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# Introduction

This paper summarizes the channel access related proposals submitted to agenda item 8.2.6, and follow up email discussions below:

[104-e-NR-52-71GHz-07] Email discussion/approval on channel access mechanism with checkpoints for agreements on Jan-28, Feb-02, Feb-05 – Jing (Qualcomm)

# Summary of contributions

The section summarises key proposals and observations from submitted contributions. Discussion points arising from each group of topics are captured separately in subsections.

## Channel bandwidth, nominal bandwidth, and LBT bandwidth

A few papers discussed the definition of channel bandwidth, nominal bandwidth and LBT bandwidth.

### LBT Bandwidth

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Key Proposals/Observations/Positions** |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Proposal 2: For NR unlicensed bands between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz, for LBT based channel access mechanism, there is no need to specify the nominal bandwidth in 3GPP and it is up to devices’ implementation on how to meet the OCB requirements. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Proposal 1: In order to avoid ambiguity about the understanding of nominal bandwidth and resolve the problem of unclear the conclusion for the OCB requirement, it is necessary to introduce a clear the definition of nominal bandwidth.  Proposal 2: The nominal bandwidth can be defined as follows:  • Nominal bandwidths for the purpose of OCB requirements at the UE are the channel BWs for transmission supported by the UE from the set of channel BWs (carrier BWs) to be defined in 38.101.  • Nominal bandwidths for the purpose of OCB requirements at the gNB are the channel BWs for transmission supported by the gNB from the set of channel BWs (carrier BWs) to be defined in 38.104.  Proposal 3: **Alt 5** that “LBT bandwidth equals with minimum supported channel bandwidth or multiples of the minimum supported channel bandwidth” should be considered to be supported, considering friendly and fair coexistence between the same systems or different systems. |
| OPPO | Proposal 3: Support Alt 5 to define LBT bandwidth. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Proposal 1: For operation in NR-U-60, the EDT formula adopted from draft v2.1.20 of EN 302 567 as a baseline should be adjusted to account for an LBT BW other than 2 GHz.  Proposal 5: For operation in the 60 GHz band, the LBT bandwidth should be specified relative to the channel bandwidth defined in RAN4 specifications.  Proposal 6: For operation in the 60 GHz band, the LBT BW can be greater than the carrier BW.  • Support Alt 3 and Alt 5 captured in the TR. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Proposal 6: The design of LBT bandwidth in FR1 can be considered as the baseline for operation on 60GHz unlicensed band, e.g., the minimum supported channel bandwidth can be considered as the LBT bandwidth. Also use of channel bandwidth as LBT bandwidth can be considered further. However, before making final decisions, the basic principles of channelization (numerology) should be agreed first. |
| Intel | Proposal 4: When operating in unlicensed 60 GHz band, in order to allow fair coexistence among incumbent systems, the ED threshold calculation shall account not only for the maximum output power, but also at least for the bandwidth used.  Proposal 5: When operating in unlicensed 60 GHz band, the ED threshold calculation shall account for the type of LBT mechanism used.  Proposal 6: For the LBT bandwidth definition, either Alt-4 or Alt-5 are preferred. |
| InterDigital | Proposal 11: Limit the number of supported LBT BWs. FFS number of supported LBT BWs. |
| Samsung | Proposal 2: The scenario for LBT bandwidth discussion should be clarified before down-selecting the alternatives. |
| CATT | Proposal 5: For DL/UL transmission, the transmission bandwidth is used as the LBT bandwidth. |
| CAICT | Proposal 1: Multiple LBT bandwidth could be considered for unlicensed band operation within 52.6-71GHz.  Proposal 2: The relationship between LBT bandwidth and nominal bandwidth should be clarified.  Proposal 3: If interlace design is used for uplink, 50 and 100 PRB based LBT bandwidth should be considered.  Proposal 4: Alt.3 and Alt.5 should be specified for LBT bandwidth selection. |
| vivo | Proposal 1: The LBT bandwidth is variable and can be defined according to the active BWP. |
| Spreadtrum | Proposal 1: At least, Alt 1 and Alt 4 should be supported for LBT bandwidth definition. |
| Ericsson | Observation 4 In EN 302 567, the nominal channel bandwidth and at least one transmission mode with occupied channel BW 70% of NBW is defined for spurious out-of-band emissions and not for LBT purposes.  Observation 5 The relationship between the LBT bandwidth and the channel bandwidth is not specified in EN 302 567 for the sake of technology-neutrality and flexibility.  Proposal 2 Adopt the current definition in 37.213 for LBT BW (“A channel refers to a carrier or a part of a carrier consisting of a contiguous set of resource blocks (RBs) on which a channel access procedure is performed in shared spectrum.”) also for the frequency range 52.6-71 GHz. Thus, no further down-selection among the alternatives for LBT BW is needed. |
| Apple | Proposal 1: LBT bandwidth is channel bandwidth, and ED thread hold is calculated based on channel bandwidth, following EN 302 567 v2.1.21. |
| Qualcomm | Proposal 2: It is not necessary to define a fixed ‘LBT bandwidth’ as a fundamental sensing unit (like the 20MHz LBT bandwidth in FR1). |

### Channelization

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Key Proposals/Observations/Positions** |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Proposal 1: For NR unlicensed bands between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz, for LBT based channel access mechanism, support aligning the channelization between 802.11ad/ay and NR at least where the absence of any other technology sharing the channel cannot be guaranteed on a long-term basis. |
| Sony | Proposal 1: NR devices support 2.16 GHz bandwidth in 60GHz spectrum as one of the nominal channel bandwidths. |
| Convida | Proposal 8: The LBT indication and channel occupation time should be studied when the channel BW for NR-U from 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz is smaller than WiFi 802.11 ad/ay channel BW. |

### Discussion

**LBT Bandwidth: Summary of positions**

* Alt 1: LBT bandwidth equals RAN4 defined channel bandwidth (equivalently RAN1 BWP bandwidth)
  + ~~HW,~~ Nokia, Spreadtrum, Qualcomm, Apple
  + Vivo: Active BWP
* Alt 2: LBT bandwidth equals the minimum of channel bandwidth and the transmission bandwidth (number of RBs for a given transmission), = min(CBW, TBW)
  + CATT, Ericsson, NTT DOCOMO
* Alt 3: LBT bandwidth can be wider than channel bandwidth,
  + HW
* Alt 4: LBT bandwidth can be narrower than the channel bandwidth, with multiple LBT subband within a channel,
  + Intel, Spreadtrum
* Alt 5: LBT bandwidth equals with minimum supported channel bandwidth or multiples of the minimum supported channel bandwidth
  + ZTE, OPPO, Intel, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, HW, FW
* Multiple LBT Bandwidth: CAICT, InterDigital

Discussion point:

Please update your position in about above list, in case it is not correctly captured.

Recommend to separate the discussion into two cases: single carrier transmission, can carrier aggregation

For single carrier case

* Alt SC.1. gNB/UE performs LBT over the channel bandwidth (or BWP bandwidth)
  + Apple, vivo, FW, QC, Ericsson (also fine), Xiaomi, Lenovo, Nokia, Sony, HW ( only if Alt. CA.2 is supported as a default behaviour), Spreadtrum, Charter
* Alt SC.2. gNB/UE performs LBT over the transmission bandwidth (from the lowest RB to the highest RB used for the transmission)
  + Ericsson, CATT, Lenovo, DCM, HW
* Alt SC.3. Define a unit of LBT bandwidth and gNB/UE performs LBT in all the LBT units (to be transmitted in) in the channel bandwidth
  + Intel, Nokia (wideband carrier), ZTE, Oppo, IDC, LGE
* Further study: Samsung, Intel

For carrier aggregation (intra-band CA) case

* Alt CA.1. gNB/UE performs multiple LBT, one for each channel bandwidth separately
  + Apple, FW, QC, Ericsson (also fine), Xiaomi, Lenovo, Nokia, Sony, HW (also fine), Spreadtrum, Charter
* Alt CA.2. gNB/UE performs single LBT over all CCs
  + QC (also fine), Lenovo, Sony, HW
* Alt CA.3. gNB/UE performs multiple LBT, one for each CC over the transmission bandwidth (from the lowest RB in to the highest RB used for the transmission in the CC)
  + Ericsson, CATT, DCM
* Alt CA.4. gNB/UE performs LBT over the transmission bandwidth over all CCs (from the lowest RB in the lowest CC to the highest RB in the highest CC used for the transmission)
* Alt CA.5. Define a unit of LBT bandwidth and gNB/UE performs LBT in all the LBT units (to be transmitted in) in the channel bandwidth in each CC
  + Intel, ZTE, IDC, LGE
* Further study: vivo, Samsung, Intel

Please show your support in the list above, or suggest other alternatives

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Apple | For single carrier, Alt SC1: channel BW (or BWP BW) for LBT BW. Even though in EN 302 567, the language used is very generic, however, it is not intended to adapt LBT BW per transmission. Adapting LBT BW can create coexistence issues with other technologies, also create high overhead for regulatory testing.  For multi carrier case, discussion is related to 2.11, multi-channel access. Alt CA.1 is preferred, corresponding to type-A access. |
| vivo | Alt SC.1 is preferred for single carrier. Although the alternatives agreed in SI mainly focus on defining the LBT bandwidth with respect to the channel bandwidth defined by RAN4, we think the LBT bandwidth should relate more to the actual operational bandwidth, e.g., active UL BWP for UE. In this way, LBT only need to be performed on the active resources. The interference on the inactive resources will not affect the transmission. For gNB, the LBT can be performed on the channel bandwidth or the DL BWP bandwidth for scheduled UE.  The LBT mechanism for CA can be discussed after we define the LBT bandwidth for single carrier. |
| Futurewei | Prefer Alt SC1 (gNB/UE performs LBT over the channel bandwidth) and respectively Alt CA 1.( gNB/UE performs multiple LBT, one for each channel bandwidth separately) |
| Qualcomm | Alt SC.1. Frequent retune and filter reconfigurations will be required for Alt SC.2.  Alt CA1 as baseline. May support Alt CA.2 |
| Ericsson | For single carrier case, Alt SC2 is preferred but Alt SC1 is ok too.  For intra-band CA, Alt CA3 is preferred but Alt CA1 is ok too.   EN 302 567 does not mandate a specific LBT BW or a relation between the LBT BW and the multiple declared channel bandwidths.  Also, RAN1 does not define the LBT BW (*to be 20 MHz for 5/6 GHz* band) even in Rel-16. TS 37.213 defines the following: “*A channel refers to a carrier or a part of a carrier consisting of a contiguous set of resource blocks (RBs) on which a channel access procedure is performed in shared spectrum.*” We further observe that the generic channel definition in 37.213 covers both the case where the LBT BW is equal to the RAN4 channel BW (i.e. carrier BW) (**Alt SC1**) and the case where the LBT BW is smaller than the RAN4 channel BW (**Alt SC2**).  Comparing the channel definition in 37.213 with the definition of operating channel in EN 302 567, we can conclude that the LBT BW definition in 37.213 is already compliant with EN 302 567, and nothing more needs to be done. |
| Samsung | Overall, we don’t see the need to down-select any of the alternatives (all of them could be supported), and more important thing may be the transmission behaviour based on each of the alternatives. |
| Intel | We feel that this discussion is a bit too premature, and should be resumed only after the basic principles of the channelization are clear. For the moment, we prefer Alt. SC3 for single carrier, and Alt.CA.5 for multi-carrier operation. |
| LG Electronics | Alt SC.1 and Alt CA.1 are preferred. The LBT bandwidth can be configured/indicated by gNB considering the supportable channel bandwidth of UE. |
| CATT | Alt SC.2 for single carrier case.  Alt CA.3 for carrier aggregation case.  LBT is used to mitigate the potential interference. For Alt SC.1, the LBT bandwidth equals to channel bandwidth. When there is the interference on the RB that is not used for transmission within the channel bandwidth, although the interference will not affect the transmission, the transmission will be delayed due to LBT failure. For Alt SC.2, the LBT bandwidth equals to transmission bandwidth. It can reduce unnecessary interference blocking at least for the transmission, thus the performance of system can be increased. For Alt SC.3, the unit of bandwidth may narrower than transmission bandwidth. It will lead to multiple parallel LBT and increase the complexity of system. Therefore, we support Alt SC.2 for single carrier case.  In Rel-16 NR-U, both type A and Type B channel access procedures on multiple channels require performing LBT on each channel, which can be reused for LBT procedure for carrier aggregation case in 52.6-71GHz band. In order to be consistent with single carrier case, we support Alt CA.3 for carrier aggregation case. |
| Xiaomi | For single carrier case, Alt SC1 is preferred.  For intra-band CA, Alt CA1 is preferred. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | For single carrier case, we support Alt SC.1  For carrier aggregation case, we can support both Alt CA.1 and Alt CA. 2 and it could be up to implementation to apply one of the two alternatives. |
| Nokia, NSB | For the single carrier case, we prefer Alt SC.1. as a starting point. For wideband carriers, SC.3. may be considered.  For CA scenario, CA.1. is the starting point. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | we prefer Alt SC.3 and Alt CA.5, because such methods are similar to LBT bandwidth corresponding to RB set specified in Rel-16 NR-U, which is beneficial to increase the chance of accessing channel and decrease resource waste due to multiple LBT is used. |
| DOCOMO | We support Alt SC 2 and Alt CA 3. We think Alt SC 2 is what ETSI specifies. |
| Sony | We support Alt SC1, Alt CA 1, and Alt CA2. Alt CA1 and alt CA 2 could be up to implementation. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | First, we would like to mention the following points regarding the summary:   1. Unlike what is mentioned in FL summary, in our view “RAN4 defined channel bandwidth” is not equivalent to “RAN1 BWP bandwidth” in Alt 1. 2. Huawei does not support Alt1 in their t-doc. We have supported Alt 3 and Alt 5 as mentioned in our proposal 6.   We believe that it is necessary to distinguish LBT at the gNB and LBT at the UE: UE typically transmits to a single destination (serving gNB) at any given time in both single carrier (SC) and cattier aggregation (CA) scenarios. However, a gNB may serve multiple UEs in a FDM manner. gNB may serve N FDMed UEs each on a single carrier or one UE on N carrier components or anything in between. So, discussing LBT BW at the gNB side based only on SC or CA cases (which both concern only one UE) may not be a complete discussion. In any case we provide our views for LBT for SC and LBT for DL/UL CA as follows:  For single carrier case: Alt SC.2. is a reasonable choice. Alt SC.1. is also a valid choice.  For carrier aggregation (intra-band CA) case: We believe that, in most cases, transmission BW of each CC and the CC BW are the same since the main usage of CA is to maximize the data rate and there is no reason to use multiple CCs in CA while transmitting in a part of each CC. Therefore, Alt CA.1 and Alt. CA.3 are practically equivalent. In the same way, Alt. CA.2 and Alt. CA.4 are also practically equivalent. We believe both Alt CA.1 and Alt CA.2 should be supported. If the chance of LBT failure is small, it is much more efficient to use a single LBT process that covers all CCs (Alt. CA2) so if the LBT passes, the transmission in all CCs are allowed. However, if the chance of LBT failure is higher or a single LBT over all CCs has already failed, then LBT should be done on each CC (Alt. CA1) so the node gets the clearance to transmit at least on the CCs with the successful LBT.  **To summarize, we propose:**  For single carrier case: Support Alt SC.2. (Alt SC.1. as a second choice)  For carrier aggregation (intra-band CA) case: Support both Alt CA.2 and Alt CA.1 where Alt CA.2 is a default behaviour and Alt CA.1 is used if configured or Alt CA.2 is failed.  Note: Discuss the gNB LBT BW when multiple UEs are FDMed. |
| Spreadtrum | For single carrier case, we support Alt SC.1. For Alt SC.2, when the transmission bandwidth changes, the LBT bandwidth and LBT mechanism have to change which is not desirable.  For carrier aggregation case, Alt CA.1can be the starting point. |
| InterDigital | For single carrier case, we believe Alt SC.1 is restrictive given that the only time channel access will be successful will be if the entire BWP is unoccupied. This is unnecessary if the transmission only occurs on a subset of RBs of the BWP. On the other hand, we agree with Qualcomm that Alt SC.2 will lead to too many filter reconfigurations.  We prefer a combination of Alt SC.2 and Alt SC.3: Alt SC.4 where we define one or more units of LBT BW and the LBT is performed over the transmission BW  Similarly, for CA scenario, we prefer a combination of Alt CA.3 and Alt CA.5 (define a unit of LBT BW and the LBT is performed per CC over the transmission BW). |
| OPPO | We propose to modify Alt SC. 3 and Alt CA. 5 as follows:   * Alt SC.3-1. Define a unit of LBT bandwidth and gNB/UE performs LBT in ~~all~~ the LBT units which are overlapped with transmission bandwidth in the channel bandwidth * Alt CA.5-1. Define a unit of LBT bandwidth and gNB/UE performs LBT in ~~all~~ the LBT units which are overlapped with transmission bandwidth in the channel bandwidth in each CC |
| Charter | Alt SC.1  Alt CA1 |

**Channelization**

Discussion point:

* For 120KHz, support up to 400MHz channel bandwidth. For 480KHz, support up to 1.6GHz channel bandwidth. For 960KHz, support up to 2.16GHz bandwidth.
  + Apple, QC, Ericsson, Samsung, Intel (2 or 2.16 for 960), Fujitsu, NEC, Xiaomi, Lenovo, ZTE (except 960KHz up to 1.6GHz), DCM, Sony, HW, Spreadtrum, Charter, Oppo, FW (except 960 kHz up to 2000MHz)
* For 960KHz with 2.16GHz channel bandwidth, at least support channelization aligned with 11ad/ay while misaligned channelization not precluded
  + Apple, QC, Ericsson (do not preclude alignment), Samsung, Fujitsu, NEC, Xiaomi, DCM, Sony, HW, Spreadtrum, Charter, Oppo

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Apple | Agree |
| Qualcomm | We support this proposal. First bullet is in line with the maximum PRB constraints. Second bullet permits but does not enforce, channelization aligned with 11ad/ay. |
| Ericsson | Support bullet point 1 above. For bullet point 2, we don’t see the need to only align with 11ad/ay channelization from spectrum utilization point of view in RAN1, but RAN4 channel raster design does not have to preclude alignment. |
| Samsung | OK with the proposal (8.2.5 also discussed this issue). |
| Intel | Same discussion is taking place in AI 8.2.5, and suggest to keep the discussion in the same AI.  The moderator suggestion in AI 8.2.5 for 960 kHz was FFS between 2 or 2.16 GHz bandwidth.  So maybe for now, we suggest to keep 2.16 GHz in brackets or something like [2 or 2.16]. |
| LG Electronics | The discussion point seems overlapped with [104-e-NR-52-71GHz-05] for 8.2.5. |
| Fujitsu | Fine with the proposal. |
| CATT | The discussion on channel bandwidth should be discussed in AI-8.2.5 |
| NEC | We support the proposal. |
| Xiaomi | OK with the proposal |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support the channelization bandwidth as captured in the discussion points |
| ZTE, Sanechips | This issue is also being discussed in A.I. 8.2.5. but for this issue, our views are as follows:  For channel bandwidth, we agree FL’s suggestion for 120kHz/480kHz SCS, while for 960kHz SCS, we prefer 1.6GHz as the maximum channel bandwidth.  For channelization, we can observe from our simulation result that aligned and misaligned channelization show similar performance in coexistence scenario. So it is unnecessary to force channelization aligned with 11ad/ay. |
| DOCOMO | We support the both bullets above, while at least the 1st bullet seems to be discussed in 8.2.5 also. |
| Sony | Support the proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We think that the decision regarding maximum channel bandwidth should be made in RAN4 and not in the channel access mechanism ED in RAN1. In any case, the suggested values for all three numerologies are reasonable. |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with the proposal. |
| vivo | As commented by other companies, we believe maximum channel bandwidth is discussed in AI 8.2.5 and prefer the discussion over there.  For the 2nd bullet, given channelization is in the scope of RAN4, we prefer not to say “at least support” rather saying something like “align with 802.11ad/ay is feasible from channel access perspective” |
| OPPO | Agree. |
| Charter | Support this proposal; should not conflict with the resolution from 8.2.5 |
| Futurewei | We do not support a maximum channel BW larger than 2000 MHz for 960kHz SCS. We support 400 MHz for SCS 120 kHz, and respectively 1600 MHz for SCS 480 kHz.  We think that an important factor in this discussion is deciding if the maximum sampling frequency is retained. The second bullet should be discussed only if the maximum BW for 960 kHz is decided to be 2.16 GHz. The channel alignment issue should be considered in RAN4. |

### 2nd round discussion

Proposal 2.1.4-1 (listing options)

For LBT for single carrier transmission, consider the following alternatives

* Alt SC.1. gNB/UE performs LBT over the channel bandwidth (or BWP bandwidth)
* Alt SC.2. gNB/UE performs LBT over the transmission bandwidth (from the lowest RB to the highest RB used for the transmission)
* Alt SC.3. Define a unit of LBT bandwidth and gNB/UE performs LBT in all the LBT units (to be transmitted in) in the channel bandwidth

For LBT for multi-carrier transmission in intra-band CA, consider the following alternatives

* Alt CA.1. gNB/UE performs multiple LBT, one for each channel bandwidth separately
* Alt CA.2. gNB/UE performs single LBT over all CCs
* Alt CA.3. gNB/UE performs multiple LBT, one for each CC over the transmission bandwidth (from the lowest RB in to the highest RB used for the transmission in the CC)
* Alt CA.4. gNB/UE performs LBT over the transmission bandwidth over all CCs (from the lowest RB in the lowest CC to the highest RB in the highest CC used for the transmission)
* Alt CA.5. Define a unit of LBT bandwidth and gNB/UE performs LBT in all the LBT units (to be transmitted in) in the channel bandwidth in each CC

Additional comments:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support Alt SC.1 and Alt CA.1 |
| Intel | Unfortunately, our position remains the same, and we feel that this discussion is a bit too premature and should be resumed only after the basic principles of the channelization are clear. Again, our current preference is for Alt. SC3 for single carrier, and Alt.CA.5 for multi-carrier operation. |
| Xiaomi | Support Alt SC.1 and Alt CA.1  When supporting Alt SC.1/Alt CA.1, we assume that DL/UL transmission can occur simultaneously on two different channel bandwidths, even the two channel bandwidths are intra band CA. but within a channel bandwidth, only DL or UL can be transmitted, but not simultaneously. Is this a reasonable assumption to all companies? |
| Ericsson | For single carrier case, Alt SC2 is preferred but Alt SC1 is ok too.  For intra-band CA, Alt CA3 is preferred but Alt CA1 is ok too.   EN 302 567 does not mandate a specific LBT BW or a relation between the LBT BW and the multiple declared channel bandwidths.  Also, RAN1 does not define the LBT BW (*to be 20 MHz for 5/6 GHz* band) even in Rel-16. TS 37.213 defines the following: “*A channel refers to a carrier or a part of a carrier consisting of a contiguous set of resource blocks (RBs) on which a channel access procedure is performed in shared spectrum.*” We further observe that the generic channel definition in 37.213 covers both the case where the LBT BW is equal to the RAN4 channel BW (i.e. carrier BW) (**Alt SC1**) and the case where the LBT BW is smaller than the RAN4 channel BW (**Alt SC2**).  Comparing the channel definition in 37.213 with the definition of operating channel in EN 302 567, we can conclude that the LBT BW definition in 37.213 is already compliant with EN 302 567, and nothing more needs to be done. |
| LG Electronics | Alt SC.3 and Alt CA.5 are preferred. The LBT bandwidth can be configured/indicated by gNB considering the supportable channel bandwidth of UE. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Our view is basically the same as that of the first round discussion, that is, prefer Alt SC.3 and Alt CA.5.  Besides, for Alt SC.1 and Alt CA.1, we think it is necessary to clarify further on “Channel bandwidth” mentioned herein. For example, can it be seen as the minimum supported channel bandwidth?  If yes, we can accept that *updated Alt SC.1: gNB/UE performs LBT over the minimum supported channel bandwidth; updated Alt CA.1: gNB/UE performs multiple LBT, one for each minimum supported channel bandwidth separately*.  Otherwise, we keep our original choices, Alt SC.3 and Alt CA.5. |
| Nokia, NSB | As expressed during the 1st round of discussion, for the single carrier case we see Alt SC.1. as the bseline, and Alt SC.3. can also be considered for wideband carriers. For CA operation, Alt CA.1. is the baseline. |
| OPPO | We support Alt SC.3 and Alt CA.5 |
| TCL | TCL supports Alt SC.1 and Alt CA.1 |
| Apple | We support Alt SC.1 and Alt CA.1 |
| CATT | We support Alt SC.2 and Alt CA.3 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Our view is similar as the first round.  For single carrier case: Alt SC.2. is a reasonable choice. Alt SC.1. is also a valid choice.  For carrier aggregation (intra-band CA) case: We believe that, in most cases, transmission BW of each CC and the CC BW are the same since the main usage of CA is to maximize the data rate and there is no reason to use multiple CCs in CA while transmitting in a part of each CC. Therefore, Alt CA.1 and Alt. CA.3 are practically equivalent. In the same way, Alt. CA.2 and Alt. CA.4 are also practically equivalent. We believe both Alt CA.1 and Alt CA.2 should be supported. If the chance of LBT failure is small, it is much more efficient to use a single LBT process that covers all CCs (Alt. CA2) so if the LBT passes, the transmission in all CCs are allowed. However, if the chance of LBT failure is higher or a single LBT over all CCs has already failed, then LBT should be done on each CC (Alt. CA1) so the node gets the clearance to transmit at least on the CCs with the successful LBT.  **To summarize, we propose:**  For single carrier case: Support Alt SC.2. (Alt SC.1. as a second choice)  For carrier aggregation (intra-band CA) case: Support both Alt CA.2 and Alt CA.1 where Alt CA.2 is a default behaviour and Alt CA.1 is used if configured or Alt CA.2 is failed.  Note: Discuss the gNB LBT BW when multiple UEs are FDMed (multi-channel case). |
| Samsung | For SC, we support SC1 (first choice), and SC3 (also fine)   * SC1 should be supported as baseline, and we support the LBT over the channel bandwidth as the baseline (FFS over BWP bandwidth) to make the LBT bandwidth easier for implementation * SC2 is not preferred from our side due to a variable sensing bandwidth * SC3 can also be acceptable as a second choice, but need to clarify the transmission behaviour after the result of sensing in SC3   For CA, we support CA1 and CA2 (first choice), and CA5 (also fine)   * CA1 should be the baseline to support (CA1 is the generalization of SC1) * CA2 should also be supported for the gNB/eNB with high capability, and up to implementation to choose between CA1 and CA2 * CA3 is not preferred from our side due to a variable sensing bandwidth * CA4 is also not preferred from our side due to a variable sensing bandwidth, and we would like to clarify CA4 should not be used for inter-band CA case * CA5 is same as SC3 (if we support such mechanism, no need to distinguish SC or CA) |
| DOCOMO | For SC, we support Alt SC.2. We can also live with SC 1 as the second preference. We think just to align with the channel bandwidth or transmission bandwidth would be sufficient, and do not see the motivation/benefit to newly specify LBT bandwidth.  For CA, we support CA3 as the first preference and CA1 as the second preference based on the discussion on SC. |
| Sony | We support Alt SC.1 and Alt CA.1. In addition to CA.1, CA.2 could be supported. Choice between CA.1 and CA.2 is up to implementation. |
| Futurewei | We support both Alt SC 1 (baseline) and Alt SC 2. Having both gives better flexibility to cover various scenarios. For multi-channel both CA.1 (baseline) and CA. 2 could be supported. |
| Convida Wireless | We are fine with the updated proposals for SC and CA cases. If Alt CS 3 and Alt CA 5 are supported, then LBT unit should be studied. |

Proposal 2.1.4-2 (1st bullet overlaps with 8.2.5)

* ~~For 120KHz, support up to 400MHz channel bandwidth. For 480KHz, support up to 1.6GHz channel bandwidth.~~ 
  + ~~FFS: For 960KHz, support up to 1.6GHz, 2GHz or 2.16GHz bandwidth.~~
  + ~~Note: RAN4 will further decide how many RBs can be used for each~~
* If 960KHz with 2.16GHz channel bandwidth is adopted, at least support channelization aligned with 11ad/ay while misaligned channelization not precluded

Additional comments:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine, but would suggest to keep only 2GHz and 2.16GHz as FFS for 960kHz |
| Intel | As we previously commented, same discussion is taking place in AI 8.2.5, and suggest to keep the discussion in the same AI. Since BW related discussion is explicitly mentioned in the agenda split suggested by Havish, we suggest to keep this discussion in 8.2.5, while just keeping the channelization aspects here. The moderator suggestion in AI 8.2.5 for 960 kHz was FFS between 2 or 2.16 GHz bandwidth. So maybe for now, we suggest to keep 2.16 GHz in brackets or something like [2 or 2.16]. |
| vivo | No need to have the 1st bullet on maximum channel bandwidth which is covered in AI 8.2.5 as we commented before in the 1st round.  We’re fine on the 2nd bullet. |
| Ericsson | Support bullet point 1. We are ok with the second bullet point now, as it does not preclude other channelization, but the discussion should be left for RAN4 channel raster design. |
| LG Electronics | We share same view with Intel. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | For the determination of channel bandwidth, some companies think that it is related with the channelization. We have different understanding on it, since our simulation in AI 8.2.5 shows that aligned and misaligned channelization show similar performance in coexistence scenario. That is to say, there is no need to consider whether to align with that of 802.11ad/ay Wi-Fi while only need to consider how to inherit the design of existing FR2 and avoid the waste of larger spectrum resources in unlicensed bandwidth. From this point of view, we prefer to support up to 2GHz channel bandwidth for 960kHz SCS.  Furthermore, on how to define channel bandwidth and how larger for it, we think it belongs to RAN4’s scope and eventually value for each SCS should be also decided and handled by RAN4. At the same time, as we know, the same issues are also being discussed in AI 8.2.5. |
| Nokia, NSB | First, this discussion should be coordinated with AI 8.2.5, where there is already a related proposal under discussion. That said, we are ok with the proposal above. |
| OPPO | We are fine with the proposal. |
| TCL | We are supportive of this proposal. |
| Apple | Fine with the proposal |
| CATT | The discussion on channel bandwidth should be discussed in AI-8.2.5 |
| Sony | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Futurewei | We do not understand why this discussion is here. The maximum channel BW is already discussed in the 8.2.5 thread. In the same thread (8.2.5) the LS was discussed. We suggest removing this discussion from this thread. |

### 3rd round discussion

Proposal 2.1.5-1 (listing options)

For LBT for single carrier transmission, consider the following alternatives

* Alt SC.1. gNB/UE performs LBT over the channel bandwidth (or BWP bandwidth)
* Alt SC.2. gNB/UE performs LBT over the transmission bandwidth (from the lowest RB to the highest RB used for the transmission)
* Alt SC.3. Define a unit of LBT bandwidth and gNB/UE performs LBT in all the LBT units (to be transmitted in) in the channel bandwidth

For LBT for multi-carrier transmission in intra-band CA, consider the following alternatives

* Alt CA.1. gNB/UE performs multiple LBT, one for each channel bandwidth separately
* Alt CA.2. gNB/UE performs single LBT over all CCs
* Alt CA.3. gNB/UE performs multiple LBT, one for each CC over the transmission bandwidth (from the lowest RB in to the highest RB used for the transmission in the CC)
* Alt CA.4. gNB/UE performs LBT over the transmission bandwidth over all CCs (from the lowest RB in the lowest CC to the highest RB in the highest CC used for the transmission)
* Alt CA.5. Define a unit of LBT bandwidth and gNB/UE performs LBT in all the LBT units (to be transmitted in) in the channel bandwidth in each CC

Note: supporting more than one alternative for at least multi-carrier transmission in intra-band CA is not precluded.

Additional comments (please only comment if you have issue with the proposal):

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Ericsson | No issue with the proposal in principle.  We observe that this may not be necessary for single carrier transmissions. The “*channel*” definition in 37.213 already covers Alt SC1 and Alt SC2 currently. Alt SC3 can also be viewed as an extension of the current broad definition in 37.213. There is nothing needed to specify except connecting “channel” as defined to 37.213 to the “operating channel BW” in EN 302 567. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We have no problem with it as long as it is clarified that more than one alternative may be selected for at least CA case. As discussed earlier, we believe both Alt CA.1 and Alt CA.2 should be supported. If the chance of LBT failure is small, it is much more efficient to use a single LBT process that covers all CCs (Alt. CA2) so if the LBT passes, the transmission in all CCs are allowed. However, if the chance of LBT failure is higher or a single LBT over all CCs has already failed, then LBT should be done on each CC (Alt. CA1) so the node gets the clearance to transmit at least on the CCs with the successful LBT. So, we suggest the following modification:  Proposal 2.1.5-1 (listing options) Modified  For LBT for single carrier transmission, consider the following alternatives   * Alt SC.1. gNB/UE performs LBT over the channel bandwidth (or BWP bandwidth) * Alt SC.2. gNB/UE performs LBT over the transmission bandwidth (from the lowest RB to the highest RB used for the transmission) * Alt SC.3. Define a unit of LBT bandwidth and gNB/UE performs LBT in all the LBT units (to be transmitted in) in the channel bandwidth   For LBT for multi-carrier transmission in intra-band CA, consider the following alternatives   * Alt CA.1. gNB/UE performs multiple LBT, one for each channel bandwidth separately * Alt CA.2. gNB/UE performs single LBT over all CCs * Alt CA.3. gNB/UE performs multiple LBT, one for each CC over the transmission bandwidth (from the lowest RB in to the highest RB used for the transmission in the CC) * Alt CA.4. gNB/UE performs LBT over the transmission bandwidth over all CCs (from the lowest RB in the lowest CC to the highest RB in the highest CC used for the transmission) * Alt CA.5. Define a unit of LBT bandwidth and gNB/UE performs LBT in all the LBT units (to be transmitted in) in the channel bandwidth in each CC   Note: supporting more than one alternative for at least multi-carrier transmission in intra-band CA is not precluded. |
| CATT | We are OK with the proposal for single carrier transmission. We think it’s premature to discuss how to perform LBT for multi-carrier transmission in intra-band CA before multi-channel access mechanism is clear. |
| Xiaomi | OK with the proposal. |
| Nokia, NSB | We support the proposal |
| Intel | We are Ok with the proposal |

Proposal 2.1.5-2

* If 960KHz with 2.16GHz channel bandwidth is adopted, at least support channelization aligned with 11ad/ay while misaligned channelization not precluded

Additional comments (please only comment if you have issue with the proposal):

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We cannot agree this proposal, the reasons are as follows:  Regarding channel bandwidth for 960kHz, it had been handled and reached a conclusion in AI 8.2.5. therefore, it is not necessary to be continue discussed herein.  While for channelization, as we previous comments, our simulation in AI 8.2.5 and AI 8.2.7 shows that aligned and misaligned channelization show similar performance in coexistence scenario. That is to say, there is no need to consider whether to support alignment with that of 802.11ad/ay Wi-Fi.  Moderator: This proposal is talking about “if 960KHz and 2.16GHz is supported”. Even from your simulation study indicating no performance issue with not aligning with WiFi channel, I don’t see any harm allowing an aligned version to give the operator more flexibility. Why insisting on having misaligned channels? What is the benefit of doing that? |
| Charter Communications | Don’t agree with ZTE that it is not necessary to continue discussion here. Even if the maximum channel BW discussion in AI 8.2.5 is considering 2.16 GHz, this does not automatically imply that the channelization in terms of center frequencies is aligned with 11ad/ay. Therefore, we support this proposal in this AI. |
| CATT | We are OK with the proposal. |
| ZTE, Sanechips(2) | Thanks Jing for your response.  We have no any bias towards aligned or misaligned channel. Based on the latest draft LS on bandwidth and channelization in AI 8.2.5, we can clearly see that channelization related aspects will be decided by RAN4, and such LS also will be sent to RAN4. Therefore, we think Proposal 2.1.5-2 cannot be discussed here. Partial contexts from LS are copied below:  *in RAN1’s understanding, RAN4 will decide channelization aspects (including but not limited to channel and sync rasters to support both licensed and unlicensed operation, channelization design flexibility to align or not align with the IEEE 802.11ad/ay channelization for supported deployment (licensed and unlicensed band, with and without potential regional regulations requiring LBT channel access mechanism),*  The link is as follows:  <https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_104-e/Inbox/drafts/8.2.5/%5B104-e-NR-52-71GHz-05%5D/draft-LS/R1-210xxxx%20%5BDraft%5D%20LS%20on%20bandwidth%20and%20channelization_v013_Moderator> |
| Xiaomi | OK with the proposal |
| Nokia, NSB | We support the proposal |
| Futurewei | We do not understand the purpose of this proposal. The raster decision in the hands of RAN4, RAN1 will send a LS regarding the channelization to RAN4 and wait for their reply. We agree with ZTE that this subject is already addressed in a different thread. |
| Intel | We have same concerns as other companies, and we do not see the purpose of this proposal. Also as previously mentioned, we would prefer to handle this topic under AI 8.5. |

## No-LBT

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Key Proposals/Observations/Positions** |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Proposal 4: No LBT can be considered to be used in the following cases:  • COT sharing case.  • Specific ares such as ITU region 2 and 3.  • Interference controlled environment.  • The transmission beams of nodes of different operators in the same system(e.g., NR-U ) have little interference with each other.  Proposal 5: Similar restriction as defined in Type 2C channel access procedure in TS 37.213 can also introduced in above 52.6GHz NR-U frequency band but the length of a transmission can be relaxed.  Proposal 6: Conditions for No LBT fallback to LBT should be further studied, e.g., based on the interference level or correctly decoding rate. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Proposal 13：For operation in the 60 GHz band, in regions where LBT is not mandated, a gNB/UE can initiate a channel occupancy access using a channel access mechanism without LBT if it is used in conjunction with an interference mitigation scheme.  - Interference mitigation schemes such as ATPC or DFS would be implemented as specified by the region-specific regulations and do not need to be specified by 3GPP.  Proposal 14：For operation in the 60 GHz band, in regions where LBT is not mandated, support switching between channel access with LBT and channel access without LBT in a serving cell by gNB configuration.  Proposal 15：For operation in the 60 GHz band, in regions where LBT is not mandated, the serving cell may enable Rx-side LBT using a higher layer configuration to mitigate high levels of interference experienced from hidden nodes.  Observation 4：When network allows enabling/disabling the LBT mode through cell-specific gNB configuration, coexistence issues would arise as the performance in the cells operating with LBT mode would be adversely impacted by the No-LBT mode operation in the neighboring cells.  Proposal 16：For operation in the 60 GHz band, in regions where LBT is not mandated, MCOT limits should be applied for a channel occupancy initiated without LBT. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Observation 8: Channel access mechanism without LBT should fulfil the expected requirements of EN 303 722 but also possibly EN 303 753.  Observation 9: NR for 60 GHz band shall be able to fulfil the EN 303 722 requirements for spectrum sharing based on automatic transmit power control and/or automatic link adaptation. Needed specification changes, if any, are to be considered along with EN 303 722 progress.  Proposal 16: Channel access mechanism (i.e. whether or not LBT is in use) is part of the cell configuration.  Proposal 17: Flexible selection of channel access mechanism (LBT or no-LBT) per gNB beam is considered further. |
| Fujitsu | Proposal 1: If regulation allows, No-LBT channel access mechanism can be applied and switching between LBT and No-LBT channel access mechanisms can be supported. No other condition is needed. |
| AT&T | Proposal 3:  • Receiver assistance in Rel. 17 is limited to measurement enhancements  • Message based schemes similar to RTS/CTS signalling can be addressed in a later release targeting Class B scenarios  • Hand shaking is not supported  • Transmission should be allowed before the receiver assistance is received  • **Receiver assistance can equally be useful, and should be allowed, for the no-LBT mode of transmissions**  • Receiver assistance is a fast, low complexity feedback mechanism to convey to the transmitter the interference environment at the receiver |
| Charter | Proposal 2: When noLBT mode is used where LBT is not required, any further enhancements or restrictions related to channel access are left to gNB implementation. |
| Qualcomm | Proposal 12: For No-LBT deployments, consider specification of optional good neighbor procedures, such as away time, to break persistent beam collisions. |

### No-LBT mode and LBT-NoLBT switching

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Key Proposals/Observations/Positions** |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Proposal 18: For NR operation in unlicensed bands between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz, adopt CG retransmission collision avoidance techniques such as retransmission deferral or additional retransmission resources.  Proposal 19: For NR operation in unlicensed bands between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz, switching between LBT and no-LBT based channel access mechanism should be supported for regions where LBT is not mandated.  Proposal 20: For NR operation in unlicensed bands between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz, different implicit and/or explicit methods for switching between LBT and no-LBT mode should be considered. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Proposal 15：For operation in the 60 GHz band, in regions where LBT is not mandated, the serving cell may enable Rx-side LBT using a higher layer configuration to mitigate high levels of interference experienced from hidden nodes. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Observation 8: Channel access mechanism without LBT should fulfil the expected requirements of EN 303 722 but also possibly EN 303 753.  Observation 9: NR for 60 GHz band shall be able to fulfil the EN 303 722 requirements for spectrum sharing based on automatic transmit power control and/or automatic link adaptation. Needed specification changes, if any, are to be considered along with EN 303 722 progress.  Proposal 16: Channel access mechanism (i.e. whether or not LBT is in use) is part of the cell configuration.  Proposal 17: Flexible selection of channel access mechanism (LBT or no-LBT) per gNB beam is considered further. |
| LG Electronics | Proposal #1: Consider switching mechanism between channel access mechanism with LBT mechanism and that without LBT based on timer operation when the local regulation allows initiating channel occupancy without LBT and the specific conditions such as low interference environment are met. |
| Samsung | Proposal 1: Support LBT mode and no-LBT mode per node in a cell.  • UEs in a cell can operate in same or different mode;  • UE can operate in same or different mode from its serving gNB;  • gNB determines its operation mode up to implementation;  • gNB indicates operation mode to UE in both cell-specific (e.g. system information and RRC parameter) and UE-specific/UE-group-specific (e.g. RRC parameter) manners. |
| CATT | Proposal 1: An explicit LBT mode/No-LBT mode indication is required for UE to obtain current channel access mechanism for up to 71GHz operation. |
| CAICT | Proposal 5: When no-LBT mode is used, when and how to trigger the LBT mechanism and configure the relevant parameters could be left to gNB implementation. |
| vivo | Proposal 7: The channel access mechanism can be selected based on the channel occupancy time, channel access rate, transmission priority, service requirement, or feedback information from the receiver, etc.r |
| Fujitsu | Proposal 1: If regulation allows, No-LBT channel access mechanism can be applied and switching between LBT and No-LBT channel access mechanisms can be supported. No other condition is needed.  Proposal 3: It is unnecessary to have explicit restrictions on direction of transmissions within a channel occupancy initiated by directional LBT. It can be achieved by gNB scheduling if needed. |
| Sony | Observation 1: In EU, no-LBT mode cannot be operated at least under the ‘C1’ for indoor and outdoor deployment.  Observation 2: No-LBT mode works in the uncongested environment.  Observation 3: Congestion could be measured by average RSSI and channel occupancy which have been already introduced in NR-U.  Proposal 2: No-LBT mode is configured by network based on measurement results of RSSI and channel occupancy. |
| Xiaomi | Proposal 1: Whether No-LBT channel access mechanism is allowed can be broadcasted by gNB or be informed by message from core network.  Proposal 2: At least the energy/interference detection threshold of when No-LBT is applicable should be defined in specification.  Proposal 3: Switching between LBT and No-LBT channel access should be studied. The following three alternatives can be considered,  Alt 1, gNB self-determines the applied channel access mechanism for both itself and UEs.  Alt 2, Both gNB and UE self-determines the applied channel access mechanism for itself.  Alt 3, gNB self-determines the applied channel access mechanism for itself, and determines for UEs based on request.  Proposal 4: How to prevent long time continuous channel occupying for Tx using No-LBT should be further studied. |
| Ericsson | Proposal 7 The gNB can choose to use LBT or not based on implementation to optimize the performance and meet regulations. 3GPP only needs to design signaling to communicate the LBT mode to be used by the UE. |
| Convida | Proposal 3: Adaptation between LBT modes and LBT sub-modes to optimize system performance should be considered. |
| DOCOMO | Observation 1:   Channel access without LBT can degrade the system performance when strong interference is frequently observed.  Proposal 1:   Mechanism to identify the actual interference condition should be supported.   RSSI/channel occupancy measurement in Rel-16 can be reused. |

### Long Term Sensing

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Key Proposals/Observations/Positions** |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Proposal 23: For NR operation in unlicensed bands between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz, long term sensing should be supported for both LBT based and no-LBT based channel access mechanism to consider potential interference.  Observation 7: Currently, there is no mechanism is support long-term sensing including interference measurements from WiFi or other NR operators at the UE and corresponding reporting.  Proposal 24: For NR operation in unlicensed bands between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz, for long term sensing to measure interference statistics from WiFi systems or other NR operators, a new category of ZP CSI-RS should be supported where the UE is not expected to receive any channel/signal (including NZP CSI-RS for interference measurement) and only measure potential interference from WiFi nodes or other NR operators and report back corresponding measurements. |
| Apple | Proposal 7: Consider using RSSI and channel occupancy for long term sensing. |

### DFS

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Key Proposals/Observations/Positions** |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | DFS can be handled by implementation |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

### ATPC

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Key Proposals/Observations/Positions** |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | ATPC should be supported for No-LBT mode with enhancements to the transmit power control calculation. The transmit power control should take into account the interference measured from WiFi and other NR operators. For this purpose, long term interference measurements (channel occupancy) from WiFi and other NR operators should be considered that could be achieved by minimal enhancements to current CSI-RS based measurements. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

### Discussion

For regions where LBT is not required, it has been discussed if additional conditions can be introduced in 3GPP spec to enable no-LBT mode and what are the conditions.

Discussion point:

gNB should indicate to the UE the system is operating in LBT mode or no-LBT mode.

The indication can be

* Alt.1. Cell specific as part of system information or part of UE RRC configuration
  + FW, Ericsson (both), Intel (both), Fujitsu, CATT, Nokia (at least), DCM, Sony, HW, Spreadtrum, Oppo, Charter, LGE
* Alt 2. UE specific as part of UE RRC configuration
  + Apple, vivo, FW (open to discuss), QC, Ericsson (both), Intel (both), Fujitsu (open for discuss), CATT (open to discuss), Lenovo, Nokia, ZTE, Sony, Convida, Spreadtrum, IDC, Charter, LGE
* Also consider dynamic indication: Xiaomi, Lenovo
* Also per beam or per CC: Nokia

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Apple | Alt 2. One metric can be used to decide LBT or no-LBT can be RSSI and channel occupancy feedback from UE. |
| vivo | Alt 2 is preferred. The LBT mode may include (quasi) omni-directional LBT, directional LBT, receiver-assisted LBT. Different LBT modes may be feasible and/or used for different scenarios or different UEs. Therefore, it is better to indicate the LBT mode in a UE specific way. Besides, since the LBT type indication is already supported in scheduling DCI in NRU, e.g. ChannelAccess-CPext-CAPC, we can also indicate the LBT mode and no-LBT mode dynamically by including the different modes in the Tables such as Table 7.3.1.1.2-35 in TS 38.212. |
| Futurewei | Alt 1, but we are open to discuss Alt 2 to understand when the UE specific No LBT could provide benefits. |
| Qualcomm | We prefer Alt 2 which provides additional flexibility. |
| Ericsson | We think that Alt 1 and Alt 2 are not mutually exclusive, and both should be supported.  Moreover, we want to revise the discussion point to:  *gNB should indicate to the UE if it should operate in LBT mode or no-LBT mode.*  *The indication can be*   * *Alt.1. Cell specific as part of system information or part of UE RRC configuration* * *Alt 2. UE specific as part of UE RRC configuration* |
| Samsung | We would like to clarify first the LBT mode or no-LBT mode is defined per system or per node? If it’s defined for the whole system, the FL’s proposal could be applicable, but for Alt 2, instead of UE-specific RRC, cell-specific RRC is more proper. If it’s defined for each node, then it needs to clarify the indicated mode is gNB’s mode or UE’s mode. |
| Intel | We share same view as E///, and both Alt-1 and Alt-2 could be supported. |
| LG Electronics | We think that the operating mode should be configured by RRC configuration and Cell-specific or UE-dedicated needs to be discussed separately. |
| Fujitsu | We prefer Alt.1 but is open to Alt-2. |
| CATT | Alt.1，but we are open to discuss Alt.2.  Rel-16 NR-U has specified some mechanisms to eliminate the impact of LBT on the NR system. gNB should indicate LBT mode/No-LBT mode to UE to notify whether these mechanisms need to be applied in the subsequence operation. The UE requires LBT mode/No-LBT mode indication before establishing a RRC connection, so it should be support the LBT mode/No-LBT mode indication as cell-specific configuration. Whether it is designed as the part of system information needs further discussion. |
| Xiaomi | Agree with Samsung’s view. And additionally, we think even dynamic indication can be used as a way to inform LBT/No-LBT. For example, in R16 NR-U, the LBT type is indicated in the scheduling DCI. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Alt. 2 is supported to allow UE-specific RRC configuration  Furthermore, switching between LBT mode and no-LBT mode should be supported. It could be either based on some rules configured to UE (via RRC) or via dynamic indication. Dynamic behaviour could allow fallback to LBT mode. |
| Nokia, NSB | At least cell-specific signalling should be supported. Additionally, LBT may be enabled/disabled also per UE, or even per beam/CC, if severe interference is observed. The choice of using or not using LBT in this case is up to the network., |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We tend to support Alt 2 from the flexibility point of view. |
| DOCOMO | We support Alt 1. LBT mode or no-LBT mode should be common in a cell. |
| Sony | We support both Alt 1 and Alt 2. UE specific configuration could override cell specific configuration. |
| Convida Wireless | We support Alt 2. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support Alt. 1. The switching between LBT and no LBT should be consistent at least among all UEs within a cell. If only some UEs perform LBT within a cell they continuously will be at a disadvantage. |
| Spreadtrum | We think both Alt 1 and Alt 2 should be supported. |
| InterDigital | At least support Alt. 2. It was shown that the benefits of LBT depend on the UE, therefore UE-specific switching should be supported. |
| OPPO | We support Alt1. |
| Charter | Support both Alt 1 and Alt 2 |

Discussion point:

For regions where LBT is not mandated, shall we introduce additional conditions for no-LBT to be used, or leave it for gNB implementation. The condition can be based on DFS, long term sensing, etc

* Alt 1: Up to gNB implementation: Apple, vivo, FW, QC, Ericsson, Samsung, Intel, Fujitsu, CATT, Nokia, DCM (based on RSSI and CO), Sony (based on RSSI and CO), Spreadtrum, OPPO, NEC, IDC, Oppo, NEC, Charter
  + Also define mechanism to assist gNB identify issues: QC, Samsung
* Alt 2: Introduce conditions for no-LBT to be used: LGE (low interference detection), Xiaomi (energy/interference detection), Lenovo (long term sensing, HARQ feedback), ZTE (use case, length of transmission, etc), HW(?)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Apple | Up to gNB implementation |
| vivo | No additional condition for no-LBT mode should be used unless regulation requires. |
| Futurewei | Leave for the gNB implementation. |
| Qualcomm | In RAN1 we can identify and define mechanisms that can be useful. The choice of the deployment and implementation can be left to the gNB choice. |
| Ericsson | For regions LBT is not mandated, there is no need to have a condition for no LBT to be used. It can be left to gNB implementation in addition to the applicable regulations (EN 303 722 or EN 303 753 as the case maybe). There is no need to add further restrictions in these regions. |
| Samsung | The condition can be up to gNB’s implementation, but to support the condition (e.g. DFS), there could be potential spec impact (e.g. on measurement metric). |
| Intel | We believe that when the LBT is not mandated, other conditions or interference management procedures should be left up to gNB’s implementation. |
| LG Electronics | The additional conditions for no-LBT can be beneficial to the system performance. For example, gNB/UE can switch to the channel occupancy initiated by channel access mechanism without LBT (during limited time) only when it can assume low interference environment e.g., by estimating interference level or by using HARQ information of (consecutive) successful transmissions. |
| Fujitsu | Leave it for gNB implementation |
| CATT | It’s up to the gNB implementation. |
| Xiaomi | It is better to define the energy/interference detection threshold of when No-LBT is applicable in spec to ensure an well co-existing environments |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | In our view, additional criterion should be introduced when no-LBT is used. Furthermore, measurements/criteria such as long-term sensing, HARQ-ACK feedback from UE should be considered to better facilitate no-LBT. |
| Nokia, NSB | There is no clear need to define such limitations in RAN1 specifications. The network will anyhow need to comply with regional regulations. Moreover, even for Europe, three scenarios c1, c2, and c3 have been defined for overlapping frequency bands, and LTB is required only on one of them. Therefore, we propose to leave it for gNB implementation. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We think it is necessary to define a clear condition for using No LBT, e.g., use cases, the length of allowed transmission, whether the transmission length can be adjusted based on the result of measurement and so on.  If we fully leave it to implementation for using No LBT, then it may lead to unfair the opportunities of channel access/occupancy and also violate the basic principle of friendly and fair coexistence, e.g., the transmission of some nodes is continuously blocked, or the effect of persistent interference on devices that have occupied the channel in advance. |
| DOCOMO | The existing RSSI/CO measurement and reporting should be reused. Based on the report, whether LBT or no LBT can be up to gNB implementation. |
| Sony | Whether LBT mode or no-LBT mode is applied should be left for gNB implementation, based on the measurement result of RSSI and channel occupancy. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | There should be some restrictions in place. However, some of these restrictions should be specified/configured while others do not need to be:  Some restrictions such as ATPC and or DFS would be implemented as specified by the region-specific regulations and do not need to be specified by 3GPP.  Some other restrictions such as the need for MCOT or LBT at the Receiver side when LBT is not mandated should be specified/configured. |
| Spreadtrum | It can be left to gNB’s implementation. |
| InterDigital | Up to gNB implementation. |
| OPPO | Up to gNB implementation. |
| NEC | Leave it to gNB implementation. |
| Charter | Up to gNB implementation. |

Discussion point:

For regions where LBT is not mandated when no-LBT is used, what are the good neighbor procedures, if any that can be useful?

* Shall we design ATPC-like mechanism to be used in no-LBT mode
* Shall we design DFS-like mechanism to be used in no-LBT mode
* Shall we design long term sensing type mechanism to be used in no-LBT mode
* Shall we design duty-cycle or away time restriction mechanism to be used in no-LBT mode
* Shall we design transmit power restriction mechanism to be used in no-LBT mode

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Apple | Prefer long term sensing such as RSSI and channel occupancy defined in NR-U can be used. EN 302 567 only specify max backoff should be >=3. With RSSI/CO measurement, gNB can choose large max backoff value for example, for better coex performance with other technology. |
| vivo | The assumption for no-LBT is used is likely no strong interference. The above listed procedures may be used as implementation methods. |
| Futurewei | Solution should be regulatory compliant. gNB may use the existing scheduling and configuration signalling to limit overall duty cycle. If the channel occupancy is high gNB should be able to reinstate LBT to control congestion. |
| Qualcomm | Providing measurement and reporting framework for long term sensing (RSSI) will be useful. They can provide input for cell level actions such as DFS, that need not be specified.  Duty cycle and peak throughput friendly away time based procedures can be identified for No-LBT good neighbhor operation. |
| Ericsson | For regions LBT is not mandated, there is no need to specify additional mechanisms. It can be left to gNB implementation to improve system performance in addition to the applicable regulations (EN 303 722 or EN 303 753 as the case maybe) |
| Samsung | It can be up to gNB’s implementation. |
| Intel | We believe that all the procedures listed above are valid. However, there is no need to include one or more of them in the specification, since these could be applied through implementation. |
| LG Electronics | Even for regions LBT is not mandated, the good neighbour procedure should be used to prevent transmission collision in high interference environment and coexist with incumbent system. The long term sensing such as RSSI measurement or HARQ feedback information of (consecutive) successful transmissions can be considered for the good neighbour procedure.  Therefore, we suggest adding the following procedure to the above bullet.  Shall we design HARQ feedback information based switching mechanism to be used in no-LBT mode |
| Fujitsu | Up to gNB implementation |
| CATT | No. It’s up to the gNB implementation. |
| Xiaomi | Prefer long term sensing type mechanism to be used in no-LBT mode |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | In our view, ATPC-like mechanism and transmit power restriction mechanisms are somewhat similar and shouldn’t be considered separately.  In terms of different options, we think that long term sensing is useful for other mechanism as well and could be applied in combination with other mechanism such as ATPC (transmit power restriction). Based on long terms sensing, measured interference from WiFi or other NR operators can be used to update the transmit power calculation. Current CSI based measurements need to be enhanced for long term sensing of channel occupancy by WiFi or other NR operators  Fallback to LBT mode should also be considered as a good neighbour procedure (in next discussion point) |
| Nokia, NSB | ATPC, automatic link adaptation, and beamforming are listed or considered as co-existence mechanisms in ETSI EN 303 722 and EN 303 753. These may not require any specifications changes. Needed specification changes, if any, are to be considered along with EN 303 722 progress. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | If No LBT is used, the above listed methods can be used as a good supplementary method to achieve interference elimination management. |
| DOCOMO | For long-term sensing, reusing the existing RSSI/CO measurement can provide the same benefit. For the other mechanisms, it seems sufficient to follow the regulatory requirements if any. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | ATPC and or DFS should be implemented as specified by the region-specific regulations and do not need to be specified by 3GPP.  MCOT and LBT at the Receiver side when LBT is not mandated should be specified/configured. |
| Spreadtrum | We think all listed procedure are beneficial for co-existence with other RAT. However, they could be left to implementation. |
| OPPO | Up to gNB implementation. |
| NEC | It is no need to specify the mechanism in specification. Up to the gNB implementation. |
| Charter | Where LBT not mandated, no need to specify additional mechanisms beyond gNB implementation. |

Discussion point:

For regions where LBT is not mandated, when operating in no-LBT mode, shall we further define mechanism for the system to fall back to LBT mode

* Yes (define mechanism): Apple (long term sensing and feedback, and RRC signalling), vivo, LGE (timer and HARQ feedback), Xiaomi, Lenovo, ZTE (interference level, decoding rate), DCM (RSSI/CO), HW, Spreadtrum (RSSI/CO)
* No (gNB implementation): FW, QC (define procedures to switch), Ericsson, Samsung, Intel (define mechanism, but not usage), Fujitsu, CATT, Nokia, OPPO, IDC, Charter

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Apple | Long term sensing and feedback, plus UE specific RRC signaling, can be the starting point. |
| vivo | Yes, a fall back mechanism should be defined in case the interference is severe in no-LBT mode. The devices which want to avoid interference can fall back to LBT mode. |
| Futurewei | The switch to and from No-LBT should be under gNB control. gNB should be able to enable the LBT mode of operation. |
| Qualcomm | Procedures based on outcome of long term sensing can be defined if necessary. The use of the mechanisms can be left to gNB/Network. |
| Ericsson | The signalling mechanisms discussed above (cell specific and UE specific) are sufficient and enables gNB to configure a group of UEs in LBT mode. No further mechanisms are needed. |
| Samsung | It can be up to gNB’s implementation. |
| Intel | We agree that a fall-back mechanism between LBT and no-LBT mode should be introduced. However, it should be left up to gNB’s implementation when the fall-back should occur. |
| LG Electronics | Even for regions where LBT is not mandated, no-LBT mode can be operated based on the timer and can fallback to LBT mode when the timer is expired or at least one of the specific conditions (e.g., when NACKs were received consecutively for the PDSCH/PUSCH transmitted without LBT) for switching the channel access mechanism is met. This switching mechanism between the LBT and No-LBT mode can be beneficial for coexistence with different RAT/operator or for high traffic load scenario. |
| Fujitsu | No further mechanism is needed. |
| CATT | No. It’s up to the gNB implementation. |
| Xiaomi | Agree with Apple and VIVO |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Yes, we think that some mechanism should be specified as when and how the system is expected to fallback to LBT mode from no-LBT mode. In our view, the fallback mechanism should be UE specific procedure. |
| Nokia, NSB | Fall back to LBT mode is up to the network. There is no reason to define such mechanism. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Firstly, such switching mechanism is very necessary to be introduced, especially for the related condition specified for No LBT is not satisfied.thus, we tend to support introduction some explicitly or implicitly triggering conditions, e.g., interference level, or correctly decoding rate. |
| DOCOMO | We agree it should be possible to fall back to LBT mode. The required specification impact is at least switching mechanism between LBT and no-LBT (i.e., how to indicate) and measurement/reporting mechanism (i.e., how to determine), which would be sufficient to reuse RSSI/CO measurement. The condition when fall-back is triggered may also be a discussion point. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | In our view, switching between channel access with LBT and channel access without LBT in a serving cell by gNB configuration should be supported. As such, in regions where LBT is not required, a serving cell can be configured to enable the LBT mode based on some performance criteria such as when a high level of interference is experienced. |
| Spreadtrum | The existing RSSI/CO measurement can be reused for the fall-back mechanism. |
| InterDigital | The network can determine whether LBT is required or not; there is no need to define such a mechanism. |
| Charter | gNB can rely on long term sensing mechanisms, at its latitude. |

### 2nd round discussion

Proposal 2.2.6-1:

For regions where LBT is not mandated, gNB should indicate to the UE this gNB-UE connection is operating in LBT mode or no-LBT mode. Further discussion whether one or both of the following alternatives can be used for indication:

* Alt.1. Cell specific (common for all UEs in a cell) as part of cell-specific RRC configuration or part of UE-specific RRC configuration or both
* Alt 2. UE specific (can be different for different UEs in a cell) as part of UE-specific RRC configuration
* FFS: Whether the indication of the decision on applying LBT mode or no-LBT mode is per beam (can be different for different UEs in different beams or can be different for different beam pairs between gNB and the UE) or per cell (can be different for different cells for a UE in carrier aggregation)

Additional comments:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine to support both Alt.1 and Alt.2.  Regarding dynamic indication of LBT or no-LBT mode, we are mainly talking about dynamic fallback from no-LBT to LBT mode |
| Intel | As previously mentioned, we are OK to support both alternatives. We believe that cell specific indication would be needed before RRC connection given the overlapping across different regions in terms of channel raster where the LTB requirements would be different. Furthermore, UE specific RRC configurability may be beneficial for some use cases and deployments where LBT may not be mandatory, but LBT would be selectively useful. |
| Fujitsu | We are fine with the proposal in principle. But we think Alt.1 can be agreed as the baseline as we do not see there would be a case that Alt.2 is supported while Alt.1 is not. |
| vivo | We have concern on this proposal.  Current wording “The indication can be one or both of the following alternatives” can be interpreted that for example, if Alt.1 is supported, then Cell specific as either part of cell-specific RRC configuration or part of UE-specific RRC configuration is supported. Is the intention to have both RRC configurations in Alt 1? Or FFS to just one option with Alt 1?  We also like a clarification on how to understand Cell specific as part of UE-specific RRC configuration in Alt 1. |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with the proposal. We believe that these two alternatives can be applied for different use cases. Before the UE enters the RRC connection state, it needs to be indicated the LBT/no-LBT mode, otherwise, the UE need to assume a default mode for LBT/no-LBT. Different UEs may suffer different interference, therefore it is beneficial to enable/disable LBT/no-LBT mode separately for different UE. |
| Xiaomi | OK with the proposal, but not very clear about FFS, what is the difference between “per cell decision” and Alt 1 cell specific configuration? |
| Ericsson | We support both Alt 1 and Alt 2. |
| LG Electronics | We are fine with the proposal since we think that the operating mode including whether or not switching to the no-LBT mode is possible can be configured by gNB. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | As the reply mentioned in the first round discussion, we tend to support Alt 2 from the flexibility point of view.  For FFS, we think it may be supported to allow per beam decision on applying LBT mode or no-LBT mode especially for multi-beams transmission in SDM mode. That is to say, there is no need to perform LBT on all beam directions while only perform LBT on remand beams to degrade LBT overhead. |
| Nokia, NSB | We are ok with the FL proposal. However, for the FFS point, our assumption is that the question should be if the \_indication\_ is per beam or per cell. |
| OPPO | We are fine with Alt-1. And we think per beam decision is not needed. |
| TCL | We support Alt 1. |
| Apple | Under region where LBT is not mandated, Alt 2 is more preferable.  SIB is preferred to signal regions where LBT is required or not. |
| Convida Wireless | We support both Alt 1 and Alt 2. |
| CATT | Alt. 1. Cell specific LBT/No-LBT indication can be configured to UE via system information, RRC configuration or DCI of scheduling SIB1 information. The signalling should be common for all UEs and included in the cell specific indication. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | First, we cannot support Alt. 2 since if only some UE do LBT in a cell, they will be at a continuous disadvantage. We think further discussion on this issue is necessary and this needs to be reflected in the proposed agreement.  Second, the text in Alt. 1 is not clear for us. We are not sure what “Cell specific as …part of UE-specific RRC configuration” means. We think that a cell specific parameter can either be indicated in “system information” or as a “RRC configured cell specific parameter/IE” (similar to, e.g., *ServingCellConfigCommon*). As an example, the description on top of *ServingCellConfigCommon* on top of the IE reads “The IE *ServingCellConfigCommon* is used to configure cell specific parameters of a UE's serving cell”. We prefer a similar terminology to avoid confusion down the road.  **Proposal:**  For regions where LBT is not mandated, gNB should indicate to the UE the system is operating in LBT mode or no-LBT mode. Further discuss whether one or both of the following alternatives can be used for indication:   * Alt.1. Cell specific (common for all UEs in a cell) as part of system information or a RRC configured cell-specific parameter or both * Alt 2. UE specific (can be different for different UEs in a cell) as part of UE-specific RRC configuration * FFS: The indication is per beam (can be different for different UEs in different beams) or per cell (can be different for different cells for a UE in carrier aggregation) decision on applying LBT mode or no-LBT mode |
| Samsung | We support both Alt 1 and Alt 2.  We need a clarification: the indicated mode in each alternative is gNB’s mode or UE’s mode? |
| NEC | We support both Alt 1 and Alt 2. |
| DOCOMO | While we prefer Alt 1 only, we can live with studying further on Alt 2 as well as Alt 1. On Samsung’s point, we thought we discussed on UE’s mode, but agree the clarification would be useful. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support both Alt 1 and Alt 2. For the FFS, we suggest following update:   * FFS: Whether the indication is per beam (can be different for different UEs in different beams) or per cell (can be different for different cells for a UE in carrier aggregation) decision on applying LBT mode or no-LBT mode |
| Sony | We are fine with the proposal. We support both Alt 1 and Alt 2. |
| Futurewei | Some further text clarifications are necessary. We are fine with both Alt 1 and Alt 2. |
|  |  |

### 3rd round discussion

Proposal 2.2.7-1:

For regions where LBT is not mandated, gNB should indicate to the UE this gNB-UE connection is operating in LBT mode or no-LBT mode. Further discussion whether one or both of the following alternatives can be used for indication:

* Alt.1. Cell specific (common for all UEs in a cell) as part of system information or dedicated RRC signaling or both
* Alt 2. UE specific (can be different for different UEs in a cell) as part of UE-specific RRC configuration
* FFS: Whether the indication of the decision on applying LBT mode or no-LBT mode is per beam (can be different for different UEs in different beams or can be different for different beam pairs between gNB and the UE) or per cell (can be different for different cells for a UE in carrier aggregation)
* FFS: Whether a gNB and its UE(s) can have different mode

Additional comments (please only comment if you have issue with the proposal):

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | 1. As discussed before, the text in Alt. 1 is not clear for us. We are not sure what “Cell specific as …part of UE-specific RRC configuration” means. We think that a cell specific parameter can either be indicated in “system information” or as a “RRC configured cell specific parameter/IE” (similar to, e.g., *ServingCellConfigCommon*). As an example, the description on top of *ServingCellConfigCommon* on top of the IE reads “The IE *ServingCellConfigCommon* is used to configure cell specific parameters of a UE's serving cell”. We prefer a similar terminology. 2. Regarding the first FFS, in our view, the indication per beam would only be possible if the indication is UE-specific (that is, if Alt. 2 is agreed).   To reflect above two issues, we propose the following change:  Proposal 2.2.7-1 (Modified):  For regions where LBT is not mandated, gNB should indicate to the UE this gNB-UE connection is operating in LBT mode or no-LBT mode. Further discussion whether one or both of the following alternatives can be used for indication:   * Alt.1. Cell specific (common for all UEs in a cell) as part of cell-specific RRC parameter/IE or system information or both * Alt 2. UE specific (can be different for different UEs in a cell) as part of UE-specific RRC configuration * FFS: Whether the indication of the decision on applying LBT mode or no-LBT mode is per beam (can be different for different UEs in different beams or can be different for different beam pairs between gNB and the UE) or per cell (can be different for different cells for a UE in carrier aggregation)   + Per beam indication may be supported only if Alt. 2 is agreed. * FFS: Whether a gNB and its UE(s) can have different mode   Moderator: Moved the two FFS as sub-bullet of Alt 2. For Alt 1, meant to say either include the configuration in system information or the cell-specific information can be provided in UE specific RRC (like for a SCell). |
| Huawei, HiSilicon2 | Thank you for the modification. However, I am afraid that there still seems to be some ambiguity in the wording may be we can replace “UE-specific RRC configurated cell-specific parameter” simply with “RRC dedicated signalling” which we believe is closer to what we want to state and also “dedicated signalling” is a specification term. Moreover, we still have concern about how “per beam indication” in FFS can be “cell specific”. We suggest the following modification to the updated proposal:  Proposal 2.2.7-1: (Modified)  For regions where LBT is not mandated, gNB should indicate to the UE this gNB-UE connection is operating in LBT mode or no-LBT mode. Further discussion whether one or both of the following alternatives can be used for indication:   * Alt.1. Cell specific (common for all UEs in a cell) as part of system information or RRC dedicated signalling or both * Alt 2. UE specific (can be different for different UEs in a cell) as part of UE-specific RRC configuration * FFS: Whether the indication of the decision on applying LBT mode or no-LBT mode is per beam (can be different for different UEs in different beams or can be different for different beam pairs between gNB and the UE) or per cell (can be different for different cells for a UE in carrier aggregation)   + Per beam indication may be supported only if Alt. 2 is agreed * FFS: Whether a gNB and its UE(s) can have different mode   Moderator: Do you want per beam indication for cell specific (Alt 1)? If you don’t, putting the FFS as sub-bullet of Alt 2 will resolve your concern, right? |
| CATT | We are generally OK with the proposal. For Alt 1, we share the same view with Huawei. We think the cell specific indication can be part of system information or part of cell-specific RRC configuration.  Per beam indication can be dynamically indicated by DCI before transmission. |
| Xiaomi | OK with the proposal |
| Nokia, NSB | We support the proposal. For Alt 1, it might suffice to simply say “Cell specific (common for all UEs in a cell)” |
| Futurewei | We are OK with the proposal |
| Intel | We are Ok with the proposal |
| Samsung | The last FFS on same or different mode for gNB or UE is applicable to both alternatives (examples already explained in previous email).  Also, we would like to clarify the “per beam indication”. If we have a cell-specific bitmap indicating the mode of all beams, is it called “per beam indication” or not? If this is, then the first FFS should also be applicable to both alternatives. In our view, whether it’s cell-specific or UE-specific is just the type of indication message, and has no relationship with the actual indication method.  Moderator: Thanks for the explanation. At this phase, we can keep it more general for future discussion. Moved the FFS one level higher. |

## LBT Mode

### Sensing Structures

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Key Proposals/Observations/Positions** |
| Intel | Proposal 1: While the 8us observation period is divided into two slots of 3 and 5us, respectively, the observation window of 5us is composed by a single observation slot of the same length. FFS: the exact value length of the measurement window that should be performed in each observation slots of which the LBT procedure is composed of. |
| Qualcomm | Proposal 4: Study the minimum measurement duration required in the 5 us observation slot.  Proposal 5: Perform two measurements within a 8us deferral period. Study the locations and durations of the two measurements.  Proposal 6: Consider specifying Type 2 LBT sensing structure similar to an observation slot in the baseline LBT procedure. |

### LBT Parameters, COT duration, Gaps

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Key Proposals/Observations/Positions** |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Proposal 9: Channel access without channel sensing is supported for a UE responding to a DL transmission within a gNB initiated COT after a time gap of at most X us.  Proposal 10: Time gap of X us is longer that PDSCH processing time and PUSCH preparation time.  Proposal 11: UEs without LBT functionality are also supported.  Proposal 12: Within a COT, gNB does not need to sense the channel after a beam switch when the time gap to previous channel sensing or transmission covering the beam is less than Y us. The value of Y is for further study. |
| Apple | Proposal 6: Regulation is ambiguous on the max gap duration in COT sharing without LBT. Since any gap is counted into 5ms COT, no gap limitation needs to be specified. |
| PANSONIC | Proposal 2: Within gNB initiated COT, if gap between DL transmission and scheduled UL transmission along a given beam direction is larger than a predefined duration, UE should perform LBT before UL transmission; otherwise, no LBT is needed. |

### ED threshold adaptation based on bandwidth

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Key Proposals/Observations/Positions** |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Observation 1: Energy detection threshold of EN 302 567 depends on the operating channel bandwidth and on the EIRP incorporating also the beamforming and antenna gain.  Proposal 3: Energy detection threshold is determined by XThresh = -80 dBm + 10 log10 (LBT Bandwidth (in MHz)) + 10 log10 (EIRPmax / EIRPout), where EIRPout is the maximum peak EIRP of intended transmissions. |
| Intel | Proposal 4: When operating in unlicensed 60 GHz band, in order to allow fair coexistence among incumbent systems, the ED threshold calculation shall account not only for the maximum output power, but also at least for the bandwidth used.  Proposal 5: When operating in unlicensed 60 GHz band, the ED threshold calculation shall account for the type of LBT mechanism used.  Proposal 6: For the LBT bandwidth definition, either Alt-4 or Alt-5 are preferred. |
| vivo | Proposal 2: The ED threshold for CCA check should adapt to LBT bandwidth, and take into account the impact of beamforming gain of the directional LBT beams. |
| Spreadtrum | Proposal 4: The formula of ED threshold should consider the LBT bandwidth and beamforming gain. |
| Ericsson | Observation 1 Draft EN 302 567 v2.2.0 contains recent updates that modifies the EDT to include dependency on the LBT bandwidth  Proposal 1 Reuse the energy detection threshold (EDT) from draft EN 302 567 v2.2.0 that already considers EDT scaling with transmit power and LBT bandwidth |
| Qualcomm | Proposal 1: Modify the baseline procedure for the WID LBT mode to include dependency of the energy detection threshold on the operating channel bandwidth. |
| DOCOMO | Proposal 2:  For ED threshold used in LBT, no additional specification is necessary in addition to what ETSI BRAN requires.  Observation 2: |

### Discussion

ED threshold should reflect the updated ETSI regulation

Discussion point:

The baseline ED threshold can be computed as

Where Pout is rated RF output EIRP (including antenna gain) and Pmax is the output power limit.

* FFS if further adjustment on ED threshold based on sensing beam and transmission beam. The adjustment will not increase the ED threshold
  + Should not adjust: Ericsson, Fujitsu (open for discussion), DCM,
* FFS if Pout is max output EIRP of the device or instantaneous output EIRP
* FFS definition of Operation Channel BW
* Support: Apple, vivo, FW, QC, Ericsson (no further adjustment to EDT by beams used), Intel, LGE, CATT, NEC, Xiaomi, Lenovo, Nokia, ZTE, Sony, Convida, , Spreadtrum, OPPO, IDC, Charter

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Apple | Agree. Reuse EDT defined in ETSI regulation.  Based on the definition of Pout is specified in 4.2.2, ED threshold should be based on transmission beamforming gain per transmission burst. Therefore, if omni-sensing is used and directional transmission happens within a transmission burst, beam forming gain needs to explicitly added to Pout calculation. “4.2.2.1 Definition The RF output power is the mean equivalent isotropically radiated power (EIRP) for the equipment during a transmission burst. 4.2.2.2 Limit The maximum RF output power is applicable to the system as a whole when operated at the highest stated power level. For a smart antenna system, the limit applies to the configuration that results in the highest EIRP. In case of multiple (adjacent or non-adjacent) channels the total RF output power of all channels shall be less than or equal to the limits in table 3.” |
| vivo | The ED threshold should be discussed based on the latest regulation as in the equation above. The updated EDT already includes the impact of the channel bandwidth.  However, the impact of the sensing beam is not considered in the EDT yet. We think some adjustment to the EDT by further including the impact of the sensing beam. |
| Futurewei | In the above formula Pout should correspond to the max RF output EIRP of the consecutive transmissions that follows that LBT. In addition to the above formula, the difference between the sensing (sensitivity) antenna beam and the rated output EIRP should be considered. |
| Qualcomm | We support this proposal. The EDT may need an additional adjustment term based on the relationship between sensing and transmission beams, as discussed in Section 2.8.1 |
| Ericsson | *Pout* includes the beamforming gain of the potential transmission beam. No further adjustments to ED threshold based on transmission beam is needed. However, increasing the ED threshold based on sensing beam is not compliant with HS EN 302 567. |
| Samsung | * Need to clarify “operating channel BW” in 3GPP terminology. * This baseline threshold is applicable to “other technology sharing the channel is not absent on a long-term basis”, and do we need to discuss another threshold for “other technology sharing the channel is absent on a long-term basis” as in NR-U? |
| Intel | We agree that the ED threshold calculation should reflect the latest updates from the ETSI BRAN, and the formulation provided should be used as a baseline, and account for the LBT bandwidth.  It is important to note that:   1. CCA level imposed by the ETSI BRAN is 1 dB looser (i.e. -47 dBm) than what IEEE 802.11ad specification requires (which operates with a bandwidth of 2.160 GHz) for energy detection (i.e. -48 dBm), and this should be accounted as well when defining the ED threshold calculation. 2. Depending on the ED threshold used, one LBT mechanism may perform better than the other, and in general when low ED thresholds are used, the directional LBT may overperform omni-directional LBT given that the level of protection offered by the later gets also increased, which may help sufficiently mitigate the hidden node issue bringing this in par with that of omni-directional LBT while still offering better spatial reuse than that. In this matter, it may be beneficial within the ED threshold calculation to also account for the type of LBT mechanism and sensing beam used so that to exploit the advantage described above. |
| LG Electronics | We support the proposal to make the updated ETSI regulation the baseline of the ED threshold. In addition, the transmit power of beam(s) in the COT and transmit beam pattern (wide/narrow) should be considered to enhance the ED threshold provided by the updated ETSI 302 567. |
| Fujitsu | We share the same view with Ericsson that no further adjustment based on transmission beam is needed. We also do not support further adjustment based on sensing beam since we do not see benefit so far, but we are fine to further discuss it. |
| CATT | The EDT formula in EN 302.567 can be used for the NR operation in 52.6GHz to 71GHz band. According to EN 302.567, there is no need to distinguish between antenna gain and inductive transmit power.  When antenna gain between the sensing beam and transmission beam are different, the EDT needs to be adjusted. The detail need to be further studied. |
| NEC | We support the proposal with the understanding that the ED threshold should take account of the relationship between sensing beams and transmission beams. |
| Xiaomi | Support this proposal |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We agree with the baseline ED threshold computation, where the Pout and Pmax are based on transmission beam |
| Nokia, NSB | We support this proposal. Our assumption is that the “Operating channel bandwidth” above is the LBT bandwidth. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We can see from the latest draft EN 302 567 that the impact of sensing beam is not considered in EDT yet. So we think such factor should be introduced in above formula and further need to consider EDT adjustment based on the relationship between sensing beam and transmission beam. |
| DOCOMO | We agree the baseline above. For FFS, we do not prefer to study this since it seems to require large specification effort. |
| Sony | Support the proposal. |
| Convida Wireless | We are generally fine with the proposal and baseline ED threshold. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | It is OK to change the baseline EDT from what was agreed in RAN1 103-e (-47 dBm + 10 × log10 (PMax / Pout)) to the above formula used in the last draft of 302 567. In fact, using 2GHz as operating channel BW reduces the above formula to the earlier agreed EDT formula. However, there are two main points that we need to discuss:   * The FFS part is actually more important than changing the baseline formula to above. We would like to stress that the above EDT formula, if agreed, is still a baseline formula and companies can discuss further EDT enhancements based on, for instance, the FFS point.   In Section 4.2.2.2 of EN 302 567 v2.1.20, “the maximum RF output power (PMax) is defined to be applicable to the system as a whole when operated at the highest stated power level”. It should be noted however that the current baseline formulae does not accurately capture that definition as it seems to allow for further reducing the EDT as Pout exceeds PMax. This unintended case can be excluded by further restricting P\_out <=P\_max. |
| Spreadtrum | We generally fine with the proposal. And our assumption of operating channel bandwidth is the LBT bandwidth. |
| InterDigital | We support the proposal and we agree with Apple, vivo, Futurewei, Qualcomm, Intel, LGE, CATT, NEC, Lenovo that the sensing beam and transmission beam should be considered in the EDT calculation. |
| Intel | We are fine with the current proposal, and to discuss further the FFS points later. |
| Charter | Agree with proposal and comments that an adjustment term may be necessary. |

Sensing structure for 8us deferral and 5us observation slot

Discussion point:

For channel sensing in the 8us deferral period, two energy measurements are required. For channel sensing in the 5us observation slot, one energy measurement is required.

* FFS the duration and the location of the energy measurements

Support

* Two measurements in 8us: QC, Samsung, Intel, LGE, NEC, Xiaomi, Lenovo, Nokia, ZTE, DCM, Sony, Spreadtrum, OPPO
* One measurement in 8us: Apple, Ericsson, Charter
* Extend the 8us to 10us and perform two measurements: CATT
* Further study: HW

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Apple | The channel sensing parameters defined in ETSI adopt the parameters defined in 11ad specification. 5us slot is definition of aSlotTime, and 8us is sum of aSIFSTime (3us) + aSlotTime(5us).  In 802.11ad specification (IEEE std 802.11-2016), a SIFSTime and aSlotTime is calculated as    Based on this, there is no need to perform 2 CCA within 8us slot. Only 1 CCA is enough.  For 5us sensing slot, at most 3us should be used for CCA time, based on 802.11ad specification. Remaining time will be used for RxTx turnaround time and propagation time. |
| vivo | We’re open to consider one or two CCA. But want to emphasize that the measurement duration for the CCA check should be agreed upon first. |
| Futurewei | The discussions point just restates the ETSI specs (5 us sensing slot, 8us deferral). We are OK FFS for further details on measurements. |
| Qualcomm | We support this proposal. |
| Ericsson | For the 8us deferral period, EN 302 567 does not specify any sensing structure. It can be left to implementation.   For the 5us observation slot, a minimum value for the duration may be specified but the location of the energy measurements can be left to implementation. |
| Samsung | OK with the proposal. |
| Intel | We are OK with the proposal, since this is in line with the design logic used during Rel.16 to define how measurement are performed, and more importantly with the definition of aSlotTime, and of a SIFS duration in 802.11ad/ay. As for the specifics of the measurement window (e.g., position, length) this could be further discussed on the basis of the implementation constrains. |
| LG Electronics | We are fine with the proposal and open to discuss. |
| CATT | For 8us deferral period, we support dividing 8us into 5us and 3us, and perform at least one measurement in the 5us.  According to the description for CCA check in EN 302.567, the minimum of the deferral period is 8us. We prefer to extent the deferral period to 10us consist of two observation slot as shown in following figure. In this case, it only needs to figure out the duration and the location of energy measurement in the observation slot, which can reduce the complexity of standard design. |
| NEC | We support the proposal. |
| Xiaomi | Support this proposal. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We agree with the above suggestion for deferral period and corresponding number of measurements |
| Nokia, NSB | We support this proposal |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Agree FL’s proposal and further discussion on the duration and the location of the energy measurements. |
| DOCOMO | We are fine with the point above. |
| Sony | Support the proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We think this issue is quite independent from other topics and should be further analysed. We do not recommend trying to reach an agreement on this in RAN1 104-e. |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Charter | We believe that one measurement in 8 us is sufficient (cf. Apple). |

### 2nd round discussion

Proposal 2.3.5-1:

The baseline ED threshold can be computed as

Where Pout is RF output power (EIRP) and Pmax is the RF output power limit, Pout≤Pmax.

* FFS if further adjustment on ED threshold based on the sensing beam and the transmission beam. ~~The adjustment will not increase the ED threshold (after the adjustment, the EDT cannot be higher than defined by the baseline EDT above)~~
* FFS if Pout is max output EIRP of the device or instantaneous output EIRP
* FFS definition of Operating Channel BW
* FFS whether ED threshold for NR-U and NR-U coexistence scenarios (eg, at regulation level) can be appropriately relaxed compared with the threshold of coexistence between NR-U and Wi-Fi.
* FFS EDT when the COT has time varying transmission beams and Pout

Additional comments:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine with the proposal |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal. However, another point that we feel should be left for further study is whether the EDT threshold should be differently calculated in controlled environments or in cases where LBT is not required, but it is configured by the network.   * FFS whether for controlled environments or when LBT is not mandate the EDT calculations should also be the same or differently calculated |
| Fujitsu | Fine with the proposal |
| vivo | Support this proposal. |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Xiaomi | Fine with the proposal |
| Ericsson | We are fine with the proposal in principle. However, we have a comment and modification.   * + - 1. Equation refers to “Operating channel BW” while the FFS refers to “Operation channel BW”. In our opinion, operating channel BW refers to the LBT BW (“channel” in 37.213). Exact details of the equation can be left to the spec editor. Furthermore, the FFS on operating channel BW refers to the discussion in section 2.1.       2. Propose to use the same definitions for Pmax and Pout as EN 302 567 v2.2.0   **EN 302 567 Clause 4.2.5.3** *“The energy detection threshold for the CCA Check shall be -80 dBm + 10 × log10 (Operating Channel*  *Bandwidth (in MHz)) + 10 × log10 (Pmax / Pout) (Pmax and Pout in W EIRP) where Pout is the RF output*  *power (EIRP) and Pmax is the RF output power limit defined in clause 4.2.2.1.”*   * + - * 1. *Pout* already includes the adjustment of ED Threshold based on transmission beam. It is the mean EIRP over a transmission burst.  “*4.2.2.1 Definition* *The RF output power is the mean equivalent isotropically radiated power (EIRP) for the equipment during a transmission burst.”*   * + - * 1. EN 302 567 defines Pmax as follows  *“4.2.2.2 Limit* *The maximum RF output power is applicable to the system as a whole when operated at the highest stated power level. For a smart antenna system, the limit applies to the configuration that results in the highest EIRP. In case of multiple (adjacent or non-adjacent) channels the total RF output power of all channels shall be less than or equal to the limits in table 3.*”  The use cases envisaged for 60 GHz are with smart antenna systems hence, the above highlighted text in our opinion means,  Pmax = *Highest EIRP attainable based on the configuration,* whether it was attained using highest stated power level or not is not important for smart antenna systems. This Pmax is capped at 40 dBm by the CEPT regulations.  Pout <=Pmax<=40 dBm EIRP(regulatory limit)  Response to Huawei’s comments: For the case Huawei proposed below, EDT calculated according to the EN 302 567 spec will be the same for both the scenarios as they have the same EIRP (but with different Antenna array gain. If Huawei’s proposal is allowed, the EDT for the narrower beamformer will be increased beyond the EDT (for the same EIRP) specified by the ETSI BRAN regulation. This will make the device non-compliant. Regulations specify the limits of operation via the EDT equation in the HS EN 302 567. We cannot go beyond what is specified in ETSI. Furthermore, although high-directionality may have less interfering effect, in our simulations through the study phase, we did not see any significant impact due to LBT. Furthermore, high-directionality also implies high instances of hidden node scenarios and collisions. Therefore, we do not see any reason to specify beyond what is required by the regulations. |
| LG Electronics | We are generally fine with the FL proposal. However, we think that the transmit power of beam(s) in the COT and transmit beam pattern (wide/narrow) should be considered to enhance the ED threshold provided by the updated ETSI 302 567.  Meanwhile, what is the meaning of “The adjustment will not increase the ED threshold” in the first FFS bullet? |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Basically agree with FL proposal, but we think another factor on ED threshold adjustment should be also considered such as *coexistence scenarios.* Therefore, suggest add a FFS, as following:   * FFS whether ED threshold for NR-U and NR-U coexistence scenarios can be appropriately relaxed compared with the threshold of coexistence between NR-U and Wi-Fi. |
| Nokia, NSB | We support the proposal |
| OPPO | We are fine with the proposal. |
| TCL | In our view, the proposal needs to clarify further the beam aspects. Nevertheless, we are supportive of the proposal. |
| Apple | We support the proposal. |
| Convida Wireless | We are fine with the FL’s proposal. |
| CATT | Fine with the proposal |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | First, we are not sure why we need further explanation in front of EIRP definition “(including antenna gain)”. We all know what EIRP is and, further, this explanation does not exist in the latest draft of ETSI EN 302 567. This may be misused to pre-empt EDT enhancements that take into account Antenna-array (beamforming) gain, LBT beam, or transmission beam and we cannot agree with it.  Second, it is not clear for us why we need “The adjustment will not increase the ED threshold”. If we want to adjust EDT based on the transmission beam/sensing beam and/or support directional LBT, in our view, one straightforward and meaningful way is to adjust the EDT so that if Antenna array 1 and Antenna array 2 have the same EIRP but Antenna array 2 has a higher antenna array gain (beamforming gain), Antenna array 2 has a higher EDT (be incentivised) since it has a lower spatial interference footprint to the network. ” Imagine two antenna Arrays 1 and 2 with the same EIRP R (represented by a sphere of radius R) but Antenna array 1 is omni-directional, that is, its radiation pattern is the sphere of radius R while Antenna array 2 is highly directional such that its radiation pattern touches the surface of the sphere of radius R only at one point and is rapidly reduced to much smaller levels in all other directions. Antenna array 1 and 2 will have exactly the same EIRP but due to the high directionality of Antenna array 2, it has far less interfering effect on co-existing systems and, hence, in our opinion, should have a higher EDT than Antenna array 1.  Third, we would prefer to add “beamforming gain” in the first FFS for further clarification.  Fourth, it might be helpful to clarify that >  Fifth, “Operation” is better to be changed to “operating” in FFS to be consistent with 302 567.  We propose the following:  **Proposal:**  The baseline ED threshold can be computed as  Where Pout(<=Pmax) is RF output power (EIRP) and Pmax is the RF output power limit.   * FFS if further adjustment on ED threshold based on sensing beam, transmission beam, or beamforming gain is needed. * FFS if Pout is max output EIRP of the device or instantaneous output EIRP * FFS definition of Operating Channel BW * FFS whether ED threshold for NR-U and NR-U coexistence scenarios (eg, at regulation level) can be appropriately relaxed compared with the threshold of coexistence between NR-U and Wi-Fi. |
| Samsung | We agree with Huawei’s comment and updated proposal. |
| NEC | We support updated proposal. |
| DOCOMO | We support the FL proposal. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine with the updated proposal |
| Sony | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Futurewei | We are fine with the proposal as a baseline, we support removing “including antenna gain” , which is not necessary. We should add *as FFS the definition of Pout when the LBT is followed by multiple transmissions with various powers, as for instance may be the case during a COT.* |

Proposal 2.3.5-2 (capture options, seems stable):

For energy measurement in 8us deferral period, down-select from the following:

* Alt 1. Two energy measurements are required
* Alt 2. One measurement is required
* Alt 3. Extend the 8us to 10us and perform two measurement, one in each 5us segment

For energy measurement in 5us observation slot, perform single measurement

* FFS minimum duration of the measurement
* FFS location of the measurement

Additional comments:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support Alt. 1 for 8us deferral period |
| Intel | We prefer Alt1, since this is in line with the design logic used during Rel.16 to define how measurement are performed. It is important to note that:   * Given that a SIFS duration in 802.11ad/ay is 5us, if a single measurement is performed within the 8us deferral period, it may be possible to actually miss the channel busy depending on how the SIFS transmissions will overlap with deferral period. * 10us deferral period is not aligned with the ETSI BRAN regulation,. |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with the proposal.  Regarding 8us deferral period, we prefer Alt 1. |
| Ericsson | For energy measurement in 8us deferral period:  Although EN 302 567 does not specify anything, we can agree with Alt 2. Alt 1 and Alt3 are over specifying beyond the regulatory requirements which only increase specification effort. Furthermore, none of the simulation results we have had so far focused on this aspect of LBT.  For energy measurement in 5us observation slot, we agree in principle. |
| LG Electronics | We are fine with the proposal. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Support Alt.1 for 8us deferral period. |
| Nokia, NSB | We support the proposal |
| OPPO | We support two measurements for 8us deferral period and single measurement for 5us sensing slot. |
| Convida Wireless | We are ok with the proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We think this issue is quite independent from other topics and should be further analysed. We do not recommend trying to reach an agreement on this in RAN1 104-e. |
| CATT | Fine with the proposal. We support Alt. 1 to extend the 8 us to 10 us to two independent measurements of sensing slots. |
| Futurewei | We are fine with the proposal |

### 3rd round discussion

Proposal 2.3.6-1 (capture options, seems stable):

For energy measurement in 8us deferral period, down-select from the following:

* Alt 1. Two energy measurements are required
* Alt 2. One measurement is required
* Alt 3. Extend the 8us to 10us and perform two measurement, one in each 5us segment

For energy measurement in 5us observation slot, perform single measurement

* FFS minimum duration of the measurement
* FFS location of the measurement

Additional comments (please only comment if you have issue with the proposal):

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| CATT | We are generally fine with the proposal. For Alt 3, we suggest following update:   * Alt 3. Extend the 8us to 10us which contains two independent measurements of sensing slots. |
| Futurewei | We are OK with the proposal. |
| Intel | We are Ok with the proposal. |

## COT Sharing Aspects

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Key Proposals/Observations/Positions** |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Proposal 11: For NR operation in unlicensed bands between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz with LBT based channel access mechanism, COT sharing between the initiating device and responding device should be supported with at least Cat 2 LBT:  - If the responding device is capable of beam correspondence and it is expected to use only any of the Rx beam(s) as Tx beam(s) for its transmission that have been used to receive at least one of the transmissions from the initiating device within the same COT  - If the responding device determines at least one suitable beam on which it is allowed to transmit within the same COT, where the suitable beam can be determined as follows:  o UE can be configured with a mapping table for determining suitable transmit beams for UL transmissions based on the receive beam(s) which the UE used to receive the prior DL transmissions in the same COT  Proposal 12: For NR unlicensed bands between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz with directional LBT based channel access mechanism, multiple COT sharing indicators and their corresponding association to different beams can be signaled in a group common DCI and the association of COT sharing indicator to transmission is semi-statically signaled. |
| LG Electronics | Proposal #5: For COT sharing, the Type 2 (e.g., 2A/2B/2C) channel access procedure can be introduced and the maximum gap between the transmissions within the COT can be defined for above 52.6 GHz. |
| CAICT | Proposal 6: Cat 2 LBT could be used to share the COT.  Proposal 7: Cat 2 LBT could also be used for short control signaling. |

### Discussion

ETSI regulation does not explicitly enforce a maximum gap within the COT

Discussion point

On maximum gap within a COT to allow COT sharing without LBT

* Alt 1. No maximum gap defined. A later transmission can share the COT without LBT with any gap within the maximum COT duration
  + Apple, Qualcomm, Ericsson, Intel, CATT, Convida, HW, Spreadtrum, Fujitsu, Charter
* Alt 2. Define a maximum gap X, such that a later transmission can share the COT without LBT only if the later transmission starts within X from the end of the earlier transmission
  + FFS: Value for X
  + Vivo, Fujitsu (open for discussion), Xiaomi, Nokia (?), Convida (also fine), IDC
* Alt 3. Define a maximum gap Y, such that a later transmission can share the COT without LBT only if the later transmission starts within Y from the end of the earlier transmission. If the later transmission starts after Y from the end of the earlier transmission, an one-shot LBT is needed to share the COT
  + FFS: Value for Y
  + FFS: How to define the one-shot LBT
  + Vivo, FW, Samsung, Intel, LGE, Fujitsu (open for discussion), NEC, ZTE, Convida (also fine), Sony, Spreadtrum, OPPO, IDC, DCM, ITRI

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Apple | Alt 1.  Alt 3 follows similar design as 802.11 and eLAA/NR-U. In this case, Y should be 3us SIFS time which is very restrictive. |
| vivo | We’re open to consider Alt 2 or Alt 3 with a maximum gap defined. |
| Futurewei | How to define a COT if there is no maximum gap allowed? For instance, if UE initiates a COT and it has two consecutive transmissions hundreds of us apart, are they in the same COT?  We prefer Alt 3. We understand that there are no ETSI requirements on the maximum gap, however without a maximum gap and a short LBT during the COT the co-existence between two deployments even of the same RAT can be very difficult. We think that one-shot (minimum LBT) would be useful to define. |
| Qualcomm | We propose Alt 1 for baseline operation. We further prefer defining mechanism such as Alt 3 with freedom for gNB to choose the behaviour of Alt 3 either for COT sharing or as part to RX assistance (Section 2.9) |
| Ericsson | Alt 1 is preferred. ETSI HS EN 302 567 defines a COT including all the gaps and transmissions from both the initiating and responding devices. There is no need to limit the gap duration if we do not envisage any issues. |
| Samsung | We support Alt 3. |
| Intel | Our view is that it should be left up to the gNB to choose whether Alt 1 or Alt3 should be used. |
| LG Electronics | We support the Alt 3. Even the EN 302 567 does not explicitly define the gap allowed for COT sharing, it is beneficial to introduce the maximum gap and the Cat-2 LBT for efficient COT sharing to support NR above 52.6GHz. |
| Fujitsu | We prefer Alt 1. Open to further discuss Alt 2 and Alt 3 |
| CATT | Alt 1. |
| NEC | We support Alt 3. |
| Xiaomi | support Alt 2 |
| Nokia, NSB | According to ETSI EN 302 567, LBT is not required for the responding device, but it should transmit “immediately” after the initiating device. However, it is not defined what immediate means, and hence we should further clarify that. In our view, the allowed gap, if defined, should at least be large enough to cover for typical UE and gNB processing times. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We tend to support Alt.3 to better achieve fair and friendly coexistence with other systems and deal with interference changes around the device. |
| Sony | We support Alt 3 to achieve better coexistence with other systems. |
| Convida Wireless | Alt 1 is preferred. Alt 2 and 3 could also be considered. Which alternative could be further discussed. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Latest draft of ETSI 302 567 does not seem to mandate any maximum gap within the 5 ms MCOT:  “6) An equipment (initiating or not initiating transmission), upon correct reception of a packet which was intended for this equipment, can skip the CCA Check, and immediately proceed with the transmission in response to received frames. A consecutive sequence of transmissions by the equipment, without a new CCA Check, shall not exceed the 5 ms Channel Occupancy Time as defined in step 5) above”  Unless there is any compelling reason to consider maximum gap, we can go with Alt. 1. |
| Spreadtrum | We prefer alt 1. Open to further discuss alt 3. |
| InterDigital | We support Alt.2 or Alt. 3 |
| DOCOMO | We support Alt 3. Depending on the gap duration and the scenario/deployment, transmission without LBT, even if it is a response, could be harmful for surrounding transmissions. |
| Charter | Alt 1. |
| ITRI | We support Alt 3. |

### 2nd round discussion

Proposal 2.4.2-1 (capture options. Seems stable)

On maximum gap within a COT to allow COT sharing without LBT, down-select from

* Alt 1. No maximum gap defined. A later transmission can share the COT without LBT with any gap within the maximum COT duration
* Alt 2. Define a maximum gap X, such that a later transmission can share the COT without LBT only if the later transmission starts within X from the end of the earlier transmission
  + FFS: Value for X
* Alt 3. Define a maximum gap Y, such that a later transmission can share the COT without LBT only if the later transmission starts within Y from the end of the earlier transmission. If the later transmission starts after Y from the end of the earlier transmission, an one-shot LBT is needed to share the COT
  + FFS: Value for Y
  + FFS: How to define the one-shot LBT

Additional view:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support Alt 3 |
| Intel | Our view is that it should be left up to the gNB to choose whether Alt. 1 or Alt. 3 should be used to accommodate for different scenarios. |
| Xiaomi | Alt 2 and Alt 3  From our understanding, Alt 3 can be covered by Alt2. We are fine with both of them. But for Alt1, our concern is, an initiating device can apply no-LBT does not mean the responding device can also apply no-LBT. So Alt 1 is not preferred. |
| Ericsson | Alt 1 is preferred. ETSI HS EN 302 567 defines a COT including all the gaps and transmissions from both the initiating and responding devices. There is no need to limit the gap duration if we do not envisage any issues. |
| LG Electronics | We support the Alt 3. Even the EN 302 567 does not explicitly define the gap allowed for COT sharing, it is beneficial to introduce the maximum gap and the Cat-2 LBT for efficient COT sharing to support NR above 52.6GHz. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Support Alt 3. |
| Nokia, NSB | Our preference is either Alt 1, or potentially Alt 2 is with a reasonably large value of X, such that typical UE/gNB processing times can be accommodated. |
| OPPO | We support Alt 3. |
| TCL | We prefer Alt 2 in this list. |
| Apple | Alt 1 is preferred |
| Convida Wireless | We prefer Alt 1 and Alt 3. |
| CATT | Alt 1. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We prefer Alt. 1. It seems that this discussion continues to the next meeting. So, we prefer to have an agreement that lists all three alternatives. |
| Samsung | We prefer Alt 3. |
| NEC | We support Alt 3. |
| DOCOMO | Our preference is Alt 3. We are ok with agreeing on the list above this meeting and then continuing the discussion on down-selection in the next meeting. |
| Sony | We support Alt.3. |
| Futurewei | We support Alt 3 |

### 3rd round discussion

Proposal 2.4.3-1 (capture alternatives. Seems stable)

On maximum gap within a COT to allow COT sharing without LBT, down-select from

* Alt 1. No maximum gap defined. A later transmission can share the COT without LBT with any gap within the maximum COT duration
* Alt 2. Define a maximum gap X, such that a later transmission can share the COT without LBT only if the later transmission starts within X from the end of the earlier transmission
  + FFS: Value for X
* Alt 3. Define a maximum gap Y, such that a later transmission can share the COT without LBT only if the later transmission starts within Y from the end of the earlier transmission. If the later transmission starts after Y from the end of the earlier transmission, an one-shot LBT is needed to share the COT
  + FFS: Value for Y
  + FFS: How to define the one-shot LBT

Additional comments (please only comment if you have issue with the proposal):

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| CATT | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Xiaomi | OK with the proposal |
| Nokia, NSB | We support the proposal |
| Futurewei | We are OK with the proposal. |
| Intel | We are OK with the proposal. |

## CWS and CAPC

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Key Proposals/Observations/Positions** |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Proposal 1: LBT procedure uses fixed contention window size for random back-off. The size of the fixed contention window is FFS.  Proposal 2: Reduced number of CAPCs can be considered for the LBT procedure for 60 GHz band. Support for CAPCs is considered together with the design of short control signalling. |
|  |  |
| Intel | Proposal 3: The procedure specified in NR-U related to the CWS adjustment should be considered for operation in unlicensed 60 GHz band. RAN1 should further discuss and identify the values Zmin and Zmax. |
| LG Electronics | Proposal #2: Introduce channel access priority class and the contention window adjustment mechanisms when LBT is used in NR above 52.6 GHz, similar to Rel-16 NR-U.  Proposal #8: It would be beneficial for coexistence that channel occupancy acquired by directional LBT is shared only for DL and UL signals/channels having spatial QCL relationship. |
| Samsung | Proposal 3: Support the following types of channel access procedures for 60 GHz unlicensed band:  • Type 1 channel access procedure without CWS adaptation;  • Type 2 channel access procedure with zero and positive fixed sensing duration.  Proposal 4: No need to define CAPC for 60 GHz unlicensed band. |
| CATT | Proposal 3: RAN 1 should further study introduction of CAPC for NR operation up to 71GHz with necessary modifications when LBT is used. |
| PANASONIC | Proposal 2: Within gNB initiated COT, if gap between DL transmission and scheduled UL transmission along a given beam direction is larger than a predefined duration, UE should perform LBT before UL transmission; otherwise, no LBT is needed. |
| Sony | Proposal 3: Contention Window Size should be allowed to be configured. |
| Ericsson | Proposal 11 CAPC, CWS adjustment can be implementation dependent. |
| Charter | Proposal 1: CAPC and contention window adjustment mechanisms are not introduced. Contention window range does not need to be adjusted. |
| Charter | Proposal 1: CAPC and contention window adjustment mechanisms are not introduced. Contention window range does not need to be adjusted. |

### Discussion

EN 302 567 only defines the CCA check at the initiating device, which can be consider as a Cat 4 LBT type mechanism. There is no CAPC defined and CWS concept and CWS adjustment procedure. Do we need to introduce them in 3GPP spec.

Discussion point:

* Alt 1. Not introduce CAPC, CWS, and CWS adjustment for 60GHz band
  + Apple, vivo, FW, Qualcomm, Ericsson, Samsung, Fujitsu, NEC, Xiaomi, Nokia, DCM, Convida, Spreadtrum, OPPO, Charter
* Alt 2. Introduce CAPC, CWS and CWS adjustment mechanism for 60GHz band, with Rel.16 NR-U as baseline.
  + Intel, LGE, CATT, Lenovo, ZTE, Sony (but not the same as Rel.16), HW, ITRI

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Apple | Alt 1. Priority class is defined in EN 301 893 for 5/6GHz band, but not defined in EN 302 567 for 60GHz.  3GPP design follow regulation, no need to further complicate the design with CAPC, CWS and CWS adjustment. |
| vivo | Alt 1 is preferred. There is no evidence showing that the current CCA check scheme cannot meet the performance requirement, so further enhancement is not necessary. |
| Futurewei | Alt 1 |
| Qualcomm | We support Alt 1. |
| Ericsson | Alt 1 is preferred. In general, LBT in 60GHz may or may not bring gains for the 5th perc. users, but what all companies agree on from the SI is that it has a negative impact on the aggregated system performance. Therefore, there is no justification to increase the LBT overhead by further introducing CAPC and CW adjustment. Also, CWS adjustment and CAPC are not specified by the regulations in the HS EN 302 567. |
| Samsung | Our understanding is EN 302 567 still has the concept of CWS, just no adjustment of the CWS. EN 302 567 has a requirement on the minimum value of CWS, and that’s all the restriction.  With this clarification, we support Alt 1 for simplicity. CAPC and CWS adjustment can be up to implementation. |
| Intel | * We prefer Alt. 2, since this allows to better address different channel and traffic conditions that may impact the channel access procedure. Also, we would like to remark that even if the ETSI BRAN does not define something, it does not mean that this is precluded. The ETSI BRAN only provides minimum requirements but does not provide guidance of the design. |
| LG Electronics | * We support Alt 2. Because the purpose of CAPC and CWS adjustment are to prioritize high priority traffic and resolve the collision between the transmissions, the introduction of CAPC and CWS adjustment mechanism can be beneficial in highly congested scenario. Moreover, considering the fair coexistence with the incumbent system (e.g., WiGig) operating in the above 52.6GHz, it is necessary to consider the introduction of CAPC and CWS adjustment procedure. |
| Fujitsu | * Alt.1. Share the same view with Samsung that the concept of CWS should be kept, just no need to specify CAPC and CWS adjustment which can be up to implementation. |
| CATT | CAPC should be introduced.   * In Rel-16 NR-U, the MCOT and corresponding sensing window become longer as the level of the channel access priority class increases. For 960KHz SCS, there are 320 slots within 5ms MCOT. For small packet, the channel occupancy time may be much less than 320 slots e.g., 10 slots being sufficient for data transmission. The possibility of channel blocking and power consumption will increase when system always performs sensing based on MCOT equal to 5ms for 480 and 960 kHz SCS. Therefore, RAN 1 should further study introduction of CAPC for NR operation up to 71GHz. For introduction of CWS adjustment mechanism for 60GHz, whether it can bring the performance gains need be further studied. |
| NEC | We prefer Alt 1. |
| Xiaomi | Alt 1. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Support Alt 2. With typo fixed |
| Nokia, NSB | ETSI does not define the (maximum) size of the contention window, but to ensure fair co-existence between different nodes, 3GPP should decide on a common value.  We see no need for CWS adaptation, since according to the SI, LBT does not play a major role on 60 GHz anyway. This corresponds to the Cat 3 LBT as defined in TR 36.889.  CAPC may no need to be specified, provided that all the control signalling (including RRC etc.) can be transmitted as short control signals. Alternatively, we may consider defining a smaller fixed CWS for control transmissions. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | * We prefer Alt.2 because its introduction is beneficial in some highly congested scenarios and to friendly and fair coexistence with Wi-Fi due to at least CWs had been introduced in 802.11ad/ay. |
| DOCOMO | We support Alt 1. Just to follow the regulations, where we do not find anything related to CAPC, CWS and CWS adjustment, would be sufficient. |
| Sony | At first, as Samsung pointed out, the concept of CWS is required from the regulation perspective. Discussion should be whether CAPC and CWS adjustment mechanism is introduced or not.  We basically support Alt.2. But, in our view, the same CWS adjustment mechanism as Rel.16 NR-U is not necessary since collision probability in 60 GHz would be less than that in 5/6 GHz. |
| Convida Wireless | We prefer Alt 1. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Alt 2. We believe that different traffic types/priorities should be treated differently. Also, HARQ feedback should still be taken into account to optimize the LBT process and provide fairness among UEs. We do not see how else different traffic priorities are taken into consideration if we do not define different classes. Rel.16 NR-U can be used as baseline. |
| Spreadtrum | We prefer alt 1 for simplicity. |
| Charter | Alt 1 |
| ITRI | We support Alt2 |

### 2nd round discussion

Proposal 2.5.2-1: (To continue discussion next meeting. No agreement needed)

FFS between the following

* Alt 1. Not introduce CAPC, CWS, and CWS adjustment for 60GHz band
* Alt 2. Introduce CAPC, CWS and CWS adjustment mechanism for 60GHz band, with Rel.16 NR-U as baseline.

## CET and short control signalling

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Key Proposals/Observations/Positions** |
| OPPO | Proposal 7: No-LBT mode should be used only for transmission of ACK/NACK, SSB, and PRACH preamble.  Proposal 8: The transmission of SSB and PRACH shall be less than or equal to 10% within an observation period of 100ms. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Proposal 17：For operation in the 60 GHz band, in regions where LBT is mandated, support transmission of short control signalling without LBT, and with a duty cycle 10 % within an observation period of 100 ms.  - Short control signaling is defined as a short transmission burst that contains unicast control information without any user plane data |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Observation 2: EN 302 567, v2.2.0 allows for Short Control Signalling transmissions for up to 10% of time within an observation period of 100 ms.  Proposal 5: NR-U design for 60 GHz bands supports transmission of DL and UL control and management signals as short control signalling without LBT. Details are FFS. |
| Intel | Observation 3:  • 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.  Proposal 14: 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.  Observation 4: 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.  Proposal 15: Consider applying short control signal exemption to PRACH transmission by the UE. |
| Samsung | Proposal 6: For “short control signal”:  • any periodic transmission with high priority can be part of “short control signal”, including discovery burst, non-unicast information, PRACH, PDCCH, PUCCH, and RS.  • support limitation on the transmission duration and duty cycle to use “short control signal”, wherein the transmission duration and duty cycle are defined from the channel occupancy point of view. |
| Ericsson | Observation 6 SCS transmissions have a duty cycle requirement but no limitations on the number of SCS transmissions within the observation period  Proposal 3 Consistent with EN 302 567, 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:  1 SS/PBCH blocks  2 PRACH  3 FFS: Other control transmissions not multiplexed with user data (subject to gNB configuration) |
| Apple | Proposal 2: For DL, at least SSB should be considered as short control signaling. For UL, at least PRACH should be considered as short control signaling. Other signal can be further discussed or can be configured by network.  Proposal 3: Transmission of SSB/RACH within an acquired COT after LBT success is not counted into 10% limitation within 100ms observation period. |
| Qualcomm | Proposal 3: The short control signaling exemption should be considered for designing LBT procedures. |

### Discussion

Discussion point:

Contention Exempt Short Control Signaling rules apply to the transmission of (combination) of the following channel. Note restriction for short control signalling transmissions still apply (10% over 100ms)

DL:

* SS/PBCH
* PDCCH
* Broadcast PDSCH
* CSI-RS
* PRS

UL:

* PRACH
* PUCCH
* SRS

Support:

* Support at least SS/PBCH with others as FFS: vivo, LGE
* Support at least SS/PBCH and PRACH with others as FFS: Apple, FW, Ericsson, Intel, NEC, DCM, Sony (also broadcast PDSCH), CATT (also PDCCH, broadcast PDSCH, PUCCH), Spreadtrum, OPPO (also PUCCH carrying HARQ-ACK information),
* Support all under short control signalling restrictions: QC, Samsung, Nokia, Charter
* Support only C-RNTI based PDCCH only transmission: HW

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Apple | At least SSB/PBCH in DL, at least PRACH in UL. Other signalling can be further discussed. |
| vivo | Prefer to support SSB as short control signalling.  For other channel/signal, we think which channel/signal can be used as Contention Exempt Short Control Signaling should be carefully studied.  One concern from our side on the usage of Contention Exempt Short Control Signaling in general is that the impact of potential contention given no LBT is performed before such short control signalling transmission is not clear. |
| Futurewei | Support contention exempt Short Control Signalling for channels such SS/PBCH, PRACH at least. |
| Qualcomm | We support short control signaling contention exemption for all the channels listed and PRACH/Msg A. The listed channels should not be counted towards short control signaling budget if they are part of the COT. |
| Ericsson | Support at least for SS/PBCH blocks and PRACH. Other control transmissions not multiplexed with other signals (subject to gNB configuration) are FFS. |
| Samsung | We support the proposal with the following editorial change:  SSB~~/PBCH~~ |
| Intel | For UL, at least PRACH should be qualified as short control signalling since the transmission should never exceeds the 10% duty cycle.  As for DL, further discussions should be applied on how the short control signalling is applied, and specifically whether to qualify the SSB as control signalling: in fact based on SCS, the SSB exceeds the 10ms transmission duration within a 100 ms observation period for 120 KHz SCS for 64 SSB with 20 msec SSB periodicity.  We suggest to put FFS for other channels and signals (other than PRACH) for now. From the contributions, it seems there is limited discussions on which channels could benefit from this, and this topic likely requires further discussions. |
| LG Electronics | Support contention exempt Short Control Signalling can be considered for non-unicast transmission such as SS/PBCH. |
| CATT | For DL signal/channel, the short control signalling at lease includes  • SSB/PBCH,  • PDCCH  • Broadcast PDSCH  For UL signal/channel, the short control signalling includes  • PRACH  • PUCCH |
| NEC | We support contention exempt short control signalling for SSB and PRACH at least. |
| Xiaomi | From our view, Contention Exempt Short Control Signaling rules concerns about the time length of the transmitted channel, not about the exact content carried in the channel. So if Broadcast PDSCH is included, what about unicasted PDSCH? |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We don’t agree that contention exempt short control signalling should apply to SSB/PBCH and CSI-RS when there could be a burst of these transmissions on different beams. Not sure why PRS is included here as no positioning techniques are currently applied in NR-U.  For UL channel/signals, we should be rather conservative to apply short control signalling, considering the number of UEs |
| Nokia, NSB | We support the proposal. The list may not be fully complete though, and could include also any PDSCH and PUSCH transmissions without user plane data, such as dedicated RRC signalling, MAC CEs, UCI on PUSCH, etc. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | we would like to first confirm one issue that the time occupied by channel/signal itself (that is regarded as short control signalling), or, the time span for channel/signal (that is regarded as short control signalling) transmission is used as a metric to judge whether it meets the condition to be less than 10ms within 100ms observation window.  After the above issue is clarified, we will further discuss which channels/signals are suitable to be used as short control signalling. |
| DOCOMO | We support to consider at least PSS/SSS/PBCH in DL and PRACH in UL as Contention Exempt Short Control Signaling. We are open to discuss on the other signals/channels. |
| Sony | We support that SCS applies at least DRS (SSB and broadcast PDSCH) and PRACH. Other channels/signals should be further discussed. |
| Convida Wireless | We share the same view with Intel. For SSB, it may depend on SCS. Further discussions may be needed. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | * 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. * **Regarding SSB Exemption:** 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. * **Regarding RACH exemption**: 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. Moreover, UL signals including RACH are transmitted using a wider beam and, therefore, have a larger interference foot-print on the network.   We think that the only signal/channel that is qualified for Contention Exempt Short Control Signaling is unicast PDCCH (CRC scrambled by C-RNTI). |
| Spreadtrum | At least SSB and PRACH/Msg A should be included. |
| Charter | Support all under short control signalling restrictions. |

By regulation, short control signalling can be transmitted for no more than 10% of time within any 100ms observation window. Do we need to introduce mechanism to enforce that?

Discussion point:

Alt 1. Usage restriction on short control signalling is enforced by gNB implementation

* Apple, FW, Qualcomm, Ericsson, Samsung, Intel, LGE, NEC, Xiaomi, Nokia (at least DL), ZTE, Spreadtrum, OPPO, Charter

Alt 2. Introduce additional mechanism to explicitly restrict the short control signalling usage. FFS how.

* Vivo, ZTE, HW

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Apple | Alt 1 |
| vivo | Alt-2 is preferred. We should make sure the signalling fulfil the short control message requirement before transmission, |
| Futurewei | Alt 1 |
| Qualcomm | Alt 1: Left to gNB implementation. |
| Ericsson | Alt 1 is preferred. |
| Samsung | We support Alt 1 in principle, but we need clarification that whether the condition in regulation will be captured in TS 37.213. |
| Intel | Alt.1 is preferred, since this may be actually very time consuming for RAN1, given that each special case would need to be discussed separately.  Additionally, this might be naturally achieved by how RAN1 has defined the channels and signals. For example, PRACH in our understanding should never exceed this value no matter how the gNB configured PRACH. Similar for SSB with 960kHz, even if gNB sends all 64 SSB with 960kHz, this should not exceed the 10% duty cycle per 100msec rule. |
| LG Electronics | Alt 1 is preferred. |
| CATT | Alt 1.  Since the transmission of DL/UL short control signals are controlled by gNB, it could be achieved by gNB implementation to ensure no more than 10% of time within observation window |
| NEC | We support Alt 1. |
| Xiaomi | Alt 1. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | In our view, first we need to agree for what channels/signals, short control signalling can be applied. Based on that decision, we can further discuss if additional mechanisms are required or not. |
| Nokia, NSB | For the DL, the gNB is anyhow in full control of the transmissions, and can ensure that 10% limit is not exceeded (i.e. Alt 1 on DL).  For the UL, we can study ways of ensuring that the 10% limit is not exceeded, and that the SCS allowance is used for the most critical UL transmissions.  From the fairness point of view, 3GPP should discuss whether there should be some limitation on the total amount of SCS transmissions in a cell (by the gNB and all the UEs), although ETSI allows for each node in a cell to transmit SCS for up to 10% of the time. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are open to these two candidate options. |
| DOCOMO | We think this is up to what is defined as Contention Exempt Short Control Signaling. |
| Sony | If SCS will apply UL channel/signal transmission, explicit/implicit signalling may be needed. But, it should be discussed after the decision which channel/signals can be applied for SCS. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are not sure what “enforced by gNB implementation” actually means in practice. If it means it depends on gNB implementation, we are not in favour of it.  We support Alt 2. |
| Spreadtrum | We prefer Alt 1. |
| Charter | Alt 1. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility (2) | As we suggested we would like to discuss this at later point, but generally, if considered during this meeting, we support Alt. 2 |

### 2nd round discussion

Proposal 2.6.2-1 (majority view except HW):

* Contention Exempt Short Control Signaling rules can be applicable to the transmission of SS/PBCH.
  + FFS what are the other DL signals and channels that can be multiplexed with SS/PBCH transmission under Contention Exempt Short Control Signaling rule
  + FFS: whether this can be applied to all supported SCS or specific SCS.
  + Note restriction for short control signalling transmissions apply (10% over 100ms)
* FFS: Other DL signals/channels can be transmitted with Contention Exempt Short Control Signaling rule, such as PDCCH, broadcast PDSCH, PDSCH without user plain data, CSI-RS, PRS, etc

Additional comments:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine with the proposal |
| Intel | We are generally fine with the current proposal. However, instead of using the term “apply”, it may be better to use the term “can be applicable”. Also it would be good to consider as part of an FFS whether the proposal can be applied to all supported SCS or only some specific ones:   * Contention Exempt Short Control Signaling rules can be applicable ~~apply~~ to the transmission of SS/PBCH.   + FFS what are the other DL signals and channels that can be multiplexed with SS/PBCH transmission under Contention Exempt Short Control Signaling rule   + FFS: whether this can be applied to all supported SCS or specific SCS.   + Note restriction for short control signalling transmissions apply (10% over 100ms) |
| Fujitsu | Fine with the proposal |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Xiaomi | OK with the proposal, and also agree with Intel on “ whether the proposal can be applied to all supported SCS or only some specific ones ” |
| Ericsson | Agree with the proposal |
| LG Electronics | We are fine with the FL proposal. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Support the updated proposal from Intel considering not all SS/PBCH corresponding to SCS can meet exempt short control signalling rule. |
| Nokia, NSB | Agree with the proposal. |
| OPPO | We are fine with the proposal. |
| TCL | We are fine with the FL proposal. |
| Apple | We support the proposal. |
| Convida Wireless | We are ok with the proposal. |
| CATT | Fine with the proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We cannot agree with the proposal.  We believe that 3GPP should interpret short “management and control Frames” terminology used in 302 567 and decide which signals/channels can actually be exempted and under what conditions. As discussed in the first round of comments, 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 interpreted so that it satisfies the above short duration (10% channel occupancy). In fact, any periodic UL/DL signal/channel can be configured with a periodicity that satisfies 10% maximum channel occupancy. This includes, for instance, CSI-RS, SRS (by configuring the periodicity of more than 10 slots), and Configured grant (by configuring any periodicity larger than sym10x14). If the 10% occupancy is the only criterion, we can even go one step further and agree that, in every 100 ms, the first 10 ms of any DL/UL physical channel is LBT-exempted. Further, assume that PDSCH n is targeting UE n in slot n for n=0,…9. Then, all of the PDSCHs can be exempted since each of them only occupies 1 slot of 10 consecutive slots (although these PDSCHs completely occupy all time resources over the whole 10 slots)… We are discussing above examples to bring to the attention of our colleagues from other companies that relying only on the 10% rule can be easily misused; rendering the whole LBT to nothing but a paper agreement that is never used as virtually everything can be designed/interpreted so that it is exempted.  So, in our view, we need to discuss which signal/channel that satisfies the 10% occupancy rule should be exempted and not automatically exempt a channel/signal just because they can have less than 10% channel occupancy. In our view, among all the candidate channels/signals that can be considered for LBT exemption, SSB would be be in fact the last candidate: SSB burst is intentionally designed to have the highest coverage which means the highest interference for a co-existing network. As such, if SSB is exempted from LBT, we do not see any use for LBT for any other signal/channel altogether! However, if LBT has been mandated in some regions, there was a need behind it.  Finally, 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. Even if higher SSB SCSs are agreed, there is no reason that they are transmitted with default periodicity. The minimum periodicity of SSB is 5 ms. |
| Samsung | We are fine with the proposal. The FFS from Intel is not needed, since for any SCS, there could be scenarios the restriction can be satisfied, depending on the number of SSB transmitted and the periodicity used by the network, so there is no need to mention which SCS is applicable. |
| NEC | We are fine with the proposal. |
| DOCOMO | We support the proposal. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine with the updated proposal |
| Sony | We are fine with the proposal. |

Proposal 2.6.2-2: (majority view except HW, vivo, LGE):

* Contention Exempt Short Control Signaling rules apply to the transmission of msg1 and msg3 for the 4 step RACH and MsgA for the 2-step RACH for all supported SCS.
  + Note restriction for short control signalling transmissions apply (10% over 100ms)
  + FFS: If the 10% over 100ms restriction is applicable to all available msg1/msg3/msgA resources configured in a cell, or msg1/msg3/msgA transmission from one UE perspective
* FFS: Other UL signals/channels can be transmitted with Contention Exempt Short Control Signaling rule, such as SRS, PUCCH, PUSCH without user plain data, etc

Additional comments:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine with the proposal |
| Intel | We are generally OK with the proposal. However the proposal could be improved a bit as follows  And can include that this is appliable for all supported SCS:   * Contention Exempt Short Control Signaling rules apply to the transmission of msg1 and msg3 for the 4 step RACH and MsgA for the 2-step RACH ~~PRACH/MsgA~~. for all supported SCS   + Note restriction for short control signalling transmissions apply (10% over 100ms) * FFS: Other signals/channels can be transmitted with Contention Exempt Short Control Signaling rule, such as PDCCH, broadcast PDSCH, CSI-RS, PRS, SRS, PUCCH, etc |
| Fujitsu | We have one question regarding the definition of the restriction (10% over 100ms), i.e., whether the restriction is defined in terms of PRACH/MsgA resource configuration or actual PRACH/MsgA transmission? If it is not clear for now, we suggest putting it as an FFS point. |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Xiaomi | Fine with the proposal. |
| Ericsson | Agree with the proposal |
| LG Electronics | We think that whether the Contention Exempt Short Control Signaling rules apply to other signals/channels or not is needed to be discussed further. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Support the updated proposal from Intel, seems it is more clear. |
| Nokia, NSB | Agree with the proposal. Related to the FFS point, we could also add PDSCH and PUSCH without user plan data to the list. |
| OPPO | We have concerns on applying Contention Exempt Short Control Signaling rules to the transmission of MsgA. |
| Apple | We support the proposal. |
| Convida Wireless | We are ok with the proposal. |
| CATT | Fine with the proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We have serious concerns about this proposal:   * If all UEs are allowed to transmit msg1/msg3/msgA without LBT, in fact the total RACH transmission time can be far more than the requirement of maximum 10 ms per every 100 ms. We understand that the FFS (“FFS: If the 10% over 100ms restriction is applicable to all available msg1/msg3/msgA resources configured in a cell, or msg1/msg3/msgA transmission from one UE perspective”) to discuss this issue, but we cannot agree with the exemption unconditionally and then discuss whether or not the 10% rule applies to the total msg1/msg3/msgA transmissions of all UEs or the msg1/msg3/msgA transmission of each individual UE. For us, if a signal/channel is exempted, it is necessary that its total occupancy time is less than 10% (in UL, total transmission time over all UEs should be less than 10%). The rationale behind this is explained in more details in our views in Contention Exempt Short Control Signalling for SSB. * As we discussed above, in our view, total transmission time over all UEs should be less than 10% to exempt a signal/channel. This gives rise to another problem specific to PRACH: PRACH is (also) used during initial access. If gNB monitors, for instance, received msgAs from UEs during the last 100 ms and measures around 10ms overall msgA occupancy, how gNB can dynamically revoke the LBT exemption for msgA for a next time interval to enforce the 10% occupancy time? * In general, we think we may need to be more cautious when discussing the exemption of UL signals: UL signals including RACH are transmitted using a wider beam and, therefore, have a larger interference foot-print on the network. * In our view, combining msg1/msg3/msgA in this proposal just adds to the complication of the discussion. Does the proposal mean that A) each of the msg1, msg3, and msgA transmission time should be less than 10%, or B) the total combined transmission time of msg1/msg3/msgA should be less than 10%? |
| Samsung | Fine with the proposal. |
| DOCOMO | We support the proposal. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine with the updated proposal |
| Sony | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Futurewei | We are OK with the proposal. We should further discuss how the restrictions are monitored and implemented. |

### 3rd round discussion

Proposal 2.6.3-1 (majority view except HW):

* Contention Exempt Short Control Signaling rules can be applicable to the transmission of SS/PBCH.
  + FFS what are the other DL signals and channels that can be multiplexed with SS/PBCH transmission under Contention Exempt Short Control Signaling rule
  + FFS: whether this can be applied to all supported SCS or specific SCS.
  + Note restriction for short control signalling transmissions apply (10% over 100ms)
* FFS: Other DL signals/channels can be transmitted with Contention Exempt Short Control Signaling rule, such as PDCCH, broadcast PDSCH, PDSCH without user plain data, CSI-RS, PRS, etc

Additional comments (please only comment if you have issue with the proposal):

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We provided our compromise in the last GTW session which was not agreeable by some of our colleagues from other companies. We do not see this as an urgent matter and we can further discuss it in the next meeting. |
| CATT | We are OK with the proposal. |
| Xiaomi | OK with the proposal |
| Nokia, NSB | We support the proposal. Moreover, and in our view also the signals listed in the FFS point are eligible for SCS transmission. The network just needs to ensure that 10% limit is not exceeded. |
| Intel | We are Ok with the proposal. ETSI BRAN does not pose any limitations on the type of signals that can be used for this exemption, but poses only constraints on the overall duration of the transmission under a specific observation period. Given the importance of initial access transmissions, it would be definitely beneficial for our design to prioritize SS/PBCH transmissions and take advantage of this exemption, if the duration of those transmissions do not exceed the 10% duty cycle. |
| Samsung | We are ok with the proposal. For the FFS on SCS, we share similar view with Nokia that for every SCS, there can be scenarios satisfying the 10% restriction, depending on the periodicity and number of SSBs transmitted, so not sure why it’s essentially needed (the value of SCS doesn’t matter, but 10% matters), but we are ok to keep it there although we don’t know what aspect is FFS. |

Proposal 2.6.3-2: (majority view except HW, vivo, LGE):

* Contention Exempt Short Control Signaling rules apply to the transmission of msg1 or msg3 for the 4 step RACH and MsgA for the 2-step RACH for all supported SCS.
  + Note restriction for short control signalling transmissions apply (10% over 100ms)
  + FFS: If the 10% over 100ms restriction is applicable to all available msg1/msg3/msgA resources configured in a cell, or msg1/msg3/msgA transmission from one UE perspective
* FFS: Other UL signals/channels can be transmitted with Contention Exempt Short Control Signaling rule, such as SRS, PUCCH, PUSCH without user plain data, etc

Additional comments (please only comment if you have issue with the proposal):

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We cannot provide a compromise on RACH exemption. As we discussed in our earlier comments, supporting exemption in UL is very problematic and unmanageable due to the transmission from multiple UEs. This is even more problematic in the case of PRACH since it is also primarily for initial access where it is not a trivial task for gNB to suspend the exemption right when the 10% channel occupancy is reached. For further details, please see our input in the second round of discussions. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | For first bullet, it seems to need to be further clarify on the wording “Contention ....apply to the transmission of msg1 **and** msg3 for the 4 step RACH...”, we think such description on using “and” in between Msg 1 and Msg3 may give us a wrong impression, for example, the total time of Msg1 transmission and Msg 3 transmission should satisfy restriction for Contention Exempt Short Control Signalling, while not Msg1 or Msg3.  Therefore, in order to avoid ambiguity, first bullet should be updated as follows:   * Contention Exempt Short Control Signaling rules apply to the transmission of msg1 or msg3 for the 4 step RACH and MsgA for the 2-step RACH for all supported SCS.   + Note restriction for short control signalling transmissions apply (10% over 100ms)   + FFS: If the 10% over 100ms restriction is applicable to all available msg1/msg3/msgA resources configured in a cell, or msg1/msg3/msgA transmission from one UE perspective * FFS: Other UL signals/channels can be transmitted with Contention Exempt Short Control Signaling rule, such as SRS, PUCCH, PUSCH without user plain data, etc |
| OPPO | We have concerns on this proposal. We don’t think the transmission of msg3/msgA in 4-step/2-step RACH procedure can use the short control signaling rules since msg3/msgA may contain user-plane data in some cases. Actually, we are a little doubt about whether or not the msg1 can use the short control signaling rules. In our understanding, the short control signaling shall follow the examples in the regulation of EN 302 567 quoted below:  *b) Apart from transmission of the frames for short control signalling (such as, for example, ACK/NACK signals, beacon frames, other time synchronization frames and frames for beamforming) no frame shall be initiated.* |
| Nokia, NSB | We support the proposal. For UL, all control signalling including RACH is eligible to be transmitted as SCS, as long as the 10% limit is not exceeded. As for the management of transmission, the gNB is in any case in control of assigning resources for RACH transmissions, and can control that the 10% limit is not exceeded. |
| Intel | We support the proposal. Similarly, as what we mentioned above ETSI BRAN does not pose any limitations on the type of signals that can be used for this exemption, but poses only constraints on the overall duration of the transmission under a specific observation period. Given the importance of initial access transmissions, it would be definitely beneficial for our design to prioritize PRACH transmissions and take advantage of this exemption, given that at least for mg1+msg3 and mgA for the 4-step and 2-step RACH, respectively, their duration never exceeds the 10% duty cycle. |
|  |  |

## Cat 2 LBT

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Key Proposals/Observations/Positions** |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Proposal 11: For NR operation in unlicensed bands between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz with LBT based channel access mechanism, COT sharing between the initiating device and responding device should be supported with at least Cat 2 LBT:  - If the responding device is capable of beam correspondence and it is expected to use only any of the Rx beam(s) as Tx beam(s) for its transmission that have been used to receive at least one of the transmissions from the initiating device within the same COT  - If the responding device determines at least one suitable beam on which it is allowed to transmit within the same COT, where the suitable beam can be determined as follows:  o |
| OPPO | Proposal 1: The LBT mechanism in EN 302 567 can be defined as Type 1 channel access to initiate a COT for unlicensed band in high frequency range.  Proposal 2: Introduce Type 2 channel access for shared COT operation for unlicensed band in high frequency range. |
| LG Electronics | Proposal #5: For COT sharing, the Type 2 (e.g., 2A/2B/2C) channel access procedure can be introduced and the maximum gap between the transmissions within the COT can be defined for above 52.6 GHz. |
| Samsung | Proposal 3: Support the following types of channel access procedures for 60 GHz unlicensed band:  • Type 1 channel access procedure without CWS adaptation;  • Type 2 channel access procedure with zero and positive fixed sensing duration.  Proposal 7:  • Support channel access mechanism with directional channel sensing.  • Support directional channel sensing in multi-beam operation:  o For multi-beam SDM scenario, both Alt 2 and Alt 3 can be supported.  SDM scenario is only applicable to gNB.  o For multi-beam TDM scenario, select between Alt 2 and Alt 3 depending on whether sensing is required for switching beams within a COT.  If sensing is supported within a COT, Type 2 channel access procedure with fixed sensing duration is sufficient.  TDM scenario can be applicable to both gNB and UE. |
| CAICT | Proposal 6: Cat 2 LBT could be used to share the COT.  Proposal 7: Cat 2 LBT could also be used for short control signaling.  Proposal 9: Multiple LBT beams covering multiple directions could be used for Cat2 LBT. |
| PANASONIC | Proposal 2: Within gNB initiated COT, if gap between DL transmission and scheduled UL transmission along a given beam direction is larger than a predefined duration, UE should perform LBT before UL transmission; otherwise, no LBT is needed. |
| AT&T | Proposal 1: Directional LBT is defined as a complete beam sweep with Cat. 4 LBT followed by Cat. 2 LBT before actually transmitting on any spatial direction deemed idle during the complete beam sweep  Proposal 2: The relationship between sensing and transmitting beams should be specified.  • ED threshold adaptation mechanisms can be considered |
| Ericsson | Proposal 10 Do not support Cat 2 LBT for shared COT |
| Qualcomm | Proposal 6: Consider specifying Type 2 LBT sensing structure similar to an observation slot in the baseline LBT procedure.  Proposal 7: Consider specifying optional/configurable use of Type 2 LBT in channel access procedure. |

### Discussion

Cat 2 LBT is not defined in ETSI regulation. There are proposals to introduce it in 3GPP spec for several use cases.

Discussion point:

Shall we define Cat 2 LBT procedure.

* Alt 1: Do not introduce Cat 2 LBT for 60GHz band
  + Apple, Ericsson, Xiaomi, Nokia, Charter
* Alt 2: Design Cat 2 LBT as part of baseline LBT procedures. Use of Cat 2 LBT, where applicable, will not be optional for channel access.
  + Vivo (for multi-beam COT), FW, Samsung, Lenovo, ZTE (multi-beam), Sony, HW, Spreadtrum, OPPO
* Alt 3: Design sensing for Cat 2 LBT observation slot requirements and include Cat 2 LBT optional procedure for LBT. Signalling will be designed to enable/disable or configure the parameters for use of Cat 2 LBT.
  + QC, Samsung, Intel, LGE, CATT, NEC, DCM, Sony, Convida, HW, Spreadtrum

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Apple | Alt 1 |
| vivo | Cat.2 LBT can be designed, but only applicable to multi-beam LBT when beam switching happens, or possibly, for multi-channel LBT. No signalling is needed since it is part of the multi-beam LBT procedure. |
| Futurewei | We prefer a single shot LBT to be defined and replace all the Cat 2 LBT types. |
| Qualcomm | Alt 3. Designing sensing aspects of Cat 2 could be straightforward as it is closely related to the corresponding task of designing observation slot and deferral period in Cat 4 LBT. |
| Ericsson | Alt 1 is preferred.  CAT2 LBT is not defined in the EN 302 567. In the HS EN 302 567, all transmissions within the COT (responding or initiating device) can be transmitted without any LBT. As long as there is no evidence that there is an issue to resolve, we do not accept complicating the procedure. |
| Samsung | We support Cat2 LBT, but need to clarify what is “optional procedure for LBT” to further down-select between Alt 2 and Alt 3. |
| Intel | Alt.3 – Cat-2 LBT can be designed, and it would be left up to the gNB on the specifics of when to use it. |
| LG Electronics | We support the Alt 3. If the directional LBT can be used to initiate channel occupancy together with omni-directional LBT for initiating a channel occupancy, it is necessary to indicate both the direction of LBT (e.g., omni-directional LBT or directional LBT) and the type of LBT (e.g., Type 1 or Type 2A/2B/2C channel access procedure in NR-U) when scheduling a UL transmission to a UE. |
| CATT | Alt 3 |
| NEC | We support Cat2 LBT. Regarding to Alt 2 and Alt 3, we prefer Alt 3, and we are open to discuss the details optional procedure for LBT. |
| Xiaomi | Alt 1 |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support Cat 2 LBT as part of baseline LBT procedure and it can be  FFS: What conditions/rules are specified to apply Cat 2 LBT |
| Nokia, NSB | Alt 1: since ETSI does not acknowledge Cat 2 LBT for 60 GHz, we see no reason to introduce it.. The benefits of defining optional LBT capabilities are unclear and should be further clarified. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Support Cat2 LBT to apply it in the case of the transmissions with multiple beams in spatial/time domain multiplexing(SDM/TDM). |
| DOCOMO | We support Alt 3. There are some regulations that requires just a sensing before transmission (e.g., Japan). Enabling sensing with fixed duration (e.g., Cat 2) should be considered in such scenario. On the other hand, there are also some regulations that does not require Cat 2 like sensing in LBT. Therefore, enabling/disabling based on signalling should be considered. |
| Sony | Alt 2 or 3. Performing Cat.2 LBT in the shared COT would be beneficial for the detection of hidden node. Whether Cat.2 LBT is optional or not should be further discussed. |
| Convida Wireless | We prefer Alt 3. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | CAT 2 LBT should be supported as a part of at least Rx-Assistance. Depending on the outcome of LBT mode at the beginning of the COT for multi-beam or multi-channel operations, it may also be required for these operations.  So, we do not support Alt 1. However, Alt 2 and Alt 3 seem to have some overlaps. We believe that “Use of Cat 2 LBT, where applicable, will not be optional for channel access” (Alt 2) and we should “Design sensing for Cat 2 LBT observation slot requirements” (Alt 3). |
| Spreadtrum | Alt 2 and Alt 3 are OK to us. |
| OPPO | Alt 2 is OK for us. |
| Charter | Alt 1. |

Discussion point:

If Cat 2 LBT is introduced, it can be used in multiple places:

* A: Resume transmission after a large gap: Cat 2 LBT is used to resume transmission by the initiating device within the COT after a large gap
  + FW, QC, Samsung, Intel, LGE, CATT, Lenovo, ZTE, DCM, Sony, Spreadtrum, InterDigital, ITRI, Oppo, NEC
* B: COT sharing: Cat 2 LBT is designed to be (optionally) used before transmission by a responding node sharing a COT
  + FW, QC, Intel, LGE, CATT, Lenovo (not optional), ZTE, DCM, Sony, HW, InterDigital, ITRI, Oppo, NEC
* C: Multi-Beam LBT: Cat 2 LBT is designed to be optionally used before beam switching in a COT
  + QC, Samsung, Intel, LGE, CATT, Lenovo (not optional), ZTE, DCM, Sony, HW, Spreadtrum, vivo (not optional) , InterDigital, Oppo, NEC
* D: Rx-Assistance: Cat 2 LBT is designed to be optionally used for sensing to be done at the receiver for Rx-Assistance measurements and associated signalling
  + QC, Samsung, Intel, LGE, CATT, DCM, Sony, HW, Spreadtrum, InterDigital, ITRI, Oppo, NEC

For companies supporting introducing Cat 2 LBT, please list your view on which use cases (A/B/C/D) Cat 2 LBT can be used for. Please add other use cases if not listed above.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Futurewei | Under the condition that we have a new single Cat 2 LBT (one shot) we support it for A and B. For options C it is not clear what multi-beam LBT means. This needs to be defined. For instance, can be a single LBT beam that covers multi-beam directions or multi LBTs one per each beam, etc. For option D, RX-Assistance, it is not yet defined therefore, it is hard to decide on the Cat 2 LBT necessity. |
| Qualcomm | We consider Cat 2 LBT as a useful tool for quick assessment of interference levels. A, B can be thought of as extension of Rel 16 design. Use case of C, sensing before transmit beam switching is a generalization of A, as interference in the direction of the new beam appears after a gap since the last sensing and a one-shot LBT may provide updated interference conditions.  We consider D – namely LBT sensing done on Rx-side as one of the most useful applications of Cat 2 LBT. It may provide a quicker coarse assessment of interference. |
| Samsung | Support A, C, and D  Need clarification on “optionally used” for B. |
| Intel | Support for A, B, C and D. A and B could be seen as an extension of NR-U design. For C, this could be used as a sensing mechanism when a device switches the transmission over a new beam. As for D, this could be used in the context of the receiver-assisted LBT by the receiver to better assess the level of interference, and occupancy of the channel. |
| LG Electronics | The same principle of NR-U can be applied to the COT sharing between the gNB and UE in the COT acquired by the directional LBT. Moreover, a gNB can transmit the multiple beams in a TDM manner, resulting in transmissions gaps on a beam, within a COT after sensing the channel in the corresponding directions at the beginning of the COT. Therefore, the maximum gap between the transmissions in the COT should be defined and the Type 2 (e.g., Type 2A/2B/2C) channel access procedure can be performed before starting the transmission to avoid the collisions. The definition of Type 2 (e.g., 2A/2B/2C) channel access procedure in Rel-16 NR-U can be reused with possible modifications to the parameters such as the gap duration for each type of LBT. Therefore, all of use cases (A/B/C/D) can be considered to support introducing Cat-2 LBT. |
| CATT | A, B, C, D |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We agree with A. For B and C, we suggest removing “optionally”. Depending upon duration of gap between the transmissions within COT, Cat 2 LBT should be required   * B: COT sharing: Cat 2 LBT is designed to be ~~optionally~~ used before transmission by a responding node sharing a COT * C: Multi-Beam LBT: Cat 2 LBT is designed to be ~~optionally~~ used before beam switching in a COT   Other alternative wording could be to replace “optionally used” with “configured to be used”. FFS: Configuration details.  Further clarification is needed for option D on how Cat 2 LBT is related to sensing and performing measurements at the receiver. |
| Nokia, NSB | as mentioned above, we see no need for Cat 2 LBT. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Support A,B,C. for D, it is not clear when Cat2 LBT is used for receiver, whether it means Cat4 LBT has been used for transmitter. |
| DOCOMO | At least C and D should be considered. A and B can also be considered further. |
| Sony | A, B, C, and D. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | CAT 2 should be supported for Rx-Assistance (Option D), Depending on the outcome of LBT mode at the beginning of the COT for multi-beam or multi-channel operations, it may also be required for these operations (Option B, C). |
| Spreadtrum | At least A, C and D |
| vivo | Cat.2 LBT can be designed, but only applicable to multi-beam LBT when beam switching happens, or possibly, for multi-channel LBT.  Our main motivation of Cat 2 LBT is C with the following rewording. We feel a bit strange to agree on scenarios with all these “optionally” mentioned at this early stage before we decide the LBT functionality.   * C: Multi-Beam LBT: Cat 2 LBT is designed to be ~~optionally~~ used before beam switching in a COT |
| InterDigital | A, B, C, D |
| ITRI | * We support A, B and D. C is supported for One LBT beam covers all transmission beams |
| OPPO | A, B, C, D |
| NEC | We support A, B, C and D. |

### 2nd round discussion

Proposal 2.7.2-1: (Capture options. Seems to be stable)

For Cat 2 LBT, down-select from the following alternatives

* Alt 1: Do not introduce Cat 2 LBT for 60GHz unlicensed band operation
* Alt 2: Introduce Cat 2 LBT for 60GHz unlicensed band operation

Additional comments:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support Alt 2 |
| Intel | We prefer Alt.2, since we believe that in some scenarios and deployments, this would bring system performance enhancements. However, the specifics on use of Cat-2 should be left up to gNB. |
| vivo | We are okay to further down select Alt 1 and Alt 2. |
| Spreadtrum | We prefer Alt 2. |
| Xiaomi | Alt 2  Form our understanding, it is a little related to section 2.4 COT sharing. If Alt 3 is supported, Cat 2 LBT should be introduced. |
| Ericsson | Alt 1 is preferred.  CAT2 LBT is not defined in the EN 302 567. In the HS EN 302 567, all transmissions within the COT (responding or initiating device) can be transmitted without any LBT. As long as there is no evidence that there is an issue to resolve, we do not accept complicating the procedure. |
| LG Electronics | We support Alt 2. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Support Alt 2. |
| Nokia, NSB | It would be more logical to look at the use cases first and only then decide is Cat 2 LBT is needed. |
| OPPO | We support Alt 2. |
| TCL | We support introduction of Cat 2 LBT for 60 GHz scenarios, hence we support Alt-2. |
| Apple | Alt 1 is preferred. EN 302 567 did not introduce CAT 2 LBT. |
| Convida Wireless | We prefer Alt 2. |
| CATT | Alt 2 |
| Huawei, HiSilico | We support Alt. 2. CAT2 LBT at the receiver can provide receiver-assistance to the transmitter and let the transmitter know whether or not the actual experienced interference level at the receiver warrants a signal transmission. This can be used along with CAT4 LBT at the transmitter. At the UE side, CAT2 LBT can be done in the direction of PDSCH reception as, e.g., indicated by PDCCH:    Depending on the outcome of the LBT discussion for COT sharing at the beginning of the COT, CAT 2 may also need to be supported for other purposes. |
| Samsung | We support Alt 2. |
| NEC | We support Alt 2. |
| DOCOMO | We support Alt 2. There is another regulation which mandates only “sensing”, e.g., the one in Japan. In such scenario, cat 2-like LBT would be beneficial. |
| Sony | We support Alt 2. |
| Futurewei | We support Alt 2. |

Proposal 2.7.2-2 (captures use cases. Seems to be stable)

If Cat 2 LBT is introduced, the following use cases can be considered:

* Resume transmission after a gap Y: Cat 2 LBT may be used to resume transmission by the initiating device within the COT after a gap Y (FFS the value of Y)
* COT sharing: Cat 2 LBT may be used before transmission by a responding node sharing a COT
* Multi-Beam LBT: Cat 2 LBT may be used before switching to a new beam in a COT with TDM beams, or resume a previously used beam after a gap Z (FFS the value of Z)
* Rx-Assistance: Cat 2 LBT may be used for sensing at the receiver for Rx-Assistance measurements and associated signalling when Cat 4 LBT is used for initiating device

Other use cases not precluded.

FFS if Cat 2 LBT is mandated for each use case or not.

Additional comments:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We suggest following updates to the proposal:   * Resume transmission after a ~~large~~ gap Y: Cat 2 LBT is used to resume transmission by the initiating device within the COT after a ~~large~~ gap Y (FFS: value of Y) * Multi-Beam LBT: Cat 2 LBT is designed to be used before beam switching in a COT if the gap between the end of last transmission on same beam and beginning of new transmission on same beam is larger than gap Y (FFS: value of Y)   In our view, this gap Y is related to Alt. 3 of section 2.4.2 |
| Intel | We support the proposal, since we believe all the listed uses cases would be equally important when Cat-2 LBT is used. |
| vivo | We are okay to list use case for Cat 2 LBT.  Wording suggestion given FFS on whether mandated or not for each use case.  If Cat 2 LBT is introduced, the following use cases can be considered:   * Resume transmission after a large gap: Cat 2 LBT may be ~~is~~ used to resume transmission by the initiating device within the COT after a large gap * COT sharing: Cat 2 LBT may be ~~is~~ ~~designed to be~~ used before transmission by a responding node sharing a COT * Multi-Beam LBT: Cat 2 LBT may be ~~is~~ ~~designed to be~~ used before beam switching in a COT * Rx-Assistance: Cat 2 LBT may be ~~is~~ ~~designed to be optionally~~ used for sensing to be done at the receiver for Rx-Assistance measurements and associated signalling   Other use cases not precluded.  FFS if Cat 2 LBT is mandated for each use case or not. |
| Spreadtrum | We support the updated proposal from Lenovo. |
| Xiaomi | Agree with the proposal. |
| LG Electronics | We are fine with the proposal but it should be clarified that regardless of performing Cat-2 LBT the transmission of beams that have directions different from the sensing beam shall not be allowed COT sharing. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We think it is necessary to further clarify the last bullet, that is, when Cat2 LBT is used for receiver, whether it means Cat4 LBT has been used for transmitter. Based on this, we suggest modification the last bullet as (Notes: revision based on vivo’s update ):   * Rx-Assistance: Cat 2 LBT may be ~~is~~ ~~designed to be optionally~~ used for sensing to be done at the receiver for Rx-Assistance measurements and associated signalling when Cat4 LBT is used for initiating device. |
| OPPO | Agree with the proposal. |
| CATT | A, B, C, D |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We believe that CAT2 LBT at the receiver can be done without CAT4 LBT at the transmitter as a receiver assistance mechanism when LBT is not mandated. When LBT is mandated, of course, CAT 4 LBT should be involved. As such, we propose the following modification:  If Cat 2 LBT is introduced, the following use cases can be considered:   * Resume transmission after a gap Y: Cat 2 LBT may be used to resume transmission by the initiating device within the COT after a gap Y (FFS the value of Y) * COT sharing: Cat 2 LBT may be used before transmission by a responding node sharing a COT * Multi-Beam LBT: Cat 2 LBT may be used before switching to a new beam in a COT with TDM beams * Rx-Assistance: Cat 2 LBT may be used for sensing at the receiver for Rx-Assistance measurements and associated signalling   + In regions where LBT is mandated, a CAT4 LBT should be performed at the beginning of the COT. |
| Samsung | OK with the proposal. |
| NEC | We support the proposal. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | For the bullet on multi-beam, we suggest to also add when the Cat 2 LBT may be used (as mentioned in our previous comment).  Moderator: The multi-beam use case is talking about beam switching, but your comment is about the gap between transmissions with the same beam. Can you clarify? |
| Sony | Support the proposal. |
| Futurewei | Support the proposal. |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility(2) | Currently, we support repetition/transmission cases where beam hopping is applied. For example, two TCI states (beams) can be indicated to perform 4 transmissions/repetitions, where first transmission/repetition is on beam 1, second transmission/repetition is on beam2, then third transmission/repetition is again on beam 1 and followed by forth transmission/repetition on beam2. So in this example, if the gap between first and third transmissions (or second and fourth) is larger than Y, then Cot 2 LBT would be needed.  I hope this clarifies |

### 3rd round discussion

Proposal 2.7.3-1: (Capture options. Seems to be stable)

For Cat 2 LBT, down-select from the following alternatives

* Alt 1: Do not introduce Cat 2 LBT for 60GHz unlicensed band operation
* Alt 2: Introduce Cat 2 LBT for 60GHz unlicensed band operation

Additional comments (please only comment if you have issue with the proposal):

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| CATT | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Xiaomi | OK with the proposal |
| Intel | We are Ok with the proposal. |

Proposal 2.7.3-2 (captures use cases. Seems to be stable)

If Cat 2 LBT is introduced, the following use cases can be further studied:

* Resume transmission after a gap Y: Cat 2 LBT may be used to resume transmission by the initiating device within the COT after a gap Y (FFS the value of Y)
* COT sharing: Cat 2 LBT may be used before transmission by a responding node sharing a COT
* Multi-Beam LBT: Cat 2 LBT may be used before switching to a new transmission beam (not used in earlier part of the COT) in a COT with TDM beams, or resume a previously used transmission beam after a gap Z (FFS the value of Z)
* Rx-Assistance: Cat 2 LBT may be used for sensing at the receiver as a responding device for Rx-Assistance measurements and associated signalling ~~when Cat 4 LBT is used for initiating device~~

Other use cases not precluded.

FFS if Cat 2 LBT is mandated for each use case or not.

Additional comments (please only comment if you have issue with the proposal):

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | As we discussed in our earlier input, we believe that CAT2 LBT at the receiver can be done without CAT4 LBT at the transmitter as a receiver assistance mechanism when LBT is not mandated. When LBT is mandated, of course, CAT 4 LBT should be involved. As such, we propose the following modification:  Proposal 2.7.3-2 (Modified)  If Cat 2 LBT is introduced, the following use cases can be considered:   * Resume transmission after a gap Y: Cat 2 LBT may be used to resume transmission by the initiating device within the COT after a gap Y (FFS the value of Y) * COT sharing: Cat 2 LBT may be used before transmission by a responding node sharing a COT * Multi-Beam LBT: Cat 2 LBT may be used before switching to a new beam in a COT with TDM beams, or resume a previously used beam after a gap Z (FFS the value of Z) * Rx-Assistance: Cat 2 LBT may be used for sensing at the receiver for Rx-Assistance measurements and associated signalling   + For regions where LBT is mandated, a CAT4 LBT should be performed at the beginning of the COT.   Other use cases not precluded.  FFS if Cat 2 LBT is mandated for each use case or not.  Moderator: Added clarification the Cat 2 LBT is for receiver as responding device. The sub-bullet may not be necessary consider it is obvious. |
| LG Electronics | For the third bullet (Multi-beam LBT), the meaning of “a new beam” needs to be clarified. It is considered that only beams covered by the LBT beam performed in the beginning of COT in order to acquire the COT can be TDMed within the COT. Therefore, it is necessary to add additional descriptions or conditions for the new beam. |
| Futurewei | We do not support this Proposal in the format. We prefer either to remove the fourth bullet or to be under FFS. We think that RX-Assistance deserves separate discussions, until it is clarified.   * Rx-Assistance: FFS Where Cat 2 LBT may be used for sensing at the receiver as a responding device for Rx-Assistance measurements and associated signalling ~~when Cat 4 LBT is used for initiating device~~   Moderator: In my understanding, this proposal is providing a further study list. We are not committed or limited to these use cases. Changed “considered” to “further studied” in main bullet. |

## Directional LBT

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Key Proposals/Observations/Positions** |
| FUTUREWEI | Proposal 1: The 60 GHz unlicensed channel access shall support directional channel sensing that covers the next transmission directions.  Proposal 2: The value of Pout in the CCA Check threshold before initiating a COT should correspond to the maximum EIRP of the transmissions during that COT.  Proposal 3: NR should support solutions to address the asymmetry between the beam (antennas TIS) used for CCA sensing and the beams (EIRP) used for transmissions. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Proposal 3: For NR operation in unlicensed bands between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz with LBT based channel access mechanism, beam based (directional) LBT operation should be supported  Proposal 4: For NR unlicensed bands between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz, with directional LBT based channel access mechanism, configuration and/or indication of multiple LBT beams to UE should be supported for beam-based UL transmission  Proposal 5: For NR unlicensed bands between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz, with directional LBT based channel access mechanism, explicit mapping between LBT beam(s) and UL transmit beam should be supported, where the LBT beams may or may not be same as the transmit beam  Proposal 6: For NR unlicensed bands between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz, with directional LBT based channel access mechanism, for UL transmissions on CG resources, time-based autonomous switching of UL Tx beam should be supported, where the switching can be based on a timer within which the UE is expected to receiver HARQ-ACK feedback |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Proposal 7: If directional LBT is supported, similar principle to determine LBT beam in LTE-LAA and below 7GHz NR-U can be reused, i.e. LBT beam is same as the reception beam. |
| OPPO | Proposal 5: The relations between LBT beams and transmission beams can be leaved as implementation. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Proposal 7: For operation in the 60 GHz band, specify the spatial relation between the LBT beam and the transmission beam.  Proposal 8: For spatial domain multiplexing of different beams, both one LBT beam covering all transmission beams, and multiple LBT beams covering multiple transmission beams are supported.  Observation 1: (Quasi-)omni-directional simplifies the implementation but could lead to an ‘over protection’ problem and thus reduction of spatial reuse.  Observation 2: Directional LBT potentially improves the channel access probability and enhances the spatial reuse. However, when performed at the transmitter side, the hidden node problem could be more severe due to limited sensing direction.  Proposal 4: It should be clarified whether antenna gain is counted in the received energy when compared with the EDT.  Proposal 9: For time domain multiplexing of transmissions in different beams in the same COT, support LBT at the beginning of COT by the initiating device with sensing beam(s) that covers all TDM transmission beams from the initiating device. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Observation 3: Clarify the feasibility and possible limitations of the omnidirectional ED sensing (true omni LBT) for prospective gNBs operating in 60 GHz unlicensed band.  Proposal 8: Leave the choice of the beam width for the directional LBT operation to the vendor-specific implementations. Vendors can use different beamforming techniques for their LBT procedures, as long as global or region and deployment specific requirements (i.e., ETSI EN 302 567) are fulfilled.  Observation 4: Generic requirements may be considered, e.g., that the beam(s) used in the LBT contain the transmission direction(s) intended to be used during the COT.  Observation 5: CCA check procedure details need to be considered when gNB uses multiple beams for channel sensing during the LBT. |
| Intel | Observation 1: Omni-directional LBT may act in many cases overprotectively and may prevent from fully exploiting spatial reuse under highly directional transmissions. This issue may be mitigated through directional LBT. However, directional sensing exacerbates the well-known hidden node issue, and leads to scenarios where the system could suffer from deafness.  Observation 2: Receiver-aided LBT is able to mitigate the issues introduced by directional LBT and offers a mean to better assess the correct level of interference at the receiver.  Proposal 8: Both omni-directional and directional LBT are supported. When directional LBT is used, a receiver-aided LBT should complement its CCA procedure.  Proposal 9: RAN1 to define some relationship between the received beams used for LBT measurements, and the transmit beam to be used after LBT success. Further details of how the relationship is defined is FFS in RAN1.  Proposal 10: When directional sensing is performed, the COT should be considered to be acquired only in the transmission beams for which the LBT is performed and the LBT measurements have indicated that the channel is idle.  Proposal 11: When directional sensing is performed, and multiple concurrent COT are acquired, these should be independently treated unless LBT measurements have overlapping beams. In this case, RAN1 should define some rules on how to handle these cases.  Proposal 12: RAN1 should further study how to efficiently allow beam-pairing due to LBT success.  Proposal 13: A device should perform directional sensing at the beginning of the COT with sensing beam(s) that covers all transmit beams or the first transmission beam, and additional directional LBT with sensing beam that covers the transmission beam(s) . |
| InterDigital | Observation 1: Omni-directional LBT in unlicensed spectrum from 52.6GHz to 71GHz can under-represent interference in the direction of the associated transmission and over-represent interference in other directions.  Observation 2: Dynamic scenarios with some level of mobility increases the likelihood of transmitter-receiver pairs interfering with each other even when using narrowbeams.  Observation 3: Directional LBT provides benefits over no LBT at least for medium to high loads and especially for tail UEs, while reducing the drawbacks associated with omni-directional LBT.  Proposal 1: Directional LBT is supported.  Proposal 2: The relationship between the LBT beam and the transmission beam should be specified.  Proposal 3: A single directional LBT process can be performed on a beam whose parameters are determined from the parameters of the Tx beam of one or more associated transmissions.  Proposal 4: RAN1 to study when to perform LBT cat 4 within a COT for an LBT beam covering a transmission beam used in a COT. |
| LG Electronics | Proposal #4: If the directional CCA procedure is introduced the followings points can be considered:   How to perform the CCA procedure for multiple-beam sweeping transmission   How to define CWS management (e.g., per-direction or across-direction management)   How to manage the back-off counter value  Proposal #6: It should be discussed how to indicate the direction of LBT (e.g., omni-directional LBT or directional LBT) and the type of LBT (e.g., Type 1 or Type 2A/2B/2C channel access procedure in NR-U) when scheduling a UL transmission inside or outside of a channel occupancy.  Proposal #7: The relationship between the LBT beam with a specific direction to acquire the COT and the transmission beam(s) allowed to transmit in that COT should be defined considering the relationship between the CCA range of the LBT beam and the interference range of the transmission beam(s). |
| Samsung | Proposal 7:  • Support channel access mechanism with directional channel sensing.  • Support directional channel sensing in multi-beam operation:  o For multi-beam SDM scenario, both Alt 2 and Alt 3 can be supported.  SDM scenario is only applicable to gNB.  o For multi-beam TDM scenario, select between Alt 2 and Alt 3 depending on whether sensing is required for switching beams within a COT.  If sensing is supported within a COT, Type 2 channel access procedure with fixed sensing duration is sufficient.  TDM scenario can be applicable to both gNB and UE. |
| TCL | Proposal 1: RAN1 shall study channel access mechanisms based on directional LBT.  Proposal 2: RAN1 shall study directional LBT at UE side to guarantee fair coexistence with 802.11ad.  Proposal 3: RAN1 shall study solutions to mitigate the effect of LBT deafness, beam orthogonality and beam imbalance in order to enable directional LBT at UE side without harming NR-U channel access efficiency.  Proposal 4: RAN1 shall consider the usage of directional LBT at gNB side. |
| AT&T | Proposal 1: Directional LBT is defined as a complete beam sweep with Cat. 4 LBT followed by Cat. 2 LBT before actually transmitting on any spatial direction deemed idle during the complete beam sweep  Proposal 2: The relationship between sensing and transmitting beams should be specified.  • ED threshold adaptation mechanisms can be considered |
| Spreadtrum | Proposal 2: The directional LBT should be supported in 60GHz unlicensed band. |
| Sony | Proposal 4: Directional LBT should be supported on 60 GHz unlicensed operation.  Proposal 5: The following relationship between LBT beam and transmission beam should be specified   One LBT beam covers all transmission beams   Multiple LBT beams cover multiple transmission beams |
| NEC | Proposal 3: For LBT based channel access in mmWave unlicensed band, the relationship between LBT beam and transmission beam should be defined to reduce the complexity of channel access for different nodes. |
| Xiaomi | Observation 1: Omni-directional LBT is more suitable for broadcasted channels and groupcasted channels, and directional LBT is more suitable for unicast channels and receiver assisted LBT. |
| Ericsson | Observation 7 The effectiveness of LBT as medium access mechanism for co-existence in unlicensed spectrum in 60 GHz band is questionable.  Observation 8 Common understanding in ETSI and 802.11ad/ay specs are omni-directional LBT or quasi-omnidirectional LBT  Observation 9 Simulation studies in general indicate no significant gain from using directional LBT.  Observation 10 There is no need to specify anything more stringent than the existing EN 302 567 standard. Directional LBT can be implementation dependent.  Observation 11 It is complex to define a directional sensing beam that covers several transmission beams for every transmission.  Proposal 4 For spatial domain multiplexing when LBT mode is used, the (directional) LBT behaviour can be left for implementation.  Proposal 5 For time domain multiplexing of DL/UL transmissions in multiple beams when LBT mode is used, it should be allowed to perform omni-directional or quasi-omni-directional LBT at the beginning of the COT and no LBT for the following beams in the COT. |
| Apple | Proposal 4: Both omni-directional and directional LBT is supported.  • For omni-directional LBT, Pout is calculated from Tx power + potential beam forming gain. One omni-directional LBT beam coverall all transmission beams.  • For directional LBT, Pout is calculated from the Tx power with Rx/Tx beam correspondence. The LBT beam should be used as the transmission beam. |
| Convida | Proposal 1: Directional LBT and interference mitigation should be considered for frequency range of 52.6GHz to 71GHz.  Proposal 2: Both omni-directional LBT and directional LBT should be supported for frequency range of 52.6GHz to 71GHz. |
| Qualcomm | Proposal 8: Consider the use of antenna gain of sensing beam and transmission beam to determine the suitability of using a given sensing beam in conjunction with a transmission beam.  • The directionality of sensing beam should be accounted for only in the directions of intended transmission i.e., within X dB of the peak EIRP. |
| ITRI | Proposal 1: In order to avoid resource wastage and hidden node problem, the LBT beam should be the same as the transmission beam. |
| DOCOMO | Observation 2:   Directional sensing should be possible in 60 GHz since narrower beam is highly assumed for the exact transmissions.   It would be difficult to support directional sensing with detailed configuration of beam characteristics.  Proposal 3:   Directional LBT should be supported with minimum specification effort.   One possibility is to support directional LBT with the same beam as the one to be used for associated transmission |

### ED threshold adaptation based on Beamforming gain

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Key Proposals/Observations/Positions** |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Proposal 11: Considering mismatch between LBT beam and transmission beam, the ED threshold provided by the ETSI BRAN 302 567 can be modified to consider mismatching between LBT beam and transmission beam.  Proposal 12: For NR-U and NR-U coexistence scenarios, its ED threshold can be considered to be appropriately relaxed compared with the threshold of coexistence between NR-U and Wi-Fi. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Proposal 2: For operation in NR-U-60, the EDT formula adopted from draft v2.1.20 of EN 302 567 as a baseline should be adjusted such that, for a given RF output power (EIRP), EDT proportionally increases with the beamforming gain of the potential following transmission.  Proposal 3: For operation in NR-U-60, when LBT is used, adopt the following generalized formula to capture the potential enhancements to the baseline EDT formulae:  • EDT= X+Y-min(Y, Po + a GTX ) [dBm], wherein 0≤a ≤1 [dBm/dBi],  • X is a reference CCA level further adjustable based on LBT BW, e.g. X=-47+10log10(BW/2GHz),  • Y is the maximum EIRP limit, e.g. Y=40 dBm,  • GTX is the effective transmit antenna gain at the potential transmitter [dBi],  • Po is the output power to the transmit antenna array [dBm] such that Pout (EIRP)= Po+GTX. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Proposal 4: Energy detection threshold adjustment can be considered for compensating any difference on the transmission and LBT beamforming gains. |
| InterDigital | Proposal 10: Adapt ED threshold to account for LBT BW and beamforming gain. |
| LG Electronics | Proposal #9: The ED threshold provided by the ETSI 302 567 can be enhanced considering the following points:   The size of LBT bandwidth   Transmit power of beam(s) in the COT   Transmit beam pattern (wide/narrow) |
| Samsung | Proposal 5: ED threshold should depend on:  • Whether other technology sharing the channel is absent or not on a long-term basis;  • LBT bandwidth;  • Beam parameters including beamforming gain and/or beam direction for transmission and/or receiving. |
| CATT | Proposal 4: The energy detection threshold for CCA check in EN 302.567 can be reused for NR operation up to 71GHz |
| vivo | Proposal 2: The ED threshold for CCA check should adapt to LBT bandwidth, and take into account the impact of beamforming gain of the directional LBT beams. |
| Spreadtrum | Proposal 4: The formula of ED threshold should consider the LBT bandwidth and beamforming gain. |
| NEC | Proposal 2: The energy detection threshold adaptation for beam based channel access procedure should take into account the maximum transmission power difference between transmission on a single beam and multiple concurrent beams. |
| Ericsson | Observation 2 EDT defined in draft EN 302 567 v.2.2.0 already depends on the transmit power of the device  Observation 3 Pmax and Pout in the EDT equation include beamforming gain |
| DOCOMO | Proposal 2:   For ED threshold used in LBT, no additional specification is necessary in addition to what ETSI BRAN requires. |

### Discussion

There is strong support to support or study directional LBT. On the other hand, in mmW system, likely there is no true “omni-directional” LBT in the beginning. When we discuss “directionality” of LBT, we should discuss its relationship with transmission beam.

Discussion point:

Should 3GPP spec defines the relationship between the LBT beam and the transmission beam or leave it as implementation. For example, should we define something like the LBT beam should “cover” the transmission beam?

* Alt 1. Leave the relationship between sensing beam and transmission beam as implementation
  + Ericsson,
* Alt 2. Defines the relationship between the sensing beam and the transmission beam, at least sensing beam “covers” the transmission beam
  + FFS: How to define the relationship
  + Apple, vivo, FW, QC, Samsung, Intel, LGE, CATT, NEC, Lenovo, Nokia (sensing beam covers transmission beam, but enforced in RAN4), ZTE, DCM, Sony, Convida, HW, Spreadtrum, IDC, Charter

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Apple | Alt 2. This is to ensure regulation compliance.  Compare to EN 301 893, the key difference is that in EN 302 567, Pout in EDT equation is explicitly specified with Tx beamforming gain. |
| vivo | Alt 2 is preferred. The device should make sure that the sensing beam “covers” the transmission beam. |
| Futurewei | We prefer Alt 2. Sensing beam should cover the transmission beams and the sensing threshold should consider the mismatch between sensing sensitivity and transmitter antenna gain. |
| Qualcomm | Alt 2: The notion a LBT beam being a ‘valid’ sensing beam for a transmission beam can be clarified, if necessary, along with ED threshold adjustment. |
| Ericsson | Alt 1 is preferred. |
| Samsung | Alt 2. It should be specified (maybe RAN4 spec). |
| Intel | Alt-2 is preferred, and indeed the sensing beam should cover the transmission beam. |
| LG Electronics | We support Alt 2. If the directional LBT is performed with a specific LBT beam using a specific directional antenna, the CCA range should cover the interference range of the transmission beam(s). |
| CATT | Alt 2. |
| NEC | We support Alt 2. The sensing beam(s) should cover related transmission beam(s) to simplify the channel sensing procedure. |
| Xiaomi | All the three Alts can be considered. Alt 1/2 are especially preferred, since Legacy RSSI measurement/ AP-CSI report are more of a long term sensing/measurement, and can be decoupled from the real-time data transmission process. But Alt 3, LBT at receiver, may has to be coupled with real-time data transmission process, that is, when a Tx wants to start transmission, it has to wait for the receiver to do receiver LBT and then decide whether it can start transmission or not. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We agree to support Alt 2. In our view, if the relationship between sensing beam and the transmission beam is left up to implementation, then there could be ambiguity on how the beam failure detection and recovery procedures are handled. For example, if UE is expected to receive transmissions on certain beams, but did not receive because of LBT failure, it might consider such scenario as beam failure. Furthermore, to increase the chances of LBT success, multiple sensing beams covering indicated (wider) transmission beam should be considered, where the transmission beam can be updated based on which one of the sensing beams has LBT success.  Explicit mapping between sensing beams and transmission beam could be supported. |
| Nokia, NSB | We agree that the LBT beam should cover the TX beam(s). From RAN1 point of view this can be left for implementation. RAN4 may potentially define a test case that verifies operation according to this principle. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We prefer Alt.2 to better reflect the interference situation on transmission beam by the definition the relationship between sensing beam and transmission beam. |
| DOCOMO | We support Alt 2 with a simple specification, e.g., specifying the same beam is used for sensing as the transmission beam.We are not sure whether Alt 1 would be safe, while also not sure how to specify sensing beam “cover” the transmission beam. |
| Sony | We support Alt 2. |
| Convida Wireless | We support Alt 2. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Alt 2. For one reason, if there is no correspondence between sensing beam and the transmission beam, the transmitting node can always do LBT in a direction that does sense any interference from and pass the LBT. In other words, LBT without correspondence between sensing and transmission beam may be completely useless. |
| Spreadtrum | We prefer Alt 2. |
| InterDigital | Alt. 2. The sensing beam(s) should at least cover the transmission beam(s) |
| Charter | Alt 2; clarification of what makes the sensing beam well defined is useful. |

If we define the relationship between LBT beam and TX beam, another question to answer is if ED threshold should be adjusted by the LBT beam and TX beam choices. For example, given a fixed TX beam, using a pseudo-omni beam or the same TX beam for LBT will produce different LBT ED measurement given the same interference.

Discussion point:

If 3GPP spec defines the relationship between the LBT beam and the transmission beam, shall we also define the impact to ED threshold given a certain LBT beam and transmission beam, or use a fixed ED threshold?

* Alt 1. No impact to ED threshold on sensing beam and transmission beam choices
  + Ericsson, DCM
* Alt 2. ED threshold is a function of the choice of sensing beam and transmission beam
  + FFS: How to adjust the ED threshold by sensing beam and transmission beam
  + Apple, vivo, FW, QC, Samsung, Intel, LGE, CATT, NEC, Lenovo, Nokia (further study), ZTE, Sony, HW, Spreadtrum, ITRI, OPPO, Charter, IDC

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Apple | Alt 2. Follow EDT equation and Pout definition. |
| vivo | Alt 2 is preferred. Different sensing beams will lead to different received power, the EDT should further consider this effect. |
| Futurewei | Alt 2 |
| Qualcomm | Alt 2: ED Threshold adjustment can facilitate medium access by allowing multiple choices for sensing and transmission beams to work together. It can further simplify LBT considerations for more complicated scenarios such as MU-MIMO COTs or Multi-Beam TDM COT.  This ED Threshold adjustment can be applied as an additive term to the EDT Definition from section 2.3.3 |
| Ericsson | ED threshold in EN 302 567 already is a function of the choice of the transmission beam. *Pout* in the equation is the RF output power (EIRP) for the potential transmission beam. In addition, increasing the ED threshold based on sensing beam is not compliant with HS EN 302 567. |
| Samsung | We support Alt 2. Otherwise, the gain from directional sensing is very limited. |
| Intel | Alt.2 as we discussed and motivated above. |
| LG Electronics | We support Alt 2. Within the COT acquired by the LBT beams with specific direction and ED threshold, the transmission of beams that have directions different from the CCA range (due to large transmit power than ED threshold) shall not be allowed to be multiplexed (SDM/TDM) in the COT. |
| CATT | Alt.2. When the device performs energy detection, the value of EDT is determined by the EIRP of the transmission beam. If the transmission beamforming gain is different from the LBT beamforming gain, then the EDT should be adjusted. The details need be further studied. |
| NEC | We support Alt 2. The ED threshold should consider the relationship between sensing beam and transmission beam. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support Alt 2. |
| Nokia, NSB | ED threshold may take into account the TX beamwidth, but this requires further study. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | in order to evaluate the actual interference in the transmission beam relatively accurately, it is necessary to consider the impact of sensing beam and transmission beam on EDT adjustment. From this point of view, we prefer Alt.2. |
| DOCOMO | We support Alt 1. Taking beamforming related information into ED threshold determination would be too complicated, and require large specification effort. |
| Sony | We support Alt 2. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | Alt 2. In particular, EDT should be a function of beamforming gain so if two transmitters have the same EIRP but one has a narrower Tx beam and the other has wider Tx beam, the transmitter with the narrower beam be incentivised due to its less spatial interference footprint. |
| Spreadtrum | We support Alt 2. |
| InterDigital | We support Alt. 2 |
| ITRI | We support Alt2 |
| Charter | Alt 2. |

### 2nd round discussion

Proposal 2.8.3-1 (majority view except Ericsson):

* 3GPP specification defines the relative relationship between all applicable sensing beams and the transmission beam, at least sensing beam “covers” the transmission beam~~, while the exact shape of the sensing beam for a transmission beam is left for implementation~~
  + FFS: How to define the relationship
  + FFS: What is the exact definition of sensing beam “covers” the transmission beam.

Additional comments:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Generally, we are fine with proposal, but would like to clarify that the relationship doesn’t have to be always one-to-one i.e. one sensing beam associated with one transmission beam. Therefore, we suggest following update to the proposal:   * 3GPP specification defines the relationship between at least one sensing beam and the transmission beam, at least sensing beam “covers” the transmission beam   + FFS How to define the relationship |
| Intel | We are generally fine with the proposal, and share same concern as Lenovo since sensing could be potentially done over more than a single beam. |
| Fujitsu | We are fine with the proposal |
| vivo | Support this proposal |
| NEC | We support the proposal, and we also share the similar view as Lenovo and Intel mentioned. Multiple sensing beams might be used to access the shared channel. |
| Spreadtrum | We support the updated proposal from Lenovo. |
| Xiaomi | OK with the proposal |
| Ericsson | It is intuitive that the sensing beam should cover the transmission beam. Regulations in EN 302 567 are written with this as the baseline assumption. Otherwise, it will not follow the regulation. We do not disagree with this in principle. However, we believe this relationship need not be specified.  It is complex and non-trivial to specify such a relationship. There is no notion of directions/beams for sensing described in the TS 37.213 and it will take a lot of specification effort. Furthermore, 37.213 already provides flexibility in sensing and this behavior is not precluded.  Even if we can get consensus here, how will RAN4 specify such a relation? We already have an example that highlights the complexity of this issue: Beam correspondence in RAN4. It is loosely specified in RAN4 currently regarding the correlation between TX and RX beams during beam correspondence with beam management.  Therefore, whether the devices use the same sensing beam as the transmission beam or a quasi-omnidirectional sensing beam or an omnidirectional sensing beam, and then transmit in a narrower beam, can be left for implementation. EN 302 567 does not preclude sensing over a larger beam width and transmit in a narrower beam width. It is akin to sensing over 20 MHz but transmitting only over 2 MHz in 5 GHz band.  In our view, sensing beam should cover the transmission beam. A device will be tested with this assumption in EN 302 567. It is up to RAN4 to define requirements to ensure the sensing beam includes the intended transmission direction. |
| LG Electronics | We are fine with the proposal. The transmission of beams that have directions different from the sensing beam shall not be allowed. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Support FL proposal. |
| Nokia, NSB | At least the RAN1 specifications will not need to define this relationship. Naturally the sensing beam should include the TX beam, but specifying this is far from a trivial task. A test case verifying that interference coming from the direction of the intended received is detected in the LBT procedure could be considered, but that is for RAN4 to decide. |
| OPPO | We are fine with the proposal. |
| TCL | In our understanding, the sensing beam must at least cover the transmission beam for directional sensing procedures. We are though open if where and how this restriction is imposed or enforced. |
| Apple | Agree with the proposal |
| Convida Wireless | We are ok with the proposal. |
| ITRI | Support FL proposal. |
| CATT | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are not sure we understand the intention of adding “while the exact shape of the sensing beam for a transmission beam is left for implementation”.  This added text can be easily misused as the transmitter can always use an omni-directional beam which obviously “covers” any transmission beam. To our understanding, most companies support directional LBT. The question is if we completely leave the “beam shape” to implementation (e.g., omni-directional can always be used), then what is the point of discussing/supporting directional LBT?  We fully understand that it is far from a trivial task to define the shape of sensing or transmission beam but, in fact, we do not need to define any shape for the sensing or transmission beam. We have spatialrelationInfo and QCL-D properties from Rel-15/16 that can be easily used; at least when there is only one transmission beam (not a SDM of multiple Tx beams during the COT). If there is there only one transmission beam that corresponds to the sensing beam, we can easily extend the concept of spatialRelationInfo (used for SRS transmission) to this case. For instance, the transmission beam has a spatialRelaitonInfo with the sensing beam.  Defining such a relation between one sensing beam and multiple transmission beams may not be readily available from Rel15/16 but, anyway, the above proposal does not seem to discuss one sensing beam covering multiple Tx beams (which is discussed in 2.10, 2.11).  We think the FFS part already covers the question of how the relation between sensing and transmission beams should be defined and there is no need discussing the shape. We can make a couple of examples as a part of FFS to clarify that the intention is not to define any beam shape.  We propose the following:  **Proposal**   * 3GPP specification defines the relative relationship between the sensing beam and the transmission beam, at least sensing beam “covers” the transmission beam   + FFS How to define the relationship (e.g, extending QCL-D/Spatial Relation properties from Rel-15/16 to define the relationship between sensing and transmission beams). |
| Samsung | We are fine with the proposal. |
| DOCOMO | We support the proposal. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We would like to reiterate our previous suggestion (also some other companies seem to have similar view). Here is the proposed updated:   * 3GPP specification defines the relative relationship between ~~the~~ at least one sensing beam and the transmission beam, at least sensing beam “covers” the transmission beam, while the exact shape of the sensing beam for a transmission beam is left for implementation   + FFS How to define the relationship   Moderator: Thanks for the suggestion. I prefer not to use “at least one”, which sounds like 3GPP can define one sensing beam, but there can be other sensing beam not defined in 3GPP. Please see if the updated language works for you. I think we should define some condition that “all” sensing beam should satisfy. |
| Sony | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Futurewei | In principle we are OK with the proposal, however the term “covers” needs further clarification.  Moderator: Yes, that is why it is in quotation marks. Let me add an FFS for that as well. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Thanks for clarification and now the updated wording is better and okay for us. |

Discussion point

* Further introduce an adjustment term in ED threshold, such that the ED threshold is a function of the choice of sensing beam and transmission beam
  + FFS: How to adjust the ED threshold by sensing beam and transmission beam

Consider the comment received, merge this to the FFS in 2.3. No further discussion needed in this section.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support the proposal |
| DOCOMO | In our view, it seems premature to decide this. Whether EDT should be a function of the choice of sensing/transmission beam would highly depend on how to support directional sensing.  Some could assume that a single sensing beam may cover multiple transmission beams. If we support such sensing beam covering multiple transmit beams, then we agree EDT should be a function of the choice of sensing/transmission beam.  On the other hand, for directional sensing, we expect that just to use the same beam for sensing as the transmission beam to be used would be still possibility. In this case, we do not see the dependency on sensing/transmission beam on EDT determination. We are not sure how to specify a complex relation between sensing beam and transmission beam(s) to be used. Note that any characteristics of beams are invisible in the current specifications. Such consideration would require large amount of specification efforts, which is not preferred in our view. |
| Intel | We support the proposal, but we are also OK to discuss this further as long as we keep the related FFS within the proposal in Sec. 2.3.5:   * FFS if further adjustment on ED threshold based on sensing beam and transmission beam. The adjustment will not increase the ED threshold |
| Fujitsu | We disagree with the proposal. As we commented in 2.3.4, we think no further adjustment based on transmission beam is needed. In addition, although we are open for further discuss adjustment based on sensing beam, we do not see benefit so far. |
| vivo | We support this proposal. |
| NEC | We support the proposal. |
| Spreadtrum | We share the same concern as Docomo and Intel, may be the main bullet should be FFS. |
| Ericsson | EDT is already a function of the transmission beam. *Pout* indicates the RF outpout power of the intended transmission including the beamforming antenna gain.   Regarding modifying EDT based on sensing beam, please refer to our comment above. We also agree with DOCOMO’s view here. In addition, while considering the sensing beam, if the EDT is increased beyond the EDT calculation in EN 302 567, the device is in violation of the regulation. |
| LG Electronics | We support the proposal. The ED threshold should be determined considering a beam pattern of the sensing beam and the interference range of the transmission beam(s). |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Support FL proposal. |
| Nokia, NSB | This is too early to decide. We agree with DOCOMO that specification of such adjustment may become a very complex task. |
| OPPO | We support the proposal. |
| TCL | In our understanding, ED threshold should take into account sensing/transmission beams. |
| Apple | Support the proposal.  By regulation, EDT is a function of transmission beam. Adjustment is mainly to capture the difference between the sensing beam and transmission beam. |
| ITRI | We support this proposal. |
| CATT | We are fine the proposal. |
| Samsung | Seems duplicated from previous proposal. |

### 3rd round discussion

Proposal 2.8.4-1 (majority view except Ericsson):

* 3GPP specification defines the relative relationship between all applicable sensing beams and the transmission beam, at least sensing beam “covers” the transmission beam~~,~~ 
  + FFS: How to define the relationship
  + FFS: What is the exact definition of sensing beam “covers” the transmission beam.
  + FFS: Whether or not there is RAN1 specification impact, and if no RAN1 impact, whether or not it can be left to RAN4 to introduce a testing requirement

Proposal 2.8.4-2 (Ericsson proposed version, with some language reorganization)

When LBT mode is used, further study whether/how to specify the relative relationship between sensing and transmission beam(s). If the relationship is specified, sensing beam(s) at least “cover” the transmission beam(s)

* FFS: Details on the definition of "cover"
* FFS: Details on the definition of relative relationship between sensing and transmission beam(s)
* FFS: Whether or not there is RAN1 specification impact, and if no RAN1 impact, whether or not it can be left to RAN4 to introduce a testing requirement

Additional comments (please only comment if you have issue with the proposal):

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Ericsson | Respectfully, we are still not okay with this proposal. There are several legitimate concerns that we have raised regarding specifying the relationship between sensing beams and the transmission beams. We also think there is merit to consider whether or not RAN4 can define a testing requirement as proposed by Nokia. It is hard for us to agree on the relationship now without knowing the exact details of the relationship.  In our view, it is intuitive that the sensing beam should cover the transmission beam. A device will be tested with this assumption in EN 302 567 and hence there is no need to have this proposal. It is up to RAN4 to define requirements to ensure the sensing beam includes the intended transmission direction.  Furthermore, the proposal states “*3GPP specification defines the relative relationship between…”* and then further adds in the FFS : *How to define the relationship*  As a compromise, we could have the following proposal:  *When LBT mode is used, further study whether/how to specify the relative relationship between sensing and transmission beam(s)*  *If the relationship is specified:*   * *Sensing beam(s) at least “cover” the transmission beam(s)*   *The following items are FFS:*   * *Details on the definition of "cover"* * *Details on the definition of relative relationship between sensing and transmission beam(s)* * *Whether or not there is RAN1 specification impact* * *If no RAN1 impact, whether or not it can be left to RAN4 to introduce a testing requirement* |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We still support proposal 2.8.4-1 as we see it as an essential feature for supporting directional LBT.  In our view, from a UE perspective, the “indicated” transmission beam for UL can be associated with one or multiple sensing beams and the “actual” transmission beam used for UL can be either same as the “indicated” transmission beam or a narrower transmission beam (within the wider beam), depending on what sensing beams the LBT is successful. One simple example, illustrated in Figure below, could be that a relatively wider transmission beam is indicated to UE for UL transmission and it is associated with 3 sensing beams, where sensing beam 1 is same (beamwidth) as indicated transmission beam, while sensing beams 2 and 3 are narrower beams. So, if the LBT is not successful on a wider sensing beam 1, then UE can perform sensing on the narrower beams 2-3 and let’s say if LBT is successful on sensing beam 2, then UE can transmit using corresponding beam.    The relationship mentioned above between indicated transmission beam and sensing beams should be configured/indicated by gNB to still have control on the transmit/sensing beam(s) that UE is expected to use.  Also, such relationship can help other way around where if multiple transmit beams are indicated, then sensing beams with possible wide beamwidth could be different to cover all the transmit beams. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Support proposal 2.8.4-1. and we have similar view as Lenovo, that is a essential feature for supporting directional LBT and directional beam transmission mode. If there is no such definition, it may result in the estimated channel states cannot relatively accurately reflect the interference in the transmission beam and reflect the difference of interference situation between sensing beam and transmission. |
| Xiaomi | More inclined to support proposal 2.8.4-1. |
| Nokia, NSB | We prefer the Proposal 2.8.4-2. Defining the relationships between the beams can be very complex, and it is questionable if there is any benefit in defining it in RAN1. It may be best if RAN4 is involved in this discussion in the future. |
| LG Electronics | We also support Proposal 2.8.4-1. For the relationship between the LBT beam and the transmission beam(s), if the directional LBT is performed with a specific LBT beam (i.e., Rx beam pattern) using a specific directional antenna, the CCA range should cover the interference range of the transmission beam(s). For example, if the COT is acquired by the directional LBT with relatively narrow beam A, the transmission of beam(s) is only allowed to the beam having the same direction as Beam A in the COT. When LBT is performed with wide beam A, it can be allow transmission of the multiple narrow beams included in the beam A in TDM/SDM manner. |
| Futurewei | We support Proposal 2.8.4-1. We understand Ericsson concerns and we think that the study in the initial proposal will clarify many of their concerns including if there is an impact in RAN1 or it needs to be left to RAN4 decision. This proposal offers rather a framework for study of the issue and not answers. We definitively think that the relationship “cover” between sensing and transmit beams must be clarified in RAN1 for LBT purposes. |
| Intel | We support proposal 2.8.4-1. As mentioned by other companies we believe that this is an essential feature that would serve the purpose of better supporting the directional LBT functionality, and a relationship between the transmission beam(s) and the sensing beam should be defined in RAN1, rather than as a testing requirement in RAN4. In our understanding, the transmission beam should not be necessarily aligned with a specific sensing beam, and may be possible as LG mentioned that multiple transmission beams may be related to a single sensing beam. |

## Rx Assistance in LBT process

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Key Proposals/Observations/Positions** |
| FUTUREWEI | Proposal 4: For UE assisted LBT, the gNB should be able to request UE to measure the interference (received energy) over a specific set of resources and report it back to the gNB prior to LBT procedure at the gNB. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Proposal 21: For NR operation in unlicensed bands between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz, receiver assistance should be supported for both LBT and no-LBT based channel access mechanisms to avoid potential interference at the receiver.  Proposal 22: For NR operation in unlicensed bands between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz, only class A receiver assistance should be supported where the assistance information is sent only to the transmitter.  Proposal 25: For NR operation in unlicensed bands between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz, signaling mechanism similar to RTS/CTS should be considered for receiver assistance  - Short transmission using control channels (such as with 1-bit) or reference signals for before the actual transmission could be supported |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Proposal 10: For receiver assisted channel access and interference management,   If existing L1 and L3 measurement mechanism is supported to obtain assistance information, some enhancements may need to be considered for using the measurement results timely and effectively to guide the subsequent transmission.   If LBT is supported to obtain assistance information, assistance information can be considered to be obtained within COT in addition to the beginning of COT. |
| OPPO | Proposal 6: RTS-like signal can be carried in a PDCCH and CTS-like signal can be carried in a PUCCH. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Observation 3：Receiver-only directional LBT saves the LBT overhead associated with the transmitter-side LBT of the receiver-assisted LBT mechanism and provides an efficient tradeoff as it aims at increasing the spatial reuse while mitigating the hidden node issue.  Proposal 12：For operation in the 60 GHz band, receiver-side LBT should be supported.  Proposal 15：For operation in the 60 GHz band, in regions where LBT is not mandated, the serving cell may enable Rx-side LBT using a higher layer configuration to mitigate high levels of interference experienced from hidden nodes.  Observation 5: When No-LBT is used in regions where LBT is not mandated by regulations, the hidden node issue would still persist.  Observation 6: Compared to No-LBT, substantial coverage gains are achieved using Receiver-assisted LBT/Receiver-only LBT in the indoor scenario, especially at medium and high traffic load.  - Even higher gains are realized when wider beams are used for directional transmissions  Observation 7: For Receiver-assisted LBT/Receiver-only LBT, if a high EDT\_Rx threshold is used, the DL cell-edge performance degrades if only CTS/idle indication is fed back when interference level is lower than the EDT\_Rx threshold. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Observation 6: Considerable benefits from new Rx assistance schemes should be shown in a reasonable range of different situations and with realistic UE feedback delays given the considerable implementation effort involved.  Observation 7: Receiver assistance for channel access is already supported with existing layer 1 and layer 3 measurements and reports.  Proposal 13: Any Rx assistance scheme should be configurable per UE, so that it could be used only with UEs frequently detecting high interference.  Proposal 14: For any new Rx assistance schemes, UE processing time similar to PDSCH processing time (N1) or CSI computation time (N2/Z1Z2) should be considered when providing Rx assistance.  Proposal 15: Rx assistance should not be limited to the beginning of COT only. |
|  |  |
| InterDigital | Observation 4: In a beam-based environment, LBT (omni-directional or directional) can fail to detect hidden nodes if the interference is only in the direction of the receiving node.  Proposal 5: Receiver based LBT should be considered for both omni-directional and directional LBT.  Proposal 6: Receiver based directional LBT is supported.  Proposal 7: A single receiver based directional LBT process can be performed on a beam whose parameters are determined from the parameters of the Rx beam of one or more associated transmissions.  Proposal 8: The UE receives configuration and indication of the channel access mechanism to use (omni-directional, directional, receiver based, no LBT) from the gNB. FFS if configuration/indication is by RRC or L1 signaling.  Proposal 9: RAN1 to consider if a UE can select a channel access mechanism as a function of measurements or prior LBT success or failure. |
| LG Electronics | Proposal #3: The directional CCA and the receiver assisted LBT can be beneficial to increase cell coverage and spatial reuse, and whether or not the receiver assisted LBT can have an impact on specification except for indicating LBT type to responder should be first investigated. |
| Samsung | Proposal 9: Support dynamic RX-assistant channel access mechanism with handshake between transmitter and receiver, e.g. wherein the channel access request is based on DCI and channel access response is based on UCI in a downlink scenario.  Proposal 10: Support RSSI measurement outside the active BWP and in non-serving cell. |
| CATT | Proposal 2: The receiver assistance information can be designed base on the A-CSI feedback framework. |
| vivo | Proposal 4: When gNB operates as an initiating device, the transmitter request can be sent in a PDCCH like channel, and receiver feedback can be sent in a PUCCH like channel.  Proposal 5: Each transmitter request monitoring occasion corresponds to a receiver feedback transmission opportunity.  Proposal 6: When UE operates as an initiating device, the transmitter request can be a UL reference signal or sent in a PUCCH like channel with UE identity information. The receiver feedback can be sent in a PDCCH like channel.  Proposal 7: The channel access mechanism can be selected based on the channel occupancy time, channel access rate, transmission priority, service requirement, or feedback information from the receiver, etc. |
| AT&T | Proposal 3:  • Receiver assistance in Rel. 17 is limited to measurement enhancements  • Message based schemes similar to RTS/CTS signalling can be addressed in a later release targeting Class B scenarios  • Hand shaking is not supported  • Transmission should be allowed before the receiver assistance is received  • Receiver assistance can equally be useful, and should be allowed, for the no-LBT mode of transmissions  • Receiver assistance is a fast, low complexity feedback mechanism to convey to the transmitter the interference environment at the receiver |
| Spreadtrum | Proposal 3: The receiver assisted LBT should be supported in 60GHz unlicensed band. |
|  |  |
| Sony | Proposal 6: Receiver assisted LBT should be supported on 60 GHz unlicensed operation. |
| Xiaomi | Proposal 5: Conditions about whether to enable/disable receiver assisted LBT can be studied.  Proposal 6: How to design a receiver assisted LBT with a simpler flow and little spec impact should be considered. |
| Ericsson | Observation 12 Ideal receiver assisted LBT does not show performance improvement as compared to no LBT.  Observation 13 Good link adaptation algorithm is enough to cope with occasional interference in 60 GHz band  Observation 14 CSI-Reporting mechanism in the current specification is a suitable tool to communicate receiver assistance information to the transmitter, i.e., the gNB. Enhancement may be needed to enable aperiodic CSI reporting to be triggered by DL DCIs and to be transmitted on PUCCH as being discussed in the URLLC WI.  Observation 15 Current processing delays for CSI reports in NR are rather long, which diminishes any potential benefit of receiver assisted channel access.\  Observation 16 If any gains of RAL are to be expected at all, then it requires fast feedback  Proposal 6 If any enhancements to better support receiver assisted channel access are to be specified at all, it should be based on CSI reporting enhancement as currently being discussed in the URLLC WI, with potential enhancements to the CSI report type and the CSI processing timeline. |
| Convida | Proposal 4: Receiver assisted LBT and channel access scheme should be supported in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz. |
| Qualcomm | Proposal 11: Consider Rx-side CCA for receiver assistance. |
| DOCOMO | Proposal 4:   RSSI/channel occupancy measurement supported in Rel-16 NR-U can be reused in 52.6 – 71 GHz unlicensed band   Whether/how to apply directivity for RSSI/CO measurement and reporting can be further discussed |

### Discussion

Rx Assistance to be considered has been narrowed down to exchange between the serving and the served nodes.

Following aspects of the Rx-Assistance can further be discussed.

Discussion point

For receiver to provide assistance, channel sensing needs to be performed. The following set of tools can be considered

* Alt 1. Legacy RSSI measurement
  + Apple, FW, QC (as part of no-LBT), Ericsson, LGE, Xiaomi, Nokia, DCM, Sony, Convida, Spreadtrum, IDC, Charter
* Alt 2. AP-CSI report
  + Apple, QC (as part of no-LBT), Ericsson, LGE, Fujitsu. CATT, Xiaomi, Lenovo (also P-CSI), Nokia, Sony, Convida, Spreadtrum, IDC
* Alt 3. LBT at receiver
  + Alt 3.1 eCCA
    - Apple, QC, Intel, Fujitsu, Xiaomi, Lenovo, Sony, Convida, HW, Spreadtrum, OPPO, IDC
  + Alt 3.2 Cat2 LBT
    - Apple, QC, Samsung, Intel, Fujitsu, Xiaomi, Lenovo (also HARQ ACK), Sony, Convida, HW, Spreadtrum, OPPO, IDC

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Apple | All alternatives can be considered. |
| vivo | We would like some clarification on the proposal here. Are the three alternatives listed above the feedback/assistance data from the receiver to the transmitter?  It’s not clear to us whether we are discussing the procedure or the feedback. |
| Futurewei | Alt 1: We prefer to reuse existing RS such as CS-RSSI, CSI-RS for IM etc that would provide interference/energy detection information for a set of physical resources, and spatial directions as requested by the transmitter. |
| Qualcomm | We prefer Alt 3 (both Alt 3.1 and Alt 3.2) as mechanisms that are useful and require additional specification effort to be the focus of WID. We also consider Alt1 or Alt2 or L1-SINR based procedures for receiver assisted no-LBT as something already available, with smaller enhancements needed to reporting or measurement procedures. |
| Ericsson | Alt 1 or Alt 2 is ok. If any enhancements to better support receiver assisted channel access are to be specified at all, it should be based on CSI reporting enhancement as currently being discussed in the URLLC WI, with potential enhancements to the CSI report type and the CSI processing timeline. We do not see the benefits or need to support a receiver assisted LBT with information exchange per COT. LBT result at the receiver needs to be communicated to the transmitter and the necessary overhead and processing delays need to be considered in any analysis carried out. |
| Samsung | We support Alt 3.2. |
| Intel | We agree with the principle of the proposal, and that a receiver assisted mechanism is needed. As for the tool to use, we prefer Alt.3. |
| LG Electronics | We support both Alt 1 and Alt 2. Since the contents of the assistant information or feedback mechanisms can be fully supported by the current Rel-15/16 specification, there is no need to specify additional mechanisms other than the indication of which LBT to be used at receiver side when the receiver assisted LBT is used. |
| Fujitsu | We think at least one of Alt 2 and Alt 3 should be considered. For Alt.1, we have concern on the latency since it is kind of L3 measurement. |
| CATT | Alt 2  The AP-CSI triggering and reporting mechanism could be reused for receiver assisted LBT. AP-CSI provides the channel condition for link adaptation and co-channel interference in the receiving direction. |
| Xiaomi | All the three Alts can be considered. Alt 1/2 are especially preferred, since Legacy RSSI measurement/ AP-CSI report are more of a long term sensing/measurement, and can be decoupled from the real-time data transmission process. But Alt 3, LBT at receiver, may has to be coupled with real-time data transmission process, that is, when a Tx wants to start transmission, it has to wait for the receiver to do receiver LBT and then decide whether it can start transmission or not. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | In our view, interference measurements should be considered for providing Rx assistance in LBT process. However legacy RSSI measurements might not be a good indicator of the channel occupancy. It could be quite possible that the RSSI measurements correspond to only interference measurements from neighbouring nodes only. Therefore, in order to get a better estimation of channel occupancy, current CSI based measurements could be enhanced to separately measure any interference from WiFi systems. For example, UE could be configured with resources where the UE is not expected to receive any transmissions (including NZP CSI-RS) from neighbouring NR nodes and only is used for checking channel occupancy by WiFi and reporting corresponding measurements.  The CSI enhancement could be applied with both periodic CSI report (long term sensing) as well as aperiodic CSI report (instantaneous channel occupancy)  For Alt. 3, CTS like signalling enhancements should be supported. Other alternative under Alt 3 could include HARQ-ACK feedback from the UE to gNB. For example, number of NACKs above a certain threshold (for some continuous transmissions) could be used to determine channel occupancy |
| Nokia, NSB | Alt 1 and Alt 2 are readily available options and will of course need to be considered. Furthermore, we need to also consider the CSI enhancements defined in the “Enhanced Industrial Internet of Things (IoT) and URLLC” WI.  It is unclear what benefits Alt 3 would have compared to Alt 1/2. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Above listed options can be considered. If Alt 1 is supported, the validity and timeliness of measurement and reporting may need to be considered further due to only periodic RSSI is supported in existing spec. |
| DOCOMO | We support Alt 1. Directional sensing aspects can be considered additionally. |
| Sony | We support Alt 3. Alt 1 and 2 could be considered further. |
| Convida Wireless | All alternatives are possible and could be considered. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support Alt 3. In our view, both Alt 3.1 and Alt 3.2 are beneficial in different cases. For instance, considering DL, CAT2 LBT as in Alt 3.2 could be used at the UE if the gNB has performed CAT4 LBT (eCCA) before transmitting the scheduling DL assignment. Otherwise, CAT4 LBT as in Alt 3.1 could be used at the UE to initiate the CO and sharing it to the gNB.  Our understanding of Alt 1 is that all UEs in the cell, say M UEs, would be semi-statically configured with resources to perform the RSSI measurements periodically. All measurements would be reported periodically to the gNB and the gNB would have to process the measurements for all M UEs.  Whereas, when LBT is performed at the receiver, only K UEs (K≤M) who are dynamically scheduled by the gNB (based on their respective data buffers) would perform the LBT procedure including the actual interference measurement a few symbols before the potential DL transmission(s). Using a low EDT at the receiver, only N UEs (N≤K) whose LBTs are successful are required to feed back their respective Rx-assistance Information/Idle indication, and the gNB needs to process the feedback from only those N UEs. The SLS results in Section 3.2.2 of our companion contribution R1-2101268 clearly show that such limited feedback does not considerably change the UPT performance if gNB uses the reported interference levels to prioritize UE scheduling.  As such, the following issues can be observed in Alt 1 in comparison to performing LBT at the receiver:   * Performing LBT at the receiver would be more efficient in terms of resource overhead and complexity at both UE and gNB, especially at high load when probably only 1 or 2 UEs would pass the receiver LBT with such a low threshold * Legacy RSSI measurement requires resources dedicated for measurements and the resources used by each of the M UEs to report the measurements in UL channels. This also incurs complexity at each UE to conduct and report the measurements periodically regardless of the gNB’s intent to schedule it, as well as the complexity at gNB to continuously process these reports.   Legacy RSSI is periodic measurement and not representative of the experienced interference immediately prior to data reception.   * Note that for such periodic measurements and reporting to reflect the actual interference during the target transmission, they would have to be even configured quite often, which further emphasizes the overhead and complexity savings of Receiver-side LBT.   Although Alt 2 could overcome some of the resource overhead and complexity incurred by Alt 1 since AP CSI-RS would be dynamically triggered for K UEs instead of M UEs, this mechanism would use more resources and introduce a more complex handshake for each CO compared to receiver-side LBT. This is due to the fact that an AP CSI-RS would have to be triggered first by each scheduling DL assignments for measurement, then followed by some processing delay before reporting CSI on PUCCH resources from all K UEs. In addition, as noted by the proponents of Alt 2 in their contribution, current processing delays for CSI reports in NR are rather long, which means that such a handshake would also result in increased overhead in time per CO compared to receiver-side LBT. Finally, the latency between CSI-RS reception and CSI-RS report is a UE capability and it may be too long so that the reported CSI is not actually a representative of the experienced interference immediately before the data reception.    Finally, it should be noted that while both Alt 1 and Alt 2 are discussed for DL only, Alt 3 is also applicable to UL, e.g., when the scheduling time offset of PUSCH is large such that the interference measurement by the gNB prior to the UL grant may not represent the interference during PUSCH reception. |
| Spreadtrum | All the listed alternatives should be further considered. |
| InterDigital | Alt 1 and 2 are already possible. Furthermore Alt. 3 should be supported to improve channel access latency. |
| Charter | Alt 3.1 and Alt 1. |

### 2nd round discussion

Proposal 2.9.2-1 (capture alternatives. Seems stable)

For receiver to provide assistance, channel sensing needs to be performed. The following set of tools can be considered

* Alt 1. Legacy RSSI measurement
* Alt 2. AP-CSI report
* Alt 3. LBT at receiver
  + Alt 3.1 eCCA
  + Alt 3.2 Cat2 LBT

Additional comments:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | As commented earlier, we think that enhancements to legacy RSSI measurement are needed to measure the channel occupancy by WiFi or other NR operators. Current RSSI measurements might report either interference from neighbouring nodes of the same NR operator as well and therefore, are not accurate measure of channel occupancy/interference from WiFi.  We suggest to either add a new Alt with enhanced RSSI measurement or add FFS under legacy RSSI measurement, FFS: enhanced RSSI measurements not precluded  In addition, we support Alt 2 and Alt 3 |
| Intel | We agree with the principle of the proposal, and that a receiver assisted mechanism is needed. As for the tool to use, we prefer Alt.3, but all alternatives could be considered and evaluated. As for the pro and cons for Alt-1 and Alt -2 compared to Alt-3, we share the same view as Huawei. |
| Xiaomi | OK with the proposal |
| Ericsson | Alt 1 or Alt 2 is ok.  Alt 3 involves overhead, feedback delay and processing delay. Receiver assisted LBT works best only if the feedback is fast. Otherwise, the channel state has changed. Therefore, if any enhancements to better support receiver assisted channel access are to be specified at all, it should be based on CSI reporting enhancement as currently being discussed in the URLLC WI, with potential enhancements to the CSI report type and the CSI processing timeline. |
| LG Electronics | We support Alt 1 and Alt2. Since we believe that the contents of the assistant information or feedback mechanisms can be fully supported by the current Rel-15/16 specification, there is no need to specify additional mechanisms other than the indication of which LBT to be used at receiver side when the receiver assisted LBT is used. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Support Alt 2 and Alt3. for Alt 3.2, we think it is more suitable to add a limitation on Cat2 LBT. For example, Cat 2 LBT is used for sensing to be done at the receiver for Rx-Assistance measurements only if Cat4 LBT is used for initiating device. Because Cat2 LBT is not supported to initiate a separate transmission or channel occupancy outside COT. |
| Nokia, NSB | We support alt 1 and alt 2 (or rather they are supported already, without specification changes). For any schemes relying of very fast feedback of assistance information (e.g. Alt 3), the proponents should clarify the feasibility of related processing times. |
| OPPO | We support Alt 3. |
| Convida Wireless | We are ok with the proposal. |
| CATT | Alt-2  The AP-CSI triggering and reporting mechanism could be reused for receiver assisted LBT. AP-CSI provides the channel condition for link adaptation and co-channel interference in the receiving direction. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support Alt. 3. For our detailed view please see the first round of discussion in 2.9.1. |
| Samsung | We support Alt 3. |
| DOCOMO | There is no reason to preclude Alt 1 and 2 and here the discussion point would be whether to support Alt3-like new mechanism in our view. We are ok with continuing the study on Alt 3. Then if no intention to down select this meeting, we support the Proposal. If down selection is intended, we support Alt 1 and/or 2 at this stage. |
| Sony | We support Alt 3.  Alt 1 and Alt 2 could be considered if no or small specification change is required. |
| Futurewei | We support Alt 1 and Alt 2 |

### 3rd round discussion

Proposal 2.9.3-1 (capture alternatives. Seems stable)

For receiver to provide assistance, channel sensing and reporting need to be performed. The following set of tools can be considered for further discussion

* Alt 1. Legacy RSSI measurement and reporting with possible enhancements
* Alt 2. AP-CSI report
* Alt 3. LBT at receiver
  + Alt 3.1 eCCA
  + Alt 3.2 Cat2 LBT

Additional comments (please only comment if you have issue with the proposal):

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | As commented earlier, we would like to reiterate with a clarification question for Alt 1. Does it preclude any enhancements in terms of CSI measurements (and reporting)? If they are not precluded, then we are fine with the proposal. Otherwise, we suggest removing “Legacy” from Alt 1 to include the possibility of enhancements related to RSSI measurements (and reporting). |
| ZTE, Sanechips | In order to make Alt3 more clearer, we think the same limitation as added in proposal 2.7.3-2 should be also added in Alt3.2 Cat2 LBT.  Updated proposal:   * Alt 1. Legacy RSSI measurement and reporting with possible enhancements * Alt 2. AP-CSI report * Alt 3. LBT at receiver   + Alt 3.1 eCCA   + Alt 3.2 Cat2 LBT used for a responding device   Moderator: I try to keep it general for now. I assume there is a case that LBT is not mandated (so there is no requirement for eCCA even for initiating device), but a simple Cat 2 LBT is used to check the receiver environment. Though this may not be likely, but we can leave that for future discussion. |
| Charter Communications | For completeness, main sentence should mention reporting in addition to channel sensing (this is common to all options).  Updated proposal:  For receiver to provide assistance, channel sensing and reporting needs to be performed. The following set of tools can be considered.   * Alt 1. Legacy RSSI measurement and reporting with possible enhancements * Alt 2. AP-CSI report * Alt 3. LBT at receiver   + Alt 3.1 eCCA   + Alt 3.2 Cat2 LBT |
| CATT | We are OK with the proposal. |
| Xiaomi | OK with the proposal. |
| Nokia, NSB | we are ok with the latest update + the proposal by Charter |
| Futurewei | We understand the proposal, and in general are OK with it. However, the text of the proposal implies that all these tools may be used may be used in the receiver assisted LBT. In our understanding it is not clear which and if some of these tools will be used. The group will need to further select from this set. Therefore, we propose the following changes:  For receiver to provide assistance, channel sensing and reporting need to be performed. The following set of tools can be considered for further discussions:   * Alt 1. Legacy RSSI measurement and reporting with possible enhancements * Alt 2. AP-CSI report * Alt 3. LBT at receiver   + Alt 3.1 eCCA   + Alt 3.2 Cat2 LBT |
| Intel | We are OK with the current text of the proposal. |

## Multibeam operation

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Key Proposals/Observations/Positions** |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Proposal 7: For NR operation in unlicensed bands between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz with LBT based channel access mechanism, when multiple UL transmissions are scheduled on multiple beams in TDM or SDM manner, then a mapping table should be configured to UE to allow different mapping combinations between LBT beams(s) and transmit beam(s) including  - One LBT beam to one transmit beam mapping  - One LBT beam to many transmit beams mapping (including omni-directional LBT as well)  Proposal 8: For NR operation in unlicensed bands between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz with LBT based channel access mechanism, when multiple DL/UL transmissions are scheduled on multiple beams in TDM in same COT, then LBT can be performed at the beginning of the transmissions and also in the middle of same COT, if needed, which is depending upon following gaps:  - Maximum allowed gap between the first symbol of the following scheduled transmission on a given beam and the last symbol of the transmitted (same) beam  - Or if there is no previous transmission on the same beam within a COT, then the maximum allowed gap between the between the first symbol of the following scheduled transmission on a given beam and the time instance when Cat 4 LBT was successful on a beam covering the transmit beam  Proposal 9: For NR operation in unlicensed bands between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz with LBT based channel access mechanism, when multiple DL/UL transmissions are scheduled on multiple beams in TDM in same COT, then either of Cat 1 LBT or Cat2 LBT can be applied in the middle of the COT depending upon the gaps between the two transmissions on the same beam or the gap between the transmission on a beam and first LBT at the beginning that covered the transmit beam  Proposal 10: For NR operation in unlicensed bands between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz with LBT based channel access mechanism, when multiple DL/UL transmissions are scheduled on multiple beams in TDM and if directional LBT is performed on multiple beams with Cat 4 LBT, then multiple COTs should be initiated corresponding to each of the LBT beam |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Proposal 8: Considering transmission opportunity and utilization of resource, multiple LBT beams that cover multiple transmission beams can be considered for the transmission with multiple beams in spatial domain multiplexing, if directional LBT is supported.  Proposal 9: Considering transmission opportunity and unnecessary interference to other device that is going to transmit transmission, Scheme-3 that “directional LBT for at the beginning of COT with sensing beam(s) that covers the first transmission beam, and additional directional LBT with sensing beam that covers the next transmission beam for each beam switching within COT” can be considered for the transmission with multiple beams in time domain multiplexing, if directional LBT is supported. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Proposal 9: For time domain multiplexing of transmissions in different beams in the same COT, support LBT at the beginning of COT by the initiating device with sensing beam(s) that covers all TDM transmission beams from the initiating device.  Proposal 10: LBT before subsequent transmissions by the initiating device within the same COT is not supported. |
| Samsung | Proposal 7:  • Support channel access mechanism with directional channel sensing.  • Support directional channel sensing in multi-beam operation:  o For multi-beam SDM scenario, both Alt 2 and Alt 3 can be supported.  SDM scenario is only applicable to gNB.  o For multi-beam TDM scenario, select between Alt 2 and Alt 3 depending on whether sensing is required for switching beams within a COT.  If sensing is supported within a COT, Type 2 channel access procedure with fixed sensing duration is sufficient.  TDM scenario can be applicable to both gNB and UE. |
| CATT | Proposal 6: When directional or omni-directional LBT with sensing beam(s) that covers all TDM beams has been performed at the beginning of COT, there is no need to support additional LBT in the middle of COT. |
| CAICT | Proposal 9: Multiple LBT beams covering multiple directions could be used for Cat2 LBT.  Proposal 10: Additional directional LBT with sensing beam that covers the next transmission beam for each beam switching in the middle of COT could be supported. |
| vivo | Proposal 3: Perform directional or omni-directional LBT at the beginning of COT with sensing beam(s) that covers all TDM beams or the first transmission beam, and additional directional LBT with sensing beam that covers the next transmission beam for each beam switching in the middle of COT. |
| TCL | Observation 5: Beam switching within an active COT may lead to collisions in case the new beam has at least partially non-overlapping coverage compared to the formerly active beam.  As this issue can degrade the quality of transmission, we propose to investigate further the mechanisms either preventing the channel access by neighboring devices, or some form of short LBT by the gNB prior to beam switching to ensure that no other device has taken over the channel.  Proposal 5: It is proposed to investigate the mechanisms which can avoid collisions due to double ownership of the shared carrier at beam transition events. |
| PANASONIC | Proposal 1: gNB performs directional LBT at the beginning of COT with a sensing beam or multiple sensing beams that covers all intended beams and additional directional LBT with sensing beam that covers the next transmission beam for each beam switching in the middle of COT. |
| Sony | Proposal 5: The following relationship between LBT beam and transmission beam should be specified   One LBT beam covers all transmission beams   Multiple LBT beams cover multiple transmission beams |
| NEC | Proposal 1: For the sensing/LBT beams on the same carrier with different directions, beam based channel access procedures could be performed independently in LBT mode operation. |
| Xiaomi | Proposal 7: Multi-beam transmission should be studied to fully take advantage of spatial diversity. |
| Apple | Proposal 5: Perform directional or omni-directional LBT at the beginning of COT with sensing beam(s) that covers all TDM beams and with no LBT before each beam switching in the middle of COT |
| Qualcomm | Proposal 9: For multi-beam COT, the sensing beam used at the start of the COT should represent the union of directions covered by the intended transmission beams.  Proposal 10: Consider the use of additional per-beam sensing before switching transmission beams for a COT |
| ITRI | Proposal 2: Multiple LBT beams cover multiple transmission beams should be supported for 60 GHz NR-U. |
| InterDigital | We support both Alt 1 and Alt 2. |

### Discussion

Discussion point:

Within a COT, what is the LBT requirement for MU-MIMO (SDM)?

Alt 1: Single LBT sensing with wide beam ‘cover’ all beams to be used in the COT with appropriate ED threshold

* Apple, vivo, FW, QC, Samsung, Intel, LGE, NEC, Xiaomi, Lenovo, Nokia, ZTE, Convida, HW, Spreadtrum, InterDigital, OPPO, Charter

Alt 2: Independent per-beam LBT sensing at the start of COT is performed for beams used in the COT

* Vivo, QC, Samsung, Intel, LGE, CATT, NEC, Xiaomi, Lenovo, Nokia, ZTE, DCM, Convida, HW, Spreadtrum, InterDigital, ITRI, OPPO, Charter

Alt 3: Left for gNB implementation

* Ericsson

Please provide your view below

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Apple | Alt 1 |
| vivo | Both Alt 1 and Alt 2 can be applied. |
| Futurewei | Alt 1 |
| Qualcomm | We support either or both mechanisms, based on gNB choice. These may have different impact to ED threshold as discussed in Section 2.8. |
| Ericsson | The question is how to define this single LBT sensing beam? Depending on the beam directions inside the COT and/or locations of the UEs, the sensing beam could be as wide as quasi-omnidirectional or omnidirectional. Also, for each COT, a sensing beam would then need a different precoder depending on the beam directions.  It is complex to define a directional sensing beam that covers several transmission beams for every transmission. This can be left to implementation. |
| Samsung | We support Alt 1 and Alt 2 for gNB (up to implementation to choose), and support Alt 2 only for UE. |
| Intel | Both Alt-1 and 2 should be supported to allow a wider range of possible implementations, and choices to address different use cases and scenarios. |
| LG Electronics | We support the both Alt 1 and Alt 2. For example, if the COT is acquired by the directional LBT with Beam A, the transmission of beam(s) is only allowed to the beam having the same direction as Beam A in the COT. |
| CATT | Alt.2.  The measurement result of Alt.2 is more accurate than the measurement result of Alt.1, |
| NEC | We support both Alt 1 and Alt 2. |
| Xiaomi | Both Alt 1 and Alt 2 can be applied. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | In our view, it is not necessary to limit to either Alt 1 or Alt 2. Both the alternatives have their own merits and can be supported. Basically, an explicit mapping between sensing beams and transmission beams could be supported and that could allow for supporting both alternatives. For example, one mapping could indicate that one wide sensing beam is associated with multiple transmission beams (Alt 1 - this is mainly applicable when the multiple transmission beams are neighbouring beams), while other mapping could indicate that different transmit beams are associated with different sensing beams (Alt 2 – this is useful when the multiple transmit beams are quite distributed, for example, multiple TRPs associated with multiple beams) |
| Nokia, NSB | Both options can be considered for now, and could be used based on gNBs discretion |
| ZTE, Sanechips | we tend to consider both Alt-1 and Alt-2. |
| DOCOMO | We support Alt 2. Alt 1 would require large specification effort. |
| Sony | We support both Alt 1 and 2. These could be selected by implementation. |
| Convida Wireless | Both Alt-1 and Alt-2 could be considered. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Both Alt 1 and Alt 2 are reasonable choices. If the transmission beams are in the same spatial continuum, the use of Alt 1 is more economic. However, if for instance, there are two transmission beams that are wide apart, it makes more sense to use Alt. 2. We agree with Qualcomm that EDT may be impacted by the choice of Alt. 1 or Alt. 2. |
| Spreadtrum | Both Alt 1 and Alt 2 should be considered. |
| InterDigital | We support both Alt 1 and Alt 2. |
| ITRI | We support Alt2 |
| Charter | Either Alt 1or Alt 2. |

Discussion point:

Within a COT, what is the LBT requirement for TDM of beams with beam switching?

Alt 1: Single LBT sensing with wide beam ‘cover’ all beams to be used in the COT with appropriate ED threshold

* FW, QC, Ericsson, Samsung, Intel, LGE, NEC, Xiaomi, Lenovo, Nokia, ZTE, Sony, HW, Spreadtrum, OPPO, InterDigital

Alt 2: Independent per-beam LBT sensing at the start of COT is performed for beams used in the COT

* Apple, FW (also fine), QC, Samsung, Intel, LGE, CATT, NEC, Xiaomi, Lenovo, Nokia, ZTE, DCM, Sony, HW, Spreadtrum, ITRI, OPPO, Charter

Alt 3: Alt 2 with additional requirement on Cat 2 LBT before beam switch

* Intel, LGE, Lenovo, ZTE, OPPO, vivo

Please provide your view below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Apple | Alt 2 |
| Futurewei | We prefer Alt 1. We could consider Alt-2 as well, however, additional details would be required if it is done via beam sweep. For instance, adding switching gaps between consecutive beams, constraints for the total beam sweeping time, how a COT time gap between consecutive transmission is measured, etc. |
| Qualcomm | We support Alt 1 or Alt 2 by gNB choice. These may have different impact to ED threshold as discussed in Section 2.8. |
| Ericsson | For TDM, it should be allowed to perform omni-directional or quasi-omni-directional LBT at the beginning of the COT and no LBT for the following beams in the COT. |
| Samsung | Alt 1 and Alt 2. |
| Intel | Once again all options could be adopted, and whether to use Cat-2 LBT or not could be left up to gNB’s decision. |
| LG Electronics | We support all the alternatives. It may be necessary to discuss whether to allow transmission of the multiple narrow beams included in the beam A (i.e., multiple beam sweeping transmission) and whether to allow the transmission of beam other than the LBT beam in the COT when LBT is performed with wide beam A. In this case, the Cat-2 LBT as the additional requirement maybe need to perform according to the gap between the transmissions. |
| CATT | Alt.2. |
| NEC | We support Alt 1 and Alt 2. More details should be discussed, such as switching gap at least. |
| Xiaomi | Both Alt 1 and Alt 2 can be applied. But for Alt 2, since the beams/transmissions are TDMed, there should be some restriction on the gaps between them. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | In our view, all the three alternatives should be supported. All three alternatives have their own merit. As mentioned for previous discussion point, an explicit mapping between sensing beams and transmission beams could be supported and that could allow for supporting these alternatives. |
| Nokia, NSB | Both options Alt 1 and Alt 2 considered for now, and can be used based on gNBs discretion. Definition of per-beam LBT sensing requires further studies; we don’t see that it needs to be concatenation of beam specific CCA check procedures” |
| ZTE, Sanechips | All options listed above seem to be fine. For Alt 3, whether Cat 2 LBT is required depends on the condition for using Cat2 LBT or gNB’s choice. |
| DOCOMO | We support Alt 2. Alt 1 would require large specification effort. |
| Sony | We support both Alt 1 and 2. These could be selected by implementation. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Similar as in the SDM case: Both Alt 1 and Alt 2 are reasonable choices. If the transmission of TDM beams are in the same spatial continuum, the use of Alt 1 is more economic. However, if for instance, there are two transmission beams that are wide apart, it makes more sense to use Alt. 2. We agree with Qualcomm that EDT may be impacted by the choice of Alt. 1 or Alt. 2. |
| Spreadtrum | We prefer Alt 1 and Alt 2. |
| vivo | Alt 3 is preferred. When the devices switches the beam, they should make sure that the channel has not been occupied during the transmission in previous direction. |
| InterDigital | We support Alt. 1, Alt. 2 and Alt.3. Alternate 3 might be required if there is a large gap between the COT initiation and the time when the beam is actually used for a transmission. |
| ITRI | We support Alt2 |
| Charter | We support Alt 2. |

### 2nd round discussion

Proposal 2.10.2-1 (capture alternatives. Seems stable):

For a COT with MU-MIMO (SDM) transmission, further consider the follow alternatives (down-select or support both)

* Alt 1: Single LBT sensing at the start of the COT with wide beam ‘cover’ all beams to be used in the COT with appropriate ED threshold
* Alt 2: Independent per-beam LBT sensing at the start of COT is performed for beams used in the COT

Additional comments:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine with the proposal and support to keep both alternatives |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal. As for our preference, we believe that both alternatived should be supported to allow a wider range of possible implementations, and choices to address different use cases and scenarios |
| vivo | We also prefer to have both alternatives. |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with the proposal and support both alternatives. |
| Xiaomi | OK with the proposal |
| Ericsson | It is intuitive that sensing beam needs to cover the transmission beam. Otherwise, it is not compliant with regulations. Also, it is complex to define a “single” LBT sensing beam that covers several transmission beams for every transmission. Both these options are viable and hence can be left to implementation.  We support Alt 1 in principle and highlight that it can be omni-directional or quasi-omnidirectional (covering all beams) LBT. Alt 2 can also be used by the gNB for flexibility sake. Therefore, we proposed that this can be left to implementation but at least Alt 1 with omni or quasi-omni LBT be supported. |
| LG Electronics | We are fine with the proposal. However, as we commented before, it may be necessary to discuss whether to allow transmission of the multiple narrow beams included in the beam A (i.e., multiple beam sweeping transmission) and whether to allow the transmission of beam other than the LBT beam in the COT when LBT is performed with wide beam A. In this case, the Cat-2 LBT as the additional requirement maybe need to perform according to the gap between the transmissions. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Agree the FL proposal and open to both alternatives. |
| Nokia, NSB | We are ok with both options. The gNB can use either option (or a combination thereof), and this may not have any RAN1 specs impact. |
| OPPO | We are fine with the proposal. |
| TCL | In our understanding, both options can be permitted with suitable choice of ED thresholds. |
| Apple | Agree with the proposal |
| Convida Wireless | We are fine with the proposal. |
| ITRI | Agree with the proposal |
| CATT | We are fine with the proposal. When using a single LBT sensing with wide beam to measure a transmission with narrow beam, it’s difficult for the specification to define the relationship between sensing beam and transmission beam, as well as the EDT for a specific transmission beam. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Generally OK with the proposal although we assume that the Single LBT beam in Alt. 1 is meant to be used at the beginning of the COT. So, it is better to clarify this. We suggest the following:  **Proposal:**  For a COT with MU-MIMO (SDM) transmission, further consider the follow alternatives (down-select or support both)   * Alt 1: Single LBT sensing at the start of the COT with wide beam ‘cover’ all beams to be used in the COT with appropriate ED threshold * Alt 2: Independent per-beam LBT sensing at the start of COT is performed for beams used in the COT |
| Samsung | We agree with FL’s proposal, and support both alternatives. The choice of the alternative can be up to gNB/UE’s implementation based on its capability. |
| NEC | We are fine with the proposal, and support both alternatives. |
| DOCOMO | We agree with FL’s proposal. |
| Sony | We are fine with the proposal, and support both alternatives. |
| Futurewei | We are fine with the proposals (both alternatives). |

Proposal 2.10.2-2 (capture alternatives, seems stable)

Within a COT with TDM of beams with beam switching, down-select one or more of the following LBT operations

* Alt 1: Single LBT sensing with wide beam ‘cover’ all beams to be used in the COT with appropriate ED threshold
* Alt 2: Independent per-beam LBT sensing at the start of COT is performed for beams used in the COT
* Alt 3: Independent per-beam LBT sensing at the start of COT is performed for beams used in the COT with additional requirement on Cat 2 LBT before beam switch

Additional comments:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support all three alternatives |
| Intel | Our view is that once again all alternatives could be adopted, and whether to use Cat-2 LBT or not could be left up to gNB’s decision. |
| Vivo | Prefer Alt. 3. |
| NEC | We support all alternatives. |
| Spreadtrum | We support Alt 1 and Alt 2. |
| Xiaomi | OK with the proposal |
| Ericsson | It is intuitive that sensing beam needs to cover the transmission beam. Otherwise, it is not compliant with regulations. Also, it is complex to define a “single” LBT sensing beam that covers several transmission beams for every transmission. This can be left to implementation.  We support Alt 1 in principle and highlight that it can be omni-directional or quasi-omnidirectional (covering all beams) LBT for simplicity sake. There is no need to specify how the LBT sensing beam covers the TDM beams in the COT. |
| LG Electronics | We support all alternatives. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | As our previous view, all options listed above seem to be fine. For Alt 3, whether Cat 2 LBT is equire depends on the condition for using Cat2 LBT or gNB’s choice. |
| Nokia, NSB | We support Alt 1 and Alt 2. The gNB can use either option (or a combination thereof), and this may not have any RAN1 specs impact. |
| TCL | The COT initiation should follow Alt 1 or Alt 2 style LBT. Once within the COT a beam is switched to a different beam in a TDM manner, a short LBT should be applied (Alt 3). |
| Apple | Support Alt 1 and 2. |
| Convida Wireless | We are ok to support all alternatives. |
| ITRI | We support Alt1 and Alt2. |
| CATT | We support Alt 2 and open to Alt 1. EN 302.567 doesn’t specify the additional requirement on LBT before beam switch and the LBT before beam switch will introduce Tx/Rx switching time. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Similar to SDM case, we support Alt. 1 and Alt. 2. |
| Samsung | We support Alt 1 and one from Alt 2/3. |
| DOCOMO | We support Alt 2. Alt 3 can also be considered. |
| Futurewei | We support Alt 1, but we are open to consider the Alt 2 |

### 3rd round discussion

Proposal 2.10.3-1 (capture alternatives. Seems stable):

For a COT with MU-MIMO (SDM) transmission, further consider the follow alternatives (down-select or support both)

* Alt 1: Single LBT sensing at the start of the COT with wide beam ‘cover’ all beams to be used in the COT with appropriate ED threshold
* Alt 2: Independent per-beam LBT sensing at the start of COT is performed for beams used in the COT

Additional comments (please only comment if you have issue with the proposal):

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| CATT | We are ok with the proposal. |
|  |  |

Proposal 2.10.3-2 (capture alternatives, seems stable)

Within a COT with TDM of beams with beam switching, down-select one or more of the following LBT operations

* Alt 1: Single LBT sensing with wide beam ‘cover’ all beams to be used in the COT with appropriate ED threshold
  + FFS: Details on the definition of "cover"
* Alt 2: Independent per-beam LBT sensing at the start of COT is performed for beams used in the COT
* Alt 3: Independent per-beam LBT sensing at the start of COT is performed for beams used in the COT with additional requirement on Cat 2 LBT before beam switch

Additional comments (please only comment if you have issue with the proposal):

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| CATT | We are ok with the proposal. |
| Futurewei | We are OK with the proposal. Please add as FFS that “cover” needs to be further discussed and clarified. Similar with the FFS in the previous proposals. |

## Multi-Channel Access

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Ericsson | Proposal 8 Support Type A multi-channel access from 37.213 wherein, LBT is performed per-carrier for the multi-channel case  Proposal 9 Do not support Type B multi-channel access from 37.213 |
|  |  |

### Discussion

Discussion point:

For multi-channel LBT,

* Alt 1 (Type A). Each channel performs independent eCCA
* Alt 2 (Type B). Identify a primary channel and perform eCCA on the primary channel, while perform Cat 2 LBT for other channels in the last observation slot

Please indicate company position on LBT for multi-channel access, Alt 1, Alt 2, or both, or others

Support

* Alt1: QC, Ericsson, LGE, CATT, Nokia, DCM, Sony, InterDigital, Charter
* Alt2
* Both: Apple, vivo (if cat 2 LBE defined), FW, Samsung, NEC, Xiaomi, Lenovo, ZTE (if cat 2 LBE defined), Convida, Spreadtrum, ITRI, OPPO

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Apple | Both. |
| vivo | If Cat 2 LBT is defined, it can be applied to Type B multi-channel access. Then both Alt 1 (type A) and Alt 2 (type B) can be supported for 60GHz. |
| Futurewei | Neutral, both may be supported and configured by gNB |
| Qualcomm | We support Alt 1. |
| Ericsson | Alt 1 is preferred. Alt 2 is not specified in HS EN 302 567. |
| Samsung | We support both alternatives. |
| Intel | We think this discussion is too premature, and we should first conclude on other topics before making a conclusion here. |
| LG Electronics | We support Alt 1. |
| CATT | Alt 1 |
| NEC | We support both alternatives. |
| Xiaomi | Both Alts can be considered. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Both alternatives could be supported |
| Nokia, NSB | Alt 1 is assumed as the baseline. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | If Cat2 LBT is supported, then we tend to support Alt1 and Alt2. |
| DOCOMO | We support Alt 1. |
| Sony | We support Alt 1 |
| Convida Wireless | Both Alt 1 and Alt 2 could be considered. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | This issue seems to have a substantial overlap with the LBT BW discussion in 2.1. We suggest to first agree on the LBT BW for single carrier and carrier aggregation cases in 2.1 and then revisit this issue if necessary. |
| Spreadtrum | Both Alt 1 and Alt 2 |
| InterDigital | Alt. 1 |
| ITRI | We support both |
| Charter | Alt 1. |

### 2nd round discussion

Proposal 2.11.2-1 (capture alternatives, seems stable)

Define Type A and Type B multi-channel channel access as:

* Type A: Perform independent eCCA for each channel
* Type B: Identify a primary channel and perform eCCA on the primary channel, while perform Cat 2 LBT for other channels in the last observation slot

Down-selection between

* Alt1: Support Type A multi-channel channel access only
* Alt2: Support both Type A and Type B multi-channel channel access.

Additional comments:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support Alt 2 |
| Intel | As previously mentioned, since this topic overlaps with other discussions (e.g., Cat-2 definition, LBT BW), we would rather prefer to defer the decision and revisit this topic later. At the current moment, we think that Alt-1 could be definitely supported, but the possible adoption of type-B should not be precluded. |
| vivo | Support Alt 2. |
| Spreadtrum | We support Alt 2. |
| Ericsson | Alt 1 is the baseline operation and the preferred choice. Type B in Alt 2 is not specified in HS EN 302 567. |
| LG Electronics | We support the proposal. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Support Alt 2. |
| Nokia, NSB | Type A is assumed as the baseline. The need for Type B is unclear, especially if fixed and relatively small CWS is assumed. |
| OPPO | Support Alt 2. |
| ITRI | Alt2 |
| CATT | Alt 1, Independent CCA for each channel. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | This can be discussed after LBT BW for CA case is agreed as CA can be considered as a special case of multi-channel. In general we support both eCCA on a channel that includes each smaller channels and eCCA on each individual channel. |
| Samsung | We are ok with the proposal, and support Alt 2. |
| NEC | We are fine with the proposal, and support Alt 2. |
| DOCOMO | We support the proposal, and support Alt 1. As HW mentioned above, it would depend on LBT BW for CA case. |
| Sony | We support Alt 1. |
| Futurewei | We support Alt 1 |

### 3rd round discussion

Proposal 2.11.3-1 (capture alternatives, seems stable)

Define Type A and Type B multi-channel channel access as:

* Type A: Perform independent eCCA for each channel
* Type B: Identify a primary channel and perform eCCA on the primary channel, while perform Cat 2 LBT for other channels in the last observation slot

Down-selection between

* Alt1: Support Type A multi-channel channel access only
* Alt2: Support both Type A and Type B multi-channel channel access.

Note: How eCCA is performed on each channel and LBT bandwidth used are separately discussed

Additional comments (please only comment if you have issue with the proposal):

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are in principle OK in terms of the functionality of Type A and Type B but it should be clarified the BW of each individual CAT2 LBT in Type B and CAT4 LBT in Type A as well as the LBT BW of the primary channel in Type B is a subject of an independent discussion. In particular, such an agreement does not imply that, similar to NR-U Rel-16, we necessarily define a LBT BW unit of a fixed size.  Proposal 2.11.3-1 (capture alternatives, seems stable) Modified  Define Type A and Type B multi-channel channel access as:   * Type A: Perform independent eCCA for each channel * Type B: Identify a primary channel and perform eCCA on the primary channel, while perform Cat 2 LBT for other channels in the last observation slot   Down-selection between   * Alt1: Support Type A multi-channel channel access only * Alt2: Support both Type A and Type B multi-channel channel access.   Note: LBT BW on the primary channel and each individual channel is the subject of further discussions. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon 2 | Thank you for adding the note but we are afraid that this does not address our concern that the BW over which eCCA is performed is a subject of another discussion. In fact, our concern is not about “how eCCA is peformed” but specifically the BW over which the eCCA is performed. We suggest the note that we suggested above or the following note instead:  Proposal 2.11.3-1 (capture alternatives, seems stable) Modified  Define Type A and Type B multi-channel channel access as:   * Type A: Perform independent eCCA for each channel * Type B: Identify a primary channel and perform eCCA on the primary channel, while perform Cat 2 LBT for other channels in the last observation slot   Down-selection between   * Alt1: Support Type A multi-channel channel access only * Alt2: Support both Type A and Type B multi-channel channel access.   FFS: BW of the channels over which eCCAs are performed  Moderator: Are you talking about the issue discussed in proposal 2.1.5-1? Isn’t it enough to point to that discussion? |
| Futurewei | We are OK with the Proposal. In our understanding the initial Note covers the BW discussion. We are OK adding to the note HW explanation too:  Note: How eCCA is performed on each channel, and the BW of the channels over which eCCAs are performed is separately discussed |

## SSB related

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Key Proposals/Observations/Positions** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Proposal 11: For operation in the 60GHz unlicensed band, support LBT before SSB burst transmission. |
| Intel | Observation 3:  • 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.  Proposal 14: 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.  Observation 4: 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. |
| Convida | Proposal 7: Increasing the number of SSB candidate positions to above 64 to increase transmission opportunities to cope with LBT failure should be considered. |

### Discussion

Discussion point:

SSB transmission with no-LBT is supported under the short control signalling framework when 10% over 100ms restriction is satisfied

FFS: Restrictions to SSB transmission with no LBT

Support: Apple, vivo, FW, QC, Ericsson, Samsung, Intel, LGE, CATT, NEC (for 480/960KHz), Xiaomi, Lenovo, Nokia, ZTE, DCM, Convida, Spreadtrum, OPPO, InterDigital, Charter

Not support: HW (LBT always needed)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Apple | Agree with the proposal. SSB transmission with no-LBT supported under short control signalling framework. This can simplify UE implementation and all measurement design and requirement.  For 480KHz SCS and 960KHz SCS, |
| vivo | SSB can be considered as short control message without LBT. |
| Futurewei | Support proposal in principle, however short control signalling restrictions may not be satisfied (120 kHz). |
| Qualcomm | We support the proposal. |
| Ericsson | Support SSB transmissions with no-LBT under short control signalling framework |
| Samsung | Yes, SSB can be part of short control signalling, subject to the restriction in regulation. |
| Intel | Our view is that we should be very careful here in making sure that the minimum requirements mandated by the ETSI BRAN are met. As mentioned above, for 120 kHz SCS, transmission of 64 SSB with 20 msec SSB periodicity exceeds the maximum of 10% duty cycle required to qualify for short control signal exemption. |
| LG Electronics | Seems overlapped with 2.6.1. As expressed in 2.6.1, we support SSB transmission with no-LBT supported under short control signalling framework |
| CATT | Agree with the proposal. |
| NEC | We support the SSB transmission with no-LBT for 480/960kHz SCS. |
| Xiaomi | Agree with moderator’s proposal. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are okay with the suggested text |
| Nokia, NSB | Agree with the proposal |
| ZTE, Sanechips | As mentioned in Section 2.6, we would like to first confirm one issue that the time occupied by channel/signal itself (that is regarded as short control signalling), or, the time span for channel/signal (that is regarded as short control signalling) transmission is used as a metric to judge whether it meets the condition to be less than 10ms within 100ms observation window.  After the above issue is clarified, we will further discuss whether SSB for different SCS is suitable to be used as short control signalling. |
| DOCOMO | We support above, i.e. SSB transmission with no-LBT supported under short control signalling frame work. |
| Sony | Support the proposal. |
| Convida Wireless | We share the same view with Intel. For SSB 10% duty cycle required to qualify for short control signal exemption may depend on SCS (e.g., 120KHz, 480KHz, 960KHz) and may need further discussions. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | This is discussed in Section 2.6.1 already where SSB is listed in short control signalling framework. No need to discuss this issue here again. However, for the sake of reference, here is our view from Section 2.6.1:   * 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. * **Regarding SSB Exemption:** 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. |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with the proposal. |
| InterDigital | We agree with the proposal |
| Intel | We are now fine with the proposal. Just one small editorial change:  SSB transmission with no-LBT is supported under the short control signalling framework when 10% over 100ms restriction is satisfied.  FFS: Restrictions to SSB transmission with no LBT |
| Charter | We agree with Intel on caution re. 10% duty cycle requirement for short control signal exemption. |

Discussion point:

SSB transmission with LBT is supported, at least when the conditions for contention exempt short control signalling based SSB transmission is not met

Note the channel access for SSB with LBT may not be different from a normal COT with multiple beams

FFS: If any difference from a multi-beam COT LBT needs to be introduced

~~FFS: How to perform LBT for SSB transmissions, such as~~

* ~~Single eCCA covers all SSB beams before the SSB burst transmission~~
* ~~Multi-beam eCCA before SSB burst transmission~~
* ~~Cat 2 LBT before each beam~~

Support: FW, QC, Intel, NEC, Xiaomi, Spreadtrum, OPPO, Charter

Not support: Apple

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Apple | Do not see the need to specify SSB transmission with LBT. SSB transmission within short control signalling framework enable efficient design for access, beam management and RRM/RLF measurement.  480KHz and 960KHz SCS has no issue to meet 10% limitation of short control signalling. For 120KHz SCS, with max 64 SSB, total SSB transmission is over 10%. However, SSB transmission within an already acquired COT should not be counted as short control signalling. Configuration of 64 SSB with 120KHz SCS can be up to gNB implementation to ensure 10% requirement is met. |
| vivo | As mentioned toward short control signalling, one concern from our side is that the impact of potential contention given no LBT is performed before such short control signalling transmission. Whether SSB with no-LBT is sufficient for system operation is not clear to us. With hat, we prefer to study further whether to support SSB with LBT as well. |
| Futurewei | Support SSB with LBT, short control signalling restrictions may not be satisfied (120 kHz). |
| Qualcomm | We Support the proposal prefer single eCCA for simplicity. Multi-beam eCCA can be done with gNB implementation. The eCCA should be compatible with the decision for TDM multI-beam COT. |
| Ericsson | Like TDM transmissions, no need to specify this. |
| Samsung | There is scenario that SSB transmission has to use LBT. For that scenario, it can be similar to regular multi-beam transmission (the first two bullet should be carried over from above discussion), and the discussion point is whether to adopt the third bullet in particular for SSB? |
| Intel | We are OK with the proposal and to support LBT for SSB. However, there could be use cases and configurations where the applicability of the short control signalling exemption on SSB is possible: for these cases the transmission of SSB could be supported without the use of LBT. In this matter, RAN1 should further study when and whether this should be only applied for 120 KHz SCS, for the reason mentioned a signalling exemption applies to SSB |
| LG | Support SSB with LBT, and single eCCA covering all SSB beams before the SSB burst transmission or multi-beam eCCA before SSB burst transmission can be considered. |
| CATT | We are OK to further discuss LBT for SSB |
| NEC | We support the SSB transmission with LBT. Although the short control signalling might be applied to SSB transmission for higher SCS(480/960kHz), LBT mode still be necessary at least for lower SCS the due to related restrictions. We are open to the detailed eCCA procedure, e.g. single eCCA or multiple-beam eCCA. |
| Xiaomi | Agree with Futurewei’s view, that when SCS=120kHz, may be SSB can not satisfy theshort control signalling restrictions, and may need to use LBT. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | All the three possibilities should be supported |
| Nokia, NSB | Ideally, all SSBs can be transmitted without LBT as Short Control Signals. This point may be revisited after the details of SCS have been clarified further |
| ZTE, Sanechips | In order to keep the same rule for SSB with different SCS, we support SSB with LBT operation. Regarding LBT for SSB transmission with different beams, we think it is more appropriate to perform multi-beam eCCA before SSB burst transmission and Cat2 LBT before each beam to increase SSB transmission chance and avoid some unnecessary interference for ongoing transmission node because the interference is different in the beginning of SSB burst and within SSB burst. |
| DOCOMO | We agree to study the FFSs further. |
| Sony | We support SBS transmission with LBT. |
| Convida Wireless | We agree that SSB transmission with LBT could be supported. All the three possibilities can be considered and supported |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | SSB transmission with LBT should be supported. The LBT beam(s) can follow the decision made for LBT for TDM multi-beam operation in Section 2.10. |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with the proposal. |
| InterDigital | If it is determined that all SSBs cannot be transmitted assuming Short Control Signalling, then discuss LBT for SSB |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal. However, we would rather prefer the following language:  “SSB transmission with LBT is supported, at least when the short control signalling exemption cannot be met” |
| Charter | Support specification of SSB transmission with LBT and unacquired COT, left as much as possible to gNB implementation. |

### 2nd round discussion

Proposal 2.12.2-1 (majority view except HW. Covered by proposal 2.6.2-1):

* SSB transmission with no-LBT is supported under the short control signalling framework when 10% over 100ms restriction is satisfied
  + FFS: Restrictions to SSB transmission with no LBT

Actually some redundancy with 2.6.2 discussion. Can consider together.

Additional comments:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine the proposal |
| Intel | We are OK with the current text of the proposal. However, this seems to overlap with proposal in 2.6.2, and the two could be merged together. |
| Fujitsu | We are fine with the proposal |
| vivo | Support this proposal.  Same view as Intel, it is duplicated with proposal in 2.6.2. |
| NEC | We support the proposal. |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Xiaomi | Fine with the proposal |
| Ericsson | We support this proposal, but we note that this is redundant with section 2.6.2. |
| LG Electronics | We are fine with the proposal. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | The same view as Intel. |
| Nokia, NSB | We support the proposal |
| TCL | We are supportive of this proposal. |
| Apple | Support |
| Convida Wireless | We are ok with the proposal. |
| ITRI | We support the proposal |
| CATT | Fine with the proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | In our view, this is essentially the same proposal as in 2.6.2 but without FFS points. So, we are not if this needs to be discussed as it is included in the proposal in Section 2.6.2. In any case, we cannot accept this proposal due to the reasons explained in details in Section 2.6.2. |
| Samsung | OK with the proposal. |
| NEC | We support the proposal. |
| Sony | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Futurewei | We are fine with the proposal. |

Proposal 2.12.2-2 (majority view except Apple):

* SSB transmission with LBT is supported, at least when the conditions for contention exempt short control signalling based SSB transmission is not met
  + Note the channel access for SSB with LBT may not be different from a normal COT with multiple beams
  + FFS: If any difference from a multi-beam COT LBT needs to be introduced

Additional comments:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support the proposal |
| Intel | We are supportive of this proposal. |
| Fujitsu | Fine with the proposal |
| vivo | Support this proposal |
| NEC | We support the proposal. |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Xiaomi | Fine with the proposal |
| Ericsson | If the note is valid, there is no need to specify this explicitly. It can be left to gNB implementation based on the discussion in 2.6. |
| LG Electronics | We are fine with the proposal. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Support FL proposal. |
| Nokia, NSB | We are ok with the proposal, but this may not have any specification impact. |
| TCL | We support this proposal from FL. |
| Apple | Existing LBT procedure can be used for all channels before transmission. No need to explicitly specify the LBT procedure defined in EN 302 567 can be applied which channel that short control signalling can apply.  This related to discussion in 2.6.1, “Usage restriction on short control signalling is enforced by gNB implementation”. |
| Convida Wireless | We support FL proposal. |
| ITRI | We are fine with the proposal. |
| CATT | Fine with the proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are OK with the proposal. |
| Samsung | OK with the proposal. |
| Sony | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Futurewei | We are OK with the proposal. |

### 3rd round discussion

Proposal 2.12.3-1 (majority view except Apple):

* SSB transmission with LBT is supported, at least when the conditions for contention exempt short control signalling based SSB transmission is not met
  + Note the channel access for SSB with LBT may not be different from a normal COT with multiple beams
  + FFS: If any difference from a multi-beam COT LBT needs to be introduced

Additional comments (please only comment if you have issue with the proposal):

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| CATT | We are ok with the proposal. |
| Xiaomi | OK with the proposal. |
| Futurewei | We are OK with the proposal. |

## Misc Issues

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Key Proposals/Observations/Positions** |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Proposal 13: Study and evaluate the impact of LBT and the limitation of COT length on the procedure of beam failure detection. |
| Samsung | Proposal 8: Support indicating COT, available RB set, and search space group switching in a beam-specific manner for 60 GHz licensed band.  Proposal 10: Support RSSI measurement outside the active BWP and in non-serving cell. |
| ITRI | Proposal 3: PDCCH monitoring enhancement for M-TRP operation should be supported for 60 GHz NR-U. |
| Fujitsu | Proposal 3: It is unnecessary to have explicit restrictions on direction of transmissions within a channel occupancy initiated by directional LBT. It can be achieved by gNB scheduling if needed. |
| Intel | According to Chairman’s guidance, discussion about short signal exemption applicability for PRACH should be also discussed in this agenda.  From our analysis and understanding, any PRACH with SCS equal or larger than 120kHz should be able to satisfy short signal exemption. Not applying LBT for PRACH does significantly reduce added complexity needed for random access procedures and should be utilized in NR.  Suggest to support application of short signal exemption to PRACH transmissions. Further study could be made for other signals/channels, e.g. Msg 3, HARQ-ACK, RMSI, CSI/RS, etc. |
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