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# Introduction

This contribution summarizes discussions on initial access aspects of NR extension up to 71 GHz. The discussion of the initial access aspects has been approved for email discussion until May 27, 2021.

* [105-e-NR-52-71GHz-01] Email discussion/approval on initial access aspects with checkpoints for agreements on May-24, May-27 – Daewon (Intel)

# Summary of issues

## 2.1 SSB Aspects

### 2.1.1 Supported Numerology

* From [1] Futurewei:
	+ Support no more than one additional SCS for CD-SSB. If an additional SCS is supported, the support should be mandatory for CD-SSB.
	+ Support only the CD-SSB SCSs in for CORESET#0, SIB1, PRACH CBRA.
* From [2] Huawei, HiSilicon:
	+ Following the agreement in RAN1 #104-e, no further discussion on supported SSB SCSs is required. Continue discussions on other aspects of initial access design based on the current agreements regarding the supported SSB SCSs.
* From [3] vivo:
	+ Support 480/960 kHz SCS for both initial BWP and SSB
	+ Support ALT1 and ALT4 as the solution for SSB and initial/non-initial BWP design, and prefer ALT4.
		- ALT 1)
			* Support SSB with 240/480/960 kHz for initial and non-initial access with support of CORESET0/Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB.
			* It is assumed that RAN4 supports a channelization design which results in the total number of synchronization raster entries in the 57 – 71 GHz band no larger than 400 (Note: the total number of synchronization raster entries in FR2 for band n259 is 344). If the assumption cannot be satisfied, it’s up to RAN4 to decide which of 240/480/960 kHz SCS are supported for initial access of such band.
			* RAN1 prioritizes time-domain multiplex of SSB and CORESET0 to minimize the number of needed synchronization raster entries.
			* Supporting 480 kHz SCS and 960 kHz SCS for SSB are UE capabilities:
				+ UE is not expected to support 480 kHz SCS for SSB if it doesn’t support 480 kHz SCS for data/control channels.
				+ UE is not expected to support 960 kHz SCS for SSB if it doesn’t support 960 kHz SCS for data/control channels.
			* Send an LS to RAN2 and RAN4.
		- ALT 4)
			* Support SSB with 240 and one of 480 or 960 kHz for initial and non-initial access with support of CORESET0/Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB.
				+ [SSB time domain candidate resource pattern (within a slot or pair of slots) for 480 and 960kHz SSB are identical]
				+ [only 1 CORESTE#0/Type0-PDCCH SCS supported for each SSB SCS]
			* It is assumed that RAN4 supports a channelization design which results in the total number of synchronization raster entries in the 57 – 71 GHz band no larger than 400 (Note: the total number of synchronization raster entries in FR2 for band n259 is 344). per band. If the assumption cannot be satisfied, it’s up to RAN4 to decide which of 240/480/960 kHz SCS are supported for initial access of such band.
			* RAN1 prioritizes time-domain multiplex of SSB and CORESET0 to minimize the number of needed synchronization raster entries.
			* Supporting 480 kHz SCS and 960 kHz SCS for SSB are UE capabilities:
				+ UE is not expected to support 480 kHz SCS for SSB if it doesn’t support 480 kHz SCS for data/control channels.
				+ UE is not expected to support 960 kHz SCS for SSB if it doesn’t support 960 kHz SCS for data/control channels.
* From [4] Spreadtrum:
	+ SSB with 240kHz SCS can be down-prioritized.
	+ SSB with 480/960kHz SCS can be supported for the case where SSB is configured with Type0-PDCCH.
	+ SSB with 480/960kHz SCS can be supported for the case where SSB is used for initial cell selection, if the following conditions are satisfied:
		- The sync raster for 480/960kHz SSB is sparse enough;
		- Initial cell selection with 480/960kHz SSB is an optional UE capability, and to allow UE only supporting initial cell selection with 120kHz SSB to access a cell gNB should guarantee 120kHz SSB is deployed in the cell.
* From [5] Nokia, NSB:
	+ Confirm that PSCell and SCell operation with 480kHz and 960kHz SSB is supported from RAN1 perspective.
	+ Consider support for “initial access” (initial cell selection) for 480kHz and 960kHz kHz SCS SSB and mitigate the UE complexity via properly defining SS-raster.
	+ Support 240 kHz SCS for the SSB transmission in NR bands ranging between 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz
* From [6] CATT:
	+ Support of 480 KHz and/or 960 KHz SCS for initial access can be considered after RAN4’s confirmation for channelization design with acceptable synchronization raster entries.
* From [8] Qualcomm:
	+ RAN1 can continue to discuss other options for the SSB SCS support, but prioritize design on the already agreed choices (120 kHz SCS for initial access and 480 kHz and 960 kHz for non-initial access case where SSB location and SCS are explicitly provided to the UE and SSB does not configure Type-0 PDCCH)
* From [9] OPPO:
	+ For above 52.6GHz, adopt single numerology for initial access, where the numerology candidates are 120kHz, 480kHz and 960kHz.
	+ For above 52.6GHz, 240kHz SSB SCS is not supported.
* From [10] ZTE, Sanechips:
	+ SSB with 480/960kHz SCS should be supported in both initial and non-initial access cases.
* From [11] Intel:
	+ Support 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS for SSB for initial access cases.
		- Note: support of 480kHz and/or 960kHz SCS for SSB is optional.
* From [14] Sony:
	+ 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS for SSB for initial access should be supported for NR above 52.6 GHz.
		- If neither 480 kHz nor 960 kHz SCS is supported for SSB for initial access, 240 kHz SCS for SSB for initial access should be supported.
	+ 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS for initial access related signals and channels should be supported for NR above 52.6 GHz regardless of supporting SCS SSB.
* From [16] Samsung:
	+ Support 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS for SS/PBCH block in initial access case.
* From [18] LGE:
	+ Support 240 kHz SCS for SS/PBCH block in frequency range from 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz.
	+ At most one of 480 and 960 kHz SCSs can be additionally supported for SS/PBCH block with initial access.
* From [19] Lenovo, Motorola Mobility:
	+ For supporting NR from 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz in Rel. 17, support the same numerologies of data channel for SSB including 480kHz and 960kHz for both initial access and non-initial access cases
	+ For supporting NR from 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz in Rel. 17, if higher subcarrier spacings (numerologies) are adopted for initial access, coverage enhancement of channels and signals used for initial access should be considered for NR beyond 52.6 GHz.
* From [20] Xiaomi:
	+ Beyond 120k Hz SCS, at least one of 240/480/960 kHz SCSs should be configured for cell defined SSB.
	+ SSB and CORESET0 multiplexing configuration tables can be reused for 120kHz SCS SSB, but may need update if additional SCS for SSB is agreed for initial access.
* From [21] Interdigital:
	+ Further study necessity of SSBs and initial access related signals/channels for additional SCSs in Rel-17.
* From [22] Convida:
	+ The support of non-initial SSB design for higher SCS 480 KHz and 960 KHz can be based on Rel-15/16 SSB design as baseline to minimize the specification impact.
* From [23] NTT Docomo:
	+ For SSB SCS, in addition to 120 kHz:
		- 480 and/or 960 kHz SCS should be supported for initial access case.
		- The support of 480 and/or 960 kHz SCS for SSB can be optional as well as for the other signals/channels.
	+ For SCS used for CORESET#0 PDCCH and SIB1 PDSCH, in addition to 120 kHz:
		- Both 480 and 960 kHz SCS should be supported.

#### Summary of Discussions

* Various views on SSB SCS
	+ No need to discuss further:
		- Huawei, HiSilicon
	+ Support 240kHz SSB
		- LGE, Nokia, NSB,
	+ No more than 1 additional SCS for cell defining SSB
		- Futurewei
	+ Support at least one of 120, 480, or 960kHz SSB for initial access
		- Xiaomi
	+ Support one of 480 and 960kHz SSB for initial access
		- Vivo, LGE
	+ Support 480 and 960kHz SSB for initial access (with conditions: e.g. optional UE capability, sparse SS raster)
		- Spreadtrum, Nokia, NSB, CATT
	+ Support 480 and 960kHz SSB for initial access
		- OPPO, ZTE, Sanechip, Intel, Sony, Samsung, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, Docomo
	+ Continue discussions
		- Qualcomm (prioritize current agreed choices in design), Interdigital
* Moderator suggestions:
	+ any companies have discussed this issue, continue discussion over email along with other issues.
	+ Given the limited TU and agreement from last RAN1 meeting, moderator suggests to only bring this issue up in GTW if there is close to consensus on a proposal.
		- Proposals described by vivo or Samsung might be good starting point for discussions.

#### **1st Round Discussion:**

Discussion on support of CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH configuration in MIB can be discussed in Section 2.1.2 and 2.1.5. Please provide further comments on 240/480/960kHz SSB and clarification on optionality.

* Further discussion on 240/480/960kHz SSB
	+ Alt 1) Supporting 240, 480, and 960 kHz SSB for initial & non-initial access with support of CORESET0/Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB with constraints.
	+ Alt 2) Supporting 240 kHz and one of 480 or 960 kHz SSB for initial & non-initial access with support of CORESET0/Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB with constraints.
	+ Alt 3) Supporting one of 240, 480, or 960 kHz SSB for initial & non-initial access with support of CORESET0/Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB with constraints.
	+ Alt 4) Supporting 480 and 960 kHz for initial & non-initial access with support of CORESET0/Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB with constraints.
	+ Alt 5) Supporting one of 480 or 960 kHz SSB for initial & non-initial access with support of CORESET0/Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB with constraints.
	+ Alt 6) conclude no support of 240, 480, and 960kHz SSB for initial access.
	+ Additional constraints:
		- Limited sync raster entry numbers (details can be sorted out if generally acceptable)
		- only 1 CORESTE#0/Type0-PDCCH SCS supported for each SSB SCS
		- SSB time domain candidate resource pattern (within a slot or pair of slots) for 480 and 960kHz SSB are identical
* Clarification on optionality of 480/960kHz SCS.
	+ Supporting 480 kHz SCS and 960 kHz SCS for SSB are UE capabilities:
		- UE is not expected to support 480 kHz SCS for SSB if it doesn’t support 480 kHz SCS for data/control channels.
		- UE is not expected to support 960 kHz SCS for SSB if it doesn’t support 960 kHz SCS for data/control channels
	+ Optionally Supporting 480/960kHz SSB is:
		- Alt A) same capability as supporting 480/960kHz SCS, respectively (e.g. single capability per SCS, UE indicates support of 480kHz SCS mean support 480kHz SSB and 480kHz data/control/RS)
		- Alt B-1) separate capability from supporting 480/960kHz SCS for data/control/RS, respectively, and same capability for supporting initial access (if this case is supported) & non-initial access (2 different capability for each SCS)
		- Alt B-2) separate capability from supporting 480/960kHz SCS for data/control/RS, respectively, and seperate capability for supporting initial access (if this case is supported) & non-initial access (3 different capability for each SCS)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| DOCOMO | For the 1st bullet, our best preference is Alt 1. Second preference is Alt 4 or Alt 5. Not prefer Alt 2 nor Alt 3, but we can live with them also if it gets clear majority. Not support Alt 6. For additional constraints, we are ok with the captured three sub-sub-bullets but it should depend on the exact alternative we will take in our view. For the 2nd bullet, while we prefer to discuss about anything related to optionality, our preference is to associate it with the optionality on the support of 480/960k SCS for data/control, i.e. the 2nd sub-sub-bullet in the 1st sub-bullet and Alt A.  |
| LG Electronics | Our first preference is to support 240 for initial & non-initial access with support of CORESET0/Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB with constraints. So, please add * Alt 7) Supporting 240 for initial & non-initial access with support of CORESET0/Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB with constraints

As a compromise, we can accept Alt 2.Regarding UE capabilities on 480/960 kHz SCS, we prefer Alt A. By the way, Alt B can be updated as follows.* + - Alt B-1) separate capability from supporting 480/960kHz SCS for SSB and data/control/RS, respectively, and same capability for supporting initial access (if this case is supported) & non-initial access (2 different capability for each SCS)
		- Alt B-2) separate capability from supporting 480/960kHz SCS for SSB and data/control/RS, respectively, and ~~seperate~~ separate capability for supporting initial access (if this case is supported) & non-initial access (3 different capability for each SCS)
 |
| Samsung | Our first preference is Alt 5), and can compromise to Alt 1) or 4). 2) and 3) seem need to be modified, since we already agreed to support 480 and 960 for non-initial access case, and if our understanding is correct, the “one of 480 or 960” only applies to initial access case. With such clarification, we are also ok with Alt 2) as a compromise. For the UE capability discussion, we already provide our understanding in the tdoc, and we are also with defining the same UE capability for SSB and data/control/RS for each SCS.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | * Regarding discussion on 240/480/960kHz SSB:
	+ Alt 6): The reason to support 480 kHz or 960 kHz SSB SCS was to facilitate a single-numerology operation. However, this is already achievable under the current agreements (supporting 120 kHz SSB SCS for both initial access and non-initial access and supporting 480/960 kHz SSB SCS for non-initial access case with SSB not configuring Type-0 PDCCH) by means of having all initial access signals/channels in 120 kHz and, after RRC connection, entirely operating on a BWP with a configured 480 kHz or 960 kHz SCS if needed. Moreover, we have already agreed in RAN1 #104-e that ***“Whether or not to support 240 kHz, 480kHz and 960kHz SCS for SSB and the conditions under which SSB for 240 kHz, 480 kHz and 960 kHz may be supported will be decided no later than RAN1#104bis-e.”*** We do not see any reason to revert this agreement and continue discussion on supported SSB SCSs.
* Regarding clarification on optionality of 480/960kHz SCS:
	+ The detail of the UE capability can be discussed at a later stage. Moreover, we do not think it is useful to discuss whether one UE capability bit or two different UE capability bits are required for the support of 480(960) kHz SSB for initial access and non-initial access case. Such a discussion is on a subject that has no urgency (UE capability bits) and, further, is speculative, as based on current agreements, 480(960) kHz SSB for initial access is not supported. If there is a need to make progress in this regard, we suggest to formally agree on the two sub-bullets of the first bullet which actually help us to in the UE capability discussion down the road:
		- ***Proposal:***
			* ***UE is not expected to support 480 kHz SCS for SSB if it doesn’t support 480 kHz SCS for data/control channels.***
			* ***UE is not expected to support 960 kHz SCS for SSB if it doesn’t support 960 kHz SCS for data/control channels***
 |
| Qualcomm | For the 1st bullet, Alt 6 can be considered as the default/baseline assumption based on the agreement we had so far (in RAN1#104-e and RAN#104bis-e), namely: “*Whether or not to support 240 kHz, 480kHz and 960kHz SCS for SSB and the conditions under which SSB for 240 kHz, 480 kHz and 960 kHz may be supported will be decided no later than RAN1#104bis-e.”*However, if further discussions are needed, we support Alt 7 (as proposed by LG with a small modification), namely: *Supporting 240 kHz SCS SSB for initial & non-initial access with support of CORESET0/Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB ~~with constraints~~*. For the reasons mentioned our paper, we prefer not to support 480/960 kHz for initial access. For non-initial access (*with support of CORESET0/Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB*), we can support 480/960 kHz SCS only if the timing of the SSB is known to the UE:Alt 8): Supporting 480 and 960 kHz SSB for non-initial access with support of CORESET0/Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB if the timing of the SSB is known to the UE.For the 2nd bullet, we support Alt A. |
| Mediatek | Alt 6 is the preferred option. We share similar with Huawei that based on current agreement, single numerology operation can be obtained. Besides, the significance of 480/960 kHz SCS for ANR purpose is not clear to us, since by using 120 kHz SCS, the CGI information can be provided to UE. It would be very much appreciated if it can be further clarified. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Alt 4 is our first preference. But as a compromise, Alt 1, 2 and 5 can also be accepted for us. From the perspective of future evolution, SSB supporting SCS 480/960 kHz may help 5G NR to have a unified design to support even higher frequency band in the future, such as above 71 GHz. We should allow some enhancements in this WI to make the system more efficient. The additional standardization impact of supporting SSB SCS 480/960 kHz in initial access case is relatively small, since we have already agreed to support two SCSs in non-initial access. For the discussion on optionality, the first bullet and corresponding sub-bullets are fine to us. As for the 2nd bullet, we support Alt A. |
| Nokia | For the first main bullet, our preference would be Alt 1), we can also compromise to Alt 4) if majority so prefers. If we need to limit further to single additional scs for initial access, based on e.g. Alt3 or 5, our preference would be in order of 960kHz, 240kHz or 480kHz. We are also OK with the proposed additional constraints. On the second main bullet, we are fine with the first sub-bullet, i.e. support of 480kHz or 960kHz SSB/SCS is not mandatory for the UE. We would prefer Alt-A for defining the relation between control/data support and SSB support. |
| Xiaomi | Alt2 and Alt3 are our preference, we do not support Alt6. Other FL’s proposal is ok to us. |
| OPPO | For 240/480/960kHz SSB, we support Alt 4) and can compromise to Alt 5) or 1).For optionality of 480/960kHz SCS, we support Alt A). |
| Futurewei | We prefer Alt-6 as the first option, which is the status quo and sufficient for single numerology operation. As a compromise Alt-7 proposed by LGE with Qualcomm modifications can be acceptable to us. For the second bullet we support Alt-A. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | For the first bullet, we prefer Alt. 4, supporting both 480 and 960kHz for SSB for initial/non-initial access to allow single numerology operation and to avoid the necessity of BWP switching when data/control use these values. We are also fine with Alt. 1 to support 240kHz as an additional numerology since it is already supported for FR2. We don’t see the motivation to select only one SCS among 240, 480, and 960kHz. For the second bullet, we are fine with the sub-sub-bullets under the first sub-bullet and Alt A for the second sub-bullet. |
| Interdigital | As for the supported SCS for the SSB, our preferences are Alt.4 and Alt.5 and we do not support Alt.6.As for the UE capability, we support the UE capability for SSB SCS to be the same as that of the data/control channels’ SCS. So, we support Alt A implying the single capability per SCS. |
| CATT | For the first bullet, we can accept Alt5 (with constraint satisfied), or alt6 with the ANR issue resolved. For UE capability discussion , we agree that UE is not expected to support 480 /960 kHz SCS for SSB if it doesn’t support 480/960 kHz SCS for data/control channels. But in general we think these discussion should happen at later stages. |
| Intel | Regarding SCS of SSB for initial access, our first preference is Alt.4 or Alt.5. We could also agree on Alt.1 or Alt.2. We think Alt.3 should be excluded from the list as it spurs further discussion on down-selection between SCS values. A clearer approach in that sense is to include Alt. 7 (from LG) into the list instead of Alt.3. We don’t think Alt.8 (from Qualcomm) is a real alternative suitable for discussion here as it says nothing about initial access case. Probably, it’s better to treat Alt.8 as part of discussion on Section 2.1.2 or 2.1.5.We don’t support Alt. 6 or Alt. 7. We still don’t agree that any of Alt.6 or Alt.7 can provide true single numerology operation as either of the alternatives mandates non-standalone (e.g., dual carrier) operation for devices which demand high data rates relying on wide bandwidth with large SCS.Regarding the clarification on optionality, we support the first sub-bullet. For the second sub-bullet, we are open for discussion among the different choices. If supporting different capability aids getting the group closer to agreement on SSB issues, we will be positive for it. |
| vivo | For the 1st bullet, our first preference is Alt 5, and can compromise to Alt 1 or Alt. 2 or Alt 4. We don’t support Alt. 6 and Alt. 7.As discussed is our contribution, if 480K/960KHz can’t be used for initial access case, the possible deployment scenarios allowed by spec are not suitable or efficient especially in managed networks. In this scenario, standalone operation in unlicensed band is typical. For Alt. 6, at least two BWPs or carriers with different SCS are mandatory to be supported in both network and UE side. For the 2nd bullet, we support Alt A. |
| Convida Wireless | For SSB SCS, we prefer Alt 4 and are open for Alt 1. Also, if SCS 480/960 KHz for SSB are supported, then Alt A is the first preference.  |
| Ericsson | Clearly Alt-6 is the baseline/fallback if there is no consensus.We support Alt-7 as proposed by LGE, since it requires no specification effort (already specified in Rel-15 FR2).We can accept Alt-1 to enable more use cases. We are okay with the additional constraints as long as both licensed and unlicensed operation are taken into account. However, to limit the work, we think there should also be a constraint on the supported SSB-CORESET0 multiplexing patterns.Regarding capabilities, we think that discussion can be deferred. There doesn't seem to be an urgency to settle that now. That being said, Alt-A with single capability per SCS seems logical.  |
| Sony | For SSB SCS, alt 4 or alt 5 is our first preference. Alt 1 or alt 2 could be fine for us since 240 kHz SCS has already been supported in FR2. |
| WILUS | For the 1st bullet on SCS for SSB, our first preference is Alt 4 or Alt 5. We are also fine with Alt 1 or Alt 2, but we do not support Alt. 6 or Alt 7. Regarding the 2nd bullet on optionality of 480/960kHz SCS, we support the 1st sub-bullet and support Alt A implying the single capability per SCS. |
| Spreadtrum | We support Alt 4. 480kHz and 960kHz SCS for SSB have equal positions, and 480kHz and 960kHz SCS for data/control also have equal positions.For initial access capability, we support separate capability for 480/960kHz respectively. For data/control capability, it should be not be discussed at this sub-topic, and it can be finalized in UE feature discussion. |

#### **1st Round Discussion Summary:**

Summary of responses from companies are provided below.

* Further discussion on 240/480/960kHz SSB
	+ Alt 1) Supporting 240, 480, and 960 kHz SSB for initial & non-initial access with support of CORESET0/Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB with constraints.
		- Docomo, Samsung, ZTE, Sanechips, Nokia, NSB, OPPO, ~~Futurewei,~~ Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, vivo, Ericsson, OPPO, Convida, Sony
	+ Alt 2) Supporting 240 kHz and one of 480 or 960 kHz SSB for initial & non-initial access with support of CORESET0/Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB with constraints.
		- LGE, Samsung, ZTE, Sanechips, vivo, Xiaomi, Sony
	+ Alt 3) Supporting one of 240, 480, or 960 kHz SSB for initial & non-initial access with support of CORESET0/Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB with constraints.
	+ Alt 4) Supporting 480 and 960 kHz for initial & non-initial access with support of CORESET0/Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB with constraints.
		- Docomo, Samsung, ZTE, Sanechips, ~~Futurewei,~~ Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, Interdigital, Intel, WILUS, Spreadtrum, OPPO, Convida, Sony, Spreadtrum
	+ Alt 5) Supporting one of 480 or 960 kHz SSB for initial & non-initial access with support of CORESET0/Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB with constraints.
		- Docomo, Samsung, ZTE, Sanechips, Nokia, NSB, OPPO, ~~Futurewei,~~ Interdigital, CATT, Intel, vivo, WILUS, Sony
	+ Alt 6) conclude no support of 240, 480, and 960kHz SSB for initial access.
		- Huawei, HiSilicon, Qualcomm, Mediatek, Futurewei, CATT(with ANR resolved)
	+ Alt 7) Supporting 240kHz SCS SSB for initial & non-initial access with support of CORESET0/Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB
		- LGE, Qualcomm, Ericsson, Futurewei
	+ Alt 8) Supporting 480 and 960 kHz SSB for non-initial access with support of CORESET0/Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB if the timing of the SSB is known to the UE.
		- Qualcomm
	+ Additional constraints:
		- Limited sync raster entry numbers (details can be sorted out if generally acceptable)
		- only 1 CORESTE#0/Type0-PDCCH SCS supported for each SSB SCS
		- SSB time domain candidate resource pattern (within a slot or pair of slots) for 480 and 960kHz SSB are identical
* Clarification on optionality of 480/960kHz SCS.
	+ Supporting 480 kHz SCS and 960 kHz SCS for SSB are UE capabilities:
		- UE is not expected to support 480 kHz SCS for SSB if it doesn’t support 480 kHz SCS for data/control channels.
		- UE is not expected to support 960 kHz SCS for SSB if it doesn’t support 960 kHz SCS for data/control channels
	+ Optionally Supporting 480/960kHz SSB is:
		- Alt A) same capability as supporting 480/960kHz SCS, respectively (e.g. single capability per SCS, UE indicates support of 480kHz SCS mean support 480kHz SSB and 480kHz data/control/RS)
			* Docomo, Samsung, Qualcomm, ZTE, Sanechips, Futurewei, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, Interdigital, vivo, Convida Wireless, Ericsson, WILUS
		- Alt B-1) separate capability from supporting 480/960kHz SCS for data/control/RS and SSB, respectively, and same capability for supporting initial access (if this case is supported) & non-initial access (2 different capability for each SCS)
			* Spreadtrum
		- Alt B-2) separate capability from supporting 480/960kHz SCS for data/control/RS and SSB, respectively, and separate capability for supporting initial access (if this case is supported) & non-initial access (3 different capability for each SCS)
			* Spreadtrum

#### **2nd Round Discussion – Part 1:**

For the clarification on optionality of 480/960kHz SCS, all companies seem to be in alignment.

Suggest agreeing to following proposal:

##### **Proposal 1.1-1)**

* Supporting 480 kHz SCS and 960 kHz SCS are UE capabilities:
	+ UE supporting 480kHz SCS for data/control channels also support reception of SSB with 480kHz SCS.
	+ UE supporting 960kHz SCS for data/control channels also support reception of SSB with 960kHz SCS.
	+ UE is not expected to support 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS for SSB if it doesn’t support 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS for data/control channels, respectively.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Samsung | We support the proposal.  |
| Qualcomm | We support the proposal with this addition/clarification:* *Supporting 480 kHz SCS and 960 kHz SCS are UE capabilities:*
	+ *UE supporting 480kHz SCS for data/control channels also support reception of SSB with 480kHz SCS (for the agreed access cases and conditions)*
	+ *UE supporting 960kHz SCS for data/control channels also support reception of SSB with 960kHz SCS (for the agreed access cases and conditions)*
	+ *UE is not expected to support 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS for SSB if it doesn’t support 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS for data/control channels, respectively.*
 |
| LG Electronics | We support the proposal. We don’t see Qualcomm’s addition is necessary, since we cannot support features that have not been agreed yet. |
| Ericsson | We still think that the UE capability discussion can be taken later – not sure that it moves us forward at the moment.However, if there must be a decision on this now, we can support Proposal 1.1-1 with Qualcomm's updates. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We can accept Qualcomm version. |
| vivo | We support the proposal and fine with Qualcomm’s version. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We support the proposal and fine with Qualcomm’s version. |
| Spreadtrum | In our view, the main concern on UE complexity is the complexity of initial cell selection. So, only the initial cell selection for 480/960kHz is optional capability. Hence, we suggest:* *Supporting 480 kHz SCS and 960 kHz SCS are UE capabilities:*
	+ *UE supporting 480kHz SCS for data/control channels also support reception of SSB with 480kHz SCS (for the agreed cases except for initial cell selection)*
	+ *Reception of SSB with 480kHz SCS for initial cell selection under conditions is a UE capability*
	+ *UE supporting 960kHz SCS for data/control channels also support reception of SSB with 960kHz SCS (for the agreed cases except for initial cell selection)*
	+ *Reception of SSB with 960kHz SCS for initial cell selection under conditions is a UE capability*
	+ *UE is not expected to support 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS for SSB if it doesn’t support 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS for data/control channels, respectively.*

There are UE capabilities:* Cap-1: 120kHz SCS for data/control/SSB
* Cap-2: 480kHz SCS for data/control
* Cap-3: reception of SSB with 480kHz SCS for the agreed cases except for initial cell selection
* Cap-4: reception of SSB with 960kHz SCS for the agreed cases except for initial cell selection
* Cap-5: reception of SSB with 480kHz SCS for initial cell selection under conditions
* Cap-6: reception of SSB with 960kHz SCS for initial cell selection under conditions

We think Cap-1/2/3/4 are normal UE capabilities, but Cap-5/6 are high-end UE capabilities. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support the proposal 1.1-1 |
| Intel | We support Proposal 1.1-1. We don’t see a strong need in the updates provided by Qualcomm, but if majority of the companies wants them, we’re fine. |
| MediaTek | We propose to delay the discussion till the outcome of the discussion in Part 2. If there is no consensus for adding 480/960 kHz SSB for initial access, then we are ok with Qualcomm’s modification. If there is a consensus for adding either one or both 480/960 kHz SSB for initial access, then we prefer to have separate capabilities like what Spreadrum suggested such that a UE supporting 480/960 kHz data/control channel reception does not mandated to do cell search on 480/960 kHz SSB for initial access. However, one clarification question is: if a UE supporting 480/960 kHz data/control channel reception can have choice on whether to support 480/960 kHz SSB for initial access, does this considered as UE capability or we have other way to capture this?  |

#### **2nd Round Discussion – Part 2:**

For the SCS issues, focusing on alternatives that has the largest support, the following seems to the list that RAN1 should focus on.

* Further discussion on 240/480/960kHz SSB
	+ Alt 1) Supporting **240, 480, and 960** kHz SSB for initial & non-initial access with support of CORESET0/Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB with constraints.
	+ Alt 4) Supporting **480 and 960** kHz for initial & non-initial access with support of CORESET0/Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB with constraints.
	+ Alt 5) Supporting **one of 480 or 960** kHz SSB for initial & non-initial access with support of CORESET0/Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB with constraints.
	+ Alt 6) conclude **no support of 240, 480, and 960kHz** SSB for initial access.
	+ Additional constraints:
		- Limited sync raster entry numbers (details can be sorted out if generally acceptable)
		- only 1 CORESTE#0/Type0-PDCCH SCS supported for each SSB SCS
		- SSB time domain candidate resource pattern (within a slot or pair of slots) for 480 and 960kHz SSB are identical

Additionally, from the list Huawei, HiSilicon, Qualcomm, and Mediatek are the companies who prefer Alt 6, who do not have alternative proposals they could live with that are largely favored by companies. The reasons for each company support some alternatives were discussed in the previous meeting pretty thoroughly.

* So moderator would like to ask Huawei, HiSilicon, Qualcomm, and Mediatek if there are nothing from the Alt 1, 4, 5 they can accept and briefly comment on the main concerning aspect for either Alt 1, 4, 5.
* Similarly to proponents of either Alt 1, 4, 5, briefly comment on the main concerning aspect for Alt 6, which is likely the implicitly conclusion when there is lack of additional agreements.
* Lastly, if there is some alternative that companies think would help breach this impasse, please comment so.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Samsung | One comment from our previous round is not addressed. The supporting for 480 and 960 kHz for non-initial access case is already agreed, so Alt 5) is a little bit against such agreement by only allowing one of them for non-initial access case. Alt 5) Supporting **one of 480 or 960** kHz SSB for initial ~~& non-initial access~~ with support of CORESET0/Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB with constraints.For Alt 6), our concern is the too limited implementation flexibility allowed by the network, and the system has to implement in mixed numerology if one wishes to implement a standalone system with 480/960 kHz data/control/RS. Alt 6) is also not beneficial from the forward compatibility point of view. Rel-17 is the first release for supporting the new frequency range, and if there is no specification support for flexible choice of the SCS in initial access, there is no chance in future release to address this issue. If companies have concern on the complexity of initial cell search (i.e., the sync raster design), RAN1 can try to provide specification support for the SCSs and leave the choice of SCS for initial access per band to RAN4. More specifically, we are considering the following as a way forward (just a general description of the intention, and wording can be further polished). RAN1 provides specification support for 240, 480, and 960 kHz SSB for initial & non-initial access with support of CORESET0/Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB with constraints, and up to RAN4 to decide the SCS of SSB for initial access for each band in 52.6 to 71 GHz.  |
| LG Electronics | First of all, we agree with Samsung’s comments for Alt 5.It is unfortunate our preferred alternatives disappear from the table. For the sake of progress, we can accept Alt 5 with modification from Samsung which has the least UE implementation burden among Alternatives 1, 4, and 5. |
| DOCOMO | We agree with Samsung’s comment for Alt 5. We also share Samsung’s view on Alt 6. In any other alternative, we are ok with limiting the complexity by leaving the choice of SCS up to RAN4. Among Alt 1, 4, 5, we slightly prefer Alt 4. The reason why we supported Alt 1 in the 1st round would be it seems possible to take into consideration the views from some companies supporting 240 kHz SCS. As “constraints” will be considered for any alternative other than Alt 6 anyway, we do not see significant reason to preclude either 480 or 960 kHz.  |
| LG Electronics2 | Based on updated company views, Alt 2 receives more supports than Alt 6, so we suggest to consider Alt 2 as well for 2nd round discussion. In that case, our first preference would be Alt 2. |
| Ericsson | Similar first comment from LGE: it is unfortunate that our preferred alternative was removed (Alt-7); this alternative is already supported in FR2 and does not require any (or at most minimal) specification effort. The only thing could foresee is the potential addition of an SSB-CORESET0 offset depending on sync raster granularity. However, given that we will likely be designing tables to support 480/960 kHz SSB for ANR purpose (from scratch), adding a new offset to the (240,120) table (if needed) does not seem like very much effort. As we have shown in our contribution an additional offset may be defined also for the (120,120) table depending on sync raster granularity decided by RAN4.However, as we commented before, we can compromise to support Alt-1 in order to enable more use cases. We think this alternative has maximal support amongst companies, and involves compromises from all sides. We also think that the UE search complexity can be managed by setting appropriate constraints on the RAN1 design and recognizing that there is a dependence on the channelization design in RAN4. We have shown in our contributions over the last 3 meetings that the search complexity can be the same or less than FR2 with appropriate RAN4 channelization design. If agreeing on constraints and dependencies is agreeable to companies, then the list of constraints must include "support for both licensed and unlicensed operation," since this is one important aspect that RAN4 will need to take into account in the channelization design. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support Alt 6) only.We cannot support Alt 1, 4, 5 due to:1. We believe current agreements about SSB (supporting 120 kHz SSB SCS for both initial access and non-initial access and supporting 480/960 kHz SSB SCS for non-initial access case with SSB not configuring Type-0 PDCCH) already support single numerology operation which was the main motivation of proponent companies to push for supporting 480/960 kHz SSB SCS.
2. We have already agreed in RAN1 #104-e that “*Whether or not to support 240 kHz, 480kHz and 960kHz SCS for SSB and the conditions under which SSB for 240 kHz, 480 kHz and 960 kHz may be supported will be decided no later than RAN1#104bis-e.”* We do not see any reason to revert this agreement and continue discussion on supported SSB SCSs.
3. Was we discussed before, our concern for supporting 480/960 kHz SSB SCS for initial access is not restricted to the additional blind detection complexity. Standardization effort (design of CORESET#0 including supported {SSB, CORESET#0} multiplexing patterns, number of supported RBs, number of symbols, RB offsets, and also design PDCCH monitoring occasions for Type0-PDCCH CSS set for both 480 and 960 kHz SSBs) and the danger of market fragmentation (having two tiers of UEs/Networks. The UEs/networks of Type X that entirely run on 480(960)kHz and do not support 120 kHz and the UEs/networks of Type Y that run on 120kHz and cannot connect to/support Type X Networks/UEs). Please note that 480(960)kHz SSB being an optional UE capability does not eliminate the danger of market fragmentation as optionality is only defined at the UE side and not the network side. Network could only support 480(960) kHz if 480(960)kHz SSB for initial access is supported.

As a final note, we don’t share the same opinion as Samsung in that “if there is no specification support for flexible choice of the SCS in initial access, there is no chance in future release to address this issue”. For instance, there is a growing demand to provide 3GPP specification support for vertical industries. We don’t see why supported initial access numerologies for such future applications have to exactly follow the design provided in Rel-17 that, being the first release in this spectrum, would mainly cater to more common horizontal market. |
| Apple  | Alt.1 is NOT acceptable for us due to the associated complexity in terms of cell search and sample buffering as discussed before. The cell search complexity maybe reduced by certain arrangement of GSCN steps of different SCSs. However, the supported SSB SCS in RAN1 should not be made based on sort of ‘unpredictable’ RAN4 decision. If cell search complexity indeed becomes key decision-factor, we are open to defer the entire discussion of SSB SCS for initial access to RAN4 and therefore it can be coupled with GSCN sync raster design together. Among other left alternatives, we prefer Alt.5 or Alt.6.  |
| InterDigital | We agree with Samsung’s update on Alt. 5.As clarified before, our first preference is Alt. 4. As both 480/960 kHz SCSs are supported for PDCCH/PDSCH/PUCCH/PUSCH, we don’t see the need to support only one of 480/960kHz for initial access. Our second preference is Alt. 1. Although we don’t see the need to support 240kHz SSBs for 52-71GHz, we can accept Alt. 1 as a compromise. Lastly, we do not support Alt 6. We strongly believe that supporting 480/960 kHz SCSs for initial access is very important feature considering single numerology operation and performance benefits of 480/960 kHz. So, we can’t accept Alt 6.  |
| vivo | We agree with Samsung’s update on Alt. 5 and it is our first preference. Alt. 1 or Alt. 4 is also acceptable for us. As discussed before, the concern from us for Alt. 6 is more UE complexity in certain scenarios. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We share similar views with Samsung on Alt 6, that is also what we replied in the first round discussion. Alt 4 is our first preference, and Alt 1 or Alt 5 can also be accepted for us. Besides, we are fine with all three sub-bullets for above additional constraints. |
| Spreadtrum | We support Alt 4. |
| Nokia | Now based on existing agreements, RAN1 will introduce the SSB pattern design for both, 480kHz and 960kHz. For 240kHz, the design exists already in Rel-15 and in similar manner as was agreed for 120kHz, this pattern could be re-used. We also think that for 480/960kHz RAN1 needs to provide support for providing CORESET0/Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB. As discussed in context of ANR, this is the most straight forward solution and seems counter-intuitive to object supporting it based on specification concerns, and suggest to introduce completely new solution.Hence, the only aspect that should be considered for 480/960kHz support, is whether the cell selection complexity can be alleviated. As discussed, this is determined by RAN4 SS-raster definition. Our preference still would be Alt1), but to alleviate the complexity concerns, we could accept Alt4. If, after RAN4 work, there are still strong concerns for the complexity, we could consider further restricting the SCS per band to single SCS.We also agree Samsung’s comment regarding forward compatibility point of view.  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support Alt 4 and fine with Alt 1. |
| Futurewei | We cannot support Alt 1 and Alt 4 due to their associated complexity. We prefer Alt 6 and Alt 7, which as Ericsson pointed out, it is unfortunate that it was removed.  |
| Intel | We agree on either Alt.1, Alt.4 or Alt.5 (with modifications from Samsung), but we can’t agree on Alt.6. Our main concern around Alt.6 is its principal inability to provide single numerology operation in standalone scenarios and forward compatibility issues.During this lengthy discussion about SSB SCS, we haven’t seen any technical argument which makes SSB SCS 480 kHz/960 kHz impossible for initial access other than complexity, which is manageable as shown by many companies, or extra standardization efforts, which are also manageable by leveraging design principles from previous releases of NR and NR-U.While we understand no solution at the moment is able to get 100% support from all companies, we believe there is sufficient support for few of the alternatives. We suggest agreeing on working agreement or working assumption for Alt 5. |
| CATT | We are fine with alt5. We are also fine with alt 6 to minimize the specification work.  |
| MediaTek | Our first preference is Alt6 based on the agreement cited by Huawei, HiSilicon, and the agreements we had in the last meeting are still only consensus companies can achieve up to now, based on our observation. We would also like to thank Moderator for asking our other preference on the listed options to see the opportunities for further progress. However, we don’t see any listed option can resolve UE initial cell search complexity clearly, which has been discussed thoroughly in the past few meetings. In our view, only Alt5 is close to an acceptable option to us since only 2 SCSs are considered, which is the same as FR2. However, cell search complexity based on 480 kHz and 960 kHz SSB are not in the comparable level at least in terms of the time domain SSS/PSS detection complexity. Therefore, we prefer to have **only** 480 kHz for kHz SSB for initial & non-initial access with support of CORESET0/Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB with the constraints listed in the last bullet. We also need some clarification that the intention of having only 1 CORESTE#0/Type0-PDCCH SCS supported for each SSB SCS is to support single numerology deployment in initial access? If so, maybe the wording needs some modification to avoid ambiguity like only 120kHz SSB+480 Type-0 PDCCH is allowed in configuration. If not, we prefer to have such constraint as well to avoid mix numerology configuration in initial access in order to reduce complexity. |
| OPPO | We support Alt-4 and fine with Alt-1 or Alt-5. |

#### **2nd Round Summary:**

From the comments, there is no consensus on a specific proposal. However, companies who had some concerns previously seems to be willing to comprise to update version of Alt 5 from Samsung. Based on inputs so far, Alt 5 seems to be best bet in terms of getting additional agreements. Moderator suggest trying to see RAN1 could agree to Alt 5 with some clarifications.

#### **3rd Round Discussion:**

##### **Proposal 1.1-2)**

* Support **one of 480 or 960** kHz SSB for initial access with support of CORESET0/Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB with following constraints.
	+ Limited sync raster entry numbers
		- It is assumed that RAN4 supports a channelization design which results in the total number of synchronization raster entries in the 57 – 71 GHz band no larger than 400 (Note: the total number of synchronization raster entries in FR2 for band n259 is 344). If the assumption cannot be satisfied, it’s up to RAN4 to decide which of 480/960 kHz SCS are supported for initial access of such band.
		- only 1 CORESTE#0/Type0-PDCCH SCS supported for each SSB SCS
		- SSB time domain candidate resource pattern (within a slot or pair of slots) for 480 and 960kHz SSB are identical

As for clarification on the optionality aspects. There are two versions, one from Qualcomm and another from Spreadtrum. While version from Qualcomm had more supporting companies, if Proposal 1.1-2 can be agreed if optional capability have been further clarified with Proposal 1.1-4, moderator thinks there might be value in discussing the two alternatives.

##### **Proposal 1.1-3)**

* Supporting 480 kHz SCS and 960 kHz SCS are UE capabilities:
	+ UE supporting 480kHz SCS for data/control channels also support reception of SSB with 480kHz SCS (for the agreed access cases and conditions).
	+ UE supporting 960kHz SCS for data/control channels also support reception of SSB with 960kHz SCS (for the agreed access cases and conditions).
	+ UE is not expected to support 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS for SSB if it doesn’t support 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS for data/control channels, respectively.

##### **Proposal 1.1-4)**

* Supporting 480 kHz SCS and 960 kHz SCS are UE capabilities:
	+ UE supporting 480kHz SCS for data/control channels also support reception of SSB with 480kHz SCS (for the agreed cases except for initial cell selection)
	+ Reception of SSB with 480kHz SCS for initial cell selection under conditions is a separate UE capability
	+ UE supporting 960kHz SCS for data/control channels also support reception of SSB with 960kHz SCS (for the agreed cases except for initial cell selection)
	+ Reception of SSB with 960kHz SCS for initial cell selection under conditions is a separate UE capability
	+ UE is not expected to support 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS for SSB if it doesn’t support 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS for data/control channels, respectively.

Companies are asked to comment further if Proposal 1.1-2, which is ALT5 with minor updates based on suggestion from Samsung (detailed description about how SSB search complexity will be handled), is an acceptable compromise for either working assumption or working agreement. Also provide input on whether Proposal 1.1-3 or Proposal 1.1-4 (or both) would be ok.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| DOCOMO | Although we may be able to live with Proposal 1.1-2, we are not sure what is the difference between Alt 4 and Alt 5 in terms of UE complexity since, regardless of Alt 4 or 5, we have a sub-bullet saying “It is assumed that RAN4 supports a channelization design which results in the total number of synchronization raster entries in the 57 – 71 GHz band no larger than 400 (Note: the total number of synchronization raster entries in FR2 for band n259 is 344). If the assumption cannot be satisfied, it’s up to RAN4 to decide which of 480/960 kHz SCS are supported for initial access of such band”. Considering a lot of companies do not agree to have more than one CORESET1/SIB1 SCS per SSB SCS, we still think both 480/960 kHz SCS should be supported. The other restriction is fine for us.For Proposal 1.1-3 and 1.1-4, we think to say “480/960 kHz SCS are optional for SSB as well as control/data” would be sufficient at this stage since the proposals seem exactly the ones which should be discussed at later phase (i.e. UE feature discussion). Assuming whether Proposal 1.1-3 or 1.1-4 will also be controversial among companies, not sure if we need to discuss it here.  |
| Nokia | We would be OK to compromise to proposal 1.1-2. A follow-up question that how will the down selection (between 480/960kHz) done?On the capability related proposals, we would of course prefer, for the SCS that the initial access is supported, to bundle the capability so that it covers all modes of use (data/cntrl/SSB/initial access) i.e. 1.1-3, but based on past experience that seems rather unlikely choice.  |
| LG Electronics | We can accept Proposal 1.1-2 even though it is not our first preference. We do not prefer Working Agreement. One clarification question on the sub-bullet “If the assumption cannot be satisfied, it’s up to RAN4 to decide which of 480/960 kHz SCS are supported for initial access of such band.”: Who will finally decide one between two SCSs? If RAN1 will decide it, the sub-bullet might be needed to be modified accordingly.For Proposal 1.1-3 and 1.1-4, this issues doesn’t seem to be urgent at this stage. We can defer the relevant discussion to the next meeting. |
| vivo | We support Proposal 1.1-2. Regarding the UE capability, we prefer Proposal 1.1-3. |
| Spreadtrum | We support Proposal 1.1-2 and 1.1-4. In our view, the complexity concern at UE sider is mainly on initial cell selection. So, it should be separated as a UE capability. We also agree with LG that the UE future can be further discussed. In fact, we supposed that the optionality is a compromise way for UE vendor to support initial cell selection with 480/960kHz SSB. But, the proposals brought out at the beginning of discussion is UE capability on reception of data/control/SSB. It is out of our expectation. We think capabilities on reception of data/control is irrelevant in discussion of SSB. We just care about the following declaration:* SSB with 480kHz and/or 960 SCS for initial cell selection under conditions is separate UE capability

Proposal 1.1-4 can be simplified as the above sentences. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Support Proposal 1.1-2 and Proposal 1.1-3.We can live with Proposal 1.1-4 if Proposal 1.1-2 is agreed. |
| Intel | We can live with Proposal 1.1-2 although this is not our first preference (actually, we prefer to have both SSB SCS 480 kHz/960 kHz for initial access). We think, Proposal 1.1-2 is the best RAN1 could achieve in terms of compromise between single numerology operation, wanted by some companies, and concerns on complexity/standardization efforts expressed by other companies.Regarding clarification on the optionality and UE capacities, we think some agreement is needed. Either Proposal 1.1-3 or Proposal 1.1-4 is fine for us. |
| Samsung | We support Proposal 1.1-2 as a compromise. One editorial change, the sub-sub-bullets of CORESET and SSB pattern should be parallel with sync raster, instead of a sub-sub-bullet. Also, regarding LG’s comment, we believe if the condition is not satisfied, none of 480/960 will be supported for such band is a reasonable statement (the original wording is supporting both, then further down-selection from RAN4 makes sense). For the UE capability, either Proposal 1.1-3 or Proposal 1.1-4 is fine, and Proposal 1.1-3 is slightly preferred.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We do not support Proposal 1.1-2.We also agree with LGE that selecting between 1.1-3 and 1.1-4 (or another proposal) is not an urgent matter that need to be finalized in this meeting. To our understanding, RAN1 designs are independent of UE capability discussions. The major issue is that the support for 480/960 kHz is an optional UE capability which is already captured in WID.  |
| Apple  | We can ok with proposal 1.1-2. On Proposal 1.1-3 and 1-4, we do not see the need of any of the, since support 480/960 as optional has been explicitly captured in WID intendedly as copied below without any conditions, i.e., for all channels: Note 2: UEs supporting a band in the range of 52.6GHz-71GHz are not required to support 480kHz SCS and 960kHz SCS.On the contrary, Proposal 1-3/1-4 may imply differences compared to Note-2. |
| MediaTek | We don’t support Proposal 1.1-2. In our view, the discussion of SSB SCS for initial access should be over in the last meeting according to the agreement cited by Huawei or at least be deprioritize in this RAN1 meeting. We don’t see the motivation to leave this decision to RAN4. What if RAN4 can’t make the decision within 2 meetings? The other point is cell search complexity is not determined solely based on the number of sync raster, which has been explained by many UE vendors. Therefore, we don’t think we can support to leave this decision to RAN4. As for the bullet* + - only 1 CORESTE#0/Type0-PDCCH SCS supported for each SSB SCS

We need to clarify the meaning of it. Otherwise, it can have only 480 kHz CORESET0+120 kHz SSB configuration, which is not desirable in our view. The adding examples as in Proposal 1.2-3 can clarify this aspect, in our view.We also don’t agree that only this proposal is discussed. At least Futurewei, LG, Qualcomm, and Ericsson showed interest on supporting 240 kHz. Huawei and MediaTek also showed our 1st preference as 120 kHz. In our observation, there are at least 6 companies have their own preference and those preferences have no chance for further consideration, which is a little bit rush for us, especially on this critical topic. Based on our observation, we don’t think we can achieve further consensus in this meeting but we can try to eliminate the alternatives for future discussion, if necessary. On the other hand, we also suggest we should seriously set the deadline for further discussion on the SSB SCS for initial access, e.g., next RAN1 meeting, to ensure we have time to finish the discussion on other topics in initial access.Regarding the capability discussion, we think the discussion can wait till we have the final decision on the supporting SSB SCS for initial access since the agreed cases are not stable yet.  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We can live with proposal 1.2-2 as a compromise between complexity and single numerology operation although our preference to support both SCSs for initial and non-initial cases. For UE capability our preference is proposal 1.2-3 |
| Moderator | To Mediatek,For the preferences, Yes there are various preferences expressed by numerous companies and they are widely different. At this point, I suggest to focus on a compromise proposal. I understand that this might not be something completely satisfactory, but from the comments so far a lot of companies think similarly but is willing to live with the proposal for sake of progress. I think RAN1 is passed the point where we are discussing 1st preferences of the companies.For the aspects of RAN1 or RAN4 determining the final SCS, I’ve added two proposals 1.1-5 and 1.1-6. |

#### **3rd Round Discussion:**

Few companies expressed opinion that discussion on Proposal 1.1-3 and 1.1-4 is not urgent at this stage of the specification and can be discussed together with general capability issue later. If this is the case, moderator suggests continuing discussion and not bring this up in GTW for approval in RAN1 #105-e.

I’ve tried to clarify the selection aspect and what happens in RAN4 based on my guess of what the intent of the original text (from Samsung) was. This has been updated in Proposal 1.1-5 and Proposal 1.1-6.

##### **Proposal 1.1-5)**

* Support **one of 480 or 960** kHz SSB for initial access with support of CORESET0/Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB with following constraints.
	+ Limited sync raster entry numbers
		- It is assumed that RAN4 supports a channelization design which results in the total number of synchronization raster entries in the 57 – 71 GHz band no larger than 400 (Note: the total number of synchronization raster entries in FR2 for band n259 is 344). ~~If the assumption cannot be satisfied,~~ It’s up to RAN4 to decide which 480/960 kHz SCS is ~~are~~ supported for initial access of such band.
	+ only 1 CORESTE#0/Type0-PDCCH SCS supported for each SSB SCS
	+ SSB time domain candidate resource pattern (within a slot or pair of slots) for 480 and 960kHz SSB are identical

##### **Proposal 1.1-6)**

* Support **one of 480 or 960** kHz SSB for initial access with support of CORESET0/Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB with following constraints.
	+ Limited sync raster entry numbers
		- It is assumed that RAN4 supports a channelization design which results in the total number of synchronization raster entries in the 57 – 71 GHz band no larger than 400 (Note: the total number of synchronization raster entries in FR2 for band n259 is 344). If the assumption cannot be satisfied, it’s up to RAN4 to decide whether 480/960 kHz SCS can ~~are~~ supported for initial access of such band.
	+ only 1 CORESTE#0/Type0-PDCCH SCS supported for each SSB SCS
	+ SSB time domain candidate resource pattern (within a slot or pair of slots) for 480 and 960kHz SSB are identical
	+ RAN1 to determine which SCS, 480 or 960kHz, for SSB for initial access and inform RAN4.

#### **4th Round Discussion (on-going):**

Moderator would like to receive feedback on whether Proposal 1.1-5 or Proposal 1.1-6 is ok. From moderator’s understanding, RAN1 specification does to describe initial access or non-initial access anyway. RAN4 specification determines this actually. Therefore, moderator assumed the intent of the proposal was for RAN4 to determine this (taking into account search complexity) which is **Proposal 1.1-5**. I think this would be the logical thing to do.

With that said, I would welcome inputs from companies on both Proposal 1.1-5 and 1.1-6.

Moderator would like to check for companies with strong objections to Proposal 1.1-5 (or Proposal 1.1-6). Please indicate if it is (still) not acceptable.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Samsung | We are ok with either Proposal 1.1-5 or Proposal 1.1-6.  |
| LG Electronics | Agree with Moderator’s comment. We support Proposal 1.1-5 with editorial change of 52.6 – 71 GHz band (also for Proposal 1.1-6). |

#### **4th Round Discussion Summary:**

TBD

### 2.1.2 ANR and CGI Reporting

* From [2] Huawei, HiSilicon:
	+ Support CGI report on cells that broadcast 120 kHz SSB in 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz spectrum as in Rel-15/16.
	+ RAN1 further discuss whether and how to support inter-operator PCI collision for 480/960 kHz SSBs whose SSB location and SCS are explicitly provided to the UE (non-initial access) and SSB does not configure Type-0 PDCCH.
* From [3] vivo:
	+ ANR should be supported for 480/960KHz SSB by indicating Type-0 PDCCH in the SSB.
* From [7] CATT:
	+ The agreement of supporting 480 KHz and 960 KHz SCS for non-initial access should be extended to include the feature to address ANR issue.
* From [10] ZTE, Sanechips:
	+ In non-initial access cases, SSB with 480/960kHz SCS should be allowed to configure Type0-PDCCH in the MIB for supporting ANR function and CGI reporting.
* From [16] Samsung:
	+ Support ANR and inter-operator PCI confusion resolution for all supported SS/PBCH block subcarrier spacings, and the CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH configuration is provided by the MIB of the SS/PBCH block.
* From [17] Mediatek:
	+ Solution to enable ANR use case can be discussed after LBT bandwidth and the number of synchronization raster within a LBT bandwidth are decided.
* From [18] LGE:
	+ Further discuss whether/how to support ANR functionality for SS/PBCH block with a SCS when SS/PBCH block with the SCS does not configure CORESET#0 and type0-PDCCH CSS set.
* From [28] AT&T, NTT DOCOMO, INC., T-Mobile USA:
	+ RAN1 shall provide solutions to support ANR and inter-operator PCI confusion resolution for all supported SSB subcarrier spacings in 52.6 GHz and beyond

#### Summary of Discussions

* Discussion further on how to support inter-operator PCI confusion resolution for 480/960kHz SSB case
	+ Huawei, HiSilicon, LGE, MEdiatek
* Support ANR by supporting CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH configuration in 480/960kHz SSB
	+ vivo, Intel, ZTE, Sanechips, Samsung, [CATT]
* RAN1 to conclude provide support for ANR and inter-operator PCI confusion resolution for all supported SSB SCS
	+ AT&T, NTT DOCOMO, INC., T-Mobile USA
* Moderator suggestions:
	+ Most companies seems to hint ANR and PCI confusion resolution issues are something worth while to resolve, and moderator suggests to further discuss over email.
	+ Given the many company support, moderator suggests to further discuss (as starting point) based on following proposal:
		- Support ANR by supporting CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH configuration in 480/960kHz SSB

#### **1st Round Discussion:**

Moderator suggest discussing on the following proposal. Moderator would like to encourage companies who prefer Alt 2 of Proposal 1.2-1 to describe the method.

##### **Proposal 1.2-1)**

* To support ANR and PCI confusion resolution,
	+ Alt 1) Support CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH configuration in MIB of 480 and 960kHz SSB
	+ Alt 2) [alternative method] to enable support to obtain neighbor cell PCI and SIB1 contents related to CGI reporting

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| DOCOMO | We prefer to support Alt 1 regardless of the support of Alt 2 since Alt 1 could be simpler solution which is something already supported in the previous releases in NR.  |
| LG Electronics | Alt 2 is preferred. One possible way could be that MIB (e.g., with 960 kHz SCS) indicates frequency domain location of SS/PBCH (e.g., with 120 kHz SCS) being able to configure CORESET#0 and type0-PDCCH CSS set. |
| Samsung | We believe there is no confusion on how to support the ANR purpose for 120 kHz (current spec already supports so), so in this sense, Alt 2 should be also for 480 and 960kHz SSB only, or more straightforward to restrict the discussion for 480 and 960kHz SSB in the main bullet. * To support ANR and PCI confusion resolution for 480 and 960 kHz SSB,

As explained in the contribution, we don’t know how dedicated signalling can work for resolving PCI confusion for inter-operator case. If Alt 2 refers to the dedicated signalling approach, please clarify; if not, please provide the details of such alternative method.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | While we are open to discuss the need to support PCI confusion resolution, we cannot agree with Proposal 1.2-1 in this form due to the following three reasons:1. **If there is a PCI confusion on a reported PCID from a 480/960 kHz SSB, it does not result in a HO failure. As such, the need for PCI confusion resolution for 480/960 kHz SSB should be clarified:** To our understanding, the main reason for PCI confusion resolution is to avoid a subsequent HO failure. However, as we have explained in our t-doc (R1-2104273) as well as in the previous meeting, given the fact that, based on the current agreements, 480/960 kHz SSBs do not configure Type-0 PDCCH (and, hence, do not configure SIB1), even if there is a PCI confusion of a reported PCID on 480/960 kHz SSB, such a PCI confusion does not result in HO failure. Let us provide further clarification using the following example: If a UE measures a neighboring Cell-A, the measurement report that includes SS-RSRP along with a PCI is associated with a corresponding MeasObject, which, itself, includes the target SSB frequency and the SSB SCS. In other words, the reported PCI/SS-RSRP back to the serving gNB is appended with a (SSB Freq., SSB SCS) pair. As such, if the appended SSB SCS = 480/960 kHz, since serving gNB knows “No cell of any operator transmits a 480/960 kHz SSB that configures SIB1” (let’s call it **Side Information A**), it already knows that the reported Cell-A does not broadcast SIB1, and, as such, the serving gNB does not initiate HO process for the reported Cell-A. Therefore, even if there are multiple cells with the same PCI from potentially multiple operators, regardless of whether none, some, or all these cells are included in the serving gNB’s NCRT, since all gNBs of all operators have **Side Information A**, the PCI confusion (or PCI collision) does not result in any subsequent HO failure: Irrespective to the single or multiple operators scenario, all gNBs know that if a reported PCI is associated with a SSB SCS = 480/960 kHz, the corresponding cell does not broadcast SIB1 and the gNB would not initiate HO process for such a target cell.

**Note:** Please note that the mere fact that PCI confusion mechanism was supported in Rel-16 is not a strong reason to support such a mechanism in Rel-17 for 480/960 kHz SSBs. In Rel-16, all supported SSBs can potentially configure SIB1 and be used a cell-defining SSB for PCells. Based on the current agreements, this is certainly not the case for 480/960 kHz SSBs in Rel-17.1. **Even if PCI confusion resolution for 480/960 kHz SSBs is deemed required, there are mechanisms to support it without UE CGI report. This is an alternative that is not considered in Proposal 1.2-1:** As we discussed in our t-doc (R12104273), there are mechanisms to support ANR and PCI confusion resolution without UE involvement. These include:
	1. *Monitoring of DL channels by gNBs*

In this mechanism, gNBs monitor DL channel and collect detectable PCI/CGI information of the neighboring cells. This mechanism can be used in both intra-operator and inter-operator scenarios. OAM can reassign PCID of each gNB if there is a PCI collision between cells of the gNB and those of neighboring cells.* 1. *Neighbour information exchange using Xn signaling*

In this mechanism, gNBs share their served cell PCI/CGI information using Xn interface. Therefore, PCI collision can be avoided without any UE involvement. Specification 38.300 provides the following lines regarding this mechanism:

|  |
| --- |
| *Excerpt from 38.300 Clause 15.3.3 Automatic Neighbour Cell Relation Function*NOTE: The neighbour information exchange, which occurs during the Xn Setup procedure or in the gNB Configuration Update procedure, may be used for ANR purpose. |

Note that this mechanism can be used if Xn interface is stablished among gNBs. Xn interface is typically stablished among gNBs of the same operator. It may also be stablished in inter-operator scenario if operators use the same vendor.CGI report and above two mechanisms to support PCI confusion resolution have their own advantages and disadvantages. It is noteworthy that, a disadvantage of CGI report is that it is a costly method since it requires additional UE reporting and may also have a higher latency 1. **Even if PCI confusion resolution for 480/960 kHz SSBs is deemed required, and, further, UE CGI report is deemed necessary to support PCI confusion resolution, CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH configuration in MIB of 480/960 kHz SSB for the mere support of CGI report (Alt 1 in Proposal 1.2-1) is not an acceptable alternative:** CGI report can be easily and more efficiently supported using dedicated signaling (Explained further below). Note that if we specify CORESET#0 and Type0-PDCCH CSS set monitoring occasions just for CGI report (use a similar mechanism that enables UE to read SIB1 in Type0-PDSCH for Initial access), it means that we would have to design CORESET#0 including supported {SSB, CORESET#0} multiplexing patterns, number of supported RBs, number of symbols, RB offsets, and also design PDCCH monitoring occasions for Type0-PDCCH CSS set for both 480 and 960 kHz SSBs. In addition, SIB1 carried in Type0-PDSCH is up to 2976 bits and can contain more than 100 parameters including parameters related to cell access, access category information, cell selection, connection establishment failure control, acquisition of OSI, UE’s timers and constants, cell specific parameters of a UE including the position in burst, periodicity, and power of serving cell SSB, cell specific Uplink/Downlink TDD configuration, common parameters of the initial UL and DL BWPs which include Paging related configuration, cell specific parameters for PDCCH, PDSCH, PUCCH, PUSCH, RACH, MsgA and so on… Among all these parameters, only three (PLMN identity, cell Id, cellReservedForOperatorUse bit) in cell access related information IE are required for CGI report. Going through all these specification efforts to support broadcasting SIB1 that, in general, provides all cell-specific configurations and contains much larger parameter set than what is required for CGI report is not justifiable in our view.

**How to support CGI report using dedicated signaling:** Let’s say there is a PCell and Cell-1 and Cell-2. Cell-1 and Cell-2 both transmit 480(960) kHz SSB without CORESET#0 and both have PCID-1. Cell-1 and PCell belong to the same operator and, as such, Xn signaling is stablished between them while Cell-2 belongs to another operator. Since PCell and Cell-1 are connected using Xn, PCell can know the location at which Cell-1 transmits its CGI parameters (eg: Cell ID and PLMN ID --let’s call them collectively as CGI-Info). Now, if UE reports a PCID-1 derived from a detected 480(960) kHz SSB to PCell, PCell may ask UE to read the CGI-info using DCI. DCI provides the CGI-info location of Cell-1 to the UE. If UE cannot find the CGI-info in the provided location, it simply means that UE had actually detected Cell-2. In such a case, UE reports an ERROR (or a message like “noSIB1”) so PCell would know that the detected cell is not cell-1 and belongs to another operator. In the unlikely situation that the location of PCI-Info for cell-1 and cell-2 happen to be the same, there is still no problem: UE can just detect the CGI corresponding to the actually detected cell and report the CGI back. **Summary:** Given all above discussion, we can provide the following proposal as a compromise:***Proposal:*** * ***RAN1 further discuss whether/ how to support PCI collision resolution mechanism for 480/960 kHz SSBs whose SSB location and SCS are explicitly provided to the UE (non-initial access) and SSB does not configure Type-0 PDCCH.***
* ***For the discussion to support PCI collision resolution, following alternatives are considered:***
	+ ***PCI collision resolution mechanism is implemented without UE CGI report.***
		- ***Examples: Monitoring of DL channels by gNBs, Neighbour information exchange using Xn signaling***
	+ ***PCI collision resolution mechanism is specified based on UE CGI report where PDCCH associated with the PDSCH carrying CGI parameters is provided by dedicated signaling***

  |
| Qualcomm | We support Alt 1 under the restriction of known timing. We are also open discussing Alt 2 depending on the designs proposed. |
| DOCOMO2 | On the proposal made by HW:* For the first bullet, we are ok if it is concluded that 480/960 kHz SCS are not supported for SSB during initial access.
* For the second bullet about alternatives,
	+ Given the following considerations, if we have the examples HW has kindly proposed, we are not sure why we need to preclude UE CGI report as a measure for ANR.
		- Monitoring of DL channels by gNBs enforces to deploy gNB with IAB-like capability only, which we believe makes practical operation more complex than CGI report
		- As HW kindly pointed out in their tdoc, Xn signaling is basically possible between intra-operator gNBs or inter-operator gNBs by same vendor only, by which PCI collision between inter operator with different vendor’s gNB is not possible. It could be too much restriction if gNBs with same vendor only have to be deployed even by different operators in 60 GHz. We believe such restriction can make the practical deployment much harder. Why 3GPP needs to have such restrictions would be unclear for us.
	+ For the second sub-bullet, why we have to go directly with the discussion about “how to support CGI report carried by PDSCH” with the same feeling as Samsung. We think there still be another way to support ANR with neither such PDSCH carrying CGI report nor CORESET#0/SIB1 with larger SCSs. At least referring 120 kHz CORESET#0/SIB1 can be considered although our preference is still Alt 1.

Note that PCI collision is necessary not only for HO failure but also RRM measurement. So we still see the strong necessity to support ANR.  |
| Mediatek | As commented in 2.1.1, the significance of 480/960 kHz SCS for ANR purpose is not clear to us, since by using 120 kHz SCS, the CGI information can be provided to UE. It would be very much appreciated if it can be further clarified. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Alt 1 is a simple solution to support ANR and PCI confusion resolution, thus Alt 1 is preferred for us. Supporting Alt 1 does not mean excluding any other possible methods, only if we have consensus on these methods. |
| Nokia | Our preference would be Alt1. This functionality is rather elementary for the system operation, thus the simplest and most straight forward method to support it is to provide the CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH configuration in MIB.Based on existing agreements, we could assume to have PCell on some other band (≠B52GHz band), and have the Pscell or Scell on B52GHz band. In such scenarios it may not be feasible to fall back to obtain the CGI from the e.g. 120kHz SSB, if the device in question does not support said band. For Xn based procedure or for PDSCH based mechanism to work successfully, we are in practice assuming known (intra-vendor/operator) cell, like pointed out by DOCOMO. For unlicensed band operation, we are not convinced that this can always be assumed. |
| OPPO | We are open to discuss Alt 1 and Alt 2 for ANR and PCI confusion resolution. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Futurewei | We prefer further discussions on this topic; we see a lot of opinions and questions that need further clarification before a decision.  |
| AT&T | We support Alt. 1. Specifically, we don’t want a band specific solution for ANR/PCI confusion resolution. Lastly, regarding Huawei’s proposal, similar to Samsung, we don’t understand how dedicated signaling can address the problem we are trying to solve here. Dedicated signaling and the whole topic of inter-operator PCI confusion resolution was discussed at length in NR-U in Rel. 16 in RAN1, RAN2, and RAN. We have little sympathy for why we need to repeat that discussion in Rel. 17 for 52.6 GHz and beyond. The situation is exactly the same. Repeating past discussions is not appropriate. We also share Docomo’s concerns on Huawei’s proposals in terms of complexity and feasibility.  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support Alt 1 as a basic functionality which is already supported in Rel15. We are also fine to discuss the support of Alt 2. |
| Interdigital | As we have already discussed in the tdoc, the UE should be provided with the CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH configuration for the ANR function. Though Alt.1 is the straightforward option, the Alt.2 can be considered as the alternative in case the configuration based on Alt.1 is not available. Alt.2 can be implemented by having the semi-static configuration of the parameters for the CORESET#0 and Type0-PDCCH, where the time and frequency allocations and the multiplexing patterns are (pre)configured in fixed settings. Then the UE may identify the (pre)configured location of CORESET#0 and Type0-PDCCH based on the SCS, the carrier frequency, or the RRC settings. |
| CATT | We are OK with Alt1. It may have some complexity involved but it is a simple solution. If companies can have consensus for a specific alt2 solution we are also open. |
| Intel | Support Alt.1 as it’s a well-known solution. Continue discussing Alt.2.One of the important things to note is future forward compatibility. In section 2.1.1, we are discussing the possibility of supporting initial access for 480kHz and 960kHz. If such feature does not get introduced, the current Release-17 will be defined in a such way to have quite negative impact to introduction of new features and modes of operation. CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH signaling can be a key aspect in keeping forward compatibility. Therefore, we suggest supporting Alt.1 first now as it will resolve ANR issues and provide forward compatibility with whatever we support in Section 2.1.1 or in future releases. |
| vivo | We support Alt 1 due to the need of solving ANR and PCI confusion issue.Regarding Huawei’s comment on the reasons of not supporting Alt. 1, we have the following response:For Reason 1, we think PCI confusion is needed with the following clarification:We agree that PCI confusion won’t cause HO failure if 480K/960K SSB is not used for initial access case. However, it will result in wrong configuration of Scell or PScell due to misunderstanding of the RRM measurement. One example is provided below: UE1 belongs to operator 1 and have dual connectivity to gNB1a and gNB1c from operator 1. Since gNB1b is a neighbor cell of gNB1a, UE1 will be configured with measurement on PCI 2. However, due to the same PCI between gNB1b and gNB2b, UE1 will report the measurement on gNB2b to gNB1a and thus gNB1a may misunderstand UE1 is closer to gNB1b. So gNB1a will configure gNB1b as PScell for UE1 which result in performance loss. We hope this could clarify the need of solving PCI confusion between operators.For Reason 2, it lists several alternatives to solve PCI confusion and ANR problem other than CGI reporting, we don’t think they are applicable.* For Alt. a “Monitoring of DL channels by gNBs”, we think monitoring of DL channels is UE function and not implemented in legacy gNB. Even gNB can monitor DL channel, gNB1b may not hear gNB2b and the PCI confusion can’t be solved either.
* For Alt. b “Neighbour information exchange using Xn signaling”, we don’t think the gNBs belonging to different operators could have Xn interface.

For Reason 3, we don’t think CGI reporting via dedicated signaling could serve the purpose of ANR. As discussed in our Tdoc R1-2104348, the purpose of ANR function is to relieve the operator from the burden of manually managing neighbor cell relations (NCRs), which are mainly used for mobility purpose (p.s. in practice, NCRs largely are configured manually). NCRs are cell-to-cell relations, while an Xn link is set up between two gNBs. One typical deployment scenario is illustrated below: gNB1&2&3 are legacy carriers in FR2 with 120K PCell and gNB a, b ,c ,d are newly deployed carriers in 52.6-71GHz with 960K PScell. The Xn interface should be established between them. One way is manual configuration which impose high burden to operators. ANR provides a good way to managing this automatically, which is the main reason to introduce ANR. In this case, how to use dedicated signaling for CGI reporting before there is Xn interface between them (e.g. dashed line in the following figure)In summary, Alt. 1 is the only way to perform CGI reporting for solving ANR and PCI confusion problem. |
| Convida Wireless | We prefer Alt 1.  |
| Ericsson | We support both Alt-1 and Alt-2.We also agree with other companies that it makes sense to restrict the discussion to 480/960 since there is no specification work needed for 120 kHzWe think it would be more appropriate to change the wording of the main bullet as follows:To support ANR and PCI conflict detection ~~confusion resolution~~since the functionality we are discussing is only the first step of ANR, i.e., methods for the UE to report ECGI for the gNB to learn if there is a PCI conflict. Once the gNB determines there is a conflict within the same/different operator, how to resolve the conflict is outside of the scope of RAN1.The reason for supporting Alt-2 is that if we cannot achieve consensus on CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH configuration being provided by MIB of 480/960 kHz SSB (Alt-1), then we would need a fallback solution (Alt-2), and we think a workable fallback solution exists via provision of CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH configuration through dedicated signaling. At heart, ECGI reporting for ANR is about using the UEs as sensors for PCI conflict detection, and different UEs (sensors) can be provided with different CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH configurations, using the observation that for a given SSB frequency domain location (already provided to the UE by dedicated signaling), there are a quite limited number of possible CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH configurations that could be configured by any operator. If different UEs are provided with different configuration candidates, and any one or more of the UEs reports an ECGI that is unknown to the gNB, then the PCI conflict is detected.Already in Rel-15, both the SSB frequency domain location (ARFCN) for the UE to measure is explicitly provided to the UE in *measObjectNR,* and the PCI for which to report ECGI is explicitly provided in *reportConfigNR*, both through dedicated signaling when the UE is in CONNECTED mode. It seems like a simple extension to also include a parameter that provides the CORESET0/Type0-PDCCH configuration. |
| WILUS | We support Alt 1 and open to discuss Alt-2 as an alternative for ANR and PCI confusion resolution. |
| Spreadtrum | We support Alt 1. |

#### **1st Round Discussion Summary:**

Summary of responses from companies are provided below.

* To support ANR and PCI confusion detection for 480/960kHz,
	+ Alt 1) Support CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH configuration in MIB of 480 and 960kHz SSB
		- Agree: Docomo, Samsung, ZTE, Sanechips, Nokia, OPPO, AT&T, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, Interdigital, CATT, Intel, vivo, Convida Wireless, Ericsson, WILUS, Spreadtrum
			* Main reasons:
				+ Unclear why CGI reporting for 480/960kHz is precluded

gNB directly monitoring requires gNB to support IAB-like capability

Xn is only possible for same operator

* + - * + Inter-operator ANR
				+ PCI confusion is not only for avoiding HO, but also to relive operator burden for manual managing neighbor cell relation (NCR)
				+ Future forward compatibility
		- Object: Huawei, HiSilicon
			* Main reasons:
				+ Believe PCI confusion is to avoid HO failure, and alternative method exist to avoid HO failure
				+ Following techniques are possible for ANR:

gNB directly detecting neighbor cell SSB

Xn signaling to exchange information between connected gNB

* + - * + SIB1 overhead is too large just for sharing PLMN info
				+ Specification effort related to CORESET0 design is not justifiable
				+ ~~DCI based CGI-info transmission (new feature?)~~
				+ PDCCH scheduling PDSCH carrying CGI parameters is provided by dedicated signaling
	+ Alt 2) [alternative method] to enable support to obtain neighbor cell PCI and SIB1 contents related to CGI reporting
		- Agree: LGE, OPPO, Interdigital, Ericsson, Huawei, HiSilicon
		- FFS: Lenovo, Mobility Mobility, CATT, Intel, WILUS

#### **2nd Round Discussion:**

Based on the discussion so far, the path forward on this issue seems clear. Moderator suggests focusing on alt 1 and while keeping alt 2 as FFS. At the very least we could try to work with this as working assumption.

##### **Proposal 1.2-2)**

* For agreement or working assumption:
	+ To support ANR and PCI confusion detection for 480/960kHz SCS based SSB, support CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH configuration in MIB of 480 and 960kHz SSB
		- FFS: additional method(s) to enable support to obtain neighbor cell PCI and SIB1 contents related to CGI reporting

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Samsung | We support the proposal. We already expressed our concern on the feasibility of using dedicated signalling for providing the CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH configuration. If there are other approach under the FFS, we are ok to list as details as part of the proposal for further discussion (it’s more clear to judge whether such additional method is needed).  |
| AT&T | In RP-191581, RAN agreed that this is “essential functionality” in unlicensed spectrum. Subsequently, RAN1 specified the feature in TS 38.213, Section 13 for operation with shared spectrum channel access. The feature was also endorsed by both RAN1 (3GPP TR 38.889 V16.0.0, Study on NR-based access to unlicensed spectrum) and RAN2 (Chairman notes for 3GPP RAN2 #103bis meeting, Chengdu, China, October 2018) during the study item phase. In light of the above history and the vast number of existing agreements on this issue in two WGs and RAN during Rel. 16, we would like to hear from Huawei, who according to the summary is the only objecting company and to my recollection did not have any concerns in Rel. 16 when this feature was agreed in RAN1 for NR-U, what is so fundamentally different in 52.6-71 GHz compared to 5 and 6 GHz that they now object to this feature. Given that only a single company objects, while 18 companies, incl. three operators strongly support the feature, a working assumption is the very least that should be agreed. In fact, it is very unfortunate how much time RAN1 is forced to spend on this topic given the exact same discussion already took place in Rel. 16 where everything was agreed and specified by consensus. |
| Qualcomm | We support this proposal |
| LG Electronics | Still it seems that companies have different views on the necessity of ANR support for 480/960 kHz SCS, which is optional feature. It should be noted that ANR can be already supported with 120 kHz SCS SSB/CORESET#0. Nevertheless, if we go with alt 1 due to majority view, we suggest to add the following note in order to minimize specification impact for optional features.* + - Note: Strive to minimize specification impact by reusing tables for CORESET#0 and type0-PDCCH CSS set configuration defined for FR2 in Rel-15, as much as possible
 |
| DOCOMO | We share AT&T’s view. While we prefer to support this as an agreement to avoid spending more time, we can live with it as a working assumption. LGE’s suggestion is also ok for us.  |
| Ericsson | We are supportive of the proposal in principle, but we think 2 changes are needed.1. We think that the scope needs to be more clearly defined to manage the workload in the remaining meetings. We agree with the suggestion by LGE, and further, we think some constraints need to be introduced (similar to the discussion on SSB numerology in Section 2.1.1). Without such constraints the risk of not completing the work is high.
	1. Only 1 CORESTE#0/Type0-PDCCH SCS supported for each SSB SCS, i.e., (480,480) and (960,960).
	2. Prioritize support SSB-CORESET0 multiplexing pattern 1. Other patterns discussed on a best effort basis.
2. On the FFS, we agree in principle; however, why is PCI included? Our understanding is that there is no issue on PCI reporting (that happens prior to configuration of ECGI reporting). The open issue is how to enable ECGI reporting that requires SIB1 reading

FFS: additional method(s) to enable support to obtain neighbor cell PCI and SIB1 contents related to CGI reporting |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | 1. **Comments on summary of our views in “1st Round Discussion Summary”**

We thank our moderator to summarize our views in “1st Round Discussion Summary”. Just two points to more accurately reflect our views:1. Our reason to object with Alt 1 (Support CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH configuration in MIB of 480 and 960kHz SSB), is not only the fact that SIB1 overhead just for sharing CGI related info (or, more accurately, *plmn-IdentityList*) is too large but also the required specification effort related to CORESET#0 design including supported {SSB, CORESET#0} multiplexing patterns, number of supported RBs, number of symbols, RB offsets, and also design PDCCH monitoring occasions for Type0-PDCCH CSS set for both 480 and 960 kHz SSBs) just to provide *plmn-IdentityList* is not justifiable.
2. As we have mentioned in our proposal in the first round of discussions, our proposed solution to support PCI collision resolution is

“*PCI collision resolution mechanism is specified based on UE CGI report where PDCCH associated with the PDSCH carrying CGI parameters is provided by dedicated signaling*”. Our solution, in principle, is similar to the solution that, for instance, InterDigital and Ericsson have explained in the first round with the main difference that Type0-PDCCH and “PDSCH scheduled by type-0 PDCCH” are replaced by generic PDCCH and PDSCH, respectively. This is simply because of the fact that, unlike the “conventional” case, such (Type0-)PDCCH is provided using dedicated signaling and such PDSCH (scheduled by type-0 PDCCH) provides only parameters related to CGI report. So, we did not use the names Type0-PDCCH and PDSCH scheduled by type-0 PDCCH to avoid confusion. However, this seems to have had an adverse effect and resulted in even a more confusion.Given above explanations and for the sake of clarification, we have modified your summary of our views in “1st Round Discussion Summary”. The changes are marked in red. 1. **Our view regarding Proposal 1.2-2):**

We cannot agree with the proposal by our feature lead as is.As we discussed in the first round of discussions, we still have questions regarding the importance of CGI report on 480/960 kHz SSBs as, at least based on the current agreements on SSBs, PCI confusion on these SSBs do not result in a HO failure (please note that this is a precedent. We cannot say the same thing about any SSB SCS in Rel-16 NR-U or in LTE LAA). Also, as discussed, in our view, there are alternative mechanisms to resolve PCI confusion in the case of 480/960 kHz SSBs. CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH configuration in MIB of 480 and 960kHz SSB without any restriction and just for the sake of supporting CGI report is not an acceptable choice for us due to, as explained before, following reasons:1. *Unjustifiable amount of standardization effort to design CORESET#0 for 480/960 kHz SSBs just to provide CGI report parameters:*
	* If we specify CORESET#0 and Type0-PDCCH CSS set monitoring occasions just for CGI report (use a similar mechanism that enables UE to read SIB1 for Initial access), it means that we would have to design CORESET#0 including supported {SSB, CORESET#0} multiplexing patterns, number of supported RBs, number of symbols, RB offsets, and also design PDCCH monitoring occasions for Type0-PDCCH CSS set for both 480 and 960 kHz SSBs.
2. *Unjustifiable overhead of SIB1/ PDSCH scheduled by type-0 PDCCH just to provide CGI report parameters:*
	* SIB1 carried in PDSCH scheduled by type-0 PDCCHis up to 2976 bits and can contain more than 100 parameters including parameters related to cell access, access category information, cell selection, connection establishment failure control, acquisition of OSI, UE’s timers and constants, cell specific parameters of a UE including the position in burst, periodicity, and power of serving cell SSB, cell specific Uplink/Downlink TDD configuration, common parameters of the initial UL and DL BWPs which include Paging related configuration, cell specific parameters for PDCCH, PDSCH, PUCCH, PUSCH, RACH, MsgA and so on… Among all these parameters, only some fields within *plmn-IdentityList* in cell access related information IE are required for CGI report. Going through all these specification efforts to support broadcasting SIB1 that, in general, provides all cell-specific configurations and contains much larger parameter set than what is required for CGI report is not justifiable in our view.
3. *How to support CGI Report and whether or not to extend the support of 480/960 kHz SSBs are two independent issues and need to be independently discussed:*
	* Currently, 480/960 kHz SSB SCS are supported for non-initial access case with SSB not configuring Type-0 PDCCH. If companies agree to provide a solution to support CGI report for PCI confusion detection, it just makes sense that the provided solution should cater to the agreed cases of supported SSBs (non-initial access without Type-0 PDCCH). Of course, if, in a parallel discussion, companies reach a consensus that 480/960 kHz SSB SCS should also be supported for initial access, in fact, we would not even need to be concerned about how to support CGI report for 480/960 kHz SSB SCS anymore as the choice is trivial and similar to the case of 120 kHz SSB: CGI report parameters would be in SIB1. However, in our view, it seems that specifying CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH configuration in MIB of 480 and 960kHz SSB for the purpose of supporting CGI report (which, indeed, has the majority support) may have dual intents: 1) PCI confusion detection; 2) Facilitating the support for 480/960 kHz SSB SCS for initial access. We think however that these two issues should be discussed and resolved separately.
4. **Providing an alternative proposal**

Despite our above discussions, we understand that most companies would like to support CGI report for 480/960 kHz SSB and we would like to find ways to reach a consensus about this issue. As such, we would like to provide the following alternative proposal on how to support CGI report for 480/960 kHz SSB. *Proposal:* * *For the case agreed in RAN1 #104bis-e where 480/960 kHz SSB location and SCS are explicitly provided to the UE (non-initial access)*
	+ *Support configuring CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH for the purpose of PCI confusion detection by down selecting from the following two alternatives*
		- *Alt 1) Using dedicated signaling*
		- *Alt 2) Using configuration in MIB*
	+ *Note 1: Specification impact should be strived to be minimized when selecting between Alt 1) and Alt 2).*
	+ *Note 2: PDSCH scheduled by type-0 PDCCH does not contain common UL and DL parameters of a cell (uplinkConfigCommon and downlinkConfigCommon which include cell-specific parameters for PDCCH, PDSCH, PUCCH, PUSCH, RACH, MsgA)*
1. **Discussion with companies who provided their views regarding CGI-Info using dedicated signaling**

We thank companies for their technical discussions. Below, we aim to address their comments/concerns:* **DOCOMO:**
* We understand your concerns and, as such, we provided an alternative proposal on how to support CGI report for 480/960 kHz SSB in Section C above. Regarding your comment on “Alt1” (configuring in SIB1) being a simpler option that “Alt2” (dedicated signaling), we would have agreed if CORESET#0 and PDSCH scheduled by type-0 PDCCHwere already designed and supported for 480/960 kHz SSBs. This is currently not the case since 480/960 kHz SSBs are not supported for initial access and do not configure Type0-PDCCH. For further details, please see Section B above.
* Also, would you please explain why PCI collision resolution is necessary *for* RRM measurement? Are you referring to, for instance, when Event A6 (Neighbour becomes amount of offset better than SCell) is triggered where PCI collision resolution may be necessary *following* RRM measurement?
* **Nokia:**
* Regarding ***“****we could assume to have PCell on some other band (≠B52GHz band), and have the Pscell or Scell on B52GHz band. In such scenarios it may not be feasible to fall back to obtain the CGI from the e.g. 120kHz SSB, if the device in question does not support said band”,* we should clarify that facilitating CGI report using dedicated signaling only means that CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH (that address the location of PDSCH scheduled by type-0 PDCCHthat includes CGI parameters) are configured in dedicated signaling instead of being configured in MIB. The dedicated signaling is provided by PCell while the location of CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH can be, in general, anywhere. We do not see any technical problem for a UE configured for Inter-band CA to receive dedicated signaling (RRC) from PCell any time during its operation. Can you please explain more about your concern? Maybe we misunderstood.
* Regarding *“For Xn based procedure or for PDSCH based mechanism to work successfully, we are in practice assuming known (intra-vendor/operator) cell, like pointed out by DOCOMO. For unlicensed band operation, we are not convinced that this can always be assumed”,* we would like to clarify that for CGI report based on dedicated signaling to work, we assume that there is Xn signaling between gNBs of the same operator (which, we believe is a reasonable assumption both in licensed and unlicensed band). This, however, does NOT mean that CGI report based on dedicated signaling only works in intra-operator scenario. As discussed, in the first round, let’s say there is a PCell and Cell-1 and Cell-2. Cell-1 and Cell-2 both transmit 480(960) kHz SSB without CORESET#0 and both have PCID-1. Cell-1 and PCell belong to the same operator and, as such, Xn signaling is stablished between them *while Cell-2 belongs to another operator*. Since PCell and Cell-1 are connected using Xn, PCell can know the configuration/location of CORESET(#0)/(Type0-)PDCCH of Cell-1 that provide the location of PDSCH (scheduled by type-0 PDCCH)transmitted by Cell-1 and contains the CGI report parameters of Cell-1. Now, if UE reports a PCID-1 derived from a detected 480(960) kHz SSB to PCell, PCell may ask UE to read the CGI info and provide the configuration/location of CORESET(#0)/(Type0-)PDCCH of Cell-1 to the UE. If UE cannot find CORESET(#0)/(Type0-)PDCCH of Cell-1, it simply means that UE had actually detected Cell-2. In such a case, UE reports an ERROR (or a message like “noSIB1”) so *PCell would know that the detected cell is not cell-1 and belongs to another operator*. In the unlikely situation that the location of CORESET(#0)/(Type0-)PDCCH for cell-1 and cell-2 happen to be the same, there is still no problem: UE can just detect the CGI corresponding to the actually detected cell and report the CGI back. In either case, at the end of the procedure, serving gNB would know whether the detected cell by the UE belongs to its own operator or another operator.
* **AT&T:**

We hope that our above explanations to DOCOMO and Nokia has resolved your concern about the complexity and inter-operator applicability of PCI confusion resolution using dedicated signaling. We also provided an alternative proposal to support CGI report in Section C) above that we hope is acceptable for AT&T. Our view however is not aligned with you in that “the situation is exactly the same” as in NR-U in Rel. 16. As per current agreements, 480/960 kHz SSBs cannot be used for initial access and do not configure Type0-PDCCH. This was certainly not the case for any supported SSB numerologies in Rel-16 NR-U. We think that configuring Type0-PDCCH for 480/960 kHz SSBs in MIB just for the sake of CGI report is not the best way forward and there are alternatives (e.g., providing Type0-PDCCH configuration using dedicated signaling) that deserve thorough investigation. * **Intel:**

Please note that, in our view, if companies reach a consensus in Section 2.1.1 that 480/960 kHz SSB SCS should also be supported for initial access, in fact, we would not even need to be concerned about how to support CGI report for 480/960 kHz SSB SCS as the choice is trivial and similar to the case of 120 kHz SSB: CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH are configured in MIB and CGI report parameters would be in SIB1. In our view, the discussion on how to support CGI report for 480/960 kHz SSB SCS should however be based on the current agreements on 480/960 kHz SSB SCS (480/960 kHz SSB is not used for initial access and does not configure Type0-PDCCH) and, as such, at least, dedicated signaling approach should not be dismissed as an alternative. Regarding forward compatibility issue, if the agreements regarding 480/960 kHz SSB SCS stand “as is” in Rel-17 but companies decide, say in Rel-18, to support 480/960 kHz SSB SCS for initial access, we do not see why there is a problem to configure CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH for 480/960 kHz SSB SCS in Rel-18. In any case, even if companies decide to configure CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH for 480/960 kHz SSB SCS in Rel-17 for the mere purpose of supporting CGI report, there is no need for a configuration optimization and a single CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH with Pattern 3 would be sufficient. Therefore, if 480/960 kHz SSB SCS for initial access is supported in later releases, additional CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH pattern designs would be anyway required. * **Vivo:**
* Thank you for your detailed analysis.
	+ For Reason 1, if UE 1 reports PCI 2, then gNB1a will provide the location/configuration of CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH of PCI 2 of gNB1b to the UE and ask the UE to use this configuration to provide CGI report. gNB1a has this information since gNB1a and gNB1b belong to the same operator and Xn connected. Now, if UE 1 had actually detected PCI 2 of gNB2b from another operator, it cannot find Type0-PDCCH of PCI 2 of gNB1b in the provided location since UE 1 that cannot find the SSB of PCI 2 of gNB1b would not be able to detect the Type0-PDCCH of PCI 2 of gNB1b either. Therefore, it returns and ERROR or “NoSIB1” as a CGI report back to gNB1a. gNB1a realizes that the detected PCI 2 by UE1 does not belong to its own operator (does not belong to gNB1b) and belongs to another operator. Consequently, gNB1a does not configure PCI 2 of gNB1b as a PSCell or SCell for UE 1 since gNB1a knows that PCI 2 of gNB1b is not detectable by UE 1. So, PCI confusion for inter-operator case is resolved without causing any problem.
	+ For Reason 2, we have provided a compromise solution to support CGI report. Please see Section C. However, as a side note, we believe that Xn signaling among multiple operators of the same vendor is also possible.
	+ For Reason 3, we are not really sure if we understood your argument accurately. It is true that, according to 38.300 “NCRs are cell-to-cell relations, while an Xn link is set up between two gNBs. Neighbour Cell Relations are unidirectional, while an Xn link is bidirectional.” But we do not see a direct relation of this with our discussion. Please also note that, according to 38.300 “The neighbour information exchange, which occurs during the Xn Setup procedure or in the gNB Configuration Update procedure, may be used for ANR purpose”. In fact, as mentioned in 38.423 (XnAP spec), during XN SETUP between two NG-RAN nodes, the responding NG-RAN node provides the list of its served cells (mandatory) and its neighbor cells (optional). In both cases, each cell entry includes (PCI, CGI, TAC, and PLMN Identity as mandatory fields). Below, is an excerpt from 38.423. Relevant parts are marked in Green.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 9.1.3.2 XN SETUP RESPONSEThis message is sent by a NG-RAN node to a neighbouring NG-RAN node to transfer application data for an Xn-C interface instance.Direction: NG-RAN node2 🡪 NG-RAN node1.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| IE/Group Name | Presence | Range | IE type and reference | Semantics description | Criticality | Assigned Criticality |
| Message Type | M |  | 9.2.3.1 |  | YES | reject |
| Global NG-RAN Node ID | M |  | 9.2.2.3 |  | YES | reject |
| TAI Support List | M |  | 9.2.3.20 | List of supported TAs and associated characteristics. | YES | reject |
| **List of Served Cells NR** |  | *0 .. <**maxnoofCellsinNG-RAN node>* |  | Contains a list of cells served by the gNB. If a partial list of cells is signalled, it contains at least one cell per carrier configured at the gNB | YES | reject |
| >Served Cell Information NR | M |  | 9.2.2.11 |  | – |  |
| >Neighbour Information NR | O |  | 9.2.2.13 |  | – |  |
| >Neighbour Information E-UTRA | O |  | 9.2.2.14 |  | – |  |
| **List of Served Cells E-UTRA** |  | *0 .. <maxnoofCellsinNG-RAN node>* |  | Contains a list of cells served by the ng-eNB. If a partial list of cells is signalled, it contains at least one cell per carrier configured at the gNB | YES | reject |
| >Served Cell Information E-UTRA | M |  | 9.2.2.12 |  | – |  |
| >Neighbour Information NR | O |  | 9.2.2.13 |  | – |  |
| >Neighbour Information E-UTRA | O |  | 9.2.2.14 |  | – |  |
| Criticality Diagnostics | O |  | 9.2.3.3 |  | YES | ignore |

 |

  |
| Apple  | We are general ok with the proposal. However, we want to make it clear that support 480/960kHz SCS for ANR reading is from system perspective, which does not mean UE is mandated to support this. In other words, if UE does not support 480/960kHz SCS, this sentence is NOT mandated UE to implement ANR for 480/960kHz SCS. To avoid potential misinterpretation, we can agree with this proposal on condition to add the following note: * Note: From UE perspective, support ANR detection for 480/960kHz SCS based SSB is optional and up to UE capability report.

On ‘PCI’ in FFS, we share the comments from Ericsson and wonder why PCI is included since PCI is part of measurement objective and not included in measurement report.  |
| InterDigital | We believe that ANR and PCI confusion detection are essential functionalities and shall be supported. In addition, we are not fine with LGE’s note.  |
| vivo | We are OK with the proposal.To Huawei: Thanks for your response to our comments.For Reason 1, the intention is to verify the need of PCI confusion problem which you think it is not necessary in the 1st round discussion. It seems that you already admits that it is needed, which is quite good☺For Reason 2, I agree that the proposed solution based on dedicated signaling could solve PCI confusion problem in some extent. But this would also introduce spec impact in other WGs, e.g. information exchange on the configuration of Type 0 PDCCH or dedicated PDCCH for CGI reporting. Besides, it only solve the PCI confusion problem but not the ANR (see details below)For Reason 3, I think your mentioned Xn setup procedures are based on the assumption that the two gNBs knows that they are neighbor cells. How does this information is known to the gNB? For example in the following figure, how does gNB1 (operating in 120KHz Pcell) know gNB b (operating in 960K PScell) is its neighbor cell. A traditional way is manually configured in gNB1 by its operator. However, this requires complicated O&M especially when the number of newly deployed cells is large. That’s why the function of ANR (Automatic Neighbor Relation) is introduced, i.e. alleviate the burden of manual configuration. I don’t think your proposed solution could serve this purpose. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | In principle, we support the FL proposal, but “neighbor cell PCI and” could be deleted or revised to “obtain neighbor cell CGI” as there is no issue on PCI, as commented by Ericsson. |
| Spreadtrum | We are basically fine with the FL proposal. |
| Nokia | We support the FL proposal to focus on Alt1.Lot of the reasoning for objecting the CORESET0/Type0-PDCCH configuration based solution was related to the complexity of the related specification work. Therefore speculating on developing an alternative solution, covering aspects under both RAN1, RAN2 and RAN3, with unknown specification effort seems counter-intuitive. To limit the specification effort for ANR support, it would seem best that RAN1 focuses on Alt1. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support moderator’s proposal |
| Futurewei | As a compromise, we can agree with the proposal, with following clarifications:1. Add the note proposed by LGE as the design principle to minimize the specifications impact
2. On the FFS, we share the same opinion as Ericsson, Apple and ZTE that there is no issue with PCI.
 |
| Samsung2 | We believe our concern on the feasibility of Alt 2 (using dedicated signalling) is not answered by the components supporting it. In the inter-operator scenario, how one operator can use dedicated signalling to provide the CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH configuration from a neighboring cell? For the sake of progress, we are ok to list the two alternatives for further discussion, but the two notes from Huawei’s proposal should be removed. The difference of specification impact from Alt 1 and Alt 2 is on RAN1 and RAN2 respectively, and we didn’t see any way to measure whose spec impact is larger. The second note is fully a RAN2 issue, and is not within the scope of our current discussion. We encourage companies to focus on the technical aspects first.  |
| Intel | We support Proposal 1.2-2 in general and we also agree with arguments explained by Ericsson and vivoAs for why having CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH is needed for forward compatibility. If this set of signals is not defined in Rel-17, and the 8 bits intended CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH is completely left unused, it might be possible to extend this in future releases. However, from the discussions there may need to introduce additional information that may need to borrow bits from existing bit fields. In such cases, it will not be possible to implement support of CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH in forward compatibility way. The best method is to develop the CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH signaling now, such that future devices that are able to perform non-initial access and CGI reporting can directly leverage this. |
| CATT | We agree with the proposal in principle but would like to add the restriction to minimize the potential specification work. The note suggested by Ericsson is fine to us. |
| MediaTek | We propose to delay the discussion till the outcome of the discussion in Part 2 is clear. If there is no consensus on adding 480/960 kHz SSB for initial access and non-initial access for other cases, then we are ok with Alt-1 in this proposal. If there is a consensus for adding either one or both 480/960 kHz SSB for initial access, then there might be some conflict between agreements? For example, if we agreed on additionally supporting only 480kHz SSB for initial access and non-initial access, then do we still support CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH configuration in MIB of 960kHz SSB based on this proposal? In addition, similar to Ericsson’s comment, we prefer to support only single numerology for ANR application and capture this aspect in the proposal. |
| OPPO | We support moderator’s proposal |
| Moderator | To Mediatek,Not sure what the potential conflict is with discussion on section 2.1.1. Moderator assumes the discussion on signaling support for MIB contents for 480/960kHz could be conducted in parallel with discussion on support for initial access cases. If initial access are to be supported, and control channel signal is supported in MIB, then the initial access can leverage this. If initial access cases are not supported, the signaling could be still supported for ANR functionality. With this said, I’ve captured Mediatek’s preferences in the summary. |

#### **2nd Round Discussion Summary:**

Moderator has updated Proposal 1.2-2 to Proposal 1.2-3 to correct the PCI issue for neighbor cell, and to add the constraints commented by Ericsson and LGE.

The following are summary of views on Proposal 1.2-2

* Support: Samsung, Qualcomm, AT&T, Docomo, Interdigital, vivo, ZTE, Sanechips, Spreadtrum, Nokia, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, Futurewei, Intel, CATT, OPPO
* Ok to accept with Note added (Proposal 1.2-3): LGE
* Ok to accept with notes on capability added: Apple
* Do not support: Huawei, HiSilicon
* Delay decision: Mediatek

Moderator also added two more proposal, one from Apple to add the capability note (Proposal 1.2-4), and one from Huawei on different compromise proposal (Proposal 1.2-5). The reason moderator has separated out Proposal 1.2-4 (capability note) from Proposal 1.2-3 is because moderator wasn’t sure if Apple was proposing another capability that is separate from capability to support 480 or 960kHz SCS, or whether it is the same capability, and we are confirming that this capability is optional. Also while it is ok to discuss the capability aspects alone with support of certain features, moderator assumed RAN1 will also have some time to discuss the exact capabilities in more detail later down the specification. With that said, if companies are ok to agree on Proposal 1.2-4, it should be ok to add.

##### **Proposal 1.2-3)**

* To support ANR and PCI confusion detection for 480/960kHz SCS based SSB, support CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH configuration in MIB of 480 and 960kHz SSB
	+ FFS: additional method(s) to enable support to obtain neighbor cell ~~PCI and~~ SIB1 contents related to CGI reporting
	+ Only 1 CORESTE#0/Type0-PDCCH SCS supported for each SSB SCS, i.e., (480,480) and (960,960).
	+ Prioritize support SSB-CORESET0 multiplexing pattern 1. Other patterns discussed on a best effort basis.
	+ Note: Strive to minimize specification impact by reusing tables for CORESET#0 and type0-PDCCH CSS set configuration defined for FR2 in Rel-15, as much as possible

##### **Proposal 1.2-4)**

* Add following note to Proposal 1.2-3)
	+ - Note: From UE perspective, support ANR detection for 480/960kHz SCS based SSB is optional and up to UE capability report.

##### **Proposal 1.2-5) – Alternative to Proposal 1.2-3**

* For the case agreed in RAN1 #104bis-e where 480/960 kHz SSB location and SCS are explicitly provided to the UE (non-initial access)
	+ Support configuring CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH for the purpose of PCI confusion detection by down selecting from the following two alternatives
		- Alt 1) Using dedicated signaling
		- Alt 2) Using configuration in MIB
	+ Note 1: Specification impact should be strived to be minimized when selecting between Alt 1) and Alt 2).
	+ Note 2: PDSCH scheduled by type-0 PDCCH does not contain common UL and DL parameters of a cell (uplinkConfigCommon and downlinkConfigCommon which include cell-specific parameters for PDCCH, PDSCH, PUCCH, PUSCH, RACH, MsgA)

#### **3rd Round Discussion:**

Moderator would like to ask companies to provide further feedback on Proposal 1.2-3, 1.2-4 and 1.2-5 (which is alternative of 1.2-3 from Huawei).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| DOCOMO | We support Proposal 1.2-3 although it includes subbullet not preferred by us. For Proposal 1.2-4, again, assuming 480 and 960 kHz SCS will be optional even for SSB as well as control/data, we don’t see the necessity to have this at this stage. For Proposal 1.2-5 from Huawei, we appreciate their compromise. Since at least MIB transmission with 480/960 kHz SCS is supported already, we think Proposal 1.2-3 is more straightforward as Proposal 1.2-3 doesn’t say anything on whether to reuse SIB1 PDSCH for SCS of 480/960 kHz. Response to HW (sorry for late response):1. Indeed, whether it is straightforward to reuse SIB1 transmission for ANR may depend on SSB SCS for initial access case, as you said. We have to admit that, although we still think it is straight forward considering some limitations and your proposal is , it would be still a discussion point. I guess, in this sense, Proposal 1.2-3 is not problematic even for you.

For the necessity of ANR, apology for very unclear statement from our side. Basically what we were going to say is cases to connect a Scell from another SCell (I guess it is what you said). Even in this case, to assign PCI appropriately would be hard for operators, thus we still see the necessity of ANR function. We share vivo’s reply for Reason 3.  |
| Nokia | We would prefer alt 1.2-3. Like noted earlier, it is not very clear why would we need an alternative solution over the existing solution. The specification effort to have an alternative solution would be larger and require work on multiple WGs. As per capability, if we agree proposal 1.1-2) we should evidently bundle this for selected SCS for the initial access. For the other ‘non-initial access’ SCS, we would of course prefer to bundle this with the support of the SCS in general, but this can be further discussed. |
| LG Electronics | We are fine with Proposals 1.2-3 and 1.2-4 and do not object to 1.2-5 once consensus can be reached. |
| vivo | We prefer proposal 1.2-3. We don’t think another alternative solution is needed to serve the same purpose. But we can live with the FFS.For proposal 1.2-4, this discussion could be deferred at this stage and we are fine with it if majority wants.For proposal 1.2-5, it only mentions “Support configuring CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH for the purpose of PCI confusion detection”. How about ANR function? In our understanding, we are discussing the mechanism of SIB1 reading for the purpose of ANR and PCI confusion detection. Besides, as commented in the 2nd Round discussion, we are not clear that how Alt. 1 using dedicated signaling could serve ANR purpose. |
| Spreadtrum | For Proposal 1.2-3), we are fine for it.For Proposal 1.2-4), in our view, companies do not much concern about the complexity of reception of SSB with 480/960kHz for ANR purpose. It can be postponed to the discussion of UE features.For Proposal 1.2-5), it can be FFS since it is too detailed. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We support Proposal 1.2-3, and do not support Proposal 1.2-5, since Proposal 1.2-3 is not only supported by most companies, but also proved to be an effective method.We are open to add a note (i.e. Proposal 1.2-4) to Proposal 1.2-3 if it can eliminate some companies’ worries. |
| Intel | We support Proposal 1.2-3.We don’t see a strong need in Proposal 1.2-4, but if the majority of the companies prefers to have it, we are fine. |
| Samsung | We support Proposal 1.2-3. We are ok with Proposal 1.2-4, although this discussion seems not that urgent. We can live with Proposal 1.2-5 without the two notes, with reasons explained in the previous round.  |
| AT&T | We support Proposal 1.2-3.Regarding Proposal 1.2-4, in its current form it is not agreeable as it suggests there is a separate capability bit for ANR. I think the intention is that UEs that don’t support 480/960 kHz PDCCH/PDSCH are not required to support 480/960 kHz SSB. That is, in fact, a proposal AT&T and others have made before for Section 2.1.1. If proposal 1.2-4 is clarified in that way, we are perfectly fine with it, in fact, we proposed the same in RAN1 #104bis-e. But the current wording is unclear to us.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support Proposal 1.2-5. Notes could be removed if it is a concern for some companies.At this stage, it is a good step forward to reach a consensus in principle to PCI confusion detection and list the alternatives. This is what proposal 1.2-5 aims to do. Also, based on current agreements, 480 kHz and 960 kHz numerologies for the SSB are supported for the case where SSB location and SCS are explicitly provided to the UE (non-initial access). As such, we think that 1.2-3 and 1.2-4 are not formulated properly based on the current agreements. In general, we think the mechanism to support PCI confusion detection would depend on the outcome of discussion regarding supported cases for SSB SCS. If a SSB SCS is supported for initial access, then the choice is clear (configuration in MIB). If a SSB SCS is not supported for initial access, then we have two choices of using dedicated signaling and configuration in MIB. Even if companies decide to use configuration in MIB for the case that SSB SCS is not supported for initial access, we should take into account that PDSCH scheduled by Type0-PDCCH is a small when configuring CORESET#0 multiplexing pattern (ie one Mux pattern 3 would be sufficient).To **Vivo**: We are not sure we understand “How about ANR function”? As we explained before, in our view Alt 1 and Alt 2 have exactly the same functionality and both equally resolve the PCI confusion. Is it related to your earlier comment in the second round “I think your mentioned Xn setup procedures are based on the assumption that the two gNBs knows that they are neighbor cells. How does this information is known to the gNB”? If yes, what I said is that during XN SET UP gNBs mandatorily exchange their own cell information. Each gNB knows its own cell information and, to our understanding, there is no need for ANR for such purpose. So by the end of XN set up between gNB1 and gNB2, gNB1 knows the cells of gNB2 and gNB2 knows cells of gNB1. Optionally, if gNB1 knows cells of another neighbor gNB3 (e.g, through a prior stablished XN Set up between gNB1 and gNB3), it can also provide the Cell information of gNB3 to gNB2 when stablishing XN set up between gNB1 and gNB2. One way or another, all gNBs that are connected to one another through XN signaling will know the Cells of one another without any need for CGI report or ANR. |
| Ericsson | We support Proposal 1.2-3. |
| Apple  | We are ok with either Proposal 1.2-3 and Proposal 1.2-5, on condition that **modified** Proposal 1.2-4 below is added. We provided brief justification on this. As evidence by the comments so far, some companies already interpreted that the P1.2-3 is sort of mandatory purely for ANR function, even for UE who reports not capable of 480/960 SCS in general. This is exactly what we intended to avoid. We are ok to ANR function with 480/960 SCS if UE supports this for data/control. However, we do not want to implement this SCS purely for ANR function. Note that, per WID, support 480/960kHz SCS is always optional for all channels/function. To address AT&T comment, we made some modification on P1.2-5 to clarify that there is no additional UE capability for this: * + Note: From UE perspective, support ANR detection for 480/960kHz SCS based SSB is optional depending on whether UE supports 480/960 SCS for SSB.

On Proposal 1.2-3, our understanding is that for ANR function, the SCS of SSB is explicitly provided as part of Measurement objective configuration in current ASN.1. Hence, it is almost same as Proposal 1.2-5. It should be clarified about the difference.  |
| Qualcomm | We support proposal 1.2-3 with the exception of “*Only 1 CORESTE#0/Type0-PDCCH SCS supported for each SSB SCS, i.e., (480,480) and (960,960).*” This was based on previous comments that we prefer to consider 120 SSB + 480/960 CORESET0 combinations. We also would like to add the condition: Supporting 480 and 960 kHz SSB for non-initial access with support of CORESET0/Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB if the timing of the SSB is known to the UE.We also support Proposal 1.2-4. May be the condition above may be added to this capability. Meaning, the capability can be also be dependent if the timing of the SSB is known to the UE or not.  |
| Samsung | We have a question regarding Qualcomm’s comment: what timing is referring to in the sentence “if the timing of the SSB is known to the UE”? For MIB reading, we didn’t see a need for timing other than symbol level, and for the context of ANR purpose, this timing should already be implied. If the timing is referring to other timing, why such timing is needed for ANR purpose?  |
| Qualcomm (from email) | To manage the UE search complexity, we prefer the timing of the SSB is known to the UE within a certain tolerance. This tolerance can be assumed to be the same as the slot timing difference “maximum receive timing difference requirement for inter-band NR carrier aggregation” as defined in Table 7.6.4-2 of TS 38.133. |
| Samsung (from email) | At least for ANR purpose, the reading of MIB is based a pre-step of RRM, which should already guarantee the timing you concerned for the MIB reading. So in this sense, we don’t prefer using a “if” condition to further restrict the alternative, since the current statement seems intend to leave ANR without SSB timing known as an open case (we don’t think there exists such a case). So it would be more proper to make the if condition a note. * Supporting 480 and 960 kHz SSB for non-initial access with support of CORESET0/Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB
	+ Note: for ANR, it is assumed the timing of SSB is known to the UE with a certain tolerance for MIB reading.
 |
| MediaTek | Thanks Moderator for capturing our preference. Our original confusion comes from there are some 1st round alternatives in 2.1.1 including the cases for non-initial access, e.g., Alt3, which is why we are not sure about the relation between the discussion here and the discussion in section 2.1.1. If the discussion for SSB SCS in 2.1.1 is only for initial access, then we agree with Moderator that there is no point to delay the discussion here. In that case, we support Proposal 1.2-4 with the condition of timing alignment mentioned by Qualcomm. Otherwise, we see some dependence with the discussion in 2.1.1 and we prefer to delay the discussion. We also need some clarification that if only one additional SSB SCS is considered for initial access, e.g., 480 kHz, then 960 kHz SSB for ANR will still be supported based on Proposal 1.2-3?  |
| Futurewei | We could live with 1.2-3 and 1.2-5 proposals; We do not see the need for 1.2.4 |
| OPPO | After analyzing all the comments from companies, we believe that proposal 1.2-3 follows the R16 design principle and should be supported.  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support Proposal 1.2-3. |
| Moderator | To Mediatek,Not 100% sure the relation with discussion in 2.1.1 is for ANR discussion.SCS for SSB consideration for initial access, is a something separate from supporting ANR. From moderator’s understanding ANR can be supported while initial access may not for each SCS (if companies agree this way).To Samsung and Qualcomm.On the note, moderator wasn’t sure what this means. Does this mean networks need to be synchronize in timing (in unlicensed band) for ANR to function? This seems bit odd.Was the intention to state “UE will perform CGI reporting only for cells that UE has obtained SSB timing?”I think it would be good to futher clarify. |

#### **3rd Round Discussion Summary:**

The following is a summary of companies views:

* Proposal 1.2-3
	+ Support: Nokia, Spreadtrum, ZTE, Sanechips, Intel, Samsung, AT&T, Ericsson, OPPO, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility
	+ Ok to accept: Docomo (have some concern on SCS pair), Futurewie
	+ Not support: Huawei, HiSilicon
* Proposal 1.2-4
	+ Defer discussion: Docomo, Spreadtrum, Samsung
	+ Support: LGE, Spreadtrum
	+ Open to add: ZTE, Sanechips, Intel, Samsung
	+ Add with timing condition: Mediatek
	+ Not Support: AT&T, Huawei, HiSilicon
* Proposal 1.2-5
	+ Support: Huwei, HiSilicon,
	+ Not support: Nokia, ZTE, Sanechips
	+ Ok to accept with removal of notes: Samsung
	+ Ok to accept: Futurewei

In terms of likelihood to convergence, Proposal 1.2-3 might have better chance in moderator’s opinion. However, there is still companies who are not satisfactory with formulation of Proposal 1.2-3. As for proposal 1.2-5 there are still concerns on how ALT 1 would work in inter-operator cases. Therefore, requires further discussions.

Moderator has added the note from Apple which seems to be address Proposal 1.2-4 and 1.2-3 as it just a simple note.

As for the added text from Qualcomm, moderator suggest further discussions. Moderator has added Proposal 1.2-8 for this.

##### **Proposal 1.2-6) clarification of Proposal 1.2-3**

* To support ANR and PCI confusion detection for 480/960kHz SCS based SSB, support CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH configuration in MIB of 480 and 960kHz SSB
	+ FFS: additional method(s) to enable support to obtain neighbor cell ~~PCI and~~ SIB1 contents related to CGI reporting
	+ Only 1 CORESTE#0/Type0-PDCCH SCS supported for each SSB SCS, i.e., (480,480) and (960,960).
	+ Prioritize support SSB-CORESET0 multiplexing pattern 1. Other patterns discussed on a best effort basis.
	+ Note: Strive to minimize specification impact by reusing tables for CORESET#0 and type0-PDCCH CSS set configuration defined for FR2 in Rel-15, as much as possible
	+ Note: From UE perspective, support ANR detection for 480/960kHz SCS based SSB is optional depending on whether UE supports 480/960 SCS for SSB.

##### **Proposal 1.2-7) – Alternative to Proposal 1.2-6**

* For the case agreed in RAN1 #104bis-e where 480/960 kHz SSB location and SCS are explicitly provided to the UE (non-initial access)
	+ Support configuring CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH for the purpose of PCI confusion detection by down selecting from the following two alternatives
		- Alt 1) Using dedicated signaling
		- Alt 2) Using configuration in MIB
	+ ~~Note 1: Specification impact should be strived to be minimized when selecting between Alt 1) and Alt 2).~~
	+ ~~Note 2: PDSCH scheduled by type-0 PDCCH does not contain common UL and DL parameters of a cell (uplinkConfigCommon and downlinkConfigCommon which include cell-specific parameters for PDCCH, PDSCH, PUCCH, PUSCH, RACH, MsgA)~~

##### **Proposal 1.2-8)**

* Add following to Proposal 1.2-6 or 1.2-7
	+ Supporting 480 and 960 kHz SSB for non-initial access with support of CORESET0/Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB if the timing of the SSB is known to the UE

#### **4th Round Discussion (on-going):**

Please comment further on Proposal 1.2-6, 1.2-7, and 1.2-8.

Moderator would like urge companies to check if Proposal 1.2-6 is something that they can live with.

Also please clarify further on Proposal 1.2-8, as

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Nokia(from email) | So to ensure that that related SSB/cell has been already detected, RAN4 uses definition of ‘known cell’ e.g. in handover requirements to define the interruption time:“In FR2, the target cell is known if it has been meeting the following conditions:During the last [5] seconds before the reception of the handover command:  - the UE has sent a valid measurement report for the target cell and  - One of the SSBs measured from the NR target cell being configured remains detectable according to the cell identification conditions specified in clause 9.3 of TS 38.133 [50],  - One of the SSBs measured from the target cell also remains detectable during the handover delay according to the cell identification conditions specified in clause 9.3 of TS 38.133 [50].otherwise it is unknown.” Also other wording is used (shorter):“cell is known if it has been meeting the relevant cell identification requirement during the last 5 seconds otherwise it is unknown.” Hence, could we use the term “cell (or SSB) is known”? As I understand this not about providing the exact timing by network (beyond of that defined by SMTC), but that the UE has acquired the SSB i.e. knows the timing. |
| Samsung(from email) | In general, my intention was, the timing of SSB is not a new issue for 52.6 to 71 GHz for ANR purpose, and all the requirement should already been specified and support for MIB reading. The details may not even fall into RAN1’s scope, and that’s why we suggested that wording. We believe Nokia’s wording is better, and we share the same understanding that not the exact timing if needed for ANR purpose (which is impossible in a general case). So how about the following clarification: ·         Supporting 480 and 960 kHz SSB for non-initial access with support of CORESET0/Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIBo   Note: for ANR, when reading the MIB, the cell containing the SSB is known to the UE.  |
| LGE(from email) | . With that, I understood what known cell means. But I would like to add “as defined in 38.133 specification” to avoid potential confusion.·         Supporting 480 and 960 kHz SSB for non-initial access with support of CORESET0/Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIBo   Note: for ANR, it is assumed the timing of SSB is known to the UE with a certain tolerance for MIB reading, as defined in 38.133 specification.  |
| Samsung | We support Proposal 1.2-6, and can be ok with Proposal 1.2-7 as a compromise. Adding a note for the timing is ok to us, but not as a condition to support MIB based approach.  |
| LG Electronics | We are fine with Proposal 1.2-6, but have clarification question for the last bullet regarding ANR UE capability. Actually, in NR-U, there is a separate UE capability for CGI reading (i.e., FG 10-23). So, does that bullet imply that 1) UE capable of 480 kHz SSB is automatically capable of ANR based on 480 kHz SSB, or 2) capability of 480 kHz SSB and capability of ANR based on 480 kHz SSB are separate? What we thought was the second implication.For Proposal 1.2-8, as we commented to reflector, the following modification can be considered.* + Supporting 480 and 960 kHz SSB for non-initial access with support of CORESET0/Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB, if the timing of the SSB is known to the UE, as defined in 38.133 specification
 |

#### **4th Round Discussion Summary:**

TBD

### 2.1.3 DRS Related Aspects

* From [1] Futurewei:
	+ Support DBTW at least for SSB with 120 kHz SCS with the following requirements:
		- PBCH payload size is no greater than that for FR2
		- Duration of DBTW is no greater than 5 ms
		- Number of PBCH DMRS sequences is the same as for FR2
	+ Support mechanisms to indicate or inform UEs that DBTW is enabled/disabled for both IDLE and CONNECTED mode UEs
	+ Support signaling to indicate that LBT is disabled or enabled for the RACH procedure for UE in IDLE and CONNECTED modes
	+ Consider using CSI-RS presence in the discovery burst for possible ways to do beam refinement during the initial channel access.
	+ Consider selection of multiple SS/PBCH blocks at UE to perform transmissions of multiple RACH preambles (MSG1/MSG A) during initial channel access.
	+ When RACH exchange may be considered as short control/management frames that can be exempt from LBT, gNB should signal to UEs if RACH exchange is LBT exempt.
* From [2] Huawei, HiSilicon:
	+ Configure DBTW length in SIB1 for operations with shared spectrum in 52.6GHz to 71GHz with the following values:
		- 120 kHz SCS: {40, 32, 24, 20, 16, 10, 4} slots
		- 480 kHz SCS: {72, 32, 26, 20, 16, 14, 8, 4} slots
		- 960 kHz SCS: {64, 32, 26, 20, 16, 14, 8, 4} slots
	+ To indicate for operation with shared spectrum in 52.6GHz to 71GHz, three bits are used from MIB payload as follows:
	+ For SSB with 120 kHz, one bit from subCarrierSpacingCommon, one bit from ssb-SubcarrierOffset, and one bit from searchSpaceZero in pdcch-ConfigSIB1.
	+ For SSB with 480 kHz or 960 kHz, one of the following alternatives can be selected:
		- Alt 1) one bit from subCarrierSpacingCommon, one bit from ssb-SubcarrierOffset, and one bit from pdcch-ConfigSIB1.
		- Alt 2) one bit from subCarrierSpacingCommon, two bits from pdcch-ConfigSIB1.
		- Alt 3) three bits from pdcch-ConfigSIB1.
* From [3] vivo:
	+ Support DBTW in un-licensed band from 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz, no matter which SSB SCS.
	+ The following methods could be considered to determine whether there is DBTW:
		- Alt. 1: Frequency band (licensed or un-licensed);
		- Alt. 2: The indicator in PBCH;
		- Alt. 3: The design of SSB sequence (PSS, SSS and DMRS).
	+ The following methods could be considered to indicate the value of Q:
		- Alt. 1: Specify the value of Q for each SCS;
		- Alt. 2: Utilize the bits in PBCH;
	+ With the increase value of Q and the introduction of DBTW, the ssbPositionsInBurst in SIB1 should be clarified.
* From [4] Spreadtrum:
	+ DBTW can be supported.
* From [5] Nokia, NSB:
	+ Support operation with and without DBTW for initial access.
	+ If the DBTW assumption is to be provided to the UE, it would need to be available from the start to be useful.
	+ If DBTW assumption can be changed, it should be available to the UE starting from initial cell selection.
	+ It is possible to apply SCSe to one part of actually transmitted SSBs and LBT procedure for other/rest of the SSBs.
	+ Consider semi-static or predetermined mechanism to determine which SSBs are under SCSe and which under LBT in certain time windows.
* From [6] Ericsson:
	+ RAN1 needs to conclude on how to indicate LBT on/off (especially addressing the issue of DCI 1\_0 size during SIB1 reading) before any decision on supporting a DBTW is made.
	+ Conclude that a DBTW is not supported for shared spectrum in the 52.6 – 71 GHz band.
* From [7] CATT:
	+ For NR operation in 60 GHz unlicensed spectrum, the discovery burst transmission window (DBTW) shall be supported for 120 KHz SSB when gNB configures more than 56 SSBs transmission.
	+ DBTW is not needed for SSB with 480 KHz/960 KHz SCS since the duty cycle is less than 10% over the 100 ms observation window for the short control signaling transmissions.
	+ For indicating the DBTW enabling/disabling, following options can be further studied.
		- Option 1：1bit indication in MIB/PBCH, e.g. subCarrierSpacingCommon can be used if Type0-PDCH SCS can be implicitly indicated from SSB SCS.
		- Option 2：1 bit information indicated by SIB-1.
		- Option 3：If 1 bit is not available in PBCH/MIB, PBCH/MIB and SIB1 can be used jointly to indicate DBTW enabling/disabling.
	+ If the actual number of SSB configured is up to 64, the scheme that DBTW is performed only for a sub-set SSB can be considered.
* From [8] Qualcomm:
	+ for an unlicensed band that requires LBT, do not support discovery burst transmission window (DBTW) for SSB for all SCSs
	+ for an unlicensed band that requires LBT, if DBTW for SSB is adopted for 120KHz SSB:
		- Minimize the number of bits needed to signal Q (1 or 2 bits) and thus the values (2 or 4 values)
		- Enabling/disabling DBTW can be implicit in the Q value
		- Based on other agreements/designs, consider getting the bits needed from one or more of the following: controlResourceSetZero, searchSpaceZero, ssb-SubcarrierOffset, subCarrierSpacingCommon (in case 120 kHz SSB and 480/960 kHz CORESET0 is not adopted)
		- Do not introduce new candidate SSB positions outside the FR2 Case D pattern, and the QCL relationship is introduced among the existing 64 candidate SSB positions
		- Consider having a subset of the SSBs (< 64) transmitted under the short control signal assumption while another subset can be best effort or have multiple positions per beam (have a Q factor within the subset)
* From [9] OPPO:
	+ For above 52.6GH unlicensed spectrum, the DBTW within which additional SSB candidate positions may be configured is supported.
	+ Reuse NRU mechanism to determine QCL relationship between SSB candidate indexes.
* From [10] ZTE, Sanechips:
	+ Discovery burst transmission window (DBTW) should be supported for 120 kHz SSB SCS and other SSB SCSs.
	+ For LBT exempt operation and overlapping licensed/unlicensed bands, it is not necessary to enable/disable the DBTW by explicit signaling. The impacts on LBT exempt operation brought by DBTW can be eliminated by configuration implementation.
* From [11] Intel:
	+ At least for SSB SCS 120 kHz:
		- Support DBTW
		- Support signaling of enable/disable of DB and DBTW
		- Consider supporting Option 1 and/or 2 for DB and DBTW for 120kHz SSB:
			* Option 1:
				+ Increase the number of candidate SSB indices up to 80, i.e., ;
				+ Support additional values of n, such as 4, 9, 14, 19, in the equation defining the first symbols of candidate SS/PBCH blocks
				+ For QCL relationship indication across SSBs, reuse Rel-16 NR-U mechanism by introducing parameter

FFS: or ;

* + - * + No changes to MIB payload size. Further discuss and consider reinterpreting bits from some bit fields within MIB to extend candidate SSB index and information.
			* Option 2:
				+ Support floating DBTW, where the time (or slot) offset for DBTW can be smaller than 5msec.

FFS: smallest supported DBTW offset (i.e. granularity of the floating DBTW)

* + - * If neither Option 1 nor 2 is supported, RAN1 to support mechanism to balance out SSB DTX (among all SSB beams) from LBT failure.
* From [13] Apple:
	+ If DBTW is introduced for above 52.6GHz frequency band, support enabling/disabling the DBTW by scrambling CRC bits of PBCH payload.
	+ If DBTW is introduced, for above 52.6GHz frequency band, consider re-purposing the 1-bit 'subCarrierSpacingCommon' and 1-bit MSB of controlResourceSetZero to signal the Q value.
* From [14] Sony:
	+ Discovery Burst Transmission Window should be supported.
	+ If Discovery Burst Transmission Window is supported for 120 kHz SSB, additional n values (4, 9, 14, 19) should be supported.
* From [15] NEC:
	+ DBTW should be supported at least for SSB transmission with 120 kHz SCS.
	+ The long term sensing could be considered as an approach to mechanism for enabling/disabling DBTW.
	+ The application of DBTW for SSB transmission could be indicated per SSB/beam.
	+ The indication of Q value in NR-U should be reused to indicate DBTW enabling/disabling and Q value jointly at least for 120 kHz SSB SCS.
	+ Additional discovery burst transmission window in the adjacent frame could be considered as a method of cycling SSB transmission.
	+ With concurrent spatial multiplexing DBTWs, all SSBs could be transmitted in a cycling transmission fashion.
* From [16] Samsung:
	+ Support discovery burst transmission window for 60 GHz unlicensed band.
		- The indication of Q can be in MIB for a best effort, and if not possible, in SIB1;
		- The indication of DBTW disabling can be joint coded with the indication of Q;
		- Support more than 64 candidate SS/PBCH block locations within a half frame;
			* Current PBCH payload can support timing indication of up to 128 candidate SS/PBCH block candidate locations;
			* For example, for 120 kHz SCS, support 80 candidate SS/PBCH block locations within a half frame;
		- For initial access, different synchronization raster entries are applied for licensed and unlicensed operations; for non-initial access, support an explicit indication of licensed or licensed operation when configuring a cell.
* From [17] MediaTek:
	+ Do not support DBTW for SSB.
* From [18] LGE:
	+ Consider the following methods to indicate enabled/disabled DBTW for idle and/or connected mode UEs.
		- Separate two sets of GSCN values where one set corresponds to the case of disabled DBTW while the other set corresponds to the case of enabled DBTW
		- Signalling via system information (e.g., measObject)
		- UE-specific RRC signaling (e.g., for SCell addition)
	+ Consider all or some of the following bits to indicate candidate values.
		- subCarrierSpacingCommon
		- LSB(s) of ssb-SubcarrierOffset
		- dmrs-TypeA-Position
	+ Discuss how to signal actually transmitted SSBs via ssb-PositionsInBurst when can be indicated to be less than 64 in MIB.
* From [19] Lenovo, Motorola Mobility:
	+ For NR operation in unlicensed bands between 52.6 GHz and 71 GHz, potential enhancements related to periodic transmission of DRS such as SSB/PBCH/CORESET#0 are needed including:
		- performing directional LBT prior to the transmission of SSB according to the ssb-PositionsInBurst
		- directional LBT on multiple beams at the same time at the beginning of the DRS window
		- Cat 2 LBT (depending on the gap) before actual transmission
* From [20] Xiaomi:
	+ Indication of DBTW information for initial access should be supported and could be carried in the PBCH.
* From [21] Interdigital:
	+ Enhance the initial access operation to support Discovery Burst (DB) and Discovery Burst Transmission Window (DBTW) in unlicensed spectrum operations that require LBT in beyond 52.6GHz spectrum.
	+ Consider the enhancements to indicate the enabling/disabling of the DBTW in initial access operations for the support of DBTW in shared spectrum in beyond 52.6GHz.
	+ Support the enhancements on the reference tables in indication of the Q parameter for up to 64 SSB beams in initial access operations for unlicensed spectrum in beyond 52.6GHz, e.g., subsamples of the Q parameter.
* From [23] Sharp:
	+ Adopt DBTW for SSB with 120 kHz SCS in above 52.6GHz.
* From [26] Charter:
	+ DBTW is supported for 120 kHz, 480 kHz, and 960 kHz SCS SSB even in the non-initial access case.
* From [27] WILUS:
	+ It seems beneficial to introduce discovery burst transmission window (DBTW) which makes it possible to define candidate SSB positions within the DBTW with support of DB which was already agreed.
	+ It should be further considered that the additional candidate SS/PBCH block locations within a DBTW can be set to the closest slot locations after LBT failure at candidate SS/PBCH blocks locations as defined in FR2.

#### Summary of Discussions

* Companies have provided several detailed proposals. Most of the proposals are suggestions and answers to several sub-issues. Moderator suggest to continue discussion with the following question list, and try to resolve each question during the RAN1 meeting.
	+ Whether or not to support DBTW for 120/480/960kHz SSB
	+ Mechanisms to support enabling/disabling LBT & DBTW, including DCI 1\_0 size issue and where to signal enable/disable (if supported)
	+ Additional information needed to be included in MIB to support DBTW, including which bits to re-purpose for the additional information
	+ Supported DBTW lengths
	+ Supported values
	+ Whether to support floating DBTW
	+ Whether to support mechanism to balance out SSB DTX (from LBT failure)
	+ Number of candidate SSB positions (not number of Tx SSBs)

#### **1st Round Discussion:**

Companies are encouraged to provide inputs on the following questions

* Q1) Whether or not to support DBTW for 120/480/960kHz SSB
* Q2) Mechanisms to support enabling/disabling LBT & DBTW, including DCI 1\_0 size issue and where to signal enable/disable (if supported)
* Q3) Additional information needed to be included in MIB to support DBTW, including which bits to re-purpose for the additional information
* Q4) Supported DBTW lengths
* Q5) Supported values
* Q6) Whether to support floating DBTW
* Q7) Whether to support mechanism to balance out SSB DTX (from LBT failure)
* Q8) Number of candidate SSB positions (not number of Tx SSBs)

If there are other aspects that require discussion, please comment them and moderator will update the list accordingly.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| DOCOMO | Q1) we support to introduce DBTW for all the supported SCSs in 52.6 – 71 GHz. As LBT can be mandatory for any SCS, the operation with DBTW should be possible with any SCS. Q2) It can be associated with LBT on/off switching and/or whether LBT needs to be performed for the associated DB transmissions. Q3) We prefer not to have any additional information in MIB for DBTW purpose. Q4) We prefer to keep it as Rel-16 NR-U to avoid increasing UE implementation burden. Q5) If only SSB and CORESET#0 multiplexing with the same numerology is supported, same as Rel-16 NR-U should be supported. Q6) We do not prefer it from SSB detection complexity perspective at UE. Q7) we do not see the necessity to support any other functionality than DBTW. Q8) Ok with further study about this, but it should be realized under the same overhead as Rel-16 NR-U in our view.  |
| LG Electronics | * Q1) Whether of not to support DBTW for 120/480/960kHz SSB
	+ Prefer to support DBTW for all of 120/480/960 kHz SSB
* Q2) Mechanisms to support enabling/disabling LBT & DBTW, including DCI 1\_0 size issue and where to signal enable/disable (if supported)
	+ Three methods can be used for different purposes. The first method is to separate two sets of GSCN values where one set corresponds to the case of disabled DBTW while the other set corresponds to the case of enabled DBTW, which is for initial access. The second methods is to indicate LBT & DBTW is enabled/disabled via system information, which is at least for neighbor cell measurement. The third methods is to indicate LBT & DBTW is enabled/disabled via UE-specific RRC signaling, which is at least for SCell addition.
* Q3) Additional information needed to be included in MIB to support DBTW, including which bits to re-purpose for the additional information
	+ values need to be included in MIB and {*subCarrierSpacingCommon,* LSB(s) of *ssb-SubcarrierOffset, dmrs-TypeA-Position*}can be used for indicating values.
* Q4) Supported DBTW lengths
	+ The same values (i.e., 0.5/1/2/3/4/5 ms) with R16 can be the starting point.
* Q5) Supported values
	+ {8, 16, 32, 64} values are preferred.
* Q6) Whether to support floating DBTW
	+ The motivation to introduce floating DBTW is unclear.
* Q7) Whether to support mechanism to balance out SSB DTX (from LBT failure)
	+ Not sure whether any specific mechanism other than DBTW is needed.
* Q8) Number of candidate SSB positions (not number of Tx SSBs)
	+ 64 candidate SSB positions might be enough, but open to discuss whether to define more candidate positions, which depends on the availability of MIB to indicate the increased number of candidate SSB positions.
 |
| Samsung | 1) We support DBTW for 120/480/960kHz SSB2) Enabling/Disabling LBT & DBTW can be jointly coded with the indication of Q, since Q is only applicable to LBT & DBTW enabled. The indication can be in MIB if the number of bits are enough, and in SIB1 otherwise. We didn’t see there is an impact on the DCI 1\_0 size. 3) Indicate 4th LSB of SFN in MIB, and reinterpret the 4th LSB of SFN in PHY bits as the 7th LSB of the candidate SSB index. 4) Within 5 ms, and the maximum number of SSB candidate locations for each SCS can be further discussed, based on the indication capacity without increasing PBCH payload size. 5) {1, 2, 4, 8, 16, 32, 64} as the starting point for discussion, and can remove some small values to save the number of bits. 6) “Floating DBTW” needs extra intra indication on the timing offset. Better to clarify its purpose first before discussing other details. 7) Didn’t quite get the intention of the question. We thought supporting DBTW is already a way to balance out SSB DTX (from LBT failure), and no other method is needed.8) 80 candidate SSB locations for 120 kHz, and up to 128 candidate SSB locations for 480/960 kHz.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Q1) Support DBTW for all applicable numerologies. Q2) To answer this question, three points should be noted:* 480/960 kHz SSB are supported when SSB location and SCS are explicitly provided to the UE (non-initial access) and SSB does not configure Type-0 PDCCH. Therefore, there is no need to discuss how to indicate enabling/disabling DBTW for 480/960 kHz SSB during initial access as UE does not try to find 480/960 kHz SSB during initial access.
* For both cases of initial access and non-initial access UE, when both DBTW length and are known to the UE, UE can infer whether or not DBTW is enabled by comparing DBTW length and values as follows:
	+ If DBTW length is equal to or smaller than the time duration from the beginning of the half frame to the end of the slot containing the candidate SSB index -1, DBTW is disabled.
	+ If DBTW length is larger than the time duration from the beginning of the half frame to the end of the slot containing the candidate SSB index -1, DBTW is enabled.
* For 120 kHz SSB, if , it means that SSB burst covers the whole 5 ms half frame and SSB burst cant be sliding within DBTW, or, equivalently, DBTW is disabled.

So, to answer Q2, we can provide the following table:**Mechanism to indicate enabling/disabling DBTW**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Initial access | Non-initial access |
| 120 kHz SSB | By comparing DBTW length (provided in SIB1) and (Provided in MIB). If , no need to read DBTW length from SIB1 and DBTW is assumed to be disabled. | By comparing DBTW length (provided in SIB1) and (Provided in MIB). Additionally, both DBTW length and are provided using dedicated signaling. |
| 480/960 kHz SSB | No need for any mechanism. UE does not support 480/960 kHz SSB | By comparing DBTW length and . Both provided using dedicated signaling. |

Q3) No need to indicate DBTW in MIB. As discussed in Q2: * For 120 kHz: similar to Rel-16 NR-U, DBTW length is indicated in SIB1 and also using dedicated signaling
* For 480/960 kHz: DBTW length is indicated using dedicated signaling.

Q4) We think that supported DBTW lengths should depend on the SSB pattern design and the supported values for . Otherwise, UE cannot use the comparison between and DBTW length to infer whether or not DBTW is enabled and explicit signaling may be required to indicate DBTW enabling/disabling. Based on our proposed values for and our proposed SSB pattern, we suggest the following values for DBTW length:* 120 kHz SCS: {40, 32, 24, 20, 16, 10, 4} slots
* 480 kHz SCS: {72, 32, 26, 20, 16, 14, 8, 4} slots
* 960 kHz SCS: {64, 32, 26, 20, 16, 14, 8, 4} slots

Q5)We think supporting would provide enough flexibility in all supported numerologies.***Q6)***This seems to be an optimization with a quite a bit of specification impact. This requires the SSB burst to be potentially not confined in a half frame and spills over to the next half frame. Then we have to discuss the meaning of half frame indicator, discuss how such a spilled-over SSB burst may affect the minimum periodicity of 5 ms (which is in fact the default periodicity in RRC connected state if the SSB periodicity is not explicitly provided), and how the UE may obtain the beginning of frame. We could discuss this later on as a lower priority optimization though Q7)In our view, this is also a lower priority optimization. In 120 kHz SCS, if the SSBs with lower candidate indexes are dropped too often due to LBT failure, gNB can always reduce the total number of transmitted SSB indexes and slide the SSB burst within the 5 ms DBTW. The optimization seems to be mainly applicable in the scenario that gNB aims to transmit 64 (or as many as possible SSB indexes) within DBTW.Q8)120 kHz: 64 (similar design as in FR2)480/960 kHz: 128* Any number above 64 up to 128 needs 7 bits in MIB/PBCH payload. So, we suggest 128 to provide maximum flexibility.
 |
| Qualcomm | Q1) We do not support introducing DBTW for any supported SCSs in 52.6 – 71 GHz for we do not see obvious benefit.However, if DBTW was agreed, here are our views for the rest of the questions:Q2) If the maximum number of candidate SSB positions is 64, enabling/disabling DBTW can be implicitly indicated as part of QQ3) Defer details for this until other SSB/CORESET0 related discussions (e.g., mux pattern details, number of CORESET RBs, etc…) are agreed. This can help identify which bits can be repurposed Q4) Keep DBTW length to be 5 ms maximum for SCS 120 kHz Q5) The number of values should be minimized (e.g., 2 or 4 max) to support the minimum number of bits (also 64 should be one of the numbers in order to be able to implicitly disable DBTW)Q6) Not preferrable Q7) Not preferrableQ8) Maximum 64 |
| Mediatek | Q1) We are open to discuss it but We do not see the necessity or need of DBTWQ2) This can be based on using system information for LBT indication (i.e., LBT mode or no LBT mode) discussed in channel access AI.Q3) Discussion for this question can be deferred, after the value of Q, SSB candidate positions, DBTW on/off is determined, it’s easier to find out bits in MIB that can be repurposed.Q4) If it’s supported, we prefer to keep it being 5msQ5) 4 should be the maximum number of supported valuesQ6) We don’t see strong needQ7) We don’t see strong needQ8) Maximum 64 SSB candidate positions |
| NEC | Q1)We support DBTW for 120/480/960kHz SSB.Q2) Because Q value indication is related to the application of DBTW in general, DBTW enabling/disabling state and Q value can be jointly indicated via system information to support UEs performing initial access without any prior information on DBTW and facilitate neighbor cell measurement at least.Q3) Based on potential decisions about SSB and CORESET#0 multiplexing numerology and pattern, the *subCarrierSpacingCommon,* the LSB of *ssb-SubcarrierOffset* bits and the *MSB of controlResourceSetZero* could be considered to indicate Q value and enabling/disabling DBTW jointly.Q4) Under the constraint of max 5ms duration, DBTW length can be discussed further depending on the number of candidate SSBs. Q5) {8, 16, 32, 64} Q values are supported.Q6) Regarding floating DBTW, additional information for timing offset should be indicated to UE, we suggest to discuss this issue on the basis of results of other questions, such as DBTW length and Q values.Q7) We prefer not to support the mechanism other than DBTW for improving LBT performance to keep system simplicity.Q8) If DBTW is supported, up to 80 SSB candidate positions for 120 kHz SCS, and be open to discuss that for 480/960kHz SCS. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | For Q1), support DBTW for all SSB SCSs including 120/480/960kHz.For Q2), for LBT exempt operation and overlapping licensed/unlicensed bands, it is not necessary to enable/disable the DBTW by explicit signaling. The impacts on LBT exempt operation brought by DBTW can be eliminated by configuration implementation, e.g. configuring a length of DBTW to match the duration of 64 SSBs.For Q3), it can be discussed after SCSs/configuration of SSB and CORESET#0 are determined.For Q4), the values for DBTW lengths in Rel-16 NR-U can be the starting point. More smaller values can be considered as SCSs are also smaller.For Q5), in order to reduce the number of bits indicating Q value, four candidate values for Q are preferred, such as {8,16,32,64}. If more bits are available, we are open to support more values of Q.For Q6), more discussion is needed to illustrate its necessity.For Q7), it seems no necessity to support any mechanisms other than DBTW. For Q8), in order to reduce the impact of standardization caused by indicating candidate SSB indices, the maximum number of candidate SSB defined in the half-frame can be kept unchanged (maintain 64) or limited to 128 for 240/480/960 kHz SSB SCS |
| Nokia | Q1) We would propose to support DBTW for all, 120kHz/480kHz/960kHz.Q2) As DBTW could affect the monitoring time needed for initial cell selection, we would propose to separate these by SS-raster locations. This maybe bit pending on the Channel Access discussions, i.e. if we can assume that when DBTW is not enabled, LBT can be enabled. If DBTW presence is indicated via SS-raster location, and we can in this case always assume that LBT is enabled, we would need to be able to be explicitly indicate if LBT is used only when DBTW is not enabled. Thus it would be possible to use/share the bits used for DBTW support (SSB candidate location relation).Q3) As we do not have sufficient number of alternative candidate locations for all the SSBs at 120kHz scs, if number of SSBs is larger than 32, the NR-U (Q) based mechanism does not seem feasible. Therefore, we think that we should be able to directly indicate in the SSB whether it is a re-transmission of a given SSB for example:* *subCarrierSpacingCommon* indicates whether or not detected SSB is in additional position
	+ *subcarrierSpacingCommon* may be obsolete parameter in the frequency range of interest because Type0-PDCCH is likely to use the same SCS as the SSB
* SSB index signaled using PBCH DMRS and MSB bits in the PBCH physical layer bits signals the actual SSB index when the SSB is transmitted in the additional position
* *k*SSB bits are repurposed so that the UE can determine the received SSB position within the group of additional positions. I.e. possible re-transmission locations are grouped so that e.g. SSB#0 can be re-transmitted on certain additional positions.

Similar mechanism could also be adopted for 480kHz and 960kHz SSBs. Q4) For 120kHz, 5ms window can be assumed, but for 480kHz and 960kHz shorter time could be considered. The final value would depend on the SSB pattern design, and number of additional candidate locations supported.Q5) As noted in Q3, we don’t think the NR-U based method is feasible in most scenarios due to limited number of additional candidate locations at least for 120kHz.Q6) Unless I’m mistaken, the floating approach would mean that the actual DBTW window time from UE perspective is increased. Not sure if that is preferable/according to the earlier agreements.Q7) We think that this is needed, for both, DBTW and possible for the short control signaling exemption for 120kHz. In case of DBTW the possible candidate locations for retransmission could be shared in time multiplexing manner so that part of the time re-transmission is allowed for certain SSBs.Q8) If we introduce the additional candidate locations between the SSB bursts, 80 candidate locations could be supported. If no additional positions are supported, we should enable using the positions not used by ‘actually transmitted SSBs’ to be used as candidate locations. For 480kHz and 960kHz, we are open to discuss whether we need to support full range of 128 positions. |
| Xiaomi | Q1) Support the DBTW for the SCSs agreed Q2) By system information or implicitly by Q value.Q3) FFS.Q4) Yes, values smaller than 5ms can be discussed and defined for 480kHz/960kHz. Q5) Yes, at least {8,16,32,64} should be supported, others can be FFS.Q6) No, we prefer not, but we are open at current stage.Q7) Not preferable.Q8) Maximum 64. |
| OPPO |  Q1) Support DBTW for 120/480/960kHz SSB Q2) Support enabling/disabling LBT & DBTW, details can be further discussed.  Q3) Agree that additional information e.g., QCL indication, needed to be included in MIB to support DBTW. Q4) Supported the same DBTW lengths as NR-U (i.e., 0.5/1/2/3/4/5 ms) Q5) Supported values {16, 64} Q6) Don’t support floating DBTW Q7) Don’t support other mechanisms to balance out SSB DTX (from LBT failure) Q8) Maximum number of candidate SSB positions is 64 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Futurewei | Q1) We support to introduce DBTW for all the supported SCSs in 52.6 – 71 GHz. Q2) It can be associated with LBT on/off switching and/or if (based on Short Control Signaling case) LBT is necessary for DB. Q3) We prefer not to have any additional information in MIB for DBTW purpose. Q4) We prefer to keep it as maximum 5ms, the existing values from Rel-16 are acceptable. Q5) Four candidates are preferred {8,16,32, 64} for Q. We are OK to further discuss if more additions are necessary.Q6) We do not see the necessity. Q7) We do not see the necessity for functionality other than DBTW. Q8) We prefer 64 as the maximum number SSB for 120kHz SCS, and Ok with further study for other SCS values.  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Q1) Support DBTW for all SCS of SSB since LBT could be mandatory regardless of the SCS value.Q2) Enabling and disabling the DBTW can be implicitly based on the LBT mode or no-LBT mode/short control signaling exemption. Q3) Agree with Qualcomm, the discussion on the details of which bit information to be/how to be used can be postponed after multiplexing patterns of SSB and CORESET0 details are agreedQ4) Support Rel-16 NR-U 5ms as a starting point, discuss further the need to have shorter lengths for 480/960kHz which depend also on the agreements on the SSB patterns as well.Q5) Support {8, 16, 32, 64}Q6) Not preferredQ7) We don’t see a need for supporting itQ8) 64 candidate SSB positions, open to discuss larger values based on the availability of the required extra bits in MIB payload |
| Interdigital | Q1) We support DBTW for all supported SCS for SSB.Q2) The enabling/disabling of the DBTW can be associated with a specific sync raster offset, where sync raster offsets within a specific range imply that DBTW is enabled and the sync raster offsets outside the range imply that DBTW is disabled. Q3) The parameters that may be unused in MIB can indicate the enabled/disabled DBTW. For instance, there might be some unused bits in *searchSpaceZero* or *controlResourceSetZero* in *pdcch-ConfigSIB1* that can be interpreted/re-purposed as the indication for the enabled/disabled DBTW.Q4) We support the settings for the DBTW to be the same as Rel-16 NR-U.Q5) We support using a subset of the possible values, e.g., {4,8,32,64} or {8,16,32,64}, to limit the indication of the Q parameter to two bits. |
| CATT | Q1) We support to DBTW for 120khz, for 480kHz/960kHz we think since the duty cycle is less than 10% there’s no need to introduce DBTW.Q2) It can be indicated via system information. Q3) Information in MIB can be repurposed for DBTW purpose. It will depend on the result of the discussion for SSB/CORESET#0 configuration.Q4) Maximum 5ms . Q5) We are Ok with {8,16,32, 64} Q6) We do not see the necessity. Q7) We do not see the necessity for functionality other than DBTW. Q8) We prefer 80 for 120kHz SCS.  |
| Intel | Q1) Support DBTW for 120/480/960kHz SSBQ2) Explicit or implicit signalling in MIB. Alternatively, explicit signalling in SIB1.Q3) Certainly, no changes should be applied to MIB size. Some of MIB and/or PBCH payload bits certainly could be repurposed after discussing availability of CORESET#0 configuration in SSB.Q4) A single fixed DBTW length, e.g., 5 ms, is preferred to avoid configuration signalling.Q5) The set of possible values should be limited to 2 or 4 values to minimize the number of signalling bits needed. The exact values of are FFS.Q6) The floating DBTW is an alternative solution which does not require changes in ordering of SSBs (within the DBTW). It relies on using both halves of radio frame for SS burst transmission. It could be supported if no additional candidate SSB positions could be found within a fixed DBTW. In this case, some changes in RRM measurement gaps seem to be needed.Q7) Consider supporting a mechanism to balance out SSB DTX if DBTW is not supported.Q8) In case of DBTW, the number of candidate SSB positions should be increased. At least 80 candidate SSB positions could be considered for SCS 120 kHz. |
| vivo | Q1) Support DBTW for all applicable SCSQ2) Three methods can be used to indicate whether there is DBTW:* Alt. 1: Frequency band (licensed or un-licensed);
* Alt. 2: The indicator in PBCH;
* Alt. 3: The design of SSB sequence (PSS, SSS and DMRS).

Q3) The additional bits can from ‘*subCarrierSpacingCommon’* or‘*pdcch-ConfigSIB1’*Q4) The DBTW length can be depended on the different SCS. Such as, the lengthe of DBTW is 0.5/1/2/3/4/5ms and 0.125/0.25/0.5/0.75/1/1.25ms under 120K SCS and 480K SCS respectively. Q5) The supported values can be {8,16,32,64}, two methods can be used to indicate the value of Q:* Alt. 1: Specify the value of Q for each SCS;
* Alt. 2: Utilize the bits in PBCH;

Q6) No supportQ7) No supportQ8) 120 kHz: 64; 480/960 kHz: 128 |
| Ericsson | Q1) We do not support DBTW for any of 120/480/960 kHz SSBHowever, we provide input on the remaining questions in case there can be consensus to support. We have a strong concern that there are quite a few details that need to be worked out before feasibility can be assessed and a decision can be made on support/no support.Q2) A reserved value of Q (e.g., Q = 64) can be used to indicate DBTW on/offHowever, before support of DBTW can be decided, it needs to be decided how to indicate LBT on/off. In the GTW it was agreed to discuss this in the channel access AI. The reason for the dependency is that the size of DCI 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by SI-RNTI (i.e., the Type0-PDCCH used to schedule PDSCH carrying SIB1) has a different size depending on shared/non-shared spectrum (see highlighted sentence in below extract from 38.212 Section 7.3.1.2.1. Hence two alternatives for handling this are:1. the UE does 2 blind decodes assuming the 2 different sizes
2. LBT on/off is indicated in MIB so that the UE can avoid 2 blind decodes

Clearly, if solution (2) is adopted, one bit needs to be found in MIB for indicating LBT on/off in addition to bits for Q.--- Extract from 38.212 Section 7.3.1.2.1 --- The following information is transmitted by means of the DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by SI-RNTI:- Frequency domain resource assignment – bits-  is the size of CORESET 0 - Time domain resource assignment – 4 bits as defined in Clause 5.1.2.1 of [6, TS38.214]- VRB-to-PRB mapping – 1 bit according to Table 7.3.1.2.2-5- Modulation and coding scheme – 5 bits as defined in Clause 5.1.3 of [6, TS38.214], using Table 5.1.3.1-1- Redundancy version – 2 bits as defined in Table 7.3.1.1.1-2- System information indicator – 1 bit as defined in Table 7.3.1.2.1-2- Reserved bits – 17 bits for operation in a cell with shared spectrum channel access; otherwise 15 bits --- End extract --- Q3) No additional information other than Q and LBT on/off is needed. As previously agreed, the PBCH payload should remain the same as Rel-16. It is not clear which bits could potentially be repurposed. The (SSB,CORESET0) SCS combinations are not yet known; it seems clear that all 4 bits are needed for signaling k\_SSB (12 values) unless RAN4 designs a very specialized sync raster; and the CORESET0 configuration table is not yet decided.Q4) No more than 5 ms (as previously agreed).Q5) It seems that at least 4 values are needed, e.g., Q = 8, 16, 32, 64, where Q = 64 indicates DBTW on/offQ6) "Floating DBTW" is a new concept which has not been previously discussed. Not clear of the motivation, and seems to be a departure from Rel-16. Not preferrable to specify a new approach from the perspective of reuse of implementations.Q7) Not clear; not preferred.Q8) No more than Q = 64 since that is what Rel-15 PBCH is able to signal today with 6 bits (3 bits from DMRS sequence and 3 bits from PBCH payload). |
| Sony | Q1) we support DBTW for all supported SCS.Q2) we support enabling/disabling LBT & DBTW. Enabling/disabling DBTW and Q could be jointly indicated via system information.Q3) Although the detailed discussion which bits to be used should be postponed until SSB/CORESET#0 related discussion is agreed, *subCarrierSpacingCommon*, LSB of *ssb-SubcarrierOffset*, and *controlResourceSetZero* in MIB could be candidate bits to indicate DBTW related parameters.Q4) Maximum 5 msec should be baseline. We can further discuss small length for 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS.Q5) {1, 2, 4, 8, 16, 32, 64} as starting point and some small values could be removed to save bits.Q6) we don’t support floating DBTW because it causes increasing detection complexity and large spec impact.Q7) we don’t see necessity to support the mechanism other than DBTW.Q8) 80 candidate SSB locations for 120 kHz SCS. Up to 128 candidate SSB location for 480 and 960 kHz SCS. |
| WILUS | Q1) Support DBTW for all applicable SCSQ2) Explicit or implicit signaling in MIB. Alternatively, explicit signaling in SIB1.Q3) Prefer not to have any additional information in MIB for DBTW purposeQ4) Prefer to have a single fixed DBTW length to avoid configuration signaling.Q5) The number of supported values to minimize required signaling bits as 1 or 2 bits should be limited.Q6) We are not clear to support this, but we are open to discuss whether or not support “Floating DBTW”.Q7) Support mechanism to balance out SSB DTX from LBT failure.Q8) In case of DBTW, the number of candidate SSB positions should be increased. At least 80 candidate SSB positions could be considered for SCS 120 kHz. |
| Spreadtrum | Q1) Support DBTW for all applicable SCSQ2) Implicit or explicit indication in MIBQ3) Strive to not introduce new bit in MIB |

#### **1st Round Discussion Summary:**

Summary of responses from companies are provided below.

* Q1) Whether or not to support DBTW for 120/480/960kHz SSB
	+ Support: Docomo, LGE, Samsung, Huawei, HiSilicon, NEC, ZTE, Sanechips, Nokia, NSB, Xiaomi, OPPO, Futurewei, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, Interdigital, CATT (for 120kHz), Intel, Spreadtrum, WILUS
	+ Do not support: Qualcomm, Mediatek, CATT (for 480/960kHz), Ericsson
* Q2) Mechanisms to support enabling/disabling LBT & DBTW, including DCI 1\_0 size issue and where to signal enable/disable (if supported)
	+ Indicate via : Samsung, Qualcomm, NEC, Xiaomi
	+ Distinct GSCN values for LBT cases & non-LBT cases: LGE, Nokia, NSB, Interdigital
	+ Indicate via SI: LGE, Mediatek, WILUS
	+ Indicate via MIB: Interdigital, CATT, Intel, Spreadtrum, WILUS
	+ Indicate via UE specific RRC: LGE
	+ Indicate by combination of and DBTW lengths: Huawei, HiSilicon (assume means DBTW is disabled)
	+ Indication not needed: ZTE, Sanechips
	+ Tied to LBT on/off: Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, Futurwei
	+ FFS: OPPO
	+ Indication in MIB will be needed to avoid double blind detection of DCI sizes: Ericsson
* Q3) Additional information needed to be included in MIB to support DBTW, including which bits to re-purpose for the additional information
	+ No need for additional information in MIB: Docomo, Huawei, HiSilicon, Futurewei, Spreadtrum, WILUS
	+ : LGE, NEC, Samsung, OPPO, Ericsson (if DBTW is supported)
	+ FFS: Qualcomm, Mediatek, ZTE, Sanechips, Xiaomi, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility
	+ Additional SSB position: Nokia, NSB
	+ Enable/disable DBTW: CATT, Ericsson (if DBTW is supported)
* Q4) Supported DBTW lengths
	+ Same as NR-U (0.5/1/2/3/4/5 msec): Docomo, LGE, ZTE, Sanechips, OPPO, Futurewei, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, Interdigital
	+ {1,2,4,8,16,32,64}: Samsung
	+ {40, 32, 24, 20, 16, 10, 4} slots for 120kHz, {72, 32, 26, 20, 16, 14, 8, 4} slots for 480kHz, {64, 32, 26, 20, 16, 14, 8, 4} slots for 960kHz: Huawei, HiSilicon
	+ Max 5 msec: Qualcomm, CATT, Ericsson (if DBTW is supported), WILUS
	+ 5msec: Mediatek, NEC, Nokia, NSB, Intel, WILUS
* Q5) Supported values
	+ Same values as in NR-U: Docomo
	+ FFS: Samsung
	+ {8,16,28,32,40,52,64}: Huawei, HiSilicon
	+ Max 2 or 4 values: Qualcomm (include 64 at least), Intel, WILUS
	+ Max 4 values: Mediatek
	+ {8,16,32,64}: NEC, ZTE, Sanechips, Xiaomi, Futurewei, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, Interdigital, CATT, Ericsson (if DBTW is supported)
	+ {4,8,32,64}: Interdigital
	+ {16, 64}: OPPO
* Q6) Whether to support floating DBTW
	+ Do not support: Docomo, LGE, Qualcomm, Mediatek, ZTE, Sanechips, Nokia, NSB, Xiaomi, OPPO, Futurewei, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, CATT, Ericsson, WILUS
	+ Further clarification needed: Samsung, NEC
	+ FFS: Huawei, HiSilicon
	+ If additional candidate SSB position not available: Intel
* Q7) Whether to support mechanism to balance out SSB DTX (from LBT failure)
	+ Support: Nokia, NSB, Intel (if DBTW is not supported), WILUS
	+ Do not support: Docomo, LGE, Qualcomm, Mediatek, NEC, ZTE, Sanechips, Xiaomi, OPPO, Futurewei, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, CATT, Ericsson
	+ FFS : Huawei, HiSilicon
* Q8) Number of candidate SSB positions (not number of Tx SSBs)
	+ FFS: Docomo
	+ 64: LGE (open for further discussion), Qualcomm, Mediatek, Xiaomi, OPPO, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, Ericsson
	+ 64 for 120kHz: Huawei, HiSilicon, Futurewei
	+ 80 for 120kHz: Samsung, NEC, Nokia, NSB, CATT, Intel, WILUS
	+ 128 for 480/960kHz: Samsung, Huawei, HiSilicon, Nokia, NSB

#### **2nd Round Discussion:**

From the discussions, three companies commented DBTW is not needed (one company commented DBTW for 480/906kHz is not needed), and larger number of the companies think DBTW would be needed. Moderator suggests focusing on getting further progress with the direction that DBTW are to be supported. Moderator has formulated a proposal that could be used for further discussions.

##### **Proposal 1.3-1)**

* Support DBTW for 120/480/960kHz SSB
	+ Enable/disable of DBTW is indicated by one or more of the following methods:
		- Option 1) signaling in MIB
			* Option 1-1) indicated by a specific state/index of
			* Option 1-2) indicated by other bit fields in MIB
			* FFS: between option 1-1 and 1-2.
		- Option 2) distinct GSCN used by the SSB
		- FFS: whether to support option 1, 2, or both.
		- Note: enable/disable signaling of DBTW by MIB or GSCN does not preclude other signaling methods
	+ MIB to support signaling of
		- Total number of valid values of to not exceed 4
		- Working assumption: {[8], [16], [32], [64]}
			* FFS: on whether can be used to disable DBTW
	+ Support DBTW lengths:
		- 0.5, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 msec
			* Note: same as Rel-16 FR1 NR-U
	+ Number of candidate positions when DBTW is enabled
		- For 120kHz SSB
			* FFS: between 64 or 80
		- For 480/960kHz SSB
			* FFS: between 64 or 128
	+ FFS:
		- Whether or not to support floating DBTW
		- Whether or not to support mechanism to balance out SSB DTX (from LBT failure)

One question from moderator on option 1-1 is that if 1 state is used to indicate disabling of DBTW in , does this mean if 2 bits are used for only 3 valid values and 1 state for disable exist?

Also please comment further on how to deal with DCI format size difference if DBTW is used (issue Ericsson brought up). Moderator assumes support of option 1-1 or 1-2 should resolve this issue, but would like to receive comments form companies.

Please note the proposal is just a starting point for focus for further discussions. Please comment further on how the proposal should be updated. If there are better alternatives, please provide them.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Samsung | We are in general ok with the proposal, with some comments for the details: * has its particular operation to decide the SSB index, so it would not be proper to say one index of is used for indicating DBTW is disabled. One alternative way of expressing the option could be jointly coding DBTW disabling with , e.g. {16, 32, 64, DBTW disabled}.
* The current options for indicating DBTW disabling and enabling is only for initial access case, and there should be options for indicating using RRC parameter for non-initial access. If the common understanding is to discuss that later, we are ok.
* The whole bullet of using MIB to indicate should be working assumption, since we don’t know whether enough bits can be re-interpreted for this purpose yet.
* The value of may depend on which option adopted in Option 1, e.g. 3 valid value or 4. The valid values should also be further discussed, since if 64 is maximum number of candidate SSB, then we may not need 64 for .

For moderator’s question, yes, that’s our understanding. Based on the comment above, we have the following suggestions for the proposal: * Support DBTW for 120/480/960kHz SSB
	+ Enable/disable of DBTW is indicated by one or more of the following methods:
		- Option 1) signaling in MIB
			* Option 1-1) ~~indicated by a specific state/index of~~ disabling DBTW is jointly coded with
			* Option 1-2) indicated by other bit fields in MIB
			* FFS: between option 1-1 and 1-2.
		- Option 2) distinct GSCN used by the SSB
		- FFS: whether to support option 1, 2, or both.
		- Note: enable/disable signaling of DBTW by MIB or GSCN does not preclude other signaling methods
	+ Working assumption: MIB to support signaling of
		- Total number of valid values of to not exceed 4
		- ~~Working assumption: {[8], [16], [32], [64]}~~
	+ Support DBTW lengths:
		- 0.5, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 msec
			* Note: same as Rel-16 FR1 NR-U
	+ Number of candidate positions when DBTW is enabled
		- For 120kHz SSB
			* FFS: between 64 or 80
		- For 480/960kHz SSB
			* FFS: between 64 or 128
	+ FFS:
		- Whether or not to support floating DBTW
		- Whether or not to support mechanism to balance out SSB DTX (from LBT failure)
 |
| Qualcomm | If DBTW is to be supported, we think that it should only apply to 120 kHz SCS. The higher SCSs (480/960 kHz) clearly can support the short control signal exemptions and do not need LBT. Adding DBTW to these SCSs will add more un-necessary complexity and specification efforts.  |
| LG Electronics | We are generally fine with moderator’s proposal. But, we don’t support adding the last two FFS points, which are unclear and not supported by majority companies. So, we would suggest to remove the last FFS (i.e., Whether or not to support floating DBTW and Whether or not to support mechanism to balance out SSB DTX (from LBT failure)).Regarding its applicability to 480/960 kHz SCSs, we’d like to know if all of regional regulations mandating LBT procedure in 60 GHz provide short control signal exemption rule. If not, it seems necessary to apply DBTW to 480/960 kHz SCS as well. |
| DOCOMO | We agree with Samsung’s update. We also prefer to remove the last two FFSs. Regarding the applicability, Japan’s 60 GHz regulation mandates LBT to initiate any transmission without exception. So we believe the support of DBTW should not be SCS dependent.  |
| LG Electronics2 | As we commented in Section 2.1.5, regarding DCI format size issue brought up by Ericsson, we understand the concern. We agree that LBT on or off needs to be signaled in MIB or prior to MIB, in order to avoid DCI 1\_0 (scrambled with SIRNTI) size misalignment between gNB and UE. However, even though LBT on or off is signaled in SIB1 or later, we think the problem can be simply figured out by UE assuming 17 bits for all cases in 60 GHz. |
| Ericsson | We agree with Qualcomm that if DBTW is to be supported, it should apply to 120 kHz SCS only.But even for 120 kHz, we still have strong concerns, and thus recommend that DBTW remains as FFS until some fundamental issues are resolved. Our main concerns are:If LBT on/off is signaled in MIB, then it is not clear yet that there are enough bits to signal both DBTW on/off and Q (even if jointly encoded)We do not agree that DBTW off implies LBT off (but of course the inverse does hold). DBTW off can even be used for unlicensed operation where LBT is required by regulation. As many companies have evaluated, in many deployments LBT failure is rare, and this is why signaling flexibility is needed to disable DBTW in such a deployment (as per previous agreement)Hence, signaling of LBT on/off and DBTW on/off needs to cover the following 3 combinations:Unlicensed with LBT off / licensedDBTW offUnlicensed with LBT onDBTW onDBTW offGiven (1), the following issues need to be resolved in this order:Is LBT on/off to be signaled in MIB?If "No," then How is the DCI 1\_0 size issue handled? Please see description of issue plus solution options in our comments above in the 1st round discussionHow/where is LBT on/off signaled?How to find the bits for signaling both DBTW on/off and Q?As hinted by Samsung, if there are not enough bits to signal Q, then Q may need to be signaled in SIB1 If "Yes," thenHow to find the bits for signaling LBT on/off, DBTW on/off, and Q?Priority should be the following orderLBT on/offDBTW on/offQAs hinted by Samsung, if there are not enough bits to signal Q, then Q may need to be signaled in SIB1 Given this, we have problems with the 1st and 2nd sub-bullets of the proposal – they do not account for the dependency on the LBT on/off signaling decision. We don't have a strong preference for how/where to signal LBT on/off other than to recognize that the solution of using a separate sets of sync raster points (like Option 2) will have a large impact on UE SSB search complexity.We also are not supportive of the FFS on "floating DBTW" or "balancing out DBTX." These are not clearly motivated. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We have a couple of comments and suggested modifications for the FL proposal. 1. **Enable/disable of DBTW indication and Q and DBTW length signaling for 480/960 kHz SSB:** Based on current agreements, 480/960 kHz SSB is only supported “for the case where SSB location and SCS are explicitly provided to the UE (non-initial access)”. Assuming that the agreements regarding 480/960 kHz SSB stand as is, we do not see why indicating enable/disable of DBTW and Q and DBTW length signaling should be implicitly or explicitly included in MIB (or even SIB1) for these SSB numerologies? Instead, indicating enable/disable of DBTW, and Q and DBTW length signaling can be explicitly provided to UE (using dedicated signaling) the same way that SSB location and SCS are explicitly provided to the UE and, in our view, there would not be any need to implicitly or explicitly indicate these values in MIB. Again, based on current agreements on SSB SCS, UE is required to have the SSB location and SCS using dedicated signaling to be able to detect SSB and read MIB in 480/960 kHz. So, why indicating enable/disable of DBTW, Q, and DBTW length can’t be done using the same dedicated signaling prior to UE attempts to read MIB? The main problem with indication in MIB is to find some bits to repurpose. There seems to be diverse views about how to do it but the common denominator of all views is that it is a difficult task due to limited MIB payload and lack of obsolete/redundant bits in MIB. So, why we should even attempt to indicate these values in MIB when, at least based on current agreements, there is no technical justification to do so for 480/960 kHz SSBs? We should emphasize that adding the note “Note: enable/disable signaling of DBTW by MIB or GSCN does not preclude other signaling methods” does not address the above problem. In our view, if the agreements regarding SSB SCS stand as is, indication in MIB is not technically justifiable.
2. **Enable/disable of DBTW using a specific state/index of** Apart from above issue, we do not see how “a specific state/index of ” (Option 1-1 or Option 1) can be used to also indicate Enable/disable of DBTW for all cases. We understand that this can work for 120 kHz SSB because essentially means that the whole 5ms is being used by SSB burst in its original location and since DBTW max window is also 5 ms, there is no room to slide the SSB burst. However, if for instance for 120 kHz SSB, does it necessarily mean that SSB burst can slide (or, in other words, DBTW is enabled)? We think not. Whether or not SSB burst can slide also depends on the length of DBTW. Network may set just to indicate to the UE that the SSBs with indexes higher than 31 are not transmitted altogether. But this does not necessarily mean that the first 32 SSB indexes can slide. This simply would depend on whether or not the DBTW length can accommodate sliding 32 SSB indexes within DBTW. Similarly, assuming for the sake of argument that enable/disable of DBTW for 480/960 kHz SSB needs to be indicated in MIB, does setting mean that DBTW is disabled? Again, we think not. Depending on the length of DBTW, a SSB burst of size 64 in 480/960 SCS can slide within a DBTW of maximum size of 5 ms. In our view, in case we cannot entirely rely on dedicated signaling to indicate enable/disable of DBTW (eg in the case of 120 kHz SSB or in the case that, for some reason, indicating enable/disable of DBTW for 480/960 kHz SSB is agreed to be provided in SI) the only way to indicate whether or not DBTW is enabled is by comparing DBTW length and values as follows:
* If DBTW length is equal to or smaller than the time duration from the beginning of the half frame to the end of the slot containing the candidate SSB index -1, DBTW is disabled.
* If DBTW length is larger than the time duration from the beginning of the half frame to the end of the slot containing the candidate SSB index -1, DBTW is enabled.
1. **Supported DBTW lengths:** Due to our discussion in 2) supporting 0.5, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 msec as in Rel-16 NR-U may not work. We believe that, in general, UE can only infer whether or not DBTW is enabled by comparing DBTW length and and, as such, the supported DBTW lengths should be more carefully selected than in NR-U Rel-16 and should at least depend on the values of .

 Based on the above discussion, we suggest the following modifications * Support DBTW for 120/480/960kHz SSB
	+ For the case agreed in RAN1 #104bis-e where 480/960 kHz SSB location and SCS are explicitly provided to the UE (non-initial access), indication of enable/disable of DBTW and signaling of and DBTW length are supported only by dedicated signaling.
	+ For 120 kHz SSB:
		- Enable/disable of DBTW is indicated by one or more of the following methods:
			* Option 1) signaling in MIB
				+ Option 1-1) indicated by a specific state/index of
				+ Option 1-2) indicated by other bit fields in MIB
				+ FFS: between option 1-1 and 1-2.
			* Option 2) distinct GSCN used by the SSB
			* Option 3) By comparing the value of and DBTW length
			* FFS: whether to support option 1, 2, 3 or ~~both~~ any combination of the options.
			* Note: enable/disable signaling of DBTW by MIB or GSCN does not preclude other signaling methods
		- MIB to support signaling of
			* Total number of valid values of to not exceed 4
			* Working assumption: {[8], [16], [32], [64]}
				+ FFS: on whether can be used to disable DBTW
	+ Support DBTW lengths:
		- ~~0.5, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 msec~~
			* ~~Note: same as Rel-16 FR1 NR-U~~
		- Maximum of 5 msec.
			* FFS: Other values
	+ Number of candidate positions when DBTW is enabled
		- For 120kHz SSB
			* FFS: between 64 or 80
		- For 480/960kHz SSB
			* FFS: between 64 or 128
	+ FFS:
		- Whether or not to support floating DBTW
		- Whether or not to support mechanism to balance out SSB DTX (from LBT failure)
 |
| InterDigital | We support the original proposal from FL.  |
| WILUS | We support the moderator’s original proposal. |
| vivo | We are generally fine with the original proposal from FL. I don’t think the last two FFS points are needed. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | For DBTW, we do not think DBTW should be SCS - dependent, as short control signaling is not supported in all regions/countries with LBT requirements. In addition, it has not been confirmed that only SSB can use short control signaling. If both SSB with 480/960 kHz and other signals/channels use short control signaling for transmission in a period e.g. 100ms, which is likely to exceed the requirements.For enable/disable of DBTW, we think there is a third option as mentioned by Huawei with implicit indication, i.e. by comparison on the length of DBTW and the values of Q. At least for SCS=480/960kHz, it is not enough to only rely on Q=64 to determine whether DBTW is enabled or not. It still needs to be considered in combination with the length of DBTW and the value of Q.For last two FFS points, we share similar view with LGE. The FFS should be deleted as they are unclear and not supported by majority companies. |
| Spreadtrum | We support DBTW for all applicable SCS of SSB.For simplicity, maybe, DBTW for SSB with 120kHz can be discussed separately from that of 480/960kHz. Otherwise, it is hard to converge. DBTW for SSB with 120kHz can be prioritized, as receptionof SSB with 120kHz may be UE mandatory capability. |
| Nokia | At the carrier frequency range of interest, the number of actually transmitted SSBs is assumed to be 64 or close to 64. We have concerns on the need to support equals to 8 or 16, at least. In addition, number of candidate positions especially with 120 kHz (64 or 80) is not enough to support NR-U like cyclic mapping when we consider typical number of SSBs beams like 56 or more. Hence, we would propose following modification:**Proposal 1.3-1)*** Support DBTW for 120/480/960kHz SSB
	+ Enable/disable of DBTW is indicated by one or more of the following methods:
		- Option 1) signaling in MIB
			* Option 1-1) indicated by a specific state/index of
			* Option 1-2) indicated by other bit fields in MIB
			* FFS: between option 1-1 and 1-2.
		- Option 2) distinct GSCN used by the SSB
		- FFS: whether to support option 1, 2, or both.
		- Note: enable/disable signaling of DBTW by MIB or GSCN does not preclude other signaling methods
	+ MIB signaling to support DBTW mechanism
		- Alt1: Via signaling of
			* Total number of valid values of to not exceed 4
			* Working assumption: {[8], [16], [32], [64]}
				+ FFS: on whether can be used to disable DBTW
		- Alt2: Explicit indication of re-transmission and SSB candidate location
			* Indication whether SSB is transmission or re-transmission (e.g. re-purpose of *subCarrierSpacingCommon*)
			* Transmitted SSB original index and for re-transmission, actual location index (of transmission)
				+ To reduce the required bits to indicate the actual location index, the valid locations are shared for set of SSBs in TDM manner (i.e. if one alternative time location is valid, no additional bits are needed, if two options for given SFN exist, one bit is needed) if number additional locations is less than the number of actually transmitted SSBs.
	+ Support DBTW lengths:
		- 0.5, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 msec
			* Note: same as Rel-16 FR1 NR-U
	+ Number of candidate positions when DBTW is enabled
		- For 120kHz SSB
			* FFS: between 64 or 80
		- For 480/960kHz SSB
			* FFS: between 64 or 128
	+ FFS:
		- Whether or not to support floating DBTW
		- Whether or not to support mechanism to balance out SSB DTX (from LBT failure)
 |
| Mediatek | Although we don’t think it’s needed , we ‘re ok if majority tends to support DBTW and find a way to achieve balance of following items1. DBTW on/off
2. Indication of DBTW length
3. QCL value
4. SSB candidate positions

We don’t support last two FFS points and agree to delete it. |
| Futurewei | We are fine with the FL proposal. |
| Samsung2 | Our comment on DCI format 1\_0.First of all, the DCI format size difference is only applicable for FR1 spec, and we don’t think it’s straightforward that such difference is automatically applicable to 52.6 to 72 GHz, which may need further discussion. The origin for having such difference is from the indication of CAPC, but whether and how to indicate for 60 GHz unlicensed may need further discussion. Then, even with a DCI format size difference, it’s applicable to licensed/unlicensed band, and may not directly related to the value of Q. For example, before monitoring Type0-PDCCH, a UE only needs to know whether the band is operating on licensed or unlicensed band, and there is no need to know the exact value of Q, so in this sense, this issue may not be closely tied to the indication of Q.  |
| Intel | We support Proposal 1.3-1 with a slight modification: we think that the sub-bullet ‘MIB to support signaling of ’ should be a Working Assumption.We also prefer to keep the last FFS sub-bullets as some alternatives for consideration if RAN1 could not find MIB/PBCH payload bits for repurposing or enough SSB candidate positions in the time domain. |
| CATT | We agree with some other companies that DBTW should only apply to 120 kHz SCS. The higher SCSs (480/960 kHz) clearly can support the short control signal exemptions and do not need LBT. We already see the specification work that need to introduce DBTW for 480/960kHz. |
| Ericsson2 | Regarding the comment from Samsung2: "…a UE only needs to know whether the band is operating on licensed or unlicensed band…" Yes, this is the core issue we are concerned about. How will the UE obtain that information? Will it be signaled in MIB, will it be indicated by different GSCN sets, will the UE know before decoding DCI 1\_0 with different sizes, etc. This has still not been discussed, and it potentially impacts MIB design, and thus is related to indication of DBTW on/off and Q.Our chief concern is that the following 3 scenarios need to be indicated in some way* (Unlicensed with LBT off or licensed) + DBTW off
* (Unlicensed with LBT on) + DBTW on
* (Unlicensed with LBT on) + DBTW off

One problem that we have with Proposal 1.3-1 is that it only talks about indicating DBTW on/off and leaves out the mechanism by which the UE learns if it is operating in licensed spectrum or unlicensed. If the DCI 1\_0 size depends on licensed/unlicensed, then this information needs to be known unless it is acceptable for the UE to perform two blind decodes with different size hypotheses.Since all of this is unknown at the moment and also has a dependence on progress in the Channel Access AI, we are uncomfortable agreeing to support DBTW before there is more clarity on this issue. Additionally, we do not think DBTW is needed for 480/960 kHz since the discovery bust can easily be contained within 10 ms thus satisfying the short control signaling requirements. Hence we recommend the following changes to Proposal 1.3.-1 to address our concerns:* FFS: Support DBTW for at least for 120~~/480/960~~kHz SSB
	+ Enable/disable of DBTW is indicated by one or more of the following methods:
		- Option 1) signaling in MIB
			* Option 1-1) indicated by a specific state/index of
			* Option 1-2) indicated by other bit fields in MIB
			* FFS: between option 1-1 and 1-2.
		- Option 2) distinct GSCN used by the SSB
		- FFS: whether to support option 1, 2, or both.
		- Note: enable/disable signaling of DBTW by MIB or GSCN does not preclude other signaling methods
	+ Support mechanism to indicate at least the following 3 scenarios:
		- (Unlicensed with LBT off or licensed) + DBTW disabled
		- (Unlicensed with LBT on) + DBTW enabled
		- (Unlicensed with LBT on) + DBTW disabled
	+ Whether/how LBT on/off is indicated in MIB
		- If not indicated in MIB, then whether/how the UE determines different sizes of DCI 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by SI-RNTI
 |
| OPPO | We support the moderator’s original proposal except for the last two FFS points. |
| Convida Wireless | We are fine with moderator’s proposal. |
| Moderator | One question to Huawei:I can capture the suggested method for determination of DBTW. However, I would like to clarify for 120kHz initial access cases, how is the UE obtaining the DBTW length at the time of MIB decoding or at the time of decoding CSS based PDCCH? Are you proposing to include DBTW length in the MIB?  |

#### **2nd Round Discussion Summary:**

Moderator has provided an updated proposal in 1.3-2. The following were changed compared to Proposal 1.3-1.

* Removal of 480/960kHz cases & added FFS – based on Qualcomm comments
* Remove of last two FFS – based on LGE/Docomo/ZTE/Sanechips/Mediatek comments
* Update of option 1-1 – based on Samsung comments
* Added Note 2 – based on Samsung comments
* Changed WA for signaling of – based on Samsung comments
* Added 1-3 and updated FFS – based on Huawei comments.
* Added ALT B – based on Nokia comments
* Added the three supported cases for DBTW signaling – based on Ericsson comments

Companies views on whether support for DBTW SCS dependent:

* Only for 120kHz
	+ Ericsson, Qualcomm, LGE, CATT
* For all SCS:
	+ Huawei, HiSilicon, Spreadtrum, ZTE, Sanechips

There seems to be number of companies that think motivation for applying for DBTW for 480/960kHz is questionable, and number of companies think DBTW should apply to all SCS.

Based on inputs received so far, moderator has provide Proposal 1.3-2.

##### **Proposal 1.3-2)**

* Support DBTW ~~for 120/480/960kHz SSB~~
	+ FFS whether DBTW will be only applicable for 120kHz SSB or for all SSB SCS
		- If DBTW is supported for 480/960kHz SSB:
			* For the case agreed in RAN1 #104bis-e where 480/960 kHz SSB location and SCS are explicitly provided to the UE (non-initial access), indication of enable/disable of DBTW and signaling of and DBTW length are supported only by dedicated signaling.
	+ Support mechanism to indicate at least the following 3 scenarios:
		- (Unlicensed with LBT off or licensed) + DBTW disabled
		- (Unlicensed with LBT on) + DBTW enabled
		- (Unlicensed with LBT on) + DBTW disabled
		- FFS: Whether/how LBT on/off is indicated in MIB
			* If not indicated in MIB, then FFS whether/how the UE determines different sizes of DCI 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by SI-RNTI
	+ Enable/disable of DBTW is indicated by one or more of the following methods:
		- Option 1) signaling in MIB
			* Option 1-1) ~~indicated by a specific state/index of~~ DBTW is jointly coded with
			* Option 1-2) indicated by other bit fields in MIB
			* Option 1-3) By comparing the value of and DBTW length
			* FFS: among options 1-1, 1-2, 1-3, or any combination of the listed options.
		- Option 2) distinct GSCN used by the SSB
		- FFS: whether to support option 1, 2, or both.
		- Note: enable/disable signaling of DBTW by MIB or GSCN does not preclude other signaling methods
	+ Working assumption: MIB signaling to support ~~signaling of~~
		- Alt A) via signaling of
			* In this case, the total number of valid values of to not exceed 4
		- ~~Working assumption: {[8], [16], [32], [64]}~~
			* ~~FFS: on whether can be used to disable DBTW~~
		- Alt B) Explicit indication of re-transmission and SSB candidate location
			* Indication whether SSB is transmission or re-transmission (e.g. re-purpose of subCarrierSpacingCommon)
			* Transmitted SSB original index and for re-transmission, actual location index (of transmission)
				+ To reduce the required bits to indicate the actual location index, the valid locations are shared for set of SSBs in TDM manner (i.e. if one alternative time location is valid, no additional bits are needed, if two options for given SFN exist, one bit is needed) if number additional locations is less than the number of actually transmitted SSBs.
		- FFS between Alt A or B.
	+ Support DBTW lengths
		- Alt 1) 0.5, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 msec
			* Note: same as Rel-16 FR1 NR-U
		- Alt 2) maximum 5 msec
			* FFS other values
		- FFS between Alt 1 and 2
	+ Number of candidate positions when DBTW is enabled
		- For 120kHz SSB
			* FFS: between 64 or 80
		- For 480/960kHz SSB
			* FFS: between 64 or 128
	+ ~~FFS:~~
		- ~~Whether or not to support floating DBTW~~
		- ~~Whether or not to support mechanism to balance out SSB DTX (from LBT failure)~~

#### **3rd Round Discussion:**

Please comment further on Proposal 1.3-2.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| DOCOMO | * A bit unclear on the sub-bullet for the case if DBTW is supported for 480/960 kHz. Our understanding is that anyway DBTW will be supported for initial access with 120 kHz SCS. Why such new dedicated signaling can be needed for 480/960 kHz? We are not sure if just to reuse the design for 120 kHz SCS would be more difficult than to introduce new dedicated signaling.
* Not pretty sure why “(Unlicensed with LBT on) + DBTW disabled” is needed. DBTW should be turned on when LBT is necessary, isn’t it? Or “only less interference is assumed” can be assumed by both gNB and UE in advance? I may misunderstand something.

Support the same DBTW length as Rel-16 NR-U.  |
| Nokia | In principle we are fine with the proposal, with some minor suggestions for change. Firstly, for the working assumption on MIB signalling, thank you for the FL for accounting our concern. While we understand that majority prefers the based method, like noted we think that this may result somewhat restrictive operation with DBTW in terms of supported SSBs. Hence as indication is not explicitly needed for AltB, we would propose to minor modifications as suggested below.Also we could further discuss whether all three scenarios are to be supported.**Proposal 1.3-2)-NOK*** Support DBTW ~~for 120/480/960kHz SSB~~
	+ FFS whether DBTW will be only applicable for 120kHz SSB or for all SSB SCS
		- If DBTW is supported for 480/960kHz SSB:
			* For the case agreed in RAN1 #104bis-e where 480/960 kHz SSB location and SCS are explicitly provided to the UE (non-initial access), indication of enable/disable of DBTW and signaling of DBTW configuration ~~and DBTW length~~ are supported only by dedicated signaling.
	+ Support mechanism to indicate at least the following 3 scenarios:
		- (Unlicensed with LBT off or licensed) + DBTW disabled
		- (Unlicensed with LBT on) + DBTW enabled
		- (Unlicensed with LBT on) + DBTW disabled
		- FFS: Whether/how LBT on/off is indicated in MIB
			* If not indicated in MIB, then FFS whether/how the UE determines different sizes of DCI 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by SI-RNTI
	+ Enable/disable of DBTW is indicated by one or more of the following methods:
		- Option 1) signaling in MIB
			* Option 1-1) ~~indicated by a specific state/index of~~ DBTW is jointly coded with
			* Option 1-2) indicated by other bit fields in MIB
			* Option 1-3) By comparing the value of and DBTW length
			* FFS: among options 1-1, 1-2, 1-3, or any combination of the listed options.
		- Option 2) distinct GSCN used by the SSB
		- FFS: whether to support option 1, 2, or both.
		- Note: enable/disable signaling of DBTW by MIB or GSCN does not preclude other signaling methods
	+ Working assumption: MIB signaling to support ~~signaling of~~ /re-transmission indication
		- Alt A) via signaling of
			* In this case, the total number of valid values of to not exceed 4
		- ~~Working assumption: {[8], [16], [32], [64]}~~
			* ~~FFS: on whether can be used to disable DBTW~~
		- Alt B) Explicit indication of re-transmission and SSB candidate location
			* Indication whether SSB is transmission or re-transmission (e.g. re-purpose of subCarrierSpacingCommon)
			* Transmitted SSB original index and for re-transmission, actual location index (of transmission)
				+ To reduce the required bits to indicate the actual location index, the valid locations are shared for set of SSBs in TDM manner (i.e. if one alternative time location is valid, no additional bits are needed, if two options for given SFN exist, one bit is needed) if number additional locations is less than the number of actually transmitted SSBs.
		- FFS between Alt A or B.
	+ Support DBTW lengths
		- Alt 1) 0.5, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 msec
			* Note: same as Rel-16 FR1 NR-U
		- Alt 2) maximum 5 msec
			* FFS other values
		- FFS between Alt 1 and 2
	+ Number of candidate positions when DBTW is enabled
		- For 120kHz SSB
			* FFS: between 64 or 80
		- For 480/960kHz SSB
			* FFS: between 64 or 128
	+ ~~FFS:~~
		- ~~Whether or not to support floating DBTW~~
		- ~~Whether or not to support mechanism to balance out SSB DTX (from LBT failure)~~
 |
| LG Electronics | Generally we are fine with Proposal 1.3-2. However, there is a question for Alt B under potential Working Assumption. Is Alt B related to signaling Q value? Rather, from my understanding, it seems to be related to how to indicate frame boundary when a SSB index can be re-transmitted in the other position, in case more than 64 SSB candidate indexes are supported. Even in Nokia’s formulation, it doesn’t seem to be clear that Alt A and Alt B have the common factor, rather they seem to be separate issues. |
| vivo | We are generally fine with Proposal 1.3-2. However, we have similar question with LG on Alt. B. In our understanding, Alt. B provide the method on indication of additional candidate SSB positions, which is a separate issue with that Alt. A aims to solve. |
| Spreadtrum | We think it is too detailed. We need time to check further. We can support the high level part, e.g.* Support DBTW ~~for 120/480/960kHz SSB~~
	+ FFS whether DBTW will be only applicable for 120kHz SSB or for all SSB SCS
		- If DBTW is supported for 480/960kHz SSB:
			* For the case agreed in RAN1 #104bis-e where 480/960 kHz SSB location and SCS are explicitly provided to the UE (non-initial access), indication of enable/disable of DBTW and signaling of and DBTW length are supported only by dedicated signaling.
	+ Support mechanism to indicate at least the following 3 scenarios:
		- (Unlicensed with LBT off or licensed) + DBTW disabled
		- (Unlicensed with LBT on) + DBTW enabled
		- (Unlicensed with LBT on) + DBTW disabled
		- FFS: Whether/how LBT on/off is indicated in MIB
			* If not indicated in MIB, then FFS whether/how the UE determines different sizes of DCI 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by SI-RNTI
 |
| ZTE, Sanechips | For DBTW lengths, we think that Alt 2 contains Alt 1. Alt 1 can be deleted or used as a sub-bullet of Alt 2. For other bullets, we are fine.Besides, we have corrected our preference in 2nd round summary on DBTW SCS dependence. |
| Intel | Generally, we are fine with Proposal 1.3-2 although we have a concern regarding the 2nd sub-bullet. For us it’s not clear why the 1st case ((Unlicensed with LBT off or licensed) + DBTW disabled) and the 3rd case ((Unlicensed with LBT on) + DBTW disabled) need to be differentiated in the SSB design (more specifically in the MIB design). They may need to be distinguished during the system operation, but for DBTW enable/disable signalling purposes, could one explain why they need to be different. |
| Samsung | Generally we are ok with the proposal. We didn’t see a need to indicate “(Unlicensed with LBT on) + DBTW disabled”. The three cases need to distinguish in our mind are “Licensed (DBTW not applicable)”, “Unlicensed with LBT on and DBTW enabled”, “Unlicensed with LBT off and DBTW disabled”. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | **To Moderator:**Thanks for the question. For 120kHz initial access cases, DBTW length is provided in SIB1. UE can assume a default of 5 ms DBTW at the time of MIB decoding or at the time of decoding CSS based PDCCH. This is a similar behavior as in Rel-16: “If *DiscoveryBurst-WindowLength* is not provided, the UE assumes that the duration of the discovery burst transmission window is a half frame”. This is also more accurately reflected in our proposed changes.**Regarding Proposal 1.3-2)**We think that for the case where 480/960 kHz SSB location and SCS are explicitly provided to the UE (non-initial access), indication of enable/disable of DBTW and signaling of and DBTW length should be done only by dedicated signaling. As such, for such case, 1) “mechanism to indicate at least the following 3 scenarios”, and 2) “MIB signaling to support signaling of ” are not relevant (everything is clearly indicated using dedicated signaling). 1 and 2 are currently relevant for 120 kHz SSB only. Also, for 120 kHz, Enable/disable of DBTW can be indicated by comparing the We suggest the following changes:* Support DBTW ~~for 120/480/960kHz SSB~~
	+ FFS whether DBTW will be only applicable for 120kHz SSB or for all SSB SCS
		- If DBTW is supported for 480/960kHz SSB:
			* For the case agreed in RAN1 #104bis-e where 480/960 kHz SSB location and SCS are explicitly provided to the UE (non-initial access), indication of enable/disable of DBTW and signaling of and DBTW length are supported only by dedicated signaling.
	+ For 120 kHz SSB:
		- Support mechanism to indicate at least the following 3 scenarios:
			* (Unlicensed with LBT off or licensed) + DBTW disabled
			* (Unlicensed with LBT on) + DBTW enabled
			* (Unlicensed with LBT on) + DBTW disabled
			* FFS: Whether/how LBT on/off is indicated in MIB
				+ If not indicated in MIB, then FFS whether/how the UE determines different sizes of DCI 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by SI-RNTI
		- Enable/disable of DBTW is indicated by one or more of the following methods:
			* Option 1) signaling in MIB
				+ Option 1-1) ~~indicated by a specific state/index of~~ DBTW is jointly coded with
				+ Option 1-2) indicated by other bit fields in MIB
				+ ~~Option 1-3) By comparing the value of and DBTW length~~
				+ FFS: ~~among options 1-1, 1-2, 1-3, or any combination of the listed options.~~ between option 1-1 and 1-2
			* Option 2) distinct GSCN used by the SSB
			* Option 3) By comparing the value of in MIB and DBTW length after UE reads SIB1 or by comparing the value of in MIB and default DBTW length of 5 ms before UE reads SIB1.
			* FFS: ~~whether to support option 1, 2, or both.~~ whether to support option 1, 2, 3 or ~~both~~ any combination of the options.
			* Note: enable/disable signaling of DBTW by MIB or GSCN does not preclude other signaling methods
		- Working assumption: MIB signaling to support ~~signaling of~~
			* Alt A) via signaling of
				+ In this case, the total number of valid values of to not exceed 4
			* ~~Working assumption: {[8], [16], [32], [64]}~~
				+ ~~FFS: on whether can be used to disable DBTW~~
			* Alt B) Explicit indication of re-transmission and SSB candidate location
				+ Indication whether SSB is transmission or re-transmission (e.g. re-purpose of subCarrierSpacingCommon)
				+ Transmitted SSB original index and for re-transmission, actual location index (of transmission)

To reduce the required bits to indicate the actual location index, the valid locations are shared for set of SSBs in TDM manner (i.e. if one alternative time location is valid, no additional bits are needed, if two options for given SFN exist, one bit is needed) if number additional locations is less than the number of actually transmitted SSBs.* + - * FFS between Alt A or B.
	+ Support DBTW lengths
		- Alt 1) 0.5, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 msec
			* Note: same as Rel-16 FR1 NR-U
		- Alt 2) maximum 5 msec
			* FFS other values
		- FFS between Alt 1 and 2
	+ Number of candidate positions when DBTW is enabled
		- For 120kHz SSB
			* FFS: between 64 or 80
		- For 480/960kHz SSB
			* FFS: between 64 or 128
	+ ~~FFS:~~
		- ~~Whether or not to support floating DBTW~~
		- ~~Whether or not to support mechanism to balance out SSB DTX (from LBT failure)~~
 |
| Ericsson | @Intel, Samsung, DOCOMOWe have previously agreed the following* If DBTW is supported
	+ Support mechanism to indicate or inform that DBTW is enabled/disabled for both IDLE and CONNECTED mode UEs
		- FFS: how to support UEs performing initial access that do not have any prior information on DBTW.

This agreement supports (Unlicensed + LBT on) for both DBTW on and off. Not all deployment scenarios in regions that require LBT need to use DBTW, e.g., deployments in which LBT failure is rare (majority of deployments). That was the original purpose of agreeing that DBTW could be enabled/disabled, even when LBT is on. DBTW on/off is not tied 1:1 to LBT on/off. That is why there are 3 cases, not just two.@Intel:To answer your question on why the 1st case may need to be distinguished from the 3rd case in the MIB design is directly related to the size of DCI 1\_0 for reading SIB1. If the design for Rel-16 DCI 1\_0 is adopted for Rel-17, then DCI 1\_0 will have 2 different sizes depending on 1st case or 3rd case (LBT off/licensed vs. LBT on). Then, if the 2 cases are not indicated in MIB (or by some other means prior to SIB1 reception), then the UE will need to do two blind decodes of DCI 1\_0 for SIB1 reading.The problem is that it is now known yet what the DCI 1\_0 design for SIB1 reading will be – will there be two different sizes are not?Clearly these decisions affect decisions on MIB design, and it is not yet known whether or not MIB will indicate LBT on/off. If it does indicate this, then there will be an impact on signaling of Q and DBTW on/off.For this reason, it is better to leave DBTW support as FFS until these issues are resolved. |
| Qualcomm | We still think DBTW is not needed. But if it is agreed, then the proposal generally seems ok to us. The only concern we have is about the Alt B details. This is too detailed and very early to agree on such details. If Alt B is needed, then we prefer to keep only the first bullet and keep the rest as FFS. Qualcomm recommendation:* Alt B) Explicit indication of re-transmission and SSB candidate location
	+ FFS on the details of whether/how to
		- Indicate whether SSB is a transmission or re-transmission
		- Indicate SSB index for the transmission and re-transmission
	+ ~~Indication whether SSB is transmission or re-transmission (e.g. re-purpose of subCarrierSpacingCommon)~~
	+ ~~Transmitted SSB original index and for re-transmission, actual location index (of transmission)~~
		- ~~To reduce the required bits to indicate the actual location index, the valid locations are shared for set of SSBs in TDM manner (i.e. if one alternative time location is valid, no additional bits are needed, if two options for given SFN exist, one bit is needed) if number additional locations is less than the number of actually transmitted SSBs.~~
 |
| Samsung | To Ericsson. For a unlicensed band, DBTW can be disabled by implementation by setting the Q value no smaller than the DBTW duration. This was discussed/supported in Rel-16 NR-U, so we don’t think an explicit indication of such combination is needed.  |
| Futurewei | We are generally OK with the Proposal. The particular details of signaling need further discussions. |
| OPPO | Support proposal 1.3-2 |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are OK with the Proposal |

#### **3rd Round Discussion Summary:**

I believe we are making bit more progress, Moderator will provide updated proposal based on feedback right after GTW on Tuesday. Suggest refining the proposal for approval over email (or GTW Thursday).

#### **4th Round Discussion (on-going):**

Moderator has updated Proposal 1.3-2 based on comments received from 3rd round discussions. The proposal was split into two proposals as it was getting long.

##### **Proposal 1.3-3)**

* Support DBTW ~~for 120/480/960kHz SSB~~
	+ FFS whether DBTW will be only applicable for 120kHz SSB or for all SSB SCS
		- If DBTW is supported for 480/960kHz SSB:
			* For the case agreed in RAN1 #104bis-e where 480/960 kHz SSB location and SCS are explicitly provided to the UE (non-initial access), indication of enable/disable of DBTW configuration~~and signaling of and DBTW~~ length are supported only by dedicated signaling.
	+ For 120kHz SSB, support mechanism to indicate at least the following 3 scenarios:
		- Case 1) (Unlicensed with LBT off or licensed) + DBTW disabled
		- Case 2) (Unlicensed with LBT on) + DBTW enabled
		- Case 3) (Unlicensed with LBT on) + DBTW disabled
		- FFS: Whether/how LBT on/off is indicated in MIB
			* If not indicated in MIB, then FFS whether/how the UE determines different sizes of DCI 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by SI-RNTI
		- FFS: whether Case 1 or 3 can be combined for DBTW signaling design and how to handle implications to DCI 1\_0 size ambiguity if is not distinguished in signaling
	+ Enable/disable of DBTW is indicated by one or more of the following methods:
		- Option 1) signaling in MIB
			* Option 1-1) ~~indicated by a specific state/index of~~ DBTW is jointly coded with
			* Option 1-2) indicated by other bit fields in MIB
			* ~~Option 1-3) By comparing the value of and DBTW length~~
			* FFS: among options 1-1 and 1-2~~, 1-3, or any combination of the listed options.~~
		- Option 2) distinct GSCN used by the SSB
		- Option 3) By comparing the value of in MIB and DBTW length after UE reads SIB1 or by comparing the value of in MIB and default DBTW length of 5 ms before UE reads SIB1.
		- FFS: whether to support option 1, 2, 3, ~~or both~~ or any combination of the options.
		- Note: enable/disable signaling of DBTW by MIB or GSCN does not preclude other signaling methods

##### **Proposal 1.3-4)**

* Support DBTW
	+ Working assumption: MIB signaling to support ~~signaling of~~  or re-transmission indication
		- Alt A) via signaling of
			* In this case, the total number of ~~valid~~ values of to not exceed 4
		- ~~Working assumption: {[8], [16], [32], [64]}~~
			* ~~FFS: on whether can be used to disable DBTW~~
		- Alt B) Explicit indication of re-transmission and SSB candidate location
			* FFS on the details of whether/how to
				+ Indicate whether SSB is a transmission or re-transmission
				+ Indicate SSB index for the transmission and re-transmission
			* ~~Indication whether SSB is transmission or re-transmission (e.g. re-purpose of subCarrierSpacingCommon)~~
			* ~~Transmitted SSB original index and for re-transmission, actual location index (of transmission)~~
				+ ~~To reduce the required bits to indicate the actual location index, the valid locations are shared for set of SSBs in TDM manner (i.e. if one alternative time location is valid, no additional bits are needed, if two options for given SFN exist, one bit is needed) if number additional locations is less than the number of actually transmitted SSBs.~~
		- FFS between Alt A or B, or supporting both.
	+ Support DBTW lengths
		- Alt 1) 0.5, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 msec
			* Note: same as Rel-16 FR1 NR-U
		- Alt 2) maximum 5 msec
			* FFS other values
		- FFS between Alt 1 and 2
	+ Number of candidate positions when DBTW is enabled
		- For 120kHz SSB
			* FFS between 64 or 80
		- For 480/960kHz SSB
			* FFS between 64 or 128
	+ ~~FFS:~~
		- ~~Whether or not to support floating DBTW~~
		- ~~Whether or not to support mechanism to balance out SSB DTX (from LBT failure)~~

Please provide further comments on Proposal 1.3-3 and Proposal 1.3-4.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Samsung | For Proposal 1.3-3, we have the following suggested modifications (highlighted): * Support DBTW ~~for 120/480/960kHz SSB~~
	+ FFS whether DBTW will be only applicable for 120kHz SSB or for all SSB SCS
		- If DBTW is supported for 480/960kHz SSB:
			* For the case agreed in RAN1 #104bis-e where 480/960 kHz SSB location and SCS are explicitly provided to the UE (non-initial access), indication of enable/disable of DBTW configuration~~and signaling of and DBTW~~ length are supported only by dedicated signaling.
	+ At least for 120kHz SSB, support mechanism to ~~indicate~~ distinguish at least the following ~~3 scenarios~~ 4 cases:
		- Case 1) (Unlicensed with LBT off ~~or licensed~~) + DBTW disabled
		- Case 2) (Unlicensed with LBT on) + DBTW enabled
		- Case 3) (Unlicensed with LBT on) + DBTW disabled
		- Case 4) Licensed + DBTW disabled
		- FFS: Whether/how LBT on/off is indicated in MIB
			* If not indicated in MIB, then FFS whether/how the UE determines different sizes of DCI 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by SI-RNTI
		- FFS: whether ~~Case 1 or 3~~ any cases can be combined for DBTW signaling design and how to handle implications to DCI 1\_0 size ambiguity if is not distinguished in signaling
		- FFS: whether all above cases need an explicit indication
	+ Enable/disable of DBTW is indicated by one or more of the following methods:
		- Option 1) signaling in MIB
			* Option 1-1) ~~indicated by a specific state/index of~~ Disabling DBTW is jointly coded with
			* Option 1-2) indicated by other bit fields in MIB
			* ~~Option 1-3) By comparing the value of and DBTW length~~
			* FFS: among options 1-1 and 1-2~~, 1-3, or any combination of the listed options.~~
		- Option 2) distinct GSCN used by the SSB
		- Option 3) By comparing the value of in MIB and DBTW length after UE reads SIB1 or by comparing the value of in MIB and default DBTW length of 5 ms before UE reads SIB1.
		- FFS: whether to support option 1, 2, 3, ~~or both~~ or any combination of the options.
		- Note: enable/disable signaling of DBTW by MIB or GSCN does not preclude other signaling methods

We are ok with Proposal 1.3-4.  |
| LG Electronics | For Proposal 1.3-3, we are generally fine but it seems that at least 120 kHz DBTW is supported and FFS for 480/960 kHz DBTW. In that sense, we can change the main bullet and first sub-bullet as follows.* Support DBTW ~~for 120/480/960kHz SSB~~ at least for 120 kHz
	+ FFS whether DBTW will be applicable for 480/960 SSB SCS

For Proposal 1.3-4, still we have a concern potential working assumption and Alt B. Main point is that SSB will not be “re-”transmitted within DBTW and Alt B is related to how to signal candidate SSB index in case more than 64 candidates are supported. In that sense, we would suggest the following to make wording more generalized.* + Working assumption: MIB signaling to support ~~signaling of~~  or candidate SSB index indication ~~re-transmission indication~~
		- Alt A) via signaling of
			* In this case, the total number of ~~valid~~ values of to not exceed 4
		- ~~Working assumption: {[8], [16], [32], [64]}~~
			* ~~FFS: on whether can be used to disable DBTW~~
		- Alt B) Explicit indication of candidate ~~re-transmission and~~ SSB indexes if more than 64 SSB candidates are supported ~~candidate location~~
			* FFS on the details of signaling ~~whether/how to~~
				+ ~~Indicate whether SSB is a transmission or re-transmission~~
				+ ~~Indicate SSB index for the transmission and re-transmission~~
 |

#### **4th Round Discussion Summary:**

TBD

### 2.1.4 SSB Resource Pattern

* From [2] Huawei, HiSilicon:
	+ Other than the agreed values of n corresponding to Cased D SSB pattern, do not support any additional values of n for SSB with 120kHz SCS in operation with shared or without shared spectrum.
	+ Support following patterns for SSB with 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS:
		- For operations without shared spectrum:
			* {2,8}+14n, (n=0,1,2,…,31) for both 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS
		- For operations with shared spectrum:
			* {2,8}+14n, (n=0,1,2,…,31,40,…,71) for 480 kHz SCS;
			* {2,8}+14n, (n=0,1,2,…,63) for 960 kHz SCS.
* From [3] vivo:
	+ Support of additional n values to support of DBTW, and the value of n can be 4, 9, 14, 19.
	+ Support to reuse case D as the baseline for designing the SCS 480 kHz and 960 kHz time domain pattern.
	+ The following alternatives could be considered to solve beam switching problem for contiguous candidate SSBs:
		- Alt. 1: New SSB pattern introducing gaps between contiguous candidate SSBs;
		- Alt. 2: The same QCL assumptions for contiguous candidate SSBs;
* From [4] Spreadtrum:
	+ If the symbol gap between SSB positions is agreed to be supported, the SSB pattern of Case A/C for SSB with 15/30kHz SCS can be considered for SSB with 480/960kHz SCS.
* From [5] Nokia, NSB:
	+ Define additional SSB locations for the purpose of SSB retransmissions
	+ Group additional SSB locations and associate each group to set of regular SSB positions, e.g. after each block of 16 regular SSB positions there is associated group of up to four additional positions that can be used to retransmit any of the associated actual SSBs.
	+ For carrier frequencies within 52.6 GHz to 71GHz, at 120kHz SSB, introduce additional candidate locations for SSB transmission support for 𝑛 = 4, 9, 14, 19.
		- The first symbols of the additional candidate SS/PBCH blocks have indexes {4, 8,16, 20} + 28×n.
	+ For carrier frequencies within 52.6 GHz to 71GHz, at 240kHz SSB, introduce additional candidate locations for SSB transmission support for 𝑛 = 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18.
		- The first symbols of the candidate SS/PBCH blocks have indexes {8, 12, 16, 20, 32, 36, 40, 44} + 56×n.
* From [6] Ericsson:
	+ For SS/PBCH block with 120 kHz SCS, support Case D pattern as defined in Rel-15. No new values of n are supported.
	+ Pending decision from RAN4 on beam switching times, if beam switching can be performed within the cyclic prefix, support the FR2 Case D pattern for time domain pattern for SSB transmissions with 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS.
* From [7] CATT:
	+ More than 64 SSB transmission opportunities shall be defined within a 5ms SSB burst set to support up to 64 beams for SSB beam sweeping in case of occasional LBT failure. The issue of supporting additional bit(s) for the extension of SSB candidate index needs further study.
	+ Additional n value such as #4, #9, #14, and #19 can be used for new SSB candidates if LBT/DBTW is needed for SSB transmission.
* From [8] Qualcomm:
	+ for the SSB for NR operation in the frequency between 52.6GHz and 71GHz and SCS = 480 kHz and 960 kHz, consider defining an SSB pattern consisting of multiple “SSB slots” where SSB symbols for one or more beams are contained in the “SSB slot”
		- A beam switching gap of 1 symbol is inserted between SSBs within the “SSB slot”
		- Additional control symbols may be defined in the SSB slots with beam switching gaps between control and SSB symbols of different beams
		- Additional “gap slots” may be inserted between “SSB slots” to account for URLLC and UL traffic
		- Consider the option of aligning the higher SCS SSBs with the corresponding beams for the lower SCS SSB
* From [9] OPPO:
	+ Wait for RAN4 response before further discuss beam switching gap issue.
* From [10] ZTE, Sanechips:
	+ For designing SSB patterns with different SCSs for NR operation above 52.6 GHz, it is proposed to reuse the existing design (i.e. Case A/C, Case B/D and Case E) as much as possible, and take different impacts in single/mixed numerology operation into account.
	+ The following options can be considered for supporting beam switching for SSB with SCS 480 kHz and 960 kHz if the CPs can not used to support beam switching and other functions simultaneously.
		- Option 1: In a half-frame, any two candidate SSBs are discontinuous in the time domain
		- Option 1-1: SSB pattern with SCS 480/960 kHz can adopt the existing pattern of Case A and Case C in one or two slots defined in Rel-15 NR
		- Option 1-2: SSB pattern with SCS 480/960 kHz should be re-designed to reserve at least one symbol between any two candidate SSBs, e.g. only defining one candidate SSB per slot, or shift the existing SSB by one or more symbols
		- Option 2: Multiple adjacent candidate SSBs are defined to have a same SSB index or QCL assumption
	+ In order to reduce the impact of standardization caused by indicating candidate SSB indices, the maximum number of candidate SSB defined in the half-frame can be kept unchanged (maintain 64) or limited to 128 for 240/480/960 kHz SSB SCS.
* From [11] Intel:
	+ Consider SSB pattern in a slot with 3 SSB containing slots, each slot with 2 SSB position, followed by 1 non-SSB carrying slot for 480 kHz and 6 SSB carrying slots followed by 2 non-SSB carrying slots for 960kHz, to accommodate Rx-Tx switching gap.
		- For 480kHz and 960kHz SCS based SSB, first symbols of the candidate SSB have indexes {2,9} + 14×n, where index 0 corresponds to the first symbol of the first slot in a half-frame.
		- For 480kHz, n = 0,1,2, 4,5,6, 8,9,10, 12,13,14, 16,17,18, 20,21,22, 24,25,26, 28,29,30, 32,33,34, 36,37,38, 40,41.
		- For 960kHz, n = 0,1,2,3,4,5, 8,9,10,11,12,13, 16,17,18,19,20,21, 24,25,26,27,28,29, 32,33,34,35,36,37, 40, 41.
* From [13] Apple:
	+ Support to introduce a unified SSB Pattern for 480kHz SCS and 960kHz SCS (if supported):
		- The first symbol of candidate SSB have indexes {2,9,16,23} within each SSB burst.
		- Reserve 2 slots for DL/UL and UL/DL switching to allow for fast UL transmission between two SSB bursts.
* From [15] NEC:
	+ Additional n values of 4, 9, 14 and 19 should be supported to indicate additional candidate SSBs in DBTW at least for 120 kHz SCS SSB pattern.
	+ The indication of additional candidate SSBs based on additional n values should be investigated.
* From [16] Samsung:
	+ Support the same SS/PBCH block pattern for 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCSs.
		- At least one symbol should be reserved between neighboring SS/PBCH block for beam sweeping delay.
		- Symbols should be reserved for CORESET and HARQ with SCS same as the SS/PBCH block.
		- For SS/PBCH block candidate locations in a slot, Case A or Case C can be reused.
* From [18] LGE:
	+ Reuse existing SS/PBCH Case D (which is applied for 120 kHz SCS) for SS/PBCH block with 480/960 kHz SCS, if RAN4 confirms that no explicit switching gap is needed between successive SS/PBCH blocks.
	+ Support of additional n values for the time domain pattern of SS/PBCH block with 120 kHz SCS can be considered to increase SS/PBCH block’s transmission opportunities, only if PBCH payload is sufficient to indicate the increased number of candidate SS/PBCH block indexes.
* From [19] Lenovo, Motorola Mobility:
	+ For supporting NR from 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz in Rel. 17, if higher subcarrier spacings (numerologies) are adopted for SSB, then to allow the beam switching between contiguous SSBs, a gap (for example a symbol gap or post prefix) should be supported before beam switching.
* From [21] Interdigital:
	+ Introduce the enhancements on SS/PBCH block transmission patterns to deliberately include the CORESET#0 and SIB1 in fixed time locations along with the corresponding SS/PBCH block to ensure the channel occupancy as much as possible, in the initial access operations for unlicensed spectrum in beyond 52.6GHz.
* From [22] Convida:
	+ Increasing the number of SSB candidate positions to above 64 to increase transmission opportunities to cope with LBT failure should be considered.
* From [23] Sharp:
	+ Based on SSB resource pattern Case D of FR2, other values of n (e.g., 4, 9, 14, 19) should be added for the SSB with 120kHz SCS in above 52.6GHz.
* From [25] NTT Docomo:
	+ When new SCSs are supported for SSB, the two alternatives below can be considered for SSB mapping in time domain:
		- Two SSBs per slot, with guard period of at least 1 symbol between the SSBs
		- One SSB per slot
* From [27] WILUS:
	+ At least one symbol gap in time domain between SS/PBCH blocks with different SSB indices should be considered for higher subcarrier spacing (e.g., 960kHz) by taking a beam switching gap into account due to a RF interruption time of Tx/Rx beams and/or LBT gap in unlicensed spectrum.

#### Summary of Discussions

* Several companies stated that RAN1 should wait for RAN4 reply LS on beam switching before deciding the exact SSB patterns.
* If exact SSB position within a slot(s) is difficult to conclude due to lack of information from RAN4, moderator suggests to discuss and conclude on other aspects of SSB pattern that do not require feedback from RAN4. For example:
	+ number of SSB candidates per slot
	+ slots that may contain candidate SSB(s) (including maximum number of candidate SSB in half-radio frame)

#### **1st Round Discussion:**

Based on input Moderator has put together possible options for SSB resource pattern.

* For 120kHz SSB:
	+ Whether or not to add n = 4, 9, 14, 19 for the SSB candidate position
* For 480kHz SSB:
	+ SSB candidate position defined over
		- Option 1-1) 1 slot (e.g. start position defined as {X,Y} + 14\*n)
		- Option 1-2) 2 consecutive slots (e.g. start position defined as {W,X,Y,Z} + 28\*n)
	+ Assuming {X,Y} + 14×n, SSB candidate position, support
		- Option 2-1) n = 0,1,2,…,31
		- Option 2-2) n=0,1,2,…,31,40,…,71 (applicable only for unlicensed cases)
		- Option 2-3) n = 0,1,2, 4,5,6, 8,9,10, 12,13,14, 16,17,18, 20,21,22, 24,25,26, 28,29,30, 32,33,34, 36,37,38, 40,41.
* For 960kHz SSB:
	+ SSB candidate position defined over
		- Option 3-1) 1 slot (e.g. start position defined as {X,Y} + 14\*n)
		- Option 3-2) 2 consecutive slots (e.g. start position defined as {W,X,Y,Z} + 28\*n)
	+ Assuming {X,Y} + 14×n, SSB candidate position, support
		- Option 4-1) n = 0,1,2,…,31
		- Option 4-2) n=0,1,2,…,63 (applicable only for unlicensed cases)
		- Option 4-3) n = 0,1,2,3,4,5, 8,9,10,11,12,13, 16,17,18,19,20,21, 24,25,26,27,28,29, 32,33,34,35,36,37, 40, 41.

Given that there are many options, moderator suggest starting out by answering some fundamental questions (as suggested by few companies)

* For 120kHz:
	+ Q1) Whether or not to add n = 4, 9, 14, 19 for the SSB candidate position for unlicensed operation
* For 480 and 960 kHz:
	+ Q2) same SSB resource pattern within pair of consecutive slots?
	+ Q3) 1 SSB per slot or 2 SSB per slot
	+ Q4) same number of candidates depending on mode of operation (e.g. licensed and unlicensed or depending on LBT on or off)?
	+ Q5) if different number of SSB candidates depending on mode of operation, SSB resource pattern for licensed/no LBT case a complete subset of the other case (i.e. value of n for one mode all included in the other mode)?
	+ Q6) should there be non-SSB slots every few SSB containing slots (i.e. non-consecutive values of n) to support intermittent UL or other transmissions than SSB?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| DOCOMO | Q1) It seems related to DBTW, so should be discussed there. Q2) Q3) We support 1 SSB per slot since it has some benefits, e.g., relaxing beam sweeping overhead and resource utilization efficiency. 1 SSB per slot can achieve more resources available for other transmissions with the same beam within the slot. Also, the time required to complete beam sweeping will not be a significant issue since slot length is shortened with larger SCS. Q4) It may depend on if DBTW is supported, but we basically think the same number of SSB candidates would be sufficient. Q5) Yes. Q6) We support to consider non-SSB slots. Its periodicity would need to be discussed further.  |
| LG Electronics | For 120 kHz, we prefer not to add n = 4, 9, 14, 19 for the SSB candidate position for unlicensed operation. But adding n = 4, 9, 14, 19 can be considered if we can find bit location to indicate the increased SSB candidate position.For 480/960 kHz, we have NOTE (Strive to minimize specification impact due to the new SCS for SSB) in the previous agreement. In that sense, we suggest legacy pattern (e.g., Case D) as the starting point. |
| Samsung | 1) Yes, if DBTW is supported for 120 kHz SSB. 2) Yes. 3) 2 SSB per slot4) No, the number of candidate SSB locations for unlicensed band can be larger. 5) Yes, the candidate SSB locations for licensed band can be a subset of the ones for unlicensed band. 6) Yes, for licensed band.  |
| Qualcomm | * For 120kHz:
	+ Q1) To allow for UL and URLLC traffic, do not add additional SSB candidate positions
* For 480 and 960 kHz:
	+ Q2)
	+ Q3) Depending on the CORESET0/SIB1 multiplexing with SSB discussion (if SIB1 can be TDMed with SSB and CORESET0 in the same slot, then 1 SSB per slot can used). We can discuss SSB/CORESET0/SIB1 multiplexing patterns first
	+ Q4) Yes
	+ Q5) Same pattern for licensed and unlicensed
	+ Q6) Yes
 |
| Sharp | * For 120kHz:
	+ Q1) Yes
* For 480 and 960 kHz:
	+ Q6) Yes
 |
| Mediatek | * + Q1) Do not add additional positioins
	+ Q2) yes
	+ Q3) 2 SSB per slot, but we are open to discuss.
	+ Q4) yes
	+ Q5 Prefer to use same pattern
	+ Q6) yes
 |
| ZTE, Sanechips | For Q1), we are open to add n = 4, 9, 14, 19 to increase candidate SSB positions if no other issues are raised.For Q2), yes.For Q3), 2 SSBs per slot are preferred.For Q4), for cases in unlicensed or with LBT on, more candidate SSB can be defined than that of cases in licensed or with LBT off.For Q5), yes.For Q6), yes. |
| Nokia | Q1) If DBTW is supported, we would prefer to add additional positions (n = 4, 9, 14, 19)Q2) We think that the SSB locations could be identical in all slots where SSBs are transmitted as it is not likely that symbols for UL transmission can be fitted in the slot due to DL-UL switching time.Q3) We would support 2 SSBs per slot, but we are open to discuss e.g. based on RAN4 feedback on beam switching gap, or LBT gap.Q4) If DBTW is supported, we would think that additional candidate locations would be preferred. We are open to discuss, whether we assume full set (64+64) or if fewer are supported. For no DBTW, only 64 are needed.Q5) Yes, sub-set is preferred due to simplicity.Q6) Yes, the period at which the UL slots would appear can be further discussed once RAN4 has concluded the UL-DL switching gap. |
| Xiaomi | Q1) n = 4, 9, 14, 19 is not preferred.Q2) YesQ3) 2 SSB per slotQ4) YesQ5) Same pattern is preferred.Q6) Yes |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Q1) No. Reserve them for UL Tx as in Rel-15/16. DBTW for 120 kHz SSB can still be supported if Q<64.Q2) Yes (of course, unless the slot is reserved for UL Tx).Q3) 2 SSB per slots that are not reserved for UL TxQ4) No. Number of candidates for unlicensed band should be higher than the number of candidates for licensed bandQ5) Yes. Q6) Yes. |
| OPPO | Q1) Don’t support additional SSB positions for 120kHzQ2) yesQ3) 2 SSB per slot, but open to discussQ4) yes, e.g., depending on the value of QCL indication Q5) Prefer to use same patternQ6) yes |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Futurewei | Q1) Do not add additional positions for 120kHz SCS.Q2) YesQ3) 2 SSB per slotQ4) The same number of candidates for licensed and unlicensedQ5) Same pattern for licensed and unlicensedQ6) Yes |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Q1) Fine with adding n = 4, 9, 14, 19 for the SSB candidate position for unlicensed operationQ2) yesQ3) 2 SSB per slotQ4) Q5) yes Q6) yes |
| Interdigital | Q1) We support the further evaluation to add the additional candicate locations.Q2) Yes.Q3) We support at least 2 SSB per slot.Q4) Yes, the number of candidate locations can be the same for both licensed and unlicensed.Q5) Yes.Q6) We support to include non-SSB slots to reduce the PRACH latency. |
| CATT | Q1) We support adding #4,#9,#14,#19 for 120kHz SCS.Q2) YesQ3) 2 SSB per slotQ4) The number for unlicensed can be different from licensedQ5) Yes, candidate SSB locations for licensed band can be a subset of those for unlicensed bandQ6) Yes |
| Intel | Q1) Additional n = 4, 9, 14, 19 could be supported if DBTW is supported and DBTW enable/disable signalling is also supported.Q2) YesQ3) 2 SSB per slotQ4) The number of candidate SSBs could be different for LBT and no-LBT cases as long as DBTW enable/disable signalling is supported.Q5) YesQ6) Yes. But this could not be always guaranteed. |
| NEC | Q1) If DBTW is supported, yes.Q2)Q3)Q4) No, there should be more candidate SSB positions for unlicensed case than licensed case. Q5)Yes, SSB resource pattern for licensed/no LBT case can be a complete subset of that for unlicensed case.Q6) Yes. |
| vivo | Q1) Could be discussed furtherQ2) Q3) 2 SSB per slotQ4) For unlicensed band, the number of candidates SSB locations can be larger.Q5) YesQ6) Fine to discuss but better to be discussed until RAN4 LS back |
| Convida Wireless | Q1) There is no need to update NRB for 120 KHz. However, we are open for the other options.Q2) Yes.Q3) YesQ4) We are fine with SSB and COREST#0 are with same SCS, i.e., (SSB, Type0-PDCCH): = {480, 480}, {960, 960}. |
| Ericsson | Q1) We do not support additional value n = 4, 9, 14, 19. According to the WID, the maximum number of SS/PBCH block beams is 64. It is also the maximum number of candidate SSB positions that can be signalled in the SS/PBCH block using 3 bits from the DMRS sequence and 3 bits from the PBCH payload. Hence, if the motivation to support additional values of *n* is to somehow increase the number of candidate SSB positions (in case DBTW is supported), then adding other values of *n* would imply that some of the existing values would need to be removed. This would be in contradiction to the agreement that existing *n* values shall be supported. Furthermore, according to the WID, the overall objective is "supporting NR above 52.6GHz and leveraging FR2 design to the extent possible." As a final note, as commented by DOCOMO, this discussion seems to be related to DBTW, so it should be handled in that context.Q2) As pointed out by LGE, for 480/960 kHz, we have NOTE (Strive to minimize specification impact due to the new SCS for SSB) in the previous agreement. In that sense, we suggest legacy pattern (e.g., Case D) as the starting pointQ3) Our preference is Case D as the starting point, so that implies up to 2 SSB/slotQ4) Our strong preference is to have a common design for unlicensed / licensed, to avoid unnecessary implementation complexity, hence we support the same number of candidates (64) for bothQ5) N/A since we prefer same number of candidates for each mode (64)Q6) Yes, we think those can be preserved assuming Case D pattern as starting point of design. |
| Sony | Q1) We support adding n =4, 9, 14, 19 if DBTW is supported.Q2) YesQ3) 2 SSB per slotQ4) No, the number of candidate SSB position for unlicensed would be larger than that for licensed if DBWT is supported.Q5) YesQ6) Yes |
| WILUS | Q1) Yes, Additional n = 4, 9, 14, 19 could be supported if DBTW is supported for 120 kHz SSB. Q2) Yes. Q3) 2 SSB per slotQ4) No, the number of candidates SSB locations for unlicensed band can be larger and also the number of candidate SSBs could be different for LBT and no-LBT cases even for unlicensed band.Q5) Yes, the candidate SSB locations for licensed band can be a subset of the ones for unlicensed band. Q6) Yes |
| Spreadtrum | Q1) prefer no additional n values for 120kHz. If low latency is addressed by 120kHz SCS data/control, the slots reserved for UL transmission is preferred. If not, there could be additional n values.Q2) same patternQ3) two SSBs in a slotQ4) No need to maintain the same number of candidates for licensed and unlicensed. Even if the number of candidates is the same and predefined with large number for unlicensed, DBTW can be used to reduce the number of candidates as well.Q5) can be subsetQ6) Yes. The design principle can follow R15/16 FR2. |

#### **1st Round Discussion Summary:**

Summary of responses from companies are provided below.

* For 120kHz:
	+ Q1) Whether or not to add n = 4, 9, 14, 19 for the SSB candidate position for unlicensed operation
		- Yes: Samsung, Sharp, ZTE, Sanechip, Nokia, NSB, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, CATT, Intel, NEC, WILUS
		- No: LGE, Qualcomm, Mediatek, Xioami, Huawei, HiSilicon, OPPO, Futurwei, Spreadtrum, Ericsson
		- FFS: Interdigital
* For 480 and 960 kHz:
	+ Q2) same SSB resource pattern within pair of consecutive slots?
		- Yes: Samsung, Mediatek, ZTE, Sanechip, Nokia, NSB, Xioami, Huawei, HiSilicon, OPPO, Futurwei, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, Interdigital, CATT, Intel, Spreadtrum, WILUS
		- No / use legacy design (case D): Ericsson
	+ Q3) 1 SSB per slot or 2 SSB per slot
		- 1 SSB per slot: Docomo
		- 2 SSB per slot: LGE(case D), Samsung, mediatek, ZTE, Sanechip, Nokia, NSB, Xioami, Huawei, HiSilicon, OPPO, Futurwei, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, Interdigital, CATT, Intel, Spreadtrum, Ericsson, WILUS
		- FFS: Qualcomm
	+ Q4) same number of candidates depending on mode of operation (e.g. licensed and unlicensed or depending on LBT on or off)?
		- Same number: Docomo, Qualcomm, Mediatek, Xioami, Futurwei, Ericsson
		- larger number for unlicensed: Samsung, ZTE, Sanechip, Nokia, NSB, Huawei, HiSilicon, OPPO, CATT, Intel, NEC, Spreadtrum, WILUS
	+ Q5) if different number of SSB candidates depending on mode of operation, SSB resource pattern for licensed/no LBT case a complete subset of the other case (i.e. value of n for one mode all included in the other mode)?
		- Yes: Docomo, Samsung, Qualcomm, Mediatek, ZTE, Sanechip, Nokia, NSB, Xioami, Huawei, HiSilicon, OPPO, Futurwei, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, Interdigital, CATT, Intel, NEC, Spreadtrum, WILUS
	+ Q6) should there be non-SSB slots every few SSB containing slots (i.e. non-consecutive values of n) to support intermittent UL or other transmissions than SSB?
		- Yes: Docomo, Samsung(for licensed), Qualcomm. Sharp, Mediatek, ZTE, Sanechip, Nokia, NSB, Xioami, Huawei, HiSilicon, OPPO, Futurwei, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, Interdigital, CATT, Intel, NEC, Spreadtrum, Ericsson, WILUS

#### **2nd Round Discussion:**

For 120kHz SSB, the inclusion of inclusion of n = 4, 8, 14, 19 for when DBTW is enabled seems to need further discussions.

For 480/960kHz SSB, companies seem to be generally aligned in the direction of the design. Moderator has formulated a proposal 1.4-1 based on inputs received so far. Please comment further on whether the following is ok. Moderator has also added Proposal 1.4-2 which might be the other alternative companies mentioned.

##### **Proposal 1.4-1)**

For 480kHz/960kHz SSB:

* first symbols of the candidate SSB have index {X, Y} + 14\*n, where index 0 corresponds to the first symbol of the first slot in a half-frame
	+ value of X and Y are identical for 480kHz and 960kHz
		- FFS: exact value of X and Y
	+ ~~FFS:~~ values of n for 480kHz and 960kHz
		- FFS: whether number of values for ‘n’ depend on licensed/unlicensed operation (or alternatively enablement/disablement of DBTW)
		- FFS: exact values of ‘n’ for each SCS
		- Values of ‘n’ for licensed (or disabled DBTW) cases shall be strictly a subset of values for unlicensed (or enabled DBTW) cases.
		- Values of ‘n’ shall not be all consecutive integer values (i.e. non-candidate SSB slots are positioned every few candidate SSB slots)
			* FFS: pattern for non-candidate SSB slots

##### **Proposal 1.4-2)**

For 480kHz/960kHz SSB:

* first symbols of the candidate SSB have index {4, 8, 16,20} + 28\*n, where index 0 corresponds to the first symbol of the first slot in a half-frame
	+ ~~FFS:~~ values of n for 480kHz and 960kHz
		- FFS: whether number of values for ‘n’ depend on licensed/unlicensed operation (or alternatively enablement/disablement of DBTW)
		- FFS: exact values of ‘n’ for each SCS
		- Values of ‘n’ for licensed (or disabled DBTW) cases shall be strictly a subset of values for unlicensed (or enabled DBTW) cases.
		- Values of ‘n’ shall not be all consecutive integer values (i.e. non-candidate SSB slots are positioned every few candidate SSB slots)
			* FFS: pattern for non-candidate SSB slots

If companies have further suggestion for consideration, please provide further comments.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Samsung | We support the proposal (proposal 1.4-1). Just comments on the FFS below FFS. Is there any intention that some bullets are FFS under the FFS, while others are not?  |
| Qualcomm | We support the proposal (proposal 1.4-1). |
| LG Electronics | Still we believe legacy SSB pattern should be the baseline. {2,8}+14\*n or {4,8,16,20}+28\*n can be the candidates. We don’t prefer to give full flexibility on X, Y, and n values for 480/960 kHz SSB pattern. |
| Moderator | Made minor updates to avoid confusion on FFS aspects. |
| DOCOMO | Given the majority, we can live with 2 SSBs per slot in 480/960 kHz SCS although we think 2 SSBs per slot basically mean no PDSCH FDM in SSB slot, which could be inefficient. Between Proposal 1.4-1 and 1.4-2, support 1.4-1. We think 1.4-1 does not mean full flexibility on X/Y/n value between 480 and 960 kHz |
| LG Electronics2 | In our opinion, it seems possible to combine Proposals 1.4-1 and 1.4-2 into a single proposal since the only difference is SSB pattern within two slots. Down-selection between two alternatives may rely on RAN4’ reply LS, so we prefer not to narrow down at this moment. In that sense, we suggest following update proposal and we prefer Alt 2.For 480kHz/960kHz SSB:* Alt 1: first symbols of the candidate SSB have index {X, Y} + 14\*n, where index 0 corresponds to the first symbol of the first slot in a half-frame
	+ value of X and Y are identical for 480kHz and 960kHz
		- FFS: exact value of X and Y
* Alt 2: first symbols of the candidate SSB have index {4, 8, 16, 20} + 28\*n, where index 0 corresponds to the first symbol of the first slot in a half-frame
	+ ~~FFS:~~ values of n for 480kHz and 960kHz for Alt 1 and Alt 2
		- FFS: whether number of values for ‘n’ depend on licensed/unlicensed operation (or alternatively enablement/disablement of DBTW)
		- FFS: exact values of ‘n’ for each SCS
		- Values of ‘n’ for licensed (or disabled DBTW) cases shall be strictly a subset of values for unlicensed (or enabled DBTW) cases.
		- Values of ‘n’ shall not be all consecutive integer values (i.e. non-candidate SSB slots are positioned every few candidate SSB slots)
			* FFS: pattern for non-candidate SSB slots
 |
| Ericsson | We are supportive of the Case D pattern which is captured in Proposal 1.4-2, at least as a starting point of discussion. We acknowledge that there is a dependence on feedback from RAN4 on potential need for gaps for beam switching. We also observe the Note from the prior agreement:Agreement:For the case where SSB location and SCS are explicitly provided to the UE (non-initial access) and SSB does not configure Type-0 PDCCH, support 480 kHz and 960 kHz numerologies for the SSB* Note: Strive to minimize specification impact due to the new SCS for SSB

Regarding the following text, we don't think disabling DBTW is equivalent to LBT off, i.e., it is a valid deployment to disable DBTW in unlicensed spectrum too:* + - FFS: whether number of values for ‘n’ depend on licensed/unlicensed operation ~~(or alternatively enablement/disablement of DBTW)~~

Values of ‘n’ for licensed ~~(or disabled DBTW)~~ cases shall be strictly a subset of values for unlicensed ~~(or enabled DBTW)~~ cases. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | In principle, we are OK with Proposal 1.4-1 except the last bullet “Values of ‘n’ shall not be all consecutive integer values”. We think it may not be necessary to reserve UL slots within a 960 kHz SSB bust in licensed spectrum. However, it may be required to reserve UL slots within a 480 kHz SSB burst in unlicensed spectrum as the total potential length of latter (considering the slide within DBTW) can be much higher than the potential length of the former. We prefer the FFS for the last bullet:For 480kHz/960kHz SSB:* first symbols of the candidate SSB have index {X, Y} + 14\*n, where index 0 corresponds to the first symbol of the first slot in a half-frame
	+ value of X and Y are identical for 480kHz and 960kHz
		- FFS: exact value of X and Y
	+ ~~FFS:~~ values of n for 480kHz and 960kHz
		- FFS: whether number of values for ‘n’ depend on licensed/unlicensed operation (or alternatively enablement/disablement of DBTW)
		- FFS: exact values of ‘n’ for each SCS
		- Values of ‘n’ for licensed (or disabled DBTW) cases shall be strictly a subset of values for unlicensed (or enabled DBTW) cases.
		- FFS: Values of ‘n’ shall not be all consecutive integer values (i.e. non-candidate SSB slots are positioned every few candidate SSB slots)
			* ~~FFS:~~ pattern for non-candidate SSB slots
 |
| Apple  | We support proposal 1.4-1.  |
| InterDigital | We support with LGE’s updated proposal.  |
| WILUS | We support proposal 1.4-1. |
| vivo | We support LG’s updated proposal. Further down selection could be waited until RAN4 reply the LS on beam switching time. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | At this stage, it is difficult to say whether we support Proposal 1.4-1 or 1.4-2, since the SSB pattern design still depends on the response of RAN4. We agree with LGE that two proposals can be merged into one proposal and listed as two options. |
| Spreadtrum | We support proposal 1.4-1 |
| Nokia | We are OK with proposal 1.4-1. As it is unlikely that we can fit UL symbols to the slot (with SSBs) due to DL-UL switching time, it would seem preferable to preserve more symbols for the PDCCHs. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support proposal 1.4-1, also fine with LGE’s suggestion to combine both proposals |
| Mediatek | We prefer to use legacy patterns as much as possible. So we support proposal 1.4-2 and LGE’s updated proposal. |
| Futurewei | We support Proposal 1.4-2 and we can compromise for LGE merge suggestion  |
| Qualcomm2 | We support Proposal 1.4-1. Proposal 1.4-2 assumes back-to-back SSBs, however, RAN1 did not conclude yet on whether beam switching gaps are needed in the SSB pattern. Hence we cannot agree to Proposal 1.4-2 as it precludes the beam switching gaps needs which is still not concluded. |
| Samsung2 | We support proposal 1.4-1, and this is our comment on why 120 kHz SSB pattern is not proper for 480/960 kHz (regardless of the beam switching time). The design of SSB pattern in Rel-15 considers reserving symbols for CORESET (symbol #0 and #1) and UL transmission (symbol #12 and #13), and the SCS of CORESET and UL transmission is 60 kHz or 120 kHz when the SCS of SSB is 120 or 240 kHz in FR2. From above figure, it’s clear that in order to reserve symbol #0, 1, 12, 13 in 60 kHz and 120 kHz, the only choice of SSB is as in the pattern supported in Rel-15 FR2, but such limitation is not needed for 52.6 to 71 GHz, since there is no need to multiple 240 kHz data with 480 kHz SSB. The key issue of this pattern is, symbol #7 in both slots are occupied by SSB, which has a conflict with using symbol #7 as starting symbol for type0-PDCCH as configured in MIB. On the other hand, SSB pattern case A and C is more proper for reserving symbols for CORESET and UL transmission with the same numerology. For the sake of progress, we are ok to list both options for further discussion.  |
| Intel | We support Proposal 1.4-1. |
| CATT | we support proposal 1.4-2 to minimize the potential specification work. |
| Convida Wireless | We are ok with Proposal 1.4-1. |

#### **2nd Round Discussion Summary:**

The following is a summary of company preferences:

* Supporting companies of 1.4-1:
	+ Samsung, Qualcomm, Docomo, Huawei, HiSilicon, Apple, Spreadtrum, Nokia, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, Intel, Convida
* Supporting companies of 1.4-2:
	+ LGE, Ericsson, Mediatek, Futurewei, CATT
* Supporting companies to combine 1.4-1 and 1.4-2 and leave the final decision open:
	+ Interdigital, vivo, ZTE, Sanechips

#### **3rd Round Discussion:**

Moderator has added Proposal 1.4-3 which merges the two proposals as LGE suggested. Remove the language on licensed vs unlicensed as moderator assumes the difference of ‘n’ could be dependent on DBTW usage or whether licensed or unlicensed is used. Moderator assumes LBT operation is more generic. However, if companies have better description, please suggest.

##### **Proposal 1.4-3)**

For 480kHz/960kHz SSB:

* ALT 1) first symbols of the candidate SSB have index {X, Y} + 14\*n, where index 0 corresponds to the first symbol of the first slot in a half-frame
	+ value of X and Y are identical for 480kHz and 960kHz
		- FFS: exact value of X and Y
* ALT 2) first symbols of the candidate SSB have index {4, 8, 16,20} + 28\*n, where index 0 corresponds to the first symbol of the first slot in a half-frame
* values of n for 480kHz and 960kHz for ALT 1 and 2
	+ FFS: whether number of values for ‘n’ depend on LBT operation (i.e. LBT vs no-LBT)
	+ FFS: exact values of ‘n’ for each SCS
	+ Values of ‘n’ for one mode of operation shall be strictly a subset of values for another mode of operation, if two mode of operation exist for number of candidate SSBs
	+ FFS: whether values of ‘n’ shall not be all consecutive integer values (i.e. non-candidate SSB slots are positioned every few candidate SSB slots)

Please comment further on Proposal 1.4-3.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| DOCOMO | Assuming whether ALT1 or ALT2 needs to be determined now is moderator’s intention, we are supportive of Proposal 1.4-3 with ALT1.  |
| Nokia | Like noted by DOCOMO it would be good to clarify if the Alt1 and Alt2 are for further discussion/down selection. With that assumption we are OK with proposal 1.4-3, (with preference to Alt1) |
| LG Electronics | We support Proposal 1.4-3. |
| vivo | We support Proposal 1.4-3 |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine for it |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Support Proposal 1.4-3. |
| Intel | We support Proposal 1.4-3.Although we’re ok with the last FFS bullet, i.e., ‘FFS: whether values of ‘n’ shall not be all consecutive integer values (i.e. non-candidate SSB slots are positioned every few candidate SSB slots)’, we think it is unnecessary since we have the more general FFS bullet, i.e., ‘FFS: exact values of ‘n’ for each SCS’, under which we assume both consecutive and non-consecutive values of ‘n’ are on the table as possible options. |
| Samsung | We support the proposal.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are fine with 1.4-3. |
| Apple  | Support Proposal 1.4-3.  |
| Qualcomm | We still think Alt 2 is not in line with the current RAN1 discussions as we did not conclude yet on the beam switching gaps. May be something like this would help cover all grounds at this point:* *first symbols of the candidate SSB have index {X(1), … , X(m)} + 14\*n, where index 0 corresponds to the first symbol of the first slot in a half-frame*
	+ *value of X(x), where x=1,…,m, are identical for 480kHz and 960kHz*
		- *FFS: value of m (i.e., how many SSBs in a slot)*
		- *FFS: exact value of X(x)*
 |
| Futurewei | We are OK with the proposal 1.4-3.  |
| OPPO | support |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine with the proposal 1.4-3 |
| Moderator | To Qualcomm,The intent from myside was not to leave open for all possibility, but try to make further progress, if possible as mentioned by Docomo and other down select in this meeting. Unless Qualcomm’s preference to have SSB pattern defined across pair of slots, it might be better to not list them. |

#### **3rd Round Discussion Summary (concluded):**

Most companies seem to be ok with Proposal 1.4-3. Suggest discussion Proposal 1.4-3 in GTW with the goal to down-select if possible.

<Moderator will copy the agreement from GTW here>

Agreement has been made in GTW, so moderator assumes this issue is close for RAN1 #105-e.

### 2.1.5 CORESET#0 Configuration

* From [2] Huawei, HiSilicon:
	+ Support only {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET#0 for Type0-PDCCH} SCS equal to {120, 120} kHz in 52.6GHz to 71GHz spectrum.
	+ CORESET#0 with 96 PRB can be configured to make full use of allowed transmit power at least for operation with shared spectrum.
	+ Support the following CORESET#0 RB offsets values for {SSB, CORESET#0} SCS={120, 120} kHz:
		- 24 RB and 48 RB CORESET#0: the same as supported values in Table 13-8 of 38.213
		- 96 RB CORESET#0: 0, 38, 76 RBs for multiplexing pattern 1 and -20 (-21) RBs when for multiplexing pattern 3.
* From [3] vivo:
	+ The following SSB-Coreset 0 multiplexing patterns are supported for each SCS pair:
		- (120K, 120K): Pattern 1, Pattern 3
		- (480K, 480K): Pattern 1, Pattern 3
		- (960K, 960K): Pattern 1, Pattern 3
		- (960K, 480K): Pattern 1, Pattern 2
	+ To save more bits, the CORESET design of un-licensed band operation from 52.6GHz to 71GHz can re-use the design criterion in NR-U, which occupies as much bandwidth as possible in the frequency domain.
* From [5] Nokia, NSB:
	+ Support providing CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH configuration for 480kHz and 960kHz kHz SCS SSB transmission in NR bands ranging between 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz.
	+ Consider supporting at least SSB and CORESET multiplexing pattern 1 for {480, 480} case. Pending on the UE minimum BW capability, consider also SSB and CORESET multiplexing pattern 2 or 3.
	+ Consider supporting at least SSB and CORESET multiplexing pattern 1 for {960, 960} case.
	+ Consider supporting pattern 1 and pattern 2 for {240,120} case.
	+ For CORESET#0 with 120kHz sub-carrier spacing, consider supporting also N\_{RB}^{CORESET}={96}. In case SSB and Type0 CORESET multiplexing pattern 1 removing option of N\_{RB}^{CORESET}={24} could be considered.
	+ For SSB and CORESET#0 with 480kHz sub-carrier spacing, support following options:
		- For multiplexing pattern1
		- For multiplexing pattern2 or 3 (if supported)
	+ For CORESET#0 with 480kHz sub-carrier spacing, support
	+ For SSB and CORESET#0 with 960kHz sub-carrier spacing, support for multiplexing pattern 1
	+ For CORESET#0 with 960kHz sub-carrier spacing, support
	+ For SSB with 240kHz sub-carrier spacing and CORESET#0 with 120kHz sub-carrier spacing, support following options:
* From [7] CATT:
	+ Multiplexing pattern 2 or 3 can be used for further multiplexing SSB/CORSET#0 with periodic CSI-RS/paging PDCCH&PDSCH in frequency.
	+ For SSB and CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH with 120 KHz SCS, support the following combinations of SSB/CORESET multiplexing pattern, number of RB and symbols for CORESET.
		- {mux pattern 1, 48 PRB CORESET, 1 symbol CORESET}
		- {mux pattern 1, 48 PRB CORESET, 2 symbol CORESET}
		- {mux pattern 3, 48 PRB CORESET, 2 symbol CORESET}
* From [8] Qualcomm:
	+ For non-initial access where SSB does configure Type-0 PDCCH and timing of the SSB is known to the UE (within limits defined in Table 7.6.4-2 of TS 38.133): support SCS = 480/960 kHz
	+ consider the following SSB and CORESET0 SCS combinations:
		- SSB SCS = 120 kHz, CORESET0 SCS = 120, 480, 960 kHz
		- If SSB SCS = 240 kHz is supported, support CORESET0 SCS = 120, 480, 960 kHz
		- If SSB SCS = 480/960 kHz is supported for non-initial access where SSB does configure Type-0 PDCCH and timing of the SSB is known to the UE, support CORESET0 SCS = SSB SCS
	+ consider ways to have 2 bits (1 extra bit compared to FR2) to indicate the common SCS in the SSB structure or contents in case more than 2 values for the common SCS are allowed
	+ NR Rel-16 SSB/CORESET0 multiplexing pattern 1 design may be reused with possibly some changes to the table (e.g., the need for < 2.5 ms options for the start of the CORESET0 wrt frame boundary) which depends on the outcome of the SSB pattern design
	+ SSB/CORESET0 multiplexing pattern 2:
		- For the 240 kHz + 120 kHz combination (if supported): reuse the same design as in NR Rel-16
		- For the 120 kHz + 480/960 kHz combination (if supported): the CORESET0 symbols may be placed in the gap symbols between the SSBs (similar to the existing NR Rel-16 design)
	+ NR Rel-16 SSB/CORESET0 multiplexing pattern 3 design may be reused for the valid combinations of 120 + 120 kHz, 480 + 480 kHz, and 960 + 960 kHz
	+ consider introducing an SSB/CORESET0 multiplexing pattern for higher SCS SSB (480 and 960 kHz), where a time domain fixed location for the CORESET0 and SIB1 is considered
	+ consider introducing an SSB/CORESET0 multiplexing pattern for higher SCS SSB (480 and 960 kHz), where TDM grouping of the SSB and the corresponding CORESET0/SIB1 is considered
* From [10] ZTE, Sanechips:
	+ The following multiplexing patterns for three approved SCS combinations of SSB and Type0-PDCCH can be considered for Rel-17 NR above 52.6 GHz. Other SCS combinations could be precluded.
		- (SSB, Type0-PDCCH): SCS (120 kHz, 120 kHz) Multiplexing patterns: 1, 3
		- (SSB, Type0-PDCCH): SCS (480 kHz, 480 kHz) Multiplexing patterns: 1, 3
		- (SSB, Type0-PDCCH): SCS (960 kHz, 960 kHz) Multiplexing patterns: 1, 3
	+ For {SSB, CORESET#0 for Type0-PDCCH} SCS = {120, 120} kHz, even though RAN4 has agreed the minimum CBW is increased to 100 MHz, at least SSB and CORESET#0 multiplexing patterns, number of RBs for CORESET#0, number of symbols (duration of CORESET#0) that are supported in Rel-15/16 should still be supported.
* From [11] Intel:
	+ Support CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH configuration indication in MIB of SSB for all supported SSB SCS.
	+ Consider only same SCS for SSB and CORESET#0 (configured by MIB) for 480 and 960 kHz SCS.
* From [16] Samsung:
	+ For CORESET#0
		- Support SSB with 240/480/960 kHz for initial and non-initial access with support of CORESET0/Type0-PDCCH configuration in the MIB.
			* SSB time domain candidate resource pattern (within a slot or pair of slots) for 480 and 960kHz SSB are identical
			* only 1 CORESTE#0/Type0-PDCCH SCS supported for each SSB SCS
		- It is assumed that RAN4 supports a channelization design which results in the total number of synchronization raster entries in the 57 – 71 GHz band no larger than [400] (Note: the total number of synchronization raster entries in FR2 for band n259 is 344). If the assumption cannot be satisfied, it’s up to RAN4 to decide which of 240/480/960 kHz SCS are supported for initial access of such band.
		- RAN1 prioritizes time-domain multiplex of SSB and CORESET0 to minimize the number of needed synchronization raster entries.
		- Supporting 480 kHz SCS and 960 kHz SCS for SSB are UE capabilities:
			* UE is not expected to support 480 kHz SCS for SSB if it doesn’t support 480 kHz SCS for data/control channels.
			* UE is not expected to support 960 kHz SCS for SSB if it doesn’t support 960 kHz SCS for data/control channels.
		- Send an LS to RAN2 and RAN4.
	+ For SS/PBCH block with 120 kHz SCS,
		- only support CORESET#0 SCS as 120 kHz;
		- additional CORESET#0 RB offsets are needed;
		- support 96 RB as the number of RBs for CORESET#0.
	+ For SS/PBCH block with 480 kHz SCS and 960 kHz,
		- only support CORESET#0 SCS same as SS/PBCH block SCS;
		- support at least the same SS/PBCH block and CORESET#0 multiplexing patterns, number of RBs for CORESET#0, and number of symbols as in 120 kHz SCS;
		- support 96 RB as the number of RBs for CORESET#0;
		- Further study the RB offset based on RAN4 design of channel and synchronization rasters.
* From [17] MediaTek:
	+ CORESET#0 should have the same SCS as SSB in initial access.
* From [21] Interdigital:
	+ Consider other means to convey the CORESET#0 and Type0-PDCCH to UE to avoid BWP and SCS switching.
	+ Consider introducing the parameters for the CORESET#0 and Type0-PDCCH, where the time and frequency allocations and the multiplexing patterns are (pre)configured in fixed settings
* From [23] Sharp:
	+ Regarding {SSB, CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH} SCS combination of {120, 120} kHz, in principle reuse the CORESET#0 configuration table of FR2. The motivations of removing/adding/modifying row(s) should be justified.
* From [25] NTT Docomo:
	+ When new SCS(s) is supported for SSB and a single numerology is used for both SSB and CORESET#0/SIB1, at least TDM between SSB and CORESET#0/SIB1 can be supported.
	+ In case of TDM between SSB and CORESET#0 PDCCH/SIB1 PDSCH, support different structure(s) of TDM than the ones supported in Rel-15/-16 NR.
		- E.g., a group of SSB/CORESET#0 PDCCH/SIB1 PDSCH, which are associated with the same QCL, is allocated within a slot
	+ When the supported SCS for SSB in initial access case is limited compared to non-initial access cases, mixed numerology between SSB and CORESET#0/SIB1 should be supported.
	+ When lower SCS is used for SSB compared with that used for CORESET#0/SIB1, FDM between SSB and SIB1 PDSCH such as in pattern 2 can be considered.
* From [26] Charter:
	+ For the case where SSB location and SCS are explicitly provided to the UE (non-initial access) and SSB configures Type-0 PDCCH, support 480 kHz and 960 kHz numerologies for the SSB.
* From [27] WILUS:
	+ Regarding the multiplexing between SSB and CORESET#0/RMSI-PDSCH, after agreeing new SCSs for SSB above all, it should be decided which combinations and multiplexing patterns are supported for NR operation from 52.6GHz to 71GHz.
	+ We propose that SS/PBCH block and CORESET#0/RMSI can be multiplexed in TDM/FDM within a slot considering multi-beam operation and it can be closely located without the gap between SSB and CORESET#0/RMSI for not allowing any in-between channel access operation in the unlicensed band.

#### Summary of Discussions

* Only support same SCS between SSB and CORESET#0/Type-PDCCH
	+ Huawei/Hilicon (for 120kHz SSB which is the only currently agreed SSB for initial access), Intel, ZTE, Sanechip, Samsung (for 480/960kHz), Mediatek, Docomo (for new SCS)
* Support only 1 SCS for CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH for each SSB SCS
	+ Samsung
* Support CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH configuration for 480/960kHz SSB
	+ vivo, Nokia, NSB, Intel, Qualcomm, Samsung, Charter
* Moderator suggest to discuss further on following issues:
	+ Whether or not support CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH configuration for 480/960kHz SSB
	+ Any updates/changes to existing CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH configuration for 120kHz SSB (if needed)
	+ Supported multiplexing patterns and CORESET#0/Type-PDCCH parameters for 480/960kHz (if supported)

#### **1st Round Discussion:**

Moderator asks companies to provide input on the following:

* Q1) Any updates/changes to existing CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH configuration for 120kHz SSB? If so what are some of the aspects that need consideration for the update/changes
* Q2) Whether Support CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH configuration for 480/960kHz SSB
* Q3) if supported in Q1, supported multiplexing patterns and CORESET#0/Type-PDCCH parameters for 480/960kHz
* Q4) Support only 1 SCS for CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH for each SSB SCS agreeable?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| DOCOMO | Q1) If 480/960 kHz SCS is not supported for SSB during initial access, we prefer to support 480 and/or 960 kHz CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH configuration in addition to 120 kHz SCS for SSB with 120 kHz SCS. Q2) We strongly support it as it achieves ANR/CGI reporting which is essential from operator’s perspective. Q3) TDM should be baseline. FDM can be considered but it needs to be carefully considered in terms of coverage of CORESET#0/SIB1. Q4) it highly depend on other aspects.  |
| LG Electronics | * Q1) Any updates/changes to existing CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH configuration for 120kHz SSB? If so what are some of the aspects that need consideration for the update/changes
	+ Existing configuration seems sufficient. However, if additional configuration is required, then that configuration can be just added with current configurations kept.
* Q2 & Q3
	+ They depend on the decision in proposals from Sections 2.1.1 and 2.1.2.
* Q4) Support only 1 SCS for CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH for each SSB SCS agreeable?
	+ We agree to support only 120 kHz CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH for 120 kHz SSB SCS.
 |
| Samsung | 1. Yes.
* The number of RBs for CORESET#0 can consider 96 RBs, since the carrier bandwidth is much larger than FR2.
* The RB offset for CORESET#0 needs to be reconsidered (after RAN4 finalizes the channel and sync raster design), since the minimum channel bandwidth is increased from FR2.

2) Yes. 3) * Other than the RB offsets, the other parameters for CORESET#0 configuration for 480 and 960 kHz can reuse 120 kHz SSB.
* Other than the offset O, the other parameters for Type0-PDCCH configuration for 480 and 960 kHz can reuse 120 kHz SSB.

4) Yes.  |
| Qualcomm | Q1) * For SSB + CORESET0 = 120 kHz + 120 kHz, no change is needed
* Support SSB + CORESET0 = 120 kHz + 480/960 kHz (to support a single numerology deployment using 120 kHz SCS SSB (and 240 kHz SCS SSB if supported) and 480/960 kHz SCS data/control)

Q2) Depends on outcome for 2.1.1 and 2.1.2Q3) Depending on SSB SCS. Recommend that we first agree on the SSB + CORESET0 combinations, then return to thisQ4) No. We would like to consider SSB + CORESET0 = { 120 + 480/960 and 120 + 120 } |
| Mediatek | Q1) We support only (SSB SCS, CORESET #0 SCS)=(120, 120)Q2) No Q3) We are not sure whether 480/960 kHz means CORESET SCS or SSB with 480/960 kHz SCS?Q4) At least for SSB SCS=120 kHz, we don’t see strong need or obvious benefit to support CORESET SCS other than 120 kHz |
| ZTE, Sanechips | For Q1), for {SSB, CORESET#0 for Type0-PDCCH} SCS = {120, 120} kHz, at least SSB and CORESET#0 multiplexing patterns, number of RBs for CORESET#0, number of symbols (duration of CORESET#0) that are supported in Rel-15/16 should still be supported. If additional configuration (e.g. introducing 96 PRBs) is proved to be feasible, the reserved bits can be used for it.For Q2), we think “yes” but depending on the decision in section 2.1.1 and 2.1.2.For Q3), depends on the decision in section 2.1.1 and 2.1.2.For Q4), yes. We support CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH is applied with a same SCS as the associated SSB SCS, e.g. * (SSB, Type0-PDCCH): SCS (120 kHz, 120 kHz)
* (SSB, Type0-PDCCH): SCS (480 kHz, 480 kHz)
* (SSB, Type0-PDCCH): SCS (960 kHz, 960 kHz)
 |
| Nokia | Q1) For 120kHz CORESET#0 we could consider supporting also ={96}. Need of additional/different offsets are also pending on the RAN4 agreements.Q2) Yes, we see this important to enable ANR/PCI confusion resolution.Q3) Consider supporting at least SSB and CORESET multiplexing pattern 1. Support for multiplexing pattern 2 or 3 (assuming still single scs for CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH and SSB) could be further considered.Q4) While this depends on the other agreements, we think that if CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH for 480/960kHz SSB is supported, we could assume single scs. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Q1) In addition to the existing {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET#0 for Type0-PDCCH} for {120, 120} kHz SCS, support CORESET#0 with 96 PRB for {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET#0 for Type0-PDCCH} for {120, 120} kHz SCS.Q2) No. Based on the current agreements, 480/960kHz SSBs do not configure Type-0 PDCCH. There is no need to configure CORESET#0 for Type0-PDCCH for CGI-report. If CGI report for 480/960 kHz is necessary, it can be supported using dedicated signaling. Q3) For the additional CORESET#0 with 96 PRB for {SS/PBCH Block, CORESET#0 for Type0-PDCCH} for {120, 120} kHz SCS, support CORESET0 RB offset with 0, 38, 76 RBs for multiplexing pattern 1 and -20 (-21) RBs when for multiplexing pattern 3.Q4) For 120 kHz SSB, support only one 1 SCS for CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH equal to 120 kHz.For 480/960 kHz SSB, do not support any CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH.  |
| OPPO | Q1) No. For 120kHz SSB, we prefer to only support (SSB 120kHz, CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH 120kHz). Q2) Depends on the outcome of section 2.1.1 and 2.1.2.Q3) Q4) Yes.  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Futurewei | Q1) for {SSB, CORESET#0 for Type0-PDCCH} SCS = {120, 120} kHz, no changes are necessaryQ2) depends on the outcome of the decision in section 2.1.1 and 2.1.2Q3) depends on the outcome of the decision in section 2.1.1 and 2.1.2Q4)  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Q1) No changes needed for 120/120kHz SSB / CORESET0 multiplexingQ2) yesQ3) Agreements on the different mux patterns of SSB + CORESET0 should be met firstQ4) We prefer single SCS for both SSB and CORESET#0 |
| Interdigital | Q1) We support keeping the existing configurations for the 120kHz SCS.Q2) Yes.  |
| CATT | Q1) If 480/960 kHZ is not supported for initial access, then we need to further discuss if 480/960kHz CORESET#0 Q2) Depends on the outcome of the decision previously, for example this may be very important to support ANRQ3) Depends on the outcome of the decision previouslyQ4) Depends on the outcome of the decision previously, but if only 120kHz is supported for initial access there may be a need to consider {120,480/960}.  |
| Intel | Q1) Reuse existing configurations for {SCS SSB, SCS CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH} = 120kHz. Additional configurations could be further discussed.Q2) SupportQ3) Pattern 1 is prioritized first. Pattern 3 could be also considered then.Q4) Yes. The same SCS for SSB and CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH |
| vivo | Q1) * For SSB + CORESET0 = 120 kHz + 120 kHz un licensed band, the CORESET0 RB number can be increased.
* Whether support SSB + CORESET0 = 120 kHz + 480/960 kHz can FFS.

Q2) Yes, CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH configuration for 480/960kHz SSB is needed to support ANR. Q3) It depends on the results from Sections 2.1.1 and 2.1.2. The design of multiplexing pattern can reuse the design in FR2. Q4) It depends on whether 480/960K SSB could be used for initial access or not. If only 960K SSB is supported for initial access, it is still beneficial to consider SSB + CORESET0 = 960 kHz + 480 kHz. |
| Ericsson | Q1) We support reuse of the existing (120,120) tables in 38.213 Section 13* Whether or not new SSB-CORESET0 offsets are needed (still an FFS item) depends on the RAN4 sync raster design. If the existing FR2 sync raster granularity (17.28 MHz) is maintained, now new offsets are needed to support 100 MHz minimum bandwidth. However, if the sync raster granularity is modified (e.g., every 2nd sync raster point = 34.56 MHz granularity), then an additional offset is needed for SSB-CORESET0 multiplexing pattern 1. The needed additional offset is 2 RBs for the case of 48 RB CORESET0 (Rel-15/16 supports only the value 14 RBs).
* Some companies have suggested support for 96 RB CORESET; however, after investigation of link budgets between various signals/channels, we found that RMSI PDSCH is the limiting channel amongst SSB, Type0-PDCCH, RMSI PDSCH. Hence, increasing the number of RBs for Type0-PDCCH is not helpful in terms of coverage, so we don’t see the motivation.

Q2) This topic is already treated in Section 2.1.1 and 2.1.2Q3) Recommended we return to this once there is more clarity. In principle, however, we should strive to reuse as much as possible from the (120,120) designQ4) Yes  |
| Sony | Q1) If 480/960 kHz SCS SSB is not supported for initial access, 480/960 kHz CORESET#0 may need to be considered. If 480/960 kHz SCS SSB is supported for initial access, no need to change for CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH configuration for 120kHz SSB.Q2) Our preference is yes, but it depends on outcome in section 2.1.1 and 2.1.2Q3) Depends on outcome in section 2.1.1 and 2.1.2Q4) Yes, we prefer single numerology operation, but it depends on outcome in section 2.1.1 |
| WILUS | Q1) Reuse existing configurations for {SCS SSB, SCS CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH} = 120kHz. Additional configurations could be further discussed.Q2) Support but it depends on outcome of the decision in section 2.1.1 and 2.1.2.Q3) Depends on the outcome of the decision in section 2.1.1 and 2.1.2.Q4) Yes.  |
| Spreadtrum | Q1) Open to discussionQ2) YesQ3) multiplexing pattern 1 and 3 are prioritizedQ4) Yes |

#### **1st Round Discussion Summary:**

* Q1) Any updates/changes to existing CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH configuration for 120kHz SSB? If so what are some of the aspects that need consideration for the update/changes
	+ Support 96 PRB: Samsung, ZTE, Sanechips, Nokia, Huawei, HiSilicon
		- Do not see a need: Ericsson
	+ RB offset for CORESET#0: Samsung
	+ Support {120, 480} and {120, 960} SCS pair for SSB and CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH: Qualcomm
	+ Only support {120, 120} SCS pair for SSB and CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH: Mediatek
* Q2) Whether Support CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH configuration for 480/960kHz SSB
	+ Yes: Docomo, Samsung, ZTE, Sanechips, Nokia, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, Interdigital, Intel, Spreadtrum, WILUS
	+ No: Mediatek, Huawei, HiSilicon
* Q3) if supported in Q1, supported multiplexing patterns and CORESET#0/Type-PDCCH parameters for 480/960kHz
	+ TDM (mux pattern 1): Docomo, Nokia, Intel, Spreadtrum, WILUS
	+ FDM (mux pattern 3): Spreadtrum
	+ Reuse configuration (other than RB offset) from 120kHz Case: Samsung
	+ FFS: Ericsson
* Q4) Support only 1 SCS for CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH for each SSB SCS agreeable?
	+ FFS: Docomo
	+ Yes: LGE (for 120kHz), Samsung, Mediatek(for 120kHz), ZTE, Sanechips, Nokia, Huawei, HiSilicon (for 120kHz), OPPO, Motorola Mobility, Intel, Spreadtrum, Ericsson, WILUS
	+ No: Qualcomm, CATT(if only 120kHz is supported for initial access)

#### **2nd Round Discussion:**

Discussion on support of CORESET#0\Type0-PDCCH for 480/960kHz will be needed before further discussion.

For 120kHz, among the issues additional support for 96 PRB CORESET seems to be popular suggestion. However, there was at least 1 company who did not think such configuration was needed. Also supporting only 1 SCS for CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH for a given SSB SCS seems to be something that has large support. Moderator has formulated two proposals based on inputs received.

##### **Proposal 1.5-1)**

* For 120kHz SSB, additionally support 96 PRB CORESET#0 configuration(s).
	+ FFS which multiplexing pattern (i.e. 1, 2, and/or 3) and number of symbols (i.e. 1, 2, and/or 3) for 96 PRB CORESET#0 will be used with.

##### **Proposal 1.5-2)**

* RAN1 to support only 1 SCS for CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH for a given SSB SCS

Please provide further comments on proposal 1.5-1 and 1.5-2.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Samsung | We support Proposal 1.5-1. One comment on the FFS, the RB offset should also be added as part of the FFS to make the design complete. We support Proposal 1.5-2.  |
| Qualcomm | We support Proposal 1.5-1We do not support Proposal 1.5-2 (we propose to consider SSB + CORESET0 = 120 kHz + 480/960 kHz (to support a single numerology deployment using 120 kHz SCS SSB (and 240 kHz SCS SSB if supported) and 480/960 kHz SCS data/control)) |
| LG Electronics | For Proposal 1.5-1, even though we are open to discuss the possibility of adding 96 PRBs for CORESET#0 configuration, we don’t think adding 96 PRBs is sufficiently justified. Minimum and maximum channel bandwidth for 120 kHz is the same as in Rel-15. In that case, what is the main motivation to add 96 PRBs for CORESET#0 configuration?We support Proposal 1.5-2. |
| DOCOMO | We support Proposal 1.5-1. We think min. CBW is different between Rel-15 FR2 and Rel-17 52.6 – 71 GHz. Rel-15 FR2 is 50 MHz, while Rel-17 52.6 – 71 GHz is 100 MHz according to RAN4 agreement. Hope it clarifies the motivation somehow. We share QC view on Proposal 1.5-2. If all SCSs 120, 480 and 960 kHz are not supported for SSB during initial access, to access 480 and 960 kHz faster, we believe multiplexing with different numerology would be beneficial. |
| LG Electronics2 | For Proposal 1.5-1, it is true that min. CBW is increased to 100 MHz for Rel-17, but it cannot justify introducing 96 PRB (occupying 138 MHz) CORESET#0 for Rel-17 NR 52.6-71 GHz. |
| Ericsson | * We do not support Proposal 1.5.1
	+ As we commented previously, we have investigated link budgets between various signals/channels, and we have found that RMSI PDSCH is the limiting channel amongst SSB, Type0-PDCCH, RMSI PDSCH. Hence, increasing the number of RBs for Type0-PDCCH is not helpful in terms of coverage. We share the view with LGE that there is insufficient justification for supporting 96 RBs.
	+ Furthermore, 96 RBs @120 kHz translates to 138 MHz which exceeds the 100 MHz minimum bandwidth.
* We support Proposal 1.5-2
 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support Proposal 1.5-1.We do not support Proposal 1.5-2. Based on current agreements, CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH for 480/960 kHz SSB is not supported. We can revisit 1.5-2 after discussions related to 2.1.2 are finalized. |
| Apple  | We support Proposal 1.5-2  |
| WILUS | We support Proposal 1.5-1. |
| vivo | We support Proposal 1.5-1.  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | For Proposal 1.5-1, we think for SCS{SSB, CORESET#0} = {120, 120} kHz, at least SSB and CORESET#0 multiplexing patterns, number of RBs for CORESET#0, number of symbols (duration of CORESET#0) that are supported in Rel-15/16 should still be supported. On the basis of above, we are open to introduce 96 PRBs if it is proved to be feasible.We support Proposal 1.5-2. |
| Spreadtrum | We support Proposal 1.5-2. |
| Nokia | We are OK with proposal 1.5-1, with similar comment as Samsung that we need FFS for the possible need of adding offsets.Proposal 1.5-2 is bit dependent on the Section 2.1.1 conclusion, but we would support this for 120/480/960kHz SSB. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support Proposal 1.5-2 and agree with LGE regarding 1.5-1, that supporting 96 RBs for 120kHz needs to be sufficiently justified. |
| Mediatek | We support 1.5-2 and open to discuss 1.5-1.  |
| Futurewei | We support Proposal 1.5-2 |
| Samsung2 | To Ericsson, in initial cell search, CORESET#0 bandwidth is the maximum number of RB configurable for PDSCH of RMSI, so if there is a coverage issue, increasing the bandwidth of CORESET#0 is beneficial. To clarify some view on the minimum channel bandwith and UE’s minimum bandwidth in initial access. The determination of the maximum number RBs for CORESET#0 is nothing related to the minimum channel bandwidth, but related to the UE’s minimum bandwidth in initial access. The CORESET#0 configuration table is not only designed for minimum channel bandwidth, so there is no reasoning on limiting all the configurations within the minimum channel bandwidth. In Rel-15 FR2, the required UE bandwidth for initial access was assumed to be 100 MHz, which was the base for determining 48 as the maximum number of RBs for CORESER#0, but such assumption can be relaxed for 52.6 to 71 GHz, since the channels would be much wider.  |
| Intel | We support Proposal 1.5-2 |
| CATT | We agree with some other companies that supporting 96 RBs for 120kHz needs to be sufficiently justified. |
| Ericsson2 | Responding to Samsung2, our main point is not so much about the minimum bandwidth, but instead related to coverage during initial access. We have investigated link budgets between various signals/channels, and we have found that RMSI PDSCH is the limiting channel amongst SSB, Type0-PDCCH, RMSI PDSCH based on typical RMSI payloads. Hence, increasing the number of RBs for Type0-PDCCH is not helpful in terms of coverage, since RMSI PDSCH is still limiting. This link budget evaluation takes into account the regulatory power limits, chiefly in the US where extending the bandwidth beyond 100 MHz doesn't help since the conducted power is limited to 27 dBm. 96 RBs translates to 138 MHz which is clearly larger than 100 MHz.We still think that 96 RB CORESET0 is not motivated. |
| OPPO | We support Proposal 1.5-2. |

#### **2nd Round Discussion Summary:**

The following is a summary of company views:

* On Proposal 1.5-1
	+ Support: Samsung, Qualcomm, Docomo, WILUS, vivo, Nokia, Huawei, HiSilicon
	+ Do no support: LGE, Ericsson, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, CATT~~, Huawei, HiSilicon~~
* On Proposal 1.5-2
	+ Support: Samsung, LGE, Ericsson, Apple, Nokia, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, Mediatek, Futurewei, Intel, OPPO, ZTE, Sanechips
	+ Do not support: Qualcomm, Docomo, Huawei, HiSilicon

It seems view on Proposal 1.5-1 is split. Companies mentioned they do not see motivation for larger BW support. Given that this is something that is in addition to RAN1 agreements, moderator suggest companies supportive of the proposal to provide further information and continue discussions.

For Proposal 1.5-2, at least two companies thought it would be beneficial to include the additional SCS support for CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH for 120kHz SSB. Moderator suggests Qualcomm and Docomo to provide further information to convince the companies supportive of Proposal 1.5-2.

#### **3rd Round Discussion:**

Please comment further on Proposal 1.5-1 and Proposal 1.5-2.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| DOCOMO | For Proposal 1.5-1, our understanding is so far 24 and 48 PRBs are supported for CORESET#0 RBs for 120 kHz SCS, both of which would be less than 100 MHz, wouldn’t they? Even though SIB1 is more bottleneck, isn’t there any value to support additional RBs more than 48? For Proposal 1.5-2, at first, since this is also discussed for 480/960 kHz SCS in section 2.1.1, it could be better to restrict the focus within 120 kHz SCS case:* RAN1 to support only 1 SCS for CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH for ~~a given~~ SSB ~~SCS~~ with 120 kHz SCS

For above, we think it depends on the result at section 2.1.1. If both 480 khz and 960 kHz are supported for SSB during initial access (which may be hard to be agreed), we are fine with modified Proposal 1.5-2 above. Or if more than 1 SCS is supported for type0-PDCCH multiplexed with SSB with either 480 or 960 kHz SCS (which may also be hard to be agreed), we are also fine with above. Otherwise, 120 kHz SCS CORESET#0 will also need to be received by UE being operated under 480 or 960 kHz SCS. It may not a “perfect” single numerology operation, but can achieve less #changes of SCS.  |
| Nokia | Same position as earlier (support 1.5-1 and can agree to 1.5-2). As a note that the discussion/use is not only limited to unlicensed operation, thus supporting wider 96RB could be used in licensed operation to e.g. improve the RMSI coverage. |
| Spreadtrum | For Proposal 1.5-1), we need time to further check it.For Proposal 1.5-2), we support it. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Proposal 1.5-1 can be de-prioritized in this meeting until it is proved necessary.Support Proposal 1.5-2. |
| Intel | We support Proposal 1.5-1 and Proposal 1.5-2.Regarding Proposal 1.5-1, there is the following excerpt from TR38.807

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Frequency band [GHz] | Power/Magnetic Field Requirements | Purpose/Node Placement requirements | Additional Notes |
| 57 – 71 | Max avg. EIRP (82 – 2N) dBmMax peak EIRP (85 – 2N) dBm.N = max(0, 51 dBi – antenna-gain)If emission-BW is less than 100 MHz, max peak conducted output power is {500mW × emission-BW / 100MHz} [Note 1]Otherwise, max peak conducted output power is 500mW | Fixed outdoor equipment | Unlicensed. |
| Note 1: Emission bandwidth is defined as the instantaneous frequency range occupied by a steady state radiated signal with modulation, outside which the radiated power spectral density never exceeds 6 dB below the maximum radiated power spectral density in the band, as measured with a 100kHz resolution bandwidth spectrum analyzer. The center frequency must be stationary during the measurement interval, even if not stationary during normal operation (e.g., for frequency hopping devices). Peak transmitter conducted output power shall be measured with an RF detector that has a detection bandwidth that encompasses the 57-71GHz band and that has a video bandwidth of at least 10MHz. |

According to it, there is some power reduction of the max peak conducted output power for fixed outdoor equipment in the US if the BW is less than 100 MHz, and 96 PRB @ SCS 120 kHz allows us to avoid this power penalty. Actually, the similar issue arises in UL for PRACH preamble of L=139 and SCS 480 kHz. As we commented further, that’s the reason to support L=571 and SCS 480 kHz for PRACH. |
| Samsung | We support Proposal 1.5-1 and Proposal 1.5-2.As mentioned in the previous comment, adding 96 RB for CORESET#0 BW is beneficial for RMSI coverage (e.g. either larger number of RB in frequency domain, or saving number of symbols in time domain). Supporting single SCS for CORESET#0 for a given SSB SCS is for the simplicity of the design, and saving one bit in MIB for other purpose.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We noticed that our views was missing from FL’s 2nd Round Discussion Summary. We have added our views to the summary. We support 1.5-1 and not support 1.5-2.1.5-1: For operation with shared spectrum, both maximum transmission power limit and power spectrum density limit should be observed and to make full use of the transmit power, the CORESET#0 with 96 PRB (138.24 MHz bandwidth in 120 kHz SCS) should also be considered.1.5-2: We do not support Proposal 1.5-2. Based on current agreements, CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH for 480/960 kHz SSB is not supported. We can revisit 1.5-2 after discussions related to SSB SCS are finalized. |
| Qualcomm | Same comments as for Round 2 |
| Futurewei | We support Proposal 1.5-1 and Proposal 1.5-2. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support Proposal 1.5-2 |

#### **3rd Round Discussion Summary:**

Moderator has updated Proposal 1.5-2 based on Docomo’s comments.

##### **Proposal 1.5-1) (copy)**

* For 120kHz SSB, additionally support 96 PRB CORESET#0 configuration(s).
	+ FFS which multiplexing pattern (i.e. 1, 2, and/or 3) and number of symbols (i.e. 1, 2, and/or 3) for 96 PRB CORESET#0 will be used with.

##### **Proposal 1.5-3) update of Proposal 1.5-2**

* RAN1 to support only 1 SCS for CORESET#0/Type0-PDCCH for 120kHz SSB ~~a given SSB SCS~~

The following is updated company views:

* On Proposal 1.5-1
	+ Support: Samsung, Qualcomm, Docomo, WILUS, vivo, Nokia, Huawei, HiSilicon, Futurewei
	+ Do no support: LGE, Ericsson, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, CATT~~, Huawei, HiSilicon~~
	+ FFS: Spreadtrum, ZTE, Sanechips
* On Proposal 1.5-2
	+ Support: Samsung, LGE, Ericsson, Apple, Nokia, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, Mediatek, Futurewei, Intel, OPPO, ZTE, Sanechips
	+ Do not support: Qualcomm, Docomo, Huawei, HiSilicon

Looks like further discussion will be needed for both Proposals.

#### **4th Round Discussion (on-going):**

Please provide further comments on Proposal 1.5-1 and 1.5-3. Also comment if moderator has incorrectly captured your preferences in 3rd round summary.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Samsung | We support Proposal 1.5-1We are ok with Proposal 1.5-3 |

#### **4th Round Discussion Summary:**

TBD

### 2.1.5 Various other aspects on SSB Design

* From [2] Huawei, HiSilicon:
	+ For operation with shared spectrum and for 480 kHz and 960 kHz SSBs, indicate the 7th bit of the candidate SSB index by borrowing the 4th LSB of SFN in the PBCH payload. Indicate the 4th LSB of SFB in MIB payload.
* From [3] vivo:
	+ For initial cell search in 52.6-71GHz, a UE may assume that half frames with SSB occur with smaller period than FR2 (e.g. 5ms), or lower RAN4 requirement for the cell search time.
* From [4] Spreadtrum:
	+ The SSB-based TRS/CSI-RS validation can be supported.
* From [8] Qualcomm:
	+ For initial access, in cases where the SSB SCS is smaller than other channels’ SCS (e.g., PDCCH/PDSCH), consider WB DMRS or cell-specific TRS for further timing error corrections
		- For cell-specific TRS, consider studying the FD density needed
* From [21] Interdigital:
	+ Consider the enhancements to indicate the license regime in initial access operations for licensed/unlicensed overlapping spectrum in beyond 52.6GHz.
* From [22] Convida:
	+ SSB coverage enhancement should be studied for higher SCS.

#### Summary of Discussions

* Companies have provided discussion on considerations for SSB design.
	+ For operation with shared spectrum and for 480 kHz and 960 kHz SSBs, indicate the 7th bit of the candidate SSB index by borrowing the 4th LSB of SFN in the PBCH payload. Indicate the 4th LSB of SFB in MIB payload.
	+ For initial cell search in 52.6-71GHz, a UE may assume that half frames with SSB occur with smaller period than FR2 (e.g. 5ms), or lower RAN4 requirement for the cell search time.
	+ The SSB-based TRS/CSI-RS validation can be supported.
	+ For initial access, in cases where the SSB SCS is smaller than other channels’ SCS (e.g., PDCCH/PDSCH), consider WB DMRS or cell-specific TRS for further timing error corrections
		- For cell-specific TRS, consider studying the FD density needed
	+ Consider the enhancements to indicate the license regime in initial access operations for licensed/unlicensed overlapping spectrum in beyond 52.6GHz.
	+ SSB coverage enhancement should be studied for higher SCS.
* Moderator suggests discussing above listed issues further.

#### **1st Round Discussion:**

Moderator asks companies to provide input on the following issues:

* Support wideband DMRS or cell-specific TRS to aide timing error correction (for 120kHz SSB with 480 or 960kHz control/data transmission)
* Any changes to the default SSB periodicity to be assumed by the UE
* Methods to indicated licensed or unlicensed operation
	+ This may need to be discussed under channel access agenda

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Samsung | * Is it for IDLE mode only? Seems more discussion is needed for this topic.
* If DBTW is supported, the initial access performance may not be an issue. More discussion towards this seems needed.
* Different sync raster can be assigned for licensed and unlicensed band for initial access purpose, and network can explicit configure this information after initial access.
 |
| Qualcomm | * For initial access, in cases where the SSB SCS is smaller than other channels’ SCS (e.g., PDCCH/PDSCH), consider WB DMRS or cell-specific TRS for further timing error corrections (for cell-specific TRS, consider studying the FD density needed).
* No change to default SSB periodicity
* Distinction of licensed, unlicensed, or unlicensed but no LBT can be in SIB1 or later
 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Futurewei | * We support wideband DMRS or cell-specific TRS to aide timing error correction
* No change to the default SSB periodicity
 |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | * For initial access, we prefer a single numerology for SSB and data/control, hence no need for wideband DMRS
 |
| Interdigital | * We prefer a single numerology operation, so we don’t support wideband DMRS and TRS.
* We don’t see the need to introduce any changes
* Supporting different sync raster offsets would be a good option as for the indication of the license regime. If the different sync raster offsets are not available (e.g., to enable/disable DBTW), we can consider other options such as MIB.
 |
| vivo | * It depends on the discussion outcome on SSB SCS and initial DL BWP SCS
* We think the cell search complexity even for 120KHz SSB should be studied, e.g. frequency domain synchronization complexity. If 480K/960K SSB is agreed for initial access purpose, the buffering complexity should also be studied. Based on the outcome on the study, we may decide whether the change of default initial access is needed or not.
* Indication of licensed or unlicensed operation is needed and sync raster differentiation is a good way to achieve this.
 |
| Convida Wireless | * If SCS 480/960 KHz for SSB are supported, then coverage enhancement can be studied.
 |
| Ericsson | * Wideband DMRS/Cell Specific TRS
	+ We don't see a strong motivation for this, as during initial access performance should not require fine time/frequency tracking
	+ Furthermore, this seems like quite a large change
* Default SSB Periodicity
	+ No change to Rel-15/16 (i.e., 20 ms default periodicity is assumed)
* Methods to indicate licensed/unlicensed operation
	+ As we highlighted in Section 2.1.3, for initial access, it needs to be decided how to indicate LBT on/off. In the GTW it was agreed to discuss this in the channel access AI. The reason for the dependency on initial access is that the size of DCI 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by SI-RNTI (i.e., the Type0-PDCCH used to schedule PDSCH carrying SIB1) has a different size depending on shared/non-shared spectrum (see highlighted sentence in below extract from 38.212 Section 7.3.1.2.1. Hence two alternatives for handling this are:
1. the UE does 2 blind decodes assuming the 2 different sizes
2. LBT on/off is indicated in MIB so that the UE can avoid 2 blind decodes

Clearly, if solution (2) is adopted, one bit needs to be found in MIB for indicating LBT on/off in addition to bits for Q.Some companies have also suggested using a different set of sync raster points (SetA vs. SetB) for indicating LBT on/off. However, we point out that this can double the UE SSB search complexity, which is most likely not desirable from a UE implementation standpoint. Furthermore, this has a strong RAN4 dependence.--- Extract from 38.212 Section 7.3.1.2.1 --- The following information is transmitted by means of the DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by SI-RNTI:- Frequency domain resource assignment – bits-  is the size of CORESET 0 - Time domain resource assignment – 4 bits as defined in Clause 5.1.2.1 of [6, TS38.214]- VRB-to-PRB mapping – 1 bit according to Table 7.3.1.2.2-5- Modulation and coding scheme – 5 bits as defined in Clause 5.1.3 of [6, TS38.214], using Table 5.1.3.1-1- Redundancy version – 2 bits as defined in Table 7.3.1.1.1-2- System information indicator – 1 bit as defined in Table 7.3.1.2.1-2- Reserved bits – 17 bits for operation in a cell with shared spectrum channel access; otherwise 15 bits --- End extract --- |

#### **1st Round Discussion Summary:**

Companies are not in agreement on the open issues that were brought up and likely require further discussions.

#### **2nd Round Discussion:**

Looks like companies need to further discussion some of the other open issues that were brought up. Please continues to comment further on issues outlined in 1st round discussion.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Qualcomm | Re-iterating the same comments for 1st round:For initial access, in cases where the SSB SCS is smaller than other channels’ SCS (e.g., PDCCH/PDSCH), consider WB DMRS or cell-specific TRS for further timing error corrections (for cell-specific TRS, consider studying the FD density needed).  |
| LG Electronics | To Qualcomm,The motivation to change FD density of TRS seems to be valid only when SSB SCS is 120 kHz but SCS of initial BWP is 960 (or 480) kHz. If this is the case, it can be further discussed after we agree such kind of SCS combination.To Ericsson,We understand the concern due to DCI size misalignment, if LBT on or off is not indicated before a UE receives SIB1. So, Ericsson’s proposal is to indicate LBT on or off in MIB or prior to MIB. Is that correct understanding? We agree that LBT on or off needs to be signaled in MIB or prior to MIB. However, even though LBT on or off is signaled in SIB1, we think the problem can be figured out by UE assuming 17 bits for all cases in 60 GHz. |
| Ericsson | To LGE:Thank-you for sharing your views on this issue. Clearly, this issue needs to decided, since it potentially affects MIB design. In turn this affects if/how to indicate DBTW related parameters in MIB and DBTW on/off.To moderator:Given that there is a dependency of MIB/DBTW design on this issue, what is the moderator's recommendation on how to proceed (1) wait for decisions in the channel access AI before making further agreements in the initial access AI, or (2) discuss this issue in the initial access AI? |
| Moderator | To Ericsson:I think as long the issue is being discussed either channel access or initial access, I think it should be ok. What is important is that there is a potential issue identified and the issue is being resolved somehow in RAN1.In terms of which agenda item to discuss, we can get Chairman’s further guidance. Based on last guidance from Chairman, it was suggested to discuss support of specific feature in channel access, and discuss the details of the signaling in initial access.In hindsight, the discussion didn’t exactly pan out that way. So I suggest we continue the discussion. |

#### **2nd Round Discussion Summary:**

The item identified might not be the most prioritized issue for RAN1 #105-e and thus lack of discussion among companies. Moderator suggest to continue discussion to help companies to get better understanding, but de-prioritize the following issues for GTW discussion.

* Support wideband DMRS or cell-specific TRS to aide timing error correction (for 120kHz SSB with 480 or 960kHz control/data transmission)
* Any changes to the default SSB periodicity to be assumed by the UE
* Potential DCI size mis-alignment for DCI 1\_0 depending on whether LBT is utilized or not.

#### **3rd Round Discussion (on-going):**

Please continue the discussions, and moderator will try to summarize issues.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Intel | We agree with FL assessment on these items after the 2nd round of discussions. |
| Samsung | We agree with FL’s assessment.  |
| moderator | Please continue discussion in this table. |
|  |  |

#### **3rd Round Discussion Summary:**

TBD

## 2.2 PRACH Aspects

### 2.2.1 Supported PRACH Numerology

* From [1] Futurwei:
	+ For initial access and non-initial access use cases, support 120kHz PRACH SCS with sequence length L=571, 1151 (in addition to L=139) for PRACH Formats A1~A3, B1~B4, C0, and C2.
		- For non-initial access use cases, support 480 and 960 kHz PRACH SCS with sequence length L=139 for PRACH Formats A1~A3, B1~B4, C0, and C2, respectively.
* From [2] Huawei, HiSilicon:
	+ When UE is in RRC\_IDLE or RRC\_INACTIVE state, support only 120 kHz SCS for PRACH preamble and Msg.3 transmission in 52.6GHz to 71GHz spectrum. This includes all following cases:
		- Initial access from RRC\_IDLE,
		- Transition from RRC\_INACTIVE to RRC\_CONNECTED,
		- Request for OSI in RRC\_IDLE or RRC\_INACTIVE state.
		- Note: When UE is in RRC\_IDLE or RRC\_INACTIVE state, RACH configuration is provided in the configuration of initial UL BWP for PCell in SIB1.
	+ When UE is in RRC\_CONNECTED state, in addition to 120 kHz SCS, support 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS for PRACH preamble and Msg.3 transmission in 52.6GHz to 71GHz spectrum.
* From [3] vivo:
	+ Support 120KHz, 480KHz and 960KHz as candidate SCS of initial UL BWP.
	+ Support 960KHz SCS in addition to 120KHz SCS for PRACH format (A, B, C).
* From [5] Nokia, NSB:
	+ Support 480kHz and/or 960 kHz SCS for PRACH in non-initial access use cases.
	+ Support 480kHz and/or 960 kHz SCS for PRACH in initial access use case when UE’s SSB search complexity can be mitigated
* From [10] ZTE, Sanechips:
	+ Support additional SCSs (480kHz and/or 960kHz) for PRACH and SSB if single subcarrier spacing is supported.
* From [11] Intel:
	+ Support 480 kHz and 960 kHz SCS for PRACH in NR extension up to 71 GHz.
		- Note: no need to distinguish whether the PRACH is for initial access or non-initial access, as such distinction does not exist for RAN1 specification.
* From [12] Fujitsu:
	+ In addition to 120kHz, support 480kHz and 960kHz for PRACH SCS for all cases.
* From [13] Apple:
	+ If 480kHz and 960kHz SCS are used for PRACH transmission, support L=139 only.
* From [18] LGE:
	+ If 480 and/or 960 kHz SCS SSB is not supported for the initial access use case, support only the 480 and/or 960 kHz SCS PRACH with the sequence length L=139 for the cases other than initial access (e.g., for SCell).
* From [19] Lenovo, Motorola Mobility:
	+ For supporting NR from 52.6 GHz to 71 GHz in Rel. 17, support both the numerologies of 480kHz and 960kHz for PRACH transmission
* From [21] Interdigital:
	+ Further study necessity of PRACH for additional SCSs in Rel-17.
* From [25] NTT Docomo:
	+ For PRACH SCS, as well as SSB, 480 and 960 kHz SCS should be supported at least for non-initial access cases.

#### Summary of Discussions

* Support 120kHz PRACH in all cases, support 480/960kHz RACH for connected mode
	+ Huawei, HiSilicon
* Support 120kHz PRACH in all cases, support 480/960kHz RACH for (at least) non-initial access cases
	+ Futurewei, Docomo
* Support 480 and 960kHz PRACH (in addition to 120kHz PRACH)
	+ vivo, ZTE, Sanechips, Intel, Fujitsu, Apple (only L=139), LGE (only L=139), Lenovo, Motorola Mobility,
* Moderator understands that most (if not all) companies have similar proposal to support 480/960kHz in RAN1 specification. There are some discussion around limiting use of specific PRACH SCS in different use cases, but from moderator’s understanding such distinction will not be present in RAN1 specification. Moderator suggest further discussion as companies seems to be close to alignment.

#### **1st Round Discussion:**

From modertor’s understanding the physical layer does not distinguish initial access and non-initial access for PRACH as all the random access behaviors is described in RAN2. In order to make further discussion and progress on RACH, moderator suggest to first see we can agree to support which SCS for PRACH, and further discuss how and whether to limit the SCS usage for specific scenarios. This way some further discussion on RO and PRACH sequence and format could be made.

Please comment further on the following proposal.

##### **Proposal 2.1-1)**

* Support 480kHz and 960kHz PRACH in physical layer specifications
	+ RAN1 to send LS to RAN2 to inform any specific PRACH SCS are to be excluded from certain modes of operation from RAN1 perspective (if any)
* RAN1 to discuss further on restriction of specific PRACH SCS for specific scenarios

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| DOCOMO | Support the Proposal 2.1-1. Since 480/960 kHz SCS for SSB are supported at least for non-initial access, 480/960 kHz PRACH should be supported in PHY specifications. Ok with sending LS to RAN2 on use case restrictions and discussing about it further in RAN1.  |
| Samsung | We support the proposal. We have a clarification question regarding the comment in the GTW. In our understanding, initial BWP configured in SIB1 can take a SCS of 480 kHz and 960 kHz, for both downlink and uplink cases, since the agreement of supporting 480 kHz and 960 kHz for data/control/RS didn’t specify its use cases. Then it would be straightforward to allow PRACH to use the same SCS as well.  |
| LG | Support the Proposal 2.1-1. Since 480/960 kHz SCS for SSB are supported at least for non-initial access, it is better to send LS to RAN2 in order to make further discussion and progress on RACH. |
| Qualcomm | Fine with proposal |
| Sharp | We support the proposal. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Fujitsu | We support the proposal.  |
| Nokia | We are OK with the proposal. |
| Xiaomi | Fine with the proposal |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We do not see the need for Proposal 2.1-1 and we can’t support it. Please note that we already have the following agreement from **RAN1 104-e**:Agreement:* For initial access and non-initial access use cases, support 120kHz PRACH SCS with sequence length L=571, 1151 (in addition to L=139) for PRACH Formats A1~A3, B1~B4, C0, and C2.
* For non-initial access use cases,
	+ if 480kHz and/or 960 kHz SSB SCS is agreed to be supported, support 480 and/or 960 kHz PRACH SCS with sequence length L=139 for PRACH Formats A1~A3, B1~B4, C0, and C2, respectively.

So, we already have agreement in place that 480 and/or 960 kHz PRACH SCS are supported **for non-initial access use cases.** We agree with the moderator to “make further discussion and progress on RACH” (let’s call this discussion as *Discussion 1*), but the basis for *Discussion 1* is already provided and we can use the above agreement as a baseline to further enhance the PRACH configuration design of 480/960 kHz PRACH SCS for non-initial access. This is similar to the discussions that we have regarding the possible enhancements in PRACH configuration for 120 kHz SCS.In parallel to above *Discussion 1*, we can have *Discussion 2*: “Whether or not the application of 480/960 kHz PRACH SCS should be extended to initial access case”. However, the outcome of *Discussion 2* would not affect the possible progress in *Discussion 1* as the enhancements in *Discussion 1* will be applicable for all supported cases (only non-initial access case or both non-initial access case and initial access case if the support for 480/960 kHz PRACH SCS is agreed to be extended to the initial access case in *Discussion 2*). After *Discussion 2* is concluded, we can send an LS to RAN2 and inform them about RAN1 decision. *But, in any case, the decision of whether 480/960 kHz PRACH SCS is only supported for non-initial access case or for both initial access and non-initial access cases must be made in RAN1. RAN2 has no means to make such a decision.* Finally, in our view, above agreement in RAN1 104-e means that “UE is not expected to be configured with 480/960 kHz SCS PRACH in initial UL BWP of a PCell provided in Type0-PDSCH”. This is clearly a RAN1 specification impact. As a summary of our views, we suggest the following proposal that is built on the Agreement in RAN1 104-e:**Proposal:*** **The agreement in RAN1 104-e on the support for 480 and 960 kHz PRACH SCS with sequence length L=139 for PRACH Formats A1~A3, B1~B4, C0, and C2 for non-initial access use case means that UE is not expected to be configured with 480/960 kHz SCS PRACH in initial UL BWP of a PCell provided in Type0-PDSCH.**
* **FFS: Enhancements on PRACH configuration design for 480 and 960 kHz PRACH SCS.**
 |
| OPPO | Fine with the proposal. |
| Futurewei | We are OK in principle with the proposal i.e. to send an LS to RAN 2. The actual LS needs further discussions. Therefore, we suggest adding “LS to RAN4 text is FFS” |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Fine with the proposal 2.1-1 |
| Interdigital | We support the proposal. |
| CATT | We support 480kHz and 960kHz PRACH in physical layer specifications. The LS to ran2 can be discussed if there is really a exclusion issue. |
| Intel | Support the proposal |
| vivo | We are fine with the Proposal 2.1-1. |
| Ericsson | Huawei has a point – we have already agreed to support 480/960 kHz PRACH for non-initial access use cases, and clearly this would be specified in RAN1.We are okay to provide an LS to RAN2 (doesn't need to be this meeting) informing them of potential restrictions on the use cases of 480/960 kHz PRACH once decisions on SSB are stable. |
| Sony | We support the proposal |

#### **1st Round Discussion Summary:**

Huawei has pointed out our previous agreement. Based on the previous agreement, moderator assumes that 480kHz and 960kHz PRACH will be supported in the physical layer specification, and the only issue left is whether or not 480kHz and 960kHz can be applicable for initial access. However, this seems quite dependent on 480/960kHz SSB support for initial access. Therefore moderator assumes discussion on supported PRACH numerology can be skipped for this meeting.

#### **2nd Round Discussion:**

Moderator assumes previous RAN1 agreement means 480/960kHz PRACH will be specified in RAN1 specification, and RAN1 could go ahead with further development of RAN1 specification for 480/960kHz PRACH.

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

If there are any different understanding, please comment further.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Samsung  | We are ok with FL’s assessment. We would also to note that actually we didn’t have a clear definition of “initial access” and “non-initial access” for PRACH (not as a clear statement as SSB), so even with the agreement, it’s still confusing which exact cases are applicable.  |
| Qualcomm | We have the same understanding as FL |
| Ericsson | We are also OK with the FL's assessment.Regarding clarification of "non-initial" access, we can revisit that later if needed. It shouldn't stop the work on physical layer specification. |
| DOCOMO | Same understanding with FL. We also share Ericsson’s point.  |
| LG | We have the same understanding with FL. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We have a similar understanding as FL.  |
| Apple  | We share the understanding from FL.  |
| Interdigital | We agree with the FL. |
| Sharp | We agree with FL’s understanding. |
| vivo | We agree with the FL |
| Fujitsu | We are OK with the FL’s assessment. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We agree with FL’s assessment. |
| Nokia | We are fine with FL conclusion. As noted earlier (in RAN1#104b-e) the distinction of ‘initial’ and ‘non-initial’ does not seem very clear for PRACH from physical layer perspective. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We agree with moderator’s assessment |
| Mediatek | We agree with FL’s assessment |
| Futurewei | We agree with the FL interpretation. |
| Intel | We agree with FL’s assessment. |
| CATT | We are fine with the proposal |
| OPPO | We agree with FL’s assessment. |

#### **2nd Round Discussion Summary (concluded):**

No disputes on the assessment. Therefore, will conclude nothing further to discuss for RAN1 #105-e.

### 2.2.2 PRACH Sequence and Format

* From [5] Nokia, NSB:
	+ Support L=139 for PRACH with 480kHz and 960kHz at above 52.6 GHz.
* From [6] Ericsson:
	+ Conclude that for PRACH with 480/960 kHz SCS, only L = 139 is supported, i.e., L = 571 and 1151 are not supported.
* From [7] CATT:
	+ Consider supporting increasing symbols in time domain to enhance PRACH coverage.
	+ Consider repeating and concatenating the PRACH preamble sequence to enhance PRACH coverage for unlicensed spectrum operation
* From [8] Qualcomm:
	+ consider only using PRACH sequence length = 139 for SCS = 480 kHz and 960 kHz
* From [9] OPPO:
	+ Sequence length L=571 and 1151 for PRACH when the SCS is 480kHz/960kHz are not needed.
* From [11] Intel:
	+ Optional support of PRACH formats A1~A3, B1~B4, C0, C2 for and with SCS 480 kHz and 960 kHz, i.e., .
* From [16] Samsung:
	+ Support short PRACH format for all PRACH sequence lengths and all SCSs , and don’t support long PRACH format.
* From [18] LGE:
	+ The 120 kHz PRACH SCS with sequence lengths L=571 and L=1151 are not required for the licensed spectrum where the regulatory requirements are not defined on PSD limit.
* From [21] Interdigital:
	+ For 52.6 – 71 GHz, the existing PRACH sequences with the existing PRACH sequence lengths 571 and 1151 should be reused.
* From [23] Sharp:
	+ Only support L = 139 for PRACH with 480kHz and 960 kHz SSB SCS.
* From [25] NTT Docomo:
	+ For PRACH sequence with 480/960 kHz SCS, at least L=139 should be supported.
		- Whether to support additional length (e.g., L=571 and/or 1151) should be discussed after receiving an LS reply from RAN4 on UE EIRP and conducted power in 52.6 – 71 GHz

#### Summary of Discussions

* Supported sequence lengths
	+ For 480/960kHz SCS PRACH (if agreed):
		- L=139: Ericsson, LGE, Nokia, NSB, OPPO, Qualcomm, Docomo (other lengths FFS)
		- L=139, 571, 1151: Intel, Samsung, Interdigital
* Supported PRACH formats:
	+ For 480/960kHz SCS PRACH (if agreed) support all existing formats, A1~A3, B1 ~B4, C0, C2:
		- Intel
* One company commented that PRACH length decision may need to wait for RAN4 reply LS on EIRP and max conducted power.
* Moderator suggest discussing further based on following proposal (as starting point):
	+ For 480/960kHz SCS PRACH (if agreed), only support L=139

#### **1st Round Discussion:**

Moderator suggest discussing on the following:

##### **Proposal 2.2-1)**

* For 480/960kHz SCS PRACH (if agreed), support all existing PRACH formats (A1~A3, B1 ~B4, C0, C2) with sequence length L = 139
	+ FFS: support for sequence length L = 571, and 1151

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| DOCOMO | We support the Proposal 2.2-1.  |
| Samsung | We are ok with the proposal.  |
| LG | We support the Proposal 2.2-1. |
| Qualcomm | SCS = 480/960 kHz with sequence length = 139 is enough to achieve the desired BW requirement for the maximum EIRP allowed.We are fine with main bullet and prefer to remove the FFS part |
| Sharp | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Mediatek | We are ok with the proposal |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Fujitsu | We support the proposal. |
| Nokia | We are OK with the proposal. |
| Xiaomi | Fine with the proposal |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We do not support Proposal 2.2-1. As discussed in our views for Proposal 2.1-1), we already have an agreement in RAN1 104-e regarding the support of 480/960kHz PRACH for non-initial access case as follows:Agreement **(RAN1 104-e):*** For initial access and non-initial access use cases, support 120kHz PRACH SCS with sequence length L=571, 1151 (in addition to L=139) for PRACH Formats A1~A3, B1~B4, C0, and C2.
* For non-initial access use cases,
	+ if 480kHz and/or 960 kHz SSB SCS is agreed to be supported, support 480 and/or 960 kHz PRACH SCS with sequence length L=139 for PRACH Formats A1~A3, B1~B4, C0, and C2, respectively.

In our view, proposal 2.2-1) potentially expands the scope of the agreement in RAN1 104-e regarding 480/960kHz PRACH to all cases (initial access and non-initial access case) without through discussion and justification. We believe that all operations during initial access should be carried out on the base numerology of 120 kHz. If companies would like to expand the support of 480/960 kHz PRACH SCS to initial access cases, we can discuss this issue. However, such an issue should be discussed in RAN1 and the outcome (whether the support of 480/960 kHz PRACH SCS is limited to non-initial access case or is expanded to both initial access and non-initial access cases) should be provided to RAN2 in an LS so it can be reflected in RAN2 specifications. RAN2 has no means to decide whether or not a specific PRACH SCS is applicable only in non-initial access case or both initial and non-initial access cases. As discussed in our views for Proposal 2.1-1), if necessary, we can further clarify the Agreement in RAN1 104-e using the following proposal:**Proposal:*** **The agreement in RAN1 104-e on the support for 480 and 960 kHz PRACH SCS with sequence length L=139 for PRACH Formats A1~A3, B1~B4, C0, and C2 for non-initial access use case means that UE is not expected to be configured with 480/960 kHz SCS PRACH in initial UL BWP of a PCell provided in Type0-PDSCH.**
* **FFS: Enhancements on PRACH configuration design for 480 and 960 kHz PRACH SCS.**
 |
| OPPO | Fine with the proposal. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Futurewei | Please clarify the intention of the proposal with respect to the prior agreement on PRACH format for SCS 480/960 kHz for non-initial channel access as we already agreed the PRACH format for non-initial access case. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Fine with the proposal 2.2-1 |
| Interdigital | We support the proposal. |
| CATT | Fine with 2.2-1. |
| Intel | Support the Proposal and fine to study L=571 and 1151. One point here is the support of fixed wireless access in the US which allows to maximize the Tx power up to 27 dBm for signal bandwidths larger than 100 MHz (for the smaller bandwidths, the highest power level should be reduced from 27 dBm). Therefore, at least for SCS 480 kHz, L=571 should be supported (without contradiction with the agreed minimal system bandwidth) in order to achieve the max Tx power level of 27 dBm for fixed wireless access in the US.Therefore, we suggest adding “support L=571 for 480kHz PRACH”.We prefer to keep the FFS, as depending on response from RAN4 on the max EIRP and max conducted power pairs, RAN1 may find other PRACH sequence length necessary. |
| Ericsson | Again, Huawei has a point. We have agreed on support of 480/960 kHz PRACH at least for non-initial access use cases, so it seems we don’t need a re-agreement.Regarding sequence lengths 571/1151, this translates to 274 / 552 MHz for 480 kHz SCS and 548 / 1105 MHz for 960 kHz. These bandwidth are excessive, and actually lead to degraded link budget. In the US, the conducted power limit of 27 dBm is achieved at 100 MHz, so it is not necessary to go to 274 MHz. In fact, the link budget degrades – no additional power, just additional noise.Hence L = 571/1151 for 480/960 kHz are not motivated. |
| Sony | We support the proposal. |

#### **1st Round Discussion Summary:**

As Huawei noted, RAN1 has already agreed to support L=139 is supported for 480/960kHz PRACH. The only open question is other values. Most companies think L=139 is sufficient. Intel has commented the support for L=571 for 480kHz, while Ericsson comments that this is not needed.

#### **2nd Round Discussion:**

Moderator assumes previous RAN1 agreement means 480/960kHz PRACH will be specified in RAN1 specification, and RAN1 could go ahead with further development of RAN1 specification for 480/960kHz PRACH.

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

If there are any different understanding, please comment further.

Also moderator asks companies to further provide comments on the L=571 for 480kHz PRACH.

* Should L=571 for 480kHz PRACH be supported to maximize (conducted) transmit power for US fixed wireless use cases?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Samsung | We are ok with FL’s assessment.For the additional question, we are ok to support L=571 for 480kHz PRACH.  |
| Qualcomm | We have the same understanding as FL. For the additional question, we do not see a need to support L=571 for 480kHz PRACH |
| Ericsson | We are OK with FL's assessmentStill, we don't think L = 571 is needed for 480 kHz as the PRACH bandwidth is excessive (274 MHz). It far exceeds the bandwidth for which the US conducted power limit maxes out at 27 dBm, i.e., 100 MHz. |
| DOCOMO | We agree with Ericsson. L=571 is not needed for UE technically.  |
| LG | We think that L=139 is sufficient for 480 kHz PRACH. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We have a similar understanding as FL.We don’t see the need for L=571 for 480kHz PRACH. |
| Apple  | Our view is that L=139 is sufficient for 480 kHz PRACH.  |
| Sharp | We have the same understanding as moderator.Regarding L=571, we neither can’t see justified motivation to support.  |
| vivo | We are OK with FL’s assessment. |
| Fujitsu | We agree with the FL’s assessment. We also do not see the need to support L=571 for 480kHz PRACH. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We agree with FL’s assessment.We are fine to support L=571 for 480kHz PRACH. |
| Nokia | We are OK with FL conclusion. We share the same view as other companies that L = 571 is not needed for 480 kHz, but we are open to leave it FFS. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We share the same understanding with moderator |
| Mediatek | We agree with FL’s assessment |
| Futurewei | We agree with FL ‘s assessment.We do not see the need to support L=571 for 480 kHz PRACH. |
| Intel | We agree with FL’s assessment.We support L=571 for 480kHz PRACH.  |
| CATT | We are fine to support L=571 for 480kHz PRACH. |
| OPPO | We agree with FL’s assessment.We don't think L = 571 is needed for 480 kHz PRACH. |

#### **2nd Round Discussion Summary:**

The following is a summary of views from companies:

* L=571 for 480kHz PRACH
	+ Support: Intel, CATT, ZTE, Sanechips, Samsung
	+ Do not support: Futurewei, Ericsson, Nokia, Fujitsu, Qualcomm, Docomo, LGE, Apple, Huawei, HiSilicon, OPPO

#### **3rd Round Discussion (on-going):**

Large number of companies think existing agreement to support L=139 for 480/960kHz is sufficient. Given that this is additional proposal for agreement, moderator suggests companies supportive of L=571 for 480kHz to provide further information and continue for discussion.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| ZTE, Sanechips | In US, “The 500 mW peak transmitter output limit applies to transmitters with an emission bandwidth of at least 100 MHz and is reduced for systems that employ narrower bandwidths.” and “Transmitters with an emission bandwidth of less than 100 MHz must limit their peak transmitter conducted output power to the product of 500 mW times their emission bandwidth divided by 100 MHz.”If we only support 139 length sequence 480KHz, the bandwidth is 66.72MHz, with the above regulatory in the US, the Tx power would be 334mW, which can not achieve max Tx power.In addition, L=571 has already been supported for 30kHz, the spec impact to additionally support another SCS for L=571 is quite limited, so we can consider L=571 for 480kHz PRACH. |
| Intel | We still support L=571 for 480kHz PRACH. And the reason is exactly the same explained by ZTE, Sanechips. Below is the corresponding excerpt from TR38.807.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Frequency band [GHz] | Power/Magnetic Field Requirements | Purpose/Node Placement requirements | Additional Notes |
| 57 – 71 | Max avg. EIRP (82 – 2N) dBmMax peak EIRP (85 – 2N) dBm.N = max(0, 51 dBi – antenna-gain)If emission-BW is less than 100 MHz, max peak conducted output power is {500mW × emission-BW / 100MHz} [Note 1]Otherwise, max peak conducted output power is 500mW | Fixed outdoor equipment | Unlicensed. |
| Note 1: Emission bandwidth is defined as the instantaneous frequency range occupied by a steady state radiated signal with modulation, outside which the radiated power spectral density never exceeds 6 dB below the maximum radiated power spectral density in the band, as measured with a 100kHz resolution bandwidth spectrum analyzer. The center frequency must be stationary during the measurement interval, even if not stationary during normal operation (e.g., for frequency hopping devices). Peak transmitter conducted output power shall be measured with an RF detector that has a detection bandwidth that encompasses the 57-71GHz band and that has a video bandwidth of at least 10MHz. |

 |
| Moderator | Continue discussion in this table. |
|  |  |

#### **3rd Round Discussion Summary:**

TBD

### 2.2.3 RACH Occasion Resources

* From [1] Huawei, HiSilicon:
	+ Support maximum of 40 ms for ra-ResponseWindow for operation with shared spectrum and msgB-ResponseWindow for both operations with and without shared spectrum. Support indicating two LSBs of SFN at which gNB has received msg1 (msgA) in DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by RA-RNTI (msgB-RNTI).
	+ For operations with shared channel access in 52.6GHz to 71GHz spectrum, a gap symbol between consecutive ROs within the PRACH slot should be supported to avoid a LBT failure at the UE due to a PRACH transmission from another UE in the previous RO.
* From [3] vivo:
	+ For RO configuration for PRACH with 480/960kHz SCS:
	+ Reuse the exiting FR2 RACH configuration table and the location of duration containing PRACH slot pattern within 10ms is same as FR2.
	+ How to determine the RACH slot index:
		- Alt.1: Reuse the same reference slot as FR2 and maintain the same number of PRACH slots per reference slot.
		- Alt.2: Reuse the same reference slot as FR2 and increase the number of PRACH slots to more than 2 per reference slot.
		- Alt.3: Define a new reference slot and maintain the same number of PRACH slots per reference slot.
		- Alt.4: Define a new reference slot and increase the number of PRACH slots to more than 2 per reference slot.
		- Alt.5: Define different reference slot for different PRACH SCS and the number of PRACH slots within a reference slot is the same as FR2.
* From [5] Nokia, NSB:
	+ Reuse the existing FR2 RACH configuration table and PRACH slot(s) for 480 and 960 kHz are allocated with the following principles where the reference SCS is 60 kHz:
		- If “Number of PRACH slots within a 60 kHz slot” is 1, then there is one PRACH slot with 480 or 960 kHz SCS among the slots defined by the 60 kHz reference slot
		- If “Number of PRACH slots within a 120 kHz slot” is 2, then there are two PRACHs slot with 480 or 960 kHz SCS among the slots defined by the 60 kHz reference slot.
* From [6] Ericsson:
	+ For 480/960 kHz PRACH, support PRACH configurations that allow maintaining the same PRACH processing load (operations/unit time) as for 120 kHz PRACH configurations.
		- support configuration of PRACH occasion(s) in only 1 or 2 480/960 kHz slots within a 60 kHz reference slot.
	+ For 480/960 kHz PRACH, reuse the current PRACH configuration table in 38.211 for FR2 "as is." Specify rule for which 1 or 2 480/960 kHz slots within a 60 kHz reference slot are used depending on the value in the existing column "Number of PRACH slots within a 60 kHz slot" in the current PRACH configuration table. The rule should be common for all PRACH configurations in the table.
* From [7] CATT:
	+ For RO configuration support of 480/960 KHz, 120 KHz configuration can be reused for each 8/16 slots within the 60 KHz slot time.
* From [8] Qualcomm:
	+ a maximum of 4 and 2 FD multiplexed ROs for SCS = 120 kHz and sequence length = 571 and 1151, respectively
	+ for SCS = 120 kHz, if the maximum number of FD ROs are reduced, consider ways to increase the TD ROs (to maintain the same capacity) with minimal specification impact
	+ for higher RACH SCS (480 and 960 kHz), consider including a symbol-level gap between ROs to allow for gNB beam switching delay
	+ for higher RACH SCS (480 and 960 kHz), consider ways to support more than 2 RACH slots per RACH reference slot
* From [9] OPPO:
	+ Set the reference SCS for RACH slot determination as 120kHz.
	+ RAN1 should design a unified RO configuration for both licensed and unlicensed spectrums.
	+ On top of RO configuration, a mask can be further added for unlicensed spectrum to switch off certain RO from being selected.
* From [10] ZTE, Sanechips:
	+ Support the same RO configuration table as in Rel-15/16 with the same RO density as in PRACH SCS equals to 120KHz.
	+ Support 60kHz for reference slot as in FR2 with the less spec effort in beyond 52.6G.
* From [11] Intel:
	+ Regarding PRACH RO configurations for SCS 480 kHz and 960 kHz:
	+ The numerology for reference slot counting within a system frame remains corresponding to SCS 60 kHz;
	+ The max number of starting positions for PRACH slots within a reference slot (which has SCS 60 kHz) is equal to 2;
	+ Fix the starting position(s) of PRACH slots within the reference slot by properly setting the values of parameter n\_{slot}^{RA} (TS 38.211, Section 5.3.2).
		- The starting position(s) should be aligned with the SSB slot patterns in order to avoid systematic overlapping between SSBs and ROs.
	+ Reuse PRACH RO configurations listed in Table 6.3.3.2-4 from TS 38.211.
	+ For PRACH SCS 480 kHz and 960 kHz, introduce optional time gaps between consecutive ROs;
	+ Modify equation defining the first OFDM symbol of PRACH RO given Section 5.3.2 from TS 38.211 as follows:
		- ,
		- where is the gap duration (number of OFDM symbols) and for no gap.
* From [12] Fujitsu:
	+ Support RO configuration for non-consecutive ROs in time domain.
* From [13] Apple:
	+ Maximum 4 PRACH ROs can be configured for 120kHz SCS with L=571.
	+ Maximum 2 PRACH ROs can be configured for 120kHz SCS with L=1151.
	+ Reuse the existing FR2 PRACH configuration Table to indicate the time-domain PRACH slot location.
	+ Support to keep the same PRACH capacity as Rel-16 FR2 for 480kHz and 960kHz SCS to minimize the signaling overhead.
	+ The configured PRACH slots should be distributed over the 60kHz reference slot.
* From [16] Samsung:
	+ Using the RO pattern for SCS = 120 kHz derived from the PRACH configuration table as the reference for larger SCS cases.
	+ For RO configuration, both direction 1 (indication on which one(s) of the 8 eighty-slots or which one(s) of the eight 960 kHz ROs within a 120 kHz RO) and direction 2 (keep 80 slots in total but redesign the RACH period and RACH duration location) can be considered.
	+ Support non-consecutive RO configuration to alleviate the RACH LBT failure.
* From [18] LGE:
	+ If the reference slot SCS is kept as 60 kHz and the density of PRACH occasion is the same as in 120 kHz in the time-domain (e.g., 2 slots out of 8 slots for 480 kHz), the PRACH slot index for 480 and 960 kHz SCS can be determined based on the selected two values of with the pre-configured rule or based on the configured/indicated value(s) of by the gNB.
	+ If the reference slot SCS is kept as 60 kHz and the density of PRACH occasion is increased compared to 120 kHz in the time-domain, the additional PRACH slots for 480 and 960 kHz SCS can be indicated/configured by the parameter X to allocate the consecutive X slots before the last slot ( for 480 and 960 kHz SCS, respectively).
	+ When LBT is used to transmit the PRACH preamble, consider to insert CCA gap between adjacent RACH occasions in time domain (e.g. X usec or Y symbol) to avoid inter-UE LBT blocking due to the propagation delay of PRACH transmitted in an earlier RO.
* From [20] Xioami:
	+ Inconsecutive RO time domain configuration should be supported.
* From [21] Interdigital:
	+ For 52.6 – 71 GHz, supporting non-consecutive RACH occasions is not preferred.
* From [23] Sharp:
	+ Regarding PRACH configuration design for 480/960kHz SCS, reuse Table 6.3.3.2-4 (Random access configurations for FR2 and unpaired spectrum) in Rel-16 38.211 as much as possible. 60kHz reference slot should be also inherited.
	+ Regarding PRACH configuration design for 480/960kHz SCS, keep the same RO density and the same relative locations as PRACH configuration in Rel-16.
* From [25] NTT Docomo:
	+ For RO configuration for PRACH with 480/960 kHz SCS,
		- Support to specify only 480/960 kHz PRACH slot within a 120 kHz referenced slot in addition to the existing RO configuration in FR2.
			* The 120 kHz referenced slot should be determined based on the existing RO configuration specified in FR2
			* Only one 480/960 kHz PRACH slot within the 120 kHz referenced slot is sufficient.
		- No need to enhance RA-RNTI calculation for NR operation in 52.6 – 71 GHz

#### Summary of Discussions

* Companies have provided several detailed proposals. Most of the proposals are suggestions and answers to several sub-issues. Moderator suggest to continue discussion with the following question list, and try to resolve each question during the RAN1 meeting.
	+ RA response window size
	+ For 120kHz RO, whether (and how) to support gap for LBT (if needed)
	+ For 480/960kHz RO (if agreed), whether (and how) to support gap for LBT (if needed)
	+ For 480/960kHz RO (if agreed), whether (and how) to support gap for beam switching (if needed)
	+ How to determine the RACH slot index for 480/960kHz
	+ Supported RO density for 480/960kHz PRACH per reference slot
	+ SCS for reference slot for 480/960kHz PRACH RO
	+ Any changes/updates to starting symbol positions of PRACH slots within reference slot

#### **1st Round Discussion:**

* Companies are encouraged to provide inputs on the following questions
	+ Q1) RA response window size (e.g. 10msec, 20msec, etc)?
	+ Q2) For 120kHz RO, whether (and how) to support gap for LBT (if needed)
	+ Q3) For 480/960kHz RO (if agreed), whether (and how) to support gap for LBT (if needed)
	+ Q4) For 480/960kHz RO (if agreed), whether (and how) to support gap for beam switching (if needed)
	+ Q5) How to determine the RACH slot index for 480/960kHz
	+ Q6) Supported RO density for 480/960kHz PRACH per reference slot
	+ Q7) SCS for reference slot for 480/960kHz PRACH RO
	+ Q8) Any changes/updates to starting symbol positions of PRACH slots within reference slot

Moderator will try to formulate proposal based on inputs from the companies.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| DOCOMO | Q1) Same as FR2 would be sufficient. Q2 and Q3) Since Rel-16 NR-U did not introduce gap for LBT, we do not see the necessity for 60 GHz either. Q4) Depending on RAN4 LS reply. Q5) It should correspond to 120 kHz PRACH slot determined by FR2 RO configuration/ Q6) It should be the same as the one for 120 kHz PRACH RO per reference slot in FR2. Q7) either 60 kHz or 120 kHz. Slightly prefer 120 kHz SCS.Q8) we do not see the necessity to change anything on symbol position within reference slots.  |
| Samsung  | 1) configured by gNB, the value range can use the one from NRU Rel16 as starting point2) support, by indicating the RO to be used in one RACH slot, e.g., even or odd RO;3) and 4). Similar way as Q2;5) down select from two ways: one is scaling 10ms-120khz PRACH pattern to fit the 2.5ms-480khz/1.25ms-960khz and find which 2.5ms/1.25ms location in 10ms; the other is indicating the 480khz/960khz RO within a 120khz RO;6). keep it same as 120khz at least, FFS others7). 120khz8). FFS. It may be impacted by decision on above questions and we think it may not need discussion from reference slot level, we can discuss from RO with reference SCS.  |
| LG | Q1) We prefer to keep the RAR window size as 10ms.Q2 and Q3) The gap between the consecutive RO should be supported for 120/480/960 kHz SCS to avoid the inter-UE LBT blocking due to the propagation delay of PRACH transmitted in an earlier RO. The gap between the adjacent RACH occasions can be the fixed duration (e.g., X usec or Y symbol).Q4) It would be better to defer the related discussion until RAN4 respond to RAN1’s LS.Q5) If the reference slot SCS is kept as 60 kHz and the density of PRACH occasion is the same as in 120 kHz in the time-domain (e.g., 2 slots out of 8 slots for 480 kHz), the PRACH slot index for 480 and 960 kHz SCS can be determined based on the selected two values of with the pre-configured rule or based on the configured/indicated value(s) of by the gNB.Q6) The density of PRACH occasion can be the same as in 120 kHz (e.g., 2 slots out of 8 slots for 480 kHz) or can be increased compared to 120 kHz.Q7) Prefer 60 kHz and we would like to ask what is meaning of 120 kHz SCS reference slot to the proponent companies (i.e., what is the differences from 60 kHz SCS reference slot?).Q8) We do not see the necessity. |
| Qualcomm | Q1) Same as FR2Q2) No LBT gap neededQ3) No LBT gap neededQ4) Depending on RAN4 LS reply, but based on our analysis we see a need for beam switching gapQ5) Due to gaps and/or coverage enhancement needs, more than 2 RACH slots per RACH reference slots may be needed (this may not necessarily lead to an increase of RACH processing load). We suggest that “determining the RACH slot index for 480/960kHz” be postponed to after the number of slots in a reference slot is finalized which may depends on the gap needsQ6) This depends on the need to have more repetitions and/or the need for beam switching gapsQ7) Can be the same as FR2 (60 kHz)Q8) This depends on the need to have more repetitions and/or the need for beam switching gaps |
| Sharp | Q1) RA response window size (e.g. 10msec, 20msec, etc)?10msec. Q2) For 120kHz RO, whether (and how) to support gap for LBT (if needed)No. The motivation (stronger than in NR-U) should be justified.Q3) For 480/960kHz RO (if agreed), whether (and how) to support gap for LBT (if needed)No. The motivation (stronger than in NR-U) should be justified.Q4) For 480/960kHz RO (if agreed), whether (and how) to support gap for beam switching (if needed)Come back with RAN4 decision.Q5) How to determine the RACH slot index for 480/960kHzShould be discussed after RO density and reference slot SCS are determined.Q6) Supported RO density for 480/960kHz PRACH per reference slotSame as 120kHz PRACH in FR2, as the baseline.Q7) SCS for reference slot for 480/960kHz PRACH RO60kHz.Q8) Any changes/updates to starting symbol positions of PRACH slots within reference slotCurrently no. |
| Mediatek | Q1) Same as FR2Q2) Gap for LBT is not neededQ3) Gap for LBT is not neededQ4) This discussion can be deferred until RAN4 respond to RAN1’s LSQ5) We prefer to reuse the same reference slot as FR2 and see whether the number of PRACH slots is the same as that in FR2 per reference slot. So this question also depends on the RO configurationQ6) The RO density can be the same as that in 120 kHzQ7) Prefer same as FR2Q8) We don’t see strong need. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Q1) Same as FR2Q2) and Q3) No LBT gap neededQ4) Wait for RAN4’s reply LSQ5) It depends on the RO density and reference slot.Q6) The same as 120kHz RO density in FR2Q7) 60kHz, the same as in FR2, with that we can reuse the FR2 PRACH configuration table as much as possibleQ8) It’s not necessary for any changes |
| Fujitsu | Q1) Same as FR2Q2) Support. By a configurable or fixed symbol gap, or by disable even/odd ROs.Q3) Support. By same way as Q2.Q4) Support. By same way as Q2.Q5) This may depend on discussion on Q6 and Q7. If more than 2 RACH slots for 480/960kHz per reference slot is supported, it would be preferred to introduce additional indication to determine the RACH slot index for 480/960kHz.Q6) This may depend on discussion on gaps in Q2-Q4, considering that the ‘RO density per reference slot’ includes two dimensions, one is number of ROs per slot, and the other is the number of RACH slots per reference slot. The baseline could be the maximum number of RO for 120kHz per 60kHz slot for FR2. If the gap is needed, the maximum number of ROs per RACH slot would be reduced, and then more than 2 RACH slots per reference slot should be supported.Q7) 60 kHzQ8) This may depend on discussion on gaps in Q2-Q4. |
| Nokia | Q1) For unlicensed operation the NR-U methodology can be a starting point.Q2)&Q3) We would prefer to define fixed LBT gap time between valid ROs that do not depend on the time domain allocation of the PRACH.Q4) We don’t see a need for this but would wait for RAN4 feedback.Q5) Reuse the existing FR2 RACH configuration table and PRACH slot(s). The slot (of 480/960kHz) would be placed to the last slot overlapping with the corresponding 120kHz slot.Q6) Same as for 120kHz in FR2.Q7) 60kHz.Q8) No changes. |
| Xiaomi | Q1) Same as FR2Q2-4) Support define LBT gap, especially for new SCS by configuration.Q5-6) Reuse FR2Q7-8）FFS |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Q1) Similar to Rel-16: Support maximum of 40 ms for ra-ResponseWindow for operation with shared spectrum and msgB-ResponseWindow for both operations with and without shared spectrum.Q2) Yes. 1 symbol gap between consecutive ROs.Q3) 480/960kHz PRACH is already agreed for non-initial access cases in RAN1 104-e. Yes. Support gap between consecutive ROs for LBT.Q4) 480/960kHz PRACH is already agreed for non-initial access cases in RAN1 104-e. Yes. Support 1 symbol gap between consecutive ROs for beam switching at least for 960 kHz SCS.Q5) We think Q6 should be agreed first.Q6) We support a higher RO density than in 120 kHz. That is, the number of 480/960 kHz SCS PRACH slots in a reference slot should be higher than the number of 120 kHz SCS PRACH slots in the same reference slot.Q7) Can remain 60 kHz. Q8) FFS. We may have to if gap for LBT and/or beam switching is required.  |
| OPPO | Q1) Same as FR2Q2) Q3) Q4): Support gap for LBT by RO configuration Q5) Based on RO configuration in a 120kHz RACH slot Q6) The configuration of 480/960kHz RO should also based on a 120kHz RACH slotQ7) 120kHz Q8) FFS |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Futurewei | Q1) Same as FR2Q2) No LBT gap is neededQ3) No LBT gap is neededQ4) Depending on RAN4 replyQ5) Discuss it later after RO density and reference slot decision.Q6) Same as for 120 kHz SCS in FR2 Q7) Same as in FR2, 60 kHzQ8) FFS |
| CATT | Q1) Same as FR2Q2) No LBT gap is neededQ3) No LBT gap is neededQ4) FFS based on RAN4 feedbackQ5) Discuss it after decision about RO density and reference slot.Q6) The configuration of 480/960kHz can be based on the 120kHz RO. Q7) 60 kHzQ8) Do not see the necessity for the change. |
| Intel | Q1) Same as in FR2Q2) No LBT gap neededQ3) No LBT gap neededQ4) Configurable beam switching gap may be neededQ5) Set properly the values of parameter and reuse RO configurations from Table 6.3.3.2-4 of TS 38.211Q6) Strive to keep the number of ROs within the reference slot the same as for SCS 120 kHz. However, the number of occupied RACH slot could be larger, e.g., because of gaps introduced between consecutive ROsQ7) 60 kHzQ8) The max number of starting positions for PRACH slots within a reference slot is the same as for SCS 120 kHz |
| vivo | Q1) Same as FR2.Q2) and Q3) For the LBT gap, it should be supported for 120/480/960 kHz to avoid LBT failure due to the utilizing of the previous RO. By defining a fixed gap between the consecutive ROs.Q4) For the beam switching gap, we should wait for RAN4’s LS reply.Q5) The RACH slot index for 480/960kHz depends on the reference slot and the number of PRACH slot per reference slot. We can further discuss the details after the two parameters are determined.Q6) Increase the RO density for 480/960kHz PRACH per reference slot compared to 120 kHz to improve the access rate.Q7) Same as FR2 (60 kHz).Q8) FFS. It depends on whether to support non-consecutive ROs for LBT gap and/or beam switching gap and how to configure. |
| Ericsson | Q1) Same as FR2Q2) We do not see a need for LBT gap. PRACH should fall under short control signal exemption.Q3) We do not see a need for LBT gap. PRACH should fall under short control signal exemption.Q4) We do not see a need for beam switching gap. However, we acknowledge that feedback from RAN4 is still pending, hence difficult to make progress here.Q5) For 480/960 kHz PRACH, reuse the current PRACH configuration table in 38.211 for FR2 (Table 6.3.3.2-4) "as is." Specify rule for which 1 or 2 480/960 kHz slots within a 60 kHz reference slot are used depending on the value in the existing column "Number of PRACH slots within a 60 kHz slot" in the current PRACH configuration table. The rule should be common for all PRACH configurations in the table. For example, for the case of 2 480/960 kHz slots, they could be the last ones within the 1st and 2nd half of the reference 60 kHz slot as shown in this figure. For the case of 1 480/960 kHz slot, it could be just the last one within the 60 kHz reference slot. Q6) We have a strong preference to support the same RO density as FR2 since we don't think the number of needed RACH opportunities scales with SCS. Furthermore, we prefer not to increase the PRCH processing load at the gNB. Reusing the FR2 PRACH configuration table with only 1 or 2 480/960 slots within a 60 kHz reference slot achieves the goal of maintaining the same RO density as FR2.Q7) In order to reuse the existing PRACH configuration table for 120/480/960 kHz PRACH, we support maintaining the SCS of the reference slot to be 60 kHz as illustrated above. Q8) Can reuse existing starting symbol positions as specified in the current PRACH configuration table in 38.211 for FR2 |
| Sony | Q1) Same as in FR2Q2) No LBT gap is neededQ3) No LBT gap is neededQ4) wait for RAN4 replayQ5) it depends on RO density and reference slot.Q6) same as FR2Q7) 60 kHzQ8 we don’t see the necessity of change. |

#### **1st Round Discussion Summary:**

Summary of responses from companies are provided below.

* Q1) RA response window size (e.g. 10msec, 20msec, etc)?
	+ Same as FR2: Docomo, Qualcomm, Mediatek, ZTE, Sanechips, Fujitsu, Xiaomi, OPPO, Futurwei, CATT, Intel, vivo, Ericsson, Sony
	+ Same as FR1 NR-U: Nokia, NSB
	+ Configured by gNB: Samsung
	+ 10msec: LGE, Sharp
	+ Max 40msec: Huawei, HiSilicon
* Q2) For 120kHz RO, whether (and how) to support gap for LBT (if needed)
	+ No need: Docomo, Qualcomm, Sharp, Mediatek, ZTE, Sanechips, Futurwei, , CATT, Intel, Ericsson, Sony
	+ Support: Samsung (even/odd RO indication), LGE, Fujitsu, Nokia, NSB, Xiaomi, Huawei, HiSilicon, OPPO, vivo
* Q3) For 480/960kHz RO (if agreed), whether (and how) to support gap for LBT (if needed)
	+ No need: Docomo, Qualcomm, Sharp, Mediatek, ZTE, Sanechips, Futurwei, CATT, Intel, Ericsson, Sony
	+ Support: Samsung, LGE, Fujitsu, Nokia, NSB, Xiaomi, Huawei, HiSilicon, OPPO, vivo
* Q4) For 480/960kHz RO (if agreed), whether (and how) to support gap for beam switching (if needed)
	+ Wait for RAN4 reply LS: Docomo, LGE, Qualcomm, Sharp, Mediatek, ZTE, Sanechips, Nokia, NSB, Futurwei, CATT, vivo, Ericsson, Sony
	+ Support: Samsung, Fujitsu, Xiaomi, Huawei, HiSilicon, OPPO, Intel
* Q5) How to determine the RACH slot index for 480/960kHz
	+ Scale 10msec 120kHz PRACH pattern to 2.5msec 480kHz 1.25msec 960kHz PRACH: Samsung
	+ Indicate 480/960kHz PRACH RO within 120kHz RO instance: Samsung, LGE, [OPPO], Intel
	+ FFS: Qualcomm (depend on RAN4 reply LS), Sharp, Mediatek, ZTE, Sanechips, Fujitsu, Huawei, HiSilicon, Futurwei, CATT, vivo, Sony
* Q6) Supported RO density for 480/960kHz PRACH per reference slot
	+ Same as density for 120kHz PRACH RO per reference slot: Docomo, Samsung, LGE, Sharp, Mediatek, ZTE, Sanechips, Nokia, NSB, Xiaomi, OPPO, Futurwei, CATT, Ericsson, Sony
	+ Higher density than 120kHz PRACH RO per reference slot: Huawei, HiSilicon
	+ FFS: Qualcomm (depend on RAN4 reply LS) , Fujitsu
* Q7) SCS for reference slot for 480/960kHz PRACH RO
	+ 120kHz: Docomo, Samsung, OPPO
	+ 60kHz: LGE, Qualcomm, Sharp, ZTE, Sanechips, Fujitsu, Nokia, NSB, Huawei, HiSilicon, Futurwei, CATT, Intel, vivo, Ericsson, Sony
	+ FFS: Xiaomi
* Q8) Any changes/updates to starting symbol positions of PRACH slots within reference slot
	+ No need: Docomo, LGE, Sharp, Mediatek, ZTE, Sanechips, Nokia, NSB, CATT, Ericsson, Sony
	+ Needed: Intel (account for beam switching gap)
	+ FFS: Samsung, Qualcomm (depend on RAN4 reply LS), Fujitsu, Xiaomi, Huawei, HiSilicon, Futurwei, vivo

#### **2nd Round Discussion – Part 1:**

For RAR window sizes, numerous companies stated same as FR2. In Rel-15/16 NR, the supported RAR window sizes are:

* From Rel-15: 1, 2, 4, 8, 10, 20, 40, 80 slots
* From Rel-16: 60, 160 slots
* The network configures
	+ a value lower than or equal to 10 ms when Msg2 is transmitted in licensed spectrum,
	+ and a value lower than or equal to 40 ms when Msg2 is transmitted with shared spectrum channel access (see TS 38.321 [3], clause 5.1.4).

Since FR2 does not contain any shared spectrum channel access, this seems to imply that RAR window need to be lower than 10msec. However, it was not clear if all companies had the same understanding. Therefore, moderator would like to ask companies again to clarify their preferences.

##### **Proposal 2.3-1)**

* For NR 52.6 ~ 71 GHz random access, support all Rel-15 and Rel-16 RAR window lengths (i.e. 1, 2, 4, 8, 10, 20, 40, 60, 80, 160 slots),
	+ Alt 1) and network configures a value lower than or equal to 10 msec
		- What is available in current FR2
	+ Alt 2) and network configures a value lower than or equal to 40 msec
		- What is available in current FR1 NR-U

Please provide further comments on which alternative companies are supportive of. If the preference is something else, please provide information on the preferred values.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Samsung | We support Alt 1 for licensed band, and Alt 2 for unlicensed band.  |
| Qualcomm | We support Alt 1 for licensed and unlicensed bands. 40ms was introduce in NR-U to allow some more time for gNB to send RAR, in case gNB has problem accessing channel due to LBT. We don’t believe the issue exists here. |
| Ericsson | We support Alt-1 for both licensed and unlicensed. We don't think extended RAR is as beneficial for the 52.6 – 71 GHz band since LBT failure is very rare. No need to optimize for LBT failure. |
| LG | We support Alt 1 for both licensed and unlicensed bands. Alt 2 will be considered if the necessity is identified. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We have a couple of questions/comments regarding Proposal 2.3-1 before discussing possible modification:1. 10 ms in 480(960) kHz SCS is 320 (640) slots. 40 ms in 480(960) kHz SCS is 1280 (2560) slots. Just wondering how Alt 1 or Alt 2 can be supported using Rel-15 and Rel-16 RAR window lengths of maximum 160 slots?
2. Is it a correct assumption that Proposal 2.3-1 only concerns *ra-ResponseWindow* andNOT *msgB-ResponseWindow?* We think that, similar to Rel-16, *msgB-ResponseWindow* should support values up to 40 ms (in licensed and unlicensed spectrum) to account for the additional PUSCH processing delay at gNB as gNB needs to decode UE’s PUSCH appended to msgA prior to sending msgB.
 |
| vivo | We have similar questions with Huawei.To solve the first question, we suggest the following wording update.* For NR 52.6 ~ 71 GHz random access, support all Rel-15 and Rel-16 RAR window lengths in terms of duration value ~~(i.e. 1, 2, 4, 8, 10, 20, 40, 60, 80, 160 slots)~~,
	+ Alt 1) and network configures a value lower than or equal to 10 msec
		- What is available in current FR2
	+ Alt 2) and network configures a value lower than or equal to 40 msec
		- What is available in current FR1 NR-U

Based on this update, we support Alt 1 for licensed operation and Alt 2 for unlicensed operation (potentially for msgB-ResponseWindow). |
| Fujitsu | We support Alt 1 for both licensed and unlicensed bands as the baseline.  |
| Nokia | We are fine with Alt 1 for both licensed and unlicensed |
| Mediatek | We support Alt 1 for both licensed and unlicensed bands |
| Futurewei | We support Alt 1 for both licensed and unlicensed.  |
| Intel | Our preference is Alt.1 |
| CATT | We support Alt 1 for both licensed and unlicensed.  |

#### **2nd Round Discussion – Part 2:**

Views on regarding RO definition to account for LBT and beam switch gap seem quite split, and require further discussions. On determination of RACH index for 480/960kHz, most companies seem to favor keeping the same density as 120kHz PRACH. Moderator has formulated a proposal based on inputs received.

##### **Proposal 2.3-2)**

* For 480kHz and 960kHz PRACH,
	+ RACH slot index corresponds to one of the slots within 120kHz RO instance, and
	+ has the same RO density (i.e. number of RO opportunity) for 480/960kHz PRACH per reference slot of 60kHz as 120kHz PRACH per reference slot
		- FFS: higher RO density for 480/960kHz PRACH is additionally supported
	+ FFS: starting symbol position, , of PRACH slots within reference slot
	+ FFS: whether and how to account for LBT in RO configuration (if needed)
	+ FFS: whether and how to account for beam switching gap in RO configuration (if needed)
	+ An “example” illustration of RO for 480/960kHz is shown below:



##### **Proposal 2.3-3)**

* For 480kHz and 960kHz PRACH,
	+ The reference slot duration corresponds to 60 kHz SCS
	+ A PRACH slot index, , corresponds to one of the 480/960 kHz PRACH slots within the reference slot ~~120kHz RO instance~~, and
	+ 480/960 kHz PRACH has the same ~~RO~~ density (i.e. number of ~~RO~~ PRACH slots per reference slot ~~opportunity~~) ~~for 480/960kHz PRACH per reference slot of 60kHz~~ as for 120kHz PRACH in FR2 ~~per reference slot~~
		- FFS: higher ~~RO~~ density for 480/960kHz PRACH is additionally supported
	+ FFS: supported values of the PRACH slot index ~~starting symbol position, , of PRACH slots~~ within reference slot
	+ FFS: whether and how to account for LBT in RO configuration (if needed)
	+ FFS: whether and how to account for beam switching gap in RO configuration (if needed)
	+ An “example” illustration of ~~RO~~ PRACH slots for 480/960kHz is shown below:



Please comment further on Proposal 2.3-2 & Proposal 2.3-3 and use it as starting point for further discussions.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Samsung | We believe there are some typo on the section index and proposal index. Seems the correct section title should be “Part 2”, and the proposal index should be 2.3-2. We have some comments on this proposal: * We have difficulty to understand the first bullet, “one of the slots within 120 kHz RO instance”, what is the “slots within 120 KHz RO instance”? The wording seems need to be improved for clarify.
* For the second bullet, is the intention to say that having the same RO density as the PRACH configuration when using 120 khz?
* The drawback to use 60 khz as the “reference slot” is that, we will need larger (double) size of the indication signaling, e.g., eight 480khz ROs per one 60khz RO, but only four 480 khz ROs per one 120khz RO. We don’t see any benefits to use 60khz over 120 khz as reference SCS.
 |
| Qualcomm | We support this proposal |
| Ericsson | We agree with the direction of this proposal, but we think it could benefit from some clarification as pointed out by Samsung.Maybe the first thing to do is agree that the reference slot duration corresponds to 60 kHz SCS (same as for the PRACH configuration table defined for FR2). Of course this does not mean that PRACH for 52.6 – 71 GHz supports 60 kHz SCS; it is simply a reference slot duration for defining how many PRACH slots occur within this duration. In FR2 for 120 kHz PRACH there can be either 1 or 2 PRACH slots (second half or both halves of the 60 kHz reference slot). Which half or halves of this reference slot are used is specified in 38.211 Section 5.3.2 with the following:-  is given by- if kHz, then - if kHz and either of "Number of PRACH slots within a subframe" in Tables 6.3.3.2-2 to 6.3.3.2-3 or "Number of PRACH slots within a 60 kHz slot" in Table 6.3.3.2-4 is equal to 1, then - otherwise, The highlighted spec text says that if the "Number of PRACH slots within a 60 kHz slot" is 1, then the second half of the 60 kHz reference slot is used; otherwise if it is 2, then both halves of the 60 kHz reference slot are used.Samsung raises a concern that this will need larger (double) size of indication signaling, but that is not true. In FR2, the indication signaling for a PRACH configuration is a PRACH configuration index that points to one of the 256 rows in the PRACH configuration table. Once the row is indicated, the number of PRACH slots within a 60 kHz reference slot is fully determined – either 1 or 2 as already mentioned (see the highlighted column in an extract of the PRACH configuration table 6.3.3.2-4 copied at the bottom of this table).Maybe the 2nd thing we can do is agree to reuse the current FR2 defined table that assumes 60 kHz reference slots. Then there is no need to increase any indication signaling overhead. In fact there is no need to change anything in the table either. All that is needed is to add a rule to the above on which 480/960 kHz slots within the 60 kHz reference slot are used.e.g., the above spec text for 38.211 Section 5.3.2 could be augmented as follows (corresponds to the example illustration in the proposal)- if then if "Number of PRACH slots within a 60 kHz slot" in Table 6.3.3.2-4 is equal to 1, and if "Number of PRACH slots within a 60 kHz slot" in Table 6.3.3.2-4 is equal to 2.- if then if "Number of PRACH slots within a 60 kHz slot" in Table 6.3.3.2-4 is equal to 1, and if "Number of PRACH slots within a 60 kHz slot" in Table 6.3.3.2-4 is equal to 2.If it is agreeable to the group to use 60 kHz reference slot (as in FR2), perhaps the proposal could be clarified as follows:**Proposal 2.3-2)*** For 480kHz and 960kHz PRACH,
	+ The reference slot duration corresponds to 60 kHz SCS
	+ A PRACH slot index, , corresponds to one of the 480/960 kHz PRACH slots within the reference slot ~~120kHz RO instance~~, and
	+ 480/960 kHz PRACH has the same ~~RO~~ density (i.e. number of ~~RO~~ PRACH slots per reference slot ~~opportunity~~) ~~for 480/960kHz PRACH per reference slot of 60kHz~~ as for 120kHz PRACH in FR2 ~~per reference slot~~
		- FFS: higher ~~RO~~ density for 480/960kHz PRACH is additionally supported
	+ FFS: supported values of the PRACH slot index ~~starting symbol position, , of PRACH slots~~ within reference slot
	+ FFS: whether and how to account for LBT in RO configuration (if needed)
	+ FFS: whether and how to account for beam switching gap in RO configuration (if needed)
	+ An “example” illustration of ~~RO~~ PRACH slots for 480/960kHz is shown below:

 |
| Moderator | I may have caused more confusion that it is solving. I’ve updated the Proposal 2.3-2 in Proposal 2.3-3 based on Ericsson & Samsung’s comments. |
| DOCOMO | Support 2.3-3 |
| LG | We support the proposal 2.3-3 and we share the same view with Ericsson for the reference slot of 60 kHz SCS. The PRACH slot index for 480 and 960 kHz SCS can be determined based on the selected two values of with the pre-configured rule or based on the configured/indicated value(s) of by the gNB. If the reference slot SCS is kept as 60 kHz and the density of PRACH occasion is increased compared to 120 kHz in the time-domain, the additional PRACH slots for 480 and 960 kHz SCS can be indicated/configured by the parameter X to allocate the consecutive X slots before the last slot ( for 480 and 960 kHz SCS, respectively). |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We can agree with Ericsson version (Proposal 2.3-3) with some slight modifications. We also removed 480/960 kHz PRACH from inside the proposal as, per the first line, the whole proposal only addresses 480/960 kHz PRACH* For 480kHz and 960kHz PRACH,
	+ The reference slot duration corresponds to 60 kHz SCS
	+ A PRACH slot index, , corresponds to one of the 480/960 kHz PRACH slots within the reference slot ~~120kHz RO instance~~, and
	+ At least ~~480/960 kHz PRACH has~~ the same ~~RO~~ density (i.e. number of ~~RO~~ PRACH slots per reference slot ~~opportunity~~) ~~for 480/960kHz PRACH per reference slot of 60kHz~~ as for 120kHz PRACH in FR2 ~~per reference slot~~ is supported
		- FFS: Support for higher ~~RO~~ density (number of PRACH slots per reference slot) ~~for 480/960kHz PRACH is additionally supported~~
	+ FFS: supported values of the PRACH slot index ~~starting symbol position, , of PRACH slots~~ within reference slot
	+ FFS: whether and how to account for LBT in RO configuration (if needed)
	+ FFS: whether and how to account for beam switching gap in RO configuration (if needed)
	+ An “example” illustration of ~~RO~~ PRACH slots for 480/960kHz is shown below:

 |
| Apple  | We support the proposal 2.3-3. Regarding the concern about using 60kHz SCS as reference slot, we share same views from Ericsson that it does not causes signaling overhead as PRACH configuration row index is signaled by referring to a hard-encoded table. The number of rows in table has been kept and hence no signaling overhead increases.  |
| Sharp | We support Proposal 2.3-3. |
| vivo | We support the proposal 2.3-3 and fine with Ericsson and Huawei’s updates. |
| Fujitsu | We support the proposal 2.3-3.  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We support Proposal 2.3-3. |
| Nokia | We are OK with Proposal 2.3-3.  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are OK with proposal 2.3-3 |
| Mediatek | We are ok with Proposal 2.3-3 |
| Futurewei | We are fine with the Proposal 2.3-3 |
| Qualcomm2 | We support Proposal 2.3-2. We do not accept Proposal 2.3-3.For Proposal 2.3-3, we have a problem with this sub-bullet:“*480/960 kHz PRACH has the same ~~RO~~ density (i.e. number of ~~RO~~ PRACH slots per reference slot ~~opportunity~~) ~~for 480/960kHz PRACH per reference slot of 60kHz~~ as for 120kHz PRACH in FR2 ~~per reference slot~~*~~”~~This assumes the same PRACH slots per reference slot (i.e., 1 or 2). But RAN1 did not conclude yet on the need for beam switching gaps. We may end up concluding that gaps are needed. In this case, to achieve the same PRACH capacity for a certain PRACH format, we may need to have more PRACH slots per reference slot (as ROs may span more slots due to gaps). Hence, we prefer the original text of maintain the **same number of ROs** per reference slot as for 120 kHz. |
| Intel | We prefer original Proposal 2.3-2 over Proposal 2.3-3.As we understood, the main motivation of Proposal 2.3-3 is to reuse the existing PRACH RO configuration framework designed for SCS 120 kHz as much as possible for SCS 480 kHz/960 kHz. However, the framework does not address properly some specifics inherent to SCS 480 kHz/960 kHz, for example, beam switching gaps between consecutive ROs. The drawback is that Proposal 2.3-3 operates in terms of counting PRACH slots and the number of PRACH slots per reference slot as the density of ROs. In our contribution, we illustrated the situation when due to the gaps between the consecutive ROs the number of PRACH slots occupied by ROs within a reference slot is increased but the density in terms of the number of ROs per reference slot remains the same.In order to describe correctly PRACH RO configurations for SCS 480 kHz/960 kHz and reuse the existing PRACH RO configuration design for SCS 120 kHz as much as possible, we believe some re-interoperation of the existing variables is needed. For that purpose, we may suggest the following modification of Proposal 2.3-2:**Proposal 2.3-3) (Modified)*** For 480kHz and 960kHz PRACH,
	+ The reference slot duration corresponds to 60 kHz SCS
	+ The variable corresponds to one of the starting 480/960 kHz PRACH slots within the reference slot, and
	+ 480/960 kHz PRACH has the same RO density (i.e. number of ROs per reference slot) as for 120kHz PRACH in FR2
		- FFS: higher RO density for 480/960kHz PRACH is additionally supported
	+ FFS: supported values of the starting PRACH slot index within reference slot
	+ FFS: whether and how to account for LBT in RO configuration (if needed)
	+ FFS: whether and how to account for beam switching gap in RO configuration (if needed)
	+ An “example” illustration of PRACH slots for 480/960kHz is shown below:

 |
| CATT | We are OK with proposal 2.3-2. |
| Ericsson | @Intel, QualcommThank-you to Intel for the explanation of the introduction of gaps between ROs and how this can affect the definition of density. From re-reading your contribution, I see that your intention is to reuse the current PRACH configuration table as is, but adjust the symbol index l in Section 5.3.2 of 38.211 to account for gaps between ROs. Do I have the correct understanding that if the PRACH configuration table (7th column) that indicates "Number of PRACH slots within a 60 kHz slot" is equal to 1, it can happen that the introduction of gaps between ROs can cause the number of PRACH slots within a 60 kHz PRACH slot to be 2 instead of 1? And furthermore, do I correctly understand that an RO can straddle a slot boundary? I copied the following diagram from your contribution showing that the 3rd RO is half in one PRACH slot and half in another PRACH slot.It is not yet clear whether or not this will cause an issue from a UE or gNB implementation perspective due to not having ROs contained fully contained within a PRACH slot and potentially ROs that cross a slot boundary. Since the need for gaps between ROs is still open and there may be more than one way to specify gaps, and the impact on implementations is not yet clear, we would be okay with the modification proposed by Intel above (we think it also satisfies Qualcomm's concern about RO density as well) but with the following modification of the FFS:* + FFS: supported values of the starting PRACH slot index within reference slot and whether or not the ROs for a given PRACH configuration can span more than one PRACH slot if gaps between consecutive ROs are supported for LBT and/or beam switching purposes
 |

#### **2nd Round Discussion Summary:**

Based on inputs received moderator has updated Proposal 2.3-4 to include components of 2.2-2 and 2.2-3, as ALT 1 and 2 of Proposal 2.3-4.

Among ALT 1 and 2, the minor difference is if the density for 120kHz happens to be changed from what is available for existing FR2.

##### **Proposal 2.3-4)**

* For 480kHz and 960kHz PRACH,
	+ The reference slot duration corresponds to 60 kHz SCS
	+ A PRACH slot index, , corresponds to one of the starting 480/960 kHz PRACH slots within the reference slot, and
	+ ALT 1) At least the same density (i.e. number of PRACH slots per reference slot) as for 120kHz PRACH in FR2 is supported
		- FFS: support for higher density (number of PRACH slots per reference slot)
	+ ALT 2) has the same density (i.e. number of PRACH slots per reference slot) as 120kHz PRACH per reference slot
		- FFS: higher RO density for 480/960kHz PRACH is additionally supported
	+ FFS: supported values of the starting PRACH slot index within reference slot and whether or not the ROs for a given PRACH configuration can span more than one PRACH slot if gaps between consecutive ROs are supported for LBT and/or beam switching purposes
	+ FFS: whether and how to account for LBT in RO configuration (if needed)
	+ FFS: whether and how to account for beam switching gap in RO configuration (if needed)
	+ An “example” illustration of PRACH slots for 480/960kHz is shown below:



#### **3rd Round Discussion:**

Please comment further on Proposal 2.3-4, especially preference between ALT 1 and 2. If possible, it would be good to resolve the alternative in this meeting before final agreement.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Sharp | We are fine with Proposal 2.3-4. |
| Nokia | A question for my clarification that should Alt2) refer to “(i.e. number of ROs per reference slot)” rather than RACH slots per reference slot?That being said we are OK to consider these options for next meeting.  |
| Fujitsu | Firstly, based on the proposal, we understand that ALT 1 is to at least support the same density (i.e. number of PRACH slots per reference slot) as for 120 kHz in the legacy FR2. And ALT 2 is to at least support the same RO density (i.e. number of ROs per reference slot) as for 120 kHz in the legacy FR2. If that is the correct understanding, we are generally fine with the proposal and would like to suggest:* + ALT 1) At least the same density (i.e. number of PRACH slots per reference slot) as for 120kHz PRACH in the legacy FR2 is supported
		- FFS: support for higher density (number of PRACH slots per reference slot)
	+ ALT 2) At least~~has~~ the same RO density (i.e. number of ~~PRACH slots~~ ROs per reference slot) as 120kHz PRACH ~~per reference slot~~ in the legacy FR2 is supported
		- FFS: higher RO density ~~for 480/960kHz PRACH~~ is additionally supported.

Secondly, regarding the clarification in the summary (copied as below), we do not quite understand the relation between the density for 120 kHz and the 2 alternatives for 480/960kHz. It seems the density for 120 kHz is something that could be separately discussed. It would be appreciated if it can be further clarified. Among ALT 1 and 2, the minor difference is if the density for 120kHz happens to be changed from what is available for existing FR2. |
| LG | We are fine with Proposal 2.3-4. For the preference between ALT1 and 2, we slightly prefer ALT2 over ALT1. |
| vivo | We are fine with Proposal 2.3-4.  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | The difference between 2 alternatives should be clarified. From our understanding, Alt1 opens the door for increased density of PRACH slot(number of PRACH slots per reference slot), while Alt2 keeps the same density of PRACH slot but opens the door for RO density(the total number of RO per reference slot), is that the correct understanding? If so, we prefer Alt2 and fine with the Proposal 2.3-4. |
| Intel | In Proposal 2.3-4, we believe ALT2 should be reformulated to be aligned with ALT1 but with the different definition of PRACH density:* + ALT 2) At least ~~has~~ the same RO density (i.e. number of ROs ~~PRACH slots~~ per reference slot) as for 120kHz PRACH in FR2 is supported ~~per reference slot~~
		- FFS: higher RO density for 480/960kHz PRACH is additionally supported

With this modification, we support the proposal.Our response to Ericsson (sorry to be late): Yes, your understanding is correct. That’s why we are fine with the corresponding FFS sub-bullet in Proposal 2.3-4. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are a bit confused about ALT1 vs. ALT2. Our preference is as follows:1. For each configuration index, the number of 120 kHz RACH slots per 60 kHz reference slot is the same as Rel15/16.
2. For each configuration index, the number of 480/960 kHz RACH slots per 60 kHz reference slot is at least equal to the number of 120 kHz RACH slots per 60 kHz reference slot.

For us, the number of ROs per each 480/960 kHz RACH slot is determined based on whether or not we need a LBT/Beam switching gap. If we decide to provide gap between consecutive ROs in 480/960 kHz RACH slot, we can make up for the lowered RO per RACH slot density with a more RACH slot per reference RACH slot density. |
| Ericsson | We support Proposal 2.3-4 with Intel's revisionEditorial change: I guess the 480/960 can be removed from the FFS in Alt-2 to align with Alt-1, and since 480/960 is already in the main bullet. |
| Qualcomm | Thank you Ericsson for the clarification and proposed text. As for the current text, we think that the FFS part: “*FFS: supported values of the starting PRACH slot index ….*” is what we need but it contradicts with Alt 2. Thus, if Alt 2 is agreed, the FFS would not make sense any more. So we prefer to have the Intel rewording for Alt 2. |
| Futurewei | In general OK with proposal and Intel revision. We have a similar observation with other companies that the ALT 1/2 formulation is confusing.  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We are fine with the proposal and also fine with Intel’s update |

#### **3rd Round Discussion Summary:**

Updates Proposal 2.3-4 based on comments received. It should now look more accurate. Suggest to check Proposal 2.3-5 in GTW.

##### **Proposal 2.3-5)**

* For 480kHz and 960kHz PRACH,
	+ The reference slot duration corresponds to 60 kHz SCS
	+ A PRACH slot index, , corresponds to one of the starting 480/960 kHz PRACH slots within the reference slot, and
	+ ALT 1) At least the same density (i.e. number of PRACH slots per reference slot) as for 120kHz PRACH in FR2 is supported
		- FFS: support for higher PRACH slot density (number of PRACH slots per reference slot)
	+ ALT 2) at least ~~has~~ the same RO density (i.e. number of RO ~~PRACH slots~~ per reference slot) as for 120kHz PRACH in FR2 is supported ~~per reference slot~~
		- FFS: support for higher RO density ~~for 480/960kHz PRACH is additionally supported~~
	+ FFS: supported values of the starting PRACH slot index within reference slot and whether or not the ROs for a given PRACH configuration can span more than one PRACH slot if gaps between consecutive ROs are supported for LBT and/or beam switching purposes
	+ FFS: whether and how to account for LBT in RO configuration (if needed)
	+ FFS: whether and how to account for beam switching gap in RO configuration (if needed)
	+ An “example” illustration of PRACH slots for 480/960kHz is shown below:



#### **4th Round Discussion (on-going):**

##### **Proposal 2.3-5) (copy & with clean up)**

* For 480kHz and 960kHz PRACH,
	+ The reference slot duration corresponds to 60 kHz SCS
	+ A PRACH slot index, , corresponds to one of the starting 480/960 kHz PRACH slots within the reference slot, and
	+ ALT 1) At least the same density (i.e. number of PRACH slots per reference slot) as for 120kHz PRACH in FR2 is supported
		- FFS: support for higher PRACH slot density (number of PRACH slots per reference slot)
	+ ALT 2) at least the same RO density (i.e. number of RO per reference slot) as for 120kHz PRACH in FR2 is supported
		- FFS: support for higher RO density
	+ FFS: supported values of the starting PRACH slot index within reference slot and whether or not the ROs for a given PRACH configuration can span more than one PRACH slot if gaps between consecutive ROs are supported for LBT and/or beam switching purposes
	+ FFS: whether and how to account for LBT in RO configuration (if needed)
	+ FFS: whether and how to account for beam switching gap in RO configuration (if needed)
	+ An “example” illustration of PRACH slots for 480/960kHz is shown below:



Please continue to comment on Proposal 2.3-5 and provide clarification/modification that would resolve further issues.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
|  |  |

#### **4th Round Discussion Summary:**

TBD

### 2.2.4 RA Preamble ID calculation

* From [3] vivo:
	+ For larger PRACH SCS (480KHz/960KHz), the following options can be considered for RA-RNTI calculation:
		- Alt.1: Modify the RA-RNTI formula as following and introduce some contention resolution mechanism to resolve the conflict.
			* RA-RNTI = (1+s\_id+14×t\_id+14×X×f\_id +14×X×8×ul\_carrier\_id) mod A
		- Alt.2: Reuse the current RA-RNTI formula while introducing additional indicator field to indicate the time-frequency resource together with RA-RNTI.
		- Alt.3: Depending on the RO configuration pattern, reuse the RA-RNTI formula and express the slot indexes t\_id based on a new specific subcarrier spacing.
* From [5] Nokia, NSB:
	+ Reuse RA-RNTI formula defined for 120 kHz SCS also for the cases PRACH is configured with 480 or 960 kHz SCS where
		- s\_{id} assumes 480/960 kHz SCS
		- t\_{id} assumes 120 kHz SCS
* From [6] Ericsson:
	+ For 480/960 kHz PRACH, reuse the RA-RNTI expressions from Rel-15/16, with the additional statement that for 480/960 kHz PRACH, t\_id should be determined based on a subcarrier spacing of 120 kHz.
* From [7] CATT:
	+ For supporting Msg1 transmission with 480 KHz/960 KHz SCS, RA-RNTI is divided into two parts. One part of RA-RNTI is carried by DCI, and the remaining 16-bit of RA-RNTI could be used to scramble CRC of the DCI1. Two possible options are:
	+ Option A:
		- s\_id is the index of the first OFDM symbol of the PRACH occasion (0 ≤ s\_id < 14)
		- t\_id is the index of the first slot of the PRACH occasion in a system frame (0 ≤ t\_id < 640)
	+ Option B:
		- s\_id is the index of the first OFDM symbol of the PRACH occasion (0 ≤ s\_id < 14)
		- t\_id is the index of the first slot of the PRACH occasion in a system frame (0 ≤ t\_id < 640)
* From [10] ZTE, Sanechips:
	+ For higher PRACH SCS (480 and/or 960 kHz), consider the following options for RA-RNTI enhancements:
		- Option 1: Modification of t\_id, change the equation of RA-RNTI calculation, without additional signalling overhead
		- Option 3: Multiple RO blocks (segmented RO blocks) with indication. Reuse the same RA-RNTI equation in NR Rel-16, divide the system frame into N segments (each segment is 80 slots using the used SCS), and signal the segment index that transmit the preamble in the DCI.
* From [11] Intel:
	+ RA-RNTI computation equation should be adjusted to avoid overflow in case of PRACH SCS 480 kHz and 960 kHz;
	+ Support the following modified equation for RA-RNTI computation:
		- RA-RNTI = 1 + s\_id + 14 × floor(t\_id / ) + 14 × 80 × f\_id + 14 × 80 × 8 × ul\_carrier\_id,
		- where t\_id is based on the value of specified in clause 5.3.2 of TS 38.211.
* From [12] Fujitsu:
	+ If 480kHz/960kHz PRACH SCS is supported, the following should be considered to uniquely identify a RO:
		- When calculating RA-RNTI, t\_id is determined in a way that more than one slot can have the same t\_id; and
		- DCI scheduling RAR indicates the local index among the slots having the same t\_id.
* From [13] Apple:
	+ modifying the existing calculation equation to solve the RA-RNTI overflowing problem:
* From [18] LGE:
	+ If the reference slot SCS remains as 60 kHz and the density of PRACH occasion is the same as in 120 kHz in the time-domain (e.g., 2 slots out of 8 slots for 480 kHz), the existing RA-RNTI/MSGB-RNTI equation can be reused for 480 and 960 kHz SCS by reinterpreting the slot indexes t\_id based on a new specific subcarrier spacing as the slot indexes of 120 kHz SCS (e.g., floor(t\_id/n) where n=4 for 480 kHz SCS and n=8 for 960 kHz).
	+ If the reference slot SCS remains as 60 kHz and the density of PRACH occasion is increased compared to 120 kHz in the time-domain, to calculate RA-RNTI/MSGB-RNTI associated with the PRACH occasion for 480 and 960 kHz SCS using the existing RA-RNTI equation, the following options can be considered:
		- Option 1: Divide the RAR window into N sub-periods (where each sub-period is 80 slots using the used SCS) + signal the sub-period index using the DCI that schedules the MSG2/MSGB.
		- Option 2: Divide the frequency index or the symbol index into M subset (if M=4, the subset index 0/1/2/3 can be configured to the frequency index {0, 1}, {2, 3}, {4, 5}, {6, 7}, respectively) + signal the subset index using the DCI that schedules the MSG2/MSGB
* From [23] Sharp:
	+ Assuming RO density per reference slot is unchanged, without modifying the formula and definition of s\_id. Modify the definition of t\_id as the slot index referring to 120kHz SCS.

#### Summary of Discussions

* In case 480/960 kHz SCS is supported for PRACH, it was identified existing RA-RNTI calculation will have overflow issue. One of more of the following options were considered by companies to resolve this issue.
	+ Option 1) Modify the RA-RNTI formula as following and introduce some contention resolution mechanism to resolve the conflict.
		- RA-RNTI = (1+s\_id+14×t\_id+14×X×f\_id +14×X×8×ul\_carrier\_id) mod A
	+ Option 2) multiple RO blocks (segmented RO blocks) with indication in RAR
	+ Option 3) update how t\_id, s\_id is determined (t\_id computed based on 120kHz, s\_id computed based on 480/960kHz)
	+ Option 4) modulous operation on whole RA-RNTI
	+ Option 5) modulous operation on t\_id
	+ Option 6) scaled and floored operation on t\_id (e.g. floor(t\_id / ))
* Moderator suggest if single solution is not agreeable, then to refine the different options (describe more precisely) and list all options for down-select in the future RAN1 meeting.

#### **1st Round Discussion:**

Moderator would like to ask companies to precisely list the solutions that companies are considering. Moderator will capture them as options for down-select in future RAN1 meeting.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| DOCOMO | Support Option 3.  |
| LG | We support the Option 3) and Option 6). |
| Qualcomm | This is highly dependent on the RO design (number of RACH slots in a reference slot, reference slot SCS, etc…). Recommend to defer this discussion until the RO design is final |
| Sharp | Generally, since some options are relevant to RO design modification while other options are not, as a result the comparison among options is dependent on RO design modification. Under the assumption that PRACH number per 120kHz slot is kept the same, we can support Option 3 for the minor specification impact.  |
| Mediatek | Prefer option 3, but also agree to defer this discussion until 2.2.3 is determined. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We prefer Option 2) and Option 5). Also fine to defer this discussion. |
| Fujitsu | We prefer Option 2. And we agree to defer this discussion. |
| Nokia | We would support option 3), but we should probably conclude the afore discussion first. |
| OPPO | Depends on the outcome of section 2.2.3. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Futurewei  | Depends on the outcome of section 2.2.3. We prefer to use Rel 16 NR-U values  ra-ResponseWindow-v1610 ENUMERATED {sl60, sl160} which lead to RA-RNTI = (1+s\_id+14×t\_id+14×160×f\_id +14×160×8×ul\_carrier\_id) With additional bits in DCI format 1\_0 to extend it if necessary, as in NR-U. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support Option 3 |
| CATT1 | Prefer to defer this discussion. |
| Intel | Option 6 is our preference. |
| vivo | This depends on RO configuration outcome. Better to defer this discussion. |
| Ericsson | Since we propose to reuse the FR2 PRACH configuration table "as is" and also adopting a rule to only have 1 or 2 480/960 PRACH slots within a 60 kHz reference slot, the only update that is needed to the RA-RNTI formula is that t\_id should be determined based on SCS 120 kHz.Hence, the closest option for us is Option 3 (note s\_id is 0..14, so is agnostic to SCS since all slots, regardless of SCS have 14 symbols). Agree with Nokia, we need to conclude the discussion in Section 2.2.3 first. |

#### **1st Round Discussion Summary:**

With the confirmation that 480/960kHz PRACH is supported in RAN1 specification. RAN1 needs to further discuss methods to mitigate RA-RNTI calculation overflow.

The following is a summary of company views.

* + Option 1) Modify the RA-RNTI formula as following and introduce some contention resolution mechanism to resolve the conflict.
		- RA-RNTI = (1+s\_id+14×t\_id+14×X×f\_id +14×X×8×ul\_carrier\_id) mod A
	+ Option 2) multiple RO blocks (segmented RO blocks) with indication in RAR
		- ZTE, Sanechips
	+ Option 3) update how t\_id, s\_id is determined (t\_id computed based on 120kHz, s\_id computed based on 480/960kHz)
		- Docomo, Mediatek, Sharp, Nokia, NSB, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, Ericsson, LGE
	+ Option 4) modulous operation on whole RA-RNTI
	+ Option 5) modulous operation on t\_id
		- ZTE, Sanechips
	+ Option 6) scaled and floored operation on t\_id (e.g. floor(t\_id / ))
		- Intel, LGE

Few companies commented that details of the RO configuration may need to be finalized before concluding on the solution for RA-RNTI calculation issue.

#### **2nd Round Discussion:**

Given that RO configuration design may have some impact on the down selection of the RA-RNTI calculation solution, moderator suggest to list the potential solutions.

##### **Proposal 2.4-1)**

* Further study the following solutions to resolve RA-RNTI overflow for 480/960kHz PRACH:
	+ Option 1)
	+ Option 2)
		- Segment the PRACH into N segments
		- In DCI:
	+ Option 3)
		- Segment the PRACH into N segments
		- In DCI:
	+ Option 4)
		- is the index of the first 120kHz slot that contains the PRACH occasion in a system frame.
		- is the index of the first OFDM symbol of the PRACH occasion based on the value of specified in clause 5.3.2 of TS 38.211.
	+ Option 5)
		- RA-RNTI = 1 + s\_id + 14 × floor(t\_id / ) + 14 × 80 × f\_id + 14 × 80 × 8 × ul\_carrier\_id,
		- t\_id is based on the value of specified in clause 5.3.2 of TS 38.211.
	+ Option 6)
		- Segment the PRACH into N segments
		- In DCI:
	+ Option 7)
		- In DCI:

Please comment further if moderator has missed any other solutions, or incorrectly captured the solution suggested by the companies.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Samsung  | Is the design of RO configuration surely impacting the change to RA-RNTI? If not, we are not ready to spend effort on identifying the changes to RA-RNTI calculation. We believe this issue should be discussed (if needed) after the issues in Section 2.2.3 are settled down, while we appreciated FL and companies’ effort on listing the options.  |
| Qualcomm | This is highly dependent on the RO design (number of RACH slots in a reference slot, reference slot SCS, etc…). Recommend to defer this discussion until the RO design is final |
| Ericsson | We also appreciate the effort of the moderator on listing options; however, we agree with Samsung, that it is too early to make progress on RA-RNTI has it is tightly coupled to the PRACH configuration design. If the same design is reused from Rel-15 FR2 with only 1 or 2 PRACH slots per reference slot, then very minimal change is needed to the RA-RNTI calculation. If a more complexity design is adopted, then RA-RNTI calculation would also need more changes.Question: in the new list of options in this proposal, we wonder where the original Option 3 went?In fact, if the the same design on PRACH configuration is used from Rel-15 FR2, the only change that is needed to RA-RNTI is that t\_id assumes 120 kHz. Nothing more.  |
| Moderator | Previous option 3 was move to Option 4. I put mod operation by mistake. |
| DOCOMO | We share Samsung and Ericsson point while we also much appreciate the effort made by FL and companies. Considering the clear dependency on the earlier section, it is not ready.  |
| LG | We also share the same view with Samsung and Ericsson. The discussion for RA-RNTI can be postponed until the design of RO configuration is determined. |
| Apple  | We support the suggestion to defer it after the RO for new SCS are concluded due to the dependency.  |
| Sharp  | We also agree to discuss the RA-RNTI calculation issue after the RO design issue is solved. |
| vivo | As commented before, we suggest to defer it after RO configuration for new SCS is settled. |
| Fujitsu | We are fine to defer the discussion. If listing the options is necessary for future discussions, we’d like to make Option 2) to be more general for now, e.g.* + Option 2)
		- Segment the PRACH into N segments
		- In DCI:
 |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We agree to discuss RA-RNTI calculation after RO configuration is determined.By the way, the current Option 2 may not be appropriate because if we change t\_id to (t\_id mod 80), no additional signaling overhead is required. The modification from Fujitsu makes Option 2 a totally different understanding from us, perhaps it can be Option 6. |
| Nokia | As indicated by other companies, we could return to this once we have agreed more details for RO. |
| Mediatek | We agree to defer this discussion after we have specific conclusions for RO configuration. |
| Futurewei | It is unfortunate that our proposal was not captured by the FL in his summary of this discussion. We reiterate our preference, which is compatible with Rel 16 NR-U RAR possible configuration.* In DCI:
 |
| Intel | We are fine with Proposal 2.4-1.  |
| CATT | We agree to discuss RA-RNTI calculation after RO configuration is determined. |
| OPPO | We agree to discuss RA-RNTI calculation after RO configuration is determined. |

#### **2nd Round Discussion Summary:**

Given that several companies express views that RO configuration needs to be resolved first, moderator will simply capture the different options in the summary for companies to review.

Moderator suggests not discuss this matter in GTW or try for agreement/conclusion. However, suggests companies to provide views on potential options so that the different options can be listed in the moderator summary for next meeting’s discussion.

I’ve added Option 6 and 7 above.

#### **3rd Round Discussion (on-going):**

If there are other options that companies would like other companies to review for further discussion in next meeting, please provide them.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Intel | We support Proposal 2.4-1, but ready to defer the discussion on it. |
| Moderator | Continue discussion & addition of options for reference in this table.Moderator will re-order the options in similar category at the end of the meeting, so that companies can use it for reference & discussion if needed. |
|  |  |

#### **3rd Round Discussion Summary:**

TBD

### 2.2.5 Other aspects on PRACH

* From [5] Nokia, NSB:
	+ Support SCSe for PRACH transmissions and consider how gNB can control use of SCSe for PRACH transmissions so that the maximum limit for the SCSe transmissions can be kept
	+ If LBT gaps are needed between ROs, it would be better to define fixed LBT gap time between valid ROs that do not depend on the time domain allocation of the PRACH. In that case the LBT gap length would not depend on the used PRACH format.
* From [11] Intel:
	+ Consider applying short control signal exemption to PRACH transmission by the UE.

#### Summary of Discussions

* Companies have provided discussion on considerations for PRACH design. The discussion includes, application of short control signal exemption for PRACH, and enable/disable of LBT for PRACH.

#### **1st Round Discussion:**

Moderator suggest to discuss the application of short control signal exemption in channel access agenda. If there are any other issues related to PRACH that requires discussion, please provide suggestions and inputs below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Qualcomm | For SCS = 120 kHz, a maximum of 4 and 2 FD multiplexed ROs can be used for sequence length = 571 and 1151, respectively, thus, the maximum number of FD ROs are reduced. Consider ways to increase the TD ROs (to maintain the same capacity) with minimal specification impact |

#### **1st Round Discussion Summary:**

Not to many companies have provided additional issues for discussion.

#### **2nd Round Discussion:**

Suggest continuing discussion and also comment on issue pointed out by Qualcomm.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Qualcomm | To further motivate the issue pointed out in the first round, the following are the straightforward options:* Option A: Re-use the existing design but use larger association period
	+ This may slow down initial access and increase UE power consumption
* Option B: Explicitly add more reference slots in a configuration period in Table 6.3.3.2-4 in TS 38.211
	+ Non-trivial spec work/time

Both options have issues and some more specification impact friendly approaches may be needed. In our paper, we have proposed:* Add more reference slots in a configuration period by:
	+ Alt 1: adding N additional slots every M reference slot​
		- Reuse existing Table 6.3.3.2-4 in TS 38.211​ (minimal spec impact)
		- N and M can be specified or indicated​
		- Example: PRACH Config. Index 0:​
			* Current table: Slot number = 4,9,14,19,24,29,34,39​
			* New values (N = 1, M = 2): Slot number = 4,5, 9,14,15,19,24,25, 29,34,35,39​
	+ Alt 2: adding one or more offseted version(s) (offset = L) of the slot number pattern to the existing one​
		- Reuse existing Table 6.3.3.2-4 in TS 38.211​ (minimal spec impact)
		- L can be specified or indicated and can be either added or subtracted to the existing slot number​
		- Example: PRACH Config. Index 0:​
			* Current table: Slot number = 4,9,14,19,24,29,34,39​
			* New values (L = 2): Slot number = 2,4,7,9,12,14,17,19,22,24,27,29,32,34,37,39​
 |
| Ericsson | We don't think such an approach suggested by Qualcomm is needed. A reduction in frequency domain ROs is a consequence of using longer sequences, but if this is a problem a, shorter sequence can be used. In other words, there are sufficient configurability tools in the spec to trade off RACH capacity/coverage. It is not needed to fundamentally change the PRACH configuration table or significantly alter interpretations of the table (which will lead to very long discussions). |
| LG | We share the same view with Ericsson that the additional slot is not needed. |

#### **2nd Round Discussion Summary:**

Continue discussion.

#### **3rd Round Discussion (on-going):**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We share similar view with Ericsson that the additional slot is not needed. |
| Qualcomm | The higher sequence length may be needed to improve coverage, but that does not necessary mean that capacity should also reduce. At sometimes we may need both. Thus we may need to have additional TD RO to account for the less FD ROs. |
| Moderator | Continue discussion in this table. |
|  |  |

#### **3rd Round Discussion Summary:**

TBD

# Summary of Agreements/Conclusions in RAN1 #105-e

TBD
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