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# Introduction

This topic area deals with the system parameters for IAB, this includes the general sections of the TS as well as the frequency and channel arrangements.

The discussion on the specification drafting methodology is necessarily discussed in this topic area also – although it will be applied to all spec drafting.

There is some overlap between topic areas particularly in the area of the BS class definitions and the TX output power, it has been decided to treat this issue in the “RAN4#94e\_#82\_NR\_IAB\_RF\_Tx” subject area a 3 papers have been moved to that discussion group.

The subjects in this discussion area have been separated into 3 topics:

* + TS Drafting and referencing
  + TS Drafting – General section (Clause 4)
  + TS Drafting - Operating bands and channel arrangement (clause 5)

# Topic #1: TS Drafting and referencing

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| R4-2002123 | Qualcomm | WF on IAB TS spec structure and terminology |
| R4-2002043 | Huawei | Discussion on drafting TS and referencing  **Observation 1:** If specific referencing is used CR’s to incorporate updates in the donor/referenced documents are needed for those updates to be applied. |

## Open issues summary

The level of referencing to donor BS and UE specification still under discussion.

### Sub-topic 1-1

WF (R4-2002123) was drafted between meetings, R4-2002043 provides more background on problems associated with specific referencing.

**Issue 1-1: TBA**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: Referencing
    - If the requirements of an IAB-DU are same as those of a gNB, 38.174 may refer to the corresponding sections of gNB specs. Additional text will be added to highlight the differences from the source specs.
    - If the requirements of an IAB-MT are same as those of a UE, 38.174 may refer to the corresponding sections of UE specs. Additional text will be added to highlight the differences from the source specs.
  + Option 2: Self contained
  + Good readability without thinking hard how to write good “delta” info text.
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| ZTE | Sub topic 1-1: support option 1 and lots of requirement for IAB DU and IAB MT is just copy&paste just replace the term NR BS or UE by NR IAB DU or NR IAB MT. |
| CATT | Sub topic 1-1: We’re just beginning to follow this topic. So we don’t have very clear view on this. But looking at what’re discussing in this meeting, there’re many requirements which may not copy exactly UE or BS requirements. Then considering this, we think it’s not just copy or self-contained. There will be some specific requirements for IAB. We support option 2. It’ll be clearer. |

### CRs/TPs comments collection

*Major close-to-finalize WIs and Rel-15 maintenance, comments collections can be arranged for TPs and CRs. For Rel-16 on-going WIs, suggest to focus on open issues discussion on 1st round.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **Comments collection** |
| XXX | Company A |
| Company B |
|  |
| YYY | Company A |
| Company B |
|  |

## Summary for 1st round

### Open issues

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 1st round, list all the identified open issues and tentative agreements or candidate options and suggestion for 2nd round i.e. WF assignment.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Status summary** |
| **Sub-topic#1** | *Tentative agreements:*  *Candidate options:*  *Recommendations for 2nd round:* |

*Recommendations on WF/LS assignment*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **WF/LS t-doc Title** | **Assigned Company,**  **WF or LS lead** |
| #1 |  |  |

### CRs/TPs

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 1st round and provides recommendation on CRs/TPs Status update*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **CRs/TPs Status update recommendation** |
| XXX | *Based on 1st round of comments collection, moderator can recommend the next steps such as “agreeable”, “to be revised”* |

## Discussion on 2nd round (if applicable)

## Summary on 2nd round (if applicable)

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 2nd round and provided recommendation on CRs/TPs/WFs/LSs Status update suggestion*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP/LS/WF number** | **T-doc Status update recommendation** |
| XXX | *Based on 2nd round of comments collection, moderator can recommend the next steps such as “agreeable”, “to be revised”* |

# Topic #2: TS Drafting – General section (Clause 4)

*Main technical topic overview. The structure can be done based on sub-agenda basis.*

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| R4-2001902 | Ericsson | TP to TS 38.174: subclause 3.1, Definitions |
| R4-2002044 | Huawei | TP to TS 38.174, clause 4 |
| R4-2001901 | Ericsson | TP to TS 38.174, subclasue 4.3, Conducted and radiated requirement reference points |
| R4-2001852 | Ericsson | TP to TS38.174, subclasue 4.7.1 Applicability of signaling characteristics related RRM requirements |
| R4-2001887 | Ericsson | TP to TR, subclause 4.2, RF Requirements reference points |
| R4-2001888 | Ericsson | TP to TR, subclause 4.1, Spec organization/ Relation with other core specification |
|  |  |  |

## Open issues summary

TPs include text for the general section in clause 4 and some definitions in clause 3

### Sub-topic 2-1 – subclause 3.1 - definitions

A number of TP’s to the TS contain definitions of terms used in those TP’s, R4-2001902 however contains 4 definitions for UL and DL

**Issue 2-1: TBA**

* Proposals
  + Agree proposed definitions
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

### Sub-topic 2-2 – subclause 4.1, 4.2

Text in R4-2002044, contains text for subclause 41. “Relationship with other core specifications” and subclause 4.2 “Relationship between minimum requirements and test requirements”

R4-2001888 is text for the TR on “Relation with other core specification” which provides more detail.

**Issue 2-1: TBA**

* Proposals
  + Accept TP to TS 38.174 for subclauses 4.1,4.2
  + Accept TP to TR 38.xxx for subclauses 4.1
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

### Sub-topic 2-3 – Subclause 4.3

Very similar (identical?) updates in R4-2002044 and R4-2001901.

Note both offer a generic IAB type 1-H, 1-O or 2-O architecture definition, they do not differentiate between IAB-DU and IAB-MT.

R4-2001887 is aTP to the TR on the same subject with background.

**Issue 2-2: TBA**

* Proposals
  + Agree TP for subclause 4.3
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

### Sub-topic 2-4 – Subclause 4.4

R4-2002044 updates BS classes subclause, this subject along with 3 papers (R4-2001868, R4-2001886 and R4-2001903) have been moved to RAN4#94e\_#82\_NR\_IAB\_RF\_Tx as the subject is linked to the Tx output power discussion

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| ZTE | Sub topic 2-1: prefer to define the IAB definition as package and some suggestions are added  IAB MT uplink: It is used by the IAB MT for transmitting signals to parent IAB node.  IAB DU uplink: It is used by the IAB DU for receiving signals from child IAB MT or legacy NR UE.  IAB MT downlink: It is used by the IAB MT for receiving signals from parent IAB node.  IAB DU Downlink: It is used by the IAB DU for transmitting signals to child IAB MT or legacy NR UE.  Sub topic 2-2:for sub-clause 4.1 and 4.2, I think that most of parts are fine, but test confromance spec is not ready, maybe we could wait for a while for spec numbering.  Sub topic 2-3: the following secion might have applicability problem when it applied to IAB MT, as MIMO layer for uplink is limited compared with DL. For Downlink, 12 layer for MU-MIMO and 8 layer for SU-MIMO and only 4 layer for uplink regardless of MU-MIMO or SU-MIMO.  For an *IAB type 1-O* the transceiver unit array must contain at least 8 transmitter units and at least 8 receiver units. Transmitter units and receiver units may be combined into transceiver units. The transmitter/receiver units have the ability to transmit/receive parallel independent modulated symbol streams. |
| CATT | Sub topic 2-1: We don’t have strong opinion on this. But I have some clarification question. I don’t know how to use these 4 definitions. I looked at RAN2 running CR, there’re some definitions. IAB MT and IAB DU are named as “IAB-MT” and “IAB-DU”. And there’re no specific IAB downlink and uplink definition in the RAN2 CR. To my understanding, there’s no confusion on the uplink and downlink understanding in IAB scenario. But if all of you think it’s necessary, then I’m ok.  Sub topic 2-2~2-4: Some editorial comments for both R4-2002044 and R4-2001888. “IAB\_DU” should be “IAB-DU”? And the same with “IAB\_MT” |

### CRs/TPs comments collection

*Major close to finalize WIs and Rel-15 maintenance, comments collections can be arranged for TPs and CRs. For Rel-16 on-going WIs, suggest to focus on open issues discussion on 1st round.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **Comments collection** |
| XXX | Company A |
| Company B |
|  |
| YYY | Company A |
| Company B |
|  |

## Summary for 1st round

### Open issues

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 1st round, list all the identified open issues and tentative agreements or candidate options and suggestion for 2nd round i.e. WF assignment.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Status summary** |
| **Sub-topic#1** | *Tentative agreements:*  *Candidate options:*  *Recommendations for 2nd round:* |

*Suggestion on WF/LS assignment*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **WF/LS t-doc Title** | **Assigned Company,**  **WF or LS lead** |
| #1 |  |  |

### CRs/TPs

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 1st round and provided recommendation on CRs/TPs Status update suggestion*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **CRs/TPs Status update recommendation** |
| XXX | *Based on 1st round of comments collection, moderator can recommend the next steps such as “agreeable”, “to be revised”* |

## Discussion on 2nd round (if applicable)

## Summary on 2nd round (if applicable)

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 2nd round and provided recommendation on CRs/TPs/WFs/LSs Status update suggestion*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP/LS/WF number** | **T-doc Status update recommendation** |
| XXX | *Based on 2nd round of comments collection, moderator can recommend the next steps such as “agreeable”, “to be revised”* |

# Topic #2: TS Drafting - Operating bands and channel arrangement (clause 5)

*Main technical topic overview. The structure can be done based on sub-agenda basis.*

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| R4-2000824 | Huawei Technologies Co.,Ltd. | FR1 IAB frequency band  **Proposal:** IAB node should support band n77 and n78 |
| R4-2000974 | ZTE | Discussion on IAB MT channel bandwidth  **Proposal:** send one clarification LS to RAN2 on declaration of IAB MT supported channel bandwidth. |
| R4-2000275 | Samsung | TP for TS38.174, clause 5, IAB system parameters |
| R4-2002045 | Huawei | TP to TS 38.174, clause 5, Operating bands and channel arrangement |
| R4-2001186 | Ericsson | On multicarrier and CA for IAB  **Observation 1:** It is possible that the IAB-MT and IAB-DU may operate on different carriers/bands simultaneously.  **Observation 2:** In case the IAB-DU and IAB-MT are implemented on the same radio hardware, it would be desirable to have a single set of RF and demodulation requirements for CA/multi-carrier.  **Observation 3:** The IAB specification should be forward compatible considering simultaneous TX/RX. The specifications should not preclude that for rel-17 the same panel may simultaneously transmit/receive IAB-MT CA and IAB-DU CA or multicarrier, and so should set requirements accordingly.  **Observation 4:** There is no need for the IAB-MT specification to preclude using CA combinations that are not defined for UEs (at least for the “wide area / planned” class).  **Observation 5:** If the BS approach to CA and multicarrier requirements is adopted, then there is no need to make a list of CA / multicarrier combinations in the IAB specification.  **Proposal 1:** For the “wide area/planned” IAB class, CA and multi-carrier requirements use the BS approach  **Proposal 2:** RAN4 should discuss and conclude whether the BS approach is also feasible for the “local area / unplanned” IAB class |

## Open issues summary

A proposal to add band n77 and n78 to the FR1 operating bands list

A proposal to send a clarification LS to RAN2

2 contributions which import and update text describing the operating bands and channel arrangement.

### Sub-topic 3-1 -Adding bands n77 and n78

Support by operators: China Telecom, China Unicom, BT plc

**Issue 3-1: Adding bands n77 and n78**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: Approve proposal
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

### Sub-topic 3-2 – Clarification LS to RAN2

Propose a clarification LS to RAN2 on declaration of IAB MT supported channel BW

**Issue 3-2: LS to RAN2**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: TBA
  + Option 2: TBA
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

### Sub-topic 3-3 – TP to TR 38.174

The 2 TP’s cover the same section, some clear differences are:

* The transformation of *BS channel bandwidth* and *UE channel bandwidth* from the donor specs has been handle differently in the 2 TP’s
* R42000275 – Uses references in 5.3.1, 5.3.2, 5.3.3, 5.3.4, 5.4 - This issue to be discussed in sub-topic 1-1

**Issue 3-3: TS text to TS 38.174 clause 5**

* Proposals
  + Revise text of one of the TP’s based on result of sub-topic 1-1
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

### Sub-topic 3-4 – Multi-carrier and CA for IAB

R4-2001186 proposes using the BS approach for multi-carrier and CA.

The proposals have some reliance on the class definitions

**Issue 3-4: Multi-carrier and CA for IAB**

* Proposals
  + Proposal-1: Only study the IAB MT and IAB DU belong to the same class scenario.
  + Proposal-2: Assume that wide area and medium range IABs are planned and local area IABs are unplanned.
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| ZTE | Sub topic 3-1: support band n77 and n78 for IAB operation  Sub topic 3-2: support to send one clarification LS back to RAN2  Sub topic 3-3: Note 2 in section 5.3.5 should be removed as this 30MHz is late request from operators from R15 I think, so it is only applied for BS side without UE side. In addition, some system parameter for intra-band contiguous CA or intra-band non-contiguous CA is different ,we need to pay attention on that.  Sub topic 3-4: okay for proposal 1 and proposal 2. |
| CATT | Sub topic 3-1: we support it.  Sub topic 3-4: we’re ok with the two proposals. |

### CRs/TPs comments collection

*Major close to finalize WIs and Rel-15 maintenance, comments collections can be arranged for TPs and CRs. For Rel-16 on-going WIs, suggest to focus on open issues discussion on 1st round.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **Comments collection** |
| XXX | Company A |
| Company B |
|  |
| YYY | Company A |
| Company B |
|  |

## Summary for 1st round

### Open issues

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 1st round, list all the identified open issues and tentative agreements or candidate options and suggestion for 2nd round i.e. WF assignment.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Status summary** |
| **Sub-topic#1** | *Tentative agreements:*  *Candidate options:*  *Recommendations for 2nd round:* |

*Suggestion on WF/LS assignment*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **WF/LS t-doc Title** | **Assigned Company,**  **WF or LS lead** |
| #1 |  |  |

### CRs/TPs

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 1st round and provided recommendation on CRs/TPs Status update suggestion*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **CRs/TPs Status update recommendation** |
| XXX | *Based on 1st round of comments collection, moderator can recommend the next steps such as “agreeable”, “to be revised”* |

## Discussion on 2nd round (if applicable)

## Summary on 2nd round (if applicable)

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 2nd round and provided recommendation on CRs/TPs/WFs/LSs Status update suggestion*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP/LS/WF number** | **T-doc Status update recommendation** |
| XXX | *Based on 2nd round of comments collection, moderator can recommend the next steps such as “agreeable”, “to be revised”* |