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# 1. Introduction

This paper is to trigger the following email discussion for IDC TDM solutions:

* [Post119-e][651][IDC] Comparison of TDM solutions (Xiaomi)

      Scope: Analyse the details of following TDM candidate solutions, and compare solutions , e.g. applied scenarios (e.g. BT voice, BT eSCO and WLAN beacon), complexity, etc;

* DRX solution;
* MUSIM gap like solution;
* UL and/or DL transmission occasion(s);
* Autonomous denial solution;

Intended outcome: Report to RAN2#120

Deadline:  Nov 3rd (Rapporteur may introduce intermediate deadlines, but no deadline during an inactive period, and no deadline in the period from Submisssion deadline to EOM of R2-119bis).

The guidance provided by the Chair is quoted below:

|  |
| --- |
| Extra Long email discussions after R2-119-e, for R2-120, Deadline: Nov 3rd  Outcome tdocs for long email discussions shall be submitted to RAN2 120-e (Nov meeting). Please request tdoc numbers as for any other input tdoc to next meeting, i.e. by 3GU.  NOTE that these discussions shall consider the duration of R2 119bis-e to be an inactive period (in addition to the general 3GPP inactive periods). |

To facilitate the discussion as indicated above, the rapporteur would like to split the discussion into the following two phases. The intention is to understand how the candidate solution would work before comparing the solution with other candidates.

|  |
| --- |
| **Phase-1 discussion:**  Scope: Analyse the details of the following TDM candidate solutions:   * DRX solution; * MUSIM gap like solution; * UL and/or DL transmission occasion(s); * Autonomous denial solution;   Intended outcome: The solution details (e.g. specification impacts) from the Phase-1 discussion are to be provided based on the companies’ feedbacks. The solution details provided via Phase-1 discussion will be used as the baseline for further polishment if the solution is adopted in the Rel-18 IDC.  Deadline for the Phase-1 discussion: Sept 23rd 00:30 AM UTC. |
| **Phase-2 discussion:**  The phase-2 discussion will be kicked off once the solutions details (e.g. specification impacts) provided from the Phase-1 discussion are relatively stable.  Scope: Based on the solution details provided by the Phase-1 discussion, compare solutions, e.g. applied scenarios (e.g. BT voice, BT eSCO and WLAN beacon), complexity, etc. Selection of TDM solutions to be specified in Rel-18.  Deadline for the Phase-2 discussion: Nov 3rd 00:30 AM UTC. |

## 1.1 Contacts

Contact person for each participating company:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Name | Email Address |
| Xiaomi | Yumin Wu | wuyumin@xiaomi.com |
| Ericsson | Henrik Enbuske | henrik.enbuske@ericsson.com |
| Intel | Yujian Zhang | yujian.zhang@intel.com |
| Nokia | Jarkko Koskela | Jarkko.t.koskela@nokia.com |
| Samsung | Weiwei Wang | ww1016.wang@samsung.com |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Jagdeep Singh | jagdeep.singh6@huawei.com |
| Qualcomm | Sherif ElAzzouni | selazzou@qti.qualcomm.com |
| LGE | Hanseul Hong | hanseul.hong@lge.com |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# 2. Phase-1 discussion

|  |
| --- |
| **Phase-1 discussion:**  Scope: Analyse the details of the following TDM candidate solutions:   * DRX solution; * MUSIM gap like solution; * UL and/or DL transmission occasion(s); * Autonomous denial solution;   Intended outcome: The solution details (e.g. specification impacts) from the Phase-1 discussion are to be provided based on the companies’ feedbacks. The solution details provided via Phase-1 discussion will be used as the baseline for further polishment if the solution is adopted in the Rel-18 IDC.  Deadline for the Phase-1 discussion: Sept 23rd 00:30 AM UTC. |

## 2.1 DRX solution

The LTE DRX solution is quoted as follows:

|  |
| --- |
| **Procedure:**  Step 1: The eNB indicates whether the IDC reporting for TDM assistance information is allowed.  Step 2: When detecting the IDC issue, the UE reports the DRX assistance information for the affected frequencies. The TDM assistance information uses the MCG as timing reference. The DRX assistance information includes: *drx-CycleLength*, *drx-Offset* and *drx-ActiveTime* in the granularity of subframe. |
| **ASN.1 signaling:**  Step 1: Network configuration  idc-Indication-r11 ENUMERATED {setup} OPTIONAL, -- Need OR  Step 2: UE reporting signaling  drx-AssistanceInfo-r11 SEQUENCE {  drx-CycleLength-r11 ENUMERATED {sf40, sf64, sf80, sf128, sf160,  sf256, spare2, spare1},  drx-Offset-r11 INTEGER (0..255) OPTIONAL,  drx-ActiveTime-r11 ENUMERATED {sf20, sf30, sf40, sf60, sf80,  sf100, spare2, spare1}  }, |

The candidate DRX solution for NR is as follows:

**Option 1: (By using the LTE DRX solution as the baseline)**

|  |
| --- |
| **Procedure:**  Step 1: The gNB indicates whether the IDC reporting for TDM assistance information is allowed.  Step 2: When detecting the IDC issue, the UE reports the DRX assistance information for the affected frequencies. The TDM assistance information uses the MCG as timing reference. The DRX assistance information includes: *drx-LongCycleStartOffset* including *drx-LongCycle* and *drx-StartOffset* in the granularity of ms, *drx-SlotOffset* in the granularity of 1/32 ms (subMilliSeconds), and *drx-ActiveTime* in the granularity of ms or 1/32 ms (subMilliSeconds). |
| **ASN.1 signaling example:**  Step 1: Network configuration  idc-TDM-Indication-r18 ENUMERATED {setup} OPTIONAL, -- Need R  Step 2: UE reporting signaling  DRX-AssistanceInfo-r18 ::= SEQUENCE {  drx-LongCycleStartOffset CHOICE {  ms10 INTEGER(0..9),  ms20 INTEGER(0..19),  ms32 INTEGER(0..31),  ms40 INTEGER(0..39),  ms60 INTEGER(0..59),  ms64 INTEGER(0..63),  ms70 INTEGER(0..69),  ms80 INTEGER(0..79),  ms128 INTEGER(0..127),  ms160 INTEGER(0..159),  ms256 INTEGER(0..255),  ms320 INTEGER(0..319),  ms512 INTEGER(0..511),  ms640 INTEGER(0..639),  ms1024 INTEGER(0..1023),  ms1280 INTEGER(0..1279),  ms2048 INTEGER(0..2047),  ms2560 INTEGER(0..2559),  ms5120 INTEGER(0..5119),  ms10240 INTEGER(0..10239)  },  drx-SlotOffset INTEGER (0..31),  drx-ActiveTime-r18 CHOICE {  subMilliSeconds INTEGER (1..31),  milliSeconds ENUMERATED {ms1, ms2, ms3, ms4, ms5, ms6, ms8, ms10, ms20, ms30, ms40, ms50, ms60, ms80, ms100, ms200, ms300, ms400, ms500, ms600, ms800, ms1000, ms1200, ms1600, spare8, spare7, spare6, spare5, spare4, spare3, spare2, spare1 }  }  } |

#### Task 1: Please provide your suggested modification for above Option 1 or other options for the DRX solution for NR.

(Rapporteur’s comment: Please provide the changes for the above option or other options in the “Comments” column. The ASN.1 signaling example provided above is to be polished further while drafting the CR. Companies can provide FFS for specific technical points. However the increasing number of FFS(s) could also cause the dropping of the solution due to the very limted TU for the Rel-18 IDC work.)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| ZTE | Generally agree, but we don’t think the slot offset with 1/32ms granularity is necessary. |
| Ericsson | It seems that the rapporteur has simply copied from the IE DRX-Config, and removed field which the UE shall not have an opinion about. This looks like a decent starting-point. |
| Intel | Generally OK with Option 1.  For the UE report signalling, our understanding is that we can use the values in LTE signalling (e.g. DRX cycle length in the range of 40 ms ~ 256 ms) as baseline. The reason is that the LTE signalling values are selected based on coexistence scenarios (clause 4.2 of TR 36.816), and were agreed in email discussion “[79#33] [LTE/IDC] IDC Open issues” (R2-124404).  We also agree with ZTE that slot offset is not necessary. |
| Nokia | For general understanding it would be good also to describe a bit about expected NW behaviour with these solutions. With this particular approach (DRX solution) NW tries not to schedule outside active time preferred by the UE.  As a generic comment on TDD approaches (drx, musim, harq) there would need to be capability in the UE to get timing information between ISM modem and 3GPP radio(s). IF that kind of capability is not present in the UE they really cannot support any TDD approach.  For this particular solution proposed solution would seem feasible baseline – of course we can consider in detail possible value ranges for parameters. |
| Samsung | As one of options, we generally fine with the modification above for option 1. Moreover, option 1 allows more fine granularity on the time domain than option 2, which is aligned with the NR design.  We understand that down-selection will be carried out in Phase 2. However, Option 1 and option 2 have some similarity as below   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **Option 1** | **Option 2** | **Comments** | | drx-LongCycleStartOffset | idc-GapRepetitionAndOffset-r17 | Option 1 has more values | | drx-SlotOffset |  | Option1 gives fine granularity of start | | drx-ActiveTime-r18 | idc-GapLength-r17 | Option 1 gives fine granularity of time length | |  | musim-Starting-SFN-AndSubframe-r17 | Option 2 can support aperiodic case. |   It can be observed that option 1 can provide more fine granularity than option 2 in terms of starting offset and time length. The missing part of option 1 is the support of aperiodic case.  In our understanding, the TDM assistant information aims at helping the TDM configuration from the network side. In LTE, the DRX assistant information for IDC helps network configure the DRX to adapt to IDC problem. In NR, the network may have two meanings to configure the TDM, i.e., DRX, and MUSIM-gap. That’s why we have a discussion on option 1 and option 2. However, essentially, the key issue of TDM solution is how to indicate a time pattern which can help network generate the TDM configuration. Compared to LTE, the big difference is fine granularity of time domain. Thus, we think a TDM solution applicable for NR should be the one providing fine granularity of time, no matter what kind name is used in the assistant information.  In this sense, a generalized solution harmolizing option 1 and option 2 would be preferred, which can include the following three parameters:   * IDC-CycleStartOffset * IDC-slotoffset: the value can be same as drx-SlotOffset * IDC-ActiveTimeLength, which indicates the time length used for NR module, and the value can be same as drx-ActiveTime-r18   After providing the above assistant information, the gNB can configure either DRX or MUSIM gap to the UE to avoid the IDC problem.  In summary, we prefer to **a generalized solution containing three parameters, i.e., IDC-CycleStartOffset, IDC-slotoffset, and IDC-ActiveTimeLength, with fine granularity**.  For the support of aperiodic case, we may need clarify the benefit first. Do we consider some cases that ISM module has some short-term traffic?Maybe we can discuss **the support of aperiodic case in phase2**.  In addition, we **suggest that this discussion should cover the topic on whether multiple TDM assistant information can be reported to the network** since Rel-18 considers the MR-DC case. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We agree that the signalling details described above can be considered as the baseline for DRX based solution. Furthermore, our view is that DRX-based TDM solution has been well designed in LTE and we don't see any issue to apply it in NR and should be considered with highest priority. |
| Qualcomm | Agree with the proposed baseline for DRX. The specific values can be worked out later if the solution is agreed to depending on IDC needs. |
| LGE | Fine with Option 1 in general as a starting point. The signalling details can be further discussed later after the down selection. |
|  |  |

## 2.2 MUSIM gap like solution

The Rel-17 MUSIM gap solution is quoted as follows:

|  |
| --- |
| **Procedure:**  Step 1: The gNB indicates whether the MUSIM reporting for gap assistance information is allowed. And a prohibit timer is provided for gap assistance information .  Step 2: When detecting the need for gap for MUSIM, the UE reports its preferred gap configuration when the prohibit timer is not running.  If the UE prefers periodic gap, the preferred gap configuration includes *musim-GapPreferenceList* with an entry for each periodic gap. Each peridodic gap configuration includes *musim-GapLength* and *musim-GapRepetitionAndOffset* including the gap repetition period and the gap offset in the granularity of ms.  If the UE prefers aperiodic gap, the preferred gap configuration includes *musim-GapPreferenceList* with an entry for each aperiodic gap. Each aperidodic gap configuration includes *musim-GapLength* in the granularity of ms and *musim-Starting-SFN-AndSubframe* including *starting-SFN* in the granularity of SFN and *startingSubframe* in the granularity of subframe. |
| **ASN.1 signaling:**  Step 1: Network configuration  MUSIM-GapAssistanceConfig-r17 ::= SEQUENCE {  musim-GapProhibitTimer-r17 ENUMERATED {s0, s0dot1, s0dot2, s0dot3, s0dot4, s0dot5, s1, s2, s3, s4, s5, s6, s7, s8, s9, s10}  }  Step 2: UE reporting signaling  MUSIM-GapPreferenceList-r17 ::= SEQUENCE (SIZE (1..4)) OF MUSIM-GapInfo-r17  MUSIM-GapInfo-r17 ::= SEQUENCE {  musim-Starting-SFN-AndSubframe-r17 MUSIM-Starting-SFN-AndSubframe-r17 OPTIONAL, -- Cond aperiodic  musim-GapLength-r17 ENUMERATED {ms3, ms4, ms6, ms10, ms20} OPTIONAL, -- Need S  musim-GapRepetitionAndOffset-r17 CHOICE {  ms20-r17 INTEGER (0..19),  ms40-r17 INTEGER (0..39),  ms80-r17 INTEGER (0..79),  ms160-r17 INTEGER (0..159),  ms320-r17 INTEGER (0..319),  ms640-r17 INTEGER (0..639),  ms1280-r17 INTEGER (0..1279),  ms2560-r17 INTEGER (0..2559),  ms5120-r17 INTEGER (0..5119),  ...  } OPTIONAL -- Cond periodic  }  MUSIM-Starting-SFN-AndSubframe-r17 ::= SEQUENCE {  starting-SFN-r17 INTEGER (0..1023),  startingSubframe-r17 INTEGER (0..9)  } |

The candidate MUSIM gap like solution for NR is as follows:

**Option 1: (By using the Rel-17 MUSIM gap solution as the baseline)**

|  |
| --- |
| **Procedure:**  Step 1: The gNB indicates whether the IDC reporting for gap assistance information is allowed. And a prohibit timer is provided for gap assistance information.  Step 2: When detecting the IDC issue, the UE reports its preferred gap configuration for the affected frequencies when the prohibit timer is not running. The TDM assistance information uses the MCG as timing reference.  If the UE prefers periodic gap, the preferred gap configuration includes *idc-GapPreferenceList* with an entry for each periodic gap. Each peridodic gap configuration includes *idc-GapLength* and *idc-GapRepetitionAndOffset* including the gap repetition period and the gap offset in the granularity of ms.  If the UE prefers aperiodic gap, the preferred gap configuration includes *idc-GapPreferenceList* with an entry for each aperiodic gap. Each aperidodic gap configuration includes *idc-GapLength* in the granularity of ms and *idc-Starting-SFN-AndSubframe* including *starting-SFN* in the granularity of SFN and *startingSubframe* in the granularity of subframe. |
| **ASN.1 signaling example:**  Step 1:  IDC-GapAssistanceConfig-r17 ::= SEQUENCE {  musim-GapProhibitTimer-r17 ENUMERATED {s0, s0dot1, s0dot2, s0dot3, s0dot4, s0dot5, s1, s2, s3, s4, s5, s6, s7, s8, s9, s10}  }  Step 2: UE reporting signaling  IDC-GapPreferenceList-r17 ::= SEQUENCE (SIZE (1..4)) OF IDC-GapInfo-r17  IDC-GapInfo-r17 ::= SEQUENCE {  idc-Starting-SFN-AndSubframe-r17 IDC-Starting-SFN-AndSubframe-r17 OPTIONAL, -- Cond aperiodic  idc-GapLength-r17 ENUMERATED {ms3, ms4, ms6, ms10, ms20} OPTIONAL, -- Need S  idc-GapRepetitionAndOffset-r17 CHOICE {  ms20-r17 INTEGER (0..19),  ms40-r17 INTEGER (0..39),  ms80-r17 INTEGER (0..79),  ms160-r17 INTEGER (0..159),  ms320-r17 INTEGER (0..319),  ms640-r17 INTEGER (0..639),  ms1280-r17 INTEGER (0..1279),  ms2560-r17 INTEGER (0..2559),  ms5120-r17 INTEGER (0..5119),  ...  } OPTIONAL -- Cond periodic  }  IDC-Starting-SFN-AndSubframe-r17 ::= SEQUENCE {  starting-SFN-r17 INTEGER (0..1023),  startingSubframe-r17 INTEGER (0..9)  } |

#### Task 2: Please provide your suggested modification for above Option 1 or other options for the MUSIM gap like solution for IDC.

(Rapporteur’s comment: Please provide the changes for the above option or other options in the “Comments” column. The ASN.1 signaling example provided above is to be polished further while drafting the CR. Companies can provide FFS for specific technical points. However the increasing number of FFS(s) could also cause the dropping of the solution due to the very limted TU for the Rel-18 IDC work.)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| ZTE | Generally OK with the ASN.1 structure in the Step 2, as Rapporteur said, the detail values can be further polished.  For the step 1, it’s about whether a prohibit timer is needed for the IDC reporting, we think it can be discussed as a separate topic. |
| Ericsson | Unclear if any change is needed since this solution needs more stage-2 type of discussion. The MUSIM-gap solution requires additional discussion to evaluate required gap-lenghts and periodicities as they have now been defined for another use case, including RAN4 work.  It is also unclear to us if/how the gap prohibit timer should be applied. More study/discussion would be needed if the gap-solution should be adopted.  But more importantly, we are not sure whether this solution adds anything benefit beyond DRX. Is it not just yet another time-pattern? |
| Intel | Similar to comment to Task 1 (DRX), the values of gap period (repetition) and length need to be aligned with the LTE DRX values as the value range is related to the coexistence scenarios.  We don’t think a prohibit timer is needed. In LTE IDC, there was discussion on whether a prohibit timer is needed or not and the final decision was that prohibit timer is not needed. In addition, there is no prohibit timer for NR Rel-16 IDC with FDM solution. |
| Nokia | Assistance information as such should be quite similar here as with DRX solution – probably it is more matter of taste how the assistance information is provided to the NW. But isn’t there big difference between MUSIM based solution compared to DRX based solution on how NW would react to the UE assistance information?  In MUSIM based solution one does decouple the provision of gaps from the provision of a DRX configuration. Gaps are running on top of the DRX and there wont be transmission during the gap. This way there is no need to impact DRX implementations as such but one would ensure that there is no scheduling during the gap in similar manner as is done with e.g. measurement gaps. |
| Samsung | As commented in Task 1, we see the similarity between option 1 and option 2. In this sense, we prefer to **a generalized solution containing three parameters, i.e., IDC-CycleStartOffset, IDC-slotoffset, and IDC-ActiveTimeLength, with fine granularity.**  For prohibit timer, we didn’t see the necessity for IDC problem since this is a dedicated feature for MUSIM gap. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | General comment: Benefit of considering MUSIM gap like solution instead of DRX based solution in Rel 18 is unclear to us. We should first discuss any benefits or advantages of having MUSIM gap like solution over DRX solution, which has worked well in LTE, before we can look at the stage 3 details of the MUSIM gap solutions.  For the proposed signanling, two comments:   1. What’s the motivation/use case for the aperiodic gap; - We don’t think this is needed for IDC. 2. What’s the motivation/use case to have more than one periodic gap - We think only one periodic gap is enough for IDC. 3. Whether to define prohibit timer can be discussed once the MUSIM like solution is agreed.   Editorial comment for the ASN.1 structure above - suffix -r17 should be changed to -r18 for the IEs used. |
| Qualcomm | Fine with current phrasing as a baseline. Gap details and proposed lengths can be worked out later if the solution is agreed. Aperiodic gap is needed for the same reason autonomous denial may be needed. Sometimes a UE anticipates a Tx or Rx event from another RAT and needs a single short-notice gap to fit WLAN/BT traffic into this gap. In fact, in some cases this is more beneficial than periodic gaps when its hard to coordinate timings and/or hard for WLAN/BT to adjust their traffic into a pattern, so to summarize, we agree with current baseline. |
| LGE | Fine with Option 1 as a starting point. We also think that prohibit timer for gap assistance information in IDC report is not needed. Rather, the gNB only needs to configure whether the IDC reporting for gap assistance information is allowed in Step 1, as in other solutions.  In addition, since the MUSIM gap-like solution looks similar to the DRX-like solution (i.e., providing cycle, period, and length), just one solution is needed between DRX-like solution and MUSIM gap-like solution, i.e., should not support both solutions. |
|  |  |

## 2.3 UL and/or DL transmission occasion(s)

The LTE HARQ reservation solution is quoted as follows:

|  |
| --- |
| **Procedure:**  Step 1: The eNB indicates whether the IDC reporting for TDM assistance information is allowed.  Step 2: When detecting the IDC issue, the UE reports the desired subframe reservation patterns for the affected frequencies. The TDM assistance information uses the MCG as timing reference. The desired subframe reservation patterns is included in *idc-SubframePatternList*. A bitmap with value 0 indicates that E-UTRAN is requested to abstain from using the subframe.  For FDD, the radio frame in which the pattern starts (i.e. the radio frame in which the first/leftmost bit of the *subframePatternFDD* corresponds to subframe #0) occurs when SFN mod 2 = 0.  For TDD, the first/leftmost bit corresponds to the subframe #0 of the radio frame satisfying SFN mod x = 0, where x is the size of the bit string divided by 10. |
| **ASN.1 signaling:**  Step 1: Network configuration  idc-Indication-r11 ENUMERATED {setup} OPTIONAL, -- Need OR  Step 2: UE reporting signaling  IDC-SubframePatternList-r11 ::= SEQUENCE (SIZE (1..maxSubframePatternIDC-r11)) OF IDC-SubframePattern-r11  IDC-SubframePattern-r11 ::= CHOICE {  subframePatternFDD-r11 BIT STRING (SIZE (4)),  subframePatternTDD-r11 CHOICE {  subframeConfig0-r11 BIT STRING (SIZE (70)),  subframeConfig1-5-r11 BIT STRING (SIZE (10)),  subframeConfig6-r11 BIT STRING (SIZE (60))  },  ...  } |

The candidate UL and/or DL transmission occasion solution for NR is as follows:

**Option 1: (By using the LTE HARQ reservation solution as the baseline)**

|  |
| --- |
| **Procedure:**  Step 1: The gNB indicates whether the IDC reporting for TDM assistance information is allowed.  Step 2: When detecting the IDC issue, the UE reports the desired subframe reservation patterns for the affected frequencies. The TDM assistance information uses the MCG as timing reference. The desired subframe reservation patterns is included in *idc-SubframePatternList*. A bitmap with value 0 indicates that NR is requested to abstain from using the subframe.  For FDD, the radio frame in which the pattern starts (i.e. the radio frame in which the first/leftmost bit of the *subframePatternFDD* corresponds to subframe #0) occurs when SFN mod 2 = 0.  For TDD, the UE indicates its *preferredTDD-UL-DL-Pattern* with *referenceSubcarrierSpacing*, and its desired subframe reservation pattern *preferredSubframePatternTDD* for the *preferredTDD-UL-DL-Pattern*. The first/leftmost bit of *preferredSubframePatternTDD* corresponds to the subframe #0 of the radio frame satisfying SFN mod x = 0, where x is the size of the bit string divided by 10. |
| **ASN.1 signaling example:**  Step 1: Network configuration  idc-TDM-Indication-r18 ENUMERATED {setup} OPTIONAL, -- Need R  Step 2: UE reporting signaling  IDC-SubframePatternList-r18 ::= SEQUENCE (SIZE (1..maxSubframePatternIDC-r18)) OF IDC-SubframePattern-r18  IDC-SubframePattern-r18 ::= CHOICE {  subframePatternFDD-r18 BIT STRING (SIZE (4)),  subframePatternTDD-r18 SubframePatternTDD-r18,  ...  }  SubframePatternTDD-r18 ::= SEQUENCE {  referenceSubcarrierSpacing-r18 SubcarrierSpacing,  preferredTDD-UL-DL-Pattern-r18 TDD-UL-DL-Pattern,  preferredSubframePatternTDD-r18 BIT STRING (SIZE (1..70))  }  TDD-UL-DL-Pattern ::= SEQUENCE {  dl-UL-TransmissionPeriodicity ENUMERATED {ms0p5, ms0p625, ms1, ms1p25, ms2, ms2p5, ms5, ms10},  nrofDownlinkSlots INTEGER (0..maxNrofSlots),  nrofDownlinkSymbols INTEGER (0..maxNrofSymbols-1),  nrofUplinkSlots INTEGER (0..maxNrofSlots),  nrofUplinkSymbols INTEGER (0..maxNrofSymbols-1),  ...,  [[  dl-UL-TransmissionPeriodicity-v1530 ENUMERATED {ms3, ms4} OPTIONAL -- Need R  ]]  } |

#### Task 3: Please provide your suggested modification for above Option 1 or other options for the UL and/or DL transmission occasion solution for NR.

(Rapporteur’s comment: Please provide the changes for the above option or other options in the “Comments” column. The ASN.1 signaling example provided above is to be polished further while drafting the CR. Companies can provide FFS for specific technical points. However the increasing number of FFS(s) could also cause the dropping of the solution due to the very limted TU for the Rel-18 IDC work.)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| ZTE | We know that the down selection will be done in Phase 2, but we still don’t think there is a need to further discuss such HARQ based solution in NR, for that the NR take the flexible timing which is quite different from the LTE. Furthermore, as in the 36816, the HARQ based solution is mainly for the LTE+BT cases. However DRX-based scheme can also work for these cases, so we prefer to focus on DRX(or MUSIM) based scheme.    Back to the option 1:  For the FDD, In the LTE, the k1=4, so there is a 4 bits bitstring, in NR, K1 is configured by network, so we don’t think it’s reasonable to set size as 4.  subframePatternFDD-r18 BIT STRING (SIZE (4)),  For the TDD, in LTE the 70bits is adopted for the LTE TDD pattern 0,while for the pattern 6, 60bits is adopted,  preferredSubframePatternTDD-r18 BIT STRING (SIZE (1..70))  LTE:  subframeConfig0-r11 BIT STRING (SIZE (70)),  subframeConfig1-5-r11 BIT STRING (SIZE (10)),  subframeConfig6-r11 BIT STRING (SIZE (60))  so it seems hard to set bits size for the different DL/UL subframe configurations in the NR for both the TDD and FDD. |
| Ericsson | In our understanding we cannot simply reuse this solution from LTE due to in NR we have symbols instead of subframes, many and dynamic TDD patterns, a different HARQ process use, etc.  We would be concerned in the amount of work this would bring compared to the DRX-solution.  Also, for the gNB to actually respect this pattern it would impact the scheduler. With the DRX-solution on the other hand, it is already built-in to the DRX feature that the gNB does not schedule the UE outside active time, aside from ensuring that the inactivity timer is not extended in to the time when the UE is experiencing IDC issues. |
| Intel | First of all, we’d like to note that DRX assistance information as discussed in Task 1 has *coarse* granularity, and is not suitable for coexistence use case of BT voice, which requires *finer* granularity (that’s why HARQ process reservation solution was used in LTE in addition to DRX assistance information).  Subframe pattern in LTE (as well as the Option 1 in this section) might not be directly applicable in NR since it is based on synchronous HARQ, while NR HARQ is asynchronous. In LTE, subframe pattern length is related to FDD/TDD and TDD UL-DL configuration. For example, although the periodicity of TDD UL-DL configuration is 10 ms, the subframe pattern length is 70 ms due to UL synchronous HARQ.  In NR, HARQ is asynchronous. Therefore there is no need to report TDM pattern based on synchronous HARQ operation. In NR TDD, the pattern periodicity for IDC can be related to the TDD UL-DL transmission periodicity (*dl-UL-TransmissionPeriodicity*). A simple TDM pattern with fine granularity (compared with DRX assistance information) can be considered. For example, the pattern periodicity for NR IDC can be a single value (e.g. 20 ms) irrespective of the actual TDD UL-DL configuration since TDD transmission periodicity is a divisor of 20 ms. The pattern periodicity for FDD can the same as that of TDD, e.g. 20 ms. For each bit indicated in the pattern, the pattern unit can be subframe (ms), i.e. each bit in the pattern indicates whether NG-RAN is requested to abstain from using the subframe (ms).  An example ASN.1 signaling for UE assistance information is as follows:  IDC-SubframePatternList-r18 ::= SEQUENCE (SIZE (1..maxSubframePatternIDC-r18)) OF IDC-SubframePattern-r18  IDC-SubframePattern-r18 ::= BIT STRING (SIZE (1..20) |
| Nokia | With asynchronous HARQ and flexible TDD, we don’t believe the NR baseline is simple enough to make any HARQ-based solution more attractive than a DRX- or MUSIM-gaps- based one. |
| Samsung | We are fine to support the preferred subframe pattern to tackle with HARQ reservation. Moreover, such pattern should be adapt to the subframe structure design in NR. The above modification can be considered as the starting point of phase2 discussion. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Similar view as ZTE. In our understanding for the HARQ pattern to work, the UE needs to know the UL scheduling pattern of the NW for the HARQ process. In NR this is up to the gNB scheduler implementation. Hence for NR IDC we think the HARQ process reservation based solution is not applicable. Moreover, as pointed by ZTE, all the usage scenarios that the HARQ reservation is applicable the DRX-based solution is also applicable.  Although the signalling aspects described above looks ok, we would like to focus on DRX based solution given the limited time we have for Rel 18 and suggest that we don’t spend time discussing this solution further. |
| Qualcomm | Same point of view as the companies above. The concept of subframe TDD is not applicable in NR.In LTE, the UE simply indicated a preferable bitmask for all 7 allowed subframe-based TDD patterns.  In NR, the TDD pattern is symbol-based and has much more configurations than LTE and HARQ is asynchronous so unclear what the UE is supposed to report. If we understand the proposal correctly, the UE gets to recommend a TDD UL-DL pattern, but then why would the gNB follow that recommendation? There are other considerations for the NW to choose TDD for the whole cell and for specific UEs. Also, that was not the case for LTE as the UE did not choose a TDD pattern but indicated a subframe bitmask preference for every possible TDD frame.  The way we see it, we cannot use LTE as a baseline here. This can be considered a new solution that requires completely new procedures and ASN.1 coding, preferably without relating this to previous LTE solutions. We also note that this would have some RAN4 impact because it’s not exactly reusing a LTE solution. |
| LGE | Same view with other companies that it would be more complicated and LTE solution cannot be used as a baseline considering the dynamic TDD patterns and the asynchronous HARQ operation in NR.  Regarding signalling aspects, it seems that the suggested parameters are based on *TDD-UL-DL-ConfigCommon* IE, which is cell-specific parameters. It is fine in general as a starting point, but it is unclear how the network would handle the cell-specfic parameters after receiving the TDM assistance information. |
|  |  |

## 2.4 Autonomous denial solution

The LTE autonomous denial solution is quoted as follows:

|  |
| --- |
| **Procedure:**  Step 1: The eNB provides the *autonomousDenialParameters* including *autonomousDenialSubframes* and *autonomousDenialValidity* in the granularity of subframe.  Step 2: The UE is allowed to deny any transmission in a particular UL subframe if during the number of subframes indicated by *autonomousDenialValidity*, preceeding and including this particular subframe, it autonomously denied fewer UL subframes than indicated by *autonomousDenialSubframes* |
| **ASN.1 signaling:**  Step 1: Network configuration  autonomousDenialParameters-r11 SEQUENCE {  autonomousDenialSubframes-r11 ENUMERATED {n2, n5, n10, n15,  n20, n30, spare2, spare1},  autonomousDenialValidity-r11 ENUMERATED {  sf200, sf500, sf1000, sf2000,  spare4, spare3, spare2, spare1}  } OPTIONAL, -- Need OR |

The candidate autonomous denial solution for NR is as follows:

**Option 1: (By using the LTE autonomous denial solution as the baseline)**

|  |
| --- |
| **Procedure:**  Step 1: The gNB provides the *autonomousDenialParameters* including *autonomousDenialSubframes* and *autonomousDenialValidity* in the granularity of subframe.  Step 2: The UE is allowed to deny any transmission in a particular UL subframe if during the number of subframes indicated by *autonomousDenialValidity*, preceeding and including this particular subframe, it autonomously denied fewer UL subframes than indicated by *autonomousDenialSubframes* |
| **ASN.1 signaling example:**  Step 1: Network configuration  autonomousDenialParameters-r18 SEQUENCE {  autonomousDenialSubframes-r18 ENUMERATED {n2, n5, n10, n15,  n20, n30, spare2, spare1},  autonomousDenialValidity-r18 ENUMERATED {  sf200, sf500, sf1000, sf2000,  spare4, spare3, spare2, spare1}  } OPTIONAL, -- Need R |

#### Task 4: Please provide your suggested modification for above Option 1 or other options for the autonomous denial solution for NR.

(Rapporteur’s comment: Please provide the changes for the above option or other options in the “Comments” column. The ASN.1 signaling example provided above is to be polished further while drafting the CR. Companies can provide FFS for specific technical points. However the increasing number of FFS(s) could also cause the dropping of the solution due to the very limted TU for the Rel-18 IDC work.)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| ZTE | Generally Ok with the Option 1 if autonomous denial for the NR was supported |
| Ericsson | The RAN2 signalling part of this solution looks OK. One can of course discuss the granularity of this solution, e.g. should the validity-period/number of subframes be as proposed needs further checking.  However, we expect that the autonomous denial solution alone cannot solve all possible problems. This would require significant RAN4 work and it is unclear if this solution would bring additional gains (e.g. compared to DRX) which would justify this enhancement. |
| Intel | Generally OK with Option 1 if autonomous denial will be supported for RAN2. We understand that some details will be discussed in later stage, e.g. the unit in configuration (current UL subframe is used, however there is no concept of UL subframe in NR). |
| Nokia | Solution option as such seems feasible but generally UE autonomous dropping sending in UL will impact Quality of Service and spectrum efficiency compared with a DRX based solutions. Latency may increase, although it may depend on exact use case.  It is not so clear what would be additional gain of this solution – especially compared to MUSIM solution which will ensure specific timings when 3GPP won’t be doing transmissions anyway. |
| Samsung | The above option 1 defines the number of denials in terms of subframe. However, considering the fine granularity of NR, we prefer to have a generalized time period as the unit of denial, i.e, autonomousDenialLength + autonomousDenialNumber.  In addition, we **suggest that this discussion should cover the topic on whether multiple autonoumous denial configuraitons can be configured to the UE** since Rel-18 considers the MR-DC case. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | ASN.1 signaling example looks ok .  Our view is that we can consider it after the more general DRX based solution and FDM enhancements for NR is finalised as the autonomous denial solution is to be used in very specific scenarios e.g. for the reception of WiFi beacon. |
| Qualcomm | Fine as a baseline for discussion |
| LGE | Fine in general if this solution is supported. |
|  |  |

# 2. Phase-2 discussion

|  |
| --- |
| **Phase-2 discussion:**  The phase-2 discussion will be kicked off once the solutions details (e.g. specification impacts) provided from the Phase-1 discussion are relatively stable.  Scope: Based on the solution details provided by the Phase-1 discussion, compare solutions, e.g. applied scenarios (e.g. BT voice, BT eSCO and WLAN beacon), complexity, etc. Selection of TDM solutions to be specified in Rel-18.  Deadline for the Phase-2 discussion: Nov 3rd 00:30 AM UTC. |

TBD…

# 3. Conclusion

TBD…
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