCCHs, PUCCH 1 and 2 are with HP. PUCCH 3 and 4 are with LP. With option 2, PUCCH 1 and 2 are multiplexed in a HP PUCCH, say PUCCH A, then PUCCH 3 and 4 are multiplexed in a LP PUCCH, say PUCCH B. After that, if PUCCH A and B are overlapping, UE needs to run a third multiplexing, which is **multiplexing between HP and LP**. With option 1, UE only needs to run a single multiplexing **between HP and LP PUCCH**. So obviously option 2 is more complicated than option 1. The problem of option 2 is that it anyway needs to run a last step to check overlapping and multiplexing between HP and LP. So the two previous steps to do multiplexing within same priority becomes unnecessary.  For the fourth proposal, we fail to follow the logic of option 2 and 3. If simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH is enabled, why UE need to performance PUCCH/PUSCH multiplexing cross CCs in a PUCCH group? What does “Perform PUCCH/PUSCH multiplexing per priority per PUCCH group” or “Performs PHY multiplexing decision for low priority channels – and determines the final LP UL transmission.”? Why there is dropping/cancel LP channel needed, given that we are talking about multiplexing LP and HP channel together in Rel-17. With the above, we disagree with proposal 3. |
| Spreadtrum | Fine with the first two proposals.  For the third proposal, Option 2 is preferred.  For the forth proposal, agree to discuss it after more details of Section 6 are determined. |
| vivo | For the 1st proposal, we share the same view with QC. We don’t see the need for this proposal.  For the 2nd proposal and 3rd proposal, the 3rd proposal is a subcase of the 2nd proposal considering that the 2nd proposal can include the overlapping of PUCCH and PUCCH, THE overlapping of PUCCH and PUSCH. Option 1 in the 3rd proposal is preferred considering it can simplify the multiplexing of PUCCHs and can avoid UCI dropping in some cases, e.g., in the case of HP SR with PF0, HP HARQ-ACK with PF1 and LP HARQ-ACK with PF1, if option 2 is adopted, HP SR will be dropped.  For the 4th proposal, we think whether simultaneous PUCCH and PUSCH transmission and multiplexing of different priorities can be configured simultaneously should be discussed first. |
| LG | On the 1st proposal, other option is preferred to avoid dropping of LP HARQ-ACK PUCCH.   * + Option 2: The low priority PUCCH performs multiplexing or dropping procedure in the first overlapping time unit that contains high priority HARQ-ACK PUCCH.   We are supportive to the 2nd proposal and Option 2 in the 3rd proposal, but I think those seem to be same thing. (?)  On the last proposal, it may need more time to study including other potential options. |
| Nokia, NSB | - Fine with the first proposal. Note that this proposal may be impacted by the discussions of the second and third proposals at least in some cases.  - For the second proposal, we are supportive of the proposal in principle. This proposal could also be discussed after finalizing the handling for the case with two overlapping PUCCH of different priority if needed.  - We are fine with the third proposal and support Option 2. But we are open to further discussions on the other options. Note that this proposal is related to the second proposal and would impact the discussions on the first proposal.  - For the 4th proposal, we are more leaning towards Option 2 / Option 3, but think that some further clarifications would be needed:   * For Option 2, does the first step ‘Perform PUCCH/PUSCH multiplexing per priority per PUCCH group’ mean that we use the Rel-15 multiplexing, i.e. within a certain priority UCI is multiplexed on PUSCH (if having an overlapping PUSCH)? And then based on the potential dropping in step 2, we may have simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH of different priorities in step 3? * Option 3: Same question on the multiplexing within priority here (for LP in step 1, HP multiplexing not considered here at all) – do we use the Rel-15 multiplexing rules within priority (i.e. no simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH of the same priority)? * Assuming the same understanding on the ‘final PUCCH/PUSCH’ of a certain priority for Option 2 and Option 3, the baseline difference between these two seems to be very much related to the discussions in the maintenance thread [106-e-NR-L1enh-URLLC-06] Issue #10: UE Procedures for UCI Multiplexing and Prioritization. So maybe the decision between Option 2 and Option 3 should take this Rel-16 behavior into account!? |
| Sony | **1st Proposal**  It isn’t clear what the objective of this proposal is for. What is the point of defining a time unit? Also, on the FFS, there is only 1 option, what FFS are we supposed to consider?  **2nd Proposal**  Similar view with QC and vivo. 2nd Proposal is basically Option 2 of the 3rd Proposal. If we agree on the 2nd Proposal, what’s the point of the 3rd Proposal or rather what is different in the 3rd Proposal? We suggest to consider only the 3rd Proposal as the 2nd Proposal is redundant.  **3rd Proposal**  For clarification, in Option 1 are we considering that all the PUCCHs have the same priority when performing multiplexing? We are ok with Option 1 assuming that there is an indicator by the gNB that the UE will multiplex the UCIs in these PUCCHs. That is Option 1 must assume that the UE has been instructed to perform multiplexing.  **4th Proposal**  Similar views with QC. The proposal isn’t clear. Perhaps the reason being is that we need to sort out Section 6 first. |
| Samsung | Support the intention of the first proposal.  Regarding QC’s concern “it highly depends on the discussion on the 2nd and 3rd proposal”, we would like to clarify a bit.  The first proposal doesn’t depend on the 2nd proposal if there is no overlapping PUSCH, to be accurate, we suggest to add the restriction that there is no overlapping PUSCH. It also doesn’t depend on the options under the 3rd proposal, for each option, for example, the case where a LP HARQ-ACK overlapping with multiple non-overlapping HP HARQ-ACK can happen.  The intention of the first proposal is to reuse Rel-15 multiplexing pseudo code defined in 38.213 Clause 9.2.5 and the pseudo code is performed per slot in Rel-15 and per slot/sub-slot in Rel-16. For a given priority, the PUCCH time unit is sub-slot if configured with sub-slot length, otherwise slot. For HP and LP PUCCH, the time unit is separate configured, to reuse the Rel-15 mux pseudo code, the time unit (or HP or LP set Q) should be defined first. Then we can put the PUCCHs in the corresponding set Q for each time unit and apply the Rel-15 pseudo code. Hopefully, the above explanation addresses QC, vivo and Sony’s concern.  The first bullet only considers multiplexing, we don’t support LP SR/CSI multiplexing with HP PUCCH, we suggest to limit the case with LP HARQ-ACK.  We suggest the following updated proposal to include other options suggest by Docomo and LG.  For handling the scenarios where a LP HARQ-ACK PUCCH ~~of a given priority~~ crosses the sub-slot boundary of the HP PUCCH ~~config of another priority~~ and overlaps with ~~a~~ one or more HP PUCCHs ~~of another priority~~, adopt the following procedure:   * The time unit (slot/sub-slot) of high priority PUCCH is used as the time unit for multiplexing of low-priority PUCCH and high-priority PUCCH. (assuming the time unit of HP PUCCH is equal to or smaller than that of LP PUCCH.) * FFS: How to determine an associated HP PUCCH time unit for the LP HARQ-ACK PUCCH if the LP HARQ-ACK PUCCH overlaps with multiple HP PUCCH time units. Options under consideration include:   + Option 1: The low priority PUCCH performs multiplexing or dropping procedure in the first overlapping time unit that contains high priority PUCCH.   + Option 2: The LP PUCCH is associated with the first HP PUCCH time unit with HP HARQ-ACK overlapping with the LP PUCCH.   + Option 3: The low priority PUCCH performs multiplexing or dropping procedure in the first overlapping time unit that contains high priority HARQ-ACK PUCCH.   + FFS: other options.   Note: There is no PUSCH overlapping with any PUCCH in this scenario.  Support the second proposal.  Regarding QC’s concern, the 3rd proposal discusses the cases where there is no overlapping PUSCH, we don’t think the 2nd proposal depends on the 3rd proposal. Also,  Postpone the discussion of the 3rd proposal.  We agree with vivo, the 3rd proposal is a sub case of the 2nd proposal, we suggest to postpone the discussion of the 3rd proposal and we should focus on the discussion of the 2nd proposal.  Support the intention of the 4th proposal. Also agree with other companies that some clarification are necessary. |
| ZTE | **For the first proposal**, we are generally fine, but for option 1 in sub-bullet, the timeline requirement should be satisfied when considering multiplexing, i.e., the option 1 can be revised to: Option 1a: The low priority PUCCH performs multiplexing or dropping procedure in the first overlapping time unit that contains high priority PUCCH if overlapped low priority PUCCH and high priority PUCCH meet the multiplexing timeline. The reason for adding timeline is as the first overlapping time unit may not satisfy the multiplexing timeline requirement. For example, if the UE capabilities are not same for high and low priority transmission, and N2 for high and low priority transmission are different, it is possible N2 of low priority transmission is larger than N2 of high priority transmission. Although LP transmission overlaps with the first time unit containing the HP transmission, but the multiplexing timeline of LP transmission is later than the first HP time unit and satisfy in the second HP time unit.    **For the second proposal**, the principle can be accepted. I assume the channels in step 1 and step 2 consist PUCCHs and PUSCHs together. Should we split PUCCH and PUSCH to handle separately, for example, the step 1 and step 2 only handle the PUCCHs, and adding step 3 to handle UCI multiplexing into PUSCH finally.  **For the third proposal**, we prefer the option 2, i.e., *single checking/multiplexing step between channels of different priorities after multiplexing (if any) between overlapping channels of the same priority is already done.* Thereason is the first step on the multiplexing between the same priority channels in the procedure is the same as the first step of prioritize process between different priorities channels. Just the second step of prioritizing is replaced by multiplexing.  **For the fourth proposal**, some comments on each option:  Option 1: “The PUCCH/PUSCH on different cells are transmitted simultaneously”, if the different cells include intra band cells, this doesn’t satisfy the motivation of simultaneously transmission agreed only in inter band. “The PUCCH/PUSCH on a same cell are multiplexed”, the same cell should include the cells in the same intra band.  Option 2: “Perform PUCCH/PUSCH multiplexing per priority per PUCCH group”, can we confirm the PUCCH group here is in the same band?  Option 2 and Option 3 don’t consider the multiplexing between different priorities which is under discussion in Rel-17. It should not only limit to Rel-16 dropping behavior, as it is natural to multiplex or prioritize firstly and handle the simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH transmissions secondly if the simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH transmissions are only supported in different cells under inter-band CA.  From my perspective, option 4 is suggested as:  Option 4: *If simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH over different cells is configured, the processing order between multiplexing/prioritizing and simultaneous-transmissions is proposed to be:*   * *The PUCCH/PUSCH on a same cell or on different cells under intra-band CA are multiplexed or prioritized, following the same procedure with simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH disabled.* * *The PUCCH/PUSCH on different cells within the same PUCCH group under inter-band CA are transmitted simultaneously at least when PUCCH/PUSCH have different priorities*   *FFS: whether to apply simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH transmissions when PUCCH/PUSCH have the same priority.* |
| Intel | Proposal 1 to some extent depends on decision on Proposal 2 and 3.  In our view, since HP and LP PUCCHs are allowed to be multiplexed in Rel17, it makes sense to consider single checking step for multiplexing, in contrast to Rel16 two step procedure where they were not allowed to be multiplexed. Hence, Option 1 of Proposal 3 should be applicable for both Proposal 2 and 3  Regarding 4th proposal, it is not clear whether it includes PUCCH and PUSCHs of same priority. Option 1 is preferrable. If simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH transmission of different priorities over x-CCs are configured/enabled, then UE would only multiplex same priority within a cell, and transmission of different priorities are made simultaneously over x-CCs. |
| Huawei | For the **1st proposal**, we can sort of understand the intention (thanks to Samsung’s explanation), but still it needs to be further clarified the correlation with the 2nd proposal (which we understand is Option 2 of the 3rd proposal). Assume the multi-PUCCH multiplexing order follows Option 2, i.e., Step 1) handling the intra-priority multiplexing then Step 2) handling the inter-priority multiplexing, as shown in the following figure, where HP is configured as subslot time unit while LP is configured as slot time unit; in Step 1) the handling of the two priorities will follow their own time units separately for determining the set Q; in Step 2) the resulting PUCCH of the hybrid priorities will be a HP PUCCH as per the agreement (“*For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH in R17, Use a PUCCH resource in the second PUCCH-Config (the PUCCH-config containing the PUCCH resource of the HP HARQ-ACK) at least in case the total number of LP and HP HARQ-ACK bits is more than 2.*”); therefore, the **multiplexing at Step 2) will naturally follow the HP time unit since the PUCCH resources are selected from the HP PUCCH-config** **which is configured as per sub-slot**. Therefore, under Option 2 of the 3rd proposal, there seems to be no strong need to particularly stress the HP time unit.    For the **2nd proposal**, we are supportive, though we understand it is correlated with the 3rd proposal.  For the **3rd proposal**, we prefer Option 2 as it is compatible with our preferred principle for handling the simultaneous X-CC PUCCH/PUSCH transmissions. As a unified procedure: Step 1) handling the intra-priority multiplexing and Step 2) handling the inter-priority, where the two channels corresponding to different priorities can simultaneously transmit if they are on different bands, and the two channels can perform inter-priority multiplexing/dropping otherwise.  For the **4th proposal**, we prefer Option 2/3, which takes R16 as a baseline. Option 1 relies on the simultaneous transmission of the same priority for which we think has not been agreed. |
| Ericsson | * 1st proposal: Support * 2nd proposal: Support * 3rd proposal: Option 2 * 4th proposal: Our view is most close to Option 2, but Option 2 has some issues. For example, why dropping LP PUCCH/PUSCH if overlapping? Simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH allows mapping LP PUCCH/PUSCH on one cell, HP PUCCH/PUSCH on another cell, even if they overlap. |
| NEC | We are fine for the first two proposals.  For the 3rd proposal, option 2 is slightly preferred to keep similar handling rule of Rel-16 prioritization.  For the 4th proposal, we agree with companies that the discussion should be postponed until there is more clarification on section 6. |

## 2nd round discussion

Targeting to first determining the baseline for R17 enhancement, companies are encouraged to provide analysis on pros and cons (**from standards as well as implementation perspective**) of the following options. Some companies’ comments in the 1st round have been captured in the table. Please confirm and complete them.

For handling the scenarios with more than two overlapping PUCCHs of different priorities in R17,

* Option 1: Use R15 multiplexing as baseline, i.e. a single checking/multiplexing step among all channels.
  + OPPO, QC, vivo, Intel, Pana, Sony (if dynamic enabled multiplexing)
* Option 2: Allow a single checking/multiplexing step between channels of different priorities after multiplexing (if any) between overlapping channels of the same priority is already done.
  + DCM, ZTE, HW, Nokia, LG, Apple, Sharp, IDC, ITRI, TCL, E///, Quectel, Spreadtrum

Table 2.5-2: Companies’ inputs on pros and cons of the two options

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Pros and cons of Option 1 | Pros and cons of Option 2 |
| OPPO | 1. One step is enough, i.e. one Q set can be reused for all PUCCH, including high priority and low priority PUCCH 2. R15 multiplexing timeline requirement has agreed as R17 multiplexing timeline requirement, it is not feasible to apply R15 multiplexing timeline in two-step multiplexing, similar as R16 intra-UE prioritization. 3. R15 multiplexing is a basic function, which is supported by all UE, however R16 intra-UE prioritization is optional. If UE does not support R16 intra-UE prioritization, it is not easy to support two-step multiplexing. |  |
| DCM | Possible unnecessary LP channels dropping due to overlapping with HP channels | Has the same principle as Rel-16 collision handling (i.e. handling for same priority first, then handling for inter priorities). The difference compared to Rel-16 handling is that different solutions are used for the inter-priority collision handling. |
| QC | UE only needs to run a single multiplexing between HP and LP PUCCH. | Unnecessarily complicates the procedure. Anyway needs to run a last step to check overlapping and multiplexing between HP and LP. So the two previous steps to do multiplexing within same priority becomes unnecessary. |
| vivo | Simplifies the multiplexing of PUCCHs and can avoid UCI dropping in some cases, e.g., in the case of HP SR with PF0, HP HARQ-ACK with PF1 and LP HARQ-ACK with PF1, if option 2 is adopted, HP SR will be dropped. |  |
| ZTE |  | Thereason is the first step on the multiplexing between the same priority channels in the procedure is the same as the first step of prioritize process between different priorities channels. Just the second step of prioritizing is replaced by multiplexing. |
| Intel | Since Rel17 allows for multiplexing across different priorities, and we have already agreed to reuse Rel-15 intra-UE multiplexing timeline in Rel17, it only makes sense to consider Rel15 multiplexing procedure as baseline. A single checking point is sufficient. | Rel16 procedure was motivated by the fact that transmissions of different priorities weren’t allowed to be multiplexed. Hence, there is a fundamental difference here, and using Rel16 framework in Rel17 could unnecessarily complicate the procedure. Moreover, it is not clear how Rel15 intra-UE multiplexing timeline (which we already agreed) would apply for Rel16 based procedure. |
| Huawei |  | Option 2 is based on the R16 multiplexing rule with the difference on performing multiplexing instead of dropping.  Option 2 is compatible with our preferred principle for handling the simultaneous X-band PUCCH/PUSCH transmissions. As a unified procedure: Step 1) handle the intra-priority multiplexing and Step 2) handle the inter-priority, where the two channels corresponding to different priorities can simultaneously transmit if they are on different bands, and the two channels can perform inter-priority multiplexing/dropping otherwise. |
| Panasonic | Multiplexing procedures can be simplified.  Undesirable dropping of HP SR is avoided in case of overlapping among HP SR with PF0, HP HARQ-ACK with PF1 and LP HARQ-ACK with PF1. |  |
| Nokia, NSB | We are not sure why it’s claimed that Option 1 consists in a “single checking/multiplexing step”. Actually, this Option would require running the Rel-15 pseudo-code considering now also the Rel-17 enhancements (and one Q set consisting of LP and HP channels). And this doesn’t consist in a single ‘checking’ step as such.; it’s more consisting of a single Q set.  Besides, we are wondering if with Option 1, there is a risk of unnecessary dropping of LP channels unless some backtracking is considered – which clearly not preferable as it would lead to even more complexity. | Option 2, as we proposed, relies on handling same priority channels first, then allowing a single step to check whether multiplexing can be done between resulting channels of different priority. More checking step could be added, but that would add complexity for the UE – which should be avoided.  As mentioned by some other companies, this considers the Rel-16 handling as a baseline.  Also, it seems that Option 2 avoid unnecessary dropping of LP channels. |
| LG |  | Option 2 could have a commonality on the first step between Rel-16 and Rel-17 from UE implementation/behavior perspective (as DOCOMO mentioned in above).  - Rel-16: intra-priority multiplexing first, then inter-priority prioritization if collided.  - Rel-17: intra-priority multiplexing first, then inter-priority multiplexing if collided.  Option 2 could avoid unnecessary dropping of LP channels, and also avoid unnecessary checking of timeline across different priorities (as Nokia mentioned above). |
| Sony | If the gNB indicates (e.g. in DCI) to the UE to perform multiplexing, then Option 1 is sufficient. UE treats all channels with same priority and perform Rel-15 multiplexing procedures. Apart from timeline (as per Rel-15) there should not be anything else to consider among the channels. | Rel-16 procedures is for dropping of one or more uplink channels. Whereas here the aim is to multiplex not to prioritise and drop one or more channels. Hence, we cannot just say Rel-16 uses Option 2-like method and therefore we must reuse it. |
| Apple | Con with Option 1:  LP UCIs over LP PUCCHs will be dropped un-necessarily in intermediate steps due to overlapping with a HP PUCCH;  Complex rules to merge payloads from two PUCCHs | Pro of Option 2:  As commented by DoCoMo, Nokia, LGE and Huawei, there are a number of benefits with Option 2. |
| Sharp |  | Option 2 is preferred. The collision resolution of the same priority it minimizes the number of the overlapping channels with different priorities. Since the handling of channels with different priorities can then be performed with the granularity defined by the HP PUCCH. |
| InterDigital | Con:  Possible unnecessary dropping of LP channels. | Pro:  Build on R16 procedure.  After the first step, the multiplexing decision only depends on two channels which could lead to simpler specification. |
| ITRI |  | Option 2 provides the same principle on collision handling procedures as Rel-16, and may avoid unnecessary dropping of LP channels. |
| TCL | Possible unnecessary LP channels dropping may exist when overlapping with HP channels. | Option 2 is preferred.  It is based on the same principle in Release-16, the collisions between same priority channels should be handled first, and then allowing a single step to check whether multiplexing can be done between resulting channels of different priority. |
| Ericsson | Con of Option 1:  Rel-15 procedure cannot be applied as is, since Rel-17 does not support multiplexing of all combinations of HP/LP UCI. For the HP/LP overlapping cases that Rel-17 does not support, prioritization across two priority levels have to be performed in Rel-16 manner then. Compared to Option 2, Option 1 is much more complicated. Also it’s not clear how the procedure would work, if simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH is supported | Pro of Option 2:   * For each priority level, Rel-15 procedure is applied as is; * Between two priority levels, only need to modify the prioritization step of Rel-16 to allowed the Rel-17 supported combinations for multiplexing.   If simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH is supported, the procedure can be easily modified to work with it. For example, if overlapping between HP and LP, HP (PUCCH or PUSCH) is mapped to one carrier, and LP (PUSCH or PUCCH) is mapper to another carrier. |
| Quectel | Con:  Possible unnecessary dropping of LP channels. | Pro:  The whole procedure is clear. Rel-15 procedure is reused for same priority and Rel-17 multiplexing is applied for different priorities. |
| Spreadtrum | Con:  Possible unnecessary dropping of LP channels. | Pro:  Build on R16 procedure. The final check step can do either dropping or multiplexing. For example, LP CSI can be dropped if it overlaps with HP HARQ-ACK on PUCCH in the final step. |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | Pro with option 1:  Since UE determines which UCI to multiplex and which UCI to drop based on one Q set and prioritizes HP UCI over LP UCI for multiplexing, UE can avoid a situation that drops some HP UCI but multiplexes LP UCI.  For example, HP SR in PF0, HP HARQ-ACK in PF1 and LP HARQ-ACK in PF3 can be multiplexed in a PUCCH resource of PF3 of a high priority index according to option 1, while HP SR is dropped according to option 2. | Con of option 2:  While handling overlapping HP PUCCHs, some HP UCI might be dropped unnecessarily.  For multiplexing of mixed priority UCI, a UE has to determine a PUCCH resource for multiplexing at least 3 times, the first one for HP UCI, the second one for LP UCI, and the third one for HP and LP UCI. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Samsung | We would like further clarify our understanding regarding the relationship of the proposal and the 2nd proposal in the 1st round discussion.  In our understanding, if the 2nd proposal is agreed, option 2 for this proposal is the only choice, down-selection is not needed. On the contrary, if either option 1 or 2 is adopted for this proposal, it doesn’t mean we will follow the same rule when PUSCH gets involved.  We think PUCCHs/PUSCHs collision is a more general issue. We suggest to focus on this issue first. Solving PUCCHs/PUSCHs collision can ease the work of PUCCHs collision.  Basically, the discussion focused on following Rel-15 rules (first resolve overlapping PUCCHs with different priorities and then PUCCHs/PUSCHs) or Rel-16 rules (first resolve overlapping PUCCHs/PUSCHs with same priorities and then PUCCHs/PUSCHs with different priorities). We have compared the spec impact and performance between the two options in our contribution, we think both options can work and suggest to do down-selection in this meeting.  Proposal #1  For resolving overlapping PUCCHs/PUSCHs with different priorities, down select from the following two options.   * Option 1) Step 1: resolve overlapping PUCCHs with different priorities; Step 2: resolve overlapping PUCCHs and/or PUSCHs. * Option 2) Step 1: resolve overlapping PUCCHs and/or PUSCHs with the same priority; Step 2: resolve overlapping PUCCHs and/or PUSCHs with different priorities.   Regarding the proposal in the 2nd round, we think both options needs further clarification  For option 1) Use R15 multiplexing as baseline, we assume the intention is to put all the overlapping PUCCHs in a same set Q and run the Rel-15 pseudo code in 9.2.5. If a LP HARQ-ACK overlaps with multiple HP HARQ-ACK, simply reuse the pseudo doesn’t work. In Rel-15, multiple overlapping PUCCHs are multiplexed in a same PUCCH, but we don’t support multiplexing of more than 2 HARQ-ACK. We need to change the pseudo code to work properly.  Further consider the following example, option 1 is not clear how to deal with this case. We think there are some other cases cannot simply reuse the pseudo.    For option 2) After PUCCH multiplexing with the same priority, a LP HARQ-ACK (and/or SR and/or CSI) can overlap with multiple non overlapping HP HARQ-ACK and/or HP SR can still happen. How to solve this issue needs further clarification.  To minimize spec impact, we should aim for reusing Rel-15 pseudo-code in 9.2.5. We suggest the candidate options should be based on Rel-15 pseudo-code in 9.2.5.  Proposal #2  For resolving overlapping PUCCHs with different priorities, candidate solutions should aim for reusing Rel-15 pseudo-code defined in TS 38.213 9.2.5. |
| QC | Reading all the comments, we think maybe there is a misunderstanding about option 1. To us, Option 1 simply means that when UE put all the channels (regardless of HP or LP) into a single set of Q and run the pseudo code to decide which channels should be multiplexed together. The priorities are effectively ignored in the Pseudo codes, which is the framework we are talking about here, no? The priorities takes effect later when UE decides PUCCH resources, RBs, max coding rate, etc, for the multiplexed channels. We don’t see option 1 causes dropping LP channels. |
| DOCOMO | Regarding the relationship between the 1st and 3rd proposal in 1st round discussion, we share similar view with Samsung that the multiplexing time unit discussion in the 1st proposal is independent from option 1 or option 2 in the 3rd proposal. The 1st proposal discusses what PUCCHs will be put in the Q set (sub-slot based or slot-based, which sub-slot to include the LP PUCCH, etc) of the pseudo code in section 9.2.5, while the 3rd proposal discusses how to resolve the overlapping of the set Q. In our understanding, the 3rd proposal is performed after the 1st proposal from UE behavior perspective, but we can discuss them separately.  For the proposal in the 2nd round discussion, we think option 2 is better from overall UL collision handling perspective. We can design the framework by “collision handling for xxx” instead of “multiplexing for xxx”. Then we can apply potential techniques for resolving the collision handling for each step. The framework can be compatible with features including Rel-16 multiplexing/prioritization, Rel-17 multiplexing and Rel-17 simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH Tx. UE can select different tools for the same collision handling” objective in each step. For example:  1) Intra-priority UL collision handling  1-1) intra-priority PUCCH/PUCCH collision handling:   * Rel-16 multiplexing feature can be applied   1-2) intra-priority PUCCH/PUSCH collision handling   * Rel-16 multiplexing feature, or Rel-17 simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH feature are possible   2) Inter-priority UL collision handling  2-1) inter-priority PUCCH/PUCCH collision handling   * Rel-16 prioritization feature, or Rel-17 multiplexing features are possible   2-2) inter-priority PUCCH/PUSCH collision handling  Rel-16 prioritization feature, or Rel-17 multiplexing feature, simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH feature are possible |
| CATT | We share the view from Samsung that we should take PUSCH into account to strive to agree on a more generic framework. Regarding the proposal #1 from Samsung, we would like to suggest the following modifications to avoid confusion.  Proposal #1  For resolving overlapping PUCCHs/PUSCHs with different priorities, down select from the following two options.   * Option 1) Step 1: resolve overlapping PUCCHs with same/different priorities; Step 2: resolve overlapping PUCCH(s) and~~/or~~ PUSCH(s), or overlapping PUSCHs on the same serving cell. * Option 2) Step 1: resolve overlapping PUCCHs and/or PUSCHs with the same priority; Step 2: resolve overlapping PUCCHs and/or PUSCHs with different priorities.   Between these two options, our preference is Option 1 which is much simpler since PUCCH collision handling is handled once while PUCCH collision handling needs to be handled up to three times. |

## 2.6. 3rd round discussion

The pros and cons of the two options are listed below.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Pros | Cons |
| Option 1 | * UE only needs to run a single multiplexing between HP and LP PUCCH, i.e. one Q set can be reused for all PUCCH. * Avoid UCI dropping in some cases, e.g., in the case of HP SR with PF0, HP HARQ-ACK with PF1 and LP HARQ-ACK with PF1, if option 2 is adopted, HP SR will be dropped. | * Option 2 would require running the Rel-15 pseudo-code considering now also the Rel-17 enhancements (and one Q set consisting of LP and HP channels). And this doesn’t consist in a single ‘checking’ step as such.; it’s more consisting of a single Q set. * LP UCIs over LP PUCCHs will be dropped un-necessarily in intermediate steps due to overlapping with a HP PUCCH. * Complex rules to merge payloads from two PUCCHs. * Since Rel-17 does not support multiplexing of all combinations of HP/LP UCI. For the HP/LP overlapping cases that Rel-17 does not support, prioritization across two priority levels have to be performed in Rel-16 manner then. Compared to Option 2, Option 1 is much more complicated. * Unnecessary checking of timeline across different priorities. * Not clear how the procedure would work, if simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH is supported |
| Option 2 | * Rel-15 procedure is reused for same priority and Rel-17 multiplexing is applied for different priorities. The Rel-17 multiplexing decision only depends on two channels which could lead to simpler specification. * Compatible with our preferred principle for handling the simultaneous X-band PUCCH/PUSCH transmissions. As a unified procedure: Step 1) handle the intra-priority multiplexing and Step 2) handle the inter-priority, where the two channels corresponding to different priorities can simultaneously transmit if they are on different bands, and the two channels can perform inter-priority multiplexing/dropping otherwise. | * Rel-16 procedure was motivated by the fact that transmissions of different priorities weren’t allowed to be multiplexed. * Reusing Rel-16 framework in Rel-17 unnecessarily complicates the procedure. Anyway needs to run a last step to check overlapping and multiplexing between HP and LP. So the two previous steps to do multiplexing within same priority becomes unnecessary. * Have already agreed to reuse Rel-15 intra-UE multiplexing timeline in Rel-17. It is not feasible to apply R15 multiplexing timeline in two-step multiplexing, similar as R16 intra-UE prioritization. * R16 intra-UE prioritization is optional. If UE does not support R16 intra-UE prioritization, it is not easy to support two-step multiplexing. |

Please check the updated proposal and options, and your positions.

For resolving overlapping PUCCHs/PUSCHs with different priorities in R17, aim at reusing Rel-15 pseudo-code defined in TS 38.213 9.2.5. Down-select from the following two options:

* Option 1:
  + Step 1: Resolve overlapping PUCCHs with same/different priorities with a single checking/multiplexing step.
    - UE puts all PUCCHs (regardless of HP or LP) into a single set of Q and run the pseudo code to decide which PUCCHs should be multiplexed.
  + Step 2: Resolve overlapping PUCCH(s) and PUSCH(s), or overlapping PUSCHs on the same serving cell.
  + FFS interaction with simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH transmissions.
  + OPPO, QC, vivo, Intel, Pana, Sony (if dynamic enabled multiplexing), Lenovo/Motorola Mobility,
* Option 2:
  + Step 1: Resolve overlapping PUCCHs and/or PUSCHs with the same priority;
  + Step 2: Resolve overlapping PUCCHs and/or PUSCHs with different priorities.
    - Per UE with the capability of inter-band CA, if simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH transmissions is configured, HP PUCCH/PUSCH and LP PUSCH/PUCCH are transmitted over different cells.
    - FFS the case where a LP channel overlaps with multiple non-overlapping HP channels.
  + DCM, ZTE, HW, Nokia, LG, Apple, Sharp, IDC, ITRI, TCL, E///, Quectel, Spreadtrum

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Huawei | We think both Option 1 and Option 2 may have the unnecessarily dropping issue. For Option 1, when processing the multiplexing in the single set Q, the LP CSI would be dropped in case of the collision with both HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK (as per the working assumption of the last meeting, when HP HARQ-ACK, LP HARQ-ACK and LP CSI would be multiplexed in one PUCCH, the LP CSI including part 1 and part 2 are dropped).  In addition, we hope the procedure approved in Sec.2 would be consistent with the Sec. 6 x-CC rule.  E.g., if Option 1 is adopted in Sec.2, the x-CC operation would be Step 1) resolve the multiplexing of all PUCCHs/PUSCHs with same/different priorities per band, and Step 2) simultaneously transmit the resulting channel for per band (this may need to allow the simultaneous transmission of the channels with the same priority which is under discussion).  If Option 2 is adopted in Sec.2, the x-CC operation would be Step 1) handle the intra-priority multiplexing and Step 2) handle the inter-priority, where the two channels corresponding to different priorities can simultaneously transmit if they are on different bands, and the two channels can perform inter-priority multiplexing/dropping otherwise. |
| Nokia, NSB | We are fine with the intention of the proposal.  First, we would like to hear other companies’ views on whether the way PUSCH(s) is currently considered under Option 2 would be fine or not; or e.g. should the PUCCHs be handled first using steps 1 and 2, and then consider the PUSCH(s).  On the bullet of ‘Per UE capability of interband CA’ a question for clarification: are we talking about HP/LP PUCCH & PUSCH (i.e. simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH of the same priority) and or either HP PUSCH or PUCCH and LP PUCCH or PUSCH (i.e. simultaneous PUCCH/PUCCH only of different priorities)?  Concerning the FFS under Option 2, or more generally the scenarios with more than two overlapping channel of different priorities, we think that the handling of these overlapping channels of different priorities should be simple so that e.g. the processing of high-priority channel(s) is not impacted. For instance, at least considering PUCCHs, a handling along the lines of the following could be adopted:  - Allow a single checking/multiplexing step between channels of different priorities (where the earliest high-priority PUCCH could be considered), where in case of multiplexing:   * The UE does not expect an overlap between the resulting resource to be used for multiplexing and another high-priority PUCCH; * and if the resulting PUCCH resource overlaps with a low-priority PUCCH (instead of a high-priority PUCCH), the low-priority PUCCH can then be simply dropped.   If the above would be agreeable, then it could be generalized to also cover PUSCH. |
| QC | We are fine to list two options. But the in our opinion, the current formulation of option 2 are missing a lot of components– meaning option 2 is not clear.  To me, the biggest question to option 2 is that: what does UE do in step 2? Does step 2 in Option 2 need duplicate the two steps in Option 1 exactly? If so, what is the point to do step 1 in option 2? **Can FL or proponents of option 2 please complete step 2 in option 2**?  My second question to option 2 is: when does UE stop step 1 to run step 2 to do multiplexing between PUCCH/PUSCH with different priorities? There are two Alternative. Alt 1) After UE finish multiplexing within HP PUCCHs, and multiplexing within LP PUCCHs respectively, UE kick off step 2. Alt 2) After UE finish multiplexing within HP PUCCHs/PUSCHs, and multiplexing within LP PUCCH/PUSCHs, UE kickoff step 2. Which alternative we are discussing?  A minor comment on option 1: “Resolve overlapping between PUCCH(s) and PUSCH(s) reuse Rel-15 procedure if simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH is not enabled, ~~or overlapping PUSCHs on the same serving cell~~” – Given simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH is captured in FFS, in the Step 2 for option 1 we just need to reuse Rel-15. |
| Sharp | We are fine to list the options.  Option 1 need to perform mixed priority handling twice for PUCCH and PUSCH independently. And each step requires mixed priority and granularity with slot/subslot.  We still prefer option 2 for easy implementation. It has no mixed priority in the first step, with minimum number of channels going to 2nd step resolution. |
| Quectel | We are fine to list these two options. For simultaneous transmissions in Option 2, we have same clarification questions as Nokia. We prefer a generalized description for the simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH transmissions in Option 2, similarly to Option 1. |
| Intel | We are fine to discuss the two options further |
| Samsung | We support the intention of the proposal.  We think the details of both options need further discussion, to make progress we should focus on the more general rules.  For Option 1, we are not clear about “a single checking/multiplexing”, i.e., the sub-bullet of Step 1. As explained in the 2nd round by QC, “The priorities are effectively ignored in the Pseudo codes…The priorities takes effect later when UE decides PUCCH resources…”  In the pseudo, the PUCCH resource is determined during performing the pseudo code. It seems the description is not aligned the pseudo and needs further clarification. The determination of PUCCH is highlighted below.   |  | | --- | | Set  to the cardinality of  Set to be the first symbol of resource  in the slot  Set  to be the number of symbols of resource  in the slot  Set  - index of first resource in set  Set  - counter of overlapped resources  while  if  and resource  overlaps with resource      else  if  determine a single resource for multiplexing UCI associated with resources  as described in clauses 9.2.5.0, 9.2.5.1 and 9.2.5.2  set the index of the single resource to    % start from the beginning after reordering unmerged resources at next step    % function that re-orders resources in current set  Set  to the cardinality of  else    end if  end if  end while |   We suggest to delete the details for Option 1 at this stage and leave it open for further discussion.  For Option 2, we also suggest to leave the details open for now.  There are too many details for both options, to reduce our work load we can try whether we can agree on some basic principle first and then go to more details.  Suggest the updated proposal  For resolving overlapping PUCCHs/PUSCHs with different priorities in R17, aim at reusing Rel-15 pseudo-code defined in TS 38.213 9.2.5. Down-select from the following two options:   * Option 1:   + Step 1: Resolve overlapping PUCCHs with same/different priorities ~~with a single checking/multiplexing step.~~     - ~~UE puts all PUCCHs (regardless of HP or LP) into a single set of Q and run the pseudo code to decide which PUCCHs should be multiplexed.~~   + Step 2: Resolve overlapping PUCCH(s) and PUSCH(s), or overlapping PUSCHs on the same serving cell.   + ~~FFS interaction with simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH transmissions.~~ * Option 2:   + Step 1: Resolve overlapping PUCCHs and/or PUSCHs with the same priority;   + Step 2: Resolve overlapping PUCCHs and/or PUSCHs with different priorities.     - ~~Per UE with the capability of inter-band CA, if simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH transmissions is configured, HP PUCCH/PUSCH and LP PUSCH/PUCCH are transmitted over different cells.~~     - ~~FFS the case where a LP channel overlaps with multiple non-overlapping HP channels.~~ |
| ITRI | We are fine to discuss these options further. |
| TCL | We are fine to discuss the two options further. |
| LG | We are fine with the intention of the proposal, and OK to list the options.  And, we agree with Samsung to leave the details open for now.  So, we are supportive to the Samsung’s modified version in above. |
| NEC | We are fine to discuss the two options further.  If overlapping between two PUSCHs with different priorities on a same cell is not considered, we are fine with both options. Otherwise, option 1 is preferred, since option 2 will lead unnecessary UCI dropping. For example, in case collision between LP PUCCH, LP PUSCH and HP PUSCH happens, with step 1, multiplex UCI of LP PUCCH (e.g., HARQ-ACK) on LP PUSCH, with step 2, do prioritization between LP PUSCH and HP PUSCH, then LP UCI may be also dropped. |
| DOCOMO | We are fine with the intention of the proposal and share the same view as Samsung. According to the companies’ comments so far, details of both options needs to be discussed further. In this sense, we prefer the proposal suggested by Samsung in order to facilitate the progress. |
| OPPO | We are fine with the proposal.  Just editorial modification on option 1. FFS is the subbullet for step 2 not paralleled with step 2,   * Option 1:   + Step 1: Resolve overlapping PUCCHs with same/different priorities with a single checking/multiplexing step.     - UE puts all PUCCHs (regardless of HP or LP) into a single set of Q and run the pseudo code to decide which PUCCHs should be multiplexed.   + Step 2: Resolve overlapping PUCCH(s) and PUSCH(s), or overlapping PUSCHs on the same serving cell.   FFS interaction with simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH transmissions. |
|  |  |

Proposal after 3rd round discussion:

For resolving overlapping PUCCHs/PUSCHs with different priorities in R17, aim at reusing Rel-15 pseudo-code defined in TS 38.213 9.2.5. Down-select from the following two options:

* Option 1:
  + Step 1: Resolve overlapping PUCCHs with same/different priorities with a single checking/multiplexing step.
    - FFS: UE puts all PUCCHs (regardless of HP or LP) into a single set of Q and run the pseudo code to decide which PUCCHs should be multiplexed.
  + Step 2: Resolve overlapping between PUCCH(s) and PUSCH(s) reusing Rel-15 procedure if simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH transmission is not enabled.
    - FFS interaction with simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH transmission.
  + OPPO, QC, vivo, Intel, Pana, Sony (if dynamic enabled multiplexing), Lenovo/Motorola Mobility
* Option 2:
  + Step 1: Resolve overlapping PUCCHs and/or PUSCHs with the same priority (aiming at a single checking/multiplexing step).
  + Step 2: Resolve overlapping PUCCHs and/or PUSCHs with different priorities (aiming at a single checking/multiplexing step).
    - FFS: Per UE with the capability of inter-band CA, if simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH transmission is enabled, the HP PUCCH/PUSCH and LP PUSCH/PUCCH with different priorities after Step 1 are transmitted over different cells.
    - FFS the case where a LP channel overlaps with multiple non-overlapping HP channels.
  + FFS the overlapping scenarios the UE does not expect after Step 2.
  + DCM, ZTE, HW, Nokia, LG, Apple, Sharp, IDC, ITRI, TCL, E///, Quectel, Spreadtrum

## 2.7. 4th round discussion

|  |
| --- |
| **Possible Agreement**  For resolving overlapping PUCCHs/PUSCHs with different priorities in R17, aim at reusing Rel-15 pseudo-code defined in TS 38.213 9.2.5. Down-select from the following two options:  Option 1:  - Step 1: Resolve overlapping PUCCHs with same/different priorities - Step 2: Resolve overlapping between PUCCH(s) and PUSCH(s) reusing Rel-15 procedure if simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH transmission is not enabled. o OPPO, QC, vivo, Intel, Pana, Sony (if dynamic enabled multiplexing), Lenovo/Motorola  o Concerns: Sharp  Option 2:  o Step 1: Resolve overlapping PUCCHs and/or PUSCHs with the same priority o Step 2: Resolve overlapping PUCCHs and/or PUSCHs with different priorities  o DCM, ZTE, HW, Nokia, LG, Apple, Sharp, IDC, ITRI, TCL, E///, Quectel, Spreadtrum, Samsung o Concerns: Qualcomm, Intel, OPPO  FFS: How to resolve overlap of multiplexing and simultaneous transmission FFS: Whether UE can support only one of multiplexing and simultaneous transmission or need to support both |

Other than following Mr.Chairman’s guidance to re-consider your positions on the two options above, please also show your position on the following proposal, i.e. if you can accept the Rel-17 multiplexing only focuses on multiplexing between 2 channels of different priorities.

Proposal for 4th round discussion:

Multiplexing between more than two overlapping PUCCHs/PUSCHs of different priorities is not supported in R17.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Sony | If we cannot agree to either Option 1 and Option 2, I think the sensible thing is to fall back to only 2 overlapping PUCCH/PUSCH. Afterall, most of the agreements we made so far concerns 2 overlapping PUCCH/PUSCH and the effort is not wasted. That is we agree to the FL proposal above. |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | We think both option 1 and option 2 would work, without serious issues. The LP UCI dropping issue (for option 1) or HP UCI dropping issue (for option 2) during the intermediate step can be avoided by gNB scheduler implementation. We are flexible for both options and would like to urge RAN1 to move forward with one option, instead of not supporting multiplexing among more than two overlapping channels of different priorities. |
| InterDigital | We prefer agreeing on either Option 1 or Option 2.  If this is not possible, no objection to simplify by reducing the number of scenarios. However, even if we agree to this 4th round proposal this may still lead to further discussions. For example, what happens in case of 3 overlapping channels, e.g. 1 HP and 2 LP channels? Is there still multiplexing between at most 2 channels (1 HP + 1 LP) and dropping 1 LP channel? Or do we revert to R16 (drop both LP channels). |
| Samsung | For the above two options, we prefer Option 2 because there is no reason to change the R16 multiplexing procedure and introduce another one which will not be as in R15. Rel-16 multiplexing procedures should not be modified. That is also complicated to do.  Not the support the 2nd proposal.  If the proposal is agreed, we still need to specify cases as following, according to the agreements in Rel-17, LP CSI/SR will be dropped, the number multiplexed channels is two but the number of overlapping channel is larger than 2.    There can be quite a few other similar cases. We need to address multiple overlapping channels collision issue any way. |
| Sharp | It is better to specify a framework for more than 2 channels.We support the majority views and accept compromise too, although we prefer option 2. Option 2 is a natural extension of Rel-16. The only difference is between channel dropping in Rel-16 and multiplexing in Rel-17. There will be only one channel of each priority left in each subslot or slot. |
| Huawei | We would prefer to down-select one option between Option 1 and Option 2, i.e., better to have a solution than nothing. If the multi-PUCCH/PUSCH overlap issue has to be avoided by the gNB, it has a huge challenge for the gNB implementation, e.g., it has to carefully schedule the HP HARQ-ACK/PUSCH or configure the HP SPS/SR to avoid the positions that could potentially have overlap with the already scheduled LP PUCCH/PUSCH or configured LP SPS/SR. This will cause burden on figuring out and avoiding numerous cases for the implementation, and cause limitation on the flexibility of the HP scheduling/configuration.  If we have to make a decision between the two options at this meeting, we prefer Option 2, as it is a unified logic for handling R16 UEs and R17 UEs from the network view, where the Step 1 is exactly the same for both UEs, and only Step 2 are different by replacing the ‘dropping’ behavior with ‘multiplexing’ behavior. For Option 1, on the other hand, the network has to develop totally different procedures to separately cope with the R16 UEs and R17 UEs. Note that the Option 1 is also different with R15 as it has to additionally introduce the dropping behavior during the multi-PUCCH multiplexing in Q set. |
| Quectel | We prefer Option 2 for the pros mentioned by companies above. We also think it is better to make a decision on one option, otherwise the use cases supported by Rel-17 would be quite limited. |
| CATT | We also prefer to down-select between Option 1 and 2, otherwise there will be severe scheduling restriction at gNB side.  Between Option 1 and 2, we prefer Option 1 since it is simpler from our side. In addition, it is not clear to us how Option 2 works with the Rel-15 timeline we agreed earlier. |
| Panasonic | We prefer agreeing on either Option 1 or Option 2. For down-selection, we think both options can work. Option 1 can avoid HP UCI dropping, while Option 2 would be simple solution as dripping can be just replaced with multiplexing as Huawei mentioned. |
| vivo | We prefer to agree on either option 1 or option 2. We think both option 1 and option 2 can work. In addition, regarding this proposal, we think what we can’t agree is the order of multiplexing with different priorities. For the case one PUCCH overlaps with multiple PUSCHs of different priorities, e.g., one HP PUCCH overlaps with multiple LP PUSCHs, UE can directly select one PUSCH for multiplexing, there is no multiplexing order issue either. So, this case shouldn’t be precluded. We have the following suggestion if we have to go with this proposal:   * Multiplexing between more than two overlapping PUCCHs of different priorities is not supported in R17 * Multiplexing between PUSCH(s) and more than one PUCCH of different priorities is not supported in R17. |
| ITRI | Prefer to down-select between Option 1 and 2, otherwise the use cases supported by Rel-17 would be limited and may further restrict gNB scheduling. In addition, as mentioned above, our preference is option 2 which is extended from Rel-16 and expect to cause less spec impact. |
| QC | We prefer to do down selection between option 1 and option 2. If proponents of option 2 clarify that how to solve the following two concerns we raised in GTW Friday, QC could consider to withdraw the objection of option 2.  Concern 1: how to resolve the recursive/iteration issue with option 2?  Concern 2: how does option 2 works with Rel-15 timeline? Do all the overlapping channels, regardless of HP or LP, have to still satisfy the Rel-15 timeline?  Regarding the proposal to restrict to multiplexing between only two channels, as Samsung already pointed out, to really simply the scenario to avoid discussing the framework, we need restrict to max of two overlapping channels. However, that may be a little too restrictive. So, it is not our preference. We still prefer down selection between option 1 and 2. |
| LG | We also prefer to agree either option 1 or option 2, rather than restricting the scenario supportable with inter-priority multiplexing.  One possible way we may be able to consider is to perform multiplexing only for PUCCHs with same priority first, then after that, to perform multiplexing for PUCCHs/PUSCHs with different priority. |
| DOCOMO | We prefer to down-select either of Option 1 or Option 2. If multiplexing of more than two overlapping cases is not supported, the Rel-17 different priorities multiplexing would be useless. gNB needs to ensure such overlapping does not happen, which also results in less scheduling flexibility and complicated scheduling. As a result, the Rel-17 multiplexing would not be used in real deployments.  Between the two options, we prefer option 2 with same reason as Huawei. A unified logic framework for Rel-16/17 is better. As the concern raised by Qualcomm on step 2 of option 2 in the 3rd round and may also be related to Concern 1 in this round, we think the handling can be “resolve overlapping of PUCCHs first, then resolve overlapping of PUCCHs/PUSCHs”. It seems similar to steps in option 1, but actually the case is different because there is no PUCCH/PUSCH overlapping of the same priority any more for the step 2 of option 2. The case would be simpler then the option 1 case.  However, although we still prefer Option2, we would be fine to compromise Option 1 if it is really difficult to converge on Option 2 given the situation. |
| Ericsson | Prefer to down-select between Option 1 and 2 in this meeting.  Option 1 is more difficult than Option 2 to specify and implement.   * Step 1: new procedure is needed to resolve overlapping PUCCHs with same/different priorities; * Step 2: It’s not possible to reuse Rel-15 procedure in Rel-17, since Rel-15 does not handle the new situations introduced in Rel-16/17. For example, Rel-15 procedure does not exist for multiple HARQ-ACK in a slot (due to e.g., sub-slot based HARQ-ACK; two HARQ-ACK CB of different priorities), since Rel-15 only has one HARQ-ACK in a slot. For instance, Rel-15 procedure does not handle the case below, even if one ignore the priorities.     Regarding the two concerns of Option 2 by QC,   * Concern 1: Agree that details of Step 2 are not yet clear, e.g., how to avoid potential recursive issue. We expect that new procedures need to be specified in Step 2, which is where Rel-17 is different from Rel-16. * Concern 2: Our view is, Rel-17 timeline should evolve from that of Rel-16, not Rel-15. Timeline of various combinations were specified in Rel-16 for cancellation of LP channels. Rel-17 can extend them to mux for supported cases.   Furthermore: if the down-selection is not possible, we don’t see any point to address individual combinations like how to mux HP HARQ-ACK + LP HARQ + HP/LP PUSCH; |
| TCL | We would prefer to agree either option 1 or option2, it is better to make a decision on one option than not supporting multiplexing among more than two overlapping channels of different priorities. For the down-selection of option 1 or option 2, we think both options can work. |
| CATT2 | We think the comment from Ericsson on Step 2 for Option 1 is valid. For a PUCCH with UCI of a given priority or UCIs of both priorities, it is FFS how to resolve the overlapping between PUCCH(s) and PUSCH(s). Thus we suggest to update Option 1 as follows.  Option 1:  - Step 1: Resolve overlapping PUCCHs with same/different priorities - Step 2: Resolve overlapping between PUCCH(s) and PUSCH(s) ~~reusing Rel-15 procedure if simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH transmission is not enabled.~~ |
| Nokia, NSB | Support the first proposal.  We share other companies’ views that it would be good to allow and agree on the handling more than two overlapping channels of different priorities.  We still prefer Option 2, for the reasons already mentioned in previous rounds.  The second proposal should only be considered as a last resort if no consensus could be achieved on the handling of more than two overlapping channels of different priorities. |
| ZTE | Multiple PUCCHs/PUSCHs overlapping should be resolved and we prefer option 2. But we are open to compromise as something is better than nothing. |
| Intel | As raised in GTW by us and mentioned above by Qualcomm as well, it has not been clarified how Rel-15 multiplexing timeline would work for Option 2. Our preference is still Option 1. |
| Spreadtrum | We are open to compromise to one solution than nothing. |
| OPPO | We prefer to down-select from option 1 and option 2. As above companies mentioned, restriction on only two different priority channel multiplexing also leads some spec work.  Between option 1 and option 2, we prefer option 1.  We have two concerns on option 2 in the following:   1. According to comments from proponent of option 2, option 2 is extended from R16. However, R16 intra UE prioritization procedure is diverse and unstable. So, we doubt option 2 is a clear procedure, although baseline of option 2 is still not clear. 2. How does option 2 works with R15 multiplexing timeline?   Concerns on option 1 from Ericsson are common issues for option 1and option2.   1. Regarding concern 1: it is what we need to do, especially for multiplexing for different priority channel, regardless option 1and option 2. 2. Regarding concern 2: It is also an open issue for option 2 that multiple PUCCHs for HARQ-ACK is multiplexed. R16 intra prioritization does not include different priority channel multiplexing and it cannot be reused directly. |
| Apple | For Option 2, we can consider how to resolve overlapping of HP/LP PUCCH resource Zs to avoid iterative procedure in Step 1. |
| NEC | We prefer to down-select between Option 1 and 2, it is too restrictive to only support multiplexing for overlapped two channels with different priorities. |
| QC2 | Agree with CATT’s edition to make option 1 better.  Regarding Ericsson’s comment on option 1 need extra procedure handle multiplexing >1 HARQ-ACK codebooks on a PUSCH, it is true. But option 2 need extra procedure to handle this case too. For a same priority, Rel-16 does not support multiplex >1 HARQ-ACK codebooks with same priority on a PUSCH neither.  Regarding the timeline issue Intel brought up, we agree. Rel-15 timeline is already agreed, which apparently makes it more friendly to reuse Rel-15 framework to be complied with Rel-15 timeline. Regarding Ericsson’s suggestion to revisit Rel-17 timeline, we don’t agree to reopen the discussion.  Regarding Apple and Ericsson’s comment to fill in details of step 2 in option 2 to remove the recursive/iterative behavior, I’d like to see how. If the detailed procedure is just first multiplexing among PUCCHs with different priorities then multiplexing among PUCCH/PUSCH with different priorities, then the procedure for step 2 in option 2 is exactly the two steps in option 1. Then I will ask: WHY we need step 1 in option 2? Is it a preprocessing? Why we need such a preprocessing?  In short, procedure-wise, option 2 definitely is more complicated with some unnecessary steps which are not well justified. So we still prefer option 1. But like I said before, we could consider compromising to option 2, if companies can show how to avoid the recursive procedure. Unfortunately, we don’t see a reasonable solution addressing our concern yet. |
| Samsung2 | Regarding the timeline for Option 2, we think it is open for now. If Rel-15 timeline apply, we don’t see any issue here, all the channels that would be multiplexed in a same PUCCH/PUSCH need to satisfy the timeline.  Regarding the procedure steps of Option 2, it may have more steps than Option 1. It doesn’t mean Option 2 is more complicated than Option 1. For the 1st step for Option 1, as we clarified several times it doesn’t work if we put all the PUCCHs in a same set and run R15 pseudo code. Instead, we need to specify all the new cases that may incur in Rel-17, similar as Rel-15 defining UE’s behavior for all possible PUCCH overlapping cases. The spec impact is not acceptable.  Regarding QC’s comment “the procedure for step 2 in option 2 is exactly the two steps in option 1. WHY we need step 1 in option 2?”, although the steps seem to be the same, the details are different. Step 1 of Option 2 eases the collision handling of PUCCHs, after Step 1 of Option 2, we have following possible cases for LP PUCCH: case a) LP HARQ-ACK and/or CSI and/or SR, case b) LP CSI and/or SR. For LP CSI and/or SR (case b), Rel-16 prioritization applies. For LP HARQ-ACK and/or CSI and/or SR (case a), we need to define a new behavior, for example, 1st proposal in the 1st round discussion. LP CSI and/or SR, if any, is dropped if LP HARQ-ACK is multiplexed with HP HARQ-ACK. Compared with putting all PUCCHs in a same set Q and run the pseudo code, Option 2 is much easier to address the PUCCHs collision issue. We only need to specify how to handle the case where LP HARQ-ACK and/or CSI and/or SR collides with HP PUCCHs for Option 2. |
| Apple2 | To address QC’s question on Step 2, in our view, per L1 priority, the Set Q 🡪 PUCCH Z procedure is run. To avoid iterative processing, then the PUCCH resources Z from two priorities are multiplexed. And the PUCCH resource Z and subsequent “offsprings” at HP are the targeted for multiplexing, and handling of HP/LP UCI become more tractable. From this procedure, LP PUCCH resource Z either survives (not touched by any HP PUCCH) or is absorbed into a HP PUCCH or is discarded (e.g. the LP PUCCH resource Z carries P/SP CSI only). |

# Multiplexing UCIs of different priorities in a PUCCH

## Agreements in previous meetings

Agreements:

*Support multiplexing for following scenarios in R17:*

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

*For the above multiplexing scenarios,*

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

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

Agreements:

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

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

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

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

Agreements:

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

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

Agreements:

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

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

Working assumption:

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

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

Agreements:

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

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

Agreements:

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

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

Agreements:

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

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

Agreements:

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

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

Agreement:

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

* *For HP HARQ-ACK or LP HARQ-ACK of 1-2 bit(s), support separate coding. Down-select from the two options:*
  + *Option 1: Reuse R15 TS 38.212 Clause 5.3.3.1 for 1-bit. Reuse R15 TS 38.212 Clause 5.3.3.2 for 2-bit.*
  + *Option 2: Reuse R15 TS 38.212 Clause 5.3.3.3, i.e., padding to 3 bits and using RM coding.*
* *For HP HARQ-ACK or LP HARQ-ACK >2 bit(s), HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK are separately encoded according to R15 TS 38.212 Clause 5.3.3.3 or Clause 5.3.1.*
* *FFS rate matching equation and RE mapping rules for PF2/3/4. Rel-15 is baseline if available.*

Agreement:

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

* *Rel-15 design (for PF0 and PF1) is baseline.*
* *Note: Qualcomm has strong concern on above scheme. The scheme cannot provide unequal error protection between the HP bit and LP bit hence could suffer from performance degradation for the HP bit. Qualcomm accepts the scheme for the sake of progress in RAN 1 with the concern on the performance reserved.*

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

## Inputs from Tdocs

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

* **Encoder for HP HARQ-ACK or LP HARQ-ACK of 1-2 bit(s):**
  + Option 1: Reuse R15 TS 38.212 Clause 5.3.3.1 for 1-bit. Reuse R15 TS 38.212 Clause 5.3.3.2 for 2-bit.
    - HW, E///, Nokia, ZTE, vivo, QC, OPPO, Intel, DCM, Quectel
  + Option 2: Reuse R15 TS 38.212 Clause 5.3.3.3, i.e., padding to 3 bits and using RM coding.
    - Samsung, LGE, Spreadtrum, CATT
* **Rate matching** 
  + HP A/N reuses the rate matching equation of Rel-15 A/N+CSI-1. LP A/N reuses the rate matching equation of Rel-15 CSI-2.
    - HW, Nokia, ZTE, vivo, QC, Pana, CATT
  + Enhanced rate matching
    - OPPO, Quectel
* **RE mapping**
  + Reuse R15 TS 38.212 Sec. 6.3.1.6 for PUCCH format 3/4. Aggregate the coded HP HARQ-ACK bits and the coded LP HARQ-ACK bits and apply the procedures described in Sec. 6.3.2.5 of R15 TS 38.211 to the aggregated coded HARQ-ACK bit sequence.
    - Nokia, ZTE, Samsung, QC, CATT
  + Distributed RE mapping for HP UCI and LP UCI



* + - HW, LGE
* **CSI dropping or not:**
  + Option 1: Confirm WA: Drop CSI (including part 1 and part2, if exist) if CSI would multiplex on a PUCCH which has HP A/N.
    - Nokia, ZTE,vivo, QC, Quectel, Sony, Apple (for LP CSI)
  + Option 2: Drop CSI part 2 if CSI would multiplex on a PUCCH which has HP A/N.
    - LGE, DCM
* **Separate code rate configurations:**
  + Option 1: An additional maxCodeRate for LP HARQ-ACK can be configured in the second PUCCH-Config.
    - Samsung, vivo, QC, Intel, Sony, Leno/Moto, Spreadtrum, Quectel
  + Option 2: Reuse maxCodeRate in the first PUCCH-Config for LP HARQ-ACK.
    - HW, Nokia, ZTE, LGE, DCM
* **Enhanced power control:**
  + HW: Further study BPRE calculation
  + QC: Two open-loop power control P0 values are configured for multiplexing LP and HP UCI
  + OPPO: Enhance the determination of 
  + Apple
  + IDC: UE utilizes a normalized UCI payload size for calculating payload-dependent factor of PUCCH transmission power.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Proposals/observations from Tdocs |
| HW | ***Proposal 2: For PUCCH format 2, support 2 encoding chains for the case of HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK multiplexing.***   * ***Support separate code rates for HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK for PUCCH format 2.***   ***Proposal 3: For the encoders* *of LP and HP HARQ-ACK bits with more than 2 bits total payload***,   * ***HP HARQ-ACK can reuse the encoder and rate matching equation of Rel-15 HARQ-ACK+CSI part 1.*** * ***LP HARQ-ACK can reuse the encoder and rate matching equation of Rel-15 CSI part 2.*** * ***For the encoding method of HP HARQ-ACK or LP HARQ-ACK of 1-2 bit(s), support Option 1, i.e., 1 bit repetition code and 2 bits simplex code.***   ***Observation 1: It is feasible to consider enhanced RE mapping rule in Rel-17.***  ***Proposal 4: For multiplexing of HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK, the distributed mapping between HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK could be considered for PUCCH format 2.***  ***Proposal 5: The BPRE calculation can be further studied for the transmission power of multiplexed HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK.***  ***Proposal 6: The code rate configured in the first PUCCH-config should be reused for LP HARQ-ACK transmission under the case of HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK multiplexing.*** |
| E/// | [Proposal 9 For separate coding of HP or LP HARQ-ACK of 1-2 bits when multiplexed into a PUCCH, reuse R15 TS 38.212 Clause 5.3.3.1 for 1-bit. Reuse R15 TS 38.212 Clause 5.3.3.2 for 2-bit.](#_Toc79181289) |
| Nokia | **Proposal 3.4: For the scenario where a PUCCH carrying high-priority HARQ-ACK overlaps with another PUCCH carrying low-priority HARQ-ACK and the total payload size is two bits, the order of the multiplexed two bits could be [high-priority HARQ-ACK bit, low-priority HARQ-ACK bit].**  **Proposal 3.6: For the multiplexing of high-priority HARQ-ACK and low-priority HARQ-ACK where the high-priority or low-priority HARQ-ACK is 1-2 bits, adopt the following:**   * **In case HARQ-ACK is 1 bit: use the existing Rel-15 1-bit information encoding scheme in TS 38.212 Sec. 5.3.3.1 to encode this HARQ-ACK.** * **In case HARQ-ACK is 2 bits: use the existing Rel-15 2-bit information encoding scheme in TS 38.212 Sec. 5.3.3.2 to encode this HARQ-ACK.**   **Proposal 3.7: Confirm the RAN1#104bis-e Working Assumption to not support multiplexing of CSI (include part 1 and part 2, if any) and high-priority HARQ-ACK on PUCCH and thus to drop the CSI and prioritize the high-priority HARQ-ACK.**  **Proposal 3.8: For the multiplexing of high-priority HARQ-ACK and low-priority HARQ-ACK, reuse Rel-15 operation for two UCI parts to determine the rate matching output sequence length for each of the high-priority HARQ-ACK and low-priority HARQ-ACK.**  **Proposal 3.9: For the multiplexing of high-priority HARQ-ACK and low-priority HARQ-ACK resulting from the overlap between high-priority PUCCH resource and low-priority PUCCH resource:**   * **the maxCodeRate configured for the selected high-priority PUCCH resource for multiplexing should be used as maxCodeRate for the high-priority HARQ-ACK; and** * **the maxCodeRate configured for the low-priority PUCCH resource could be used as maxCodeRate for low-priority HARQ-ACK.**   + **If the low-priority PUCCH resource is with Format 0/1, use the maxCodeRate (for low-priority HARQ-ACK) associated to the low-priority PUCCH resource corresponding to a low-priority HARQ-ACK payload size of 3 bits.**   **Proposal 3.10: For the multiplexing of high-priority HARQ-ACK and low-priority HARQ-ACK on PUCCH Format 3/4, adopt the Rel-15 operation of ‘multiplexing of coded UCI bits to PUCCH’ given in TS 38.212 Sec. 6.3.1.6.**  **Proposal 3.11: For the multiplexing of high-priority HARQ-ACK and low-priority HARQ-ACK on PUCCH Format 2, adopt the following approach for mapping the separately coded bits to PUCCH:**   * **Aggregate the coded high-priority HARQ-ACK bits and the coded low-priority HARQ-ACK bits and apply the procedures described in Sec. 6.3.2.5 of TS 38.211 to this aggregated coded HARQ-ACK bit sequence.** |
| ZTE | ***Proposal 1:*** *For HP HARQ-ACK or LP HARQ-ACK of 1-2 bit(s), support separate coding and reuse R15 TS 38.212 Clause 5.3.3.1 for 1-bit, reuse R15 TS 38.212 Clause 5.3.3.2 for 2-bit.*  ***Proposal 2:*** *When the two UCIs with different priorities will be multiplexed on a PUCCH format 2/3/4 by separate coding, for a certain priority UCI,*   * *If the payload size is more than 2 but less than 12, RM code is performed.* * *If the payload is more than 11 bits, Polar coding is performed.*   ***Proposal 3:*** *For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH in R17, when the total number of LP and HP HARQ-ACK bits is more than 2, confirm the RAN1#104b-e meeting working assumption as:*   * *Drop LP CSI (including part 1 and part2, if exist) if the CSI would multiplex on the PUCCH.*   ***Proposal 4:*** *For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH in R17, when the total number of LP and HP HARQ-ACK bits is more than 2,*   * *Let HP A/N reuse the encoder, rate matching equation, and RE mapping rules in Rel-15 for A/N+CSI-1.* * *Let LP A/N reuse the encoder, rate matching equation, and mapping rules in Rel-15 for CSI-2.*   ***Proposal 5:*** *For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH in R17, when the total number of LP and HP HARQ-ACK bits is more than 2,*   * *Rel-15 can be the baseline for rate matching and RE mapping rules for PF3/4.* * *Coded bits of HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK are continuously mapped in the time-frequency resources for PF2.*   ***Proposal 6:*** *For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH in R17, when the total number of LP and HP HARQ-ACK bits is 2, R15 design is reused without power boosting.*  ***Proposal 7:*** *The maxCodeRate configuration in Rel-16 is reused for multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH in Rel-17.* |
| Samsung | **Proposal 3: Zeros are appended to the LP/HP HARQ-ACK information bits if the payload of LP/HP HARQ-ACK is 1 or 2 bits when multiplexing HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK in a PUCCH.**  **Proposal 4: For PRB determination and RE mapping when multiplexing HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK in a PUCCH**   * **Reuse Rel-15 rules of separate coding in a PUCCH format 3/4.** * **Drop LP HARQ-ACK if the PUCCH resource is with PUCCH format 2.**   **Proposal 5: RRC configures presence of a T-DAI field in a DL DCI format associated with HP HARQ-ACK to indicate the T-DAI of LP HARQ-ACK.**  **Proposal 6: When multiplexing HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK in a PUCCH:**   * **Reuse the *maxCodeRate* configured in the second *PUCCH-Config* for HP HARQ-ACK.** * **A separate *maxCodeRate* for LP HARQ-ACK is provided by the second *PUCCH-Config* per PUCCH format.** |
| vivo | ***Proposal 2: When the total number of LP and HP HARQ-ACK bits is more than 2, for HP HARQ-ACK or LP HARQ-ACK of 1-2 bit(s), option 1 is slightly preferred.***   * ***Option 1: Reuse R15 TS 38.212 Clause 5.3.3.1 for 1-bit. Reuse R15 TS 38.212 Clause 5.3.3.2 for 2-bit.***   ***Proposal 3: Confirm the working assumption that drop CSI (including part 1 and part2, if exist) if CSI would multiplex on a PUCCH which has HP A/N.***  ***Proposal 4: The following principle should be baseline for UCI multiplexing with different priorities***   * ***HP A/N reuse the encoder, rate matching equation, and RE mapping rules in Rel-15 for A/N+CSI-part 1.*** * ***LP A/N reuse the encoder, rate matching equation, and mapping rules in Rel-15 for CSI-part 2.***   ***Proposal 5: For both HP and LP A/N on PUCCH, two maximum code rates are configured for each PUCCH format corresponding to HP and LP HARQ-ACK, respectively.*** |
| Spreadtrum | 1. ***For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH, if HP HARQ-ACK or LP HARQ-ACK is of 1-2 bit(s), reuse R15 TS 38.212 Clause 5.3.3.3, i.e., padding to 3 bits and using RM coding.*** 2. ***For separate coding of the two HARQ-ACKs with HARQ-ACK bits being more than 2, the maxcoderate for HP and LP HARQ-ACK can be different.*** 3. ***The minimum PRB number for HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK can be separately determined based on Rel-15 rule by using the maxcoderate configured for HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK separately.*** |
| CATT | ***Proposal 3: For multiplexing of HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK on PUCCH when total number of bits is more than 2, padding to 3 bits and using RM coding for HP HARQ-ACK or LP HARQ-ACK of 1 or 2 bits.***  ***Proposal 4: For separate coding of HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK when multiplexing on a PUCCH resource with PUCCH format 3 or PUCCH format 4:***   * ***Let HP HARQ-ACK reuse the rate matching equation, and RE mapping rules in Rel-15 for A/N+CSI part 1;*** * ***Let LP HARQ-ACK reuse the rate matching equation, and mapping rules in Rel-15 for CSI part 2.***   ***Proposal 5: For separate coding of HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK when multiplexing on a PUCCH resource with PUCCH format 2, the encoded HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK are cascaded and mapping to PUCCH REs in increasing order of frequency domain followed by time domain.*** |
| QC | ***Proposal 1*: Confirm the working assumption in the following.**  **For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH in R17, when the total number of LP and HP HARQ-ACK bits is more than 2, support separate coding for the two HARQ-ACKs.**   * **FFS for HP HARQ-ACK or LP HARQ-ACK of 1-2 bit(s).** * **(working assumption) Drop CSI (including part 1 and part2, if exist) if CSI would multiplex on a PUCCH which has HP A/N.**   + **FFS Strive to let HP A/N reuse the encoder, rate matching equation, and RE mapping rules in Rel-15 for A/N+CSI-1.**   + **FFS Strive to let LP A/N reuse the encoder, rate matching equation, and mapping rules in Rel-15 for CSI-2.**   ***Proposal 2*: For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into PUCCH format 3 or format 4, when the total number of LP and HP HARQ-ACK bits is more than 2,**   * **With >2 bits HP A/N payload, HP A/N reuse the encoder, rate matching equation, and RE mapping rules in Rel-15 for A/N+CSI part 1. With <=2 bits HP A/N, HP A/N use repetition encoding (for 1 bit) or simplex encoding (for 2 bits), reuse rate matching equation, and RE mapping rules in Rel-15 for A/N+CSI part 1.** * **With >2 bits LP payload, LP A/N reuse the encoder, rate matching equation, and RE mapping rules in Rel-15 for CSI part 2. With <= 2 LP payload, LP A/N use repetition encoding (for 1 bit) or simplex encoding (for 2 bits), reuse rate matching equation, and RE mapping rules in Rel-15 for CSI part 2.** * **FFS: rate matching and RE mapping for HP and LP HARQ-ACK multiplexed on PUCCH format 2**   ***Proposal 3*: In NR Rel-17, for multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into PUCCH, when the total number of low priority (LP) and high priority (HP) HARQ-ACK bits is more than 2**   * **Support gNB to configure coding rates separately for HP and LP HARQ-ACK.** * **For a given priority, support gNB to configure multiple coding rates for HARQ-ACK based on the payload size.**   ***Proposal 7*: For HP UCI and LP UCI multiplexing on PUCCH format 2/3/4, support the following**   * **Two open-loop power control P0 values are configured for multiplexing LP and HP UCI** * **Two separate powers are computed for LP UCI and HP UCI (following TS 38.213 Section 7.2.1) based on the corresponding and BPRE for LP and HP UCI respectively, and based on the total number of RBs used to HP and LP UCI** * **The final PUCCH power is determined based on the max power of the HP and LP powers** |
| OPPO | ***Proposal 1: When the total LP HARQ-ACK and HP HARQ-ACK bits is more than 2 and one of HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK is not more than 2, option 1 is supported.***  ***Proposal 2: PUCCH format 2 can be used for multiplexing of HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK.***  ***Proposal 5: The rate matching output sequence lengths for HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK should be determined as follows***  ***Proposal 6:*** ***Except the determination of the number of PRBs for PUCCH transmission and the rate matching output sequence lengths for HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK, other Rel-15 procedures for multiplexing HARQ-ACK and CSI should be reused.***  ***Proposal 7: When multiple code rates are supported for different priorities in a PUCCH, the determination of***  ***to calculate the PUCCH transmission power should be enhanced.*** |
| LGE | **Proposal #1: Consider to apply RM coding with bit-padding for HP/LP HARQ-ACK of up to 2 bits (in case when the total number of LP and HP HARQ-ACK bits is more than 2), in order to minimize impacts to the specification as well as UE implementation.**  **Proposal #2: Consider the following UE behaviour for the multiplexing of CSI at least on PUCCH format 3/4.**   * **In case with HP HARQ-ACK and CSI (without LP HARQ-ACK), the HP HARQ-ACK and CSI part 1 can be separately encoded where CSI part 2 is dropped.** * **In case with HP HARQ-ACK, LP HARQ-ACK and CSI, the LP HARQ-ACK and CSI part 1 can be jointly encoded and the HP HARQ-ACK can be solely encoded where CSI part 2 is dropped.**   **Proposal #3: Consider to support separate encoding for HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK on PUCCH format 2.**   * **HP (coded) UCI is firstly mapped over distributed REs on the PUCCH resource (to guarantee the reliable HP UCI performance by achieving frequency diversity), then LP UCI is mapped to the remaining REs not occupied by the HP UCI.**   **Proposal #4: Consider the following aspects for the multiplexing of HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK on PUCCH format 0/1 with the total UCI payload size of 2 bits.**   * **HP UCI bit and LP UCI bit are mapped to MSB and LSB, respectively.** * **HP PUCCH format 0/1 resource is selected for the UCI multiplexing.**   **Proposal #10: Consider to reuse the existing maximum UCI coding rate (configured for LP UCI on LP PUCCH) for the LP UCI multiplexed on HP PUCCH.** |
| Intel | **Proposal 4: For HP HARQ-ACK or LP HARQ-ACK of 1-2 bit(s), support separate coding by reusing R15 TS 38.212 Clause 5.3.3.1 for 1-bit. Reuse R15 TS 38.212 Clause 5.3.3.2 for 2-bit.**  **Proposal 5: A pair of *maxCodeRate* values per PUCCH format canbe configured to UE for UCI multiplexing of different priorities into PUCCH.**  **Proposal 6: At least PUCCH format 3 and 4 are supported for LP and HP HARQ-ACK multiplexing**   * **FFS: PUCCH format 2** |
| Apple | **Proposal 5-1: considering coding rates of UCI parts in the PRB number adjustment/interlace number adjustment.**  **Proposal 5-2: The condition to trigger PRB number adjustment is given by**    **And the stop condition for PRB number adjustment is as follows:**    **Proposal 6-1: Consider different coding rates for UCI parts in UCI omission rule.**  **Proposal 6-2: With two UCI parts, the omission rule is as follows:**  **the following conditions are used for UCI omission:**    **If all UCI part II is dropped, then the the following is examined to determine remaining UCIs in UCI part I:**  **.**  **Proposal 9-1: leverage the Rel-15 design, LP HARQ-ACK is mapped to UCI Part II in separate encoding, adopt the UCI mapping in Figures 9-6a/9-6b.**  **Proposal 9-2:**  **Consider for PUCCH format 2 to support multiplexing of HP UCI(s) and LP UCI(s):**  **generating two encoded sequences for HP-ACK (with r1) and LP-ACK (with r2) separately and then concatenating those two encoded sequences into one encoded sequence, UCI mapping is not changed for PUCCH Format 2.**  **Proposal 13: For PUCCH formats 2/3/4, the delta factor is determined from UCI part 1:**   * **The number of resource elements for UCI part 1 where is the number of coded bits for UCI part 1** * **If is smaller or equal to 11,**   + **If a HARQ-ACK codebook with bits is included in UCI part 1,  is used instead of for the HARQ-ACK codebook:**   + **If more than one HARQ-ACK codebooks are included in UCI part 1 (e.g. one due to SPS HARQ deferral, another for HARQ feedback for dynamic grant PDSCH(s)), then replacement of the number of HARQ-ACK codebook size by the associated can be applied to each HARQ-ACK codebook.** * **otherwise**   + **where**      - **and** * **And = is applied to both UCI parts.** |
| Pana | **Proposal 1: For multiplexing a HP HARQ-ACK and a LP HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH, when the total number of LP and HP HARQ-ACK bits are more than 2 bits, rate matching equation in Rel.15/16 is baseline.**  **Proposal 3: A single *maxCodeRate* is configured per PUCCH format for HP + LP HARQ-ACK multiplexing.** |
| IDC | ***Proposal 8: The UE utilizes a normalized UCI payload size for calculating payload-dependent factor of PUCCH transmission power.*** |
| Sony | **Proposal 1: Confirm the following working assumption:**  **For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH in R17, when the total number of LP and HP HARQ-ACK bits is more than 2, support separate coding for the two HARQ-ACKs.**   * **Drop CSI (including part 1 and part2, if present) if CSI would multiplex on a PUCCH which has HP A/N.**   **Proposal 2: Separate *maxCodeRate* is configured for HP and LP UCIs.**  **Proposal 3: Encoded UCI symbols for HP UCI are mapped to earlier OFDM symbols of the PUCCH whilst those for LP UCI are mapped to later OFDM symbols.** |
| Quectel | **Proposal 1**: Confirm the working assumption that CSI (including part 1 and part2, if exist) is dropped if CSI would multiplex on a PUCCH which has HP A/N.  **Proposal 2**: Option 1 is supported, i.e., repetition coding or simplex coding is adopted for HP HARQ-ACK or LP HARQ-ACK of 1-2 bit(s) when the total number of HP or LP HARQ-ACK bits multiplexed on the PUCCH is larger than 2.  **Proposal 3**: Placeholder bits “y” are introduced for the scrambling of PUCCH.  **Proposal 4**: Rate matching output sequence lengths respectively for HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK are computed based on a coding rate  configured by the *PUCCH-config* containing the PUCCH resource of the HP HARQ-ACK when the total number of HP or LP HARQ-ACK bits multiplexed on the PUCCH is larger than 2.  **Proposal 5**: A set of candidate values dedicated for HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK rate matching is supported when HP and LP HARQ-ACK bits are multiplexed on a PUCCH and the total number of HP and LP HARQ-ACK bits is larger than 2. |
| NEC | ***Proposal 1:***  *Support multiplexing of two Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebooks of different priorities on a PUCCH in Rel-17 as follows:*   * *Firstly, UE constructs the high-priority Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook based on K1 set of high-priority HARQ-ACK as Rel-16, and constructs low-priority Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook based on K1’ set obtained by removing values in the intersection of the two separate HARQ-ACK timing K1 sets of two Type-1 CBs from the K1 set of low-priority HARQ-ACK.* * *Then, UE pastes the two HARQ-ACK codebooks together as a multiplexed HARQ-ACK codebook.* |
| FGI/APT | Proposal 4 For multiplexing LP HARQ-ACK and HP HARQ-ACK on a PUCCH format 0, HARQ-ACK values to CS indices mapping with unequal distance between mapped CS indices should be supported. |
| DCM | **Proposal 1:**   * *CSI part 2 is dropped if CSI would multiplex on a PUCCH which has HARQ-ACK information in case the total number of LP and HP HARQ-ACK bits is more than 2.*   **Proposal 2:**   * *Option 1 is slightly preferable considering the potential overhead of padding for the separate coding method of 1-2 HARQ-ACK bit(s).*   + *Option 1: Reuse R15 TS 38.212 Clause 5.3.3.1 for 1-bit. Reuse R15 TS 38.212 Clause 5.3.3.2 for 2-bit.*   **Proposal 4:**   * *For separate coding, a scaling factor can be introduced for HP and LP UCI coding rate determination.* |
| Leno/Moto | * **Proposal 4:** Support indicating two values of *maxCodeRate*, a first value for HP UCI and a second value for LP UCI in a PUCCH configuration corresponding to a high priority index, in order to support different coding rates for HP UCI and LP UCI that are multiplexed in a PUCCH. |
| WILUS | * ***Proposal 1****. To determine a code rate for LP HARQ-ACK for multiplexing, consider the following two options.*   + *Option 1. Additional code rate for LP HARQ-ACK in a HP PUCCH format is configured by RRC.*   + *Option 2. Code rate configured in LP PUCCH format is reused.* * ***Proposal 2:*** *Further discuss whether/how to multiplex HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK in a PUCCH resource if the second PUCCH-Config contains only the first PUCCH resource (for 1- or 2-bit HARQ-ACK information).* * ***Proposal 3:*** *For PUCCH format 3/4,*    + *To maximize reliability of HP HARQ-ACK, the mapping rule of PUCCH format 3/4 in Rel-15 can be reused., i.e., the HP HARQ-ACK is mapped to adjacent symbols to DMRS symbols.*   + *To minimize latency of HP HARQ-ACK, the HP HARQ-ACK can be mapped to earlier symbols.* * ***Proposal 4:*** *For PUCCH format 2,*   + *Support PUCCH format 2 to multiplex LP HARQ-ACK and HP HARQ-ACK*   + *To maximize a reliability of HP HARQ-ACK, the HP HARQ-ACK is distributed to REs across RBs as much as possible.* * ***Proposal 6:*** *To multiplex HP-SR with PF0 and LP HARQ-ACK with PF0, we propose*   + *If HP-SR is negative, then transmit LP HARQ-ACK on HARQ-ACK resource.*     - *In case of 1-bit LP HARQ-ACK, use 2 CSs, i.e., {0, 6} CS index*     - *In case of 2-bit LP HARQ-ACK, use 4 CSs, i.e., {0, 3, 6, 9} CS index*   + *If HP-SR is positive, then transmit LP HARQ-ACK and HP-SR on HARQ-ACK resource*     - *In case of 1-bit LP HARQ-ACK, use 2 CSs, i.e., {3, 9} CS index*     - *In case of 2-bit LP HARQ-ACK, use 4 CSs, i.e., {1, 4, 7, 11} CS index*        * *To enhance HP-SR reliability, 2-bit LP HARQ-ACK can be bundled to 1-bit and then the 1-bit bundled LP HARQ-ACK is treated as 1-bit LP HARQ-ACK, i.e., use 2 CSs, {3, 9} CS index .* |

## 1st round discussion

Proposal for 1st round discussion:

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

* For HP HARQ-ACK or LP HARQ-ACK of 1-2 bit(s), support separate coding, and reuse R15 TS 38.212 Clause 5.3.3.1 for 1-bit. Reuse R15 TS 38.212 Clause 5.3.3.2 for 2-bit.
* Support: Quectel, Pana, Leno/Moto, Apple, OPPO, DCM, QC, Spreadtrum, vivo, Nokia, ZTE, Intel, Huawei (also fine with Option 2)
* Not support (support Option 2): CATT, LGE, Samsung

Proposal for 1st round discussion:

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

* HP A/N reuses rate matching equation, and RE mapping rules in Rel-15 for A/N+CSI-1.
* LP A/N reuses rate matching equation, and RE mapping rules in Rel-15 for CSI-2.

Proposal for 1st round discussion:

For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH in R17, an additional maxCodeRate for LP HARQ-ACK can be configured in the second PUCCH-Config per PUCCH format.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| CATT | 1. For repetition coding or simplex coding, placeholder bits are used and the placeholder bits are not scrambled by the scrambling bit sequence to maintain the maximized Euclidean distance. The scrambling design for PUCCH in current specification does not take the placeholder bits into account. Therefore, we prefer padding to 3 bits and using RM coding to avoid modification of the scrambling design for PUCCH. We would like to clarify whether the proponents of the 1st proposal propose to modify the scrambling design for PUCCH to take the placeholder bits into account as for PUSCH. 2. We support the 2nd proposal. 3. For the 3rd proposal, we would like to better understand the necessity and benefit of introducing new RRC configuration. |
| Quectel | 1st Proposal, support, for reasons: 1) Performance gains as shown by simulation results in R1-2104329; 2) lower overhead; 3) more flexible to control effective coding rate hence smaller specification impact (the scrambling for PUSCH could be directly reused for PUCCH).  2nd Proposal, support;  3rd Proposal, we are generally OK for this proposal, but we think this should be discussed in Section 3.4.2. In our understanding, the additional maxCodeRate is not used for HP and LP rate matching and RE mapping. The second Proposal effectively implies that a single code rate is used for HP and LP rate matching and RE mapping (that is the case in Rel-15). The single code rate should be the one configured for HP HARQ-ACK in the second PUCCH-Config.  We suggest to discuss this proposal in Section 3.4.2 and replace it with a new 3rd proposal as below:  Proposal for 1st round discussion:  For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH in R17, a single maxCodeRate configured in the second PUCCH-Config is used to calculate rate matching output sequence lengths, i.e.,  for HP HARQ-ACK and  for LP HARQ-ACK   * FFS whether Rel-16  is reused. |
| Panasonic | We support the above three proposals.  On the third proposal, we think maxCodeRate will be used for PRB determination of PUCCH, and therefore it would be merit to have controllable parameter (i.e., additional maxCodeRate) for multiplexing case. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Fine with the 1st proposal. |
| Apple | Fine with the first proposal. |
| OPPO | Fine with 1st and 2nd proposal. |
| DOCOMO | Fine with the 1st proposal. |
| QC | Support the first proposal. |
| Spreadtrum | Fine with 1st and 2nd proposal. |
| vivo | Support the first proposal. |
| LG | On the first proposal, we have similar view with CATT.  To avoid/minimize the impact on implementation/specification, RM code with simple bit-padding is preferred. |
| Nokia, NSB | Support the first proposal.  2nd and 3rd proposal already agreed during Mon GTW session. |
| Sony | We support the 3rd proposal and share similar views with Panasonic that the additional maxCodeRate gives the gNB control on the number of PRBs used in the multiplexed PUCCH. |
| Samsung | We don’t support the 1st proposal for the following reasons.   * Larger spec impact compared with option 2 (Reuse R15 TS 38.212 Clause 5.3.3.3, i.e., padding to 3 bits and using RM coding), the proposal will impact PUCCH scrambling. In Rel-15/16, there is no special design for 1 or 2 bits for PUCCH scrambling. To support this new feature, new scrambling needs to also be introduced for PUCCH. * Larger gNB/UE implementation complexity, new scrambling and coding schemes needs to be implemented for PUCCH. * RM coding in option 2 may have larger channel coding gain.   We suggest the following proposal  For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH in R17, when the total number of LP and HP HARQ-ACK bits is more than 2,   * Reuse R15 TS 38.212 Clause 5.3.3.3, i.e., padding to 3 bits and using RM coding. |
| ZTE | We support the first proposal.  The second proposal and third proposal have been agreed with some changes in Monday GTW discussion. |
| Intel | Support first proposal |
| Huawei | **For the 1st proposal**, Option 1 (repetition/simplex code) is beneficial on coding performance, while Option 2 (padding to 3 bits) is beneficial on simple implementation. We are generally fine for both.  **For the 2nd and the 3rd proposal**, we are supportive. |
| NEC | Support the second proposal |

## 2nd round discussion

Targeting to first determining the coding chain for the following case, companies are encouraged to provide analysis on pros and cons (**from standards as well as implementation perspective**) of the following options. Some companies’ comments in the 1st round have been captured in the table. Please confirm and complete them.

For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH in R17, when the total number of LP and HP HARQ-ACK bits is more than 2, for HP HARQ-ACK or LP HARQ-ACK of 1-2 bit(s), support separate coding, and

* Option 1: Reuse R15 TS 38.212 Clause 5.3.3.1 for 1-bit. Reuse R15 TS 38.212 Clause 5.3.3.2 for 2-bit.
* Option 2: Reuse R15 TS 38.212 Clause 5.3.3.3, i.e., padding to 3 bits and using RM coding.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Pros and cons of Option 1 | Pros and cons of Option 2 |
| CATT | For repetition coding or simplex coding, placeholder bits are used and special handling is performed for the placeholder bits to maintain the maximized Euclidean distance. The scrambling design for PUCCH in current specification does not take the placeholder bits into account. Therefore, we prefer padding to 3 bits and using RM coding to avoid modification of the scrambling design for PUCCH. |  |
| Quectel | Reason for select Option 1: 1) Performance gains as shown by simulation results in R1-2104329; 2) lower overhead; 3) more flexible to control effective coding rate hence smaller specification impact (the scrambling for PUSCH could be directly reused for PUCCH). | 1/3 or 2/3 overhead for padding based RM coding is not acceptable especially considering 1 or 2 bit HARQ-ACK are very typical cases. |
| Samsung | * Larger spec impact compared with option 2 (Reuse R15 TS 38.212 Clause 5.3.3.3, i.e., padding to 3 bits and using RM coding), the proposal will impact PUCCH scrambling. In Rel-15/16, there is no special design for 1 or 2 bits for PUCCH scrambling. To support this new feature, new scrambling needs to also be introduced for PUCCH. * Larger gNB/UE implementation complexity, new scrambling and coding schemes needs to be implemented for PUCCH. | RM coding in option 2 may have larger channel coding gain. |
| Intel | Lower overhead and seemingly less spec efforts needed for Option 1 |  |
| Huawei | Pros: Better coding performance  Cons: Changing on the scrambling for PUCCH |  |
| Nokia, NSB | We share other companies views on the pros and cons of Option 1. | Option 2 increases the overhead. |
| OPPO | Pros: Lower overhead  Cons: Spec impact from scrambling for PUCCH | Pros: More reliable from RM coding  Cons: Spec impact on determination of rate matching output sequence length.  Larger overhead, i.e. the number of encoded bits is not smaller than 32. |
| ZTE |  | Cons: Performance is worse than simple repetition coding (simulation result shown in R1-2104329). Also un-equal protection for the 2bits is observed for padding. |
| LG | Option 1 causes larger specification impacts as well as additional impacts to UE/gNB implementation on PUCCH (as CATT and Samsung mentioned in above). | Option 2 could keep current specification and same UE/gNB implementation on PUCCH as before by simple bit-padding. |
| Sharp | Lower overhead, and minimum spec impact by reusing existing methods. | Increased overhead. |
| QC | Option 1 is simple and have the optimal performance. For 1 bit payload, repetition code is the optimal code. For 2 bits payload, simplex code is the optimal code.  Repetition code and simplex code already implemented in Rel-15 for UCI on PUSCH, there is nearly zero spec impact to apply them for UCI on PUCCH. | Increased overhead by padding dummy bit.  66% or 33% percent of power are waisted to transmit the useless dummy bit, which causes performance degradation. |
| DOCOMO | Pros: lower overhead  Cons: spec impact on scrambling for PUCCH | Pros: could be less spec impact; only simple bit padding needs to be defined  Cons: increases in overhead |
| ITRI | Pros: Lower overhead and better performance.  Cons: Spec. impact on scrambling design | Cons: Increases overhead. |
| Ericsson |  | Option 2  Considering the impact to scrambling of PUCCH formats, Option 2 is preferred. This avoids the spec impact and implementation impact of Option 1. |
|  |  |  |

The pros and cons of the two options are listed below.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Pros | Cons |
| Option 1 | * For 1 bit payload, repetition code is the optimal code. For 2 bits payload, simplex code is the optimal code. Performance gains as shown by simulation results in R1-2104329. * Lower overhead. * Repetition code and simplex code already implemented in Rel-15 for UCI on PUSCH, there is nearly zero spec impact to apply them for UCI on PUCCH. * More flexible to control effective coding rate hence smaller specification impact (the scrambling for PUSCH could be directly reused for PUCCH). | * For repetition coding or simplex coding, placeholder bits are used and special handling is performed for the placeholder bits to maintain the maximized Euclidean distance. The scrambling design for PUCCH in current specification does not take the placeholder bits into account. * Larger gNB/UE implementation complexity, new scrambling and coding schemes needs to be implemented for PUCCH. |
| Option 2 | * RM coding in option 2 may have larger channel coding gain. * Avoid modification of the scrambling design for PUCCH. | * 1/3 or 2/3 overhead for padding based RM coding is not acceptable especially considering 1 or 2 bit HARQ-ACK are very typical cases. The number of encoded bits is not smaller than 32. * Spec impact on determination of rate matching output sequence length. * Un-equal protection for the 2bits is observed for padding. |

Proposal after 2nd round discussion:

For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH in R17, when the total number of LP and HP HARQ-ACK bits is more than 2, for HP HARQ-ACK or LP HARQ-ACK of 1-2 bit(s), support separate coding, and

* Option 1: Reuse R15 TS 38.212 Clause 5.3.3.1 for 1-bit. Reuse R15 TS 38.212 Clause 5.3.3.2 for 2-bit.
  + Reuse R15 scrambling for PUSCH as baseline.
  + Quectel, Intel, HW, Nokia, OPPO, ZTE, Sharp, QC, DCM, ITRI
* Option 2: Reuse R15 TS 38.212 Clause 5.3.3.3, i.e., padding to 3 bits and using RM coding.
  + CATT, Samsung, E///, LG

## 3rd round discussion

Void.

## 4th round discussion

Proposal for 4th round discussion:

For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH in R17, when the total number of LP and HP HARQ-ACK bits is more than 2, for HP HARQ-ACK or LP HARQ-ACK of 1-2 bit(s), support separate coding, and

* Reuse R15 TS 38.212 Clause 5.3.3.1 for 1-bit. Reuse R15 TS 38.212 Clause 5.3.3.2 for 2-bit.
  + Reuse R15 scrambling for PUSCH as baseline. FFS details.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| InterDigital | Support |
| QC | Support |
| Samsung | NOT support.  We don’t want to repeat our arguments in previous reply. In additional, we would like to clarify a bit regarding the overhead mentioned by a few companies.  The padding bits are not dummy bits in our understanding. For example, 1 bit after RM coding is either all 1s or all 0s, it is the same as option 1. But option 1 doesn’t have scrambling gain, for option 2, the repeated bits are scrambled.  The padding bits are known to gNB, gNB can use the information to help decoding.  We cannot agree with the 1/3 or 2/3 overhead cons.  Regarding Oppo’s comments on 32 encoded bits, the RE number is determined based on the UCI information before encoding instead of 32 encoded bits.  [OPPO] Due to the output of RM encoding is not smaller than 32 bits, so output bit number of RM encoding is the maximum value between UCI bit number/configured code rate and 32.  Regarding Oppo’s another comment “Spec impact on determination of rate matching output sequence length. ”, could you clarify a bit more ?  [OPPO] Current rate matching output sequence length is determined by UCI bit number and configured code rate only. As mentioned above, if RM coding is applied, the rate matching output sequence length should be the maximum value between UCI bit number/configured code rate and 32.  In addition, we would like to point out that Option 2 is beneficial for DCI protection in case of Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook. If the last DCI is missed, the size of HARQ-ACK remains the same if the actual size of HARQ-ACK codebook is no larger than 3 bits. |
| Sharp | Support |
| Huawei | As mentioned in the 1st round, we are fine to both Option 1 (repetition/simplex code) and Option 2 (padding and RM coding). In addition, we acknowledge that Option 2 would have smaller challenge on implementation regarding the placeholder issue and the resulting complexity on scrambling raised by some companies. |
| Quectel | Support the proposal. The argument that padding to 3 bits can provide better protection from DCI mis-detection is not valid for HP HARQ-ACK. For LP HARQ-ACK, we can resort to solutions in Section 3.4 to resolve the ambiguity. Up to 1 dB performance degradation is observed by padding based RM for 2-bit HP HARQ-ACK (R1-2104329) and even larger performance degradation is expected for 1-bit HP HARQ-ACK. |
| CATT | We are fine with the proposal for the sake of progress although we preferred RM coding for smaller specification impact. |
| Panasonic | We support the proposal. |
| vivo | support |
| ITRI | Support the proposal. |
| LG | Not supportive to the proposal.  We largely agree with Samsung and Huawei in terms of overhead aspect and the concern on impacts to UE implementation/specification. Nevertheless, if the bit-padding is considered as overhead, we can consider to apply RM code without the bit-padding. Even by doing so, it sufficiently provides the benefits to avoid the impacts to UE implementation/specification. |
| DOCOMO | Support |
| Ericsson | Do not support.  We are also puzzled by the claim of large performance degradation if using zero padding + RM code. For example, if 1-bit HARQ-ACK, two zeros are padded to make 3-bit input, and value of the two padded bits are known to receiver. Thus the (32,3) RM code is reduced to (32,1) repetition code. Clause 5.3.3.1 also uses repetition code for 1-bit input. Only difference is scrambling. But as several companies pointed out, it’s not worth the complexity to add new scrambling procedure to PUSCH.  Also: we do not see the point to debate individual combinations like this one, if the framework question (e.g., section 2.7) is not resolved. |
| Nokia, NSB | Support  Although we have a slight preference towards Option 1, we could also be fine with / would not object to Option 2 (i.e. padding). |
| ZTE | Support.  For the example in Ericsson’s comment, I hesitate the same analysis can apply to the 2-bit case. The performance gain on 2 bits with Clause 5.3.3.2 coding is valid.  Furthermore, the coding scheme in Clause 5.3.3.2 doesn’t have the issue of scrambling. If I remember correctly, the placeholder doesn’t affect the Qm=1 or 2 when number of information bits = 2, and our discussion is only on BPSK or QPSK modulation for PUCCH, right? |
| Intel | Support |
| OPPO | Support  We add our response on comments from Samsung in line. |
| Apple | From discussion provided by Samsung and Ericsson, it seems Option 2 is better. |
| QC2 | Fully agree with ZTE comment that with QPSK or BPSK on PUCCH, the placeholder bits do not exist thus there is NO scrambling issue for using repetition code or simplex code. |
| Samsung2 | We don’t agree with Quectel on “DCI mis-detection is not valid for HP HARQ-ACK”, at least for HP CG PUSCH, DCI missing can happen for HP HARQ-ACK.  Also, we don’t agree with Quectel on “even larger performance degradation is expected for 1-bit HP HARQ-ACK.”, as Ericsson and we have explained, for the 1 bit case, the encoded bits for option 1 is repetition, but for option 2 repetition with scrambling. Option 2 should have better performance.  Regarding scrambling, for 1 bit case, it exists according to the spec below.   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Table 5.3.3.1-1: Encoding of 1-bit information   |  |  | | --- | --- | |  | Encoded bits | | 1 |  | | 2 |  | |   Regarding oppo’s reply, we don’t agree, the rate matching output sequence length doesn’t depend on the RM encoded bit length (i.e., 32).   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Table 6.3.1.4.1-1: Rate matching output sequence length   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | UCI(s) for transmission on a PUCCH | UCI for encoding | Value of | | HARQ-ACK | HARQ-ACK |  | | HARQ-ACK, SR | HARQ-ACK, SR |  | | CSI  (CSI not of two parts) | CSI |  | | HARQ-ACK, CSI  (CSI not of two parts) | HARQ-ACK, CSI |  | | HARQ-ACK, SR, CSI  (CSI not of two parts) | HARQ-ACK, SR, CSI |  | | CSI  (CSI of two parts) | CSI part 1 |  | | CSI part 2 |  | | HARQ-ACK, CSI  (CSI of two parts) | HARQ-ACK, CSI part 1 |  | | CSI part 2 |  | | HARQ-ACK, SR, CSI  (CSI of two parts) | HARQ-ACK, SR, CSI part 1 |  | | CSI part 2 |  | | |
| ZTE2 | To echo Ericsson and Samsung’s proposal, a new simulation result is provide for the 1bit HARQ information case. This is the comparison between option 1 and option 2. Yellow cure is option 1, blue/red/purple is for option 2. Blue and Red is the result from decoding as RM(32,3) and Purple is the result from decoding as RM(32, 1) which is as Ericsson said the padding bits is known and information is stable for decoding. The interesting thing is the yellow overlaps with the purple, it means for 1 bit case, option 1 and option 2 have the same performance, and the scrambling of option 2 doesn’t help anything. It is encouraged for companies to repeat and confirm the simulation.    For 2 bits case, we update the simulation result. Although we can decode the RM(32,3) as RM(32,2) with similar way as above, but the 0.5dB performance gap is still observed between option 1(yellow) and option 2(green, sorry for the typo in green notation, it should be with 2 bit decoding). I guess the performance gap is due to the stable coding distance of option 1 with 21, but flexible coding distance between 16 and 32 for option 2. Also for option 1 here, there is no issue about the interaction between scrambling and placeholder, as no placeholder for PUCCH transmission when Qm=1 or 2.    Technically, the cons and pros are clear for option 1 and option 2, an acceptable compromise may be considered: option 2 for 1 bit case, and option 1 for 2bits case. |

## Multiplexing enable/disable mechanism

## Inputs from Tdocs

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

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Proposals/observations from Tdocs |
| Huawei | ***Proposal 1: Adopt RRC configuration to enable/disable the multiplexing of HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK on PUCCH, and the multiplexing of HARQ-ACK on PUSCH with different priorities.***   * ***Additional conditions shall be specified to further guarantee the latency/reliability of the HP HARQ-ACK for the overlapping case.*** |
| E/// | [Proposal 4 In case of overlapping between PUCCH and/or PUSCH resources in a slot with different priorities, dynamically enabling or disabling UCI multiplexing on PUCCH or PUSCH is supported.](#_Toc79181281) |
| Nokia | **Proposal 3.1: The gNB dynamically indicates, via an explicit field in the DCI scheduling high-priority HARQ-ACK, whether multiplexing of high-priority HARQ-ACK and low-priority HARQ-ACK (or more generally low-priority multiplexed UCIs) is enabled or disabled.**  **Proposal 3.5: For the scenario where a PUCCH carrying high-priority HARQ-ACK overlaps with another PUCCH carrying low-priority HARQ-ACK: If the high-priority HARQ-ACK does not have a corresponding PDCCH, the multiplexing is not supported.** |
| ZTE | ***Proposal 8****: For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH in R17, support DCI+RRC configuration for gNB to enable/disable the multiplexing when DCI is applied.*   * *For SPS HARQ-ACK, the enable/disable scheme falls back to RRC configuration.*   ***Proposal 9****: The indicator of intra-UE multiplexing UCI with different priorities should be carried on the scheduling DCI or RRC parameter for the high priority transmission.* |
| vivo | ***Proposal 16: Dynamic indication of intra-UE multiplexing and prioritization manner can be supported in Rel-17.***  ***Proposal 17: For dynamic indication, multiplexing or prioritization indication field can be included in DCI for HP or LP or both HP and LP service.*** |
| Samsung | **Proposal 1: Support multiplexing UCI of different priorities subject to timeline conditions and RRC configuration and/or dynamic indication from gNB.**  **Proposal 2: The UCI types with first priority that can be multiplexed on a PUCCH/PUSCH of a second priority are configurable by the network.** |
| Spreadtrum | 1. ***For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH, support RRC configuration to enable/disable the multiplexing as a baseline. RRC+DCI-based enabling/disabling method can be considered as an optional feature.*** |
| CATT | ***Proposal 11: Semi-static RRC configuration to enable/disable the multiplexing between channels with different priorities is supported.*** |
| QC | ***Proposal 20:* The Rel-17 intra-UE multiplexing feature is enabled/disabled via RRC configuration on per UE basis.** |
| LGE | **Proposal #8: Consider RRC configuration for the mechanism to enable/disable the multiplexing of HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK on PUCCH or the multiplexing of HARQ-ACK on PUSCH with different priority, with consideration of potential UE complexity and UCI/PUSCH reliability.** |
| Intel | **Proposal 9: DCI triggering HARQ-ACK may include an indication for enabling or disabling multiplexing.**   * **The indication may be applicable to both HARQ-ACK/HARQ-ACK and HARQ-ACK/SR multiplexing.** |
| FGI/APT | Proposal 3 Dynamic indication is supported for indicating whether to multiplex overlapping high priority PUCCH and low priority PUCCH. |
| China Telecom | **Proposal 1: For multiplexing UCI/PUSCH with different priorities on PUCCH or PUSCH in R17, support RRC configuration to enable/disable the multiplexing at least.** |
| Pana | **Proposal 7:**   * **For multiplexing a HP HARQ-ACK and a LP HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH in Rel.17, the multiplexing is RRC configured.**   + **Dynamic indication for enabling should also be supported.** |
| Sony | **Proposal 7: The gNB dynamically enables/disables multiplexing in an HP PUCCH by an indication in the DL Grant scheduling the HP PUCCH.**  **Proposal 8: When a HP PUCCH scheduled by multiple DL Grants overlap with LP HARQ-ACKs, the decision to multiplex the HP & LP HARQ-ACKs is determined by the indicator in the last DL Grant scheduling the HP PUCCH.** |
| Quectel | **Proposal 9**: Dynamic enabling/disabling by DCI for HARQ-ACK multiplexing on PUCCH with different priorities is supported on top of RRC configuration. |
| TCL | **Proposal 1: Support explicit indication to enable multiplexing procedure between HP UCI and LP UCI via RRC configuration.** |
| IDC | ***Proposal 2: DCI indicating HP HARQ-ACK also indicates if UE multiplexes HP HARQ-ACK with LP HARQ-ACK.***  ***Proposal 3: RRC configuration of SPS with HP HARQ-ACK includes an indication of whether the UE can multiplex HP HARQ-ACK with LP HARQ-ACK.***  ***Proposal 4: RRC configuration of a HP SR resource includes an indication of whether the UE can multiplex HP SR with LP HARQ-ACK.*** |
| Sharp | **Proposal 2: Multiplexing of UCI of different priorities on PUCCH, and different scenarios of UCI multiplexing on PUSCH can be separately enabled/disabled by RRC configuration.** |
| DOCOMO | **Proposal 7:**   * *RRC configuration should be baseline for enabling/disabling multiplexing of LP and HP PUCCH* |
| MTK | Proposal 1: Dynamic indication of the multiplexing activation/de-activation is not supported.   1. Guard gap timeline of the new multiplexed PUCCH is of the earliest PUCCH. |
| ETRI | **Proposal 1: The scheduling DL-DCI has an additional field whether or not to allow multiplex HP UCI and LP UCI, or otherwise by the RRC signalling.**  **Proposal 7: The scheduling UL-DCI has an additional field whether or not to allow multiplex HP UCI and LP UCI, or otherwise by the RRC signalling.** |

## 1st round discussion

Proposal for 1st round discussion:

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

* FFS whether or not to additionally introduce DCI indication to enable/disable the multiplexing.
* FFS: Interaction between the enable/disable mechanism and other multiplexing conditions
* FFS for other types of UCI.
* Support: CATT, Quectel, Pana, Leno/Moto, Apple, OPPO, IDC, DCM, QC, TCL, Spreadtrum, vivo, LGE, Huawei, NEC
* Not support (RRC+DCI): Nokia, Sony, Samsung, ZTE, Ericsson

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| CATT | Support the proposal. |
| Quectel | We can accept this proposal for the sake of progress, although our first preference is to agree the DCI indication together with RRC. |
| Panasonic | We are fine with the proposal. In addition, we prefer to introduce dynamic enabling/disabling the multiplexing via explicit indication. This can avoid additionally introducing mechanism for multiplexing such as reliability and/or latency requirement. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Fine with the proposal. |
| Apple | Fine with the proposal. |
| OPPO | Fine with proposal |
| InterDigital | We would prefer to agree on DCI indication at the same time but can accept for sake of progress. |
| DOCOMO | Fine with the proposal. |
| QC | Support the proposal |
| TCL | Support the proposal. |
| Spreadtrum | Fine with the proposal. |
| vivo | There seems no company object the RRC configuration option, we prefer to focus on the issue of whether to additionally support DCI indication. DCI indication can significantly simplify the multiplexing conditions and provide flexibility for gNB. Otherwise, it would be too complex to specify the multiplexing conditions considering that there are only two PHY priorities but various latency and reliability requirements, such as:   * There may be no need to specify bundling / compression of low-priority HARQ-ACK information as the enabling/disabling of multiplexing could be dynamically indicated. If the combined payload size would become too large and thereby too much impacting the reliability or latency of the high-priority information, the gNB would simply dynamically disable the multiplexing.   When DCI indication is used, there is no need to define an extensive set of rules when multiplexing should be possible as this could be left to gNB implementation simplifying the specification effort. |
| LG | Fine with the proposal. |
| Nokia, NSB | Not support.  Instead of toggling the proposals of the two alternatives from GTW session to GTW session as during RAN1#105-e, we suggest the moderator to bring both options to the GTW session and there try to down-select. As the support for both alternatives is rather even, may be the better choice than having the proposal on a single alternative not accepted (again).  We agree on the RRC aspect (as it would be anyhow needed) but not without the DCI indication. In the following, we reiterate our view on the importance of introducing DCI indication for dynamically enabling/disabling multiplexing.  **Without such dynamic support, the reliability and latency requirements cannot be guaranteed. Otherwise, we would need to define a set of complicated rules/conditions for the UE to decide whether mux is OK or not in such a way that the latency and reliability requirements are not impacted. In addition to the complexity that this would bring, this will require a large specification effort and thus should be really avoided (as we don’t have the luxury of time).**  Finally, when the high-priority HARQ-ACK does not have a corresponding PDCCH (i.e. SPS case), multiplexing of high-priority HARQ-ACK bits with low-priority HARQ-ACK bits should not be supported. |
| Sony | RRC configuration to enable multiplexing is required even for DCI indication since there will be a need for RRC configuration of that DCI indicator.  The DCI indicator is a simple mechanism and gives full control for the gNB to manage multiplexing of UCIs. As vivo mentioned, it also avoids having to define complicated rules to determine whether the UE needs to multiplex or not and thereby avoid high specs impact. |
| Samsung | We consider RRC-based indication to be insufficient and also support indication by DCI to:  (a) enable the network to control the impact LP UCI has on the reception of HP UCI/data and, as importantly,  (b) help avoid having to specify some corner cases that can be handled by the NW disabling the multiplexing. |
| ZTE | Not support. The RRC based enabling and disabling is common sense, but we want more progress to support DCI based indication additionally. At least, spec should support making choice between ‘RRC-only’ and ‘RRC+DCI’. |
| Huawei | Support. The RRC configuration is a simple and unified solution for handling the HP&LP multiplexing for both dynamic HARQ-ACK and semi-static UCI or HARQ-ACK triggered by fallback DCI. |
| Ericsson | Dynamic signaling is necessary so that gNB can flexibly control the multiplexing. |
| NEC | Support the proposal. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

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

## Inputs from Tdocs

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

* Option 1: Use a PUCCH resource in the second *PUCCH-Config* (the *PUCCH-config* containing the PUCCH resource of the HP HARQ-ACK).
  + Nokia, ZTE, Intel, Pana, IDC, Leno/Moto, Quectel, Sharp, ETRI

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

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

* Option 1: UCI payload size = the number of HP UCI bits + the number of LP UCI bits
  + ZTE, Samsung, LGE, Intel, Sony, Quectel
* Option 2: UCI payload size = the number of HP UCI bits + the number of LP UCI bits \* scaling factor.
  + vivo, Apple, DCM, Pana, IDC, FGI/APT, ETRI, Quectel

**PRB number determination**

* HW: For HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK multiplexing on PUCCH format 2/3, the minimum PRB numbers for HP and LP are separately determined based on their coding rates, respectively.
* Pana: Determination of the number of PRBs does not depend on the number of LP HARQ-ACK bits.
* CATT: The number of RBs for multiplexing HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK on a PUCCH format 2 and 3 is determined as following:
  + *If , the number of RBs is determined as ;*
  + *Otherwise, the number of RBs is determined as the minimum number of , satisfying .*

**The problem of ambiguity on LP HARQ-ACK existence or LP HARQ-ACK type-2 codebook size due to DCI mis-detection and the candidate options:**

* Option 1: Configure a dedicated PUCCH resource for HP+LP in the second *PUCCH-Config*
  + HW, vivo, Pana
* Option 2: PRI+x in the HP DCI is used to implicitly determine an extended PUCCH resource
  + ZTE
* Option 3a: The LP type 2 codebook size is quantized/rounded up to a nearest reference size. FFS reference size granularity.
  + QC, Intel (in combination with Option 4), Quectel
* Option 3b: Configuration of semi-static size reservation for LP HARQ-ACK payload is provided by RRC. LP HARQ-ACK semi-static size reservation is used instead of determined LP HARQ-ACK codebook size when selecting the PUCCH resource set.
  + Nokia (1st preference), LGE, DCM, China Telecom, FGI/APT, CATT (FFS whether it is semi-static), Quectel
* Option 4: Additional DCI field in DCI corresponding HP HARQ-ACK or HP PUSCH for determining the number of LP HARQ-ACK bits multiplexed on PUCCH/PUSCH.
  + Nokia (2nd preference), LGE, Intel (in combination with Option 3a), FGI/APT, CATT, InterDigital
* Option 5: Provide indication on at least the number of RBs and/or PUCCH resource set index to be used in the PUCCH transmission, where the indication is included in the high-priority DL assignment.
  + Nokia (2nd preference), China Telecom, FGI/APT

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

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

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

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

* Option 1: LP HARQ-ACK is compressed/bundled/compaction.
  + QC, OPPO, Apple, TCL, MTK, WILUS
* Option 2: LP HARQ-ACK is dropped.
  + HW
* Option 3: LP HARQ-ACK is partially dropped.
  + Intel, TCL
* Option 4: Transmit LP HARQ-ACK with higher code rate than configured.
  + HW
* Option 5: Further check possible multiplexing in the next sub-slot.
  + Leno/Moto

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Proposals/observations from Tdocs |
| Huawei | ***Proposal 7: For HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK multiplexing on PUCCH format 2/3, the minimum PRB numbers for HP and LP are separately determined based on their coding rates, respectively.***   * ***In case the remaining rate matching resources cannot guarantee the LP configured code rate, drop all LP HARQ-ACKs or transmit LP HARQ-ACK with higher code rate than configured.***   ***Observation 2: Ambiguity on the existence of LP HARQ-ACK should be the target case that needs to be resolved by specification***.  ***Proposal 8: Support a group of dedicated PUCCH sets in the second PUCCH-Configuration to carry the multiplexed HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK.*** |
| Nokia | **Proposal 3.2: For the scenario where a PUCCH carrying 1-bit high-priority HARQ-ACK overlaps with another PUCCH carrying 1-bit low-priority HARQ-ACK, the multiplexing of high-priority HARQ-ACK and low-priority HARQ-ACK is done on the high-priority PUCCH resource.**  **Proposal 3.3: Dedicated PUCCH resource configuration for multiplexing of high- and low-priority HARQ-ACK is not supported.**  **Proposal 3.4: For the scenario where a PUCCH carrying high-priority HARQ-ACK overlaps with another PUCCH carrying low-priority HARQ-ACK and the total payload size is two bits, the order of the multiplexed two bits could be [high-priority HARQ-ACK bit, low-priority HARQ-ACK bit].**  **Proposal 3.5: For the scenario where a PUCCH carrying high-priority HARQ-ACK overlaps with another PUCCH carrying low-priority HARQ-ACK: If the high-priority HARQ-ACK does not have a corresponding PDCCH, the multiplexing is not supported.**  **Proposal 3.12: Further discuss the selection of PUCCH resource set and the number of RBs for the multiplexing of high-priority HARQ-ACK and low-priority HARQ-ACK.**  ***Observation 3.1: Errors in low-priority HARQ-ACK codebook size determination may cause selection of different PUCCH resource set or use of smaller number of RBs for the multiplexed high-priority and low-priority HARQ-ACKs feedback than what gNB would expect.***  **Proposal 3.13: To avoid discrepancy between the UE and the gNB on the determination of PUCCH resource set and number of RBs for UCI containing multiplexed high-priority and low-priority HARQ-ACKs, support Option 3b:**   * **Option 3b: Configuration of semi-static size reservation for low-priority HARQ-ACK payload is provided by RRC.**   **Otherwise, as a second preference, support either Option 4 or Option 5:**   * **Option 4: The indication and determination are defined by combining dynamic indication for enabling/disabling low-priority HARQ-ACK multiplexing and for low-priority HARQ-ACK codebook size.** * **Option 5: The indication and determination are defining the number of RBs and/or PUCCH resource set index to be used in the PUCCH transmission, where the indication is included in the high-priority DL assignment.**   ***Observation 3.2: In principle, multiplexing could be supported for all four possible combinations of high-priority HARQ-ACK overlapping with low-priority HARQ-ACK considering Type-1 and Type-2 codebooks. If there would be a need to prioritize some cases for the discussions, the cases involving same HARQ-ACK codebook type (Type-1/Type-2) could be discussed first. The case corresponding to multiplexing high-priority Type-1 HARQ-ACK and low-priority Type-2 HARQ-ACK could also be of interest.*** |
| ZTE | ***Proposal 10****: For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH in R17, use a PUCCH resource in the second PUCCH-Config (the PUCCH-config containing the PUCCH resource of the HP HARQ-ACK) in case the total number of LP and HP HARQ-ACK bits is 2.*  ***Proposal 11****: For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH in R17, UCI payload size for PUCCH resource determination is determined as the total number of HP UCI bits + LP UCI bits*  ***Proposal 12：****For the case that the total number of bits is no more than 2 bits, the PRI+x in the HP DCI is used to implicitly determine an extended PUCCH resource from the same PUCCH set in the PUCCH-config with high priority for the multiplexed UCI.*  *- x is predefined, e.g., x=1.* |
| Samsung | **Proposal 7: A UE determines a PUCCH resource set for multiplexing LP/HP HARQ-ACK in a PUCCH as in Rel-16 based on the total number of LP/HP HARQ-ACK bits (Option 1).** |
| vivo | ***Proposal 6: A scaling factor to determine a target reference UCI payload size should be considered for PUCCH resource set selection due to the different code rates for HP and LP UCI. The scaling factor can be a function of code rate for HP and LP UCI.***  ***Proposal 11：For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH in R17, option 1 are preferred***   * ***Option 1: Configure a dedicated PUCCH resource for HP+LP in the second PUCCH-Config*** |
| CATT | ***Proposal 10: The following two options can be considered to avoid the impact on HP HARQ-ACK(s) due to missing DCIs corresponding to LP HARQ-ACK codebook.***   * ***Option 1: Define a reference number of bits for LP HARQ-ACK codebook*** * ***Option 2: Indicate information for determine the number of LP HARQ-ACK bits by DCI corresponding to HP HARQ-ACK***   ***Proposal 14: An additional UL DAI bit field can be considered to be added in the UL DCI for multiplexing PUCCH and PUSCH with different priorities.*** |
| QC | ***Proposal 4*: For HP UCI and LP HARQ-ACK (in type 2 codebook) multiplexing on a PUCCH, round up LP HARQ-ACK size to a nearest reference size, in the calculation of total number of RBs for HP and LP UCI.**  ***Proposal 5*: For HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK multiplexing on a PUCCH, the PUCCH resource set is determined based on a weighted sum of the LP and HP HARQ-ACK payload size**  **where**   * **is the payload size of the HP HARQ-ACK** * **is a reference payload size for the LP HARQ-ACK, which is obtained by round up the LP HARQ-ACK size to a nearest reference size as in Proposal 6** * **is a weight factor** * **FFS: how to signal/determine the weigh factor .**   ***Proposal 16:* In Rel-17 UCI multiplexing, support low priority HARQ-ACK compression.**   * **FFS conditions to trigger low priority HARQ-ACK compression** * **FFS details of compression scheme.** |
| OPPO | ***Proposal 3: The number of PRBs used to transmit HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK should result to:***  , and  ***Proposal 4: If , the UE transmits the PUCCH over  PRBs. LP HARQ-ACK should be compressed into bits that satisfy:***  , and  ***Proposal 8: If a PUCCH carrying HP dynamic HARQ-ACK overlaps with a PUCCH carrying LP HARQ-ACK, a PUCCH resource in the PUCCH resource set configured for HP dynamic HARQ-ACK is used to transmit HP dynamic HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK.***  ***Proposal 9: If a PUCCH carrying HP SPS HARQ-ACK overlaps with a PUCCH carrying LP HARQ-ACK, multiplexing of HP SPS HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK is not supported.***  ***Proposal 16: When the total number of HP HARQ-ACK/SR and LP HARQ-ACK exceeds the capacity of the multiplexing PUCCH,***   * ***If CBG-based HARQ-ACK, HARQ-ACK bundling across multiple CBGs of one TB is firstly used for LP HARQ-ACK;*** * ***For TB-based HARQ-ACK, HARQ-ACK bundling across multiple PDSCHs on one serving cell can be used for LP HARQ-ACK.*** * ***If after time-domain TB-based HARQ-ACK bundling, the number of bundled bits is still more than , LP HARQ-ACK can be dropped.*** |
| LGE | **Proposal #11: Consider to determine HP PUCCH resource set based on the total UCI payload size of HP UCI and LP UCI as done so far.**  **Proposal #12: Consider the following to determine a PUCCH resource in the HP PUCCH resource set selected based on total UCI payload size.**   * **In case when at least one HP DL DCI is received by the UE, the PUCCH resource corresponding to the PRI indicated in the last HP DCI is selected.** * **In case when LP DL DCI is only received by the UE, the PUCCH resource corresponding to the PRI indicated in the last LP DCI is selected.**   **Proposal #13: Consider how to generate the HARQ-ACK payload per each of LP and HP for the multiplexing of LP/HP HARQ-ACK on PUCCH (or PUSCH), according to HARQ-ACK codebook type (e.g. Type-1/2/3 codebook).**  **Proposal #18: Consider the following aspect by taking potential missing of the DCI corresponding to HP HARQ-ACK by the UE into account.**   * **The reserved REs corresponding to 2-bit HARQ-ACK on PUSCH are to be generated based on the beta offset configured for HP HARQ-ACK and to be mapped even on LP PUSCH as well as HP PUSCH, even in case when there is no HP HARQ-ACK from UE perspective.** |
| Intel | **Proposal 3: For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH in R17, in case the total number of LP and HP HARQ-ACK bits is 2:**  **Use a PUCCH resource in the second PUCCH-Config (the PUCCH-config containing the PUCCH resource of the HP HARQ-ACK).**  **Proposal 7: For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH in R17, support the following for determining the UCI payload size for PUCCH resource determination:**  **UCI payload size = the number of HP UCI bits + the number of LP UCI bits** |
| Apple | **Proposal 6-1: Consider different coding rates for UCI parts in UCI omission rule.**  **Proposal 6-2: With two UCI parts, the omission rule is as follows:**  **The following conditions are used for UCI omission:**    **If all UCI part II is dropped, then the the following is examined to determine remaining UCIs in UCI part I:**  **.**  **Proposal 7-1:**  **when HP CSI is present, only the following UCIs are carried in UCI part I and part II:**  **HP HARQ-ACK > HP SR > (HP CSI) > LP HARQ-ACK > (LP SR)**  **When HP CSI is absent, only the following UCIs are carried UCI part I and part II**  **HP HARQ-ACK > HP SR > LP HARQ-ACK > (LP SR) > LP CSI**  **Proposal 8-1: consider joint PUCCH resource set selection and PUCCH resource selection.**  **Proposal 8-2: if joint PUCCH resource set selection and PUCCH resource selection is supported, and are configured per PUCCH format or per PUCCH resource.**  **Proposal 10-1: consider PRB # adjustment and CSI omission/HARQ compaction for the PUCCH resource under multi-CSI-PUCCH-ResourceList and pucch-CSI-ResourceList.** |
| China Telecom | **Proposal 3: Support option 3b configuring by RRC semi-static size reservation for LP HARQ-ACK payload or option 5 indicating the PUCCH resource set index by DCI for PUCCH resource set determination.**  **Proposal 4: To deal with ambiguity on LP HARQ-ACK existence,**   * **for 1-bit LP HARQ-ACK and 1-bit HP HARQ-ACK multiplexed in PF0, CS=0, 3, 6, 9 is mapped to (HP HARQ-ACK, LP HARQ-ACK)=(NACK, NACK), (NACK, ACK), (ACK, NACK), (ACK,ACK);** * **for 1-bit LP HARQ-ACK and 1-bit HP HARQ-ACK multiplexed in PF1, (HP HARQ-ACK, LP HARQ-ACK) is QPSK modulated using .** * **for the multiplexing of LP HARQ-ACK and HP HARQ-ACK with larger than 2 total bits, reserved PUCCH resource for HP LP multiplexing in the second PUCCH-Config is considered.** |
| Sony | **Proposal 4: The UCI payload size used for PUCCH Resource Set selection is the number of HP UCI bits + the number of LP UCI bits (i.e. Option 1).**  **Proposal 5: Do not consider options that increases PUCCH resources or introduce additional PUCCH resources to solve the CB size misalignment between gNB and UE for multiplexing HARQ-ACKs of different L1 priorities into Type 2 HARQ-ACK CB.**  **Proposal 6: For multiplexing HARQ-ACKs of different L1 priorities into a Type 2 HARQ-ACK CB, the gNB indicates the DAI value of the last DL Grant associated with the LP HARQ-ACKs in a HP DL Grant when multiplexing these HARQ-ACKs of different L1 priorities into the Type 2 HARQ-ACK CB.** |
| Pana | **Proposal 2: Determination of the number of PRBs does not depend on the number of LP HARQ-ACK bits.**  **Proposal 4: In case the total number of LP and HP HARQ-ACK bits is 2, use a PUCCH resource in the second PUCCH-Config (the PUCCH-config containing the PUCCH resource of the HP HARQ-ACK)**  **Proposal 5: In case the total number of LP and HP HARQ-ACK bits is more than 2, dedicated PUCCH resource is configured for multiplexing of HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK.**  **Proposal 6: UCI payload size for PUCCH resource determination is the number of HP UCI bits + the number of LP UCI bits \* scaling factor.** |
| Quectel | **Proposal 6**: A PUCCH resource in the second *PUCCH-Config* (i.e., the *PUCCH-config* containing the PUCCH resource of the HP HARQ-ACK) is used for multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK in case the total number of LP and HP HARQ-ACK bits is 2. FFS enhancements to ensure the reliability of HP HARQ-ACK.  **Proposal 7**: **Alt 1** (i.e., LP HARQ-ACK is used as HP UCI) or **Alt 2** (i.e., an equivalent UCI bit size for HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK) is considered for the PUCCH resource determination in case the total number of LP and HP HARQ-ACK bits multiplexed on a PUCCH is larger than 2.  **Proposal 8**: A reference LP type 2 HARQ-ACK codebook size is used for PUCCH resource set determination and/or PUCCH resource determination. How to determine the reference size is FFS. |
| TCL | **Proposal 2: If the total UCI bits exceed the payload of the multiplexed PUCCH resource, partially dropped low priority UCI and/or compressed/bundled low-priority HARQ-ACK should be supported.** |
| ETRI | **Proposal 2: The LP DCI determines the final PUCCH resource in at least for the HP SPS case.**  **Proposal 3: Multiplex HP UCI, and check to multiplex each LP UCI at earliest order.**  **Proposal 4: Further study how to adjust the power of PUCCH for payload from the other priority.** |
| FGI/APT | **Proposal 2 Further consider the following options to resolve the issue of DCI miss detection.**  **- Option 3b: Configuration of semi-static size reservation for LP HARQ-ACK payload is provided by RRC. LP HARQ-ACK semi-static size reservation is used instead of determined LP HARQ-ACK codebook size when selecting the PUCCH resource set.**  **- Option 4: Additional DCI field in DCI corresponding HP HARQ-ACK or HP PUSCH for determining the number of LP HARQ-ACK bits multiplexed on PUCCH/PUSCH.**  **- Option 5: Provide indication on at least the number of RBs and/or PUCCH resource set index to be used in the PUCCH transmission, where the indication is included in the high-priority DL assignment.** |
| LGE | **Proposal #7: Consider the partial dropping for LP HARQ-ACK according to HARQ-ACK codebook type for the case of exceeding the maximum UCI coding rate on PUCCH.**  **Proposal #8: Discuss and decide at least the following details for PUCCH resource determination based on the agreed HP PUCCH configuration.**   * **How to select one of multiple HP PUCCH resource sets** * **How to determine a PUCCH resource in the selected HP PUCCH resource set**   **Proposal #9: Consider how to generate the HARQ-ACK payload per each of LP and HP for the multiplexing of LP/HP HARQ-ACK on PUCCH (or PUSCH), according to HARQ-ACK codebook type (e.g. Type-1/2/3 codebook).** |
| IDC | ***Proposal 5: DCI indicating HP HARQ-ACK also indicates the PUCCH resource for multiplexing HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK.***  ***Proposal 6: The PUCCH resource for multiplexing HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK is from the PUCCH configuration for HP HARQ-ACK (for any total number of LP and HP bits).***  ***Proposal 7: The UE determines PUCCH resource set based on a normalized UCI payload size calculated as the sum of the number of high priority bits and the scaled number of low priority bits.***  ***Proposal 9: DCI indicating HP HARQ-ACK includes an indication of the DAI of LP HARQ-ACK.*** |
| ETRI | **Proposal 5: The Option 1 (resource in the second PUCCH-Config) is preferred.**  **Proposal 6: The Option2 (considering a scaling factor for UCI size) is considered.** |
| Sharp | **Proposal 3: For multiplexing a HP HARQ-ACK and a LP HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH with separate coding,**   * **Code rate for HARQ-ACK with different priorities are determined based on existing or additional maxCoderate parameters, or separate scaling factor configurations.** * **A HP PUCCH resource is selected based on a derived effective payload.** |
| DOCOMO | **Proposal 3:**   * *For the problem of ambiguity on LP HARQ-ACK existence or LP HARQ-ACK type 2 codebook size due to DCI miss-detection, support Option 3b.*   + *Option 3b:* *Configuration of semi-static size reservation for LP HARQ-ACK payload is provided by RRC. LP HARQ-ACK semi-static size reservation is used instead of determined LP HARQ-ACK codebook size when selecting the PUCCH resource set.*   **Proposal 5:**   * *For separate coding, an effective UCI payload size is introduced for PUCCH resource selection and PRB determination procedure, where is determined by HP UCI payload size, LP UCI payload size, HP UCI coding rate for multiplexing, LP UCI coding rate for multiplexing, and also additional CRC bits introduced by separate coding.*   **Proposal 6:**   * *For PRB determination for separate coding, introduce the following procedure:*   + *If ,*      - *PRB number is determined as the minimum number of , satisfying ;*   + *Otherwise,*      - *PRB number is determined as .* |
| MTK | Group-bundling is supported when multiplexing and when the resulted UCI payload is large. |
| Leno/Moto | * **Proposal 1:** A PUCCH resource for multiplexing UCI of mixed priorities including HARQ-ACK is selected from a PUCCH resource set configured by the second PUCCH-Config, based on:   + a last DCI format indicating a higher priority index, or   + a last DCI format if no DCI format indicating a higher priority index is detected, or   + a PUCCH resource configured for UCI of mixed priorities for a given UCI size range, when there is no corresponding DCI format. * **Proposal 5:** UE determines whether to multiplex LP HARQ-ACK with HP UCI in a PUCCH resource of PUCCH format 2, 3, or 4 of higher priority index, based on the total UCI payload size and configured max. code rate/max PRB parameters. |
| WILUS | ***Proposal 5:*** *If the required # of RBs for low-priority HARQ-ACK information exceeds the limit of PUCCH formats, then bundle the low-priority HARQ-ACK information. Detail bundling rules should be further discussed in Rel-17 URLLC/IIoT WI.* |

## 1st round discussion

Proposal for 1st round discussion:

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

* Use a PUCCH resource in the second *PUCCH-Config* (the *PUCCH-config* containing the PUCCH resource of the HP HARQ-ACK).
* Support: Quectel, Pana, Leno/Moto, OPPO, IDC, DCM, QC, TCL, vivo, LGE, Sony, Samsung, ZTE, Intel, Huawei, Ericsson, NEC

Proposal for 1st round discussion:

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

* UCI payload size = the number of HP UCI bits + the number of LP UCI bits
* Support: CATT, Quectel, Pana, Leno/Moto, OPPO, Spreadtrum, LGE, Sony, Samsung, ZTE, Intel, Huawei, Ericsson, NEC
* Not support (Support Option 2: UCI payload size = the number of HP UCI bits + the number of LP UCI bits \* scaling factor): Apple, IDC, DCM, QC, vivo, Nokia

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| CATT | Given that we have already agreed that the 2 bits are treated as HP HARQ-ACK, is the first proposal still needed?  We support the 2nd proposal. |
| Quectel | 1st Proposal: support  2nd Proposal: We are generally fine with this proposal. We want to clarify that “PUCCH resource determination” includes both PUCCH resource set determination and PUCCH PRB determination. |
| Panasonic | We support the 1st proposal.  On 2nd proposal, we are fine with the proposal assuming *maxCodeRate* is separately configured for HP and LP HARQ-ACK. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Fine with both proposals. |
| Apple | We don’t support Proposal 2: as LP HARQ-ACK and HP HARQ-ACK are protected with different coding rates as agreed this morning, it is reasonable to reflect that in PUCCH resource determination. |
| OPPO | Fine with both proposals. |
| InterDigital | OK with 1st proposal  Not OK with 2nd proposal for the same reason as Apple. |
| DOCOMO | For the 1st proposal, we support it but we don’t think it is needed since it was agreed that the 2bits are treated as high priority at the last meeting.  For the 2nd proposal, we don’t support it. A scaling factor, which can be determined by coding rates of LP and HP HARQ-ACK, should be considered for UCI payload size determination as the amount of required resource is different for different coding rates. |
| QC | We are fine with the 1st proposal.  We don’t support the second proposal, based on the same review as Apple mentioned. We suggest FL list two options and let RAN1 to discuss and choose between the two options. |
| TCL | Fine with both proposals. |
| Spreadtrum | Fine with both proposals. |
| vivo | For the 1st proposal, support  For the 2nd proposal, not support. when HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK are multiplexed on a PUCCH, different code rates are used. The PUCCH resource determination should be determined based on effective payload rather than actual payload. |
| LG | Fine with both proposals. |
| Nokia, NSB | Support the first proposal in principle. We are not sure why the proposal suggests using “**a** PUCCH resource …”. In our view, it’s clear that the PUCCH resource corresponding to HP HARQ-ACK should be used for the multiplexing in this case. We thus propose the following updates:  Proposal for 1st round discussion:  For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH in R17, in case the total number of LP and HP HARQ-ACK bits is 2:   * Use the ~~a~~ PUCCH resource in the second *PUCCH-Config* (the *PUCCH-config* containing the PUCCH resource of the HP HARQ-ACK).   On the second proposal, we slightly prefer using the effective UCI payload size (i.e. Option 2 from the last meeting). It should be noted that this proposal may be related to the discussions on how to avoid discrepancy between the UE and gNB regarding the LP HARQ-ACK payload size. |
| Sony | Fine with both proposals.  Comments on scaling factor in Proposal 2 as suggested by some companies, it should be noted that the number of PRBs (i.e. determination of PUCCH resources) is determined **AFTER** the UCI is encoded **NOT BEFORE**, where encoding (as it names suggest) takes into account the coding rates. Hence it isn’t clear why we need to change the existing method since the existing method WILL TAKE the coding rate into account when decoding the LP & HP UCIs. |
| Samsung | Support both proposals. |
| ZTE | Fine with both proposals. |
| Intel | Support both proposals |
| Huawei | **For the 1st proposal**, we are fine with it.  **For the 2nd proposal**, we are OK with it. The step of determining the UCI payload size is used to select the PUCCH resource set and will not impact the accuracy of the final PRB number. |
| Ericsson | Support both proposals |
| NEC | Support both proposals. |
|  |  |

## 2nd round discussion

Companies are encouraged to provide reasons and problems (**from standards as well as implementation perspective**) of the Option 2 below. Some companies’ comments in the 1st round have been captured in the table. Please confirm and complete them.

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

* Option 2: UCI payload size = the number of HP UCI bits + the number of LP UCI bits \* scaling factor

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Reason for Option 2 | Problems of Option 2 |
| Apple | As LP HARQ-ACK and HP HARQ-ACK are protected with different coding rates as agreed, it is reasonable to reflect that in PUCCH resource determination. (we support Option 2, it seems the column title is not accurate )  Following the Rel-15 design, the PUCCH determination is according to the required payload size. For Rel-17, we should do the same. |  |
| DCM | We agree with Nokia that the payload size discussed here is for determination of PUCCH resource set. A scaling factor, which can be determined by coding rates of LP and HP HARQ-ACK, should be considered for UCI payload size determination as appropriate PUCCH resource set is different for different coding rates. Without a scaling factor for LP, PUCCH resource set for larger UCI payload size would be chosen in some cases, which should be avoided. |  |
| vivo | When HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK are multiplexed on a PUCCH, different code rates are used. The PUCCH resource determination should be determined based on effective payload rather than actual payload. |  |
| Sony | The existing encoding procedure (i.e. Option 1) will take the coding rate into account.  Less specs impact as we don’t have to go through the trouble of defining a set of suitable scaling factors and then another set of discussion on how to signal them. | It should be noted that the number of PRBs (i.e. determination of PUCCH resources) is determined **AFTER** the UCI is encoded **NOT BEFORE**, where encoding (as it names suggest) takes into account the coding rates. Hence it isn’t clear why we need to change the existing method since the existing method WILL TAKE the coding rate into account when decoding the LP & HP UCIs.  Putting a scaling factor on the raw UCI bits may lead to “***double applying”*** the coding rate since we ***artificially*** inflate (or deflate depending on the scaling factor) the raw UCI bits prior to the encoding process. Option 2 also leads to extra specs impact of having to define a scaling factor, which doesn’t really serve any purpose. |
| Intel | Option 1 follows from Rel15 procedure, require less specification efforts and it can work. Recent agreement on separate maxcoderate configuration for LP HARQ-ACK facilitates different level of protection for PRB allocations for LP and HP HARQ-ACKs. It is not necessary to reflect that for payload determination. Option 1 is preferrable since it at least makes sure that the determined PUCCH resource could support the total payload, and then number of RBs are determined based on payload and separately configured maxcoderates. | The arguments on taking into account different code rates for determining total payload is not clear. Actual code rate is determined after UCI encoding and more importantly, with Option 2, it seems it does not necessarily guarantee overall payload is supported by the determined PUCCH resource. Moreover, scaling factor would need to be RRC configured and/or dynamically indicated and it is not clear how it can be based on or related to actual code rates. This certainly requires more spec efforts. |
| Panasonic | Option 1 has less specification impact. | The motivation of to introduce scaling factor is to count for different coding rate for HP and LP HARQ-ACK. Since it was agreed that separate maxCodeRate is configured for HP and LP HARQ-ACK for multiplexing, Option 1 is sufficient. |
| Nokia, NSB | In contrast to Option 1, Option 2 considers the effective total UCI payload size for the PUCCH resource set determination. For Option 2, the scaling factor should simply be the ratio between the corresponding maxcoderates.  To our understanding, the total UCI payload size being discussed here is for determining the PUCCH resource set and not for determining the number of RBs. |  |
| OPPO |  | Before determining PUCCH resource, we can not get the coding rate for HP UCI and LP UCI, in other words, the scaling factor can not be determined before PUCCH resource is determined.  If a new parameter for scaling factor is introduced, how to align scaling factor with various coding rate ratio for HP UCI and LP UCI of different PUCCH resource/format? |
| ZTE |  | Firstly, we confirm that the total UCI payload size being discussed here is for determining the PUCCH resource set and not for determining the number of RBs  We share the same view from Sony and OPPO on the cons of option 2.  Option 2 with scaling factor can be regarded as an optimization solution but may bring more issues and spec cost is very large. We suggest to adopt the simple way, i.e., option 1 |
| LG | Option 1 doesn’t have any problem in terms of UL resource efficiency since the number of RBs in PUCCH actually used by the UE would be determined based on the number of coded bits for LP UCI, not based on the number of information bits before encoding (as Sony and Intel mentioned in above). | Option 2 would require additional handling on some cases.  For example, in case when HP payload is 1 bit and LP payload is L bits where L > 1, if the scaled LP payload becomes smaller than 1, then which PUCCH resource set is selected? |
| Sharp |  | Since HP UCI and LP UCI are configured with different maxCoderates on a HP PUCCH resource, the maximum payload that can be carried on the HP PUCCH can be different for HP UCI and LP UCI.  The payload range configured for HP PUCCH should be an equivalent payload for HP UCI. Thus, a scaling factor over the payload of LP UCI can represent the equivalent payload for HP UCI using the same number of RB/RE resources. |
| InterDigital | Using a non-scaled payload for LP bits will result in UE unnecessarily picking resources within the set reserved for higher payload. While this will not result in using excessive number of RBs (since this is adjusted in subsequent step), this will result in overuse of the higher payload sets. If this was not a problem, then there would be no reason to support multiple PUCCH resource sets in the first place. |  |
| QC | Same comment as Nokia, the total UCI payload size being discussed here is for determining the **PUCCH resource** **set,** not for determining number of RBs. Yes, for the # RBs selection, different maxcoding rates for HP and LP were already agreed and should be used to determine # RBs. But for the resource set selection, shouldn’t we do the same by taking account different coding rate for HP and LP? Otherwise, a wrong resource set may be selected. Hope this can clarify some confusion/concern that Intel/LG and other companies had. |  |
| ITRI | Since we have agree to have separate *maxCodeRate* for HP and LP HARQ-ACK, option 1 is sufficient for determining the PUCCH resource by using the Rel-15 scheme. |  |
| Ericsson |  | We don’t see the need of applying a scaling factor. As stated in the proposal, the payload size is for PUCCH resource determination. The agreed, separate maxCodeRate allows adjustment of PRBs to reflect the different levels of reliability requirement. |
| FGI/APT | Option 1 does not consider the difference of code rates of HP UCI and LP UCI, which may result in choosing a resource set that eventually causes the LP UCI being dropped. |  |
| NEC | Option 1 can reuse legacy rule for PUCCH resource set determination. | Option 2 will increase the signaling overhead and have large specification impact. In addition, it is not necessary to introduce a scaling factor, as point out by other companies, the total UCI payload is used to determine PUCCH resource set rather than the actual PRBs of PUCCH resource, it will not result in a waste of resources. |
| Quectel | We understand that the discussion here is to come up with a unified solution on the total UCI payload size for both PUCCH resource set determination and PUCCH PRB determination. Is that FL’s intention?  We think both of these two options could work once there is a common understanding between gNB and UE on the number of LP HARQ-ACK bits used for resource determination (including both PUCCH resource set determination and PUCCH PRB determination).  For Option 1, gNB could sophisticatedly configure the *maxPayloadSize* for each PUCCH resource set, the PUCCH resources included in each PUCCH resource set and PRI, which may largely alleviate the problem of the mismatching between the actual coding rate and the coding rate applied for resource determination.  For an example, gNB could configure a HP PUCCH resource with small margin for LP HARQ-ACK multiplexing within a PUCCH resource set determined based on Option 1. | Option 2 could make gNB configuration much easier since the use of scaling factor has already reflected the coding rate difference of HP and LP. gNB doesn’t need to carefully manage the PUCCH resources within each PUCCH resource set to do the matching between configured resource and expected coding rate. Compared to Option 1, as mentioned by a number of companies above, more standardization efforts as well as more specification changes may be needed. |
| Spreadtrum |  | We don’t see much necessarily of applying a scaling factor. Using a separate higher max coderate for LP HARQ-ACK has already compressed the needed PRB number and increased the coding rate. |
| LG2 |  | @QC: Not sure if you had checked on my previous comment in above. Let me provide an example which seems to require additional handling.  In case where HP payload size is 1 bit and LP payload size is 3 bits, if the scaled LP payload size (after applying scaling factor) becomes smaller than or equal to 1, then the scaled total UCI payload size would be smaller than or equal to 2.  In this case, according to the scaling approach, the PUCCH resource set corresponding to 2-bit (scaled) payload size would be selected for HP/LP UCI multiplexing. On the other hand, the PUCCH resource set consists of only PF0/1 which is used for 1/2-bit transmission, but actual total payload size is 4-bit. In this case, how to handling such mismatch? |
| CATT | We think the proposal is for PUCCH resource set determination only. With that understanding, we think Option 1 without taking scaling factor into account is simple without additional specification efforts. For the RBmin determination, we think the different coding rates are taken into account so that the benefit of introducing a scaling factor for PUCCH resource set selection becomes marginal if any. | Larger specification efforts without clear benefit. |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | Option 1 is sufficient for determining a PUCCH resource set, as long as gNB configures payload size threshold values for PUCCH resource set selection properly by taking into account different *maxCodeRate* values for HP UCI and LP UCI, respectively. Option 1 has minimum impact on specification and UE implementation. | In Option 2, a scaling factor is dependent on a ratio of *maxCodeRate* values for HP UCI and LP UCI. The *maxCodeRate* value ratio may be different for each PUCCH format, and UE may not know which PUCCH format it would use until selecting a PUCCH resource set and determining a PUCCH resource from the selected PUCCH resource set. |

* Reasons for Option 2:
  + Appropriate PUCCH resource set is different for different coding rates. Without a scaling factor for LP, PUCCH resource set for larger UCI payload size would be chosen in some cases, which should be avoided.
* Problems of Option 2:
  + Recent agreement on separate maxcoderate configuration for LP HARQ-ACK facilitates different level of protection for PRB allocations for LP and HP HARQ-ACKs. The existing encoding procedure (i.e. Option 1) will take the coding rate into account. It is not necessary to reflect that for payload determination.
  + Putting a scaling factor on the raw UCI bits may lead to “***double applying”*** the coding rate since we ***artificially*** inflate (or deflate depending on the scaling factor) the raw UCI bits prior to the encoding process. For the RBmin determination, we think the different coding rates are taken into account so that the benefit of introducing a scaling factor for PUCCH resource set selection becomes marginal if any.
  + Unnecessary specs impact on defining a set of suitable scaling factors and designing corresponding signaling.
  + With Option 2, it seems it does not necessarily guarantee overall payload is supported by the determined PUCCH resource.
  + Before determining PUCCH resource, we cannot get the coding rate for HP UCI and LP UCI, in other words, the scaling factor cannot be determined before PUCCH resource is determined.
  + If a new parameter for scaling factor is introduced, how to align scaling factor with various coding rate ratio for HP UCI and LP UCI of different PUCCH resource/format?
  + Option 2 would require additional handling on some cases. For example, in case when HP payload is 1 bit and LP payload is L bits where L > 1, if the scaled LP payload becomes smaller than 1, then which PUCCH resource set is selected?

## 3rd round discussion

* Reasons for Option 2:
  + Appropriate PUCCH resource set is different for different coding rates. Without a scaling factor for LP, PUCCH resource set for larger UCI payload size would be chosen in some cases, which should be avoided.
* Problems of Option 2:
  + Recent agreement on separate maxcoderate configuration for LP HARQ-ACK facilitates different level of protection for PRB allocations for LP and HP HARQ-ACKs. The existing encoding procedure (i.e. Option 1) will take the coding rate into account. It is not necessary to reflect that for payload determination.
  + Putting a scaling factor on the raw UCI bits may lead to “***double applying”*** the coding rate since we ***artificially*** inflate (or deflate depending on the scaling factor) the raw UCI bits prior to the encoding process. For the RBmin determination, we think the different coding rates are taken into account so that the benefit of introducing a scaling factor for PUCCH resource set selection becomes marginal if any.
  + Unnecessary specs impact on defining a set of suitable scaling factors and designing corresponding signaling.
  + With Option 2, it seems it does not necessarily guarantee overall payload is supported by the determined PUCCH resource.
  + Before determining PUCCH resource, we cannot get the coding rate for HP UCI and LP UCI, in other words, the scaling factor cannot be determined before PUCCH resource is determined.
  + If a new parameter for scaling factor is introduced, how to align scaling factor with various coding rate ratio for HP UCI and LP UCI of different PUCCH resource/format?
  + Option 2 would require additional handling on some cases. For example, in case when HP payload is 1 bit and LP payload is L bits where L > 1, if the scaled LP payload becomes smaller than 1, then which PUCCH resource set is selected?

Proposal for 3rd round discussion:

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

* PUCCH resource set determination is based on: UCI payload size = the number of HP UCI bits + the number of LP UCI bits.
* The minimum PRB numbers for HP A/N and LP A/N are separately determined based on their coding rates.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Sony | Support the (3rd round) proposal |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | Support the proposal. In case the group thinks that the wording “minimum” causes unnecessary confusion, can remove “minimum”. |
| Huawei | We are OK with it. As the accurate coding rate is derived after obtaining the PUCCH resource, the configured scaling factor may not reflect the actual coding rate for LP and HP. |
| Nokia, NSB | We are fine with the proposal in principle – although we have a slight preference towards Option 2.  The intention of the second bullet-point is not clear to us. We thus suggest removing it or at least clarifying it. |
| Sharp | We do not support the proposal.  The payload range for a HP PUCCH should be configured assuming HP UCI only case, i.e. the PUCCH resource can carry the max. payload with approximately the configured maxCoderate for HP UCI.   * Using the total HP + LP payload implies even the maxCoderate for HP UCI can be satisfied for all payloads. Since the maxCodetate for LP UCI is higher than that of the HP UCI, there will always be PRBs left when LP UCI is multiplexed. This causes waste of PUCCH resource and limits the maximum LP UCI payload that can be carried with HP UCI on a HP PUCCH. * Since maxCoderates for HP UCI and LP UCI are already known. It is trival to derive an effective or equivalent “HP UCI” payload based on the actual HP UCI payload and the LP UCI payload. Ceiling function can be used to avoid fractional numbers.   Define minimum number of PRBs is not necessary. The number of PRBs can be determined by the payload size and the maxCodetate of each priority using existing coding chains already supported on PUCCH. |
| Panasonic | We are fine with the 1st bullet point.  We have similar view with Nokia that the intention of second bullet point is unclear. We think clarification and/or more detailed formulation (e.g., equation) is necessary. |
| Quectel | We support the first bullet. For the second bullet, it is not clear for us. How to determine the minimum number of PRBs for PUCCH has not been extensively discussed. We do not have strong view between Option 1 and Option 2, but we prefer a unified design for PUCCH resource set determination and minimum PRB determination. It looks strange to us that gNB plans for PUCCH resource set based on a payload size whereas configures PRBs for PUCCH in the PUCCH resource set based on a different payload size. By now, we suggest removing the second bullet or leaving it FFS. |
| Intel | Support the proposal |
| Samsung | Fine with the first sub-bullet.  Same view as Nokia about the 2nd sub-bullet. |
| ITRI | Fine with the proposal, but the second sub-bullet seems not necessary. |
| TCL | We support the proposal. |
| LG | We are fine with the proposal.  And, we have the same view with Nokia on the 2nd sub-bullet. |
| NEC | We are fine with the proposal. |
| DOCOMO | We are fine with the 1st bullet although we prefer Option 2 to avoid not optimal resource set selection.  For the 2nd bullet, we share the same view as Nokia and other companies. |
| Apple | We don’t support the proposal. We have proposed our views for the first bullet. On the second bullet, note for two UCI parts, it is clear in Rel-15, the # of PRBs is jointly decided by the payload from UCI part 1 and UCI part 2. The transmission of two UCI parts can happen in Rel-17 also. Decide the minimum number of PRBs separately for UCI parts is not motivated. |
| OPPO | Support the first bullet-point.  The intention of the second bullet-point is not clear to us. There are at least two interpretations on the second bullet:  Interpretation 1: The required resource for HP A/N and LP A/N is determined separately, then total number of PRB is sum by the required resource for HP A/N and LP A/N. From perspective of UCI mapping, frequency-first is applied, then for one PRB, there may be both HP A/N and LP A/N.  Interpretation 2: The required PRB for HP A/N and LP A/N is determined separately. From perspective of UCI mapping, HP A/N is mapped in the PRB for HP, and LP A/N is mapped in the PRB for LP.  Due to there is ambiguity in second sub-bullet, we suggest delete it. |
|  |  |

Proposal after 3rd round discussion:

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

* PUCCH resource set determination is based on: UCI payload size = the number of HP UCI bits + the number of LP UCI bits.
* FFS PRB number determination for HP A/N and LP A/N, e.g. based on their coding rates.
* Support: Sony, Moto/Leno, HW, Nokia, Pana, Quectel, Intel, Samsung, ITRI, TCL, LG, NEC, DCM, OPPO
* Not support: Sharp, Apple

## 4th round discussion

Proposal for 4th round discussion:

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

* PUCCH resource set determination is based on: UCI payload size = the number of HP UCI bits + the number of LP UCI bits.
* FFS PRB number determination for HP A/N and LP A/N, e.g. based on their coding rates.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Sony | Support the 4th round proposal. |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | Support the proposal. |
| Apple | Comments on the “cons” listed for Option 2 are marked in red:   * + Recent agreement on separate maxcoderate configuration for LP HARQ-ACK facilitates different level of protection for PRB allocations for LP and HP HARQ-ACKs. The existing encoding procedure (i.e. Option 1) will take the coding rate into account. It is not necessary to reflect that for payload determination.   + Putting a scaling factor on the raw UCI bits may lead to “***double applying”*** the coding rate since we ***artificially*** inflate (or deflate depending on the scaling factor) the raw UCI bits prior to the encoding process. For the RBmin determination, we think the different coding rates are taken into account so that the benefit of introducing a scaling factor for PUCCH resource set selection becomes marginal if any.   Actually the PRI indication can be already used to identify the PUCCH resources matching the PRI indication among PUCCH resource sets, since each PUCCH resource has a HP maxcoderate and a LP maxcoderate, the UE just pick the PUCCH resource with the minimum payload size supporting both LP and HP HARQs.   * + Unnecessary specs impact on defining a set of suitable scaling factors and designing corresponding signaling.   + The needed support is already there (an additional maxCodeRate for LP HARQ-ACK can be configured in the second PUCCH-Config per PUCCH format.   + With Option 2, it seems it does not necessarily guarantee overall payload is supported by the determined PUCCH resource.   + Please elaborate.   + Before determining PUCCH resource, we cannot get the coding rate for HP UCI and LP UCI, in other words, the scaling factor cannot be determined before PUCCH resource is determined.   + The needed support is already there (an additional maxCodeRate for LP HARQ-ACK can be configured in the second PUCCH-Config per PUCCH format.   + If a new parameter for scaling factor is introduced, how to align scaling factor with various coding rate ratio for HP UCI and LP UCI of different PUCCH resource/format?   Actually the PRI indication can be already used to identify the PUCCH resources matching the PRI indication among PUCCH resource sets, since each PUCCH resource has a HP maxcoderate and a LP maxcoderate, the UE just pick the PUCCH resource with the minimum payload size supporting both LP and HP HARQs.   * + Option 2 would require additional handling on some cases. For example, in case when HP payload is 1 bit and LP payload is L bits where L > 1, if the scaled LP payload becomes smaller than 1, then which PUCCH resource set is selected?   1 HP + 1 LP HARQ and the rest cases should be easy to differentiate. |
| InterDigital | We prefer option 2 and agree with Apple’s comments above but can accept option 1 for progress. |
| QC | We prefer option 2. We agree with Apple’s comment. The special case LG brought up need some handling, that we agree. But it can as simple as if the scaled LP payload <=1 bit, don’t apply the scaling. Other than this special case, we think in most of other cases, option 2 pick a more suitable PUCCH resource set that matched with the actually # RBs for multiplexed payload, which is better from system design point of view.  But if majority companies somehow don’t see the benefit of option 2, we can accept option 1 for the progress. |
| Samsung | Support |
| Sharp | We prefer Option 2 and agree with Apple’s comments above.  For Option 1, it is more appropriate for joint coding than for separate coding.   * The PUCCH resource can support the configured maxCoderate with HP UCI only. * The PUCCH resource will be under-utilized in case of HP UCI + LP UCI since LP UCI has a higher code rate than HP UCI. * Joint coding is much easier than separate coding if the PUCCH resource can carry them by treating them all as HP UCI. Should we add an option to allow joint coding even for total payload > 2 bits?   For progress, we can live with Option 1 though if the majority wants it. |
| Huawei | Support. |
| Quectel | Support |
| CATT | Support |
| Panasonic | We support the proposal. |
| vivo | We prefer option 2. We agree with Apple, QC and Sharp’s comment. |
| ITRI | Support the proposal. |
| QC2 | One additional comment to this proposal: For LP HARQ-ACK, due to missing DL DCI issue, we should **FFS the number of LP UCI bits used for PUCCH resource set determination is the actual number of LP UCI bits or a round up reference number of LP UCI bits.** |
| LG | Support the proposal. |
| DOCOMO | We are fine with the proposal as a compromise if majority companies does not see the benefit of Option 2 although we still prefer Option 2. We also agree with Apple’s comments above and Option 2 should be reasonable from technical point of view. |
| Ericsson | Support the proposal. |
| TCL | Support the proposal. |
| Nokia, NSB | As we mentioned in the previous round, we are fine with the proposal – although we have a slight preference towards Option 2. |
| ZTE | Support |
| Intel | Support |
| Spreadtrum | Support |
| OPPO | Support |
| NEC | Support |

## Timeline and latency requirements

## Inputs from Tdocs

**Latency requirements:**

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

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

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Proposals/observations from Tdocs |
| Huawei | ***Proposal 9: For HP HARQ-ACK overlapping with LP HARQ-ACK, the multiplexing is allowed only when the PUCCH carrying the multiplexed UCI ends no later than the PUCCH carrying HP HARQ-ACK.*** |
| QC | ***Proposal 18:* For d1 defined for PUCCH vs PUCCH or PUCCH vs PUSCH cancellation with different priorities, support subcarrier spacing dependent d1 values. FFS exact d1 values for each subcarrier spacing.**  ***Proposal 19:* Confirm the working assumption made in #104-e to reuse Rel-15 intra-UE PUCCH/PUSCH multiplexing timeline requirements for Rel-17 intra-UE PUCCH/PUSCH multiplexing with different priorities.** |
| OPPO | ***Proposal 15: Reuse Rel-15 intra-UE PUCCH/PUSCH multiplexing timeline conditions for Rel-17 intra-UE multiplexing with different priorities:***   * ***For a UE doesn’t support Rel-16 prioritization, the UE doesn’t expect the multiplexing timeline conditions are not satisfied.*** * ***For the UE support Rel-16 prioritization, if the timeline conditions are not met, UE behavior fallbacks to Rel-16 prioritization.*** |
| LGE | **Proposal #5: Consider additional condition for the processing of inter-priority multiplexing and the latency requirement for HP UCI.** |
| China Telecom | **Proposal 2: Multiplexing for channels with different priorities is allowed only when the ending symbol of PUCCH or PUSCH resource carrying the multiplexed UCI is no later than the ending symbol of channel carrying HP traffic.** |
| Intel | **Proposal 16: When UCIs of different priorities overlap and if at least one is based on a DCI, UE may drop the low priority UCI and transmit the high priority UCI, when timeline conditions are not satisfied.** |
| TCL | **Proposal 3: Multiplexing for UCIs with different priorities should only be allowed when the PUCCH carrying the multiplexed UCI ends no later than the PUCCH carrying high-priority UCI.** |
| Sharp | **Proposal 1: Reusing Rel-15 intra-UE PUCCH/PUSCH multiplexing timeline for Rel-17 intra-UE PUCCH/PUSCH multiplexing with different priorities.**  **The Rel-16 dropping rule is reused if the multiplexing timeline requirements are not met.** |
| MTK | 1. Guard gap timeline of the new multiplexed PUCCH is of the earliest PUCCH. |
|  |  |

## Multiplexing HARQ-ACK and SR with different priorities

## Inputs from Tdocs

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

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

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

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

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

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Proposals/observations from Tdocs |
| E/// | [Proposal 5 When PUCCH with HP SR overlaps with PUCCH with LP HARQ-ACK:](#_Toc79181282)  [ For 1-2 LP HARQ-ACK bits: The PUCCH resource for HARQ-ACK is used for multiplexing of the HP SR and LP HARQ-ACK. If SR is positive, an offset (e.g. 1 PRB) is added to the starting PRB of the HARQ-ACK PUCCH resource (i.e. Opt. 2a).](#_Toc79181283)  [ For more than 2 LP HARQ-ACK bits: Rel-15 rules are used for multiplexing HARQ-ACK and SR in a PUCCH resource. If SR is positive, an offset (e.g. 1 PRB) is added to the starting PRB of the PUCCH resource (i.e. Opt. 2a).](#_Toc79181284)  [Proposal 6 When PUCCH with HP HARQ-ACK/SR overlaps with PUCCH with LP HARQ-ACK:](#_Toc79181285)  [ First, a PUCCH resource set associated to HP HARQ-ACK based on the total number of HP HARQ-ACK/SR and LP HARQ-ACK is determined. Then, a PUCCH resource in the PUCCH resource set to carry both HP and LP HARQ-ACK based on the last DCI corresponding to the HP HARQ-ACK is determined.](#_Toc79181286) |
| HW | ***Proposal 10: For multiplexing HP SR and LP HARQ-ACK with PF0/PF1,***   * ***For the case of HP SR with PF0 vs LP HARQ-ACK with PF0, SR is multiplexed on HARQ-ACK resource in the same way as Rel-15 if SR is positive and transmit only HARQ-ACK on HARQ-ACK resource if SR is negative (i.e. option 2c);*** * ***For the case of HP SR with PF0 vs LP HARQ-ACK with PF1, drop LP HARQ-ACK if HP SR is positive (i.e. option 4/5);*** * ***For the case of HP SR with PF1 vs LP HARQ-ACK with PF0,*** ***Opt.2c should be supported. That is SR is multiplexed on HARQ-ACK resource in the same way as Rel-15 if SR is positive and transmit only HARQ-ACK on HARQ-ACK resource if SR is negative (i.e. option 2c);*** * ***For the case of HP SR with PF1 vs LP HARQ-ACK with PF1, reuse the resource selection method in Rel-15.***   ***Proposal 11: For multiplexing HP SR and LP HARQ-ACK with PUCCH format 2/3/4,***   * ***Adopt separate coding to HP SR and LP HARQ-ACK on one PUCCH resource*** * ***The PUCCH resource is selected from dedicated PUCCH resource sets in the second PUCCH-Config for multiplexing HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK*** * ***The multiplexing is only allowed if the ending symbol of the PUCCH resource carrying multiplexed SR and HARQ-ACK is no later than the ending symbol of the PUCCH resource carrying SR.***   ***Proposal 12: When*** ***a PUCCH format 0 or 1 carrying HP/LP HARQ-ACK overlaps with both a HP SR and a LP SR, drop the LP SR, and multiplex the HP SR and the HP/LP HARQ-ACK.*** |
| Nokia | **Proposal 3.14: For the scenario where a PUCCH carrying high-priority SR overlaps with a PUCCH carrying low-priority HARQ-ACK:**   * **If SR is with F0 and HARQ-ACK is with F0/F1, adopt one of the following options:**    + **Opt.1b: The positive SR and HARQ-ACK are multiplexed and transmitted on the SR resource. For negative SR, the UE transmits only HARQ-ACK on the HARQ-ACK resource.**   + **Opt.1c: The SR and HARQ-ACK are multiplexed and transmitted on the SR resource.** * **If SR is with F1 and HARQ-ACK is with F0/F1, adopt Opt.3: Transmit HARQ-ACK on the SR resource if SR is positive; and transmit HARQ-ACK on the HARQ-ACK resource when SR is negative.** * **If SR is with F0/F1 and HARQ-ACK is with F2/F3/F4: If SR is positive, transmit SR on the SR resource and drop HARQ-ACK; if SR is negative, transmit HARQ-ACK only on the HARQ-ACK resource.** |
| ZTE | ***Proposal 13:*** *For positive SR, transmit HARQ-ACK on the SR resource. For negative SR, transmit HARQ-ACK on the HARQ-ACK resource. The principle is applied at least for three cases:*   * *PUCCH carrying HP SR with PF0 overlaps with a PUCCH carrying LP HARQ-ACK with PF0* * *PUCCH carrying HP SR with PF0 overlaps with a PUCCH carrying LP HARQ-ACK with PF1* * *PUCCH carrying HP SR with PF1 overlaps with a PUCCH carrying LP HARQ-ACK with PF0*   ***Proposal 14:*** *Adopt the following rules to multiplex high priority SR and low priority HARQ-ACK.*   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | *HARQ-ACK*  *SR* | *PUCCH format 0* | *PUCCH format 1* | *PUCCH format 2/3/4* | | *PUCCH format 0* | *For positive SR, the UE transmits the PUCCH in the resource using PUCCH format 0 in PRB(s) for SR. The same way in Rel-15 can be reused for the UE to determine the value of  and  for computing the value of cyclic shift .*  *For negative SR, the UE transmits only a PUCCH with HARQ-ACK information.* | | *For positive SR, the UE Reuse Rel-15 rules.*  *For negative SR, the UE transmits only a PUCCH with HARQ-ACK information and drops the PUCCH with negative SR.* | | *PUCCH format 1* | *For positive SR, the UE transmits the PUCCH in the resource using PUCCH format 1 in PRB(s) for SR. The value of cyclic shift of sequence, i.e., , of this PUCCH format 1 is determined by HARQ-ACK, and the bit, i.e., b(0), of this PUCCH format 1 is determined by SR*  *For negative SR, the UE transmits only a PUCCH with HARQ-ACK information and drops the PUCCH with negative SR.* | *Reuse Rel-15 rules.* | |
| Samsung | **Proposal 8: Drop LP HARQ-ACK PUCCH when a LP HARQ-ACK PUCCH with PF0/1 overlaps with a HP SR PUCCH.**  **Proposal 9: Support multiplexing of LP HARQ-ACK and HP SR when HARQ-ACK is transmitted in a PUCCH using format 2/3/4**   * **Use Rel-15 mechanism as a baseline assuming HARQ-ACK and SR have same priority.**   **FFS: how to ensure latency and reliability of HP SR.** |
| vivo | ***Proposal 1: Support multiplexing a high-priority HARQ-ACK and a low-priority SR into a PUCCH in Rel-17.***  ***Proposal 7: When a PUCCH carrying HP SR with PF0 overlaps with a PUCCH carrying LP HARQ-ACK with PF0, option 2c is adopted, i.e.,***   * ***If SR is positive, SR is multiplexed on HARQ-ACK resource in the same way as Rel-15. If SR is negative, transmit only HARQ-ACK on HARQ-ACK resource.***   ***Proposal 8: When a PUCCH carrying HP SR with PF0 overlaps with a PUCCH carrying LP HARQ-ACK with PF1, option 4 is adopted, i.e.,***   * ***For positive SR, transmit SR on the SR resource and drop HARQ-ACK. For negative SR, transmit HARQ-ACK on the HARQ-ACK resource.***   ***Proposal 9: When a PUCCH carrying HP SR with PF1 overlaps with a PUCCH carrying LP HARQ-ACK with PF0, option 2c is adopted, i.e.,***   * ***If SR is positive, SR is multiplexed on HARQ-ACK resource in the same way as Rel-15. If SR is negative, transmit only HARQ-ACK on HARQ-ACK resource.***   ***Proposal 10: Define UCIs of different priorities multiplexing rule at least for the following cases***   * + ***LP HARQ-ACK using PF 1 and HP HARQ-ACK and LP SR using PF 0.***   + ***HP HARQ-ACK using PF 1 and LP HARQ-ACK and HP SR using PF 0.*** |
| Spreadtrum | 1. ***If a PUCCH carrying HP SR with PF0 overlaps with a PUCCH carrying LP HARQ-ACK with PF0, if SR is positive, SR is multiplexed on HARQ-ACK resource in the same way as Rel-15. If SR is negative, transmit only HARQ-ACK on HARQ-ACK resource.*** 2. ***When a PUCCH carrying HP SR with PF0 overlaps with a PUCCH carrying LP HARQ-ACK with PF1, for positive SR, LP HARQ-ACK can be dropped or transmitted on the SR resource. For negative SR, transmit HARQ-ACK on the HARQ-ACK resource.*** 3. ***If a PUCCH carrying HP SR with PF1 overlaps with a PUCCH carrying LP HARQ-ACK with PF0, if SR is positive, SR is multiplexed on HARQ-ACK resource in the same way as Rel-15. If SR is negative, transmit only HARQ-ACK on HARQ-ACK resource.*** |
| CATT | ***Proposal 7: For multiplexing of HP SR and LP HARQ-ACK with PF0/1,***   * ***positive SR and HARQ-ACK are multiplexed on the SR resource;*** * ***for negative SR, the UE transmits only HARQ-ACK on the HARQ-ACK resource.***   ***Proposal 8: For multiplexing of HP SR and LP HARQ-ACK with PF2/3/4,***   * ***for positive SR, drop LP HARQ-ACK;*** * ***for negative SR, transmit only HARQ-ACK on the HARQ-ACK resource.***   ***Proposal 9: For multiplexing of 1 bit HP HARQ-ACK, 1 bit LP HARQ-ACK and 1 bits HP SR, the following two options can be further considered:***   * ***Option 1: Multiplexing of 1 bit HP HARQ-ACK, 1 bit LP HARQ-ACK and 1 bit HP SR to a PUCCH resource with PF 2/3/4 for HP HARQ-ACK;*** * ***Option 2: Multiplexing of 1 bit HP HARQ-ACK, 1 bit LP HARQ-ACK and 1 bit HP SR to a PUCCH resource with PF 0/1 for HP HARQ-ACK.*** |
| QC | ***Proposal 8*: In NR Rel-17, if a HARQ-ACK (with single priority) transmission on PUCCH format 0 or PUCCH format 1 collide with one SR, the UE performs the actions in Table 1 to resolve the collision.**   * **FFS: collision resolution for 1-bit HP HARQ-ACK and 1-bit LP HARQ-ACK overlapping with 1-bit HP or LP SR**   Table 1. Collision resolution for overlapping HARQ-ACK and SR in NR Rel-17   |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | Ack: PF0, LP | Ack: PF1, LP | Ack: PF0, HP | Ack: PF1, HP | | SR: PF 0, LP | Same as Rel-15 (i.e., multiplex on HARQ-ACK resource). | Same as Rel-15 (i.e., drop SR) | Multiplex the HARQ-ACK and SR on the HARQ-ACK resource (as in Rel-15), with a power boost to the multiplexed transmission. | Same as Rel-15 (drop SR). | | SR: PF1, LP | Same as rel-15 (i.e., multiplex on HARQ-ACK resource) | Same as Rel-15 (RB selection) | Multiplex the HARQ-ACK and SR on the HARQ-ACK resource (as in Rel-15), with a power boost to the multiplexed transmission. | RB selection (as in Rel-15) but with the enhancement that, if SR is positive, the power of the PUCCH transmission follows the power of the HARQ-ACK resource. | | SR: PF0, HP | Use the SR resource to transmit multiplexed SR and HARQ-ACK, with a power boost to the multiplexed transmission. | Perform RB selection (i.e., if SR is negative, then transmit HARQ-ACK on the HARQ-ACK resource. Otherwise, transmit HARQ-ACK on the SR resource.) | Same as Rel-15 | Same as Rel-15 | | SR: PF1, HP | Perform RB selection (i.e., if SR is negative, then transmit HARQ-ACK on the HARQ-ACK resource. If SR is positive, transmit HARQ-ACK on the SR resource.) | Same as Rel-15 (i.e., RB selection). | Same as Rel-15 | Same as Rel-15 |   ***Proposal 9*: In NR Rel-17, for the case of multiplexing 1 bit SR and up to 2 bits HARQ-ACK with different priorities in a PUCCH format 0, adopt the multiplexed payload to CS indices mapping as shown in Fig 6 and Fig 7.**  ***Proposal 10*: In NR Rel-17, if a HARQ-ACK transmission on PUCCH format 2/3/4 collide with K SR transmissions including HP SRs and LP SRs, the UE append bits to the HARQ-ACK payload. Furthermore, if any of the HP SR is positive, thebits shall indicate a positive HP SR.** |
| OPPO | ***Proposal 10: Multiplexing of HP SR and LP HARQ-ACK with more than 2 bits are not supported in Rel-17.***  ***Proposal 17: Rel-15 or Rel-16 mechanism should be reused to support multiplexing of LP HARQ-ACK with PF 0/1 and HP SR with PF 0/1.***  ***Proposal 18: When PF0 is used by both HP SR and LPHARQ-ACK , whether to use Rel-15 multiplexing or Rel-16 prioritization can be determined according to the number of PUCCH symbols. The details are summarized in the table 2.***  Table 2: Multiplexing of LP HARQ-ACK and HP SR   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | | LP HARQ-ACK | | | PF 0 | PF 1 | | HP SR  (positive) | PF 0 | If , Rel-15 multiplexing;  Otherwise, Rel-16 prioritization. | Rel-16 prioritization | | PF 1 | Rel-16 prioritization | Rel-15 multiplexing | |
| LGE | **Proposal #15: Consider to support Opt 2b for the combinations of {SR PF0 + HARQ-ACK PF0} and {SR PF0 + HARQ-ACK PF1} and {SR PF1 + HARQ-ACK PF0}, to ensure HP SR reliability as well as to keep PUCCH resource overhead.**  **Proposal #16: Consider to support Opt 2a for the combinations of {SR PF0 + HARQ-ACK PF0} and {SR PF0 + HARQ-ACK PF1} and {SR PF1 + HARQ-ACK PF0}, to guarantee LP HARQ-ACK performance on top of HP SR reliability.** |
| Intel | **Proposal 16:**  **HP SR PF0, LP HARQ PF0**:   * If SR is positive, SR is multiplexed on HARQ-ACK resource in the same way as Rel-15. If SR is negative, transmit only HARQ-ACK on HARQ-ACK resource.   **HP SR PF0, LP HARQ PF1**:   * For positive SR, transmit SR on the SR resource and drop HARQ-ACK. For negative SR, transmit HARQ-ACK on the HARQ-ACK resource   **HP SR PF1, LP HARQ PF0**:   * If SR is positive, SR is multiplexed on HARQ-ACK resource in the same way as Rel-15. If SR is negative, transmit only HARQ-ACK on HARQ-ACK resource.   **Collision handling LP SR and HP HARQ-ACKs**   |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | **HARQ-ACK with PF0** | **HARQ-ACK with**  **PF1** | **HARQ-ACK with PF2** | **HARQ-ACK with**  **PF3 or PF4** | | SR with PF0 | Multiplexed UCI is transmitted using PF0 on HARQ-ACK resource | Drop SR and transmit HARQ-ACK on HARQ-ACK resource | Multiplexed UCI is transmitted using PF 2 on HARQ-ACK resource if SR is with PF 0. SR is dropped if it is PF 1 | Multiplex HARQ-ACK and SR according to Rel-15 procedure. | | SR with PF1 | SR is dropped | Multiplexed UCI is transmitted using PF 1 on HARQ-ACK resource | |
| China Telecom | **Proposal 5: Resource selection is adopted in Rel-17 when a PUCCH carrying HP SR overlaps with a PUCCH carrying LP HARQ-ACK:**   * **When HP SR is positive, SR resource is used for the transmission.**   + **If SR resource corresponds to PF0, positive HP SR and LP HARQ-ACK are multiplexed using the cyclic shift values the same as in Rel-15.**   + **If SR resource corresponds to PF1, HARQ-ACK is transmitted on the SR resource to indicate the positive SR.** * **When HP SR is negative, the UE transmits only LP HARQ-ACK on the HARQ-ACK resource.** |
| Pana | **Proposal 9: When a PUCCH carrying HP SR with PF0 overlaps with a PUCCH carrying LP HARQ-ACK with PF0, the SR and HARQ-ACK are multiplexed and transmitted on the HARQ-ACK resource.**  **Proposal 10:**   * **When a PUCCH carrying HP SR with PF0 overlaps with a PUCCH carrying LP HARQ-ACK with PF1, either of following options is supported.**   + **Option 4: For positive SR, transmit SR on the SR resource and drop HARQ-ACK. For negative SR, transmit HARQ-ACK on the HARQ-ACK resource.**   + **Option 5: No enhancement over Rel.16**   **Proposal 11: When a PUCCH carrying HP SR with PF1 overlaps with a PUCCH carrying LP HARQ-ACK with PF0, no enhancement is necessary over Rel.16.**  **Proposal 12:**   * **When a PUCCH carrying HP SR with PF1 overlaps with a PUCCH carrying LP HARQ-ACK with PF1, either of following options is supported.**   + **Option 1: Same multiplexing mechanism as in Rel.15/16.**   + **Option 2: The SR and HARQ-ACK are multiplexed and transmitted on the SR resource.**     - **1-bit for LP HARQ-ACK information bit is appended to SR information bit. For 2-bits HARQ-ACK information, bundling is used.**   **Proposal 13:**   * **When a PUCCH carrying HP SR with PF0 or PF1 overlaps with a PUCCH carrying LP HARQ-ACK with PF2, 3, or 4, following options are supported.**   + **The SR and HARQ-ACK are multiplexed and transmitted on the HARQ-ACK resource if the latency condition is satisfied; otherwise, LP HARQ-ACK is dropped and HP SR is transmitted.**   **Proposal 14:**   * **For multiplexing a LP HARQ-ACK, a HP HARQ-ACK and HP SR into a PUCCH, following two procedures are studied.**   + **Option 1: UE first resolve the overlapping for PUCCH transmission of HP HARQ-ACK and HP SR. After resolving the overlapping, multiplexing of LP HARQ-ACK is handled.**   + **Option 2: How UCIs are concatenated up to certain size is handled as one step procedure, e.g., with the priority of HP HARQ-ACK > HP SR > LP HARQ-ACK.** |
| Sony | **Proposal 9: When HP SR using PF0 multiplexes with LP HARQ-ACK using PF0:**   * **If SR is positive, SR is multiplexed on HARQ-ACK resource in the same way as Rel-15.** * **If SR is negative, transmit only HARQ-ACK on HARQ-ACK resource.**   **Proposal 10: When HP SR using PF0 multiplexes with LP HARQ-ACK using PF1:**   * **The positive SR and HARQ-ACK are multiplexed and transmitted on the SR resource** * **For negative SR, the UE transmits only HARQ-ACK on the HARQ-ACK resource.**   **Proposal 11: When HP SR using PF1 multiplexes with LP HARQ-ACK using PF0:**   * **If SR is positive, SR is multiplexed on HARQ-ACK resource in the same way as Rel-15.** * **If SR is negative, transmit only HARQ-ACK on HARQ-ACK resource.** |
| Quectel | **Proposal 17**: When a PUCCH carrying HP SR with PF0 overlaps with a PUCCH carrying LP HARQ-ACK with PF0, Opt.1b (i.e., The positive SR and HARQ-ACK are multiplexed and transmitted on the SR resource, and the UE transmits only HARQ-ACK on the HARQ-ACK resource for negative SR) is supported.  **Proposal 18**: When a PUCCH carrying HP SR with PF0 overlaps with a PUCCH carrying LP HARQ-ACK with PF1, Opt.4 (i.e., for positive SR, transmit SR on the SR resource and drop HARQ-ACK. For negative SR, transmit HARQ-ACK on the HARQ-ACK resource) is supported.  **Proposal 19**: When a PUCCH carrying HP SR with PF1 overlaps with a PUCCH carrying LP HARQ-ACK with PF0, Opt 3 (i.e., for positive SR, transmit HARQ-ACK on the SR resource. For negative SR, transmit HARQ-ACK on the HARQ-ACK resource) is supported. |
| Leno/Moto | * **Proposal 2**: For multiplexing a HP SR, 1-bit HP HARQ-ACK, and 1-bit LP HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH, first, determine a PUCCH resource for multiplexing the 1-bit LP HARQ-ACK and the 1-bit HP HARQ-ACK and secondly, multiplex the HP SR (i.e. a positive SR) and HARQ-ACK of mixed priorities according to Rel-15 SR/HARQ-ACK multiplexing rules. * **Proposal 3**: For multiplexing a HP SR and 1- or 2-bit LP HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH, treat the LP HARQ-ACK as HARQ-ACK bits with high priority, determine a HP PUCCH resource for the LP HARQ-ACK, and apply Rel-15 SR/HARQ-ACK multiplexing rules based on the determined HP PUCCH resource. |
| IDC | ***Proposal 10: In case PUCCH format 0 carrying HP SR overlaps with PUCCH format 0/1 carrying LP HARQ-ACK, the UE multiplexes HARQ-ACK and SR on the PUCCH resource for HP SR.***  ***Proposal 11: In case PUCCH format 1 carrying positive HP SR overlaps with PUCCH format 0/1 carrying LP HARQ-ACK, the UE transmits HARQ-ACK on the PUCCH resource for HP SR.***  ***Proposal 12: In case PUCCH format 1 carrying negative HP SR overlaps with PUCCH format 0/1 carrying LP HARQ-ACK, the UE transmits HARQ-ACK on the PUCCH resource for LP HARQ-ACK.*** |
| Sharp | **Proposal 4: When a PUCCH carrying HP SR with PF1 overlaps with a PUCCH carrying LP HARQ-ACK with PF0,**   * **Transmit LP HARQ-ACK on the HP SR resource for positive HP SR, and** * **Transmit LP HARQ-ACK on the LP HARQ-ACK resource for negative HP SR.**   **Proposal 5: When a PUCCH carrying HP SR with PF0 overlaps with a PUCCH carrying LP HARQ-ACK with PF0,**   * **Multiplex positive HP SR on LP HARQ-ACK PUCCH by a CS is preferred.** * **Alternatively, multiplex positive HP SR and LP HARQ-ACK on a HP SR PUCCH can be considered if a HP SR PUCCH PF0 resource is configured with multiple reserved CS values.**   **Proposal 6: When a PUCCH carrying HP SR with PF0 overlaps with a PUCCH carrying LP HARQ-ACK with PF1, the Rel-16 dropping behaviour may be applied.**   * **Alternatively, positive HP SR and LP HARQ-ACK multiplexing on the HP SR PUCCH with PF0 can be considered if the HP SR PUCCH PF0 resource is configured with multiple reserved CS values.**   **Proposal 7: For multiplexing of HP SR with LP HARQ-ACK with PUCCH format 2/3/4,**   * **HP SR bits can be generated based on the number of overlapping HP SR PUCCH resources.** * **FFS on the ordering of HP SR and LP HARQ-ACK** * **FFS on if LP SR bits should also be included.**   **Proposal 8: For multiplexing of HP HARQ-ACK, LP HARQ-ACK and SR, the multiplexing order and SR bit generation methods should be further clarified.** |
| DOCOMO | **Proposal 8:**   * *Agree the table for UE behavior on multiplexing eMBB HARQ-ACK and URLLC SR as a baseline. Further considerations are needed for down-selection.*  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | |  | **URLLC SR PF0** | **URLLC SR PF1** | | **eMBB HARQ-ACK PF0** | * Opt.1b: For positive SR, same as Rel-15/16 multiplexing for same priority to multiplex eMBB HARQ-ACK bit(s) and URLLC SR bit, but transmitted on URLLC SR PF0 resource. For negative SR, the UE transmits only HARQ-ACK on the HARQ-ACK resource. | * Opt 3: eMBB HARQ-ACK transmitted on URLLC PF1 resource if URLLC SR positive, while eMBB HARQ-ACK transmitted on eMBB PF0 resource if URLLC SR negative. | | **eMBB HARQ-ACK PF1** | * Opt.1b/Opt.3: eMBB HARQ-ACK transmitted on URLLC PF0 resource if URLLC SR positive, while eMBB HARQ-ACK transmitted on eMBB PF1 resource if URLLC SR negative. | * Same as Rel-15/16 multiplexing for same priority, i.e transmit eMBB HARQ-ACK on HARQ-ACK resource if SR negative, transmit eMBB HARQ-ACK on SR resource if SR positive. | | **eMBB HARQ-ACK PF2/3/4** | * Opt 1: If latency and reliability condition satisfied for eMBB HARQ-ACK resource, URLLC SR is appended after eMBB HARQ-ACK and transmitted on eMBB HARQ-ACK resource. Otherwise, eMBB HARQ-ACK is dropped and URLLC SR is transmitted. * Opt 2: eMBB HARQ-ACK is dropped and URLLC SR is transmitted. | |   **Proposal 9:**   * *For collision handling among LP HARQ-ACK, HP HARQ-ACK, and HP SR, following UE behaviour is proposed:*   + *Step 1: multiplexing of HP HARQ-ACK and HP SR by following Rel-16 procedure.*   + *Step 2: multiplexing of the outcome of step 1 and LP HARQ-ACK by following Case 1.* |
| WILUS | * ***Proposal 6:*** *To multiplex HP-SR with PF0 and LP HARQ-ACK with PF0, we propose*   + *If HP-SR is negative, then transmit LP HARQ-ACK on HARQ-ACK resource.*     - *In case of 1-bit LP HARQ-ACK, use 2 CSs, i.e., {0, 6} CS index*     - *In case of 2-bit LP HARQ-ACK, use 4 CSs, i.e., {0, 3, 6, 9} CS index*   + *If HP-SR is positive, then transmit LP HARQ-ACK and HP-SR on HARQ-ACK resource*     - *In case of 1-bit LP HARQ-ACK, use 2 CSs, i.e., {3, 9} CS index*     - *In case of 2-bit LP HARQ-ACK, use 4 CSs, i.e., {1, 4, 7, 11} CS index*        * *To enhance HP-SR reliability, 2-bit LP HARQ-ACK can be bundled to 1-bit and then the 1-bit bundled LP HARQ-ACK is treated as 1-bit LP HARQ-ACK, i.e., use 2 CSs, {3, 9} CS index .* * ***Proposal 7:*** *We propose to support Option 2b for multiplexing with HP-SR with PF0 and LP HARQ-ACK with PF1.*   + *To multiplex HP-SR with PF0 and LP HARQ-ACK with PF1, use the HARQ-ACK resource.*      - *Applying QPSK for SR+1-bit HARQ-ACK. For the case of 2-bit HARQ-ACK, the HARQ-ACK is reduced/compressed to 1-bit.* * ***Proposal 8:*** *To multiplex HP-SR with PF1 and LP HARQ-ACK with PF0, reuse multiplexing rule for HP-SR with PF0 and LP HARQ-ACK with PF0.* |

## 1st round discussion

Proposal for 1st round discussion:

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

* If SR is positive, SR is multiplexed on HARQ-ACK resource in the same way as Rel-15.
* If SR is negative, transmit only HARQ-ACK on HARQ-ACK resource.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| CATT | It is not clear how the proposal is drawn based on companies’ input. It seems that more companies prefer to multiplex HP positive SR and LP HARQ-ACK on SR resource instead of HARQ-ACK resource. In addition, the proposal is for PF0/1 only according to summary in section 3.6.1. Therefore, We would like to update the proposal as follows.  ~~When a PUCCH carrying~~ For multiplexing of HP SR ~~overlaps with a PUCCH carrying~~ and LP HARQ-ACK with PF0/1,   * If SR is positive, SR is multiplexed on ~~HARQ-ACK~~SR resource ~~in the same way as Rel-15~~. * If SR is negative, transmit only HARQ-ACK on HARQ-ACK resource. |
| Quectel | Similar views as CATT. |
| Panasonic | We would like to clarify whether the proposal is applied to all PUCCH format combinations.  We are fine with the proposal for the following cases:  - PUCCH carrying HP SR with PF0 overlaps with a PUCCH carrying LP HARQ-ACK with PF0  - PUCCH carrying HP SR with PF0 or PF1 overlaps with a PUCCH carrying LP HARQ-ACK with FP2, 3, or 4  For the case when a PUCCH carrying HP SR with PF0 overlaps with a PUCCH carrying LP HARQ-ACK with PF1, to transmit HP SR and LP HARQ-ACK on the HARQ-ACK resource would increase the latency of SR transmission. Therefore, if the proposal is applied, latency requirement should be introduced.  For the case when a PUCCH carrying HP SR with PF1 overlaps with a PUCCH carrying LP HARQ-ACK with PF0, the proposal means Rel.15/16 multiplexing behavior for the same priority. However, to transmit HP SR and LP HARQ-ACK on the HARQ-ACK resource would cause the performance degradation since the HP SR is originally to be transmitted on PUCCH format 1. In our view, this case (HP SR is long PUCCH while LP HARQ-ACK is short PUCCH) might be a corner case. Therefore, no enhancement (i.e., drop LP-HARQ-ACK) could be sufficient. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | For multiplexing a HP SR and 1- or 2-bit LP HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH, we suggest treating the LP HARQ-ACK as HARQ-ACK bits with high priority, determine a HP PUCCH resource for the LP HARQ-ACK, and apply Rel-15 SR/HARQ-ACK multiplexing rules based on the determined HP PUCCH resource. |
| Apple | Please see our comment in Section 4.2.2. If in the end, the LP HARQ-ACK is transmitted (e.g. multiplexed over PUSCH) and is not discarded, the discussion here is meaningful. Otherwise, the discussion is less important. |
| OPPO | The first sub-bullet is not clear for us. In R15 procedure, SR PUCCH with PF1 and HARQ-ACK PUCCH with PF0 is not supported. The proposal means the preclusive case is not supported in R17 or it is open to discuss, e.g. follows R16 prioritization.  In our understanding, R17 multiplexing should not be worse than R16 prioritization, so the preclusive case in R15 should be supported and R16 prioritization solution can be baseline.  So, we suggest to modify proposal:  When a PUCCH format 0/1 carrying HP SR overlaps with a PUCCH format 0/1 carrying LP HARQ-ACK,   * If SR is positive, * SR is multiplexed on HARQ-ACK resource in the same way as Rel-15 for the case of SR PUCCH with PF 0 and HARQ-ACK PUCCH with PF0, SR PUCCH with PF 1 and HARQ-ACK PUCCH with PF1, and SR PUCCH with PF 0 and HARQ-ACK PUCCH with PF1. * SR transmits in SR resource and HARQ-ACK drops for the case of SR PUCCH with PF 1 and HARQ-ACK PUCCH with PF0. * If SR is negative, transmit only HARQ-ACK on HARQ-ACK resource. |
| InterDigital | Don’t support.  At least when SR is positive, need to use the HP resource for transmission (in this case SR resource) otherwise the reliability requirement of HP SR is not met. |
| DOCOMO | We share the similar view with CATT. It would be better to separately discuss proposals for different PUCCH formats. Besides, we prefer to use HP PUCCH resource for the multiplexing. |
| QC | Similar to other companies already commented, it is hard to see how this proposal is formulated based on companies’ input. To us, this proposal over-simplifies things. SR and HARQ-ACK multiplexing should be discussion case by case, according to combinations of different PUCCH format. We suggest to revert back to the formulate of proposals in last meeting and use that as a starting point. |
| TCL | We share the similar view as Panasonic. We need to clarify whether the proposal is applied to all PUCCH format combinations.  We are fine with the proposal for the following cases:  - PUCCH carrying HP SR with PF0 overlaps with a PUCCH carrying LP HARQ-ACK with PF0  - PUCCH carrying HP SR with PF0 or PF1 overlaps with a PUCCH carrying LP HARQ-ACK with FP2, 3, or 4 |
| Spreadtrum | Partially agree, for a PUCCH carrying HP SR with PF0 overlaps with a PUCCH carrying LP HARQ-ACK with PF1, LP HARQ-ACK can be dropped for positive SR. |
| vivo | Not support  For the case HP SR with PF0 and LP HARQ-ACK with PF1, in Rel-15, SR is dropped when SR is positive. This is not reasonable to drop HP SR and transmit LP HARQ-ACK.  For the other case, we are fine with the proposal. |
| LG | We are not supportive to the proposal.  Many companies including us are considering the multiplexing of positive SR on SR PUCCH resource, especially to avoid small distance of CS offset on PF0.  Therefore, the reformulation is needed to reflect UCI performance aspect. |
| Nokia, NSB | Share similar views a CATT. |
| Sony | Not support.  Similar view with CATT as it is not clear how this proposal is derived from companies input and it doesn’t identify the combination of PUCCH Formats, which we agreed to consider. |
| Samsung | Not support.  The Rel-15 behavior is different for different PUCCH formats.  For HARQ-ACK with PF 0, gNB cannot differentiate the following two cases,  Case a) HP SR+ overlaps with LP HARQ-ACK  Case b) LP SR+ overlaps with LP HARQ-ACK  To ensure the reliability of HP UL traffic, gNB will treat the SR in Case b) as HP SR and may overbook the resource allocation for the PUSCH. It may degrade SE. Further, for a given logical channel, the parameter allowedPHY-PriorityIndex-r16 can be configured as p0, in this case, if gNB schedules a HP PUSCH, the data associated with the logical channel cannot be transmitted. The worst consequence of this case in Rel-16 is to retransmit up to 2 PDSCHs, optimization for this case needs further justification.  For HARQ-ACK with PF 1, if a UE would transmit SR in a resource using PUCCH format 0 and HARQ-ACK information bits in a resource using PUCCH format 1 in a slot, the UE transmits only a PUCCH with the HARQ-ACK information bits in the resource using PUCCH format 1. Rel-15 doesn’t support multiplexing SR and HARQ-ACK for such case. The first sub-bullet is not clear.  For HARQ-ACK with PF 2, 3 and 4, UE multiplexes SR and HARQ-ACK in a HARQ-ACK PUCCH regardless of whether SR is positive or negative, this proposal introduces new behaviors. Also, it is not clear how to multiplex only positive SR. For example, does it mean only ceiling (log2(K)) bits are needed instead of ceiling (log2(K+1))? Further, it is not clear how to handle the case where both HP SR(s) and LP SR(s) overlap with a LP HARQ-ACK.  Considering there are only 3 meeting left, it will be difficult to discuss the issue case by case, we suggest to reuse Rel-16 behavior and suggest the following proposal  When a PUCCH carrying HP SR overlaps with a PUCCH carrying LP HARQ-ACK and there is no other overlapping channel, Rel-16 behavior is reused.   * ~~If SR is positive, SR is multiplexed on HARQ-ACK resource in the same way as Rel-15.~~ * ~~If SR is negative, transmit only HARQ-ACK on HARQ-ACK resource.~~ |
| ZTE | Not support the proposal. The proposal doesn’t consider the latency requirement of HP SR should be satisfied if the HP SR is multiplexed into a LP PUCCH resources. We suggest:  *For positive SR, transmit HARQ-ACK on the SR resource. For negative SR, transmit HARQ-ACK on the HARQ-ACK resource. The principle is applied at least for three cases:*   * *PUCCH carrying HP SR with PF0 overlaps with a PUCCH carrying LP HARQ-ACK with PF0* * *PUCCH carrying HP SR with PF0 overlaps with a PUCCH carrying LP HARQ-ACK with PF1* * *PUCCH carrying HP SR with PF1 overlaps with a PUCCH carrying LP HARQ-ACK with PF0* |
| Intel | Similar view as CATT |
| Huawei | The multiplexing of HP SR and LP HARQ-ACK should be discussed case by case depending on the specific PUCCH format. From our understanding, e.g., for HP SR PF0/1 vs LP HARQ-ACK PF 0, or HP SR PF1 vs LP HARQ-ACK PF1, SR is multiplexed on HARQ-ACK resource in the same way as Rel-15 if SR is positive; for HP SR PF0 vs LP HARQ-ACK PF 1, the LP HARQ-ACK should be dropped if SR is positive. The reason not choosing the HP SR as the resulting resource for multiplexed SR and HARQ-ACK is that the doubled SR resources always need to be reserved even for the case where there is no dynamic HARQ-ACK, which causes unnecessary waste of SR resources. |
| Ericsson | Do not support  We recommend to follow the general principle of Rel-15, i.e., to multiplex SR on LP HARQ-ACK PUCCH resource. In general, HARQ-ACK is much more frequent than SR, and HARQ-ACK should stay with its configured resources most of the time, as is done in Rel-15. This helps with UE and gNB implementation.  For the rare occasion when HP SR is positive, we suggest to add an offset (e.g. 1 PRB) to the starting PRB of the HARQ-ACK PUCCH resource. Thus reliability of SR is ensured by the two different HARQ-ACK PUCCH resources (negative SR => no PRB offset; positive SR => 1 PRB offset).  This method is generally applicable and avoids to discussed one by one each combination of SR PFx + LP HARQ-ACK PFx. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## Other enhancements

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Proposals/observations from Tdocs |
| E/// | 1. In case of overlapping between PUCCH and/or PUSCH resources in a slot with different priorities, methods based on partial puncturing with or without resuming and HARQ-ACK bundling as part of overlapping resolution procedures are not supported. 2. In case of overlapping between PUCCH and/or PUSCH resources in a slot with different priorities, only UCI multiplexing methods on PUCCH or PUSCH resources that are extension of already existing UCI multiplexing methods are supported. |
| ETRI | Proposal 3: Further study how to adjust the power of PUCCH for payload from the other priority. |
| DOCOMO | **Proposal 7:**   * *For collision handling among LP HARQ-ACK, HP HARQ-ACK, and HP SR, following UE behaviour is proposed:*   + *Step 1: multiplexing of HP HARQ-ACK and HP SR by following Rel-16 procedure.*   + *Step 2: multiplexing of the outcome of step 1 and LP HARQ-ACK by following Case 1.* |
| Leno/Moto | * **Proposal 4:** If LP HARQ-ACK not multiplexed due to payload size limitation, UE can further check possible multiplexing in the next sub-slot, unless a PUCCH of low priority index for LP HARQ-ACK is limited up to a current sub-slot. |
| Ericsson | Rather than spending time to reduce the options for the 3 combinations, it’s more efficient if framework type of issues are addressed first. If we go one by one for each specific combination, it’s time consuming and inefficient.  For example, just for the question of HP SR + LP X, there are still many combinations to go through:   * HP SR + LP HARQ-ACK:   + What to do for HP SR on PF1 and LP HARQ-ACK on PF1?   + What to do for SR on PF0 or PF1, HP HARQ-ACK on PF 2/3/4? * HP SR + HP HARQ-ACK + LP HARQ-ACK: this is agreed to be supported in Rel-17   + If we follow the way the 3 proposals were handled, then all the PF combinations have to be listed, each with possible options, then down-select. * HP SR + LP SR? * HP SR + LP CSI? * HP + LP PUSCH?   Thus, for the HP SR + LP HARQ-ACK, the 3 proposals are preferably combined into one:   * For positive SR, transmit HARQ-ACK on the SR resource. For negative SR, transmit HARQ-ACK on the HARQ-ACK resource. |
|  |  |

# Multiplexing UCIs of different priorities in a PUSCH

## Agreements in previous meetings

Agreements:

*Support multiplexing for following scenarios in R17:*

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

*For the above multiplexing scenarios,*

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

Agreements:

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

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

Working assumption:

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

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

Agreements:

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

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

Agreement:

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

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

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

## Inputs from Tdocs

**Encoder and CSI dropping:**

* If HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK would be transmitted on HP/LP PUSCH without CSI,
  + Reuses R15 TS 38.212 Clause 5.3.1 and Clause 5.3.3 for LP HARQ-ACK.
    - HW, ZTE, OPPO, Apple, DCM
* If HP HARQ-ACK, LP HARQ-ACK, and LP CSI would be transmitted on LP PUSCH,
  + Option 1: Both CSI part 1 and part 2 are dropped, the LP HARQ-ACK can be multiplexed by reusing the encoder chain, rate matching and RE mapping for Rel-15 CSI part 1.
    - Nokia, vivo
* Option 2: The CSI part 2 is dropped. LP HARQ-ACK and CSI part 1 can be multiplexed by reusing the encoder chain, rate matching and RE mapping for Rel-15 CSI part 1 and part 2 respectively.
  + Option 2a: LP HARQ-ACK has lower priority than LP CSI part 1, and LP HARQ-ACK may be dropped (similar to Rel-15 CSI-part2);
  + Option 2b: LP HARQ-ACK has higher priority than LP CSI part 1, and LP CSI part 1 may be dropped (similar to Rel-15 CSI-part1);
    - HW, ZTE, Samsung, vivo, CATT, QC, OPPO, Quectel
* Option 3: The CSI part 1 is dropped. CSI part 2 is similarly treated as CSI part 1 in Option 2.
* Option 4: No CSI is dropped. LP HARQ-ACK and LP CSI part 1 are jointly encoded and reuse the coding method used for CSI part 1 in Rel-15. CSI part 2 reuses the coding method used for CSI part 2 in Rel-15.
  + - vivo, DCM, Spreadtrum
* If HP HARQ-ACK, LP HARQ-ACK, and HP A-CSI would be transmitted on HP PUSCH,
  + LP HARQ-ACK is dropped. CSI part 1 and CSI part 2 can be multiplexed by reusing the encoder chain, rate matching and RE mapping for Rel-15 CSI part 1 and part 2 respectively.
    - HW, Nokia, CATT (if HP CSI includes two parts), QC, Quectel (if HP CSI includes two parts),
  + The CSI part 2 is dropped. LP HARQ-ACK and CSI part 1 can be multiplexed by reusing the encoder chain, rate matching and RE mapping for Rel-15 CSI part 1 and part 2 respectively.
    - ZTE,
  + LP HARQ-ACK is jointly encoded with CSI part 1 or CSI part 2.
    - vivo, Apple, DCM

**Rate matching and RE mapping:**

* Reuse Rel-15 rate matching and RE mapping as the baseline.
  + Nokia, HW
* HP HARQ-ACK is rate match around by other UCIs (if exist) and UL-SCH (if exist). LP HARQ-ACK is padded to 2 bits if it is 0 or 1 bit. The padded LP HARQ-ACK is rate matched around by other UCIs (if exist) and UL-SCH (if exist).
  + QC
* Different RE mapping rules considering whether the multiplexed CSI consists of two parts or single part and whether the PUSCH for multiplexing of the UCIs is conveying UL-SCH or not.
  + LGE
* Coded LP HARQ-ACK bit(s) (if exist) is(are) concatenated to coded HP HARQ-ACK bits as an input to the HARQ-ACK multiplexer in PUSCH.
  + Quectel

**Power control:**

* For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUSCH in R17, reuse the same power control formula as in Rel-15.
  + QC

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Proposals/observations from Tdocs |
| Huawei | ***Proposal 18: If HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK would be transmitted on HP/LP PUSCH without CSI, the LP HARQ-ACK can be multiplexed by reusing the encoding chain for legacy CSI part 1 or CSI part 2.***  ***Proposal 19: If HP HARQ-ACK, LP HARQ-ACK, and CSI would be transmitted on LP PUSCH, or, if HP HARQ-ACK, LP HARQ-ACK, and semi-static CSI would be transmitted on HP PUSCH, the CSI part 2 should be dropped, and following two candidates can be further studied:***   * ***Candidate 1: HP HARQ-ACK reuses the encoding chain for legacy HARQ-ACK, and LP HARQ-ACK reuses the encoding chain for legacy CSI part 2.*** * ***Candidate 2: HP HARQ-ACK reuses the encoding chain for legacy HARQ-ACK, LP HARQ-ACK reuses the encoding chain for legacy CSI part 1, and CSI part 1 reuses the encoding chain for legacy CSI part 2.***   ***Proposal 20: If HP HARQ-ACK, LP HARQ-ACK, and A-CSI would be transmitted on HP PUSCH, the LP HARQ-ACK should be dropped.***  ***Proposal 21: For collision of HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK with PUSCH, if the LP HARQ-ACK is to be multiplexed on PUSCH, it should be rate matched with the UL-SCH and/or CSI regardless of the LP HARQ-ACK payload.*** |
| Nokia | **Proposal 3.21: For the scenario of the multiplexing between HARQ-ACK and PUSCH with different priorities, RAN1 should not support joint coding of different UCI types, for example low-priority HARQ-ACK and CSI.**  **Proposal 3.22: For the scenario where high-priority HARQ-ACK bits, low-priority HARQ-ACK bits and CSI would be multiplexed into a low-priority PUSCH, drop CSI (including part 1 and part 2, if exist).**  ***Observation 3.3: For the scenario where multiplexing both high-priority HARQ-ACK bits and low-priority HARQ-ACK bits into a high-priority PUSCH without CSI, the number of encoding chains is sufficient.***  **Proposal 3.23: For the scenario where both high-priority HARQ-ACK bits and low-priority HARQ-ACK bits would be multiplexed into a high-priority PUSCH carrying CSI, drop low-priority HARQ-ACK.**  **Proposal 3.24: For the scenarios where both high-priority HARQ-ACK bits and low-priority HARQ-ACK bits are multiplexed into a PUSCH, reuse Rel-15 rate matching and RE mapping as the baseline.** |
| ZTE | ***Proposal 17:*** *For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUSCH in R17, the coding scheme, rate matching and RE mapping of HP HARQ-ACK reuse the mechanism of HARQ-ACK multiplexed in PUSCH in Rel-15.*  ***Proposal 18:*** *For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUSCH in R17, if HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK would be transmitted on HP/LP PUSCH without CSI, the coding scheme, rate matching and RE mapping of LP HARQ-ACK reuse the mechanism of CSI-part 1 in Rel-15.*  ***Proposal 19:*** *For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUSCH in R17, if HP HARQ-ACK, LP HARQ-ACK, and LP CSI consisting of two parts would be transmitted on LP PUSCH conveying UL-SCH,*   * *The LP CSI part 2 is dropped firstly.* * *LP HARQ-ACK is coded separately from HP HARQ-ACK and CSI part 1.* * *The coding scheme, rate matching and RE mapping of LP HARQ-ACK and LP CSI part 1 will respectively follow the rules of Rel-15 CSI-part 1 and Rel-15 CSI-part 2.*   *If the leftover resources for LP HARQ-ACK and LP CSI part 1 is not sufficient, LP HARQ-ACK has higher priority than LP CSI part 1, and LP CSI part 1 may be partially dropped or compressed.*  ***Proposal 20:*** *For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUSCH in R17, if HP HARQ-ACK, LP HARQ-ACK, and HP CSI consisting of two parts would be transmitted on HP PUSCH conveying UL-SCH,*   * *Dropping HP A-CSI part 2.* * *The coding scheme, rate matching and RE mapping of LP HARQ-ACK and HP CSI part 1 will respectively follow the rules of Rel-15 CSI-part 1 and Rel-15 CSI-part 2.* * *If the leftover resources for LP HARQ-ACK and HP CSI part 1 is not sufficient, LP HARQ-ACK has lower priority than HP CSI part 1, and LP HARQ-ACK may be partially dropped or compressed.*   ***Proposal 21:*** *For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUSCH in R17, if HP HARQ-ACK, LP HARQ-ACK, and HP/LP CSI consisting of two parts would be transmitted on HP/LP PUSCH not conveying UL-SCH, UE follows the same behaviour as that in case of PUSCH conveying UL-SCH.* |
| Samsung | **Proposal 14: For multiplexing LP/HP HARQ-ACK and CSI in a PUSCH, LP HARQ-ACK is treated as CSI part 1, CSI part 1 is treated as CSI part 2, and CSI part 2 is dropped.** |
| vivo | ***Proposal 14: When HP and LP HARQ-ACK are multiplexed on a LP PUSCH with LP CSI, the following alternatives can be investigated:***   * + ***Alt 1: drop LP CSI part 2, LP HARQ-ACK is handled as the same manner as CSI part 2.***   + ***Alt 2: LP HARQ-ACK and LP CSI part 1 are encoded jointly and the same manner with CSI part 1 is reused for LP HARQ-ACK and LP CSI part 1.***   + ***Alt 3: drop LP CSI, LP HARQ-ACK is handled as the same manner as CSI part 1.***   ***Proposal 15: When HP and LP HARQ-ACK are multiplexed on a HP PUSCH with HP CSI, LP HARQ-ACK is jointly encoded with CSI part 1 or CSI part 2.*** |
| CATT | ***Proposal 16: For multiplexing HP HARQ-ACK, LP HARQ-ACK and HP A/SP-CSI on PUSCH, LP HARQ-ACK can be dropped in case the HP A/SP-CSI includes two parts.***  ***Proposal 17: For multiplexing HP HARQ-ACK, LP HARQ-ACK and LP CSI on PUSCH, it is proposed to drop CSI part 2 if exists.***  ***Proposal 18: For separate coding of HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK when multiplexing on PUSCH,***   * ***both HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK reuse the rate matching equation, and RE mapping rules in Rel-15 for HARQ-ACK on PUSCH with same priority;*** * ***LP HARQ-ACK mapped on PUSCH after the reserved RE resources for HP HARQ-ACK in case 0~2 bits HP HARQ-ACK and after the actual RE resources for HP HARQ-ACK in case >2 bits HP HARQ-ACK.*** |
| Spreadtrum | 1. ***For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUSCH in R17, if HP HARQ-ACK, LP HARQ-ACK, and LP CSI consisting of two parts would be transmitted on LP PUSCH conveying UL-SCH, Option 4 is supported, i.e., no CSI is dropped.*** |
| QC | ***Proposal 11*: For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUSCH in R17, if CSI would multiplex on the same PUSCH,**   * **Drop CSI part 2, if CSI is a low priority CSI.**    + **HP A/N reuse encoder and rate matching equation for Rel-15 A/N**   + **LP A/N reuse encoder and rate matching equation for Rel-15 CSI part 1**   + **LP CSI part 1 reuse encoder and rate matching equation for Rel-15 CSI part 2** * **Drop LP HARQ-ACK, if CSI is a high priority CSI.**    + **HP A/N reuse encoder and rate matching equation for Rel-15 A/N**   + **HP CSI part 1 reuse encoder and rate matching equation for Rel-15 CSI part 1**   + **HP CSI part 2 reuse encoder and rate matching equation for Rel-15 CSI part 2** * **FFS: RE mapping rules.**   ***Proposal 14*: For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUSCH in R17, the following RE mapping rules are supported.**   * **HP HARQ-ACK is rate match around by other UCIs (if exist) and UL-SCH (if exist)** * **LP HARQ-ACK is padded to 2 bits if it is 0 or 1 bit. The padded LP HARQ-ACK is rate matched around by other UCIs (if exist) and UL-SCH (if exist)** |
| OPPO | ***Proposal 20: To support multiplexing UCI in one PUSCH with different priority, reuse the encoder, rate matching equation, and RE mapping rules in Rel-15:***   * + ***Treat HP HARQ-ACK as Rel-15 HARQ-ACK;***   + ***Treat LP HARQ-ACK as Rel-15 CSI-Part1;***   + ***Treat CSI-Part1 as Rel-15 CSI-Part 2;***   + ***CSI-Part 2 is dropped.*** |
| LGE | **Proposal #17: Consider at least the following aspects for determining UCI RE mapping rule (order) on PUSCH, according to various combinations of UCI and PUSCH.**   * **Whether the CSI to be multiplexed on PUSCH consists of two parts or single part.**   + **UCI RE mapping rule (order) could be different according to the above.** * **Whether the PUSCH for multiplexing of the UCIs is conveying UL-SCH or not.**   + **UCI RE mapping rule (order) could be different according to the above.** |
| Intel | **Proposal 10: Separate encoding is used for multiplexing LP and HP HARQ-ACK bits onto the PUSCH.**   * **Separate beta offset configuration can be used depending on the combination of PUSCH and HARQ-ACK to be multiplexed** * **LP HARQ-ACK payload bits can be partially dropped if needed.** |
| Apple | **Proposal 7-1**  **when HP CSI is present, only the following UCIs are carried in UCI part I and part II:**  **HP HARQ-ACK > HP SR > (HP CSI) > LP HARQ-ACK > (LP SR)**  **When HP CSI is absent, only the following UCIs are carried UCI part I and part II**  **HP HARQ-ACK > HP SR > LP HARQ-ACK > (LP SR) > LP CSI**  **Proposal 11-1: Between two options of mapping LP HARQ-ACK into UCI Part I and UCI Part II, RAN1 select one of them consistently across multiplexing scenarios.**  **Proposal 11-2: Adopt Alt. 1 or Alt. 2 design from Tables 11-1 and 11-2.** |
| Leno/Moto | * **Proposal 7:** If a PUCCH resource to multiplex HP UCI and LP UCI overlaps in time with one or multiple PUSCHs including at least one HP PUSCH, a PUSCH to multiplex the HP UCI and the LP UCI is selected from the at least one HP PUSCH. * **Proposal 8:** If a PUCCH resource to multiplex HP UCI and LP UCI overlaps in time with one or multiple PUSCHs without at least one HP PUSCH, a PUSCH to multiplex the HP UCI and the LP UCI is selected according to Rel-15 PUSCH selection rules. * **Proposal 9:** UE does not multiplex SR of a given physical layer priority into a PUSCH of the given physical layer priority but may multiplex SR of a physical layer priority different than the given physical layer priority into the PUSCH. * **Proposal 10:** If a UE would transmit semi-persistent or aperiodic CSI on a PUSCH determined for multiplexing mixed priority UCI of PUCCH, the UE may multiplex the semi-persistent or aperiodic CSI with the mixed priority UCI of PUCCH in the PUSCH. * **Proposal 11:** Further study encoding and rate-matching when multiplexing semi-persistent/aperiodic CSI of a PUSCH with mixed priority UCI of a PUCCH in the PUSCH. |
| Quectel | **Proposal 10**: LP CSI part 2 (if exists) is dropped when HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK are multiplexed on a LP PUSCH.  **Proposal 11**: Multiplexing of LP HARQ-ACK in a HP PUSCH is supported only when HP A/N and HP CSI part 2 do not simultaneously exist on the HP PUSCH.  **Proposal 14**: LP HARQ-ACK is multiplexed on a number of last symbols occupied by the HP PUSCH when multiplexing of LP HARQ-ACK in HP PUSCH occurs.  **Proposal 16**: When multiplexing of a HP HARQ-ACK associated to a later DCI and a LP PUSCH scheduled by an earlier DCI is enabled, two possible solutions (or a hybrid of the two solutions) could be considered:   * The HP HARQ-ACK is punctured on the LP PUSCH; * The multiplexing is expected to be applied only when certain timeline criterion are met. |
| ETRI | **Proposal 8: For HARQ-ACK codebook construction, sub-slot based HARQ-ACK codebooks are concatenated, and may be transmitted for PUSCH repetition.**  **Proposal 9: Further study how to adjust the power of PUSCH for payload from the other priority.**  **Proposal 10: Further study the SR multiplexing onto PUSCH** |
| NEC | ***Proposal 2:*** *When multiplexing both low-priority HARQ-ACK and high-priority HARQ-ACK on a PUSCH scheduled by an UL non-fallback DCI with a DAI field, which HARQ-ACK codebook the DAI field is applied to should be configured by gNB.* |
| Sharp | **Proposal 10: For HP HARQ-ACK with or without LP HARQ-ACK on LP PUSCH, details should be further studied on**   * **Multiplexing location, e.g. starting/ending symbol** * **Detailed multiplexing methods, etc.**   **Proposal 11: HP SR multiplexing on LP PUSCH can be supported, and enhanced channel dropping rule should be defined based on whether HP UCI is multiplexed on LP PUSCH.** |
| WILUS | * ***Proposal 9:*** *To multiplex LP HARQ-ACK and HP HARQ-ACK into a PUSCH in case of UCI on PUSCH, reuse Rel-15 rules as much as possible.*   + *The number of REs for LP HARQ-ACK and HP HARQ-ACK is determined by Rel-15 RE calculation rules for HARQ-ACK.*   + *RE positions for LP HARQ-ACK and HP HARQ-ACK in a PUSCH are determined by Rel-15 RE mapping rules for HARQ-ACK.* |
|  |  |

## 1st round discussion

Proposal for 1st round discussion:

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

* HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK are separately encoded according to R15 TS 38.212 Clause 5.3.1 and Clause 5.3.3 for LP HARQ-ACK.
* Reuse R15 HARQ-ACK rate matching and RE mapping for HP HARQ-ACK.
* Reuse R15 Part 1 CSI rate matching and RE mapping for LP HARQ-ACK.

Proposal for 1st round discussion:

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

* The CSI part 2 is dropped. LP HARQ-ACK is coded separately from HP HARQ-ACK and CSI part 1.
* LP HARQ-ACK and CSI part 1 can be multiplexed by reusing the encoder chain, rate matching and RE mapping for Rel-15 CSI part 1 and part 2 respectively.
* FFS for LP CSI consisting of single part.
* FFS for HP/LP PUSCH not conveying UL-SCH.

Proposal for 1st round discussion:

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

* LP HARQ-ACK is dropped. CSI part 1 and CSI part 2 can be multiplexed by reusing the encoder chain, rate matching and RE mapping for Rel-15 CSI part 1 and part 2 respectively.
* FFS for LP CSI consisting of single part.
* FFS for HP/LP PUSCH not conveying UL-SCH.

Proposal after 1st round discussion:

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

* HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK are separately encoded according to R15 TS 38.212 Clause 5.3.1 and Clause 5.3.3 ~~for LP HARQ-ACK~~.
* Reuse R15 HARQ-ACK rate matching and RE mapping for HP HARQ-ACK in principle. FFS details.
* Reuse R15 Part 1 CSI rate matching and RE mapping for LP HARQ-ACK in principle. FFS details.

Proposal after 1st round discussion:

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

* The CSI part 2 is dropped. ~~LP HARQ-ACK is coded separately from HP HARQ-ACK and CSI part 1.~~
* ~~LP HARQ-ACK and CSI part 1 can be multiplexed by reusing the encoder chain, rate matching and RE mapping for Rel-15 CSI part 1 and part 2 respectively.~~
* Reuse R15 HARQ-ACK rate matching and RE mapping for HP HARQ-ACK in principle. FFS details.
* Reuse R15 CSI part 1 rate matching and RE mapping for LP HARQ-ACK in principle. FFS details.
* Reuse R15 CSI part 2 rate matching and RE mapping for LP CSI part 1 in principle. FFS details.
* FFS for LP CSI consisting of single part.
* FFS for ~~HP/~~LP PUSCH not conveying UL-SCH.

Proposal after 1st round discussion:

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

* LP HARQ-ACK is dropped. ~~CSI part 1 and CSI part 2 can be multiplexed by reusing the encoder chain, rate matching and RE mapping for Rel-15 CSI part 1 and part 2 respectively.~~
* Reuse R15 HARQ-ACK rate matching and RE mapping for HP HARQ-ACK.
* Reuse R15 CSI part 1 rate matching and RE mapping for HP CSI part 1.
* Reuse R15 CSI part 2 rate matching and RE mapping for HP CSI part 2.
* FFS for LP CSI consisting of single part.
* FFS for HP~~/LP~~ PUSCH not conveying UL-SCH.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| CATT | 1. For the 1st proposal, “for LP HARQ-ACK” at the end of the first sub-bullet should be removed. 2. For all the three proposals, for LP HARQ-ACK, our prefer is to reuse rate matching and RE mapping for HARQ-ACK, i.e. LP HARQ-ACK may puncture HP PUSCH when LP HARQ-ACK includes 1-2 bits. The benefit is that missing LP DCI corresponding LP HARQ-ACK would not impact the coding rate of HP PUSCH. 3. For the 2nd proposal, we would like to propose to modify the second sub-bullet to avoid potential confusion as follows. In addition, it seems that the proposal can be applied to both LP PUSCH and HP PUSCH so that “LP” in “LP PUSCH conveying UL-SCH” in the main bullet can be removed.    * LP HARQ-ACK and CSI part 1 ~~can be multiplexed by reusing~~ reuse the encoder chain, rate matching and RE mapping for Rel-15 CSI part 1 and part 2 respectively. 4. For the 3rd proposal, we would like to propose to modify the first sub-bullet to avoid potential confusion.    * LP HARQ-ACK is dropped. CSI part 1 and CSI part 2 ~~can be multiplexed by reusing~~ reuse the encoder chain, rate matching and RE mapping for Rel-15 CSI part 1 and part 2 respectively. |
| Quectel | 1st Proposal: Not support for the third sub-bullet. We are fine for the first two sub-bullets. For the third sub-bullet, we think the cases for HP HARQ-ACK in LP PUSCH and LP HARQ-ACK in HP PUSCH should be separately discussed. For the case of HP HARQ-ACK in LP PUSCH, R15 Part 1 CSI rate matching and RE mapping is reused for LP HARQ-ACK. For the case of LP HARQ-ACK in HP PUSCH, we think R15 UL-SCH (if exists) rate matching and RE mapping should be reused for LP HARQ-ACK. The reason is that LP HARQ-ACK should not be prioritized over HP UL-SCH.  2nd Proposal: Not support for the second sub-bullet. For same priority multiplexing of HARQ-ACK in PUSCH, RE reservation is supported when the number of HARQ-ACK bits is not larger than 2. No RE reservation for CSI. We are unclear what the second sub-bullet means for RE reservation. Is RE reservation still supported or not?  3rd Proposal: We generally support the idea. We think the first sub-bullet means Rel-16 behavior is reused. |
| Panasonic | We are fine with three proposals. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | For the 1st proposal, we propose the following modification (in red):  For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUSCH in R17, if HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK would be transmitted on HP/LP PUSCH without CSI,   * HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK are separately encoded according to R15 TS 38.212 Clause 5.3.1 and Clause 5.3.3 ~~for LP HARQ-ACK~~. * In principle, Reuse R15 HARQ-ACK rate matching and RE mapping for HP HARQ-ACK. * In principle, Reuse R15 Part 1 CSI rate matching and RE mapping for LP HARQ-ACK. * FFS: impact of separate beta offset values and separate alpha values   Regarding the 2nd proposal, we support first encoding with HP HARQ-ACK, second encoding jointly with LP HARQ-ACK/LP CSI-part1, and third encoding with LP CSI-part2, which correspond to Rel-15 HARQ-ACK, CSI-part1, and CSI-part2 encoding/rate matching/RE mapping, respectively. We think whether to drop LP CSI-part2 should be dependent on available REs.  Regarding the 3rd proposal, we support first encoding with HP HARQ-ACK, second encoding with HP CSI-part1, and third encoding jointly with HP CSI-part2/LP HARQ-ACK, which correspond to Rel-15 HARQ-ACK, CSI-part1, and CSI-part2 encoding/rate matching/RE mapping, respectively. In this way, LP HARQ-ACK of a small payload size can still be transmitted. |
| Apple | Proposal 1 is not very clear, we support Motorola’s modification on Proposal 1.  As for Proposal 3, we have several comments 1) How to reconcile Proposal 3 with the previous agreement (copied below in italics)?  *Support multiplexing for following scenarios in R17:*   * *Multiplexing a low-priority HARQ-ACK in a high-priority PUSCH (conveying UL-SCH only).* * *Multiplexing a high-priority HARQ-ACK in a low-priority PUSCH (conveying UL-SCH only)* * *Multiplexing a low-priority HARQ-ACK, a high-priority PUSCH conveying UL-SCH, a high-priority HARQ-ACK and/or CSI.* * *Multiplexing a high-priority HARQ-ACK, a low-priority PUSCH conveying UL-SCH, a low-priority HARQ-ACK and/or CSI.*   2) what is the enhancement over Rel-16? ☺ 3) Note for UCI multiplexing over PUCCH as in Section 3, we are discussing UCI multiplexing for 1 HP bit and 1 LP bit (apparently that is found to be worthy discussion), it would be very strange if in the end the LP-HARQ ARK would be dropped if the UCI would be multiplexed over PUSCH. We should be more consistent than that. Hence we support motorola’s modification on Proposal 3 (copied below also):  Proposal 3’:  First encoding with HP HARQ-ACK, second encoding with HP CSI-part1, and third encoding jointly with HP CSI-part2/LP HARQ-ACK, which correspond to Rel-15 HARQ-ACK, CSI-part1, and CSI-part2 encoding/rate matching/RE mapping, respectively. In this way, LP HARQ-ACK of a small payload size can still be transmitted.  Then for Proposal 2, we also support Motorola’s modification, with that, the treatment for HARQ/CSI multiplexing over PUSCH is unified:  Proposal 2’:  support first encoding with HP HARQ-ACK, second encoding jointly with LP HARQ-ACK/LP CSI-part1, and third encoding with LP CSI-part2, which correspond to Rel-15 HARQ-ACK, CSI-part1, and CSI-part2 encoding/rate matching/RE mapping, respectively.  In our contribution, we also discuss the pros and cons of mapping LP HARQ-ACK to CSI-part2, interested companies please also check our discussion on that (Section 11.1 of R1-2107735) |
| OPPO | We are fine with three proposals’ intention.  With respect to the 2nd proposal, due to procedure for HP HARQ-ACK is missed and encoder chain mapping is not required to be specified, we modify as following:  For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUSCH in R17, if HP HARQ-ACK, LP HARQ-ACK, and LP CSI consisting of two parts would be transmitted on LP PUSCH conveying UL-SCH,   * The LP CSI part 2 is dropped. ~~LP HARQ-ACK is coded separately from HP HARQ-ACK and CSI part 1.~~ * ~~LP HARQ-ACK and CSI part 1 can be multiplexed by reusing the encoder chain, rate matching and RE mapping for Rel-15 CSI part 1 and part 2 respectively.~~ * Reuse R15 HARQ-ACK rate matching and RE mapping for HP HARQ-ACK. * Reuse R15 CSI part 1 rate matching and RE mapping for LP HARQ-ACK. * Reuse R15 CSI part 2 rate matching and RE mapping for LP CSI part 1. * FFS for LP CSI consisting of single part. * FFS for HP/LP PUSCH not conveying UL-SCH.   With respect to the 3rd proposal, similar modification as the 2nd proposal:  For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUSCH in R17, if HP HARQ-ACK, LP HARQ-ACK and HP A-CSI consisting of two parts would be transmitted on HP PUSCH conveying UL-SCH,   * LP HARQ-ACK is dropped. CSI part 1 and CSI part 2 can be multiplexed by reusing the encoder chain, rate matching and RE mapping for Rel-15 CSI part 1 and part 2 respectively. * Reuse R15 HARQ-ACK rate matching and RE mapping for HP HARQ-ACK. * Reuse R15 CSI part 1 rate matching and RE mapping for HP CSI part 1. * Reuse R15 CSI part 2 rate matching and RE mapping for HP CSI part 2. * FFS for ~~LP~~HP CSI consisting of single part. * FFS for HP/LP PUSCH not conveying UL-SCH.   In addition, in the 3rd proposal, multiplexing output is the same as intra-UE prioritization procedure, i.e. only HP UCI and data are transmitted, if we regard it as R17 multiplexing case, multiplexing timeline should be satisfied. Prioritization timeline should be not considered further. |
| DOCOMO | For the 1st proposal, we prefer the Lenovo’s modification. Regarding the issue for multiplexing on LP PUSCH raised by Quectel, it is valid but we think separate beta-offset and/or alpha can handle the issue.  As for the 2nd and 3rd proposal, we share the same view as Apple and we also support the Lenovo’s modifications on the two proposals. |
| QC | In general, for the three proposals, we are fine about the coding part. For rate matching and RE mapping, we are generally fine. A minor comment is that for HP HARQ-ACK, fully reuse Rel-15 RE mapping may not be a good idea. Because there is very low missing DCI probability with HP HARQ-ACK, puncturing PUSCH for <=2 bits while rate matching PUSCH for >2 bits for HP HARQ-ACK is not necessary. HP HARQ-ACK can always rate matching PUSCH. I suggest put the rate matching and RE mapping as FFS for now.  For the 1st proposal, we are fine with the 1st bullet, except the typo “for LP HARQ-ACK” at the end of the sentence for the 1st proposal should be removed. Suggest the put the 2nd and 3rd bullet as FFS for now.  For the 2nd proposal, we are fine with the 1st bullet. Suggest the put the 2nd and 3rd bullet as FFS for now.  Fine with the 3rd proposal. A minor comment is that the encoding, RM, and RE mapping for HP HARQ-ACK is missing. |
| TCL | For the 1st proposal, we partially support the proposal, since the description is not very clear, ‘for LP HARQ-ACK’ at the 1st sub-bullet should be removed.  For the 2nd proposal, we share the similar view with Lenovo, whether to drop LP CSI-part2 should be dependent on available REs.  Regarding the 3rd proposal, we share the similar view with Apple and Lenovo and support Lenovo’s modification on the 3rd proposal. |
| Spreadtrum | Fine with the 1st proposal. For the 2nd and 3rd proposal, support share same view as Apple and Lenovo. |
| vivo | For the first proposal, fine.  For the 2nd and the 3rd proposal, we share the similar view with Apple and Lenovo to avoid UCI dropping as much as possible. |
| LG | We are fine with the 1st and 2nd proposals, but not supportive to the 3rd proposal.  As we had already agreed, multiplexing of LP HARQ-ACK on HP PUSCH should be supported by dropping HP CSI part 2 as below.  **For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUSCH in R17, if HP HARQ-ACK, LP HARQ-ACK and HP A-CSI consisting of two parts would be transmitted on HP PUSCH conveying UL-SCH,**   * **CSI part 2 is dropped. LP HARQ-ACK and CSI part 1 can be multiplexed by reusing the encoder chain, rate matching and RE mapping for Rel-15 CSI part 1 and part 2 respectively.** * **FFS for HP CSI consisting of single part.** * **FFS for HP/LP PUSCH not conveying UL-SCH.**   By doing so, symmetric design can be achieved between 2nd and 3rd proposals as below:   * Reuse R15 HARQ-ACK rate matching and RE mapping for HP HARQ-ACK. * Reuse R15 CSI part 1 rate matching and RE mapping for LP HARQ-ACK. * Reuse R15 CSI part 2 rate matching and RE mapping for HP/LP CSI part 1. |
| Nokia, NSB | - For the 1st proposal, support. As pointed out by some companies, remove “for LP HARQ-ACK” at the end of the 1st sub-bullet.  - For the 2nd proposal, although we prefer dropping entire CSI (both CSI part 1 and CSI part 2) for better alignment with the agreed working assumption from RAN1#104bis-e meeting for the multiplexing on PUCCH, we could be fine for the purpose of good progress. Moreover, since the proposal is about LP PUSCH, suggest modifying the last sub-bullet as following:   * “FFS for ~~HP/~~LP PUSCH not conveying UL-SCH.”   -For the 3rd proposal, support. As the proposal is only about multiplexing HARQ-ACK into a HP PUSCH, suggest modifying the last sub-bullet as following:  “FFS for HP/~~LP~~ PUSCH not conveying UL-SCH.” |
| Sony | We share same view with Lenovo on the 1st proposal and is fine with Lenovo’s modification  We are fine with the 2nd Proposal  On the 3rd proposal, Apple’s view regarding the agreement that we will multiplex HP HARQ-ACK + LP HARQ-ACK + HP CSI into a PUSCH do need to be reconciled. |
| Samsung | Support the first proposal, and suggest the following editorial modifications,  For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUSCH in R17, if HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK would be transmitted on HP/LP PUSCH without CSI,   * HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK are separately encoded according to R15 TS 38.212 Clause 5.3.1 and Clause 5.3.3 ~~for LP HARQ-ACK~~. * Reuse R15 HARQ-ACK rate matching and RE mapping for HP HARQ-ACK. * Reuse R15 Part 1 CSI rate matching and RE mapping for LP HARQ-ACK.   Support the 2nd proposal.  However, don’t understand either of the two FFS. Behavior should be same.  Not support the 3rd proposal.  It contradicts with the former agreements “*Multiplexing a low-priority HARQ-ACK, a high-priority PUSCH conveying UL-SCH, a high-priority HARQ-ACK and/or CSI.*”  Further, we think a unified solution should be supported for HP and LP PUSCH and we suggest the following update.  For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUSCH in R17, if HP HARQ-ACK, LP HARQ-ACK, and ~~LP~~ CSI consisting of two parts would be transmitted on ~~LP~~ PUSCH conveying UL-SCH,   * The CSI part 2 is dropped. LP HARQ-ACK, ~~is coded separately from~~ HP HARQ-ACK and CSI part 1 are separate coded. * Reuse R15 HARQ-ACK rate matching and RE mapping for HP HARQ-ACK. * LP HARQ-ACK and CSI part 1 can be multiplexed by reusing the encoder chain, rate matching and RE mapping for Rel-15 CSI part 1 and part 2 respectively. * FFS for LP CSI consisting of single part. * FFS for HP/LP PUSCH not conveying UL-SCH. |
| ZTE | For proposal 1, we share the same change commented by CATT.  For proposal 2, we share the same view with CATT that the LP and HP PUSCH could both be applied.  We don’t support proposal 3. Our preference is dropping HP CSI-part2 and keep LP HARQ-ACK to be multiplexed into PUSCH. The LP HARQ-ACK is prioritized than HP CSI-part 2.  For all three proposals, if LP HARQ-ACK reuses the coding chain of CSI-part1, as contribution from Qualcomm mentioned, if the LP DCI corresponding LP HARQ-ACK is missing, the bits for LP HARQ-ACK should be padded up to 2 bits which would not negatively affect the RE mapping rules. Or the new Total DAI for LP HARQ-ACK can be added into UL grant of PUSCH which can also solve the DCI missing issue.  For proposal 2 and 3, the “FFS for HP/LP PUSCH not conveying UL-SCH” should be deleted, as the coding chain for UL-SCH is LDPC codec, anyway the coding chain for UL-SCH will be not suitable to apply to UCI. |
| Intel | Regarding Proposal 1, support revision from Samsung or Lenovo (excluding the separate alpha in FFS bullet)  We are fine with second and third proposals. |
| Huawei | **For the 1st proposal**, we are supportive.  **For the 2nd proposal**, we are generally OK with it. In addition, it looks the HP HARQ-ACK & LP HARQ-ACK & LP CSI on HP PUSCH w/ UL-SCH was missed in the proposal. In our understanding, the principle for tackling this case should be the same as for the LP PUSCH case. Maybe we can update this proposal as  “  For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUSCH in R17, if HP HARQ-ACK, LP HARQ-ACK, and LP CSI consisting of two parts would be transmitted on HP/LP PUSCH conveying UL-SCH,   * The CSI part 2 is dropped. LP HARQ-ACK is coded separately from HP HARQ-ACK and CSI part 1. * LP HARQ-ACK and CSI part 1 can be multiplexed by reusing the encoder chain, rate matching and RE mapping for Rel-15 CSI part 1 and part 2 respectively. * FFS for LP CSI consisting of single part. * FFS for HP/LP PUSCH not conveying UL-SCH.   ”  **For the 3rd proposal**, we are supportive. |

## 2nd round discussion

Proposal for 2nd round discussion:

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

* HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK are separately encoded according to R15 TS 38.212 Clause 5.3.1 and Clause 5.3.3.
* Reuse R15 HARQ-ACK rate matching and RE mapping for HP HARQ-ACK in principle. FFS details.
* Reuse R15 Part 1 CSI rate matching and RE mapping for LP HARQ-ACK in principle. FFS details.

Proposal for 2nd round discussion:

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

* The CSI part 2 is dropped.
* Reuse R15 HARQ-ACK rate matching and RE mapping for HP HARQ-ACK in principle. FFS details.
* Reuse R15 CSI part 1 rate matching and RE mapping for LP HARQ-ACK in principle. FFS details.
* Reuse R15 CSI part 2 rate matching and RE mapping for LP CSI part 1 in principle. FFS details.
* FFS for LP CSI consisting of single part.
* FFS for LP PUSCH not conveying UL-SCH.

Proposal for 2nd round discussion:

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

* LP HARQ-ACK is dropped.
* Reuse R15 HARQ-ACK rate matching and RE mapping for HP HARQ-ACK.
* Reuse R15 CSI part 1 rate matching and RE mapping for HP CSI part 1.
* Reuse R15 CSI part 2 rate matching and RE mapping for HP CSI part 2.
* FFS for LP CSI consisting of single part.
* FFS for HP PUSCH not conveying UL-SCH.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Intel | Support the three proposals |
| Huawei | **For the 1st proposal**, we are supportive.  **For the 2nd proposal**, we are generally OK with it. In addition, it looks the HP HARQ-ACK & LP HARQ-ACK & LP CSI on HP PUSCH w/ UL-SCH was missed in the proposal. In our understanding, the principle for tackling this case should be the same as for the LP PUSCH case. Maybe we can update this proposal as  “  For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUSCH in R17, if HP HARQ-ACK, LP HARQ-ACK, and LP CSI consisting of two parts would be transmitted on HP/LP PUSCH conveying UL-SCH,   * The CSI part 2 is dropped. LP HARQ-ACK is coded separately from HP HARQ-ACK and CSI part 1. * LP HARQ-ACK and CSI part 1 can be multiplexed by reusing the encoder chain, rate matching and RE mapping for Rel-15 CSI part 1 and part 2 respectively. * FFS for LP CSI consisting of single part. * FFS for HP/LP PUSCH not conveying UL-SCH.   ”  It is also fine for us to accept the original version of the 2nd proposal.  **For the 3rd proposal**, we are supportive. |
| Panasonic | We are fine with the three proposals. |
| Apple | We are fine with Proposal 1, and we don’t support Proposal 2 and Proposal 3. Besides the reasons given previously, please consider   * 1. For Proposal 2: Please consider how CSI part 1 only is used by gNB scheduled? For Type II MIMO codebook, that means the precoder information is essentially missing.   2. Regarding Proposal 3: let us review activities on UCI multiplexing: for 1 LP HARQ-ACK + 1 HP HARQ-ACK over PUCCH, companies provide multiple solutions for that, yes somehow it is fine to drop LP HARQ-ACK over HP PUSCH. This is like exploring ways to squeeze 2 people in a compact car (PUCCH) but at the same deciding kicking one person off a big bus (PUSCH). How do we reconcile both? |
| Nokia, NSB | Support the 1st and the 2nd proposal.  Support the 3rd proposal with the following modification:   * “FFS for ~~L~~HP A-CSI consisting of single part.”   In our understanding, the modified version is the intention of the 3rd proposal.  Regarding to updated proposal from some companies, it is worth to mention that multiplexing LP CSI on HP PUSCH has not been discussed yet. |
| OPPO | Fine with three proposals  For the 3nd proposal, a typo is modified.  For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUSCH in R17, if HP HARQ-ACK, LP HARQ-ACK and HP A-CSI consisting of two parts would be transmitted on HP PUSCH conveying UL-SCH,   * LP HARQ-ACK is dropped. * Reuse R15 HARQ-ACK rate matching and RE mapping for HP HARQ-ACK. * Reuse R15 CSI part 1 rate matching and RE mapping for HP CSI part 1. * Reuse R15 CSI part 2 rate matching and RE mapping for HP CSI part 2. * FFS for H~~L~~P CSI consisting of single part. * FFS for HP PUSCH not conveying UL-SCH. |
| ZTE | Fine with first proposal and second proposal. Concerns about the third proposal.  For the third proposal, we think LP HARQ-ACK priories than HP CSI-part 2 as CSI-part 2 is only the sub band channel information, and the performance loss of MIMO can be accepted.  For the second proposal, I share the same view as Huawei’s revision.  Furthermore, for proposal 2 and 3, the “FFS for HP/LP PUSCH not conveying UL-SCH” should be deleted, as the coding chain for UL-SCH is LDPC codec, anyway the coding chain for UL-SCH will be not suitable to apply to UCI. |
| LG | Fine with 1st and 2nd proposals.  But, we are not supportive to 3rd proposal since, as several companies already commented earlier, support of multiplexing between LP HARQ-ACK and HP HARQ-ACK, HP CSI on HP PUSCH had been already agreed.  Related to this issue, handling of the LP HARQ-ACK size ambiguity is being discussed in above Section 3.4, including the possibility to indicate 0-bit as LP HARQ-ACK payload by DCI. **Thus, deciding CSI part 2 dropping as default, gNB could indicate 0-bit (i.e., dropping) for LP HARQ-ACK payload whenever it want to get both HP CSI part 1 and part 2.**  **It is obviously better than dropping LP HARQ-ACK always**, and also has benefit to apply same rate-matching & RE mapping for LP HARQ-ACK and CSI part 1 regardless whether PUSCH is LP or HP. For the above reasons, we suggest the following.  For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUSCH in R17, if HP HARQ-ACK, LP HARQ-ACK and HP A-CSI consisting of two parts would be transmitted on HP PUSCH conveying UL-SCH,   * HP CSI part 2 is dropped. * Reuse R15 HARQ-ACK rate matching and RE mapping for HP HARQ-ACK. * Reuse R15 CSI part 1 rate matching and RE mapping for LP HARQ-ACK. * Reuse R15 CSI part 2 rate matching and RE mapping for HP CSI part 1. * FFS for HP CSI consisting of single part. * FFS for HP PUSCH not conveying UL-SCH. |
| Sony | We are fine with the 1st and 2nd proposals.  On the 3rd proposal there is a typo on the 5th subbullet as spotted by most companies i.e.:   * FFS for HP CSI consisting of single part.   The 3rd proposal still requires the UE to drop the LP HARQ-ACK which contradicts our previous agreement to multiplex HP HARQ-ACK + HP PUSCH + HP CSI + LP HARQ-ACK. (Good analogy from Apple on kicking out a dude from the bus) |
| Apple2 | To provide more details on UCI part1/UCI part2, please see the UCI components for Type II codebook, and the table is from the rapporteur’s summary on Rel-16 NR eMIMO. MIMO delegates worked hard to come up with CSI omission rules, so in the case there is a payload shortage (rank 2 is preferred yet base station gives enough resource for rank 1 feedback only), CSI omission is applied to UCI part 2, and the resulted CSI is useful to gNB scheduler. The same goes for Rel-15 UCI part 2 omission rule.  As the Rel-15 Type II UCI part 2 omission rule is easier to explain, we can use that as an example, roughly speaking for Rel-15 Type II CSI omission for UCI part 2, even subbands PMIs are kept and odd subbands’ PMIs are discarded. Assuming frequency selective fading is not too severe, gNB can still use interpolation to recover the odd subbands’ PMIs, so the UCI with omission remains useful to gNB scheduler. I don’t MIMO delegates expect UCI part 2 can be dropped in total (all the parts marked in yellow below), and when UCI part 2 is dropped in total, the whole PMI information is gone, which totally defeats the purpose of Type II CSI feedback. Note by 38.214, wideband CQI and subband CQI are derived under the PMI assumption, once information about PMI is gone, then widebandCQI and subband CQI are meaningless. Also the “ # NZ coefficients” is for the PMI definition, since PMI information in UCI part II is gone, it is also meaningless.  There is an obvious way to avoid that from happening, as suggested Motorola and other companies. Can we make enhancement enhancement? Taking away a tire from a car while adding a leather seat is not enhancement.  After Rel-17, the feature selection for UCI multiplexing should be straightforward, should not be involving the pro and con of missing a tire/adding a leather seat.  Table 4 UCI parameter list   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **Parameter** | **Location** | **Details/description** | | # NZ coefficients | UCI part 1 | RI (∈{1,…, RIMAX}) and *KNZ,TOT* (the total number of non-zero coefficients summed across all the layers, where *KNZ,TOT* ∈{1,2,…, 2*K*0} are reported in UCI part 1 | | Wideband CQI | UCI part 1 | Same as R15 | | Subband CQI | UCI part 1 | Same as R15 | | Bitmap per layer | UCI part 2 | RI=1-2: for layer *l*, size-  For RI=3-4, bitmaps, each with size-2*LMi* (*i*=0,1,…, *RI*-1, where *i* denotes the *i*-th layer) are reported in UCI part 2 | | Strongest coefficient indicator (SCI) | UCI part 2 | RI=1: the existing agreement on SCI: “A -bit indicator for the strongest coefficient index ”  RI>1: See Table below | | SD basis subset selection indicator | UCI part 2 | SD basis subset selection indicator is a -bit indicator. Details follow Rel.15 | | FD basis subset selection indicator | UCI part 2 | See Table below | | LC coefficients: phase | UCI part 2 | Quantized independently across layers | | LC coefficients: amplitude | UCI part 2 | Quantized independently across layers (including reference amplitude for weaker polarization, for each layer) | | SD oversampling (rotation) factor q1, q2 | UCI part 2 | Values of q1, q2 follow Rel.15 | |
| Sharp | We agree the principles of these proposals, esp. on the different coding chains.  For the RE mapping, there are some discussions on the timeline limitations for HP UCI multiplexing, e.g. the last symbol of the multiplexed HP HARQ-ACK should not be later than the end of the HP PUCCH for HP HARQ-ACK.  Thus, for HP HARQ-ACK multiplexing on LP PUSCH when frequency hopping is enabled, the HP HARQ-ACK should be limited to one hop only to avoid potential delay/timeline problems. |
| QC | We agree with the principle of these proposal. We have a few comments as below.  1. For HP HARQ-ACK, fully reuse Rel-15 RE mapping may not be a good idea. Because there is very low missing DCI probability with HP HARQ-ACK, puncturing PUSCH for <=2 bits while rate matching PUSCH for >2 bits for HP HARQ-ACK is not necessary. HP HARQ-ACK can always rate matching PUSC to simplify spec and UE implemenation.  2. For proposal 3, we should also add FFS for the bullets “Reuse Rel-15 … in principle. FFS details.”  3. For proposal 3, about this “FFS for LP CSI consisting of single part”, is there a typo: LP CSI should be HP CSI? |
| vivo | For the 1st proposal, fine.  For the 2nd proposal, we prefer not to dropped CSI part 2. To keep the number of coding chains is not increased, LP HARQ-ACK can be jointly encoded with LP CSI part1.  For the 3rd proposal, agree with some other companies’ view, LP HARQ-ACK and HP HARQ-ACK, HP CSI on HP PUSCH had been already agreed. In addition, if we agree to drop LP HARQ-ACK as the 1st sub-bullet, the 2nd to 4th sub-bullet is not needed, since there are only HP HARQ-ACK, HP CSI with part 1 and part 2 on a HP PUSCH, this is one multiplexing case in Rel-16. Of course, the same multiplexing and mapping rule should be used. We think LP HARQ-ACK should not be dropped according to our previous agreements, LP HARQ-ACK can jointly encoded with HP CSI part 1 or CSI part 2. |
| DOCOMO | We are fine with the 1st proposal.  Regarding the 2nd and 3rd proposals, we are not supportive with the reasons in the 1st round. |
| ITRI | Fine with the first and second proposals.  For the third proposal, the fourth sub-bullet should be fixed as “FFS for HP CSI consisting of single part”. |
| TCL | We are fine with the 1st proposal.  For the 2nd and 3rd proposals, we keep the same view as mentioned in the 1st round. |
| Ericsson | Fine with 1st and 2nd proposal.  Do not support 3rd proposal.   * In 3rd proposal, by dropping LP HARQ-ACK, it’s left with HP UCI on HP PUSCH. Everything in Rel-15/Rel-16 should be reused as is. We don’t see the point of the subbullets. * Instead, we understood the intention of this combination is to multiplex (instead of dropping) LP HARQ-ACK with the HP UCIs and HP PUSCH. One simple way can be, concatenate LP HARQ-ACK with HP CSI part 1 before applying PHY processing like channel coding, rate matching, etc. |
| FGI/APT | We are fine with the three proposals. |
| NEC | We are fine with the first two proposals. For the 3rd proposal, we are fine with the updated proposal from Nokia. |
| Quectel | Proposal 1: we are generally OK for the direction. For LP HARQ-ACK reusing R15 Part 1 CSI rate matching and RE mapping, does this mean that rate matching is always applied (e.g., for HP UL-SCH) around LP HARQ-ACK even when there is only 1 or 2 bits for LP HARQ-ACK? Then how to deal with the ambiguity problem caused by misdetection?  Proposal 2: we are generally OK with this proposal. A same clarification question as for Proposal 1, is rate matching always used around LP HARQ-ACK by this proposal?  Proposal 3: we support this proposal with correction for the typo in the FFS bullet, “LP CSI” -> “HP CSI”. |
| Spreadtrum | Same view as first round. |
| CATT | For both the first and the second proposals, as we commented in the first round discussion, we would like to reuse HARQ-ACK rate matching and RE mapping for LP HARQ-ACK to avoid the impact on the RM of UL-SCH in case 1-2 LP HARQ-ACK is multiplexed in the PUSCH and LP DCI is missed at UE side. Given that we would discuss how to handle impact on HP PUSCH in case LP DCI is missed, we would propose to make the rate matching and RE mapping for LP HARQ-ACK open for now. In addition, in Rel-15, CSI part 1 cannot be punctured by HARQ-ACK and we think that should be kept for Rel-17.  Proposal for 2nd round discussion:  For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUSCH in R17, if HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK would be transmitted on HP/LP PUSCH without CSI,   * HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK are separately encoded according to R15 TS 38.212 Clause 5.3.1 and Clause 5.3.3. * Reuse R15 HARQ-ACK rate matching and RE mapping for HP HARQ-ACK in principle. FFS details. * FFS Reuse R15 HARQ-ACK rate matching and RE mapping or R15 Part 1 CSI rate matching and RE mapping for LP HARQ-ACK ~~in principle. FFS details.~~   Proposal for 2nd round discussion:  For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUSCH in R17, if HP HARQ-ACK, LP HARQ-ACK, and LP CSI consisting of two parts would be transmitted on LP PUSCH conveying UL-SCH,   * The CSI part 2 is dropped. * Reuse R15 HARQ-ACK rate matching and RE mapping for HP HARQ-ACK in principle. FFS details. * FFS Reuse R15 HARQ-ACK rate matching and RE mapping or R15 CSI Part 1 ~~CSI~~ rate matching and RE mapping for LP HARQ-ACK ~~in principle. FFS details.~~ * FFS Reuse R15 CSI part 1 rate matching and RE mapping or R15 CSI part 2 rate matching and RE mapping for LP CSI part 1 ~~in principle. FFS details.~~ * FFS for LP CSI consisting of single part. * FFS for LP PUSCH not conveying UL-SCH. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Fine with the 1st proposal.  Regarding the 2nd proposal, reusing Rel-15 CSI part 2 rate matching and RE mapping for LP CSI part 1 does not even guarantee proper LP CSI part 1 transmission without partial dropping. Unless we want to waste UE transmission power with sending not so useful information to gNB in the end, LP CSI part 1 should be jointly encoded with LP HARQ-ACK with reuse of rel-15 CSI part 1 rate matching and RE mapping principle. UE can reuse rel-15 CSI part 2 rate matching and RE mapping principle directly to LP CSI part 2.  Suggested modification (in red):  For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUSCH in R17, if HP HARQ-ACK, LP HARQ-ACK, and LP CSI consisting of two parts would be transmitted on LP PUSCH conveying UL-SCH,   * ~~The CSI part 2 is dropped~~. * Reuse R15 HARQ-ACK rate matching and RE mapping for HP HARQ-ACK in principle. FFS details. * Reuse R15 CSI part 1 rate matching and RE mapping for LP HARQ-ACK and LP CSI part 1 in principle. FFS details. * Reuse R15 CSI part 2 rate matching and RE mapping for LP CSI part ~~1~~2 in principle. FFS details. * FFS for LP CSI consisting of single part. * FFS for LP PUSCH not conveying UL-SCH.   Regarding the 3rd proposal, LP HARQ-ACK of a small payload size can still be transmitted without dropping, by jointly encoding HP CSI-part2 and LP HARQ-ACK. Dropping may happen only if an available number of REs are not sufficient to accommodate HP CSI-part2 and LP HARQ-ACK.  Suggested modification (in red):  For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUSCH in R17, if HP HARQ-ACK, LP HARQ-ACK and HP A-CSI consisting of two parts would be transmitted on HP PUSCH conveying UL-SCH,   * ~~LP HARQ-ACK is dropped.~~ * Reuse R15 HARQ-ACK rate matching and RE mapping for HP HARQ-ACK. * Reuse R15 CSI part 1 rate matching and RE mapping for HP CSI part 1. * Reuse R15 CSI part 2 rate matching and RE mapping for HP CSI part 2 and LP HARQ-ACK. * ~~FFS for LP CSI consisting of single part~~. * FFS for HP PUSCH not conveying UL-SCH. |
| Samsung | Support the 1st and 2nd proposal.  Not support the 3rd proposal, the rule is preferred for both HP and LP PUSCH. Drop Part 2 CSI. |

Proposal after 2nd round discussion:

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

* HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK are separately encoded according to R15 TS 38.212 Clause 5.3.1 and Clause 5.3.3.
* Reuse R15 HARQ-ACK rate matching and RE mapping for HP HARQ-ACK in principle. FFS details.
* Reuse R15 Part 1 CSI rate matching and RE mapping for LP HARQ-ACK in principle. FFS details.
* Support: HW, Intel, Pana, ZTE, LG, Apple, Sony, Sharp, QC, vivo, DCM, ITRI, TCL, E///, FGI/APT, NEC, Quectel, Spreadtrum, CATT,Samsung, Nokia

Proposal after 2nd round discussion:

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

* The CSI part 2 is dropped.
* Reuse R15 HARQ-ACK rate matching and RE mapping for HP HARQ-ACK in principle. FFS details.
* Reuse R15 CSI part 1 rate matching and RE mapping for LP HARQ-ACK in principle. FFS details.
* Reuse R15 CSI part 2 rate matching and RE mapping for LP CSI part 1 in principle. FFS details.
* FFS for the case where LP CSI consisting of two parts is transmitted on HP PUSCH conveying UL-SCH.
* FFS for LP CSI consisting of single part.
* FFS for LP PUSCH not conveying UL-SCH.
* Support: HW, Intel, Pana, ZTE, LG, Sony, Sharp, QC, ITRI, E///, FGI/APT, NEC, Quectel, Samsung, Nokia
* Not support: Apple, vivo, DCM, TCL, Spreadtrum, CATT, Lenovo/Motorola Mobility

Proposal after 2nd round discussion:

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

* LP HARQ-ACK is dropped.
* Reuse R15 HARQ-ACK rate matching and RE mapping for HP HARQ-ACK in principle. FFS details.
* Reuse R15 CSI part 1 rate matching and RE mapping for HP CSI part 1 in principle. FFS details.
* Reuse R15 CSI part 2 rate matching and RE mapping for HP CSI part 2 in principle. FFS details.
* FFS for HP A-CSI consisting of single part.
* FFS for HP PUSCH not conveying UL-SCH.
* Support: HW, Intel, Pana, Sharp, QC, ITRI, FGI/APT, NEC, Quectel, Nokia
* Not support: ZTE, LG, Apple, Sony, DCM, TCL, E///, Spreadtrum, CATT, Lenovo/Motorola Mobility, Samsung

## Enhancements for multiplexing parameters

## Beta-offset value and configuration

#### Inputs from Tdocs

**Support Beta-offset =0?**

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

**Other Beta-offset values**

* Non-numerical
  + Pana

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

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Proposals/observations from Tdocs |
| E/// | 1. For UCI multiplexing on PUSCH, one or more PUCCH can overlap with PUSCH where the corresponding UCI can be multiplexed in the PUSCH. 2. For UCI multiplexing on PUSCH, a different target code rate and beta factor is considered for high priority HARQ-ACK. 3. Support dynamically enable/disable multiplexing by beta factor (e.g. beta=0 to disable mux) |
| HW | ***Proposal 13: For multiplexing LP HARQ-ACK on HP PUSCH scheduled dynamically by UL grant, support beta-offset = 0 to disable the multiplexing.***  ***Proposal 15: For multiplexing HP HARQ-ACK/CSI and LP HARQ-ACK/CSI on one PUSCH, support different beta-offsets for these two UCIs.***  ***Proposal 16: For DCI format 0\_1/0\_2 with existing beta-offset bit-field, one codepoint of the field is linked to a quadruple {,,,} to jointly indicate the beta-offset values for HP HARQ-ACK, LP HARQ-ACK, CSI part 1 and CSI part 2.*** |
| Nokia | **Proposal 3.17: For the scenarios of multiplexing HARQ-ACK bits in DG PUSCH of different priorities,** gNB dynamically indicates via beta-offset in the corresponding scheduling DCI whether to multiplex HARQ-ACK in PUSCH of different PHY priority or not (e.g. beta-offset = 0)**. FFS whether to support multiplexing of HARQ-ACK bits on CG PUSCH of a different PHY priority.**  **Proposal 3.18: For the scenarios of multiplexing HARQ-ACK bits in PUSCH of different priorities, RAN1 should specify:**   * **three sets of beta-offset values (i.e. Option 1) for:**   + **multiplexing HARQ-ACK bits on the PUSCH with the same priority (specified already);**   + **multiplexing low-priority HARQ-ACK bits on high-priority PUSCH;**   + **multiplexing high-priority HARQ-ACK bits on low-priority PUSCH;** * **for multiplexing of both low-priority and high-priority HARQ-ACK bits, the beta-offset indicator field in the DCI points to the respective two sets of beta-offset values to be applied respectively for low- and high-priority HARQ-ACK.** |
| ZTE | ***Proposal 13****: The beta-offset should not be used to disable the intra-UE multiplexing UCI with data*.  ***Proposal 14****: The indicator of intra-UE multiplexing UCI with data exists in the scheduling DCI or RRC parameter for the high priority transmission.*  ***Proposal 15****: In NR Rel-17, up to three sets of beta offset values can be configured to the UE to indicate separate beta\_offset values for the following cases:*   * *Multiplexing HARQ-ACK on the PUSCH with same priority* * *Multiplexing LP HARQ-ACK on HP PUSCH* * *Multiplexing HP HARQ-ACK on LP PUSCH* |
| Samsung | **Proposal 15: A scaling factor for limiting a maximum number of REs of HP HARQ-ACK in a LP PUSCH is not defined. A separate is provided for HP HARQ-ACK multiplexing in a LP PUSCH.** |
| vivo | ***Proposal 12: For HP and LP UCI on PUSCH with UL-SCH, UE can be configured with 3 beta-offset sets including***   * + ***beta-offset set 1 for UCI multiplexing with a single priority***   + ***beta-offset set 2 for HP UCI multiplexing on LP PUSCH***   + ***beta-offset set 3 for LP UCI multiplexing on HP PUSCH***   ***Proposal 13: UE determines beta-offset set based on the priority of scheduled target PUSCH and the priority of multiplexed target UCI.*** |
| CATT | ***Proposal 12: For a UE supporting multiplexing between different priorities, consider enhancements to UCI multiplexed on PUSCH based on independent beta offsets for different priority combinations of UCI and PUSCH.*** |
| QC | ***Proposal 12*: In NR Rel-17, up to four sets of beta offset values can be configured to the UE to indicate separate beta offset values for the following cases:**   * **Multiplexing LP HARQ-ACK/UCI on LP PUSCH** * **Multiplexing LP HARQ-ACK/UCI on HP PUSCH** * **Multiplexing HP HARQ-ACK/UCI on LP PUSCH** * **Multiplexing HP HARQ-ACK/UCI on HP PUSCH** |
| OPPO | ***Proposal 21: Beta-offset values should be separately configured for different priority combinations.*** |
| LGE | **Proposal #19: Consider separate configuration of beta offset as well as alpha factor per each of UCI priority or per UCI priority combination (e.g. for LP and HP, or for LP only case and other cases) for each priority (e.g. LP, HP) of PUSCH, to ensure reliability/protection of HP PUSCH.** |
| Intel | **Proposal 11: Separate encoding is used for multiplexing LP and HP HARQ-ACK bits onto the PUSCH.**   * **Separate beta offset configuration can be used depending on the combination of PUSCH and HARQ-ACK to be multiplexed** * **LP HARQ-ACK payload bits can be partially dropped if needed.**   **Proposal 12:**   * **Support 4 sets of beta-offset configuration for the following scenarios**   + - **Multiplexing LP HARQ-ACK/UCI on LP PUSCH**     - **Multiplexing LP HARQ-ACK/UCI on HP PUSCH**     - **Multiplexing HP HARQ-ACK/UCI on LP PUSCH**     - **Multiplexing HP HARQ-ACK/UCI on HP PUSCH** * **FFS: whether and how to apply the above beta offset configurations for the following multiplexing scenario**   + - **Multiplexing LP HARQ-ACK/UCI, HP HARQ-ACK/UCI on LP PUSCH**     - **Multiplexing HP HARQ-ACK/UCI, LP HARQ-ACK/UCI on HP PUSCH** |
| China Telecom | **Proposal 6: In addition to beta offset configuration for each priority in Rel-16, two additional sets of beta offset values can be configured to the UE in Rel-17 for multiplexing a LP HARQ-ACK in a HP PUSCH, multiplexing a HP HARQ-ACK in a LP PUSCH.**   * **Beta-offset =0 can be configured in the value set for multiplexing a LP HARQ-ACK in a HP PUSCH.** |
| Apple | **Proposal 12-1: a beta offset set can be looked up according to physical layer priority, beta offset selection, and the presence of mixed UCIs.** |
| Pana | **Proposal 15:**   * **For multiplexing a LP HARQ-ACK in a HP PUSCH (conveying UL-SCH only), enhancement of beta-offset values including , which allows for dropping LP HARQ-ACK should be supported.** * **For multiplexing a HP HARQ-ACK in a LP PUSCH (conveying UL-SCH only), enhancement of beta-offset values including specific or non-numerical value, which allows for dropping LP PUSCH should be supported.** |
| Sony | **Proposal 12: For multiplexing of UCI into PUSCH of different L1 priorities, the gNB is able to configure four different sets of ** offsets.** |
| IDC | ***Proposal 13: Support separate configuration of beta\_offset parameters for the following cases:***   * ***LP HARQ-ACK multiplexed in LP PUSCH*** * ***LP HARQ-ACK multiplexed in HP PUSCH*** * ***HP HARQ-ACK multiplexed in LP PUSCH*** * ***HP HARQ-ACK multiplexed in HP PUSCH***   ***Proposal 14: DCI format 0\_1 and 0\_2 can be configured with two beta\_offset indicator fields, where one is applicable to LP HARQ-ACK and the other to HP HARQ-ACK.*** |
| Sharp | **Proposal 9: Support up to 4 different beta-offsets for different UCI and PUSCH priority combinations, and do not support beta offset = 0 for UCI disabling signalling.** |
| DOCOMO | **Proposal 11:**   * *Support beta-offset =0 or a value disabling the UCI multiplexing on PUSCH of different priorities*   **Proposal 12:**   * *Introduce new RRC parameter for the new beta-offset range (i.e. 0 < beta-offset < 1) in order to let UE to use different beta-offset values for different multiplexing scenario.* |
| Potevio | ***Proposal 1: Three sets of beta-offset values should be configured to the UE for the following cases:***   * ***Multiplexing HARQ-ACK on PUSCH with same priority.*** * ***Multiplexing low-priority HARQ-ACK on high-priority PUSCH.*** * ***Multiplexing high-priority HARQ-ACK on low-priority PUSCH.***   ***Proposal 2: DCI should be configured with two beta-offset indicator fields, one for each of low-priority and high-priority HARQ-ACK.*** |
| FGI/APT | Proposal 5 Separate beta offsets and scalings can be configured for low priority UCI multiplexed in low priority PUSCH, for low priority UCI multiplexed in high priority PUSCH, for high priority UCI multiplexed in low priority PUSCH, and for high priority UCI multiplexed in high priority PUSCH. |
| MTK | Proposal 5: Two sets of beta-offset could be defined one for high priority UCI and one for low priority UCI multiplexing. |
| ITRI | **Proposal 5:**  For HP and LP UCI on PUSCH, UE can be configured with 3 beta-offset sets and 2 alpha sets for UCI multiplexing, including:   * A first beta-offset set for UCI multiplexing on PUSCH with the same priority * A second beta-offset set for HP UCI multiplexing on LP PUSCH * A third beta-offset set for LP UCI multiplexing on HP PUSCH * A first alpha set for LP PUSCH * A second alpha set for HP PUSCH   **Proposal 6:**  When UCIs corresponding to different priorities are decided to multiplex in a PUSCH:   * The beta-offset of UCI with the same priority as PUSCH is determined by RRC; while the beta-offset of UCI with different priority from the PUSCH is determined by the UL grant DCI.   **Proposal 7:**  For PUCCH multiplexed in PUSCH, beta-offset configuration can be used to enable or disable the multiplexing. The multiplexing disabled if beta-offset=0; otherwise the UE should perform the multiplexing. |
|  |  |

#### 1st round discussion

Proposal for 1st round discussion:

In NR Rel-17, up to 4 sets of beta offset values can be configured to the UE to indicate separate beta\_offset values for the following cases:

* Multiplexing LP ~~HARQ-ACK/~~UCI on LP PUSCH
* Multiplexing HP ~~LP HARQ-ACK/~~UCI on HP PUSCH
* Multiplexing LP ~~HARQ-ACK~~UCI on HP PUSCH
* Multiplexing HP ~~HARQ-ACK~~UCI on LP PUSCH
* Support: CATT, Quectel, QC, Pana, Leno/Moto, IDC, DCM, Spreadtrum, LGE, Sony, Samsung, ZTE, Intel, Huawei, Ericsson, NEC
* Not support (replace the first two bullets by “Multiplexing HARQ-ACK/UCI on the PUSCH with same priority”): Nokia, vivo

Proposal for 1st round discussion:

In NR Rel-17, support Beta-offset =0.

* Support: CATT, Quectel, Pana, OPPO, IDC, DCM, Spreadtrum, Nokia, Huawei, Ericsson, NEC
* Not support: QC, Leno/Moto, LGE, Samsung, ZTE, Intel

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| CATT | 1. We agree with the first proposal in principle. But HARQ-ACK is one type of UCI so that HARQ-ACK in the first two bullets can be removed. 2. We support the 2nd proposal. |
| Quectel | 1st Proposal: support;  2nd Proposal: This proposal is not clear for us. Does Beta-offset=0 mean that HP and LP HARQ-ACK multiplexing is disabled? Is Beta-offset=0 supported for both of multiplexing LP HARQ-ACK/UCI on HP PUSCH and multiplexing HP HARQ-ACK on LP PUSCH? |
| Panasonic | We support the above two proposals. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support the first proposal.  For the second proposal, disabling/enabling of multiplexing can be used instead of beta\_offset = 0. |
| OPPO | For the first proposal, we slightly prefer to configure 3 sets of beta offset values, including   * The same priority for multiplexed UCI and PUSCH * HP multiplexed UCI and LP PUSCH * LP multiplexed UCI and HP PUSCH   Agree with the second proposal. |
| InterDigital | Support both proposals |
| DOCOMO | For the first proposal, although 3 sets of beta-offset values are enough as OPPO listed, we are fine with the proposal.  For the 2nd proposal, we support it. |
| QC | We support proposal 1 in general. Just a quick question: why “/UCI” is not included in the 3rd and 4th bullets?  We don’t support proposal 2, because we don’t see the motivation to dynamically disable UCI multiplexing on PUSCH. The main argument to support this feature from proponents is disable LP UCI multiplexing on HP PUSCH, which means that it cannot be used for HP UCI on LP PUSCH. Therefore it is a partial solution, even RAN1 want to support dynamic enable/disable UCI mux. Secondly, based on Rel-15 spec, DL grants cannot arrive later than UL grant. Unless we change spec to remove this restriction in Rel 17 (which will create a lot follow up issues by the way), gNB can always schedule enough number of RBs for the PUSCH to accommodate the UCI. There is NO need to dynamically disable UCI multiplexing. |
| Spreadtrum | Support both proposals |
| vivo | For the first proposal, we think 3 sets of beta-offset values are enough. In Rel-16, the same sets of beta offset values are used for HP UCI on HP PUSCH and LP UCI on LP PUSCH. Rel-17 only makes enhancements on UCI multiplexing of different priorities, 4 sets change the mechanism of UCI multiplexing of the same priority which is out of scope. |
| LG | Support the 1st proposal.  Not support the 2nd proposal due to same reason with other companies. |
| Nokia, NSB | - 1st proposal: not support. We think 3 beta-offsets should be sufficient.  In Rel-16, one set of beta offset values is sufficient for multiplexing HARQ-ACK on PUSCH of the same priority, what is the difference in Rel-17 considering the cases where HARQ-ACK and PUSCH are of the same priority? In our view, in Rel-17 it should be sufficient to specify two additional sets of beta offset values for multiplexing HARQ-ACK on PUSCH of different priorities. And therefore, three sets of beta offset values are sufficient.  -2nd proposal: support. |
| Sony | Support the 1st proposal  2nd proposal needs clarification on what it means by Beta Offset = 0, especially for the case where HP UCI is multiplexed into LP PUSCH since this would effectively drops the HP UCI. |
| Samsung | Support the 1st proposal, we suggest the following editorial modifications,  In NR Rel-17, up to 4 sets of beta offset values can be configured to the UE to indicate separate beta\_offset values for the following cases:   * Multiplexing LP HARQ-ACK/UCI on LP PUSCH * Multiplexing LP HARQ-ACK~~/UCI~~ on HP PUSCH * Multiplexing ~~LP~~ HP HARQ-ACK on HP PUSCH * Multiplexing HP HARQ-ACK on LP PUSCH   NOT support the 2nd proposal.  Having beta\_offset = 0, or any other non-functioning value, does not work. Assuming that beta\_offset = 0 is for disabling LP HARQ-ACK multiplexing in HP PUSCH, the proposal has several flaws:   1. What would be the beta\_offset for HP UCI? Is the functionality of beta\_offset supposed to be disabled for HP UCI just for the purpose of disabling LP UCI multiplexing? 2. Beta offset is an optional feature. How will the disabling be when a UE does not support beta\_offset? Why should a new feature be linked to support of an optional feature? 3. What is the purpose/benefit of the proposal? For a UE that supports beta\_offset, the number of bits can be 0, 1, or 2 in DCI format 0\_2. Then, either the indication will need to be explicit (beta offset is 0 or 1 bit) or “half a bit” can be saved if beta\_offset is 2 bits.   Why should the indication for enabling/disabling be different between the PUSCH and the PUCCH? |
| ZTE | We are open to the first proposal.  Not support second proposal, semi-static indication of enabling/disabling HARQ-ACK multiplexed into PUSCH with different priorities is sufficient, no need to introduce beta\_offset to aid the disabling of multiplexing. |
| Intel | Support first proposal  Do not support second proposal. Similar view as Samsung |
| Huawei | We are OK for both proposals. |
| Ericsson | Fine with both proposals |
| NEC | We are fine with both proposals. |

## Separate configurations of alpha values?

#### Inputs from Tdocs

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Proposals/observations from Tdocs |
| Nokia | **Proposal 3.19: For the scenarios of multiplexing HARQ-ACK bits in a PUSCH of different priorities, do not support separate configurations of the scaling factor “alpha”.** |
| QC | ***Proposal 13*: In NR Rel-17, up to four sets of scaling factors alpha can be configured to the UE to indicate separate alpha values for the following cases:**   * **Multiplexing LP HARQ-ACK/UCI on LP PUSCH** * **Multiplexing LP HARQ-ACK/UCI on HP PUSCH** * **Multiplexing HP HARQ-ACK/UCI on LP PUSCH** * **Multiplexing HP HARQ-ACK/UCI on HP PUSCH** |
| China Telecom | **Proposal 7: For multiplexing HARQ-ACK and PUSCH with different priority combinations, there is no need for further extension to configure more separate alpha values.** |
| Sony | **Proposal 13: For multiplexing of UCI into PUSCH of different L1 priorities, the gNB is able to configure separate ** offsets for different PUSCH L1 priorities.** |
| Quectel | **Proposal 12**: Separate configuration of scaling factors (“alpha”) is supported for UCI-PUSCH multiplexing with different priority combinations. |
| ITRI | **Proposal 4:**  Support separate configuration of alpha for multiplexing with different priority combinations of HARQ-ACK and PUSCH. |
| Leno/Moto | **Proposal 9:** Support configuring more than one scaling value for the variable , to allocate different maximum numbers of resource elements to UCI with different priorities. |

## Multiplexing enable/disable mechanism

## Inputs from Tdocs

Multiplexing enable/disable mechanism

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

The arguments are similar to that for Section 2.3.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Proposals/observations from Tdocs |
| E/// | Proposal 6 In case of overlapping between PUCCH and/or PUSCH resources in a slot with different priorities, dynamically enabling or disabling UCI multiplexing on PUCCH or PUSCH is supported. |
| ZTE | ***Proposal 22****: The beta\_offset should not be used to disable the intra-UE multiplexing UCI with data*.  ***Proposal 23****: The indicator of intra-UE multiplexing UCI with data exists in the scheduling DCI or RRC parameter for the high priority transmission.* |
| Vivo | ***Proposal 17: Dynamic indication of intra-UE multiplexing and prioritization manner can be supported in Rel-17.***  ***Proposal 18: For dynamic indication, multiplexing or prioritization indication field can be included in DCI for HP or LP or both HP and LP service.*** |
| CATT | ***Proposal 10: Semi-static RRC configuration to enable/disable the multiplexing between channels with different priorities is supported.***  ***Proposal 11: A value of zero for beta-offset in a DCI can be used to dynamically indicate that LP UCI is not multiplexed on the HP PUSCH scheduled by the DCI.*** |
| QC | ***Proposal 20:* The Rel-17 intra-UE multiplexing feature is enabled/disabled via RRC configuration on per UE basis.** |
| Intel | **Proposal 15: DCI and higher layer indication can be provided to enable multiplexing of UCI onto DG PUSCH and CG PUSCH, respectively.** |
| China Telecom | **Proposal 1: For multiplexing UCI/PUSCH with different priorities on PUCCH or PUSCH in R17, support RRC configuration to enable/disable the multiplexing at least.** |
| Sony | **Proposal 15: The gNB dynamically indicates whether to enable/disable multiplexing of UCI bits into PUSCH of different L1 priorities.**  **Proposal 16: The “*beta\_offset indicator*” DCI field in the UL Grant scheduling the PUSCH is used to enable/disable multiplexing of UCI bits into PUSCH, where some of the indices have non-numerical values, i.e. “NOT MULTIPLEX”, to indicate that multiplexing is not used and that the UE performs prioritisation. That is:**   * **If *beta\_offset indicator* is numerical then:**   + **LP UCI is multiplexed into HP PUSCH using the indicated ** offset value**   + **HP UCI is multiplexed into LP PUSCH using the indicated ** offset value** * **If *beta\_offset indicator* = “NOT MULTIPLEX” or non-numerical then:**   + **For the case of LP UCI & HP PUSCH, the LP UCI is dropped and HP PUSCH is transmitted**   + **For HP UCI & LP PUSCH, the LP PUSCH is dropped and HP UCI is transmitted on PUCCH** |
| Quectel | **Proposal 15**: Dynamic enabling/disabling by DCI for UCI-PUSCH multiplexing with different priorities is supported. FFS whether existing fields (e.g., the fields for UL DAI and/or beta\_offset) could be reused or re-interpreted. |
| Potevio | ***Proposal 3: gNB should dynamically indicate whether to enable/disable multiplexing of UCI bits into PUSCH of different priorities.***  ***Proposal 4: For CG, RRC configuration should include an indication of whether UE can multiplex low-priority HARQ-ACK on high-priority PUSCH.*** |
| TCL | **Proposal 5: RRC configuration for enabling UCI multiplexing on PUSCH with different priorities should be supported.** |
| ETRI | **Proposal 7: The scheduling UL-DCI has an additional field whether or not to allow multiplex HP UCI and LP UCI, or otherwise by the RRC signalling.** |
| LGE | **Proposal #5: Prefer RRC configuration for the mechanism to enable/disable the multiplexing of HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK on PUCCH or the multiplexing of HARQ-ACK on PUSCH with different priority, with consideration of potential UE complexity and UCI/PUSCH reliability.** |
| IDC | ***Proposal 15: DCI scheduling HP PUSCH indicates if UE multiplexes LP HARQ-ACK in HP PUSCH.***  ***Proposal 16: DCI indicating HP HARQ-ACK also indicates if UE multiplexes HP HARQ-ACK in LP PUSCH.***  ***Proposal 17: A beta\_offset indicator field set to 0 indicates that UE disables multiplexing of LP HARQ-ACK in HP PUSCH.***  ***Proposal 18: RRC configuration for each HP CG configuration includes an indication of whether the UE can multiplex LP HARQ-ACK in corresponding HP PUSCH.***  ***Proposal 19: RRC configuration of SPS with HP HARQ-ACK includes an indication of whether the UE can multiplex HP HARQ-ACK in LP PUSCH.***  ***Proposal 20: DCI scheduling PUSCH includes a single DAI value. In case both LP and HP HARQ-ACK are multiplexed in PUSCH, the DAI corresponds to HP HARQ-ACK only.*** |
| MTK | 1. Dynamic indication of the multiplexing activation/de-activation is not supported. |
| FGI/APT | Proposal 6 Dynamic indication is supported for indicating whether to multiplex overlapping high priority PUSCH and low priority PUCCH. FFS the indication method when semi-static beta offsets are configured. |
| DOCOMO | **Proposal 8:**   * *Support beta-offset =0 or a value disabling the UCI multiplexing on PUSCH of different priorities* |
| ITRI | **Proposal 7:**  For PUCCH multiplexed in PUSCH, beta-offset configuration can be used to enable or disable the multiplexing. The multiplexing disabled if beta-offset=0; otherwise the UE should perform the multiplexing. |
|  |  |

## 1st round discussion

Proposal for 1st round discussion:

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

* FFS whether or not to additionally introduce dynamic mechanism, e.g. DCI indication, beta\_offset=0
* FFS: Interaction between the enable/disable mechanism and other multiplexing conditions
* FFS for other types of UCI.
* Support: CATT, Pana, Leno/Moto, Apple, OPPO, IDC, DCM, QC, TCL, Spreadtrum, LGE, ZTE, Huawei
* Not support (RRC+dynamic): Quectel, Nokia, Sony, Samsung, Intel, Ericsson

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| CATT | Support the proposal. |
| Quectel | Not support. In our understanding, dynamic enabling/disabling has already been supported based on UL DAI for HARQ-ACK multiplexing in PUSCH for a same priority. We don’t see any reason to preclude this in case of different priority multiplexing. Otherwise, the UL DAI should be re-interpreted for the multiplexing of different priorities. |
| Panasonic | We are fine with the proposal. In addition, we prefer to introduce dynamic enabling/disabling mechanism via explicit indication. Dynamic indication can avoid additionally introducing mechanism for multiplexing such as reliability and/or latency requirement. For explicit indication, beta-offset=0 can be used for disabling the multiplexing for multiplexing a LP HARQ-ACK and a HP PUSCH. For multiplexing a HP HARQ-ACK and a LP PUSCH, non-numerical value of beta-offset can be used for disabling the multiplexing. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Fine with the proposal. |
| Apple | Fine with the proposal. |
| OPPO | Fine with the proposal. |
| InterDigital | We would prefer to agree on DCI indication at the same time but can accept for progress.  We note that the solution beta\_offset = 0 to disable multiplexing works well for LP HARQ-ACK in HP PUSCH but may not be sufficient for the case of HP HARQ-ACK in LP PUSCH. The scheduling time of LP PUSCH is typically earlier than the scheduling time of HP HARQ-ACK and thus network may not know before sending DCI for LP PUSCH if multiplexing with a potential HP HARQ-ACK transmission would be acceptable. Therefore, it is preferred to include a dynamic indication for multiplexing in the DCI scheduling the HP HARQ-ACK. |
| DOCOMO | Fine with the proposal. |
| QC | We support this proposal |
| TCL | Fine with the proposal. |
| Spreadtrum | Fine with the proposal. |
| vivo | We prefer to agree on DCI indication at the same time. see the comments in section 3.3.2. |
| LG | Fine with the proposal. |
| Nokia, NSB | Not support.  Similar as commented in 3.3.2, instead of toggling the proposals of the two alternatives from GTW session to GTW session as during RAN1#105-e, we suggest the moderator to bring both options to the GTW session and there try to down-select. As the support for both alternatives is rather even, may be the better choice than having the proposal on a single alternative not accepted (again).  RRC configuration is needed for enabling/disabling as a baseline. On top of this, gNB should be able to dynamically enable/disable multiplexing HARQ-ACK in PUSCH of different priorities especially considering beta\_offset is **already** part of the DCI. In addition, supporting dynamic indication can avoid introducing any complicated/additional conditions for multiplexing which will reduce the standardization efforts significantly. Suggest updating the proposal as below:  “For multiplexing a HARQ-ACK into a PUSCH with different priorities in R17, ~~at least~~ in addition to ~~support~~ RRC configuration, support dynamic indication for gNB to enable/disable the multiplexing at least for PUSCH with DCI.   * FFS ~~whether or not to additionally introduce dynamic~~ mechanism for dynamic enabling/disabling of multiplexing, e.g. ~~DCI indication,~~ beta\_offset=0 * FFS: Interaction between the enable/disable mechanism and other multiplexing conditions   FFS for other types of UCI.” |
| Sony | Same comment as in Section 3.3.2, we prefer that DCI indication is used. Afterall what’s the point of defining a Beta offset = 0 in Section 4.3.1.2? |
| Samsung | We consider RRC-based indication to be insufficient and also support indication by DCI to:  (a) enable the network to control the impact LP UCI has on the reception of HP UCI/data and, as importantly,  (b) help avoid having to specify some corner cases that can be handled by the NW disabling the multiplexing, and  (c) possibly allow differentiation for multiplexing between CG-PUSCH (e.g. disable) and DG-PUSCH (e.g. enable and control by DCI) |
| ZTE | Generally fine with the proposal. Not comfortable on the “beta\_offset=0” |
| Intel | Do not Support. We are fine with Nokia’s revision |
| Huawei | Support. Same rule as for multiplexing enable/disable for PUCCH. |
| Ericsson | Do not support.  Dynamically enabling/disabling should be supported. We are fine with Nokia’s revised version. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

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

## Inputs from Tdocs

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Proposals/observations from Tdocs |
| QC | ***Proposal 16:* In Rel-17 UCI multiplexing, support low priority HARQ-ACK compression.**   * **FFS conditions to trigger low priority HARQ-ACK compression** * **FFS details of compression scheme.** |
| OPPO | ***Proposal 22: LP HARQ-ACK transmitted on HP PUSCH should be compressed when the actual coding rate is higher than a threshold.*** |
| LGE | **Proposal #20: Consider the bundling/dropping of LP UCI on PUSCH based on the maximum UCI coding rate as for the case of LP UCI on PUCCH.** |
| Apple | **Proposal 11-3: For a UCI part, UCI omission/compaction is applied to the right-most UCI first among UCIs in that UCI part as in Tables 11-1 and 11-2. Before all the later-placed UCIs are omitted, an early UCI is not omitted or compacted.** |
| TCL | **Proposal 6: For the multiplexing between low priority UCI and high priority PUSCH, if the resource is not sufficient for the multiplexing, considering bundling or partially drop the low priority UCI.** |
| Sony | **Proposal 14: When multiplexing UCI bits into PUSCH of different L1 priorities, if there are insufficient REs in a PUSCH to carry the UCI bits, the LP UCI bits are dropped.** |
| MTK | Group-bundling is supported when multiplexing and when the resulted UCI payload is large. |
|  |  |

## Timeline and latency requirements

## Inputs from Tdocs

**Latency requirement:**

* Option 1: Multiplexing is only allowed when the ending symbol of the LP PUSCH is no later than the ending symbols of PUCCHs carrying HP HARQ-ACK
  + HW, ZTE, China Telecom, TCL, ITRI
* Option 3: Multiplexing is only allowed when the ending symbol used for UCI transmission in a LP PUSCH is not later than the ending of HP PUCCH.
  + OPPO

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

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Proposals/observations from Tdocs |
| Huawei | ***Proposal 14: For HP HARQ-ACK overlapping with LP PUSCH, the multiplexing is only allowed when the ending symbol of the LP PUSCH is no later than the ending symbol of the PUCCH carrying HP HARQ-ACK.*** |
| Nokia | **Proposal 3.20: For the scenario of the multiplexing between HARQ-ACK and PUSCH with different priorities,**   * **RAN1 should confirm the working assumption of reusing Rel-15 timeline conditions for multiplexing HARQ-ACK and PUSCH.** * **If multiplexing timeline conditions are not met or no multiplexing is indicated from gNB, Rel-16 prioritization rule should be applied (i.e. the transmission of the low-priority channel(s) is cancelled)**. |
| ZTE | ***Proposal 17:*** *For the overlapping between high priority HARQ-ACK and low priority PUSCH, if the gNB allows a UE to multiplex the HARQ-ACK on PUSCH, the UE maps this HARQ-ACK to PUSCH resource elements no later than the last symbol of PUCCH resource for HARQ-ACK.* |
| QC | ***Proposal 18:* For d1 defined for PUCCH vs PUCCH or PUCCH vs PUSCH cancellation with different priorities, support subcarrier spacing dependent d1 values. FFS exact d1 values for each subcarrier spacing.**  ***Proposal 19:* Confirm the working assumption made in #104-e to reuse Rel-15 intra-UE PUCCH/PUSCH multiplexing timeline requirements for Rel-17 intra-UE PUCCH/PUSCH multiplexing with different priorities.** |
| OPPO | ***Proposal 19: To support multiplexing UCI in one PUSCH with different priority, the ending symbol used for UCI transmission in a low-priority PUSCH is not later than the ending of high-priority PUCCH.***   * ***If the condition is not met, UE behavior fallbacks to Rel-16 prioritization.*** |
| China Telecom | **Proposal 2: Multiplexing for channels with different priorities is allowed only when the ending symbol of PUCCH or PUSCH resource carrying the multiplexed UCI is no later than the ending symbol of channel carrying HP traffic.** |
| TCL | **Proposal 7: Multiplexing for UCI and PUSCH with different priorities should only be allowed when the ending symbol of multiplexed PUSCH is no later than the ending symbol of high-priority UCI.** |
| LGE | Proposal #19: Consider to introduce new timeline or offset in case of PUSCH collision handling with different priority. |
| Sharp | **Proposal 1: Confirm the working assumption of reusing Rel-15 intra-UE PUCCH/PUSCH multiplexing timeline requirements for Rel-17 intra-UE PUCCH/PUSCH multiplexing with different priorities.**  **The Rel-16 dropping rule is reused if the multiplexing timeline requirements are not met.** |
| MTK | 1. Guard gap timeline of the new multiplexed PUCCH is of the earliest PUCCH.   Multiplexing allowed only if the resulted PUCCH is confined within the sub-slot of the HP-PUCCH sub-slot. |
| ITRI | **Proposal 1:**  The UE can multiplex HP UCI in a LP PUSCH only if the processing time of HP UCI is sufficient. Otherwise, the UE should not perform the multiplexing and the LP PUSCH should be dropped.  **Proposal 2:**  The HP UCI should only multiplexed on a set of LP PUSCH resource even if the LP PUSCH is configured with frequency hoping, and the set of PUSCH resource is selected from the first DMRS symbol of the LP PUSCH that can satisfy the timeline requirement.  **Proposal 3:**  To ensure the acknowledgement response validity, a UE should perform the multiplexing procedure only if the latest symbol for multiplexing the HP UCI is not later than the latest symbol of the PUCCH. Otherwise, the UE should not perform the multiplexing. |
|  |  |

## Other enhancements

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Proposals/observations from Tdocs |
| HW | ***Proposal 17: For multiplexing LP HARQ-ACK with type 1 HARQ-ACK codebook on HP PUSCH, LP HARQ-ACK is not transmitted if DAI\_UL is 0.*** |
| Nokia | **Proposal 3.25: For the scenario where multiplexing high-priority HARQ-ACK bits on a low-priority PUSCH, RAN1 to investigate UL power control aspects to guarantee the required reliability of high-priority HARQ-ACK bits.**  **Proposal 3.26: Multiplexing high-priority SR in low-priority PUSCH is supported. FFS detailed ways of carrying high-priority SR information.** |
| LGE | **Proposal #21: Consider how to determine the priority of CG-UCI and how to encode the CG-UCI payload in case of UCI multiplexing on NR-U CG PUSCH with different priority.**  Proposal #24: Consider to introduce new timeline or offset in case of PUSCH collision handling with different priority.  Proposal #25: Consider enhanced collision handling between HP PUSCH and LP PUSCH with UCI piggybacking. |
| Intel | **Proposal 13: CG-UCI is regarded as high priority and can be multiplexed in a similar manner as HP HARQ-ACK onto PUSCH.**  **Proposal 14: If both HP and LP HARQ-ACK are to be multiplexed onto CG-PUSCH that includes CG-UCI, CG-UCI is jointly encoded with HP HARQ-ACK with same beta offset.** |
| Pana | **Proposal 16: Multiplexing a HP SR in a LP PUSCH (conveying UL-SCH only) should be supported by the identical design with multiplexing a HP HARQ-ACK in a LP PUSCH (conveying UL-SCH only).** |
| FGI/APT | Proposal 7 CG-UCI multiplexed in a high priority CG PUSCH is treated as high priority HARQ-ACK and jointly encoded with high priority HARQ-ACK, if there is high priority HARQ-ACK to be multiplexed in the CG PUSCH. |
| WILUS | ***Proposal 10:*** *In case of HP-PUSCH or LP-PUSCH contains LP HARQ-ACK and HP HARQ-ACK, it should be discussed how to indicate the presence of LP HARQ-ACK and/or HP HARQ-ACK to be multiplexed and “beta offset” for LP HARQ-ACK and/or HP HARQ-ACK.* |

# PHY prioritization between DG and CG PUSCHs with different priorities

## Agreements and discussion status in previous meetings

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

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

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

Agreements:

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

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

Agreements:

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

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

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

## Inputs from Tdocs

* Option 1: For collision between HP CG PUSCH and LP DG PUSCH, PHY layer can make the prioritization so that the UE is expected to transmit the CG PUSCH and cancel the overlapping DG PUSCH at latest from the first symbol that is overlapping with the CG PUSCH.
  + HW, Nokia, Samsung, vivo, ZTE, Intel, MTK

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Proposals/observations from Tdocs |
| Huawei | ***Proposal 24: For collision between HP CG PUSCH and LP DG PUSCH, PHY layer can make the prioritization so that the UE is expected to transmit the CG PUSCH and cancel the overlapping DG PUSCH at latest from the first symbol that is overlapping with the CG PUSCH.*** |
| E/// | 1. MAC may send two PDUs to two overlapping grants only if the later grant has higher PHY priority than the earlier grant. 2. When *lch-basedPrioritization* is configured, Rel-16 UL skipping is not enabled in Rel-17. 3. Identification of PUSCH for UCI multiplexing is performed after CG-vs-DG prioritization. |
| Nokia | ***Observation 2.1: For the scenarios CG PUSCH vs. DG PUSCH of different PHY priorities, the aspects related to handling the cases where a PUCCH overlaps with at least one of the overlapping PUSCHs and the impact of uplink skipping can be discussed after reaching a conclusion on the related Rel-16 discussions.***  **Proposal 2.1: For the scenario high-priority CG PUSCH vs. low-priority DG PUSCH, it is up to UE implementation to ensure that the low-priority DG PUSCH is cancelled, at the latest, from the first symbol that is overlapping with the high-priority CG PUSCH.** |
| ZTE | ***Proposal 18:*** *For the overlapping between HP CG and LP DG, PHY layer can make the prioritization so that the UE is expected to transmit the PUSCH corresponding to the configured grant, and cancel the overlapping low priority PUSCH scheduled by the PDCCH at latest starting at the first symbol of the PUSCH corresponding to the configured grant.* |
| Samsung | **Proposal 17: If transmission of a CG-PUSCH with priority 1 starts after a transmission of a DG-PUSCH with priority 0 from a UE on a same serving cell and the two PUSCHs overlap, the UE is expected to cancel the DG-PUSCH before the first overlapping symbol.** |
| vivo | ***Proposal 18: For collision handling between high priority CG and low priority DG, the UE is expected to transmit the PUSCH corresponding to the configured grant, and cancel the overlapping low priority PUSCH scheduled by the PDCCH at the first overlapping symbol of the PUSCH corresponding to the configured grant at the latest.*** |
| Intel | **Proposal 1: UE is expected to transmit the CG PUSCH and cancel the overlapping DG PUSCH at the latest from the first symbol that is overlapping with the CG PUSCH when collision between HP CG PUSCH and LP DG PUSCH occurs.**   * **Sufficient to capture the above in RAN1 specification.** |
| Apple | **Proposal 14-1: Clarify the Rel-16 UE behavior concerning DG/CG transmission.** |
| DOCOMO | **Proposal 18:**   * *Wait for Rel-16 discussion outcome on DG PUSCH/CG PUSCH/UCI collision handling*   + *If only one MAC PDU is delivered to PHY for all the collision cases, no need to further discuss PHY prioritization between DG PUSCH and CG PUSCH with different priorities.* |
| MTK | Proposal 12: The UE is expected to transmit the HP-CG PUSCH and cancel the overlapping LP-DG PUSCH scheduled by the PDCCH starting at latest at the first symbol of the CG PUSCH. |

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

## Inputs from Tdocs

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Proposals/observations from Tdocs |
| Huawei | ***Proposal 25: For collision between HP DG PUSCH and LP CG PUSCH, PHY layer can make the prioritization so that the UE is expected to transmit the DG PUSCH and cancel the CG PUSCH by the first overlapping symbol at the latest.***   * ***The UE expects to transmit the DG PUSCH no later than Tproc,2+d1 after the last symbol of the PDCCH scheduling the DG PUSCH.*** |
| Nokia | **Proposal 2.2: The Rel-16 handling of the scenarios where a dynamically scheduled high-priority channel overlaps with a low-priority channel is adopted for the scenario of overlapping between high-priority DG PUSCH and low-priority CG PUSCH.** |
| ZTE | ***Proposal 19:*** *For the overlapping between LP CG and HP DG, PHY layer can make the prioritization so that the UE is expected to cancel the overlapping low priority CG PUSCH by the first overlapping symbol at the latest. Further, a UE expects that the first [overlapping] symbol of the high priority DG PUSCH is not earlier than Tproc,2+d1 after the last symbol of the PDCCH with the DCI format scheduling the high priority channel.* |
| Samsung | **Proposal 18: If transmission of a DG-PUSCH with priority 1 starts after a transmission of a CG-PUSCH with priority 0 from a UE on a same serving cell and the two PUSCHs overlap, a UE is expected to cancel the CG-PUSCH before the first overlapping symbol.** |
| vivo | ***Proposal 19: For collision handling between high priority DG and low priority CG, the UE is expected to cancel the overlapping low priority CG PUSCH by the first overlapping symbol at the latest. Further, a UE expects that the first overlapping symbol of the high priority DG PUSCH is not earlier than Tproc,2+d1 after the last symbol of the PDCCH with the DCI format scheduling the high priority channel, where d1 is determined by a reported UE capability.*** |
| QC | ***Proposal 17:* On top of Rel-16 cancellation time (N2+d1) for PUCCH/PUCCH or PUCCH/PUSCH collision, additional time d2 is needed (which results N2+d1+d2 in total cancellation time) for LP CG-PUSCH and HP DG-PUSCH collision resolution. The additional number of OFDM symbols (d2) needed is listed in following table**  Table 3. d2 for LP CG-PUSCH and HP DG-PUSCH collision resolution   |  |  | | --- | --- | |  | d2 [symbols] | | **0** | **1** | | **1** | **2** | | **2** | **4** | | **3** | **8** | |
| Intel | **Proposal 2. Define a new UE capability for collision handling between the LP CG and HP DG PUSCH in PHY layer.**   * **If UE supports the capability, the UE is expected to cancel the overlapping low priority CG PUSCH by the first overlapping symbol at the latest. Further, the UE expects that the first symbol of the high priority DG PUSCH is not earlier than Tproc,2+min(d1,d2) after the last symbol of the PDCCH with the DCI format scheduling the high priority DG PUSCH, where d1 and d2 can be from {0, 1, 2} symbols, and correspond to the additional margins for cancelation and preparation times respectively in case of intra-UE prioritization and reported as UE capability.** * **Otherwise, the UE can only cancel the entire PUSCH transmission corresponding to the configured grant starting in a symbol 𝑗, if the end of symbol 𝑖 for PDCCH scheduling the PUSCH is at least Tproc,2 before the beginning of symbol 𝑗.** |
| LGE | Proposal #23: Consider to apply Rel-15 timeline requirements between dynamic grant and configured grant, for PHY prioritization for the case where low-priority CG-PUSCH collides with high-priority DG-PUSCH. |
| DOCOMO | **Proposal 17:**   * *Wait for Rel-16 discussion outcome on DG PUSCH/CG PUSCH/UCI collision handling*   + *If only one MAC PDU is delivered to PHY for all the collision cases, no need to further discuss PHY prioritization between DG PUSCH and CG PUSCH with different priorities.* |
| MTK | Proposal 11: Support PHY prioritization for the case where high-priority DG-PUSCH collides with low-priority CG-PUSCH.  Proposal 13: The UE is expected to transmit the HP-DG PUSCH and cancel the overlapping LP-CG PUSCH. Further, the UE expects that the first overlapping symbol of the high priority DG is not earlier than Tproc,2+d1 after the last symbol of the PDCCH scheduling the HP-DG PUSCH. |

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

## Agreements in previous meetings

Agreements:

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

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

Agreements:

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

* *FFS: dynamic indication*

## How to trigger this function?

## Inputs from Tdocs

Support dynamic indication?

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Proposals/observations from Tdocs |
| E/// | [Proposal 2 Support simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH transmission of same PHY priorities over different cells can be RRC configured within the same PUCCH group](#_Toc79181279)  [Proposal 3 When simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH transmissions is enabled by RRC configuration, simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH transmissions can be dynamically disabled.](#_Toc79181280) |
| Nokia | **Proposal 4.5: For UE with the capability of inter-band CA, simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH transmission over different cells can be triggered via higher layer signalling (e.g. RRC signalling).** |
| QC | ***Proposal 21:* The enabling/disabling of the feature of simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH transmission for inter-band CA is via RRC configuration on per CC basis. For a CC where RRC enables simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH transmission, this CC is dedicated to PUSCH transmission and UCI is not multiplexed on this CC.** |
| CATT | ***Proposal 19: Dynamic indication of simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH transmission is not supported.*** |
| LGE | **Proposal #22: Consider the framework designed in Rel-10 LTE-A as the baseline for supporting simultaneous transmission of PUCCH and PUSCH in Rel-17 NR.**   * **The simultaneous PUCCH+PUSCH transmission should be applied for any priority combinations (enabled by single RRC parameter) by taking potential UE complexity and gNB/UE ambiguity into account.** |
| TCL | **Proposal 8: Dynamic indication for simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH should not be supported.** |
| MTK | Proposal 10: Simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH transmissions is enabled based on specific conditions. E.g. LP-PUCCH carrying HARQ feedback. |

## Use cases for simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH transmission

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

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

#### Inputs from Tdocs

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Proposals/observations from Tdocs |
| Nokia | **Proposal 4.3: The simultaneous transmission of PUCCH and PUSCH on different serving cells is applicable only for the case when PUCCH and PUSCH are of different PHY priority.** |
| CATT | ***Proposal 20: Simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH transmission of same PHY priority over different cells for inter-band CA can be supported.*** |
| DCM | **Proposal 19:**  *Not to introduce the simultaneous PUCCH and PUSCH transmission for same priority case.* |
| MTK | Proposal 9: Per UE with the capability of inter-band CA, simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH transmission of the same PHY priority over different cells can be RRC configured within the same PUCCH group. |

#### 1st round discussion

Proposal for 1st round discussion:

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| CATT | Support the proposal. |
| Quectel | Support |
| DOCOMO | Fine with the proposal. |
| QC | We support this proposal. |
| Spreadtrum | Support |
| vivo | support |
| LG | Fine with the proposal.  In addition, single RRC parameter can be used to enabling/disabling both same priority and different priority. |
| Nokia, NSB | **Not support.**  As commented already in previous meeting(s), multiplexing PUCCH/PUSCH of the same PHY priority over different cells already supported since Rel-15. Even more important, the support of simultaneous PUSCH/PUCCH of the same PHY priority will increase the possibility of dropping low-priority information and channel as discussed in our Tdoc (R1-2106637). In addition, the high-priority PUSCH may be transmitted with a reduced Tx power because following the specified Tx power allocation procedure (Section 7.5 of TS 38.213), the UE prioritizes power allocation for the carrier where UE is configured to transmit PUCCH. Moreover, we fail to see any advantages of supporting simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH of the same priority and have not heard from any companies why this should be supported in the first place (i.e. the merits of doing so). Furthermore, **multiplexing enhancements of the same PHY priority are not in scope of the Rel-17 WI objective**. |
| Sony | Support |
| Samsung | There is no reason to preclude intra-band CA and substantially limit the usefulness of the feature for no reason. At least from RAN1 perspective there is no difference with inter-band CA. There is also no reason for RAN4 to preclude intra-band CA (for a UE that can do intra-band CA for PUSCHs) but that can be up to RAN4. |
| ZTE | We are open to support simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH transmission of the same PHY priority in inter-band CA case. For intra-band CA case, it should be further studied. |
| Intel | Do not support. Same view as Nokia above |
| Ericsson | Support |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

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

#### Inputs from Tdocs

* Support with conditions
  + CATT, Apple (introducing PTRS for PUCCH to handle phase discontinuity problem), MTK (for some cases), Ericsson
  + Arguments:
    - In NR Rel-15, multiple PUSCHs transmission on different carries and one among them with the piggy-backed UCI has been already supported for both inter band CA and intra band CA.
* Not support.
  + Nokia, Intel
  + Arguments:
    - Considering the most efficient implementation with a single PA (most likely case of intra-band CA), e.g. Tx discontinuity, Large Tx power back-off.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Proposals/observations from Tdocs |
| Nokia | **Proposal 4.4: For intra-band CA, simultaneous transmission of PUCCH and PUSCH on different cells is not supported.** |
| CATT | ***Proposal 21: Simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH transmission for intra-band CA can be supported.*** |
| Intel | **Proposal 23: Discussion on support of simultaneous transmission of PUSCH and PUCCH over different carriers for intra-band CA is deprioritized.** |
| Apple | **Proposal 15-1: Simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH transmission for intra-band CA is not supported if phase discontinuity problem cannot be addressed.**  **Proposal 15-2: consider the feasibility of introducing PTRS for PUCCH to handle phase discontinuity problem in simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH transmissions for intra-band CA.** |
| MTK | Proposal 6: Support simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH transmissions on different cells for intra-band CA for the same numerology both with aligned and non-aligned channel case.  Proposal 7: Support simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH transmissions on different cells for intra-band CA for different numerology if the transmissions are aligned on symbol-level (with the symbol of the lowest SCS as a reference).   * i.e. Allocation on the carrier with higher numerology doesn’t start during an ongoing symbol on the other carrier with the smaller numerology.   Proposal 8: The UE is to be configured separately for inter-band and intra-band simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH transmissions. |
| Ericsson | We also support simultaneous PUSCH/PUCCH transmission for intra-band CA |

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

#### Inputs from Tdocs

* No:
  + Apple, DCM

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Proposals/observations from Tdocs |
| Apple | **Proposal 15-3: Simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH transmission on the same CC is not supported.** |
| DOCOMO | **Proposal 13:**   * *Not to introduce the simultaneous PUCCH and PUSCH transmission for same priority case.* |
|  |  |

#### 1st round discussion

Void.

#### 2nd round discussion

Void.

#### 3rd round discussion

Void.

#### 4th round discussion

Proposal for 4th round discussion:

Simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH transmission on the same cell is not supported in Rel-17.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Sony | Support (albeit we thought this was already agreed). |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | Support the proposal. |
| InterDigital | Support |
| QC | Support the proposal. |
| Samsung | OK. We can consider it if possible in Rel-18.  Also, from a RAN1 perspective, PUSCH + PUCCH should not differentiate intra-band and inter-band CA. Conditions are up to RAN4 similar to PUSCH. |
| Sharp | Support |
| Quectel | Support |
| CATT | Support |
| Panasonic | We support the proposal. |
| vivo | support |
| LG | Support. |
| DOCOMO | Support |
| Ericsson | support |
| Nokia, NSB | Support |
| ZTE | Support |
| Spreadtrum | Support |
| OPPO | Support |
| NEC | Support |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## Other enhancements

## Inputs from Tdocs

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Proposals/observations from Tdocs |
| Qualcomm | ***Proposal 22:* Support the PHR for simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH for inter-band CA with either of the following two options.**   * **Option 1: reuse LTE type 2 PHR for PUCCH transmission on PCC with a virtual/reference PUSCH** * **Option 2: define a type 4 PHR for PUCCH transmission on a component carrier.** |
| DOCOMO | **Proposal 20:**   * *Support PHR for simultaneous PUCCH and PUSCH transmission on different carriers.*   **Proposal 21:**   * *Discuss the interaction between capabilities for two PUCCH groups and the new capability for simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH transmission on different carriers.* |
|  |  |

# Proposals for email approval

## Email approval starting from 23rd Aug. (5th round discussion)

Please check the following proposals and input your position by 24th Aug. UTC 15:00pm. After then, the proposals without explicit objections will be suggested to Mr.Chairman for endorsement. If you object a proposal, please provide your reason for objection. In order to make necessary progress for Rel-17 intro-UE multiplexing before next RAN plenary (you all know the risk that the agenda item may be addressed for down-scoping if the progress is below expectation), from moderator perspective, I hope you seriously consider objecting a proposal (e.g. it does not work, rather then less optimal). Especially for those related to RRC configurations, we need some constructive compromise to settle them down as much as possible in this meeting. Thank you for the cooperation.

Proposal 3-1:

Confirm the working assumption below:

* For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH in R17, when the total number of LP and HP HARQ-ACK bits is more than 2, drop CSI (including part 1 and part2, if exist) if CSI would multiplex on a PUCCH which has HP A/N.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| FL’s consideration: | Further optimizations are proposed by a couple of companies. But most of companies think they are not necessary. Approving the proposal can make necessary progress and move forward to other essential discussions. |
| Supporting companies: | Huawei/Hisi, Sharp, InterDigital, Panasonic, DOCOMO, ZTE (@LG +LP A/N may not be very necessary, as the HP A/N only here emphasizes on the priority index after multiplexing is 1 ), NEC, Quectel, Ericsson, Spreadtrum, Intel, CATT (but also think it is not urgent to confirm WA since CSI multiplexing on PUCCH with HP A/N is not supported yet), Nokia/NSB,OPPO, QC |
| Objecting companies: |  |
| Company | Reason for objection |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | Considering that Rel-17 CSI enhancement is currently under discussion, we would like to add the following clarification (shown in red):  Proposal 3-1:  Confirm the working assumption with the following clarification ~~below~~:  For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH in R17, when the total number of LP and HP HARQ-ACK bits is more than 2, drop Rel-15/16 CSI (including part 1 and part2, if exist) if Rel-15/16 CSI would multiplex on a PUCCH which has HP A/N. |
| LG | To make clearer, we think that a small correction is needed as below.  Proposal 3-1:  Confirm the working assumption below:   * For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH in R17, when the total number of LP and HP HARQ-ACK bits is more than 2, drop CSI (including part 1 and part2, if exist) if CSI would multiplex on a PUCCH which has HP A/N + LP A/N. |
| Samsung | We have concerns on “if CSI would multiplex on a PUCCH which has HP A/N”, it is not supported in Rel-17 yet, if multiplexing of LP CSI and HP A/N is not supported, do we still need to confirm the WA?  Another concern is about the 2bits case which is excluded here. |
| Nokia, NSB | Agree with LT that LP A/N would need to be added, as this is also the condition in the first sentence. We are fine with the intention of the proposal/WA and think that such handling (i.e. dropping LP CSI in this case) should be adopted regardless of the total number of HP and LP HARQ-ACK bits. |

Proposal 3-2:

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

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| FL’s consideration: | Discussed for several meetings. Trade-off between “flexibility” and “DCI overhead”. Related to RRC list. Suggested to first agree on the RRC part. Dynamic part can be further discussed in next meeting. |
| Supporting companies: | Huawei/Hisi, Lenovo/Motorola Mobility, Apple (Lenovo’s update is okay also), Sharp, InterDigital, Panasonic (Lenovo’s update is OK), LG, DOCOMO (Lenovo’s update is OK),TCL, NEC, Quectel (fine with Lenovo’s updates) , Spreadtrum, CATT (fine with Lenovo’s update) ,OPPO (fine with Lenovo’s update), QC |
| Objecting companies: | Sony,vivo, Ericsson, Intel, Nokia/NSB |
| Company | Reason for objection |
| Sony | RRC configuration is required even for DCI case since it is required to configure the DCI for enabling/disabling multiplexing. So it isn’t clear what we are trying to agree here. |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | To address Sony’s concern, can modify the wording as follows:  Proposal 3-2:  For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUCCH in R17, at least support RRC based semi-static enabling/disabling of multiplexing ~~configuration for gNB to enable/disable the multiplexing~~. |
| vivo | There are various services with various latency and reliability requirements. If only RRC configuration is supported, some additional considerations such as multiplexing conditions, compression for LP UCI, etc. may be needed. But with DCI indication, all these aspects are considered by gNB. From UE side, UE just follows the DCI indication to do multiplexing or not. Thus, this can not only provide flexibility, but simplify the multiplexing conditions and multiplexing rules. We are afraid that if we agree with this proposal, additional multiplexing conditions or rules will be needed. |
| Samsung | The proposal is unnecessary. The discussion should be on whether or not to support indication by DCI |
| Ericsson | We also think that the focus should be on supporting DCI indication or not |
| Intel | Agree with Samsung and Ericsson comments above. RRC configuration will be there to enable/disable the feature. Discussion point is whether to support DCI based adaptation |
| Nokia/NSB | Agree with the comments by Samsung, Ericsson and Intel. This issue is very important for the overall operation of this feature, just based on RRC configuration only we see little use for the overall feature. As noted in our previous replies, we think this should be discussed and decided in a GTW session online. |

Proposal 4-1:

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

* HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK are separately encoded according to R15 TS 38.212 Clause 5.3.1 and Clause 5.3.3.
* Reuse R15 HARQ-ACK rate matching and RE mapping for HP HARQ-ACK in principle. FFS details.
* Reuse R15 Part 1 CSI rate matching and RE mapping for LP HARQ-ACK in principle. FFS details.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| FL’s consideration: | All companies agree in principle. Some companies think the proposal can be implicitly covered by a previous agreement. But it is suggested to explicitly agreed in no objection. |
| Supporting companies: | Huawei/Hisi, Lenovo/Motorola Mobility, Sharp (agree in principle, with reservations on detailed mapping for HP UCI on LP PUSCH when freq hopping is configured), InterDigital, Panasonic, LG, DOCOMO, ZTE, NEC, vivo, Quectel (with reservations), Samsung, Ericsson, Spreadtrum, Intel, Nokia/NSB, OPPO |
| Objecting companies: |  |
| Company | Reason for objection |
| Quectel | We want to make sure that UL-SCH rate matching around 1 or 2 bit HP HARQ-ACK on LP PUSCH and UL-SCH punctured by 1 or 2 bit LP HARQ-ACK on HP PUSCH are not precluded by this proposal. |
| CATT | As commented earlier, we prefer to reuse R15 HARQ-ACK rate matching and RE mapping for LP HARQ-ACK, i.e. 1 or 2 bits LP HARQ-ACK(s) puncture UL-SCH. This is one of the solutions to avoid impact on HP UL-SCH in case 1-2 LP HARQ-ACK is multiplexed in the PUSCH and LP DCI is missed at UE side. and should not be precluded at this stage given that we will discuss this issue later.  The proposal with the following update is fine with us.  For multiplexing a high-priority (HP) HARQ-ACK and a low-priority (LP) HARQ-ACK into a PUSCH in R17, if HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK would be transmitted on HP/LP PUSCH without CSI,   * HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK are separately encoded according to R15 TS 38.212 Clause 5.3.1 and Clause 5.3.3. * Reuse R15 HARQ-ACK rate matching and RE mapping for HP HARQ-ACK in principle. FFS details. * FFS Reuse R15 HARQ-ACK rate matching and RE mapping or R15 Part 1 CSI rate matching and RE mapping for LP HARQ-ACK ~~in principle. FFS details.~~ |
|  |  |

Proposal 4-2:

In NR Rel-17, at least 2 sets of beta offset values can be configured to the UE to indicate separate beta\_offset values for the following cases:

* Multiplexing LP UCI on HP PUSCH
* Multiplexing HP UCI on LP PUSCH
* FFS: Other cases.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| FL’s consideration: | Discussed for several meetings. Trade-off between “flexibility” and “RRC overhead”. Some companies questioned the necessity of separate configurations for LP-LP and HP-HP combinations. Related to RRC list. Suggested to first agree on HP-LP and LP-HP configurations for progress. |
| Supporting companies: | Huawei/Hisi (though we think we can try a bigger step for supporting 4 sets which is preferred by a vast majority), Lenovo/Motorola Mobility, Sharp (should it be at least 3 sets with 1 set for UCI on the PUSCH of the same priority?), InterDigital, Panasonic, LG, DOCOMO (@Sony since beta-offset for other cases is FFS in the proposal, the concern seems to be resolved.), TCL, ZTE, NEC, vivo, Quectel, Samsung, Ericsson, Spreadtrum, Intel, CATT (Similar as Huawei, we can try to agree on up to 4 sets as in section 4.3.1.2), Nokia/NSB (but should be limited to HARQ-ACK only, i.e. UCI 🡪 HARQ) ,OPPO (same view as Sharp, i.e. at least 3 sets with one set the same priority), QC |
| Objecting companies: | Apple |
| Company | Reason for objection |
| Sony | We can only agree to this if we are going to discuss remaining two beta offsets. |
| Apple | We feel the more fundamental issues such as the supported combinations should be settled first to treat beta offsets design. |
|  |  |

Proposal 4-3:

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

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| FL’s consideration: | Discussed for several meetings. Trade-off between “flexibility” and “DCI overhead”. Related to RRC list. Suggested to first agree on the RRC part. Dynamic part can be further discussed in next meeting. |
| Supporting companies: | Huawei/Hisi, Lenovo/Motorola Mobility, Sharp, InterDigital, Panasonic (Lenovo’s update is OK), LG, DOCOMO (Lenovo’s update is OK), TCL, NEC, Quectel (fine with Lenovo’s updates) , Spreadtrum, CATT (fine with Lenovo’s update), OPPO, QC |
| Objecting companies: | Sony,vivo, Ericsson, Intel, Nokia/NSB |
| Company | Reason for objection |
| Sony | RRC configuration is required even if DCI indicator is used. It is unclear what we are agreeing here. |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | To address Sony’s concern, can modify the wording as follows:  Proposal 4-3:  For multiplexing a HARQ-ACK into a PUSCH with different priorities in R17, at least support RRC based semi-static enabling/disabling of multiplexing ~~configuration for gNB to enable/disable the multiplexing.~~ |
| vivo | Same reason as Proposal 3-2. |
| Samsung | The proposal is unnecessary. The discussion should be on whether or not to support indication by DCI |
| Ericsson | We also think that the focus should be on supporting DCI indication or not |
| Intel | Same comment as Samsung and Ericsson |
| Nokia/NSB | Agree with the comments by Samsung, Ericsson and Intel. This issue is very important for the overall operation of this feature, just based on RRC configuration only we see little use for the overall feature. Supporting dynamic indication can avoid introducing any further complicated/additional conditions for multiplexing which we are not supportive, as well as the multiplexing and therefore PUSCH reliability stays under gNB control. As noted in our previous replies, we think this should be discussed and decided in a GTW session online. |

Proposal 6-1:

Simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH transmission on the same cell is not supported in Rel-17.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| FL’s consideration: | Narrow down the scope to focus on area with more interests. |
| Supporting companies: | Sony, Huawei/Hisi, Lenovo/Motorola Mobility, Apple, Sharp, InterDigital, Panasonic, LG, DOCOMO, ZTE, NEC,vivo, Quectel, Samsung, Ericsson, Spreadtrum, Intel, CATT, Nokia/NSB, OPPO, QC |
| Objecting companies: |  |
| Company | Reason for objection |
| Samsung | We can consider it if possible in Rel-18.  Also, from a RAN1 perspective, PUSCH + PUCCH should not differentiate intra-band and inter-band CA. Conditions are up to RAN4 similar to PUSCH. |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## Email approval starting from 24th Aug. (6th round discussion)

The proposals are updated based on the reasons for objection in last round. Please check the following proposals and input your position by 25th Aug. UTC 18:00pm. After then, the proposals without explicit objections will be suggested to Mr.Chairman for endorsement.

Proposal 4-1:

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

* HP HARQ-ACK and LP HARQ-ACK are separately encoded according to R15 TS 38.212 Clause 5.3.1 and Clause 5.3.3.
* Reuse R15 HARQ-ACK rate matching and RE mapping for HP HARQ-ACK in principle. FFS details.
* FFS for LP HARQ-ACK in principle, e.g. Reuse R15 Part 1 CSI rate matching and RE mapping or Reuse R15 HARQ-ACK rate matching and RE mapping.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Supporting companies: | Ericsson, ZTE, LG, DOCOMO, Sharp, Panasonic, OPPO, InterDigital, Quectel (also fine with QC’s suggestion), ITRI ,vivo, Spreadtrum, Samsung, Intel, CATT, Nokia/NSB, Sony |
| Objecting companies: | QC |
| Company | Reason for objection |
| QC | Sorry for not express our comment in 5th round of email discussion, which I accidentally missed the new section in FL summary. Regarding this bullet: “Reuse R15 HARQ-ACK rate matching and RE mapping for HP HARQ-ACK in principle”, we don’t think <=2 bits HP HARQ-ACK puncturing PUSCH is needed, because HP HARQ-ACK codebook size is quite robust. For HP HARQ-ACK, always rate match PUSCH should be used. If the last bullet is put under FFS, it is better to put the second bullet under FFS as well. We will be fine to put the second bullet also under FFS. |
|  |  |
|  |  |

Proposal 4-2:

In NR Rel-17, at least 2 sets of beta offset values can be configured to the UE to indicate separate beta\_offset values for the following cases:

* Multiplexing LP ~~UCI~~ HARQ-ACK on HP PUSCH
* Multiplexing HP ~~UCI~~ HARQ-ACK on LP PUSCH
* FFS other cases:
  + Alt.1: Multiplexing HARQ-ACK on the PUSCH with the same priority.
  + Alt.2:
    - Multiplexing LP HARQ-ACK on LP PUSCH
    - Multiplexing HP HARQ-ACK on HP PUSCH

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Supporting companies: | Ericsson (with comments/edits below), ZTE, LG (with suggestion below), DOCOMO (fine but slightly prefer the updates from Ericsson and LG), Sharp, Panasonic, QC (with editorial comments), OPPO(fine but slightly prefer to LG’s update), InterDigital (also fine with Ericsson or LG update), , ITRI (aQuectel (fine with LG’s update)lso fine with Ericsson’s update), vivo(fine with LG’s update) , Spreadtrum(fine with LG’s update), Samsung(also fine with Ericsson’s update), Intel (with updates), CATT (with comments below), Nokia/NSB (with Ericsson’s & LG’s updates), Sony (we agree to E///’s update, that is we are introducing 2 new sets of beta offsets and not deleting the 2 existing sets) |
| Objecting companies: |  |
| Company | Reason for objection |
| Ericsson | We are supportive of the intention of Proposal 4-2. But we don’t understand the meaning of Alt1/Alt2 under FFS. Beta offset for multiplexing HARQ-ACK on the PUSCH with the same priority is in the existing spec. Also Alt1 and Alt2 are the same?  Suggestion:   * + Remove FFS including Alt1 and Alt2.   + Add ‘new’ to main bullet to indicate that the 2 sets are in addition to the existing beta offset: “In NR Rel-17, at least 2 new sets of beta offset values can be configured to the UE…” |
| LG | It seems better to modify the FFS part in above for clarity, so we suggest the following modification.   * FFS whether to configure the set of beta values separately for following two cases:   + Multiplexing LP HARQ-ACK on LP PUSCH   + Multiplexing HP HARQ-ACK on HP PUSCH |
| Panasonic | We agree with LG’s modification to clarify the FFS point. |
| QC | We are not sure why UCI is replaced by HARQ-ACK only. But we are fine with this change to make progress. The formulation of the two alternatives can be improved. I guess Alt 1 uses one more beta offset for HARQ-ACK on the PUSCH with the same priority, and Alt 2 uses two more beta offsets. |
| Intel | We are fine with LG updates. We would like to add FFS bullet as follows. Note that we have already agreed the following multiplexing scenario.  FFS: how to apply the sets when both LP and HP HARQ-ACKs are to be multiplexed onto LP/HP PUSCH. |
| CATT | The FFS is also not clear to us.  Our understanding of the potential controversial part is whether a single or separate set(s) of beta offsets are configured for multiplexing LP UCI on LP PUSCH and multiplexing HP UCI on HP PUSCH. Given that separate sets of beta offsets are already supported in Rel-16, we do not see the reason why it is not supported in Rel-17.  Therefore, we think we should directly go for the proposal in section 4.3.1.2 (copied below) which is supported by majority companies.  In NR Rel-17, up to 4 sets of beta offset values can be configured to the UE to indicate separate beta\_offset values for the following cases:   * Multiplexing LP ~~HARQ-ACK/~~UCI on LP PUSCH * Multiplexing HP ~~LP HARQ-ACK/~~UCI on HP PUSCH * Multiplexing LP ~~HARQ-ACK~~UCI on HP PUSCH * Multiplexing HP ~~HARQ-ACK~~UCI on LP PUSCH |
| Sony | We support Ericsson’s proposal, that is we introduce 2 new sets of beta offsets in addition to the 2 existing ones. |

Proposal 6-1:

Simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH transmission on the same cell is not supported in Rel-17.

* Potential study in future release is not precluded.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Supporting companies: | Ericsson, ZTE, LG, DOCOMO, Sharp, Panasonic, QC, OPPO, InterDigital, Quectel, ITRI,vivo, Spreadtrum, Intel |
| Objecting companies: | Nokia/NSB (see below) |
| Company | Reason for objection |
| CATT | We do not need to discuss this proposal since it is already agreed as announced by Mr. Chair unless the intention is to include the sub-bullet. If so, we do not think it is necessary. |
| Nokia/NSB | Agree with CATT, no decision needed as already concluded. And the sub-bullet is not needed either, as we only say it is not supported in Rel-17 (which does not preclude anything in future releases) |
| Sony | Agree, chairman already concluded this the day before (24 Aug). |

## Email approval starting from 25th Aug. (7th round discussion)

Following the Chair’s guidance, this round discussion focuses on the following proposal. The option with less concerns in the first GTW session is proposed here. Please check and input your position by 26th Aug. UTC 15:00pm. It is suggested to carefully consider your objection (from my perspective, if you really think the option is not workable, or bring acceptable complexity) and the attempt to live with it. We can make it as a working assumption allowing further check until next meeting. We do need the progress.

Proposed working assumption 2-1:

For resolving overlapping PUCCHs/PUSCHs with different priorities in R17, aim at reusing Rel-15 pseudo-code defined in TS 38.213 Clause 9.2.5.

* Step 1: Resolve overlapping PUCCHs with same/different priorities
* Step 2: Resolve overlapping between PUCCH(s) and PUSCH(s) reusing Rel-15 procedure if simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH transmission is not enabled.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Supporting companies: | Sony, QC, CATT (with the update from QC), vivo(with the update from QC), TCL(with the update from QC) |
| Objecting companies: | Ericsson |
| Company | Reason for objection |
| QC | As CATT already commented in 4th round of email discussion, a more accurate formulation of step 2 could be “Step 2: Resolve overlapping between PUCCH(s) and PUSCH(s) ~~reusing Rel-15 procedure if simultaneous PUCCH/PUSCH transmission is not enabled~~.”, because strictly speaking, Rel-15 procedure does not support different priorities.  Please notice that the recursive structure of current option 2 requires a new UE implementation. Writing a recursive pseudo code in spec might be easy. But it requires a brand-new implementation by UE. If I am not wrong, there is no recursive pseudo code in current NR spec so UE never implement anything in recursive fashion. Now, option 2 will force UE to implement this new recursive structure. For option 2, like I commented already, if proponents of option 2 can show how to avoid recursive UE behavior, I will not object it. But so far, my concern is not addressed yet. |
| CATT | Agree with the update from Qualcomm. |
| Apple | To address QC’s question on Option 2, in our view, per L1 priority, the Set Q 🡪 PUCCH Z procedure is run. To avoid iterative processing, then the PUCCH resources Z from two priorities are multiplexed. And the PUCCH resource Z and subsequent “offsprings” at HP are the targeted for multiplexing, and handling of HP/LP UCI become more tractable. From this procedure, LP PUCCH resource Z either survives (not touched by any HP PUCCH) or is absorbed into a HP PUCCH or is discarded (e.g. the LP PUCCH resource Z carries P/SP CSI only).  A clarification question to FL and other companies:  Does the FL proposal mean both Option 1 and Option 2 are allowed under the proposal? Is the procedure described here in Apple’s input compatible with the FL proposal? |
| QC2 | To Apple: “To address QC’s question on Option 2, in our view, per L1 priority, the Set Q 🡪 PUCCH Z procedure is run. To avoid iterative processing, then the PUCCH resources Z from two priorities are multiplexed.” – You need to run the green step cross the two different priorities anyway, why you need to run the red step within each priority first? What does this red step help you here? |
| Ericsson | As QC edited, Option 1 (proposal above) Step 2 cannot reuse Rel-15. Step 1 also cannot reuse any existing procedure. Thus new procedures are to be defined for both steps for Option 1.  In contrast, Option 2 step 1 reuses Rel-16 procedure (which runs Rel-15 procedure once per PHY priority). Only new procedure needs to be defined for Step 2.  About recursive procedure of Option 2: actually I don’t understand what QC refers to exactly? Could you please describe?  I wonder how Option 1 can be claimed to be better? After performing Option 1 step 1, an example is shown below. How is Option 1 step 2 run such that it has no problem? In my view, Option 1 Step 1 does not resolve PUSCH overlapping, thus may leaving a complex scenario to Step 2. Option 1 Step 2 requires substeps like:   * Step 2a: handle PUCCH/PUSCH of same priority; * Step 2b: handle PUCCH/PUSCH of different priority; * *Unclear: how to handle a PUCCH that contains multiplexed HP UCI + LP UCI?*   That is, Option 1 Step 2 alone has to perform something similar to that of Option 2. Overall, Option 1 is more complex to implement and specify. |
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