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# Introduction

The discussion handles:

|  |
| --- |
| Email thread on finding a way forward on DC scenarios in IAB.  Goal: Generate an agreeable way forward.  Input contributions covered:  2533, 2626, 2672.  Moderator: Georg Hampel. |

The contributions RP-202533, RP-202626 and RP-202672 discuss the support for intra-carrier DC in Rel-17 IAB. All three contributions propose that TSG RAN preclude support for intra-carrier DC for Rel-17 IAB since not enough time would be available within present TU budgeting to handle the technical issues. One contribution claims that intra-carrier DC would not be supported by the Rel-17 IAB WID.

RAN#89e already had a discussion on this topic (RP-202083). In the discussion, 8 out of 15 companies were in favor for intra-frequency DC, 5 companies were opposed while 1 company needed more information. No agreement was reached. There was further no agreement if intra-carrier DC for IAB was compliant with the WID or not.

In this follow-up discussion in RAN#90e, the moderator would like to make further progress. The following is proposed:

**On compliance of intra-carrier DC with Rel-17 WID:** The RAN#89 discussion already indicated that the Rel-17 IAB WID was not sufficiently clear on the support of intra-carrier DC for IAB. For that reason, we will not spend further time on discussing the wording of the Rel-17 WID.

**On the size of the specification effort for intra-carrier DC for IAB:** In the prior discussion, some companies claimed that only little work was needed while others believed it was a major effort. The discussion did not try to scope the effort. We will therefore use the RAN#90 follow-up discussion to identify the main issues that need to be addressed for intra-carrier DC for IAB by each RAN WG. This exercise will provide a better understanding on what needs to be done, and it might make it easier to converge on this topic for Rel-17.

To keep focus, the following assumptions are made:

* Inter-carrier DC is supported in Rel-17 IAB.
* Intra-carrier DC is not supported in Rel-16 IAB.
* The discussion only focuses on intra-carrier DC for IAB, not for UEs.

The contributions to RAN#90e raised the following issues related to intra-carrier DC for IAB:

**RP-202533** claims that there is no verification on the feasibility of intra-carrier DC for IAB. The contribution does not discuss any issues that would need to be handled.

**RP-202626** made the following claims:

* Dynamic scheduler coordination between parent IAB-nodes would be necessary. No details were giving on what this would entail and which WG would be involved.
* For FR2, DC synchronization requirements would imply severe, if not impossible, restrictions in the IAB-deployment.No details were given on what such FR2 DC synchronization requirements would have to entail and why this would be severe or impossible.
* Implementation of intra-carrier DC would require extensive work that was not accounted for in the present time budgeting. No details were given on what this work would include.

**RP-202672** claims that the following issues would need to be addressed by RAN1:

* Revisiting IAB-MT assumptions on DL synchronization and UL timings,
* Parent nodes sending conflicting D/U/F indications in DCI 2\_0 for same IAB-MT resource,
* Parent nodes sending conflicting soft resource availability in DCI 2\_5 for same IAB-DU resource on IAB-node’s child link,
* Parent nodes indicating different number of guard-symbols in MAC-CE.

The contributions further claimed that the following issues would have to be addressed by RAN3:

* Resource coordination between gNBs for topology redundancy scenarios, where MCG and SCG links are controlled by different (donor or non-donor) gNBs.

The contribution further claims that RAN4 would need to investigate the potential impact of intra-carrier DC. No details were giving on what this would involve.

# Discussion

## Initial discussion: Issues to be handled for intra-carrier DC for IAB

The following aim to identify the main issues to be addressed by the individual RAN WGs. For each issue, we need to understand:

1. The underlying problem to be solved,
2. The main aspects to be addressed by each WG to solve the problem,
3. The adverse effects an implementation-only solution might have, e.g., on performance, inter-vendor interoperability, etc.

The questions below are based on the issues raised in contributions to RAN#90e. Companies are invited to discuss additional issues as well.

**Q1: In your view, what needs to be done for inter-parent-node scheduler coordination to support intra-carrier DC for IAB? Please explain the problem to be solved, aspects to be addressed by each WG, and impact if done via implementation only.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| AT&T | “Scheduler coordination” is a broad term, but at a fundamental level this would require ensuring that the scheduling of the two parent links does not 1) violate the duplex constraint within the IAB node (i.e. half duplex or full duplex) and 2) does not violate the half duplex constraint within the backhaul link (i.e. simultaneous DL Rx and UL Tx by the MT function). This can be done on a semi-static basis and requires some specification effort to support inter-vendor IAB deployments. In our understanding this work would first be carried out in RAN1 to define the requirements and general framework for the coordination and RAN3 would determine what updates (if any) to the existing DU resource coordination signaling would be required (e.g. to support intra vs. inter donor operation). In our view, the scope of scheduler coordination for intra-carrier DC is similar to what would be required for inter-carrier DC, at least when it comes to ensuring the duplex constraint at the IAB node is not violated, since even in Rel-16 it is possible to indicate different multiplexing capabilities for different DU/MT carriers (e.g. half duplex may still be required even for inter-band operation between parent nodes). |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Q2: In your view, what needs to be done for the coordination of DCI 2\_0 signaling for D/U/F indication among parent nodes to support intra-carrier DC for IAB? Please explain the problem to be solved, aspects to be addressed by each WG, and impact if done via implementation only.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| AT&T | The problem is similar to Q1 except instead of involving the donor nodes to resolve the conflicts, it is just the IAB nodes themselves which determine the slot indication on a dynamic basis instead of semi-static basis (but with the same goal of avoiding scheduling conflicts which violate the duplex constraint). RAN1 could handle this objective by itself and define child/parent node behavior to avoid or handle potential conflicts (within the framework already provided by the semi-static coordination addressed in Q1). Again as in Q1, ensuring that duplex constraints are not violated by the multiple parents is a common objective for both intra-carrier and inter-carrier DC. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Q3: In your view, what needs to be done for the coordination of DCI 2\_5 signaling for soft-resource-availability indication among parent nodes to support intra-carrier DC for IAB? Please explain the problem to be solved, aspects to be addressed by each WG, and impact if done via implementation only.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| AT&T | Similar scope as Q3, however it should be noted that soft resources are not strictly essential for IAB. As in Rel-16, RAN1 may not need to specify all aspects of the determination of the availability of soft resources at the child node and leave potential optimizations up to implementation. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Q4: In your view, what needs to be done for parent-to-child timing synchronization to support intra-carrier DC for IAB? Please explain the problem to be solved, aspects to be addressed by each WG, and impact if done via implementation only.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| AT&T | The timing requirements are both a function of deployment considerations (distance between parent nodes) and IAB node implementation (shared or common hardware at the MT for the MCG/SCG links). In our view, specification work is not essential for this objective (other than documenting requirements). Optimizations are certainly possible, but just as T\_delta in Rel-16 is a helpful “tool in the toolbox” for achieving OTA-based timing alignment, they would not be required for DC with IAB. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Q5: In your view, what other issues need to be addressed to support intra-carrier DC for IAB? Please explain the problem to be solved, aspects to be addressed by each WG, and impact if done via implementation only.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| AT&T | We want to highlight that the critical need from an operator perspective, is for multi-parent support in Rel-17 which aligns with **practical deployment** scenarios for IAB. Requiring that different carriers or frequency bands are assigned for different parents diminishes the usefulness of the feature by limiting the backhaul capacity and creates an undesirable tradeoff in the network between performance and robustness. In our assessment, intra-carrier DC is the shortest path to achieving this objective – but we can understand that working on optimizations for different corner cases may also take up valuable WG time. Our suggestion for a compromise is to identify a subset of requirements/restrictions (i.e. FR2 only, assumptions on network timing synchronization, reusing inter-carrier DC features as the baseline) that can keep the workload to the bare minimum and deliver a solution for the intra-carrier scenario in Rel-17, which is the most relevant scenario for early IAB deployments, instead of pushing it out into the future. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## Intermediate discussion: Aspects to be handled for intra-carrier DC for IAB

…

## Final discussion: Aspects to be handled for intra-carrier DC for IAB

…

# Conclusion

…
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