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# Introduction

In this contribution, we summarize all issues submitted on initial access aspects for NR extension up to 71 GHz for RAN1 #104-e meeting. Section 2 contain a summary of issues identified from contributions submitted to RAN1 #104-e [1] ~ [27]. The list of issues in Section 2 are **not** ordered in terms of discussion priority. Section 3 contains list of conclusions/agreements proposed by the moderator based on discussions. Section 4 contains list of conclusions and agreements made in RAN1 #104-e. Please note the conclusions and agreements listed in Section 4 may not be the full list as moderator is updating the list as meeting progresses.

# Summary of Issues and Discussions

## 2.1 SSB Aspects

### 2.1.1 DRS Related Aspects (including potential use of Short Signal Exemption for SSB)

* From [1] FUTUREWEI:
  + In 60 GHz shared spectrum, support SS/PBCH across discovery burst transmission windows that are quasi co-located with respect to average gain, QCL-Type A, and QCL-Type D properties.
* From [3] ZTE, Sanechips:
  + More than 64 candidate SSBs can be defined in a half-frame for Rel-17 NR above 52.6 GHz.



* From [4] OPPO:
  + For above 52.6GH unlicensed spectrum, introduce SSB candidate positions to allow more SSB transmission occasions for a given SSB beam or to allow SSB beam repetitions.
* From [5] Huawei, HiSilicon:
  + For unlicensed operation in 52.6GHz to 71GHz, support LBT before SSB transmission and reuse the concept of discovery burst window from Rel-16 NR-U.
* From [8] CATT:
  + For NR operation in unlicensed spectrum in 52.6-71 GHz, the principle of transmission window defined in Rel-16 NR-U is supported.
  + More than 64 SSB transmission opportunities shall be defined within a 5ms SSB burst set to support up to 64 beams for SSB beam sweeping in case of occasional LBT failure. The additional bit(s) for the extension of SSB index need to be further study.
* From [12] Intel:
  + Observation: For 120 kHz SCS SSB, transmission of 64 SSB with 20 msec SSB periodicity exceed 10 msec transmission duration within a 100 msec observation period required for short control signal exemption. For 480 kHz SCS SSB, transmission of 64 SSB and 64 Type0-PDCCH with associated PDSCH with 20 msec SSB periodicity exceed 10 msec transmission duration within a 100 msec observation period required for short control signal exemption. For 960 kHz SCS SSB, transmission of 64 SSB and 64 Type0-PDCCH with associated PDSCH with 20 msec SSB periodicity does not exceed 10 msec transmission duration within a 100 msec observation period required for short control signal exemption.
  + While SSB may be considered as a candidate for short control signal exemption, RAN1 specification shall support operations of SSB transmission with LBT (at the gNB) at least for 120 kHz SSB.
    - For 480 kHz and 960 kHz SSB, also support operations of SSB transmission with LBT (at the gNB) for commonality with 120 kHz SSB
* From [15] Spreadtrum:
  + The initial access mechanisms for R16 NR-U can be further adapted for high frequency, e.g., to support up to 64 SSB beams.
* From [18] NEC:
  + With respect to the 120 kHz SCS SSB pattern for LBT mode operation, CORESET and PDSCH related to SIB1 should be multiplexed with SSB to guarantee the absence of any gaps greater than 16us in the discovery burst set.
* From [20] Samsung:
  + Discovery burst transmission window should be supported for 60 GHz unlicensed band.
* From [22] Ericsson:
  + Consistent with EN 302 567, when operating in LBT mode a node can access the channel without LBT for control signal/channel transmissions, the total duration of which shall not exceed 10ms within an observation period of 100ms. The following signals/channels shall be classified as Short control signaling transmissions:
    - SS/PBCH blocks
    - PRACH
    - FFS: Other control transmissions not multiplexed with user data (subject to gNB configuration)
  + Observation: It is not necessary to optimize the SS/PBCH transmission/reception mechanism by introducing a transmission window, especially since SS/PBCH blocks can be classified as short control signaling transmissions consistent with EN 302 567.
* From [24] Convida:
  + Increasing the number of SSB candidate positions to above 64 to increase transmission opportunities to cope with LBT failure should be considered.

**Summary of Discussions in Tdoc**

* Discussion on DRS window to cope with LBT failure is supported or not. If supported, the details of the DRS.
  + Majority of the companies seems to propose support of DRS like windows and corresponding SSB candidate positions similar to NR-U
    - FUTUREWEI, ZTE, Sanechips, OPPO, Huawei, HiSilicon, CATT, Intel, Spreadtrum, Samsung, Convida
  + Some companies suggested that DRS like operation is not necessary for SSB as short signal exemption (defined in EN 302 567) could be applied.
    - Ericsson

**Discussions #1**

* Please provide further views on whether DRS window (to cope with LBT failure) should be supported. Also provide further comments on related issues to DRS.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Support DRS (similar to Rel-16 NR-U)?** | **Discussions/Comments** |
| Samsung | Yes | There is always scenario where short control signal is not applicable, e.g. for the region where regulation doesn’t define short control signal, or for the condition (duty cycle) short control signal is not satisfied. Hence, the SSB transmission subject to LBT always happens, then it’s natural to reuse NR-U DBTW for such cases. |
| NEC | Yes | The DRS window with necessary modification should be supported as a mechanism to improve the SSB transmission performance for LBT mode operation. Discovery burst transmission may not always meet the restrictions of short control signal. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Yes | Short control signalling has strict usage requirements. No matter for SSB or DRS including SSB and CORESET#0/RMSI, their transmission time in a periodicity of 100 ms may exceed 10 ms. In such cases, LBT could be used. Thus we support to define DRS window and more candidate SSB positions to increase the opportunities for SSB/DRS. |
| DOCOMO | Yes | We agree to support DRS window to cope with LBT failure. We also see the scenario where short control signal is not applicable while LBT is necessary prior to the transmission. For example, regulation in Japan require LBT before transmissions with transmission power larger than a certain threshold. In other words, there is a case where SSB transmission is subject to LBT. Ok to reuse the one specified in Rel-16 NR-U. |
| LG Electronics | Yes | For the scenario whether LBT is required for SSB transmission, it would be beneficial to provide more opportunities for SSB to cope with LBT failure. |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| vivo | Yes | We agree to support DRS window to cope with possible LBT failure if it is needed. |
| Nokia |  | While we would prefer to apply the short control signaling as much as feasible, it is evident that with 120kHz it may not be always applied if the number of actually transmitted SSBs is large. Hence it would seem relevant to consider LBT mechanism in initial access.  Whether and how to extend the number of potential SSB time locations should be further considered. With 120kHz if the number of locations is increased, the DRS window may extend beyond 5ms. Thus, instead of increasing max number of SSB positions beyond 64, e.g. up to 128 (and use similar cycling mechanism as in Rel. 16 NR-U) it could be considered that max number of SSB positions remains 64 while some of the positions (e.g. last N positions) can be used as a back-up positions for the SSBs which were not transmitted due to LBT failure.  For RMSI and LBT it could be possible to consider SSB and CORESET#0 multiplexing pattern1 and pattern 2/3 separately. |
| Charter Communications |  | Prefer to apply short control signaling as much as possible and avoid elaborate DRS transmission window design for SSB. In regions where there is no short control signaling defined, it is usually the case that LBT is also not mandated. |
| Futurewei | Yes | Support DRS window to cope with LBT failure similar as Rel 16. |
| Ericsson | No | Our view is that contrary to operation in the 5/6 GHz band, a discovery burst transmission window (DBTW) is unjustified for operation in the 60 GHz band for a number of reasons:   * As we and others have shown, when operating with LBT (which is not even required in many regions), deferral due to LBT failure is very rare in the 60 GHz band due to high pathloss and heavy reliance on beamforming. Even if LBT failure occurs in a rare event, it is not disastrous to system operation to drop an SSB transmission on rare occasions. * Furthermore, if there is a serious concern about rare dropping of an SSB, by implementation the gNB can secure access to the channel in advance of an SSB burst, e.g., by one or more attempts to schedule data to a user. * MIB re-design. The current MIB supports indication of only 64 candidate SS/PBCH positions, hence if 64 beams are used, indication of more than 64 positions (plus a larger Q value compared to Rel-16) will require adding additional bits to MIB, thus negatively affecting coverage. * SSB can be classified as short control signaling, thus removing the need for LBT in many scenarios of interest. It does not matter that the 10 ms duration could be exceeded for certain numbers of beams, since LBT can still be performed if the duration is exceeded. This in itself is not a motivation to introduce a transmission window.   Given that a DBTW is not motivated for operation in the 60 GHz band, it unwarranted for RAN1 to spend a lot of time designing such a feature (as was done in Rel-16). |
| Qualcomm | No | We share the same view as Ericsson. Considering the high beam directivity for 60 GHz range compared to FR1, LBT failure rate may be low. Hence, we recommend that DRS window is not used, especially that the SSB can be considered as a short control signal. |
| OPPO | Yes | The concept of DRS window should be reused at least for SSB transmission subject to LBT case. |
| Xiaomi | Yes | For LBT required operation case, it is necessary to support the DRS window as defined in Rel-16. |
| Apple |  | The SSB transmission should be prioritized to leverage the short control signaling rule. Can be discussed in channel access under short control signaling and SSB related subjects |
| Intel | Yes | RAN1 specification should support possibility of SSB transmission with LBT. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | In our view, the 10 ms out of 100 ms channel occupancy is only a necessary condition for exemption and not sufficient. Otherwise, virtually any single signal/channel could be designed so that it satisfies the above short duration criteria. 3GPP should interpret short “management and control  Frames” terminology used in 302 567 and decide which signals/channels can be exempted. In particular, we believe that LBT is still necessary before gNB transmits SSB because of a broader energy emission foot-print of SSB burst. Moreover, if default periodicity of 20 ms is assumed, neither Case D nor Case E SSB patterns in 120 and 240 kHz satisfy the necessary 10/100 ms criteria.  Therefore, similar to Rel-16 NR-U, discovery burst transmission window should be supported. Moreover, transmitting RMSI PDCCH/PDSCH together with its associated SSB in discovery burst transmission window should be considered to reduce the initial access latency and required beam switching. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Yes | Support of DRS like windows and LBT before SSB transmission. Increasing the number of SSB candidate positions to cope with LBT failure needs to be studied further. |
| Convida Wireless | Yes | Yes. To consider LBT failure, number of SSB opportunities can be increased. |
| Mediatek | No | Agree with Ericsson and Qualcomm’s view, the probability of LBT collision is rare in 60 GHz due to the highly directional transmission. We prefer not to adopt DRS window. |

**Moderator Summary of Discussions #1**

* Support DRS for NR operating 52.6 ~ 71 GHz, similar to SSB design for NR-U
  + [17] Companies
    - Samsung, NEC, ZTE, Sanechips, NTT Docomo, LG Electronics, Spreadtrum, vivo, Nokia(?), Futurewei, Xiaomi, Intel, Huawei, HiSilicon, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, Convida
  + Companies commented 120kHz SSB may not strictly meet the short signal exemption requirements needed to avoid LBT and therefore may need to consider DRS.
* Do not support DRS for NR operating 52.6 ~ 71 GHz
  + [5] Companies
    - Charter(?), Ericsson, Qualcomm, Apple(?), Mediatek
  + Companies commented with use of pre-emptive channel access gain prior to SSB and use of short signal exempt rules, it should be possible to operate the system without LBT for SSB.
* Larger number of the companies seems to think DRS support is needed. With that said, moderator suggests further discussing this in GTW or over email discussion to at least hear out the companies that do not believe DRS for 60GHz band is needed to explain their logic and motivation.
* Strive to make a conclusion. Further discuss using the following statement as a starting point for further discussion:
  + Support DRS for NR operating 52.6 ~ 71 GHz, similar to SSB design for NR-U

**Discussions #2**

Further discuss using the following statement as a starting point for further discussion:

##### Proposal #1.1-1 (original)

* Support DRS for NR operating 52.6 ~ 71 GHz, similar to SSB design for NR-U

##### Proposal #1.1-2 (updated)

* Support DRS and DRS transmission window for NR operating 52.6 ~ 71 GHz~~, similar to SSB design for NR-U~~
  + PBCH payload size remains the same when supporting DRS
  + Similar SSB design with NR-U is applied when LBT is required for SSB transmission in unlicensed band.

##### Proposal #1.1-3 (update of 1.1-2 with FFS on the design aspects)

* Support DRS and DRS transmission window for NR operating 52.6 ~ 71 GHz~~, similar to SSB design for NR-U~~
  + PBCH payload size remains the same when supporting DRS
  + FFS: Similar SSB design with NR-U is applied when LBT is required for SSB transmission in unlicensed band.

##### Proposal #1.1-4 (update of 1.1-3 with additional FFS)

* Support DRS and DRS transmission window for NR operating 52.6 ~ 71 GHz~~, similar to SSB design for NR-U~~
  + PBCH payload size remains the same when supporting DRS
    - FFS: How to indicate SSB candidate indexes (if increased) and QCL relation between SSB candidate indexes
  + FFS: Similar SSB design with NR-U is applied when LBT is required for SSB transmission in unlicensed band.
  + FFS: How disable/enable DRS functionality considering LBT exempt operation

##### Proposal #1.1-5 (update of 1.1-3 with additional FFS)

* Support DRS and DRS transmission window at least for SSB with 120kHz SCS ~~NR operating 52.6 ~ 71 GHz, similar to SSB design for NR-U~~
  + PBCH payload size remains the same when supporting DRS
    - FFS: How to indicate SSB candidate indexes (if increased) and QCL relation between SSB candidate indexes
  + FFS: Similar SSB design with NR-U is applied when LBT is required for SSB transmission in unlicensed band.
  + FFS: How disable/enable DRS functionality considering LBT exempt operation
  + FFS: whether DRS and DRS transmission window could be applicable for SSB with other SCS, if agreed.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Discussions/Comments** |
| Samsung | We support the FL proposal. Maybe it’s good to clarify “Support DRS and DRS transmission window”, since the later is the focus of the discussion.  Regarding the comments for including SSB as part of short control signal such that no LBT needs to be considered, we don’t share the same view. There is constriction on using short control signal, and there should be other components for short control signal as well. So there are cases SSB transmission cannot be exempt from LBT, and for those cases, we don’t think it’s straightforward to conclude the transmission of SSB can be not impact by LBT. We didn’t observe SSB transmission to be any different from other transmission when subject to regular LBT. Meanwhile, supporting transmission window for SSB is also beneficial for offloading the usage of short control signal, such that other components have more chance to be used as short control signal to improve the channel access opportunity from the system point of view.  Regarding the concern on MIB change, we don’t have intention to change the size of PBCH payload to support DRS. Maybe it’s also good to clarify this point to resolve such concern by adding one sub-bullet: “PBCH payload size maintains the same when supporting DRS”. |
| LG Electronics | Support the proposal with some clarifications:   * Similar SSB design with NR-U is applied when LBT is required for SSB transmission in unlicensed band. * As Samsung stated, PBCH payload size remains the same as in Rel-15. |
| vivo | Support the proposal with further clarifications as indicated by Samsung and LG |
| DOCOMO | We support the FL proposal in general. Although we agree SSB can be treated as a short control signaling, we would like to point out that there is another regulation in Japan in which carrier sensing is mandatory for any transmission with more than a certain transmit power. To adapt such regulations, DRS and DRS transmission window should be supported as an optional feature.  For PBCH payload size, we are also fine with clarifying that it remains the same as in Rel-15. |
| Moderator | Updated the proposal based on comments received so far in P#1.1-2.  Please continue to provide comments. |
| Nokia | In general we are fine with the FL proposal, with the note that we should not prevent/preclude the use of short control signaling rule when possible. As noted earlier, while NR-U based SSB pattern design is one option, we felt that it would be good leave some room when considering the SSB pattern design i.e. leave the last bullet as FFS. |
| Intel | We support the updated Proposal #1.1-2. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support the updated proposal from FL. |
| Moderator | Added P#1.1-3 as commented by Nokia. |
| Futurewei | Support the Proposal P#1.1-2 |
| Huawe/HiSilicon | We are OK with Proposal #1.1-2. |
| Ericsson | We have strong concerns on all 3 proposals, due to the fact that there are too many unknowns associated with it:   1. Even if the proposal is restricted to maintain the same PBCH payload size as Rel-16, it is not at all clear that we can do the same "repurposing of bits" in order to indicate Q in the MIB. The two fields that were repurposed may be needed for the 52.6 GHz band depending on (a) what SCSs combinations are decided for (SSB,CORESET0), and (b) whether the sync raster is designed to ensure that only even values of k\_SSB need to be indicated. If these fields cannot be repurposed as in Rel-16, how will one avoid to increase the PBCH payload size to indicate Q?    1. Is the DRS transmission window only for the case when there is no CORESET0? 2. The current PBCH/MIB allows for indication of up to 64 candidate SSB positions. If 64 SSBs are used, the window is all used up. If it is desired to increase the number of candidate positions, how will that be done without increasing the PBCH payload size? 3. Unlike NR-U in the 5/6 GHz band, it is necessary to disable the discovery burst transmission window when operating in licensed spectrum or in unlicensed spectrum with LBT can be on or off. There has been no technical discussion on how this should be done when the licensed and unlicensed bands overlap (as in Europe/CEPT). Also, what is the UE behavior/assumptions on the window before the UE knows if it is licensed/unlicensed or whether LBT is on or off? 4. There has been no performance evaluation that shows that the discovery burst transmission window (the proper name in 37.213) is fundamentally needed. In general, it should be avoided to specify features that solve a problem that has not been demonstrated.   In summary, we are not willing to agree to this proposal without having clarity on the above issues. At most, we are willing to agree to study further whether or not it is needed to introduce this functionality. The study should address at least the above points. |
| LG Electronics | Support the Proposal P#1.1-2. We can understand the concern from Ericsson. However, even in NR-U, we didn’t show performance improvement of DRS. If we add the following bullets to address Ericsson’s concern, could it be agreeable to Ericsson?   * FFS: How to indicate SSB candidate indexes (if increased) and QCL relation between SSB candidate indexes * FFS: How disable/enable DRS functionality considering LBT exempt operation |
| Convida Wireless | We support the updated proposal. |
| Qualcomm | We still believe that considering the high beam directivity for 60 GHz range compared to FR1, LBT failure rate may be low. Hence, we recommend that DRS window is not used, especially that the SSB can be considered as a short control signal.  However, if at all it is supported for this FR, then it may make sense to have support for only 120 kHz. Higher SCS (240/480/960 kHz) clearly can be considered as short control signal and pass the requirements for short signal exemption. But for 120 kHz, we need to extend the DRS tx window to beyond 5 ms (e.g., 10 ms) which may not be desirable. |
| Moderator | I’ve started to formulate a summary of discussion #2 (below). Please note the summary is temporary and will be updated further as additional comments are received.  I’ve captured concerns and questions from Ericsson in the summary, as I don’t know a good way to resolve them by tweaking the proposals 1-1-1/2/3.  I’ve added Proposal #1.1-4, which added the FFS aspects commented by LG Electronics.  I’ve added alternative Proposal #1.1-5 based on Qualcomm’s comments. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We prefer Proposal # 1-1-2, can also live with Proposal #1.1-5 |
| Moderator | See summary below |

**Moderator Summary of Discussions #2**

Suggest to further discuss with Proposal #1.1-5 as it contains all the components of other proposals and could be modified as such during further discussions.

On the proposal to support DRS itself, while large number companies are supportive of DRS at least two companies still had concerns. A quick summary of the concerns are:

* How to indicate the different SSB candidate positions and Q parameter needed to implement DRS while keeping the same MIB payload the same.
* How to enable/disable LBT for deployments with DRS that do not require LBT.
* No evaluation that show DRS bring performance benefits.

To address some of the concerns additional FFS were added to the proposal (in blue).

Moderator suggest to further discuss based on Proposal #1.1-5.

##### Proposal #1.1-5

* Support DRS and DRS transmission window at least for SSB with 120kHz SCS ~~NR operating 52.6 ~ 71 GHz, similar to SSB design for NR-U~~
  + PBCH payload size remains the same when supporting DRS
    - FFS: How to indicate SSB candidate indexes (if increased) and QCL relation between SSB candidate indexes
  + FFS: Similar SSB design with NR-U is applied when LBT is required for SSB transmission in unlicensed band.
  + FFS: How disable/enable DRS functionality considering LBT exempt operation
  + FFS: whether DRS and DRS transmission window could be applicable for SSB with other SCS, if agreed.

**Discussions #3**

Moderator suggests picking up the discussions from Proposal 1.1-5. Please continue to provide comments on the proposal and concerns raised against the proposal.

##### Proposal #1.1-5 (Cleaned up)

* Support DRS and DRS transmission window at least for SSB with 120kHz SCS
  + PBCH payload size remains the same when supporting DRS
    - FFS: How to indicate SSB candidate indexes (if increased) and QCL relation between SSB candidate indexes
  + FFS: Similar SSB design with NR-U is applied when LBT is required for SSB transmission in unlicensed band.
  + FFS: How disable/enable DRS functionality considering LBT exempt operation
  + FFS: whether DRS and DRS transmission window could be applicable for SSB with other SCS, if agreed.

##### Proposal #1.1-6

* Support DRS and DRS transmission window ~~at least~~ for SSB with 120kHz SCS when LBT is required for SSB transmission in unlicensed band
  + PBCH payload size and PBCH DMRS sequences remains the same when supporting DRS
    - FFS: How to indicate SSB candidate indexes (if increased) and QCL relation between SSB candidate indexes
  + DRS transmission window is up to 5 msec
  + FFS: Similar SSB pattern design with NR-U is applied ~~when LBT is required for SSB transmission in unlicensed band.~~
  + FFS: How to disable/enable DRS functionality considering LBT exempt operation
  + FFS: whether DRS and DRS transmission window could be applicable for SSB with other SCS, if agreed.

##### Proposal #1.1-7

* For an unlicensed band that requires LBT, further study whether/how to support discovery burst transmission window (DBTW) at least for 120 kHz SSB SCS
  + If supported
    - Support mechanism to indicate that DBTW is disabled for both IDLE and CONNECTED mode UEs
    - When DBTW is enabled, PBCH payload size is no greater than that for FR2
    - Duration of DBTW is no greater than 5 ms
    - Number of PBCH DMRS sequences is the same as for FR2
  + The following points are FFS:
    - How to indicate candidate SSB indices and QCL parameter Q without exceeding limit on PBCH payload size
    - Details of enabling/disabling DBTW considering LBT exempt operation and overlapping licensed/unlicensed bands
    - Whether or not to support DBTW for SSB SCS(s) other than 120 kHz

##### Proposal #1.1-8

* For an unlicensed band that requires LBT, further study whether/how to support discovery burst transmission window (DBTW) at least for 120 kHz SSB SCS
  + If supported
    - FFS: Support mechanism to indicate that DBTW is disabled for both IDLE and CONNECTED mode UEs
    - When DBTW is enabled, PBCH payload size is no greater than that for FR2
    - Duration of DBTW is no greater than 5 ms
    - Number of PBCH DMRS sequences is the same as for FR2
  + The following points are FFS:
    - How to indicate candidate SSB indices and QCL parameter Q without exceeding limit on PBCH payload size
    - Details of enabling/disabling DBTW considering LBT exempt operation and overlapping licensed/unlicensed bands
    - Whether or not to support DBTW for SSB SCS(s) other than 120 kHz

Please provide further comments on Proposal 1-1-5 and concerns that were discussed for the proposal:

* How to indicate the different SSB candidate positions and Q parameter needed to implement DRS while keeping the same MIB payload the same.
* How to enable/disable LBT for deployments with DRS that do not require LBT.
* No evaluation that show DRS bring performance benefits.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Discussions/Comments** |
| Nokia | We are OK with proposal #1.1-5, with minor clarification as noted below.  When we consider similar SSB design with NR-U, just to clarify that do we relate to the SSB time domain pattern accounting additional candidate SSB indices/locations? Hence should the corresponding bullet be updated for clarity, as for example suggest below. Proposal #1.1-5 (Modified)  * Support DRS and DRS transmission window at least for SSB with 120kHz SCS   + PBCH payload size remains the same when supporting DRS     - FFS: How to indicate SSB candidate indexes (if increased) and QCL relation between SSB candidate indexes   + FFS: Similar SSB pattern design with NR-U is applied when LBT is required for SSB transmission in unlicensed band.   + FFS: How disable/enable DRS functionality considering LBT exempt operation   + FFS: whether DRS and DRS transmission window could be applicable for SSB with other SCS, if agreed |
| Intel | We are Ok with Proposal #1.1-5 |
| Qualcomm | We have the following comments/concerns about adding a DRS Tx window:   * Current default DRS tx window is 5 ms which may not have enough additional SSB candidates (beyond 64) for SCS 120 kHz, hence, it may need to be increased to 10 ms, this has the following implications:   + Larger UE power consumption   + Delayed initial access and slower beam sweep   + Additional SSB overhead (e.g., most of the10 ms out of the 20 ms SSB period) * No simulations/study were conducted to evaluate the need for LBT at such high directivity operation for 60 GHz, so it is not clear if this is needed * Increasing the number of candidate SSBs to say 128 need some additional signaling/complexity to indicate the indexes * Licensed and unlicensed may use this FR, hence if SSB design is different, a way need to be specified on how to differentiate them adding to the spec changes   In summary, if we are to adopt a DRX Tx window, we propose to have it confined to a maximum of 5 ms. In this case, depending on the Q factor, the number of actualy beam may be < 64. |
| CATT | We are OK with Proposal# 1.1-5. We don’t expect the increase of DRS Tx window of 5 ms for 120 kHz SCS, which the number of SSBs to support might be less than 64. |
| LG Electronics | We are generally OK with Proposal #1.1-5 with the following modifications, considering LBT dependent DRS should not be FFS and Qualcomm’s comment on up to 5 ms DRS transmission window.   * Support DRS and DRS transmission window at least for SSB with 120kHz SCS when LBT is required for SSB transmission in unlicensed band   + PBCH payload size remains the same when supporting DRS     - FFS: How to indicate SSB candidate indexes (if increased) and QCL relation between SSB candidate indexes   + DRS transmission window is up to 5 ms.   + FFS: Similar SSB design with NR-U is applied.   + FFS: How to disable/enable DRS functionality considering LBT exempt operation   + FFS: whether DRS and DRS transmission window could be applicable for SSB with other SCS, if agreed. |
| Spreadtrum | We have no strong position for this. But, to our understanding, 64 SSB beams with more candidate SSB positions could not be supported by the current PBCH payload size or 5ms DRS TX window. If the candidate SSB index is the same as SSB index, it is biased to NR-U solutions.  In addition, we think PBCH DMRS sequence number should remain the same with R16. It is important to remain unchanged for UE implementation of PBCH DMRS sequence detection for SSB time index.   * PBCH payload size and PBCH DMRS sequences number remains the same when supporting DRS |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are OK with LG's revised version of Proposal #1.1-5, that seems more accurate. |
| vivo | We support Proposal #1.1-5 |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are generally ok with the proposal #1.1-5. Minor modification to the first main bullet: We think that the applicability of other SCS is covered in the last sub-bullet as FFS.   * Support DRS and DRS transmission window for SSB with 120kHz SCS   + PBCH payload size remains the same when supporting DRS     - FFS: How to indicate SSB candidate indexes (if increased) and QCL relation between SSB candidate indexes |
| OPPO | We support proposal #1.1-5. |
| Ericsson | Respectfully, we are still not okay with this proposal. We don't seem to be going about this in the proper way. There are a number of legitimate concerns that have been raised about the design, and whether or not a new design is needed in the first place. It does not seem right to agree to support DRS window, and then discuss problems after.  Our two biggest concerns are (1) coverage and (2) ability to turn DRS window off considering operation with LBT/no LBT. Regarding the latter point, this is also important considering that both licensed and unlicensed bands overlap, and there has been no discussion on how the UE should try to detect SSB if there are two different MIB contents (Qualcomm raises a similar concern above). Will the UE be required to perform two blind decodes of MIB and RMSI to find out if the band is licensed/unlicensed and whether or not DRW window is on/off?  We cannot accept a design that reduces coverage compared to FR2. The bullet that says "PBCH payload size remains the same when supporting DRS" is not enough. The PBCH payload must be the same as FR2 to avoid degrading coverage, both for the case when DRS window is on and off.  We are not saying that there are not ways to solve various problems, but a more complete picture needs to be available first before agreeing to support DRS window. In NR-U, we "borrowed" two bits from other fields to signal Q. Can we still do that for the 52.6 band? Probably not. That means the PBCH payload will increase if Q is still signaled in MIB, thus degrading coverage. It has also not been clarified whether or not more than 64 candidate positions are to be designed. If companies want that, then again, the PBCH payload size will increase, degrading coverage again.  A better way forward is to list the issues and design criteria (including whether or not DRS window it is motivated by performance), and then study further how/if to support. Otherwise, it feels like a blank check. |
| InterDigital | We are fine with proposal #1.1-5 |
| Convida Wireless | We are OK with proposal #1.1-5 |
| Futurewei | We are fine with the proposal and recognize the need for additional discussions (such limiting the duration of the DRS to 5ms). |
| DOCOMO | We are ok with Proposal #1.1-5 |
| Ericsson | To be constructive, we can consider the following proposal, but we prefer to leave this open until there is more clarity on the overall design. Our chief concern is avoiding a PBCH payload increase compared to FR2. We also agree with Spreadtrum's comment that the number of PBCH DMRS sequences should not be increased so that there is commonality with the FR2 framework. We also agree with Qualcomm's comment about avoiding a window size > 5 ms. Please note that I have used the term "Discovery Burst Transmission Window (DBTW)" since this is the terminology that is specified in 37.213 for NR-U.  Proposal:   * For an unlicensed band that requires LBT, further study whether/how to support discovery burst transmission window (DBTW) at least for 120 kHz SSB SCS   + If supported     - Support mechanism to indicate that DBTW is disabled for both IDLE and CONNECTED mode UEs     - When DBTW is enabled, PBCH payload size is no greater than that for FR2     - Duration of DBTW is no greater than 5 ms     - Number of PBCH DMRS sequences is the same as for FR2   + The following points are FFS:     - How to indicate candidate SSB indices and QCL parameter Q without exceeding limit on PBCH payload size     - Details of enabling/disabling DBTW considering LBT exempt operation and overlapping licensed/unlicensed bands     - Whether or not to support DBTW for SSB SCS(s) other than 120 kHz |
| Moderator | Updated P#1.1-6 based on comments from companies.  Added P#1.1-7 based on suggestion from Ericsson. |
| LG Electronics | We can accept Proposal #1.1-7. |
| Mediatek | We support Proposal #1.1-7 |
| Nokia2 | We are OK with proposal #1.1-7. |
| Samsung | We can accept Proposal #1.1-7 at this moment.  On minor editorial change (since for initial access there may not be explicit indication for this purpose, and the information can be provided by sync raster):   * + - Support mechanism to ~~indicate~~ inform that DBTW is disabled for both IDLE and CONNECTED mode UEs |
| Qualcomm | We are fine with proposal Proposal #1.1-7 |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support proposal #1.1-7. |
| Intel | We are fine with either Proposal #1.1-6 or Proposal #1.1-7 |
| Futurewei | We are OK with proposal #1.1-7 with a FFS change to the first sub-bullet. We think that more issues need to be clarified regarding the conditions when DBTW should be disabled or enabled.   * + If supported     - FFS Support mechanism to indicate that DBTW is disabled for both IDLE and CONNECTED mode UEs |

**Moderator Summary of Discussions #3**

Latest suggestion from Ericsson (in Proposal #1.1-7) seems to be ok with many companies who were supportive of Proposal #1.1-6. Moderator suggest to further discuss based on Proposal #1.1-8, which add FFS to the first sub-bullet in Proposal#1.1-7.

**Discussions #4**

Please provide further comments using Proposal #1.1-8 for discussion.

##### Proposal #1.1-8

* For an unlicensed band that requires LBT, further study whether/how to support discovery burst transmission window (DBTW) at least for 120 kHz SSB SCS
  + If supported
    - FFS: Support mechanism to indicate that DBTW is disabled for both IDLE and CONNECTED mode UEs
    - When DBTW is enabled, PBCH payload size is no greater than that for FR2
    - Duration of DBTW is no greater than 5 ms
    - Number of PBCH DMRS sequences is the same as for FR2
  + The following points are FFS:
    - How to indicate candidate SSB indices and QCL parameter Q without exceeding limit on PBCH payload size
    - Details of enabling/disabling DBTW considering LBT exempt operation and overlapping licensed/unlicensed bands
    - Whether or not to support DBTW for SSB SCS(s) other than 120 kHz

##### Proposal #1.1-9 (updated based on comments)

* For an unlicensed band that requires LBT, further study whether/how to support discovery burst transmission window (DBTW) at least for 120 kHz SSB SCS
  + If DBTW supported
    - ~~FFS:~~ Support mechanism to indicate or inform that DBTW is enabled/disabled for both IDLE and CONNECTED mode UEs
    - When DBTW is enabled, PBCH payload size is no greater than that for FR2
      * *Moderator Note: shouldn’t this be regardless of enabled or disabled?*
    - Duration of DBTW is no greater than 5 ms
    - Number of PBCH DMRS sequences is the same as for FR2
    - FFS: What signals/channels are included in DBTW other than SS/PBCH block
  + The following points are FFS:
    - How to indicate candidate SSB indices and QCL relation ~~parameter Q~~ without exceeding limit on PBCH payload size
    - Details of the mechanism for enabling/disabling DBTW considering LBT exempt operation and overlapping licensed/unlicensed bands
    - Whether or not to support DBTW for SSB SCS(s) other than 120 kHz

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Discussions/Comments** |
| Qualcomm | Fine with Proposal #1.1-8 |
| DOCOMO | Support the Proposal #1.1-8 |
| LG Electronics | Fine with Proposal #1.1-8 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We still don’t have the definition of discovery burst and what signals/channels are included in it, so discussing details of discovery burst transmission window seems a bit premature. We suggest the following modification to the proposal:  **Proposal:**   * For an unlicensed band that requires LBT, further study whether/how to define discovery burst and whether/how to support discovery burst transmission window (DBTW) at least for 120 kHz SSB SCS   + If supported   + What signals/channels are included in discovery burst     - FFS: Support mechanism to indicate that DBTW is disabled for both IDLE and CONNECTED mode UEs     - When DBTW is enabled, PBCH payload size is no greater than that for FR2     - Duration of DBTW is no greater than 5 ms     - Number of PBCH DMRS sequences is the same as for FR2   + The following points are FFS:     - How to indicate candidate SSB indices and QCL parameter Q without exceeding limit on PBCH payload size     - Details of enabling/disabling DBTW considering LBT exempt operation and overlapping licensed/unlicensed bands     - Whether or not to support DBTW for SSB SCS(s) other than 120 kHz   Moreover, the two sub-bullets “*Support mechanism to indicate that DBTW is disabled for both IDLE and CONNECTED mode UEs*” and “*Details of enabling/disabling DBTW considering LBT exempt operation and overlapping licensed/unlicensed bands*” seem to have some overlap that we would like to have further clarification about. |
| Ericsson | We have a strong concern on adding an FFS to the following bullet:  "Supporting mechanism to indicate that DBTW is disabled for both IDLE and CONNECTED mode UEs."  Having the ability to turn the DBTW on and off is a key condition for us to accept a DBTW. It is vital to have such a mechanism, since unlike NR-U in 5/6 GHz band, NR in the 60 GHz band can be deployed in licensed or unlicensed portion of the band and with LBT either on or off depending on the deployment and the region. Hence, the DBTW cannot be hardwired to be on all of the time.  Responding to Samsung's suggestion, we think "indicate" leaves some wide latitude for designing such an on/off mechanism. However, if there is a strong desire to be even more broad, then we could accept "inform" as well  Responding to the following observation from Huawei:  Moreover, the two sub-bullets “*Support mechanism to indicate that DBTW is disabled for both IDLE and CONNECTED mode UEs*” and “*Details of enabling/disabling DBTW considering LBT exempt operation and overlapping licensed/unlicensed bands*” seem to have some overlap that we would like to have further clarification about.  Yes, there is overlap, and that is intentional. The first bullet is meant to say that if DBTW is supported, then the on/off mechanism must be supported. The second bullet is to say that the detail of the mechanism are FFS.  If further clarification is needed, then we suggest the following:   * + If DBTW is supported     - Support mechanism to indicate or inform that DBTW is enabled/disabled for both IDLE and CONNECTED mode UEs   + The following points are FFS:     - Details of the mechanism for enabling/disabling DBTW considering LBT exempt operation and overlapping licensed/unlicensed bands   Regarding Huawei's other question about definition of "Discovery Burst," this is defined in 37.213. Is there a need to revisit this definition? |
| Nokia | In principle we are fine with the proposal #1.1-8, but we are not quite sure that we can directly adopt the QCL parameter Q based approach due to the restricted number of candidate SSB time locations due to restricting the DBTW time duration to 5ms. Hence, while it is noted to FFS, following sub-bullet should be maybe adjusted for example as follows: Proposal #1.1-8 (modified, unchanged part omitted):  * + The following points are FFS:     - How to indicate candidate SSB indices and QCL relation ~~parameter Q~~ without exceeding limit on PBCH payload size |
| Intel | We are fine with Proposal #1.1-8 |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are fine with Proposal #1.1-8 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | **To Ericsson:** Thank you for reply. Regarding the definition of “discovery burst”, we are fine to use the definition of 37.213 but we believe we need a formal agreement as many of the concepts used in Rel-16 NRU are being revisited or modified in 60 GHz. In general, we do not believe that all the definitions in Rel-16 NRU would be automatically and without any formal agreement applied in 60 GHz unlicensed. |
| CATT | We are OK with Proposal #1.1-9 |
| Futurewei | We are supportive of the Proposal #1.1-8 with the following changes in addition to Ericsson proposal:   * For an unlicensed band that requires LBT, further study whether/how to support discovery burst transmission window (DBTW) at least for 120 kHz SSB SCS   + If supported   FFS: If DBTW may be disabled/enabled. If yes, support mechanism to indicate or inform that DBTW is enabled/disabled for both IDLE and CONNECTED mode UEs |
| Moderator | Added Proposal #1.1-9 based on comments received. For CATT comments, I assume they meant to say 1.1-8 as 1.1-9 did not exist at the time CATT commented.  I did have 1 question on one of the subbullets. I assumed the MIB size should not change regardless DRS is configured or not, since for initial access UEs that have not gotten any information from the network, it has no clue what has been configured. Therefore, the MIB size should be the same for all cases.  Can companies comment on this? |

**Moderator Summary of Discussions #4**

The discussion seems to be converging thanks to some companies willingness to compromise. There are still some comments of the proposal formulation in Proposal #1.1-8 (and 1.1-9). Moderator suggests discussing Proposal #1.1-9 to see if it can be acceptable. We may need to remove the highlighted text depending on further discussion.

**Discussions #5**

Please provide further comments using Proposal #1.1-9 as basis for further discussion.

##### Proposal #1.1-9 (cleaned up)

* For an unlicensed band that requires LBT, further study whether/how to support discovery burst transmission window (DBTW) at least for 120 kHz SSB SCS
  + If DBTW supported
    - ~~FFS:~~ Support mechanism to indicate or inform that DBTW is enabled/disabled for both IDLE and CONNECTED mode UEs
    - When DBTW is enabled, PBCH payload size is no greater than that for FR2
      * *Moderator Note: shouldn’t this be regardless of enabled or disabled?*
    - Duration of DBTW is no greater than 5 ms
    - Number of PBCH DMRS sequences is the same as for FR2
    - FFS: What signals/channels are included in DBTW other than SS/PBCH block
  + The following points are FFS:
    - How to indicate candidate SSB indices and QCL relation without exceeding limit on PBCH payload size
    - Details of the mechanism for enabling/disabling DBTW considering LBT exempt operation and overlapping licensed/unlicensed bands
    - Whether or not to support DBTW for SSB SCS(s) other than 120 kHz

##### Proposal #1.1-10

* For an unlicensed band, discovery burst (DB) is supported with the same definition as in 37.213.
* For an unlicensed band that requires LBT, further study whether/how to support discovery burst transmission window (DBTW) at least for 120 kHz SSB SCS
  + If DBTW supported
    - FFS: Support mechanism to indicate or inform that DBTW is enabled/disabled for both IDLE and CONNECTED mode UEs
      * FFS: how to support UEs performing initial access what do not have any prior information on DBTW.
    - ~~When DBTW is enabled,~~ PBCH payload size is no greater than that for FR2
    - Duration of DBTW is no greater than 5 ms
    - Number of PBCH DMRS sequences is the same as for FR2
    - ~~FFS: What signals/channels are included in DBTW other than SS/PBCH block~~
  + The following points are additionally FFS:
    - How to indicate candidate SSB indices and QCL relation without exceeding limit on PBCH payload size
    - Details of the mechanism for enabling/disabling DBTW considering LBT exempt operation and overlapping licensed/unlicensed bands
    - Whether or not to support DBTW for SSB SCS(s) other than 120 kHz

##### Proposal #1.1-11

* For an unlicensed band that requires LBT, further study whether/how to support discovery burst (DB) and discovery burst transmission window (DBTW) at least for 120 kHz SSB SCS
  + If DB supported
    - FFS: What signals/channels are included in DB other than SS/PBCH block
  + If DBTW supported
    - FFS: Support mechanism to indicate or inform that DBTW is enabled/disabled for both IDLE and CONNECTED mode UEs
      * FFS: how to support UEs performing initial access what do not have any prior information on DBTW.
    - ~~When DBTW is enabled,~~ PBCH payload size is no greater than that for FR2
    - Duration of DBTW is no greater than 5 ms
    - Number of PBCH DMRS sequences is the same as for FR2
    - ~~FFS: What signals/channels are included in DBTW other than SS/PBCH block~~
  + The following points are additionally FFS:
    - How to indicate candidate SSB indices and QCL relation without exceeding limit on PBCH payload size
    - Details of the mechanism for enabling/disabling DBTW considering LBT exempt operation and overlapping licensed/unlicensed bands
    - Whether or not to support DBTW for SSB SCS(s) other than 120 kHz

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Discussions/Comments** |
| Qualcomm | Fine with Proposal #1.1-9  We agree with FL note that PBCH payload size should be the same regardless if DBTW is enabled/disabled |
| LG Electronics | Agree with Moderator’s note. “When DBTW is enabled” should be removed. We are fine with Proposal #1.1-9 with removing “When DBTW is enabled”. |
| Ericsson | We support Proposal #1.1-9 (assuming the cyan text is removed). While we still don't think the definition of discovery burst needs to be revisited, if this FFS must remain, then it should be corrected as follows:  FFS: What signals/channels are included in a discovery burst ~~DBTW~~ other than SS/PBCH block  Also agree with the moderator's suggestion that the text "When DBTW is enabled" can be removed. |
| vivo | We support Proposal #1.1-9 |
| Nokia | Regarding the mechanism to indicate whether DBTW needs to be applied, while we in principle support the approach, this in the end relates also to the applied UE assumption in cell search e.g. in initial cell selection. While it maybe feasible/possible via broadcast or dedicated signaling inform IDLE/CONNECTED mode UEs on the status of DBTW, this may not be viable for initial cell selection. Therefore, it might be, before concluding, it could be good consider the necessity/benefit of this indication. Hence, it might be best to keep the FSS on the first sub-bullet.  We agree to the FL suggestion to omit "When DBTW is enabled". |
| Intel | We are fine with Proposal #1.1-9. We also think that the yellow part could be removed. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine with Proposal #1.1-9, we also agree to remove the yellow part of the second sub-bullet. PBCH payload should not change in both cases. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | 1. Above proposal does not address our earlier concern regarding de the definition of “discovery burst” (DB) and its independence from “discovery burst transmission window” (DBTW). In our view, the DB is a group of signal and channels which can be regarded as a whole from the perspective of channel access, while the DBTW is the time span the DB can be shifted if LBT fails. In our view, even if there is no DBTW, DB can be still there. 2. OK with removing “When DBTW is enabled”.   Based on the above discussions and Proposal #1.1-9 we suggest the following two alternatives:  **Alt 1: (two independent proposals for DB and DBTW)**  Proposal #1.1-9.a   * For an unlicensed band, discovery burst (DB) is supported with the same definition as in 37.213.   Proposal #1.1-9.b   * For an unlicensed band that requires LBT, further study whether/how to support discovery burst transmission window (DBTW) at least for 120 kHz SSB SCS   + If DBTW supported     - ~~FFS:~~  Support mechanism to indicate or inform that DBTW is enabled/disabled for both IDLE and CONNECTED mode UEs     - PBCH payload size is no greater than that for FR2     - Duration of DBTW is no greater than 5 ms     - Number of PBCH DMRS sequences is the same as for FR2   + The following points are FFS:     - How to indicate candidate SSB indices and QCL relation without exceeding limit on PBCH payload size     - Details of the mechanism for enabling/disabling DBTW considering LBT exempt operation and overlapping licensed/unlicensed bands     - Whether or not to support DBTW for SSB SCS(s) other than 120 kHz   **Alt 2: (One proposal for both DB and DBTW)**  Proposal #1.1-9 (modified)   * For an unlicensed band that requires LBT, further study whether/how to support discovery burst (DB) and discovery burst transmission window (DBTW) at least for 120 kHz SSB SCS   + If DB supported     - FFS: What signals/channels are included in DB other than SS/PBCH block   + If DBTW supported     - ~~FFS:~~  Support mechanism to indicate or inform that DBTW is enabled/disabled for both IDLE and CONNECTED mode UEs     - PBCH payload size is no greater than that for FR2     - Duration of DBTW is no greater than 5 ms     - Number of PBCH DMRS sequences is the same as for FR2   + The following points are FFS:     - How to indicate candidate SSB indices and QCL relation without exceeding limit on PBCH payload size     - Details of the mechanism for enabling/disabling DBTW considering LBT exempt operation and overlapping licensed/unlicensed bands     - Whether or not to support DBTW for SSB SCS(s) other than 120 kHz |
| moderator | Added Proposal #1.1-10 and #1.1-11 based on comments from Huawei.  In both added proposal’s I’ve highlighted the FFS as there is still some questions on this bullet. Among the two, Proposal #1.1-11 seem to be more open (although we are not really concluding anything), and might be more acceptable to all. |

**Moderator Summary of Discussions #5**

Among the discussed proposals, Proposal #1.1-11 seem to be more open (although we are not really concluding anything), and might be more acceptable to all. Given that short signal exemption for SSB is still being discussed, and there could potentially be some relationship between short signal exempt signal/channels and with how DB is defined, it might be safer to leave it as part of study for now.

Suggest discussing further based on Proposal #1.1-11.

**Conclusion of Discussion**

Agreement:

* For an unlicensed band that requires LBT, further study whether/how to support discovery burst (DB) and discovery burst transmission window (DBTW) at least for 120 kHz SSB SCS
  + If DB supported
    - FFS: What signals/channels are included in DB other than SS/PBCH block
  + If DBTW is supported
    - Support mechanism to indicate or inform that DBTW is enabled/disabled for both IDLE and CONNECTED mode UEs
      * FFS: how to support UEs performing initial access that do not have any prior information on DBTW.
    - PBCH payload size is no greater than that for FR2
    - Duration of DBTW is no greater than 5 ms
    - Number of PBCH DMRS sequences is the same as for FR2
  + The following points are additionally FFS:
    - How to indicate candidate SSB indices and QCL relation without exceeding limit on PBCH payload size
    - Details of the mechanism for enabling/disabling DBTW considering LBT exempt operation and overlapping licensed/unlicensed bands
    - Whether or not to support DBTW for SSB SCS(s) other than 120 kHz if other SSB SCS(s) are supported

### 2.1.2 Supported Numerology

* From [2] Lenovo, Motorola Mobility:
  + For supporting NR from 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz in Rel. 17, support the same numerology of data channel for SSB and PRACH including 480KHz and 960KHz
* From [3] ZTE, Sanechips:
  + The following options can be considered for determining SCSs of SSB and other initial access signals/channels in initial BWP, wherein Option 1 is preferred.
    - Option 1: both SSB and other initial access signals/channels support SCS (120kHz, 480kHz, 960kHz)
    - Option 2: SSB supports SCS (120kHz, 240kHz); Other initial access signals/channels support SCS (120kHz)
* From [4] OPPO:
  + For above 52.6GHz, adopt single numerology for initial access, where the numerology candidates are 120kHz, 480kHz and 960kHz.
  + For above 52.6GHz, 240kHz SSB SCS is not supported.
* From [5] Huawei, HiSilicon:
  + SCS other than 120 kHz are not supported for SSB and other initial access related signals/channels in initial BWP.
* From [6] Nokia, NSB:
  + Support 240 kHz SCS for the SSB transmission in NR bands ranging between 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz.
  + Observation: Supporting 480kHz and 960kHz sub-carrier spacings for SSB can have implications to initial cell search/selection complexity, UE minimum initial RF BW and possibly to ignalingation raster, depending on the minimum carrier BW.
  + Consider and discuss of support of 480kHz and 960kHz kHz SCS for the SSB transmission in NR bands ranging between 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz.
  + Observation: It would appear that 480 and 960 kHz cannot be used for initial access related data and control channels in initial BWP for IDLE and Inactive Mode Ues.
  + Support additional SCS (480 kHz, 960 kHz) for SSB for other use cases than initial cell selection (e.g. for Scell, BM and RRM).
* From [7] CAICT:
  + SSB design with 480 and 960kHz SCS should be considered.
* From [8] CATT:
  + The complexity or performance degradation will be introduced if 960 KHz is used for the SCS of SSB.
* From [9] vivo:
  + Observation: All supported SCS for data/control SCS in FR2 could be used for initial DL BWP.
  + Support SCS 120KHz, 480KHz and 960KHz for initial DL BWP in NR operation from 52.6-71GHz.
  + Support the following SCS pairs for SSB and initial DL BWP in NR operation from 52.6-71GHz：(120K, 120K) + (960K, 480K) + (960K, 960K).
  + Observation: For frequency domain offset estimation during SSB detection, using SSB with low SCS such as 120K/240KHz may increase hardware complexity or cell search latency. For number of buffering samples during SSB detection, using SSB with high SCS such as 960KHz will need larger buffer cost compared to that in FR2 if adopting the same SSB period (20ms).
* From [10] TCL:
  + Introduce groups of SCS in FR2 and all control/data communication will use the SCS from one such group.
* From [11] MediaTek:
  + Support only 120 kHz for SSB SCS in initial access.
* From [12] Intel:
  + Support 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS for SSB and initial BWP.
* From [13] Fujitsu:
  + Do not support 240kHz for SSB for the new frequency range (52.6~71GHz).
  + In addition to 120kHz, support 480 kHz and 960 kHz for SSB at least for the cases other than initial access.
* From [15] Spreadtrum:
  + Support 120kHz SCS for SSB and initial BWP.
  + Support 240kHz SCS for SSB.
* From [17] LGE:
  + Support 240 kHz SCS for SS/PBCH block in frequency range from 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz.
  + For SS/PBCH block with 480 and/or 960 kHz SCS, the following three alternatives can be taken into account and Alt 3 is preferred considering no specification impact and CSI-RS as an alternative of SS/PBCH block in most use cases.
    - Alt 1: Support SS/PBCH block with 480 and/or 960 kHz SCS for all cases
    - Alt 2: Support SS/PBCH block with 480 and/or 960 kHz SCS for cases other than initial access
    - Alt 3: Do not support SS/PBCH block with 480 and/or 960 kHz SCS for any case
* From [20] Samsung:
  + Support 480 kHz SCS and 960 kHz SCS for SS/PBCH block after initial access.
* From [22] Ericsson:
  + Like in Rel-15/16 FR2, for initial access (Pcell), support 240 kHz SCS for SS/PBCH block in an initial BWP (in addition to the already supported 120 kHz) and 120 kHz SCS for initial access related signals/channels in an initial BWP.
  + For cases other than initial access (e.g. for an Scell), support 480 and 960 kHz SCS for SS/PBCH block.
* From [23] Apple:
  + Support 480kHz SCS for SSB and PRACH in addition to 120kHz SCS for initial access in an initial BWP.
* From [24] Convida:
  + The support of SSB and SSB burst design for higher SCS like 480 KHz and above should be studied for NR operation from 52.6 to 71 GHz.
* From [25] Qualcomm:
  + Observation:
    - increasing the SSB SCS will have an effect on the UE initial search complexity which will depend on multiple factors including the number of frequency bins needed and the number of correlations in time. The effect of the initial search timing resolution (for different SSB SCSs) on the performance of channels with high SCS (480 and 960 kHz) needs to be studied
    - larger SSB SCS causes less time domain blockages to other channels
    - explicit beam switching gap between SSBs may be required for larger SSB SCS
    - for NSA mode, increasing the SCS for the SSB may have a different effect on the UE search complexity compared to SA mode
  + for the SSB for NR operation in the frequency between 52.6GHz and 71GHz:
    - Use SCS = 120 kHz and 240 kHz for SA mode
      * FFS for 480 kHz and 960 kHz
    - Use SCS = 120 kHz, 240 kHz, 480 kHz, and 960 kHz for NSA mode
* From [26] NTT Docomo:
  + Observation: For SSB, all the candidate SCSs, i.e., from 120 kHz to 960 kHz, would be available in terms of detection/BLER performance.
    - Lower SCS may be slightly better
  + For SSB SCS, in addition to 120 kHz,
    - 480 and 960 kHz SCS should be supported to achieve single numerology at least for non-initial access cases.
    - FFS: which SSB SCS(s) is assumed for initial access in each band in 52.6 – 71 GHz

**Summary of Discussions in Tdoc**

* Various views on which SCS should be supported for SSB (in addition to 120 kHz)
  + No other SCS:
    - Huawei, HiSilicon, MediaTek
  + 240 kHz:
    - Nokia, Spreadtrum, LGE, Ericsson, Qualcomm
  + 480 kHz:
    - Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, ZTE, Sanechips, OPPO, CAICT, Intel, Fujitsu, Samsung, Ericsson (for Scell only), Apple, Convida(?), Qualcomm (for non-initial access) , NTT Docomo (for non-initial access)
  + 960 kHz
    - Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, ZTE, Sanechips, OPPO, CAICT, vivo, Intel, Fujitsu, Samsung, Ericsson (for Scell only), Qualcomm (for non-initial access), NTT Docomo (for non-initial access)
* Discuss further on the supported SCS and applicable scenarios (e.g. initial access, non-initial access, Pcell, Scell)

**Discussions #1**

* Please provide further views on supported SCS for SSB and applicable scenarios (e.g. initial access, non-initial access, Scell only, etc).
* Please directly edit the summary of the views below (if there are any errors or require clarifications)
  + No other SCS:
    - Huawei, HiSilicon, MediaTek
  + 240 kHz:
    - Nokia, Spreadtrum, LGE, Ericsson, Qualcomm
  + 480 kHz:
    - Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, ZTE, Sanechips, OPPO, CAICT, Intel, Fujitsu (for non-initial access, FFS for initial access), Samsung, Ericsson (for Scell only), Apple, Convida(?), Qualcomm (for non-initial access) , NTT Docomo (for non-initial access), AT&T (initial access and non-initial access)
  + 960 kHz
    - Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, ZTE, Sanechips, OPPO, CAICT, vivo, Intel, Fujitsu (for non-initial access, FFS for initial access), Samsung, Ericsson (for Scell only), Qualcomm (for non-initial access), NTT Docomo (for non-initial access), AT&T (initial access and non-initial access)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Additional Discussions/Comments** |
| Samsung | Support for 480/960 kHz for non-initial access case, and open to 240/480/960 for initial access case, if the UE complexity can be limited. The discussion of SCS for initial access should take into account the sync raster design in RAN4. |
| NEC | Support 480 and 960 kHz SCSs for non-initial access case and initial access case. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Support SCS 480/960 kHz for operating with single numerology, to achievie required time synchronization accuracy and reduced synchronization complexity. |
| DOCOMO | As captured by the moderator above, we support 480/960 kHz for non-initial access case. For initial access, we are also open to 240/480/960 kHz, while we slightly prefer to deprioritize 240 kHz as the advantage seems small and the number of supported SCSs should be minimized in our view. As Samsung mentioned above, we should consider factors related to RAN4, including sync raster design and minimum channel bandwidth. |
| LG Electronics | It is confirmed that our views are correctly captured. From our understanding, the main motivation to introduce new SCS(s) for SSB is to provide a tool for a UE to be operated with single numerology as much as possible. However, as described in our Tdoc [17], CSI-RS having the same numerology with the SCS configured for the active BWP can be considered as an alternative of SSB for most use cases. |
| Spreadtrum | The SSB with 480 and 960kHz SCS could be supported for measurement to reduce UE complexity when UE is receiving data with 480 and 960kHz SCS. For CSI-RS based measurement, in our view, CSI-RS validation is not well supported in NR-U. |
| vivo | Support at least one of 480/960KHz SCS for SSB in non-initial access case and initial access case.  Support for 480/960KHz for non-initial access case is needed due to single numerology, measurement complexity, time synchronization accuracy and complexity, as mentioned above.  For initial access, we need to determine supported numerology for initial DL BWP first as described in 2.1.4. When looking at FR1&FR2, the SCS for data/control in normal BWP is both supported for initial DL BWP, e.g. 60K/120K in FR2. The benefit is to avoid BWP switching for UE operation. Following this, 480K/960K should be supported for initial DL BWP. If this is the case and only allows 120K SSB for initial access, it will occur (120K, 480K) and (120K, 960K) combination with mixed numerology, which will result in problems such as K\_offset indication, time synchronization accuracy and etc. So it is better to support at least 960K SSB to avoid these problems. |
| Nokia | Support for 240kHz for initial cell selection. In order to enable single sub-carrier spacing operation in selected cells (such as Scells) we would support 480/960kHz scs at least for Scells/non-initial access/cell selection case. We are open to support 480/960kHz scs for initial cell selection case as well.  Please note that it would be good to try to clarify what all use cases are considered as non-initial access. E.g. does the initial access cover UE initial cell selection procedure without any assistance information or does it also cover other/all cases when cell is accessed. For example, if SSB center frequency (together with scs) is provided in system information (for IDLE) or via Connected mode signaling, can that considered to be part of non-initial access? E.g. can we differentiate initial cell selection procedure from other cases. |
| Charter Communications | Support 480 and 960 kHz SCSs for non-initial access case and initial access case to facilitate running a cell with a single numerology. We did not observe any performance benefit in terms of PCI detection performance with 240 kHz SCS compared to 120 kHz SCS. |
| Futurewei | Support a single numerology (120 kHz) for initial access (initial cell selection). We are open to discuss the benefits in having larger SCS (480kHz, 960 kHz) for non-initial access. |
| Ericsson | Support 120/240 kHz in an initial BWP.  Support 480/960 kHz for an Scell. |
| Qualcomm | Initial access: 120 and 240 kHz (FFS for 480/960 kHz)  Non-initial access: 120/240/480/960 kHz  Study the feasibility of 480 and 960 kHz wrt UE search complexity for initial access and non-initial access  Study the initial timing resolution based on low SCS (120/240 kHz) and its impact on higher SCS data |
| OPPO | Support 480/960 kHz SSB for both initial access and non-initial access cases. |
| InterDigital | Support 120/240 kHz for initial access (FFS 480/960kHz)  Support 120/240/480/960kHz for non-initial access |
| Fujitsu | Firstly, to clarify initial access case and non-initial access case, in our view, initial access case is referring to SSB locates at a sync raster and is associated with RMSI based on which UE can perform random access to access the cell, and non-initial access case is talking about the other SSBs.  Support 480/960 kHz for non-initial access.  For initial access, as mentioned by other companies e.g. Samsung and DOCOMO, some aspects related to RAN4 need to be considered, e.g. minimum channel bandwidth and maximum mandatory bandwidth of UE. Since the bandwidth issues are under discussion in RAN4, RAN1 can wait for RAN4’s decision or send LS to RAN4 asking about the situation, and then further discuss the SCS of SSB for initial access accordingly. |
| Xiaomi | Support 240 for initial access case for initial access, open for one of 480/960 for initial access as well .Support 480/960 for same numerology operation after initial access. |
| AT&T | One or both of 480 and 960 kHz for both initial access and non-initial access cases. Okay to mandate only 120 kHz for initial access and leave additional SCSs to capability. |
| CATT | Support SSB and all other physical channels in the same numerology 120, 480 and 960 kHz SCS  FFS: 120 kHz SCSfor SSB/initial access channel and 480 kHz, 960 kHz for other physical channel |
| Apple | We support 480kHz for none-initial access case and initial access case. However, we do not see strong justification to support 960kHz for SSB including both initial access and non-initial access case. Note that 480kHz SSB is sufficient to support 960kHz data control from timing accuracy perspective. In addition, TRS with 960kHz SCS can be used if single SCS is pursued. |
| Intel | Support SCS 480 kHz and 960 kHz for SSB and initial BWP. There are some deployments where both gNBs and Ues are fully controlled by the network operator. In these scenarios, the support of single numerology operation can enable efficient transceiver implementation and operation. In order to have an option for single numerology operation across initial access, control and data transmissions, RAN1 specification should support SCS 480 kHz and 960 kHz for SSB and initial BWP. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | First, we think that the discussion of additional SSB SCS needs to be split into SSB SCS for Initial Access and non-Initial Access from the outset due to the following reasons:   * WID considers two separate objectives for possible additional SCSs for SSBs:  |  | | --- | | * “Study and specify, if needed, additional SCS (240kHz, 480kHz, 960kHz) for SSB, and additional SCS(480kHz, 960kHz) for initial access related signals/channels in initial BWP. * Study and specify, if needed, additional SCS (480kHz, 960kHz) for SSB for cases other than initial access.” |  * Most companies have studied the issues of additional SSB SCS for Initial access and non-initial access scenarios separately as additional SSBs for each scenario has its own challenges and possible applications.   In any case, to provide our view, we do not think any additional SSB SCS is required for either of the initial access and non-initial access scenarios. Moreover, all operations during Initial access can be done using 120 kHz SCS (see our discussions in 2.1.3 for further details).   * Some of the reasons that additional SSB SCSs are not required for initial access:   + Additional SSB SCSs increases UE blind search complexity due to increased number of blind detections.   + Although SSB burst with a higher SCS in general has a shorter length, this does not translate into a smaller initial access latency as, during initial access, UE buffers a 20 ms (default SSB periodicity) of the signal around the synch raster and tries to find the SSB within the buffered duration. Moreover, the initial access latency also includes higher layer latencies that are independent from the used SCS.   + The number of required time samples per unit of time to detect SSB is proportional to the SSB SCS. This results in an added complexity for a UE if a higher SSB SCS is used.   + The achievable DL timing accuracy of SSB with 120 kHz is around 34 ns which is considerably below the CP of 960 kHz SCS that may be used in th connected mode. It is most likely that the timing accuracy obtained using 120 kHz SCS is enough for operation in 960 kHz. Even if the achievable DL timing accuracy is not enough for high data rate operation, fine tuning of timing is readily possible using TRS after initial access.   + SSBs with higher SCSs have a lower coverage as well-documented during SI. As a side effect, if a higher SCS is used, more actually-transmitted SSB beams may be required to provide the same coverage as that of the 120 kHz SSB.   + A 48 PRB CORESET#0 that uses Mux pattern 3 with SSB, requires at least 800 MHz in 960 kHz SCS. 800 MHz Minimum Channel BW is too large and may not be practical. More practical minimum channel BWs restrict the SSB CORESET#0 multiplexing to Pattern 1 only, which does not necessarily translate in faster beam sweeping than using 120 kHz SSB.   + Specification effort associated with designing SSB patterns, CORESET#0 Mux with SSB, and other initial access channels/signals if 480/960 kHz SSBs are agreed do not justify any possible potential gain. * Some of the reasons that additional SSB SCSs are not required for cases other than initial access:   + A main usage of SSB in connected mode is RRM purposes. Even if SSB and data use the same numerology (i.e., both 960 kHz or both 480 kHz), UE still requires to have scheduling restrictions/measurement gap for RRM measurement. Use of single numerology does not avoid scheduling restriction/MG during SMTC. There are scenarios that SSB measurement for RLM also needs scheduling restrictions even if SSB and data have the same SCS.   + Almost all usages of SSB in the connected mode (RRM, RLM, BFD-RS, BFR-RS, CSI) can be done using CSI-RS with the same numerology of the Active BWP. If SSB measurement in a different numerology than that of Active BWP is problematic (which we do not believe it is), CSI-RS with the same numerology as that of the Active BWP is readily available.   + Since SSBs of neighboring cells are measured during RRM, the single-numerology operation cannot be deployed per cell. In practice, the whole network has to operate on a single numerology to make the single numerology operation per UE even possible.   + Switching BWP1 with SCS1 to BWP2 with SCS2 is already supported in Rel-15/16. After RRC configuration, UE can switch its initial BWP with 120 kHz SCS to a configured BWP with 480/960 kHz to increase its maximum achievable data rate if necessary (BWP change can also happen any time during RRC Connected state). The BWP switch delay is provided in Table 4.5.6.1.0.1-1of TS 38.533 as follows:   Table 4.5.6.1.0.1-1: BWP switch delay   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | NR Slot length (ms) | BWP switch delay TBWPswitchDelay (slots) | | | Type 1Note 1 | Type 2Note 1 | | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | | 1 | 0.5 | 2 | 5 | | 2 | 0.25 | 3 | 9 | | 3 | 0.125 | 6 | 18 | | Note 1: Depends on UE capability.  Note 2: If the BWP switch involves changing of SCS, the BWP switch delay is determined by the smaller SCS between the SCS before BWP switch and the SCS after BWP switch. | | | |   As can be observed, the absolute time of BWP switch delay is the more or less the same for all SCSs (e.g. 1 ms for mu=0, 0.75 ms for mu=2 and 0.75 ms for mu=3 for type 1). This trend most likely will continue for higher SCSs. Therefore, the BWP switching latency from 960 kHz BWP to 960 kHz BWP is not considerably smaller, if any, than the BWP switching latency from 120 kHz BWP to 120 kHz BWP. More important, changing BWP from 120 kHz SCS to 960 kHz SCS does not incur a longer delay than changing a BWP from 480/960 kHz SCS to another 960 kHz SCS as the absolute time of BWP switch delay for all SCSs are more or less the same (Please Note 2 of the above table)   * If more accurate DL synchronization is required due to the use of 960 kHz data channel, this can be achieved using configured 960 kHz TRS after initial access. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS for both initial access and non-initial access cases. We are also open for supporting 480/960 kHz for only non-initial access case. |
| Convida Wireless | Support of SSB with SCS 480 KHz and/or 960 KHz can be considered. |
| Mediatek | Agree with LG’s view that in many cases, CSI-RS can be an alternative for SSB. Besides, UE search complexity could be a feasibility concern for higher SCS. Thus, we support only 120 kHz. |

**Moderator Summary of Discussions #1**

* Several companies discussed limiting the applicability of larger SCS based SSB to non-initial access, Scell, cases without assistance information, etc. It would good to clarify the mode of operation in which specific SCS SSB will be limited to (if agreed to be supported and if agreed to be limiting). Moderator has provide a suggested definition that could be use for discussion purposes:
  + “SSB in non-initial access” in this discussion refers to:
    - SSB in Scell, where gNB is able to provide assistance information (e.g. SSB center frequency, SCS, etc)
    - SSB for neighbor cell RRM measurements, where information is provided by gNB).
  + “SSB in initial access” in discussion
    - SSB used for “Cell Selection” defined in TS38.133 Section 4.1, which includes stored information cell selection and initial cell selection.
* The following is summary of company opinion:
  + No other SCS (other than agreed 120kHz):
    - Huawei, HiSilicon, MediaTek
  + Additionally support 240 kHz:
    - For initial access & non-access: Nokia, Spreadstrum, LGE, Ericsson, Qualcomm
  + Additionally support 480 kHz:
    - For both initial & non-initial access: Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, ZTE, Sanechips, OPPO, CAICT, Intel, Samsung Apple, Convida, AT&T, Fujitsu (FFS)
    - For non-initial access: Fujitsu, , Ericsson, Qualcomm, NTT Docomo
  + Additionally support 960 kHz
    - For both initial & non-initial access: Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, ZTE, Sanechips, OPPO, CAICT, vivo, Intel, Samsung, AT&T, Fujitsu (FFS)
    - For non-initial access: Fujitsu, Ericsson, Qualcomm, NTT Docomo
* Majority of the companies seems to at least support 480/960kHz for non-initial access cases. With that said, suggest to discuss in GTW to at least hear out the companies that do not believe no other SCS (than 120 kHz) is needed to explain their logic and motivation. Also discuss the support of 240 kHz SCS SSB.
* Strive to make a conclusion. Further discuss on following statement (as a starting point for further discussion):
  + Support 480kHz and 960kHz SCS SSB for non-initial access cases
  + FFS: support 480 kHz and/or 960 kHz SCS SSB for initial access cases
  + FFS: support 240 kHz SCS SSB for initial and non-initial access cases
    - “SSB in non-initial access” here refers to:
      * SSB in Scell, where gNB is able to provide assistance information (e.g. SSB center frequency, SCS, etc)
      * SSB for neighbor cell RRM measurements, where information is provided by gNB).
    - “SSB in initial access” here refers to
      * SSB used for “Cell Selection” defined in TS38.133 Section 4.1, which includes stored information cell selection and initial cell selection.

**Discussions #2**

Further discuss using the following statement as a starting point for further discussion:

##### Proposal #1.2-1 (original)

* Support 480kHz and 960kHz SSB SCS for non-initial access cases
* FFS: support 480 kHz and/or 960 kHz SSB SCS for initial access cases
* FFS: support 240 kHz SCS SSB for initial and non-initial access cases
  + “SSB in non-initial access” here refers to:
    - SSB in Scell, where gNB is able to provide assistance information (e.g. SSB center frequency, SCS, etc)
    - SSB for neighbor cell RRM measurements, where information is provided by gNB).
  + “SSB in initial access” here refers to
    - SSB used for “Cell Selection” defined in TS38.133 Section 4.1, which includes stored information cell selection and initial cell selection.

##### Proposal #1.2-2 (alterative update)

* Support 480kHz and 960kHz SSB SCS for non-initial access cases
* FFS: support one or more of 240, 480, 960 kHz SSB SCS for initial access cases
* FFS: support 240 kHz SCS SSB for ~~initial and~~ non-initial access cases

##### Proposal #1.2-3 (clarification of initial and non-initial)

* + “SSB in non-initial access” here refers to:
    - All cases when UE can be provided with assistance information. For example:
      * SSB in Scell, where gNB is able to provide assistance information such as reconfiguration with sync ~~(e.g. SSB center frequency, SCS, etc)~~
      * SSB for neighbor cell RRM measurements, where information is provided by gNB~~)~~.
      * Cell re-selection, e.g. in priority-based re-selection, where the neighboring carrier assistance is provided
  + “SSB in initial access” here refers to
    - All cases when UE cannot be provided with assistance information. For example:
      * SSB used for “Cell Selection” defined in TS38.133 Section 4.1, which includes stored information cell selection and initial cell selection.

##### Proposal #1.2-4 (alternative update)

* Support 480kHz and 960kHz SSB SCS for non-initial access cases
* ~~FFS:~~ support 480 kHz and/or 960 kHz SSB SCS for initial access cases
* FFS: support 240 kHz SCS SSB for initial and non-initial access cases

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Discussions/Comments** |
| Samsung | We support the FL proposal.  Regarding the comment for implementing Scell using CSI-RS as an “alternative” to SSB to achieve same numerology, we have different view. SSB is always the most fundamental signal to be used for RRM, and CSI-RS is optional and supplemental. For example, for some cases the timing of CSI-RS needs to depends on the timing of SSB for measurement, so SSB cannot be simply replaced by CSI-RS. |
| LG Electronics | We disagree with the proposal.  As we commented earlier, the main motivation of introducing 480/960 kHz SSB is to provide a tool enabling single numerology operation. But, this can be provided by using the same numerology CSI-RS, instead of introducing new SCS SSB. Without technical discussion in more details, we cannot accept this proposal. |
| Ericsson | We disagree with the formulation of the 2nd and 3rd sub-bullets (FFSs); we would rather have 240/480/960 for initial access discussed on the same level. We can accept the following. Once a decision on that is made, it should be easy to come back to the non-initial access case.   * FFS: support one or more of {240, 480, 960} kHz ~~480 kHz and/or 960 kHz~~ SCS SSB for initial access cases * FFS: support 240 kHz SCS SSB for ~~initial and~~ non-initial access cases |
| vivo | Support FL’s proposal. SSB-based RRM is mandatory and CSI-RS based RRM is an optional capability. |
| DOCOMO | We support the FL proposal. Reformulation suggested by Ericsson is fine for us. |
| Moderator | Updated an alternative P#1.2-2 based on comments.  If companies have issues, please feel free to provide alternative proposal that you think would be acceptable. I will periodically add the alternative proposals to the list so that other companies can review them.  Sometimes there are limits to how much you can edit a proposal, if the whole proposal structure is unsatisfactory, please feel to provide a suggestion that you think will work with rest of the group. As mentioned above, I will add them as alternatives to the list. |
| Nokia | Firstly, we would like to consider bit the split between ‘initial’ and ‘non-initial’. As noted majority of the complexity concerns relate to the un-assisted blind initial cell selection e.g. via synch raster. Thus, we would think that all cases when UE can be provided with assistance information (e.g. as a part of reconfiguration with sync) could be considered as ‘non-initial’ scenarios. Also, for the cell re-selection operation, e.g. in priority-based re-selection, where the neighboring carrier assistance is provided, could be considered as ‘non-initial access’. Is this common understanding?  Beyond that we are fine with the FL proposal (P#1.2-2). |
| Intel | We prefer Proposal #1.2-1 over Proposal #1.2-2. We think FFS from the second bullet in Proposal #1.2-1 should be removed because we need to make further progress on SCS as early as possible in the WI to facilitate other technical discussions.  For us it is critical to treat 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS SSB for initial access cases separately from 240 kHz because it’s a key enabler for single numerology operation (recall, there is no SCS 240 kHz for data). With the single numerology operation, we avoid very serious issues with timing misalignment which, we believe, cannot be resolved relying on CSI-RS as commented by LGE. One example is that CSI-RS may not be always available due to LBT whereas SSB could be a part of DRS or short control signal exemption.  Finally, we don’t see any significant obstacles in supporting 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS SSB for initial access as anyway it would be an optional UE capability as well as data transmission using SCS 480 kHz and 960 kHz. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine with the updated proposal. We are also fine with the reformulation made by Ericsson. |
| Moderator | Added P#1.2-3 to separately to address initial access vs non-initial access cases as commented by Nokia.  Added P#1.2-4, which removes FFS from P#1.2-1 as commented by Intel. |
| Futurewei | We do not support P#1.2-4 (former P#1.2-1 alternative update). We would like to have two separate discussions one for the initial access and one for the non-initial access. The initial access SCS decision should have higher priority and it should be addressed first, as the baseline decision for further SCS considerations. We prefer for the initial access to have a single SCS of 120 kHz only.  After the group decides on the initial access SCS, we could consider adding {480, 960} kHz as well as 240kHz SCS for the non-initial access |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | We cannot agree with the suggested proposals. As we explained in details in the first round of discussions (please see our input in Discussion#1), we do not see any need in practice for SSB other than 120 kHz. Studying provided inputs from proponents of additional SSB SCSs, our concerns still stand.   * **Initial access (Cell selection)**   + ***Some of our concerns for SSBs other than 120 kHz (more details in “Discussion#1)”:***   As we discussed in “Discussion#1” in details, supporting additional SSB SCSs results in multitude of problems only one of which is the additional blind search complexity due to multiple numerologies.  Additionally, as provided in details in “Discussion#1”, support of higher SSB SCSs during initial access does not result in a shorter initial access latency as, in any case, UE has to buffer 20 ms (default periodicity of SSB) of signal to find SSB. Additionally, the higher layer latencies associated with initial access are independent from the used numerology and can comprise a big portion of the overall initial access latency.  More important, if higher SSB SCSs are supported, the buffer size and associated UE processing will increase since the rate of UE sampling during the 20 ms needs to be proportional with the maximum SCS of the SSB.  As discussed in “Discussion#1”, other problems of supporting higher SSB SCSs include a lower coverage, restriction in some CORESET#0/SSB multiplexing pattern (a Mux#3 of 48 PRB CORESET#0 with SSB in 960 kHz would require 800 MHz minimum channel BW that is unlikely to be agreed; limiting CORESET#0/SSB multiplexing pattern in 960 kHz to Mux#1 and increasing the beam sweeping latency), and specification efforts.   * + ***Answer to some other companies concerns if only 120 kHz SSB SCS is supported for initial access:***   Some companies raised concern about the achievable time accuracy using 120 kHz SSBs. Please note that we believe all operations during initial access need to be in 120 kHz (Initial BWP SCS is 120 kHz) as higher numerologies main usage is to support higher data rates that are anyway non-achievable during initial access. Similarly, a high MCS is not typically used during initial access so the effect of phase noise in 120 kHz SCS is negligible. Since all operations are done in 120 kHz SCS, there is no concern about time accuracy during initial access (please note that, in fact, we believe that 120 kHz SSB SCS can provide enough accuracy for 960 kHz SCS operation as well. However, this will be separately discussed when discussing SSB SCS for non-initial access).  A company raised the issue of K-ssb indication. This would of course be no problem if both SSB and CRESET#0 have the same SCS of 120 kHz.   * **Non-initial access**    + ***Some of our views on why SSBs other than 120 kHz do not need to be supported (more details in “Discussion#1)”:***   A main usage of SSB after initial access is RRM measurement. *UE needs to have scheduling restriction or MG during SMTC irrespective to whether or not the SCS of SSB and the active BWP are the same or different.* Therefore, the use of the same 480/960 kHz for SSB and data to avoid scheduling restriction/MG is unwarranted. Moreover, since SSBs of neighboring cells are measured during RRM, the single-numerology operation cannot be deployed per cell. In practice, the whole network has to operate on a single numerology to make the single numerology operation per UE even possible.  In addition, almost all usages of SSB in the connected mode (RRM, RLM, BFD-RS, BFR-RS, CSI) can be done using CSI-RS with the same numerology of the Active BWP. If SSB measurement in a different numerology than that of Active BWP is problematic (which we do not believe it is), CSI-RS with the same numerology as that of the Active BWP is readily available.  Also, note that switching BWP with SCSA to BWP with SCSB is already supported in Rel-15/16. As shown in “Discussion#1”, the absolute time of BWP switch delay from SCSA to SCSB (A and B equal or different) is the more or less the same in FR2 according to Table 4.5.6.1.0.1-1of TS 38.533. So, there is no issue with BWP change latency of 120 kHz to a higher SCS.   * ***Answer to some other companies concerns if only 120 kHz SSB SCS is supported for non-initial access:***   Some companies raised the concern that the achievable time accuracy of 120 kHz SSB is not enough for operations in 480/960 kHz. Please note that the achievable time accuracy of 120 kHz SSB is 34 ns which is less than half of the CP of 960 kHz SCS (72 ns). Therefore, we believe that the achievable time accuracy of 120 kHz SSB can support the 960 kHz SCS operations after initial access. Even if in some cases, e.g., when an extremely high data rate in 960 kHz SCS is used in channel dispersive environment (which, in our view, actually does not seem to be a practical scenario), TRS in the operating SCS is readily available for fine time tuning.  Some companies raised the issue that SSB in 480/960 SCS enables RRM in the same SCS as that of the active BWP. In our view, we do not see much of a value in this as UE needs to always have a scheduling restriction/MG during RRM measurement even if SSB and active BWP SCSs are the same. Moreover, RRM can be done using CSI-RS with the same numerology of active BWP.  Some companies raised the issue that CSI-RS based RRM is optional while SSB-based RRM is mandatory. In our view, and as discussed above, if UE does not support CSI-RS based RRM we always have SSB-based RRM based on 120 kHz SSB which, in our view, does not cause any complexity for the UE. Moreover, please note that even if 480/960 kHz SSB is supported it will not be a mandatory UE feature anyway (as per WID agreement) similar to CSI-RS based RRM.  A company raised the issue that the timing of RRM CSI-RS may depend on the timing of SSB. In our view, the RRM CSI-RS and SSB do not need to have the same SCS. The timing of RRM CSI-RS with 960 kHz SCS can be derived from the timing of an associated SSB with 120 kHz SCS.  Some companies raised the issue that supporting 480/960 SSB SCS in both initial access and non-initial access enables a single-numerology network. Our view is that if a network only supports 480 or 960 kHz numerology, then the Ues that support 120 kHz SCS only (according to the WID, UE is not required to support 480 and 960 SCS), cannot camp on it. Excluding these Ues creates fragmentation since there is no guarantee that a UE built for 60 GHz range will be able to access any network deployed in 60 GHz. Fragmentation increases both the UE and network cost (so this defeats the purpose of reducing complexity with a single numerology). We agree with Proposal #1.2-3 (clarification of initial and non-initial) |
| Ericsson | We support P#1.2-2 (as proponent)  Regarding P#1.2-3, we would like to understand the cell-reselection use case a bit better. Is the actual SSB location (ARFCN) and SCS indicated such that the UE requires no search? |
| LG Electronics | We disagree Proposal #1.2-1 and Proposal #1.2-2. As we commented earlier, CSI-RS with the same numerology configured to BWP can be used for use cases other than initial access, as an alternative of 480/960 kHz SCS SSB. Some companies stated CSI-RS based RRM measurement is an optional UE feature. However, 480/960 kHz SCS SSB based RRM measurement will be optional considering 480/960 kHz support itself is optional. Moreover, CSI-RS based design does not require any further specification impact while new SCS SSB necessitates significant specification impact.  For Proposal #1.2-3, does “SSB in non-initial access” include the case of non-initial BWP in Pcell? |
| Qualcomm | We are fine with proposal #1.2-3  For Proposal #1.2-1:   * 1st bullet: we are fine with this * 2nd bullet: we think more study is needed for UE search complexity for 480.960 kHz and hence prefer to have this as FFS for now. It may be too early (without study) to conclude on feasibility of this option. * 3rd bullet: we are fine with this |
| Moderator | I’ve started to formulate a summary of discussion #2 (below). Please note the summary is temporary and will be updated further as additional comments are received. |
| DOCOMO | We support Proposal #1.2-2 and P#1.2-3 below.  Regarding P#1.2-3, cell re-selection is considered as a non-initial access as SIB4 indicates them for cell re-selection. |
| AT&T | We support Proposal 1.2-4. Proposal 1.2-2 can be an intermediate step. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We support Proposal#1.2-3 and #1.2-4 |
| Moderator | See summary below |

**Moderator Summary of Discussions #2**

Suggest to further discuss with Proposal #1.2-2, 1-2-3, and 1-2-4 as it contains all the components debated issues and could be modified as such during further discussions.

In Proposal 1-2-2, one of the debated components is whether or not to remove the yellow highlighted FFS (2nd bullet of 1-2-2). Similar concern is on the second bullet of Proposal 1-2-4. The primary concern for support of 480/960kHz for initial access seems to be around added complexity, while proponents of the proposal claim enablement of single numerology operation is important and complexity can be managed as 480/960kHz SCS are optional where not all Ues will be required to support.

Proposal 1-2-3 is clarification of scope of initial access and non-initial for SSB.

Moderator’s suggest discussing proposal #1.2-2, 1-2-3, and 1-2-4 further.

##### Proposal #1.2-2

* Support 480kHz and 960kHz SSB SCS for non-initial access cases
* FFS: support one or more of 240, 480, 960 kHz SCS SSB for initial access cases
* FFS: support 240 kHz SCS SSB for ~~initial and~~ non-initial access cases

##### Proposal #1.2-4

* Support 480kHz and 960kHz SSB SCS for non-initial access cases
* ~~FFS:~~ support 480 kHz and/or 960 kHz SSB SCS for initial access cases
* FFS: support 240 kHz SCS SSB for initial and non-initial access cases

##### Proposal #1.2-3

* + “SSB in non-initial access” here refers to:
    - All cases when UE can be provided with assistance information. For example:
      * SSB in Scell, where gNB is able to provide assistance information such as reconfiguration with sync ~~(e.g. SSB center frequency, SCS, etc)~~
      * SSB for neighbor cell RRM measurements, where information is provided by gNB~~)~~.
      * Cell re-selection, e.g. in priority-based re-selection, where the neighboring carrier assistance is provided
  + “SSB in initial access” here refers to
    - All cases when UE cannot be provided with assistance information. For example:
      * SSB used for “Cell Selection” defined in TS38.133 Section 4.1, which includes stored information cell selection and initial cell selection.

**Discussions #3**

The following proposal was discussed in GTW session. Given that we weren’t able to conclude, moderator suggest picking up the discussions from the proposal below.

##### Proposal #1.2-5

* Support 480kHz and 960kHz SSB SCS when center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE
* FFS: support one or more of 240, 480, 960 kHz SCS SSB for other cases
* FFS: support 240 kHz SCS SSB for access cases when center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE

##### Proposal #1.2-6

* Support 480kHz and 960kHz SSB SCS when center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE and CORESET0 and Type0-PDCCH search space are not configured in MIB
  + Note: support of 480/960kHz SCS for SSB is optional
* ~~FFS: support one or more of 240, 480, 960 kHz SCS SSB for other cases~~
  + FFS: support 480 kHz and/or 960 kHz SSB SCS for other cases
    - Study the UE initial search complexity of 480 and 960 kHz (for other cases)
    - Study the initial timing resolution based on low SCS (120 kHz) and its impact on the performance of higher SCS data (480/960 kHz)
  + SCS of the configured BWP(s) in the carrier carrying 480/960 kHz SSB is expected to be the same as the SCS of the SSB.
* FFS: support 240 kHz SCS SSB ~~for access cases~~ when center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE and CORESET0 and Type0-PDCCH search space are not configured in MIB
  + FFS: support 240 kHz SCS SSB for other cases

##### Proposal #1.2-7

* Support 480kHz and 960kHz SSB SCS when center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE and CORESET0 and Type0-PDCCH search space are not configured in MIB
  + SCS of the configured BWP(s) in the carrier carrying 480/960 kHz SSB is expected to be the same as the SCS of the SSB.
  + Note: support of 480/960kHz SCS for SSB is optional
* FFS: support one or more of 240, 480, 960 kHz SCS SSB for other cases
  + FFS: support 240 kHz SCS SSB ~~for access cases~~ when center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE and CORESET0 and Type0-PDCCH search space are not configured in MIB
  + Study the UE initial search complexity of 480 and 960 kHz (for other cases)
  + Study the initial timing resolution based on low SCS (120 kHz) and its impact on the performance of higher SCS data (480/960 kHz)

##### Proposal #1.2-8

* Do not introduce 480kHz/960kHz SSB SCS
  + [support 120kHz SSB SCS, and 120k Hz SCS for CORESET#0]
    - *Moderator note: seems obviously but wasn’t sure if we wanted to capture this explicitly*
  + FFS: whether to support 480 and/or 960 kHz SCS for CORESET#0
  + FFS: whether BWP with 480 kHz/960 kHz SCS can be configured in Pcell
    - If non-initial BWP with 480/960kHz SCS is supported, FFS on how to obtain accurate timing for receiving signals/channels in BWP with 480/960kHz SCS
  + FFS: how (neighbor cell) timing for CSI-RS for mobility with 480/960kHz SCS can be accurately derived based on 120kHz SSB
  + FFS: whether to enable and how to enable 480/960 kHz single numerology operation for Scell/PSCell with 120kHz SSB

##### Proposal #1.2-9 (suggested by LGE)

* For SCS of SSB for 52.6-71 GHz, consider the following options and down-select to one or more options in RAN1#104bis-e.
  + Option 1: Do not introduce 240 kHz/480 kHz/960 kHz SSB SCS
  + Option 2: Support 240 kHz SSB SCS
    - Option 2-1: Support 240 kHz SSB SCS only for initial BWP
    - Option 2-2: Support 240 kHz SSB SCS for all cases
  + Option 3: Support 480 kHz/960 kHz SSB SCS
    - Option 3-1: Support 480 kHz/960 kHz SSB SCS as optional, when center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE and CORESET#0 and Type0-PDCCH search space are not configured in MIB
    - Option 3-2: Support 480 kHz/960 kHz SSB SCS for all cases
* Further studies are needed at least for the following identified issues for down-selection.
  + initial cell search complexity
  + timing resolution during initial access, (neighbor cell) RRM measurement, activation of different numerology BWP
  + minimization of specification impact (e.g., reuse of legacy SSB pattern, common numerology between SSB and CORESET#0)
  + whether/how to enable single numerology operation

##### Proposal #1.2-10 (suggested by Huawei)

* Support 480kHz and 960kHz SSB SCS only when center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE and CORESET0 and Type0-PDCCH search space are not configured in MIB
  + Note: support of 480/960kHz SCS for SSB is optional
* FFS: support 240 kHz SCS SSB when center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE and CORESET0 and Type0-PDCCH search space are not configured in MIB
  + FFS: support 240 kHz SCS SSB for other cases

##### Proposal #1.2-11 (modified by Nokia and modified by Qualcomm)

* Support 480kHz and 960kHz SSB SCS when center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE ~~and CORESET0 and Type0-PDCCH search space are not configured in MIB~~
  + SCS of the configured BWP(s) in the carrier carrying 480/960 kHz SSB is expected to be the same as the SCS of the SSB.
  + Note: support of 480/960kHz SCS for SSB is optional
* FFS: support one or more of 240, 480, 960 kHz SCS SSB for other cases
  + FFS: support 240 kHz SCS SSB ~~for access cases~~ when center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE ~~and CORESET0 and Type0-PDCCH search space are not configured in MIB~~
  + Study the UE initial cell selection search complexity of 480 and 960 kHz (for other cases)
* Study the initial timing resolution based on low SCS (120 kHz) and its impact on the performance of higher SCS data (480/960 kHz)

##### Proposal #1.2-12 (update from Ericsson)

* Support 480kHz and 960kHz SSB SCS when center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE and CORESET0 and Type0-PDCCH search space are not configured in MIB
  + Note: support of 480/960kHz SCS for SSB is optional
* ~~FFS: support one or more of 240, 480, 960 kHz SCS SSB for other cases~~
  + FFS: support one or more of 240, 480 kHz, ~~and/or~~ 960 kHz SSB SCS for other cases
    - Study the UE initial search complexity of 240, 480 and 960 kHz (for other cases)
    - ~~Study the initial timing resolution based on low SCS (120 kHz) and its impact on the performance of higher SCS data (480/960 kHz)~~
  + SCS of the configured BWP(s) ~~in~~ of the carrier carrying 480/960 kHz SSB is expected to be the same as the SCS of the SSB.
* ~~FFS: support 240 kHz SCS SSB for access cases when center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE and CORESET0 and Type0-PDCCH search space are not configured in MIB~~
  + ~~FFS: support 240 kHz SCS SSB for other cases~~
* Study the initial timing resolution based on low SCS (120 and/or 240 kHz) and its impact on the performance of higher SCS data (480/960 kHz)

Please provide further comments below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Discussions/Comments** |
| Nokia | We are OK with FL proposal #1.2-5 |
| Intel | We have strong concerns regarding the second bullet.  First of all, it is mixing up two types of SCS for SSB: 240 kHz which cannot be also used for data/control transmissions and 480 kHz/960 kHz which can be used for data/control. For us, it is important to discuss 480 kHz/960 kHz SCS for SSB separately from 240 kHz because SCS 480 kHz/960 kHz can enable the single numerology operation across initial access/data/control while SCS 240 kHz cannot do that. Better formulation would be based on Proposal #1.2-4. The reformulation of Proposal #1.2-4 to reflect Proposal #1.2-5 would be as follows:   * Support 480kHz and 960kHz SSB SCS when center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE * FFS: support 480 kHz and/or 960 kHz SSB SCS for other cases * FFS: support 240 kHz SCS SSB for access cases when center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE   In the above proposal, we prefer to remove the FFS in the 2nd bullet.  On the issue of supporting 480/960kHz for SSB, we don’t agree with some companies’ reasons for not supporting 480/960kHz. The concerned companies have not been able to provide a satisfactory alternative that would allow networks to be deployed using a single numerology during the email discussions and during the latest GTW session. From our side, there are a couple of reasons in single numerology operation:   * No issues with timing misalignment between SSB and data/control. For example, the sample time duration after detection of SSB with SCS 120 kHz is about 34.7 ns, i.e., . This is only two times smaller than CP duration of 960 kHz SCS used for data/control which is 73.2 ns. Therefore, even small SSB timing detection errors for SCS 120 kHz, e.g., two samples, will cause serious issue with OFDM symbols of SCS 960 kHz numerology, e.g., ISI. To address this timing issue, a separate synchronization source is needed for data/control. Although LG has mentioned the use of CSI-RS for this purpose, CSI-RS cannot be considered as such source. In case of initial access (prior to RRC connection establishment), it’s not clear how TRS could be configured for post Msg 4 PDSCH/PUSCH before RRC connection. Not only the use of CSI-RS (TRS) as a primary source of time/frequency synchronization does not exist in NR, but introduction of such functionality requires significant change to gNB and UE implementation. In NR, CSI-RS has interlaced pattern in the frequency domain which corresponds to periodic structures in the time domain. Because of CSI-RS periodicity in time, its timing accuracy is poor. That’s why in NR the CSI-RS (TRS) is used for correction of time/frequency reference obtained from the primary synchronization source, which is SSB, and SSB is used as a time/frequency sync source for CSI-RS based RRM measurements. If 480/960kHz SSB is not supported, and if CSI-RS is utilized for RRM, CSI-RS would follow data/control SCS, e.g. 960kHz, then Ues trying to perform CSI-RS RRM measurements would need to obtain timing from 120kHz SSB, which might not be able to provide accurate timing in order for the UE to properly perform RRM measurements. No company so far has provided any evaluation that there is no timing issue if 120kHz SSB is used for 960kHz data/control, while we have provided evaluation that shows there will be timing issues. * Single numerology operation can potentially reduce complexity and ease the device implementation (at both UE and BS). LG mentioned the use of CSI-RS (TRS) as a replacement for SSB. However, such operation or functionality does not only exist in NR but will result in significant impact to Ues. Implementing CSI-RS detector to provide an accurate synchronization source for data/control is likely not only infeasible but not trivial to implement and, thus, brings additional complexity to UE device. Such hypothetical device would contain multiple detectors, i.e., CSI-RS-based and SSB detector.   Finally, any concern on added complexity for introducing 480/960kHz can be addressed by UE capability. Not all devices that support 52~71 GHz need to support 480/960kHz SSB. We would like to point out that there are use cases and deployment scenarios that demand ultra-high data rates and that are completely managed by network operator (both gNB and UE). Some examples of such use cases are: IAB, fixed wireless communications with consumer premise equipment (CPE), inter-rack communications in data center, and industrial private 5G networks. It seems quite unnecessarily to force these deployments to always work with mixed numerology and take a huge hit from SSB overhead if only 120kHz SSB is supported.  To resolve concerns from companies, we suggest adding a note to the agreement:   * Note: support of 480/960kHz SCS for SSB is optional. |
| Qualcomm | We are OK with FL proposal #1.2-5  Some studies may be needed to help conclude on the FFS parts:   * Study the UE initial search complexity of 480 and 960 kHz (for other cases) * Study the initial timing resolution based on low SCS (120 kHz) and its impact on the performance of higher SCS data (480/960 kHz) |
| CATT | We are OK with Proposal #1.2-5  Our preference is that same SCS for both initial access and other channel should be supported since SSB is used for reference RRM measurements of IDLE/Inactive Ues and reference QCL for channel tracking for CONNECTED mode UE. |
| LG Electronics | We are not acceptable to Proposal #1.2-5.   * “it’s not clear how TRS could be configured for post Msg 4 PDSCH/PUSCH before RRC connection” 🡪 [LG] Is Intel considering the scenario where a UE in PCell can be configured with 480/960 kHz SCS for (initial) BWP configured in Pcell after initial access is done with 120 kHz SCS? * We don’t think TRS as the primary t/f sync source even for the case where 480/960 kHz SCS SSB is not introduced. For the serving cell, UE can perform coarse t/f sync procedure based on 120 kHz SCS SSB on Pcell and/or Scell, and then perform fine t/f sync procedure based on TRS with the same numerology of active BWP, which does not lead to frequent numerology switching to 120 kHz SCS. For neighbor cell CSI-RS based RRM measurement case, it seems to be related to UE implementation and RAN4 measurement accuracy requirement, and we don’t see the issue. If 120 kHz SCS SSB is problematic in some cases, we can consider to support 240 kHz SCS SSB as well which is already supported by Rel-15 specification. It would be appreciated if more elaboration could be provided. * Moreover, even though 480/960 kHz SCS SSB is introduced for non-initial access, single numerology operation may not be guaranteed especially with respect to neighbor cell RRM measurement. This is because neighbor cell can be operated with numerology different from 480/960 kHz SCS of serving cell. * Therefore, still we don’t see the strong necessity to introduce 480/960 kHz SCS SSB at the cost of significant RAN1 specification impact.   One clarification on the main bullet of Proposal #1.2.-5: If “when center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE” may include cell reselection or ANR case, will 480/960 kHz SCS SSB contain the information on CORESET#0 to provide SIB1? |
| Spreadtrum | We are OK with FL proposal #1.2-5. Leaving more points as FFS is reasonable way.  Similar to some companies, we don’t think CSI-RS can replace SSB for measurement with 480/960kHz SCS.  For idle mode, it is general view that CSI-RS cannot be known for idle UE. The exception of TRS in power saving topic is another story, and we can postpone this decision after power saving conclusions (UE should not blindly detect CSI-RS in the discussion).  For connected mode,   * for neighbor cell RRM measurement, CSI-RS usually needs the timing related to SSB by ssb-ToMeasure, and * for serving cell RRM measurement or fine T/F tracking, CSI-RS/TRS needs the validation by DCI format (e.g. 2-0) or resource scheduled by UE-specific DCI format, which is slightly restrictive and has been optionally supported by CSI-RS/TRS, and * for L1 measurement (e.g. CSI, L1-RSRP), it relies on CSI-RS which has been supported in R16. |
| Fujitsu | In our previous view, cell re-selection is an initial access case since it is for non-connected Ues and design of multiplexing between SSB with new SCS and RMSI is needed if new SSB SCS is supported for cell re-selection. With that assumption, we proposed to support 480/960kHz for non-initial access and FFS for initial access.  If cell re-selection is classified as ‘non-initial access’ or as the case ‘when center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE’, compared with only supporting new SCS for SSB in non-initial access, there would be no much additional standardization effort/UE complexity for supporting new SCS for initial access. Therefore, if Proposal #1.2-5 is agreeable, we think 480kHz and 960kHz should be supported for initial access as well. That is, 480kHz and 960kHz should be supported for all cases.  Based on the above, we prefer either of the following way forward:  Alt.1: Clarify that cell re-selection is initial access case.   * Based on that assumption, support 480kHz and 960kHz for non-initial access and FFS for initial access (Proposal #1.2-2).   Alt.2: Support 480kHz and 960kHz for all cases (Proposal #1.2-4). |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We share similar view with Intel (it is better to discuss 480 kHz/960 kHz SCS for SSB separately from 240 kHz) on FL proposal #1.2-5. But we can also accept if most companies agree with the current description. |
| LG Electronics | Response to Spreadtrum:   * For idle mode, we don’t think paging can be based on 480/960 kHz SCS considering its optionality for NR 52.6-71 GHz. * For connected mode,   + For neighbor cell RRM measurement, what is the issue if CSI-RS based measurement requires coarse timing measurement from SSB? Once coarse t/f sync is set for a neighbor cell with 120 (or 240) kHz SCS SSB, UE can perform RRM based on CSI-RS for the neighbor cell. Since this coarse t/f sync procedure is not necessary every measurement occasion, frequent numerology change is not expected. Furthermore, as we commented earlier, even though 480/960 kHz SCS is introduced for RRM measurement, single numerology operation cannot be guaranteed without the assumption that all deployed gNBs provide the same numerology SSB.   + For serving cell RRM measurement, irrespective of SSB SCS, fine tracking based on TRS is needed.   + For L1 measurement, if it relies on CSI-RS, does it mean that same numerology CSI-RS is more important than SSB? Maybe I didn’t catch the point… |
| vivo | We support current proposal #1.2-5. The main typical use cases for 52.6-71GHz is indoor private networks since it comprises a large amount of unlicensed bands. In this use case, peak data rate is the primary target (e.g. supporting AR/VR traffic). So 120KHz operation is not suitable for this case. If no support of 480K/960K SSB, at least two operation BWP (i.e. one is 120K for initial access and the other one for data communication) is needed which is a waste of resource. The preferred operation mode is a single numerology with 480/960KHz. However, no support of 480/960K SSB will make this operation impossible. As indicated by Intel, support of 480/960K SSB is optional and doesn’t mandate all Ues to implement in all use cases, which means it won’t bring any mandatory complexity increase. However, it clearly provide benefit in several target use cases. In general, support of 480/960KHz in spec doesn’t bring complexity issue but is useful for some typical use cases. |
| Spreadtrum | Quick response to LG:   * For idle mode, whether Msg-1/2/3/4 is based on 120kHz SCS is TBD. * For connected mode,   + For neighbor cell RRM measurement, if 480/960kHz SCS CSI-RS based RRM needs the timing of 120kHz SCS SSB, UE should switch to process the 120kHz SCS SSB to get the coarse timing (e.g. find the symbol boundary of the neighbor cell) and then switch back to 480/960kHz BWP to measure CSI-RS. Is this the procedure your referred to?   + For serving cell RRM measurement, I agree CSI-RS can be optionally supported, but the CSI-RS validation is a restriction in some cases, e.g. DCI format 2-0 is absent or miss detected by UE.   + For L1 measurement, I agree CSI-RS is the main measurement source. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | In general, we are Ok with Proposal #1.2-5. However, same numerology operation if 480/960KHz are used for SSB which can not be achieved in case of 240KHz. |
| TCL Communication | We support the proposal#1.2-5 from FL. |
| OPPO | We support the proposal #1.2-4. Regarding proposal #1.2-5, we prefer to separate the discussion of 240kHz SSB and 480/960kHz SSB. |
| Ericsson | We are mostly okay with Proposal #1.2-5 but we have a strong view on the following:   1. The second bullet should remain as it is, i.e., 240/480/960 kHz SSB SCS are FFS on the same level until further progress is made on SSB search complexity. 2. The first bullet is clarified to answer LG’s question:   *One clarification on the main bullet of Proposal #1.2.-5: If “when center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE” may include cell reselection or ANR case, will 480/960 kHz SCS SSB contain the information on CORESET#0 to provide SIB1?*  To address LG’s concern, perhaps the first bullet could be clarified as follows:  Support 480kHz and 960kHz SSB SCS when center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE and CORESET0 and Type0-PDCCH search space are not configured in MIB |
| InterDigital | Although our original position is to support only 120 kHz SSB regardless of initial access or non-initial access, we are fine to support 480kHz and 960kHz as a compromise. However, we would like to emphasize that SSBs with 480kHz and 960kHz should be used for single numerology operation. Given that, we would propose following updates:   * Support 480kHz and 960kHz SSB SCS when following conditions are satisfied:   + center frequency is explicitly provided to the UE   + SCS of PDCCH/PDSCH is identical with SCS of SSB * FFS: support one or more of 240, 480, 960 kHz SCS SSB for other cases * FFS: support 240 kHz SCS SSB for access cases when center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE   If this proposal is not fine, then we prefer to discuss this proposal after having agreements on proposal #1.3-6. |
| Samsung | We support Proposal #1.2-5 (although we are also ok with some other proposals, this seems the best way forward for now).  Regarding other companies’ comments, we would like to respond and provide some new comments as follow:   * CSI-RS is an optional UE feature, and 480/960 kHz SCS is also an optional feature, but it doesn’t imply a UE capable of supporting 480/960 kHz SCS automatically support CSI-RS as well (at least this discussion has not happened yet), and we should not mandate such UE capability. Then for the Ues capable of supporting 480/960 but not CSI-RS, how can those Ues use CSI-RS to replace SSB? * For IDLE mode, of course 480/960 can be used for broadcast data and control channels including paging (e.g. reconfigured initial BWP), and it has nothing related to the UE capability as optional. So we fully agree with Fujitsu and Spreadtrum’s comment that at least for cell-selection, there is no way to use CSI-RS to replace the functionality of SSB (even in Rel-17 power saving, it has been agreed that CSI-RS in IDLE mode cannot be used for neighboring cell measurement). * Regarding Huawei’s comment in the GTW: the benefit from single implementation is from gNB side or UE side, our response is, at least from our interest of business, it’s from both sides, and we believe this observation is obtained by many other companies including both sides as well. * We commented that in some cases the timing of CSI-RS for RRM measurement relies on the timing of SSB, which implies a detection of a SSB with different numerology if data is using 480/960 kHz SCS. Then, the detection of such SSB of course is based on SSB-based RRM, which makes a SSB-based RRM unavoidable. Like mentioned by Intel and Spreadtrum, there is no such CSI-RS based cell search in implementation (actually the CSI-RS sequences are too many for blind detection), and if a gNB intends to acquire a cell’s information of a new cell, SSB based RRM is the basic (that’s why SSB based RRM is mandatory but CSI-RS based is not), and actually any procedure of cell-reselection and handover cannot fully avoid the use of SSB based RRM in all cases. * We still find some of our observed issues with mixed numerology are not addressed by the companies having concern on supporting single numerology implementation: waste of resource on guard band between two different SCS, and inflexibility on multiplexing HARQ when a large number of symbols have to be DL due to overlapping with SSB. * Furthermore, we would like to comment that for some certain scenarios, LG’s comment on how a system can implement may apply, but we want to address the point that those certain scenarios may not cover all the scenarios, and may not even be typical. One should not mandate all the other implementations to have to follow such non-typical way in product. So for those still having concerns with the benefit with single numerology implementation, we would like to ask those to check with their own product team how much mixed numerology is implemented, and how much SSB is not implemented. * Finally, we also would like to hear whether there is any concern or issue with supporting the new SCSs for SSB. Seems other than specification impact, we didn’t see any technical concern to do so. Then we would suggest to support the new SCSs for SSB at least for non-initial access case, and move on to the specification impact design. Actually the potential spec impact is very clear, all the other proposals in this agenda, so there is no ambiguity on the amount of work to be specified, and it’s not proper to conclude the specification is too huge especially in the first meeting of the WI. * One more side note for Ericsson’s comment: We didn’t see LG has a concern on that point but a clarification, and we didn’t see the necessity to separate that out as a special case. The single numerology implementation motivation applies to such case as well. |
| Intel2 | Here we want to respond to LG and better explain our position:  In initial access case, when there are different SCSs used for SSB and for data/control, e.g., SCS 120 kHz and SCS 480/960 kHz, respectively, the UE has to receive RRC configuration for TRS in order to correct SSB timing and further operate with SCS 480/960 kHz. However, the SCS of PDSCH, which carries the RRC configuration, has to be 120 kHz because PDSCH with SCS 480/960 kHz could not be decoded without timing correction which is based on TRS. Therefore, there are two types of PDSCH: one with SCS 120 kHz and another with SCS 480/960 kHz. At least multiplexing of two PDSCH types with different SCSs within the same OFDM symbols is inefficient from the resource allocation perspective as some of REs should be reserved for guard bands. And this is not saying about complexity to schedule PDSCHs with different numerologies. From network perspective, it’s simpler and straightforward to operate with single numerology across initial access/data/control.  Regarding the timing misalignment issue, we don’t believe that simple correction of SSB timing based on CSI-RS is possible in case of mixed numerologies with smaller SSB SCS. Our concerns provided in the example above, when SSB SCS is 120 kHz and SCS for data/control is 960 kHz, were not addressed in LG’s argumentation. We still insist that even small sync errors of SSB-based timing result in inability to demodulate the CSI-RS of larger SCS without special detection techniques. However, even detection of CSI-RS is not a trivial task due to its distributed nature in the frequency domain/periodic structure in the time domain.  We don’t agree that SSB SCS 480 kHz/960 kHz is not necessary. We think we’ve provided quite many use cases where the single numerology operation, which requires the support of SSB SCS 480 kHz/960 kHz, brings a lot of benefits at the cost of moderate specification impact.  Another point is FFS for SSB SCS 480 kHz/960 kHz for initial access cases. Without prior information about center frequency and SCS for SSB, the UE has to scan sync raster positions in a band from 52.6 GHz up to 71 GHz. However, proper assignment of SCS for bands from 52.6 GHz up to 71 GHz and careful sync raster design seem to be a task for RAN4. And RAN1 could easily agree to support SSB SCS 480 kHz/960 kHz for all cases (i.e., initial and non-initial access). |
| LG Electronics | Response to Spreadtrum:   * For idle mode, the use of 120 kHz SCS for initial access related signals/channels in an initial BWP was already agreed in the last RAN plenary. * For connected mode,   + For neighbor cell RRM measurement, *if 480/960kHz SCS CSI-RS based RRM needs the timing of 120kHz SCS SSB, UE should switch to process the 120kHz SCS SSB to get the coarse timing (e.g. find the symbol boundary of the neighbor cell) and then switch back to 480/960kHz BWP to measure CSI-RS. Is this the procedure your referred to?* 🡪 [LG] Correct. That is one of implementation algorithms. However, as mentioned, numerology change will not be frequent. Meanwhile, if tight synchronization can be guaranteed between serving cell and neighbor cell, UE may not need to perform t/f sync procedure based on neighbor cell SSB.   + For serving cell RRM measurement, I agree that sometimes CSI-RS can be invalid due to dynamic SFI. However, the point here is aiming at single numerology and CSI-RS based serving cell RRM measurement can be done without numerology change.   Response to Ericsson:   * We share the view with Ericsson in that non-initial access implies SSB not providing information on CORESET#0 and Type0-PDCCH CSS set. But it seems that companies have different understanding on what non-initial access means.   Response to Samsung:   * Optionality of CSI-RS: At least from our perspective, CSI-RS cannot be an optional for a UE supporting 480/960 kHz SCS. CSI-RS for tracking should be supported for the UE, considering BW of CSI-RS (full RB) vs. SSB (20 RBs). * Idle mode UE: How can 480/960 kHz SCS (which is optional) be used for paging or broadcast signal/channel? * Neighbor cell RRM: I agree that SSB based RRM is basic. However, from UE perspective, mixed numerology operation cannot be avoided unless all gNBs in the same frequency operate with the same numerology. * Resource waste: It is acknowledged that 1 or 2 PRB can be used for guard band but DL/UL ratio of 480/960 kHz would be the same as that of 120 kHz. * Spec impact: Our main concern is specification impact even though in most cases CSI-RS can replace SSB. As can be seen in other sections, companies seem to have different designs for SSB pattern and we need to define how to configure Type0-PDCCH CSS set for new SCSs, if needed.   Response to Intel:   * RRC configuration for TRS: Still I don’t understand the scenario that Intel is assuming. Once a UE is connected with Pcell 120 kHz, the UE can be configured with Scell 480 kHz + TRS 480 kHz + SSB 120 kHz on Scell, by RRC signaling with 120 kHz PDSCH on Pcell. Then, UE activates Scell and get the timing based on 120 kHz SSB and 480 kHz TRS for Scell. What is the problem in this scenario? * To resolve timing alignment issue between 120 kHz SSB and 960 kHz TRS, we already provided a method to introduce 240 kHz SSB that was already supported from Rel-15 NR. It should be noted that combination of 15 kHz SSB and 60 kHz BWP is supported in FR1. It should be also noted that interlaced pattern has been introduced since LTE CRS and we don’t see the problem on that. |
| Futurewei | We do not support 480/960 kHz SCS SSB for the initial access. We support a single numerology for the access. Therefore, we prefer to have only one SCS (120kHz) for SSB/CORESET#0 and PRACH. We are OK with the support for non-initial access of 480/960 SCS SSB.  On timing issues for the initial access: We did not see simulations to show that the timing is a problem when only 120kHz is used for the initial access. We think that more studies are necessary to support the timing as an issue. If such simulations will be provided that show the problem, we think that we should consider 240kHz SCS SSB for the initial access (which is already supported by the specs) as a solution. Moreover, if a single SCS (120kHz) is used for SSB/CORESET#0/PRACH the UE can be directed to a new BWP (for instance SCS 480/960 kHz), after the initial access.  Therefore, we propose the following text changes: Proposal #1.2-5  * Support 480kHz and 960kHz SSB SCS when center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE   + FFS: support ~~one or more of~~ 240~~, 480, 960~~ kHz SCS SSB for other cases * FFS: support 240 kHz SCS SSB for access cases when center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE |
| Samsung2 | Please find our response to LG’s comments:   * Optionality of CSI-RS: At least from our perspective, CSI-RS cannot be an optional for a UE supporting 480/960 kHz SCS. CSI-RS for tracking should be supported for the UE, considering BW of CSI-RS (full RB) vs. SSB (20 RBs).   [Samsung] We don’t understand why LG mandates all UE vendors to support CSI-RS as a non-optional feature to support their argument of implementation. Also, SSB can achieve the purpose of tracking, and there are different implementations to achieve this as well (e.g. multiple SSB in frequency domain).   * Idle mode UE: How can 480/960 kHz SCS (which is optional) be used for paging or broadcast signal/channel?   [Samsung] “Optional” is a UE capability, and only related to the signaling when RRC is set up. Network cannot transmit signal/channel with 480/960 for those Ues without such capability, but why the network cannot transmit signal/channel with 480/960 to the UE supporting such capability, even the network doesn’t know the existence of such UE? This can be achieved by implementation and the market. Back to the question, the SCS of paging can be reconfigured by system information as a general BWP configuration, then of course it can take value of 480/960.   * Neighbor cell RRM: I agree that SSB based RRM is basic. However, from UE perspective, mixed numerology operation cannot be avoided unless all gNBs in the same frequency operate with the same numerology.   [Samsung] Isn’t it a typical implementation scenario?   * Resource waste: It is acknowledged that 1 or 2 PRB can be used for guard band but DL/UL ratio of 480/960 kHz would be the same as that of 120 kHz.   [Samsung] If operators have a choice not to waste that 1 or 2 RBs, why they want to do so? Every RB is paid, and it’s expensive! For example, a 32 RB system will have 3 to 6 % resource wasted due to the mixed numerology, for the slots containing SSB.   * Spec impact: Our main concern is specification impact even though in most cases CSI-RS can replace SSB. As can be seen in other sections, companies seem to have different designs for SSB pattern and we need to define how to configure Type0-PDCCH CSS set for new SCSs, if needed.   [Samsung] We believe our view is clear: CSI-RS can never replace SSB. It’s even not an alternative, but only a supplement. As far as we know, no vendor only relies on CSI-RS in implementation. Different designs from companies are quite normal, but things can converge when we really begin to design it (we used too much time on determining the SCS, and we’d rather use it for detailed design). We are also ok with trying to minimize the spec impact, e.g. supporting fewest SSB and CORESET#0 SCS combination as possible. |
| LG Electronics | Please find our response to LG’s comments:   * Optionality of CSI-RS: At least from our perspective, CSI-RS cannot be an optional for a UE supporting 480/960 kHz SCS. CSI-RS for tracking should be supported for the UE, considering BW of CSI-RS (full RB) vs. SSB (20 RBs).   [Samsung] We don’t understand why LG mandates all UE vendors to support CSI-RS as a non-optional feature to support their argument of implementation. Also, SSB can achieve the purpose of tracking, and there are different implementations to achieve this as well (e.g. multiple SSB in frequency domain).  [LG] We do not enforce UE vendors beyond Rel-15. As you may know, CSI-RS at least for tracking, RLM, and beam failure is mandatory feature from Rel-15, which is nothing new. Furthermore, I’m not sure whether multiple SSBs in frequency domain is typical implementation or not.   * Idle mode UE: How can 480/960 kHz SCS (which is optional) be used for paging or broadcast signal/channel?   [Samsung] “Optional” is a UE capability, and only related to the signaling when RRC is set up. Network cannot transmit signal/channel with 480/960 for those Ues without such capability, but why the network cannot transmit signal/channel with 480/960 to the UE supporting such capability, even the network doesn’t know the existence of such UE? This can be achieved by implementation and the market. Back to the question, the SCS of paging can be reconfigured by system information as a general BWP configuration, then of course it can take value of 480/960.  [LG] Once a UE go into idle mode, network typically abandons all RRC configuration for the UE. Moreover, gNB may not know exact location of a specific UE in idle mode. Even though gNB can use 480/960 kHz SCS for paging or broadcast signal/channel, those would be redundant since network is also required to transmit them with 120 kHz SCS.   * Neighbor cell RRM: I agree that SSB based RRM is basic. However, from UE perspective, mixed numerology operation cannot be avoided unless all gNBs in the same frequency operate with the same numerology.   [Samsung] Isn’t it a typical implementation scenario?  [LG] The point is that at least from neighbor cell RRM perspective, single numerology operation may not be assumed considering different capabilities of Ues associated with a neighbor cell.   * Resource waste: It is acknowledged that 1 or 2 PRB can be used for guard band but DL/UL ratio of 480/960 kHz would be the same as that of 120 kHz.   [Samsung] If operators have a choice not to waste that 1 or 2 RBs, why they want to do so? Every RB is paid, and it’s expensive! For example, a 32 RB system will have 3 to 6 % resource wasted due to the mixed numerology, for the slots containing SSB.  [LG] True. But the percentage should be re-calculated. Assuming 5 ms duration of SSB every 20 ms, even for 32 RB system, resource waste ratio is only 0.75 % to 1.5 %. Also, for the typical case of 2 GHz (170 RBs) for 960 kHz, the percentage of wasted resource is just 0.14 % to 0.28 %.   * Spec impact: Our main concern is specification impact even though in most cases CSI-RS can replace SSB. As can be seen in other sections, companies seem to have different designs for SSB pattern and we need to define how to configure Type0-PDCCH CSS set for new SCSs, if needed.   [Samsung] We believe our view is clear: CSI-RS can never replace SSB. It’s even not an alternative, but only a supplement. As far as we know, no vendor only relies on CSI-RS in implementation. Different designs from companies are quite normal, but things can converge when we really begin to design it (we used too much time on determining the SCS, and we’d rather use it for detailed design). We are also ok with trying to minimize the spec impact, e.g. supporting fewest SSB and CORESET#0 SCS combination as possible.  [LG] We don’t claim that UE vendor should rely on only CSI-RS, but suggest that 480/960 kHz CSI-RS seems sufficient with the intermittent help of 120/240 kHz SSB. |
| DOCOMO | We support the 1st bullet. We agreed to support 480/960 kHz SCS for data as optional, then we believe it is straightforward to support 480/960 kHz SCS for SSB at least when center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE in order to support single numerology operation. We share Intel’s view on timing misalignment and the use of CSI-RS on this issue.  Plus, if we do not support 480/960 kHz SCS for SSB at all, we will have to specify SSB and CORESET#0 multiplexing pattern with (SSB SCS, CORESET#0 SCS) = (120k, 480k) and (120k, 960k), which may require large specification efforts. Just to support single numerology operation would be much simpler from specification perspective as well as implementation perspective.  Moreover, we are not sure what is a concern to support 480/960kHz SCS for SSB as optional.  We are fine with the 2nd bullet, while we feel sympathy with Intel’s comment on this.  For the 3rd bullet, we are not sure the exact meaning of “for access cases when center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE”. So far we see only two conditions, one is when center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE, and the other is when center frequency and SCS of SSB is NOT explicitly provided to the UE (i.e. for other cases in the 2nd bullet). We assume the 3rd bullet would be related to the discussion on whether to support 240 kHz SCS for SSB for non-initial access cases, so the following modification may be applied in our view: Proposal #1.2-5  * Support 480kHz and 960kHz SSB SCS when center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE * FFS: support one or more of 240, 480, 960 kHz SCS SSB for other cases * FFS: support 240 kHz SCS SSB when center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE |
| Spreadtrum3 | Response to LG:   * For idle mode, the use of 120 kHz SCS for initial access related signals/channels in an initial BWP was already agreed in the last RAN plenary.   [SPRD]: I agree it is the baseline, but the initial BWP with 480/960kHz is not excluded currently as discussed in FL summary Section 2.1.4.   * For connected mode,   + For neighbor cell RRM measurement, *if 480/960kHz SCS CSI-RS based RRM needs the timing of 120kHz SCS SSB, UE should switch to process the 120kHz SCS SSB to get the coarse timing (e.g. find the symbol boundary of the neighbor cell) and then switch back to 480/960kHz BWP to measure CSI-RS. Is this the procedure your referred to?* 🡪 [LG] Correct. That is one of implementation algorithms. However, as mentioned, numerology change will not be frequent. Meanwhile, if tight synchronization can be guaranteed between serving cell and neighbor cell, UE may not need to perform t/f sync procedure based on neighbor cell SSB.   [SPRD]: It may be related to RAN4 discussion. I’m not sure UE can just perform one timing sync based on neighbor cell SSB for the timely CSI-RS based RRM. Maybe in the general UE implementation, UE should perform timing sync for each CSI-RS measurement, since UE cannot assume the measurement object has the constant timing (center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE, but UE has to perform a part of cell search for unknown Cell ID and timing). We think we cannot draw the conclusion about the simplified timing sync you mentioned. Indeed, we share the similar view with Samsung that UE actually perform a part of SSB measurement firstly in case of CSI-RS measurement for neighbor cell. In addition, because CSI-RS validation is based on DCI format (CSS) or resource scheduled by DCI format, we are not sure CSI-RS of the neighbor cell can be validated lack of DCI from neighbor cell.   * + For serving cell RRM measurement, I agree that sometimes CSI-RS can be invalid due to dynamic SFI. However, the point here is aiming at single numerology and CSI-RS based serving cell RRM measurement can be done without numerology change. |
| Ericsson 2 | Response to Samsung on the following:  *One more side note for Ericsson’s comment: We didn’t see LG has a concern on that point but a clarification, and we didn’t see the necessity to separate that out as a special case. The single numerology implementation motivation applies to such case as well.*  Yes, it is a clarification, but an important one. The ANR procedure specified for NR-U still requires the UE to obtain information from the MIB on CORESET0 configuration. While this is not an initial access use case, if 480/960 kHz SSB SCS is supported for this use case, it requires much of the same design work as for initial access. Hence, our position is that we can revisit this use case once there is a decision on whether or not 240/480/960 kHz is supported for initial access. Hence, we still prefer to modify the proposal as follows: Proposal #1.2-5  * Support 480kHz and 960kHz SSB SCS when center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE and CORESET0 and Type0-PDCCH search space are not configured in MIB * FFS: support one or more of 240, 480, 960 kHz SCS SSB for other cases   FFS: support 240 kHz SCS SSB for access cases when center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE |
| Moderator | There has been lots of interesting discussions. ☺  I’ve added P#1.2-6 based on feedback received. Added P1.2-7 based on comments from Ericsson. I didn’t know how to merge 1.2-6 and 1.2-7 together given the comments from different companies. The distinction between two seem very subtle.  To put all the options on the table, I’ve also added P1.2-8. I’ve added some questions that were asked by companies as FFS. However, I must admit that P1.2-8 likely requires more work and might be unstable at the moment.  With this said, this issue was an open issue from WID and should be clarified in order to make progress on other aspects. I encourage companies to provide further feedback, including any suggestion you might have for us to resolve this issue and move us forward. |
| LG Electronics | Considering the extensive discussion among companies, I’m not sure whether we can make a consensus one of proposals. As an another alternative, I tried to capture all options that companies are considering and also capture which aspects should be considered for potential down-selection. The suggestion is as follows:   * For SCS of SSB for 52.6-71 GHz, consider the following options and down-select to one or more options in RAN1#104bis-e.   + Option 1: Do not introduce 240 kHz/480 kHz/960 kHz SSB SCS   + Option 2: Support 240 kHz SSB SCS     - Option 2-1: Support 240 kHz SSB SCS only for initial BWP     - Option 2-2: Support 240 kHz SSB SCS for all cases   + Option 3: Support 480 kHz/960 kHz SSB SCS     - Option 3-1: Support 480 kHz/960 kHz SSB SCS as optional, when center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE and CORESET#0 and Type0-PDCCH search space are not configured in MIB     - Option 3-2: Support 480 kHz/960 kHz SSB SCS for all cases * Further studies are needed at least for the following identified issues for down-selection.   + initial cell search complexity   + timing resolution during initial access, (neighbor cell) RRM measurement, activation of different numerology BWP   + minimization of specification impact (e.g., reuse of legacy SSB pattern, common numerology between SSB and CORESET#0)   + whether/how to enable single numerology operation |
| Mediatek | Our original position is to support only 120 kHz for both initial access and non-initial access cases. However, since the major concern of the most companies is the timing resolution and some other factors, we agree with LG’s view that we can investigate the impact of these issues first. |
| Nokia2 | We share the views on the benefits of single sub-carrier spacing operation. While it would be possible to consider frequency multiplexing different numerologies, SSB transmission with hybrid/analog beam forming architecture would restrict the spatial multiplexing, several slots, thus would negatively impact system operation. Also, providing SIB1 (based on Type0-PDCCH) would result corresponding need to operate with multi numerology with restricted spatial flexibility. Hence the implied overhead is not minor.  In NR, even for a frequency band where multiple scs hypotheses are supported for initial cell selection, in my understanding UE can assume, that intra-frequency neighboring cells would share same numerology. We could consider similar assumption also for for NR operating 52.6 ~ 71 GHz.  Hence we would be supportive #1.2-7 with some modifications (below) and could also consider #1.2-6 (*with same modifications*). Proposal #1.2-7 (modified)  * Support 480kHz and 960kHz SSB SCS when center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE ~~and CORESET0 and Type0-PDCCH search space are not configured in MIB~~   + SCS of the configured BWP(s) in the carrier carrying 480/960 kHz SSB is expected to be the same as the SCS of the SSB.   + Note: support of 480/960kHz SCS for SSB is optional * FFS: support one or more of 240, 480, 960 kHz SCS SSB for other cases   + FFS: support 240 kHz SCS SSB ~~for access cases~~ when center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE ~~and CORESET0 and Type0-PDCCH search space are not configured in MIB~~   + Study the UE initial cell selection search complexity of 480 and 960 kHz (for other cases)   + Study the initial timing resolution based on low SCS (120 kHz) and its impact on the performance of higher SCS data (480/960 kHz)   Hence we would not want to preclude the option of e.g. re-selection case. The separation is what we tried to clarify earlier e.g. see proposal 1.2-3 was to address the complexity point related to initial cell selection i.e. when UE is required to do blind cell search over synchronization raster with multiple numerologies. Thus, when assistance information is assumed to be available (center frequency and SCS of SSB) we should not preclude the case that MIB provides the CORESET#0 and Type0-PDCCH SS configuration. Like said, assuming that UE supports (optional) the 480kHz and/or 960kHz scs for SSB and control/data, it should be possible for the UE to access a cell that operates only with aforementioned numerology, even from IDLE. So we would prefer not to restrict/preclude the case when CORESET#0 and Type0-PDCCH SS configuration are provide by MIB. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | There has been a through discussion about different aspects of supported SSB SCSs so far and we do not see any further detailed discussions can provide consensus; at least in this meeting.  As we discussed in the latest GTW and earlier round of discussions, we do not believe any SCS other than 120 kHz is required during initial access so there is no issue of mixed numerology of SSB/CORESET0 during initial access. Moreover, RRM measurement can be based on 120 kHz SSB (or complimented by) 480/960 kHz CSI-RS that may derive its timing from a 120 kHz SSB of the target cell or the serving cell (if tight timing between cells is available). Finally, if necessary, the timing that is obtained from a SSB SCS in 120 kHz can be further fine-tuned using 960 kHz TRS after initial access. As such, **our preference is Proposal #1.2-8**.  However, we believe that the issue of SSB SCS should be resolved as soon as possible as it is a pre-requisite for other discussions related to initial access. As such, we can compromise and accept to support 480/960 SSB SCS **only** when center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE and CORESET0 and Type0-PDCCH search space are not configured in MIB, so it alleviates the concern of the companies that would like to avoid using 120 kHz SSB in RRM measurement (as a RRM-RS or as a time reference for 960 kHz RRM-CSI-RS) when the UE is operating in a 480/960 kHz BWP. As such, as a way of compromise, we suggest the following:  **Proposal:**   * Support 480kHz and 960kHz SSB SCS only when center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE and CORESET0 and Type0-PDCCH search space are not configured in MIB   + Note: support of 480/960kHz SCS for SSB is optional * FFS: support 240 kHz SCS SSB when center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE and CORESET0 and Type0-PDCCH search space are not configured in MIB   + FFS: support 240 kHz SCS SSB for other cases   If above proposal is not acceptable by other companies, the only way forward that we see is to agree on the proposal by LGE and continue the discussion in the next meeting. |
| Samsung3 | Please find our further response to LG’s comments:   * Optionality of CSI-RS: At least from our perspective, CSI-RS cannot be an optional for a UE supporting 480/960 kHz SCS. CSI-RS for tracking should be supported for the UE, considering BW of CSI-RS (full RB) vs. SSB (20 RBs).   [Samsung] We don’t understand why LG mandates all UE vendors to support CSI-RS as a non-optional feature to support their argument of implementation. Also, SSB can achieve the purpose of tracking, and there are different implementations to achieve this as well (e.g. multiple SSB in frequency domain).  [LG] We do not enforce UE vendors beyond Rel-15. As you may know, CSI-RS at least for tracking, RLM, and beam failure is mandatory feature from Rel-15, which is nothing new. Furthermore, I’m not sure whether multiple SSBs in frequency domain is typical implementation or not.  [Samsung3] Understand, CSI-RS for tracking and RLM are mandatory for Rel-15, and CSI-RS for RRM is optional for Rel-15, but CSI-RS for RLM is optional for Rel-16 NR-U. So the capability for CSI-RS should be further studied for supporting 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz in Rel-17, which includes both licensed and unlicensed bands. It’s not straightforward to conclude a UE capable of supporting 480/960 can support CSI-RS at least for RRM and RLM in Rel-17, and for those Ues there is no way to use CSI-RS to replace SSB.   * Idle mode UE: How can 480/960 kHz SCS (which is optional) be used for paging or broadcast signal/channel?   [Samsung] “Optional” is a UE capability, and only related to the signaling when RRC is set up. Network cannot transmit signal/channel with 480/960 for those Ues without such capability, but why the network cannot transmit signal/channel with 480/960 to the UE supporting such capability, even the network doesn’t know the existence of such UE? This can be achieved by implementation and the market. Back to the question, the SCS of paging can be reconfigured by system information as a general BWP configuration, then of course it can take value of 480/960.  [LG] Once a UE go into idle mode, network typically abandons all RRC configuration for the UE. Moreover, gNB may not know exact location of a specific UE in idle mode. Even though gNB can use 480/960 kHz SCS for paging or broadcast signal/channel, those would be redundant since network is also required to transmit them with 120 kHz SCS.  [Samsung3] As mentioned above multiple times, if one operator chooses to implement in 480 or 960 and there is a consensus from UE to support so by market, why the network cannot use 480 or 960 for broadcast channels.   * Neighbor cell RRM: I agree that SSB based RRM is basic. However, from UE perspective, mixed numerology operation cannot be avoided unless all gNBs in the same frequency operate with the same numerology.   [Samsung] Isn’t it a typical implementation scenario?  [LG] The point is that at least from neighbor cell RRM perspective, single numerology operation may not be assumed considering different capabilities of Ues associated with a neighbor cell.  [Samsung3] At least for single operator scenario, this could be a typical scenario. Again, we are enforcing to use single numerology implementation, and avoid the use of mixed numerology at all. What we are trying to argue is the spec should not enforce the UE to always perform RRM in mixed numerology.   * Resource waste: It is acknowledged that 1 or 2 PRB can be used for guard band but DL/UL ratio of 480/960 kHz would be the same as that of 120 kHz.   [Samsung] If operators have a choice not to waste that 1 or 2 RBs, why they want to do so? Every RB is paid, and it’s expensive! For example, a 32 RB system will have 3 to 6 % resource wasted due to the mixed numerology, for the slots containing SSB.  [LG] True. But the percentage should be re-calculated. Assuming 5 ms duration of SSB every 20 ms, even for 32 RB system, resource waste ratio is only 0.75 % to 1.5 %. Also, for the typical case of 2 GHz (170 RBs) for 960 kHz, the percentage of wasted resource is just 0.14 % to 0.28 %.  [Samsung3] If there is an implementation to make it 0, why not?   * Spec impact: Our main concern is specification impact even though in most cases CSI-RS can replace SSB. As can be seen in other sections, companies seem to have different designs for SSB pattern and we need to define how to configure Type0-PDCCH CSS set for new SCSs, if needed.   [Samsung] We believe our view is clear: CSI-RS can never replace SSB. It’s even not an alternative, but only a supplement. As far as we know, no vendor only relies on CSI-RS in implementation. Different designs from companies are quite normal, but things can converge when we really begin to design it (we used too much time on determining the SCS, and we’d rather use it for detailed design). We are also ok with trying to minimize the spec impact, e.g. supporting fewest SSB and CORESET#0 SCS combination as possible.  [LG] We don’t claim that UE vendor should rely on only CSI-RS, but suggest that 480/960 kHz CSI-RS seems sufficient with the intermittent help of 120/240 kHz SSB.  [Samsung3] Based on the concerns we and many companies proposed, we don’t believe the suggestion is technically solid.  Comments to Ericsson and LG on the CGI reporting issue:  We didn’t the motivation to separate out SSB for CGI reporting from a general SSB for measurement.   * First, CGI reporting is just one configuration of the measurement reporting type, and the indication of SSB for measurement purpose is common. If we support different SCS of SSB for the purpose of CGI reporting, there seems many impact to RAN2 spec, and we should ask RAN2 whether this is a correct direction to go. * Second, CGI reporting is closely associated with SSB based measurement. Actually a pre-step for CGI is to do measurement as specified in 38.300. So at least from current RAN2 specification, all SSB used for measurement could be for CGI reporting, so in this sense, if one is ok 480/960 for measurement, we didn’t see why it’s not acceptable for CGI reporting. * Lastly, it’s true that CGI reporting needs associated CORESET#0, but it’s far from initial cell search, and we didn’t the reason why it relies on the discussion of SSB SCS for initial cell search. If a SCS of SSB can be supported for initial cell search, there is no issue with supporting it for CGI; if a SCS of SSB can be supported for CGI reporting, it doesn’t mean it can be supported for initial cell search. The decision of initial cell search mainly depends on UE complexity, and that’s a separate discussion and not related to CGI reporting at all since the location of SSB is preconfigured.   Finally, we are ok with the update from Nokia. |
| Convida Wireless | We support Proposal #1.2-5. |
| Qualcomm | We are ok with the either Proposal #1.2-6 (prefer this wording) or Proposal #1.2-7 and with Nokia’s modifications.  A small “logical” modification. The sentence below should not be a sub-bullet of the FFS since it is for 120 k SSB SCS. Thus indenting to the left. Proposal #1.2-7 (modified by Nokia and modified by Qualcomm)  * Support 480kHz and 960kHz SSB SCS when center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE ~~and CORESET0 and Type0-PDCCH search space are not configured in MIB~~   + SCS of the configured BWP(s) in the carrier carrying 480/960 kHz SSB is expected to be the same as the SCS of the SSB.   + Note: support of 480/960kHz SCS for SSB is optional * FFS: support one or more of 240, 480, 960 kHz SCS SSB for other cases   + FFS: support 240 kHz SCS SSB ~~for access cases~~ when center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE ~~and CORESET0 and Type0-PDCCH search space are not configured in MIB~~   + Study the UE initial cell selection search complexity of 480 and 960 kHz (for other cases) * Study the initial timing resolution based on low SCS (120 kHz) and its impact on the performance of higher SCS data (480/960 kHz) |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support proposal #1.2-7 and fine with Nokia and Qualcomm’s update. |
| Intel | Among the three proposals, P#1.2-6, P#1.2-7 and P#1.2-8, our preference is Proposal #1.2-6 as it separates the discussion on SSB SCS 480 kHz/960 kHz from other SCS.  Proposal #1.2-8 is not acceptable for us. It completely precludes the single numerology operation which is important for high data rate scenarios we described many times.  We don’t think that the proposal to capture and list all options can progress us anywhere further because the mentioned options are already a part of Proposal #1.2-6. In addition, SCS 480 kHz/960 kHz for SSB is already considered to be optional. Furthermore, we don’t agree that any study is needed on whether to enable single numerology operation. It should be enabled as it is enabled in LTE, LTE-A, NR FR1/FR2.  Regarding Proposal #1.2-6, we don’t agree that the following bullet is specific to the case when SCS 480 kHz/ 960 kHz is used for SSB for initial access.   * + - Study the initial timing resolution based on low SCS (120 kHz) and its impact on the performance of higher SCS data (480/960 kHz)   Moreover, when SSB SCS is 480 kHz/960 kHz there is no timing issues with data/control transmissions of higher SCS (480 kHz/960 kHz). The bullet is generally relevant when lower SCS is used for SSB (e.g., 120 kHz/240 kHz) and higher SCS is used for data/control (e.g., 480 kHz/960 kHz). Therefore, this bullet should be considered at the same level as the main bullets. Based on that, we suggest to slightly modify Proposal #1.2-6 as follows: Proposal #1.2-6 (suggested modification)  * Support 480kHz and 960kHz SSB SCS when center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE and CORESET0 and Type0-PDCCH search space are not configured in MIB   + Note: support of 480/960kHz SCS for SSB is optional * ~~FFS: support one or more of 240, 480, 960 kHz SCS SSB for other cases~~   + FFS: support 480 kHz and/or 960 kHz SSB SCS for other cases     - Study the UE initial search complexity of 480 and 960 kHz (for other cases)     - ~~Study the initial timing resolution based on low SCS (120 kHz) and its impact on the performance of higher SCS data (480/960 kHz)~~   + SCS of the configured BWP(s) in the carrier carrying 480/960 kHz SSB is expected to be the same as the SCS of the SSB. * FFS: support 240 kHz SCS SSB ~~for access cases~~ when center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE and CORESET0 and Type0-PDCCH search space are not configured in MIB   + FFS: support 240 kHz SCS SSB for other cases * Study the initial timing resolution based on low SCS (120 kHz) and its impact on the performance of higher SCS data (480/960 kHz)   Some further thoughts on SCS 480 kHz/960 kHz for SSB. If such SSB is used for non-initial access then there should be Pcells in the network which provide initial synchronization and ignaling about center frequency location and SCS of SSBs with SCS 480 kHz/960 kHz (as well as information about corresponding CORESET0 and Type0-PDCCH). Likely those Pcells would operate with agreed SSB SCS, e.g., 120 kHz. The question is what is SCS used for data/control transmissions by those Pcells? If it’s a high SCS (480 kHz/960 kHz) for data/control then we face the above-mentioned issues with timing misalignment, resource wastage, scheduling complexity and so on, as described by some companies. If the SCS for data/control at Pcells is the same as SSB, i.e., single numerology operation with SCS 120 kHz, then we have a slow primary component carrier (CC) relative to the high data rate secondary CC with SCS 480 kHz/960 kHz. From our perspective, it’s another kind of resource wastage to maintain a whole CC just to provide an initial access. |
| Futurewei | We support #1.2-7 and with Nokia and Qualcomm’s updates. |
| InterDigital | We support proposal #1.2-8 and cannot accept explicit indication of SCS as the motivation is to support single numerology operation. We believe that proposal #1.2-8 is a default option anyway if we can’t achieve comprised solution. |
| Ericsson | The moderator indicated that he was not sure how to merge Proposals #1.2-6 and #1.2-7. While we support #1.2-7, are open to the following merge (using Intel’s suggestion above as a starting point).  To clarify our position, we would like to support 240 kHz in an initial BWP for the initial access use case (i.e., a Pcell). We do not see a strong need for 240 kHz for use cases other than that (e.g., for an Scell, we don’t see a need to mix 240 kHz SSB with 480/960 kHz data/control. So, if it is agreed to support additional SCSs in an initial BWP for initial access, then we want to discuss 240/480/960 on the same level when search complexity is discussed.  Since the below merged proposal is FFS on “for other cases” anyway, we think that the study can narrow down which SSBs are supported for which use cases.  @Samsung: We do not intend to preclude the CGI reporting use case. We think it just muddies the waters at the moment, and prefer to make an initial agreement on the SCSs at least for the case when ARFCN+SCS is provided to the UE and CORESET0/Type0 CSS are not provided by MIB. If we can make progress on that first, then let’s come back to the CGI reporting case.  Proposal (merge of #1.2-6 and #1.2-7):   * Support 480kHz and 960kHz SSB SCS when center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE and CORESET0 and Type0-PDCCH search space are not configured in MIB   + Note: support of 480/960kHz SCS for SSB is optional * ~~FFS: support one or more of 240, 480, 960 kHz SCS SSB for other cases~~   + FFS: support one or more of 240, 480 kHz, ~~and/or~~ 960 kHz SSB SCS for other cases     - Study the UE initial search complexity of 240, 480 and 960 kHz (for other cases)     - ~~Study the initial timing resolution based on low SCS (120 kHz) and its impact on the performance of higher SCS data (480/960 kHz)~~   + SCS of the configured BWP(s) ~~in~~ of the carrier carrying 480/960 kHz SSB is expected to be the same as the SCS of the SSB. * ~~FFS: support 240 kHz SCS SSB for access cases when center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE and CORESET0 and Type0-PDCCH search space are not configured in MIB~~   + ~~FFS: support 240 kHz SCS SSB for other cases~~   Study the initial timing resolution based on low SCS (120 and/or 240 kHz) and its impact on the performance of higher SCS data (480/960 kHz) |
| Moderator | Added Proposal #1.2-9 suggested by LGE  Added Proposal #1.2-10 suggested comprising proposal by Huawei  Added Proposal #1.2-11 based on Nokia and Qualcomm’s suggestion.  Added Proposal #1.2-12 based on Ericsson’s comments. |
| Qualcomm | At this point, it may be better to keep open (as FFS) the 240 kHz SSB SCS support for the case “*when center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE*”. It may be early to preclude that as suggested by Proposal #1.2-12.  Hence, we support Proposal #1.2-11.  We also agree to study 240 kHz for the initial timing resolution. Proposal #1.2-11 (modified by Nokia and modified by Qualcomm)  * Support 480kHz and 960kHz SSB SCS when center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE ~~and CORESET0 and Type0-PDCCH search space are not configured in MIB~~   + SCS of the configured BWP(s) in the carrier carrying 480/960 kHz SSB is expected to be the same as the SCS of the SSB.   + Note: support of 480/960kHz SCS for SSB is optional * FFS: support one or more of 240, 480, 960 kHz SCS SSB for other cases   + FFS: support 240 kHz SCS SSB ~~for access cases~~ when center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE ~~and CORESET0 and Type0-PDCCH search space are not configured in MIB~~   + Study the UE initial cell selection search complexity of 480 and 960 kHz (for other cases)   Study the initial timing resolution based on low SCS (120/240 kHz) and its impact on the performance of higher SCS data (480/960 kHz) |

**Moderator Summary of Discussions #3**

Yet no consensus on proposals so far (8 different attempts were tried so far). While some companies mentioned they would be willing to comprise to specific proposals, further discussion on the comprise proposal will be needed (due to lack of time for discussion on the comprise proposals). Moderator suggest discussing further based on Proposal #1.2-9, #1.2-10, #1.2-11, and #1.2-12. Among the three #1.2-11 (or #1.2-12) seems to have the largest support, but there are multiple companies who oppose this.

**Discussions #4**

Please provide further comments using Proposal #1.2-9, #1.2-10, #1.2-11, and #1.2-12 for discussion. Moderator has colored the difference between 1.2-11 and 1.2-12.

##### Proposal #1.2-9

* For SCS of SSB for 52.6-71 GHz, consider the following options and down-select to one or more options in RAN1#104bis-e.
  + Option 1: Do not introduce 240 kHz/480 kHz/960 kHz SSB SCS
  + Option 2: Support 240 kHz SSB SCS
    - Option 2-1: Support 240 kHz SSB SCS only for initial BWP
    - Option 2-2: Support 240 kHz SSB SCS for all cases
  + Option 3: Support 480 kHz/960 kHz SSB SCS
    - Option 3-1: Support 480 kHz/960 kHz SSB SCS as optional, when center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE and CORESET#0 and Type0-PDCCH search space are not configured in MIB
    - Option 3-2: Support 480 kHz/960 kHz SSB SCS for all cases
* Further studies are needed at least for the following identified issues for down-selection.
  + initial cell search complexity
  + timing resolution during initial access, (neighbor cell) RRM measurement, activation of different numerology BWP
  + minimization of specification impact (e.g., reuse of legacy SSB pattern, common numerology between SSB and CORESET#0)
  + whether/how to enable single numerology operation

##### Proposal #1.2-10

* Support 480kHz and 960kHz SSB SCS only when center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE and CORESET0 and Type0-PDCCH search space are not configured in MIB
  + Note: support of 480/960kHz SCS for SSB is optional
* FFS: support 240 kHz SCS SSB when center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE and CORESET0 and Type0-PDCCH search space are not configured in MIB
  + FFS: support 240 kHz SCS SSB for other cases

##### Proposal #1.2-11 (cleaned up – added 240kHz comment from Qualcomm)

* Support 480kHz and 960kHz SSB SCS when center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE
  + SCS of the configured BWP(s) in the carrier carrying 480/960 kHz SSB is expected to be the same as the SCS of the SSB.
  + Note: support of 480/960kHz SCS for SSB is optional
* FFS: support one or more of 240, 480, 960 kHz SCS SSB for other cases
  + FFS: support 240 kHz SCS SSB when center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE
  + Study the UE initial cell selection search complexity of 480 and 960 kHz (for other cases)
* Study the initial timing resolution based on low SCS (120 and/or 240 kHz) and its impact on the performance of higher SCS data (480/960 kHz)

##### Proposal #1.2-12 (cleaned up)

* Support 480kHz and 960kHz SSB SCS when center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE and CORESET0 and Type0-PDCCH search space are not configured in MIB
  + SCS of the configured BWP(s) of the carrier carrying 480/960 kHz SSB is expected to be the same as the SCS of the SSB.
  + Note: support of 480/960kHz SCS for SSB is optional
* FFS: support one or more of 240, 480 kHz, 960 kHz SSB SCS for other cases
  + Study the UE initial search complexity of 240, 480 and 960 kHz (for other cases)
* Study the initial timing resolution based on low SCS (120 and/or 240 kHz) and its impact on the performance of higher SCS data (480/960 kHz)

##### Proposal #1.2-13 (merge of 1.2-11 and 1.2-12 based on comments)

* Support 480kHz and 960kHz SSB SCS when center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE and CORESET0 and Type0-PDCCH search space are not configured in MIB
  + SCS of the configured BWP(s) of the carrier carrying 480/960 kHz SSB is expected to be the same as the SCS of the SSB.
  + Note: support of 480/960kHz SCS for SSB is optional
* FFS: support one or more of 240, 480 kHz, 960 kHz SSB SCS for other cases
  + FFS: support 240 kHz SCS SSB when center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE and CORESET0 and Type0-PDCCH search space are not configured in MIB
  + Study the UE initial search complexity of 240, 480 and 960 kHz (for other cases)
* Study the initial timing resolution based on low SCS (120 and/or 240 kHz) and its impact on the performance of higher SCS data (480/960 kHz)

##### Proposal #1.2-14 (suggested compromise from Huawei)

* Support 480kHz and 960kHz SSB SCS only when center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE and CORESET0 and Type0-PDCCH search space are not configured in MIB
  + SCS of the configured BWP(s) in the carrier carrying 480/960 kHz SSB is expected to be the same as the SCS of the SSB
  + Note: support of 480/960kHz SCS for SSB is optional

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Discussions/Comments** |
| Qualcomm | Fine with Proposal #1.2-11  At this point, it may be better to keep open (as FFS) the 240 kHz SSB SCS support for the case “*when center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE*”. It may be early to preclude that as suggested by Proposal #1.2-12. |
| Samsung | We are fine with Proposal #1.2-11.  We may need clarification on the technical concern on supporting 480/960 kHz SCS for SSB for CGI reporting (i.e., adding the restriction of “CORESET0 and Type0-PDCCH search space are not configured in MIB”). If 480/960 can be supported for SSB for measurement purpose, what’s the technical issue with supporting it for CGI reporting, and if not supporting such SCS for SSB for CGI reporting, how CGI collision issue can be handled? |
| DOCOMO | We support Proposal #1.2-11.   * Proposal #1.2-9 wouldn’t be acceptable for us since it should be decided if 480/960 kHz SCS are supported or not at least when center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE in this meeting. We assume no additional information even if we postpone the decision for non-initial access case. * Proposal #1.2-10 wouldn’t be preferred since we believe enabling single numerology operation would reduce the amount of specification effort e.g. to support SSB and CORESET#0 multiplexing with different numerology. * Proposal #1.2-12 wouldn’t also be preferred since we think even in non-initial access case, it would be necessary to consider SSB-CORESET#0 multiplexing for ANR. |
| LG Electronics | We cannot accept Proposals #1.2-11 and #1.2-12.  Now Qualcomm, Samsung, and NTT DOCOMO propose to support MIB configuring CORESET#0 and Type0-PDCCH CSS set, at least for the purpose of ANR. In that case, from RAN1 specification perspective, there is no difference between SSB for initial access and SSB for non-initial access case, which is our main concern for huge specification impact. Here are several questions to proponents supporting Proposal #1.2-11.   * If we have to introduce 480/960 kHz MIB signaling to provide CORESET#0 and Type0-PDCCH CSS set for ANR, it seems to be an optimization to us. What is the problem if it is not supported? If network needs to avoid PCI collision, it can provide SIB1 information in 120 kHz MIB. Even for legacy network, if SSB does not provide SIB1, UE can report “no SIB1” to the network for CGI reporting. * In the NOTE under the main bullet, it is explicitly stated that support of 480/960kHz SCS for SSB is optional. Even with this NOTE, do you think 480/960 kHz SCS SSB can be used for initial access case? * With Proposal #1.2-11, is it possible for a UE to be provided with 480/960 kHz SCS SSB for a BWP (other than initial BWP) in PCell? |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We can support Proposal #1.2-10.  As a second choice and to reach a compromise and finalize this discussion, we can also accept with only the main bullet of Proposal #1.2-11 as follows:  **Proposal:**   * Support 480kHz and 960kHz SSB SCS only when center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE   + SCS of the configured BWP(s) in the carrier carrying 480/960 kHz SSB is expected to be the same as the SCS of the SSB.   + Note: support of 480/960kHz SCS for SSB is optional |
| Ericsson | We think Proposals #1.2-11 and #1.2-12 should be aligned with only one point of difference between them. This alignment resolves the following issue about #1.2-12 that Qualcomm raises above:  At this point, it may be better to keep open (as FFS) the 240 kHz SSB SCS support for the case “*when center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE*”. It may be early to preclude that as suggested by Proposal #1.2-12.  We also think that 240 kHz was unintentionally missing from #1.2-11.  The modifications to the two proposals to make them align are shown in red. Then, the only remaining difference between the proposals is highlighted in yellow. Proposal #1.2-11a  * Support 480kHz and 960kHz SSB SCS when center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE   + SCS of the configured BWP(s) in the carrier carrying 480/960 kHz SSB is expected to be the same as the SCS of the SSB.   + Note: support of 480/960kHz SCS for SSB is optional * FFS: support one or more of 240, 480, 960 kHz SCS SSB for other cases   + FFS: support 240 kHz SCS SSB when center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE   + Study the UE initial cell selection search complexity of 240, 480 and 960 kHz (for other cases) * Study the initial timing resolution based on low SCS (120 and/or 240 kHz) and its impact on the performance of higher SCS data (480/960 kHz)  Proposal #1.2-12a  * Support 480kHz and 960kHz SSB SCS when center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE and CORESET0 and Type0-PDCCH search space are not configured in MIB   + SCS of the configured BWP(s) of the carrier carrying 480/960 kHz SSB is expected to be the same as the SCS of the SSB.   + Note: support of 480/960kHz SCS for SSB is optional * FFS: support one or more of 240, 480 kHz, 960 kHz SSB SCS for other cases   + FFS: support 240 kHz SCS SSB when center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE and Type0-PDCCH search space are not configured in MIB   + Study the UE initial search complexity of 240, 480 and 960 kHz (for other cases) * Study the initial timing resolution based on low SCS (120 and/or 240 kHz) and its impact on the performance of higher SCS data (480/960 kHz)   In summary, we support the updated Proposal #1.2-12a shown here. We do not mean to preclude the ANR use case, but we think that that can be discussed later once we have a basic agreement on supported numerologies as above. This use case would fall under the FFS in the 2nd bullet, i.e., "for other cases" |
| Nokia | As commented by Samsung, we would like to have better understanding of the reason for excluding the case of ‘cell defining SSB’ where MIB provides CORESET#0 and Type0-PDCCH CSS. In my understanding this (MIB not provides CORESET#0 and Type0-PDCCH CSS) would preclude both re-selection and PScell operation as well.  In terms of specification effort, we do understand that defining the UE procedure for monitoring Type0-PDCCH CSS sets would require some effort, but we think that this would be overweighed by the benefit of supporting more diverse deployments.  Hence we would prefer to adopt #1.2-11. |
| Intel | For the sake of progress, we can accept Proposal #1.2-11.  We also would like to share some further thoughts on single numerology operation.  One of the typical use cases of bands from 52.6 GHz up to 71 GHz, is to provide extremely high throughput. This can be enabled by two things: 1) utilization of very large bandwidths and 2) very fast signal processing at the same time. In NR extension up to 71 GHz, the first enabler is realized by applying SCS 480 kHz/960 kHz for data transmissions. Such high SCS is a must-have which absence makes little reason to utilize frequencies from 52.6 GHz up to 71 GHz (recalling difficulties with signal propagation, necessity of highly directive beams and sophisticated beam management, issues with unlicensed operation, etc.). The second enabler assumes a simple and efficient implementation of transceiver devices which implies, as should not be difficult to understand, the single numerology operation. And there is no work around solution to make these two enablers work simultaneously. However, if only SCS 120 kHz (or 240 kHz) is used for SSB, the network is enforced by the specifications to always use mixed numerology to utilize large bandwidths with SCS 480 kHz/960 kHz which is inefficient as we and other companies claimed many times. This kind of operation is inacceptable for us.  So far, NR has never imposed such strict restriction on the network side. Moreover, the single numerology operation has been accepted in 3GPP since LTE Rel-8 while the mixed numerology has been accepted for network operation only recently when NR came and only as an option. Now for NR extension up to 71 GHz, some companies would like to go even further and restrict even optional operation with single numerology and SCS 480 kHz/960 kHz. This thinking is strange to us and cannot be agreed.  We acknowledge that there is some specification impact of supporting SSB SCS 480 kHz/960 kHz. However, we don’t agree that this impact is huge as we’ve already agreed not to redesign SSB itself or adopt new PSS/SSS sequences and so on. Actually, the impact is mostly limited to new SSB patterns, CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH multiplexing and signalling. Other than the modest specification impact, *there is no technical issues of supporting SCS 480 kHz/960 kHz for SSB*. At the same time, there are multiple technical issues of mixed numerology operation with SSB SCS 120 kHz and SCS 480 kHz/960 kHz for data/control, e.g., timing misalignment, RRM measurements, etc.  Finally, we could not understand the motivation of Huawei to prohibit SCS 480 kHz/960 kHz for SSB for initial access at this stage. If some are willing to support SCS 480 kHz/960 kHz for SSB for non-initial access only (i.e., only when center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE), like Huawei, then they should accept the corresponding specification impact in RAN1. However, further support of SCS 480 kHz/960 kHz for SSB for initial access will not impact RAN1 specifications a lot as most of the work should be completed. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are fine with Proposal #1.2-11. |
| Samsung | Response to LG:  Now Qualcomm, Samsung, and NTT DOCOMO propose to support MIB configuring CORESET#0 and Type0-PDCCH CSS set, at least for the purpose of ANR. In that case, from RAN1 specification perspective, there is no difference between SSB for initial access and SSB for non-initial access case, which is our main concern for huge specification impact. Here are several questions to proponents supporting Proposal #1.2-11.  [Samsung] For the concern of RAN1 specification impact, yes, the amount of text in the specification is the same, but the amount of work for design is quite different. Actually the key specification impact is the CORESET#0 configuration table, and the key design aspects for that table is the RB offset for Pattern 1. For initial access, case, the design of the RB offset is subject to the design of sync raster and channel bandwidth; but for non-initial access case, the design doesn’t need to consider those aspects at all, which means any RB offset can work. So if we finally supporting 480/960 for initial access case, there is no extra work needed since the design can directly reused for non-initial access case; if we finally don’t support 480/960 for initial access case, then the design can be quite simple with no need to consider sync raster issue. In this sense, we don’t think the amount of work is “huge” at all.   * If we have to introduce 480/960 kHz MIB signaling to provide CORESET#0 and Type0-PDCCH CSS set for ANR, it seems to be an optimization to us. What is the problem if it is not supported? If network needs to avoid PCI collision, it can provide SIB1 information in 120 kHz MIB. Even for legacy network, if SSB does not provide SIB1, UE can report “no SIB1” to the network for CGI reporting.   [Samsung] Let us try to explain the whole procedure of ANR as described in 38.300 (figure copied below). If we use a 480/960 SSB for a regular RRM measurement (which is supported by Proposal #1.2-12), which is step 1 in the figure, and if Cell A finds the need to ask the UE to report CGI (for whatever reason), Cell A will configure the report type to be CGI-reporting (please note there is no separate configuration of the measurement object itself), which is step 2 in the figure. If the UE cannot read MIB to further get the CGI in RMSI, step 2b cannot be performed, and the network cannot switch to another SSB with 120 kHz for this case to report the CGI since the SSB with 120 kHz is another cell. This is the reason we mentioned CGI reporting is closely tied with RRM measurement, and if we don’t support CGI reporting for 480/960 SSB, it’s equivalent to not supporting 480/960 SSB for neighboring cell measurement at all (without the functionality of avoid CGI collision, why a network wants to implement a 480/960 SSB?). The combining with the comment from Nokia, we didn’t find any useful application scenario at all from Proposal #1.2-12. Hopefully it clarifies.     * In the NOTE under the main bullet, it is explicitly stated that support of 480/960kHz SCS for SSB is optional. Even with this NOTE, do you think 480/960 kHz SCS SSB can be used for initial access case?   [Samsung] We believe this question has been clarified many times in the RAN plenary and in this RAN1 meeting. We don’t bother to repeat… 480/960 SCS SSB is optional, only means a UE will indicate its capability on whether to support it when RRC is connected. There is no harm for a network to try to implement a standalone carrier to serve UEs only with such capability, which can be totally possible by implementation and choice of market.   * With Proposal #1.2-11, is it possible for a UE to be provided with 480/960 kHz SCS SSB for a BWP (other than initial BWP) in PCell?   [Samsung] Short answer is Yes. Reasoning is explained in the above comment. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | **To Intel:** As we discussed in our t-doc, in GTW, and in our earlier inputs to Discussion#1 and Discussion#2 in great lengths, we do not believe any SSB SCS other than 120 kHz is required for an efficient operation in 60 GHz (please revisit our entries in Discussion#1 and Discussion#2 for the details). Specification impact of 480/960 kHz is only one the concerns and even not the most important one.  Being willing to support #1.2-10 or the modified version of #1.2-11 (as proposed above) is mainly motivated by trying to reach an agreement about this important issue and move on. Other than that, in our view, still #1.2-10 or the modified version of #1.2-11 have no significant technical advantage. If we agree on #1.2-10 or the modified version of #1.2-11 (as proposed above), the concern of the companies who would like to use only the same SCS for SSB for measurements and data (480/960 kHz) after initial access is alleviated. We cannot agree with the whole #1.2-11, as we do not believe that using SSB with 480/960 kHz for initial access has any merit and we cannot compromise about it.  We believe that the use of 480/960 kHz for initial access only results in additional blind search complexity, larger required UE buffer and the need for higher sampling rate during initial access without resulting in a faster initial access procedure, lower SSB coverage, and constraints on the minimum supported BW and the Multiplexing patterns with CORESET#0. Also, we believe initial access operations should entirely performed on 120 kHz to maintain the coverage and since there is no high MCS or extremely high data rate requirement during initial access. Moreover, since Initial BWP should be in 120 kHz SCS, there is no timing accuracy for using 120 kHz SSB at least during initial access (CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH monitoring, RMSI detection, and PRACH procedure) [Although we do not believe that 120 kHz SSB timing accuracy is not enough even for 960 kHz SSB operation].  As such, we cannot agree with the FFS part of #1.2-11. If our motivation to propose the modified version #1.2-11 (without FFS part) is still not understandable, we are OK to **support only #1.2-10** and take back our further compromise made in the modified version #1.2-11 proposed again below:  **Proposal:**   * Support 480kHz and 960kHz SSB SCS only when center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE   + SCS of the configured BWP(s) in the carrier carrying 480/960 kHz SSB is expected to be the same as the SCS of the SSB.   + Note: support of 480/960kHz SCS for SSB is optional   Finally, we would like to raise our concern about the following comparison that Intel made about single numerology in LTE and what is being proposed by Intel for 60 gHz: “*single numerology operation has been accepted in 3GPP since LTE Rel-8 while the mixed numerology has been accepted for network operation only recently when NR came and only as an option.*” In LTE, there was only one numerology available which means that there was no chance of market fragmentation. What is proposed by Intel here is to run the whole operations entirely on 960 kHz or 480 kHz. This simply means that the UEs that do not support 480/960 kHz cannot camp on such network (480/960 kHz are not mandatory for 60 gHz operation). This simply means that these UEs are excluded from such network and this means fragmentation. Fragmentation directly results in higher cost for both network and UE sides which actually goes against the motivation of using a single numerology network that is proposed by Intel. |
| CATT | We only support Proposal#1.2-11. We suggest adding “channel tracking” in the following sentence in Proposal#1.2-11  Study the initial timing resolution and channel tracking based on low SCS (120 and/or 240 kHz) and its impact on the performance of higher SCS data (480/960 kHz) |
| Ericsson | I would like to **responding to Samsung's comments** about the CGI reporting use case (for ANR) which requires MIB to indicate CORESET0 and Type0-PDCCH monitoring configuration.  The solution introduced for shared spectrum in Rel-16 is based on that there is a single sync raster point defined in each channel. If there is more than one sync raster point, the solution doesn't work. It was discussed during Rel-16 on whether or not this was a future proof solution, and clearly it is not. The Rel-16 solution requires the UE to read the SSB-CORESET0 offset from MIB and use that in combination with knowledge of the single sync raster position in order to determine the position of CORSET0.  So, given that this solution will not work when there is more than a single sync raster point per channel, it is too early to agree that this use case should be automatically supported for 480/960 kHz SSB. Further discussion will be required once the channel and sync raster design is known.  Samsung mentions the following:  [Samsung] For the concern of RAN1 specification impact, yes, the amount of text in the specification is the same, but the amount of work for design is quite different. Actually the key specification impact is the CORESET#0 configuration table, and the key design aspects for that table is the RB offset for Pattern 1. For initial access, case, the design of the RB offset is subject to the design of sync raster and channel bandwidth; but for non-initial access case, the design doesn’t need to consider those aspects at all, which means any RB offset can work.    For the CGI reporting (ANR) use use, while it is true that any RB offset can work, there needs to be a procedure for indicating/informing the UE on the RB offset. As mentioned above, the current Rel-16 procedure will not work, and some other solution is needed. One simple approach is for the gNB to explicitly indicate the RB offset or ARFCN of CORESET0 in the *ReportConfigNR*, in much the same way as the SSB center frequency is indicated in the measurement object. But this will require some discussion.  Setting the ANR use case aside for a moment, even though "any RB offset can work," **is Samsung suggesting** that the existing FR2 tables in 38.213 can be used "as is" for the 52.6 – 71 GHz band if only non-initial access use cases are supported?  In summary, we have the following concerns about Proposal #1.2-11 (or Proposal #1.2-11a)   * The ANR use case is not automatically inherited if we agree to Proposal #1.2-11 (or Proposal #1.2-11a). * Further study is needed on CORESET0 indication   This is the reason we think further study is needed and suggest Proposal #1.2-12a.  **Question to Nokia**. I am still confused about the "cell re-selection" use case. Can you please clarify? I'm guessing you do not mean cell re-selection in IDLE mode, correct, because then the UE needs to search for SSB. If this is not what you mean, then what procedure do you mean for cell re-selection in CONNECTED mode? Are you referring to intra or inter-frequency handover? |
| Samsung2 | Responses to Huawei’s comments:   * Please check our comment on the concern with adding “CORESET0 and Type0-PDCCH search space are not configured in MIB”. Basically the system cannot work with such limitation. Agreeing with such restriction is equivalent to not supporting 480/960 for neighboring cell measurement at all. * Regarding the comments for the issues with supporting 480/960 for initial access, we generally agree with the increase of blind detection number and larger UE buffer (whether these two can be called “issues” can be further justified), but not agree with the remaining.   + Whether the coverage of SSB is an issue depending on the intended development scenario. If the scenario itself doesn’t require high coverage (e.g. indoor), why we need to implement a system with SSB coverage much larger than data. We agree with the observation that SSB coverage is lower, but it may not be an issue with SSB using 480/960 kHz SCS.   + There is no constraint on determining the minimum channel bandwidth when using larger SCS for SSB. The current agreed candidate values for minimum channel bandwidth all include the SSB bandwidth.   + There is no impact of supporting multiplexing Pattern 2/3 when using larger SCS for SSB. Supporting Pattern 2/3 doesn’t require to be within minimum channel bandwidth, so we didn’t see any relationship of this argument.   Response to Ericsson:  We believe you misunderstand our comments. We are not trying to emphasize whether Rel-16 approach can be applicable to CGI reporting for 480/960 kHz, and we are talking about if the CGI reporting feature is not supported for 480/960 kHz and only supporting it for neighboring cell measurement, RAN2 spec will break. If Ericsson has alternative solutions for supporting such feature in RAN1 spec, we are open to discuss.  Actually RAN1 supported two ways for supporting ANR: Rel-15 legacy behavior (applicable to one band with multiple sync rasters) and Rel-16 NR-U enhancement (applicable to one band with single sync raster). At least for now, we don’t have much concern on why neither of them can work for Rel-17 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz, but if Ericsson has such concern, we are open to discuss, but this should not be the reason for not supporting ANR.  To be short, we have strong concern on not supporting ANR feature for 480/960 kHz SCS, but we are open to enhancement in RAN1 solution on how to support it if issue is observed. Hopefully this clarifies.  Please check whether the following modification addressing Ericsson’s concern: Proposal #1.2-11 (revised by Samsung)  * Support 480kHz and 960kHz SSB SCS when center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE   + SCS of the configured BWP(s) in the carrier carrying 480/960 kHz SSB is expected to be the same as the SCS of the SSB.   + Note: support of 480/960kHz SCS for SSB is optional   + FFS: how to indicate CORESET#0 and SSB frequency offset for ANR purpose * FFS: support one or more of 240, 480, 960 kHz SCS SSB for other cases   + FFS: support 240 kHz SCS SSB when center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE   + Study the UE initial cell selection search complexity of 480 and 960 kHz (for other cases) * Study the initial timing resolution based on low SCS (120 and/or 240 kHz) and its impact on the performance of higher SCS data (480/960 kHz) |
| Futurewei | We support Proposal #1.2-12a, we share the same concerns as Ericsson. ANR discussion may continue after a decision on the SCS support for initial access. |
| Intel | Here we would like to respond to Huawei regarding their concerns about market fragmentation. We were unable to understand the logic of these concerns because enablement of additional features doesn’t necessarily result in market fragmentation, especially if the features are tailored to enable new use cases or improve specific use cases.  Our position is that the optional support of SSB SCS 480 kHz/960 kHz does not fragment the market but enable various appealing use cases instead. It can address specific scenarios with fully managed network deployments (both gNBs and UEs). Common example is private networks. In such networks, if gNB uses SCS 480 kHz/960 kHz for SSB then it’s because it knows there are managed UEs that are capable to support this SSB and it does not care about other non-managed UEs that support only SCS 120 kHz. Moreover, due to mandatory support of SCS 120 kHz for NR extension from 52.6 GHz up to 71 GHz, the UEs from private networks with SCS 480 kHz/960 kHz are also able to operate in public networks with SCS 120 kHz.  Finally, the current market of 5G private networks is rapidly growing so far and is expected to grow even further. So, inability to provide a simple, fast, and efficient solution for private networks in bands from 52.6 GHz up to 71 GHz with single numerology operation would make NR less appealing.  It is very clear that implementation support for mixed numerology is far more complex than support of single numerology operation, which could be different to the work required for standards specification. However, standards should do the work needed to support use cases and deployments, and it should not be the driving factor to not enable specific use cases and deployments. |
| Moderator | Added Proposal #1.2-13 and 1.2-14 based on comments received. |
| Nokia2 | As response to Ericsson question; Thank you for the question. This is of course up for a debate as we haven’t really detailed the differences, but from SSB search perspective I don’t see much difference between e.g. inter-frequency handover (known/unknown cell) and inter-frequency re-selection. In both cases, UE would need to search for the SSB based on provided assistance information; ARFCN-ValueNR, SubcarrierSpacing and SSB-MTC. For hand-over to known cell, UE is assumed to have sent valid measurement report (of cell/SSB) within 5s, implying that there has been a measurement configured, or in case of unknown cell UE would need carry out the cell search after HO triggering.  Regarding the NSA case, in my understanding there is a requirement that PCell and PSCell would need to be associated to ‘CD-SSB’, but this, after quickly checking I did not find confirmation so I’m not 100% sure anymore.  Apologizes if I misunderstood the question or some other aspect. |
| Samsung | We are not fine with Proposal #1.2-13 or 1.2-14, since the separation of use case of “CORESET0 and Type0-PDCCH search space configured in MIB” makes the whole bullet useless. The first bullet basically says 480 and 960 kHz can be supported for SSB for neighboring cell RRM measurement, but cannot use such SSB for cell re-selection, handover, or ANR purpose, then what’s the point to support it for RRM only? The separation of such functionality can lead to two possibilities: 1) no one use 480 or 960 kHz SCS SSB; 2) much spec impact in RAN2 to try to support the excluded functionality using mixed numerology, and neither of them is acceptable to us.  Also we would like to clarify whether companies have concern with supporting the feature of such functionality or have concern with the current RAN1 methodology to support such functionality. We didn’t any issue with using Rel-15 and/or Rel-16 methodology to support such functionality, but if there is concern raised, we are ok to leave such methodology only having RAN1 impact as FFS, instead of leaving such feature as FFS.  We proposed a revised proposal based on 1.2-11 and would like to check whether it resolves the concerns. Proposal #1.2-11 (revised by Samsung)  * Support 480kHz and 960kHz SSB SCS when center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE   + SCS of the configured BWP(s) in the carrier carrying 480/960 kHz SSB is expected to be the same as the SCS of the SSB.   + Note: support of 480/960kHz SCS for SSB is optional   + FFS: how to indicate CORESET#0 and SSB frequency offset for ANR purpose * FFS: support one or more of 240, 480, 960 kHz SCS SSB for other cases   + FFS: support 240 kHz SCS SSB when center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE   + Study the UE initial cell selection search complexity of 480 and 960 kHz (for other cases) * Study the initial timing resolution based on low SCS (120 and/or 240 kHz) and its impact on the performance of higher SCS data (480/960 kHz) |

**Moderator Summary of Discussions #4**

From the additional discussions, Proposal #1.2-9 suggested by LGE has not received much traction and main discussion seems to be evolved around Proposal #1.2-11 and some variants of the Proposal #1.2-11.

The following is a quick summary of discussion so far:

* At least 2 companies do not see a need to support 480/960 kHz for SSB as system can operate with 120kHz.
  + One of the companies is willing to compromise to support only if support of 480/960 SSB does not support indication of CORESET0 and Type0-PDCCH configuration.
  + One of the companies claimed single numerology operation is feasible even without support of 480/960 SSB and therefore support of 480/906 is completely not needed. Note that this claim is being deputed.
* Large number of the companies seems to support 480/960 kHz for SSB at least for the cases CORESET0 and Type0-PDCCH configuration is not needed in MIB.
  + Further debates among companies on whether it is possible to completely avoid indication of CORESET0 and Type0-PDCCH configuration in MIB, if we consider CGI reporting and ANR, which is operators will likely wish to support for unlicensed bands. Therefore from moderator’s perspective, it might be reasonable to consider this aspect (support of SSB with CORESET0 & Type0-PDCCH CSS configuration in MIB) for further study.
* There were additional discussion about market fragmentation and optionality of the features, need to enable single numerology operation (at least for managed networks), additional cell search complexity, whether cell search complexity is important for optional features, concerns of timing acquisition for 480/960 kHz based on 120kHz SSB, potential methods that can help with timing, and others. Moderator thinks the additional discussion should have help companies understand each other position better.

Moderator suggest further discussion based on the Proposal #1.2-13 and #1.2-14 which contain all the components of the discussion. If no agreement can be made, the discussion may need to take place in the next Plenary (before the next RAN1 meeting) to avoid further delay in progress of the WI.

**Discussions #5**

Please provide further comments using Proposal #1.2-13 and #1.2-14 as basis for further discussion.

##### Proposal #1.2-13

* Support 480kHz and 960kHz SSB SCS when center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE and CORESET0 and Type0-PDCCH search space are not configured in MIB
  + SCS of the configured BWP(s) of the carrier carrying 480/960 kHz SSB is expected to be the same as the SCS of the SSB.
  + Note: support of 480/960kHz SCS for SSB is optional
* FFS: support one or more of 240, 480 kHz, 960 kHz SSB SCS for other cases
  + FFS: support 240 kHz SCS SSB when center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE and CORESET0 and Type0-PDCCH search space are not configured in MIB
  + Study the UE initial search complexity of 240, 480 and 960 kHz (for other cases)
* Study the initial timing resolution based on low SCS (120 and/or 240 kHz) and its impact on the performance of higher SCS data (480/960 kHz)

##### Proposal #1.2-14

* Support 480kHz and 960kHz SSB SCS only when center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE and CORESET0 and Type0-PDCCH search space are not configured in MIB
  + SCS of the configured BWP(s) in the carrier carrying 480/960 kHz SSB is expected to be the same as the SCS of the SSB
  + Note: support of 480/960kHz SCS for SSB is optional

##### Proposal #1.2-15 (update from Samsung)

* Support 480kHz and 960kHz SSB SCS when center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE and the UE is not required to decode SIB1 ~~CORESET0 and Type0-PDCCH search space are not configured in MIB~~
  + FFS: whether SCS of the configured BWP(s) of the carrier carrying 480/960 kHz SSB is expected to be the same as the SCS of the SSB.
  + Note: support of 480/960kHz SCS for SSB is optional
* FFS: support 240 kHz SCS SSB when center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE and the UE is not required to decode SIB1 ~~CORESET0 and Type0-PDCCH search space are not configured in MIB~~
* FFS: support one or more of 240, 480 kHz, 960 kHz SSB SCS for other cases
  + Study the UE initial search complexity of 240, 480 and 960 kHz (for other cases)
* Study the initial timing resolution based on low SCS (120 and/or 240 kHz) and its impact on the performance of higher SCS data (480/960 kHz)

##### Proposal #1.2-16 (update from Huawei)

* Support 480kHz and 960kHz SSB SCS only when center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE and CORESET0 and Type0-PDCCH search space are not configured in MIB
  + ~~SCS of the configured BWP(s) in the carrier carrying 480/960 kHz SSB is expected to be the same as the SCS of the SSB~~
  + Note: support of 480/960kHz SCS for SSB is optional

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Discussions/Comments** |
| Ericsson  (copy of portion of comments from discussion #4) | **Question to Nokia**. I am still confused about the "cell re-selection" use case. Can you please clarify? I'm guessing you do not mean cell re-selection in IDLE mode, correct, because then the UE needs to search for SSB. If this is not what you mean, then what procedure do you mean for cell re-selection in CONNECTED mode? Are you referring to intra or inter-frequency handover? |
| Nokia | This is of course up for a debate as we haven’t really detailed the differences, but from SSB search perspective I don’t see much difference between e.g. inter-frequency handover (known/unknown cell) and inter-frequency re-selection.  In both cases, UE would need to search for the SSB based on provided assistance information; ARFCN-ValueNR, SubcarrierSpacing and SSB-MTC. For handover to known cell, UE is assumed to have sent valid measurement report (of cell/SSB) within 5s, implying that there has been a measurement configured, or in case of unknown cell UE would need carry out the cell search after HO triggering.  Regarding the NSA case, in my understanding there is a requirement that (PCell and) PSCell would need to be associated to ‘cell-defining SSB’, but this, after quickly checking I did not find confirmation so I’m not 100% sure anymore. |
| Samsung | We are not fine with Proposal #1.2-13 or 1.2-14, since the separation of use case of “CORESET0 and Type0-PDCCH search space configured in MIB” makes the whole bullet useless. The first bullet basically says 480 and 960 kHz can be supported for SSB for neighboring cell RRM measurement, but cannot use such SSB for cell re-selection, handover, or ANR purpose, then what’s the point to support it for RRM only? The separation of such functionality can lead to two possibilities: 1) no one use 480 or 960 kHz SCS SSB; 2) much spec impact in RAN2 to try to support the excluded functionality using mixed numerology, and neither of them is acceptable to us.  Also we would like to clarify whether companies have concern with supporting the feature of such functionality or have concern with the current RAN1 methodology to support such functionality. We didn’t any issue with using Rel-15 and/or Rel-16 methodology to support such functionality, but if there is concern raised, we are ok to leave such methodology only having RAN1 impact as FFS, instead of leaving such feature as FFS.  We proposed a revised proposal based on 1.2-11 and would like to check whether it resolves the concerns. Proposal #1.2-11 (revised by Samsung)  * Support 480kHz and 960kHz SSB SCS when center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE   + SCS of the configured BWP(s) in the carrier carrying 480/960 kHz SSB is expected to be the same as the SCS of the SSB.   + Note: support of 480/960kHz SCS for SSB is optional   + FFS: how to indicate CORESET#0 and SSB frequency offset for ANR purpose * FFS: support one or more of 240, 480, 960 kHz SCS SSB for other cases   + FFS: support 240 kHz SCS SSB when center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE   + Study the UE initial cell selection search complexity of 480 and 960 kHz (for other cases) * Study the initial timing resolution based on low SCS (120 and/or 240 kHz) and its impact on the performance of higher SCS data (480/960 kHz) |
| Samsung | We share the same understanding that in cell reselection and DC case, the UE needs to read the MIB then RMSI for the cell access, since there is critical information on whether the UE is allowed to camp on the cell or not in RMSI. |
| LG Electronics | I’d like to clarify my understanding on RMSI reading issue here. First we need to separate PCell operation and PSCell operation.   * For PCell operation, such as hand-over, cell reselection   + I agree that UE shall read RMSI that is transmitted from target cell. However, I don’t see the problem if these procedures are based on 120 kHz SSB which is mandatory feature for this frequency range. * For PSCell operation, such as DC   + UE shall read MIB to obtain frame boundary information for PSCell, however it doesn’t need to read RMSI since PCell can provide system information for PSCell to UE. |
| Samsung | Thanks for the follow-up. I confirmed too quick on the understanding, and LGE is correct that RMSI can be indicated by dedicated message for PScell.  Regarding LGE’s comment on 120 kHz SSB for cell re-selection, I think the background of the discussion is, why to separate the case needing RMSI reading out from a general case for non-initial access. So when we discuss cell reselection, the underlying question is why a UE can perform RRM using 960 kHz SSB, but cannot cell reselection using such SSB. I understand your position on 120 kHz SSB, but the context of this discussion may not be that relevant to 120 kHz SSB. Hopefully it clarifies the background. |
| LG Electronics | Still we request further discussion on the necessity of 480/960 kHz SCS SSB. Based on Intel’s comment, the main use case of 480/960 kHz SCS seems to be for managed network (e.g., private network).   * For managed network such as private network: Apart from initial access, from CONNECTED mode UE’s perspective, CSI-RS based operation seems feasible and can enable single numerology operation considering tight synchronization between serving cells can be guaranteed. * For un-managed network: Even in case 480/960 kHz SSB is introduced, single numerology operation cannot be ensured since neighbor cell can be operated with the numerology different from serving cell due to different UE capabilities.   Regarding several aspects to Proposal #1.2-13/14, we have comments including follow-up questions to Samsung’s responses:   * CGI reporting: We disagree with Samsung that system is broken when CGI reporting for 480/960 kHz is not supported. We cannot accept MIB signaling to indicate CORESET#0 and Type0-PDCCH, only for the purpose of CGI reporting. If CGI reporting should be introduced, we may need to study how to support it without creating spec impact to support MIB signaling to indicate CORESET#0 and Type0-PDCCH. * In the NOTE under the main bullet, it is explicitly stated that support of 480/960kHz SCS for SSB is optional. Even with this NOTE, do you think 480/960 kHz SCS SSB can be used for initial access case?   [Samsung] We believe this question has been clarified many times in the RAN plenary and in this RAN1 meeting. We don’t bother to repeat… 480/960 SCS SSB is optional, only means a UE will indicate its capability on whether to support it when RRC is connected. There is no harm for a network to try to implement a standalone carrier to serve UEs only with such capability, which can be totally possible by implementation and choice of market.  [LG] So, if network 480/960 kHz SCS SSB transmits for initial access, UE incapable of 480/960 kHz SCS SSB cannot access to the cell. Is this correct understanding?   * With Proposal #1.2-11, is it possible for a UE to be provided with 480/960 kHz SCS SSB for a BWP (other than initial BWP) in PCell?   [Samsung] Short answer is Yes. Reasoning is explained in the above comment.  [LG] If Yes, do you think it is allowed in current specification? That is, for a UE configured with initial active BWP after initial access by using X kHz SCS SSB, the UE can be configured with the other BWP in PCell with Y kHz SCS SSB. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Going through the discussions, we noticed another important ambiguity on the purpose of the first sub-bullet in both Proposal #1.2-14 and Proposal #1.2-13:   * “SCS of the configured BWP(s) in the carrier carrying 480/960 kHz SSB is expected to be the same as the SCS of the SSB”.   We in fact are not sure why above sub-bullet is added and what is the real advantage of it. To our understanding, is up to the network how to configure the BWPs and in which numerology. If a carrier transmits 960 kHz SSB, it is up to the gNB to configure a BWP in that carrier with 120 kHz or 960 kHz. If gNB decides that the configured BWP and SSB in the carrier should have the same numerology, it can configure the BWP with 960 kHz SCS and if not, gNB should have the flexibility to configure 120 kHz BWP SCS for the UE (as the UE supports 120 kHz SCS anyway).  The same issue goes to 120 kHz: If a carrier only transmits 120 kHz SSB, gNB may decide to configure BWP with the same SCS of the SSB (120 kHz) or 960 kHz SCS (to potentially support a higher data rate).  This is quite strange to restrict the SCS of the BWP if the carrier transmits 480/960 kHz SCS to the same SCS of the SSB. In particular, considering that such a restriction for 120 kHz SCS is not considered.  In light of this, we prefer to only support Proposal #1.2-14 without the sub-bullet. **Proposal #1.2-14 (modified):**  * Support 480kHz and 960kHz SSB SCS only when center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE and CORESET0 and Type0-PDCCH search space are not configured in MIB   + Note: support of 480/960kHz SCS for SSB is optional |
| Ericsson | Question to Samsung regarding this statement:  The first bullet basically says 480 and 960 kHz can be supported for SSB for neighboring cell RRM measurement, but cannot use such SSB for cell re-selection, handover, or ANR purpose, then what’s the point to support it for RRM only?  I agree that the first bullet says that the ANR use case is not supported (at least not yet). This requires further study as you point out, and also for the reasons that I mentioned in a previous comment about sync raster design.  By why do you say "useless." Are you saying that 480/960 kHz is useless on an SCell or PSCell in a CA or DC deployment?  RRM measurements for handover would be based on PCell, operating most likely on 120 kHz. And cell re-selection is an IDLE mode procedure, thus it falls into the same camp as initial access, which it seems we agree is for further study (i.e., the other use cases).  So, in my mind, the first bullet is saying that how to support the ANR use case is FFS, and I think this is legitimate because there is a RAN4 dependency. |
| vivo | We are not fine with Proposal #1.2-13 and Proposal #1.2-14 by adding “CORESET0 and Type0-PDCCH search space are not configured in MIB”.  Besides, for the sub-bullet of the second FFS of Proposal #1.2-13, it is better to include 120kHz as well so that the initial search complexity could be compared for all the SCSs.  To LG:   * For managed network such as private network: Apart from initial access, from CONNECTED mode UE’s perspective, CSI-RS based operation seems feasible and can enable single numerology operation considering tight synchronization between serving cells can be guaranteed.   [vivo] In managed/private network, if no support of 480/960K SSB for initial access, gNB can only have one deploy choice to support high data rate assuming 2GHz bandwidth available: one 120KHz BWP bandwidth with 100Mhz bandwidth for initial access and one 960KHz BWP with 1900MHz for operation (called deployment case 1). If supporting 960K SSB for initial access, gNB could deploy one 960KHz BWP with 2000MHz for both initial access and operation (called deployment case 2). The benefit of deployment case 2 over case 1 is at least in the following aspects: 1) More available scheduled resource in frequency domain in operation stage (e.g. 2000MHz vs 1900MHz); 2) Avoid BWP switching in initial access stage; 3) Single numerology operation for the whole carrier. If spec doesn’t support 480/960KHz SSB, deployment case 2 is not possible in this typical use case in 60GHz. Even when spec support 480/960KHz SSB, since it is an optional feature, UEs are not mandatory to support 480/960KHz SSB without any additional complexity in other use cases. In general, support of 480/960KHz SSB is clearly beneficial for a typical use case such as private network but doesn’t bring additional complexity for other use case.   * In the NOTE under the main bullet, it is explicitly stated that support of 480/960kHz SCS for SSB is optional. Even with this NOTE, do you think 480/960 kHz SCS SSB can be used for initial access case?   [vivo] Related with the private network deployment, the gNB and UE in a private network could be fully controlled by the operator (e.g. factory). In this case, optional feature is also one candidate choice for initial access. I think support of interlace in NRU is also an example: Interlace is an optional feature but it may be used in the process of initial access.  To Huawei:  I don’t understand the argument of market fragmentation. As we know, whether in FR1 or FR2, spec support multiple SCS for the SSB and initial BWP but it seems that there is no such market fragmentation problem.  To Ericsson:  Agree with Samsung that ANR procedure can’t work without indication of Coreset #0 and Type #0 PDCCH. How to solve the problem? |
| Nokia | Firstly, regarding the ‘cell defining SSB’ requirement for PScell, I was not able to find any confirmation for this, thus let’s assume it is not valid for time being. Regarding the system information delivery for PScell (which is partly separate issue from need to be associated CD-SSB), noted by LGE and Samsung, we agree, it is stated in 38.331 that it is provided by dedicated signaling. So no disagreement here.  Now with the risk of sounding broken record (since Rel-15) just to make sure that we have aligned understanding of what we mean by initial access and what are the complexity concerns for it and what are the complexity concerns related to initial cell selection, let me recapitulate:   * As expressed, earlier, with the assumption that UE supports the (optional) sub-carrier spacings 480kHz and 960kHz, most of the complexity concerns related to the initial cell selection where UE would need to consider multiple sub-carrier hypotheses and synchronization raster’s. This we agree can be further considered. * Most companies seem to be fine to support SSBs with 480kHz and 960kHz sub-carrier spacings, at least when the SSB/MIB does not provide CORESET#0 and Type0-PDCCH CSS configuration. From the UE requirement/capability to be able to search SSBs this is similar requirement/functionality for RRM/mobility in Connected and IDLE, thus there should not be any complexity concerns in this perspective. Hence the only reason to preclude the case that SSB/MIB provides CORESET#0 and Type0-PDCCH CSS configuration seems to be the specification work required to introduce these and the concerns raised for the ANR. For the specification work to introduce CORESET#0 and Type0-PDCCH CSS configuration options for these sub-carrier spacings, I would think that this would be reasonable trade of to enable different kind of deployments. As per ANR, while it is important, we are OK to leave it as FFS for time being to further evaluate the mechanism.   As per Huawei concern on the configured scs for the dedicated BWP, we are OK to leave the dedicated BWP sub-carrier spacing configuration to the network. The SSB and RMSI numerology combinations are discussed separately in Section 2.1.3.  In this context, on the feasibility of applying 480kHz or 960kHz sub-carrier on dedicated BWP, while broadcast (SSB, RMSI) are using 120kHz, we have some concerns when accounting the UL/DL slot pattern configuration. In our understanding, with large number of beams there would be rather large bias towards DL slots, which in certain respect negates the benefits of higher sub-carrier spacing.  After that being said, we would prefer to agree the proposal without the restriction (on CORESET#0/Type0 configuration), but would be fine to accept proposal #1.2-13 as a, hopefully, intermediate step. |
| DOCOMO | Although our preference is Proposal #1.2-11 (revised by Samsung), we would be ok with Proposal #1.2-13 and with continuing the discussion on how to support ANR use case. We agree with Nokia’s assessment for supporting SSB/MIB providing CORESET#0 and Type0-PDCCH configuration and we also think it would deserve the specification effort well for ANR. Therefore, we are not fine with precluding such feature, i.e. Proposal #1.2-14. |
| Intel | Our main priority is Proposal #1.2-11 with modifications made by Samsung.  We think that support of ANR and CGI reporting is especially important for unlicensed operation in private networks and should be enabled. In such networks, their owners may not carefully deploy gNBs from the beginning. Then the information provided by ANR and CGI reporting functionality may be useful for further network optimization.  In Proposal #1.2-11, we don’t think that the FFS on SCS 240 kHz for non-initial access SSB should be a sub-bullet of the second FFS bullet. Basically, it should be a main bullet. Therefore, we suggest slight modification as follows: **Proposal #1.2-11 (revised by Samsung and with small modification)**  * Support 480kHz and 960kHz SSB SCS when center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE   + SCS of the configured BWP(s) in the carrier carrying 480/960 kHz SSB is expected to be the same as the SCS of the SSB.   + Note: support of 480/960kHz SCS for SSB is optional   + FFS: how to indicate CORESET#0 and SSB frequency offset for ANR purpose * FFS: support 240 kHz SCS SSB when center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE * FFS: support one or more of 240, 480, 960 kHz SCS SSB for other cases   + ~~FFS: support 240 kHz SCS SSB when center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE~~   + Study the UE initial cell selection search complexity of 240, 480 and 960 kHz (for other cases)   Study the initial timing resolution based on low SCS (120 and/or 240 kHz) and its impact on the performance of higher SCS data (480/960 kHz)  If Proposal #1.2-13 would be accepted as a compromise among all companies, we could also accept it. For Proposal #1.2-13, we suggest the same modification as above, i.e., making the FFS bullet on SCS 240 kHz for non-initial access SSB as a main bullet as follows: Proposal #1.2-13 (slightly modified)  * Support 480kHz and 960kHz SSB SCS when center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE and CORESET0 and Type0-PDCCH search space are not configured in MIB   + SCS of the configured BWP(s) of the carrier carrying 480/960 kHz SSB is expected to be the same as the SCS of the SSB.   + Note: support of 480/960kHz SCS for SSB is optional * FFS: support 240 kHz SCS SSB when center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE and CORESET0 and Type0-PDCCH search space are not configured in MIB * FFS: support one or more of 240, 480 kHz, 960 kHz SSB SCS for other cases   + ~~FFS: support 240 kHz SCS SSB when center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE and CORESET0 and Type0-PDCCH search space are not configured in MIB~~   + Study the UE initial search complexity of 240, 480 and 960 kHz (for other cases) * Study the initial timing resolution based on low SCS (120 and/or 240 kHz) and its impact on the performance of higher SCS data (480/960 kHz)   We cannot accept Proposal #1.2-14 because it prohibits SCS 480 kHz/960 kHz for initial access without any study. We could consider Proposal #1.2-14 without saying ‘only’ in the main bullet, but it would be our lowest priority.  Then we would like to comment some points raised by LG.  [LG]:   * For managed network such as private network: Apart from initial access, from CONNECTED mode UE’s perspective, CSI-RS based operation seems feasible and can enable single numerology operation considering tight synchronization between serving cells can be guaranteed.   [Intel]: As we understood the described scenario, there is a PCell which provides initial access and configuration for SSB-less SCell which operates using SCS 480 kHz/960 kHz and where measurements for neighbour cells rely on CSI-RS. We don’t think this is a preferred deployment scenario for private networks as there should be always PCells maintained exclusively for initial access and configuration. More natural way of operation in private networks is to provide initial access/data/control by PCells relying on single numerology operation and SSB-based measurements. As we see, the main issue in the deployment scenario suggest by LG for private networks is how to provide the tight synchronization between cells. Obviously, the current NR requirements for FR2 would not be valid anymore. Moreover, such strict inter-cell synchronization to allow SSB-less neibour cell measurements could be achieved only in networks of relatively small size. This limits applicability of the suggested deployment scenario. Another point is that to enable the suggested scenario, there should be introduced a new UE capability for simultaneous supporting two optional features: CSI-RS for measurements and SCS 480 kHz/960 kHz.  [LG]:   * For un-managed network: Even in case 480/960 kHz SSB is introduced, single numerology operation cannot be ensured since neighbor cell can be operated with the numerology different from serving cell due to different UE capabilities.   [Intel]: Here we didn’t understand what deployment scenario was assumed. If we put aside CA/DC scenarios, there are PCells with different numerologies (however, the same numerology is used by each cell for initial access/data/control, i.e., single numerology operation per cell), and UE is only connected to one cell at a time. If the neighbor cells do not support same SCS, from RRM perspective, this is considered inter-frequency measurements, and measurement gaps will be provided such that UE can switch and perform measurements. Is this an assumed example where the single numerology operation is not ensured?  [LG]:   * With Proposal #1.2-11, is it possible for a UE to be provided with 480/960 kHz SCS SSB for a BWP (other than initial BWP) in PCell?   [Intel]: As we understood the question and further comments, the PCell maintains two types of SSBs simultaneously. One SSB is a full-blown SSB with SCS 120 kHz, which can be used for initial access, and another one is a dummy SSB with SCS 480 kHz/960 kHz used for synchronization purposes only. Our position here is that Proposal #1.2-11 is not intended for such type of PCell operation as it is indeed unsupported by current NR specs. And we are not going to propose it for NR extension up to 71 GHz. What is intended by the first bullet in Proposal #1.2-11 is that a PCell can provide a UE with an information about SSB with SCS 480 kHz/960 kHz in another cell (not the same cell). |
| Samsung | Before we add responses to the questions in companies’ comments, we would like to check whether it helps to make a progress if we make a compromise to consider ANR case later (e.g. taking Proposal #1.2-13 with slightly wording change)?  Also, the current description “CORESET0 and Type0-PDCCH search space are not configured in MIB” is a little bit confusing in the context, since CORESET0 and Type0-PDCCH are only applicable when UE tries to decode SIB1, and in regular RRM without the need to decode SIB1, the condition is confusing to understand. So we have the following wording change to clarify this point (on top of Intel’s revision):   Proposal #1.2-13 (slightly modified by Intel and then Samsung)  * Support 480kHz and 960kHz SSB SCS when center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE and the UE is not required to decode SIB1 ~~CORESET0 and Type0-PDCCH search space are not configured in MIB~~   + SCS of the configured BWP(s) of the carrier carrying 480/960 kHz SSB is expected to be the same as the SCS of the SSB.   + Note: support of 480/960kHz SCS for SSB is optional * FFS: support 240 kHz SCS SSB when center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE and the UE is not required to decode SIB1 ~~CORESET0 and Type0-PDCCH search space are not configured in MIB~~ * FFS: support one or more of 240, 480 kHz, 960 kHz SSB SCS for other cases   + ~~FFS: support 240 kHz SCS SSB when center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE and CORESET0 and Type0-PDCCH search space are not configured in MIB~~   + Study the UE initial search complexity of 240, 480 and 960 kHz (for other cases) * Study the initial timing resolution based on low SCS (120 and/or 240 kHz) and its impact on the performance of higher SCS data (480/960 kHz)   We are preferring the modified proposal, as explained in the previous comment that this is “useless” in term of implementing using the same numerology, but for the sake of progress, we can be fine to discuss further the FFS points. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | As we discuss before, we don’t really see any real merit for SSB SCS other than 120 kHz neither for initial access nor for non-initial access.  To **Nokia** and other proponents of higher SSB SCS, our concern for supporting higher SCSs for SSB is not only limited to specification effort. In fact specification effort is not the first or major concern. We have detailed our concerns in our entries in Discussion#1, 2, 3, 4 and will not repeat it here to avoid acting as a broken record.  As a compromise, we can accept the following: Proposal #1.2-14 (Modified)  * Support 480kHz and 960kHz SSB SCS only when center frequency and SCS of SSB is explicitly provided to the UE and CORESET0 and Type0-PDCCH search space are not configured in MIB   + ~~SCS of the configured BWP(s) in the carrier carrying 480/960 kHz SSB is expected to be the same as the SCS of the SSB~~   + Note: support of 480/960kHz SCS for SSB is optional   Above is enough for RRM measurement, DC (because PSCell SI can be provided by PCell) and, of course, CA. It seems that the proponents concern with the above proposal is that ANR of the cells running on 480/960 kHz SSB cannot be supported with the current 3GPP mechanisms. Our views about this new issue of ANR is as follows:   * First, please let’s go back to the origin of the discussion. Some companies including Huawei have major concerns about supporting SSB SCSs other 120 kHz. Yet, we offer a compromise to reach an agreement but we are faced with the counter-argument that the proposed compromise does not support current ANR mechanism for the cells running on 480/960 kHz SSB. Well, this problem is completely solved if we only support 120 kHz SSB SCS! There is absolutely no problem to support ANR if higher SSB SCSs are not supported at the first place. A 60 GHz network is completely functional with the current supported SCSs (120 kHz for SSB, 120/480/960 for data) and, in opinion of some companies, the cost/reward of supporting higher SSB SCSs is not justifiable.   According to the proponents, a main motivation of supporting 480/960 kHz SSB SCS is to support single numerology for private and controlled networks like data centers. We are not convinced why ANR or SON are important for a data center. Further, ANR/SON has not been studied in SI, to the best off our knowledge was not mentioned in any of the discussions up until yesterday, and is not part of the WID. So, we are not be willing to support yet another compromise just to support this new feature which can be perfectly supported if we stick to the current agreements (supporting 120 kHz SSB SCS only). |
| Samsung | We don’t understand Huawei’s logic in above comment.  AT the beginning, Huawei commented they made a compromise on allowing 480/960 kHz SSB to achieve single numerology implementation for RRM, DC, and CA cases; and then argued 480/960 SSB should not be supported for ANR. But ANR is a feature that can be implemented based on a cell that using DC or CA. So essentially the single numerology implementation is still not achieved. What compromise is Huawei made other than a trick on the wording? |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | **To Samsung**: we are not sure where we have done “trick on the wording” . The compromise we offer supports RRM, DC, and CA but not ANR at least using the current mechanism. So, the feature(s) that have been a concern from the very beginning of SSB SCS (e.g., RRM) discussion will be supported with higher SSB SCS. ANR on cells using 480/960 kHz using the current mechanism is not supported. But this problem would be avoided altogether if we only support SSB with 120 kHz from the first place. And please note to our other parts of our arguments that “ We are not convinced why ANR or SON are important for a data center. Further, ANR/SON has not been studied in SI, to the best off our knowledge was not mentioned in any of the discussions up until yesterday, and is not part of the WID.”  Anyway, the intention is not playing with words here but finding a common ground so we can move on with other aspects that are dependent on the supported SSB SCS. |
| Samsung | Let us try to clarify, and hopefully it helps to understand the background.   * So far, ANR is supported for every SCS of SSB, and every SSB can be used for ANR purpose after performing a RRM * In Rel-16, there was a long discussion on how to enhance the network’s flexibility on supporting ANR for NR-U, since the motivation for using ANR feature is no double for unlicensed band (please note the discussion is on enhancement of the flexibility, not whether to support) * There is no mentioning of whether ANR is supported in SI, since there is no one questioning why it’s not… We are not going over all functionalities in Rel-15/16 to judge again whether they are supported or not. * As I mentioned in previous comment, ANR is not a separate functionality. For example, network only implements one cell-defining SSB, and it can be used for RRM, CA, DC, and ANR at the same time (I guess this is the typical case implemented). If we mandated ANR to use a different SCS, the network either has to implement two SSB with different SCSs, or has to use 120 kHz SCS SSB for all purposes, and none of them achieves the purpose of using 480/960 as single SCS for implementation |
| Moderator | Added Proposal #1.2-15 and Proposal #1.2-16 based on comments received. |

**Moderator Summary of Discussions #5**

Thanks all for the lively discussion. Looks like our gap among companies are still not fully resolved. Most likely this should be resolved during GTW. Moderator suggest taking Proposal #1.2-15 and Proposal #1.2-16 for further discussion.

The following is a quick summary of discussion so far:

* At least 2 companies do not see a need to support 480/960 kHz for SSB as system can operate with 120kHz.
  + One of the companies is willing to compromise to support only if support of 480/960 SSB does not support indication of CORESET0 and Type0-PDCCH configuration.
  + One of the companies claimed single numerology operation is feasible even without support of 480/960 SSB and therefore support of 480/906 is completely not needed. Note that this claim is being deputed.
* Large number of the companies seems to support 480/960 kHz for SSB at least for the cases CORESET0 and Type0-PDCCH configuration is not needed in MIB.
  + Further debates among companies on whether it is possible to completely avoid indication of CORESET0 and Type0-PDCCH configuration in MIB, if we consider CGI reporting and ANR, which is operators will likely wish to support for unlicensed bands. Therefore, from moderator’s perspective, it might be reasonable to consider this aspect (support of SSB with CORESET0 & Type0-PDCCH CSS configuration in MIB) for further study.
* There were additional discussion about market fragmentation and optionality of the features, need to enable single numerology operation (at least for managed networks), additional cell search complexity, whether cell search complexity is important for optional features, concerns of timing acquisition for 480/960 kHz based on 120kHz SSB, potential methods that can help with timing, support of ANR and CGI reporting and its relationship to SIB1 decoding, and others. Moderator thinks the additional discussion should have help companies understand each other position better.

**Conclusion of Discussion**

Agreement:

* Whether or not to support 240 kHz, 480kHz and 960kHz SCS for SSB and the conditions under which SSB for 240 kHz, 480 kHz and 960 kHz may be supported will be decided no later than RAN1#104bis-e.

### 2.1.3 Mixed Numerology between SSB and CORESET#0

* From [1] FUTUREWEI:
  + The SCS for all SS/PBCH blocks and CORESET #0 on a carrier is always the same for operation in 60GHz shared spectrum.
* From [3] ZTE, Sanechips:
  + The following multiplexing patterns and combinations of SCSs of SSB and Type0-PDCCH can be considered for Rel-17 NR above 52.6 GHz.
    - (SSB, Type0-PDCCH): SCS (120 kHz, 120 kHz)
      * Multiplexing patterns: 1, 3
    - (SSB, Type0-PDCCH): SCS (480 kHz, 480 kHz)
      * Multiplexing patterns: 1, 3
    - (SSB, Type0-PDCCH): SCS (960 kHz, 960 kHz)
      * Multiplexing patterns: 1, 3
* From [7] CAICT:
  + In order to match different SCS, different initial BWP should be considered.
* From [9] vivo:
  + Support the following SCS pairs for SSB and initial DL BWP in NR operation from 52.6-71GHz：(120K, 120K) + (960K, 480K) + (960K, 960K).
* From [12] Intel:
  + Observation: Single numerology operation can enable efficient transceiver implementation and operation.
* From [14] AT&T:
  + The same subcarrier spacings are specified for initial access related signals and channels in the initial BWP and cases other than initial access.
* From [25] Qualcomm:
  + consider the following SSB and CORESET0 SCS combinations:
    - SSB SCS = 120 kHz, CORESET0 SCS = 120, 480, 960 kHz
    - SSB SCS = 240 kHz, CORESET0 SCS = 120 kHz
    - SSB SCS = 480/960 kHz, CORESET0 SCS = SSB SCS

Table 1: Allowed SSB/CORESET0 SCS Combinations

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SSB SCS (kHz)** | **CORESET0 SCS (kHz)** | | |
| **120** | **480** | **960** |
| **120** | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| **240** | Yes | No | No |
| **480** | No | Yes | No |
| **960** | No | No | Yes |

**Summary of Discussions in Tdoc**

* Various views on which SCS combinations of SSB and CORESET#0 (initial DL BWP)
  + Some companies explicitly listed the SCS combinations for SSB and CORESET#0
    - (SSB 120kHz, CORESET#0 120kHz)
    - (SSB 120kHz, CORESET#0 480kHz)
    - (SSB 120kHz, CORESET#0 960kHz)
    - (SSB 480kHz, CORESET#0 480kHz)
    - (SSB 480kHz, CORESET#0 960kHz)
    - (SSB 960kHz, CORESET#0 480kHz)
    - (SSB 960kHz, CORESET#0 960kHz)
* Suggest to discuss further the supported SCS combination of SSB and CORESET#0 (initial DL BWP)

**Discussions #1**

* Please provide further views on supported SCS combination for SSB and COERSET#0.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Discussions/Comments** |
| Samsung | At least same SCS between SSB and CORESET#0 should be supported and prioritized. Mixed SCS can be evaluated further based on the need. |
| NEC | Support the same SCS for SSB and CORESET#0 as a baseline, and open to the other SCS combination(s). |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Same SCS for SSB and CORESET#0 should be supported to reduce the complexity of multiplexing and indication of the SCS of CORESET#0, etc. The following three SCS pairs for SSB and CORESET#0 can be considered.   * + - (SSB 120kHz, CORESET#0 120kHz)     - (SSB 480kHz, CORESET#0 480kHz)     - (SSB 960kHz, CORESET#0 960kHz) |
| DOCOMO | We agree same SCS between SSB and CORESET#0 should be supported and prioritized. After that, for mixed SCS, (SSB 120kHz, CORESET#0 480/960kHz) should be discussed at first. We do not see the motivation to support (SSB 480kHz, CORESET#0 120kHz) and (SSB 960kHz, CORESET#0 120/480kHz) |
| LG Electronics | Before discussing multiplexing between SSB and CORESET#0, we should first discuss whether new SCS for SSB/CORESET#0 during initial access is supported or not. If new SCS for SSB/CORESET#0 during initial access is not supported, the current specification would suffice. |
| Spreadtrum | Qualcomm’s table could be starting point of discussion. |
| Vivo | Down selection of the above combinations is needed. The comparison could be based on complexity, spec impact, synchronization accuracy and etc. |
| Nokia | Like noted above we would also like to consider the support of 240kHz scs for SSB. Hence, would propose following combinations (accounting the support of 480kHz and 960kHz scs) as a first priority (numbers in square brackets gives the considered SSB and CORESET#0 multiplexing patterns):   * + - (SSB 120kHz, CORESET#0 120kHz) [#1,#3]     - (SSB 240kHz, CORESET#0 120kHz) [#1,#2]     - (SSB 480kHz, CORESET#0 480kHz) [#1]     - (SSB 960kHz, CORESET#0 960kHz) [#1]   Afore listed 480kHz and 960kHz SSB and CORESET#0 multiplexing patterns could be considered also in a certain from of non-initial access, e.g. if scenario noted in Section 2.1.2 can be considered as non-initial access.  Depending on RAN4 agreements on support BW options, the SSB and CORESET multiplexing patterns can be further discussed. |
| Charter Communications | Agree with Samsung and NEC |
| Futurewei | Support having the same SCS for SSB and CORESET#0. Mixed numerology should not be considered at this time. |
| Ericsson | Agree with LGE. It should first be discussed if SCS other than 120 kHz for CORESET0 are supported before going into the details of which combinations of SSB/CORESET0 SCS are supported. Otherwise it becomes a hypothetical discussion. We support the following combinations assuming 120 kHz CORESET0:   * + (SSB 120kHz, CORESET#0 120kHz)   + (SSB 240kHz, CORESET#0 120kHz) |
| Qualcomm | SSB SCS = 120 kHz, CORESET0 SCS = 120, 480, 960 kHz  SSB SCS = 240 kHz, CORESET0 SCS = 120 kHz  SSB SCS = 480/960 kHz, CORESET0 SCS = SSB SCS |
| OPPO | We slightly prefer to support single numerology for SSB and CORESET#0 multiplexing. |
| InterDigital | Agree with LGE and Ericsson that supported SCSs for CORESET0 should be discussed before discussing combinations. |
| Fujitsu | Same SCS for SSB and CORESET#0 should be prioritized. In addition, 480kHz and/or 960kHz SCS for CORESET#0 can be supported only if 480kHz and/or 960kHz SCS is supported for SSB for initial access. |
| Xiaomi | Support the combination by QC with a little modification below:  SSB SCS = 120 kHz, CORESET0 SCS = 120, 480/960 kHz |
| AT&T | The important point is that for each SSB SCS we also have the same CORESET0 SCS. Mixed numerology cases can be specified but we don’t see these as important. Same as R15 FR1 and FR2 basically. |
| CATT | Same SCS for SSB and CORESET#0. |
| Apple | We think at least a same numerology between SSB and CORESET should be supported for new SCS if the corresponding SSB SCS would be agreed in earlier question. Support different SCS combination should be justified by strong and clear use cases. |
| Intel | The support of operation with the same SCS for SSB and CORESET#0 should be prioritized in RAN1. For mixed SCS, the combination of (SSB 120/240 kHz, CORESET#0 120 kHz) could be easily accepted as it requires almost zero specification efforts in RAN1. Other scenarios with mixed SCS operation could be de-prioritized. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | (SSB 120kHz, CORESET#0 120kHz): We don’t see any usage for mixed numerology during Initial Access. Both SSB and CORESET#0 in 120 kHz are sufficient. As discussed in our answer in Section 2.1.2, using a higher numerology does not shorten Initial access procedure anyway. As PDCCH in CORESET#0 is QPSK, the PN effect on 120 kHz is negligible based on observations in SI and there is no need to use a higher SCS to counter the PN effect. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | If 480/960 kHz SCS are agreed to be supported for both CORESET#0 and SSB, we support prioritizing the option of same SCS for SSB and CORESET#0. Mixed numerology cases need further study on the potential multiplexing complexity. |
| Convida Wireless | Mixed numerologies between SSB and CORESET#0 can be supported. Qualcomm’s table (Table 1) can be a good starting point for discussion. |
| Mediatek | Support same SCS for SSB and CORESET#0. Other SCS combinations can be discussed after SCS of signals/channels related to initial access are determined. |

**Moderator Summary of Discussions #1**

* Several companies stated support of same SCS between SSB and CORESET#0 should be the starting point for further discussions, and this mode of operation should be prioritized.
* From moderator’s understanding if initial access is not supported for 480, and 960 kHz SCS, then there is no need for consideration of SSB and CORESET#0 SCS combination when SSB is either 480 or 960 kHz. This is because SSB/CORESET SCS combination is only relevant for Type0-PDCCH search space configured by MIB.

Further discuss on following statement (as a starting point for further discussion):

* For CORESET and Type0-PDCCH search space configured in MIB:
  + Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {120, 120} kHz
    - FFS: SSB and CORESET multiplexing pattern, number of RBs for CORESET, number of symbols (duration of CORESET), SSB to CORESET offset RBs.
  + If 480kHz and 960 kHz SSB SCS are agreed to be supported, and if initial access is also supported for these SSB SCS,
    - Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {480, 480} kHz
    - Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {960, 960} kHz
  + FFS:
    - If 240kHz SSB SCS is agreed to be supported, {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {240, 120} kHz
    - {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {120, 480} kHz
    - {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {120, 960} kHz
    - {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {480, 960} kHz

**Discussions #2**

Further discuss using the following statement as a starting point for further discussion:

##### Proposal #1.3-1 (original)

* For CORESET and Type0-PDCCH search space configured in MIB:
  + Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {120, 120} kHz
    - FFS: SSB and CORESET multiplexing pattern, number of RBs for CORESET, number of symbols (duration of CORESET), SSB to CORESET offset RBs.
  + If 480kHz and 960 kHz SSB SCS are agreed to be supported, and if initial access is also supported for these SSB SCS,
    - Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {480, 480} kHz
    - Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {960, 960} kHz
  + FFS:
    - If 240kHz SSB SCS is agreed to be supported, {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {240, 120} kHz
    - {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {120, 480} kHz
    - {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {120, 960} kHz
    - {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {480, 960} kHz

##### Proposal #1.3-2 (updated)

* For CORESET and Type0-PDCCH search space configured in MIB:
  + Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {120, 120} kHz
    - FFS: SSB and CORESET multiplexing pattern, number of RBs for CORESET, number of symbols (duration of CORESET), SSB to CORESET offset RBs.
  + If 480kHz ~~and 960 kHz SSB SCS are~~ is agreed to be supported, and if initial access is also supported for ~~these~~ this SSB SCS,
    - Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {480, 480} kHz
    - FFS: {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {480, 960} kHz
  + If 960 kHz SSB SCS is agreed to be supported, and if initial access is also supported for this SSB SCS,
    - Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {960, 960} kHz
    - FFS: {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {960, 480} kHz
  + If 240 kHz SSB SCS is agreed to be supported, and if initial access is also supported for this SSB SCS,
    - Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {240, 120} kHz
  + FFS:
    - ~~If 240kHz SSB SCS is agreed to be supported, {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {240, 120} kHz~~
    - {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {120, 480} kHz
    - {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {120, 960} kHz
    - {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {480, 960} kHz

##### Proposal #1.3-3 (modified to address initial/non-initial definition)

* For CORESET and Type0-PDCCH search space configured in MIB:
  + Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {120, 120} kHz
    - FFS: SSB and CORESET multiplexing pattern, number of RBs for CORESET, number of symbols (duration of CORESET), SSB to CORESET offset RBs.
  + If 480kHz ~~and 960 kHz SSB SCS are~~ is agreed to be supported, ~~and if initial access is also supported for these this SSB SCS~~,
    - Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {480, 480} kHz
    - FFS: {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {480, 960} kHz
  + If 960 kHz SSB SCS is agreed to be supported~~, and if initial access is also supported for this SSB SCS~~,
    - Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {960, 960} kHz
    - FFS: {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {960, 480} kHz
  + If 240 kHz SSB SCS is agreed to be supported~~, and if initial access is also supported for this SSB SCS~~,
    - Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {240, 120} kHz
  + FFS:
    - ~~If 240kHz SSB SCS is agreed to be supported, {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {240, 120} kHz~~
    - {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {120, 480} kHz
    - {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {120, 960} kHz
    - {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {480, 960} kHz

##### Proposal #1.3-4 (update of 1.3-2 to remove duplicate FFS entries)

* For CORESET and Type0-PDCCH search space configured in MIB:
  + Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {120, 120} kHz
    - FFS: SSB and CORESET multiplexing pattern, number of RBs for CORESET, number of symbols (duration of CORESET), SSB to CORESET offset RBs.
  + If 480kHz ~~and 960 kHz SSB SCS are~~ is agreed to be supported, and if initial access is also supported for ~~these~~ this SSB SCS,
    - Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {480, 480} kHz
    - ~~FFS: {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {480, 960} kHz~~
  + If 960 kHz SSB SCS is agreed to be supported, and if initial access is also supported for this SSB SCS,
    - Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {960, 960} kHz
    - ~~FFS: {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {960, 480} kHz~~
  + If 240 kHz SSB SCS is agreed to be supported, and if initial access is also supported for this SSB SCS,
    - Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {240, 120} kHz
  + FFS:
    - ~~If 240kHz SSB SCS is agreed to be supported, {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {240, 120} kHz~~
    - {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {120, 480} kHz
    - {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {120, 960} kHz
    - {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {480, 960} kHz
    - {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {960, 480} kHz

##### Proposal #1.3-5 (update)

* For CORESET and Type0-PDCCH search space configured in MIB:
* Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} with the same SCS
  + FFS: Different SCSs
* FFS: details of SSB and CORESET multiplexing pattern, number of RBs for CORESET, number of symbols (duration of CORESET), SSB to CORESET offset RBs.

##### Proposal #1.3-6 (update of 1.3-3 based on Docomo comments)

* For CORESET and Type0-PDCCH search space configured in MIB:
  + Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {120, 120} kHz
    - FFS: SSB and CORESET multiplexing pattern, number of RBs for CORESET, number of symbols (duration of CORESET), SSB to CORESET offset RBs.
  + If 480kHz ~~and 960 kHz SSB SCS are~~ is agreed to be supported~~, and if initial access is also supported for these this SSB SCS~~,
    - Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {480, 480} kHz
    - ~~FFS: {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {480, 960} kHz~~
  + If 960 kHz SSB SCS is agreed to be supported~~, and if initial access is also supported for this SSB SCS~~,
    - Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {960, 960} kHz
    - ~~FFS: {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {960, 480} kHz~~
  + If 240 kHz SSB SCS is agreed to be supported~~, and if initial access is also supported for this SSB SCS~~,
    - Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {240, 120} kHz
  + FFS: any other combinations between one of SSB SCS (120, 240, 480, 960) and one of CORESET#0 SCS (120, 480, 960)
    - ~~If 240kHz SSB SCS is agreed to be supported, {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {240, 120} kHz~~
    - ~~{SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {120, 480} kHz~~
    - ~~{SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {120, 960} kHz~~
    - ~~{SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {480, 960} kHz~~
    - ~~{SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {960, 480} kHz~~

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Discussions/Comments** |
| Samsung | We support the FL proposal with further comments for FFS as below:   * We didn’t see a good motivation to support {120, 480} and {120, 960}, with the assumption to support {120, 120} already. The multiplexing Pattern 1 of CORESET#0 with SSB will be quite challenging in these scenarios due to the large ratio of SCS, and potentially need modifications to SSB pattern of 120 kHz. Maybe supporting companies can clarify the intention. * If mixed numerology {480, 960} is FFS, it should be fair enough to also consider {960, 480}, although we agree they both should be deprioritized. |
| LG Electronics | {120,120} combination is already supported by current specification. Do we need to agree on that?  We do not understand the structure itself. Even though we do not have an explicit agreement for any of 240/480/960 kHz SSB, 240 kHz SSB is FFS but 480/960 kHz SSB is not FFS. |
| Moderator | Just to clarify moderator’s understanding.  While existing specification does support {120, 120} combination. It was not evident to the moderator that the table defined for {120, 120} which includes multiplexing pattern, number of PRB for CORESET, number of symbols, and SSB to CORESET offset RBs could be resused as is.  There are several companies discussing which multiplexing pattern to use, number of PRBs for CORESET is likely effected by min-max channel bandwidth, which is currently not yet defined but most likely different from existing FR2, SSB to CORESET offset is highly dependent on sync/channel raster, which also is likely to be not identical to FR2 (given the unlicensed characteristic and min-max channel BW), potential for using DRS which changes how SSBs are utilized in time domain. So from moderator’s understanding there is nothing in the existing table for {120,120} that can be directly re-used.  The only thing that might be reused is the fact that {120,120} entries exists. Moderator was not sure if this is sufficient to say no agreement is needed. To encourage companies to provide further information about how to fill in the table entries for {120,120}, I’ve explicitly put “FFS: SSB and CORESET multiplexing pattern, number of RBs for CORESET, number of symbols (duration of CORESET), SSB to CORESET offset RBs”  Of course, this is just moderator’s understanding of the situation and it could certainly be debated and doesn’t necessarily justify the description. I just wanted to provide some background information behind the formulation.  With that said, please continue to provide comments. **As I’ve stated the text was intended to excite feedback and discussion, and it was not necessarily meant to get direct agreement.** |
| Ericsson | As we indicated in Section 2.1.2, we prefer to keep 240, 480, 960 for initial access on the same level of discussion. Hence we prefer the following formulation:   * + If 480kHz ~~and 960 kHz SSB SCS are~~ is agreed to be supported, and if initial access is also supported for ~~these~~ this SSB SCS,     - Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {480, 480} kHz   + If 960 kHz SSB SCS is agreed to be supported, and if initial access is also supported for this SSB SCS,     - Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {960, 960} kHz   + If 240 kHz SSB SCS is agreed to be supported, and if initial access is also supported for this SSB SCS,     - Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {240, 120} kHz   + FFS:     - ~~If 240kHz SSB SCS is agreed to be supported, {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {240, 120} kHz~~     - {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {120, 480} kHz     - {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {120, 960} kHz     - {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {480, 960} kHz |
| vivo | Support moderator’s proposal in general with the following comment  For the second bullet, it may bring some confusing that if both of 480K and 960K SCS are supported, then we support (480K, 480K) and (960K, 960K). How about the result when only one of 480K and 960K is supported for SSB? To avoid this, I propose to split it into two parts. Besides, (960K, 480K) should be also a candidate since the design could reuse (240K, 120K) in FR2 as much as possible.   * For CORESET and Type0-PDCCH search space configured in MIB:   + Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {120, 120} kHz     - FFS: SSB and CORESET multiplexing pattern, number of RBs for CORESET, number of symbols (duration of CORESET), SSB to CORESET offset RBs.   + If 480kHz SSB SCS is agreed to be supported, and if initial access is also supported for this SSB SCS,     - Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {480, 480} kHz     - FFS: {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {480, 960} kHz   + If 960kHz SSB SCS is agreed to be supported, and if initial access is also supported for this SSB SCS,     - Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {960, 960} kHz     - FFS: {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {960, 480} kHz   + FFS:     - If 240kHz SSB SCS is agreed to be supported, {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {240, 120} kHz     - {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {120, 480} kHz     - {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {120, 960} kHz   For the SSB, we don’t see a motivation to support 240KHz SCS. For {120, 480} and {120, 960} in FFS part, *k*\_offset indication and time domain synchronization will have problems since the SCS of coreset 0 is much larger than the SCS of SSB. |
| DOCOMO | For {120, 120} kHz SCS case, we are fine with the FFS. For the 2nd and 3rd sub-bullet, what the moderator captured above is aligned with our understanding, while the reformulation suggested by Ericsson is also fine for us. |
| Moderator | Added alternative P#1.3-2 based on comments from Ericsson and vivo.  To @LG Electronics:  If you feel the formulation of the proposal is wrong. Please feel to provide an alternative formulation that you think will work for you. I can capture it as another alternative. |
| Nokia | As noted in Section 2.1.2, if we extend the ‘non-initial’ to consider also e.g. re-selection (where assistance information is provided), we should consider enabling the system information delivery also in case of ‘non-initial’ access. Hence we would propose following modification: Proposal #1.3-2 (modified)  * For CORESET and Type0-PDCCH search space configured in MIB:   + Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {120, 120} kHz     - FFS: SSB and CORESET multiplexing pattern, number of RBs for CORESET, number of symbols (duration of CORESET), SSB to CORESET offset RBs.   + If 480kHz ~~and 960 kHz SSB SCS are~~ is agreed to be supported, ~~and if initial access is also supported for these this SSB SCS~~,     - Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {480, 480} kHz     - FFS: {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {480, 960} kHz   + If 960 kHz SSB SCS is agreed to be supported~~, and if initial access is also supported for this SSB SCS~~,     - Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {960, 960} kHz     - FFS: {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {960, 480} kHz   + If 240 kHz SSB SCS is agreed to be supported~~, and if initial access is also supported for this SSB SCS~~,     - Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {240, 120} kHz   + FFS:     - ~~If 240kHz SSB SCS is agreed to be supported, {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {240, 120} kHz~~     - {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {120, 480} kHz     - {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {120, 960} kHz     - {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {480, 960} kHz |
| Intel | We are Ok with updated Proposal #1.3-2. However, there are some duplicated FFS points in the proposal. Because of that, we think it would be more convenient to have a single FFS bullet with a list of possible SCS combinations:   * For CORESET and Type0-PDCCH search space configured in MIB:   + Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {120, 120} kHz     - FFS: SSB and CORESET multiplexing pattern, number of RBs for CORESET, number of symbols (duration of CORESET), SSB to CORESET offset RBs.   + If 480kHz ~~and 960 kHz SSB SCS are~~ is agreed to be supported, and if initial access is also supported for ~~these~~ this SSB SCS,     - Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {480, 480} kHz     - ~~FFS: {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {480, 960} kHz~~   + If 960 kHz SSB SCS is agreed to be supported, and if initial access is also supported for this SSB SCS,     - Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {960, 960} kHz     - ~~FFS: {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {960, 480} kHz~~   + If 240 kHz SSB SCS is agreed to be supported, and if initial access is also supported for this SSB SCS,     - Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {240, 120} kHz   + FFS:     - ~~If 240kHz SSB SCS is agreed to be supported, {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {240, 120} kHz~~     - {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {120, 480} kHz     - {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {120, 960} kHz     - {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {480, 960} kHz     - {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {960, 480} kHz |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We share the same view as Nokia and fine with Samsung’s edits |
| Moderator | Added P#1.3-3 based on comments from Nokia.  Added P#1.3-4 based on Intel comments. |
| Futurewei | In principle we prefer for the initial access the SCS for SS/PBCH Block and CORESET for Type0-PDCCH be the same or a combination already supported by specs. However, we prefer addressing these combinations only after the decision for SSB SCS is made. It would avoid the discussion of unnecessary combinations {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH}. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We think that the common denominator is only the first bullet and its sub-bullets:   * For CORESET and Type0-PDCCH search space configured in MIB:   + Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS as {120, 120} kHz     - FFS: SSB and CORESET multiplexing pattern, number of RBs for CORESET, number of symbols (duration of CORESET), SSB to CORESET offset RBs.   Other bullets are mainly hypothetical discussions whose validity very much depends on what SSB SCS is supported for initial access. We think it is better to spend more energy/GTW time to the discussion of supported SSB SCS(s) in 2.1.2. Once that discussion is resolved, it is much easier to progress in the discussion of supported SSB/CORESET0 pair SCS(s). If companies think that before resolving the SSB SCS issue we do need to make progress in the discussion of supported SSB/CORESET0 pair SCS(s), maybe we should try to make this addition agreement:   * Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} with the same SCS (FFS: Different SCSs). |
| Ericsson | We support P#1.3-4.  After understanding the cell re-selection use case a bit better (see question in Section 2.1.2), we can be open to modifying P#1.3-4 to capture comments from Nokia. |
| Convida Wireless | We are fine with the updated proposals. |
| Qualcomm | We support the non-FFS parts proposals for Proposal #1.3-4  ANR can be a motivation to use {480,480} and {960,960}.  For the FFSs:   * Regarding {120, 480}, {120, 960}, there may be a clear motivation to use this (higher SCS for higher data rates, but lower SCS for SSB for reduced UE search complexity), but we need to study if the timing resolution for 120 is enough for the higher SCS (480/960). So we support it being FFS, but add a note to study the timing resolution aspect. * For {480,960} and {960,480}: we don’t see a clear motivation to support these. Also, to have consistent SCS numerology (for lower UE implementation complexity) and to reduce spec impact, we propose not to include these (even in the FFS). |
| Moderator | I’ve started to formulate a summary of discussion #2 (below). Please note the summary is temporary and will be updated further as additional comments are received.  I’ve added P1-3-5 based on comments from Huawei. |
| DOCOMO | We agree with Nokia that we should consider enabling the system information delivery also in case of ‘non-initial’ access. Our understanding is that cell re-selection is non-initial access.  We also agree with Intel that FFS duplication should be avoided. Plus, we don’t think the exact candidate combinations should be listed one by one. Therefore, we propose the following update on #1.3-4 below colored in purple: Proposal #1.3-4  * For CORESET and Type0-PDCCH search space configured in MIB:   + Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {120, 120} kHz     - FFS: SSB and CORESET multiplexing pattern, number of RBs for CORESET, number of symbols (duration of CORESET), SSB to CORESET offset RBs.   + If 480kHz ~~and 960 kHz SSB SCS are~~ is agreed to be supported~~, and if initial access is also supported for these this SSB SCS~~,     - Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {480, 480} kHz     - ~~FFS: {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {480, 960} kHz~~   + If 960 kHz SSB SCS is agreed to be supported~~, and if initial access is also supported for this SSB SCS~~,     - Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {960, 960} kHz     - ~~FFS: {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {960, 480} kHz~~   + If 240 kHz SSB SCS is agreed to be supported~~, and if initial access is also supported for this SSB SCS~~,     - Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {240, 120} kHz   + FFS: any other combinations between one of SSB SCS (120, 240, 480, 960) and one of CORESET#0 SCS (120, 480, 960)     - ~~If 240kHz SSB SCS is agreed to be supported, {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {240, 120} kHz~~     - ~~{SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {120, 480} kHz~~     - ~~{SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {120, 960} kHz~~     - ~~{SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {480, 960} kHz~~     - ~~{SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {960, 480} kHz~~ |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We prefer Proposal #1.3-4 |
| Moderator | Added Proposal 1-3-5 based on comments from Docomo.  See summary below |

**Moderator Summary of Discussions #2**

Suggest to further discuss with Proposal #1.3-4, 1-3-5, and 1-3-6 as it contains all the components debated issues and could be modified as such during further discussions.

In Proposal 1.3-4, the highlighted components under FFS are debated and suggested to be removed. At least one company had concerns of making agreements on hypothetical support of specific SCS and suggested an alternative formulation in Proposal 1.3-5.

Moderator suggest to further discuss based on Proposal 1.3-4 and 1.3-5.

##### Proposal #1.3-4

* For CORESET and Type0-PDCCH search space configured in MIB:
  + Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {120, 120} kHz
    - FFS: SSB and CORESET multiplexing pattern, number of RBs for CORESET, number of symbols (duration of CORESET), SSB to CORESET offset RBs.
  + If 480kHz ~~and 960 kHz SSB SCS are~~ is agreed to be supported, and if initial access is also supported for ~~these~~ this SSB SCS,
    - Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {480, 480} kHz
    - ~~FFS: {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {480, 960} kHz~~
  + If 960 kHz SSB SCS is agreed to be supported, and if initial access is also supported for this SSB SCS,
    - Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {960, 960} kHz
    - ~~FFS: {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {960, 480} kHz~~
  + If 240 kHz SSB SCS is agreed to be supported, and if initial access is also supported for this SSB SCS,
    - Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {240, 120} kHz
  + FFS:
    - ~~If 240kHz SSB SCS is agreed to be supported, {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {240, 120} kHz~~
    - {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {120, 480} kHz
    - {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {120, 960} kHz
    - {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {480, 960} kHz
    - {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {960, 480} kHz

##### Proposal #1.3-5

* For CORESET and Type0-PDCCH search space configured in MIB:
* Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} with the same SCS
  + FFS: Different SCSs
* FFS: details of SSB and CORESET multiplexing pattern, number of RBs for CORESET, number of symbols (duration of CORESET), SSB to CORESET offset RBs.

##### Proposal #1.3-6 (update of 1.3-3 based on Docomo comments)

* For CORESET and Type0-PDCCH search space configured in MIB:
  + Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {120, 120} kHz
    - FFS: SSB and CORESET multiplexing pattern, number of RBs for CORESET, number of symbols (duration of CORESET), SSB to CORESET offset RBs.
  + If 480kHz ~~and 960 kHz SSB SCS are~~ is agreed to be supported~~, and if initial access is also supported for these this SSB SCS~~,
    - Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {480, 480} kHz
    - ~~FFS: {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {480, 960} kHz~~
  + If 960 kHz SSB SCS is agreed to be supported~~, and if initial access is also supported for this SSB SCS~~,
    - Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {960, 960} kHz
    - ~~FFS: {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {960, 480} kHz~~
  + If 240 kHz SSB SCS is agreed to be supported~~, and if initial access is also supported for this SSB SCS~~,
    - Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {240, 120} kHz
  + FFS: any other combinations between one of SSB SCS (120, 240, 480, 960) and one of CORESET#0 SCS (120, 480, 960)
    - ~~If 240kHz SSB SCS is agreed to be supported, {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {240, 120} kHz~~
    - ~~{SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {120, 480} kHz~~
    - ~~{SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {120, 960} kHz~~
    - ~~{SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {480, 960} kHz~~
    - ~~{SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {960, 480} kHz~~

**Discussions #3**

Moderator suggest continuing discussion based on Proposal 1-3-4, 1-3-5, and 1-3-6.

##### Proposal #1.3-4 (cleaned up)

* For CORESET and Type0-PDCCH search space configured in MIB:
  + Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {120, 120} kHz
    - FFS: SSB and CORESET multiplexing pattern, number of RBs for CORESET, number of symbols (duration of CORESET), SSB to CORESET offset RBs.
  + If 480kHz is agreed to be supported, and if initial access is also supported for this SSB SCS,
    - Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {480, 480} kHz
  + If 960 kHz SSB SCS is agreed to be supported, and if initial access is also supported for this SSB SCS,
    - Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {960, 960} kHz
  + If 240 kHz SSB SCS is agreed to be supported, and if initial access is also supported for this SSB SCS,
    - Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {240, 120} kHz
  + FFS:
    - {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {120, 480} kHz
    - {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {120, 960} kHz
    - {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {480, 960} kHz
    - {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {960, 480} kHz

##### Proposal #1.3-5

* For CORESET and Type0-PDCCH search space configured in MIB:
* Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} with the same SCS
  + FFS: Different SCSs
* FFS: details of SSB and CORESET multiplexing pattern, number of RBs for CORESET, number of symbols (duration of CORESET), SSB to CORESET offset RBs.

##### Proposal #1.3-6 (update of 1.3-3 based on Docomo comments)

* For CORESET and Type0-PDCCH search space configured in MIB:
  + Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {120, 120} kHz
    - FFS: SSB and CORESET multiplexing pattern, number of RBs for CORESET, number of symbols (duration of CORESET), SSB to CORESET offset RBs.
  + If 480kHz is agreed to be supported,
    - Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {480, 480} kHz
  + If 960 kHz SSB SCS is agreed to be supported,
    - Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {960, 960} kHz
  + If 240 kHz SSB SCS is agreed to be supported,
    - Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {240, 120} kHz
  + FFS: any other combinations between one of SSB SCS (120, 240, 480, 960) and one of CORESET#0 SCS (120, 480, 960)

##### Proposal #1.3-7 (update of 1.3-6 fixing typos)

* For CORESET#0 and Type0-PDCCH search space configured in MIB:
  + Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET#0 for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {120, 120} kHz
    - FFS: SSB and CORESET#0 multiplexing pattern, number of RBs for CORESET, number of symbols (duration of CORESET), SSB to CORESET offset RBs.
  + If 480kHz SSB SCS is agreed to be supported,
    - Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET#0 for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {480, 480} kHz
  + If 960 kHz SSB SCS is agreed to be supported,
    - Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET#0 for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {960, 960} kHz
  + If 240 kHz SSB SCS is agreed to be supported,
    - Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET#0 for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {240, 120} kHz
  + FFS: any other combinations between one of SSB SCS (120, 240, 480, 960) and one of CORESET#0 SCS (120, 480, 960)
    - FFS: initial timing resolution based on low SCS (120 kHz) and its impact on the performance of higher SCS (480/960 kHz)

If Proposal 1-3-4 or 1-3-5 like proposals are difficult to agree to, Proposal 1-3-5 might be something that may be able to achieve better common ground. With that said, please provide further comments.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Discussions/Comments** |
| Nokia | We would be OK with proposal #1.3-6 with a minor alignment of 2nd main bullet with 3rd and 4th main bullet as follows: Proposal #1.3-6 (modified)  * For CORESET and Type0-PDCCH search space configured in MIB:   + Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {120, 120} kHz     - FFS: SSB and CORESET multiplexing pattern, and whether/how to modify Rle-15 FR2 number of RBs for CORESET, number of symbols (duration of CORESET), SSB to CORESET offset RBs.   + If 480kHz SSB SCS is agreed to be supported,     - Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {480, 480} kHz   + If 960 kHz SSB SCS is agreed to be supported,     - Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {960, 960} kHz   + If 240 kHz SSB SCS is agreed to be supported,     - Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {240, 120} kHz   + FFS: any other combinations between one of SSB SCS (120, 240, 480, 960) and one of CORESET#0 SCS (120, 480, 960) |
| Intel | We can accept Proposal #1.3-5, although it would be better to explicitly agree on the candidates for FFS to narrow the discussion further. |
| Qualcomm | We are fine with proposal #1.3-6 and with Nokia’s minor modification  For the FFS part, for a better decision on {120,480/960} combination, it may be beneficial to study the initial timing resolution based on low SCS (120 kHz) and its impact on the performance of higher SCS (480/960 kHz) |
| CATT | We support proposal#1.3-6. We are OK for further discussion of 120/480/960 SCS combination but not in favor of supporting different numerologies. |
| LG Electronics | Basically we think discussion on SSB SCS should be preceded over discussion on multiplexing between SSB and CORESET#0. However, if we need to make some progress on this issue, Proposal#1.3-6 could be acceptable. |
| Fujitsu | We think it would be better to discuss this proposal after we have conclusion in Section 2.1.2 so that we can have appropriate wording for this proposal. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We can support both Proposal #1.3-5 and Proposal #1.3-6 at this phase, since the SCS of SSB has not been determined yet. |
| Vivo | We are fine with this proposal l#1.3-6 |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are ok with Proposal #1.3.-6. Also agree with Qualcomm that a study might be needed for initial timing resolution when different combinations of SCS are used. |
| TCL Communication | We are find with Proposal#1.3-6. In our understanding, mixed numerologies should be supported in this frequency range which is FFS here. |
| OPPO | We are fine with Proposal #1.3-6. |
| Ericsson | We support Proposal #1.3-6; however, one correction CORESET 🡺 CORESET0  Also, the FFS could be clarified as follows:   * + - FFS: SSB and CORESET multiplexing pattern, and whether/how to modify Rle-15 FR2 number of RBs for CORESET, number of symbols (duration of CORESET), SSB to CORESET offset RBs |
| InterDigital | We are fine with proposal #1.3-6 with the updates from Nokia and Ericsson. |
| Futurewei | We are OK with {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {120, 120} kHz.  Everything else, in our opinion, should be kept as FFS rather than an IF /THEN statements. |
| DOCOMO | We support Proposal #1.3-6 with Nokia’s update. As LGE mentioned above, the discussion on SSB SCS should be preceded over this discussion. Our suggested Proposal #1-3-6 would be to avoid unintentional narrowing down of the discussion scope at this early stage. |
| Moderator | Added P1.3-7 based on inputs so far. I’ve added a second FFS based on Qualcomm’s comments. |
| Samsung | We are ok with Proposal 1-3-7 |
| Qualcomm | We are fine with Proposal #1.3-7 |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine with Proposal 1.3-7 |
| Intel | We are fine with Proposal #1.3-7 except the latest addition of the second FFS bullet because it duplicates the FFS bullet from Proposal #1.2-6. Therefore, we prefer to remove the latest FFS from the Proposal #1.3-7. |
| Futurewei | We are fine with Proposal # 1.3-7 |
| InterDigital | We are fine with Proposal #1.3-7. |

**Moderator Summary of Discussions #3**

Companies seem to be gravitating towards Proposal #1.3-7. There was a comment to remove duplicate FFS from another potential agreement. Moderator suggest discussing the removal of duplicate FFS once agreements are about to be made.

* Moderator suggest agreeing to Proposal #1.3-7

**Discussions #4**

Please provide further comments using Proposal #1.3-7.

##### Proposal #1.3-7 (cleaned up)

* For CORESET#0 and Type0-PDCCH search space configured in MIB:
  + Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET#0 for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {120, 120} kHz
    - FFS: SSB and CORESET#0 multiplexing pattern, number of RBs for CORESET, number of symbols (duration of CORESET), SSB to CORESET offset RBs.
  + If 480kHz SSB SCS is agreed to be supported,
    - Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET#0 for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {480, 480} kHz
  + If 960 kHz SSB SCS is agreed to be supported,
    - Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET#0 for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {960, 960} kHz
  + If 240 kHz SSB SCS is agreed to be supported,
    - Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET#0 for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {240, 120} kHz
  + FFS: any other combinations between one of SSB SCS (120, 240, 480, 960) and one of CORESET#0 SCS (120, 480, 960)
    - FFS: initial timing resolution based on low SCS (120 kHz) and its impact on the performance of higher SCS (480/960 kHz)

##### Proposal #1.3-8

* For CORESET#0 and Type0-PDCCH search space configured in MIB:
  + Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET#0 for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {120, 120} kHz
    - FFS: SSB and CORESET#0 multiplexing pattern, number of RBs for CORESET, number of symbols (duration of CORESET), SSB to CORESET offset RBs.
  + If 480kHz SSB SCS that configures CORESET0 and Type0-PDCCH CSS in MIB is agreed to be supported,
    - Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET#0 for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {480, 480} kHz
  + If 960 kHz SSB SCS that configures CORESET0 and Type0-PDCCH CSS in MIB is agreed to be supported,
    - Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET#0 for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {960, 960} kHz
  + If 240 kHz SSB SCS is agreed to be supported,
    - Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET#0 for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {240, 120} kHz
  + FFS: any other combinations between one of SSB SCS (120, 240, 480, 960) and one of CORESET#0 SCS (120, 480, 960)
    - FFS: initial timing resolution based on low SCS (120 kHz) and its impact on the performance of higher SCS (480/960 kHz)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Discussions/Comments** |
| Qualcomm | Fine with Proposal #1.3-7 |
| DOCOMO | We support the Proposal #1.3-7 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We can agree with the proposal with some modification:   1. We think that at least the multiplexing patterns, values for number of RBs, symbols, and offset RBs that are supported in Rel-15/16 should also be supported in 60 GHz for the case that {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET#0 for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {120, 120} kHz 2. According to some alternatives in 2.1.2, 480/960 kHz SSB may be supported but only for the case that when “CORESET0 and Type0-PDCCH search space are not configured in MIB”. In such a case, discussing SSB/CORESET#0 SCS pairs seem irrelevant. This needs to be reflected in the sub-bullets concerning 480/960 kHz SCS.   We suggest the following modification:  **Proposal:**   * For CORESET#0 and Type0-PDCCH search space configured in MIB:   + Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET#0 for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {120, 120} kHz     - Support at least SSB and CORESET#0 multiplexing patterns, number of RBs for CORESET, number of symbols (duration of CORESET), and SSB to CORESET offset RBs that are supported in Rel-15/16.       * FFS: Support for additional values.   + If 480kHz SSB SCS that configures CORESET0 and Type0-PDCCH search space in MIB is agreed to be supported,     - Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET#0 for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {480, 480} kHz   + If 960 kHz SSB SCS that configures CORESET0 and Type0-PDCCH search space in MIB is agreed to be supported,     - Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET#0 for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {960, 960} kHz   + If 240 kHz SSB SCS is agreed to be supported,     - Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET#0 for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {240, 120} kHz   + FFS: any other combinations between one of SSB SCS (120, 240, 480, 960) and one of CORESET#0 SCS (120, 480, 960)     - FFS: initial timing resolution based on low SCS (120 kHz) and its impact on the performance of higher SCS (480/960 kHz)   If suggested changes to the second and third sub-bullets (for 480 and 960 kHz SCS) are not agreeable by other companies, we can only support the first sub-bullet concerning 120 kHz. |
| Nokia | We are fine with the proposal #1.3-7 |
| Intel | We are fine with Proposal # 1.3-7 |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We support the Proposal #1.3-7 |
| CATT | We support Proposal #1.3-7 |
| Futurewei | We are OK with the Proposal # 1.3-7 |
| Moderator | Added Proposal#1.3-8 based on comments from Huawei.  On the removal of the FFS, from moderator’s understanding the CORESET offset value will need to be updated depending on sync and channel raster definition in RAN4. Given that the supported bands are likely to be different from existing FR2, moderator’s not sure if the values can be re-used. For some of the parameters that might be possible, but at least for CORESET0 offset that might not be possible.  Moderator has left the FFS in highlights so further discussion can take place for the FFS part in Proposal 1.3-8. |

**Moderator Summary of Discussions #4**

The discussion seems to be converging somewhat. There is some discussion on whether existing table entries for CORESET0 and Type0-PDCCH CSS configuration can be reused as is for NR operating in 52.6 ~ 71 GHz band. Some further discussion is likely needed. Moderator suggests to further discussion based on Proposal #1.3-8.

**Discussions #5**

Please provide further comments using Proposal #1.3-8 as basis for further discussion.

##### Proposal #1.3-8

* For CORESET#0 and Type0-PDCCH search space configured in MIB:
  + Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET#0 for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {120, 120} kHz
    - FFS: SSB and CORESET#0 multiplexing pattern, number of RBs for CORESET, number of symbols (duration of CORESET), SSB to CORESET offset RBs.
  + If 480kHz SSB SCS that configures CORESET0 and Type0-PDCCH CSS in MIB is agreed to be supported,
    - Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET#0 for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {480, 480} kHz
  + If 960 kHz SSB SCS that configures CORESET0 and Type0-PDCCH CSS in MIB is agreed to be supported,
    - Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET#0 for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {960, 960} kHz
  + If 240 kHz SSB SCS is agreed to be supported,
    - Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET#0 for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {240, 120} kHz
  + FFS: any other combinations between one of SSB SCS (120, 240, 480, 960) and one of CORESET#0 SCS (120, 480, 960)
    - FFS: initial timing resolution based on low SCS (120 kHz) and its impact on the performance of higher SCS (480/960 kHz)

##### Proposal #1.3-9

* For CORESET#0 and Type0-PDCCH search space configured in MIB:
  + Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET#0 for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is equal to {120, 120} kHz
    - FFS: SSB and CORESET#0 multiplexing pattern, number of RBs for CORESET, number of symbols (duration of CORESET), SSB to CORESET offset RBs, including whether the existing (120,120) FR2 table can be reused
  + If 480kHz SSB SCS that configures CORESET0 and Type0-PDCCH CSS in MIB is agreed to be supported,
    - Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET#0 for Type0-PDCCH} SCS ~~is~~ equal to {480, 480} kHz
  + If 960 kHz SSB SCS that configures CORESET0 and Type0-PDCCH CSS in MIB is agreed to be supported,
    - Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET#0 for Type0-PDCCH} SCS ~~is~~ equal to {960, 960} kHz
  + If 240 kHz SSB SCS is agreed to be supported,
    - Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET#0 for Type0-PDCCH} SCS ~~is~~ equal to {240, 120} kHz
  + FFS: any other combinations between one of SSB SCS (120, 240, 480, 960) and one of CORESET#0 SCS (120, 480, 960)
    - FFS: initial timing resolution based on low SCS (120 kHz) and its impact on the performance of higher SCS (480/960 kHz)

##### Proposal #1.3-10

* For CORESET#0 and Type0-PDCCH search space configured in MIB:
  + Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET#0 for Type0-PDCCH} SCS ~~is~~ equal to {120, 120} kHz
    - Support at least SSB and CORESET#0 multiplexing patterns, number of symbols (duration of CORESET#0) that are supported in Rel-15/16 for {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET#0 for Type0-PDCCH} SCS = {120, 120} kHz.
      * FFS: Supporting additional values
    - FFS: Supported values for SSB to CORESET#0 offset RBs, number of RBs for CORESET#0.
  + If 480kHz SSB SCS that configures CORESET#0 and Type0-PDCCH CSS in MIB is agreed to be supported,
    - Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET#0 for Type0-PDCCH} SCS ~~is~~ equal to {480, 480} kHz
  + If 960 kHz SSB SCS that configures CORESET#0 and Type0-PDCCH CSS in MIB is agreed to be supported,
    - Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET#0 for Type0-PDCCH} SCS ~~is~~ equal to {960, 960} kHz
  + If 240 kHz SSB SCS is agreed to be supported,
    - Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET#0 for Type0-PDCCH} SCS ~~is~~ equal to {240, 120} kHz
  + FFS: any other combinations between one of SSB SCS (120, 240, 480, 960) and one of CORESET#0 SCS (120, 480, 960)
    - FFS: initial timing resolution based on low SCS (120 kHz) and its impact on the performance of higher SCS (480/960 kHz)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Discussions/Comments** |
| Qualcomm | We prefer the version without “*that configures CORESET0 and Type0-PDCCH CSS in MIB*”, i.e., the wording in Proposal #1.3-7. |
| LG Electronics | As commented before, we prefer to put FFS for 240/480/960 kHz, since we haven’t made the agreement SSB SCS yet. For yellow-highlighted part, the following may address some companies’ concern on the change from existing specification for 120 kHz SCS SSB.  FFS: Whether SSB and CORESET#0 multiplexing pattern, number of RBs for CORESET, number of symbols (duration of CORESET), SSB to CORESET offset RBs can be reused from Rel-15 NR or not. |
| vivo | We are fine with this proposal but prefer the original Proposal #1.3-7 |
| Nokia | We would prefer proposal #1.3-7, with modifications proposed by LGE, but can live with #1.3-8 for time being. |
| DOCOMO | Same as vivo and Nokia that we prefer the original Proposal #1.3-7 but can live with #1.3-8. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Same as vivo, we are generally fine with Proposal 1.3-8, but prefer the wording in the previous versions #1.3-7. No need for “that configures CORESET0 and Type0-PDCCH CSS in MIB”. The update from LGE is also acceptable for us. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We accept the moderator’s earlier comment that reusing all the values for COREST0 offset may not be possible but we believe that at least SSB and CORESET#0 multiplexing patterns, number of RBs for CORESET, number of symbols (duration of CORESET) that are supported in Rel-15/16 for {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET#0 for Type0-PDCCH} SCS = {120, 120}, should be reused in 60 GHz as well. Therefore, we suggest the following: Proposal #1.3-8 (modified)  * For CORESET#0 and Type0-PDCCH search space configured in MIB:   + Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET#0 for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {120, 120} kHz     - Support at least SSB and CORESET#0 multiplexing patterns, number of RBs for CORESET, number of symbols (duration of CORESET) that are supported in Rel-15/16 for {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET#0 for Type0-PDCCH} SCS = {120, 120} kHz.       * FFS: Supporting additional values     - FFS: Supported values for SSB to CORESET offset RBs.   + If 480kHz SSB SCS that configures CORESET0 and Type0-PDCCH CSS in MIB is agreed to be supported,     - Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET#0 for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {480, 480} kHz   + If 960 kHz SSB SCS that configures CORESET0 and Type0-PDCCH CSS in MIB is agreed to be supported,     - Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET#0 for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {960, 960} kHz   + If 240 kHz SSB SCS is agreed to be supported,     - Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET#0 for Type0-PDCCH} SCS is {240, 120} kHz   + FFS: any other combinations between one of SSB SCS (120, 240, 480, 960) and one of CORESET#0 SCS (120, 480, 960)     - FFS: initial timing resolution based on low SCS (120 kHz) and its impact on the performance of higher SCS (480/960 kHz) |
| Ericsson | We support Proposal #1.3-8, but think that the FFS could be slightly modified (similar to LG's proposal)   * + - FFS: SSB and CORESET#0 multiplexing pattern, number of RBs for CORESET, number of symbols (duration of CORESET), SSB to CORESET offset RBs, including whether the existing (120,120) FR2 table can be reused. |
| Moderator | Added Proposal #1.3-9 and #1.3-10 based on comments.  For Proposal #1.3-10, moderator has moved the number of RB for CORESET to FFS as the available RB isn’t strictly defined yet by RAN4. With that said Proposal 1.3-10 might be better approach as it provide more agreement and guidance for companies to focus their proposal on. |

**Moderator Summary of Discussions #5**

Moderator suggests discussion further with Proposal #1.3-9 and #1.3-10. The main difference between the two are the FFS aspects on configuration parameters for {120,120} SCS combination case for SSB/CORESET. Among the two Proposal #1.3-10 makes further agreements and narrows down further discussion points so moderator suggest trying to see Proposal #1.3-10 is acceptable, and if not further discussion Proposal #1.3-9. The highlighted parts seem to be controversial aspects.

### 2.1.4 Initial Access Support for additional Numerologies

* From [2] Lenovo, Motorola Mobility:
  + For supporting NR from 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz in Rel. 17, if higher subcarrier spacings (numerologies) are adopted for initial access, new CORESET0 mapping structures should be investigated
* From [6] Nokia, NSB:
  + Support additional SCS (480 kHz, 960 kHz) for SSB for other use cases than initial cell selection (e.g. for Scell, BM and RRM).
* From [13] Fujitsu:
  + 480kHz and/or 960kHz SCS for initial BWP can be supported only if 480kHz and/or 960kHz SCS is supported for SSB for initial access.
* From [14] AT&T:
  + Specify one additional SCS (either 480kHz or 960kHz) for initial access related signals and channels in the initial BWP
* From [16] InterDigital:
  + Observation: A single numerology operation is beneficial and NR in 52.6 – 71 GHz already supports a single numerology operation with existing SCS. It’s possible to support a single numerology operation with 120 kHz for UE which wants to avoid frequency numerology change and corresponding complex UE implementation while other UE, which is ready to support additional SCSs and numerology changes, achieves performance benefits with relatively complex UE implementation. Designing new SSBs and initial access related signals/channels for additional SCSs may require a lot of evaluations and corresponding discussions under the limited Tus for the WI.
  + Further study necessity of SSBs and initial access related signals/channels for additional SCSs in Rel-17.
* From [20] Samsung:
  + Whether extra SCS can be supported for SS/PBCH block in initial access depends on the synchronization raster interval.
    - If any of 480 kHz or 960 kHz SCS is supported as default SCS of SS/PBCH block in initial access, the CORESET#0 configuration corresponding to the same SCS as SS/PBCH block should be supported.
* From [22] Ericsson:
  + For cases other than initial access (e.g. for an SCell), support 480 and 960 kHz SCS for SS/PBCH block.
  + Observation: For basic SCell operation, two of the spare bits in IE SubcarrierSpacing can be used to indicate either 480 or 960 kHz SCS for a non-initial BWP via dedicated signaling.

**Summary of Discussions in Tdoc**

* Several companies has discussed whether specific SSB SCS could be used for initial access or whether they should be strictly used only for Scell or non-initial cell selection cases. Some examples of expressed views:
  + 480/960 kHz SSB used for other than initial cell selection:
    - Nokia, NSB, Ericsson
  + 480/960 kHz SSB used for initial access:
    - * AT&T, Samsung
* Suggest to discuss together with supported numerology (2.1.2).

**Discussions**

* Please provide further comments in Section 2.1.2

### 2.1.5 SSB Resource Pattern

* From [1] FUTUREWEI:
  + For 60GHz shared spectrum, consider the support of 120kHz SCS for SS/PBCH (Case D) with necessary changes for LBT opportunities between consecutive SS/PBCH blocks.
* From [2] Lenovo, Motorola Mobility:
  + Observation: For supporting NR from 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz in Rel. 17, if higher subcarrier spacings (numerologies) are adopted for SSB, beam switching issue would appear between the contiguous SSB beams since the CP length would not be enough for beam switching, and an extra gap might be needed to prevent performance degradation.
  + For supporting NR from 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz in Rel. 17, if higher subcarrier spacings (numerologies) are adopted for SSB, then to allow the beam switching between contiguous SSBs, a gap (for example a symbol gap or post prefix) should be supported before beam switching.
* From [3] ZTE, Sanechips:
  + For designing SSB patterns with different SCSs for NR operation above 52.6 GHz, it is proposed to reuse the existing design (i.e. Case A/C, Case B/D and Case E) as much as possible, and take different impacts in single/mixed numerology operation into account.
  + The following options can be considered for supporting beam switching for SSB with SCS 480 kHz and 960 kHz.
    - Option 1: In a half-frame, any two candidate SSBs are discontinuous in the time domain
      * Option 1-1: SSB pattern with SCS 480/960 kHz can adopt the existing pattern of Case A and Case C in one or two slots defined in Rel-15 NR
      * Option 1-2: SSB pattern with SCS 480/960 kHz should be re-designed to reserve at least one symbol between any two candidate SSBs, e.g. only defining one candidate SSB per slot
    - Option 2: Multiple adjacent candidate SSBs are defined to have a same SSB index or QCL assumption
* From [5] Huawei, HiSilicon:
  + Reuse SSB pattern case D for 120 kHz SCS without change at least for licensed operation.
* From [7] CAICT:
  + For the SSB design of 120kHz SCS, the distribution of SSB in each slot could be enhanced.
* From [9] vivo:
  + Observation: No additional gap can considered to accommodate beam switching gap if 120 KHz/240 KHz/480KHz SCS s are used for NR operation up to 71GHz.
* From [10] TCL:
  + FR2 existing SCS and new numerologies can provide a large number of potential SS/PBCH candidate positions to combat channel uncertainty issues.
  + It is proposed to investigate how to transmit the indication about additional SS/PBCH candidate positions which can become available with existing FR2 numerologies or future new numerologies.
* From [12] Intel:
  + Same SSB pattern and Type0-PDCCH CSS configuration to be applicable to 480 kHz and 960 kHz with numerology scaling.
  + Consider 480 kHz and 960kHz SCS based SSB positions in a slot with SSB symbols 2, 3, 4, 5 and 9, 10, 11, 12 in a slot.
    - Note: symbols numbers are enumerated from 0.
* From [19] Xiaomi:
  + Observation: For 120k SCS SSB pattern, there is no candidate SSB positions in 5ms window.
  + At least one SCS beyond 120 kHz should be supported for SSB for initial access and its pattern need update.
* From [20] Samsung:
  + Support new SS/PBCH block pattern for 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCSs.
    - At least one symbol should be reserved between neighboring SS/PBCH block for beam sweeping delay.
    - Symbols should be reserved for CORESET and HARQ with same SCS as SS/PBCH block.
* From [21] CEWiT:
  + Observation: At least for 120KHz SCS, existing SSB design can be reused for NR above 52.6GHz
  + Support for a new SSB design to accommodate more number of SSB beams in the 5ms window and also to accommodate beam switching gap.
  + 120KHz and one among 480KHz and 960KHz should be supported for SSB transmission in NR above 52.6GHz
* From [22] Ericsson:
  + Discuss and agree on design principles for defining SSB time domain patterns for 480 and 960 kHz SCS, including whether or not it is needed to include short gaps for beam switching (e.g., 1 OFDM symbol) and/or long gaps (e.g., 2 slots) to allow for UL transmissions.
  + Use SSB time domain patterns for 120 and 240 kHz SCS as defined for FR2 as a starting point for the design.
* From [23] Apple:
  + Extending the current 120kHz SCS SSB pattern for 480KHz SCS such that PUCCH occasion(s) can be reserved after two consecutive SSBs.

****

* From [25] Qualcomm:
  + Observation:
    - to accommodate explicit SSB beam switching gaps, a new SSB pattern may be required for larger SSB SCS (SCS = 480 kHz and 960 kHz)
    - a symbol-level (1 symbol) SSB beam switching gap may be required for larger SSB SCS (SCS = 480 kHz and 960 kHz)
    - for larger SSB SCS (480 kHz and 960 kHz), accommodating UL segments within the SSB burst may require accounting for DL/UL switching delays taking considerable number of symbols (possibly slot-level)
  + for the SSB for NR operation in the frequency between 52.6GHz and 71GHz and SCS = 480 kHz and 960 kHz, consider defining an SSB pattern consisting of multiple “SSB slots” where SSB symbols for one or more beams are contained in the “SSB slot”
    - A beam switching gap of 1 symbol is inserted between SSBs within the “SSB slot”
    - Additional control symbols may be defined in the SSB slots with beam switching gaps between control and SSB symbols of different beams
    - Additional “gap slots” may be inserted between “SSB slots” to account for URLLC and UL traffic





* From [26] NTT Docomo:
  + When new SCSs are supported for SSB, the two alternatives below can be considered for SSB mapping in time domain:
    - Two SSBs per slot, with guard period of at least 1 symbol between the SSBs
    - One SSB per slot
* From [27] WILUS:
  + At least one symbol gap in time domain between SS/PBCH blocks with different SSB indices should be considered for higher subcarrier spacing (e.g., 960kHz) taking into account a beam switching gap due to a RF interruption time of Tx/Rx beams and/or LBT gap in unlicensed spectrum.

**Summary of Discussions in Tdoc**

* For the not yet specified SSB SCS (i.e. 480 and 960 kHz), several companies provided proposals on which OFDM symbols and slots the SSB should be mapped on.
* For 120 kHz SSB SCS, few companies suggested to update the SSB pattern (OFDM symbols and slots SSB is defined for).
* Suggest to discuss first supported SSB numerology. For the agreed SSB numerology, e.g. 120 kHz, suggest to discuss SSB resource patterns (including whether existing pattern should be applicable).

**Discussions #1**

* While moderator suggest to first discuss SSB numerology, companies are encourage to provide additional discussions to SSB pattern for the (potentially) supported SSB SCS, including whether 120 kHz SSB pattern (OFDM symbol, slot placement) could be used as is or further update is needed.
* For issues related to SSB pattern update due to support of DRS, please provide comments in 2.1.1 to keep the relevant discussions in the same section.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Discussions/Comments** |
| Samsung | If 480/960 kHz is supported for SSB, the corresponding SSB pattern should reserve 1 symbol between neighboring SSB for beam sweeping gap. |
| NEC | Support considering the effect of switching time requirement on SSB pattern for 480 and 960kHz SSB SCS. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We provide several options related to SSB pattern/transmission that can be considered to support beam switching and/or LBT operation.   * Option 1: Any two candidate SSBs are discontinuous in the time domain * Option 1-1: SSB pattern with SCS 480/960 kHz can adopt the existing pattern of Case A and Case C in one or two slots defined in Rel-15 NR * Option 1-2: SSB pattern with SCS 480/960 kHz should be re-designed to reserve at least one symbol between any two candidate SSBs, e.g. only defining one candidate SSB per slot * Option 2: Multiple adjacent candidate SSBs are defined to have a same SSB index or QCL assumption   Among above, we think Option 2 is preferred as it has no limitation on SSB pattern design. With it, Case D SSB pattern for 120 kHz can also be reused for 480kHz/960kHz. |
| DOCOMO | We agree with Samsung that beam sweeping gap with at least 1 symbol should be considered for SSB with 480/960 kHz SCS if supported. We also think that how to utilize resources in a SSB slot efficiently should be considered with beam switching gap. To minimize the overhead due to beam switching gap, a different SSB pattern within a slot for new SCSs, e.g., one SSB per slot, can be considered so that SSB/CORESET#0/SIB1 with same beam can be transmitted within a same slot and only one beam sweeping cycle per period can be achieved. |
| LG Electronics | For 120 kHz SSB which is already agreed to be supported, existing SSB pattern applied for 120 kHz, i.e., Case D, should be reused. |
| Vivo | Agree that beam switching gap problem needs to be considered for SSB with 480K/960K SCS. The following alternatives could be considered:   * + - Alt. 1: New SSB pattern introducing gaps between contiguous candidate SSBs;     - Alt. 2: The same QCL assumptions for contiguous candidate SSBs (e.g. case D in TS38.213);     - Alt. 3: Hopping transmission for contiguous candidate SSBs (e.g. case E in TS38.213). |
| Nokia | We consider that assumption for the beam switching time is << 70 ns meaning that normal cyclic prefix length of 960 kHz subcarrier spacing is long enough to handle beam switching and no explicit beam switching gap is needed between successive SSB blocks. Thus, in our understanding it should be possible to do the beam switching within CP for 480kHz and 960kHz scs so that no additional beam switching gap is needed. To conclude it might be best to consider sending a LS to RAN4 to update or confirm the assumed beam switch time duration. |
| Futurewei | Support existing patterns (such Case D for 120kHz). For shared spectrum, the need of LBT and LBT failure prior to a sequence of SSB transmissions should be discussed. |
| Ericsson | It seems that at least two high level design decisions need to be agreed:   1. Whether or not a symbol gap is needed between SSBs within a slot for beam switching purposes 2. Whether or not a slot-level gap is needed in the pattern, e.g., to allow UL transmissions. This discussion should account for the required DL/UL and UL/DL switching times in order to provide sufficient opportunity for UL transmissions (if slot level gaps are agreed).   Then we can decide if the existing patterns (e.g., Case D) can be reused “as is” or require some modifications. |
| Qualcomm | For higher SCS (at least for 960 kHz and possibly 480 kHz):   * consider adding 1 symbol gap between beams * consider adding slot-level gap for UL/DL switching and UL/URLLC traffic within the pattern |
| OPPO | If 480/960 kHz SSB is supported, we agreed with that at least one symbols should be reserved between neighboring SSBs for the corresponding SSB pattern. But the details should be discussed after we agree to introduce the new SCSs for SSB. |
| InterDigital | We agree that adding a time gap for 960 kHz SSB is needed, if supported. For 480 kHz, further study should be needed. |
| Xiaomi | If 480/960 kHz is supported for SSB, the corresponding SSB pattern can be modified, detail can be FFS after the agreement of 2.1.2. |
| Apple | We support Nokia’s proposal to send RAN4 LS about the beam switching time of new SCSs. As discussed in study item phase, the beam switching gap is an absolute time in a range of <100us. With this assumption, it is still within CP length of 480kHz SCS, but it exceeds the CP length of 960KHz SCS. Nevertheless, it is necessary to ask RAN4 for this as inputs of the design. |
| Intel | For SSB with SCS 480 kHz and 960 kHz, RAN1 specification should support an SSB pattern with at least 1-symbol time gap between consecutive SSB/Type0-PDCCH transmissions. However, minimum 1-symbol gap between SSB and CORESET#0 may result in a slightly larger number of OFDM symbols between consecutive SSBs (up to 3 symbols). Therefore, some further discussion on the number of OFDM symbols for the gap would be useful. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | As discussed in our reply to Section 2.1.2, only 120 kHz SSB needs to be supported in which case the same Pattern D can be reused for the location of SSB indexes at least for licensed band. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | If 480/960 kHz SCS are supported for SSB, beam switching gap e.g. a symbol gap between SSB candidates needs to be introduced. |
| Convida Wireless | For SCS 120 KHz, existing SSB time-domain pattern can be reused. For higher SCS (e.g 480/960 KHz) with consideration of beam switching gap, etc., SSB time-domain pattern should be studied. |
| Mediatek | SSB pattern should be discussed if 480/960 kHz SCSs are supported. Otherwise, current time pattern for SSB would suffice. |
| CEWiT | A new SSB pattern that can accommodate more beams in the beam sweeping window should be supported. If one of 480/960 KHz is supported, then at least one symbol gap should be introduced between SSBs. |

**Moderator Summary of Discussions #1**

* Several companies commented that with the sub 100ns beam switching time (which was the assumption during Rel-15), minimum 1 symbol could be needed between SSB for beam switching for larger SSB SCS.
* Companies also commented some reserved symbols could be needed to provide slot-level gap between DL and UL for larger SSB SCS.
* This discussion does depend on whether 480 kHz and 960 kHz SSB is supported (at least for non-initial access cases). However, given that there is significant number of companies supportive of 480kHz and 960 kHz SSB SCS at least for non-initial access case, let hypothetically assume they are supported and discuss further.

Further discuss on following statement (as a starting point for further discussion):

* For 480 kHz and 960 kHz SSB SCS (if agreed)
  + consider adding 1 symbol gap between beams
  + consider adding slot-level gap for UL/DL switching within the pattern
    - slot-level gap refers to supporting slot(s) that do not contain SSB candidate positions after one or more slot(s) that contain SSB candidate positions.
  + Send an LS to RAN4 to get input on gap required for beam switching, e.g. whether 100ns beam switching gap assumed during Rel-15 NR is applicable for NR operating in 52.6 ~ 71 GHz.

**Discussions #2**

Further discuss using the following statement as a starting point for further discussion:

##### Proposal #1.5-1 (original)

* For 480 kHz and 960 kHz SSB SCS (if agreed)
  + consider adding 1 symbol gap between beams
  + consider adding slot-level gap for UL/DL switching within the pattern
    - slot-level gap refers to supporting slot(s) that do not contain SSB candidate positions after one or more slot(s) that contain SSB candidate positions.
* Send an LS to RAN4 to get input on gap required for beam switching, e.g. whether 100ns beam switching gap assumed during Rel-15 NR is applicable for NR operating in 52.6 ~ 71 GHz.

##### Proposal #1.5-2 (updated)

* For 480 kHz and 960 kHz SSB SCS (if agreed)
  + consider reserving ~~adding~~ 1 symbol gap between SSB candidate positions (and possibly between SSB candidate position and other signal/channels)~~beams~~
  + consider reserving ~~adding~~ slot-level gap for UL/DL switching within the pattern
    - slot-level gap refers to supporting slot(s) that do not contain SSB candidate positions after one or more slot(s) that contain SSB candidate positions.
* Send an LS to RAN4 to get input on gap required for beam switching and input on UL/DL and DL/UL switching gap, e.g. whether 100ns beam switching gap assumed during Rel-15 NR is applicable for NR operating in 52.6 ~ 71 GHz.

##### Proposal #1.5-3 (updated)

* For 480 kHz and 960 kHz SSB SCS (if agreed)
  + Study further on ~~consider~~ reserving ~~adding~~ ~~1~~ symbol gap between SSB candidate positions (and possibly between SSB candidate position and other signal/channels)~~beams~~
  + Study further on ~~consider~~ reserving ~~adding~~ slot-level gap for UL/DL switching within the pattern
    - slot-level gap refers to supporting slot(s) that do not contain SSB candidate positions after one or more slot(s) that contain SSB candidate positions.
* Send an LS to RAN4 to get input on gap required for beam switching and input on UL/DL and DL/UL switching gap, e.g. whether 100ns beam switching gap assumed during Rel-15 NR is applicable for NR operating in 52.6 ~ 71 GHz.

##### Proposal #1.5-4 (updated)

* For 480 kHz and 960 kHz SSB SCS (if agreed)
  + Study further on ~~consider~~ reserving ~~adding~~ ~~1~~ symbol gap between SSB ~~candidate~~ positions (and possibly between SSB ~~candidate~~ position and other signal/channels)~~beams~~
    - FFS: whether symbol gap is needed for both 960 kHz or both 480 and 960 kHz.
  + Study further on ~~consider~~ reserving ~~adding~~ slot-level gap for UL/DL switching within the pattern
    - slot-level gap refers to supporting slot(s) that do not contain SSB candidate positions after one or more slot(s) that contain SSB candidate positions.
* Send an LS to RAN4 to get input on gap required for beam switching and input on UL/DL and DL/UL switching gap, e.g. whether 100ns beam switching gap assumed during Rel-15 NR is applicable for NR operating in 52.6 ~ 71 GHz.

##### Proposal #1.5-5 (updated based on comments from ZTE)

* For 480 kHz and 960 kHz SSB SCS (if agreed)
  + Study further on ~~consider~~ reserving ~~adding~~ ~~1~~ symbol gap between SSB ~~candidate~~ positions with different SSB index (and possibly between SSB ~~candidate~~ position and other signal/channels)~~beams~~
    - FFS: whether symbol gap is needed for both 960 kHz or both 480 and 960 kHz.
  + Study further on ~~consider~~ reserving ~~adding~~ slot-level gap for UL/DL switching within the pattern
    - slot-level gap refers to supporting slot(s) that do not contain SSB candidate positions after one or more slot(s) that contain SSB candidate positions.
* Send an LS to RAN4 to get input on gap required for beam switching and input on UL/DL and DL/UL switching gap, e.g. whether 100ns beam switching gap assumed during Rel-15 NR is applicable for NR operating in 52.6 ~ 71 GHz.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Discussions/Comments** |
| Samsung | We are ok with the proposal in general.   * Suggest to use wording “reserving” instead of “adding”. (“reserve” is the wording used in Rel-15 agreements). * Suggest to use “gap between SSB candidate positions” instead of “gap between beams” * Suggest to add “input on UL/DL switching gap” as well in the LS. |
| LG Electronics | Agree to send an LS to RAN4 to check state-of-art of beam switching delay, since it is also related to other agenda item, e.g., beam management AI. However, we disagree with the main bullet since 480/960 kHz SSB has not yet been agreed. |
| Ericsson | One of the factors that is needed to figure out the duration of a potential slot level gap for UL/DL switching within the pattern is the Tx to Rx and Rx to Tx switching delays in terms of number of OFDM symbols at 480 and 960 kHz. We think this should be included as a question in the LS to RAN4. |
| Vivo | Agree to send a LS to RAN4 and include the questions as Ericsson mentioned. We need to consider the solutions to solve the beam switching problem after we get feedback. It is too early to say add 1 symbol gap between SSBs since it changes the existing SSB pattern which may have further impact. So, we disagree the main bullet. |
| DOCOMO | We agree to send an LS to RAN4 about the required gap for beam switching. |
| Moderator | Added P#1.5-2 based on comments from Ericsson and Samsung.  Added P#1.5-3 based on comments from vivo. Changed to study further, so that certain progress can be made as RAN1 waits for feedback from RAN4. |
| Nokia | We agree to the FL proposal #1.5-3. |
| Intel | Support Proposal #1.5-3 |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine with FL’s updated proposal also fine with sending an LS to RAN4. However, we think that the necessity of reserving one symbol gap with the 100ns hardware switching delay assumption is applicable only for 960KHz. NCP in case of 480KHz can still handle this delay. |
| Futurewei | We agree sending LS to RAN4. We do not see the value of the symbol gap discussions until the SCS for SSB is decided. We prefer to postpone these discussions (both proposals as FFS) until the SCS for SSB is decided. |
| Ericsson | We would like to clarify if the intention of using the wording “candidate positions” is related to the discovery burst transmission window? If so, we would like to decouple this proposal from Proposal #1.1-3.  Except for clarification on the wording “candidate,” we are supportive of Proposal #1.5-3 |
| Qualcomm | We support Proposal #1.5-3 |
| Moderator | I’ve started to formulate a summary of discussion #2 (below). Please note the summary is temporary and will be updated further as additional comments are received.  I’ve added P#1.5-4 based on comments from Ericsson and Lenovo/Motorola. |
| DOCOMO | We agree the Proposal #1.5-4 below |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Regarding symbol level gap between SSB positions, we prefer to add “with different SSB index”, this is because if the neighbour SSB positions are using the same SSB index, there is no need for a gap. Thus we propose:   * + Study further on ~~consider~~ reserving ~~adding~~ ~~1~~ symbol gap between SSB ~~candidate~~ positions with different SSB index (and possibly between SSB ~~candidate~~ position and other signal/channels)~~beams~~ |
| Moderator | Added P#1.5-5 based on comments from ZTE. |

**Moderator Summary of Discussions #2**

Suggest to further discuss with Proposal #1.5-5 as it contains all the components debated issues and could be modified as such during further discussions.

The first bullet of Proposal 1-5-5 is debated at least by one company, who prefer to review the proposal once the SCS is agreed. From moderator perspective while that could be done, depending on when the SCS is finalized, all discussion could be halted or delayed. Given that there is larger group of companies who prefer support of larger SCS for SSB, having these as study seem reasonable balance. With that said, moderator suggest further discussions on the matter.

##### Proposal #1.5-5

* For 480 kHz and 960 kHz SSB SCS (if agreed)
  + Study further on ~~consider~~ reserving ~~adding~~ ~~1~~ symbol gap between SSB ~~candidate~~ positions with different SSB index (and possibly between SSB ~~candidate~~ position and other signal/channels)~~beams~~
    - FFS: whether symbol gap is needed for both 960 kHz or both 480 and 960 kHz.
  + Study further on ~~consider~~ reserving ~~adding~~ slot-level gap for UL/DL switching within the pattern
    - slot-level gap refers to supporting slot(s) that do not contain SSB candidate positions after one or more slot(s) that contain SSB candidate positions.
* Send an LS to RAN4 to get input on gap required for beam switching and input on UL/DL and DL/UL switching gap, e.g. whether 100ns beam switching gap assumed during Rel-15 NR is applicable for NR operating in 52.6 ~ 71 GHz.

**Discussions #3**

There was already agreement to send the LS to RAN4. The contents of the LS could be discussed separately. Moderator suggest focusing on the rest of the proposal #1.5-5.

##### Proposal #1.5-6 (clean up of 1.5-5)

* For 480 kHz and 960 kHz SSB SCS (if agreed)
  + Study further on reserving symbol gap between SSB positions with different SSB index (and possibly between SSB position and other signal/channels)
    - FFS: whether symbol gap is needed for both 960 kHz or both 480 and 960 kHz.
  + Study further on reserving slot-level gap for UL/DL switching within the pattern
    - slot-level gap refers to supporting slot(s) that do not contain SSB candidate positions after one or more slot(s) that contain SSB candidate positions.

##### Proposal #1.5-7 (update of 1.5-6)

* For 480 kHz and 960 kHz SSB SCS (if agreed)
  + Study further on reserving symbol gap between SSB positions with different SSB index (and possibly between SSB position and other signal/channels)
    - FFS: whether symbol gap is needed for ~~both~~ only 960 kHz or both 480 and 960 kHz.
  + Study further on reserving ~~slot-level~~ gap for UL/DL switching within the pattern accounting possibility for reserving UL transmission occasions in the SSB pattern
    - ~~slot-level gap refers to supporting slot(s) that do not contain SSB candidate positions after one or more slot(s) that contain SSB candidate positions.~~

Please provide further comments.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Discussions/Comments** |
| Nokia | As it is evident that we need to consider this further, based on RAN4 feedback, we are OK with the proposal #1.5-6, with the following modifications.  Firstly a minor editorial correction would be needed for the first FFS. Secondly, we would prefer to leave the final assumption for the duration of the UL/DL switching gap open until we have received feedback from RAN4. The option/possibility to leave gaps for UL transmission in the pattern e.g. similar to 120kHz can be separately considered. Proposal #1.5-6 (modified)  * For 480 kHz and 960 kHz SSB SCS (if agreed)   + Study further on reserving symbol gap between SSB positions with different SSB index (and possibly between SSB position and other signal/channels)     - FFS: whether symbol gap is needed for ~~both~~only 960 kHz or both 480 and 960 kHz.   + Study further on reserving ~~slot-level~~ gap for UL/DL switching within the pattern accounting possibility for reserving UL transmission occasions in the SSB pattern.     - ~~slot-level gap refers to supporting slot(s) that do not contain SSB candidate positions after one or more slot(s) that contain SSB candidate positions.~~ |
| Intel | Proposal #1.5-6 is acceptable for us. |
| Qualcomm | We are fine with Proposal #1.5-6 as is and with Nokia’s modifications |
| CATT | We are OK with Proposal #1.5-6 with preference of Nokia’s revision. |
| Fujitsu | We are fine with the Proposal with modifications from Nokia. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are fine with Nokia’s modifications on Proposal #1.5-6. |
| Vivo | We are find with Proposal #1.5-6 |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | For Proposal #1.5-6, we are fine with the modifications made by Nokia. |
| TCL Communications | We agree to proposal #1.5-6, that a study is necessary for the gap evaluation. |
| OPPO | We are fine with Proposal #1.5-6. |
| Ericsson | We are fine with the modifications made by Nokia |
| InterDigital | We are fine with proposal #1.5-6 with Nokia’s update. |
| Futurewei | We are fine with Nokia’s updates. |
| DOCOMO | We support the Proposal #1.5-6 with Nokia’s update. |
| Moderator | Added P#1.5-7 based on Nokia’s update. |
| Samsung | We support Proposal #1.5-7 |
| Convida Wireless | We are fine with Proposal #1.5-7 with Nokia’s update. |
| Qualcomm | We are fine with Proposal #1.5-7 |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine with the new Proposal #1.5-7. |
| Intel | Proposal #1.5-7 is acceptable for us. |
| Futurewei | We are OK with the Proposal 1.5-7 |
| InterDigital | We are fine with Proposal #1.5-7. |

**Moderator Summary of Discussions #3**

Companies seem to be gravitating towards Proposal #1.5-7.

* Moderator suggest agreeing to Proposal #1.5-7

**Discussions #4**

Please provide further comments using Proposal #1.5-7.

##### Proposal #1.5-7 (cleaned up)

* For 480 kHz and 960 kHz SSB SCS (if agreed)
  + Study further on reserving symbol gap between SSB positions with different SSB index (and possibly between SSB position and other signal/channels)
    - FFS: whether symbol gap is needed for only 960 kHz or both 480 and 960 kHz.
  + Study further on reserving gap for UL/DL switching within the pattern accounting possibility for reserving UL transmission occasions in the SSB pattern

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Discussions/Comments** |
| Qualcomm | Fine with Proposal #1.5-7 |
| DOCOMO | We support the Proposal #1.5-7. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are fine with Proposal #1.5-7 |
| Nokia | We are OK with proposal #1.5-7 |
| Intel | Proposal #1.5-7 is acceptable for us. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Fine with Proposal #1.5-7 |
| CATT | We are Ok with proposal #1.5-7 |
| Futurewei | We are Ok with proposal #1.5-7 |
| vivo | We are Ok with proposal #1.5-7 |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine with proposal #1.5-7 |

**Moderator Summary of Discussions #4**

Moderator suggest agreeing to Proposal #1.5-7

**Discussions #5**

Proposal #1.5-7 seems table. However, please provide comments **only if you have concerns on Proposal #1.5-7**.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Discussions/Comments** |
|  |  |

**Moderator Summary of Discussions #5**

No concerns were received for Proposal #1.5-7. Moderator suggest agreeing to Proposal #1.5-7

### 2.1.6 SSB and CORESET#0 Multiplexing

* From [1] FUTUREWEI:
  + Support a configuration of SS/PBCH and Type-0 PDCCH multiplexed in the same slot using the same QCL.
  + Support SSB and CORESET#0 multiplexing pattern 1 (different slots), and pattern 3 (same slots).
  + Support a configuration where the PDSCH scheduled by Type-0 PDCCH can be rate-matched around the corresponding SSBs.
* From [2] Lenovo, Motorola Mobility:
  + Observation: For supporting NR from 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz in Rel. 17, with higher SCS values such as 480kHz and 960kHz, if existing SSB structures are used, then the minimum bandwidth requirements for UE will increase significantly in order to accommodate the required number of frequency resources within a time-symbol for PBCH/PSS/SSS and only multiplexing pattern 1 could be supported
* From [3] ZTE, Sanechips:
  + The following multiplexing patterns and combinations of SCSs of SSB and Type0-PDCCH can be considered for Rel-17 NR above 52.6 GHz.
    - (SSB, Type0-PDCCH): SCS (120 kHz, 120 kHz)
      * Multiplexing patterns: 1, 3
    - (SSB, Type0-PDCCH): SCS (480 kHz, 480 kHz)
      * Multiplexing patterns: 1, 3
    - (SSB, Type0-PDCCH): SCS (960 kHz, 960 kHz)
      * Multiplexing patterns: 1, 3
* From [7] CAICT:
  + At most two SSB and CORESET#0 multiplexing patterns are used for 480 and 960 kHz SCS.
* From [8] CATT:
  + While 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS are introduced, the 1bit indication in MIB provides the information ofType0-PDCCH SCS along with the detected SSB SCS in a given band in 52.7 -71 GHz ,
    - Issue on multiplexing pattern type(s) (Pattern 1, 2, and/or 3) for SSB and CORESET#0 multiplexing, and other signals

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| SCS of SS/PBCH in extended FR2 | Associated Type0-PDCCH SCS in extended FR2 |
| 120KHz | 120KHz |
| 480KHz |
| 480KHz | 480KHz |
| 960KHz |

* + Patterns 2 and 3 of SSB and CORESET for Type0-PDCCH can multiplex with periodic CSI-RS/paging PDCCH&PDSCH in frequency.
* From [9] vivo:
  + The following alternatives could be considered to solve beam switching problem for contiguous candidate SSBs:
    - Alt. 1: New SSB pattern introducing gaps between contiguous candidate SSBs;
    - Alt. 2: The same QCL assumptions for contiguous candidate SSBs (e.g. case D in TS38.213);
    - Alt. 3: Hopping transmission for contiguous candidate SSBs (e.g. case E in TS38.213).
  + The following SSB-Coreset 0 multiplexing patterns are supported for each SCS pair:
    - (120K, 120K): Pattern 1, Pattern 3
    - (960K, 960K): Pattern 1, Pattern 3
    - (960K, 480K): Pattern 1, Pattern 2
* From [12] Intel:
  + Consider only SSB and CORESET#0 multiplexing pattern 1 for 480 and 960 kHz SCS.
  + Type0-PDCCH CSS may utilize symbols {0,1} and {7,8} that correspond to SSB in the first half and second half of the slot.
* From [19] Xiaomi:
  + Configuration of SSB and CORESET0 multiplexing tables need update to support additional SCS other than 120k for NR from 52.6GHz to 71 GHz.
* From [23] Apple:
  + SSB and CORESET 0/RMSI PDSCH multiplexing pattern 1 can be considered to increase the allowable RMSI payload size with reasonable coverage.
* From [25] Qualcomm:
  + consider the following SSB and CORESET0 SCS combinations:
    - SSB SCS = 120 kHz, CORESET0 SCS = 120, 480, 960 kHz
    - SSB SCS = 240 kHz, CORESET0 SCS = 120 kHz
    - SSB SCS = 480/960 kHz, CORESET0 SCS = SSB SCS

Table 1: Allowed SSB/CORESET0 SCS Combinations

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SSB SCS (kHz)** | **CORESET0 SCS (kHz)** | | |
| **120** | **480** | **960** |
| **120** | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| **240** | Yes | No | No |
| **480** | No | Yes | No |
| **960** | No | No | Yes |

* + consider ways to have 1 extra bit to indicate the common SCS in the SSB structure or contents in case more than 2 values for the common SCS are allowed
  + NR Rel-16 SSB/CORESET0 multiplexing pattern 1 design may be reused with possibly some changes to the table (e.g., the need for < 2.5 ms options for the start of the CORESET0 wrt frame boundary) which depends on the outcome of the SSB pattern design
  + SSB/CORESET0 multiplexing pattern 2:
    - For the 240 kHz + 120 kHz combination: reuse the same design as in NR Rel-16
    - For the 120 kHz + 480/960 kHz combination: the CORESET0 symbols may be placed in the gap symbols between the SSBs (similar to the existing NR Rel-16 design)



* + NR Rel-16 SSB/CORESET0 multiplexing pattern 3 design may be reused for the valid combinations of 120 + 120 kHz, 480 + 480 kHz, and 960 + 960 kHz.
  + Consider introducing an SSB/CORESET0 multiplexing pattern for higher SCS SSB (480 and 960 kHz), where a time domain fixed location for the CORESET0 and SIB1 is considered





* + consider introducing an SSB/CORESET0 multiplexing pattern for higher SCS SSB (480 and 960 kHz), where TDM grouping of the SSB and the corresponding CORESET0/SIB1 is considered



* From [26] NTT Docomo:
  + When new SCS(s) is supported for SSB and a single numerology is used for both SSB and CORESET#0/SIB1, at least TDM between SSB and CORESET#0/SIB1 can be supported.
  + When lower SCS is used for SSB compared with that used for CORESET#0/SIB1, FDM between SSB and SIB1 PDSCH such as in pattern 2 can be considered.
* From [27] WILUS:
  + We propose that SS/PBCH block and CORESET#0/RMSI can be multiplexed in TDM/FDM within a slot considering multi-beam operation and it can be closely located without the gap between SSB and CORESET#0/RMSI for not allowing any in-between channel access operation in the unlicensed band.

**Summary of Discussions in Tdoc**

* Several companies discuss the applicability of SSB/Type0-PDCCH multiplexing pattern 1/2/3 for specific SSB SCS
* Suggest to discuss further for each supported SSB/CORESET#0 SCS combination, which Type0-PDCCH multiplexing pattern (1, 2, and/or 3) would be supported.

**Discussions #1**

* Please provide comments on which Type0-PDCCH multiplexing pattern should be supported for each SSB/CORESET#0 SCS combination.
* Additionally, please provide comments on supported bandwidth/PRB for CORESET#0 and any other issues related with Type0-PDCCH CSS/CORESET#0 configuration.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Discussions/Comments** |
| Samsung | • If synchronization raster interval is larger than FR2, additional CORESET#0 RB offsets are needed for 120 kHz SS/PBCH block SCS;  • If 480 kHz and/or 960 kHz SS/PBCH block SCS is supported, at least CORESET#0 configuration table with same SCS as SS/PBCH block should be supported;  • If there are reserved configurations, all of multiplexing Pattern 1, Pattern 2 and Pattern 3 can be supported in a CORESET#0 configuration table;  • If there are reserved configurations, 96 RB can be added to the CORESET#0 configuration table for 120 kHz SS/PBCH block SCS. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | As commented in 2.1.3, same SCS for SSB and CORESET#0 should be supported to reduce the complexity of multiplexing and indication of the SCS for CORESET#0, etc. Thus, multiplexing pattern 1 and 3 can be considered. In addition, bandwidth/PRB for CORESET#0 also depends on minimum bandwidth, multiplexing pattern and the SCS of SSB and CORESET#0. |
| DOCOMO | At least TDM like pattern should be supported considering the available resource for CORESET#0/SIB1.  Even for TDM pattern, beam switching gap overhead should be minimized. For example, TDM between SSB and CORESET#0/SIB1 in the same slot should be considered.  FDM like pattern can be considered if mixed numerology between SSB and CORESET#0 is supported, and if minimum channel bandwidth is large enough. |
| LG Electronics | As we commented in Section 2.1.3, before discussing multiplexing between SSB and CORESET#0, we should first discuss whether new SCS for SSB/CORESET#0 during initial access is supported or not. If new SCS for SSB/CORESET#0 during initial access is not supported, the current specification would suffice. |
| Vivo | The multiplexing pattern should be discussed after the SCS pair for SSB and CORESER#0 is determined. Current pattern should be the baseline with minimum spec impact. In our view, the following SCS pair could be supported by reusing current multiplexing pattern:   * + The following SSB-Coreset 0 multiplexing patterns are supported for each SCS pair:     - (120K, 120K): Pattern 1, Pattern 3     - (960K, 960K): Pattern 1, Pattern 3     - (960K, 480K): Pattern 1, Pattern 2 |
| Nokia | For (SSB 120kHz, CORESET#0 120kHz) and (SSB 240kHz, CORESET#0 120kHz) we think that it would be important to enable operation with 96 RB CORESET#0 for 120kHz (to enable for L=1151 for RACH). Then for the considered SSB and CORESET#0 scs combinations, we think that following multiplexing patterns could be considered.   * + - (SSB 120kHz, CORESET#0 120kHz) [#1,#3]     - (SSB 240kHz, CORESET#0 120kHz) [#1,#2]     - (SSB 480kHz, CORESET#0 480kHz) [#1]     - (SSB 960kHz, CORESET#0 960kHz) [#1]   Afore listed 480kHz and 960kHz SSB and CORESET#0 multiplexing patterns could be considered also in case of non-initial access, if scenario noted in Section 2.1.2 can be considered.  Pending of course on RAN4 discussions, but with 480kHz and 960kHz scs for CORESET#0, CORESET BW could be restricted only to 48RB and 24RB, respectively. |
| Futurewei | Support Pattern 1 (TDM) and Pattern 3 (FDM, same numerology). We do not think that mixed numerology is necessary. |
| Ericsson | Agree with LGE. Clearly this topic is dependent on whether or not SCS other than 120 kHz is supported for CORESET0, as well as minimum bandwidth which is being discussed in RAN4. This is particularly relevant for multiplexing patterns 2 and 3.  Our view is that at least Pattern 1 (TDM multiplexing between SSB and and CORESET0) should be supported. |
| Qualcomm | * Multiplexing patterns 1, 2 (for 120 kHz + 480/960 kHz), and 3 (for equal SCS SSB and CORESET0) can be considered with scaling to the new SCSs * Consider adding new/replacement designs that may help mitigate some of the issues for higher SCSs, e.g.:   + Time domain fixed location for the CORESET0 and SIB1 is considered     - UE may sleep until the corresponding CORESET0/SIB1, thus achieve some power saving     - Smaller delay between SSB and CORESET0/SIB1 (within the same frame)   + TDM grouping of the SSB and the corresponding CORESET0/SIB1 is considered     - Back-to-back SSB/CORESET0/SIB1 help reduce the beam switching gap overheads in case they are adopted |
| OPPO | For SSB and CORESET#0 multiplexing with single numerology, Patten 1, Pattern 2 and Pattern 3 should be supported. |
| InterDigital | Agree with LGE and Ericsson that SCSs for CORESET0 should be discussed first. |
| Xiaomi | Agree with several companies to discuss the SCSs for CORESET#0 in the first place. |
| CATT | Same SCS for SSB and CORESET 0 with multiplexing Patterns 2 and 3. |
| Apple | We shared LG’s view. If new SCSs target for the non-initial access case, i.e., non-standalone e.g., SCell/non-initial BWP, there is no need to transmit SIB information by CORESET #0, hence SSB itself is sufficient.  The maximum bandwidth of CORESET is upbound by the minimum bandwidth of new SCSs, which was handled by RAN4. So, one LS to RAN4 maybe desirable to include other questions identified in earlier discussions to seek inputs.  Assuming there is needed to support SSB/CORESET 0 multiplexing for new SCSs, our preference is multiplexing pattern 0 with a same numerology for SSB/CORESET 0, which is mainly motivated to ensure the performance of SIB1 delivery (coverage and decoding performance) by avoiding FDMed with SSB. |
| Intel | As we pointed out previously, the support of single numerology operation for NR extension up to 71 GHz should be prioritized. Assuming that, the support of SSB and CORESET#0 multiplexing pattern 1 should be prioritized.  As for number of PRBs for CORESET#0. This will highly depend on minimum channel bandwidth supported. For example, for 120kHz case if the minimum channel bandwidth is 400 MHz, it would be possible to focus on the larger CORESET#0 sizes, such as 96 or even larger values.  For 480kHz and 960 kHz, PRB sizes equal or larger than 48 or 24 PRBs, e.g. 60 or 32, respectively, could be candidates for consideration for minimum 400 MHz bandwidth. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | As discussed in our views in Section 2.1.2 and 2.1.3, only 120 kHz SSB and CORESET#0 need to be supported in which case both Mux Pattern 1 and Mux Pattern 3 can be reused. For licensed band, both 24 PRB and 48 PRB can be configured for CORESET0 as in Rel15/16. For operation in shared spectrum, CORESET0 with 48 PRB and 96 PRB can be configured to make full use of allowed transmit power.  96 PRB CORESET0 in the shared spectrum is due to FCC regulation for 57-71 GHz which restricts the maximum conducted output power at 27 dBm if the emission bandwidth is at least 100 MHz and the conducted power should be scaled down if the transmission bandwidth is smaller than 100MHz. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support multiplexing pattern 1, and pattern 3 with same SCS for both CORESET#0 and SSB. Also agree with ZTE that the minimum bandwidth may impact the required number of PRBs for both CORESET#0 and SSB. If 480/960 are to be supported for both SSB and CORESET#0 and if the minimum bandwidth is not large enough, then multiplexing pattern 3 with 960KHz SCS for example may require further study on the possible CORESET#0 RB configuration. |
| Mediatek | Agree with several companies that SCS for SSB and CORESET #0 should be discussed first. |

**Moderator Summary of Discussions #1**

* Several companies commented to prioritize multiplexing pattern 1.
* Given that this discussion is highly dependent on whether larger SSB SCS is supported and whether initial access is also supported for these cases, moderator suggest companies to continue to provide comments but hold off making conclusions for now.

Continue to provide comments on this issue.

**Discussions #2**

Continue to provide comments on this issue discussed in #1.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Discussions/Comments** |
| Samsung | We agree that Pattern 1 should be the baseline to support.  Other than this, we want to clarify some of the understanding on the supporting of Pattern 2 and Pattern 3 with the concern of minimum channel bandwidth. Basically the CORESET#0 configuration table indicated by MIB is applicable to the set of all channel bandwidths, and not only for minimum channel bandwidth, so Pattern 2 and Pattern 3 only need to be valid for at least one of the supported channel bandwidth, but not necessarily the minimum channel bandwidth. Actually in Rel-15, Pattern 2 and Pattern 3 are not supported for minimum channel bandwidth, but for operators with higher channel bandwidth. For example, taking {120, 120} kHz SCS combination as an example, FR2 minimum channel bandwidth is 50 MHz, which is 32 RBs, and it’s impossible to include both SSB and CORESET#0 in Pattern 3 into the minimum channel bandwidth. In this sense, Pattern 3 is only supported for those operators with higher channel bandwidth (e.g. at least 100 MHz), and for operators only with minimum channel bandwidth, only the configuration corresponding to Pattern 1 with 24 RB as CORESET#0 bandwidth can be used.  Hopefully the above clarification can resolve the concern on the dependency of multiplexing pattern with minimum channel bandwidth. |
| LG Electronics | We support multiplexing Patterns 1 and 3 for the same numerology and Patterns 1 and 2 for the different numerologies. |
| Nokia | Like noted earlier it would be good to conclude the supported SCS first. After saying that, pattern 1 would require most of the design effort thus may be a good point to start. However, when considering applicability of short control signaling, we should also consider pattern #2 (and #3). |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support multiplexing Pattern 1 and 3. However, agree with several companies that the conclusion on the supported SCS and decision on the different combinations; same numerology/ multiplexed numerology, if made first, will help the discussion on this proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We think this issue is better to be discussed after we agreed in SSB SCS(s) for initial access. In any case, we support (SSB, CORESET#0) = (120, 120) with both Mux1 and Mux3. We support COREST#0 BW of 24 and 48 PRBs for licensed operation and 48 and 96 PRBs for shared spectrum operation. |
| Qualcomm | We may need to delay proposals for this until the SSB SCS and patterns, and SSB+CORESET0 SCS combinations are agreed |
| Moderator | I’ve started to formulate a summary of discussion #2 (below). Please note the summary is temporary and will be updated further as additional comments are received. |
| Moderator | See summary below |

**Moderator Summary of Discussions #2**

Several companies commented (in discussion #1 and #2) that this issue should be revisited once the SCS combination for SSB and CORESET#0 is further resolved. Suggest discussing once the proposal on SCS combination is concluded.

**Discussions #3/4**

Moderator suggests companies to provide any additional comments (if any).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Discussions/Comments** |
| Ericsson | We are fine to defer discussion until there is more clarity on SSB SCSs and (SSB,CORSEET0) SCS combinations |
| Futurewei | We are fine postponing this discussion. |
| Samsung | OK with FL’s assessment |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Ok with postponing the discussion until decisions of SSB/CORESET0 multiplexing options and their SCS are made |
| Moderator | Please continue to provide input to this table |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are OK to postpone this discussion. |

**Moderator Summary of Discussions #4**

Moderator recommends postponing discussing SSB and CORESET#0 multiplexing issue until the SCS combination for SSB and CORESET#0 is further resolved.

**Discussions #5**

Company seem to be ok with postponing the discussion. Please provide comments **only if you have concerns on the suggestion**.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Discussions/Comments** |
|  |  |

**Moderator Summary of Discussions #5**

No concerns were raised to postpone the discussion on SSB and CORESET#0 multiplexing issue until until the SCS combination for SSB and CORESET#0 is further resolved.

### 2.1.7 CORESET#0 Configuration

* From [5] Huawei, HiSilicon:
  + For licensed operation, both 24 PRB and 48 PRB can be configured for CORESET0. For operation in shared spectrum, CORESET0 with 48 PRB and 96 PRB can be configured to make full use of allowed transmit power.
* From [9] vivo:
  + To solve the problem of the limited CORESET and RMSI payload, two solutions can be utilized:
    - Assuming two consecutive SSB beams have QCL relationship
    - Assuming only one SSB is transmitted every two consecutive SSB beams
* From [10] TCL:
  + Observation: The transmission of minimum system information with a large number of active beams makes the system inefficient and imposes beam switching constraints, resulting in reduced scheduler flexibility.
  + Observation: For shared carriers, the transmission of minimum system information with a large number of active beams brings additional issues related to channel ownership, and potential requirements to perform channel access procedures while switching the beams.
  + It is proposed to investigate efficient transmission of MSI including the multiplexing patterns for both licensed and shared carriers.
* From [13] Fujitsu:
  + Further discuss SCS of SSB for initial access at least considering maximum mandatory bandwidth of UE.
    - If the maximum mandatory bandwidth of UE is as for the current FR2 and RedCap UE should be considered for the new frequency range, neither of 480kHz and 960kHz can be supported.
    - If the maximum mandatory bandwidth of UE is as for the current FR2 and RedCap UE should not be considered for the new frequency range, 480kHz can be supported.
    - If the maximum mandatory bandwidth of UE is 400MHz, 480kHz and/or 960kHz can be supported.
* From [19] Xiaomi:
  + Configuration of SSB and CORESET0 multiplexing tables need update to support additional SCS other than 120k for NR from 52.6GHz to 71 GHz.
* From [20] Samsung:
  + For COREST#0,
    - if synchronization raster interval is larger than FR2, additional CORESET#0 RB offsets are needed for 120 kHz SS/PBCH block SCS;
    - if 480 kHz and/or 960 kHz SS/PBCH block SCS is supported, at least CORESET#0 configuration table with same SCS as SS/PBCH block should be supported;
    - if there are reserved configurations, both multiplexing Pattern 2 and Pattern 3 can be supported in a CORESET#0 configuration table;
    - if CORESET#0 bandwidth can be increased, 96 RB can be added to the CORESET#0 configuration table for 120 kHz SS/PBCH block SCS.

**Summary of Discussions in Tdoc**

* Following up discussions on supported SSB/Type0-PDCCH multiplexing pattern, companies have provided further discussion on supported bandwidth (#PRB) and configured Type0-PDCCH CSS resources.
* Suggest to discuss further along with SSB/CORSET#0 multiplexing issue (2.1.6)

**Discussions**

* Moderator suggests to discuss this issue along with SSB/CORESET#0 multiplexing issue.
* Please provide comments in Section 2.1.6.

### 2.1.8 Various other aspects on SSB Design

* From [2] Lenovo, Motorola Mobility:
  + For supporting NR from 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz in Rel. 17, if higher subcarrier spacings (numerologies) are adopted for initial access, new SSB structures should be investigated.
  + For supporting NR from 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz in Rel. 17, if higher subcarrier spacings (numerologies) are adopted for initial access, coverage enhancement of channels and signals used for initial access should be considered for NR beyond 52.6 GHz.
* From [7] CAICT:
  + Initial BWP includes only one LBT bandwidth for unlicensed deployment.
* From [9] vivo:
  + For initial cell search in 52.6-71GHz, a UE may assume that half frames with SSB occur with smaller period than FR2 (e.g. 5ms), or lower RAN4 requirement for the cell search time.
* From [13] Fujitsu:
  + For further study on initial access for the new frequency range (52.6~71GHz), it should be clarified whether to consider RedCap UE.
  + For further study on initial access for the new frequency range (52.6~71GHz), RAN1 can send LS to RAN4 asking about at least the minimum channel BW (50MHz or 400MHz) and the maximum mandatory bandwidth of UE (including RedCap UE if it should be considered), or wait for the progress in RAN4.
* From [14] AT&T:
  + Observation: For both single carrier and intra-band multi-carrier deployments regardless of time or frequency division multiplexing of multiple numerologies a myriad of complexities arise during every step of the system design and operation, from standardization, to implementation, to orchestrating the resources during actual deployment which result in additional and unnecessary costs and performance impairments
* From [15] Spreadtrum:
  + The initial access mechanisms for R16 NR-U can be kept, e.g. candidate SSB index, SSB (beam) index, discovery burst transmission window, ssb-PositionQCL-r16, new interpretation of ssb-PositionInBurst and off-raster SSB for cgi report.
* From [18] NEC:
  + Upon LBT based SSB transmission for initial access, the sensing beam group with multiple concurrent LBT/sensing beams could be used to improve the SSB transmission performance.
  + For LBT based initial access, transmission beam(s) for certain SSB should be covered by corresponding LBT/sensing beam(s) on which the channel is sensed to be idle.
  + The energy detection threshold adaptation procedures for LBT based initial access should take into account the maximum transmission power difference between transmission on a single beam and multiple concurrent beams.
* From [21] CEWiT:
  + For SSB with 120KHz SCS, solutions for mitigating effect of phase noise need to be defined.
* From [24] Convida:
  + SSB coverage enhancement should be studied for higher SCS if it is supported.
  + Introduction of TRS/CSI-RS in idle/inactive mode UE in Rel 17 should be studied for NR operation from 52.6 to 71 GHz.
* From [26] NTT DOCOMO:
  + Wider bandwidth than 50 MHz should be considered as minimum channel bandwidth for a band in 52.6 – 71GHz

**Summary of Discussions in Tdoc**

* Companies have provided discussion on considerations for SSB design. The discussion includes, how to handle the 5 msec SSB periodicity, enhanced SSB (e.g. larger number of symbols for PBCH), applicability of reduced capability Ues and how RedCap UE would be handled, support of TRS/CSI-RS in idle/inactive mode, relationship between initial BWP and LBT bandwidth, and minimum channel bandwidth considered.
* Suggest to discuss these issues further.

**Discussions #1**

* Among the issues discussed, please highlight issues that companies think would benefit from having agreements/conclusions in RAN1 #104-e. Also provide issues that were not captured by the moderator in this document.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Discussions/Comments** |
| Samsung | * No need to change the minimum periodicity of 5 ms. There are examples the SSB burst is much shorter than 5 ms, and there is no issue with that. * We didn’t see an issue with PBCH coverage from the SI, so no need to modify the SSB structure. * We don’t think Rel-17 RedCap is targeted for and applicable to 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz * Support of TRS/CSI-RS in idle/inactive mode is discussed in power saving enhancement * We didn’t see a need for special treatment of LBT bandwidth for initial access * We support the proposal of supporting a minimum carrier bandwidth to be larger than 50 MHz (to allow larger sync raster interval), but the discussion should be made in RAN4. |
| NEC | 1. Considering the SSB transmission for initial access in shared channel, we are open to discuss the SSB periodicity.  2. We support keeping the same SSB structure for higher SCS.  3. Upon the minimum channel bandwidth, we support leaving it to RAN4. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Similar view with Samsung. Most of the issues above do not need a specific discussion. Among them, some have been excluded from WID above 52.6 GHz e.g. SSB coverage enhancement, some are being discussed in other WI group e.g. TRS/CSI-RS, and some enhancements seem unnecessary e.g. smaller half-frame periodicity. We only need to consider the impact of the minimum channel bandwidth on initial access signals/channels. |
| DOCOMO | If 480/960 kHz is supported for SSB, SSB burst may be much shorter than 5 ms. Then SSB measurement window shorter than 1 ms could be beneficial to reduce UE monitoring burden, as described in [28].  We support the minimum carrier bandwidth should be larger than 50 MHz. Ok to discuss the minimum carrier bandwidth itself in RAN4, but we believe it is related to SSB SCS selection for initial access. |
| Vivo | Clarification on the SSB period issue here: In FR2, UE will assume 20ms SSB period for initial cell search. Here we propose to change this default SSB period to be smaller (e.g. 5 or 10ms) considering the increasing SSB synchronization complexity for NR operation from 52.6-71GHz. Another alternative is to relax the time requirement in RAN4 for cell search. To maintain the performance, we prefer to have a smaller default SSB period. |
| Nokia | From the issues listed we feel that the minimum carrier/UE BW support discussion is the highest priority/relevant aspect, but these would also depend on RAN4 discussions. |
| Charter Communications | Retain 5 ms SSB burst periodicity. Minimum channel BW discussions are already on-going in RAN4, so need to coordinate there. |
| Futurewei | Initial access BW, LBT BW should be prioritized. We prefer a 400 MHz carrier BW, but we should consider RAN4 discussions on this subject. FR2 SSB burst periodicity and SSB structure should be reused. |
| Ericsson | * Regarding the moderator’s suggestion on whether or not to discuss “how to handle the 5 msec SSB periodicity”, it is not clear what the discussion point is. Is it about the default SSB periodicity that the UE assumes on initial access? Or is it about the minimum configured periodicity? * No need to modify SSB structure (coverage enhancements are out of scope in the WID anyway) * No need to discuss TRS/CSI-RS in IDLE mode in this WI * LBT bandwidth is being discussed in Channel Access – no need for special handling for initial access * Minimum channel bandwidth is being discussed in RAN4; however, we share a similar view as Samsung; 50 MHz is not needed. |
| Qualcomm | Consider ways to have 1 extra bit to indicate the common SCS in the SSB structure or contents in case more than 2 values for the common SCS are allowed  This comment was not made by Qualcomm:  “*From [25] Qualcomm:*   * *Wider bandwidth than 50 MHz should be considered as minimum channel bandwidth for a band in 52.6 – 71GHz*” |
| OPPO | * No need to change min periodicity of 5 ms * Open to revisit SSB structure if issues are clarified. * No need to consider R17 RedCap UE. * Relation between BWP in general, LBT bandwidth and channel bandwidth can be discussed in 8.2.6. |
| InterDigital | We don’t see the need for discussion on the above issues. |
| CATT | Those issues should be discussed later |
| Apple | - SSB coverage enhancement is NOT in the WID scope.  - As commented earlier, minimum channel BW should ask RAN4 for inputs. |
| Intel | We believe that SS/PBCH coverage enhancements as well as RedCap UE support is not a part of the current WI as described in the WID:  Note: coverage enhancement for SSB is not pursued. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We think the discussion should focus first on supported SSB SCS in initial access as many other discussions in this Email discussion depend on the outcome of this discussion.  As discussed in our reply in 2.1.2, we believe that the discussion of additional SSB SCS in Section 2.1.2 needs to be split into SSB SCS for Initial Access and non-Initial Access from the outset (with the first focus on Initial access) due to the following reasons:   * WID considers two separate objectives for possible additional SCSs for SSBs:  |  | | --- | | * “Study and specify, if needed, additional SCS (240kHz, 480kHz, 960kHz) for SSB, and additional SCS(480kHz, 960kHz) for initial access related signals/channels in initial BWP. * Study and specify, if needed, additional SCS (480kHz, 960kHz) for SSB for cases other than initial access.” |  * Most companies have studied the issues of additional SSB SCS for Initial access and non-initial access scenarios separately as additional SSBs for each scenario has its own challenges and possible applications. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | In our view if the minimum bandwidth is not large enough, then for the case of 960kHz for example with multiplexing pattern 3, an investigation of the required number of RBs might be required. We agree with keeping the current SSB structure in terms of number PRBs/symbols if it can satisfy this case, and only reducing the CORESET#0 bandwidth if there is no impact on the performance and the size of the information carried by CORESET#0. |
| Convida Wireless | We share the same view with Samsung. |

**Moderator Summary of Discussions #1**

* From the comments from companies, its clear that there is no consensus on the additional issues raised so far. Moderator suggests discussing further and proponents of the proposals to provide further information or responses to comments above.
* Moderator suggests further discussion.

**Discussions #2**

Continue to provide comments on this issue discussed in #1.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Discussions/Comments** |
| Samsung | To vivo’s comment on the SSB default periodicity: if we understand correctly, this concern is only applicable when 480 or 960 kHz is used as default SCS for initial cell search. We can go back to this issue if the such proposal is agreed. |
| Vivo | Clarify again on our proposal is to change the default SSB period to be smaller (e.g. 5 or 10ms) considering the increasing SSB synchronization complexity for NR operation from 52.6-71GHz from 20ms assumption for initial cell search in FR1/FR2. There is no intention to have a smaller SSB period than 5ms.  To Samsung’s question, even when 120KHz SSB for initial cell search, the number of searchers for coarse SSB frequency synchronization is increased due to higher frequency. One straightforward solution is to increase the number of searchers which brings more hardware cost. Another way is to distribute the searchers in different periods which may introduce more cell search delay. To maintain the same requirement, assuming a smaller default SSB period could also be considered. |
| Nokia | We would like to note that this would in practice prevent the use of short control signaling up to 480kHz SCS and would result need to apply longer search window (to account LBT). Thus reducing the period may be counterproductive. |
| Samsung2 | To vivo’s comment: thanks for the further comment. For 120 kHz SCS, if I understand correctly, you mean the initial frequency offset can be larger due to higher frequency range (assuming the same ppm). We can further investigate the potential complexity issue as commented by vivo, but decreasing the SSB periodicity may be an essential factor to reduce such complexity. Typically UE uses a sliding window to search PSS, and periodicity only impacts the number of cross-correlation to store for potential soft-combining. In initial cell search, since all UE buffer is empty, the impact to buffer is not the most essential issue in this case, and we’d rather try to reduce the number of searching points as the most essential issue. |
| Moderator | I’ve started to formulate a summary of discussion #2 (below). Please note the summary is temporary and will be updated further as additional comments are received. |
| Moderator | See summary below |

**Moderator Summary of Discussions #2**

There were several other aspects that was discussed in contributions. Some notable ones are (not an exhaustive list):

* Reduction of default SSB periodicity from 20msec to a smaller value
* enhanced SSB (e.g. larger number of symbols for PBCH)
* applicability of reduced capability Ues and how RedCap UE would be handled
* support of TRS/CSI-RS in idle/inactive mode
* relationship between initial BWP and LBT bandwidth

There was no clear majority or consensus to support some of the proposals, as companies commented that many of the proposals fall outside the WI scope. Some further discussion took place for changes to default SSB periodicity, but some companies raised concerns of other potential system impact.

Moderator suggest letting companies discuss further on the issues over email.

**Discussions #3**

Moderator suggests companies to provide any additional comments (if any).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Discussions/Comments** |
| Intel | The following bullets seem to be addressing coverage issues and are out of WI’s scope:   * enhanced SSB (e.g. larger number of symbols for PBCH) * applicability of reduced capability Ues and how RedCap UE would be handled * support of TRS/CSI-RS in idle/inactive mode   So, we prefer to remove them.  The first bullet seems to have some issues with applicability of short signal exemption to SS burst if 20 ms periodicity is reduced to smaller value. Because of the implications, further study would be needed. |
| Ericsson | Agree with the comments from Intel  If default SSB periodicity is studied, the scope should be broadened to consider increasing the period, e.g., to 40 ms since operation at 60 GHz is most likely to be in environments that are more stationary.  Regarding the point on relationship between initial BWP and LBT bandwidth, that is better treated in the channel access AI where LBT bandwidth is being discussed. At least we can wait until more progress is made there. |
| InterDigital | We agree with Intel. |
| Futurewei | We are OK with Intel’s comments. We could add these points later if needed. |
| Nokia2 | We are OK with comments from Intel and preclude the listed points at this stage. Also, if we want to consider the SSB default periodicity, we should consider both options (decreasing as well increasing) as proposed by Ericsson. |
| Samsung | We agree with Intel’s comment. |
|  |  |

**Moderator Summary of Discussions #3**

Moderator is not sure if we need a formal conclusion but provided a summary of the potential conclusion that could be made. If the conclusion is not essential, moderator suggests avoiding making unnecessary conclusions/agreements.

(skip if not needed) Moderator suggested conclusion:

* RAN1 concludes the following issues are out-of-scope for NR extension to 71 GHz WI
  + enhanced SSB (e.g. larger number of symbols for PBCH)
  + applicability of reduced capability Ues and how RedCap UE would be handled
  + support of TRS/CSI-RS in idle/inactive mode

**Discussions #4**

Please provide further comments on the following suggestion conclusion, including whether agreeing to such conclusion is needed or not.

* RAN1 concludes the following issues are out-of-scope for NR extension to 71 GHz WI
  + enhanced SSB (e.g. larger number of symbols for PBCH)
  + applicability of reduced capability Ues and how RedCap UE would be handled
  + support of TRS/CSI-RS in idle/inactive mode

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Discussions/Comments** |
| Qualcomm | We don’t believe there is a need for such conclusion |
| Nokia | We are OK with the proposed conclusion. |
| Intel | We slightly prefer to make the conclusion in order not to get back to this kind of discussion in next meetings. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are OK with above conclusion. |
| CATT | Ok with the proposed conclusion |
| Futurewei | We believe that we could postpone such conclusion for now. |

**Moderator Summary of Discussions #4**

Moderator suggest to discussion the following potential conclusion. From moderatos’ perspective it would be better to avoid conclusions that may not be completely necessary and does not have any specification impact.

* RAN1 concludes the following issues are out-of-scope for NR extension to 71 GHz WI
  + enhanced SSB (e.g. larger number of symbols for PBCH)
  + applicability of reduced capability UEs and how RedCap UE would be handled
  + support of TRS/CSI-RS in idle/inactive mode

**Discussions #5**

The proposed conclusion seems stable. However, its not clear whether we need to agree on the conclusions explicitly or not. Please provide comments only if you think having the conclusion agreed is important. If multiple companies think having the conclusion has value, we can bring it up in GTW. Otherwise, moderator will assume making an agreement on the conclusion is not needed.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Discussions/Comments** |
| LG Electronics | OK to proposed conclusion, with the understanding that TRS/CSI-RS in idle inactive mode can be applicable to this frequency range without specification impact in addition to Rel-17 power saving WI. |
| Nokia | Regarding the TRS occasions applicability (as per Rel-17 UE power saving WID), it may be bit premature to say that these would be applicable without any specification change as the details of the TRS occasion configuration are open. |
| Ericsson | Similar view as LGE |

**Moderator Summary of Discussions #5**

Moderator suggests discussing the following conclusion

* RAN1 concludes the following issues are out-of-scope for NR extension to 71 GHz WI
  + enhanced SSB (e.g. larger number of symbols for PBCH)
  + applicability of reduced capability UEs and how RedCap UE would be handled

## 2.2 PRACH Aspects

### 2.2.1 PRACH BW and Sequence Length

* From [1] FUTUREWEI:
  + With RAN 1 interpretation the OCB restriction does not imply that each of PRACH possible format transmissions should occupied 70% of the nominal channel bandwidth.
  + For 60 GHz shared spectrum, support 400MHz as the default channel bandwidth for the initial channel access and as the default channel bandwidth for the CCA (LBT) operations.
  + Consider the necessity of interlaced based PRACH mappings to achieve the maximum radiated power as well as at least one PRACH format that satisfies the minimum OCB condition.
* From [3] ZTE, Sanechips:
  + Support sequence length 139, 571 and 1151 for PRACH, and further study the corresponding SCS when channel bandwidth and SCS are determined.
* From [5] Huawei, HiSilicon:
  + PRACH sequence length 571 and 1151 are supported for 120 kHz SCS above 52.6 GHz.
* From [6] Nokia, NSB:
  + Observation: Initial BWP bandwidth options for 120 kHz CORESET#0 in FR2 are 34.56 MHz and 69.12 MHz. PRACH preamble using 120 kHz SCS and sequency length of 1151 would not fit into initial BWP defined by 120 kHz SCS CORESET#0 in FR2.
  + Consider supporting wider initial BWP bandwidth options than supported in FR2, e.g. 96 PRBs with 120 kHz SCS.
  + Support PRACH preamble length 571 and 1151 at least for 120 kHz SCS.
* From [9] vivo:
  + Observation: With the usage of higher SCS, the PRACH sequence capacity is very limited when the preamble sequence length is 139.
  + With the usage of higher SCS, the issue of preamble sequence generation needs to be considered to match the certain coverage area.
* From [11] MediaTek:
  + Support PRACH sequence lengths 139/571/1151 for NR above 52.6GHz.
* From [16] InterDigital:
  + Observation: For 52.6 – 71 GHz, longer PRACH sequences are needed for the case that the transmit power is limited, however, no additional specification enhancements are needed as the existing PRACH sequences with the existing sequence lengths 571 and 1151 can be reused for with existing SCS.
  + For 52.6 – 71 GHz, the existing PRACH sequences with the existing PRACH sequence lengths 571 and 1151 should be reused.
* From [17] LGE:
  + The PRACH sequence lengths (i.e., L=139, L=571 and L=1151) can be supported for 120 kHz considering the regulatory requirements in the unlicensed band but it needs to clarify whether all of these lengths of PRACH sequence are required in the licensed band where regulatory requirements are not defined on PSD limit.
* From [20] Samsung:
  + Support short PRACH format for all PRACH sequence lengths LRA ϵ {139, 571, 1151} and all SCSs µ ϵ {3, 5, 6}, and don’t support long PRACH format.
* From [22] Ericsson:
  + Observation: While L = 139/571/1151 is beneficial for 120 kHz PRACH from a coverage perspective, the longer sequence lengths (L = 571/1151) lead to excessive PRACH bandwidth for 480/960 kHz PRACH, and are not needed in order to maximize PRACH transmission power given regulatory/UE power limits.
  + Specify support for all sequence lengths (139/571/1151) for 120 kHz PRACH. For 480/960 kHz PRACH, specify support for only L = 139.
* From [25] Qualcomm:
  + consider using the following for the PRACH preamble sequence lengths for higher bands:
    - SCS = 120 kHz: 139 and 571
    - SCS = 480/960 kHz: 139 only

**Summary of Discussions in Tdoc**

* Companies have provided views on supported PRACH sequence lengths for each supported SCS
  + Support L=139
    - ZTE, Sanechips, MediaTek, Intel, Interdigital, LGE, Ericsson, Qualcomm (for 120,480,960kHz)
  + L=571, 1151
    - ZTE, Sanechips, Huawei, HiSilicon , Nokia, NSB (at least for 120kHz), MediaTek, Intel, LGE, Interdigital, Ericsson, Qualcomm (for 120kHz only)
* Discuss further supported PRACH sequence lengths for each supported SCS

**Discussions #1**

* Please provide comments on supported PRACH sequence length (e.g. L=139, 571, 1151), PRACH Format (e.g. 0-3, A, B, C), PRACH SCS (and applicable scenarios).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Discussions/Comments** |
| Samsung | Support all PRACH sequence length (L=139, 571, 1151) for short PRACH format (A, B, C)   * Support SCS = 480 kHz and 960 kHz for non-initial access case * Support SCS same as initial BWP SCS for initial access case (depending on the outcome from SSB discussion) |
| ZTE, Sanechips | * Support sequence length 139, 571 and 1151 for PRACH format A, B, C. * Support 120kHz SCS for PRACH, jointly discuss additional SCSs (480kHz and 960kHz) for PRACH and SSB if single subcarrier spacing is supported. |
| DOCOMO | We support PRACH sequency length L=139 and 571. We are open to L=1151. We support all short PRACH format.  We support 480/960 kHz SCS for PRACH for non-initial access case, and the same SCS as initial BWP SCS for initial access case. |
| LG Electronics | For PRACH sequence lengths, the lengths (i.e., L=139, L=571 and L=1151) can be supported for the PRACH format (A, B, C). If 480 or 960 kHz subcarrier spacing is supported for PRACH, the corresponding PRACH sequence length can be L=139 and/or L=571. However, it is necessary to clarify whether all of these lengths of PRACH sequence are required in the licensed band where regulatory requirements are not defined on PSD limit.  Support of 480/960 kHz SCS for PRACH is not preferred considering the specification impact on the RO configuration and RA-RNTI issue for 480/960 kHz SCS. |
| Spreadtrum | The PRACH with 480 and 960kHz for non-initial access could be supported to reduce UE complexity when UE is sending data with 480 and 960kHz SCS. |
| Vivo | Support all PRACH sequence length (L=139, 571, 1151) for short PRACH format (A, B, C) and not support PRACH format 0-3.  We support 480K and 960K SCS for PRACH and initial UL BWP with single numerology. |
| Nokia | Support PRACH preamble length 571 and 1151 (in addition to L=139) at least for 120 kHz SCS for short formats (A,B and C). For 480kHz and 960kHz scs PRACH sequence L=139 is supported at least for non-initial access. |
| Futurewei | Support all preambles for SCS 120 kHz (139, 571,1151) and all existing corresponding FR2 PRACH formats. We do not prefer 480kHz/960 kHz for PRACH. |
| Ericsson | * SCS = 120 kHz   + Support L = 139, 571, 1151 for PRACH formats A,B,C * SCS = 480/960 kHz   + Support for non-initial access case only, e.g., SCell   Support L = 139 for PRACH formats A,B,C |
| Qualcomm | Sequence length (LRA):  - SCS = 120 kHz: 139 and 571  - SCS = 480/960 kHz: 139 only  We believe the metric that should be used to get the LRA is the max EIRP of 40 dBm EIRP limit which leads to a required BW of 50 MHz (at 23 dBm/MHz PSD limit). The conducted FCC requirements may not be a good metric choice because, realistically, depending on the UE antenna array gain, a much smaller BW (compared to the “conducted” 100 MHz BW number) may be sufficient to achieve the 40 dBm max EIRP. For example, a 15 dB antenna gain yields a 63 MHz BW where the above SCS/LRA combinations are sufficient to achieve that.  For higher bands consider reusing the PRACH formats defined in NR Rel-16 (with appropriate SCS scaling) |
| OPPO | For spectrum without PSD limit (e.g., licensed spectrum), support L=139 for 120, 480, 960 kHz PRACH sequence; For spectrum with PSD limit (e.g., unlicensed spectrum), support L=571, 1151 for 120 kHz PRACH sequence. For 480kHz and 960kHz SCS, L=139 has already made the PRACH bandwidth greater than 50MHz, which meets the maximum allowed EIRP. In this case, further increasing L to 571 and 1151, does not help to have a better coverage. |
| InterDigital | As clarified in our contribution, we prefer to support L=571, 1151 for 120 kHz. For other SCSs, whether to support 480kHz and/or 960kHz should be discussed before discussing applicable PRACH sequence. |
| Fujitsu | Support all PRACH sequence length and all short PRACH format.  For non-initial access, support 480kHz and 960kHz and all combinations of PRACH sequence length and PRACH SCS can be supported.  For initial access, similar as SSB, some aspects related to RAN4 need to be considered to figure out applicable combinations of PRACH sequence length and PRACH SCS, e.g. minimum channel bandwidth and maximum mandatory bandwidth of UE. Since the bandwidth issues are under discussion in RAN4, RAN1 can wait for RAN4’s decision or send LS to RAN4 asking about the situation, and then further discuss the applicable combinations of PRACH sequence length and PRACH SCS for initial access accordingly. |
| CATT | Support sequence lengths 139, 571 and 1151 for all PRACH format A, B, C. |
| Apple | For 120 kHz, support of length 139,571 and 1151.  For 480kHz and 960kHz SCS, only support L = 139. |
| Intel | Support larger PRACH preamble sequences (571, 1151). Support PRACH formats for L=139, 571, 1151 with SCS 480 kHz and 960 kHz.  As a starting point, RAN1 could agree on L=139 with corresponding PRACH formats and SCS 480 kHz and 960 kHz.  We do not see a need to support Format 0~3. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | **RACH numerology:** The main usage of RACH is during initial access wherein the cost/benefit compromise for the use of a higher than 120 kHz SCS for any signal/channel is not justifiable. Moreover, RACH use in any case is limited to designated RACH slots. As such, we don’t see any compelling reason to support higher than 120 kHz SCS for RACH transmission.  **RACH sequence length:** Support L=571, L=1151 for operation in shared spectrum so the UE can transmit with the maximum allowed power which requires minimum 50 MHz BW for EU and minimum 100 MHz for US. For licensed band, L=139 can be supported.  **RACH format:** Support all short PRACH formats (A,B,C) in Rel-15/16 in principle at least as a baseline. Reducing guard time or PRACH duration may be further considered. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support PRACH with 480 and 960kHz depending on the agreed SCS for SSB |
| Mediatek | PRACH SCS: support only 120 kHz, since utilization of 120 kHz will not prevent data channel from adopting higher SCS  PRACH sequence and format: support sequence lengths 139, 571 and 1151 for the short format (A, B, C) |

**Moderator Summary of Discussions #1**

* Majority of the companies seems to support L=139, 571, and 1151 for 120kHz PRACH SCS. Note that this is already supported in current specification.
* For 480 and 960 kHz PRACH SCS, there seems to be a general support for at least L =139. L=571, 1151 for these may require further discussion.
* No company seems to be against supporting PRACH formats A, B, and C.
* Strive to make a conclusion. Further discuss on following statement (as a starting point for further discussion):
  + Moderator note: assume no additional agreement is needed to support L=139, 571, and 1151 for 120kHz PRACH SCS.
  + Support at least 480 and 960 kHz PRACH SCS with sequence length L=139 for PRACH Formats A1~A3, B1~B4, C0, and C2.
    - FFS: support of sequence length L = 571, 1151

**Discussions #2**

Further discuss using the following statement as a starting point for further discussion:

##### Proposal #2.1-1 (original)

* Moderator note: assume no additional agreement is needed to support L=139, 571, and 1151 for 120kHz PRACH SCS.
* Support at least 480 and 960 kHz PRACH SCS with sequence length L=139 for PRACH Formats A1~A3, B1~B4, C0, and C2.
  + FFS: support of sequence length L = 571, 1151

##### Proposal #2.1-2 (updated)

* ~~Moderator note: assume no additional agreement is needed to support L=139, 571, and 1151 for 120kHz PRACH SCS~~
* For initial access and non-initial access use cases, support 120kHz PRACH SCS with sequence length L=571, 1151 (in addition to L=139) for PRACH Formats A1~A3, B1~B4, C0, and C2.
* For at least non-initial access use cases, support ~~Support~~ ~~at least~~ 480 and 960 kHz PRACH SCS with sequence length L=139 for PRACH Formats A1~A3, B1~B4, C0, and C2.
  + FFS: support of sequence length L = 571, 1151
  + FFS: Support of 480 and 960 kHz PRACH SCS for initial access use cases

##### Proposal #2.1-3 (alternative update of 2.1-1)

* ~~Moderator note: assume no additional agreement is needed to support L=139, 571, and 1151 for 120kHz PRACH SCS~~
* For initial access and non-initial access use cases, support 120kHz PRACH SCS with sequence length L=571, 1151 (in addition to L=139) for PRACH Formats A1~A3, B1~B4, C0, and C2.
  + FFS: support ~~Support~~ ~~at least~~ 480 and 960 kHz PRACH SCS with sequence length L=139, 571, and/or 1151 for PRACH Formats A1~A3, B1~B4, C0, and C2.
  + ~~FFS: support of sequence length L = 571, 1151~~
  + FFS: whether 480 and 960 kHz PRACH SCS are applicable for initial access and/or non-initial access use cases

##### Proposal #2.1-4 (separate proposal, addition of condition to 2-1-2)

* + Note: 480 and 960 kHz PRACH SCS for initial access use cases is assumed to be supported if SCS 480 and 960 kHz are accepted for SSB for initial access cases

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Discussions/Comments** |
| Samsung | We have a different understanding of moderator’s note. L=571 and 1151 is not supported in current specification, so agreement and spec impact are both needed.  For the second bullet, it would be also good to clarify this is for “initial access” or “non-initial access” cases. If 480 and 960 kHz are not supported for initial BWP, this proposal may not be valid. |
| Ericsson | Agree with Samsung that in the current specs, L = 571 is supported only for 30 kHz SCS, and L = 1151 is supported only for 15 kHz. Hence, an agreement is needed to support L = 571, 1151 for 120 kHz.  Agree with Samsung that the 2nd bullet should be clarified as follows:   * For non initial access use cases, support at least 480 and 960 kHz PRACH SCS with sequence length L=139 for PRACH Formats A1~A3, B1~B4, C0, and C2.   + FFS: support of sequence length L = 571, 1151   + FFS: Support of 480 and 960 kHz PRACH SCS for initial access use cases |
| LG Electronics | We share the same view with Samsung for the first bullet. Meanwhile, whether to support 480 and 960 kHz PRACH SCS should be discussed with SSB SCS. Therefore, we suggest the modification on the second bullet as follow:   * FFS for the support of 480 and 960 kHz PRACH SCS, if supported, at least sequence length L=139 for PRACH Formats A1~A3, B1~B4, C0, and C2 can be considered |
| vivo | Agree with Samsung for the first bullet and support Ericsson’s reformulated proposal on bullet 2. |
| DOCOMO | We share the view of Samsung and Ericsson. |
| Moderator | Added P#2.1-2 based on Samsung, Ericsson, and vivo comments.  Added P#2.1-3 based on LG Electronics comments. |
| Nokia | We also share the view with Ericsson et al on supporting 480kHz and 960kHz for non-initial access cases. Other than that we are OK with FL proposal #2.1-3. |
| Intel | We support Proposal #2.1-2 with some modifications. Moreover, we think that if SCS 480 kHz and 960 kHz are agreed for SSB for initial access then they should be supported for PRACH as well. Therefore, we suggest:  Support of 480 and 960 kHz PRACH SCS for initial access use cases if SCS 480 and 960 kHz are accepted for SSB for initial access cases. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Fine with the updated proposal. |
| Moderator | Added P#2.2-4 based on Intel’s comments. |
| Futurewei | We support Proposal 2-1-3, and 2-1-4 Note. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Generally OK with Proposal #2.1-3, but we think that, similar to Rel-16, where L=571, L=1151 for mu=0, mu=1 were only added to handle PSD restriction in shared spectrum, we don’t need see why L=571, L=1151 are required for licensed operation. L=139 can work well in for licensed operation as there is no PSD limit. Also, we think FFS sub-bullets related to 480/960 SCS should be main bullet as they are not a special case of the first bullet that is only concerned with 120 kHz SCS. We suggest the following change to reflect this (marked in Blue):   * ~~Moderator note: assume no additional agreement is needed to support L=139, 571, and 1151 for 120kHz PRACH SCS~~ * For initial access and non-initial access use cases, support 120kHz PRACH SCS ~~with sequence length L=571, 1151 (in addition to L~~=139) for PRACH Formats A1~A3, B1~B4, C0, and C2.   + Support sequence length L=571, 1151 (in addition to L=139) for shared spectrum operation.   + Support sequence L=139 for licensed operation.     - FFS: Whether L=571, 1151 are supported for licensed operation. * FFS: support ~~Support~~ ~~at least~~ 480 and 960 kHz PRACH SCS with sequence length L=139, 571, and/or 1151 for PRACH Formats A1~A3, B1~B4, C0, and C2. * ~~FFS: support of sequence length L = 571, 1151~~   + FFS: whether 480 and 960 kHz PRACH SCS are applicable for initial access and/or non-initial access use cases |
| Ericsson | We support P#2.1-2, and we are okay with the note in P#2.1-4 |
| Qualcomm | We support Proposal #2.1-2 in conjunction with Proposal #2.1-4  For Proposal #2.1-3, we think SCS 480/960 + LRA=139 should prioritized over SCS 480/960 + LRA = 571 and 1151. Hence, we do not support this language. Prefer Proposal #2.1-2 + Proposal #2.1-2 4. |
| Moderator | I’ve started to formulate a summary of discussion #2 (below). Please note the summary is temporary and will be updated further as additional comments are received. |
| DOCOMO | We support P#2.1-2 with the note in P#2.1-4. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We prefer Proposal#2.1-2 combined with Proposal#2.1-4. |
| Moderator | See summary below |

**Moderator Summary of Discussions #2**

Suggest to further discuss with Proposal #2.1-2, 2-2-3, and 2.3-4 as it contains all the components debated issues and could be modified as such during further discussions.

There are debate between Proposal 2.1-2 or 2.1-3, where the main difference is support of 480/960kHz for PRACH at least for non-initial access case. Proposal 2.1-4 is a note that could be appended to either 2.1-2 and 2.1-3.

Moderator suggest to further discuss Proposals 2.1-2, 2.1-3 and 2.1-4.

##### Proposal #2.1-2 (Alternative 1)

* ~~Moderator note: assume no additional agreement is needed to support L=139, 571, and 1151 for 120kHz PRACH SCS~~
* For initial access and non-initial access use cases, support 120kHz PRACH SCS with sequence length L=571, 1151 (in addition to L=139) for PRACH Formats A1~A3, B1~B4, C0, and C2.
* For at least non-initial access use cases, support ~~Support~~ ~~at least~~ 480 and 960 kHz PRACH SCS with sequence length L=139 for PRACH Formats A1~A3, B1~B4, C0, and C2.
  + FFS: support of sequence length L = 571, 1151
  + FFS: Support of 480 and 960 kHz PRACH SCS for initial access use cases

##### Proposal #2.1-3 (Alternative 2)

* ~~Moderator note: assume no additional agreement is needed to support L=139, 571, and 1151 for 120kHz PRACH SCS~~
* For initial access and non-initial access use cases, support 120kHz PRACH SCS with sequence length L=571, 1151 (in addition to L=139) for PRACH Formats A1~A3, B1~B4, C0, and C2.
  + FFS: support ~~Support~~ ~~at least~~ 480 and 960 kHz PRACH SCS with sequence length L=139, 571, and/or 1151 for PRACH Formats A1~A3, B1~B4, C0, and C2.
  + ~~FFS: support of sequence length L = 571, 1151~~
  + FFS: whether 480 and 960 kHz PRACH SCS are applicable for initial access and/or non-initial access use cases

##### Proposal #2.1-4 (Note for either Alternatives)

* + Note: 480 and 960 kHz PRACH SCS for initial access use cases is assumed to be supported if SCS 480 and 960 kHz are accepted for SSB for initial access cases

**Discussions #3**

Moderator suggest continuing discussion based on Proposal 2.1-2, 2.1-3, and 2.1-4.

##### Proposal #2.1-2 (cleaned up, Alternative 1)

* For initial access and non-initial access use cases, support 120kHz PRACH SCS with sequence length L=571, 1151 (in addition to L=139) for PRACH Formats A1~A3, B1~B4, C0, and C2.
* For at least non-initial access use cases, support 480 and 960 kHz PRACH SCS with sequence length L=139 for PRACH Formats A1~A3, B1~B4, C0, and C2.
  + FFS: support of sequence length L = 571, 1151
  + FFS: Support of 480 and 960 kHz PRACH SCS for initial access use cases

##### Proposal #2.1-3 (cleaned up, Alternative 2)

* For initial access and non-initial access use cases, support 120kHz PRACH SCS with sequence length L=571, 1151 (in addition to L=139) for PRACH Formats A1~A3, B1~B4, C0, and C2.
  + FFS: support 480 and 960 kHz PRACH SCS with sequence length L=139, 571, and/or 1151 for PRACH Formats A1~A3, B1~B4, C0, and C2.
  + FFS: whether 480 and 960 kHz PRACH SCS are applicable for initial access and/or non-initial access use cases

##### Proposal #2.1-4 (Note for either Alternatives)

* + Note: 480 and 960 kHz PRACH SCS for initial access use cases is assumed to be supported if SCS 480 and 960 kHz are accepted for SSB for initial access cases

##### Proposal #2.1-5 (modification of Alternative 1)

* For initial access and non-initial access use cases, support 120kHz PRACH SCS with sequence length L=571, 1151 (in addition to L=139) for PRACH Formats A1~A3, B1~B4, C0, and C2.
* For at least non-initial access use cases, if 480kHz and/or 960 kHz SSB SCS is agreed to be supported, support 480 and 960 kHz PRACH SCS with sequence length L=139 for PRACH Formats A1~A3, B1~B4, C0, and C2, respectively.
  + FFS: support of sequence length L = 571, 1151
  + FFS: Support of 480 and 960 kHz PRACH SCS for initial access use cases

##### Proposal #2.1-6 (update of 2.1-2/2.1-5)

* For initial access and non-initial access use cases, support 120kHz PRACH SCS with sequence length L=571, 1151 (in addition to L=139) for PRACH Formats A1~A3, B1~B4, C0, and C2.
* For at least non-initial access use cases, if 480kHz and/or 960 kHz SSB SCS is agreed to be supported, support 480 and/or 960 kHz PRACH SCS with sequence length L=139 for PRACH Formats A1~A3, B1~B4, C0, and C2, respectively.
  + FFS: support of sequence length L = 571, 1151
  + FFS: Support of 480 and/or 960 kHz PRACH SCS for initial access use cases

Please provide further comments.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Discussions/Comments** |
| Nokia | We would be in principle fine with proposal #2.1-2, but as we have not yet concluded the support of 480kHz/960kHz for SSB, it would bit break the causality. Thus maybe align #2.1-2 with earlier proposals. Of course if we conclude the supported SSB SCS first this is not needed: Proposal #2.1-2 (modified)  * For initial access and non-initial access use cases, support 120kHz PRACH SCS with sequence length L=571, 1151 (in addition to L=139) for PRACH Formats A1~A3, B1~B4, C0, and C2. * For at least non-initial access use cases, if 480kHz and/or 960 kHz SSB SCS is agreed to be supported, support 480 and 960 kHz PRACH SCS with sequence length L=139 for PRACH Formats A1~A3, B1~B4, C0, and C2, respectively.   + FFS: support of sequence length L = 571, 1151   + FFS: Support of 480 and 960 kHz PRACH SCS for initial access use cases   We are also fine with proposal#2.1-4. |
| Intel | We support Proposal #2.1-2 and Proposal #2.1-4. |
| Qualcomm | We share the same view as Nokia’s, i.e., we support Proposal #2.1-2 (given the corresponding SSB SCS is agreed) + Proposal #2.1-4 |
| CATT | We support Proposal #2.1-4 |
| LG Electronics | We support Proposal #2.1-3. As we commented before, whether to support 480 and 960 kHz PRACH SCS should be discussed with SSB SCS. Support for 480 and 960 kHz PRACH SCS should be treated as FFS for both initial access case and non-initial access case, as support for 480/960 kHz SCS for SSBs has not yet been determined. |
| Fujitsu | We support original Proposal #2.1-2 with Proposal #2.1-4. We do not think it is necessary to bound PRACH SCS for non-initial access with SSB SCS. It may be needed for the FFS of PRACH SCS for initial access. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We think that the intention to introduce additional SCS is for single numerology operation, so considering that SSB SCS has not been determined yet, we prefer Nokia’s updated Proposal 2.1-2.  We also agree with Proposal #2.1-4. |
| Vivo | We support Proposal #2.1-2 and Proposal #2.1-4. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support Proposal #2.1-2 and Proposal #2.1-4. |
| OPPO | We support Proposal #2.1-3 and share similar view with LGE. |
| Ericsson | I assume the first comment in this table is from Nokia.  We support Proposal #2.1-2 with Nokia’s changes and Proposal #2.1.4.  We don’t think L = 571/1151 makes sense for 480/960 kHz PRACH as the PRACH bandwidth becomes very large – much larger than the 100 MHz point at which the 27 dBm FCC conducted power limitation kicks in. |
| InterDigital | We also prefer to discuss SSB SCS and corresponding PRACH SCS before discussing proposal #2.1-2, #2.1-3 and #2.1-4. |
| Futurewei | We prefer an agreement on SCS for SSB/CORESET#0/PRACH before discussing these proposals. |
| DOCOMO | We support Proposal #2.1-2 and Proposal #2.1-4. Also ok with Nokia(?)’s update to consider the progress of the discussion on SSB SCS. |
| Moderator | Updated 2.1-2 to 2.1-4 based on Nokia’s comments.  Current summary of company preferences:   * Modified Alt 1: Docomo, Ericsson, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, vivo, ZTE, Sanechips, Fujitsu, Qualcomm, Intel, Nokia, Samsung * Alt 2: OPPO, LGE * 2.1-4 Note: Docomo, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, vivo, ZTE, Sanechips, CATT, Qualcomm, Intel, Nokia, Samsung * Hold off agreement until SCS is determined: Futurewei, Interdigital, LGE |
| Mediatek | We support Proposal #2.1-3 and share similar view with OPPO and LGE. |
| Samsung | We support Proposal #2.1-2 and #2.1-4 |
| Qualcomm | We support Proposal #2.1-2 and Proposal #2.1-4 with small modification: Proposal #2.1-2 (modification of Alternative 1 modified)  * For initial access and non-initial access use cases, support 120kHz PRACH SCS with sequence length L=571, 1151 (in addition to L=139) for PRACH Formats A1~A3, B1~B4, C0, and C2. * For at least non-initial access use cases, if 480kHz and/or 960 kHz SSB SCS is agreed to be supported, support 480 and/or 960 kHz PRACH SCS with sequence length L=139 for PRACH Formats A1~A3, B1~B4, C0, and C2, respectively.   + FFS: support of sequence length L = 571, 1151   + FFS: Support of 480 and/or 960 kHz PRACH SCS for initial access use cases |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support the modified P#2.1-2 (Alt.1) and P#2.1-4 |
| Intel | We guess that the updated Proposal #2.1-2 with the latest changes suggested by Nokia should be referred to as Proposal #2.1-5 and not as Proposal #2.1-2 (modification of Alternative 1). Assuming that, we are ok with the latest updated proposal. |
| Moderaotr | Added Proposal #2.1-6 based on Qualcomm’s comments.  Fixed Proposal #2.1-5 numbering issue. |
| Qualcomm | We are fine with Proposal #2.1-6 |

**Moderator Summary of Discussions #3**

Companies seem to be gravitating towards minor modifications of Proposal#2.1-2 and #2.1-5. Moderator Suggests agreeing to Proposal #2.1-6.

**Discussions #4**

Please provide further comments on Proposal #2.1-6.

##### Proposal #2.1-6 (cleaned up)

* For initial access and non-initial access use cases, support 120kHz PRACH SCS with sequence length L=571, 1151 (in addition to L=139) for PRACH Formats A1~A3, B1~B4, C0, and C2.
* For at least non-initial access use cases, if 480kHz and/or 960 kHz SSB SCS is agreed to be supported, support 480 and/or 960 kHz PRACH SCS with sequence length L=139 for PRACH Formats A1~A3, B1~B4, C0, and C2, respectively.
  + FFS: support of sequence length L = 571, 1151
  + FFS: Support of 480 and/or 960 kHz PRACH SCS for initial access use cases

##### Proposal #2.1-7 (cleaned up)

* For initial access and non-initial access use cases, support 120kHz PRACH SCS with sequence length L=571, 1151 (in addition to L=139) for PRACH Formats A1~A3, B1~B4, C0, and C2.
* For ~~at least~~ non-initial access use cases, if 480kHz and/or 960 kHz SSB SCS is agreed to be supported, support 480 and/or 960 kHz PRACH SCS with sequence length L=139 for PRACH Formats A1~A3, B1~B4, C0, and C2, respectively.
  + FFS: support of sequence length L = 571, 1151
  + FFS: Support of 480 and/or 960 kHz PRACH SCS for initial access use cases

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Discussions/Comments** |
| Qualcomm | We are fine with Proposal #2.1-6 |
| DOCOMO | We support the Proposal #2.1-6. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We agree with the first bullet.  We have concern about the second bullet as the support for 480/960 kHz SSB SCS is also discussed separately for initial access and non-initial access uses cases. If the intention of the second bullet is to facilitate the UE to send PRACH and receive SSB with the same SCS, this is only possible if both SSB and PRACH with the same SCS are supported for the same case (both for initial access or both for non-initial access). As such, we suggest the following change: **Proposal:**  * For initial access and non-initial access use cases, support 120kHz PRACH SCS with sequence length L=571, 1151 (in addition to L=139) for PRACH Formats A1~A3, B1~B4, C0, and C2. * For non-initial access use cases   + If 480kHz and/or 960 kHz SSB SCS is agreed to be supported, support 480 and/or 960 kHz PRACH SCS with sequence length L=139 for PRACH Formats A1~A3, B1~B4, C0, and C2, respectively.     - FFS: support of sequence length L = 571, 1151 * FFS: Support of 480 and/or 960 kHz PRACH SCS for initial access use cases |
| LG Electronics | We share the same view with Huawei and support the modified proposal offered by Huawei. |
| Nokia | We are OK with the proposal #2.1-6 |
| Intel | We are fine with Proposal #2.1-6 |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are fine with Proposal #2.1-6 |
| CATT | We are OK with proposal #2.1-6 |
| Futurewei | We agree with HW and LGE comments that “at least” is not necessary. With this change we support the Proposal #2.1-6 |
| Moderator | The suggested changes from Huawei doesn’t seem to change the essence of the proposal, and therefore might be ok.  Added Proposal #2.1-7 based on Huawei’s comments. |

**Moderator Summary of Discussions #4**

Moderator suggests further discussing Proposal #2.1-7.

**Discussions #5**

The discussion seems to be converging. Please provide comments **only if you have concerns on Proposal #2.1-7**.

##### Proposal #2.1-7

* For initial access and non-initial access use cases, support 120kHz PRACH SCS with sequence length L=571, 1151 (in addition to L=139) for PRACH Formats A1~A3, B1~B4, C0, and C2.
* For ~~at least~~ non-initial access use cases, if 480kHz and/or 960 kHz SSB SCS is agreed to be supported, support 480 and/or 960 kHz PRACH SCS with sequence length L=139 for PRACH Formats A1~A3, B1~B4, C0, and C2, respectively.
  + FFS: support of sequence length L = 571, 1151
  + FFS: Support of 480 and/or 960 kHz PRACH SCS for initial access use cases

##### Proposal #2.1-8

* For initial access and non-initial access use cases, support 120kHz PRACH SCS with sequence length L=571, 1151 (in addition to L=139) for PRACH Formats A1~A3, B1~B4, C0, and C2.
* For ~~at least~~ non-initial access use cases,
  + if 480kHz and/or 960 kHz SSB SCS is agreed to be supported, support 480 and/or 960 kHz PRACH SCS with sequence length L=139 for PRACH Formats A1~A3, B1~B4, C0, and C2, respectively.
    - FFS: support of sequence length L = 571, 1151
  + FFS: Support of 480 and/or 960 kHz PRACH SCS for initial access use cases, if 480 and/or 960 kHz SSB SCS is agreed to be supported for initial access

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Discussions/Comments** |
| Nokia | We would prefer to keep the ‘at-least’. Reason is similar as noted in afore discussion in (2.1.2) that we would prefer to further consider extending the use case.  As an afterthought, as noted by Huawei, the definition of initial access and non-initial access is not very well suited for this discussion. In principle the use cases are 1) SR, UL timing acquisition etc. and 2) access. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | **To Nokia and moderator:** There is already an FFS for supporting 480 and/or 960 kHz PRACH SCS for initial access use cases. Wouldn’t it address Nokia’s concern?  Also, what we proposed earlier is to just clarify the language of the agreement so, if 480 and/or 960 kHz SSB is agreed only for non-initial access use cases, 480 and/or 960 kHz PRACH SCS is also agreed only for non-initial access use cases.  But if 480 and/or 960 kHz SSB is also agreed for initial access use cases, 480 and/or 960 kHz PRACH SCS may also be agreed for initial access use cases.  We our original proposed structure address our above concern better. Also, to better address **Nokia**’s concern, we suggest to elevate the last sub-bullet to a main bullet: Proposal #2.1-7 (modified):  * For initial access and non-initial access use cases, support 120kHz PRACH SCS with sequence length L=571, 1151 (in addition to L=139) for PRACH Formats A1~A3, B1~B4, C0, and C2. * For ~~at least~~ non-initial access use cases,   + If 480kHz and/or 960 kHz SSB SCS is agreed to be supported, support 480 and/or 960 kHz PRACH SCS with sequence length L=139 for PRACH Formats A1~A3, B1~B4, C0, and C2, respectively.     - FFS: support of sequence length L = 571, 1151 * FFS: Support of 480 and/or 960 kHz PRACH SCS for initial access use cases |
| Ericsson | Proposal #2.1-7 looks generally fine. We are okay to remove "at least" since there is an FFS for initial access. To make the FFS consistent with the main bullet, I would suggest to add   * + FFS: Support of 480 and/or 960 kHz PRACH SCS for initial access use cases, if 480 and/or 960 kHz SSB SCS is agreed to be supported for initial access. |
| Moderator | Added Proposal #2.1-8 based on received comments. |

**Moderator Summary of Discussions #5**

Moderator suggest further discussion based on Proposal #2.1-8.

### 2.2.2 Supported PRACH Numerology

* From [1] FUTUREWEI:
  + Support only 120kHz SCS for PRACH for initial access.
* From [2] Lenovo, Motorola Mobility:
  + For supporting NR from 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz in Rel. 17, support the same numerology of data channel for SSB and PRACH including 480KHz and 960KHz
* From [3] ZTE, Sanechips:
  + Support 120kHz SCS for PRACH, jointly discuss additional SCSs (480kHz and 960kHz) for PRACH and SSB if single subcarrier spacing is supported.
* From [5] Huawei, HiSilicon:
  + For PRACH and Msg3 in initial UL BWP, only 120 kHz should be used in the frequency band from 52.6GHz to 71GHz.
* From [6] Nokia, NSB:
  + Observation: 960 kHz SCS for PRACH can support required range for the indoor scenario. It would be beneficial to support e.g. 960 kHz PRACH for SCell operating with 960 kHz SCS.
* From [9] vivo:
  + Observation: All supported SCS for data/control SCS could be used for initial UL BWP in NR FR2 operation. There are only two applicable SCSs for PRACH format (A, B, C) in NR FR2 operation.
  + Support 120KHz, 480KHz and 960KHz as candidate SCS of initial UL BWP.
* From [11] MediaTek:
  + Support only 120 kHz for PRACH SCS in initial access.
* From [12] Intel:
  + Support 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS for PRACH in NR extension up to 71 GHz.
* From [13] Fujitsu:
  + In addition to 120kHz, support 480kHz and 960kHz for PRACH at least for the cases other than initial access.
  + Select combinations of SCS and sequence length for PRACH for initial access at least considering maximum mandatory bandwidth of UE.
    - If the maximum mandatory bandwidth of UE is as for the current FR2 and RedCap UE should be considered for the new frequency range, only consider the combinations with BW not larger than 100MHz, i.e. (L=139, SCS=120kHz), (L=139, SCS=480kHz), and (L=571, SCS=120kHz).
    - If the maximum mandatory bandwidth of UE is as for the current FR2 and RedCap UE should not be considered for the new frequency range, only consider the combinations with BW not larger than 200MHz, i.e. (L=139, SCS=120kHz), (L=139, SCS=480kHz), (L=139, SCS=960kHz), (L=571, SCS=120kHz) and (L=1157, SCS=120kHz).
    - If the maximum mandatory bandwidth of UE is 400MHz, only consider the combinations with BW not larger than 400MHz, i.e. (L=139, SCS=120kHz), (L=139, SCS=480kHz), (L=139, SCS=960kHz), (L=571, SCS=120kHz), (L=571, SCS=480kHz), and (L=1157, SCS=120kHz).
* From [16] InterDigital:
  + Observation: PRACH with 120 kHz generally outperforms PRACHs with additional SCSs.
  + Further study necessity of PRACH for additional SCSs in Rel-17.
* From [22] Ericsson:
  + For cases other than initial access (e.g. for an SCell), support 480 and 960 kHz SCS for PRACH
* From [25] Qualcomm:
  + Observation: for the PRACH performance of different numerologies in the high frequency regime,
    - No noticeable difference in the misdetection performance is identified among SCSs.
    - With the same CINR, the false alarm rate increases as the SCS or sequence length (i.e., bandwidth) increases
  + consider using the following for the PRACH preamble sequence lengths for higher bands:
    - SCS = 120 kHz: 139 and 571
    - SCS = 480/960 kHz: 139 only
  + Observation: for higher RACH SCS (480 and 960 kHz), the CP length may not be long enough to absorb the gNB beam switching delay requirement
* From [26] NTT Docomo:
  + For SCS of PRACH preamble, in addition to 120 kHz,
    - 480 and 960 kHz SCS should be supported to achieve single numerology operation

**Summary of Discussions in Tdoc**

* Companies provided proposals on supported SCS for PRACH. Some proposal suggest to limit specific SCS for PRACH to initial access or SCell operation.
  + Support only 120kHz
    - FUTUREWEI (for initial access), Huawei, HiSilicon, MediaTek
  + Support 120, 480, 960 kHz
    - Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, Intel, Fujitisu, Ericsson (non-initial access cases), Qualcomm, NTT Docomo
* Suggest discussing further on the supported SCS for PRACH along with supported sequence lengths (2.2.1)

**Discussions**

* Moderator suggests discussing together with supported sequence lengths.
* Please provide comments in Section 2.2.1.

### 2.2.3 PRACH Format

* From [5] Huawei, HiSilicon:
  + For PRACH SCS = 120 kHz, the PRACH formats A1, A2, A3, C2 with reduced guard time or reduced PRACH duration NdurRA should be supported.
* From [8] CATT:
  + Consider supporting the increasing of symbols in time domain to enhance coverage and the extending of frequency domain by repeating and concatenating the RACH preamble sequence in the unlicensed spectrum.
* From [9] vivo:
  + Format 0-3 with special SCS is not supported
  + Support 120KHz and 960KHz SCS for PRACH format (A, B, C) in NR operation from 52.6-71GHz.
* From [25] Qualcomm:
  + for higher bands consider reusing the PRACH formats defined in NR Rel-16 (with appropriate SCS scaling)

**Summary of Discussions in Tdoc**

* Several companies provided proposals on supported PRACH Formats (0~3, A, B, C) for 52.6 ~ 71 GHz band. The discussion includes potential updates to guard time for existing PRACH formats, and increasing number of symbols in time domain.
* Suggest discussing further supported PRACH Formats and related issues.

**Discussions**

* Moderator suggest discussing together with supported sequence lengths.
* Please provide comments in Section 2.2.1.

### 2.2.4 RACH Occasion Resources

* From [1] FUTUREWEI:
  + Support non-consecutive RO to reduce possibility of LBT failure.
* From [4] OPPO:
  + set the reference SCS for RACH slot determination as 120kHz.
  + RAN1 should design a unified RO configuration for both licensed and unlicensed spectrums.
  + On top of RO configuration, a mask can be further added for unlicensed spectrum to switch off certain RO from being selected.
* From [5] Huawei, HiSilicon:
  + A gap between two consecutive TDM Ros should be introduced to avoid a LBT failure at the UE due to a RACH transmission from another UE in the previous RO.
* From [6] Nokia, NSB:
  + Observation: If LBT gaps are needed between Ros, it would be better to define fixed LBT gap time between valid Ros that do not depend on the time domain allocation of the PRACH. In that case the LBT gap length would not depend on the used PRACH format.
* From [8] CATT:
  + Observation: The current RO configuration of FR2, based on the 60 KHz slot as the basic unit, which supports two slots configuration when SCS is 120KHz.
  + When the specification supports SCS=/480/960 KHz, 120 KHz configuration is reused for each 8/16 slots within 60 KHz slot.
* From [9] vivo:
  + With the introduction of larger SCS in 52.6-71GHz, such as 480/960kHz, how to configure time domain Ros should be considered.
  + One approach is to reuse FR2 RO slot configuration rule but to define new reference slot and re-interpret RACH slot index for high PRACH SCS in 52.6-71GHz.
* From [11] MediaTek:
  + There is no need to support non-consecutive RACH occasions configuration.
* From [13] Fujitsu:
  + Support RO configuration for non-consecutive Ros in time domain.
* From [16] InterDigital:
  + Observation: In NR-U, introduction of non-consecutive RACH occasions was discussed, but agreements on the specification support weren’t made as it could be handled by gNB mplementation. For 52.6 – 71 GHz, non-consecutive RACH occasions still can be handled by gNB implementation and CCA failure may be a relatively rare event due to a narrower beam.
  + For 52.6 – 71 GHz, supporting non-consecutive RACH occasions is not preferred
* From [17] LGE:
  + If 480 or 960 kHz subcarrier spacing is supported for PRACH, the corresponding PRACH sequence length can be L=139 and/or L=571, and the following FFS points can be considered:
    - How to express slot indexes within the 10ms window for 960 kHz subcarrier spacing PRACH by using existing 16 bits RA-RNTI
    - How to configure RACH slot for 480 or 960 kHz subcarrier spacing PRACH
  + When LBT is used to transmit the PRACH preamble, consider to insert CCA gap between adjacent RACH occasions in time domain (e.g. X usec or Y symbol) to avoid inter-UE LBT blocking due to the propagation delay of PRACH transmitted in an earlier RO.
* From [19] Xiaomi:
  + Inconsecutive RO time domain configuration need be discussed.
* From [20] Samsung:
  + Using the RO pattern for SCS = 120 kHz derived from the PRACH configuration table as the reference for larger SCS cases.
  + For RO configuration, both direction 1 (indication on which one(s) of the 8 eighty-slots) and direction 2 (keep 80slots in total but redesign the RACH period and RACH duration location) can be considered.
  + Support non-consecutive RO configuration to alleviate the RACH LBT failure.
* From [22] Ericsson:
  + For 480/960 kHz PRACH, support PRACH configurations that allow maintaining the same PRACH processing load (operations/unit time) as for 120 kHz PRACH configurations.
  + Observation: The current PRACH configuration table for FR2 which defines PRACH slot positions based on a reference numerology of 60 kHz can be reused as is for 480/960 kHz. What needs to be specified is a rule on which 1 or 2 480/960 kHz slots within the reference 60 kHz slot contain PRACH occasion(s).
  + Support configuration of PRACH occasion(s) in only 1 or 2 480/960 kHz slots within a 60 kHz reference slot.
  + For 480/960 kHz PRACH, reuse the current PRACH configuration table in 38.211 for FR2 “as is.” Specify rule for which 1 or 2 480/960 kHz slots within a 60 kHz reference slot are used depending on the value in the existing column “Number of PRACH slots within a 60 kHz slot” in the current PRACH configuration table. The rule should be common for all PRACH configurations in the table.
* From [25] Qualcomm:
  + a maximum of 4 FD multiplexed Ros for SCS = 120 kHz and sequence length = 571. For all other SCS and sequence length combinations, a maximum of 8 FD multiplexed Ros can be used
  + for higher RACH SCS (480 and 960 kHz), consider including a symbol-level gap between Ros to allow for gNB beam switching delay
  + for higher RACH SCS (480 and 960 kHz), consider including a symbol-level gap between Pos to allow for gNB beam switching delay

**Summary of Discussions in Tdoc**

* Large number of companies discusses issue of supporting (or not supporting) non-contiguous RO.
* Suggest discussing further on support of non-contiguous RO.

**Discussions #1**

* Please provide further comments on support of non-contiguous RO to cope with LBT.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Is there a need to consider LBT failure in RO design (e.g. by supporting non-contiguous RO configuration)?** | **Discussions/Comments** |
| Samsung | Yes | We observed more severe issue of RO blocking by LBT due to shorter symbol duration for 60 GHz unlicensed band, so we support configuring symbol gaps before RO for LBT purpose. |
| NEC | Yes | Support no-contiguous RO to reduce the impact of failure LBT. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Neutral | We agree that non-contiguous RO configuration has benefit on LBT, so if LBT is required for RACH transmission, non-contiguous RO can be considered; otherwise, it’s not needed. |
| DOCOMO | Yes | We agree non-contiguous RO could be discussed from both perspective of beam switching gap with 480/960 kHz SCS as well as LBT failure, though the probability of LBT failure may be low. |
| LG Electronics | Yes | Consider to insert CCA gap between adjacent RACH occasions in time domain (e.g. X usec or Y symbol) to avoid inter-UE LBT blocking due to the propagation delay of PRACH transmitted in an earlier RO. |
| Spreadtrum | Neutral |  |
| vivo | Yes | We support non-contiguous RO is needed to avoid LBT blocking. Besides, RO configuration details for new SCS should also be discussed, e.g. reference slot and RO mapping within the slot |
| Nokia | Yes (covering also non-initial access scenarios) | If LBT is needed/supported for RACH, then non-contiguous Ros can be considered. If supported, it would be better to define fixed LBT gap time between valid Ros that does not depend on the time domain allocation of the PRACH. |
| Charter Communications | Neutral | Similar feature was not supported for Rel-16 NR-U which has much longer LBT sensing durations. |
| Futurewei | Neutral | Non-contiguous RO may be considered when LBT is required prior to RACH transmissions. RACH transmissions may also be considered under the short control signal transmissions category (LBT exempt) |
| Ericsson | No | As we discuss in Section 2.1.1 for SSB, LBT failure is rare, and furthermore, PRACH should not require LBT in the first place due to short control signaling exemption. It makes little sense to re-design PRACH configurations to support such gaps. The PRACH configuration table can be used “as is” in the 60 GHz band as we describe in our contribution. It is undesirable to re-design the PRACH configuration tables to support such gaps when they are not warranted in practice. |
| Qualcomm | No to LBT gap (but may need beam switching gap) | Agree with Ericsson on the LBT part. However, there may be a need for gNB beam switching gaps in between Ros/Pos depending on SCS |
| OPPO | Yes | We support to configure non-contiguous RO for both licensed and unlicensed spectrum. The gap between Ros can be considered as LBT gap at UE side in unlicensed spectrum as well as beam switching gap at gNB side. |
| InterDigital | No | We believe that LBT failure issue can be handled by gNB implementation. |
| Fujitsu | Yes | We agree that non-contiguous RO should be supported, considering not only LBT but also beam switching. |
| Xiaomi | Yes | We prefer non-contiguous RO configuration for LBT failure case. |
| CATT | Yes | Non-contiguous RO is useful |
| Intel | No | From our analysis, even if we utilize 120 kHz SCS for PRACH, we do not believe the UE could ever exceed total transmission duration of 10 msec within 100 msec observation period. So, it might be possible to always consider utilizing short control signal exemption for PRACH transmissions.  We suggest to further discuss this. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | We believe a gap between two consecutive TDM Ros should be introduced to avoid a LBT failure at the UE due to a RACH transmission from another UE in the previous RO. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Yes | Support non-contiguous Ros for RACH if LBT based PRACH transmission is supported. |
| Mediatek | No | Due to short control signal exemption and rare possibility of LBT failure, we do not support non-contiguous RO. |

**Moderator Summary of Discussions #1**

* Support non-consecutive RO
  + 15 Companies
    - Samsung, NEC, NTT Docomo, LG Electronics, vivo, Nokia, Qualcomm, OPPO, Fujitsu, Xiaomi, CATT, Huawei, HiSilicon, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility
  + Companies commented non-consecutive RO would be needed to cope for the following reasons:
    - Gap for LBT, gap for gNB Rx beam switching, and/or gap to avoid inter-UE LBT blocking
* No need to support non-consecutive RO
  + 4 Companies
    - Ericsson, Interdigital, Intel, Mediatek
  + Companies commented PRACH can be considered as part of short signal exemption and/or handle LBT by implementation.
* Majority of the companies seems to think non-consecutive RO is needed. With that said, suggest to discuss in GTW to at least hear out the companies that do not believe non-consecutive RO is needed to explain their logic and motivation.
* Strive to make a conclusion. Further discuss on following statement (as a starting point for further discussion):
  + Support non-consecutive RO configuration for PRACH

**Discussions #2**

Further discuss using the following statement as a starting point for further discussion:

##### Proposal #2.4-1 (original)

* Support non-consecutive RO configuration for PRACH

##### Proposal #2.4-2 (suggested alternative from Samsung)

* Using the RO pattern for SCS = 120 kHz derived from the PRACH configuration table as the reference for larger SCS cases.
* Further study details of RO configuration, which may include
  + Approach 1) indication on which one(s) of the 8 eighty-slots are for RO
  + Approach 2) keep 80slots in total but redesign the RACH period and RACH duration location

##### Proposal #2.4-3 (suggested alternative from Ericsson)

* If 480 and/or 960 kHz PRACH is supported, adopt the existing FR2 PRACH configuration table in 38.211
  + FFS: Details for indicating which 480/960 kHz PRACH slots within a 60 kHz reference slot contain PRACH occasion(s).

##### Proposal #2.4-4 (suggested alternative from Docomo)

* Using the RO pattern for SCS = 120 kHz derived from the PRACH configuration table as the reference for larger SCS cases.
* FFS: Details for indicating which 480/960 kHz PRACH slots within a 60 kHz reference slot contain PRACH occasion(s).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Discussions/Comments** |
| Samsung | We support the FL proposal. |
| Ericsson | In addition to our view presented above, we cannot accept this proposal for the following reasons:   * No decision has been made yet on classifying RACH as short control signaling. If it is classified this way (our preference), then there is no motivation for introduction of LBT gaps. * It has not been demonstrated that there is an LBT blocking issue, especially in a deployment which relies on highly directional beams making the probability of blocking very low * It is not motivated to introduce gaps between consecutive Ros for beam switching time. Most practical PRACH formats have multiple repeated symbols, such that if beam switching time eats a little bit into the first symbol of the PRACH occasion, it will have little or no impact on PRACH detection performance. * A blanket agreement to adopt gaps is procedurally not correct. A more correct approach is to list alternative approaches that are proposed by companies, and then have a technical discussion around the pros/cons of each scheme (including not introducing gaps) and the impact to system performance. |
| LG Electronics | We support the FL proposal. |
| Vivo | We support the FL proposal |
| DOCOMO | We think non-consecutive RO configuration for PRACH may be necessary to deal with beam switching at gNB. Since RAN1 is going to send an LS to RAN4 about the required time for beam switching, whether to support non-consecutive RO can be discussed after the reply from RAN4. |
| Nokia | We share the view with Ericsson and DOCOMO that this can be discussed once we have agreed the need for LBT and received reply from RAN4 regarding the need for beam switching gap. |
| Samsung2 | We want to share our view on other aspects for RO configuration other than non-consecutive RO, if 480 and/or 960 kHz SCS are supported, and we believe such topics are not listed yet in the summary (we are ok with starting such discussion after the SCS of PRACH is closed, but it would be good to keep a holder for such a discussion so other companies can start to think of this issue as well). In particular, we have the following proposals not captured in the summary yet for RO configuration of 480 kHz and 960 kHz.  **Proposal 7: Using the RO pattern for SCS = 120 kHz derived from the PRACH configuration table as the reference for larger SCS cases.**  **Proposal 8: For RO configuration, both direction 1 (indication on which one(s) of the 8 eighty-slots) and direction 2 (keep 80slots in total but redesign the RACH period and RACH duration location) can be considered.** |
| Moderator | Added P#2.4-2 based on Samsung comments. |
| Futurewei | We do not think that the P#2.4-2 addresses some of other companies concerns. We support P#2.4-1, however, if the group wants, we are OK to have the entire discussion FFS until LBT and beam switching details are decided. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support FL Proposal #2.4-1. Samsung suggestion is reasonable but be better to be discussed after we decide on possible additional PRACH SCS(s). |
| Ericsson | We do not support P#2.4-1 for the reasons listed above.  We think a more productive way forward is a modification of P#2.4-2. For this modification, we don’t think the alternatives listed by Samsung are exhaustive, hence it is better to leave some more room for further study. Also, note that the FR2 table is based on 60 kHz reference slots (0 .. 39). When 120 kHz PRACH is used, the FR2 table specifies which 1 or 2 120 kHz slots within a 60 kHz reference slot are used for PRACH. Hence, we think a generic way of formulating the proposal is as follows:  Alternative proposal:   * If 480 and/or 960 kHz PRACH is supported, adopt the existing FR2 PRACH configuration table in 38.211 * FFS: Details for indicating which 480/960 kHz PRACH slots within a 60 kHz reference slot contain PRACH occasion(s). |
| Qualcomm | We support Proposal #2.4-1. However, in our view, a gap is needed for the beam switching for the gNB and not for LBT (PRACH can be considered as short control signal as discussed/concluded in Proposal #2.6-1). Hence, gaps between Ros may be only needed for certain SCS values (480/960 kHz) if adopted.  We think Proposal #2.4-2 needs more discussions before agreeing. |
| Moderator | I’ve started to formulate a summary of discussion #2 (below). Please note the summary is temporary and will be updated further as additional comments are received.  Added Proposal 2-4-3 based on Ericsson’s comments. |
| DOCOMO | We do not support P#2.4-1. It would be important to wait for the input from RAN4 about beam switching gap.  We tend to agree with Ericsson. However, we also think it would be a bit premature to say “adopt the existing FR2 PRACH configuration table in 38.211. Our preference is as follows:  Proposal from DOCOMO (combination of the ones by Samsung and Ericsson)   * Using the RO pattern for SCS = 120 kHz derived from the PRACH configuration table as the reference for larger SCS cases. * FFS: Details for indicating which 480/960 kHz PRACH slots within a 60 kHz reference slot contain PRACH occasion(s). |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We support Proposal #2.4-2. As for Proposal #2.4-1, we are not sure whether the gaps between Ros are only for beam switching time, if so, it can be discussed after 480kHz and 960kHz are introduced in PRACH. |
| Moderator | Add P #2.4-4 based on comments from Docomo.  See summary below |

**Moderator Summary of Discussions #2**

There is number of discussions on Proposal 2-4-1, 2-4-2, 2-4-3, and 2-4-4 including discussions on whether to agree one over the other. Moderator suggest discussing further on these proposals.

##### Proposal #2.4-1 (Alternative 1)

* Support non-consecutive RO configuration for PRACH

##### Proposal #2.4-2 (Alternative 2)

* Using the RO pattern for SCS = 120 kHz derived from the PRACH configuration table as the reference for larger SCS cases.
* Further study details of RO configuration, which may include
  + Approach 1) indication on which one(s) of the 8 eighty-slots are for RO
  + Approach 2) keep 80slots in total but redesign the RACH period and RACH duration location

##### Proposal #2.4-3 (Alternative 3)

* If 480 and/or 960 kHz PRACH is supported, adopt the existing FR2 PRACH configuration table in 38.211
  + FFS: Details for indicating which 480/960 kHz PRACH slots within a 60 kHz reference slot contain PRACH occasion(s).

##### Proposal #2.4-4 (Alternative 4)

* Using the RO pattern for SCS = 120 kHz derived from the PRACH configuration table as the reference for larger SCS cases.
* FFS: Details for indicating which 480/960 kHz PRACH slots within a 60 kHz reference slot contain PRACH occasion(s).

**Discussions #3**

##### Proposal #2.4-5 (modified Alternative 1 based on Qualcomm’s comments)

* If 480 and/or 960 kHz PRACH SCS is supported, for these SCS values support non-consecutive RO configuration for PRACH

##### Proposal #2.4-6 (modification of alt 4)

* Using the RO pattern for SCS = 120 kHz derived from the PRACH configuration table as the reference for larger SCS cases.
  + Note: use as reference means to striving to re-utilize the RO patterns and configurations as is or as much as possible and strive to make only appropriate changes to enable functionality.
  + FFS: Details for indicating which 480/960 kHz PRACH slots within a 60 kHz reference slot contain PRACH occasion(s).
  + If gap between time adjacent RO is needed, e.g. due to LBT and/or beam switching, FFS on details of supporting non-consecutive RO.

##### Proposal #2.4-7 (update of Proposal#2.4-6)

* Using the RO pattern for SCS = 120 kHz derived from the PRACH configuration table as the reference for larger SCS cases.
  + Note: use as reference means to striving to re-utilize the RO patterns and configurations as is or as much as possible and strive to make only appropriate changes to enable functionality.
  + FFS: Details for indicating which 480/960 kHz PRACH slots ~~within a 60 kHz reference slot contain PRACH occasion(s)~~.
  + If gap between time adjacent RO is needed, e.g. due to LBT and/or beam switching, FFS on details of supporting non-consecutive RO.

Moderator suggests continuing discussion based on Proposal 2.4-1, 2.4-2, 2.4-3, and 2.4-4 listed above. Please provide further comments.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Discussions/Comments** |
| Nokia | As noted earlier, support of non-consecutive RO configuration should be preceded by the need, i.e. we should wait to understand whether short control signaling can be applied, and if gap for beam switching is needed (RAN4 LS). Therefore, we would support alternative 4. We can also accept alternative 3. |
| Intel | We are fine with Proposal #2.4-4 |
| Qualcomm | We support Proposal #2.4-1. However, in our view, a gap is needed for the beam switching for the gNB and not for LBT (PRACH can be considered as short control signal as discussed/concluded in Proposal #2.6-1).  Hence, gaps between Ros may be only needed for certain SCS values (480/960 kHz) if adopted. We propose a modification:  Proposal #2.4-1 (Alternative 1) – modified   * If 480 and/or 960 kHz PRACH SCS is supported, for these SCS values support non-consecutive RO configuration for PRACH |
| CATT | Support Alternative 1 Proposal #2.4-1 with Qualcomm’s revision |
| LG Electronics | We support Proposal #2.4-1 (Alternative 1) as is. |
| Fujitsu | We support Proposal 2.4-1 and prefer Proposal 2.4-4 among Proposal 2.4-2, 2.4-3, and 2.4-4. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We share similar view with Nokia. Non-consecutive RO configuration can be discussed when we make sure that LBT is required for PRACH and 480kHz/960kHz are supported(beam switching gap). So we prefer Proposal 2.4-4. |
| Vivo | We support Proposal #2.4-1 |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support Proposal 2.4-1 (Alt1). However, we agree with Nokia and ZTE view that the decision on the LBT requirement or short control signal concept need to be made first. We are also fine with Proposal 2.4-4 as well |
| OPPO | We are fine with Proposal #2.4-4 |
| Ericsson | We don’t see Alternative 2, 3, and 4 as alternatives to Alternative 1. Is the understanding that if Alternative 1 is adopted, then PRACH configuration table re-design is needed?  Amongst 2/3/4, we support Alternative 3 as it is the most clear. For alternatives 2/4, it is not clear what “derived from” means. Also the two approaches in Alternative 2 are not clear. It seems like this is pointing to a specific design which has not yet been studied. Perhaps Alternatives 3 and 4 could be merged in some way, but it needs to be clarified what “derived from” means.  Respectfully, we cannot agree to Proposal #2.4-1. A number of important issues have not been discussed or agreed yet, some of which affect whether or not gaps are even needed.   * No decision has been made yet on classifying RACH as short control signaling. If it is classified this way (our preference), then there is no motivation for introduction of LBT gaps. * Some companies suggest gaps are needed for beam switching; however, we have not even sent or received an LS from RAN4 on beam switch gap time. Furthermore, most practical PRACH formats have multiple repeated symbols, such that if beam switching time eats a little bit into the first symbol of the PRACH occasion, it will have little or no impact on PRACH detection performance. * It has not been demonstrated that there is an LBT blocking issue, especially in a deployment which relies on highly directional beams making the probability of blocking very low   We have a very strong concern that if Proposal #2.4-1 is agreed it will lead to a re-design of the PRACH configuration table in 38.211. This will be an endless discussion given the time it took to design the table in the first place. Proposal #2.4-1 is far too open ended. No alternatives are listed, and it is not clear what the scope is. Will a PRACH configuration table re-design be needed? How to enable/disable gaps when operating with/without LBT?  As we stated previously, a blanket agreement to adopt gaps is procedurally not correct. A more correct approach is to list alternative approaches that are proposed by companies, and then have a technical discussion around the pros/cons of each scheme (including not introducing gaps) and the impact to system performance. |
| InterDigital | Proposal #2.4-1: we don’t support the proposal as we clarified before.  Proposal #2.4-2: we don’t support the proposal.  Proposal #2.4-3: we are fine with the proposal but prefer to discuss SSB SCS and PRACH SCS first before discussing this proposal  Proposal #2.4-4: we don’t support the proposal. |
| Futurewei | We agree with Ericsson that more decisions on PRACH as Short Control Signal need to be made before deciding on RO design. If LBT will be necessary prior to PRACH we could come back to this discussion. |
| DOCOMO | From our perspective, the effective motivation to support non-consecutive RO is only to compensate beam switching time at gNB, not LBT failure related issue. Therefore, we do not support Proposal #2.4-1 until we get RAN4’s input on the required time for beam switching, which will be triggered by the LS being drafted.  We do not object to other potential enhancements on RO at this stage. To cover such possibility, we support Proposal #2.4-4. |
| Moderator | It might be my fault in poor categorization, as I can sort of agree that the different proposal aren’t meant to be different competing alternatives but different flavors of potential agreements that could be made.  Summary of company preferences:  P#2.4-1 / 2.4-4 – alt 1) Qualcomm, CATT, LGE, Fujitsu, vivo, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility  P#2.4-2 – alt 2)  P#2.4-3 – alt 3) Nokia, Ericsson, Interdigital  P#2.4-4 – alt 4) Intel, Fujitsu (prefer over alt 2/3), ZTE, Sanechips, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, Docomo  Need further discussion (given the LS to RAN4): Nokia, Interdigital, Futurewei, Docomo  So far, I see that companies are somewhat split between Alt 1 and 4, and few companies are strongly against agreeing on non-consecutive RO at least before more information on supported SCS, applicability of short signal exemption, and/or feedback from RAN4 is available. On the other hand, from the contributions and feedback quite a bit of companies did support non-consecutive RO.  Moderator provided P#2.4-6 which is modification of Alt 4 with further FFS aspects. Please comment further. |
| Mediatek | We support Proposal #2.4-1. |
| Nokia2 | We support P#2.4-6 |
| Samsung | We are ok with P#2.4-6 with the following update (whether to use 60 kHz as a reference slot could be further discussed, for both time domain and frequency domain actually):  Using the RO pattern for SCS = 120 kHz derived from the PRACH configuration table as the reference for larger SCS cases.   * Note: use as reference means to striving to re-utilize the RO patterns and configurations as is or as much as possible and strive to make only appropriate changes to enable functionality. * FFS: Details for indicating methods on the PRACH slots ~~which 480/960 kHz PRACH slots within a 60 kHz reference slot contain PRACH occasion(s).~~ * If gap between time adjacent RO is needed, e.g. due to LBT and/or beam switching, FFS on details of supporting non-consecutive RO. |
| Qualcomm | We are fine with Proposal #2.4-6 |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are ok with proposal #2.4-6 |
| Intel | We are fine with Proposal #2.4-6 |
| Qualcomm | We are fine with Proposal #2.4-7 |

**Moderator Summary of Discussions #3**

The following is a summary of company preferences so far.

* Proposal #2.4-1 / 2.4-4 – alt 1) Qualcomm, CATT, LGE, Fujitsu, vivo, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, Mediatek
* Proposal #2.4-2 – alt 2)
* Proposal #2.4-3 – alt 3) Nokia, Ericsson, Interdigital
* Proposal #2.4-4 – alt 4) Intel, Fujitsu (prefer over alt 2/3), ZTE, Sanechips, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, Docomo

From the discussion, none of the proposal were close to consensus. Therefore, moderator provided a comprise in Proposal #2.4-6, which was updated to Proposal #2.4-7 based on comments received.

Moderator suggest discussing further based on Proposal #2.4-7.

**Discussions #4**

Please provide further comments on Proposal #2.4-7.

##### Proposal #2.4-7 (cleaned up)

* Using the RO pattern for SCS = 120 kHz derived from the PRACH configuration table as the reference for larger SCS cases.
  + Note: use as reference means to striving to re-utilize the RO patterns and configurations as is or as much as possible and strive to make only appropriate changes to enable functionality.
  + FFS: Details for indicating which 480/960 kHz PRACH slots.
  + If gap between time adjacent RO is needed, e.g. due to LBT and/or beam switching, FFS on details of supporting non-consecutive RO.

##### Proposal #2.4-8 (update)

* Using the RO pattern for SCS = 120 kHz derived from the PRACH configuration table as the reference for ~~larger~~ all SCS cases.
  + Note: use as reference means to striving to re-utilize the RO patterns and configurations as is or as much as possible and strive to make only appropriate changes to enable functionality.
  + FFS: Details for indicating which 480/960 kHz PRACH slots.
  + If gap between time adjacent RO is needed, e.g. due to LBT and/or beam switching, FFS on details of supporting non-consecutive RO.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Discussions/Comments** |
| Qualcomm | We are fine with Proposal #2.4-7 |
| DOCOMO | We are fine with Proposal #2.4-7 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We do not support Proposal #2.4-7  We don’t see value in this agreement as it does not provide any clear guideline on PRACH configuration for higher SCSs if they are supported. PRACH configuration for 120 kHz may be changed itself, due to, the need for gap between adjacent Ros if PRACH is not agreed to be LBT-exempted.  Overall there seems to be too many unknown variables to make a decision on PRACH occasion configurations: 1) Whether or not 480/960 kHz SCS for PRACH agreed; 2) whether or not beam switching gap is required if 480/960 kHz SCS for PRACH agreed; 3) and whether or not PRACH is agreed to be exempted from LBT as a short signaling.  It may be more practical to revisit this issue when at least some of the above three major issues are resolved. |
| LG Electronics | We share the same view with Huawei and support only Proposal #2.4-1 (Alternative 1) in the current stage. |
| Nokia | We are OK with proposal #2.4-7 |
| Intel | We are fine with Proposal #2.4-7.  We don’t agree with the comments provided by Huawei. Actually, Proposal #2.4-7 is just an initial and very small step towards the design of PRACH for NR extension up to 71 GHz. It just states that the current NR PRACH design for SCS 120 kHz is the reference and guidance for further work in RAN1. All other points, including some mentioned by Huawei, are FFS or not precluded by the proposal. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are fine with proposal #2.4-7 |
| CATT | We are OK with Proposal #2.4-7 |
| Futurewei | We prefer to discuss first the RO pattern for SCS = 120 kHz for unlicensed, as then use it as basis for larger SCS. Therefore, we suggest having this proposal as FFS:   * FFS Using the RO pattern for SCS = 120 kHz derived from the PRACH configuration table as the reference for larger SCS cases. |
| Moderator | Added Proposal #2.4-8 based on Huawei comments.  Moderatos thinks Huawei has some point. Given that consecutive vs non-consecutive RO is being debated even for 120kHz (maybe not from beam switching but from LBT), maybe one way to progress is to agree the statement for all SCS. |

**Moderator Summary of Discussions #4**

Moderator suggest discussing further based on Proposal #2.4-8.

**Discussions #5**

Moderator suggest discussing further based on Proposal #2.4-8.

##### Proposal #2.4-8 (update)

* Using the RO pattern for SCS = 120 kHz derived from the PRACH configuration table as the reference for ~~larger~~ all SCS cases.
  + Note: use as reference means to striving to re-utilize the RO patterns and configurations as is or as much as possible and strive to make only appropriate changes to enable functionality.
  + FFS: Details for indicating which 480/960 kHz PRACH slots.
  + If gap between time adjacent RO is needed, e.g. due to LBT and/or beam switching, FFS on details of supporting non-consecutive RO.

##### Proposal #2.4-9

* Further study RO configuration for 480 and/or 960 kHz PRACH, if supported:
  + Use existing FR2 PRACH configuration table in 38.211 as a starting point for study of RO configuration
  + Study whether or not modifications to the table and/or modifications to the supporting specification text are needed to support 480/960 kHz PRACH
  + Study whether or not a gap between contiguous ROs is needed, e.g., due to LBT and/or beam switching including consideration of potential feedback from RAN4 and discussions on short control signaling

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Discussions/Comments** |
| Nokia | We are OK with this #2.4-8. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine with this #2.4-8. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We cannot agree with Proposal #2.4-8. We had concerns about the earlier Proposal #2.4-7 which discussed RO pattern for 480/960 kHz SCS if PRACH with 480/960 kHz SCS is agreed. Inclusion of 120 kHz SCS to the proposal does not alleviate our concerns. As discussed earlier, we don’t see value in this agreement as it does not provide any clear guideline on PRACH configuration for higher SCSs if they are supported.  Overall there seems to be too many unknown variables to make a decision on PRACH occasion configurations: 1) Whether or not 480/960 kHz SCS for PRACH agreed; 2) whether or not beam switching gap is required if 480/960 kHz SCS for PRACH agreed; 3) and whether or not PRACH is agreed to be exempted from LBT as a short signaling.  It may be more practical to revisit this issue when at least some of the above three major issues are resolved. |
| Ericsson | Given the different view points, and number of unknowns at this point, and that there is still some lack of clarity in the proposal, perhaps the below proposal is all we can do for this meeting? Also, if the feeling is that listing study points is not helpful, then it's also okay to not have any proposal.  Proposal:  If 480 and/or 960 kHz PRACH SCS is supported, further study RO configuration for 480 and/or 960 kHz PRACH   * Use existing FR2 PRACH configuration table in 38.211 as a starting point for study of RO configuration * Study whether or not modifications to the table and/or modifications to the supporting specification text are needed to support 480/960 kHz PRACH * Study whether or not a gap between contiguous ROs is needed, e.g., due to LBT and/or beam switching including consideration of potential feedback from RAN4 and discussions on short control signaling |
| Moderator | Added Proposal #2.4-9 based on Ericsson’s comment |

**Moderator Summary of Discussions #5**

Further discussion based on Proposal #2.4-8 and #2.4-9. However, given that these are further study aspects, moderator suggests not to spend too much time debating them. As chairman suggested previously, one alternative would be to put an moderator suggestion for further discussion in the last discussion summary document for companies to review, and have the chairman explicitly note this in the meeting notes.

### 2.2.5 RA Preamble ID calculation

* From [9] vivo:
  + When a larger PRACH SCS is introduced in 52.6-71GHz, the issue of RA-RNTI calculation needs to be investigated.
* From [17] LGE:
  + If 480 or 960 kHz subcarrier spacing is supported for PRACH, the corresponding PRACH sequence length can be L=139 and/or L=571, and the following FFS points can be considered:
    - How to express slot indexes within the 10ms window for 960 kHz subcarrier spacing PRACH by using existing 16 bits RA-RNTI
    - How to configure RACH slot for 480 or 960 kHz subcarrier spacing PRACH
* From [25] Qualcomm:
  + for higher RACH SCS (480 and 960 kHz), consider the following options for the RA-RNTI:
    - Option A: using the following equation for the RA-RNTI calculations µmax is the maximum µ for the FR used) and defining rules in case RA-RNTI conflicts with pre-allocated RNTIs or in case multiple Ros have the same RA-RNTI
      * RA-RNTI = (1 + s\_id + 14×t\_id + 14×max(80,Nslotframe,µmax)×f\_id + 14×max(80,Nslotframe,µmax) × 8 × ul\_carrier\_id) mod 216
    - Option B: reuse the same RA-RNTI equation in NR Rel-16, divide the RAR window into N segments (each segment is 80 slots using the used SCS), and signal the segment index in the DCI that schedules the MSG2/B

**Summary of Discussions in Tdoc**

* Some companies noted that RA-RNTI calculation (RA preamble ID) could overflow for larger PRACH SCS (i.e. 480 and 960 kHz) and suggest some potential modifications of this including methods to avoid issues by RO configuration definition.

**Discussions #1**

* Please provide further comments on RA-RNTI calculation issue identified by companies.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Discussions/Comments** |
| Samsung | We agree this issue should be further investigated in the WI. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We agree to discuss this issue. Among the solutions above, Option B proposed by Qualcomm seems a more straightforward solution. |
| DOCOMO | We agree to discuss this issue further. |
| LG Electronics | If 960 kHz subcarrier spacing is supported for PRACH, further discussions are needed for how to express slot indexes within the 10ms window for 960 kHz subcarrier spacing PRACH by using existing 16 bits RA-RNTI. |
| Vivo | We agree to discuss this issue after RO configuration for new SCS is determined. |
| Nokia | We can discuss this once we have concluded on supported scs (for RACH) and RO design. |
| Futurewei | Agree with the vivo and Nokia that we can discuss this topic after RO design and SCS for RACH decision. |
| Ericsson | We are fine to discuss this; however, it is not clear that a change is needed. It depends on the number of RACH occasions that are defined within a 60 kHz reference slot. Following the Rel-15/16 design, if two 480/960 kHz PRACH slots are defined within a 60 kHz reference slot, then changes may not be needed. |
| Qualcomm | Some solution is needed for this issue |
| OPPO | We can further investigate this issue. |
| InterDigital | We are fine to discuss this issue further. |
| Fujitsu | We agree that this issue should be discussed further. |
| CATT | These issue should be discussed after the conclusion of SCS for PRACH. |
| Apple | We agree to discuss this issue in the WI phase.  On Option B, it is unclear for us about the need of indicating segment index, as the potential use case is only when RAR window is overlapped between RO in two consecutive segmented windows |
| Intel | Further investigate this issue in RAN1 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | This issue may be further investigated after we reach an agreement for the supported RACH SCS(s). This won’t be an issue if only 120 kHz is supported. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We agree to discuss this issue further. Also agree with Nokia that the decision on SCS for RACH needs to be made first. |
| Mediatek | We agree that this issue should be investigated if needed. |

**Moderator Summary of Discussions #1**

* There seems to be consensus that RA-RNTI calculation problem needs to be resolved (assuming 480/960kHz PRACH SCS is needed)
* Suggest to conclude the following:
  + If 480 and/or 960 kHZ PRACH SCS is supported, RAN1 observes that current RA-RNTI calculation and PRACH identification in RAR does not correctly provide unique identification of PRACH.
  + Study further on how UE can uniquely identify PRACH in RAR.
    - Some examples for consideration:
      * Modification of RA-RNTI calculation equation
      * Divide RO into N segments, and indicate which segment in RAR

**Discussions #2**

Further discuss using the following statement as a starting point for further discussion:

##### Proposal #2.5-1 (original)

* If 480 and/or 960 kHZ PRACH SCS is supported, RAN1 observes that current RA-RNTI calculation and PRACH identification in RAR does not correctly provide unique identification of PRACH.
* Study further on how UE can uniquely identify PRACH in RAR.
  + Some examples for consideration:
    - Modification of RA-RNTI calculation equation
    - Divide RO into N segments, and indicate which segment in RAR

##### Proposal #2.5-2 (updated)

* If 480 and/or 960 kHZ PRACH SCS is supported, RAN1 ~~observes~~ should study whether or not the ~~that~~ current RA-RNTI calculation and PRACH identification in RAR ~~does not~~ correctly provides unique identification of PRACH.
* ~~Study further on how UE can uniquely identify PRACH in RAR.~~ 
  + Some examples for consideration, if needed:
    - Modification of RA-RNTI calculation equation
    - Divide RO into N segments, and indicate which segment in RAR

##### Proposal #2.5-3 (update of 2-5-2)

* If 480 and/or 960 kHZ PRACH SCS is supported, RAN1 ~~observes~~ should study whether or not the ~~that~~ current RA-RNTI calculation and PRACH identification in RAR ~~does not~~ correctly provides unique identification of PRACH.
* ~~Study further on how UE can uniquely identify PRACH in RAR.~~ 
  + ~~Some examples for consideration, if needed:~~
    - ~~Modification of RA-RNTI calculation equation~~
    - ~~Divide RO into N segments, and indicate which segment in RAR~~

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Discussions/Comments** |
| Samsung | We support the FL proposal. |
| Ericsson | We do not agree to the observation in the first bullet. Whether or not a change is needed depends on the RACH design. As we pointed out in our comments above, if the same number of PRACH occasions within a 60 kHz reference slot are defined as in FR2 (1 or 2 Ros), then the RA-RNTI formula may not need modification. Therefore we suggest the following reformulation:   * If 480 and/or 960 kHZ PRACH SCS is supported, RAN1 ~~observes~~ should study whether or not the ~~that~~ current RA-RNTI calculation and PRACH identification in RAR ~~does not~~ correctly provides unique identification of PRACH. * ~~Study further on how UE can uniquely identify PRACH in RAR.~~    + Some examples for consideration, if needed:     - Modification of RA-RNTI calculation equation     - Divide RO into N segments, and indicate which segment in RAR |
| LG Electronics | We support the proposal reformulated by Ericsson. |
| Vivo | We support the FL proposal |
| Moderator | Added Proposal #2.5-2 based on comments from Ericsson. |
| Nokia | We share the view with Ericsson that we should further the RACH design to determine the need. In this spirit we would propose to remove the examples from the proposal as follows: Proposal #2.5-2 (modified)  * If 480 and/or 960 kHZ PRACH SCS is supported, RAN1 ~~observes~~ should study whether or not the ~~that~~ current RA-RNTI calculation and PRACH identification in RAR ~~does not~~ correctly provides unique identification of PRACH. * ~~Study further on how UE can uniquely identify PRACH in RAR.~~    + ~~Some examples for consideration, if needed:~~     - ~~Modification of RA-RNTI calculation equation~~     - ~~Divide RO into N segments, and indicate which segment in RAR~~ |
| Intel | We support Proposal #2.5-2 with some modifications. We think that the issue is well understood and there is no need in examples. So, the second bullet could be removed. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Agree with FL’s proposal |
| Moderator | Added P#2.5-3 based on comments from Nokia and Intel. |
| Futurewei | In principle we are OK with modifications provided that this agreement is considered only after 480kHz/960 kHz PRACH SCS discussion, |
| Ericsson | Support P#2.5-3 |
| Qualcomm | Proposal #2.5-3, we are fine with this proposal, although some example may help. |
| Moderator | I’ve started to formulate a summary of discussion #2 (below). Please note the summary is temporary and will be updated further as additional comments are received. |
| DOCOMO | Our preference is Proposal #2.5-3, but we can live with Proposal #2.5-2. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are fine with Proposal #2.5-3 |
| Moderator | See summary below |

**Moderator Summary of Discussions #2**

Moderator suggest to further discuss based on Proposal #2.5-2 as it contains all debated components and can be further modified based on discussion.

One of the debated aspects are whether or not to discuss this issue after SCS for PRACH is concluded and whether to keep the examples (highlighted in yellow).

Moderator suggest to further discuss Proposal 2.5-2.

##### Proposal #2.5-2

* If 480 and/or 960 kHz PRACH SCS is supported, RAN1 ~~observes~~ should study whether or not the ~~that~~ current RA-RNTI calculation and PRACH identification in RAR ~~does not~~ correctly provides unique identification of PRACH.
* ~~Study further on how UE can uniquely identify PRACH in RAR.~~ 
  + Some examples for consideration, if needed:
    - Modification of RA-RNTI calculation equation
    - Divide RO into N segments, and indicate which segment in RAR

**Discussions #3**

Moderator suggest continuing discussion based on Proposal #2.5-2.

##### Proposal #2.5-2 (cleaned up)

* If 480 and/or 960 kHz PRACH SCS is supported, RAN1 should study whether or not the current RA-RNTI calculation and PRACH identification in RAR correctly provides unique identification of PRACH.
  + Some examples for consideration, if needed:
    - Modification of RA-RNTI calculation equation
    - Divide RO into N segments, and indicate which segment in RAR

##### Proposal #2.5-4 (removal of example from 2.5-2)

* If 480 and/or 960 kHz PRACH SCS is supported, RAN1 should study whether or not the current RA-RNTI calculation and PRACH identification in RAR correctly provides unique identification of PRACH.
  + ~~Some examples for consideration, if needed:~~
    - ~~Modification of RA-RNTI calculation equation~~
    - ~~Divide RO into N segments, and indicate which segment in RAR~~

Please provide further comments.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Discussions/Comments** |
| Nokia | We are fine with the first bullet of proposal #2.5-2 but would propose to remove the examples for time being. Proposal #2.5-2 (modification)  * If 480 and/or 960 kHz PRACH SCS is supported, RAN1 should study whether or not the current RA-RNTI calculation and PRACH identification in RAR correctly provides unique identification of PRACH.   + ~~Some examples for consideration, if needed:~~     - ~~Modification of RA-RNTI calculation equation~~     - ~~Divide RO into N segments, and indicate which segment in RAR~~ |
| Intel | We are fine with Proposal #2.5-2 but also propose to remove the examples. |
| Qualcomm | We are fine with Proposal #2.5-2 |
| CATT | We are OK with Proposal #2.5-2 |
| LG Electronics | We are fine with Proposal #2.5-2. |
| Fujitsu | We are fine with Proposal #2.5-2. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are fine with Proposal #2.5-2. |
| Vivo | We are fine with Proposal #2.5-2. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are ok with Proposal #2.5-2. |
| OPPO | We prefer to remove the examples. |
| Ericsson | Similar to Nokia, we are fine with the first bullet of the the proposal, but prefer to remove the examples. |
| InterDigital | We are fine with the first bullet, but prefer to remove the examples similar to Nokia and Ericsson. |
| Futurewei | We support the first bullet with the examples removed. |
| DOCOMO | We prefer Nokia’s update. |
| Moderator | Added Proposal 2.5-4, which removes the examples. |
| Samsung | We are ok with Proposal #2.5-4 |
| Qualcomm | We prefer Proposal #2.5-2 (with examples), but also ok with Proposal #2.5-4 (without example) if it helps the progress |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are ok with the new Proposal 2.5-4. |
| Intel | We support Proposal #2.5-4 |
| Futurewei | We are OK with the Proposal #2.5-4 |

**Moderator Summary of Discussions #3**

Moderator Suggests agreeing to Proposal #2.5-4.

**Discussions #4**

Please provide further comments on Proposal #2.5-4.

##### Proposal #2.5-4 (cleaned up)

* If 480 and/or 960 kHz PRACH SCS is supported, RAN1 should study whether or not the current RA-RNTI calculation and PRACH identification in RAR correctly provides unique identification of PRACH.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Discussions/Comments** |
| Qualcomm | We are fine with Proposal #2.5-4 |
| DOCOMO | We support the Proposal #2.5-4 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | OK with the proposal |
| LG Electronics | We are fine with this proposal. |
| Nokia | We are OK with proposal #2.5-4 |
| Intel | We are fine with Proposal #2.5-4 |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are fine with Proposal #2.5-4 |
| CATT | We are OK with Proposal #2.5-4 |
| Futurewei | We are OK with Proposal #2.5-4 |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine with Proposal #2.5-4 |

**Moderator Summary of Discussions #4**

Moderator Suggests agreeing to Proposal #2.5-4.

**Discussions #5**

Discussion seems to be converging. Please provide comments **only if you have concerns on Proposal #2.5-4**.

##### Proposal #2.5-4d

* If 480 and/or 960 kHz PRACH SCS is supported, RAN1 should study whether or not the current RA-RNTI calculation and PRACH identification in RAR correctly provides unique identification of PRACH.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Discussions/Comments** |
| Ericsson | Fine with the proposal |

**Moderator Summary of Discussions #4**

No concerns were raised for Proposal #2.5-4. Moderator Suggests agreeing to Proposal #2.5-4.

### 2.2.6 Short Signal Exception for PRACH

* From [12] Intel:
  + Observation: For 120 kHz, 480kHz, and 960 kHz PRACH transmission, UE does not exceed total transmission duration of 10 msec for PRACH within a 100 msec observation period.
  + Consider applying short control signal exemption to PRACH transmission by the UE.
* From [22] Ericsson:
  + It is not necessary to optimize PRACH design to allow for gaps between consecutive PRACH occasions within a PRACH slot, especially since SS/PBCH blocks can be classified as short control signaling transmissions consistent with EN 302 567.

**Summary of Discussions in Tdoc**

* Few companies discussed whether short signal exemption defined in EN302 567 can be applied to PRACH.
* Suggest to discuss further on short signal exemption to PRACH.

**Discussions #1**

* Please provide further comments applicability of short signal exemption for PRACH.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Discussions/Comments** |
| Samsung | Support including PRACH as short control signal. |
| NEC | Support treat the PRACH as a shot control signal. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Support including PRACH as short control signal. |
| DOCOMO | Support including PRACH as short control signal |
| LG Electronics | Support transmission of short control signaling without LBT can be considered for transmitting information without any user plane data such as SSB, PRACH considering the updated ETSI EN 302 567. |
| vivo | Support including PRACH as short control signal |
| Nokia | We support treating the PRACH as short control signal. This discussion may relate to general channel access method discussion in agenda 8.2.6. |
| Charter Communications | Support including PRACH as short control signal |
| Futurewei | Support PRACH transmissions as short control signal. |
| Ericsson | Support defining PRACH as short control signal |
| Qualcomm | Support including PRACH as short control signal |
| OPPO | Support including PRACH as short control signal. |
| Xiaomi | Support to include PRACH as short control signal. |
| CATT | Support including PRACH as short control signal |
| Apple | Support including PRACH as short control signal. |
| Intel | Apply short control signal exemption to PRACH transmission by the UE |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We do not support short signal exemption for PRACH due to the following reasons:   * If all UEs are allowed to transmit RACH without LBT, in fact the total RACH transmission time can be far more than the requirement of maximum 10 ms per every 100 ms. For instance, PRACH configuration Index 28 in Table 6.3.3.2-4 of 38.211 for FR2 allows RACH transmission in symbols (7-13) of all 40 reference subframes of all frames; resulting in the maximum total RACH occupancy of 42% (42 ms out of 100 ms). Although this might be an extreme example, in fact, many other PRACH configuration Indexes don’t meet the maximum 10 ms per every 100 ms requirement. * UL signals including RACH are transmitted using a wider beam and, therefore, have a larger interference foot-print on the network. * In our view, and as discussed in our reply in Section 2.1.1, the 10 ms out of 100 ms channel occupancy is only a necessary condition for exemption and not sufficient. Otherwise, virtually any single signal/channel could be designed so that it satisfies the above short duration criteria. 3GPP should interpret short “management and control Frames” terminology used in 302 567 and decide which signals/channels can be exempted. In particular, we believe that LBT is still necessary before gNB transmits SSB because of a broader energy emission foot-print of SSB burst. Moreover, if default periodicity of 20 ms is assumed, neither Case D nor Case E SSB patterns in 120 and 240 kHz satisfy the necessary 10/100 ms criteria. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support treating PRACH as short control signal. |
| Mediatek | Support including PRACH as short control signal. |

**Moderator Summary of Discussions #1**

* There seems to be majority support on application of short signal exemption to PRACH.
* Moderator would like to further ask companies, if below statement (Proposal #2.6-1) is agreed, does this mean RAN1 no longer considers LBT for PRACH, or does the specification still need to support LBT for PRACH as an option?
* Moderator suggest further discuss on the following:

##### Proposal #2.6-1

* + RAN1 concludes NR PRACH is considered as control/management frames that can be exempt from LBT as described by short signal exception rules in EN 302 567.

**Discussion Guidance from Chairman**

Chairman’s guidance was to discuss the applicability to signals/channel in agenda item.8.2.6.

Please continue to provide comments to agenda item 8.2.6.

# Summary of Moderator Proposals and Conclusions

**From Section 2.1.1**

This discussion has been concluded for RAN1 #104-e.

**From Section 2.1.2/2.1.4**

This discussion has been concluded for RAN1 #104-e.

**From Section 2.1.3**

Moderator asks to quickly check the following proposal.

##### Proposal #1.3-10 (CORESET0 typo fixed)

* For CORESET#0 and Type0-PDCCH search space configured in MIB:
  + Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET#0 for Type0-PDCCH} SCS ~~is~~ equal to {120, 120} kHz
    - Support at least SSB and CORESET#0 multiplexing patterns, number of symbols (duration of CORESET#0) that are supported in Rel-15/16 for {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET#0 for Type0-PDCCH} SCS = {120, 120} kHz.
      * FFS: Supporting additional values
    - FFS: Supported values for SSB to CORESET#0 offset RBs, number of RBs for CORESET#0.
  + If 480kHz SSB SCS that configures CORESET#0 and Type0-PDCCH CSS in MIB is agreed to be supported,
    - Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET#0 for Type0-PDCCH} SCS ~~is~~ equal to {480, 480} kHz
  + If 960 kHz SSB SCS that configures CORESET#0 and Type0-PDCCH CSS in MIB is agreed to be supported,
    - Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET#0 for Type0-PDCCH} SCS ~~is~~ equal to {960, 960} kHz
  + If 240 kHz SSB SCS is agreed to be supported,
    - Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET#0 for Type0-PDCCH} SCS ~~is~~ equal to {240, 120} kHz
  + FFS: any other combinations between one of SSB SCS (120, 240, 480, 960) and one of CORESET#0 SCS (120, 480, 960)
    - FFS: initial timing resolution based on low SCS (120 kHz) and its impact on the performance of higher SCS (480/960 kHz)

##### Proposal #1.3-11 (Update from Huawei)

* For CORESET#0 and Type0-PDCCH search space configured in MIB:
  + Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET#0 for Type0-PDCCH} SCS ~~is~~ equal to {120, 120} kHz
    - Support at least SSB and CORESET#0 multiplexing patterns, number of RBs for CORESET, number of symbols (duration of CORESET#0) that are supported in Rel-15/16 for {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET#0 for Type0-PDCCH} SCS = {120, 120} kHz.
      * FFS: Supporting additional values
    - FFS: Supported values for SSB to CORESET0 offset RBs ~~number of RBs for CORESET~~
  + If 480kHz SSB SCS that configures CORESET#0 and Type0-PDCCH CSS in MIB is agreed to be supported,
    - Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET#0 for Type0-PDCCH} SCS ~~is~~ equal to {480, 480} kHz
  + If 960 kHz SSB SCS that configures CORESET#0 and Type0-PDCCH CSS in MIB is agreed to be supported,
    - Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET#0 for Type0-PDCCH} SCS ~~is~~ equal to {960, 960} kHz
  + If 240 kHz SSB SCS is agreed to be supported,
    - Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET#0 for Type0-PDCCH} SCS ~~is~~ equal to {240, 120} kHz
  + FFS: any other combinations between one of SSB SCS (120, 240, 480, 960) and one of CORESET#0 SCS (120, 480, 960)
    - FFS: initial timing resolution based on low SCS (120 kHz) and its impact on the performance of higher SCS (480/960 kHz)

**From Section 2.1.5**

Moderator asks to quickly check the following proposal.

##### Proposal #1.5-7

* For 480 kHz and 960 kHz SSB SCS (if agreed)
  + Study further on reserving symbol gap between SSB positions with different SSB index (and possibly between SSB position and other signal/channels)
    - FFS: whether symbol gap is needed for only 960 kHz or both 480 and 960 kHz.
  + Study further on reserving gap for UL/DL switching within the pattern accounting possibility for reserving UL transmission occasions in the SSB pattern

##### Proposal #1.5-8 (update proposed by LGE)

* For 480 kHz and 960 kHz SSB SCS (if agreed)
  + Study further on reserving symbol gap between SSB positions with different SSB index (and possibly between SSB position and other signal/channels)
    - FFS: whether symbol gap is needed for only 960 kHz or both 480 and 960 kHz.
  + Study further on reserving gap for UL/DL switching within the pattern accounting possibility for reserving UL transmission occasions in the SSB pattern
  + Study should account for inputs from RAN4

**From Section 2.1.6/2.1.7**

Moderator recommends postponing discussing SSB and CORESET#0 multiplexing issue until the SCS combination for SSB and CORESET#0 is further resolved.

**From Section 2.1.8**

Moderator suggests discussing the following conclusion. If concerns or comments are made about the proposal, moderator suggests skipping the agreement for the proposed conclusion.

* RAN1 concludes the following issues are out-of-scope for NR extension to 71 GHz WI
  + enhanced SSB (e.g. larger number of symbols for PBCH)
  + applicability of reduced capability UEs and how RedCap UE would be handled

Updated conclusion

* RAN1 concludes the following issues are out-of-scope for Rel-17 NR extension to 71 GHz WI
  + enhanced design of SSB (e.g. larger number of symbols for PBCH)
  + applicability of reduced capability UEs and how RedCap UE would be handled

**From Section 2.2.1/2.2.2/2.2.3**

Moderator asks to quickly check the following proposal.

##### Proposal #2.1-8

* For initial access and non-initial access use cases, support 120kHz PRACH SCS with sequence length L=571, 1151 (in addition to L=139) for PRACH Formats A1~A3, B1~B4, C0, and C2.
* For ~~at least~~ non-initial access use cases,
  + if 480kHz and/or 960 kHz SSB SCS is agreed to be supported, support 480 and/or 960 kHz PRACH SCS with sequence length L=139 for PRACH Formats A1~A3, B1~B4, C0, and C2, respectively.
    - FFS: support of sequence length L = 571, 1151
  + FFS: Support of 480 and/or 960 kHz PRACH SCS for initial access use cases, if 480 and/or 960 kHz SSB SCS is agreed to be supported for initial access

**From Section 2.2.4**

Since there were comments on Proposal#2.4-8 from at least two companies, moderators suggest quickly checking Proposal #2.4-9.

##### Proposal #2.4-9

* Further study RO configuration for 480 and/or 960 kHz PRACH, if supported:
  + Use existing FR2 PRACH configuration table in 38.211 as a starting point for study of RO configuration
  + Study whether or not modifications to the table and/or modifications to the supporting specification text are needed to support 480/960 kHz PRACH
  + Study whether or not a gap between contiguous ROs is needed, e.g., due to LBT and/or beam switching including consideration of potential feedback from RAN4 and discussions on short control signaling

**From Section 2.2.5**

Moderator asks to quickly check the following proposal.

##### Proposal #2.5-4

* If 480 and/or 960 kHz PRACH SCS is supported, RAN1 should study whether or not the current RA-RNTI calculation and PRACH identification in RAR correctly provides unique identification of PRACH.

**From Section 2.2.6**

As per chairman’s guidance, moderator suggest to further discuss Proposal #2.6-1 in agenda 8.2.6. No further discussion will be held under agenda 8.2.1 for this issue.

**Final Comments from Companies on moderator proposals**

Please provide final comments on all the proposals above. For companies who were actively providing comments to the proposal, you **MUST provide acknowledge of acceptance**, otherwise chairman will not endorse the proposals.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments |
| template | **Proposal #1.3-10:** ok/ not agreeable (also whether 1.3-11 is ok or not)   * Comments here   **Proposal #1.5-7:** ok/ not agreeable (also whether 1.5-8 is ok or not)   * Comments here   **(Updated) Conclusion for Section 2.1.8:** ok/ conclusion not needed   * Comments here   **Proposal #2.1-8:** ok/ not agreeable   * Comments here   **Proposal #2.4-9:** ok/ not agreeable   * Comments here   **Proposal #2.5-4:** ok/ not agreeable   * Comments here |
| Nokia | **Proposal #1.3-10:** ok  **Proposal #1.5-7:** ok  **Conclusion for Section 2.1.8:** ok  **Proposal #2.1-8:** ok  **Proposal #2.4-9:** ok  **Proposal #2.5-4:** ok |
| Samsung | **Proposal #1.3-10:** ok  **Proposal #1.5-7:** ok  **Conclusion for Section 2.1.8:** ok  **Proposal #2.1-8:** ok  **Proposal #2.4-9:** ok  **Proposal #2.5-4:** ok |
| Ericsson | **Proposal #1.3-10:** ok   * Editorial comment: CORESET should be CORESET0 in the FFS   **Proposal #1.5-7:** ok  **Conclusion for Section 2.1.8:** ok  **Proposal #2.1-8:** ok  **Proposal #2.4-9:** ok  **Proposal #2.5-4:** ok |
| Qualcomm | **Proposal #1.3-10:** ok (with preferred modification)   * We prefer the proposal without the “*that configures CORESET0 and Type0-PDCCH CSS in MIB*” part for the {480,480} and {960,960} cases. * But we are willing to accept 1.3-10 as is, if needed for the sake of progress.   **Proposal #1.5-7:** ok  **Conclusion for Section 2.1.8:** ok (with minor addition)   * RAN1 concludes the following issues are out-of-scope for NR extension to Rel-17 71 GHz WI   + enhanced SSB (e.g. larger number of symbols for PBCH)   + applicability of reduced capability UEs and how RedCap UE would be handled   **Proposal #2.1-8:** ok  **Proposal #2.4-9:** ok  **Proposal #2.5-4:** ok |
| DOCOMO | **Proposal #1.3-10:** ok  **Proposal #1.5-7:** ok  **Conclusion for Section 2.1.8:** ok   * We agree with Qualcomm update. Also, while not strong view, “enhanced SSB” may be clarified as “enhanced design of SSB”?   **Proposal #2.1-8:** ok  **Proposal #2.4-9:** ok  **Proposal #2.5-4:** ok |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Futurewei | **Proposal #1.3-10:** OK  **Proposal #1.5-7:** OK  **Conclusion for Section 2.1.8:** OK  **Proposal #2.1-8:** OK  **Proposal #2.4-9:** OK  **Proposal #2.5-4:** OK |
| LG Electronics | **Proposal #1.3-10:** OK  **Proposal #1.5-7:** In general fine, but   * Suggest to add “Study should account for inputs from RAN4”, as we did in agenda item 8.2.4.   **Conclusion for Section 2.1.8:** OK  **Proposal #2.1-8:** OK  **Proposal #2.4-9:** OK  **Proposal #2.5-4:** OK |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | **Proposal #1.3-10:** ok (for the sake of progress. Prefer modification as follows):   * We don’t see any reason why at least supporting 24 and 48 PRBs for CORESET#0 for 120 kHz (Similar values as in Rel-15/16) would need a further discussion. We also do not remember any company had raised an issue about supporting these two values. As such, we prefer that the first part of the proposal concerning {120, 120} would be changed to the following if it is agreeable by other companies (changes in blue from us):   + Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET#0 for Type0-PDCCH} SCS ~~is~~ equal to {120, 120} kHz     - Support at least SSB and CORESET#0 multiplexing patterns, number of symbols (duration of CORESET), and number of RBs for CORESET#0 that are supported in Rel-15/16 for {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET#0 for Type0-PDCCH} SCS = {120, 120} kHz.       * FFS: Supporting additional values     - FFS: Supported values for SSB to CORESET#0 offset RBs, ~~number of RBs for CORESET~~.   **Proposal #1.5-7:** ok  **Conclusion for Section 2.1.8:** conclusion not needed   * We don’t see any need to make conclusions on what is out of scope. There are many things that if discussed, majority of companies would consider out of scope, we do not understand why RedCap should be singled out. Should we make an out-of-scope conclusion for, e.g, positioning, NTN, …   **Proposal #2.1-8:** ok  **Proposal #2.4-9:** not agreeable   * We do not see the need or value for such an agreement at this point.   Overall there seems to be too many unknown variables to make a decision on PRACH occasion configurations: 1) Whether or not 480/960 kHz SCS for PRACH agreed; 2) whether or not beam switching gap is required if 480/960 kHz SCS for PRACH agreed; 3) and whether or not PRACH is agreed to be exempted from LBT as a short signaling.  It may be more practical to revisit this issue when at least some of the above three major issues are resolved.  **Proposal #2.5-4:** ok |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| InterDigital | **Proposal #1.3-10:** ok  **Proposal #1.5-7:** ok  **Conclusion for Section 2.1.8:** ok  **Proposal #2.1-8:** ok  **Proposal #2.4-9:** ok  **Proposal #2.5-4:** ok |
| Apple | **Proposal #1.3-10: Ok.**  **Proposal #1.5-7: Ok.**  **Conclusion for Section 2.1.8: Ok.**  **Proposal #2.1-8: Ok.**  **Proposal #2.4-9: Ok.**  **Proposal #2.5-4: Yes.** |
| Moderator | **Companies to provide further input on whether updated proposals suggested by other is also ok.**  **Most notably Proposal #1.3-11, Proposal#1.5-8, and updated conclusion (copied below).** Proposal #1.3-11 (Update from Huawei)  * For CORESET#0 and Type0-PDCCH search space configured in MIB:   + Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET#0 for Type0-PDCCH} SCS ~~is~~ equal to {120, 120} kHz     - Support at least SSB and CORESET#0 multiplexing patterns, number of RBs for CORESET, number of symbols (duration of CORESET#0) that are supported in Rel-15/16 for {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET#0 for Type0-PDCCH} SCS = {120, 120} kHz.       * FFS: Supporting additional values     - FFS: Supported values for SSB to CORESET0 offset RBs ~~number of RBs for CORESET~~   + If 480kHz SSB SCS that configures CORESET#0 and Type0-PDCCH CSS in MIB is agreed to be supported,     - Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET#0 for Type0-PDCCH} SCS ~~is~~ equal to {480, 480} kHz   + If 960 kHz SSB SCS that configures CORESET#0 and Type0-PDCCH CSS in MIB is agreed to be supported,     - Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET#0 for Type0-PDCCH} SCS ~~is~~ equal to {960, 960} kHz   + If 240 kHz SSB SCS is agreed to be supported,     - Support {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET#0 for Type0-PDCCH} SCS ~~is~~ equal to {240, 120} kHz   + FFS: any other combinations between one of SSB SCS (120, 240, 480, 960) and one of CORESET#0 SCS (120, 480, 960)     - FFS: initial timing resolution based on low SCS (120 kHz) and its impact on the performance of higher SCS (480/960 kHz)  Proposal #1.5-8 (update proposed by LGE)  * For 480 kHz and 960 kHz SSB SCS (if agreed)   + Study further on reserving symbol gap between SSB positions with different SSB index (and possibly between SSB position and other signal/channels)     - FFS: whether symbol gap is needed for only 960 kHz or both 480 and 960 kHz.   + Study further on reserving gap for UL/DL switching within the pattern accounting possibility for reserving UL transmission occasions in the SSB pattern   + Study should account for inputs from RAN4   Updated conclusion   * RAN1 concludes the following issues are out-of-scope for Rel-17 NR extension to 71 GHz WI   + enhanced design of SSB (e.g. larger number of symbols for PBCH)   + applicability of reduced capability UEs and how RedCap UE would be handled |
| LG Electronics | Support updated Proposal #1.3-11, Proposal #1.5-8 and conclusion. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | OK with updated Proposal #1.3-11 and Proposal #1.5-8. Still don’t see the need for the conclusion. |
| CATT | Proposal #1.3-10: ok  Proposal #1.5-7: ok  Conclusion for Section 2.1.8: ok  Proposal #2.1-8: ok  Proposal #2.4-9: ok  Proposal #2.5-4: ok |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Updated Proposal #1.3-11: ok  Updated Proposal #1.5-8: ok  Updated Conclusion: ok  Proposal #2.1-8: ok  Proposal #2.4-9: ok  Proposal #2.5-4: ok |

# Summary of Agreements/Conclusion in RAN1 #104e

**Agreed in GTW session on Jan 28.**

Agreement:

* Send an LS to RAN4 to get input on gap required for gNBs and UEs for beam switching and for UL/DL and DL/UL switching.

**Agreed in GTW session on Feb 04.**

**R1-2102073** [Draft] LS on beam switching gap for 60 GHz band Intel Corporation

Final LS endorsed in **R1-2102202**

Agreement:

* Whether or not to support 240 kHz, 480kHz and 960kHz SCS for SSB and the conditions under which SSB for 240 kHz, 480 kHz and 960 kHz may be supported will be decided no later than RAN1#104bis-e.

Agreement:

* For an unlicensed band that requires LBT, further study whether/how to support discovery burst (DB) and discovery burst transmission window (DBTW) at least for 120 kHz SSB SCS
  + If DB supported
    - FFS: What signals/channels are included in DB other than SS/PBCH block
  + If DBTW is supported
    - Support mechanism to indicate or inform that DBTW is enabled/disabled for both IDLE and CONNECTED mode UEs
      * FFS: how to support UEs performing initial access that do not have any prior information on DBTW.
    - PBCH payload size is no greater than that for FR2
    - Duration of DBTW is no greater than 5 ms
    - Number of PBCH DMRS sequences is the same as for FR2
  + The following points are additionally FFS:
    - How to indicate candidate SSB indices and QCL relation without exceeding limit on PBCH payload size
    - Details of the mechanism for enabling/disabling DBTW considering LBT exempt operation and overlapping licensed/unlicensed bands
    - Whether or not to support DBTW for SSB SCS(s) other than 120 kHz if other SSB SCS(s) are supported

**Agreed over email**

**TBD**
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