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# Introduction

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

# RRC parameters for PUCCH repetitions

For PUCCH repetitions, there is a remaining RRC related issue from last RAN1 meeting.

**Remaining issue: Value range for PUSCH-Frequencyhopping-Interval and PUCCH-Frequencyhopping-Interval**

VIVO Proposal 1: The value range of frequency hopping interval is the same as the value range for the configured TDW length.

Xiaomi Proposal 3: The value range of PUCCH-Frequencyhopping-Interval can be the same as PUCCH-TimeDomainWindowLength, and the value range of PUSCH-Frequencyhopping-Interval can be the same as PUSCH-TimeDomainWindowLength.

CATT Proposal 3: Support the value range of {2,4,5,10} for PUCCH-Frequencyhopping-Interval and {2,4,5,8,10,16} for PUSCH-Frequencyhopping-Interval.

Panasonic Proposal 5: The value range of frequency hopping interval is {2, 4, 5, 8, 10} consecutive slots.

CT Proposal 2: The value range of PUCCH-Frequencyhopping-Interval at least includes {2,4,5} and the value range of PUSCH-Frequencyhopping-Interval can be {2,4,5,8,10,16,20}.

DCM Proposal 2: Value range of “PUSCH-Frequencyhopping-Interval” and “PUCCH-Frequencyhopping-Interval” should include at least 5 and 10 slots with considering TDD pattern.

Spreadtrum proposal 3: Value range for PUCCH-Frequencyhopping-Interval is set to “{2, 4, [5]}

Spreadtrum proposal 4: for PUSCH-Frequencyhopping-Interval, down select between:

* 1. Value range for PUSCH-Frequencyhopping-Interval is set to “{1,2,4,5,8,10,16,20}, when PUSCH repetition Type B is configured, value shall not exceed the duration of PUSCH repetition Type B
	2. Value range for PUSCH-Frequencyhopping-Interval is set to “{1,2,4,5,8,10,16,20} for PUSCH repetition Type A, and a new parameter PUSCH-RepTypeB-Frequencyhopping-Interval is set to {1,2,4,5,8,10}

CMCC Proposal 3：The value range for PUCCH-Frequencyhopping-Interval is set to “{2, 4,}” or “{1, 2, 4, 8}”, the second one is preferred.

Ericsson Proposal 5:

* For both PUSCH-Frequencyhopping-Interval and PUCCH-Frequencyhopping-Interval, the value range to be specified is selected taking into account TDD configurations.
	+ A maximum value of no less than 10 slots is specified
	+ Whether or not a maximum value of more than 10 slots is specified is further discussed.

Samsung Proposal 5:

* Value range for PUCCH-Frequencyhopping-Interval is “{2, 4}”
* Value range for PUSCH-Frequencyhopping-Interval is “{1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16}”

Sharp Proposal 4: The following value sets should be supported for PUCCH-Frequencyhopping-Interval/PUSCH-Frequencyhopping-Interval:

PUCCH-Frequencyhopping-Interval = {2, 4, 5}

PUSCH-Frequencyhopping-Interval = {2, 4, 5, 8, 10, 16, 20}

Apparently, given different companies may have different interested use cases in mind, the views on this issue are quite diverged. FL’s initial recommendation is to take a super set of all proposed values so that the spec could allow all meaningful use cases.

**FL proposal 1:**

* Value range for PUCCH-Frequencyhopping-Interval is “{1, 2, 4, 5, 8, 10}”
* Value range for PUSCH-Frequencyhopping-Interval is “{1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 20}”

Please provide comments to the above proposal, if any, in the following table.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Comment** |
| vivo | Generally fine.For value ‘1’, we would like to clarify the intention? The following interpretations are what we have in mind.- interpretation-1: fall back to legacy inter-slot frequency hopping for type-A PUSCH repetition? For this interpretation, legacy frequency hopping pattern **w/o** DMRS bundling is enabled by a new RRC configuration, we wonder whether such optimization is in scope.- interpretation-2: phase continuity and power consistency should be ensured within a slot for sub-slot based PUCCH repetition (which is supported in R17 URLLC). for this interpretation, we have deprioritized B2B and non-B2B PUCCH repetitions with in a slot in previous meetings.- interpretation-3: for type-B PUSCH repetition, phase continuity and power consistency should be ensured across actual PUSCH repetitions within a slot. If this value is used only for repetition type-B, we have agreed that the same mechanism as for type-A PUSCH repetitions is used for type-B PUSCH repetition, we are not sure whether we need to have a value only applicable for type-B PUSCH repetition. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | For unpaired spectrum, at least {5,10} should be supported.As discussed last meeting, the values 4, 7, 8, 12, 14, 16 need more justification because they have more spec impacts than other values. To be specific, PUSCH FH pattern in current spec is based on physical slot index without involving system frame number (S6.3.1 of TS 38.214). However, since value 4, 7, 8, 12, 14, 16 slots cannot divide 10 nor 20 slots which is the typical number of slots in one radio frame, the proposal implies more spec impacts to involve SFN into the FH patterning determination. We would like to ask proponents for clarification on this.If the values were motivated by TDD UL/DL configurations, then at least the interval should be able to divide 20ms because all slot configuration periods (P or P+P2) (S11 of TS 38.213) divide 20ms.Therefore, we suggest that all the potential values should be able to divide 20ms. |
| Intel | It is not clear to us why {1} is included as hopping interval for both PUSCH and PUCCH.We already support inter-slot frequency hopping in Rel-15/16. It seems redundant to support inter-slot frequency hopping with inter-slot bundling, but with hopping interval = 1. This is equivalent to inter-slot frequency hopping in Rel-15/16.For PUSCH frequency hopping interval, it may be good to clarify the motivation to configure large hopping interval, e.g., {14, 16, 20}. We do not see the need for these large values.  |
| Samsung | A maximum value not larger than half the number of repetitions seems to be sufficient so that frequency hopping can be enabled with 2 hops when these parameters are provided.[1] is not needed. |
| Nokia/NSB | We object the inclusion of [1] in the list of values since this value would implicitly disable DM-RS bundling regardless of the value of *PUCCH-DMRS-Bundling* and *PUSCH-DMRS-Bundling*. This behavior goes against the principle upon which the activation of DM-RS bundling has been designed, and against the agreed description of such parameters RAN1 provided to RAN2, i.e., “Enabling/disabling of DM-RS bundling and time domain window for PUCCH repetitions.” and “enabling/disabling of DM-RS bundling and time domain window for PUSCH repetitions.”. Indeed, if FH interval duration is set to 1, then the *PUCCH-DMRS-Bundling* and *PUSCH-DMRS-Bundling* could enable DM-RS bundling for PUSCH and PUCCH if and only if the configured FH interval is larger than 1. Moreover, if it will be agreed that physical slot index is used for FH interval determination of PUCCH, then setting FH interval length equal to 1 would imply that FH behavior for PUCCH in Rel-17 is different from Rel-16 counterpart, even when DM-RS bundling is not used. This is not acceptable. Concerning the remaining values, we think that a decision cannot be taken unless we first define which slot index is used to determine the hops (physical or relative). More precisely, if physical slot index is used than the concern expressed by Huawei is valid and values different from {2, 5, 10} should not be supported to avoid complicating the specification with no sound technical reasons. Conversely, if relative slot index is used, then values different from {2,5,10} can be supported without large specification impact, although the motivation for supporting values larger than 8 for PUCCH would be unclear in this case.  |
| QC | For PUCCH repetitions, from a FDD perspective, we think values 2 and 4 suffice. From a TDD perspective, multiples of 5 might be helpful (for e.g. 5 and 10). The pattern should repeat itself every frame i.e., dependence only on slot index. For PUSCH repetitions, from a FDD perspective, we think values 2,4, and 8 suffice. From a TDD perspective, multiples of 5 might be helpful (for e.g. 5 and 10). The pattern should repeat itself every frame i.e., dependence only on slot index.Okay if the interval does not divide the number of slots in a frame --- the last hop is a bit shorter. |
| Ericsson | We’re not sure why restricting the values to a submultiple of radio frame length is beneficial for FDD, since the scheduling can be anywhere in a radio frame. Having e.g. different value ranges for FDD and TDD to solve this seems unnecessarily complicated. Also, there seems to be no need to limit the use of this feature to where DMRS bundling is configured, since not all UEs that benefit from the new hopping pattern may simultaneously benefit (or even support) DMRS bundling. Therefore, we think the frequency hopping pattern should be better defined before limiting the values that can be configured. |
| China Telecom | Generally fine with the proposal. As companies have commented, we also think value 1 should not be included as it just disabled DMRS bundling. For other values, we think at least {5,10} should be included. |
| Panasonic | We share the Huawei’s comment that the number dividable by 20 ms would be reasonable since the current PUSCH hopping pattern based physical slot index does not include system frame number. On the necessity of the value “1”, since the inter-slot frequency hopping interval enhancement is targeting for DMRS bundling, value “1” is unnecessary for the purpose of PUSCH repetition Type A and slot-based PUCCH repetition. For PUSCH repetition Type B and sub-slot-based PUCCH repetition, DMRS bundling within a slot can be performed if the value “1” is supported. If the value “1” is used only for PUSCH repetition Type B or sub-slot-based PUCCH with DMRS bundling, we can accept to support it, although our best preference is not to support it. |
| CMCC | For PUCCH repetition, if the value of FH-interval is configured as {1}, then the UE would do FH every slot though the PUCCH repetitions, which means DMRS bundling is disabled. The same scenario also happens when the value of FH-interval is {8}, which means UE would transmit PUCCH repetition without FH, in other word, the FH is disabled.The values of {1, 8} introduce implicit on/off of DMRS bundling and FH. If the group think the implicit on/off is necessary then both values should be introduced. If not, both values should be removed. for PUCCH, both values {5,10} should be included considering the TDD configuration of DDDSUDDSUU and 7D1S2U respectively. For PUSCH, values of {5,10,20} could also work for the TDD configurations mentioned above. At least values of {5,10} should be supported for both PUCCH and PUSCH FH intervals. We are open for further discussion of value {20}.  |
| ZTE | Suggest to remove {1} as the intention of the WID is to only support inter-slot FH bundling in case of DMRS bundling. In addition, depending on the discussion of adopting physical slot index or relative slot index for PUSCH/PUCCH, new FH mechanism may be introduced. However, there was no intent before to support new FH mechanism in case of no DMRS bundling. |
| Sharp | Value 1 is unnecessary. This is because the UE determines to use Rel-15/16 frequency hopping when DMRS bundling is not enabled in the current spec., and enabling of DMRS bundling is configured in PUSCH-Config. Therefore, PUSCH-Frequencyhopping-Interval in PUSCH-Config does not need to have value 1.@FL, we added our proposal for PUSCH-Frequencyhopping-Interval/PUCCH-Frequencyhopping-Interval above. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We are generally fine with the proposal. We support to include 5, 10 to align with TDD pattern, are open for other numbers. |
| LG | We have similar view with Nokia regarding the value of [1] that it should be removed. |
| CATT | Generally fine. Considering the parameter is generally configured to perform the joint channel estimation and frequency hopping simultaneously to improve the coverage, value ‘1’ should not be included in the set of candidate values of hopping interval for either PUSCH or PUCCH. |
| Xiaomi | We are fine to include value 5 and 10 to align with TDD pattern, however for PUCCH, the maximum number of repetition is 8, smaller than 10, which means there would be no frequency diversity gain if the hopping interval is 10. So value ‘10’ should not be included in the set of candidate values for PUCCH hopping interval. |
| Spreadtrum | Unnecessary to include “1”. Legacy inter-slot PUCCH/PUSCH hopping can already cover “1”. It is redundant to have two same mechanisms.  |

## 3rd round discussion

The following FL proposal is slightly updated given the only proponent of support 3, 7 withdrawn the proposal.

FL proposal 1c:

* Values ~~range~~ for PUSCH-Frequencyhopping-Interval is “{~~1~~, 2, ~~3~~, 4, 5, [6], ~~7~~, ~~[~~8~~]~~, 10, [12], [14], [16], [20]}”

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| FL  | @Samsung, “3” is proposed in Samsung Tdoc. Originally, I also thought 3 is for 6 repetitions in FDD (As Ericsson commented). But now I checked RRC parameter spreadsheet, it seems the # repetitions allowed for Rel-17 PUSCH rep type A are “1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 12, 16, 20, 24, 28, 32”. So I put “3” with []. Hope Samsung can clarify why “3” is needed. @Samsung, “7” is proposed in Samsung Tdoc. Please also provide some justification why “7” is needed. @all, based on comments, it seems multiple companies think 8 is a good candidate to support, at least for FDD. So I removed the [] around 8. @all, for values 6, 12, 14, 16, proponents please comment why they are needed. But FL’s understanding is that they are for repetition factor 12, 24, 28, 32, in FDD For value 20, it is FL’s understanding that it is for TDD with for example DDDSUDDSUU pattern with 8 repetitions configured. Please check if the above explanation justifies 6, 12, 14, 16, and 20. If no objection, I will remove [] around them in next round updated proposal.  |
| Samsung | @FL – we are fine with excluding 3,7.  |
| **FL** | **@all, please continue to comment on the above proposal. Please notice that we have to settle down this RRC related topic in this meeting.** |
| Panasonic | We are fine with the update proposal. |
| Intel | We are fine to include 6, 12, 14, 16, and 20, which can cover different scenarios.  |
| China Telecom | We share the similar view as Intel. |
| CATT | We are OK with it. |

The following FL proposal is updated by putting 5, 10 into square bracket, per Sharp’s comment, given PUCCH frequency hopping pattern is agreed following relative slot index.

FL proposal 1d:

* Value range for PUCCH-Frequencyhopping-Interval is “{~~1~~, 2, 4, [5], [8],[10]}”

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Comment** |
| Nokia/NSB | 8 could be included in the list without square brackets. Suggest adding [12], [14], [16], [20] until input from RAN4 on max time time duration for DM-RS bundling is received. Not, in fact, that no differentiation between PUSCH and PUCCH is considered in that context.  |
| Vivo | Fine. |
| Panasonic | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal. We do not think additional values are needed.  |
| CATT | Fine. |
| Ericsson | Agree with Nokia, and would go a step further. Again, we do we exclude certain values when we don’t know if they are useful? |
| CMCC | The motivation we proposed to add {1}and {8} is that gNB can indicate DMRS bundling disabled or frequency hopping disabled implicitly. Since majority think it may lead to some ambiguity, maybe the value range could be {2, 4, 5, 10}. |
| Sharp | We are fine with the proposal because we prefer Option 1 in FL proposal 1b.However, if inter-slot frequency hopping with DMRS bundling for PUCCH is determined by relative slot index (Option 2), 5 and 10 are unnecessary because the hopping pattern depends on the starting slot of PUCCH repetition and cannot be aligned with TDD pattern. |
| China Telecom | Generally fine. |
| Samsung | It could be used only {2,4}. |
| LG | Same comment as proposal 1c. |
| ZTE | OK with the proposal.  |
| QC | Okay with the proposal. Good to keep the list short. |
| DOCOMO | Fine with the proposal. |
| OPPO | If the PUCCH is also counted based on physical slot, we prefer to have larger value up to 20, as proposed by Nokia. |
| **FL** | **@all, please continue to comment on the above proposal. Please notice that we have to settle down this RRC related topic in this meeting.** |
| OPPO | Since relative slot agreed for PUCCH, we did not identify value>10 except for further RAN4 input.For the proposed values by FL, we think the [] are reserving RRC bits. Then, we are fine with the prpoposal. |
| Panasonic | We think 5 and 10 are necessary even if hopping pattern is based on relative slot. When 5 or 10 slots is configured for frequency hopping pattern in TDD, the same hopping pattern can be expected for the determination based on the physical slot and relative slot. This is because we concluded relative slot of option A i.e., counting regardless the slot is used to transmit PUCCH/PUSCH or not i.e., regardless of UL slot or not. |
| Intel  | Our understanding is that 5 and 10 may be useful for TDD, even when inter-slot frequency hopping pattern is determined based on relative physical slot index. 8 seems not needed. |
| China Telecom | Share the similar view that 5 and 10 is useful for TDD. Take the following illustration with 8 PUCCH repetition as example, if 5 or 10 is not included, there will be a break point between PUCCH rep #7 and rep #8.So at least the bracket of 5 should be removed, although we prefer both 5 and 10 are included. |
| CATT | We think CMCC and China Telecom have a point. Can we just go with {2, 4, 5, 8,10} and move forward? Anyway, gNB can choose the one it prefers. |

# Dynamic PUCCH repetition factor indication

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

IDC Proposal 1: The dynamic PUCCH repetition factor indication applies to HARQ-ACK corresponding to the SPS release DCI.

IDC Proposal 2: The dynamic PUCCH repetition factor indication applies to the HARQ-ACK corresponding to SPS PDSCH received after SPS activation DCI in case SPS-PUCCH-AN-List is not configured.

Intel 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.
* No TP is needed for dynamic PUCCH repetition factor indication for HARQ-ACK of SPS PDSCH which is not associated with or activated by a DCI.

Ericsson Proposal 1:

* Revise the moderator’s updated proposed 2 RAN1#107bis to the following:
	+ 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

In FL’s understanding, this open issue is heavily related to a Rel-15/16 maintenance issue which is discussed under [108-e-NR-CRs-02]. FL suggest to not discuss this open issue until the email thread [108-e-NR-CRs-02] is concluded.

## Other proposals

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

Apple proposed Conclusion 1: No new value for the maximum number of PUCCH resources within each resource set is defined in Rel-17.

FL’s initial assessment is that the discussion of this proposal can be deprioritized. But companies are welcome to provide comments to the above proposals in the following table.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Comment** |
| InterDigital | Ok to wait for [108-e-NR-CRs-02] for whether to differentiate first and subsequent SPS PDSCH, but the part about SPS release seems independent on the outcome of this discussion? |
| CATT | There has been no discussion on modify the maximum number of PUCCH resources so far. By default, no new value is introduced. |

# 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.

## PUCCH TDW design details

In RAN1 107e, the following agreement was made.

**Agreement**

**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)**

In RAN1 107bis-e, the following agreement was made.

**Agreement**

**PUCCH repetitions with different sets of power control parameters in multi-TRP operation should be regarded as a [semi-static] event that causes power consistency and phase continuity not to be maintained across PUCCH repetitions.**

The remaining issue is whether to confirm the above event is a “semi-static” event. The proposals to address this issue are summarized as below.

Nokia Proposal 1. RAN1 to remove square brackets and agree the following: “PUCCH repetitions with different sets of power control parameters in multi-TRP operation should be regarded as a semi-static event that causes power consistency and phase continuity not to be maintained across PUCCH repetitions.”

VIVO Proposal 2: PUCCH repetitions with different sets of power control parameters in multi-TRP operation should be regarded as semi-static event.

Intel Proposal 2

* PUCCH repetitions with UL beams switching and different sets of power control parameters for multi-TRP operation is regarded as a semi-static event.

Based on the above proposals, the following FL proposal is made.

**FL proposal 2: update the following agreement made in RAN1 107bis-e as below**

**Agreement**

**PUCCH repetitions with different sets of power control parameters in multi-TRP operation should be regarded as a ~~[~~semi-static~~]~~ event that causes power consistency and phase continuity not to be maintained across PUCCH repetitions.**

Please provide comments to the above FL proposal, if any, in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **comment** |
| Vivo | support |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support. |
| Intel | We are fine with the FL proposal 2.  |
| Samsung | OK with the proposed updated agreement. |
| Nokia/NSB | Support. |
| QC | Support |
| Ericsson | Support |
| China Telecom | Support. |
| Panasonic | Support |
| CMCC | Fine with updated agreement. |
| ZTE | Support |
| Sharp | Support |
| InterDigital | Support |
| LG | Support |
| CATT | Support. |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| Spreadtrum | Support |

Furthermore, the following TP was provided in R1-2201711, which is related to this open issue.

**------------------------------ TP#1: TS 38.214-----------------------------------**

6.1.7 UE procedure for determining time domain windows for bundling DM-RS

**< Unchanged text omitted >**

The UE shall maintain power consistency and phase continuity within an actual TDW, across PUSCH transmissions of PUSCH repetition Type A scheduled by DCI format 0\_1 or 0\_2, or PUSCH repetition Type A with a configured grant, or PUSCH repetition type B or TB processing over multiple slots, or across PUCCH transmissions of PUCCH repetition, in case the actual TDW is created in response to frequency hopping, or in response to the use of a different SRS resource set association for the two PUSCH transmissions of PUSCH repetition type A, or PUSCH repetition type B, ~~[~~or in response to the use of different spatial relations or different power control parameters for the two PUCCH transmissions of PUCCH repetition,~~]~~ or in response to any event not triggered by DCI or MAC-CE. The UE maintains power consistency and phase continuity within an actual TDW, across PUSCH transmissions of PUSCH repetition Type A scheduled by DCI format 0\_1 or 0\_2, or PUSCH repetition Type A with a configured grant, or PUSCH repetition type B or TB processing over multiple slots, or across PUCCH transmissions of PUCCH repetition, in case the actual TDW is created in response to an event triggered by DCI other than frequency hopping or by MAC-CE, subject to UE capability.

**< Unchanged text omitted >**

**------------------------------ end of TP#1: TS 38.214-----------------------------------**

**FL question 1: What is your view on the above TP? Is it agreeable?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **comment** |
| vivo | support. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | The term “power control parameters” is broad and can unnecessarily include some RAN4 parameters that are up to UE implementation, e.g. P-MPR. Additionally, it should be only related to uplink power control instead of downlink power control.Therefore, suggest to replace it with “or different higher layer parameters of uplink power control” |
| Intel | We are fine with the TP.  |
| Samsung | Perhaps mTRP operation be mentioned. |
| Nokia/NSB | Support. |
| Ericsson | Ok to be more precise as Huawei suggests, but “different higher layer power control parameters” is a little more succinct.  |
| China Telecom | Support. |
| Panasonic | We are fine with the TP. |
| CMCC | Support. And share similar views with Huawei and Ericsson the description could be more precise. |
| ZTE | Support |
| Sharp | We are fine with the TP |
| InterDigital | Fine with TP or Ericsson suggestion. Could also use “different power control configurations” to address Huawei’s concern. |
| LG | Fine with the TP. |
| CATT | Fine and support Huawei or Ericsson’s update. |
| Xiaomi | Fine with the TP |
| Spreadtrum | Support |

## Inter slot freq hopping enhancement with DMRS bundling

In RAN1 107e, the following agreement was made for inter-slot frequency hopping.

**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: Frequency hopping pattern is determined by physical slot indices.
		- 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 is not configured, the default hopping interval is the same as the configured TDW length
			* FFS: if both hopping interval and TDW length are not configured
		- Note: hopping interval is only determined by the configuration of hopping interval if hopping interval is configured

There are still three FFS that need to be address. Companies’ input for each FFS are summarized as following.

### FFS: different FH pattern determination for PUCCH and PUSCH

HW Proposal 1: Different rules to determine the inter-slot frequency hopping with DMRS bundling for PUSCH repetition and PUCCH repetition are preferred.

* For PUSCH repetition, the inter-slot frequency hopping with DMRS bundling is determined based on the physical slot indices;
* For PUCCH repetition, the inter-slot frequency hopping with DMRS bundling is determined based on the relative physical slot indices.

Nokia Proposal 2. Frequency hopping pattern is not determined by physical slot indices, and a UE configured for DM-RS bundling determines the frequency hopping intervals for a set of PUCCH/PUSCH transmissions based at least on the starting slot of the set of PUCCH/PUSCH transmissions for which DM-RS bundling is activated

Nokia Proposal 3. Define frequency hopping interval in case of DM-RS bundling constrained to being either equal to the length of the configured TDW or a divisor of the length of the configured TDW, upon condition that the frequency hopping interval length is larger than 1 slot.

VIVO Proposal 3: Physical slot index is used for PUSCH hopping pattern determination, and relative slot index is used for PUCCH hopping pattern determination.

ZTE Proposal 2: For inter-slot frequency hopping for PUCCH/PUSCH with DMRS bundling.

* Physical slot index is used to determine inter-slot frequency hopping for PUSCH repetitions with DMRS bundling.
* Relative slot index is used to determine inter-slot frequency hopping for PUCCH repetitions with DMRS bundling.

CATT Proposal 2: Physical slot index is used to determine inter-slot frequency hopping for PUCCH/PUSCH repetitions with DMRS bundling.

Panasonic Proposal 1: Either of following option is taken.

* Option 1: Frequency hopping pattern is determined by physical slot indices for both PUSCH and PUCCH.
* Option 2: Frequency hopping pattern is determined by physical slot indices for PUSCH and is determined by relative slot indices for PUCCH.
* Option 3: Frequency hopping pattern is determined by physical slot indices if hopping interval is configured. Frequency hopping pattern is determined by relative slot indices if hopping interval is not configured.

CT Proposal 1: For inter-slot frequency hopping for PUCCH/PUSCH with DMRS bundling, physical slot index is used to determine inter-slot frequency hopping for PUCCH/PUSCH repetitions with DMRS bundling.

DCM Proposal 1: Physical slot index is used for PUSCH and relative slot index is used for PUCCH to align with current mechanism.

Spreadtrum Proposal 1: For inter-slot frequency hopping for PUCCH/PUSCH with DMRS bundling, Option 1: Physical slot index is used to determine inter-slot frequency hopping for PUCCH/PUSCH repetitions with DMRS bundling.

Intel proposal 3: For inter-slot frequency hopping with inter-slot bundling

* + For PUSCH repetition, frequency hopping pattern is determined based on physical slot index.
	+ For PUCCH repetition, frequency hopping pattern is determined based on relative physical slot index.

Apple Proposal 1: For DMRS bundling with frequency hopping, the first hopping interval starts relative to scheduling DCI and/or the first repetition occasion. The subsequent intervals are determined based on a fixed (not floating) hopping pattern.

CMCC Proposal 2: Frequency hopping pattern should be determined by physical slot indices.

Xiaomi Proposal 2: Frequency hopping pattern can be determined by physical slot indices.

Ericsson Proposal 2:

* Enhanced frequency hopping designs for PUCCH and PUSCH include the following:
	+ Frequency hopping offsets are determined from a hopping index that is calculated from the (physical) slot number, where the hopping index changes once every N slots, the index can attain up to M values, and the hopping pattern has a configurable time shift (in the unit of slots).

Samsung Proposal 1: For PUCCH repetitions with DM-RS bundling enabled, the frequency hopping pattern is determined based on a relative slot index as in Rel-16 (and as in Rel-17 when DM-RS bundling is not enabled).

Samsung Proposal 2: For PUSCH repetitions with DM-RS bundling enabled, the frequency hopping pattern is determined based on a physical slot index as in Rel-16 (and as in Rel-17 when DM-RS bundling is not enabled).

QC Proposal 1: Frequency hopping pattern for DMRS bundling across PUCCH transmissions is determined based on physical slot indices.

Sharp Proposal 3: The unified design of the hopping pattern should be applied to both PUSCH and PUCCH with DMRS bundling.

Sharp Proposal 1: If a hopping interval $H$ is configured, UEs with the hopping pattern should be multiplexed independently from starting slots of PUSCH/PUCCH transmissions of the UEs.

TCL Proposal 1: For inter-slot frequency hopping for PUCCH/PUSCH with DMRS bundling, option 4 is preferred.

* Option 4: Physical slot index is used to determine inter-slot frequency hopping for PUSCH repetitions with DMRS bundling. Relative slot index is used to determine inter-slot frequency hopping for PUCCH repetitions with DMRS bundling.

LG Proposal 1: The frequency hopping pattern for inter-slot frequency hopping is determined only by physical slot index.

WILUS Proposal 1: For Rel-17 inter-slot frequency hopping with inter-slot bundling, Rel-15/16 inter-slot frequency hopping pattern design is reused as much as possible.

* + Physical slot index is used for PUSCH.
	+ Relative physical slot index is used for PUCCH.

Based on companies’ input, it is observed that the views on this issue are still diverged. Furthermore, based on FL’s understanding of companies’ proposals, among the companies supporting using relative slot index, there seems two ways to count relative slot index. Before we make a decision to use physical slot index or relative slot index, a discussion is needed to clarify how relative slot index is counted.

The two options to count relative slot index are listed as following, and illustrate by Figure 1.

* Option A: frequency hopping pattern is determined based on relative slot index. Relative slot 0 is the slot where PUCCH/PUSCH repetition starts. Each of the subsequent slots are counted and relative slot index increase by one **regardless** the slot is used to transmit PUCCH/PUSCH or not.
* Option B: frequency hopping pattern is determined based on available slot index. Relative slot 0 is the slot where PUCCH/PUSCH repetition starts. One of the subsequent slots are counted and the slot index increase by one **only if** the slot is used to transmit PUCCH/PUSCH.



Figure 1. Different options for relative slot index counting

Based on the above example, relative slot index – option B can achieve balanced hopping pattern in TDD regardless of TDD pattern. Relative slot index – option A seems just a shift version of physical slot index.

The benefits/drawbacks of each option are listed as below.

* Frequency hopping based on physical slot can pair/multiplex UEs with hopping in a more spectrum efficient fashion. However, R1-2201015 identifies that this benefit may not hold in case of different frequency hopping intervals are used cross UEs, as illustrated in the following Figure 2. FL’s assessment is that indeed the benefit of UE pairing/multiplexing with physical slot based hopping only holds among UEs with same hopping intervals. The drawback of using physical slot index to determine frequency hopping interval is also obvious, which would lead to unbalanced hopping intervals in TDD due to UL/DL pattern. Even in FDD, due to unaligned hopping boundary and TDW boundary, the hopping interval could be unbalanced, as mentioned in R1-2201167. However, it is FL’s understanding that gNB can configure hopping boundary to be aligned with TDW boundary to avoid this issue in FDD.
* Frequency hopping based on relative slot – option B can achieve more balanced hopping intervals, according to R1-2201015, which is also obviously shown in above Figure 1. But the drawbacks of option B is that it is deviation from the legacy approach to determine hopping interval.
* Frequency hopping based on relative slot – option A seems just a time shift version of frequency hopping based physical slot index, as shown in Figure 1. In TDD, the benefit of option A is not clear. In FL understanding, in TDD, it can neither achieve balanced hopping interval nor pair users better to improve spectrum efficiency. In FDD, option A is identical to option B, which has the benefit of more balanced hopping intervals.



Figure 2. Frequency multiplexing of frequency hopping UEs with different hopping patterns

In summary, the benefits/drawbacks of different options are captured in the following table

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Frequency hopping based on Physical slot index  | Frequency hopping based on relative slot index – option A | Frequency hopping based on relative slot index – option B |
| TDD | Pros: More spectrum efficient MU pairing (requires same freq hopping interval)Cons: unbalanced hopping intervals | Pros: not identified so farCons: unfriendly to MU pairing | Pros: balanced hopping intervalsCons: unfriendly to MU pairing |
| FDD | Pros: More spectrum efficient users pairing (requires same freq hopping interval)Pros: balanced hopping interval with aligned TDWCons: unbalanced hopping interval with misaligned TDW | Pros: balanced hopping intervalCons: unfriendly to MU pairing | Pros: balanced hopping intervalsCons: unfriendly to MU pairing |

Before making a recommend proposal, FL would like to collect more input, especially on whether anything is missed in the analysis of the pros/cons of different hopping determination options as listed in the above table.

**FL question 2: Anything comment in the above table regarding the assessment of the pros/cons of the three different options to determine frequency hopping interval?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **comment** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We feel Option B may suffer from DCI misdetection or false alarm if it relies on DCI to determine whether a slot is transmitted and whether there is a frequency hopping. Better to clarify whether it is dynamic or semi-static determination on slot transmission with respect to the concept of Option B.Regarding unbalanced hopping intervals, not sure if it is an important aspect. Even it is important, such unbalance can be mitigated by scheduling a UE with a different starting hopping position from that position for its preceding scheduling, e.g. if the 1st scheduled repetitions (by 1st DCI) starts hopping at the left half of a UE bandwidth, then the 2nd scheduled repetitions (by 2nd DCI) starts hopping at the right half of a UE bandwidth. |
| Intel | Our view is that extension of existing mechanisms should be one of the most important factors to be considered to determine the frequency hopping pattern, which would minimize the spec impact and UE implementation effort. In particular, for PUSCH repetition, frequency hopping pattern is determined based on physical slot index. For PUCCH repetition, frequency hopping pattern is determined based on relative physical slot index |
| Samsung | As this discussion is about applying frequency hopping when DM-RS bundling is enabled, we don’t support changing Rel-16 frequency hopping for either PUSCH or PUCCH for this case when no issue has been identified. MU pairing seems not to be one. |
| Nokia/NSB | We agree with most of the FL’s analysis of the situation. The best performance is surely delivered by Option B of relative slot index. Option A is based on a straightforward extension of the legacy behavior which does not seem to yield performance improvement at first glance. However, and differently from the physical slot approach it still yields a more flexible approach to FH interval duration configuration, while ensuring simpler spec impact (please see discussion on RRC parameters in Section 2). |
| QC | We are okay with the FL summary. Going forward, we prefer to focus on only two options: (a) hop pattern based on physical slot indices and (b) hop pattern based on relative slot indices with Option A. Option B does not seem compatible with how we think of frequency hopping interval --- a set of consecutive slots. |
| Ericsson | Regarding option A vs. option B for relative slot counting, option B does not seem to be in line with the RRC parameters agreed in RAN1#107bis. Since the hopping intervals for both PUSCH and PUSCH are in units of consecutive slots, a hopping interval ends *PUSCH[/PUCCH]-Frequencyhopping-Interval* slots after it starts, and the slot index always increases within a window. For physical slot hopping, we find the opposite regarding unbalanced hopping in R1-2201964: relative slot hopping with consecutive slots allows a better balance than relative slot counting. As can be seen in the figure below, using the slot index (or ‘physical slots’) and a hopping interval related to the TDD pattern can allow coherent combining within a nominal TDW (e.g. for Rep #2 and #3), balanced hopping within a small number of repetitions.We agree with the MU pairing benefit of physical slot indices.A general comment is that scheduler restrictions should be avoided, and so this this is an important aspect to differentiate among hopping designs. |
| China Telecom | For frequency hopping based on physical slot index TDD, we don’t think “unbalanced hopping intervals” is a issue, as it can be avoided by proper configuration, e.g. configure the hopping interval as 5. |
| CMCC | Determination based on physical slot index is the legacy rule for PUSCH FH, and the **relative slot index – option B** is used to determine the PUCCH FH. **Relative slot index – option A** seems like amixbetween the above mechanism, and we do not see any benefit from it. We would like to keep the legacy rule and add an upgrade. |
| ZTE | For Option B, one drawback not captured in the table is it would introduce new UE implementation of slot index determination for FH compared to legacy. For MU pairing, it is more for efficiency not the coverage. So, achieving more balanced hopping interval with Option A is more important.  |
| InterDigital | Generally fine, but agree with other companies that maximizing reuse of existing implementation is an important aspect. |
| LG | Fine with the down selection with removal of relative slot index option B. The physical slot index based or relative slot index based (option A) is originated from the legacy behavior of PUSCH or PUCCH but it seems the relative slot index based (option B) is a whole new feature we did not discussed. Considering it is the last meeting and we need progress, selection without introducing a new option is desirable. |
| CATT | Option B is far different with current mechanism – either Rel-15 PUCCH repetition or Rel-17 PUSCH JCE. We are fine to remove Option B, and down-select between Option A and Option for pure physical slot index. |
| Xiaomi | Prefer to down-select between (a) hop pattern based on physical slot indices and (b) hop pattern based on relative slot indices with Option A.  |
| WILUS | In our view, relative slot index – Option B is aligned with Rel-15/16 PUCCH case, while Option A seems new behavior for both PUSCH and PUCCH case. |

**FL question 3: Inter-slot frequency hopping for PUCCH with DMRS bundling should be determined based on**

**physical slot index, or relative slot index – option A, or relative slot index – option B?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Answer** |
| Vivo | Relative slot index-option A, and we are also fine with frequency hopping based on physical slot index. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | In current spec, the inter-slot frequency hopping for PUCCH repetitions is determined based on relative slot index, and the relative slot index is increased by one regardless of the slot is used to transmit PUCCH or not. So option A is preferred where the inter-slot frequency hopping for PUCCH with DMRS bundling is determined based on relative slot index. Regarding option B, as commented above, balanced hopping interval is an observation only based on single scheduling. For multiple scheduling instances, it is not important aspect and can be mitigated by gNB scheduling if needed. |
| Intel | We support relative slot index – Option A. This is extension of existing mechanism.  |
| Samsung | For PUCCH - relative slot index. No reason to change Rel-16 FH for PUCCH when DM-RS bundling is enabled. |
| Nokia/NSB | Prefer relative slot index – Option B. Can live with Option A. |
| QC | We prefer hop pattern based on physical slot indices for both PUCCH and PUSCH. |
| Ericsson | Option B is not in line with agreed RRC parameters, as commented above, since counting within a window is for consecutive slots.Option A has problems with hopping balance and/or alignment with nominal TDWs.Physical slot hopping works well with TDD patterns, avoiding the problems in option A. Therefore, we support physical slot determination for PUCCH. |
| China Telecom | We prefer physical slot index, but can live with relative slot index Option A. |
| Panasonic | We support either physical slot index or Option A of relative slot index. |
| CMCC | We support relative slot index -option B. |
| ZTE | Support relative slot index – option A, which is the same as legacy.  |
| Sharp | We prefer physical slot index. |
| NTT DOCOMO | In our understanding, we may have the same interval by determined based on physical and relative slot index if hopping interval is appropriately configured. Therefore, we may follow the current rule (relative slot index), on the other hands can live with physical slot index. |
| LG | We are aligned with QC that same hopping pattern determination for PUCCH and PUSCH, i.e., based on physical slot index, is desirable. |
| CATT | Our first preference is physical slot index. Can live with relative slot index-Option A. |
| Xiaomi | Our first preference is physical slot index. Can live with relative slot index-Option A. |
| Spreadtrum | Physical slot index |
| WILUS | We support relative slot index – Option B. |

**FL question 4: Inter-slot frequency hopping for PUSCH with DMRS bundling should be determined based on**

**physical slot index, or relative slot index – option A, or relative slot index – option B?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Answer** |
| Vivo | Physical slot index |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | In current spec, the inter-slot frequency hopping for PUSCH repetitions is determined based on physical slot index. So reusing the existing mechanism is preferred. |
| Intel | We support physical slot index. This is extension of existing mechanism.  |
| Samsung | For PUSCH - physical slot index. No reason to change Rel-16 FH for PUSCH when DM-RS bundling is enabled. |
| Nokia/NSB | Prefer relative slot index – Option B. Can live with Option A. Physical slot index cannot be accepted if [1] is not excluded from the list of configurable FH interval values, for the reasons explained in Section 2. |
| QC | We prefer hop pattern based on physical slot indices for both PUCCH and PUSCH. |
| Ericsson | Physical slot index, for the reasons above. |
| China Telecom | Physical slot index. |
| Panasonic | We support either physical slot index or Option A of relative slot index. |
| CMCC | We support physical slot index. |
| ZTE | Fine with either physical slot index or relative slot index – option A.  |
| Sharp | We prefer physical slot index |
| NTT DOCOMO | We prefer physical slot index determination. |
| LG | Physical slot index. |
| CATT | Physical slot index. Reuse the mechanism of inter-slot frequency hopping is a simple method to facilitate the resource allocation and UE multiplexing.  |
| Xiaomi | Physical slot index |
| Spreadtrum | Physical slot index |
| WILUS | We support physical slot index. |

**FL question 5: If no convergence can be achieved, is the following conclusion acceptable?**

* **Rel-17 does not support inter-slot frequency hopping for PUCCH/PUSCH repetitions with DMRS bundling.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Answer** |
| Intel | We do not support the proposal. In our view, inter-slot frequency hopping with inter-slot bundling, in conjunction with DMRS bundling is an important feature for coverage enhancement. This has been great effort in RAN1 for this feature and it would be really unfortunate that this is not supported in Rel-17.  |
| Samsung | It is not clear the intent of this proposal. The default is existent specifications - if there is no consensus in changing a Rel-16 operation (frequency hopping) when an agreed Rel-17 feature is enabled (DM-RS bundling), Rel-16 operation should be maintained. This is the same principle used in FL Proposed conclusion 1 in next section – it should be applied here as well. |
| Nokia/NSB | We prefer discussing a bit more before starting to consider this kind of proposals. |
| QC | Lets try to find common ground. Will be good to have this feature. |
| Ericsson | Such a conclusion is inconsistent with the WID. Other alternatives should be exhausted first. |
| China Telecom | Not acceptable. |
| ZTE | If no consensus can be reached, we should follow the legacy rules for determination of the slot index, i.e., physical slot index for PUSCH and relative slot index for PUCCH.  |
| Sharp | No. It was determined in WID to specify inter-slot frequency hopping with DMRS bundling. |
| LG | Similar view with Samsung. It is our understanding that legacy behavior is kept naturally if there is no consensus without this kind of conclusion. |
| CATT | It is too early to consider such conclusion. It is better to have this feature, even if we have to make a hard decision.  |
| Xiaomi | Discuss it further |
| Spreadtrum | No. Great effort for this issue has been done in Rel-17 and this feature is shown to be effective. |

### FFS: details of FH pattern design

HW Proposal 5: It is not necessary to increase the number of frequency offsets over what are supported in Rel-15/16.

Ericsson Proposal 2:

* Enhanced frequency hopping designs for PUCCH and PUSCH include the following:
	+ - Increased hopping offsets over Rel-15 are supported, e.g. M=4,

Samsung Proposal 4:

For PUCCH and PUSCH repetitions with DM-RS bundling enabled, the number of frequency hops is two.

HW Proposal 2: In case of inter-slot frequency hopping with DMRS bundling for PUSCH repetition, the starting RB during slot $n\_{s}^{μ}$ is given by:

$$RB\_{start}\left(n\_{s}^{μ}\right)=\left\{\begin{matrix}RB\_{start}&\left⌊{n\_{s}^{μ}}/{N\_{FH}}\right⌋mod2=0\\\left(RB\_{start}+RB\_{offset}\right)modN\_{BWP}^{size}&\left⌊{n\_{s}^{μ}}/{N\_{FH}}\right⌋mod2=1\end{matrix}\right.$$

where $n\_{s}^{μ}$ is the current slot number within a radio frame, $RB\_{start}$ is the starting RB with the UL BWP, $RB\_{offset}$ is the frequency offset in RBs between the two frequency hops, and $N\_{FH}$ is the interval of the frequency hopping indicated by PUSCH-Frequencyhopping-Interval.

HW Proposal 3: In case of inter-slot frequency hopping with DMRS bundling for PUCCH repetition, the starting RB during slot $n$ is given by:

$$RB\_{start}\left(n\right)=\left\{\begin{matrix}RB\_{start}&\left⌊{n}/{N\_{FH}}\right⌋mod2=0\\\left(RB\_{start}+RB\_{offset}\right)modN\_{BWP}^{size}&\left⌊{n}/{N\_{FH}}\right⌋mod2=1\end{matrix}\right.$$

where the slot indicated to the UE for the first PUCCH transmission has number 0, i.e., $n=0$, the each subsequent slot until the UE transmits the PUCCH in $N\_{PUCCH}^{repeat}$ slots is counted regardless of whether or not the UE transmits PUCCH in the slot, $RB\_{start}$ is the starting RB with the UL BWP, $RB\_{offset}$ is the frequency offset in RBs between the two frequency hops, and $N\_{FH}$ is the interval of the frequency hopping indicated by PUCCH-Frequencyhopping-Interval.

OPPO proposed TP1:



* +  is the current slot physical number not consider frame boundary
	+ $RB\_{start}$$RB\_{start}$ is the starting RB within the UL BWP as calculated from the resource block assignment information
	+ $RB\_{offset}$$RB\_{offset}$ is the frequency offset in RBs between the two frequency hops
	+ H is hopping interval in number of slots

CATT Proposal 1: System frame nuber should be introduced to determine the hopping pattern:

$$RB\_{start}\left(n\_{s,f}^{μ}\right)=\left\{\begin{array}{c}RB\_{start} \\\left(RB\_{start}+RB\_{offset}\right)modN\_{BWP}^{size}\end{array}   \genfrac{}{}{0pt}{}{\left⌊\frac{n\_{s,f}^{μ}+n\_{f}∙N\_{slot}^{frame,μ}}{L\_{interval}}\right⌋ mod 2=0}{\left⌊\frac{n\_{s,f}^{μ}+n\_{f}∙N\_{slot}^{frame,μ}}{L\_{interval}}\right⌋ mod 2=1}\right.$$

Panasonic Proposal 2: Frequency hopping pattern based on physical slot indices is realized as following.

* The starting RB during slot $n\_{s}$ is given by
	+ $RB\_{start}\left(n\_{s}\right)=\left\{\begin{matrix}RB\_{start}&\left⌊n\_{s}/N\_{FH}\right⌋ mod 2=0\\\left(RB\_{start}+RB\_{offset}\right) mod N\_{BWP}^{size}&\left⌊n\_{s}/N\_{FH}\right⌋ mod 2=1\end{matrix}\right.$
		- $n\_{s}$ is the current slot number within a radio frame
		- $RB\_{start}$ is the starting RB within the UL BWP as calculated from the resource block assignment information.
		- $RB\_{offset}$ is the frequency offset in RBs between the two frequency hops
		- $N\_{FH}$ is the length of hopping interval

Proposal 3: Frequency hopping pattern based on relative slot indices is realized as following.

* The starting RB during slot $n\_{s}^{'}$ is given by
	+ $RB\_{start}\left(n\_{s}^{'}\right)=\left\{\begin{matrix}RB\_{start}&\left⌊{n\_{s}^{'}}/{N\_{FH}}\right⌋ mod 2=0\\\left(RB\_{start}+RB\_{offset}\right) mod N\_{BWP}^{size}&\left⌊{n\_{s}^{'}}/{N\_{FH}}\right⌋ mod 2=1\end{matrix}\right.$
		- $n\_{s}^{'}$ is the relative slot number. The slot indicated to the UE for the first PUSCH/PUCCH repetition has number 0 and each subsequent slot until the UE transmits the PUSCH/PUCCH in $K$ slots is counted regardless of whether or not the UE transmits the PUSCH/PUCCH in the slot.

Sharp Proposal 2: If a hopping interval $H$ is configured, the hopping pattern should be determined as:

$$RB\_{start}\left(n\_{f},n\_{s,f}^{μ}\right)=\left\{\begin{array}{c}RB\_{start}, \&\left⌊(N\_{slot}^{frame,μ}n\_{f}+n\_{s,f}^{μ})/H\right⌋ mod 2=0\\\left(RB\_{start}+RB\_{offset}\right) mod N\_{BWP}^{size}, \&\left⌊(N\_{slot}^{frame,μ}n\_{f}+n\_{s,f}^{μ})/H\right⌋ mod 2=1\end{array}\right.$$

There are two major open issues regarding the details of the FH pattern design.

* Issue 1: Whether increase the number of frequency offset over Rel-15/16 are supported?
* Issue 2: What is the exact equation to decide hopping pattern?

For issue 2, the solution depends on the decision for questions in Section 4.2.1. FL suggest putting the discussion on issue 3 on hold until the open issues in Section 4.2.1 are resolved. For issue 1, based on the discussion in last meeting and also checking the input from companies’ contributions submitted to this meeting, it is FL’s initial assessment that there is no consensus to support increased the number of frequency offset over what are supported in Rel-15/16. Therefore, FL recommend to agree on the following conclusion to close this open issue 1.

**FL Proposed conclusion 1: For frequency hopping for PUCCH/PUSCH repetitions with DMRS bundling, in Rel-17, there is no consensus to increase the number of frequency offset over what are supported in Rel-15/16.**

Further comments on the above proposed conclusion can be added in the following table.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **comment** |
| Vivo | Support.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support.Additionally, according to the following agreement, we feel that increased number of frequency offset for PUSCH frequency hopping **without** DMRS bundling has been precluded.Agreement:* For Rel-17 PUSCH repetition Type A without joint channel estimation, no new inter-slot frequency hopping mechanism is introduced.
 |
| Intel | We support the FL Proposed conclusion 1 |
| Samsung | OK |
| Nokia/NSB | Ok |
| Ericsson | In short, we do not object to the FL’s assessment of the situation or the proposal. It is however quite unfortunate, given the gains found in and provided for quite some time now, and the very low UE complexity needed to support such a feature.We also observe that the agreement referenced by Huawei above clearly does not preclude designs with more hopping positions for Type A with joint channel estimation, nor for PUCCH, nor for TBoMS. |
| China Telecom | Support. |
| Panasonic  | We support the proposed conclusion. |
| CMCC | Support. |
| ZTE | Support  |
| Sharp | Support |
| LG | Support the conclusion. |
| CATT | Support. |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| WILUS | Support |

### FFS: if both hopping interval and TDW length are not configured

In RAN1-107bis, the following four options were discussed to solve this issue of default hopping interval, if both hopping interval and TDW length are not configured.

* **Option 1: half duration of PUCCH/PUSCH repetitions**
	+ Supporting companies: Intel, Samsung, ZTE, OPPO
* **Option 2: default window length of the configured TDW**
	+ Supporting companies: Nokia/NSB, VIVO, CATT, Panasonic(conditioning on DMRS bundling enabled), LG, DCM, IDC, CT, Ericsson, CMCC, Lenovo/Moto, Spreadtrum, Xiaomi, HW/HiSi, TCL (conditioning on DMRS bundling enabled)
* **Option 3: half of default window length of the configured TDW**
	+ Supporting companies: Intel, Sharp, ZTE
* **Option 4: a single slot (fallback to Rel-15/16 inter-slot frequency hopping)**
	+ Supporting companies: TCL(conditioning on DMRS bundling is disabled), Panasonic (conditioning on DMRS bundling is disabled), WILUS, QC

In RAN1 108e, the following proposals are submitted to address this issue. It is FL’s initial assessment that companies views on this open issue are not changed comparing to RAN1 107-bis-e.

HW Proposal 4: In the case of both frequency hopping interval and TDW length are not configured, the default frequency hopping interval is the default TDW length, i.e., min(maximum duration, duration of all PUSCH/PUCCH repetitions).

Nokia Proposal 4. Set the frequency hopping interval length equal to the default configured TDW length, in the case the configured TDW length is not configured, and the frequency hopping interval is not configured

VIVO Proposal 5: Support option 2 as the default hopping interval

ZTE Proposal 3: If both hopping interval and configured TDW are not configured, the default hopping interval is equal to half of the duration of all PUSCH/PUCCH repetitions. (Option 1)

OPPO Proposal1: If inter-slot is enabled but hopping interval and window length L are not configured, UE expected PUCCH-bundling is not enabled.

Panasonic Proposal 4: If both hopping interval and TDW length are not configured,

* If DMRS-budling is enabled, default hopping interval should be same as the default TDW length.
* If DMRS-budling is not enabled, Rel.15/16 hopping pattern should be applied.

Spreadtrum Proposal 2: Support FL proposal 3b: In case of both hopping interval and TDW length are not configured, the default hopping interval is the default window length of the configured TDW.

IDC Proposal 3: If both hopping interval and TDW length are not configured, hopping interval is determined by L = min (maximum duration, duration of all PUSCH repetitions) and L = min (maximum duration, duration of all PUCCH repetitions) for PUSCH and PUCCH, respectively.

Intel Proposal 3

* For inter-slot frequency hopping with inter-slot bundling
	+ If hopping interval and TDW length are not configured, default hopping interval is half of default window length of the configured TDW.

Xiaomi Proposal 4: If both hopping interval and TDW length L are not configured, the hopping interval can be the same as the default TDW length L = min (maximum duration, duration of all PUSCH repetitions).

Samsung proposal 3: For PUCCH and PUSCH repetitions with DM-RS bundling enabled, if configuration of frequency hopping interval is not provided and configuration of TDW length is not provided, the default value of the frequency hopping interval is half the number of repetitions.

TCL Proposal 2: If DMRS-bundling is enabled, option 2 is preferred. Otherwise, option 4 is preferred.

LG Proposal 3: In case the joint channel estimation is enabled and frequency hopping is indicated without a hopping interval and configured TDW, the default value for configured TDW should be applied as a default value for the hopping interval.

WILUS Proposal 3: If both hopping interval (i.e., L’) and configured TDW length (i.e., L) are not configured, hopping interval is determined as a single slot, i.e., Rel-15/16 inter-slot frequency hopping can be reused.

The pros/cons of the 4 options are summarized as below

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Summary of pros/cons of the four options |
| Option 1 | Option 1 can explore hopping gain with two equal length hopping intervals, even when hopping interval is not configured, which potentially achieves balanced tradeoff between hopping diversity gain and DMRS bundling gain |
| Option 2 | Option 2 is the most natural extension of current agreement/specification. Option 2 can still explore hopping diversity gain if maximum < duration of all PUSCH/PUCCH repetitions. Option 2 cannot explore hopping diversity gain (while still maximizing DMRS bundling gain) if maximum > duration of all PUSCH/PUCCH repetitions.  |
| Option 3 | Option 3 is very similar to option 1. Based on analysis in R1-2201167, option 1 seems better than option 3.  |
| Option 4 | If hopping interval is not configuration Option 4 seems effectively disabling DMRS bundling, which seems an unnecessary outcome.  |

Given the pros/cons of the options and the number of companies supporting each option, FL recommend to focus on further discussion on option 1 and option 2 and remove option 3 and 4.

**FL Proposal 3: For the interaction between inter-slot frequency hopping and DMRS bundling for PUCCH/PUSCH repetitions, in the case of both** **frequency hopping interval and TDW length are not configured, down-selection from the following two options to determine the default frequency hopping interval for PUCCH/PUSCH repetitions**

* **Option 1: the default frequency hopping interval is half duration of PUCCH/PUSCH repetitions**
* **Option 2: the default frequency hopping interval is the default window length of the configured TDW**

Please provide comments, if any, to the above proposal in the following table.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Comments** |
| Vivo | Option 2. According to the agreements in RAN1#107 e-meeting, if hopping interval is not configured, the default frequency hopping interval equals the configured TDW length, and the default TDW length would be the minimum one between the maximum duration and duration of all PUSCH/PUCCH repetitions if TDW length is not configured, it is clear that the default frequency hopping interval is the default window length of the configured TDW.Moreover, if a certain hopping interval length is expected by NW, an explicit RRC configuration can be provided to UE. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | The motivation to support option 1 is not clear. If any gain can be achieved by Option 1, then a gNB can configure it directly. Therefore, option 2 is preferred. |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal in principle. For Option 1, we suggest to modify this as “the half of the default window length of the configured TDW”. Note that default window length of the configured TDW depends on both repetition duration and configured TDW duration. It would be good not to only limit this to repetition duration. Based on this, the Proposal 3 can be updated to **FL Proposal 3: For the interaction between inter-slot frequency hopping and DMRS bundling for PUCCH/PUSCH repetitions, in the case of both frequency hopping interval and TDW length are not configured, down-selection from the following two options to determine the default frequency hopping interval for PUCCH/PUSCH repetitions** * **Option 1: the default frequency hopping interval is half of the default window length of the configured TDW ~~duration of PUCCH/PUSCH repetitions~~**
* **Option 2: the default frequency hopping interval is the default window length of the configured TDW**
 |
| Samsung | The reason for supporting Option 1 is to be able to enhance performance by using frequency hopping when DM-RS bundling is enabled. |
| Nokia/NSB | Fully agree with vivo and Huawei/HiSilicon. We are not even sure this discussion is needed, since we have a default behavior for cTDW when this is not configured, and we have a default behavior for FH interval when this is not configured.  |
| Ericsson | Option 2 |
| China Telecom | Agree with vivo, Huawei and Nokia, we support Option 2. |
| Panasonic | We are fine with the proposal. Our preference is Option 2. We agree to the comment from vivo, Huawei and Nokia. |
| CMCC | Support option 2. Since we have an agreement on default FH interval, we should stick to the same spirit when both cTDW and FH intervals are not configured. For option 1, we can realize it through an explicit configuration. |
| ZTE | Support the proposal and prefer Option 1, which can ensure the diversity gain in case of DMRS bundling. This is an FFS point and we don’t think previous agreements can cover the case.  |
| Sharp | We are fine with the Intel’s proposal and prefer Option 1. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We prefer Option2, since we are in the same understanding with Vivo. |
| InterDigital | Prefer Option 2 and agree with comments from vivo/Huawei. |
| LG | Agree with Huawei/Hisilicon and Nokia/NSB. It is our understanding that it is only resultant of combination of two default behaviors which is naturally supported. |
| CATT | Support Option 2. Regarding to the missing hopping diversity gain when maximum duration < duration of all PUSCH/PUCCH repetitions, ‘both parameters absent’ is really a weird case. Why does the gNB omit a hopping interval according to the resource allocation and frame structure when pursuing the hopping diversity?  |
| Xiaomi | Support Option 2 |
| Spreadtrum | Support option 2 |
| WILUS | Between two options, we support at least the Intel’s version of Option 1.A UE would perform inter-slot FH when *frequencyHopping* in *PUSCH-Config* is configured as inter-slot and/or inter-slot frequency hopping among PUCCH transmissions when *interslotFrequencyHopping* in *PUCCH-Config* is configured as enabled. Thus, at least one FH should be guaranteed during PUSCH/PUCCH transmissions.Additionally, both Option 1 and Option 2 are meaningful when *PUSCH-DMRS-Bundling* or *PUCCH-DMRS-Bundling* is configured as enabled. By the way, frequency diversity via legacy inter-slot FH is more efficient since joint channel estimation would not be performed at gNB when *PUSCH-DMRS-Bundling* or *PUCCH-DMRS-Bundling* is configured as disable. Therefore, fallback to legacy inter-slot FH can be considered at least when *PUSCH-DMRS-Bundling* or *PUCCH-DMRS-Bundling* is configured as disable. It’s more backward compatible regarding that UE configured as no DMRS bundling should follow the same behavior with legacy UE. |

#### 3rd round of discussion

For proposal 3, Thank Sharp and ZTE to be flexible. The proposal is also slightly modified taking into account WILUS’s comment “Thus, we propose that selected one of three options is applied only when DMRS-Bundling is enabled”. Indeed, when DMRS bundling is disabled, the proposal should not apply.

FL Proposal 3: ~~For the interaction between~~ When both inter-slot frequency hopping and DMRS bundling are enabled for PUCCH/PUSCH repetitions, in the case of both frequency hopping interval and TDW length are not configured, option 2 is adopted to determine the default frequency hopping interval for PUCCH/PUSCH repetitions

* Option 2: the default frequency hopping interval is the default window length of the configured TDW

Supported by (15): VIVO, Huawei/HiSi, Nokia/NSB, Ericsson, CT, Panasonic, CMCC, DCM, Interdigital, LG, CATT, Xiaomi, Spreadtrum, ZTE (can live with it), Sharp (can live with it)

Objected by (2): Intel, Samsung, OPPO

Intel suggested the following proposal:

* When both inter-slot frequency hopping and DMRS bundling are enabled for PUCCH/PUSCH repetitions, UE is expected to be configured with at least one of frequency hopping interval and TDW length.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Comment** |
| FL | @all, Please check the above proposal and add comments, if any. Please also check if Intel’s proposal is agreeable, if no consensus can be achieved.  |
| OPPO | We are fine with the way forward. Thanks. |
| Panasonic | We support the FL proposal 3. The Intel’s suggested proposal is acceptable if no consensus can be achieved. |
| Intel | We are fine with the following proposal. We do not think Option 2 is reasonable design as this simply indicates frequency hopping is disabled. When both inter-slot frequency hopping and DMRS bundling are enabled for PUCCH/PUSCH repetitions, UE is expected to be configured with at least one of frequency hopping interval and TDW length. |
| CATT | Support Option 2 and can live with Intel’s proposal. |

## Other proposals

OPPO Proposal 2: Time domain windows for bundling PUCCH DM-RS is to be moved from 6.1.7 38.214 to 38.213.

Panasonic Proposal 6: The value “1” of frequency hopping interval can be added with the condition that it is supported only for PUSCH repetition Type B or sub-slot-based PUCCH repetition.

CMCC Proposal 1: The details and the differences between the slot-based and sub-slot-based repetition may still need more discussion.

LG Proposal 4: The bundle size can be same as or different from the time domain window size.

WILUS Proposal 2: Following methods can be further considered to maximize the gain of joint channel estimation in case of both hopping interval (i.e., L’) and configured TDW length (i.e., L) are configured:

* + Alt 1: A UE does not expect to be configured as hopping interval (i.e., L’) > configured TDW length (i.e., L).
	+ Alt 2: Hopping interval (i.e., L’) is used for determination of configured TDW length if configured hopping interval value of L’ is larger than configured TDW length value of L.

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Comment** |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# 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 2/22 GTW

The two options to count relative slot index are listed as following, and illustrated by Figure 1.

* Option A: frequency hopping pattern is determined based on relative slot index. Relative slot 0 is the slot where PUCCH/PUSCH repetition starts. Each of the subsequent slots are counted and relative slot index increase by one **regardless** the slot is used to transmit PUCCH/PUSCH or not.
* Option B: frequency hopping pattern is determined based on relative slot index. Relative slot 0 is the slot where PUCCH/PUSCH repetition starts. One of the subsequent slots are counted and the slot index increase by one **only if** the slot is used to transmit PUCCH/PUSCH.

****

The following is Rel-15 specification regarding inter-slot frequency hopping for PUCCH

- if the UE is configured to perform frequency hopping for PUCCH transmissions across different slots

- the UE performs frequency hopping per slot

- 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

- the UE does not expect to be configured to perform frequency hopping for a PUCCH transmission within a slot

FL Observation: Rel-15/16 PUCCH frequency hopping is based on relative slot index – option A.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Comment** |
| FL | @WILUS, please check the above Rel-15 spec and hope it is clear that relative slot index – option A is the Rel-15/16 behavior for PUCCH frequency hopping.  |
| Apple | Support |
| Vivo | support |
| Panasonic | Support |
| Intel | Agree |
| WILUS | We checked that current specification is aligned with relative slot index – Option A. Sorry for confusion. |
| CATT | Support. Option A shall be the correct understanding, literally. |
| CMCC | Agree. |
| LG | Support. |
| ZTE | Support |

FL proposal 1a: Inter-slot frequency hopping pattern for PUSCH repetitions with DMRS bundling is determined based on

* Option 1: physical slot index

Supported by (16): VIVO, Huawei/HiSi, Intel, Samsung, QC, Ericsson, Panasonic, CMCC, ZTE, Sharp, DCM, LG, CATT, Xiaomi, Spreadtrum, WILUS

* ~~Option 2: relative slot index – option A~~

Supported by (4): Nokia/NSB (2nd preference), Panasonic, ZTE, Apple

* ~~Option 3: relative slot index – option B~~

Supported by (1): Nokia/NSB (1st preference)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Comment** |
| Apple | In current spec, we have a bit different UE behavior/specification between PUCCH and PUSCH for FH pattern determination (respectively given by 38.213 Clause 9.2.6 and 38.214 Clause 6.3.1). While in **R15/16 “without DMRS bundling and per slot hopping”** this slight difference in specification for FH pattern determination makes no difference at neither system performance nor UE implementation’s complexity, we cannot take similar procedure in R17 and going with different procedures for PUCCH and PUSCH for FH pattern determination. FH pattern based on physical slot index hurst system performance, since we may end up with more hopping (without more diversity gain) and definitely less DMRS bundling gain. Needless to say, physical slot index also impacts UE’s implementation as more hopping may be needed. Given that FH pattern based on physical index for DMRS bundling in R17 is not justified, and we support a unified solution for both PUCCH and PUSCH, we only support Option 2. |
| Nokia/NSB | Our preference is for Option 2 – Option A for both PUSCH and PUCCH.However, given the current situation, we also suggest a middle ground solution, which is to reuse Rel-16 mechanisms and agree on using physical slot index for determining the inter-slot FH pattern for PUSCH and relative slot index for determining the inter-slot FH pattern for PUCCH. For this reason, would it be possible to combine FL proposal 1a and FL proposal 1b into one proposal?The rationale of this suggestion is that we already know that inter-slot FH for PUCCH without DM-RS bundling uses relative slot index in Rel-17. We are not comfortable with the idea of having the same channel following two different FH pattern determination logics depending on whether DM-RS bundling is enabled or not. This complicates the scheduling at NW side with no evident and consistently measurable technical advantage. |
| Vivo | Support |
| Panasonic | We are fine with either Option 1 or Option 2 at the end. To have the decision that the frequency hopping interval supports the length aligned with dl-UL-TransmissionPeriodicity (e.g., 5 and 10) is more important. Then, unaligned hopping pattern in TDD, which we think the critical issue, can be avoided. For FDD, regardless of relative or physical slot, proper gNB scheduling can manage the difference well as the argument for MU-MIMO or resource fragmentation. The alignment with Rel.15/16 or the alignment between PUCCH/PUSCH is the matter of the preference. Therefore, considering the situation of the majority, we prefer to determine Option 1 for PUSCH. |
| Intel | We are fine with the Proposal. We share similar view as Nokia on the extension of Rel-15/16 mechanism for frequency hopping pattern, which would help reduce implementation effort, i.e., for PUSCH repetition, frequency hopping pattern is determined based on physical slot index. For PUCCH repetition, frequency hopping pattern is determined based on relative physical slot index  |
| WILUS | Support |
| Apple2 | To Intel/Nokia/NSB:I am a bit puzzled by referring to R15/16 design for R17 PUSCH FH pattern, something like “We are not comfortable with the idea of having the same channel following two different FH pattern determination logics depending on whether DM-RS bundling is enabled or not.” Note that anyway we are asking a new UE behavior for DMRS bundling and FH in R17! Keeping phase continuity for DMRS bundling is a new procedure; Sticking with physical index brings no advantage to reduce “implementation effort”. Indeed, as explained before, it definitely increases implementation, and reduces JCE gain. |
| CATT | Option 1. Not plan to repeat the reasons, as already listed in Section 4.2. |
| Ericsson | Support |
| CMCC | Support. |
| Sharp | Support |
| China Telecom | Support. |
| Samsung | Support physical slot index for PUSCH. |
| Nokia/NSB2 | @Apple: there is a misunderstanding. We agree with you on the high-level principles and prefer going for Option 2 (A) for both PUSCH and PUCCH, since this helps performance. However, reality is that we need to work together as a group and Option 2 (A) is preferred only by very few companies. Given this assessment, we believe that using physical slots for both PUSCH and PUCCH when DM-RS bundling is enabled is much more detrimental than keeping legacy R15/R16 logics related to which slot indexing to use for FH determination for PUSCH and PUCCH. Hence, reusing such logics in R17, regardless of whether DM-RS bundling is enabled or not is the best middle ground in our view.@FL: we would like to ask a second question (the first one is about the merge of Proposal 1a and Proposal 1b). You said that if we cannot converge in this discussion, then it means that inter-slot FH for DM/RS bundling is incomplete. Wouldn’t you say that the natural outcome would instead be that the legacy logics related to which slot indexing to use for FH determination for PUSCH and PUCCH are reused, with trivial extension to allow FH interval larger than 1? After all we already agreed that inter-slot FH with DM-RS bundling is supported, and we do have an existing FH logic in the spec, why wouldn’t this be naturally reused, if no further agreement in RAN1 revises it? |
| LG | Support. And for the “strive for common design of PUSCH and PUCCH with inter-slot frequency hopping” as agreed, it should be applied for both of PUSCH and PUCCH. |
| ZTE | Fine with the proposal. We share similar view that Option 2 could provide more balanced FH interval and therefore better performance. Option 1 can provide better multiplexing benefits while multiplexing is not that important compared to performance in this WI. On the other hand, as a group, we can also be fine with Option 1. We fully support Nokia’s proposal to reuse Rel-15/16 mechanisms for both PUSCH and PUCCH.  |
| QC | Support. Don’t have much to add. |
| DOCOMO | Fine with the proposal. |
| OPPO | We general supportive to use physical slot index for PUCCH hopping pattern. Agree the updated proposal.No really convinced if there is any really problem of implementation if the FH is based on physical slot.  |

FL proposal 1b: Inter-slot frequency hopping pattern for PUCCH repetitions with DMRS bundling is determined based on down-selection (in RAN1#108e) between option 1 and option 2

* Option 1: physical slot index

Supported by (11): VIVO, QC, Ericsson, CT (1st preference), Panasonic, Sharp, DCM(2nd preference), LG, CATT (1st preference), Xiaomi (1st preference), Spreadtrum

* Option 2: relative slot index – option A

Supported by (11): VIVO, Huawei/HiSi, Intel, Samsung, Nokia/NSB (2nd preference), CT (2nd preference), Panasonic, ZTE, DCM (1st preference), CATT (2nd preference), Xiaomi (2nd preference)

* ~~Option 3: relative slot index – option B~~

Supported by: Nokia/NSB (1st preference), CMCC, WILUS

Note: Option A/B for relative slot index are defined as the following

* Option A: frequency hopping pattern is determined based on relative slot index. Relative slot 0 is the slot where PUCCH/PUSCH repetition starts. Each of the subsequent slots are counted and relative slot index increase by one regardless the slot is used to transmit PUCCH/PUSCH or not.
* Option B: frequency hopping pattern is determined based on relative slot index. Relative slot 0 is the slot where PUCCH/PUSCH repetition starts. One of the subsequent slots are counted and the slot index increase by one only if the slot is used to transmit PUCCH/PUSCH.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Comment** |
| Apple | Option 2 (see comments above) |
| Nokia/NSB | Please see our comments to FL proposal 1a |
| vivo | Support.Prefer Relative slot index-option A, and we are also fine with frequency hopping based on physical slot index. |
| Panasonic | If Option 1 is supported for PUSCH repetition, either Option 1 or Option 2 is fine. Option 1 allows the alignment between PUCCH and PUSCH. Option 2 allows the alignment with Rel.15/16. If Option 2 is supported for PUSCH, Option 2 is also supported for PUCCH for the alignment between PUCCH and PUSCH. |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal and okay for down-selection between Option 1 and Option 2 in this meeting. Our preference is Option 2, based on same reason as mentioned above.  |
| WILUS | We are fine with the FL’s proposal and prefer Option 2. |
| CATT | Option 1 as 1st preference. Can live with Option 2-Opton A if it helps move forward. |
| Ericsson | Support. We have concerns with Option 2, since it does not align well with TDD patterns and/or TDWs, such that hops either break up a TDW or there is an unbalanced number of hops. |
| CMCC | We are fine with this proposal and the option2 is preferred, which is close to the legacy FH of PUCCH . |
| Shrap | Support |
| China Telecom | Support. |
| Samsung | Support relative slot index for PUCCH. |
| LG | Fine for the down-selection and our preference is option 1. |
| ZTE | Support Option 2. Prefer a joint proposal for both PUSCH and PUCCH.  |
| QC | Okay to downselect. Common design preferred across PUSCH and PUCCH. |
| DOCOMO | Fine with the proposal. |
| OPPO | We support the proposal.Back to the interpreting of Rel15, it is also clear the hopping is based on physical slot with the number of repetition is counted by relative slots. I guess, the confusion may be from they use “n slots” in description of hopping. But the even/odd slots means physical number. So Option A is clear for Rel15.Regarding preference we prefer the Option1 which is physical slot, we don’t see problem of TDD UL/DL configuration. As those are semi-static configured and generally not more than 10 slot periodicity, we can allow are larger hopping interval to cover it. We can live with Opton2. However, we would like more unified solution for PUSCH and PUCCH and avoid Rel-15 mistake. |

FL proposal 1c:

* Value range for PUSCH-Frequencyhopping-Interval is “{~~1~~, 2, 3, 4, 5, [6], [7], [8], 10, [12], [14], [16], [20]}”

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Comment** |
| Nokia/NSB | May we know why the value 3 is included in the list? Can the proponents explain in which practically relevant use case this could be useful? We are not aware of any practically relevant, or tested, slot structure with 3 (or multiple of 3) consecutive U slots. 8 could be included in the list without square brackets. Decision on values larger than 10 should be conditioned on RAN4’s input on the max time duration for DM-RS bundling. |
| Vivo | Generally fine. Maybe we can make the uncontroversial value range as a starting point, which seems {2,4,5,10}. |
| Panasonic | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal in principle. We are also not sure why 3 is included.  |
| CATT | Try to understand the reason to include 3, 12, 14, which are not commonly used. |
| Ericsson | RAN4 are studying maximum durations of 5, 8, 16 and 32 slots. As we show above, 8 slots is useful for 4 repetitions even for TDD. So that value should not be bracketed. In general, the bracketed values except for 20 seem to be half of the number of repetitions, which seems useful for FDD. Why are the brackets needed?Regarding the value of 3, 6 repetitions is supported for Rep Type A, and so that seems reasonable at least for FDD.Moreover, the design process feels a bit adhoc here. Is there some reason that all values from 2 to 20 are not included? |
| CMCC | Generally fine but have some concern about {3} {7} {12}, the using scenario is not very clear.  |
| Sharp | We are fine with the proposal |
| China Telecom | Generally fine. |
| Samsung | It is unclear why some values are used and also the fine granularity. Values equal to half the number of repetitions can be used.  |
| LG | Agree with the removal of value 1. However considering the default value of frequency hopping interval is the length of configured TDW, we think at least all of configured TDW lengths should be included. |
| ZTE | Ok with the proposal.  |
| QC | Current list seems okay to us. 8 seems to be a good candidate for addition (from a FDD perspective.) |
| DOCOMO | Fine with the proposal. |
| OPPO | Fine with that. |

FL proposal 1d:

* Value range for PUCCH-Frequencyhopping-Interval is “{~~1~~, 2, 4, 5, [8],10}”

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Comment** |
| Nokia/NSB | 8 could be included in the list without square brackets. Suggest adding [12], [14], [16], [20] until input from RAN4 on max time time duration for DM-RS bundling is received. Not, in fact, that no differentiation between PUSCH and PUCCH is considered in that context.  |
| Vivo | Fine. |
| Panasonic | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal. We do not think additional values are needed.  |
| CATT | Fine. |
| Ericsson | Agree with Nokia, and would go a step further. Again, we do we exclude certain values when we don’t know if they are useful? |
| CMCC | The motivation we proposed to add {1}and {8} is that gNB can indicate DMRS bundling disabled or frequency hopping disabled implicitly. Since majority think it may lead to some ambiguity, maybe the value range could be {2, 4, 5, 10}. |
| Sharp | We are fine with the proposal because we prefer Option 1 in FL proposal 1b.However, if inter-slot frequency hopping with DMRS bundling for PUCCH is determined by relative slot index (Option 2), 5 and 10 are unnecessary because the hopping pattern depends on the starting slot of PUCCH repetition and cannot be aligned with TDD pattern. |
| China Telecom | Generally fine. |
| Samsung | It could be used only {2,4}. |
| LG | Same comment as proposal 1c. |
| ZTE | OK with the proposal.  |
| QC | Okay with the proposal. Good to keep the list short. |
| DOCOMO | Fine with the proposal. |
| OPPO | If the PUCCH is also counted based on physical slot, we prefer to have larger value up to 20, as proposed by Nokia. |

FL Proposed conclusion 1: For frequency hopping for PUCCH/PUSCH repetitions with DMRS bundling, in Rel-17, there is no consensus to increase the number of frequency offset over what are supported in Rel-15/16.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Comment** |
| Nokia/NSB | Support |
| vivo | Support |
| Panasonic | We are fine with the proposed conclusion. |
| Intel | Support |
| WILUS | Support |
| CATT | Support. |
| Ericsson | We will not object, despite the significant benefit that additional hopping offsets bring. |
| CMCC | Support. |
| Sharp | Support |
| China Telecom | Support. |
| Samsung | OK |
| LG | Support. |
| ZTE | Support |
| DOCOMO | Fine with the proposal. |
| OPPO | OK |

FL proposal 2: Update the following agreement made in RAN1 107bis-e as below

Agreement

PUCCH repetitions with different sets of power control parameters in multi-TRP operation should be regarded as a ~~[~~semi-static~~]~~ event that causes power consistency and phase continuity not to be maintained across PUCCH repetitions.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Comment** |
| Nokia/NSB | Support |
| vivo | Support |
| Panasonic | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Intel | Support |
| CATT | Support. |
| Ericsson | Support |
| CMCC | Support. |
| Sharp | Support |
| China Telecom | Support. |
| Samsung | OK |
| LG | Support. |
| ZTE | Support |
| OPPO | OK |

FL Proposal 3: For the interaction between inter-slot frequency hopping and DMRS bundling for PUCCH/PUSCH repetitions, in the case of both frequency hopping interval and TDW length are not configured, option 2 is adopted to determine the default frequency hopping interval for PUCCH/PUSCH repetitions

* ~~Option 1: the default frequency hopping interval is half duration of PUCCH/PUSCH repetitions~~

Supported by (3): Samsung, ZTE, Sharp

* Option 2: the default frequency hopping interval is the default window length of the configured TDW

Supported by (13): VIVO, Huawei/HiSi, Nokia/NSB, Ericsson, CT, Panasonic, CMCC, DCM, Interdigital, LG, CATT, Xiaomi, Spreadtrum,

* ~~Option 3: the default frequency hopping interval is~~ ~~half of default window length of the configured TDW~~

Supported by (3): Intel, Sharp, WILUS

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company name** | **Comment** |
| Nokia/NSB | Support |
| vivo | Support |
| Panasonic | We support the proposal. |
| Intel | We do not support the proposal. If we support Option 2, this indicates that inter-slot frequency hopping is disabled when both frequency hopping interval and TDW length are not configured. This is unnecessary restriction on the configuration of hopping interval, which means that hopping interval needs to be configured in order to support inter-slot frequency hopping with inter-slot bundling. If consensus is not reached, we suggest the following:* UE is expected to be configured with at least one of frequency hopping interval and TDW length.
 |
| WILUS | With Option 2, frequency hopping can be performed only if maximum duration is smaller than duration of all PUSCH/PUCCH repetitions. Since UE is configured to perform inter-slot FH, it’s reasonable to guarantee frequency hopping at least once during PUSCH/PUCCH transmissions. On top of listed three options, UE behavior should be clarified when DMRS-Bundling is configured as disabled. In this case, fallback to legacy inter-slot FH is efficient for frequency diversity gain. Thus, we propose that selected one of three options is applied only when DMRS-Bundling is enabled. |
| CATT | Support. There is no issue at all. Let’s just not assume the gNB is too lazy to forget configuring neither frequency hopping interval nor configured TDW length. |
| Ericsson | Support |
| CMCC | Support.Since we have an agreement on default FH interval, we should stick to the same spirit when both cTDW and FH intervals are not configured. For option 1, we can realize it through an explicit configuration. |
| Sharp | We are OK to go with the majority |
| China Telecom | Support. |
| Samsung | Don’t support the proposal. If there is no configuration, it should be simply used half the number of repetitions not a default value of another parameter that is not configured hat implies not using frequency hopping. Hence, we support Option 1. |
| LG | Support. |
| ZTE | For sake of progress, we can live with the proposal.  |
| QC | Okay to go with majority. |
| DOCOMO | Fine with the proposal. |
| OPPO | We don’t support, We are fine to consider Samsung’s proposal, or we can mandate a TDW configuration by intel. |

# Proposals for 2/24 GTW

The situation did not change in the second round of discussion. FL thank Nokia for the suggestion to bundle proposal 1a and 1b. However, given proposal 1a is much more stable than proposal 1b (which is almost equal split), it is better to keep the two proposal separately discussed to make progress step by step.

FL proposal 1a: Inter-slot frequency hopping pattern for PUSCH repetitions with DMRS bundling is determined based on

* Option 1: physical slot index

Supported by (16): VIVO, Huawei/HiSi, Intel, Samsung, QC, Ericsson, Panasonic, CMCC, ZTE, Sharp, DCM, LG, CATT, Xiaomi, Spreadtrum, WILUS

* ~~Option 2: relative slot index – option A~~

Supported by (4): Nokia/NSB (2nd preference), Panasonic, ZTE, Apple

* ~~Option 3: relative slot index – option B~~

Supported by (1): Nokia/NSB (1st preference)

FL proposal 1b: Inter-slot frequency hopping pattern for PUCCH repetitions with DMRS bundling is determined based on down-selection (in RAN1#108e) between option 1 and option 2

* Option 1: physical slot index

Supported by (11): VIVO, QC, Ericsson, CT (1st preference), Panasonic, Sharp, DCM(2nd preference), LG, CATT (1st preference), Xiaomi (1st preference), Spreadtrum

* Option 2: relative slot index – option A

Supported by (12): VIVO, Huawei/HiSi, Intel, Samsung, Nokia/NSB (2nd preference), CT (2nd preference), Panasonic, ZTE, DCM (1st preference), CATT (2nd preference), Xiaomi (2nd preference), Apple

* ~~Option 3: relative slot index – option B~~

Supported by: Nokia/NSB (1st preference), CMCC, WILUS

Note: Option A/B for relative slot index are defined as the following

* Option A: frequency hopping pattern is determined based on relative slot index. Relative slot 0 is the slot where PUCCH/PUSCH repetition starts. Each of the subsequent slots are counted and relative slot index increase by one regardless the slot is used to transmit PUCCH/PUSCH or not.
* Option B: frequency hopping pattern is determined based on relative slot index. Relative slot 0 is the slot where PUCCH/PUSCH repetition starts. One of the subsequent slots are counted and the slot index increase by one only if the slot is used to transmit PUCCH/PUSCH.

FL proposal 1c:

* Values ~~range~~ for PUSCH-Frequencyhopping-Interval is “{~~1~~, 2, [3], 4, 5, [6], [7], ~~[~~8~~]~~, 10, [12], [14], [16], [20]}”

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| FL  | @Samsung, “3” is proposed in Samsung Tdoc. Originally, I also thought 3 is for 6 repetitions in FDD (As Ericsson commented). But now I checked RRC parameter spreadsheet, it seems the # repetitions allowed for Rel-17 PUSCH rep type A are “1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 12, 16, 20, 24, 28, 32”. So I put “3” with []. Hope Samsung can clarify why “3” is needed. @Samsung, “7” is proposed in Samsung Tdoc. Please also provide some justification why “7” is needed. @all, based on comments, it seems multiple companies think 8 is a good candidate to support, at least for FDD. So I removed the [] around 8. @all, for values 6, 12, 14, 16, proponents please comment why they are needed. But FL’s understanding is that they are for repetition factor 12, 24, 28, 32, in FDD For value 20, it is FL’s understanding that it is for TDD with for example DDDSUDDSUU pattern with 8 repetitions configured. Please check if the above explanation justifies 6, 12, 14, 16, and 20. If no objection, I will remove [] around them in next round updated proposal.  |
| Samsung | @FL – we are fine with excluding 3,7.  |

For proposal 1d, indeed, the values for PUCCH-Frequencyhopping-Interval depends on which option we take for PUCCH hopping with DMRS bundling. FL suggest to put the discussion on hold for a little while, until the down selection is done. Given the urgency to finalize RRC parameters, FL hope companies can be more flexible to make the down-selection sooner.

For proposal 3, Thank Sharp and ZTE to be flexible. The proposal is also slightly modified taking into account WILUS’s comment “Thus, we propose that selected one of three options is applied only when DMRS-Bundling is enabled”. Indeed, when DMRS bundling is disabled, the proposal should not apply.

FL Proposal 3: ~~For the interaction between~~ When both inter-slot frequency hopping and DMRS bundling are enabled for PUCCH/PUSCH repetitions, in the case of both frequency hopping interval and TDW length are not configured, option 2 is adopted to determine the default frequency hopping interval for PUCCH/PUSCH repetitions

* Option 2: the default frequency hopping interval is the default window length of the configured TDW

Supported by (15): VIVO, Huawei/HiSi, Nokia/NSB, Ericsson, CT, Panasonic, CMCC, DCM, Interdigital, LG, CATT, Xiaomi, Spreadtrum, ZTE (can live with it), Sharp (can live with it)

Objected by (2): Intel, Samsung, OPPO

Intel suggested the following proposal:

* When both inter-slot frequency hopping and DMRS bundling are enabled for PUCCH/PUSCH repetitions, UE is expected to be configured with at least one of frequency hopping interval and TDW length.
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