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# **1 Introduction**

This document summarizes contributions [3] – [57] submitted to agenda item 11.1 (Overview of 6GR air interface).

Since this is the first RAN1 meeting to discuss this SI [1], RAN1 focuses on the following aspects to make reasonable progress, while keeping open minded.

* Make common understanding among companies on the terminologies
* Establish a finer agenda for future meetings, including the main focus in each meeting

The following sections are categorized according to the following guidance provided by RAN1 chair:

|  |
| --- |
| High level design proposals/principles/target and overall design of 6G air interface to illustrate/address the pain points observed from different angles, e.g., aspects of how to design a single RAT to serve diverse devices, channel bandwidth (at least minimum and maximum), aspects of overall coverage, aspects of initial access and common channel, aspects of MRSS, aspects of service/channel multiplexing/collision, including concurrence of UL transmissions,…..., aspects of concept and operation of bandwidth, aspects of supporting existing and new services, aspects of spectrum utilization and operations, aspects of spectrum efficiency, aspects of all duplex types, as well as concepts and aspects of harmonization of TN and NTN, etc. |

Note: A number of companies provide views on technical details of the following aspects. As per guidance from RAN1 chair, those aspects will be discussed in separate agenda items and/or future RAN1 meetings:

* This RAN1 meeting
  + Evaluation assumptions for 6GR air interface
    - *Discussions on models, scenarios, parameters, and methodology, metrics/criteria that can be used for evaluating technology proposals, energy efficiency, sensing performance (including potential extension of channel model).*
  + Waveform
    - *Including proposals for improving spectrum efficiency, power efficiency, coexistence and coverage, etc.*
  + Frame structure
    - *Including numerology and frame structure (for all duplex types), as well as compatibility with 5G NR to allow for efficient 5G-6G Multi-RAT Spectrum Sharing (MRSS).*
  + Channel coding
    - *Including metrics/criteria that can be used for evaluating technology proposals and for down selecting proposals*
  + Modulation, joint channel coding and modulation
    - *Including metrics/criteria that can be used for evaluating technology proposals and for down selecting proposals*
  + Energy efficiency
    - *Including discussion of proposal for NW power saving, UE power saving, and joint mechanisms taking both NW and UE into account for power saving, targeting to categorize proposals by RAN1#123. From RAN1#124, proposals will be distributed to respective related agenda.*
  + AI/ML in 6GR interface
    - *Collecting AI/ML use cases in all potential components in physical layer design, targeting to select some use cases by RAN1#123. From RAN1#124, selected use cases will be distributed to respective related agenda.*
* Future RAN1 meetings
  + Initial access
    - *Placeholder only and to be broken down. No contributions before RAN1#124. Including synchronization signal and raster, broadcast signals/channel and physical random access channel, etc.*
  + MIMO operation
    - *Placeholder only and to be broken down. No contributions before RAN1#124.*
  + Physical layer control, data scheduling and HARQ operation
    - *Placeholder only and to be broken down. No contributions before RAN1#124.*
  + Duplexing
    - *Placeholder only and to be broken down or adapted based on the discussion in AI 11.1. No contributions before RAN1#124.*
  + 6GR spectrum utilization and aggregation
    - *Placeholder only and to be broken down. No contributions before RAN1#124.*
  + NTN
    - *Placeholder only and to be broken down or adapted based on the discussion in AI 11.1. No contributions before RAN1#124.*
  + Other physical layer signals, channels and procedures
    - *Placeholder only and to be broken down. No contributions before RAN1#124.*
  + Sensing
    - *Including PHY functions and procedures for sensing technology (e.g., waveform. reference signals, measurement feedback, etc…), aspects of integration with communication services.*
    - *Placeholder only and to be broken down. No contributions before RAN1#124b.*

Similarly, a number of companies provide views on 6G RAN requirements, which is subject to the progress in RANp study for 6G RAN requirements.

# **2 Proposals for Online Sessions**

## **2.1 Proposals for xxxday Online**

To be updated

# **3 How to design a single RAT to serve diverse devices, channel bandwidth (at least minimum and maximum)**

Related to these aspects, the SID states following objectives and Interim Milestone:

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Single technology framework based on a stand-alone architecture (Note1) to support the agreed existing and new services, and to satisfy the usage scenarios, requirements, deployment scenarios and design principles with acceptable performance/complexity trade-off, as determined by the RAN requirements in [RP-250810] and [TR38.914], including: [RAN1], [RAN2], [RAN3], [RAN4]    1. Ensuring appropriate set of functionalities, minimize the adoption of multiple options for the same functionality, avoid excessive configurations, excessive UE capabilities and UE capabilities reporting.    2. Energy efficiency and energy saving: both for network and device.    3. Enhanced spectral efficiency.    4. Enhanced overall coverage, focus on cell-edge performance and UL coverage.    5. Wider channel bandwidth (at least 200MHz) support for 6G deployments at least above 2 GHz, around 7 GHz.    6. Re-use of existing 5G mid-band (~3.5GHz) site grid for 6G deployments in at least around 7 GHz and targeting comparable coverage to 5G mid-band.    7. Target scalable and forward compatible design for diverse device types.    8. Improved spectrum utilization and operations taking into account diverse spectrum allocations.    9. Aim at using common 6G Radio design, which meets mobile broadband service requirements as high priority, to also meet vertical needs.    10. Aim at a harmonized 6G Radio design for TN and NTN, including their integration.    11. System simplification, including reducing configuration complexity, enabling more efficient Cell/UE management, etc.   Note1: the term stand-alone architecture does not imply any particular Core network architecture, which is up to SA2 discussion.   1. Physical Layer structure for 6GR,    1. Waveforms (OFDM-based) and modulations. 5G NR Waveforms and modulation should be considered for 6GR and is also the benchmark for other potential proposals. [RAN1, RAN4]    2. Frame structure, including compatibility with 5G NR to allow for efficient 5G-6G Multi-RAT Spectrum Sharing (MRSS). [RAN1]    3. Channel coding, using LDPC and Polar Code as baseline, considering applicable extensions to satisfy 6G requirements and characteristics with acceptable performance/complexity trade-off [RAN1]    4. Channel Bandwidth (at least minimum and maximum), Numerology, avoiding multiple numerologies for the same band / sub-range (e.g., enabling synergies among frequency bands in the ~7GHz range) [RAN1, RAN4]    5. Physical layer control, data scheduling and HARQ operation [RAN1, RAN2]    6. MIMO operation [RAN1, RAN4]    7. Duplexing [RAN1, RAN4]    8. Initial access [RAN1, RAN2, RAN4]       * Studies on synchronization signal and raster, broadcast signals/channel and physical random access channel [RAN1, RAN4]       * Studies on initial access procedure, random access procedures, system information and paging [RAN2, RAN1, RAN4]    9. 6GR spectrum utilization and aggregation. [RAN1, RAN2, RAN4]    10. Other physical layer signals, channels and procedures [RAN1, RAN2, RAN4]    11. Evaluate performance of at least energy efficiency, spectrum efficiency, and coverage compared to 5G NR, and deliver the initial result at the end of study [RAN1].        1. RAN4 can be involved, if necessary, based on the LS from RAN1   …  **TSG#112 (June/2026):**  RAN1 to provide interim assessment on the following areas:   * Waveform, modulation, channel coding: scope of enhancements beyond NR baseline ((2) a, c) * Channel bandwidth (min and max), frame structure, numerology ((2) b, d) * Basic sync signal structure and associated periodicity(ies) ((2) h)   For objectives where RAN4 may be impacted, RAN1 shall coordinate with RAN4 early to enable the above assessment by June 2026. |

Regarding how to design a single RAT to serve diverse devices, quite a few companies mention that common/scalable 6GR should be studied. More specifically, modular/nucleus/scalable design is mentiend by a number of companies and some examples are shown below. Although the details need to be further discussed, the commonality among these concepts is to have a basic feature set / framework commonly applicable to all 6G use cases / device types, as well as add-on features (modules) dedicated to specific use cases / device types.
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Scalable design in [46]

These concepts are well aligned with the objectives in the SID, and following proposal can be considered as starting point.

#### [Old]Proposal 3.1:

* Study a scalable 6GR design having at least the following aspects:
  + basic feature set / framework commonly applicable to all 6G use cases / device types
  + add-on features dedicated to specific use cases / device types

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Y/N | Comments |
| Tejas | Y | Scalable 6GR design need to address high data rate. It need not address all 6G use cases in the basic feature set. |
| Nokia | Y | In addition, specific device types may have their own basic feature set, with possible add-on features as well. |
| OPPO | Y | If a basic feature set can be applicable to all 6G use cases/device types, it should be based on the low-end IoT, because all use cases needs IoT-like data transfer and all device types can be regarded as a IoT device in low-data working mode. |
| CMCC | Probably OK | The principle seems OK. Features or feature sets are not only RAN1 related. Would this be more appropriate to discuss the principle in RAN plenary? |
| Apple | In principle okay | We are not sure whether add-on features dedicated to specific use cases / device types is absolutely needed, but we are open to study.  It might also be better to clarify the meaning of “dedicated”, whether it means the feature is motivated by specific use cases/ device types, or it means the featruer is only applicable (can only be deployed) to specific use cases / device types.  In NR, we do have extensive discussion on whether a NR-U feature should be applicable to Uu, a NTN feature should be applicable to TN, etc.  Furthermore, we prefer clarification that the use cases are not coupled with the device types.  Therefore, we propose the following change   * Study a scalable 6GR design having at least the following aspects:   + basic feature set / framework commonly applicable to all 6G use cases ~~/~~ and all device types   + FFS: add-on features dedicated to specific use cases / device types |
| ETRI | Y |  |
| Samsung | Y | We have a clarification question for this proposal. We understand the intention but the current formulation may imply the possibility of introducing massive add-on features dedicated for diversge use cases and device types which is not aligned with a high-level direction of 6GR. We suggest to update as follows   * Study a scalable 6GR design having at least the following aspects:   + Basic feature set / framework commonly applicable to all 6G use cases / device types   + Identify and minimize add-on features dedicated to specific use cases / device types |
| CATT, CICTCI | Y | We think the direction is right to go. To better undestand the relationship between basic feature and add-on feature, and also to refine the term ‘scalable’, we have following questions:  (1) Does it imply that add-on features are assumed indivitial to each other, and all built on top of basic features?  (2) If the basic feature set is designed based on low capability UE, e.g. IoT UE, does it mean some low-hand fruit feature (e.g. 200 MHz BW, 2 layer, Tx switching…) will be addn-on feature and ‘optional’ in general? |
| ZTE | Slightly N | It seems that this proposal is directly for the feature set definition without some common understanding on the support device types, and potential difference. It will lead to different interpretation of “add-on features”. For this agenda, maybe we can start to achieve consensus on the expected device types firstly. Then we can discuss the basic feature set per device type. For now, we don’t think it is necessary to have such proposal as scalable 6GR design using a common framework has been captured in the SID. |
| FUTUREWEI | partly | We need to focus on the common framework for the scaleable design with basic features usable for all device types incl coverage and power savings. The bullet on add on features should be removed or FFS |
| Spreadtrum | Y |  |
| Rakuten | Ok in Principle | We concern the terms “all 6G use cases / device types”. Suggest to   * Provide reference for all 6G use cases * Consider device types specified as the outcome of this study |
| Ofinno | Y | Agree with comment from Nokia that specific types may have additional basic features as well |
| Fainity | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y | We propose to add a third bullet, “optimized for the main stream solution supporting majority of deployments”, to the FL bullet list above.  6G should be optimized for the *majority of deployment and use cases* and not end up with an overly complex design due to some “small” and potential use case that would dictate a bad, inefficient or over engineered design for majority of implementations that do not use the feature. It is important to address use cases “sufficiently well” at an early point in time to get the market going rather than waiting for a later release to address corner cases with a highly optimized (and complex) solution. If a certain use case takes off and becomes commercially successful, enhancements motivated by business needs can be added in later releases. Relying on a main-stream solution provides great advantages with respect to economy of scale. |
| MediaTek | Partially | Agree with main bullet and 1st sub-bullet.  The 2nd sub-bullet seems a bit strong. Add-on features “may” be specific to certain types of device or may be driven by certain use cases, where necessary. |
| SK Telecom | Y | Fine for the proposal.  From our perspective, the design and implementation of a single radio access technology capable of supporting diverse types of devices from low-tier UE and massive IoT devices to high-end terminals (XR, autonomous vehicle, robot, etc) will be one of the key aspects to be taken into account. We think that it would be effective to define the basic capabilities for 6G which need to supported by all the types of 6G UE so as to ensure no backward compatibility issue in the later release, and then any further features/capability need to be identified to support specific use cases/device types. |
| CEWiT | Y | We are fine with the proposal on a high level. But as Samsung mentioned, the scope of second bullet should be monitored carefully. |
| Xiaomi | Y in principle | We agree with the design principle. On the other hand, we are not sure how the proposal would impact/restrict the future discussions as it is expected that there can be different understandings on “basic feature set/framework”. |
| Sharp | Y |  |
| SONY | Y | While we agree with the proposal, the difficulty will be in defining what the basic feature set / framework is. We assume that the basic feature inlcudes a device to perform initial access to the network. |
| CSCN | Y | Based on the harmonized 6GR design principle for TN and NTN, NTN characteristics should be incorporated in the basic feature set / framework design. |
| Fujitsu | Yes in principle | We understand the intention of this proposal and would like to support this principle in principle.  It seems the proposal needs to be further polished to make sure companies would be on the same page of the exact meaning of, such as, ‘scalable’ and ‘add-on’. This can help to avoid unnecessary misunderstanding the future discussion, e.g., on how to identify which part is basic and which part is add-on. Acutually, in our undersatanding, it is more like ‘common need’ and ‘individual need’ for the support of devices/services. |
| InterDigital | Y | We support the direction but whether it is feasible and/or efficient is highly dependent on how to define basic feature set and add-on features. |
| Huawei | partly | We support to have a scalable 6GR design for diverse device types. However, how to achieve such scalable design would still depend on the defintions of the device types, e.g. we cannot assume that basic features are based on the low end IoT as commented by a few companies.  In addition, it is a bit risky at this stage to say that there will be a basic featue set/framework that can be commonly applicable to “all” 6G use cases/device types, especially we are not sure whether companies share the same understanding on 6G use cases and device types in terms of their capabilities.  Therefore, it is pre-mature to have such proposal at this moment. If we really want to achieve something here, we can make this proposal focus more on diverse types:   * Study a scalable 6GR design for diverse device types having at least the following aspects:   + basic feature set / framework commonly applicable to all ~~6G use cases /~~ device types   + add-on features dedicated to specific ~~use cases /~~ device types if any |
| Lenovo | Y | The scalable design should also consider different frequency range, TN/NTN deployments.  basic feature set / framework commonly applicable to all 6G use cases / device types, frequency range, TN/NTN deployments. |
| Google | OK in principle | We also think the last bullet can be FFS |
| vivo |  | It is fine in general, however the sub-bullets sound like a specific design in mind. In our view, proposal 3.1 has some relation with proposal 3.2. The basic feature set can be designed/defined for each device types rather than defining a feature set of for example IoT (Device Type C in the table below) then add-on features for other device types (Device Type A and B). |
| HONOR | Y |  |

#### Proposal 3.1a:

* Study a scalable 6GR design for diverse device types having at least the following aspects:
  + basic feature set / framework commonly applicable to all 6G ~~use cases /~~ device types
  + FFS: add-on features dedicated to specific ~~use cases /~~ device types, if any

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Y/N | Comments |
| Moderator |  | Generally companies are OK with the intention of the Proposal. Some update to reflect feedback:   * Foucs on the scalable design for diverce device types * Soften 2nd sub-bullet to maximuze the scale of 1st sub-bullet |
| FUTUREWEI | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | Y | Focus on unified and scalable design. for essential one-off features should be proposed in in dividual agenda items, however, companies could also be encouraged to bring on common designs that could benefit specific device type and eMBB and other verticals in general. |
| Ericsson | Y | We are fine with the proposal (the softening of the second bullet partially addresses our earlier comment “optimized for the main stream solution supporting a majority of deployments”). Details are to be handled in the respective agenda item. Important that fundamental aspects such as initial access are designed to handle all types of devices from the start. |
| Apple | Y | The updated proposal looks good to us |
| Samsung | Y | We are generally OK. |
| Fraunhofer | Y |  |
| CATT, CICTCI | Y | Since we only focus on diverse device types now, we think add-on features are expected to study, at least for MBB UE compared to IoT UE. Like MIMO features for Rx>2. With that, we can remove the term ‘FFS’ now.   * + ~~FFS:~~ add-on features dedicated to specific device types~~, if any~~ |
| Spreadtrum | Y |  |
| Fujitsu | Y | We are fine with the proposal, we think that ‘add-on’ is still not clear enough though.  Besides, we’d like to check our understanding on the relation between ‘basic feature set / framework’ and ‘add-on features’. Can we understand in this way that whenever a feature can be supported by scaling ‘basic feature set / framework’, there would not be an ‘add-on’ design for this feature? |
| ETRI | Y |  |
| China Telecom |  | One clarification question, is AIoT-like device type included? Since the basic feature set/ framework may be quite different. |

Then, the next question is how to define diverse device types to be supported by 6GR. A number of companies provide views and some examples are shown below. Although the details need to be further discussed, the commonality among companies are limiting the number of device types to avoid excessive UE capabilities, and having some mandatory capability set in each device type.

Device types in [10]

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Device type A | Device type B | Device type C |
| Typical Device/service | Smartphones, immersive eMBB, CPE, | Reduced capability eMBB, e.g., wearable/XR, etc | IoT |
| Downlink peak data rate | ~10Gbps | 200Mbps ~ 1Gbps | ~10Mbps |
| Uplink peak data rate | ~2Gbps | 50Mbps ~ 200Mbps | ~5Mbps |
| Supported maximum downlink channel bandwidth | At least 200 MHz | 100 MHz | ~5MHz for FDD  ~20MHz for TDD |
| Supported maximum uplink channel bandwidth | [100/200] MHz | 100 MHz | ~5MHz for FDD  ~20MHz for TDD |
| Supported maximum Downlink MIMO layer | At least 4 layers | 1~2 layers | 1~2 layers |
| Supported maximum Uplink MIMO layer | At least 2 layers | 1 layer | 1 layer |
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Device types in [26]

These views are well aligned with the objectives in the SID, and following proposal can be considered as starting point.

#### [Old]Proposal 3.2:

* Study how to define device types suppored by 6GR, including at least
  + How to avoid excessive UE capabilities
  + Mandatory capability set in each device type

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Y/N | Comments |
| Tejas | Y | Support the proposal |
| Nokia | Y |  |
| Vodafone | Y |  |
| OPPO | Y | But as a special case, mandatory capabilities of low-end IoT are mandatory for all device types. Suggest change to the proposal:   * Study how to define device types suppored by 6GR, including at least   + How to avoid excessive UE capabilities   + Mandatory capability set in each device type   + A basic capability set is mandatory for all device types |
| CMCC | Y | On the second bullet, regarding the mandatory capability set for each device type, it is difficult to discuss at this early stage. Some clarification may be needed on the ‘mandatory capability set’ that would be discussed under this agenda. |
| Apple | In principle okay | We prefer to add the following based on the online presention from operators   * + How to ensure that the manadatory feature can be IoDT’d   We also believe there is significant performance benefit from both the UE and NW perspective to allow UE to update its capability based on the UE circumstances, therefore, we propose to study the following   * + Study the benefit, and how to support event-based UE capability update |
| ETRI | Y |  |
| Samsung | N | We are generally ok with intention of proposal 3.2 but we first need to align design principles for device types. Namely, we should identify options such as   * How to define UE types, such as form factor, use case, or capability * How to define/update/signaling of UE capabilities * Which metrics/features should be included in a capability set   Based on that, we suggest to modify   * Study how to define device types suppored by 6GR, including at least   + How to define UE types, such as form factor, use case, or capability   + How to define/update/signaling of UE capabilities   + Which metrics/featues should be included in capability set |
| CATT, CICTCI | Y |  |
| ZTE |  | It’s somehow overlapped with previous proposal with some “mis-alignment”. For exsample, we need to clarify the relationship between “mandatory capability set for each device type” vs. “general feature set” vs. “add-on feature”. We are fine with exploring “mandatory capability set” in each device type. |
| FUTUREWEI | Y |  |
| Spreadtrum | Y |  |
| Rakuten | Y |  |
| Ofinno | Y |  |
| Fainity | Y | Basic feature set refer mandatory capabilities for all devie type and each device type may have corresponding mandatory capabilities additionally |
| Ericsson | Y | General principles can be discussed (in cooperation with other working groups). |
| MediaTek | N | We agree there needs to be a study in relation to device types and framework within TSG RAN. However, the sub-bullet points are premature and are not necessarily having a 1-1 mapping to this topic. We would appreciate some RAN plenary discussion/guidance on how WGs should address such additional device types before we dive into trying to make agreements in RAN1, as these issues cross RAN1/2/4. |
| SK Telecom | Y | Recollecting all the complexity of 5G UE capability, simplified UE capability for 6G should be pursued. |
| CEWiT | Y |  |
| Xiaomi | Y |  |
| Sharp | Y |  |
| SONY | Y |  |
|  |  |  |
| LGE | Y | While it is also a topic for study whether to introduce mandatory capability set for each device type, it is worth to study this approach. |
| CSCN | Y | We agree with this proposal in principle. However, before the detailed discussion, use cases for all devie types should be determined considering the harmonized 6GR design principle for TN and NTN. |
| Fujitsu | Y |  |
| InterDigital | Y |  |
| Huawei | partly | We are fine with the proposal except the second sub-bullet. It is not clear to us what does mandatory capability set here mean, does it mean mandatory UE features or just the mandatory device capability, e.g. supported maximum bandwidth, coverage target, form factor. At this stage, I think the only thing we can study is the device capability, therefore we can update the proposal as below:   * Study how to define device types suppored by 6GR, including at least   + How to avoid excessive UE capabilities   + Mandatory device capability set in each device type, e.g. UE bandwidth, form factor, coverage target, etc. |
| Nordic | Y | Add 1 sub-bullet,  whether mandatory capability is applicable also to network |
| Lenovo | Y | Similar to LTE, UE device type can be introduced in 6G, However, excessive device categories (Cat 1 to Cat 21) should not be introduced like in LTE.  What aspects needs to be taken when defining new device type in 6G should be discussed.   * Study how to define device types suppored by 6GR, including at least   + How to avoid excessive UE capabilities, and aspects to be taken into consideration to define device type   + Mandatory capability set in each device type |
| Google | Y | We do not think we need to define a basic capability set for all devices. The mandatory capability set should be defined per device type. |
| vivo | Y |  |
| HONOR | Y |  |

#### Proposal 3.2a:

* Study how to define device types suppored by 6GR, including at least
  + How to avoid excessive UE capabilities
  + How to define mandatory capability set in each device type (e.g., form factor, UE BW), including how to ensure the testability of mandatory capability set with NW
  + Note: This requires involvement with other WGs

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Y/N | Comments |
| Moderator |  | Generally companies are OK with the intention of the Proposal. Some update to reflect feedback:   * Make the intention of 2nd bullet clear * Add the testability aspect in the 2nd sub-bullet * Add a note that other WGs needs to be involved, while RAN1 can lead the discussion |
| FUTUREWEI | Y | We also want to avoid excessive numbers of UE types, not only capabilities. For example 5 types + a form factor exception for the ‘normal’ types may be sufficient. (RP-2505143)   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Type** | **Bandwidth** | | High Normal (e.g. FWA) | 400MHz | | Normal (e.g., smartphone) | 200MHz | | Low Normal (e.g. low-complexity smartphone) | 100MHz | | High RedCap (e.g., wearable) | 40 or 50 MHz | | Low RedCap (e.g., sensor) | 3 or 5 MHz | |
| Qualcomm | Y | Max, min bandwidth discussed in individual sessions. Tradeoff between UE capability reporting complexity vs. modem area efficiency need to be carefully considered especially at the envelope.  To ensure smooth new device types rollout at a future time, it is essential to incorporating “critical features” from NW side from day 1, not just for these devices types, but also make sure they are part of eMBB mandatory features on both NW and UE side, so that the functionalities could be tested from Day 1. Also future device side rollout will require minimum network side upgrade |
| Ericsson | Y | The intention of discussing general principles is fine. |
| Apple | Y | The updated proposal looks good to us  One thing to clarify is that for the second sub-bullet, to ensure the testability, it should include all the mandatory capabilities, not just limit to the mandatory capabilies that are used to differentiate different device types. Ther can also be many mandatory capabilies that are common for multiple or all device types. |
| Samsung | Y | We are ok with this proposal. |
| Fraunhofer | Y |  |
| CATT, CICTCI | Y in general | But the examples in 2nd bullet is too detailed, and may lead to limited study scope. To us the number of TRx is also important. But to avoid excessive examples, suggest deleting all examples. So:   * + How to define mandatory capability set in each device type ~~(e.g., form factor, UE BW)~~, including how to ensure the testability of mandatory capability set with NW |
| Spreadtrum | Y |  |
| Fujitsu | Y |  |
| ETRI | Y |  |

Regarding the channel bandwidth (at least minimum and maximum), there is in general good alignment among companies for avoiding multiple numerologies for the same band / sub-range, while companies may have different preference on which SCS/numerology to take in each band / sub-range, resulting in different assumptions of the maximum CBW and required FFS size for the SCS as shown in below table. Note that the maximum supported BW for low-tier 6G UE is discussed in Section 9.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FR** | **Range** | **SCS (kHz)** | **Required FFT size** | **Max CBW (MHz)** | **Min CBW (MHz)** |
| FR1 | 400 MHz – 6.425 GHz | 15, 30 | 4096, 8192 | 20, 100 | 3, 5 (FDD)  10, 20 (TDD) |
| 6.425 – 7.125 GHz | 15, 30, 60 | 4096, 8192 | 100, 200, 400 | 20 |
| New FR(s) | 7.125 – X GHz | 30, 60 | 4096, 8192,16384 | 200, 400 | 20 |
| X – 24.25 GHz | 60, 120 | 4096, 8192 | 400, 800 | 20 |
| FR2-1 | 24.25 – 52.6 GHz | 120 | 4096, 8192 | 400, 800 | 50, 100 |

TBD: the value X

Also, the view on max/min CBW can be different due to different situation for the spectrum allocation in each region. As stated in the SID and pointed out by some companies, this issue would need RAN4 involvement in early stage.

As this issue was also discussed in AI11.3.2 (Frame structure), moderators in each agenda coordinated how to avoid overlap. {SCS, required FFT size, Max CBW} are more suitable to be discussed under AI11.3.2 since those would highly affect overall design of frame structure. On the other hand, Min CBW can be discussed in this agenda item since this would not have much impact on overall design design of frame structure, rather related to the maximum supported BW for low-tier 6G UE and the spectrum allocation in each region.

Therefore, following proposal can be considered as starting point for further discussion together with RAN4.

#### [Old]Proposal 3.3:

* Study the minimum CBW in each band / sub-range using the following table as starting point
  + Note: RAN4 involvement is necessary
  + TBD the value X, including the possibility that this value is not defined, i.e., common values in the new FR(s).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FR** | **Range** | **Min CBW (MHz)** |
| FR1 | 400 MHz – 6.425 GHz | 3, 5 (FDD)  10, 20 (TDD) |
| 6.425 – 7.125 GHz | 20 |
| New FR(s) | 7.125 – X GHz | 20 |
| X – 24.25 GHz | 20 |
| FR2-1 | 24.25 – 52.6 GHz | 50, 100 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Y/N | Comments |
| Tejas | Y | Support the proposal. 3 MHz channel BW support is required in 6G. |
| Nokia | Y | Indeed RAN4 involvement is necessary, and the final decisions on min CBW are dependent on the supported SCS for the different channels. The table has some implicit assumptions of what SCS is the baseline for the different bands, which is fine as starting point for discussion though. |
| OPPO |  | Suggest to discuss in Agenda 11.3.2. |
| CMCC |  | We should not preclude <10MHz for TDD at this moment. We suggest removing the duplex mode for Min CBW.  For new spectrum (including U6G and new FR), the minimum CBW can depend on available spectrum and decided by RAN4, for example, in R15, RAN4 decided to define 40MHz as minimum CBW for n79. We can keep TBD for now. Proposal 3.3 (revised):  * **Study the minimum CBW in each band / sub-range using the following table as starting point**   + **Note: RAN4 involvement is necessary**   + **TBD the value X, including the possibility that this value is not defined, i.e., common values in the new FR(s).**  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **FR** | **Range** | **Min CBW (MHz)** | | FR1 | 400 MHz – 6.425 GHz | 3, 5 | | 6.425 – 7.125 GHz | TBD | | New FR(s) | 7.125 – X GHz | TBD | | X – 24.25 GHz | TBD | | FR2-1 | 24.25 – 52.6 GHz | 50, 100 | |
| Apple | Y | The proposal looks good to us as starting point |
| ETRI | Y |  |
| Samsung | Y | We are supportive of this proposal. |
| CATT, CICTCI |  | We still have concern on min CBW = 3 MHz, but OK as starting point.  We should also list the associated SCS assumption for each Min CBW. Otherwise, we do not know how this CBW comes.  For example, 20 MHz min CBW, it is unclear whether 30 kHz or 60 kHz SCS is assumed. |
| ZTE |  | It’s fine to discuss the min CBW in this agenda. As starting point, we prefer to keep only single value and try to identify if there is any serious issue behind. For example, 5 MHz is more suitable to be the baseline. |
| Spreadtrum |  | Suggest to discuss in Agenda 11.3.2. |
| Rakuten |  | We expect RAN1 to have a list of candidates for minimum CBW for each FR above for further evaluation which requires RAN4 to involve. |
| Ofinno | Y |  |
| Ericsson | Y | The topic can be discussed under 11.3.2. The smallest bandwidth has an impact on the design of e.g. initial access and the search raster (RAN4 involvement needed). We are in general fine with the numbers proposed above. |
| MediaTek |  | Suggest to discuss under 11.3.2 |
| SK Telecom |  | We are generally fine for the proposal but the column for “min CBW” itself needs to be further discussed. |
| CEWiT | Y |  |
| Xiaomi |  | For the minimum CBW for FR1 FDD, we propose to start with 5MHz and further discuss 3MHz with involvement of RAN4. |
| Sharp | Y | Minimum CBW will have potential impact on sync. signal design, and thus, we support to discuss this under AI11.1. |
| SONY | Y for CBW | The proposal is about channel bandwidth. We agree with the minimum CBWs. The maximum UE bandwidth can be less than the minimum channel bandwidth, to enable low complexity IoT devices.  For the maximum UE bandwidth, we think that UL bandwidth is particularly important, where an UL bandwidth of 3MHz allows for SAW-less multi-band devices, which significantly reduces UE and module complexity. This UL bandwidth applies for FR1 and for FDD and TDD. |
| LG Electronics | Y | We are fine with discussing on minimum CBW in this Agenda. |
| InterDigital | Y | Support 3MHz as minimum CBW for FR1 as in 5G NR |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  | We support the update from CMCC |
| Nordic | N | 400 MHz – 6.425 GHz -> 3 UL/5DL for (FDD) 3UL/10DL (TDD) |
| Lenovo | Y | We should further discuss whether optimizing system design for the min CBW of 3 MHz is needed or not.  The reason is an MNO’s min CBW of 3 MHz can be supported using system BW of 5MHz min CBW and existing Rel-18 mechansim. Impact of min. CBW on the synchronization raster needs further consideration as well.  For the moment, we can put [3 MHz] in the bracket. |
| Google |  | Probably for new FR, we can study more on the min CBW. |
| vivo |  | It should be clarified that whether the minimum CBW is from newtwork perspective or device perspective. For example, minimum CBW supported by the device could be 20MHz but the same device can also operate in a network operating with 3MHz bandwidth |
| HONOR | Y |  |

#### Proposal 3.3a:

* Study the minimum CBW in each band / sub-range using the following table as starting point
  + Note: RAN4 involvement is necessary
  + TBD the value X, including the possibility that this value is not defined, i.e., common values in the new FR(s).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FR** | **Range** | **Min CBW (MHz)** |
| FR1 | 400 MHz – 6.425 GHz | 3, 5 (FDD)  10, 20 (TDD) |
| 6.425 – 7.125 GHz | 20, 40 |
| New FR(s) | 7.125 – X GHz | 20, 40 |
| X – 24.25 GHz | 20, 40 |
| FR2-1 | 24.25 – 52.6 GHz | 50, 100 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Y/N | Comments |
| Moderator |  | Generally companies are OK with the intention of the Proposal. As mentioned above, moderators has coordinated and decided min CBW is discussed in this agenda, and others (including SCS) are discussed under AI 11.3.2.  Note that this proposal discussed min CBW (i.e. system perspective). UE BW especially for low-tier device is discussed in Section 9.  Some update to reflect feedback:   * Add 40MHz min CBW to three sub-ranges |
| FUTUREWEI | Y | Assuming that just one value per band is selected from these candidates |
| Qualcomm | Y | This discussion should take place in numerology/frame structure agenda item as is going on now. |
| Ericsson | Y | We are fine with the proposal as long as we avoid discussing the topic under multiple agenda points. |
| Apple | Y | The updated proposal looks good to us |
| Samsung |  | We would also like to note that this topic is also discussed in Frame Structure agenda. To prevent duplication, it is perhaps better to address this topic only in one agenda. |
| Fraunhofer | Y |  |
| CATT, CICTCI | Y | Still have concern for CBW = 3 MHz. Suggest to add a [] on it for now.  [3], 5 (FDD) |
| Spreadtrum | Y |  |
| ETRI | Y |  |

# **4 Overall coverage**

Related to this aspect, the SID states following objectives:

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Single technology framework based on a stand-alone architecture (Note1) to support the agreed existing and new services, and to satisfy the usage scenarios, requirements, deployment scenarios and design principles with acceptable performance/complexity trade-off, as determined by the RAN requirements in [RP-250810] and [TR38.914], including: [RAN1], [RAN2], [RAN3], [RAN4] 2. Ensuring appropriate set of functionalities, minimize the adoption of multiple options for the same functionality, avoid excessive configurations, excessive UE capabilities and UE capabilities reporting. 3. Energy efficiency and energy saving: both for network and device. 4. Enhanced spectral efficiency. 5. Enhanced overall coverage, focus on cell-edge performance and UL coverage. 6. Wider channel bandwidth (at least 200MHz) support for 6G deployments at least above 2 GHz, around 7 GHz. 7. Re-use of existing 5G mid-band (~3.5GHz) site grid for 6G deployments in at least around 7 GHz and targeting comparable coverage to 5G mid-band. 8. Target scalable and forward compatible design for diverse device types. 9. Improved spectrum utilization and operations taking into account diverse spectrum allocations. 10. Aim at using common 6G Radio design, which meets mobile broadband service requirements as high priority, to also meet vertical needs. 11. Aim at a harmonized 6G Radio design for TN and NTN, including their integration. 12. System simplification, including reducing configuration complexity, enabling more efficient Cell/UE management, etc.   Note1: the term stand-alone architecture does not imply any particular Core network architecture, which is up to SA2 discussion. |

Quite a few companies provide the views on coverage target for 6GR, including not only + 5 to 10 dB enhancement from normal coverage (144dB MCL) for cell-edge performance but also overall UL performance improvements in anywhere within the cell coverage. However, the target values need to be discussed and clarified in RANp study for 6G requirements and hence, RAN1 needs to wait for their progress.

While RAN1 does not have exact target value for coverage enhancement, as stated in SID, the 6GR is assumed to support enhanced overall coverage. Therefore, RAN1 can start studying some technical direction for coverage enhancements, including which signals/channels need to be improved, and which UEs/device types need to support features for coverage enhancements. According to the contributions, there is in general good alignment to consider coverage enhancement not only dedicated channels (e.g. scheduled PDSCH/PUSCH) but also common signals/channels during initial/random access (e.g., PRACH, Msg3 PUSCH) from the 1st release, while further discussion would be necessary on the applicable UEs (e.g., MBB and/or IoT, TN and/or NTN). Therefore, following proposal can be considered as starting point for further discussion.

#### [Old]Proposal 4.1:

* Study how to enhance overall coverage, including at least
  + which signals/channels need to be improved, including both cell-common and UE-dedicated signals/channels
  + which UEs/device types need to support features for coverage enhancements

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Y/N | Comments |
| China Telecom |  | Considering the importance of coverage for us operators, we think 6G DAY-1 needs to pay more attention to this topic. Meantime, we need to learn lessons from 5G to ensure a good coverage at the beginning. Since the coverage target is not determined currently, we think instead of identifying which signals/channels need to be improved (maybe all the channels need to be improved), it’s better to study which technique can improve the coverage and can be supported in 6G, e.g., coverage enhancement solutions studied/specified in 5G. Then, after the target coverage related values are determined, we think evaluation is needed to check if the target can be met for each channel. Thus, we suggest the following proposal instead:   * Study potential techniques/solutions for coverage improvement for both downlink and uplink channels. |
| Tejas | Y | Support the proposal |
| Nokia | Y | Improvements need to be defined with respect to baseline, so it is important to define the target MCL for 6GR.  Generally the coverage enhancement features should be agnostic to device types. UE-type or scenario-specific enhancements may be considered on top at a later stage. |
| Vodafone | Y |  |
| OPPO | Y |  |
| CMCC |  | For the first bullet, which signals/channels need to be improved should based on evaluation, e.g. under agenda 11.2.  What can be dicussed under agenda 11.1 is the target for coverage enhancement. Hence, we propose to add another bullet for study:   * A unified target for coverage (a MCL target) for all the signals/channels.  Proposal 4.1 (revised):  * Study how to enhance overall coverage, including at least   + A unified target for coverage (a MCL target) for all the signals/channels.   + ~~which signals/channels need to be improved, including both cell-common and UE-dedicated signals/channels~~   + which UEs/device types need to support features for coverage enhancements |
| Apple |  | We think the right approach is to set a common coverage requirement, e.g., MCL (Maximum Coupling Loss), that covers (1) all channels/signals and PHY procedures in all RRC states, (2) all services, use cases, verticals, (3) all supported device types. Of cousse, MCL should be coupled with the performance requirement, e.g., control channel (e.g, PUCCH/PDCCH) reliability, data channel (e.g., PDSCH/PUSCH) minimum data rate, etc. Then each agenda should ensure that the design meets the coverage requirement in 6G day 1. Therefore, we propose   * Study a common coverage requirement, e.g., MCL (maximum coupling loss), for (1) all channels/signals and PHY procedures in all RRC states, (2) all services, use cases, verticals supported at least in 6G day 1, (3) all device types supported at least in 6G day 1 ~~how to enhance overall coverage, including at least~~   + Note: the coverage requirement is a combination of the performance requirement and the associated channel condition, e.g., MCL   + ~~which signals/channels need to be improved, including both cell-common and UE-dedicated signals/channels~~   + ~~which UEs/device types need to support features for coverage enhancements~~ |
| ETRI | Y | Based on the learning from 5G, at least all UL signals/channels should be improved. The improvement of DL signals/channel can be also considered. |
| Samsung | N | We think the moderator’s approach appears similar to NR, where coverage enhancements were handled release-by-release based on the results of NR deployments; this led to fragmented handling and inconsistent implementation.  It is more important to have a common understanding, such as 6GR should consider coverage enhancemenets from the first release and RAN1 should support coverage enhancement schemes, when needed, to all applicable channels and signals.  Moreover, channel/signal designs and device types are currently unknown. Therefore, it is too early to conclude on the moderator’s proposal. |
| CATT, CICTCI |  | Agree that overall coverage is important.  When we go into details, for the 1st bullet, it is very difficult to study without a clear target, either:   * Abosolute target value (and metric such as MCL, MPL, or MIL), or * Target reference channel (e.g. using which channel as refrence for comparison and bottlenect channel identification)   For the 2nd bullet, we think we can conclude that all UE/devices in 6G need to support features for coverage enhancements☺. |
| ZTE | Slighly No | It’s fine to first align the assumptions/configurations at both BS and UE but further details should be discussed later along with the design of cell-common and UE-dedicated signals/channels. |
| FUTUREWEI |  | The last bullet should be deleted … all UE should at least be able to optioally support the features for coverage enhancement. |
| Spreadtrum |  | We agree with CTC that potential techniques/solutions can also be studied. |
| Rakuten |  | We align with CMCC for studying a common target for MCL rather than on which channels needing to enhance. |
| Ofinno |  | We generally are supportive to study improving coverage for 6G compared with 5G. One question is what baseline to use to compare with as different coverage enhancement techniques were introduced in different 5G releases. If we target “enhancing” then we need to discuss what/where we are enhancing from. |
| Fainity |  | We think coverage enhancement is needed for all UEs/device types. In addition, for better UE experience to camp on and connect to the cell successfully, study how to improve the DL synchronizations (e.g., SSB) and PRACH transmission is needed. |
| Ericsson | Y | The term “coverage enhancement” is somewhat misleading as we not yet have any 6G coverage to enhance (although 5G can be considered the baseline. Coverage is a basic aspect and not related to a specific device type.  Relevant coverage-enhancements features introduced in later NR releases (e.g. dynamic repetition and TBoMS) should (in some form) be included as part of the overall framework in the first 6G release (e.g. through the possibility to schedule a transport block spanning multiple slots) under the respective agenda item. |
| MediaTek | Partially | We think some agreement on a target is required, probably at RAN plenary. We also think baseline coverage enhancement should be targeted as part of the basic feature set for all devices. It’s premature to talk about device specific aspects without identifying/studying the potential techniques further, and should not be the initial main focus. |
| SK Telecom | Y | From our perspective, the overall coverage is very important topic which should be definitely studied, however it seems a bit unclear what the baseline would be when we say ‘enhance’. |
| CEWiT | Conditonal Y | We strongly believe coverage requirement should be considered from day-1 of designing all the signals/channels, not just as improvement but as a part of the baseline design. So, we should first strive to come up with MCL values required for different deployment scenarios and different device types and work on the signals/channels design based on the required value. |
| Xiaomi |  | We share the same view as other companies that we should first agree on an overall coverage target. |
| Sharp |  | NR SSB could be the coverage baseline. How much coverage extension compared to NR SSB is required can be discussed. |
| SONY | Y | It is not clear whether a +5dB / +10dB coverage improvement relative to 5G is a “coverage enhancement” or a “native support of deep coverage”. |
| LG Electronics |  | We think that it is good to study the coverage requirement for 6GR in this Agenda 11.1. |
| CSCN |  | To achieve the unified air interface design, the coverage for both DL and UL should be studied based on the harmonized 6GR design principle for TN and NTN. Besides, the requirments originated from the practical deployment scenarios also could be considered, such as the sparse network. |
| Fujitsu |  | We think ‘coverage enhancement’ may not be proper, because now is the start of 6G. We silghtly ‘coverage requirement’ used by Apple in their proposal. A mandate common coverage requirement for all devices does make sense. |
| InterDigital |  | As we don’t have a 6GR signals/channels yet, it is hard to make any decision which signals/channels require coverage enhancement. Also, target MCL is missing too. Under this agenda, it would be good enough to make decision on the overall target coverage requirements |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  | We agree coverage is a very critical aspect for 6GR study and the moderator proposal is a good starting point. The first step to study is what evaluation methodology to take, it is pre-mature to conclude taking MCL at this moment.   * Study how to enhance overall coverage, including at least   + Evaluation methodology   + Identify which signals/channels need to be improved and the corresponding target taking into account divers device types, including both cell-common and UE-dedicated signals/channels   + ~~which UEs/device types need to support features for coverage enhancements~~ |
| Lenovo | Y | We also need to know what are coverage requirements for these device types   * Study how to enhance overall coverage, including at least   + Coverage requirements   + which signals/channels need to be improved, including both cell-common and UE-dedicated signals/channels   + which UEs/device types need to support features for coverage enhancements |
| Google | Y | We think the coverage related aspects are important and should be supported as a Day-1 feature. |
| vivo |  | In our view, overall coverage enhancement/requirements is not only for cell edge coverage. Study should consider improved performance at each MCL points.  We have concern on the second sub-bullet, our view is that coverage enhancements should applicable for all device type, this should be the design principle by default. |
| HONOR | Y |  |

#### Proposal 4.1a:

* Study how to enhance overall coverage, including at least
  + Evaluation methodology
  + Identify coverage target considering diverse use cases and device types
  + Identify which signals/channels need to be improved, including both cell-common and UE-dedicated signals/channels
  + ~~which UEs/device types need to support features for coverage enhancements~~

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Y/N | Comments |
| Moderator |  | Generally companies are OK with the intention of the Proposal. Some update to reflect feedback:   * Add to study evaluation methodology * Add to identify coverage target for diverse use cases and device types * Delete last sub-bullet |
| FUTUREWEI | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | Y | Each relevant agenda item should be encouraged to discuss aspects for coverage improvements (waveform, MIMO, etc.) |
| Ericsson | Y | We are in general fine with the proposal assuming that the evaluation methodology is aligned with discussions under agenda point 11.2 to avoid duplicate work. Detailed solutiosn to be handled under the respective agenda point. |
| Apple | Y | The updated proposal looks good to us |
| Samsung | Y | Support moderator’s proposal. |
| Fraunhofer | Y |  |
| CATT, CICTCI | Y | Minior update by adding metric, since we need to align which metric should be used (e.g. MCL, MPL or MIL):   * + Evaluation methodology and metric |
| Spreadtrum | Y |  |
| Fujitsu | Y |  |
| ETRI | Y |  |
| China Telecom |  | We are fine with the modification. However, since the main bullet says: “Study how to enhance overall coverage”, but the subbulet doesn’t include any study on enhancement, just to evaluate. Sugget the following changes:   * Study how to enhance overall coverage, including at least   + Evaluation methodology   + Identify coverage target considering diverse use cases and device types   + Identify which signals/channels need to be improved, including both cell-common and UE-dedicated signals/channels   + Study potential techniques/solutions for coverage enhancement   + ~~which UEs/device types need to support features for coverage enhancements~~   Another comment is, how to deal will the relationship between this and that in AI 11.2? |

Regarding ~7GHz band coverage, a number of companies mention larger number of antennas is necessary to achieve the comparable coverage to 5G mid-band (~3.5GHz). This aspect can be discussed in RANp SI for 6G requirement (especially for deployment scenarios) as well as RAN1 6G study AI11.2 for evaluation assumptions.

# **5 Initial access and common channel**

Related to these aspects, the SID states following objectives and Interim Milestone:

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Physical Layer structure for 6GR, 2. Waveforms (OFDM-based) and modulations. 5G NR Waveforms and modulation should be considered for 6GR and is also the benchmark for other potential proposals. [RAN1, RAN4] 3. Frame structure, including compatibility with 5G NR to allow for efficient 5G-6G Multi-RAT Spectrum Sharing (MRSS). [RAN1] 4. Channel coding, using LDPC and Polar Code as baseline, considering applicable extensions to satisfy 6G requirements and characteristics with acceptable performance/complexity trade-off [RAN1] 5. Channel Bandwidth (at least minimum and maximum), Numerology, avoiding multiple numerologies for the same band / sub-range (e.g., enabling synergies among frequency bands in the ~7GHz range) [RAN1, RAN4] 6. Physical layer control, data scheduling and HARQ operation [RAN1, RAN2] 7. MIMO operation [RAN1, RAN4] 8. Duplexing [RAN1, RAN4] 9. Initial access [RAN1, RAN2, RAN4]    * + Studies on synchronization signal and raster, broadcast signals/channel and physical random access channel [RAN1, RAN4]      + Studies on initial access procedure, random access procedures, system information and paging [RAN2, RAN1, RAN4] 10. 6GR spectrum utilization and aggregation. [RAN1, RAN2, RAN4] 11. Other physical layer signals, channels and procedures [RAN1, RAN2, RAN4] 12. Evaluate performance of at least energy efficiency, spectrum efficiency, and coverage compared to 5G NR, and deliver the initial result at the end of study [RAN1]. 13. RAN4 can be involved, if necessary, based on the LS from RAN1   …  **TSG#112 (June/2026):**  RAN1 to provide interim assessment on the following areas:   * Waveform, modulation, channel coding: scope of enhancements beyond NR baseline ((2) a, c) * Channel bandwidth (min and max), frame structure, numerology ((2) b, d) * Basic sync signal structure and associated periodicity(ies) ((2) h)   For objectives where RAN4 may be impacted, RAN1 shall coordinate with RAN4 early to enable the above assessment by June 2026. |

Initial access aspects are planned to be discussed from RAN1#124 (Feb. 2026). Therefore, in general, it is better to wait for RAN1#124 to open the discussion on initial access aspects. However, the Interim Milestone states that RAN1 needs to provide interim assessment on the basic sync signal structure and associated periodicity(ies) by June 2026. Therefore, at least on these aspects, RAN1 should start discussion earlier to provide enough assessment.

Regarding the basic sync signal periodicity, quite a few companies provide views to introduce longer SSB periodicity than that assumed for NR initial access (i.e., 20ms) from NES perspective. The candidate values vary from 40ms to 320ms and it was pointed out by some companies that RAN1 needs to consider the trade-off between NES gaing and UE complexity. As this aspects highly related to AI11.5 for Energy efficiency, moderator suggest discussing SSB periodicity in AI11.5.

Also, it is interesting to note that multiple operators have similar concept to minimize always-on signals (including SSB/SI) for the case of multi-carrier operation, and some examples are shown below. The commonality among these concepts is that the initial cell search is done only on a specific carrier and hence, the always-on signals can be minimized on other carriers. This aspect can be discussed in Section 10 as well.



Elastic cell concept in [39]



Perch/anchor/data concept in [48]

Regarding the basic sync signal structure, the design needs to consider at least following aspects:

* NES: Reduced number of sync raster, which can be obtained by narrower SSB BW
* Low-tier 6G device: maximum supported BW for complexity reduction, which is discussed in Section 9
* Detection performance: If narrower SSB BW is considered, more OFDM symbols would be required to maintain the NR performance

At the same time, not a few companies mention NR SSB structure should be the baseline. Unlike the periodicity, the structure design include multiple aspects (not only NES), and hence, moderator suggest discussing SSB sturcure in this AI. Following proposal can be considered as starting point for further discussion. Note that this aspect also needs early RAN4 imvolvement.

#### [Old]Proposal 5.1:

* Study the basic sync signal structure considering at least following aspects:
  + NR SSB as baseline
  + Whether to reduce SSB BW considering at least NES and low-tier 6G device
  + Whether to increase the number of OFDM symbols considering at least detection performance
  + Note: RAN4 involvement is necessary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Y/N | Comments |
| China Telecom | Y | For SS structure, we support to take NR SSB as a baseline, for the 2nd and 3rd bullet, we think they can be treated as kinds of optimization. If we follow the principle that only high level design is considered for this agenda, we suggest to make it simple as follows: Proposal 5.1:  * Study the basic sync signal structure considering at least following aspects:   + NR SSB as baseline   + Wheter optimization is needed   + ~~Whether to reduce SSB BW considering at least NES and low-tier 6G device~~   + ~~Whether to increase the number of OFDM symbols considering at least detection performance~~   + Note: RAN4 involvement is necessary |
| Tejas | Y | In addition to this, we would like to include the what should be KPI should be used for 6G SSB.  More number of symbols to improve the detection performance & study whether new services can signalled in the initial access. |
| Nokia | Y | Support as a starting point, with the implicit assumption that this means pursuing a basic sync signal structure that is NES-friendly and that it does not prevent us from pursuing alignment between different scenarios, e.g. NTN, if possible. Also we would like to clarify that we need to define a performance target for 6GR, taking into account the different devices types and the overall target of TN/NTN harmonization, as well as the coverage aspects raised in Proposal 4.1, which might have implications on the overall design. |
| Vodafone | Y |  |
| OPPO |  | Suggest to discuss in Agenda 11.3.2, 11.5 and 11.7. |
| CMCC |  | We prefer to not have “NR SSB as baseline” at this moment, which put unnecessary restriction on the study.  Also, we think increasing number of OFDM symbols for sync signal need to be discussed based on evaluation and it may be more appropriate to be discussed under initial access agneda. Proposal 5.1 (revised):  * Study the basic sync signal structure considering at least following aspects:   + ~~NR SSB as baseline~~   + Whether to reduce SSB BW considering at least NES and low-tier 6G device   + ~~Whether to increase the number of OFDM symbols considering at least detection performance~~   Note: RAN4 involvement is necessary |
| Apple | In principle okay | In principle we are okay. But we feel the main driving factor for reduced SSB BW is the spectrum holding of the operators, e.g., 3MHz, therefore we propose the following change   * + Whether to reduce SSB BW considering at least minimum CBW ~~NES and low-tier 6G device~~ |
| ETRI |  | Generally fine with NR SSB structure, however different number of RBs for PSS/SSS and PBCH should be revisited. We prefer to align the number of RBs for all signals and channels for 6GR SSB |
| Samsung | N | The meaning of “NR SSB as baseline” is unclear/premature. As many companies mentioned in tdocs, when considering the NES impact with longer SSB periodicity, we first need to identify which parts of NR design must be modified to achieve 6GR requirements. We suggest the following revisions.   * Remove the word “basic”, which is ambiguous. * The most essential motivation for reducing SSB bandwidth is for reducing the number of sync raster entries and save UE complexity in initial cell search, which is missing from the current proposal. * We also propose to study whether to support more than one SSB structures for 6GR, for example, different SSB structures can be used for NES mode and non-NES mode, or different SSB structures can be used for cell-defining SSB and non-cell-defining SSB, or different SSB structures can be used for always-on SSB and on-demand SSB. * Study the ~~basic~~ sync signal structure considering at least following aspects:   + ~~NR SSB as baseline~~   + Whether to reduce SSB BW over NR SSB considering at least the number of sync raster entries, NES and low-tier 6G device   + Whether to increase the number of OFDM symbols over NR SSB considering at least detection performance   + Whether to support more than one sync signal structures, e.g., different structures for regular operation vs network energy saving operation, cell-defining vs non-cell-defining, always-on vs on-demand   + Note: RAN4 involvement is necessary |
| CATT, CICTCI |  | OK with most of the contents. However, we have concern in 2nd bullet (reducing SSB BW) since:   * It is unclear the min CBW so far, which impacts SSB BW.   + Even if min CBW is smaller, SSB can still be larger than min CBW and work by puncturing * It looks like opening the door for different SSB designs for several aspects, e.g. IoT v.s. MBB UE. |
| ZTE | No | It seems too early to touch the details of the design since there will be dedicated AI for initial access later.  For this agenda, we can try to achieve the high-level principle only, e.g., which aspects/scenario can be considered for initial access design. |
| FUTUREWEI | N | The bandwidth will need to be lower in a scalable 6G design |
| Spreadtrum |  | For SS structure, we also think NR SSB structure should be inherited. For the proposal, we have similar views as China Telecom, and we suggest to make it as follows: Proposal 5.1:  * Study the basic sync signal structure considering at least following aspects:   + NR SSB as baseline   + Whether ~~to reduce SSB BW~~ optimization is needed considering at least NES and low-tier 6G device   + ~~Whether to increase the number of OFDM symbols considering at least detection performance~~   + Note: RAN4 involvement is necessary |
| Rakuten | Y |  |
| Ofinno |  | We would like to highlight that the study for sync signal structure needs to consider the work in 11.5. There are many different proposed enhancements to 5G SSB design. We feel at this stage if we are going to list options/potential enhancements it is better to be comprehensive. So we feel that the 2nd and 3rd sub-bullets may not be needed at this stage. |
| Fainity | Y | Support NR SSB as baseline, agree to reduce SSB BW with increasing the number of OFDM symbols for covering both NES and coverage purposes. |
| Ericsson | Y | The 5G SSB design can be used as a starting point, taking the smallest carrier bandwidth (3/5 MHz) into account. Network energy efficiency for mandatory SSB transmissions should be considered (e.g. through a longer 160 ms SSB periodicity). |
| MediaTek | N | We would suggest to first align on the requirements and goals impacting the SSB design i.e. further discussion on EE, Coverage, NTN, Access latency would be needed first. Then after that we can start discussing the SSB structure itself.  Maybe those impacting objectives should be first identified/elaborated and aligned on as considerations before going into design details. Also RAN4 involvement would be needed on raster aspects. |
| SK Telecom |  | At this stage, it would be better to study the sync signal structure without too much restriction in mind. We would like to suggest the following text. Proposal 5.1 (revised):  * Study the basic sync signal structure considering at least following aspects:   + How to realize network energy saving while guaranteeing the detection performance   + How to properly support diverse UE types |
| CEWiT | Partially Y | We believe the initial access design of 6GR should support diverse requirements as   * NR SSB structure for MRSS * LPWA devices requiring smaller CBW(3MHz) ; * NTN, NES requiring larger periodicity; * eMBB,FWA UEs requiring faster beam acquisition   Considering all the above requirements and also the comment from Samsung, we believe 6GR can have different SSB structures between on-demand and always on SSBs, while the always on SSBs can consider NR SSB as baseline.  Now to satisfy the LPWA device requirements, we align with Apple and ETRI’s comments, to redesign the PBCH for the min CBW, while possibly reuse existing PSS and SSS from NR as baseline for such device types, which requires decoupling of PSS/SSS and PBCH. So we propose the following corrections   * Study the basic sync signal structure considering at least following aspects:   + NR ~~SSB~~ sync signal as baseline   + Whether to reduce SSB BW and default periodicity considering at least NES and low-tier 6G device   + Whether to increase the number of OFDM symbols considering at least detection performance   + Note: RAN4 involvement is necessary |
| Xiaomi |  | We think it can be discussed later in initial access agenda. If we intend to agree something here, we agree with the proposed changes from CT and Spreadtrum. |
| Sharp |  | The 3rd sub-bullet could be rephased to broader concept like “study how to achieve coverage level identified in the 6G study.” |
| SONY | Y | While NR SSB can be considered as a baseline, it is important to consider support of low-tier 6G devices. Our view on low-tier devices is that the UL bandwidth is more critical than the DL bandwidth, so the NR SSB as a baseline is probably OK for low-tier devices. |
| LGE |  | We are fine with discussing on the SSB design in this Agenda Item. One of important usage case for 6GR is NTN.  Integeration of TN and NTN should be considered for SSB structure design and periodicity decision.  One suggestion is to delete ‘basic’ in the text. Proposal 5.1:  * Study the ~~basic~~ sync signal structure considering at least following aspects:   + NR SSB as baseline   + Whether to reduce SSB BW considering at least NES and low-tier 6G device   + Whether to increase the number of OFDM symbols considering at least detection performance   + Note: RAN4 involvement is necessary |
| CSCN |  | The SSB periodicity extension is essential for both NTN and NES, which should be discussed in this AI. Furthermore, the number of SSBs could be increased to improve deployment flexibility. |
| Fujitsu |  | Now may be a bit early to say ” NR SSB as baseline”. We may need to discuss the BW of SSB first. |
| InterDigital |  | The baseline and details of basic sync signal structure can be discussed in the dedicated initial access agenda. We better focus on what is the desired design consideration for 6GR sync signal structure including coverage, energy efficiency, MRSS, and so on. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | N | The basic sync structure design would depend on requirements from quite many aspects, e.g. energy saving, requirement from NTN, spectrum allocations, etc. Therefore, we think it is too early to discuss such kind of details at this moment. |
| Lenovo | Y | We can keep the text general, and not downselect at this stage to a particular solution direction   * Study the basic sync signal structure considering at least with following aspects:   + NR SSB as baseline   + ~~Whether to reduce SSB BW~~ considering at least NES and low-tier 6G device   + ~~Whether to increase the number of OFDM symbols considering at least~~ detection performance   + Note: RAN4 involvement is necessary |
| Google | N | We do not think NR-SSB should be the baseline. The min CBW is the first step to determine whether the NR-SSB can be the baseline or not. |
| vivo | N | Maybe “NR SSB as baseline” needs more clarification, in our view, NR SSB design principle can be taken as starting point while supporting various device types in one framework taking energy efficiency and performance requirements including latency and UE complexity during cell search etc. This topic should be addressed in energy saving and later in initial access agenda item |
| HONOR | Y |  |

#### Proposal 5.1a:

* Study the basic sync signal structure considering at least following aspects:
  + NR SSB as baseline
  + Identify the aspects which impact on the structure, e.g., min CBW, NES, low-tier 6G device, detection performance
  + ~~Whether to reduce SSB BW considering at least NES and low-tier 6G device~~
  + ~~Whether to increase the number of OFDM symbols considering at least detection performance~~
  + Note: RAN4 involvement is necessary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Y/N | Comments |
| Moderator |  | Generally companies are OK with the intention of the Proposal. Some update to reflect feedback:   * Soften the words to clarify that the main focus in this agenda is to identify which aspects need to be considered when designning the basic sync signal beyond NR SSB |
| FUTUREWEI | N | The unpunctured NR SSB is too wide in frequency for a 3MHz CBW, so the meaning of taking it as a baseline in a scaleable design is unclear. Or does “NR SSB as baseline” also mean that the 3MHz NR SSB is baseline? Perhaps starting point is a better term. |
| Qualcomm | N | Assuming NR SSB as a baseline is premature at this point of time. From our perspectives, this type of proposal can be discussed under 6GR initial access in Feburary. High level considerations for SSB design regards: 1) NW energy saving vs. UE complexity/user experience impact. 2) support for variety of device types with a unified initial access framework. 3) evaluation assumptions for SSB design discussions. |
| Ericsson | Y | We are fine to take the 5G SSB as a starting point and to discuss some general requirements/design directions. Detailed discussions will take place under the initial access agenda item. |
| Apple |  | We slightly prefer to remove “NR SSB as baseline”   * + ~~NR SSB as baseline~~ |
| Samsung | N | We still have a concern on the first sub-bullet “NB SSB as baseline”, because this may imply that NR SSB will be used in 6G. We suggest to remove that bullet and modify the second bullet.   * Study the basic sync signal structure considering at least following aspects:   + ~~NR SSB as baseline~~   + Identify the aspects which impact on the structure compared to NR SSB, e.g., min CBW, NES, low-tier 6G device, detection performance |
| Fraunhofer |  | Regarding the first bullet “NR SSB as baseline”, we agree if it is intended for the purpose of comparison in the evaluation of the benefits and impacts of the new 6G design. Otherwise, the concern raised by FUTUREWEI above seems valid.  We think the second bullet is simple yet general enough to capture important aspects in examples at this level of discussion. Details can be addressed in AI 11.7. We think the key requirements concerning sync signal structure include   * NES: sparse SSBs via increased peridicity and on-demand transmissions for NES * Low-tier 6G devices: reduced SSB BW   Ensuring detection performance: to mitigate the impacts of the above in synchronization, network search, UE power consumption etc. |
| CATT, CICTCI |  | NR SSB may be the starting point, but ‘baseline’ is too strong.   * Study the basic sync signal structure considering at least following aspects:   + NR SSB as starting point ~~baseline~~   + Identify the aspects which impact on the structure, e.g., min CBW, NES, low-tier 6G device, detection performance   + Note: RAN4 involvement is necessary |
| Spreadtrum |  | Our view is that 5G SSB can serve as a starting point for study. The time-frequency characteristics of 6G SSB structure would depend on requirements from min CBW, NES, low-tier 6G device and detection performance, etc. If some companies think current proposal may imply that NR SSB will fully be used in 6G, we are fine with CATT’ version. |
| Fujitsu | Y | Treating 5G SSB as the starting point of 6G SSB is good. We think this is helpful for the discussion on which aspects need further improvement. |
| ETRI |  | As mentioned in the previous comment, further clarification is needed regarding "NR SSB as baseline." It should be made clear whether "NR SSB as baseline" simply refers to the concept consisting of PSS, SSS, and PBCH, or whether it also includes their resource mapping structure. |
| China Telecom | Y | Share the similar view as CATT, if company have concern on the first bullet, could we just say: NR SSB as a starting point? |

# **6 MRSS**

Related to this aspect, the SID states following objectives:

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Physical Layer structure for 6GR,    1. Waveforms (OFDM-based) and modulations. 5G NR Waveforms and modulation should be considered for 6GR and is also the benchmark for other potential proposals. [RAN1, RAN4]    2. Frame structure, including compatibility with 5G NR to allow for efficient 5G-6G Multi-RAT Spectrum Sharing (MRSS). [RAN1]    3. Channel coding, using LDPC and Polar Code as baseline, considering applicable extensions to satisfy 6G requirements and characteristics with acceptable performance/complexity trade-off [RAN1]    4. Channel Bandwidth (at least minimum and maximum), Numerology, avoiding multiple numerologies for the same band / sub-range (e.g., enabling synergies among frequency bands in the ~7GHz range) [RAN1, RAN4]    5. Physical layer control, data scheduling and HARQ operation [RAN1, RAN2]    6. MIMO operation [RAN1, RAN4]    7. Duplexing [RAN1, RAN4]    8. Initial access [RAN1, RAN2, RAN4]       * Studies on synchronization signal and raster, broadcast signals/channel and physical random access channel [RAN1, RAN4]       * Studies on initial access procedure, random access procedures, system information and paging [RAN2, RAN1, RAN4]    9. 6GR spectrum utilization and aggregation. [RAN1, RAN2, RAN4]    10. Other physical layer signals, channels and procedures [RAN1, RAN2, RAN4]    11. Evaluate performance of at least energy efficiency, spectrum efficiency, and coverage compared to 5G NR, and deliver the initial result at the end of study [RAN1].        1. RAN4 can be involved, if necessary, based on the LS from RAN1   …   1. Migration from 5G NR to 6GR as well as interworking and mobility between 5G NR and 6GR: 2. 5G-6G Multi-RAT Spectrum Sharing for migration [RAN1, RAN2, RAN4, RAN3] 3. Study if any additional migration mechanism is necessary. [RAN] [RAN2, RAN1, RAN3, RAN4] NOTE: the start of this study objective (b) should be triggered by RAN plenary in time to guarantee proper completion of the WG study. 4. Mobility between 5G NR and 6GR [RAN2, RAN3, RAN4] |

Not only the frame structure as stated in the SID, a number of companies mention that 5G compatible design should be ensured for MRSS, including waveform, modulation, numerology, channel coding and so on. All these aspects are discussed in other AIs in RAN1, and hence, moderator suggest considering MRSS aspects when discussion the above topics in other AIs 11.3.1, 11.3.2, 11.4.1, 11.4.2.

When considering the coexistence with NR signals/channels on MRSS carrier, in general there are following two directions and companies view are split, and hence, further discussion is necessary to clarify the pros/cons for each direction.

* NR/6GR resources are split via TDM/FDM, including rate-matching
* 6GR shares NR signals/channels

Another aspect is whether “5G-6G MRSS” includes LTE as well as NR, since LTE Rel-15 or later are also considered as 5G. Some companies mention that coexistence with eMTC/NB-IoT should be ensured, which needs further discussion.

Based on the above, following proposal can be considered as starting point for further discussion.

#### [Old]Proposal 6.1:

* For NR-6GR MRSS support, study the following options for the coexistence with NR signals/channels on MRSS carrier
  + Opt1: NR/6GR resources are split via TDM/FDM, including rate-matching
  + Opt2: 6GR shares NR signals/channels
  + FFS: whether/how to support LTE-6GR MRSS

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Y/N | Comments |
| China Telecom |  | Opt 2 is not clear to us, does it mean 6GR has the same signals/channels as NR on MRSS carrier? From our perspective, we think the collision between NR/6GR resources should be avoided. For LTE-6GR MRSS, we don’t think it is needed, but we can live with the FFS. |
| Tejas | Y | We also want to include whether 6GR can use new waveform and can coexist with 5G NR |
| Nokia | Y | Opt1 is the baseline together with SDM, but investigate the feasibility and potential benefits of Opt2 for NR-6GR MRSS. We do not see a need to support LTE-6GR MRSS. |
| Vodafone | Y | As long as handover from 6G to 4G is specified MRSS between LTE-6GR may not be needed. Important however to ensure coexistence between 6GR and NB-IoT |
| OPPO |  | Suggest to discuss in Agenda 11.11. |
| CMCC |  | Before discussing whether to share or split, we need first to discuss the MRSS use cases, e.g. which signal/channel are going to be shared/rate mated. Once these are identified, detailed solution of MRSS can be discussed and evaluated under dedicated agendas. Proposal 6.1 (revised): For NR-6GR MRSS support, study necessary MRSS use cases, e.g. which signal/channel are going to be shared/rate mated. |
| Apple |  | We are okay, but we propose to delete the FFS   * + ~~FFS: whether/how to support LTE-6GR MRSS~~   In 6G WG SID RP-251881, below is the quote regarding LTE/6G coexistence  *Note: Inclusion of LTE/6G interworking/coexistence aspects may be further discussed based on the requirement from RAN plenary*  Hence, we believe the RAN1 study of LTE/6G spectrum sharing needs to be triggered by new RAN plenary guidance |
| ETRI |  | At least for the data region, it is preferred that 5G and 6G be separated by TDM or FDM, while certain signals and channels may still be shared for resource efficiency. Therefore, both Option 1 and Option 2 can be considered together. |
| Samsung | N | We are unsure whether Option 1 and Option 2 are intended to be the same level. Regardless of TDM/FDM splitting, whether and how to support sharing can be discussed separately and is design-dependent. Whether NR signals/channels can be shared will depends on decisions for the design of those 6G channels/signals. Morever, how the NR/6GR resources are shared can be transparent to the UE – e.g., may even be in spatial domain. Therefore, we suggest:   * For NR-6GR MRSS support, study the following ~~options~~ for the coexistence with NR signals/channels on MRSS carrier   + ~~Opt1:~~ NR/6GR resources are split via TDM/FDM, including rate-matching patterns   + ~~Opt2: 6GR shares NR signals/channels~~   + FFS: whether/how to support LTE-6GR MRSS |
| CATT, CICTCI |  | OK for further study, but we have strong concern on Opt2, which largely limit the 6G NW planning, common signal/channel design, and high-layer information design.  We also think MRSS with 4G is unnecessary. |
| ZTE |  | It’s unclear about the intention, especially before detailed study on the design, e.g., RS. Early decision on this aspect will lead to unexpected restriction before solid study.  Also, the last FFS bullet should not be discussed in RAN1. The note from 6G SID is copied here: ‘Note: Inclusion of LTE/6G interworking/coexistence aspects may be further discussed based on the requirement from RAN plenary’. The issue of MRSS between LTE and 6GR should be discussed in RAN plenary. |
| FUTUREWEI |  | Not the right agenda |
| Spreadtrum |  | For Option 1, which NR signal/channel is to be shared/rate matched should be identified first.  For Option 2, similar view as CTC. We prefer not to support signals/channels sharing between 5G and 6G. It would complicate the 6G design and UE implementation complexity. The motivation and performance gains for Option 2 should be clarified by proponents. The discussion on Option 2 can be postponed.  For LTE-6GR MRSS, we think it is not needed. |
| Rakuten |  | Support Opt1 only and remove FFS. |
| Ofinno | N | We agree with China Telecom that Opt 2 is not clear. We believe it is beneficial to have multiple options; however, such options should not be considered mutually exclusive or the only available choices. For instance, while sharing certain reference signals, allocating separate resources for other channels (by TDM/FDM, including rate-matching) is also a feasible approach. |
| Fainity |  | OK for Opt1 and opt2 and further suggest to discuss Opt2 and clarify which signals/channels could be shared for better spectrum efficiency and.  Not support LTE-6GR MRSS |
| Ericsson | Y | A highly dynamic MRSS scheme is essential for 6G, allowing the scheduler to, on a dynamic basis, assign resources to 5G or 6G users based on the traffic load. For spectrum sharing with LTE-M/NB-IoT a semi-static scheme is sufficient (e.g. reserve a set of resource blocks on the carrier for IoT technologies). We see no need to support dynamic spectrum sharing with 4G in general.  New 6G signals must be invisible to a 5G device using the 5G functionality as 5G devices in the field cannot be changed. This implies that it is not sufficient if the 5G functionality is captured in the 5G specifications, it must also have been implemented and tested for the vast majority of already deployed 5G devices.  Sharing the same signals for 5G and 6G (i.e. opt 2 above) can be considered on a case-by-case basis. |
| MediaTek | Partially | We would like to consider SDM in addition to TDM/FDM. We do consider sharing of certain signals at least to reduce overhead, but we would like to discuss the motivations further first.  We do not think LTE/6G MRSS is required (can be semi-static sharing only), fine with plenary furtther discussing that as suggested by Apple. |
| SK Telecom | Y | Share the view with Vodafone that 6G-4G MRSS would not be needed once mobility between 6G and 4G is specified. |
| CEWiT | In principle, Y | Though we agree with the proposed text, we believe the intention is not very clear between having Opt1 and Opt2. Our interpretation of the proposal is either 5G and 6G resources are TDMed/FDMed or 6GR shares 5G signals/channels. Even with some of the 5G signals/channels reused by 6GR, resources other than the one occupied by the shared signals/channels can be multiplexed with other 5G resources. Hence, we propose the following minor change.   * For NR-6GR MRSS support, study the following options for the coexistence with NR signals/channels on MRSS carrier   + ~~Opt1:~~ NR/6GR resources are split via TDM/FDM, including rate-matching   + ~~Opt2:~~ 6GR shares NR signals/channels   + FFS: whether/how to support LTE-6GR MRSS |
| KDDI | Y | We fundamentally agree with FL's Proposal. As an operator, we particularly hope to minimize the reduction in frequency efficiency caused by NR and 6GR coexisting within the same band, aiming for the highest possible frequency efficiency in NR-6GR MRSS. From this perspective, we should discuss not only Opt1 but also the direction of Opt2. |
| Xiaomi | Y in principle | We are generally fine with the proposal. For Opt 2, our understanding of the intention is to share some of the NR signals/channels and would like to confirm the understanding. |
| Sharp |  | Even with Opt2 in which 6GR and NR share some signals and channels, at least TDM/FDM (and potentially rate-matching) would be required. Thus, Opt1 should be the baseline for study, and Opt2 can be discussed further. |
| SONY | Needs update | It is important to support coexistence with 4G-IoT, based on the longevity requirements of 4G-IoT services. We think that 6GR and 4G-IoT can be split via TDM / FDM, including rate matching. Note that 4G-IoT does not need reservation of 4G-PDCCH resources since 4G-IoT does not use 4G-PDCCH.  A proposal is that RAN1 also studies how to support 4G-IoT/6GR coexistence.   * For NR-6GR MRSS support, study the following options for the coexistence with NR signals/channels on MRSS carrier   + Opt1: NR/6GR resources are split via TDM/FDM, including rate-matching   + Opt2: 6GR shares NR signals/channels   + FFS: whether/how to support LTE-6GR MRSS   + Study how to support 4G-IoT/6GR coexistence |
| LGE | Y | We are fine with the proposal from a high-level perspective. If understood correctly, this proposal aims to make a high-level decision on the study scope for MRSS, with the details to be explored under suitable agenda items. Specifically, we believe that topics such as whether and how to support rate matching or puncturing, and the sharing of NR signals/channels, can be discussed under agenda items 11.9 and/or 11.13 and/or 11.7. Of course, we remain open to further high-level discussions on MRSS if needed. |
| Fujitsu |  | Agree with CMCC. We may need to discus use cases first. For example, in which cases we may need rate matching. Regarding the FFS bullet, some clarification may be needed. Perhaps, the intention of the FFS bullet is for some IoT devices rather than LTE smart phones. |
| InterDigital | Y | Support to remove FFS bullet as well as suggested by some companies. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  | It is too early to discuss how to do MRSS. Without better understanding how the 6GR channel/signal would look like, difficult to judge which way is better. |
| Lenovo | Y | We can keep it general by deleting the options,   * For NR-6GR MRSS support, study which cell common channels/UE dedicated channels are affected ~~the following options~~ for the coexistence with NR signals/channels on MRSS carrier   + ~~Opt1: NR/6GR resources are split via TDM/FDM, including rate-matching~~   + ~~Opt2: 6GR shares NR signals/channels~~   + FFS: whether/how to support LTE-6GR MRSS   We still need to study on how to do RAT identification in MRSS and complexity from UE side. |
| Google | Y | The basic option (TDM/FDM) should be supported. |
| vivo | N | Our general view is that NR and 6GR MRSS should be studied however 6GR signal/channel design should not be restricted by NR design, but sharing NR signal/channel would have such risk. TDM/FDM of NR and 6GR resources maybe supported by configuration, however the study should focus on rate matching.  For the sharing, we need to understand the need first. |
| HONOR | Y |  |

#### Proposal 6.1a:

* For NR-6GR MRSS support, study the following options and applicable scenarios for the coexistence with NR signals/channels on MRSS carrier
  + Opt1: NR/6GR resources are split via TDM/FDM, including rate-matching
  + Opt2: 6GR shares NR signals/channels
  + ~~FFS: whether/how to support LTE-6GR MRSS~~

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Y/N | Comments |
| Moderator |  | Generally companies are OK with the intention of the Proposal. Some update to reflect feedback:   * To clarify that the study includes to identify the applicable scenarios for each option * Delete last sub-bullet, which is subject to RANp study |
| FUTUREWEI | N | Too early to discuss, should be in a different AI later. Opt 2 seems not a good way to study for 6GR. |
| Qualcomm | N | Too early to discuss detailed MRSS design aspect. Companies should be encouraged to continue to highlight 4G/5G DSS lessons learned and pain point analysis and which directions to look at to avoid the same issue instead of detailed proposal discussions. |
| Ericsson | Y | We are fine with the proposal. The discussion should focus on general aspects, e.g. how to handle NB-IoT/LTE-M devices (no need for as dynamic sharing as is the case for 5G-6G MRSS). Opt 1 is our preference; we can consider opt 2 in addition on a case-by-case basis once we get to these details. |
| Apple | Y | The updated proposal looks good to us |
| Samsung | N | We do not consider it appropriate to classify MRSS into Option 1 vs. Option 2. The mechanisms are coupled rather than mutually exclusive, and their applicability depends on the overall design. Separation may even be in the spatial domain and have no TDM/FDM separation (also note that any TDM/FDM separation is transparent for LTE-NR coexistence).  Whether or not 6GR shares NR signals/channels may also depend on the design of 6GR signals/channels and may be transparent. For example, SSB may not be shared, CORESETs or CSI-RS may be transparently shared.  We would also like to note that this topic is also discussed in Frame Structure agenda. To prevent duplication, it is perhaps better to address this topic only in one agenda.  We suggest the following update to have a generic statement at this point.  For NR-6GR MRSS, study coexistence with NR signals/channels and requirements for rate-matching patterns |
| Fraunhofer | Y | We support the proposal with preference for Opt 1. |
| CATT, CICTCI | N | **Delete Option 2** for the sake of comphehansive and adequate study for 6GR and healthy future deployment. |
| Spreadtrum |  | Samilar view as QC. We suggest to first identify the pain points of 4G/5G DSS solution. Option 2 is not specified in 4G/5G DSS and can be postponed. |
| Fujitsu |  | We prefer to prioritize the discussion on the application scenarios of MRSS.  Besides, the FFS bullet is removed. We’are wonderting how to maintain the services for 4G IoT users (such as NB-IoT users and eMTC users) in the early stage of 6G. Even though the equivalent device types can lauch on the market on 6G day 1, it could be difficult to let all 4G IoT users quit on one day. |
| ETRI |  | As mentioned in the previous comment, there is no need to distinguish between Opt 1 and Opt 2, instead, it is necessary to consider both options together. |
| China Teleocm | N | Opt 2 is still not clear to us, we’re not sure how 6G shares all NR signals/channels. Does that mean, 6G device also needs to support all the NR design? |

# **7 Service/channel multiplexing/collision, including concurrence of UL transmissions**

The SID does not have text explicitly mentioning this aspect. However, according to companies’ contributions so far, companies have high interest in improvement/simplification of the Service/channel multiplexing/collision, including PUSCH/PUCCH transmissions, UCI multiplexing/prioritization, common RS for communication/sensing/positioning, and so on. Since these aspects are highly related to other agenda items to be discussed in RAN1 (e.g., “Physical layer control, data scheduling and HARQ operation”, “Other physical layer signals, channels and procedures”, and “Sensing”), moderator suggests discussing the above aspects in other RAN1 agenda items. Following is open question to hear companies’ view.

#### Question 7.1:

* Companies are invited to provide views on whether to discuss any features which contribute to improvement/simplification of service/channel multiplexing/collision, other than the features (to be) discussed in other agendas in RAN1. If yes, please elaborate which features need to be studied in this agenda.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Y/N | Comments |
| Tejas | Y | We would like to study on simplifying UCI multiplexing |
| Nokia | N | We believe the topics can be covered in the dedicated AIs, as mentioned by the moderator above. |
| OPPO |  | Suggest to discuss in Agenda 11.9. |
| CMCC | N |  |
| Apple | N | We think the current scope in FL summary is a good starting point. We do not see strong need to discuss other features. |
| Samsung | N | Suggest to discuss in Agenda 11.9 |
| CATT, CICTCI |  | Fine to discuss these issues in dedicated agenda (11.9).  In 6G overview agenda, if discussion continuous, we think we can collect pain points and high-level guidance on study directions, rather than technical/performance discussion. |
| ZTE |  | We see a lot of interest for UCI multiplexing simplification compared with NR. Not only for the multiplexing rules, but also for the timeline for UCI transmission, especially on HARQ.  **Proposal:**  Study simplifying UCI multiplexing rules on PUSCH/PUCCH with unified timeline.  With this, the study should be held and distributed to the agenda item of 11.9. |
| Ofinno | N | Okay with the FL suggestion to discuss in the other AIs. |
| Ericsson | N | The overall system (including uplink-downink interaction form higher-layer protocols) needs to be looked at, not only individual design choices in isolation. Details can be discussed in tthe respective agenda item.  As an example, the UCI handling in 5G is very complex. For example, strict timing rules (part of UCI information is encoded in the timing), in-order delivery of HARQ feedback, and no possibility to map HARQ feedback to an already scheduled PUSCH limits downlink scheduling flexibility and negatively impacts the performance. These limitations should be avoided in 6G by taking a fresh look at the uplink control signaling from an overall system perspective. |
| MediaTek |  | Discuss in the relevant agenda items (especially 11.9). |
| CEWiT | N | Not at this point under 11.1 |
| Xiaomi | N |  |
| Sharp |  | We understand that 5G NR has some complexity in service/channel multiplexing/collision, including concurrence of UL transmissions. However, discussion should be technical oriented, rather than in terms of specification complexity. The issue can be discussed in corresponding agendas. |
| LGE | N | Our understanding on FL’s question is whether to discuss (or are there) any features in this agenda other than the features to be treated later under the agendas 11.9 and 11.13. |
| InterDigital | N | It is a bit too much details under this agenda. Better to be discussed in the dedicated agenda. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  | Slightly prefer to leave such detailed discussion to agenda 11.9. |
| Google |  | We also think such detailed aspects should be in other agenda and discussed later |
| Fraunhofer | N |  |

# **8 Concept and operation of bandwidth**

The SID does not have text explicitly mentioning this aspect. However, according to companies’ contributions so far, companies have high interest in improvement/simplification of NR BWP framework, which is fundamental unit of BW for UE transmissions/receptions, including but not limited to

* SCS switching
* Association with CORESET/Search space
* BWP switching delay
* RRC configuration overhead
* BWP types
* Frequency location between DL and UL
* Discuntiguous frequency resources within BWP
* Combined with TCI framework
* Support diverse device types

Since the potential scope for the improvement/simplification of NR BWP framework is quite broad, following proposal can be considered as starting point for further discussion. Note that the aspects on BW from multiple carrier perspectives can be discussed in Section 10.

#### [Old]Proposal 8.1:

* Study how to improve/simplify BWP framework for 6GR

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Y/N | Comments |
| China Telecom | Y | Support. |
| Tejas | Y | We support the study. |
| Nokia | Y | Robust operation of BWP is important for 6GR. To a large extent it should be covered under dedicated AIs though. RF-related aspects of BWP configuration and operation need RAN4 involvement. Regarding SCS switching, it is only relevant in case there is a possibility of having different SCS for control and data. In case we manage to converge on single SCS per band this is clearly not needed, but in any case our assumption is that we should have a single SCS per carrier in 6GR. Perhaps this is a discussion for the numerology AI, but we just wanted to highlight the connection here. |
| Vodafone | Y | Probably important to also study the need to have NCD-SSB in 6GR BWP operation |
| OPPO |  | Suggest to discuss in Agenda 11.3.2, 11.9, 11.11. |
| Apple | Y | We are okay with the proposal |
| ETRI | Y | Simplfied BWP framework, e.g., reducing the number of BWPs should be studied |
| Samsung | Y | Need to also discuss the scope/ultility of BWPs in 6GR and what aspects from NR regarding BWP operation are to be kept/disarded in 6GR. |
| CATT, CICTCI | Y |  |
| ZTE | Yes | The discussion can start with sharing companies’ views on whether to keep the concept of BWP and which aspects should be improved in general. The details should be studied later. |
| FUTUREWEI | Y |  |
| Spreadtrum | Y |  |
| Rakuten | Y |  |
| Ofinno |  | We support to study this topic for 6GR. However, there are many proposals in 11.5 for this same topic. Should this study be under 11.1 or 11.5? One option is to add a similar note as exists in proposal 10.1 |
| Fainity | Y | Support the simplification at least on (1) Assoicaiton with CORESET/Search space (2) RRC configuration overhead (3) BWP types (4) Discuntigious frequency resources within BWP |
| Ericsson | Y | The word “BWP” should be avoided as it is the 5G solution; we should identify the problems we need to solve and (later) solutions to them rather than using a term for which different companies can have different interpretations.  The BWP handling in 5G is a very complex tool, not only adjusting the UE bandwidth but also changing a large part of the RRC configuration. Later releases of 5G introduced multiple new schemes with partially overlapping capabilties, for example search space set group switching where in theory the BWP mechanism could have been used.  6G should provide a simple and generic mechanism for rapidly switching between different RRC configurations (e.g. LTM-like operation, beam management, …) and a separate mechanism for changing the UE bandwidth only. |
| MediaTek | Y | Agree that these are important aspects. Also agree with Nokia this will need early RAN4 involvement to get the right BWP framework. Suggest to discuss in the 11.5 (EE) and later 11.11 (Spectrum Utilization) agendas initially. |
| SK Telecom | Y | Support the proposal. |
| CEWiT | Y | We agree to the high-level proposal. For the requirements of ‘Spectrum utilization and operations’ and also some of the freq-domain NES schemes, BWP definition can be customized like having discontinuous resources under a BWP. |
| Xiaomi |  | We noticed that there is already a proposal in 11.3.2 on the simplification of BWP. Not sure whether the proposal is still needed or not here. |
| Sharp |  | In our understanding, the motivation of having this discussion is “avoiding multiple numerologies for the same band / sub-range” in SID. Thus, we suggest focusing on whether SCS switching is necessary for BWP switching. |
| SONY | Y | We might not want to use the term BWP, but talk generally about bandwidth adaptation.   * Study how to improve/simplify ~~BWP framework~~ bandwidth adaptation for 6GR |
| LGE | Y | The study should also include BWP operation (e.g. structure/configutation) as well as BW adaptation (e.g. carrier activation/deactivation) of multi-carrier single cell.  Meanwhile, it is worth while that BWP-related issues are also being discussed via email under agenda item 11.1. We may need to address and resolve any potential overlaps or conflicts between different agenda items. |
| Fujitsu | Y |  |
| InterDigital |  | Let’s not take “BWP” as a starting point, as if 5G design would be baseline. We should rather formulate in terms of what we want to achieve, e.g.:  Study control of UE operating bandwidth for 6GR:   * + Minimize switching delay between narrowband and wideband operation   + Minimize UE complexity and signaling overhead   […] |
| Huawei | Y | Agree that how to improve/simplify BWP framework for 6GR should be studied. Detailed study might need go to the specific agenda though. |
| Lenovo | Y | Improving BWP framework is needed in 6GR by splitting the BWP parameters into cell common/group common and UE dedicated to simplify the adaptation of BWP for NES and UEPS. |
| Google | Y | As a starting point, we should avoid unnecessary BWP-specific parameters. |
| vivo | Y |  |
| HONOR | Y |  |

#### Proposal 8.1a:

* Study how to improve/simplify ~~BWP~~ framework for UE operating BW for 6GR, including
  + To identify the pain points of NR BWP framework

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Y/N | Comments |
| Moderator |  | Generally companies are OK with the intention of the Proposal. Some update to reflect feedback:   * Rephrase to avoid ”BWP” for 6GR * The focus of this study includes to identify the pain points of NR BWP |
| FUTUREWEI | Y, but prefer original | No need to abandon BWP at this stage, especially considering other proposals that take NR as a baseline. |
| Qualcomm | Y, but prefer original | Agree with FutureWei. Important to bring in design pain points and directions to pursue at this point. Detailed design follows later and the name is of the least concern at this point. Evovling BWP framework gives enough clarity at this point of time. |
| Ericsson | Y | We are ok with the refined proposal.  The word “BWP” should be avoided as itmight imply to copy the complex 5G solution; we should identify the problems we need to solve and (later) solutions to them rather than using a term for which different companies can have different interpretations.  The BWP handling in 5G is a very complex tool, not only adjusting the UE bandwidth but also changing a large part of the RRC configuration.  6G should provide a simple and generic mechanism for rapidly switching between different RRC configurations (e.g. LTM-like operation, beam management, …) and a separate mechanism for changing the UE bandwidth only. |
| Apple | Y | The updated proposal looks good to us, but the original version is better (more focused). |
| Samsung | Y | Support in general.  The support is with the understanding that the study will include the basic question on the need to have configuration of multiple BWPs to a UE in 6GR in conjunction with possible support of other mechanisms, and how to avoid duplicated functionalities (i.e. the existence of the NR BWP framework is not assumed as agreed for 6GR). |
| Fraunhofer | Y |  |
| CATT, CICTCI | Y |  |
| Spreadtrum | Y |  |
| Fujitsu | Y | The updated proposal is better than the previous one. |
| ETRI | Y |  |

# **9 Supporting existing and new services**

Related to these aspects, the SID states following objectives and Interim Milestone:

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Single technology framework based on a stand-alone architecture (Note1) to support the agreed existing and new services, and to satisfy the usage scenarios, requirements, deployment scenarios and design principles with acceptable performance/complexity trade-off, as determined by the RAN requirements in [RP-250810] and [TR38.914], including: [RAN1], [RAN2], [RAN3], [RAN4] 2. Ensuring appropriate set of functionalities, minimize the adoption of multiple options for the same functionality, avoid excessive configurations, excessive UE capabilities and UE capabilities reporting. 3. Energy efficiency and energy saving: both for network and device. 4. Enhanced spectral efficiency. 5. Enhanced overall coverage, focus on cell-edge performance and UL coverage. 6. Wider channel bandwidth (at least 200MHz) support for 6G deployments at least above 2 GHz, around 7 GHz. 7. Re-use of existing 5G mid-band (~3.5GHz) site grid for 6G deployments in at least around 7 GHz and targeting comparable coverage to 5G mid-band. 8. Target scalable and forward compatible design for diverse device types. 9. Improved spectrum utilization and operations taking into account diverse spectrum allocations. 10. Aim at using common 6G Radio design, which meets mobile broadband service requirements as high priority, to also meet vertical needs. 11. Aim at a harmonized 6G Radio design for TN and NTN, including their integration. 12. System simplification, including reducing configuration complexity, enabling more efficient Cell/UE management, etc.   Note1: the term stand-alone architecture does not imply any particular Core network architecture, which is up to SA2 discussion. |

As stated in the SID, the scope of this SI is limited to the “agreed” existing and new services, while no requirements of existing and new services have been agreed/captured in the RANp SI TR38.914 v0.1.0 yet. Companies provide views on whether/how to support existing and new services, including low-tier device (e.g. IoT, LPWA, RedCap), XR, voice, FWA, positioning, broadcast/multicast, sidelink, unlicensed spectrum, HRLLC, NW for AI, sensing, and so on. Especially on sensing, quite a few companies provide some details on how to support sensing for 6GR. However, this is to be discussed in other agenda items in RAN1 from RAN1#124bis (Apr. 2026) after the use cases and the associated requirement are clarified in RANp study for 6G requirements. Similar to this, moderator does not see any urgency to start discussion on how to support the “agreed” existing and new services in this meeting, except for Low-tier device.

Regarding the low-tier device (e.g. IoT, LPWA, RedCap), as discussed in Section 3, in general companies have aligned view that common/scalable 6GR framework should be studied for diverse device types, including the low-tier device. Toward this, it would be better to clarify the maximum supported BW for the low-tier device in early stage, so that some fundamental aspects discussed in this agenda (minimum CBW in Section 3, SSB BW in section 5) can make progress. Companies have split views on the maximum supported BW; 5MHz BW has the highest interest, while some other candidates, such as 3MHz, 10MHz, and 20MHz are also mentioned. Since too narrow UE BW may cause negative impact to the overall 6GR design, the pros/cons for those options need further study.

Other aspects for low-tier device, including the target use cases, complexity reduction (peak data reduction, reduced# of antennas, HD-FDD, and so on), UE power savings, coverage enhancements, and so on, can be discussed in RANp study for 6G requirements at first, and can be refined in RAN WGs.

#### [Old]Proposal 9.1:

* For low-tier device support by common/scalable 6GR framework, study following options for maximum supported UE BW
  + Opt1: 3MHz
  + Opt2: 5MHz
  + Opt3: 10MHz
  + Opt4: 20MHz

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Y/N | Comments |
| Tejas | Y | Option1 of 3MHz also needs to be studied (This should be minimum supported UE Bandwidth) |
| Nokia | N | Opt1 is not necessary, minimum UE BW should be 5MHz for FDD (15kHz SCS), even if system BW may be 3MHz for some specific bands and sync raster points. Opt4 is only necessary in case 60kHz SCS is introduced for TDD, otherwise it is not needed. Hence, the baseline should be Op2 (for FDD, 15kHz SCS) and Opt3 (for TDD, 30kHz SCS) in our view. |
| Vodafone | Y |  |
| OPPO |  | Suggest to discuss in Agenda 11.3.2. |
| CMCC |  | It is better to add a note: this should be equal to the minimum CBW in proposal 3.3.. Proposal 9.1 (revised):  * For low-tier device support by common/scalable 6GR framework, study following options for maximum supported UE BW   + Opt1: 3MHz   + Opt2: 5MHz   + Opt3: 10MHz   + Opt4: 20MHz   **Note: this BW should be equal to the minimum CBW in proposal 3.3** |
| Apple | Y | We are okay with the proposal |
| Samsung | Y | We are okay to study listed options. We support **Opt4 (from UE perspective) for RF bandwidth.** |
| CATT, CICTCI |  | We think the max UE BW of low-tier device highly depend on the FR, band and SCS. Otherwise, it is quite confusing how could it be possible to support some cases like “3 MHz with SCS=30 kHz”. Some suggestions:   * For low-tier device support by common/scalable 6GR framework, study following options for maximum supported UE BW and also the associated SCS, for each 6G FR (FR1 FDD, FR1 TDD, FR2-1, new FR around 7 GHz)   + Opt1: 3MHz   + Opt2: 5MHz   + Opt3: 10MHz   + Opt4: 20MHz |
| ZTE | Yes | It seems overlapped with proposal in other sectionm, e.g., section 3. It can be jointly discussed as one aspect for UE device type.  Besides, we think we can also try to categorize the services need to be studied in high level. For example,   * The following services are studied in RAN1   Positioning, Sensing, HRLLC, FWA, Immersive communication |
| FUTUREWEI | Y |  |
| Spreadtrum |  | We suggest to define different maximum UE BW for different duplex modes. We prefer 5MHz for FDD and 10MHz for TDD for LPWA devices, where it can achieve the comparable data rate for different duplex modes. Besides, we also support 20MHz for 6G RedCap devices. |
| Rakuten | Y |  |
| Ofinno | Y | Okay to study the different options. |
| Ericsson | N | Important aspect but better discussed under 11.3.2.  The UE bandwidth for low-end devices (e.g. targeting IoT applications) should be ~5 MHz for FDD (15 kHz scs) and ~10 MHz for TDD (30 kHz scs). The complexity reduction from even smaller bandwidth is very small according to earlier RAN1 evaluations (TR 36.888, TR 38.875, TR 38.865) and would complicate the overall system design considerably. |
| MediaTek | Y | We should consider economies of scale as a key factor, not just device build complexity. This is something not considered in TR 38.875. Our preference would be to consider Opt4 (20MHz), as an acceptable trade-off between build cost and broad applicability to create the necessary scale. It would be good to incorporate that aspect into any study considerations.  Then, we should clearly separate this “device envelope” discussion from the “minimum spectrum allocation” that the system should support. The Opt4 device would need to be able to operate in spectrum allocations smaller than 20MHz (e.g. 3/5MHz) of course for it to be broadly applicable. |
| SK Telecom | Y |  |
| CEWiT | Y |  |
| Xiaomi | N | We do not think Opt 1 is can achieve meaningful complexing/power reduction compared with 5MHz and propose to remove the option. |
| Sharp | Y | At this stage, we should not preclude other values. |
| SONY | Y | Support for Opt1 (3MHz) UL bandwidth is important for enabling a low complexity SAW-less multi-band low tier UE. Hence, we strongly support studying this maximum bandwidth.  Even if the max bandwidth is 3MHz, the DL bandwidth can be wider, while still supporting a low complexity design. We could add a note:   * For low-tier device support by common/scalable 6GR framework, study following options for maximum supported UE BW   + Opt1: 3MHz   + Opt2: 5MHz   + Opt3: 10MHz   + Opt4: 20MHz   + Note: the UL bandwidth may be different to the DL bandwidth |
| LGE | Y | We are fine to study the list-up options. We think option 1 (i.e. 3MHz as the minimum UE BW) needs to be included in the study as the current proposal. |
| Fujitsu | Y | We think this is a good start. |
| InterDigital | Y |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  | It is not clear why 3MHz is listed as an option. We could understand there are 3MHz in a small number of FDD bands in FR1 but why should lower-tier IoT capability be tied with this?  We are fine to study the other options further either in RAN1 or RANp considering the device complexity, power consumption, target use case, deployment scenarios and impact on system design.  In our view, option 4 is more appropriate considering that bandwidth really not contribute quite much at least from the cost perspective. |
| Nordic |  | Our prefrerence is Option 1 for UL, and Option 2 for DL FDD, Option 3 for DL TDD  3MHz in UL, when coupled with HD-FDD may significantly reduce module complexty, particularly regarding RF front-end. |
| Lenovo | Y | We can remove these options and keep the following text.  We should discuss in order to support a min CBW of 3 MHz whether optimizing system design for the min CBW. of 3 MHz is needed or not.  The reason is an MNO’s min CBW of 3 MHz can be supported using system BW of 5MHz min CBW and existing Rel-18 mechansim. |
| Google | Y |  |
| vivo | N | In our view, the maximum support BW by low-tier device (Device Type C as discussed above), depends on for example FDD or TDD operation. A device capable of up to 3MHz should not be considered any further as its application scenario is very limted. It should be noted that a device capable of larger BW (e.g. 5/10/20MHz) are expected to support operation under network of 3MHz BW  Our proposal would be to further study among option 2, 3 and 4. |
| HONOR | Y |  |

#### Proposal 9.1a:

* For low-tier device support by common/scalable 6GR framework, study following options for maximum supported UE BW
  + Opt1: 3MHz
  + Opt2: 5MHz
  + Opt3: 10MHz
  + Opt4: 20MHz
  + Note: the UL bandwidth may be different to the DL bandwidth

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Y/N | Comments |
| Moderator |  | Generally companies are OK with the intention of the Proposal. Some update to reflect feedback:   * Add a note to allow the possiblity to have different UL/DL max UE BW |
| FUTUREWEI | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | Y | This topic should be discussed in numerology/frame structure session to streamline the workload |
| Ericsson | Y | We are ok with the revised proposal with the understanding it applies to FR1. The UE bandwidth may depend on the scs used. Align with the frane structure agenda point to avoid t´discussing the same issue under multiple agenda points. |
| Apple | Y | The updated proposal looks good to us, even though we do not see the necessity of the note |
| Samsung |  | We want to clarify “UE BW” is RF or BB. As far as we understand this should be RF, so we suggest to modify:   * For low-tier device support by common/scalable 6GR framework, study following options for maximum supported RF UE BW   + Opt1: 3MHz   + Opt2: 5MHz   + Opt3: 10MHz   + Opt4: 20MHz   + Note: the UL bandwidth may be different to the DL bandwidth |
| CATT, CICTCI | N | UE BW of IoT is not necessary the same as min. CBW. 3 MHz is too restrictive which makes the system very hard to design.  And we think it is strange of add the new note at the beginning, since the motivation and benefit isi unclear.   * + ~~Opt1: 3MHz~~   + Opt2: 5MHz   + Opt3: 10MHz   + Opt4: 20MHz   + ~~Note: the UL bandwidth may be different to the DL bandwidth~~ |
| Spreadtrum | Y |  |
| Fujitsu | Y |  |

# **10 Spectrum utilization and operations**

Related to these aspects, the SID states following objectives:

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Single technology framework based on a stand-alone architecture (Note1) to support the agreed existing and new services, and to satisfy the usage scenarios, requirements, deployment scenarios and design principles with acceptable performance/complexity trade-off, as determined by the RAN requirements in [RP-250810] and [TR38.914], including: [RAN1], [RAN2], [RAN3], [RAN4] 2. Ensuring appropriate set of functionalities, minimize the adoption of multiple options for the same functionality, avoid excessive configurations, excessive UE capabilities and UE capabilities reporting. 3. Energy efficiency and energy saving: both for network and device. 4. Enhanced spectral efficiency. 5. Enhanced overall coverage, focus on cell-edge performance and UL coverage. 6. Wider channel bandwidth (at least 200MHz) support for 6G deployments at least above 2 GHz, around 7 GHz. 7. Re-use of existing 5G mid-band (~3.5GHz) site grid for 6G deployments in at least around 7 GHz and targeting comparable coverage to 5G mid-band. 8. Target scalable and forward compatible design for diverse device types. 9. Improved spectrum utilization and operations taking into account diverse spectrum allocations. 10. Aim at using common 6G Radio design, which meets mobile broadband service requirements as high priority, to also meet vertical needs. 11. Aim at a harmonized 6G Radio design for TN and NTN, including their integration. 12. System simplification, including reducing configuration complexity, enabling more efficient Cell/UE management, etc.   Note1: the term stand-alone architecture does not imply any particular Core network architecture, which is up to SA2 discussion.   1. Physical Layer structure for 6GR, 2. Waveforms (OFDM-based) and modulations. 5G NR Waveforms and modulation should be considered for 6GR and is also the benchmark for other potential proposals. [RAN1, RAN4] 3. Frame structure, including compatibility with 5G NR to allow for efficient 5G-6G Multi-RAT Spectrum Sharing (MRSS). [RAN1] 4. Channel coding, using LDPC and Polar Code as baseline, considering applicable extensions to satisfy 6G requirements and characteristics with acceptable performance/complexity trade-off [RAN1] 5. Channel Bandwidth (at least minimum and maximum), Numerology, avoiding multiple numerologies for the same band / sub-range (e.g., enabling synergies among frequency bands in the ~7GHz range) [RAN1, RAN4] 6. Physical layer control, data scheduling and HARQ operation [RAN1, RAN2] 7. MIMO operation [RAN1, RAN4] 8. Duplexing [RAN1, RAN4] 9. Initial access [RAN1, RAN2, RAN4]    * + Studies on synchronization signal and raster, broadcast signals/channel and physical random access channel [RAN1, RAN4]      + Studies on initial access procedure, random access procedures, system information and paging [RAN2, RAN1, RAN4] 10. 6GR spectrum utilization and aggregation. [RAN1, RAN2, RAN4] 11. Other physical layer signals, channels and procedures [RAN1, RAN2, RAN4] 12. Evaluate performance of at least energy efficiency, spectrum efficiency, and coverage compared to 5G NR, and deliver the initial result at the end of study [RAN1]. 13. RAN4 can be involved, if necessary, based on the LS from RAN1 |

As discussed in Section 5, multiple operators have similar concept to minimize always-on signals (including SSB/SI) for the case of multi-carrier operation. The commonality among these concepts is that the initial cell search is done only on a specific carrier and hence, the always-on signals can be minimized on other carriers.

In addition, companies provide views on how to improve the spectrum utilization and operations, including Flexible DL/UL pairing, DL/UL decoupling, flexible carrier switching, fast SCell activation/deactivation, single cell multi-carrier operation, and so on. Some examples are shown below:

**グラフィカル ユーザー インターフェイス

AI 生成コンテンツは誤りを含む可能性があります。**

Single cell multi-carrier operation in [10]



DL/UL decoupling in [20]

Although the technical details on the above aspects can be further discussed in other agenda items to be discussed in RAN1 (e.g., “Initial access”, “Physical layer control, data scheduling and HARQ operation”, and “6GR spectrum utilization and aggregation”), it wold be better to discuss some high-level direction on how to improve the spectrum utilization and operations in this agenda items, because this issue has impact on multiple agenda items. Following proposal can be considered as starting point for further discussion.

#### [Old]Proposal 10.1:

* Study how to improve the spectrum utilization and operations for multi-carrier operations
  + Note: the study under this agenda item should be kept on high-level directions, and the technical details can be studied under other agendas in future RAN1 meetings

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Y/N | Comments |
| China Telecom | Y | Support the mainbullet. But we’re not sure what “high-level directions” will be like for this part. From our perspective, we support to study: Single cell multiple carriers, Flexible UL DL carrier association and Flexible carrier switching. We wonder whether the above three aspects can be high-level directions? |
| Tejas | Y |  |
| Nokia | Y | This is a relevant topic, though more specific discussion is expected to take place in dedicated AIs in the near future. |
| Vodafone | Y |  |
| OPPO | Y | High-level design principle for spectrum utilization can be discussed in this agenda, e.g., requirements from operators, needs of single cell with multiple carriers (SCMC), etc.  Details should be dicussed in Agenda 11.11. |
| Apple | In principle okay | We propose to focus on the carrier aggregation   * Study how to improve the spectrum utilization and operations for carrier aggretation, including single carrier, ~~multi-carrier~~ operations   In 6G WG SID RP-251881, below is the quote for DC  *RAN plenary to make a decision on additional 6G-6G aggregation beyond 6G CA: 6G-6G DC. RAN plenary will task relevant RAN WGs for any specific technical analysis, as needed.*  Hence, we think the study of DC needs to the tasked by RAN plenary, if needed. |
| ETRI | Y | At least virtual handling of fragmented multiple carriers should be studied |
| Samsung | Y | We are generally OK with Proposal 10.1 but want to clarify whether “multi-carrier opertaitons” include both multi-carrier in same band and in different-bands. As reflected in several tdoc, layered (high-band and low-band, anchor carrier/non-anchor, coverage/capacity cell) approaches depend on carrier utilization with accros different bands. It would be helpful for the proposal to state this scope explicitly. |
| CATT, CICTCI | Y | Fine with the proposal.  Just to confirm the understanding: ‘multi-carrier operation’ is a high-level description, so the examples listed above (e.g. DL/UL decoupling) is not precluded. |
| ZTE |  | In 5G, different technologies are designed for multi-carrier operation even for the same requirement. We think a unified framework is very important.   * Study how to improve the spectrum utilization and operations for multi-carrier operations   + A unified multi-carrier framework is pursued.   + Note: the study under this agenda item should be kept on high-level directions, and the technical details can be studied under other agendas in future RAN1 meetings   With this, the study should be held and distributed to A.I. 11.11. |
| FUTUREWEI |  | Not this agenda item |
| Spreadtrum | Y | We suggest to list some potential high-level solutions, such as multiple carriers single cell (MCSC), DL and UL decoupling, etc. |
| Rakuten | Y | Support |
| Fainity | Y | At least support study DL/UL decoupling |
| Ericsson | Y | General aspects of the CA framework and whether additional tools are needed can be discussed here. It is important not to define multiple mechanisms addressing the same problem (and the problem addressed should be clear before diving into solutions). Detailed solutions are likely better discussed in other agenda item.  Flexible pairing of UL and DL carriers (“UL/DL decoupling”) can provide significant improvements in the uplink and should be considered as a part of the general CA framework. Given the bursty nature of packet data, rapid activation of additional spectrum resources is important. Whether to define ‘virtual carriers’ spanning multiple physical carriers needs further investigations. |
| MediaTek | Y | We do not support to change “multi-carrier” to “CA”, as we have not defined yet the framework for 6G. |
| SK Telecom | Y | Generally fine but unclear what exactly ‘high-level decision’ would be. |
| CEWIT | Y | We are ok with the proposal, but propose further to take this up along with ‘Concept and Operation of BWP’ |
| Xiaomi |  | We think this can be discussed later in the related agenda. |
| Sharp | Y |  |
| SONY | Y |  |
| LGE | Y | We can see diverse view on multi carrier operation in 6G. It would be beneficial to make an early high-level decision on which topics will be considered for the 6G study, as this could impact several areas, such as BWP, DL/UL control channel, scheduling, PDSCH/PUSCH design, HARQ, RACH allocation, and more. Therefore, we would like to suggest listing candidate features for multi-carrier operation, including the following:  - multi-carrier single cell operation  - carrier adaptation (e.g. switching, activation/deactivation)  - flexible DL-UL carrier association |
| Fujitsu | Y |  |
| InterDigital | Y |  |
| Huawei |  | We can understand the intention, but it seems better to leave such discussion to the specific agenda. |
| Lenovo | Y | Fine with proposal. |
| Google | Y |  |
| vivo | Y |  |
| HONOR | Y |  |

#### Proposal 10.1a:

* Study how to improve the spectrum utilization and operations for multi-carrier operations
  + ~~Note: the study under this agenda item should be kept on high-level directions, and the technical details can be studied under other agendas in future RAN1 meetings~~
  + To identify the pain points of NR CA framework

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Y/N | Comments |
| Moderator |  | Generally companies are OK with the intention of the Proposal. Some update to reflect feedback:   * The focus of this study includes to identify the pain points of NR CA framework |
| FUTUREWEI | Can accept the subbullet | Detailed discussing solutions belongs in another agenda item, but OK for identifying pain points here. From that perspective, only the subbullet (without “To” should be the proposal. |
| Qualcomm | Y | Companies should be encouraged to continue to bring in design pain point considerations for multicarrier aspects in 5G NR |
| Ericsson | Y | We are fined with the refined proposal. The focus should be on identifyting the problems and the high-level direction for the solutions. Details can be discussed under other agernda items. Avoid multiple solutions to the same problem, |
| Apple | Y | The updated proposal looks good to us |
| Samsung | Y | OK |
| Fraunhofer | Y |  |
| CATT, CICTCI | Y |  |
| Spreadtrum | Y |  |
| Fujitsu | Y |  |
| ETRI | Y |  |

# **11 Spectrum efficiency**

Related to these aspects, the SID states following objectives:

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Single technology framework based on a stand-alone architecture (Note1) to support the agreed existing and new services, and to satisfy the usage scenarios, requirements, deployment scenarios and design principles with acceptable performance/complexity trade-off, as determined by the RAN requirements in [RP-250810] and [TR38.914], including: [RAN1], [RAN2], [RAN3], [RAN4] 2. Ensuring appropriate set of functionalities, minimize the adoption of multiple options for the same functionality, avoid excessive configurations, excessive UE capabilities and UE capabilities reporting. 3. Energy efficiency and energy saving: both for network and device. 4. Enhanced spectral efficiency. 5. Enhanced overall coverage, focus on cell-edge performance and UL coverage. 6. Wider channel bandwidth (at least 200MHz) support for 6G deployments at least above 2 GHz, around 7 GHz. 7. Re-use of existing 5G mid-band (~3.5GHz) site grid for 6G deployments in at least around 7 GHz and targeting comparable coverage to 5G mid-band. 8. Target scalable and forward compatible design for diverse device types. 9. Improved spectrum utilization and operations taking into account diverse spectrum allocations. 10. Aim at using common 6G Radio design, which meets mobile broadband service requirements as high priority, to also meet vertical needs. 11. Aim at a harmonized 6G Radio design for TN and NTN, including their integration. 12. System simplification, including reducing configuration complexity, enabling more efficient Cell/UE management, etc.   Note1: the term stand-alone architecture does not imply any particular Core network architecture, which is up to SA2 discussion.   1. Physical Layer structure for 6GR, 2. Waveforms (OFDM-based) and modulations. 5G NR Waveforms and modulation should be considered for 6GR and is also the benchmark for other potential proposals. [RAN1, RAN4] 3. Frame structure, including compatibility with 5G NR to allow for efficient 5G-6G Multi-RAT Spectrum Sharing (MRSS). [RAN1] 4. Channel coding, using LDPC and Polar Code as baseline, considering applicable extensions to satisfy 6G requirements and characteristics with acceptable performance/complexity trade-off [RAN1] 5. Channel Bandwidth (at least minimum and maximum), Numerology, avoiding multiple numerologies for the same band / sub-range (e.g., enabling synergies among frequency bands in the ~7GHz range) [RAN1, RAN4] 6. Physical layer control, data scheduling and HARQ operation [RAN1, RAN2] 7. MIMO operation [RAN1, RAN4] 8. Duplexing [RAN1, RAN4] 9. Initial access [RAN1, RAN2, RAN4]    * + Studies on synchronization signal and raster, broadcast signals/channel and physical random access channel [RAN1, RAN4]      + Studies on initial access procedure, random access procedures, system information and paging [RAN2, RAN1, RAN4] 10. 6GR spectrum utilization and aggregation. [RAN1, RAN2, RAN4] 11. Other physical layer signals, channels and procedures [RAN1, RAN2, RAN4] 12. Evaluate performance of at least energy efficiency, spectrum efficiency, and coverage compared to 5G NR, and deliver the initial result at the end of study [RAN1]. 13. RAN4 can be involved, if necessary, based on the LS from RAN1 |

Quite a few companies provide the view related to the improvement of spectrum efficiency, and most of them can be fall into MIMO and AI/ML related features, which are (to be) discussed in other agenda items in RAN1. Therefore, moderator does not see any aspects to be discussed in this agenda item related to the improvement of spectrum efficiency. Following is open question to hear companies’ view. Note that in RANp study for 6G requirements, only a few target values for spectrum efficiency has been agreed yet, and RAN1 needs to wait for further RANp progress to see how much spectrum efficiency improvement 6GR aims to achieve.

#### Question 11.1:

* Companies are invited to provide views on whether to discuss any features which contribute to spectrum efficiency improvements, other than the features (to be) discussed in other agendas in RAN1. If yes, please elaborate which features need to be studied in this agenda.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Y/N | Comments |
| Tejas | Y | Relook at Guardband & Guard-time and reduced rolloff in conjuction with RAN-4 |
| Samsung | N | We think this is mainly to use more aggressive MU-MIMO, higher modulation order, and other areas. We may consider spectrum efficiency in agenda’s other than 11.1 as moderator suggested. |
| CATT, CICTCI | Y | UE centric system design (including spectrum reuse improvement, dynamic interference management, on demand access control, etc.) can be a candidate for study. |
| ZTE |  | First of all, we tend to agree that most of the improvement on spectrum efficiency can fall into other agendas like MIMO and AI/ML which will be discussed later in RAN1. We can just use this agenda to share views what to be considered in other agendas like MIMO. e.g. From ZTE perspective, the following should be considerd.   * Scheme-1: Single-TRP transmission scheme for supporting ultra-massive MIMO (involving both gNB and UE); * Scheme-2 Multi-TRP operation, e.g., coherent joint transmission among multi-TRP; * Scheme-3: UE-perceived cell-free operation starting from T0; * Scheme-4: Near field communications: * Scheme-5: RIS (distributed/localized deployment) |
| Ofinno |  | Agree with FL view to discuss in other AIs. |
| Fainity | Y | For further increase the spectrum utilization, for MRSS, it will be beneficial to study how to apply NAICS feature in FR1. |
| Ericsson | N | No need to discuss this outside the other agenda items (e.g. MIMO, modulation, …) |
| MediaTek | Y | Also, spectrum utilization and control overheads will impact spectral efficiency, so should not be excluded from that discussion. Also aspects such as inter-cell interference coordination (which may or may not be seen as part of MIMO).  Then somewhat related to spectrum efficiency, we also need to include latency-bound capacity for Immersive Comms. This will impact on areas such as spectrum utilization and duplexing as well if we consider realistic IC traffic. |
| CEWiT | N | We can handle such proposals under other agenda items. |
| Sharp |  | Spectral efficiency aspect can be discussed under respective agendas while we suggest precoder design taking near-field propagation characteristics into account. |
| SONY | N | We think that spectrum efficiency is important, but can be discussed under other agendas (e.g. multi-TRP and coherent joint TXRX can be considered in the MIMO AI, non-uniform constellations can be considered in the modulation AI etc). |
| Fujitsu | N | We think it would be better to consider spectrum efficiency in the agenda where the specific features belong to. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  | It is better to leave such discussion to the specific agendas. |
| Google |  | It can be discussed in MIMO agenda later |
|  |  |  |

# **12 All duplex types**

Related to this aspect, the SID states following objectives:

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Physical Layer structure for 6GR, 2. Waveforms (OFDM-based) and modulations. 5G NR Waveforms and modulation should be considered for 6GR and is also the benchmark for other potential proposals. [RAN1, RAN4] 3. Frame structure, including compatibility with 5G NR to allow for efficient 5G-6G Multi-RAT Spectrum Sharing (MRSS). [RAN1] 4. Channel coding, using LDPC and Polar Code as baseline, considering applicable extensions to satisfy 6G requirements and characteristics with acceptable performance/complexity trade-off [RAN1] 5. Channel Bandwidth (at least minimum and maximum), Numerology, avoiding multiple numerologies for the same band / sub-range (e.g., enabling synergies among frequency bands in the ~7GHz range) [RAN1, RAN4] 6. Physical layer control, data scheduling and HARQ operation [RAN1, RAN2] 7. MIMO operation [RAN1, RAN4] 8. Duplexing [RAN1, RAN4] 9. Initial access [RAN1, RAN2, RAN4]    * + Studies on synchronization signal and raster, broadcast signals/channel and physical random access channel [RAN1, RAN4]      + Studies on initial access procedure, random access procedures, system information and paging [RAN2, RAN1, RAN4] 10. 6GR spectrum utilization and aggregation. [RAN1, RAN2, RAN4] 11. Other physical layer signals, channels and procedures [RAN1, RAN2, RAN4] 12. Evaluate performance of at least energy efficiency, spectrum efficiency, and coverage compared to 5G NR, and deliver the initial result at the end of study [RAN1]. 13. RAN4 can be involved, if necessary, based on the LS from RAN1 |

Since the dedicated agenda item on duplexing is planned to be started from RAN1#124, technical details can be discussed there. However, as also stated by RAN1 chair, the 6GR frame structure is discussed for “all duplex types”, it would be better to clarify what “all duplex types” means. It is moderator’s understanding that the frame structure will be studied for the agreed duplex types for study. In this sense, this agenda discusses which duplex types are to be studied in 6GR at first.

There is sufficient support from companies to consider at least following duplexing types,

* FD-FDD
* Semi-static TDD
* gNB semi-static SBFD

while companies may have split views on whether to consider following duplexing types

* HD-FDD, subject to the support for low-tier 6G device
* Dynamic TDD, especially on whether to support SFI
* gNB dynamic SBFD
* UE SBFD
* gNB FD

Based on the above, following proposal can be considered as starting point for further discussion.

#### [Old]Proposal 12.1:

* On 6GR duplexing study, RAN1 considers at least following duplex types
  + FD-FDD
  + Semi-static TDD
  + gNB semi-static SBFD
* FFS whether to consider following duplexing types
  + HD-FDD
  + Dynamic TDD
  + gNB dynamic SBFD
  + UE SBFD
  + gNB FD

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Y/N | Comments |
| China Telecom | Y | We think gNB FD can also be studied for 6G as the evolution of SBFD. |
| Tejas | Y | HD-FDD is required for NTN at higher frequencies, hence we suggest to include HD-FDD.  gNB dynamic SBFD and gNB full duplex will increase spectral efficiency and should be considered for 6G duplex study. |
| Nokia | Y | Support the 3 first duplex types as the baseline, however we believe Dynamic TDD should be confirmed as one of the duplex types for further study as well. |
| Vodafone |  | Agree that FD-FDD, Semi-static TDD and gNB semi-static SBFD should be studied.  We also want to include HD-FDD in the study as it is a main consideration for 6G IoT device for many companies and it is important for it to be considered in 6G scheduler implementation since its start. UE (semi-static) SBFD can also be considered for the study |
| OPPO | Y |  |
| CMCC |  | We see no technical reasons to preclude HD-FDD and dynamic TDD, which has already been specified in 4G and 5G. Proposal 12.1 (revised):  * On 6GR duplexing study, RAN1 considers at least following duplex types   + FD-FDD   + Semi-static TDD   + gNB semi-static SBFD   + HD-FDD   + Dynamic TDD * FFS whether to consider following duplexing types   + gNB dynamic SBFD   + UE SBFD   + gNB FD |
| Apple | In principle okay | We are okay with the proposal.  We assume “gNB semi-static SBFD” only covers non-overlapping sub-band full duplex. |
| ETRI | Y | We think HD-FDD for RedCap UEs can be considered together with the other basic duplex types. |
| Samsung | N | Some clarifciaiton is be needed on whether “duplexing” is to be interpreted from the NW perspective only or both NW perspective and UE perspectives. If this includes both sides (UE and NW), we think HD-FDD should be in the main bullet. If we support 6G IoT (LPWA) in a single RAT, it is obvious to support HF-FDD for cost reduction offor low-cost UE types.  Regarding the second bullet, we do not recommend studying those items in Rel-21 6GR. Based on lessons from NR (and even LTE in some cases) and on considering the gNB/UE complexity, we suggest to focus on the first 3 items and include support of HD-FDD. |
| CATT, CICTCI | Y |  |
| ZTE |  | We can try to identify the high-level issues which may have impacts on the decision for duplex. The potential down-selection may be considered for other dedicated agendas like frame structure and duplexing. |
| FUTUREWEI | Y |  |
| Spreadtrum | Y |  |
| Ofinno | N | Semi-static TDD and dynamic TDD in NR are differentiated by the use of different TDD configurations between adjacent gNBs. However, it is worth noting that semi-static TDD with flexible symbols is effectively similar to dynamic TDD. Although dynamic TDD has not been deployed in commercial networks, 3GPP studies have demonstrated its benefits under certain circumstances. Therefore, it is premature to exclude this option at this stage.  Similarly, for gNB dynamic SBFD and UE SBFD, we are hesitant to put them as FFS at this point, as their exact definitions are not yet clear. For instance, carrier aggregation with transmitting and receiving at the same time with different carrirers could be interpreted as a form of UE SBFD. |
| Fainity | Y |  |
| Ericsson | N | The 5G duplex schemes (at least FD-FDD, HD-FDD, and dynamic/semi-static TDD) should be the basis. Details to be discussed under 11.10.x |
| MediaTek | Partially | Agree with the 1st three bullets, but HD-FDD and UE SBFD should also be included in the study. Premature to try to conclude on advanced duplexing to downscoping before the Duplexing Agenda Item has started and related performance goals e.g. latency bound capacity and coverage) have been properly elaborated. |
| SK Telecom | N | We prefer to study first three duplex types and HD-FDD. |
| CEWiT | Y | Fine with the proposal in general. Regarding FFS, UE SBFD is a beneficial feature for certain scenarios, where UL throughput and latency requirements are comparable with DL (E.g., immersive communication) and in case of high capability devices (E.g., FWA) |
| Sharp | Y |  |
| SONY | N | Agree with Ericsson: at least FD-FDD, HD-FDD, and dynamic/semi-static TDD should be the basis. HD-FDD is a core duplexing mode for IoT devices that significanlt reduces complexity and enables multi-band support (which significantly reduces complexity). |
| LGE | N | Ok with having first 3 bullets, but we think some other types of duplexing mode should be included as well.  For HD-FDD, since it is a practical and effective duplexing scheme for low-cost/complexity devices (e.g., 6G LPWA, 6G RedCap), it should be included in 6GR duplexing study.  For Dynamic TDD and gNB dynamic SBFD, what types of duplexing schemes to consider would make an impact on the fundamental design principles of frame structure. Dynamic TDD and gNB dynamic SBFD has large support so could be included to study considering the unified and forward compatible frame structure.  For the forward compatible frame structure, even though we prefer including UE SBFD and gNB FD for 6G duplexing study, we are ok with FFS as of now. |
| CSCN |  | We share the similar views with some companies that HD-FDD needs to be included. Besides, based on the harmonized 6GR design principle for TN and NTN, NTN characteristics should be incorporated in the study of all duplex types, including FDD, TDD and HD-FDD. |
| Fujitsu | Y |  |
| InterDigital | Y | Support the revised proposal by CMCC to include dynamic TDD in the 6G duplexing study scope, also suggested by Nokia and other companies. Neither semi-static TDD nor gNB semi-static SBFD can fully replace the benefits of dynamic TDD, particularly in isolated-cell deployments such as indoor factories, indoor hotspots, and small-cell scenarios, where cross-cell interference is limited and traffic asymmetry varies rapidly.  We also support studying gNB dynamic SBFD as a potential alternative/complimentary approach to dynamic TDD, as also suggested by multiple companies. This could enable a more unified framework for supporting multiple duplex types across diverse deployments. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  | It is not good to preclude others without full study. We think better to leave such discussion to the frame structure/duplex agenda, where solid study can be performaned before making any decision here. |
| Nordic | N | at least HD-FDD should be part of study for Iot-Low. If we exclude HD-FDD from day 1 for IoT Low, then no point to do IoT-Low at all. |
| Lenovo | Partially | Fine with general proposed direction, but as many other companies noted, HD-FDD is critical for IoT-Low. Also, UE SBFD should be further considered as it would be premature to exclude at this stage. |
| Google | Y | We think this is a fair proposal as a good starting point |
| vivo | N | We believe HD-FDD and dynamic TDD should also be supported in 6G in general, these should be included the same level of gNB semi-static SBFD. However, we are open to simplify dynamic TDD operation to address companies concerns. |
| HONOR | Y |  |

#### Proposal 12.1a:

* On 6GR duplexing study, RAN1 considers at least following duplex types
  + FD-FDD
  + Semi-static TDD
  + gNB semi-static SBFD
  + HD-FDD
* FFS whether to consider following duplexing types
  + ~~HD-FDD~~
  + Dynamic TDD
  + gNB dynamic SBFD
  + UE SBFD
  + gNB FD

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Y/N | Comments |
| Moderator |  | Generally companies are OK with the intention of the Proposal. Some update to reflect feedback:   * HD-FDD is moved under the 1st main bullet due to no objection and enough support |
| FUTUREWEI | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | Y | Again, this should be discussed in frame structure and later duplexing session. In overview, the focus could be on high level idea on how to facilitate commercialization, discussion on implementation concerns and potential directions to address or facilitate the commercialization from day 1 |
| Ericsson | Y | We support the includion of HD-FDD in the first main bulet. The 5G duplex schemes (at least FD-FDD, HD-FDD, and dynamic/semi-static TDD) should be the basis. Details to be discussed under 11.10. |
| Apple | Y | The updated proposal looks good to us |
| Samsung | Y | Support |
| Fraunhofer | Y |  |
| CATT, CICTCI |  | Dynamic TDD should be supported. For dynamic TDD, we think it can simply be supported by adopting ‘flexible symble + DCI scheduling PDSCH/PUSCH’. No need for SFI of course. |
| Spreadtrum | Y |  |
| Fujistu | Y | We also support HD-FDD as well. But we think if the time units are limited, the priority of HD-FDD could be lower than others. |
| ETRI | Y |  |

# **13 Harmonization of TN and NTN**

Related to this aspect, the SID states following objectives:

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Single technology framework based on a stand-alone architecture (Note1) to support the agreed existing and new services, and to satisfy the usage scenarios, requirements, deployment scenarios and design principles with acceptable performance/complexity trade-off, as determined by the RAN requirements in [RP-250810] and [TR38.914], including: [RAN1], [RAN2], [RAN3], [RAN4] 2. Ensuring appropriate set of functionalities, minimize the adoption of multiple options for the same functionality, avoid excessive configurations, excessive UE capabilities and UE capabilities reporting. 3. Energy efficiency and energy saving: both for network and device. 4. Enhanced spectral efficiency. 5. Enhanced overall coverage, focus on cell-edge performance and UL coverage. 6. Wider channel bandwidth (at least 200MHz) support for 6G deployments at least above 2 GHz, around 7 GHz. 7. Re-use of existing 5G mid-band (~3.5GHz) site grid for 6G deployments in at least around 7 GHz and targeting comparable coverage to 5G mid-band. 8. Target scalable and forward compatible design for diverse device types. 9. Improved spectrum utilization and operations taking into account diverse spectrum allocations. 10. Aim at using common 6G Radio design, which meets mobile broadband service requirements as high priority, to also meet vertical needs. 11. Aim at a harmonized 6G Radio design for TN and NTN, including their integration. 12. System simplification, including reducing configuration complexity, enabling more efficient Cell/UE management, etc.   Note1: the term stand-alone architecture does not imply any particular Core network architecture, which is up to SA2 discussion. |

Since the dedicated agenda item on NTN is planned to be started from RAN1#124, technical details can be discussed there. Howerver, for the harmonized 6GR design for TN and NTN, it would be better to identify which technical areas the NTN aspects need to be considered in early stage. In this sense, this agenda discusses to identify the affected technical areas for the harmonized 6GR design for TN and NTN.

According to the contributions, the potentially affected areas by NTN are quite broad. There is a joint contribution from satellite companies [52] and another contribution from another satellite company [53]. It would be good to start from their proposal as starting point to reflect the industry’s view. Other aspects can be included through discussion.

Note that the orbit type and payload type will be discussed in RANp study for 6G requirements.

#### [Old]Proposal 13.1:

* For harmonized 6GR design for TN and NTN, RAN1 studies to identify the technical aspects affected by NTN characteristics, including at least
  + a) GNSS-resilient operation
    - Further discuss how to avoid duplication with Rel-20 5G-A NR-NTN study
  + b) PAPR reduction for NTN DL
  + c) Frame structure
  + d) Coverange enahncements
  + e) Duplex types
  + f) Propagation impairments
  + g) Long propagation delay
  + h) Grant free access
  + i) Beam hopping and longer SSB periodicity
  + j) Positioning/Location
  + k) NTN/TN mobility
  + l) DC/CA
  + m) Coexistence with IoT-NTN/NR-NTN
  + n) Beam-specific signal/channel design
  + o) Interference management for TN-NTN, inter-orbit, and inter-satellite cases

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Y/N | Comments |
| China Telecom |  | We are a bit confused here. For example, for Frame structure part, since there is an agnenda being discussed in parallel, then how to deal with the relationship between them? |
| Tejas | Y | Dual connectivity of TN and NTN should be considered as well. |
| Nokia | N | In this early stage, the main questions to be addressed is whether the waveform, frame structure, and numerology under study for TN can be utilized by NTN as well. From that point of view, mainly topics b), c), d), e), f) are relevant for this AI. In addition, topic l) DC/CA should not be addressed in RAN1 without prior indication from RAN Plenary. Some of the topics (i.e. m) and o)) seem to fall into the domain of RAN4 and should not be discussed as part of the RAN1 discussions. Topic k) is additionally more in the RAN2 domain and should not be discussed here either. Other topics can be discussed under dedicated AI in the near future. In general we should avoid significant deviations in the design, especially on essential functionalities, e.g. related to cell discovery and initial access signals and procedures. |
| OPPO |  | Details should be studied in Agenda 11.12. But in 11.1, we can discuss a general design principle for 6GR:  Step 1: 6GR Baseline design is identified considering requirement of 6G TN communication (i.e. MBB and IoT).  Step 2: Design for 6G verticals (e.g. Sensing, NTN) can be studied based on the 6GR baseline design. Strive for reusing the 6GR baseline design (e.g. waveform, frame structure, channel coding, modulation) for 6GR verticals. But Sensing-specific and NTN-specific designs can be studied. |
| CMCC |  | For Duplex type, TDD spectrums can be considered as addtiaonl resources to FDD spectrum providing more candidate spectrum resources fro deployments.  When TDD is supported for NTN, the round trip time needs to be covered by the GP between DL and UL slots. With the consideration of this, longer periodicity for TDD-UL-DL periodicity can be considered.  It needs further clarification on Grant free access. There would be some pre-conditions for the Grant freee access, such as GNSS with high accuracy of timingfor uplink transmission. Legacy PRACH procedure still can be considered as baseline behavior for UE initial access. After the design of initial access, we can discuss the grant free access.  In addition, it seems some aspects listed may not purely RAN1 scope, for example, NTN/TN mobility, DC/CA, and some fuctions also require RAN SI discussion. |
| Apple |  | For us, the scope of the study is to large and may not fit into 6G day 1, we are mostly interested in   * + a) GNSS-resilient operation     - Further discuss how to avoid duplication with Rel-20 5G-A NR-NTN study   + d) Coverange enahncements   + e) Duplex types   + g) Long propagation delay   + i) Beam hopping and longer SSB periodicity   + k) NTN/TN mobility   + m) Coexistence with IoT-NTN/NR-NTN |
| ETRI | Y | We assume that “b) PAPR reduction for NTN DL” covers the waveform discussions as well. |
| Samsung | N | We appreciate the effort to identify NTN-specific aspects. However, the current proposal is overly detailed with many specific examples, and it does not fully account for the potential side impacts on TN operation. The study should instead focus on an integrated TN-NTN design between TN and NTN from the initial stage of the 6GR specifications, under the premise that such integration will not introduce any adverse impact, complexity, or limitation on TN operation.  Accordingly, we would like to suggest the following updated proposal:  Proposal: For a harmonized 6GR design for TN and NTN, RAN1 should study the technical aspects affected by NTN characteristics, underwith the clear principle that such studies shall not cause any degradation, complexity, or limitation to TN performance and operation. |
| CATT, CICTCI | Y | In additionl to the above list, we propose the following directions:   * **Numerology** (since it is unclear whether NCP is sufficient in some NTN band) * **MIMO transmission** (NTN terminals may have left-hand circular polarization and right-hand circular polarization to form multi-layer transmission) * **Satellite related system information broadcasting** |
| ZTE | Yes | We should focus more on the identification of the impacts for design. |
| Spreadtrum |  | Considering that only high level design is considered for this agenda, we suggest to make it simple as follows:  Proposal 13.1:   * **For harmonized 6GR design for TN and NTN, RAN1 studies to identify the technical aspects affected by NTN characteristics, including at least**   + **a) Time/frequency synchronization (including GNSS-resilient operation)**     - **~~Further discuss how to avoid duplication with Rel-20 5G-A NR-NTN study~~**   + **~~b) PAPR reduction for NTN DL~~**   + **~~c) Frame structure~~**   + **b) Coverange enahncements**   + **c) Timing relationship**   + **d) Capactiy/throughput enhancements**   + **e) Duplex types**   + **~~f) Propagation impairments~~**   + **~~g) Long propagation delay~~**   + **~~h) Grant free access~~**   + **~~i) Beam hopping and longer SSB periodicity~~**   + **~~j) Positioning/Location~~**   + **f) NTN/TN mobility**   + **~~l) DC/CA~~**   + **~~m) Coexistence with IoT-NTN/NR-NTN~~**   + **~~n) Beam-specific signal/channel design~~**   + **g) Multi-orbits operation~~Interference management for TN-NTN, inter-orbit, and inter-satellite cases~~** |
| Ofinno | N | Agree with Nokia. We don’t have a strong view but suggest that we should also try to apply same criteria for different topics at this stage. For NTN why do we list so many very specific items to study but for other topics we focus on either very high level proposals or one specific proposal? |
| Ericsson | N | Integrated NTN support should be part of the 6G design. It is important not to have deviating solutions for NTN and TN (e.g. in terms of frame structure, waveform, modulation schemes, etc) as any differences likely means delayed and/or incomplete commercial NTN support. Details to be discussed under the respective agenda item. |
| MediaTek |  | Would suggest to start by identifying at the needs and key functional areas for 6G NTN, and then quickly distributing into other agenda items. |
| SK Telecom |  | Among the items suggested by moderator, we are more interested in the following aspects:   * + c) Frame structure   + k) NTN/TN mobility   + l) DC/CA   + m) Coexistence with IoT-NTN/NR-NTN   + o) Interference management for TN-NTN, inter-orbit, and inter-satellite cases   Regarding (j), it is unclear what exactly means. Better to be clarified. |
| CEWiT | Conditionally Y | We are not very clear on what basis the moderator has formed the list. Mainly because some of the items are either unclear or totally immature to be included in the list at this stage. For eg DC/CA , it is not clear whether it is TN-NTN DC or NTN-NTN DC. Similarly for CA, whether it NTN-CA with single satellite or multiple satellites. The same goes with NTN/TN Mobility, which is too soon to be considered. So we propose to remove any item which has less revelance or maturity to be included at this stage. |
| Xiaomi |  | We would propose the following changes:   * For harmonized 6GR design for TN and NTN, RAN1 studies to identify the technical aspects affected by NTN characteristics, including at least   + a) GNSS-resilient operation     - Further discuss how to avoid duplication with Rel-20 5G-A NR-NTN study   + b) PAPR reduction for NTN DL   + c) Frame structure   + d) Coverange enahncements   + e) Duplex types   + f) Propagation impairments   + g) Long propagation delay   + ~~h) Grant free access~~   + i) Beam hopping and longer SSB periodicity   + ~~j) Positioning/Location~~   + k) NTN/TN mobility   + l) ~~DC/~~multi-satellite CA/distributed MIMO   + m) Coexistence with IoT-NTN/NR-NTN   + n) Beam-specific signal/channel design   + o) Interference management for TN-NTN, inter-orbit, and inter-satellite cases |
| Sharp |  | Rather than listing all the potential technical aspects, we would suggest more generalized wording. For example, RAN1 strives to unifiy the basic feature set, and study how to minimize add-on features specific to NTN. |
| SONY | Y | It is important to provide a list of NTN features/requirements and TN features/requirements and work out how we can achieve commonality. The list acts (in many respects) as such a checklist. |
| LGE |  | From our side, it would be good to know which 6GR design parts may need to consider the NTN aspects.  On “GNSS-reselient operation”, it would necessary to be modified to cover GNSS-less operation explicitly. The suggestion is to add “UEs without GNSS capabiites”. In our understanding, they could target totally different things. When we consider the low-cost UE in NTN scenario, it is important to support the GNSS-less operation. In this case, the residual TO (time offset)/FO (frequency offset) after pre/post-compensation will affect to initial access and common channel design, and frame structure design.  Since a single satellite can serve few hundreds or thousands of cells and the total EIRP or TX power will be limited, PAPR reduction even for DL and beam hopping and longer SSB periodicity would need to be studied. On PAPR reduction for DL, it will affect to the waveform design. Beam hopping and longer SSB periodicity will affect to the initial access and common channel design.  On the propagation impariments, it will affect to the frame structure design (e.g., TBoMS) and coverage enhancement (including cell common channel target).  On the long propagation delay, it will affect to duplex type design, frame structure design. Moreover, to mitigate the long propagation delay, it can be considered to study the impact on the initial access and common channel design. It will also affect to the DL/UL scheduling design. |
| CSCN | Y | For a), NTN without ephemeris and/or GNSS assistance could be further studied to enable the commercial deployment of NTN.  For b) and c), the discussion should be incorporated into the corresponding AIs, considering the harmonization of TN and NTN.  For d), from the commercial perspective, both DL and UL coverage are important for operators, and should be discussed in coverage part, i.e., Proposal 4.1, based on the harmonization of TN and NTN.  For e), FDD, TDD, and HD-FDD should be natively supported in 6G NTN. The discussion of duplex types should be incorporated into the previous section, i.e., Proposal 12.1, taking into account the characteristics of both TN and NTN to achieve the unified air interface.  For i), due to the limited number of active beams, beam hopping and longer SSB periodicity should be studied to improve the coverage ratio in NTN.  For n), to increase the flexibility and achieve better performance of NTN, lower latency and beam-specific signal/channel design for access and mobility should be supported.  For o), with the similar consideration of above issues, we support the study of interference management for TN-NTN, inter-orbit, and inter-satellite cases.  Besides, NTN characteristics (e.g., distributed and lightweight computing power) could be involved in native AI design. |
| Huawei |  | We appreciate the effort from feature lead to summarize such many aspects. However, there is no need to discuss NTN-specific aspects in the overview agenda here, which can be left to the specific agenda. For this agenda, if needed, we can just simply identify the potential technical aspects affected by NTN characteristic, e.g. initial access, then let the specific agenda to study the corresponding details. |
| Lenovo | Y | Some of these optimizations can also be done in Day-2. We want to minimize the impact to NTN in Rel-21. Only NTN minimal feature set that cannot be addressed using future forward-compatible design should be supported in Rel-21. Moreover, consider adding large delay dispersal into the list to account for the large delay variation among UEs in a same NTN cell. |
| Google | Partially | As a starting point, we think item i), j) and l) should be removed. We cannot study too many things in one release. |
| vivo |  | The sub-bullets seem to not only cover the other topics list above, e.g., e) Duplex types vs 12 All duplex types, and also other topics with separate AIs. It is a bit unclear how to manage the discussion, given the potential lots of interactions may happen. |
| HONOR | Partially | As a starting point, we think item b) should be removed. We cannot study too many things in one release. |

#### Proposal 13.1a:

* For harmonized 6GR design for TN and NTN, RAN1 studies to identify the technical aspects affected by NTN characteristics~~, including at least~~
  + ~~a) GNSS-resilient operation~~
    - ~~Further discuss how to avoid duplication with Rel-20 5G-A NR-NTN study~~
  + ~~b) PAPR reduction for NTN DL~~
  + ~~c) Frame structure~~
  + ~~d) Coverange enahncements~~
  + ~~e) Duplex types~~
  + ~~f) Propagation impairments~~
  + ~~g) Long propagation delay~~
  + ~~h) Grant free access~~
  + ~~i) Beam hopping and longer SSB periodicity~~
  + ~~j) Positioning/Location~~
  + ~~k) NTN/TN mobility~~
  + ~~l) DC/CA~~
  + ~~m) Coexistence with IoT-NTN/NR-NTN~~
  + ~~n) Beam-specific signal/channel design~~
  + ~~o) Interference management for TN-NTN, inter-orbit, and inter-satellite cases~~

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Y/N | Comments |
| Moderator |  | The proposal is updated to be simple as other proposals. The main focus in this agenda is to identify the technical aspects affected by NTN characteristics. The details of the identidied technical aspects will be further studied in the corresponding agendas. |
| FUTUREWEI | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | Y | It is too early to discuss technical details. At high level, a unified design for NT/NTN is highly preferred and NTN specific time/frequency compensation readiness on device side from Day 1 is preferred, though testability is a big question to discuss. |
| Ericsson | Y | We agree to the revised proposal with less focus on details. It is important not to have deviating solutions for NTN and TN (e.g. in terms of frame structure, waveform, modulation schemes, etc) as any differences likely means delayed and/or incomplete commercial NTN support. Details to be discussed under the respective agenda item. |
| Apple | Y | The updated proposal looks good to us |
| Samsung |  | We suggest to add a note that “harmonization between TN and NTN shall not cause any degradation, complexity, or limitation to TN performance and operation”. |
| Fraunhofer | Y |  |
| CATT, CICTCI |  | Fine to keep in high level.  But just remind that NTN demand should be carefully taken into consideration, when studying fundamental features in physical laer. |
| Spreadtrum | Y |  |
| Fujitsu | Y | Basically, we are fine with current proposal |

# **14 Other aspects**

Other than the aspects discussed in the above sections or other agenda items (including those planned in future RAN1 meetings), some companies mention the aspects related to PHY security, NW resilience, and so on. It is moderator’s understanding that neither of other aspects can be discussed in RAN1 without any progress in RANp study on 6G requirements. RAN1 cannot discuss any features without justification on the target/motivation, which need to be clarified in RANp study at first. Following is open question to hear companies’ view.

#### Question 14.1:

* Companies are invited to provide views on whether to discuss any features, other than those (to be) discussed in other sections in this summary or in other agendas in RAN1. If yes, please elaborate which features need to be studied in this section.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Y/N | Comments |
| Vodafone |  | Important to have close alignment between SA3 (with early input being desired) and the RAN groups to ensure that any new security requirements on lower layers are delivered. Any new procedure/mechanism on L1 security should consider and study the additional payload to DCI/UCI control signalling |
| Ericsson |  | Resilience and security/privacy are important aspects which can potentially be discussed under 11.1, at least initially. |
| MediaTek |  | Som of the service aspects will likely need more elaboration at RAN plenary (e.g. Immersive comms KPI, Sensing) and then may need further consideration on how to organize related effort within RAN1. |
| ST Engineering iDirect |  | It is important that RAN1 already engages with SA3 to have early input on requirements regarding waveform security. As we have pointed out in [43], physical layer security is considered by many companies for 6G Radio, but different aspects are considered by multiple companies. Therefore, guidance from SA3 on what should be studied is needed (e.g., anti-jamming resilience, encryption, network traffic hiding, …). Furthermore, SA3 will approve a SID on 6G security in the September plenary, and a discussion on requirements of PHY layer security could be part of that SID. |
| LGE |  | While we are open to any further useful discussion, we should be careful to restrict the scope of discussion in this agenda to the topics which can lead to practical progress of the study rather than listing up all the candidates. |

# **15 Conclusions**

Following agreements were made in this meeting:

To be updated
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