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# Introduction

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

# Dynamic PUCCH repetition factor indication

## Whether semi-static PUCCH can use a PUCCH resource with “nrofSlots-r17” configured

Regarding whether dynamic PUCCH repetition factor indication should be applied to semi-static PUCCH, the following agreement is made in RAN1 106e.

**Agreement**

**Dynamic PUCCH repetition factor indication for SR or P/SP-CSI on PUCCH is not supported in Rel-17.**

With the above agreement, in R1-2109889 and R1-2110866, a potential ambiguity is observed. The ambiguity is that whether SR or P/SP-CSI on PUCCH can utilize a PUCCH resource configured with repetition factor “nrofSlots-r17”. The following proposal is made, which basically allow UE to use the PUCCH resource configured with repetition factor “nrofSlots-r17”. But UE ignore the RRC parameter “nrofSlots-r17” and use the legacy RRC parameter nrofSlots to determine the repetition factor for this particular PUCCH resource.

R1-2109889 & R1-2110866, Proposal 1: in the case a PUCCH resource is not associated with a scheduling DCI (e.g. PUCCH resource associated with CSI report) and the PUCCH resource is characterized by a dynamic repetition factor, the parameter nrofSlots is used for determining the repetition factor of the specific PUCCH resource.

After discussing the above issue in RAN1#106bis, the following FL proposal was made. The FL proposal seems supported by majority companies. But no agreement was made on this due to limited discussion time. Therefore, FL would like to repropose the following.

FL proposal 1: **For a PUCCH resource to transmit a PUCCH without an associated scheduling DCI (e.g. P/SP-CSI or SR), if the PUCCH resource is configured with RRC parameter “nrofSlots-r17”, “nrofSlots-r17” is ignored and the RRC parameter “nrofSlots” is used for determining the repetition factor of the specific PUCCH resource.**

Companies are welcome to provide further comments to the above FL proposal

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Comment** |
| Sharp | In our view, the above agreement means the repetition factor for SP or P/SP-CSI on PUCCH is not dynamically indicated. If “nrofSlots-r17” is configured on a PUCCH resource for the PUCCH without the associated scheduling DCI, the PUCCH resource and “nrofSlots-r17” are not dynamically indicated. Therefore, we think no special handling is needed (i.e., ignoring “nrofSlots-r17” is not needed).  However, we are OK with the proposal if the majority supports it. |
| Panasonic | We are fine with the FL proposal 1. |
| Nokia/NSB | Support |
| China Telecom | We support this proposal. |
| CATT | Support. |
| Vivo | Support |
| ZTE | Fine with the proposal |
| CMCC | Fine with the FL proposal 1. |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Apple | Support FL’s proposal |
| Ericsson | Support |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support the proposal |
| Samsung | Same understanding as Sharp. It is not clear to us the additional specification impact of this proposal respect to existing agreements, so the proposal seems not necessary. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Fine with the proposal. |
| Xiaomi | Fine with the proposal |
| Spreadtrum | Support |
| LG | Support |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | OK with the proposal if it could be clarified with no RAN1 spec impact. When the RRC parameter nrofSlots-r17 is introduced in TS 38.331, it can be described for dynamic indication only. It seems unnecessary to capture it in RAN1. |
| FL | @Huawe/HiSi@Samsung@Panasonic: The intention of the proposal is to clarify whether the following case is an error case or a legitimate case.   * **“nrofSlots-r17” is configured for a PUCCH resource without associated scheduling DCI**   One could argue this is an error case because “nrofSlots-r17” is for dynamic repetition indication which is a feature only supported for PUCCH with scheduling DCI.  However, majority prefer to allow the above case, with a simply clarification that UE just ignore the “nrofSlots-r17” configured on that PUCCH resource **(@Huawei @Samsung, it has a minor RAN1 spec impact. A UE behavior needs to be described for this case. That is why an agreement is needed**). This is a simple operation at UE. But it will help gNB resource configuration with larger flexibility/less restriction.  Based on this motivation, FL think it is a good proposal to pursue, and would like to ask @Samsung @Huawei to reconsider if it is acceptable. |

## Dynamic PUCCH repetition factor indication for HARQ-ACK of first SPS PDSCH associated with the activation DCI and SPS release DCI

Regarding whether dynamic PUCCH repetition factor indication is applicable to HARQ-ACK for first SPS PDSCH associated with the activation DCI and SPS release DCI, the following FL conclusion was proposed in RAN1#106bis. however, it was not agreeable due to controversial views.

Updated FL proposed conclusion 0: In NR Rel-17, the dynamic PUCCH repetition factor indication mechanism agreed in RAN1 106e does not apply to HARQ-ACK for SPS PDSCH except for the following two cases

* HARQ-ACK for the first SPS PDSCH associated with the activation DCI.
* HARQ-ACK corresponding to the SPS release DCI

Note: HARQ-ACK for the first SPS PDSCH associated with the activation DCI and HARQ-ACK corresponding to the SPS release DCI are categorized as PUCCH with associated scheduling DCI

In this meeting, companies input on this topic is listed as below.

R1-2111439 Proposal 1: The dynamic PUCCH repetition factor indication mechanism does not apply to HARQ-ACK for SPS PDSCH except for the following two cases.

* HARQ-ACK for the first SPS PDSCH associated with the activation DCI
* HARQ-ACK corresponding to the SPS release DCI

R1-2110921 Proposal 1: Dynamic PUCCH repetition indication is supported for HARQ-ACK for the first SPS PDSCH with associated with the activation DCI and HARQ-ACK corresponding to the SPS release DCI, while not supported for HARQ-ACK for the remaining SPS PDSCHs other than the first SPS PDSCH.

R1-2112233 Proposal 2: Support dynamic PUCCH repetition indication for HARQ-ACK for the first SPS PDSCH associated with the activation DCI.

R1-2111510 Proposal 1: Dynamic PUCCH repetition factor indication for HARQ-ACK of SPS PDSCH which is not associated with or activated by a DCI is not supported.

R1-2111754 Proposal 1: Conclusion

In NR Rel-17, the dynamic PUCCH repetition factor indication mechanism agreed in RAN1#106-e does not apply to HARQ-ACK for SPS PDSCH except for

* HARQ-ACK corresponding to the SPS release DCI

Note: The resource for HARQ-ACK for the first SPS PDSCH associated with the activation DCI is configured in SPS-Config by n1PUCCH-AN as a single PUCCH resource.

R1-2112038 Proposal 1:

* Revise the moderator’s updated proposed conclusion 0 from RAN1#106bis to the following:
  + In NR Rel-17, the dynamic PUCCH repetition factor indication mechanism agreed in RAN1 106e does not apply to HARQ-ACK for SPS only operation

Based on the companies’ input, for HARQ-ACK of SPS release DCI, it seem common understanding that dynamic PUCCH repetition factor indication can be applied. For HARQ-ACK of the first SPS PDSCH with activation DCI, the views are still controversial.

Therefore, the following FL proposal is made.

**FL proposed conclusion 1: In NR Rel-17, for HARQ-ACK for SPS PDSCH, it is clarified that the dynamic PUCCH repetition factor indication mechanism agreed in RAN1 106e applies to HARQ-ACK corresponding to the SPS release DCI**

* **FFS whether dynamic PUCCH repetition factor indication mechanism is applied to HARQ-ACK for the first SPS PDSCH associated with the activation DCI.**

Comments to the above FL proposal can be provided in the following table.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Comment** |
| Sharp | OK |
| Panasonic | We are fine with the FL proposed conclusion 1.  On FFS point, i.e., whether HARQ-ACK for the first SPS PDSCH associated with the activation DCI is categorized as dynamic PUCCH or semi-static PUCCH, the same handling as Rel.15/16 should be taken. |
| Nokia/NSB | We do not agree with logic provided in R1-2111754. Clause 9.2.3 of TS 38.213 does not differentiate between scheduling/activation/triggering DCI, but rather refers to a corresponding PDCCH.   |  | | --- | | If a UE is not provided SPS-PUCCH-AN-List and transmits HARQ-ACK information corresponding only to a PDSCH reception without a corresponding PDCCH, a PUCCH resource for corresponding PUCCH transmission with HARQ-ACK information is provided by n1PUCCH-AN. |   In our view, the common understanding in RAN1 is that a corresponding PDCCH is any PDCCH which carries a DCI which used by UE to locate/receive a subsequent PDSCH. We acknowledge that some ambiguity may exist w.r.t. the so-called activation DCI, at least in terms of terminology, however such ambiguity does not exist in terms of meaning. In this context, we may want to note that this understanding is the same used in 8.3.1, for which the following agreement was made during RAN1 #106-e.   |  | | --- | | **Agreement**  In addition to HARQ-Ack of PDSCH dynamically scheduled by a DCI indicating a PUCCH carrier, the dynamic target carrier indication also applies to:   * HARQ-ACK corresponding to the first SPS PDSCH activated by Activation DCI based on the indication in the activation DCI * HARQ-ACK corresponding to the SPS Release DCI based on the indication in the release DCI * triggered PUCCH for Rel-16 Type 3 CB, Rel-17 enh. Type 3 CB of smaller size and Rel-17 one-shot triggering for HARQ-Ack retransmission based on the indication in the triggering DCI * FFS: Additional cases |   Therefore, for the sake of consistency with both specification and common understanding in RAN1, we prefer the formulation provided by FL proposed conclusion 0, as provided by FL during #106b-e. |
| CATT | We support to have a conclusion.  For the FFS, it is worth to mention that *Issue#23* of *AI 7.1* in THIS meeting is about clarification for the first SPS PDSCH in 38.214. According to the feedback from companies, it seems to be a common understanding that that the first SPS PDSCH associated with the activation DCI is viewed as a dynamic scheduled PDSCH repetition.  Following the same logic, we tend to agree that dynamic PUCCH repetition factor indication mechanism is applied to HARQ-ACK for the first SPS PDSCH. |
| Vivo | Support.  In our understanding, the HARQ-ACK resource for first SPS PDSCH associated with the activation DCI is also indicated by PRI, hence dynamic PUCCH repetition factor should be applied. |
| ZTE | Support.  As CATT pointed out, it is a common understanding that the first SPS PDSCH associated with the activation DCI is treated as a dynamic scheduled PDSCH repetition based on the discussion in AI 7.1. So, we support dynamic PUCCH repetition factor indication is also applied to HARQ-ACK for the first SPS PDSCH associated with the activation DCI. |
| Intel | We do not support this conclusion.  As mentioned previously, our understanding is that based on the agreement, it is clear that if a PUCCH is associated with a scheduling DCI, dynamic PUCCH repetition factor indication is supported. This covers the cases for 1) dynamic HARQ-ACK feedback 2) HARQ-ACK feedback for HARQ-ACK for the first SPS PDSCH associated with the activation DCI, 3) HARQ-ACK corresponding to the SPS Release DCI.  Further, we also need to cover other cases, e.g., when PUCCH carrying dynamic HARQ-ACK overlaps with PUCCH resource carrying other UCI types like P-CSI, SR, etc.. In this case, dynamic repetition factor indication is applied for the determined PUCCH resource which is associated with a DCI based on the agreement.  In our view, we can either list all possible cases, or only state the following as conclusion or proposal.   * Dynamic PUCCH repetition factor indication for HARQ-ACK of SPS PDSCH which is not associated with or activated by a DCI is not supported. |
| Apple | We share similar view as Nokia/NSB |
| Ericsson | We are OK with the main bullet.  However, we seem to have an opposite understanding from vivo, CATT, and ZTE on if there is an SPS PDSCH scheduled by the activation DCI. Our understanding is that an SPS activation DCI does not schedule a PDSCH, but only activates it. So the configured PUCCH resources used for all PDSCHs scheduled by SPS are configured PUCCH resources.  Since this is Rel-15 behavior, we prefer to be very conservative in the FFS. As the FFS is written now it assumes there is a PDSCH (and a HARQ-ACK) for the activation DCI. Can we have something like:  **FL proposed conclusion 1: In NR Rel-17, for HARQ-ACK for SPS PDSCH, it is clarified that the dynamic PUCCH repetition factor indication mechanism agreed in RAN1 106e applies to HARQ-ACK corresponding to the SPS release DCI**   * **FFS: ~~whether dynamic PUCCH repetition factor indication mechanism is applied to HARQ-ACK for the first SPS PDSCH associated with the~~ activation DCI.** |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support the conclusion.  For the FFS, we agree with Panasonic that Rel-15/16 specification should be applied to determine whether the HARQ-ACK associated with first SPS PDSCH is considered as dynamic or semi-static PUCCH |
| Samsung2 | The main bullet is fine.  We do not support the FFS because it is against R15/16 specifications. If it is agreed via a CR to modify Rel-15/16 for the PUCCH resource used for the first SPS PDSCH to be the one indicated by the PRI (instead of a resource from *SPS-PUCCH-AN-List* in *PUCCH-Config* or *n1PUCCH-AN* as in Rel-15/16), that would also resolve the FFS. |
| Xiaomi | Fine with the proposal. |
| Spreadtrum | Support the proposal.  We also support dynamic PUCCH repetition factor indication mechanism is applied to HARQ-ACK for the first SPS PDSCH associated with the activation DCI. Because the first SPS PDSCH is treated as dynamic PDSCH. |
| LG | We share similar view with Nokia. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Similar view with Nokia. |

## Other proposals

There are a few other proposals in submitted contributions to this agenda, which are listed as below.

R1-2111694 Proposal 1: RAN1 should specify whether later DCI can override former DCI indicating the same PUCCH slot with different PUCCH repetition factor.

R1-2111890, Proposal 6: Support the existing mechanism in 38.213 Sec. 9.2.3 when number of resources per PUCCH resource set is up to 32.

* Combine existing mechanisms based on PRI, NCCE and nCCE,0 to indicate the PUCCH resource with repetition factor within a PUCCH resource set up to 64 PUCCH resources

R1-2112233 Proposal 1: Support also using other properties of PDCCH (e.g. PDCCH aggregation level), in addition to PRI and starting CCE index, to indicate the PUCCH resource.

R1-2112233, Proposal 3: Support enhancing RRC signaling to allow dynamic indication of frequency hopping for PUCCH repetition via indication of PUCCH resource.

R1-2111981, Proposal 1: The following methods to configure PUCCH repetition for the UE without dedicated PUCCH resource configuration should be studied.

* PUCCH repetition is indicated by using repetition number of PUSCH.
* PUCCH repetition is indicated by PRI and/or system information.
* Introduce a PUCCH resource set with repetition number.

FL’s initial assessment is that the discussion of those proposals can be deprioritized, comparing to proposals in Section 2.1 and 2.2. But companies are welcome to provide comments to the above proposals in the following table.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Comment** |
| Panasonic | We are supportive to R1-2112233, Proposal 3. If the length of configured TDW and/or hopping interval is per PUCCH resource, in addition to PUCCH repetition factor indication, length of the configured TDW and/or hopping interval can be indicated as an additional parameter in the PUCCH resource set and PUCCH resource indicator field can be reused. In this case, in order to allow flexibility, extending the PUCCH resource indicator field would be one possibility. |
| Apple | For R1-2111890, Proposal 6, it should be discussed whether number of PUCCH resources within a set is allowed be larger than 32 or not. And if so, what will be the new formulation to map (PRI, NCCE and nCCE,0) to indicate the PUCCH resource (based on the existing agreement). |
| Ericsson | Agree with FL summary in general. Most proposals seem to be further optimization/flexibility that may not be so essential.  For R1-2111694, we are open to further discussion, but wonder why indicating two different repetition values for the same PUCCH slots is not an error case. |
| Samsung | We agree with the FL’s assessment, and no further discussion on these proposals is necessary. |
| LG | The dynamic PUCCH repetition factor indication can be differentiated by two parts; for the UE with dedicated PUCCH resource configuration and the UE without dedicated PUCCH resource configuration. It is our understanding that agreed dynamic indication method is based on UE with dedicated PUCCH resource. Therefore it should be discussed further how to indicate PUCCH repetition factor dynamically for the UE without dedicated PUCCH resource, or at least clarification is needed that dynamic PUCCH repetition indication is applied only for the UE with dedicated PUCCH resource. |

# DMRS bundling across PUCCH repetitions

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

## Use cases

Regarding the use cases for DMRS bundling for PUSCH repetitions, the following conclusion was made in RAN1 106bis in AI 8.8.1.3.

**Conclusion**

* Joint channel estimation over PUSCH transmissions across non-consecutive slots is not supported in Rel-17.

For the use cases of DMRS bundling for PUCCH repetitions, companies’ input are listed as below.

R1-2111432 Proposal 1: Not support Use case 5 for PUCCH repetitions with DMRS bundling.

R1-2112233 Proposal 4: RAN1 to confirm that use cases 3 and 4a are the only two use cases for PUCCH DMRS bundling.

R1-2110866 Proposal 8. For non-back-to-back PUCCH transmissions, in case the other UL transmission in between two successive PUCCH repetitions has different settings than PUCCH, the gNB indicates one of the following options to the UE:

* Option 1: Drop the other UL transmission with different settings.
* Option 2: Transmit the other UL transmission with different settings and break the phase continuity.
* Option 3: Adapt the settings of the other UL transmission to make it be the same as the PUCCH repetitions.

Given that RAN1 should strive for a common design between PUCCH and PUSCH DMRS bundling, it is reasonable to make the following conclusion for PUCCH as well.

**FL proposed conclusion 2: The following use case 5 of PUCCH DMRS bundling is not supported in Rel-17**

* **Use case 5: PUCCH repetitions across non-consecutive slots.**
  + **Use case 5a: no uplink transmission in the middle of two PUCCH repetitions**
  + **Use case 5b: other uplink transmissions in the middle of two PUCCH repetitions**

Comments to the above FL proposal can be provided in the following table.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Comment** |
| Sharp | OK |
| Panasonic | We are fine with the FL proposed conclusion 2. |
| QC | Support |
| Nokia/NSB | Ok |
| China Telecom | We support this proposal. |
| CATT | Agree. |
| Vivo | Support. |
| ZTE | Support |
| CMCC | Support FL proposal conclusion 2. |
| Intel | We are fine with the conclusion. |
| Apple | Support |
| Ericsson | Support |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support the conclusion |
| Samsung | OK |
| WILUS | Support |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| Spreadtrum | Support |
| LG | Support. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | OK |
| TCL | OK |

## PUCCH TDW design details

In RAN1 #106e, after a heated discussion, the following working assumption was agreed for time domain window design for DMRS bundling across PUSCH repetitions.

**Working assumption:**

For joint channel estimation for PUSCH repetition type A of PUSCH repetitions of the same TB, all the repetitions are covered by one or multiple consecutive/non-consecutive configured TDWs.

   Each configured TDW consists of one or multiple consecutive physical slots.

   The window length *L* of the configured TDW(s) can be explicitly configured with a single value~~and~~*~~L~~*~~is no longer than the maximum duration~~.

‐   FFS: The maximum value of *L* ~~is the duration of all repetitions~~

‐   FFS: Solutions to error propagation issue if ~~for~~ *L* is longer than the maximum duration is to be discussed further.

‐   FFS: The window length *L* is configured per UL BWP

   The start of the first configured TDW is the first PUSCH transmission

‐   FFS: The first available slot/symbol, or the first physical slot/symbol for the first PUSCH transmission.

   The start of other configured TDWs can be implicitly determined prior to first repetition.

‐   FFS: The configured TDWs are consecutive for paired spectrum/SUL band

‐   FFS: The start of the configured TDWs for unpaired spectrum is implicitly determined based on semi-static DL/UL configuration.

   The end of the last configured TDW is the end of the last PUSCH transmission.

‐   FFS: The end of the configured TDW is the last available slot/symbol, or the last physical slot/symbol for the last PUSCH transmission.

   Within one configured TDW, one or multiple actual TDWs can be implicitly determined:

‐   The start of the first actual TDW is the first PUSCH transmission within the configured TDW.

* FFS: The first available slot/symbol, or the first physical slot/symbol for the first PUSCH transmission.

‐   After one actual TDW starts, UE is expected to maintain the power consistency and phase continuity until one of the following conditions is met, then the actual TDW is ended.

* The actual TDW reaches the end of the last PUSCH transmission within the configured TDW.

  FFS: The end of the actual TDW is the last available slot/symbol, or the last physical slot/symbol for the last PUSCH transmission.

* An event occurs that violates power consistency and phase continuity

  FFS: The events may include e.g., a DL slot based on DL/UL configuration for unpaired spectrum, the actual TDW reaches the maximum duration, DL reception/monitoring occasion for unpaired spectrum, high priority transmission, frequency hopping, precoder cycling.

  FFS: The end of the actual TDW is the last available slot/symbol of the PUSCH transmission right before an event such that the power consistency and phase continuity are violated.

‐   If the power consistency and phase continuity are violated due to an event, whether a new actual TDW is created is subject to UE capability of supporting restarting DMRS bundling.

* If UE is capable of restarting DM-RS bundling, one new actual TDW is created after the event,

  FFS: The start of the new actual TDW is the first available slot/symbol for PUSCH transmission after the event.

* If UE is not capable of restarting DM-RS bundling, no new actual TDW is created until the end of the configured TDW.
* FFS: UE capability of restarting DMRS bundling is applied only to dynamic event or not

Note 1: A ‘configured TDW’ refers to a time domain window whose length can be configured to ‘L’ and whose start and end is determined as described above.

Note 2: An ‘actual TDW’ refers to a time domain window during whose entire duration the DM-RS bundling is actually applied. An ‘actual TDW’ duration is always less than or equal to the ‘configure TDW’ duration.

Note 3: Whether the terms ‘configured TDW’ and ‘actual TDW’ are revised to other terms and if such terminology is used in specifications is to be further discussed.

Furthermore, the following agreements were made in RAN1 106bis on TDW design.

**Agreement**

* For PUSCH repetition type A counting based on physical slots
  + The configured TDWs are consecutive, where the start of other configured TDWs is the first physical slot right after the last physical slot of a previous configured TDW.
* For PUSCH repetition type A counting based on available slots
  + The configured TDWs are determined based on available slots, where start of a configured TDWs is the ~~next~~ first available slot after the ~~conclusion~~ last available slot of a previous configured TDW.
  + Note: The determination of available slots for PUSCH repetition Type A is defined in AI 8.8.1.1.

Working Assumption

Support Actual TDW Option 2b’:

* The start of the first actual TDW is the first ~~available~~ symbol (at least determined by TDRA table) ~~in available slot~~ for the first PUSCH transmission in an available slot within the configured TDW.
* The end of the actual TDW is
  + the last ~~available~~ symbol (at least determined by TDRA table) ~~in available slot~~ for the last PUSCH transmission in an available slot within the configured TDW if the actual TDW reaches the end of the last PUSCH transmission within the configured TDW.
  + the last ~~available~~ symbol (at least determined by TDRA table) ~~in available slot~~ of the PUSCH transmission right before the event if an event occurs that violates power consistency and phase continuity, and the PUSCH transmission is in an available slot.
  + For UE capable of restarting DM-RS bundling, the start of the new actual TDW is the first ~~available~~ symbol (at least determined by TDRA table) ~~in available slot~~ for PUSCH transmission after the event violates power consistency and phase continuity, and the PUSCH transmission is in an available slot.

Since almost all companies prefer to have a common TDW(time domain window) design between PUCCH and PUSCH DMRS bundling. The following is proposed by FL.

**FL Proposal 2: For PUCCH DMRS bundling, when pplicable, reuse the procedure developed for PUSCH DMRS bundling to determine configured TDW(s) and actual TDW(s).**

Comments to the above FL proposal can be provided in the following table.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Comment** |
| Sharp | OK and the procedure of the configured TDW determination for PUSCH repetition type A counting based on available slot should be reused for PUCCH’s configured TDW determination. |
| Panasonic | We are fine with FL proposal 2. |
| QC | Support |
| Nokia/NSB | Support |
| China Telecom | We support this proposal. |
| CATT | Support. |
| Vivo | Support. |
| ZTE | Support |
| CMCC | Support. |
| InterDigital | Support |
| Intel | We are fine with the FL proposal.  Our understanding is that the agreement for determination of configured TDWs for PUCCH repetition for FDD/TDD system was already captured in 214. |
| Ericsson | OK in principle, but e.g. TDRA table is not used for PUCCH. Also, we have not discussed events for PUCCH; should we have ‘FFS: events for PUCCH’? |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support the proposal |
| Samsung | We are fine with reusing PUSCH DMRS bundling procedures for PUCCH, if applicable. |
| WILUS | Support |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| Spreadtrum | Support |
| LG | Reusing the procedure when applicable looks fine but it needs to be refined more to fit PUCCH well. For example, TDRA table, physical/available slot and events. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support. |
| TCL | Support |

## Inter slot freq hopping enhancement with DMRS bundling

In RAN1 106bis, the following agreement is made.

**Agreement:**

**For the interaction between inter-slot frequency hopping and DMRS bundling for PUCCH/PUSCH repetitions, a UE perform the “hopping intervals determination”, “configured TDW determination”, and “actual TDW determination” in a sequential ordering. One option of the following options is to be selected.**

* **Option 1: “hopping intervals determination” -> “configured TDW determination” -> “actual TDW determination”**
* **Option 2: “configured TDW determination” -> “hopping intervals determination” -> “actual TDW determination”**
* **Option 4: “configured TDW determination” -> “actual TDW determination” and “hopping intervals determination”**

**Note: option 1~~,~~ and 2~~, and 3~~ assume a hopping interval can be different than an actual TDW. Option 4 assumes a hopping interval is the same as an actual TDW.**

Based on companies input in Tdocs submitted to RAN1#107, the pros and cons of the above options are summarized as below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Option 1: | Pros: more efficient resource allocation for MU, including Rel-15/16 UEs not supporting DMRS bundling and Rel-17 Ues with different length of configured TDW [R1-2112233, R1-2112038] |
| Cons: smaller DMRS bundling gain, when hopping interval and configured TDW having misaligned length [R1-2110792] |
| Option 2: | Pros: Better DMRS bundling performance over option 1 [R1-2111439, R1-2112122] |
| Cons: less efficient resource allocation for MU [R1-2112233, R1-2112038] |
| Option 4: | Pros: higher gain for the combination of joint channel estimation and frequency hopping [R1-2110866, R1-2112122]; Guaranteed same length between actual TDW and hopping interval [R12111951]. |
| Cons: dynamic events impact hopping pattern [R1-2111439], mis-alignment of hopping pattern between gNB and UE, due to missed DCI [R1-2111510] |

The positions of companies are summarized in below:

* Supporting option 1: ZTE, Spreadtrum, CATT, Intel, XiaoMi, Samsung, Interdigital, Apple, Sharp, Ericsson, QC
* Supporting option 2: Huawei/HiSi, ZTE, VIVO, Panasonic, Sharp, DCM
* Supporting option 4: Nokia, CMCC, Lenovo, ETRI, Wilus

FL’s assessment is that the missing DCI is indeed an issue for option 4. Between option 1 and option 2, they have pros and cons over each other, depends on the design criteria is optimizing SU performance or MU performance. Also considering the number of companies supporting each option, FL recommend to take option 1. Therefore, the following proposal is made.

**FL Proposal 3: For the interaction between inter-slot frequency hopping and DMRS bundling for PUCCH/PUSCH repetitions, option 1 (as agreed in RAN1 106bis) is adopted.**

Comments to the above FL proposal can be provided in the following table.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Comment** |
| Sharp | Support |
| Panasonic | We agree to FL’s assessment that the missing DCI is the issue for Option 4. On comparison between Option 1 and Option 2, Option 2 can achieve “frequency positions are alternatives in every configured TDWs” and such frequency hopping pattern can provide better performance than Option 1. For TDD, if only 2 or 4 slots is considered for the length of frequency hopping interval, such length is not so aligned with TDD configuration. In this case, we think Option 1 results in poor frequency hopping performance. In order to achieve the similar hopping pattern as Option 2, we can compromise to Option 1 with the configuration that hopping interval and configured TDW are same as the period of TDD {DL + S + UL} slots. That means the length of frequency hopping interval and configured TDW should support the length aligned with *dl-UL-TransmisisonPeriodicity*, which takes the value of {ms0p5, ms0p625, ms1, ms1p25, ms2, ms2p5, ms5, ms10} and {ms3, ms4}. |
| QC | Support |
| Nokia/NSB | We think that this deserves a bit more discussion, given that we have never discussed how each Option would be realized in practice. Before doing this, we would like to elaborate on major differences between Option 1 and the others. We believe that this is fundamental to ensure that RAN1 does not make a hasty decision which may undermine the success of the feature:   * Option 2 and Option 4 imply that FH patterns/intervals for DM-RS bundling are implicitly defined and configured once the nominal TDW is configured to the UE (for Option 2) and once actual TDW is determined (for Option 4). Conversely, such patterns will have to configured separately to each UE in Option 1. It is worth observing that RAN1 has not started discussing about new patterns/intervals yet and this is the last meeting of the release. If we do not agree on such new patterns/intervals, then Option 1 is fundamentally incompatible with DM-RS bunding due to how current hopping patterns/intervals work for PUSCH (based on odd/even slot number within radio frame) or PUCCH (based on odd/even slot number within sequence of N PUCCH repetitions). In this context, we are not comfortable with the idea of rushing the design of this aspect now, or signing a blank cheque, with no possibility to have a proper technical discussion about it. Furthermore, it is also worth adding that this would complicate the signaling anyway, regardless of which FH patterns/interval might be agreed. * The missing DCI problem impacts Option 4 only in case of dynamic events, but not in case of semi-static events. * Option 4 is a generalization of Option 2, which offers more flexibility in combining FH and DM-RS bundling gain. * We think that the advantages for MU scheduling of Option 1 are overrated, unless we are implying that DM-RS feature is never enabled. Assuming the existence of new FH patterns/intervals (which do not exist yet), Option 1 would simplify the MU scheduling of CE Ues for which DM-RS bundling is activated, and configured TDW length is identical across such Ues. However, it would not offer any advantage in all other cases, since the hopping patterns/intervals of legacy Ues, of CE Ues for which DM-RS bundling is not activated will be the same as for R15/R16. In this sense, Option 1 would offer advantages only when a very minor set of Ues in the cell are scheduled in the same slot(s). We argue this is a corner case and we would like to understand why proponents of Option 1 consider it so important.   Now, moving to how different Options could work:   * Option 1:   + It requires new FH patterns/intervals to be designed (and we haven’t started this yet)   + It requires FH patterns/intervals and TDW to be configured to the UE separately   + It handles semi-static and dynamic events in the same way.   + Performance depends on how flexible the configuration of the new FH patterns/intervals is. * Option 2:   + It does not require new FH patterns/intervals to be designed, since the duration of each hop is equal to the size of the nominal TDW   + It does not require FH patterns/intervals and TDW to be configured separately   + It handles semi-static and dynamic events in the same way. * Option 4:   + It does not require new FH patterns/intervals to be designed, since the duration of each hop is equal to the size of the corresponding actual TDW   + It does not require FH patterns/intervals and TDW to be configured separately   + It can handle semi-static and dynamic events in the same or different ways.   Given the above, we observe that Option 4 is the most flexible and powerful option, whose performance does no rely on assumptions on how FH patterns/internals are designed and configured. The problem of the missing DCI can be solved easily by handling semi-static and dynamic events separately as follows:   * If an actual TDW is created due to a semi-static event, UE hops.   + The length of FH intervals and nominal TDW can be different, depending whether semi-static events occur within the TDW or not. * If an actual TDW is created due to a dynamic event, UE does not hop.   + The length of FH intervals and nominal TDW is the same.   In other words, FH across actual TDWs could occur in Option 4 in case of semi-static events (the missing DCI is not a problem) where it cannot occur in case of dynamic events. This would make Option 4 behave like Option 2 in case of dynamic events.  We think this would be the best compromise to account for all companies’ preferences, while (i) simplifying the discussion on FH, and (ii) not hindering the success of the feature. |
| China Telecom. | We support Option 1, but we want to make some more clarification on option 1. For option 1, the hopping interval can be separately configured and can be different from the window length of the **configured TDWs** and **the actual TDWs**. In this option, inter-slot frequency hopping with inter-slot bundling can be deemed as one semi-static event that violates the power consistency and phase continuity. |
| CATT | We support the proposal. Option 1 will be more compatible for cell-level UE multiplexing.  In addition, if the hopping interval is configured as equal to the window length of the configured TWDs to obtain the best performance of JCE (without the breaking of power consistency and phase continuity caused by frequency hopping), there seems no much difference between option 1 and option . |
| Vivo | Not support this proposal, and prefer option 2.  It has been agreed in AI 8.8.1.1 that no new inter-slot frequency hopping mechanism is introduced for PUSCH repetition type A without joint channel estimation. If frequency hopping interval is configured by a separated RRC parameter, a new hopping pattern can be introduced when DMRS bundling is not enabled, which would violate previous agreements.  Besides, configuring frequency hopping interval and configured window separately is obvious deviation from the intention of inter-slot frequency hopping with DMRS bundling. Hence, opt-1 is not preferred. |
| ZTE | In our view, we need to first clarify some fundamental questions about FH, including,   1. Whether the FH interval is RRC configured or not? 2. Whether the FH interval it is the same as configured TDW or it is a new RRC parameter that is separately configured? 3. Whether FH is an event or not?   For 1), our answer is yes. One value for FH configured by RRC is sufficient, and there is no need multiple values or dynamic indication.  For 2), we slightly prefer to use the same length for configured TDW and FH interval.  For 3), if FH interval is the same as configured TDW, FH is not an event. Otherwise, we need to treat it as an event.  In addition, it needs to clarify the main difference between Option 1 and Option 2. If the options only presents a proceeding order without any clear restrictions between FH intervals and configured TDW, we don’t see much difference between the two options. |
| CMCC | We cannot agree with the proposal and still support option 4. As we are talking about the determination of actual TDW and frequency hopping TDW, both of them should be determined based on the configured TDW and the semi-static event, e.g. TDD-UL-DL configuration, before the transmissions and frequency hopping. Then the frequency hopping interval is determined. If an dynamic event happens before the determination, it should be also considered for the determination but it also happens before the transmission. Then when the PUSCH/PUCCH transmission happens, the frequency hopping interval is determined. And once the dynamic event happens during the transmission, a new actual window is generated and the DMRS bundling is also interrupted but the frequency interval will not change. We cannot change the frequency hopping pattern while we are doing it. This is the same case as option 1 and 2, in which the frequency hopping interval are not changed dynamically.  For the dynamic event, the DMRS bundling of all three options will be interrupted. But the benefit of the option 4 is, for some predictable dynamic event or the dynamic events that are already known, the frequency hopping pattern could fit into it and does not lose the JCE gains.  And for the miss detection of DCI, if it happens during the transmission, it is same for the three cases. The DMRS bundling are not interrupted and the frequency hopping does not change.  For option 1, the performance will depends on the proper configuration of both frequency hopping interval and the configured TDW. |
| InterDigital | Support |
| Intel | We support the FL proposal.  For Option 4, this may have mis-alignment between gNB and UE side, when considering the potential mis-detection of dynamic events. This would result in PUSCH decoding failure if hopping boundary is not aligned between gNB and UE side.  Further, in Rel-15/16, inter-slot frequency hopping pattern is defined based on slot index. Option 1 can help to allow backward compatibility. If hopping interval is configured with different value from the TDW length, this can provide appropriate tradeoff between frequency diversity gain and channel estimation gain |
| Apple | Support FL’s proposal |
| Ericsson | We support option 1.  Regarding agreements in 8.8.1.1: our understanding is that agreement addressed FH proposals specific to Type A repetition. We here discuss FH in support of JCE. Then, as usual, if the mechanism should be precluded for certain scenarios can be discussed.  As we show in R1-2112037, there are tradeoffs of diversity gain vs. channel estimation gain, so restricting a hopping pattern to be a function only of a TDW size could degrade the performance of hopping.  Similarly, different Ues in a cell could support different maximum durations or not support DMRS bundling, while on the other hand Ues should be able to share a hopping pattern in order to avoid wasted PUSCH resources. If the hopping patterns are different according to scheduling or if we are forced to configure different patterns to match bundling capability, the capacity gains from hopping will be degraded by less resource efficiency.  Lastly, as we have discovered during the WI phase, maintaining phase coherence is often not feasible, and so JCE mechanisms are in general rather more difficult to implement in a UE than frequency hopping. Exploiting FH gains as part of a mechanism designed to support JCE is therefore quite important, and should be available to both Ues that do and do not support JCE.  Regarding the design of the mechanism itself, we think a simple one can be straightforward and could use the following principles:   * The hopping offsets are determined by the slot index * Frequency hopping is an event that sets the actual TDW size * Ues can be configured with the hopping pattern * Support increased numbers (e.g. up to 4) of hopping offsets, where the number of consecutive slots per hop can be controlled. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We don’t support the proposal and agree with Nokia to have further discussion on this. In our view, option 4 is simpler, yet flexible option and doesn’t require further discussion on hopping patterns as they are implicitly determined by the actual window duration. With option 2 also, similar conclusion can be made, so we would be okay to support option 2 as our second preference.  However, option 1 would require separate configuration and design of hopping patterns |
| Samsung | We are fine with the proposal. The main point is that there cannot be frequency hopping within a TDW. And FH and DM-RS bundling/TDW length configurations should be independent configurations. |
| WILUS | We still have preference on Option 4.  Regarding the missing DCI problem in Option 4, events that violate power consistency and phase continuity may include not only dynamic event but also semi-static event. Thus, hopping interval can be determined at least based on the semi-static events, such as TDD UL/DL configuration in unpaired spectrum.  Also, since inter-slot frequency hopping with inter-slot bundling is started from gain of the channel estimation in addition to frequency diversity gain, it is worth noting that the maximum gain of DMRS bundling can be achieved via Option 4. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We agree with the FL assessment, so that we prefer Option 1 or 2 and Pros and Cons of Options are the UE multiplexing and the joint channel estimation gain. We slightly prefer Option 2 with considering the joint channel estimation gain, on the other hands, we can live with the FL proposal. |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| Spreadtrum | Support |
| LG | It is our understanding that one of the huge difference between option 1 and option 2 is whether frequency hopping is event or not. It is being discussed in AI 8.8.1.2. To achieve “Strive for common design of the time domain window for PUSCH/PUCCH with DMRS bundling as much as possible”, we think we should wait for the decision regarding frequency hopping on joint channel estimation of PUSCH agenda. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We prefer option 2. Option 1 will introduce one additional RRC signaling to indicate the frequency hopping interval, but option 2 is not. Option 2 can achieve a balance between DMRS bundling gain and frequency hopping gain, compared with option 1. If two UEs are in MU, both UEs are scheduled with the same number of PRBs. Since one of UEs is coverage limited and can be scheduled with only limited number of PRBs, it is not a wise gNB scheduling to schedule a cell-center UE also with the same limited number of PRBs just for a MU with the first UE, which costs obvious UL throughput drop. Therefore, the MU paired UEs should be both coverage limited UEs that have similar SINR. In this case, both MU paired UEs can be configured with JCE and have Option 2 to get the full gain. If there is no other UE capable of JCE, then optimizing the MU for a single UE by Option 1 seems not necessary, the UE with limited number of scheduled PRBs can be scheduled in a FDM manner. |

Based on companies’ input so far, the situation is summarized as below

* Supporting option 1 **(13)**: ZTE, Spreadtrum, CATT, Intel, XiaoMi, Samsung, Interdigital, Apple, Sharp, Ericsson, QC, DCM (can accept option 1), Panasonic (can accept option 1 with certain restriction)
* Supporting option 2 (**6**): Huawei/HiSi, ZTE, VIVO, Panasonic, Sharp, DCM
* Supporting option 4 (**5**): Nokia/NSB, CMCC, Lenovo, ETRI, Wilus

Given that option 4 indeed has the missing DCI issue, and also based on the number of supporting companies, FL suggest to make a small step forward with the following proposal.

**Updated FL Proposal 3: Update the following agreement made in RAN1 106#bis-e as below. Further down-select between option 1 and 2 in RAN1#107e.**

**For the interaction between inter-slot frequency hopping and DMRS bundling for PUCCH/PUSCH repetitions, a UE perform the “hopping intervals determination”, “configured TDW determination”, and “actual TDW determination” in a sequential ordering. One option of the following options is to be selected.**

* **Option 1: “hopping intervals determination” -> “configured TDW determination” -> “actual TDW determination”**
  + **FFS: whether same or separate RRC configuration(s) for hopping interval and configured TDW.**
* **Option 2: “configured TDW determination” -> “hopping intervals determination” -> “actual TDW determination”**
* **~~Option 4: “configured TDW determination” -> “actual TDW determination” and “hopping intervals determination”~~**

**Note: option 1 and 2 assume a hopping interval can be different than an actual TDW. ~~Option 4 assumes a hopping interval is the same as an actual TDW~~.**

Comments to the above FL proposal can be provided in the following table.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Comment** |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Although, our preference has been option 4, but considering the majority, for sake of progress, we will be willing to accept Option, with the understanding that frequency hopping is violation event |
| Sharp | Support the proposal |
| Nokia/NSB | @FL: we provided several arguments in the first round which were all ignored. Stating that Option 4 suffers from missing DCI problem is not correct, since this is related only to dynamic events. Option 4 does not suffer from missing DCI problem in case of semi-static events. On the other hand, it is the solution with the best compromise in terms of signaling enhancement (none is needed as opposed to Option 1) and FH/JCE performance increase trade-off (both gains can be effectively harnessed, as opposed to Option 2). We are putting a lot of efforts in this discussion to ensure that a solid technical direction is chosen. In this context, we proposed a way to reach middle ground between Option 4 and Option 2, which was also ignored. Would it possible to discuss this possibility before discarding it completely? |
| Panasonic | We are fine with the proposal. Related to FFS, just to have one parameter to define “hopping length and configured TDW when both are configured”, could be middle ground between Option 1 and Option 2. In such case, the order difference between option 1 and option 2 are gone. It restricts the amount of complexity and standardization effort as this is the last meeting of Rel.17. |
| Ericsson | Support the proposal |

On inter-slot frequency hopping, there are proposals from companies to address the issue whether the same or different length should be applied to hopping interval and TDWs.

R1-2111430 Proposal 2:

* For inter-slot frequency hopping with inter-slot bundling, the hopping interval is separately configured and can be different from the window length of the configured TDWs and the actual TDWs.
* The hopping interval can be configured smaller than the window length of the configured TDWs. Whether the hopping interval can be configured larger than the window length of the configured TDWs needs further study.

R1-2111510 Proposal 3

* For inter-slot frequency hopping with inter-slot bundling
  + Option 1 is supported for the hopping interval determination.
  + Hopping interval can be separately configured from TDW length.
  + Frequency hopping pattern is determined based on slot index.

R1-2112022 Proposal 2: The length of the configured TDW (i.e., the window length L) should be equal to the hopping interval by configuring single parameter.

R1-2112122 Proposal 3: Configured time domain window length (L) should be used for the determination of hop duration in inter-lost frequency hopping.

R1-2111439 Proposal 6: For PUSCH/PUCCH with joint channel estimation, the inter-slot frequency hopping is performed per configured TDW, which is determined based on configured/indicated TDW length and semi-static TDD configuration.

On this issue, FL would like to collect more views from companies using the following table, before making a proposal.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Support same or different length between hopping interval and configured TDW?** | **Pros and cons of adopting same length** | **Pros and cons of allowing different length** |
| Sharp | Support same length between hopping interval and configured TDW. | Pros: The occurred number of events within the configured TDW can be reduced and error propagation can be mitigated. |  |
| Panasonic | Support same and different length | Pros: Better gain due to both the frequency hopping and joint channel estimation  Cons: Since maximum duration for configured TDW could be UE capability, common hopping pattern among UEs could not be possible. | Pros: Common hopping pattern among UEs is possible.  Cons: Less frequency hopping and/or joint channel estimation gain |
| QC | Support different lengths |  | We are thinking of hopping being completely decoupled from TDW configuration. Therefore aligning with TDW configurations may not even be possible. Hopping patterns may be common across a cell, while TDW config may be UE specific. |
| Nokia/NSB | Different length in case of actual windows created by semi-static events  Same length in case of actual windows created by dynamic events.  Therefore, we support a mixed approach, as explained in the previous table. | PRO: If only one actual window exists inside the nominal window, i.e., no event occurs, adopting the same length guarantees max performance of DM-RS bundling.  CON:   * If events occur within a nominal window, i.e., two or more actual TDWs are created, then the advantage in terms of DM-RS bundling may vanish * FH gains will be smaller, regardless of whether events occur within a TDW or not | PRO: FH gains are larger, irrespective of whether events occur or not  CON: The advantage in terms of DM-RS bundling may vanish, if Option 1 is adopted. |
| China Telecom | We support different length between hopping interval and configured TDW.  Assuming the length of hopping interval is *M* and the length of configured TDW is *L*.  We think *M* should be less than or equal to *L*. Moreover, *L* and *M* can have the following relationship as *L* = *k·M*, where *k* is a positive integer. | Pros: Since the window length of the configured TDWs is explicitly configured, gNB and UE have the same understanding where frequency hopping takes place.  Cons: less flexibility. | Pros: gNB has the flexibility to configure the appropriate hopping interval taking into account both gain of frequency hopping and gain of joint channel estimation. |
| CATT | We support different length between hopping interval and configured TDW. | Cons: If the length of the configured TDW is large and the channel condition in one hop is terrible, JCE cannot compensate for the loss of diversity gain. | Pros: More configuration flexibility. Separate configuration for frequency interval and window length of the configured TDW does not mean that two parameters always need to be different. |
| Vivo | Same | Pros:  simple, and better performance due to phase continuity are not violated in a configured TDW due to FH. | Cons:  1, higher signaling overhead to configure a different length;  2, If hopping interval is different than configured TDW, it may lead to degraded performance, due to shortened actual TDW; |
| ZTE | Same | Pros:  Less signaling overhead; simple procedure without considering FH as an event; and better performance by DMRS bundling across a longer duration. | Cons:  Large signaling overhead; FH needs to be treated as an event which unnecessarily complicates the implementation; Worse performance. |
| InterDigital | Same | Pro : consistency, for the same reason mentioned by China Telecom |  |
| Intel | Same or different lengths for hopping interval and configured TDW. | Pro: no need to signal the hopping length parameter.  Con: this may depend on maximum duration that UE can support for DMRS bundling. | Pros: can achieve appropriate tradeoff between channel estimation gain and frequency diversity gain.  Can provide good flexibility on the gNB scheduling and resource allocation in the network. |
| Ericsson | Support different length, but also same length depending on configuration | Cons:  Forces UE specific hopping patterns, since the CTDW determines the hopping, making it hard to get good resource efficiency.  The DDDSUDDSUU TDD pattern may have imbalanced hopping (see R1-2112037)  Unnecessarily restricts FH to exactly match JCE. | Pros:  Allows cell specific FH operation, where UEs can hop in the same pattern to improve resource efficiency.  Allows more tradeoffs of diversity vs. channel estimation gain. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | In our view, it is more crucial to have the same length between actual TDW and hopping interval. The configured TDW may be same or different length | Pros: Same length between actual TDW and hopping interval will ensure maximum performance gain from JCE |  |
| WILUS | Different length between hopping interval and configured TDW, and same length between hopping interval and actual TDW | For the same length between hopping interval and configured TDW  Pros: Simple  Cons: Less gain of DMRS bundling | For the different length between hopping interval and configured TDW, and same length between hopping interval and actual TDW  Pros: Maximum gain of DMRS bundling  Cons: If dynamic event is considered, mis-alignment between gNB and UE |
| NTT DOCOMO | Same length if Option 2 is selected in FL Proposal 3.  Different length can be considered if Option 1 is selected in FL Proposal 3. | (Option 2 in FL Proposal 3)  Pros : Simple and better joint channel estimation performance | (Option 1 in FL Proposal 3)  Pros : flexible configuration for the configured TDW and FH duration for UE multiplexing. |
| Xiaomi | Support same or different length between hopping interval and configured TDW | Pros: simple and save the configuration signal overhead  Cons: less gain and less flexibility. | Pros: gNB has the flexibility to configure the appropriate hopping interval to balance both gain of frequency hopping and gain of joint channel estimation.  Cons: more configuration signaling needed |
| Spreadtrum | We prefer different length can be configured for FH interval and configured TDW. | Pros: for physical based PUSCH repetition in TDD or FDD, no additional events caused by FH.  Cons: Different UE may have different max TDW capability. Same length requires more limitations to configure same configured TDW length for different UE, in order to do MU or share two frequency hopping resources.  Additional events can be caused by FH for available based PUSCH repetition and PUCCH repetition, even if they have the same value. | Pros: it is easier to choose a propose TDW length according to UE capability and UL transmission. Furthermore, it is easier to choose a FH interval for MU or sharing two frequency hopping resources. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Same | Pros:   1. Simple. There is no extra RRC singling to indicate the frequency hopping duration. 2. A better balance between frequency domain diversity gain and DMRS bundling gain. | Cons:   1. An extra signaling to indicate frequency hopping duration is required. 2. It will result in clutter actual TDWs if the window length and the frequency hopping interval are under an inappropriate relation, thus decreasing the performance of joint channel estimation for PUCCH/PUSCH repetitions. |

The following agreement is made in Monday GTW.

**Agreement**

**For the interaction between inter-slot frequency hopping and DMRS bundling for PUCCH/PUSCH repetitions, a UE perform the “hopping intervals determination”, “configured TDW determination”, and “actual TDW determination” in a sequential ordering. One option of the following options is to be selected.**

* **Option 1: “hopping intervals determination” -> “configured TDW determination” -> “actual TDW determination”**
  + **FFS: DMRS bundling should be restarted in case of frequency hopping event**
  + **FFS: whether same or separate RRC configuration(s) for hopping interval and configured TDW.**
* **Option 2: “configured TDW determination” -> “hopping intervals determination” -> “actual TDW determination”**

We need to down-selection between option 1 and 2 in this meeting, to further the discussion, FL like to collect feedback on the FFS points.

**FL question 1: For option 1, what are the motivation/benefits of “DMRS bundling should be restarted in case of frequency hopping event”? What are the concerns on “DMRS bundling should be restarted in case of frequency hopping event”?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **motivation/benefits** | **concerns** |
| Apple | See comments | What’s the motivation to add the note? Isn’t UE expected to perform DMRS bundling within actual TDW anyway, if the conditions for DMRS bundling is met? We are not sure why adding such a note is needed! |
| Panasonic | The wording should be “DMRS bundling shall be restarted in case of frequency hopping event. If this is not agreed, only the first hop support DMRS bundling. The second and later hop would not support DMRS bundling. |  |
| CATT | The UE will always restart actual TDW interrupted by frequency hopping, which is not up to UE capability.  If so, there is no worry about violating JCE while using frequency hopping. The best performance will be guaranteed | Frequency hopping may be considered as a dynamic event, since DCI is involved for DG-PUSCH scheduling. This will mandate UE to have the ability to resume actual TDW due to one kind of dynamic event (hopping). |
| QC | A general remark: since the FH pattern is fixed/predetermined in Option 1, a UE should be able to restart DMRS bundling. For Option1, FH can be treated as a semi static event. |  |
| NTT DOCOMO | We have the same understanding with Panasonic. In our understanding for Option1, the frequency resource of the PUCCH is related to e.g. slot index, so that frequency hopping may be happened during the configured TDW. Therefore if it’s not supported, DMRS bundling can be supported only for the first hop. |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | In order to fully utilize the benefit of DMRS bundling, the restart of DMRS bundling should be supported whenever a violation event is encountered due to frequency hop |  |
| China Telecom | The motivation is to obtain JCE gain as much as possible. Here, we simply take a FDD case for example, if the length of configured window is 10 slots, and the frequency interval is 5 slots, then if DMRS bundling is not restarted, JCE can only be performed for the first 5 slots. If DMRS bundling is restarted, then JCE can be performed for the first 5 slots and the next 5 slots separately, which can fully obtain JCE gain. |  |
| CMCC | Share the similar idea that, after the frequency hopping, the DMRS bundling should be resumed.  If it is the common understanding, then this note should also apply to the option 2. |  |
| Intel | When DMRS bundling restarts in case of frequency hopping, frequency hopping can be enabled within the configured TDW. Otherwise, frequency hopping is not possible in the configured TDW. |  |
| Nokia/NSB | Agree with Panasonic, the verb should be “shall” and not “should”, i.e., “DMRS bundling shall be restarted in case of frequency hopping event”. This is crucial for allowing the JCE feature to be meaningful in case FH occurs in Option 1. We have the same understanding as QC that, in case of Option 1, all FH patterns/intervals are known by the UE beforehand, hence FH can be modeled as a semi-static event even in case of interaction with the DCI. | Concern is about the wording the verb should be “shall” and not “should”. |
| WILUS | The motivation of inter-slot frequency hopping with inter-slot bundling is to achieve gain of both frequency diversity and channel estimation accuracy. Thus, it’s beneficial to support restarting of DMRS bundling in case of Option 1. |  |
| OPPO | It should be restarted make reasonable joint channel estimation | Original option 1 actually did not make it clear if the hopping or other semi-static event can restart the DMRS bundling(We also think it means actual TDW restarted) |
| Ericsson | Agree with other companies on the benefit of restarting FH to ensure JCE gains for the hops after the first hop. | Hopping can be indicated by DCI, and so there is the question if it is a dynamic event. However, the DCI is the one scheduling the PUSCH, and so the UE can determine actual TDWs in essentially the same way as for events known from RRC. So we don’t see why FH indicated by scheduling DCI is any different from RRC configured FH. |
| InterDigital | Joint channel estimation is enabled during frequency hopping. |  |
| Samsung | In option 1 FH is configured first, then DMRS bundling. Within a frequency hop there can be one or more TDWs depending on DMRS bundling configuration. There can’t be a TDW across frequency hops because of the violation of the constant power/phase requirement, hence a TDW would end when the frequency hop ends. In the next frequency hop there will be a new TDW. |  |
| Apple2 | Question to understand the intention of first FFS | I need to know the motivation of this “DMRS bundling shall be restarted”? In my understanding, DMRS bundling is anyway restarted per actual TDW, and thus no need to add it (although if this understanding is correct we are fine to have it for the sake of progress). Let’s go through an example, UE is indicated FH with (4,4), i.e. 4 slot per hop, and nominal TDW is 6 slots. We know first actual TDW is 4 slots, and second actual TDW is 2 slots. AND UE is not supposed to keep DMRS bundling in the last 2 slots (in the second hop). Are we all on the same page? |
| Nokia/NSB2 | @Samsung: You are talking about actual TDW, right? If you are talking about configured TDW, then what you describe seems Option 2 to us. In our view the difference between Option 1 and Option 2 is trivially the following:   * Option 1: there is only one FH hop per actual TDW but there can be multiple hops for configured TDW (depending on configuration).   Option 2: there is only one FH per actual TDW and configured TDW. | @Apple: Very good question! Our understanding is that the DM-RS bundling is restarted per actual TDW only if the UE supports DM-RS bundling restart. If the UE does not support DM-RS restart, then no DM-RS bundling occurs until the end of the configured/nominal TDW. If this were not the case, we fail to see the point of having the discussion about the capability in the first places, given that if “DMRS bundling is anyway restarted per actual TDW” then when would it not be restarted? |
| Apple3 | Support by this modification | Thanks Marco for the reply. Your concern is now clear to us and we support the sub-bullet added by Nokia/NSB. Although we suggest to modify a bit as follows:  DMRS bundling should be restarted per actual TDW in case of frequency hopping event. |
| Spreadtrum | We can live with it.  Although our first preference is restarting of DMRS bundling is optional for all the events. | One question: when the actual TDW is caused by more than one events, such as frequency hopping and like TPC command, whether DMRS bundling should be mandatory restarted in this case? |
| LG | We share similar view with other companies that if DMRS bundling is not restarted after the frequency hopping, only first hop is DMRS bundled. The simple solution for it is making frequency hopping to be a semi-static event and DMRS bundling is restarted after semi-static events. |  |

**FL question 2: For option 1, whether supporting same or separate RRC configurations for hopping interval and configured TDW.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **whether supporting same or separate RRC configurations for hopping interval and configured TDW?** | **Justifications** |
| Panasonic | Although to have separate RRC configuration has some merit of the flexibility, given the limited time to achieve the consensus, we propose to stick to same RRC configuration. |  |
| Sharp | Same RRC configuration (i.e., Hopping pattern is the same as the configured TDW) | DMRS bundling gain can be maximized because frequency is not hopped within the configured TDW. |
| CATT | Separate RRC configuration is preferred. | * The gNB can still configure hopping interval = configured TDW, if desired. * UEs have different capability on maximum duration. It is expected that gNB will configure different TDW lengths to UEs. But from gNB’s view, frequency hopping need to consider inter-UE multiplexing, and thus a unified hopping interval for all UEs is pursued from cell level. Better not to bundle this two parameters. |
| QC | Keep them independent. No need to introduce any dependency. |  |
| NTT DOCOMO | May be separate RRC configurations | In our understanding, the hopping interval is configured based on physical slots counting, and TDW length is configured based on available slots counting. (If we follow the PUSCH agreement for configured TDW determination for the counting based on available slots.) Therefore the appropriate length may be different, e.g. DDSUU for TDD pattern, 5 slots for hopping interval, and 2 for TDW length. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support having same configuration |  |
| China Telecom | We support separate RRC configuration | gNB has the flexibility to configure the appropriate hopping interval taking into account both gain of frequency hopping and gain of joint channel estimation. We think this is the main difference between option 1 and option 2. |
| CMCC | Separated RRC configuration is preferred. | Separated configuration could provide flexibilities to both frequency hopping and TDW. The frequency hopping interval could be same as the length of the configured TDW. And then FH interval could also be smaller than the configured TDW according to UE capabilities.  The configuration of frequency hopping interval should be only applied to DMRS bundling, and not impact the legacy UE’s (without JCE enhancement) behavior. |
| Intel | Support same or different hopping interval and configured TDW lengths. | Can achieve appropriate tradeoff between channel estimation gain and frequency diversity gain.  Can provide good flexibility on the gNB scheduling and resource allocation in the network. |
| Nokia/NSB | Why don’t we consider the following:   * Same and different hopping interval can be considered. * NW can configure TDW length and FH intervals independently.   + If no FH interval is explicitly configured, then the length of FH interval coincides with TDW length.   + If FH interval is explicitly configured, then the length of the FH interval and TDW may differ, and UE shall support DM-RS bundling restart in case in of FH event.   This approach would combine Option 1 and Option 2 in a rather smooth way, while keeping the best of the two worlds. In practice, Option 2 would be the default behavior, unless FH hopping intervals are configured. | If only “same length” is supported, then this is Option 2 and we do not need to bullet on the DM-RS restart. |
| WILUS | Same RRC configuration. | 1. Same RRC configuration:   Additional signaling is unnecessary and more gain of DMRS bundling can be achieved than separate configuration.    2) Separate RRC configuration:  Flexible. However, additional signaling is necessary and gain of DMRS bundling is small. |
| OPPO | Separate configuration would ease the implication between 2 parameters.  We prefer separate parameters. |  |
| Ericsson | Separate configurations should be supported. | **The relative gains of frequency hopping and joint channel estimation vary according to the configurations and scenario.** For example, when the number of slots that can be combined by JCE is small, or the operating SNR is higher, JCE gains will be reduced, and may be less than those from frequency hopping. However, at lower SNRs or where there is already enough diversity from other sources, JCE gain can be more substantial.  **Frequency hopping needs to be cell specific in order to maximize frequency domain scheduling efficiency, as is done in Rel-15/16.** If different UEs hop in a completely different manner, as could be when hopping patterns are determined in a completely UE specific way, only a subset of resources can be used without conflict. This reduces the ability of the network to schedule efficiently in the frequency domain.  **Limiting frequency hopping to UEs using DMRS bundling may severely restrict the availability of frequency hopping.** Frequency hopping is much easier to support as compared to DMRS bundling, and DMRS bundling is not possible in a large number of cases. If UEs must be configured with DMRS bundling to support a given frequency hopping pattern, but UEs do not support DMRS bundling or cannot in a given scenario, the benefit of FH is unnecessarily lost. Furthermore, all UEs in a cell should ideally share an FH pattern to maximize the resource efficiency, as discussed above. Limiting FH to UEs using DMRS bundling will force operators to wait for wide availability of UEs supporting DMRS bundling and FH, which would be unfortunate. |
| InterDigital | We prefer separate parameters. |  |
| Samsung | Separate configurations | Configuration of frequency hopping and DMRS bundling should be independent. It is up to the network to configure parameters for any or both of DMRS bundling and FH. |
| Spreadtrum | Separate configurations |  |
| LG | Same or different hopping interval and configured TDW lengths. | For the multi user multiplexing from gNB side, it is desirable to indicate group of UEs to have same hopping intervals. However the length of configured TDW depends on maximum duration of UE, it can be different between UEs. Putting them together, configured TDW length and hopping interval can be same or different depending on configured TDW size, but the hopping interval is aligned among group of UEs. |

**FL question 3: For option 2, any open issue is missed in previous discussions discussion?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Any open issue need further discussion for option 2?** |
| CMCC | The 1st bullet under option 1 should also applies to the option 2 |
| Intel | If number of repetitions is equal to configured TDW length, it is not clear to us whether option 2 can enable inter-slot frequency hopping with inter-slot bundling. |
| Nokia/NSB | Disagree with CMCC. In Option 2, DM-RS would always restart after FH event since a new nominal TDW would start. |
| Spreadtrum | Clarification: for Option 2, when PUSCH repetition based on available slots, such as starting slot is the available slot not physical slot. In this case, whether FH interval follow this available slot based configured TDW or not? |

**FL question 4: Whether option 1 or option 2 should be supported? Please provide technical justifications for supporting each option.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Support option 1 or option 2?** | **Justifications** |
| Apple | We tend to support option 1 |  |
| Panasonic | Only to support same RRC configurations for hopping interval and configured TDW means no need to agree either Option 1 or Option 2 technically. Just for the specification description purpose, purely majority choice between Option 1 or Option 2 can be selected. |  |
| Sharp | Either | If the same RRC configuration for hopping interval and configured TDW is supported, there is no difference between Option 1 and Option 2. |
| CATT | Option 1, with (1) no mandating on restarting actual TDW, (2) no bundling of configured window length and hopping interval. | (1) We tend to allow UE not resume actual TDW (up to UE capability). If the UE is not capable with resuming actual TDW due to dynamic event, the gNB shall carefully choose the parameters, or simply not configure ‘hopping+JCE’ simultaneously by implementation.  (2) The reason of supporting separate RRC parameters is provided in the previous table. |
| QC | Support Option 1. | Option 2 will almost certainly lead to inefficient resource utilization. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We slightly prefer option2, but also accept Option 1. | Considering the joint channel estimation gain (Option 2) and UE multiplexing (Option 1), both aspects are important. For the simplicity, single RRC parameter for the hopping interval and configured TDW length can be used for Option 2. |
| Vivo | Option 2. | One of the advantages raised for option-1 is better for MU multiplexing. However, we do not think this is true.  The preconditions for MU multiplexing are very harsh. Considering typically only 5% percent of UEs in poor coverage, it is not easy for NW find coupled UEs in poor coverage which also support JCE, and configured with right DMRS sequence scramble ID and right hopping offset. Besides, different UEs may be scheduled with different repetitions, different number of PRBs due to different TB size and channel qualities. It will make the MU multiplexing even difficult. Hence, MU multiplexing should be not considered as advantage of option-1.  Furthermore, we are not fully clear of the detailed hopping design of option 1 before we agree with it. For example, whether the starting time of frequency hopping interval is semi-static determined or floating based on dynamic scheduling (i.e., depending on k0 or k2)? We prefer to clarify it first. While for option 2, these details are clear, based on outcome of AI 8.8.1.3  Besides, option 1 may lead to imbalance hopping pattern due to independent hopping interval and number PUSCH/PUCCH repetitions.  If consensus cannot be reached, a merged solution, which may be one way forward. That is,   * if hopping interval is configured, the hopping pattern is determined using option-1;   + FFS determination of the starting of the FH interval. * if hopping interval is not configured, the default hopping interval is the configured window length, and the hopping pattern is determined using opt-2. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support option 1 | Same reason in our reply to Q1 |
| China Telecom | We support option 1. | As we comment before, for option 1. gNB has the flexibility to configure the appropriate hopping interval taking into account both gain of frequency hopping and gain of joint channel estimation. |
| CMCC | Option 2.  Though if the frequency hopping interval and the configured TDW are separated configured, the difference between option 1 and 2 are not obvious. | Logically, the frequency hopping interval is introduced due to DMRS bundling. Otherwise, there is no need to introduce a new frequency hopping pattern for the legacy UEs.  We also share the similar idea that the MU multiplexing is not an issue for only option 2.  Legacy UE only support frequency hopping per single slot (inter slot frequency hopping), once the frequency hopping interval is larger than one, the enhanced UEs cannot multiplexed with the legacy ones. This is same for both option 1 and option 2.  As we commented for the question 2, the configured TDW and frequency hopping interval could be separated configured. Then the both parameter could be set with same value. Or according to performance of both JCE and FH, set different values according to UE capabilities. |
| Intel | Option 1 | As mentioned previously, in Rel-15/16, inter-slot frequency hopping pattern is defined based on slot index. Option 1 can help to allow backward compatibility. If hopping interval is configured with different value from the TDW length, this can provide appropriate tradeoff between frequency diversity gain and channel estimation gain |
| Nokia/NSB | If we replace “should” with “shall” in the DM-RS restart bullet, we are fine with either Option 1 or Option 2.  At the same time, we would like to reiterate the proposal we wrote above.  Why don’t we consider the following:   * Same and different hopping interval can be considered. * NW can configure TDW length and FH intervals independently.   + If no FH interval is explicitly configured, then the length of FH interval coincides with TDW length.   + If FH interval is explicitly configured, then the length of the FH interval and TDW may differ, and UE shall support DM-RS bundling restart in case in of FH event.   This approach would combine Option 1 and Option 2 in a rather smooth way, while keeping the best of the two worlds. In practice, Option 2 would be the default behavior, unless FH hopping intervals are configured. | We need to ensure that FH event does not prevent DM-RS bundling to restart. |
| WILUS | Support Option 1 with same RRC configuration and Option 2. | For Option 1 with same RRC configuration, restarting of DMRS bundling should be supported. |
| OPPO | Option 1. | The option 1 would be friendly for multiplexing, although this is not very strong advantages from other companies.  With the updated notes that DMRS bundling restarted base on the Frequency Hopping, we would also be OK for Option 2. |
| Ericsson | Option 1.  To address the concerns from some companies expressed on whether FH is a dynamic event: FH need not be considered a ‘dynamic’ event, even in the case it is scheduled by DCI, as we discuss above. This has the same kind of behavior as DL slots in ATDW determination.  To address this concern on FH, it may be helpful to agree that the hopping index is calculated from the slot number.  A concern we have with option 2 where the hopping pattern is strictly determined by the ATDWs, is that if the UE hops every ATDW, then the hopping pattern is imbalanced for some TDD configurations. Consider a ‘DDDSUDDSUU’ pattern where the UE hops at every ATDW, then hopping offsets 0 and 1 would yields the following over 20 slots, where the ‘1’ offset is used twice as much as the ‘0’ offset, degrading diversity gain to some degree.  Xxxx0xxx11xxxx0xxx11  Please find further details in R1-2112037. | To summarize our views on the benefit of Option 1 over Option 2 (see discussions above for details):   * Option 1 allows the network to control the relative gains of frequency hopping and joint channel estimation according to the configurations and scenario, since hopping and TDW determination are independent. * Frequency hopping can be cell specific in order to maximize frequency domain scheduling efficiency, as is done in Rel-15/16. * Operators can obtain the gain of frequency hopping and/or of DMRS bundling without requiring UEs in their networks to support both. |
| InterDigital | We support Option 1. | Allows independent configuration of frequency hopping and DMRS bundling. |
| Samsung | Option 1 (although Option 2 can work too), with independent RRC configurations, and no change to legacy FH configuration. |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support option 2. | 1. Simple. There is no extra RRC singling to indicate the frequency hopping duration. 2. It provides a balance between frequency domain diversity gain and DMRS bundling gain. 3. It is no need to introduce an extra signaling to indicate the frequency hopping interval. |
| Nokia/NSB2 | @Samsung: it is not clear to us how we can use legacy FH hopping configuration to have a hop duration larger than one slot (which I what we need for bundling DM-RS across slots in the same actual TDW). Could you please clarify? |  |
| Samsung | @Nokia: did not mean no change to legacy FH procedure” – the statement was “no change to legacy FH configuration”. |  |
| TCL | Support option 2 | For option 2, the configured TDW is fixed, which I think is one of the reasons it was designed. It also provides a balance between frequency diversity gain and JCE gain. |
| Spreadtrum | Option 1 | Cons for Option 2: Additional events can be caused by FH for available based PUSCH repetition and PUCCH repetition, even if they have the same value.  Pros for Option 1: it is easier to choose a propose TDW length according to UE capability and UL transmission. Furthermore, it is easier to choose a FH interval for MU or sharing two frequency hopping resources. |
| LG | Support option 1 | For multi user multiplexing, the hopping boundary should be aligned among UEs which is the same principle to legacy FH. |

Based on the discussion in the above tables, FL have the following observations

* With same configuration of hopping interval and configured TDW, option 1 is equivalent to option 2.
* With separate configuration of hopping interval and configured TDW, by allowing same configuration of hopping interval and configured TDW, option 2 can be absorbed into option 1 as a special case.
* Under option 1, frequency hopping can be viewed as semi-static events which shall restart DMRS bundling.
* The TDW boundary to restart DMRS bundling due to frequency hopping should be based on actual TDW, not configured TDW.

With the above observation, FL suggest the following way forward.

**FL proposal 4: For the interaction between inter-slot frequency hopping and DMRS bundling for PUCCH/PUSCH repetitions, a UE perform the “hopping intervals determination”, “configured TDW determination”, and “actual TDW determination” in a sequential ordering, based on the following option 1.**

* **Option 1: “hopping intervals determination” -> “configured TDW determination” -> “actual TDW determination”**
  + **DMRS bundling shall be restarted per actual TDW in case of frequency hopping ~~event~~**
  + **Support separate RRC configuration(s) for hopping interval and configured TDW.** 
    - **Note: Both same and different configuration(s) for hopping interval and configured TDW are allowed by specification. It is up to NW to configure same or different configuration(s).**
* **~~Option 2: “configured TDW determination” -> “hopping intervals determination” -> “actual TDW determination”~~**

Comments to the above FL proposal can be provided in the following table.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Comment** |
| Apple | Support FL’s proposal |
| InterDigital | Ok with the proposal but we don’t think the note is needed since the intention of the note is not clear. Our understanding is that FH and DMRS bundling are independently configured under Option 1 and harmonization between FH and DMRS bundling parameters is achievable by implementation. Thus, “**Support separate RRC configuration(s) for hopping interval and configured TDW”** is enough to covey the intention. |
| Vivo | We still prefer option 2.  For the sake of progress, we can compromise with the merged Option 1 and Option 2, as follows.  **FL proposal 4: For the interaction between inter-slot frequency hopping and DMRS bundling for PUCCH/PUSCH repetitions, a UE perform the “hopping intervals determination”, “configured TDW determination”, and “actual TDW determination” in a sequential ordering, based on the following option 1.**   * **Option 1: “hopping intervals determination” -> “configured TDW determination” -> “actual TDW determination”**   + **DMRS bundling shall be restarted per actual TDW in case of frequency hopping ~~event~~**   + **Support separate RRC configuration(s) for hopping interval and configured TDW.**      - **if hopping interval is not configured, the default hopping interval equals to the configured window length.**     - **~~Note: Both same and different configuration(s) for hopping interval and configured TDW are allowed by specification. It is up to NW to configure same or different configuration(s).~~** * **~~Option 2: “configured TDW determination” -> “hopping intervals determination” -> “actual TDW determination”~~** |
| Panasonic | We support the FL's proposal in principle. On “DMRS bundling shall be restarted per actual TDW in case of frequency hopping”, actual TDW would be UE capability and it would not be better to use actual TDW here. We propose to modify as following.  **DMRS bundling shall be restarted ~~per actual TDW in case of~~ at the start of each frequency hopping ~~event~~ frequency hopping. If a frequency hop contains multiple actual TDWs, second or later actual TDW is based on the discussion of agenda 8.8.1.3.** |
| OPPO | We can agree the proposed bullet by FL.  We also think the configured TDW and actual TDW have enough definition (with few FFS include events). But, the hopping interval does not have more detailed definition.  We suggest to add one bullet into the proposal.  “In the first available slot after a hoping interval, PUCCH/PUSCH is transmitted to the other frequency location.”  From the feedback also from Nokia/Samsung etc. You can see there is lack of same understanding of how to deal with N>1 hopping interval (legacy scheme is N=1)  I understand this is the only condition that PUCCH/PUSCH will switch location. TDW end/start will not switch Frequency location. |
| CATT | We can support the current version of FL proposal.  Although we think the 1st sub-bullet is not needed, if AI 8.8.1.3already confirm that FH is a semi-static event (naturally guaranteed). |
| Sharp | Looking at companies' views, it seems to me that most of Option 1 proponents assume that FH pattern is determined only by physical slot indices. Actually, we still think the most reasonable solution is that the hopping pattern is exactly the same as the configured TDW pattern. However, to sake a progress, we can live with the majority's views, if that is clarified in the proposal.  More specifically, we suggest adding the following sub-bullet to have more clarity.   * FH pattern is determined by physical slot indices only. |
| QC | We are okay with the FL proposal. We want to make sure that that the hopping pattern is defined based on physical slot indices and not tied to PUSCH scheduling. We are not sure if there is 100% agreement regarding this in the group.  Can we add the following bullet:   * Inter-slot hopping pattern is defined based on physical slot indices and not tied to PUSCH scheduling |
| Nokia/NSB | We prefer vivo’s version of the proposal, which is also what we proposed in the previous round and is, in our view, more inclusive while not changing the spirit of the proposal. The addition of the bullet suggested by QC is also acceptable to us, provided that the part related to PUSCH is dropped (it is quite ambiguous), i.e.:   * Inter-slot hopping pattern is defined based on physical slot indices ~~and not tied to PUSCH scheduling~~ |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | In principle, we are fine with the proposal, but also prefer the updates from Vivo.  Also agree with QC’s suggestion |
| Spreadtrum | We support the proposal, also fine with the additional bullet. |
| CMCC | Support the proposal and fine with the updates from vivo and QC |
| Samsung | The proposal is fine in principle.  We agree with the formulation by Panasonic that points out that a restart is needed if frequency hopping happens considering that the configurations of DMRS bundling and FH are independent.  **DMRS bundling shall be restarted ~~per actual TDW in case of~~ at the start of each frequency hopping ~~event~~.**  We agree with QC’s suggestion. |

The following possible agreement have be discussed in the GTW on Wed. FL think it is very close to convergence. Companies please express further comments, if any, as soon as possible, so that other companies and FL can address those comments.

Possible Agreement

**For the interaction between inter-slot frequency hopping and DMRS bundling for PUCCH/PUSCH repetitions, a UE performs the “hopping intervals determination”, “configured TDW determination”, and “actual TDW determination” in a sequential ordering, based on the following option 1.**

* **Option 1: “hopping intervals determination” -> “configured TDW determination” -> “actual TDW determination”**
  + **DMRS bundling shall be restarted at the beginning of each frequency hop**
  + **DMRS bunding is per actual TDW**
    - **~~FFS: determination of actual TDWs, if a frequency hop contains multiple actual TDWs.~~**
  + **Frequency hopping pattern is determined by physical slot indices only.**
  + **Support separate RRC configuration(s) for hopping interval and configured TDW.** 
    - **if hopping pattern is not configured, the default hopping pattern is the same as the configured TDW**
      * **FFS: if both hopping pattern and TDW are not configured**
    - **Note: hopping pattern is determined by the configuration of hopping pattern if hopping pattern is configured**
    - **[Note: Both same and different configuration(s) for hopping interval and configured TDW are allowed by specification. It is up to NW to configure same or different configuration(s).]**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Comment** |
| Nokia/NSB | We commented in the reflector about the difference between frequency hopping pattern and frequency hopping interval, but we did not receive any answer. With reference to the definitions that we shared via email:   * Frequency hopping interval is the duration of one hop, * Frequency hopping pattern is the sequence of the hops,   We suggest the following modification.   * **Option 1: “hopping intervals determination” -> “configured TDW determination” -> “actual TDW determination”**   + **DMRS bundling shall be restarted at the beginning of each frequency hop**   + **DMRS bunding is per actual TDW**     - **~~FFS: determination of actual TDWs, if a frequency hop contains multiple actual TDWs.~~**   + **Frequency hopping pattern is determined by physical slot indices only.**   + **Support separate RRC configuration(s) for hopping interval and configured TDW.**      - **if hopping interval ~~pattern~~ is not configured, the default hopping interval ~~pattern~~ is the same as the configured TDW**       * **FFS: if both hopping interval ~~pattern~~ and TDW are not configured**     - **Note: hopping interval ~~pattern~~ is determined by the configuration of hopping interval ~~pattern~~ if hopping interval ~~pattern~~ is configured**     - **[Note: Both same and different configuration(s) for hopping interval and configured TDW are allowed by specification. It is up to NW to configure same or different configuration(s).]**   Concerning the FFS, we think it can already be solved using the agreements in AI 8.8.1.3 and do not need other agreements. Indeed, if the TDW length is not configured, then L is equal to the repetition duration. In turn, this implies that the frequency hopping interval is equal to repetition duration. |
| Intel | We share similar view as Nokia that we need to differentiate the hopping interval and hopping pattern. We are fine with the update from Nokia, with some further refinement:   1. configured TDW should be configured TDW length. 2. Delete the last note as this seems not needed. 3. Suggest to remove “only” as hopping pattern is also determined based on hopping interval.   As commented in the GTW, given that for PUSCH repetition type A counting based on available slot, configured TDW is determined based on available slot index. If hopping interval is not configured, and if hopping pattern is same as configured TDW, this indicates that hopping pattern is determined based on available slot index, instead of physical slot index. This seems contradictory to the “Frequency hopping pattern is determined by physical slot indices only”.  Note that in Rel-15/16, inter-slot frequency hopping for PUCCH repetition is determined based on relative physical slot index (starting slot = 0). It would be more appropriate to follow similar mechanism for inter-slot frequency hopping with inter-slot bundling.   * **Option 1: “hopping intervals determination” -> “configured TDW determination” -> “actual TDW determination”**   + **DMRS bundling shall be restarted at the beginning of each frequency hop**   + **DMRS bunding is per actual TDW**     - **~~FFS: determination of actual TDWs, if a frequency hop contains multiple actual TDWs.~~**   + **For PUSCH repetition, frequency hopping pattern is determined by physical slot indices ~~only~~.**   + **For PUCCH repetition, frequency hopping pattern is determined by relative physical slot index, where the slot for the first PUCCH repetition is slot 0.**   + **Support separate RRC configuration(s) for hopping interval and configured TDW length.**      - **if hopping interval ~~pattern~~ is not configured, the default hopping interval ~~pattern~~ is the same as the configured TDW length**       * **FFS: if both hopping interval ~~pattern~~ and TDW length are not configured**     - **Note: hopping interval ~~pattern~~ is determined by the configuration of hopping interval ~~pattern~~ if hopping interval ~~pattern~~ is configured**   **~~[Note: Both same and different configuration(s) for hopping interval and configured TDW are allowed by specification. It is up to NW to configure same or different configuration(s).]~~** |
| Spreadtrum | We support the proposal in principle, with the following two comments:   1. We agree that only hopping interval equals to the configured TDW length, not hopping pattern. FH pattern depends hopping interval, hopping type and physical slot indicts. Even when configured TDW is based on available slot, FH pattern still based on physical slot. 2. For the new bullet added by Intel, we do not think so. Because when inter-slot FH is configured, FH pattern is determined by relative slot index to the first PUCCH transmission, as shown below in 38213. It means the slot of first PUCCH is 0, not the real physical slot 0.   *the UE transmits the PUCCH starting from a first PRB, provided by startingPRB, in slots with even number and starting from the second PRB, provided by secondHopPRB, in slots with odd number. The slot indicated to the UE for the first PUCCH transmission has number 0 and each subsequent slot until the UE transmits the PUCCH in slots is counted regardless of whether or not the UE transmits the PUCCH in the slot* |
| QC | We are okay with frequency hop interval being determined differently when no RRC config is available.  But on frequency hop pattern determination, we prefer to have just one solution. Else, UE needs to develop and test two separate solutions. We don’t want this overhead.  We are okay to go with Nokia’s edits. Intel’s edits to distinguish PUSCH and PUCCH seem unnecessary. |
| Sharp | We agree with the Nokia’s suggestion. |
| Panasonic | In our view, the hopping pattern is determined by slot index, interval and FDRA. FDRA indicates the frequency location of the first hop and the latter frequency position of the latter slots are determined alternatively. However, our understanding is that the discussion point here would be only time domain pattern. “FDRA indicates the frequency location of the first hop and the latter frequency position of the latter slots are determined alternatively.” might be common understanding. On Intel's refinement 3, we think the removal of "only" implies it can have more parameters for the time domain. Therefore, we propose the following modification.   * + **For PUSCH repetition, frequency hopping pattern is determined by physical slot indices, hopping interval [and FDRA] ~~only~~.**   On Intel’s proposal to distinguish PUSCH and PUCCH, we are open to discuss it and it might be better to have FFS whether the relative slot index or physical slot index toward the next meeting. The multiplexing aspect is more complicated in PUCCH because multiple UEs share a PRB. |
| Ericsson | Thanks for the compromise way forward. We can accept Intel’s and Nokia’s revisions.  Regarding Intel’s revisions for PUCCH, they are in line in our view with Rel-15/16 operation, and so we’re fine with them.  We think it is critical to have a good hopping pattern design that exploits both the channel estimation gain and frequency diversity for repeated PUSCH/PUCCH. As we show in R1-2112037, R1-2112038, and R1-2112040, more than two frequency hopping offsets provides significant gain over two offsets (e.g. roughly 0.5 and 1.5 dB at 10% and 1% BLER) for repeated PUSCH/PUCCH and TBoMS. Please see example BLER curves from R1-2112037 below.  Therefore, we propose to add a bullet:   * + **A period of a frequency hopping pattern supports up to 4 distinct frequency offsets for both PUCCH and PUCCH repetition.**   As shown below:   * **Option 1: “hopping intervals determination” -> “configured TDW determination” -> “actual TDW determination”**   + **DMRS bundling shall be restarted at the beginning of each frequency hop**   + **DMRS bunding is per actual TDW**     - **~~FFS: determination of actual TDWs, if a frequency hop contains multiple actual TDWs.~~**   + **For PUSCH repetition, frequency hopping pattern is determined by physical slot indices ~~only~~.**   + **For PUCCH repetition, frequency hopping pattern is determined by relative physical slot index, where the slot for the first PUCCH repetition is slot 0.**   + **A period of a frequency hopping pattern supports up to 4 distinct frequency offsets for both PUCCH and PUCCH repetition.**   + **Support separate RRC configuration(s) for hopping interval and configured TDW length.**      - **if hopping interval ~~pattern~~ is not configured, the default hopping interval ~~pattern~~ is the same as the configured TDW length**       * **FFS: if both hopping interval ~~pattern~~ and TDW length are not configured**     - **Note: hopping interval ~~pattern~~ is determined by the configuration of hopping interval ~~pattern~~ if hopping interval ~~pattern~~ is configured**   **~~[Note: Both same and different configuration(s) for hopping interval and configured TDW are allowed by specification. It is up to NW to configure same or different configuration(s).]~~** |
| NTT DOCOMO | We basically support the proposal, and would like to clarify the behavior if “hopping interval” is not configured, so which behavior can we expect ?  In the case of DDSUU and window length L is 2 (= hopping interval) for PUSCH with available slot counting, or PUCCH.  1. Frequency hopping pattern is determined by physical slot so frequency hops every 2 physical slot index, e.g. DD(f1) SU(f2) UD(f1) DS(f2) UU(f1)  (in this case hopping pattern is per cell specific)  (We expect that the slot index is absolute number in this case.)  2. Frequency hopping pattern is determined by configured TDW (like Option 2), e.g. (DDS) UU(f1) (DDS) UU(f2)  (in this case hopping pattern is per UE specific)  We prefer behavior “2”, since it’s the middle ground of Option 1 and 2 (take Option 1 if hop interval is configured, and Option 2 if not configured), and NW can select one of them by configuration. In this case “Frequency hopping pattern is determined by physical slot indices” is available if hopping pattern is configured, otherwise hopping pattern follows configured TDW. |
| OPPO | We were trying to add comments in last GTW for 2 aspects.  One is the configured TDW can actually support both physical slot counting and available slots. In last meeting:  “**Agreement**   * For PUSCH repetition type A counting based on physical slots   + The configured TDWs are consecutive, where the start of other configured TDWs is the first physical slot right after the last physical slot of a previous configured TDW. * For PUSCH repetition type A counting based on available slots   + The configured TDWs are determined based on available slots, where start of a configured TDWs is the ~~next~~ first available slot after the ~~conclusion~~ last available slot of a previous configured TDW.   + Note: The determination of available slots for PUSCH repetition Type A is defined in AI 8.8.1.1.   ”  If we did not miss any further agreements, we see some problem of contradicting. In that case, we think it can be acceptable that the value configured TDW is applied to physical slots regardless it is based on physical slot and available slot. The bullet can be further updated base on Nokia/intel/Ericssion.   * + - **if hopping interval ~~pattern~~ is not configured, the default hopping interval ~~pattern~~ is the same as the configured TDW length regardless it is based on available slots or physical slots.**   2nd. We think the note can be add with “only”:   * + - **Note: hopping interval ~~pattern~~ is only determined by the configuration of hopping interval ~~pattern~~ if hopping interval ~~pattern~~ is configured**   3rdly. We did not touch in the discussion. We are also supportive for Ericssons proposal for “up to 4 distinct frequency offsets.” |
| Vivo | Definition of FH interval and FH pattern provided by Nokia makes the proposal clearer. And OK with revision from intel. |
| Samsung | The version in Intel’s comment is fine.  Suggest to add the following to include the case that TDW length is not configured (as sub-bullet of the last bullet):   * **if TDW length is not configured and hopping interval is configured, the default TDW length is the same as the hopping interval** |
|  |  |

@all, based on the feedback received so far. I updated the proposal as the following. Companies please make a final check. The deadline to receive comment is still at **11/18 8:00 AM PST**. Last minute comments before deadline, strictly speaking, is OK, but is not appreciated. Please respect the hard work and constructiveness of the group to make progress. If you have concern about the proposal, please express it ASAP in the table below so the group can address it. We are approaching the end of the last meeting of Rel-17 WI. FL would suggest companies to be flexible and constructive to make agreement on this critical issue.

@Ericsson, about the new proposal of 4 hopping offset, thanks for proposing it. But I prefer not mix the discussion on the following proposal with the details of new hopping pattern design, which can still be discussed later.

@OPPO, regarding adding this “regardless it is based on available slots or physical slots”, I am not sure what is the difference with and without the added words. It says regardless so whatever after the regardless has no impact. To avoid crease unnecessary confusion and discussion, I prefer not adding this.

**Updated FL proposal 4:** **For the interaction between inter-slot frequency hopping and DMRS bundling for PUCCH/PUSCH repetitions, a UE performs the “hopping intervals determination”, “configured TDW determination”, and “actual TDW determination” in a sequential ordering, based on the following option 1.**

* **Option 1: “hopping intervals determination” -> “configured TDW determination” -> “actual TDW determination”**
  + **DMRS bundling shall be restarted at the beginning of each frequency hop**
  + **DMRS bunding is per actual TDW**
    - **~~FFS: determination of actual TDWs, if a frequency hop contains multiple actual TDWs.~~**
  + **Frequency hopping pattern is determined by physical slot indices ~~only~~.**
    - **FFS: different FH pattern determination for PUCCH and PUSCH**
  + **Support separate RRC configuration(s) for hopping interval and configured TDW** **length.** 
    - **if hopping interval ~~pattern~~ is not configured, the default hopping interval ~~pattern~~ is the same as the configured TDW length**
      * **FFS: if both hopping interval ~~pattern~~ and TDW length are not configured**
    - **if TDW length is not configured and hopping interval is configured, the default TDW length is the same as the hopping interval**
    - **Note: hopping interval ~~pattern~~ is only determined by the configuration of hopping interval ~~pattern~~ if hopping interval ~~pattern~~ is configured**
    - **~~[Note: Both same and different configuration(s) for hopping interval and configured TDW are allowed by specification. It is up to NW to configure same or different configuration(s).]~~**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company objecting the Proposal** | **Ericsson (Can be OK if clarified)** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Reason for objection** |
| Ericsson | While we would hope to make more progress on the FH design, we can understand FL’s wish to go more step-by-step, and so are OK to discuss the number of hopping offsets in a next step.  However, while it is the FL’s understanding, it may not be clear to the group from the agreement as written that the new hopping pattern design will be discussed. Can we please have an FFS, i.e.   * + **Frequency hopping pattern is determined by physical slot indices ~~only~~.**     - **FFS: different FH pattern determination for PUCCH and PUSCH**     - **FFS: details of FH pattern design** |
| CATT | Fine with the update.  On the ‘FFS: if both hopping interval pattern and TDW length are not configured’, we think the simplest way is to follow the default length of configured TDW as agreed in AI 8.8.1.3, i.e. min{maximum duration, PUSCH/PUCCH repetition length} |
| Intel | Strictly speaking, for PUCCH repetition, if following existing design, the hopping pattern is determined based on relative physical slot index, rather than physical slot index. This seems to be also majority views.  Given the limited time, we suggest to use this version to make further progress.   * + **For PUSCH repetition, frequency hopping pattern is determined by physical slot indices ~~only~~.**   + **For PUCCH repetition, frequency hopping pattern is determined by relative physical slot index, where the slot for the first PUCCH repetition is slot 0.** |
| Sharp | Support the proposal. |
| CMCC | Fine with the updated proposal.  For the FFS that neither hopping interval or TDW length are configured, as some company replied in the last round, the TDW length follows the default value and the hopping interval equals to the TDW length. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support the latest updated proposal. It provided much better clarity. |
| QC | Support FL proposal. Okay with the new FFS, but we do not want to fork the design between PUCCH and PUSCH.  @Intel and others,  We deliberately want to depart from how its currently written in the spec for PUCCH. The current design in the spec makes it difficult to ensure efficient resource utilization. All PUCCH repetitions of two users will need to start at the same time, follow complementary FH patterns, and follow the same available slot pattern to make sure resources get used efficiency. This is quite hard for a gNB to ensure across all configurations we assume. We suspect these issues havent yet been seen in the field as PUCCH repetitions are not used in practice. Then, there is also the issue of shared PRBs across users for PUCCH, as mentioned by Panasonic.  This is the same debate between Option 1 vs. Option 2. What you are proposing is to effectively pick Option 2 for PUCCH repetitions. Lets not reopen this debate. |
| China Telecom | Generally, we are fine with the proposal. Only one comment as follows:  Since the following agreement was achieved in AI 8.8.1.3:  **Agreement:**  **Support Option 1’-a**  **Option 1’-a:**   * If L is configured, the maximum value of window length L of the configured TDW should not exceed the maximum duration, which is reported as UE capability as the duration where UE is able to maintain power consistency and phase continuity subject to power consistency and phase continuity requirements. * If L is not configured, the default value of L = min (maximum duration, duration of all PUSCH repetitions)   We think the default TDW length is clear, thus we prefer to delete the following bullet:  **~~if TDW length is not configured and hopping interval is configured, the default TDW length is the same as the hopping interval~~** |
| Panasonic | We are OK with the updated FL proposal 4. Our preference is to follow FL’s suggestion of “FFS: different FH pattern determination for PUCCH and PUSCH”. |
| Nokia/NSB | Not ok with this bullet:   * **if TDW length is not configured and hopping interval is configured, the default TDW length is the same as the hopping interval**   As pointed out by some companies already, this is not compatible with existing agreements in AI 8.8.1.3. The bullet should be removed.  Let us not try to change what we have already agreed, please. As we said earlier, everything is already crystal-clear using agreements in AI 8.8.1.3. The only thing we need in this proposal is the following bullet, where the FFS is not needed.   * **if hopping interval ~~pattern~~ is not configured, the default hopping interval ~~pattern~~ is the same as the configured TDW length**   + **~~FFS: if both hopping interval pattern and TDW length are not configured~~**   Indeed:  We have already agreed on the default behavior in case TDW length is not configured.  We just need to agree what happens when the frequency hopping interval is not configured. |
| Samsung | For relative/absolute physical slot index:  support relative slot index, no change from R16. |

## Other proposals

R1-2111030 Proposal 3: DMRS bundling size of L = 1 slot may need to be introduced, if DMRS bundling for sub-slot PUCCH repetitions within a slot is supported.

R1-2111030 Proposal 5: The starting RB for each frequency hop is determined by frequency hop index, and the frequency hopping index corresponds to the order of configured TDWs for PUCCH/PUSCH repetitions.

R1-2112038 Proposal 6:

* Enhanced frequency hopping designs for PUCCH supporting joint channel estimation support increased numbers (e.g. up to 4) of hopping offsets, where the number of consecutive slots per hop can be controlled.

R1-2111030 Proposal : UCI repetition with DM-RS bundling can prioritize with respect to its UCI type (of a same priority index).

R1-2111030 Proposal 2: If inter-slot frequency hopping is enabled, then the PUCCH repetition may hop in the middle of slot, depending on the TDD slot pattern and the number of repetitions, and the coherence can be kept in the same split.

R1-2111439 Proposal 4: If the length of the configured TDW needs dynamic indication, PUCCH resource indicator field can be used to inform UE length of the configured TDW. If dynamic indication is supported, consider extending PUCCH resource indicator field for further flexibility.

R1-2111890 Proposal 2: If DMRS bundling is supported, specify conditions under which phase continuity is kept for a PUCCH with DMRS bundling overlapping in one (or more) occasions with a second PUCCH without DMRS bundling.

R1-2111981 Proposal 3: For the time domain window for DMRS bundling of PUCCH, adopt a time domain window based on available slots for joint channel estimation of PUSCH.

R1-2112038 Proposal 3:

* Enhanced frequency hopping designs for PUCCH supporting joint channel estimation include the following:
  + The hopping offsets are determined by the slot index
  + Frequency hopping is an event that sets the actual TDW size
  + UEs can be configured with the hopping pattern

R1-2111274 Proposal 2: UE performs the inter-slot frequency hopping with inter-slot bundling as long as the hopping interval of inter-slot bundling is configured.

R1-2110866 Proposal 5. RAN1 to discuss and define hopping intervals longer than 1 slot

FFS: details for definition of hopping intervals

FL’s initial assessment is that the discussion of those proposals can be deprioritized, comparing to proposals in Section 3.1, 3.2, 3.3. But companies are welcome to provide comments to the above proposals in the following table.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Comment** |
| Vivo | Sub-slot based PUCCH repetition have been introduced in URLLC, and PUCCH repetitions can be transmitted within a slot. If joint channel estimation can be enabled for sub-slot PUCCH repetitions, the DMRS bundling size can be 1 slot.  We may need to further discuss whether this use cases are supported, especially is ‘PUCCH-DMRS-bundling’ is configured per BWP. |
|  |  |

# Power control and TA with PUCCH repetitions

Based on companies input in contributions, we could strive for a common design of power control and TA handling for PUCCH and PUSCH repetitions. Therefore, we could hold on the discussion on this topic until progress made in agenda 8.8.1.3.

# Proposals for Monday GTW

**FL proposal 1:** **For a PUCCH resource to transmit a PUCCH without an associated scheduling DCI (e.g. P/SP-CSI or SR), if the PUCCH resource is configured with RRC parameter “nrofSlots-r17”, “nrofSlots-r17” is ignored and the RRC parameter “nrofSlots” is used for determining the repetition factor of the specific PUCCH resource.**

**FL proposed conclusion 2: The following use case 5 of PUCCH DMRS bundling is not supported in Rel-17**

* **Use case 5: PUCCH repetitions across non-consecutive slots.**
  + **Use case 5a: no uplink transmission in the middle of two PUCCH repetitions**
  + **Use case 5b: other uplink transmissions in the middle of two PUCCH repetitions**

**FL Proposal 2: For PUCCH DMRS bundling, when appliable, reuse the procedure developed for PUSCH DMRS bundling to determine configured TDW(s) and actual TDW(s).**

* **FFS: events for PUCCH actual TDW(s)**

# Proposals for Wed GTW

**FL proposal 4: For the interaction between inter-slot frequency hopping and DMRS bundling for PUCCH/PUSCH repetitions, a UE performs the “hopping intervals determination”, “configured TDW determination”, and “actual TDW determination” in a sequential ordering, based on the following option 1.**

* **Option 1: “hopping intervals determination” -> “configured TDW determination” -> “actual TDW determination”**
  + **DMRS bundling shall be restarted in case of frequency hopping ~~event~~**
  + **DMRS bunding is per actual TDW**
    - **FFS: determination of actual TDWs, if a frequency hop contains multiple actual TDWs.**
  + **Frequency hopping pattern is determined by physical slot indices only.**
  + **Support separate RRC configuration(s) for hopping interval and configured TDW.** 
    - **if hopping interval is not configured, the default hopping interval equals to the configured window length.**
    - **[Note: Both same and different configuration(s) for hopping interval and configured TDW are allowed by specification. It is up to NW to configure same or different configuration(s).]**
* **~~Option 2: “configured TDW determination” -> “hopping intervals determination” -> “actual TDW determination”~~**

**~~Chart

Description automatically generated~~**

# Proposals for Friday GTW

@all, I add a new FFS per Ericsson’s request

@Intel, there is comment which is against separated FH hopping pattern for PUCCH and PUSCH. So let’s not do that and stay with current version. Anyway there is a “FFS for different PH pattern determination for PUCCH and PUSCH”. I hope it address at least part of your concern.

@Samsung, per Nokia and CT comment, the case when TDW length is not configured is already settled. The corresponding sub-bullet is removed in the following proposal.

@all, I tried to take care the requests/concerns from all companies, where some of them are controversial. I think the following is the best we can do at this point. I envision we will not have much time in GTW online to discuss this proposal. So, please leave your final round of comments, if any (and I hope no), in the table below by 6PM PST 11/18/2021.

**Updated FL proposal 4:** **For the interaction between inter-slot frequency hopping and DMRS bundling for PUCCH/PUSCH repetitions, a UE performs the “hopping intervals determination”, “configured TDW determination”, and “actual TDW determination” in a sequential ordering, based on the following option 1.**

* **Option 1: “hopping intervals determination” -> “configured TDW determination” -> “actual TDW determination”**
  + **DMRS bundling shall be restarted at the beginning of each frequency hop**
  + **DMRS bunding is per actual TDW**
    - **~~FFS: determination of actual TDWs, if a frequency hop contains multiple actual TDWs.~~**
  + **Frequency hopping pattern is determined by physical slot indices ~~only~~.**
    - **FFS: different FH pattern determination for PUCCH and PUSCH**
    - **FFS: details of FH pattern design**
  + **Support separate RRC configuration(s) for hopping interval and configured TDW length.** 
    - **if hopping interval ~~pattern~~ is not configured, the default hopping interval ~~pattern~~ is the same as the configured TDW length**
      * **FFS: if both hopping interval ~~pattern~~ and TDW length are not configured**
    - **~~if TDW length is not configured and hopping interval is configured, the default TDW length is the same as the hopping interval~~**
    - **Note: hopping interval ~~pattern~~ is only determined by the configuration of hopping interval ~~pattern~~ if hopping interval ~~pattern~~ is configured**
    - **~~[Note: Both same and different configuration(s) for hopping interval and configured TDW are allowed by specification. It is up to NW to configure same or different configuration(s).]~~**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company objecting the Proposal** |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Reason for objection** |
|  |  |
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